U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS
THIRD SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 86—PART 15

APRIL 25, 1940, TO JUNE 6, 1940
(PAGES 2401 TO 3600)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1940

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

JUL 3 '41

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

Appendix

The Roosevelt Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR W. WATWOOD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Old Stuff," written by Arthur W. Watwood, and published in the Dallas News, Dallas, S. Dak., April 11, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (S. Dak.) News of April 11, 1940]

OLD STUFF

(By Arthur W. Watwood)

A late press dispatch quotes Hugh Johnson, of N. R. A. fame, as belaboring the Roosevelt administrations recently before a group of Wall Street Democrats assembled at a so-called Thomas Jefferson banquet.

In so criticizing the humanitarian work of Roosevelt, who has faithfully worked in behalf of the neglected and underprivileged masses of the Nation, Johnson is handing out the same "old stuff" used since George Washington's oldest dog was a pup.

Whenever a group of politicians, representing the plutocrats, exploiters, and big business grabbers want to discredit something or someone who has achieved success, either for the people or themselves, they arrange a banquet under the name of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, or some other famed individual. Instead of discussing principles advocated by such famous men, they proceed to misrepresent and, if possible, destroy, in the eyes of the people, a man or principle the voters should support.

What right has Hugh Johnson to say in the name of a Thomas Jefferson Democrat that Roosevelt has failed, when Johnson stands directly opposed to everything good and noble for which the great Thomas Jefferson fought during his lifetime?

No real Democrat, who believes that the Democratic Party should fight in the interest of the rank and file of humanity, needs to apologize for the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

CONDITIONS OF 1931 AND 1932

When Roosevelt was elected in 1932 this Nation was on the verge of a revolution; farmers were halting sheriff's sales; hungry people were breaking store windows to obtain food; millions of men and women and little children walked in soup lines; banks were failing by the hundreds; small-business men were going bankrupt; big-business men were crying for a Moses to lead them out of a wilderness into which their greed had taken them; soldiers of the late World War were marching to Washington as a protest of their mistreatment; wheat was selling for 20 cents a bushel; hogs were selling for $2.50 a hundred; corn wasn't worth the price of hauling to market; millionaires made paupers by their own financial trickery, approved by the Republican Party, were jumping out of skyscrapers; and everyone, including some of Roosevelt's modern-day critics, was clamoring for a change in government.

BETTER DAY—BUT NOT PERFECT DAY

Roosevelt brought us a better day, but not a perfect one. There is room for improvement in our Government, as well as in the general make-up of our economic system. We shall never see the day of perfection. We shall have to fight as long as there is time to get what we want—and then, perhaps, we shall get only a part.

But when critics like Hugh Johnson point a finger of scorn at Roosevelt, I say, "Let us look at the record."

Roosevelt has given us the best banking law we have ever had. He has given us the best farm program. He has given us the foundation of a social security system to help the aged, the crippled, the blind, and underprivileged mothers. He has helped education more than any President in the history of this Republic. He has taken millions of our young men and boys off the street and placed them in C. C. C. camps. He has helped honest business, whether large or small. He has made investments safe. He has helped to lift mortgages off farms and homes. He has reached out his hand to American labor. He has kept us out of war. In brief, he has fought for humanity.

Does Hugh Johnson think the American people have forgotten 1931 and 1932? The people—a grateful people—simply are not going to turn on Roosevelt, their tried and proven friend. If he wants a third term, he may have it; and I will do what I can toward helping him to win again. Only reactionaries, or people who fail to think about what Roosevelt has done, want him out of the way.

The American Attitude Toward the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D. D.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of the most eminent and inspiring living Americans is Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, of Massachusetts, who now approaches his ninetieth birthday. On April 10 he made a speech on the American attitude toward the European war which I think is so interesting and inspiring and full of wisdom that I should like to make it available to the Members of the Senate. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every Presidential candidate is claiming that if he is elected he "will keep this country out of war," and those promises are cabled around the world.

In return come back questions from correspondents (I have some from Americans in Europe), "Why does not our country come in and help the Allies? Tell us, and let the world know."

And then we proceed to give our reasons. We protest that we hate war and its carnage and murderous armament—so does almost everyone in the world. We assume, perhaps a little too easily, that no one suspects any of us of cowardice, or even of a desire to make money out of the war. And then we come to sounder reasons: it is a European war, economic, of national boundaries and historic racial rights, in which we have not an essential part. We say to our friends in Europe, "We sympathize with the causes for which you Allies are fighting—the right of small nations to life, the overthrow of military aggression, for the right of personal liberty, free speech, freedom of worship, those rights upon which Christian civilization is founded and upon which our country stands."

We continue our protestations: "We sympathize with you; we will help you with money and goods; we will sell you arms, if you will pay in cash and carry them away. It is your fight. We are a strong Nation, separated from you by the Atlantic; it is due future civilization that we keep strong in order that we may be able, whatever happens in Europe, to carry on Christian civilization. And when your fight is over, and, as we hope, the Allies have won, we shall be glad to advise you and, perhaps, be a mediator between you and your former enemies in laying the foundation of peace by the creation of a federation of countries, something like the economic and political Union which we, in this Nation, have had for a century."

Now I should not take your time in saying all of this if I did not have something to contribute which affects directly the members of this convention and all members of the church, indeed all citizens.

Has it occurred to you that this statement of reasons, which we think sounds so plausible and sympathetic, is so smug and patronizing that if it sinks into the minds of the allied peoples of Europe they will scorn us as hypocrites? Of course, the totalitarian states have no use, anyway, for our talk and boastings.

And now let us look more closely at the situation. The people of the allied nations have no fond imagination that they are on a picnic; they have solemnly pledged to fight this thing through to the end—to victory or to their own annihilation. They have tightened their belts and have put themselves under rigid forms of rationing, labor, service, taxes, and self-sacrifice. All their younger men have left their homes; every man, woman, and child is doing his bit. English, French, and other peoples—they are expecting to have their hospitals filled, their sons and lovers wounded and killed—and for what? For the defense of personal liberty, the rights and sacredness of the individual, the freedom of the press, religious liberty, Christian civilization. And then they look across at this country, great and strong, talking so sympathetically of the cause of the Allies, and yet in the same breath, saying firmly that we will not enter the war but that we will advise and may lead in the future.

Is not this the time for us to ask ourselves the question: What preparation are we making for carrying this Nation into leadership in civilization?

Here are some plain facts. Our country is piling up a debt of over $40,000,000,000, a sizeable percentage of which is used in giving us comforts for which not we but our descendants have got to pay; a country which has billions of gold stored in the mountains of Kentucky, whose drink bill is enormous, whose public gambling runs into the millions, whose Empire State has just adopted pari-mutuel betting, demoralizing to thousands of youth in order that the State may, as does Massachusetts, take a rake-off; a country notoriously lawless, whose luxuries, sports, and amusements are absorbing millions of dollars. We talk much of ourselves as a great and strong Nation, our citizens write eloquently of international brotherhood and good neighbors and pronounce us ready to help and lead the world, but this Nation will not risk a single life to join those who are defending the principles upon which our Nation is founded.

All these facts are well known to the peoples of Europe, many of whom are boiling with indignation. They may not say much publicly; it would not be prudent. We are a strong Nation and they must stay on good terms with us outwardly. We are, in my judgment, moving along a path which will make us suspected, unpopular, and even despised among all nations.

The truth is, and we know it when we take time to consider, that the strength of a nation is not in its material wealth, its military defenses or its form of government, except so far as these are supported by a people of character.

I name three qualities, which among many I select, which we should do well to cultivate; and my hope is that we may make this a personal matter for each one of us and not allow our thoughts to float off in vague generalities.

My first quality is honesty, a determination to face the facts, to stand for the truth.

A while ago, a presidential candidate thanked God that in this great and free country we could look into the eyes of every baby born in this land, of whatever color or race, with the assurance that it was within the possibilities that he might one day be President. A beautiful thought acclaimed throughout our glorious land. And yet that candidate knows, and we know, that there are several millions of citizens in the South, given by our Constitution the right to vote, who dare not go to the polls; and neither political party dares to make it an issue or protect the voter.

We proclaim the virtues of our democracy, but we know that the administration of some of our cities is wasteful or corrupt beyond the record of many cities of totalitarian governments. We dare not face the problem of balancing the Budget but leave it to our descendants.

We slip into habits of self-indulgence, of gaming, of drink, which are weakening the moral fiber of young and old. The people of Europe have tightened their belts and are ready for action. What are we—you and I—doing for plain, simple honesty and truth? Are we facing the facts while we talk of leadership?

Second: Intelligent sympathy with the conditions of others.

How glibly we talk of the situation in China, Japan, the Balkans, and Russia, when we have not the slightest knowledge of the history, the habits, the social life of those people. It seems as if some of us thought that about all that we have to do is to read the Constitution of the United States to any foreign people, shout "Democracy forever" and they will leap with enthusiasm to adopt a democratic government.

We are too apt to draw conclusions from our own narrow viewpoint. It was the mistake that Christian missions made long ago; trying to convert peoples of whose traditions, habits, and religion they knew little or nothing. That is all changed now; but the cause of missions suffers today because of that earlier, mistaken method of Christian men and women. That has been a weak spot in many international treaties: that the treaty makers have not known intimately or sympathetically the people with whom they were in treaty. You recall the stupid action of the Senate some years ago about Japanese immigration, an unintentional insult which Japan has never forgotten and which affects her relations to us to this day.

Coming to ourselves, as I get older I appreciate more and more the worth of imagination, the ability to put ourselves in the other man's place and try to think as he thinks. Without this we can have no intelligent sympathy. The development of rapid transit, the steamship, and the airplane are great and increasing agencies toward gaining such intelligence; but there must be a far more intimate knowledge and more patient study than is possible for the casual traveler. Each of us in our family, town, and neighborhood life has the opportunity to cultivate that imagination. The Italian, the Chinaman, the day laborer, whomever we pass upon the street, the man or woman who is at the opposite pole from ourselves in social life, has qualities and traditions of life, often very fine ones, of which we are totally unaware.

If peace ever comes to this world, real peace through good will, it will come only after the masses of people in each and every nation have the willingness and patience to understand each other and the sympathy to act upon that understanding. Good will must take possession before peace can settle down.

Third: Sacrifice. Besides friendliness and understanding, there must be a readiness to adjust ourselves to others by mutual sacrifice.

We know that a community is knit together by the members of the community joining in giving up something for each other. Our Union of federated States was accomplished because each Colony gave up something which it treasured; the doctrine of States' rights was tempered by sacrifice for greater unity. It is upon this ideal, is it not, that we hope, even though it may take

centuries, for a brotherhood or a federation of nations that will insure world peace.

What I am trying to press home is that we put a softer pedal upon our talk of Europe, war, and political and strategic guesses, and put a heavier emphasis upon the building of our own country in character and true leadership.

Recognizing our military and political force, our officers of government and our Congress, we know that we are founded upon the tradition and the fact that the people are behind them all; and not only the people as a mass, but each individual. What the people are, what they think and say and do, the official leaders and legislators will in time say and think and do.

Now, we the people are of good stock. From our forbears we—and I speak of the people as a whole, not the Sons of the Mayflower alone, but the hundred and thirty million—have the traditions of a religious faith; we have enterprise, optimism, determination, and above all we have ideals. Tap any American, and if you go deep enough you will find that however noisy or vacillating or wild he may be he has some ideals. The trouble is that in all of us our finest ideals are allowed to fall into the background under the pressure of everyday life, especially when, as in these times, the pressure of material competition is heavy; but the ideals are there.

The renaissance of Abraham Lincoln in these days is, I believe, a sign that we miss him—the honesty, the sympathy, and the sacrifice even unto death which were his. We want, and we know that we want to be finer, that we are not satisfied with life as it is with its superficiality, its evasions of hard duty, its everlasting pressure of trivialities. The need of today is to so kindle the finer life and arouse the ideals in every separate person that, in time, the mass will be leavened: the young of today will be the elders of tomorrow.

Here, my friends—and mark my words—here is our job.

If our civilization is to be a Christian civilization, then Christ must be behind and beneath it. The man or woman, however humble, who is by life and teaching, trying to lift just one person up to a finer character, is at the very heart of the movement for international peace.

Let us rise, each of us, to the dignity of our work as father, mother, teacher, pastor, men, and women who are trying so to live in the spirit of Christ that we have at heart the building of national character. We are far away from the realization of world peace, but each one of us can do his bit in the creation of a manhood and womanhood—honest, sympathetic, and ready to sacrifice self for the good of others.

My last word is this:

We recall the tradition of the aged Apostle John, Bishop of Ephesus, being carried through the city and with outstretched hands saying again and again, "Little children, love one another."

I am older than was John at that time, having been born just around the corner from this very spot 90 years ago next month. I do not have to be carried; I can walk. For 47 years I have been your bishop.

Whatever may be said of a world peace—cannons may roar or armies and navies may be silent—we are sure that, fundamentally, peace is a matter of the heart, the will, the temper, of the spirit, of personal and national character. The song on the birthday of Jesus Christ was of "good will, peace."

Therefore I can do no better than St. John, and repeat to you, my people, "Little children, love one another; little children, love one another."

Embellishment of Public Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM GILMORE D. CLARKE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, which I think should be of interest to the Members of the Senate and others.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, April 20, 1940.

MY DEAR SENATOR LA FOLLETTE: During the past several years the Commission of Fine Arts has supported a movement, inaugurated by this administration, to embellish public buildings in the District of Columbia and in the several States of the Union. This movement has conclusively demonstrated that we have in the United States artists—architects, painters, and sculptors—who have rendered most distinguished service in the professions of the arts.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully wish to emphasize the importance of maintaining the highest standards in respect to both design and execution of buildings erected by the Federal Government, for, in quality of excellence, the examples established in the art and architecture of governmental structures exert a potent national influence.

A serious handicap in the current movement to embellish public buildings has been the rather meager allotment of funds for sculpture and mural paintings. On many Federal post-office buildings but 1 percent of the total building cost has been allocated for the purposes of decoration. This sum seems much too small in consideration of the great influence which the work of competent painters and sculptors has upon the lives of people in all parts of the United States. In Italy, for example, 5 percent of the total cost of governmental buildings is the normal allowance for works of art developed collaboratively.

In the case of public buildings constructed in the National Capital since 1927, the percentages of the cost of sculpture and mural decoration, in relation to the total cost, were as follows:

	Percent
Building for the Department of Justice	3.5
Building for The Archives	3.1
Building for the Post Office Department	3.0
Building for the Department of Commerce	1.2
Building for the Department of the Interior	1.0
Building for the Federal Trade Commission	1.7
The United States Supreme Court	3.0

In many instances the allocations of funds for sculpture and mural painting have been, in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, woefully inadequate. It is the considered judgment of this Commission that appropriations for decoration should never be less than 3 percent of the cost of the building; often these appropriations might be increased to provide an allowance of from more than 3 to 5 percent of the cost of a given structure. In any case the percentage should be sufficient to meet the cost of decoration as may be determined by the governmental agencies in immediate charge of the design of each project in conference with the architect of each building. The needs for embellishment of public buildings, in consideration of the particular character or type of structure should be, we believe, fixed and not sacrificed later for unforeseen expenditures in other directions, as has frequently obtained in the past.

It is unnecessary to remind the Members of the Congress of the important place the fine arts have in the history of the great nations of the world. The record of national achievement is largely told in sculpture and mural painting; we usually think of the nations of the past in terms of their principal heritage, the fine arts. "Art confers immortality. A noble, artistic representation immortalizes the cause symbolized, the thought embodied, the individual portrayed."

The decoration of our public buildings has an important bearing upon the future of art in this country. Linked with our artistic development are questions of patriotism and culture. This Nation, while young, has, nevertheless, a notable record of oustanding achievement and noble and inspiring historic events which deserve to be portrayed for posterity in great and important works of art.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully present this problem to the Members of the Congress with the earnest hope that the art of the United States may be encouraged to grow and to find expression in association with buildings, great and small, erected by authority of the Congress in Washington and in the States of the Union.

Respectfully submitted for the Commission of Fine Arts.

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

HON ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Sale of Airplanes to Great Britain and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JACK PURCELL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I clipped from the April 24 issue of the Washington

Times-Herald entitled "Plane Sales Boon to Army, Says Air Chief."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 24, 1940]

PLANE SALES BOON TO ARMY, SAYS AIR CHIEF—GENERAL ARNOLD TESTIFIES AT SENATE HEARING

(By Jack Purcell)

The administration's policy of selling latest-type warplanes to the Allies is a great boon to this country's aircraft industry and enables the Army to obtain better planes at lower costs, Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps, told the Senate Naval Affairs Committee yesterday.

Testifying on the effect of these sales on the defense program, Arnold denied foreign purchases delayed in any way procurement of aircraft for American use.

QUOTA NOT ALTERED

He pointed out that production delays have been ordered only on those contracts for planes intended for reserve use. The quota of 3,337 planes for tactical combat by June 30, 1941, he said, has not been altered.

Therefore, Arnold declared, the 2,200 ships necessary for reserve strength will be top-notch planes constructed in the light of the war experience of previous models in combat duty with the Allied air armada.

CITES PLANE SALE

As an example, he cited the sale of the Curtiss P-40's to the Allies.

"It became apparent in the light of war conditions that our planes were not top notch," Arnold said. "One item, in particular, was the self-sealing gas tank," a German invention which automatically seals bullet holes.

"France and England had to substitute similar tanks for those in use. It's a wise move for us to delay production for increased plane performance, self-sealing tanks, and increased armament."

COURTESY EXCHANGED

Interrupting him at this point, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS (Democrat), of Maryland, pointed out that English and French planes were open to our inspection. Therefore, he said, we could take advantage of their technical improvements without revealing any of our own military secrets.

Benefits to the plane industry in foreign purchases, Arnold testified, are apparent in increased production space and employment.

In 1938 the aircraft companies had 6,089,000 square feet of space and employed 23,140 men. Today floor space has increased to 7,800,000 square feet and employees total 55,700, Arnold declared.

The Army air chief revealed that 4,000 war planes have been ordered by foreign buyers, of which 3,173 are for England and France. He said that 580 have already been delivered.

CLOSED SESSIONS NEXT

Arnold was the last major witness to appear before the committee on the House-approved $655,000,000 naval-expansion bill. Chairman DAVID I. WALSH (Democrat), of Massachusetts, announced that the committee will go into closed session next week to consider the measure.

Meanwhile, congressional protest against Rear Admiral Taussig's prediction that "war with Japan is inevitable" was voiced today by Representative HAMILTON FISH (Republican), of New York, perennial foe of the Roosevelt adminstration. FISH charged that Taussig's statement before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee Monday was the "most provocative, inflammatory, and dangerous remark made by any naval man in our time."

He suggested that Congress investigate all "warlike" forecasts or statements by naval officers, accusing them of embarking on a propaganda campaign every time a Navy bill is under consideration.

To Destroy Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK POST

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include therein an editorial which appeared in the New York Post, Monday, April 15, 1940, entitled "To Destroy Labor Standards." This editorial refers to the Barden amendments to the Wage and Hour Act, depriving 1,500,000 agricultural employees of the protection of this fine law, which has been so effective in raising the living standards of so many millions of working men and women. I was opposed to this bill when it was introduced last July and stated my position in the RECORD at that time. During the interim I have had an opportunity to observe the effective and beneficial operation of this law more thoroughly in my own State, and I am more than ever opposed to these amendments, which are designed to oppress the living conditions of the laboring classes. I concur in the opinion set forth in the following editorial that the Barden amendments would, in effect, destroy labor standards, and they will continue to receive my opposition:

[From the New York Post of April 15, 1940]

TO DESTROY LABOR STANDARDS

The wage and hour law now faces a fight for its very existence. The opponents of the act do not try for its outright repeal; the principles incorporated in the law are far too popular for that. Instead, its opponents propose amendments, cloaked in the attractive garb of "protecting the farmers" and clearing up "certain ambiguities in the statute." The suggested changes may sound innocent and not unreasonable. But as soon as their effects are understood it is clear that the amendments would destroy the law by exempting from its provisions those who most need its protection.

The emasculatory changes are incorporated in a bill introduced by Representative BARDEN of North Carolina, last July. The bill is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the House next week along with the Logan-Walter bill, which is also designed to hamstring New Deal activity under the guise of minor improvement in administrative procedure.

The Barden bill has nothing to do with the farmers, who do not come under the wage and hour law. It is simply a device to take away the law's protection from 1,500,000 employees who perform industrial operations on agricultural, horticultural, and dairy products from the time they have left the farm until they have reached the ultimate retail distributors. In October 1939, when the 30-cent hourly wage and the 42-hour week went into effect, only 650,000 workers got raises, and only 2,400,000 were benefited by the minimum-hour provision. By depriving 1,500,000 workers in the most poorly paid industries of the law's protection, therefore, the Barden amendments would vitiate the greater part of the law's effectiveness.

The wage and hour law was designed to put a floor under wages in some of the most shockingly underpaid industries in the United States and at the same time to fix a limit to impossibly long hours. In each case the minimum standards set were extremely modest—no more than a first step toward the conditions that would be socially desirable. After a year and a half the lobbyists for those who have maintained the lowest standards of employment are about to succeed in bringing their destructive amendments to a vote.

Congress should reply by treating the Barden amendments to a smashing defeat.

Is Secretary of Agriculture Wallace Interested in a Farm Program, or Is He Interested in a Political Campaign for the Presidency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of a program to help the farmer, some people are getting the idea that the Secretary of Agriculture is interested as much in building up a political machine as he is in getting aid to the dirt farmer.

A constituent from Allegan County, Mich., writes me as follows—I withhold his name, as the publicity might affect the number or the amount of checks which he might otherwise be eligible to receive from the Department:

APRIL 4, 1940.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am one of the A. A. A. committeemen of ——— township.

About March 1 a meeting was called of all the committeemen of the county, at a cost of over $300, which comes out of the farmers' soil checks, to boost a dinner to celebrate the anniversary of the A. A. A.

I am glad to say that the committeemen refused to act.

These meetings were called all over the country.

To that I replied, asking him as to where he got the information that it would cost $300 for the county dinner, and

whether he had any idea how that expense was met. To that letter he replied as follows:

APRIL 18, 1940.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: In reply to your letter of April 15.

A meeting of the community committeemen was called, or 72 of them, at $4.50 a day each, to push the dinner.

There were tickets printed with form to fill in with purchaser's name and address. Then a church or society could put on the dinner; then all the tickets sold were to be turned in, so that whoever was behind the affair would have the names and addresses of all those attending.

The pay to the committee members is charged to administration of the farm program, so comes out of the farmers' soil checks.

We were to get someone else to push the dinners so that our hands wouldn't show.

I give you this correspondence for what it is worth. I have introduced a privileged resolution, calling upon the Secretary to advise us how much, if any, truth there is in the statements contained in this letter.

Whether there is any truth or whether the farmer who wrote me bases his conclusions upon gossip among the farmers, justice demands that the situation be cleared, and that from authoritative sources; hence my resolution.

I trust you will watch for the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture.

New Deal Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the techniques developed by the New Deal administration to a greater state of perfection than it has hitherto ever reached in this country is the practice of letting high-ranking personages, either in or out of the Military Establishments, or the diplomatic ranks, make alarming statements which will find ready and permanent lodgment in the mind of the Nation and then, in order to evade official responsibility, later to disavow the statement. This has been the case so many times, in one form or another, during the last 7 years that it has come to be recognized as a part of the New Deal technique of propaganda.

Sometimes these utterances, speeches, testimony before committees of the Congress, or newspaper interviews, are fully disavowed. In other cases they are merely deprecated. In still other cases they have been referred to as indiscreet. In still other cases they are disposed of by a perfunctory assertion that they were merely personal views.

It remains a fact, however, and a very dangerous fact, so far as the peace and security of this Nation are concerned, that when diplomats of ambassadorial or ministerial rank, naval or military officers of the rank of admiral or general, or men or women of Cabinet rank make serious public statements, those statements not only lodge in the mind of the Nation but the people believe what is said. Therefore, it is deceitful and dangerous for any administration to promote propaganda and endeavor to mold public opinion by such technique as this.

It is true, of course, that perfectly honest, sincere, and able officers in the Naval and Military Establishments of the United States at times find themselves in positions where they are made to understand that statements which ordinarily they would be too discreet to make would be appreciated, even though departments of the Government or the White House might have to disavow them the next day. Such a position is a most delicate and uncomfortable one for any officer of the Navy or the Army, or for any other official of the Government, so far as that is concerned. Whenever any officer of the Naval or Military Establishment, or of any other department of Government, is so used by an administration, it is an outrageous procedure, and doubly dangerous because the people have no way of recognizing such utterances as propaganda.

There are times when courageous officers do speak their minds and their statements are later disavowed. There are other times when they speak their minds and get court-martialed for it. There are other times, as in the case of our Canadian minister recently, when the most indiscreet—not to say reprehensible—statements were made, and the official was permitted to continue drawing his pay, and was rebuked by a slight verbal tap on the wrist and an admonition to "please don't do it again." It would seem, however, he has been rewarded with the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate from New Jersey for his indiscreet speech.

It is always difficult, even for a Member of Congress, to tell when an officer of the Navy or the Army, or some other official, is speaking voluntarily or because of suggestions from "on high."

In any event the people of this country ought to and do regard any expressions or statements from any official, military or otherwise, which would persuade us to go into war, or which would tend to embroil us with other nations, with very great suspicion and disapproval.

It is just as much the duty of the Navy and the Army as it is of any other branch of our Government to do its utmost to keep the United States out of war with any other nation.

The greatest possible defense for this Nation would be just that—to keep it out of war.

There have been times—and the people should be alert—when it has seemed that men ordinarily known as being very discreet have made some exceedingly rash utterances at a time when it was almost like tossing a firebrand into a powder magazine to say such things.

All of these expressions do not change one iota the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people want their Nation to stay out of war.

Relation of Our Foreign Trade to the Problem of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the unemployment conference of the House, I was assigned the task of presenting to my subcommittee a study of the relation of our foreign trade to the problem of unemployment. In the course of this study I have examined this intricate problem from various angles. It is necessary to state at the beginning that the relationship of foreign trade to our whole economic structure is one of such major importance that a complete study and analysis would take months of intensive labor. Hundreds of statistical tables would have to be assembled and broken down. I, of course, was unable to indulge in any such elaborate undertaking. The following study, while hastily prepared, does, I believe, fairly present the highlights of the subject.

Those who study the subject with an open mind are bound to realize that our foreign trade gives employment to thousands and even to hundreds of thousands of our people. I am convinced that if this trade is developed by sound economic policies, such development will greatly expand employment and thus contribute materially to the reduction of our unemployment rolls.

I realize that many otherwise well-informed people look upon foreign trade as a very minor factor in employment.

It is commonly stated in an offhand way that, since our foreign trade is only about 10 percent of our total trade, it is of little importance one way or another and hence can have no vital bearing on the problem of unemployment.

Let us consider for a moment what this 10 percent of our entire trade means in terms of jobs. Normally there should be 50,000,000 employed men and women in the United States. Since it is conceded that foreign trade constitutes one-tenth of our entire trade, it is apparent that this means employment for one-tenth of 50,000,000 people, or the very important item of 5,000,000 jobs. What intelligent man or woman will sniff at that?

Furthermore, while 10 percent relates to the whole of our trade, it is a fact that many branches of industry are dependent upon foreign markets, not for a mere one-tenth of their business, but for as much as 40 or 50 or 60 percent of their business.

Take cotton, for instance. For many years over two-thirds of our raw cotton was regularly exported. Dr. James A. B. Scherer some years ago wrote a notable book showing that cotton had throughout the years paid what would otherwise have been an enormous adverse balance of trade. This book, Cotton as a World Power, is worth any man's reading, despite the fact that conditions have so greatly changed since its publication. Basically, it is a sound book and one that makes clear many problems not sufficiently well understood.

In order to show what conditions prevail at present in regard to the importance of our exports, I have dug out the figures in regard to the value of our exports in certain commodities and have figured out the percentage this bears to our total production of each of these.

It proved rather difficult to get all the data I needed, but I have made what I can guarantee are pretty correct estimates in the few cases where exact figures were not available.

Here is the table:

	Percent of production exported			Value of exports		
	1929	1933	1937	1929	1933	1937
Raw cotton	54.8	64.9	46.5	$770,830,000	$398,212,000	$368,660,000
Leaf tobacco	41.2	34.3	45.3	145,763,000	82,094,000	134,520,000
Wheat	22.5	4.5	7.3	192,292,000	18,592,000	63,977,000
Automobiles	12.0	10.9	10.0	541,396,000	90,630,000	346,887,000
Radio apparatus	5.6	14.1	12.0	23,122,000	16,126,000	25,454,000
Sewing machines	29.8	35.0	31.6	12,189,000	3,356,000	[1] 11,053,000
Office appliances	30.2	27.0	23.2	54,754,000	15,768,000	37,523,000
Borax	47.0	46.0	42.9	8,271,000	5,552,000	----------
Mining and pumping machinery	18.5	15.2	23.0	54,449,000	13,504,000	50,989,000

[1] For 1935.

I am not going to read the entire table, but running through it I find that in 1929, 54.8 percent of our raw cotton was exported, as against 46.5 percent for 1937. The value of our cotton exports in 1929 was $770,830,000, and in 1937, $368,660,000. Did these enormous sales in 1929 mean anything to the men and women engaged in producing cotton? Did these exports give work to only an insignificant number of people, or did they mean the difference between penury and comfort for hundreds of thousands of people? Of course, the first statement is false and the second is true. That is why no amount of propaganda can influence the cotton States against the reciprocal-trade agreements. They know what the export trade means to them in the way of markets, jobs, better prices, and better returns on each year's work.

The second item on the table is leaf tobacco.

Tobacco farmers and all employed in the tobacco trade watch with intense interest the rise or fall of the exports of tobacco. All know that when exports are high there will be more activity all along the line, with greater employment at better pay.

In 1929 our exports of leaf tobacco took care of 41.2 percent of our production. This fell in 1933 to 34.3 percent and rose in 1937 to 45.3. No one need point out which year brought better returns, with fuller employment in the tobacco country.

Wheat exports have varied greatly from year to year. As the table shows, in 1929 the percentage of our production exported was 22.5 or nearly a quarter of the crop. This fell to 4.5 percent in 1933 and rose to only 7.3 percent in 1937. No one here needs to be told how largely our wheat farmers and all the thousands of men and women who get their living from wheat farming depend upon the foreign market. We either must increase our exports, and do what is possible to stabilize them from year to year, or we must convert thousands of acres of first-class wheat land to some other use. That this involves great and difficult changes in the lives and fortunes of tens of thousands of families is apparent to all. The solution for this large part of our population is to promote exports of wheat and keep on promoting them. Thus only can the farmer and his family and his hired men hope to have any security in their jobs and in their purchasing power.

Turning to some of our great manufacturing industries that depend to a high degree on the export market, we find that from 10 to 12 percent of the automobiles produced in this country each year find a market abroad. When our production fell in 1931–33 armies of men were thrown out of work, with repercussions that affected every part of this country. The part that the falling off of exports of automobiles played in this is indicated by the fall of the value of the exports from over half a billion dollars in 1929 to $90,000,000 in 1933. How many men did this slump in exports throw out of work and put in the bread line? It is difficult to say definitely, but there were enough to threaten our entire employment structure.

The United States long ago took the international lead in the manufacture of sewing machines. In quality, appearance, price, and general superiority they ranked first. By consistent effort the manufacturers built up an enormous export sale of these machines, so that even in 1933 over a third of the sewing machines made in the United States was exported. This rose to nearly a half in 1937. The value exceeded $37,000,000 that year. That this gave employment to an army of workers in the factories is apparent. Not so readily recognized is the fact that this export trade also gave jobs to many railroad and other transportation workers and to a great organization of American salesmen, sales managers, and office workers both here and abroad.

An interesting item that I selected from many others is that of borax, which regularly exports very nearly half of each year's production. A lot of men and a lot of mules found work in mining and transporting borax. Without the export market they would have been in the surplus category.

One might go on indefinitely with the different products. For instance, the great dependence of our corn and hog farmers on the foreign market might be stressed. Or the value of exports to our fresh- and dried-fruit industries and to all the various canning factories might be noted. But I hope enough has been considered to bring out the basic fact that foreign trade means jobs, purchasing power, stability, and prosperity to men and women in almost countless industries.

Now, as to precisely how many people depend upon foreign trade for their livelihood, authorities differ. As I said in the beginning, it is commonly stated that our export trade in general constitutes one-tenth of our total. This should indicate 5,000,000 jobs when industry is active and times fairly good.

Looking at the latest summary made by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, dated January 19, 1939, we find a set of conservative figures. These estimate that the number of persons engaged in production and distribution for export was in 1929, about 3,198,000; for 1933, about 2,384,000; and for 1937, about 2,400,000. The percent of total employment in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and transportation in 1929 was 12.4; in 1935 it was 8.9 percent; and in 1937, 9.6 percent.

	1929	1933	1935	1937
Estimated number of persons engaged in production and distribution for export	3,198,000	2,384,000	2,088,000	2,400,000
Percent of total employment in agriculture, manufactures, mining, and transportation in the United States	12.4	11.1	8.9	9.6
Percent of total employment in all industries in the United States	6.6	6.0	4.7	5.1
Manufactures, total	846,000	374,000	468,000	673,000
Mining, total	102,000	49,000	57,000	75,000
Fishing	10,000	4,000	28,000	38,000
Agriculture	1,958,000	1,807,000	1,393,000	1,432,000
Distribution	267,000	139,000	154,000	204,000
Banking and marine insurance	15,000	11,000	12,000	12,000

These estimates, while doubtless as carefully made as possible, necessarily fail to include much employment indirectly due to foreign trade. For example, the total effect on our 31,000,000 farm population, living on over 6,000,000 farms, of a drastic drop in farm exports is not confined to them. The income of this population depends upon marketing their crops readily at fair prices. With as much as half the crop frequently depending upon the export market, the falling away of that market is ruinous. For it piles up surpluses, brings prices tumbling down, cuts the precious cash income to pieces, and destroys the farmers' purchasing power. At once the market for the products of industry falls. Farm machinery, automobiles, sewing machines, shoes, clothing, millinery, furniture, and all the other commodities the farmer ordinarily buys remain in the stockroom. Factories cut production and lay off employees. The railroads go into bankruptcy. In every industry the pinch is felt, with retrenchment and discharge of employees repeating itself in ever-widening circles. That is why it is impossible to state definitely the effect of our export trade on employment. All that we can assert with complete assurance is that it is much greater than even the five million estimate given at the beginning of this report.

The old mercantile theory that declared an excess of exports over imports created a favorable balance of trade, still prevails to a surprising extent. In fact, the feeling against imports is rather general. This is due to the theory that a dollar's worth of imports necessarily displaces a dollar's worth of goods that might otherwise be produced in this country by our own labor. The fact that one-third of our imports in 1937 was made up of crude materials for use in manufacturing and nearly one-seventh was crude foodstuffs that were processed here, is an answer to the displacement theory. These imports certainly gave jobs to our workers. Since they either supplemented an insufficient domestic production or were entirely noncompetitive, the truth is apparent.

Even the most rigid mercantilist admits that certain imports are essential to our industry and our well-being. Hence, little objection is made to bringing in such imports as crude rubber, tin in the form of bars, blocks, and pigs to keep our tin mills going, chemicals needed in industry, certain grades of wool and fibers required by our manufacturers, coffee, tea, and cocoa, and certain tropical imports not produced here. As a matter of fact, many other imports are essential to our industry and to full employment in our factories.

There is also a class of partly competitive imports that supplement our domestic production and are considered essential.

It is undisputable that imports directly or indirectly give employment to great numbers of our people. All sorts of rubber manufactures, food-processing industries, chemical works, and many other industries depend upon imports for their very existence. Hence, their employees owe their jobs to imports.

Manufactured imports also open employment to our people. Take such luxury articles as beaded or hand-embroidered bags, hand-wrought laces, carved or painted fans, perfumery, and dozens of other imports that appeal to those who indulge in such things. These imports maintain great importing houses, with their staff of experts, clerks, salesmen, packers, correspondents. Sent by truck, train, boat, or air to stores in all parts of the country, they help employment in all the transportation industries. In the small shops and large mercantile establishments they open jobs for salesmen and women. It is doubtless true that they do in some cases displace domestic products, but not to the extent that is generally thought.

In the end, of course, the whole question of imports rests upon the necessity of our taking imports to pay for our exports, and thus keeping our people employed in export industries. The only alternative is to take services, such as shipping and insurance, to build up great export balances and invest them in foreign securities, as we did to our sorrow in the era of Harding and Coolidge and Hoover, or to take imports for our exports. The truth is that trade is and must be an exchange of goods for goods or services or something of value. To speed up exports and dam up imports is to court disaster and create unemployment. Right now we are all concerned over the enormous amount of gold we are accumulating. This gold influx is due, first, to our too "favorable" balance of trade, which is partly settled by establishing credits here derived from gold imports. Second, our unwieldy gold stock is partly due to foreign investors snapping up the credits established by gold shipments and purchasing stocks and bonds and buildings and other investments here. Why? Because this is the safest country in the world for investments as well as for people. We can check or stop the imports of gold by developing the reciprocal-trade treaties in a way that imports and services will balance exports and services. That way means full employment for our people.

Incidentally, the influx of gold is not due to the price paid here for gold. That price is uniform in the United States and Great Britain.

In closing I wish to call your attention to this extract from a statement recently made by the State Department:

> Restoration of foreign trade is essential to the ability of industry to employ labor at high wage levels.
>
> Exports, although never making up much more than 10 percent of the total national production of movable goods, are important enough to make the difference between operating at a profit and operating at a loss in a number of industries. Reopening of profitable foreign markets means the opening of plants shut down during the depression, with consequent reemployment, not only of men to produce exports but of men to produce for home sales. Elsewhere, where export-trade losses have necessitated the spreading of work, wage increases or added working time result from increased foreign trade. These gains gradually spread through the entire economy. New employment resulting from increased exports is created not only for those workers employed in making radios for Brazil or office machines for the United Kingdom but for all workers in manufacturing, distribution, or service industries. Increased pay rolls in manufacturing mean increased travel by motor, rail, and water; increased consumption of meat and dairy products, etc.
>
> Evidence of the close relationship between foreign trade and domestic prosperity is found in the fact that increased factory employment has always accompanied increased foreign trade, while employment falls with decreases in foreign trade. This parallel not only refutes the theory that increased imports hurt domestic labor but further points to the fact that domestic activity depends to an important extent on the volume of foreign trade.

Can't the Waterway People Figure?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2337, the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman KITCHENS, made an attack upon S. 2009, the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill, which is based on entirely erroneous information.

In the first place, someone has misled Congressman KITCHENS into believing that the National Conference of Railroad Investors has raised a lobbying fund of over $100,000,000 in

behalf of this bill. There are today less than $11,000,000,000 in bonds issued by American railroads. Taking the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. KITCHENS'] own figure that the National Conference of Railroad Investors was requesting contributions of 5 cents for each $1,000 railroad bond, this would make approximately $550,000. When the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. KITCHENS] speaks of $100,000,000, he is just overestimating the amount the National Conference of Railroad Investors could raise under their scheme by 200 times.

This is not unusual, however, because we have all seen the wild and extravagant statements of proponents of the wasteful appropriations for waterways. In my short period of service in the House, I have never seen them make a conservative estimate about anything.

I want also to point out that the National Conference of Railroad Investors has no connection with the Association of American Railroads, or with the railroad employees' organizations. I do not hold any brief for the National Conference of Railroad Investors, but I am interested in a sound transportation system for this country.

S. 2009 is a step in the direction of bringing around stable and satisfactory transportation conditions, thereby benefiting all types of transportation—water, rail, and highway. I want to see happy and contented railroad employees, which is one of my first objectives, and S. 2009 is a step in that direction.

In Defense of the Cause of Trade Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM TACOMA (WASH.) LABOR ADVOCATE OF APRIL 12, 1940

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for some little time there has been pronounced criticism, by the tories, of trade unions. There is an increasing tendency manifest among commentators and writers of bitter criticism of the trade-union movement. I have been disturbed by the failure on the part of many thoughtful citizens to recognize the important part played in our national economy by the expansion and strengthening of unionism.

Because John McGivney, editor of the Tacoma Labor Advocate, is a brilliant scholar and student of the history of trade-unions, I believe an editorial appearing in the recent issue of the Tacoma Labor Advocate, which is the official organ of the Tacoma Central Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this editorial he devastatingly shatters certain criticisms directed at the trade-union movement. I commend the reading of the editorial to those who may be unthinkingly inclined to lend support to ill-considered criticism of trade-unionists.

The editorial is as follows:

FOR UNIONISM

Under the heading "Against Unions," here is a letter that appeared in the Post-Intelligencer of last Tuesday:

To the Post-Intelligencer:

Every so often some craze overtakes mankind and a great many people are coerced into believing that a panacea for a blissful existence has been found. Today such a dilemma is spreading through this Nation in the form of organized labor.

Unionism contradicts the first law of life—individual self-expression.

All gain is a result of intelligence. Intelligence is the result of initiative, that something which differentiates each from the other by means of individual expressiveness.

"Unionism aims at power through strength of numbers, and not, as it should, through strength of mind. Unionism makes men weak; because it deprives its adherents of the right to individual self-expression by competitive initiative. Competition is the incentive from which the power of initiative emanates, and when unionism deprives a man of his right to willful progress by out-thinking his contemporaries, it robs him of his life and soul.

"G. G. HOLT.

"SEATTLE."

We don't know what or who is responsible for the pessimistic views as to the unions which Mr. Holt has concerning them, and whether it was the breakfast he ate, or the hangover of the night before that made him see things in America as through a dark glass darkly.

He is, however, voicing an opinion which the votaries of the National Association of Manufacturers and other economic royalists have been expressing for some time, when every operator of an establishment, two by four or larger, see in themselves gifted, talented geniuses, and examples of the survival of the fittest.

Mr. Holt's idea that unionism contradicts the first law of life is very definitely a statement that all the facts of industrial history disprove. And the mere fact that with the advancement and progress of humanity, unionism also has progressed, should be enough to show this theorist that he is absolutely in error.

The fact is that unionism gives expression to the highest impulse in man and that to which man's survival is mainly due. The fact that mutual aid has in the history of living things been the main protection and the stay of all living animals, is one that no sort of illusion can destroy. And the tendency of mankind to get together in racial, class, national groups for their own protection is one that is so inherently hereditary that it has become second instinct with the children of men.

All gain, says Holt, is the result of intelligence. That of course is just a half truth, and certainly intelligence does not necessarily bring gain to the individual. The intelligence that makes a great invention may, nay it has, died in the workhouse. And the man whose wealth could acquire that invention, although born a dullard, may make an immense gain.

That intelligence is the result of initiative is not true. There can be initiative that is intelligence and initiative that is in its essence very stupid, but a man like Holt could not understand that. Unions can.

The statement is made that unions aim at power through strength of numbers, and not as it should, through strength of mind. That is very inconclusive. For strength of numbers is not necessarily incompatible with strength of mind, and it has been noted of old that two heads are better than one.

We would like to express resentment at the stupidity which declares with a brazen indifference to facts that unionism deprives its adherents of self-expression. What else has given the workers the right of self-expression but the unions which they established? No union worker has been allowed to apply the Bill of Rights on the job until recent days. He has been subjected to yellow-dog contracts and chased and smashed and scattered with spies and thugs and all the mechanism of suppression of which political tyrants in American industry were capable of sustaining. And in this, worse luck, they were sustained by judges with injunctive measures to shut up their attempts at self-expression and compelling them to an employer's subjection, regardless of the Bill of Rights, regardless of the law.

Holt sees in competition, that is, of man against man, worker against worker, an ideal condition. As, indeed, it is for the employers who thereby can work their will upon the men who produce all the wealth of the Nation. We confess that that sentence, "competition is the incentive from which the power of initiative emanates," is a new one on us. We don't know what it means, and we doubt if anyone else could interpret such a bunch of weedy hooey.

Quite otherwise is his declaration that when "unionism deprives a man of his right to willful progress by out-thinking his contemporaries it robs him of his life and soul." For one can very easily realize that such a theory of ethics would bring much consolation to a Capone, to a Dillinger, or a Baby-Face Nelson, to scrupulously avoid mention of eminent rogues in the more legitimate business world but whose ways are so singularly akin.

These attempts to attack unionism are becoming exceedingly general. They are expressions of hatred and resistance to the steady advance of the "craze," as Holt calls it. They are also efforts to take unionism down a peg, as the system of individualist enterprise has been taken down and debunked by the economic facts as to what followed the debacle of 1929 and the collapse of that system with almost the finality of the fall of Humpty-Dumpty.

The Townsend Plan—A Brief Study of Income and Statistical Background—Senate Authorizes Committee Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend plan is receiving more serious attention and consideration

in both House and Senate than ever before. I insert the news story which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, April 9, 1940:

SENATORS PROPOSE COMMITTEE STUDY OF TOWNSEND PLAN

Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, suggested today that the Senate Finance Committee might well begin a study of the Townsend old-age pension plan so that it would be prepared to deal with the legislation if it comes up next session.

A proposal for a study of the Townsend plan and a review of the operations of the present Social Security Act won bipartisan support in the Senate yesterday.

Senator DOWNEY, Democrat, of California made the proposal. He asked that the committee investigate and report to Congress on the system and on the Townsend plan.

Several Senators offered encouragement to the Californian. Senators LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts and LUNDEEN, Farmer-Labor, of Minnesota expressed the hope that Senator DOWNEY would obtain an early and complete hearing on the "General Welfare Act," incorporating the Townsend plan.

IDAHOAN PRAISES PLAN

Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Idaho said he thought the Townsend plan was the only one extant which "promises to keep money in circulation and keep the productive plant of the Nation at anywhere near capacity without the vicious counterpart of going into debt."

Senator MINTON, Democrat, of Indiana broke in to inquire what was being done about the Townsend movement, and Republican leader MCNARY suggested that Senator DOWNEY'S proposal for a special study be submitted directly to the Senate without the delay of reference to a committee.

Senator ASHURST, Democrat, of Arizona, said he wished to commend the legislation containing the Townsend plan "to the Senate and to the country." He said he believed Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend pension movement, had "hit upon a truth that may be the solution of the financial problems of this country—no appropriation without a tax to accompany it."

At one point Senator VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, interrupted Senator DOWNEY to comment that the social-security program entails "horrible discrimination against the less privileged."

A $6,000,000,000 YIELD ESTIMATED

Senator DOWNEY told his colleagues that the Townsend plan, on the basis of the present national income, would raise about $6,000,000,000 a year through imposition of a 2-percent gross income tax. The money, he said, would be distributed among 10,000,000 persons over 60, with payments averaging $50 a month.

At the present time, he said, old-age pensioners received an average of $4 a week.

On April 22, 1940, a special subcommittee consisting of the following Senators was appointed: GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman; CONNALLY, of Texas; BYRD, of Virginia; HERRING, of Iowa; JOHNSON of Colorado; LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and TOWNSEND, of Delaware. The appointment of this senatorial committee, which will make a thorough study and investigation of the Townsend plan, marks the greatest forward step and recognition accorded on the proposal in the history of the Townsend movement, and should be a source of gratification to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth a brief study of income and statistical background relating to the pending Townsend bill, H. R. 8264, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], and S. 3255, introduced in the Senate by Senator DOWNEY, of California. Reply will also be made in the course of these remarks to the recent speech against the Townsend bill by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

FIRST. HOW MANY PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES ARE PAST 60?

On page 86 of volume 1 of social-security hearings will be found the Bureau of the Census figures and estimates prepared by W. L. Austin, director.

In 1930 there were 10,385,026 persons 60 years of age and over. The estimate for July 1938 was 12,450,000.

HOW MANY OF THESE ARE EMPLOYED?

In 1937, according to the same authority, more than 4,000,000 past the age of 60 had jobs. At least half of these, because of earnings, might reasonably be expected to continue their employment. Not more than 10,000,000 persons are, therefore, expected to apply for pensions under the Townsend plan.

The new Townsend bill proposes to finance its program by means of a 2-percent gross-income tax applied to incomes in excess of $250 per month or $3,000 per year. The net returns from this tax are to be equally divided between citizens past 60 without regard to race, religion, color, or sex.

Income of religious, labor, fraternal, civic, service, and charity organizations of a nonprofit nature is exempt from the tax, as well as payments received on insurance policies, or in compensation for injuries or death under employer's liability.

HOW MUCH PER MONTH WILL EACH RETIRED PERSON RECEIVE?

This depends on the national gross income. On page 83 of volume 1, social-security hearings, there will be found gross-income totals for 1934 of $271,000,000,000, and for 1936, $449,000,000,000. Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, in preparing his estimates of possible yield of the 2-percent tax, used a conservative gross-income figure of $365,000,000,000. From this he subtracted $65,000,000,000 to cover the exempted incomes of the lower wage, salary, and business groups, as well as exempt income of firms and individuals with incomes over $3,000. This leaves $300,000,000,000 subject to a 2-percent tax. The gross incomes of individuals and companies receiving less than $3,000 per annum is $44,614,889,000. The exemption of the first $3,000 allowed to those who will pay the tax amounts to $12,080,000,000. These statistics were estimated by reference to the pay-roll data of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivor's Insurance, Social Security Board, while the census of business for 1935 supplied the data in regard to companies under the $3,000 level. See also Bureau of Agricultural Economics for rural community income figures. The exempt income of businesses grossing more than $3,000 annually was obtained by multiplying the number of such firms by $3,000.

As the figures used are authoritative, and the estimates derived from them conservative, we may reasonably look for a 2-percent net tax yield of $6,000,000,000 annually; which, when divided amongst the 10,000,000 annuitants, will provide a minimum pension at the outset of approximately $50 per month. The first month the law is in operation, there will be paid out $500,000,000. This should turn over at least 5 times, providing an additional two and a half billion dollars of gross income, a large part of which will be subject to the tax.

In order to encourage home markets, to stimulate turnover and prevent hoarding, each annuitant must spend his pension within the United States, and within 35 days of its receipt.

It seems logical that through enforced circulation, as outlined, there will be a gradual increase in general prosperity and a gradual rise in the amount available for pensions. This rise should continue under proper control until the Nation approximates full-demand production.

To provide opportunities for youth, beneficiaries will not be permitted to engage in any gainful occupation. To discourage slothfulness, annuitants are forbidden to support any able-bodied person in idleness except husband or wife.

Thrifty pensioners are not to be penalized for their past productive efforts, and so are permitted to collect interest, rents, or other revenues from their own investments.

The right to receive retirement compensation is not transferable under the Townsend Act and none of the moneys or rights are subject to attachment. It is, however, considered to be the duty of the annuitant to pay his just obligations and to allot at least 10 percent of any monthly installment for obligations incurred before any pension money was received.

THE TOWNSEND BILL HAS TEETH

Fines not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 10 years, or both, may be imposed for attempts to evade the payment of the 2-percent tax or for the making of false returns or statements.

CERTAIN OPPONENTS OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN USE AS THEIR STOCK ARGUMENT THE FEAR OF INCREASED TAXATION

While it is true that there will be a per capita rise in the income of the elder citizens, this rise will be largely met by savings in other forms of taxation. The social-security tax, for instance, amounting to 6 percent on pay rolls, will be wiped out along with charity age pensions, institutional care, and other expenses. The Townsend plan offers a tested, simple, and almost painless method to provide the

funds necessary for age security. Instead of taxing the lower-income groups, as under the social security pay-roll tax, the Townsend plan begins where social security leaves off and assesses those best able to pay. That the tax will be reflected in a slight increase in the cost of living is to be expected, but this increase should not exceed 5 percent and enables all to share justly in the expense. The low wage and income groups, however, will enjoy a 2 percent tax exemption, and so their increased cost of living should not exceed 3 percent, no more than the social-security tax, which will be abolished.

Our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee and one of the ablest and most industrious Members on the Republican side of the House and a vigorous opponent of the Townsend plan, brings up a point which has confused many. He states:

> The bill proposes a 2-percent tax on gross incomes, but provides an exemption of $3,000 per year. In other words, if a man receives a salary of $3,000 per year he pays no tax. If a merchant has gross sales of $20,000 and has a net profit of 7½ percent, or $1,500, after taking out an exemption of $3,000 on his gross income, he would pay 2 percent on $17,000, or $340. In this particular case the man with an income of $3,000 in salary would pay no tax, while a man with a net income of $1,500 in a business would pay $340, or 22½ percent, on his net income.

The fallacy in the above argument lies in the apparent failure to understand the operation of our present tax structure.

Let us say that the man in the above illustration is in the automobile business, and before the imposition of the 2-percent tax sold 20 cars at a thousand dollars each. After the imposition of the tax he would simply add $20 to the price of each car, not disturbing his profit margin. That is exactly what this automobile man and every businessman does with his taxes—he adds them to the price of his product. And that is exactly what would happen when the Townsend plan is in operation.

To illustrate further, we will point to the gasoline or cigarette business. Here are two industries which carry taxes of from 40 to more than 50 percent. Yet the wholesaler, the middleman, and the retailer add their costs, taxes, and profit, and business continues.

The gentleman from New York also states:

> Now, it appears that only 30 percent of the gross income is received by individuals and corporations whose gross income exceeds $3,000 a year.

Unfortunately, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does not tell us to whom it appears, where it appears, or how it appears. It magically appears. From the authentic figures it may be estimated that considerably less than one-sixth of the national gross income is received by firms and individuals grossing less than $3,000 per year; while approximately five-sixths of the gross income may be accounted for in the higher income brackets and therefore will be subject to the tax.

The gentleman from New York, Representative TABER, has evidently confused net family and individual incomes with individual, family, and gross corporation incomes. See National Resources Committee report, "Consumer Incomes in the United States," August 1938, p. 6, table 2, column 6—30.9 percent of the aggregate net income received by families and single individuals with net incomes in excess of $3,000. Of corporative gross income, considerably less than 1 percent goes to corporations receiving less than $100,000 annually. Reference is made to Statistics of Income for 1936 (Bureau of Internal Revenue), pt. 2, pp. 9–10 and 39.

The gentleman from New York goes on to say:

> In other words, taking the figures offered to us by the advocates of the bill (Townsend bill), and nothing else, and using a pencil and paper to figure it out, we find that adding practically $1,600,000,000 to the taxes of the country would only result in the payment of $12.25 to each individual pensioner.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does not use the figures offered by the Townsend-plan advocates. He uses his own figures and his own methods to arrive at his conclusions. He says that present pay-roll taxes on business have operated to stifle and prevent recovery. Yet he gives the Townsend plan no credit for entirely stamping out the pay-roll taxes on poverty and shifting the burden to the shoulders of those best able to sustain it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says:

> I doubt very much the ability of the people in this country under 60 years of age to pay taxes enough to provide a substantial pension to those over 60.

We are compelled to wonder if the gentleman from New York doubts the ability of American productive enterprise to produce goods and services sufficient to meet the legitimate needs of our elder citizens. If it is physically possible to produce the goods and services necessary to assure an American standard of living to our elders, then certainly it must be possible to evolve a bookkeeping or financial system capable of distributing these goods.

Our leading manufacturers, engineers, and economists are agreed that due to the far-reaching technological improvements in the past decade our full productive capacity has increased to such a degree that in this year of 1940 it is probably 50 percent greater than in 1929. The enormous extent to which we could increase our national income is indicated by the estimate of the Brookings Institution that in 1929, when it was ninety-four billions in goods and services, we only utilized 81 percent of our capacity, allowing 19 percent to remain unused. We could readily have produced twenty billions more, or one hundred and fourteen billions of goods and services instead of ninety-four billions. The Government's national survey of potential production capacity shows that in 1929 we could have produced one hundred and thirty-five billions, or forty-one billions more than we did.

Our national income this year will probably be about seventy billions, as compared with the figure of eighty billions envisioned by President Roosevelt and the one hundred billions which Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, recently declared to be possible. Estimates of possible national income run as high as one hundred and fifty billions by some of the most eminent engineers, scientists, architects, and builders living today, based, of course, upon the assumption that we would utilize upon a sound economical basis our full productive capacity by producing first and foremost a maximum of foodstuffs, clothing, and housing for all our people and then proceed to provide slum clearance, superhighways, airports, flood control, health and sanitation, antistream pollution, river and harbor improvements, reforestation, irrigation, reclamation, and armed and equipped with the products of the test tubes and crucibles in our laboratories, by adopting the Townsend old-age pension and national-recovery plan, abolish poverty, disease, and crime in America.

Development of the White River in Missouri and Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, OF ARKANSAS, BEFORE THE HOUSE FLOOD CONTROL COMMITTEE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I herewith insert in the RECORD my testimony before the House Flood Control Committee on the development of the White River in Missouri and Arkansas, as follows:

> Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, you and all of the Flood Control Committee have been so patient and considerate with us on all of the matters that have been presented in behalf of the White River Basin that I am almost embarrassed to ask your indulgence further.

The first testimony for the White was given by Lt. Col. Stanley L. Scott, district engineer, of Little Rock, on Saturday, March 23. Then on Monday, March 25, you heard five witnesses, all from the territory affected—three county officials from Arkansas and two from Missouri. Then on Monday, April 1, you heard six State officials, three county officials, and two private citizens, all from Arkansas and from the territory affected. Today, and especially for the benefit of you members who did not hear the witnesses from the White River, I should like to make a general and supplemental statement.

THE WHITE RIVER

To give you a bird's-eye view of the White River, I should like to lay before you these small maps prepared by the engineers. You will note that it rises in northwest Arkansas, in the Ozark Mountains, and flows northward a distance of more than 100 miles into Missouri, then bears eastward for a hundred miles or so and flows back into Arkansas, then southeastward through the mountains again and down into the lowlands and on to the Mississippi just above the mouth of the Arkansas, a total distance of 733 miles. The basin covers 28,000 square miles, in whole or in part 41 counties in Arkansas and 21 counties in Missouri, or an area only 12,000 square miles less than the celebrated Tennessee. Three-fourths of this area, or 21,000 square miles, is above the point where the river leaves the mountains and 7,000 square miles is in the rich alluvial valley below the mountains and subject to the floods.

The CHAIRMAN. At what place?

Mr. ELLIS. Batesville, at mile 301 above the mouth. There is one thing that the White can always be depended upon to do, and that is to furnish approximately one-fifth of the waters of any major flood below its confluence with the Mississippi.

PROJECTS AUTHORIZED

The Congress authorized, by the Flood Control Act of 1938, six small flood-control reservoirs on the White. The specific authorization I quote as follows:

"WHITE RIVER BASIN

"The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the White River Basin, as set forth in Flood-Control Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, is approved and for the initiation and partial accomplishment of said plan there is hereby authorized $25,000,000 for reservoirs; the reservoirs to be selected and approved by the Chief of Engineers."

The act of 1938 also provides:

"That pen stocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission."

House Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, to which the authorization act refers, lists the following projects, which are of course now authorized: Norfork, Clearwater, Lone Rock, Water Valley, Greers Ferry, and Bell Foley. These are all on the tributaries and would cost, according to plans as of that date, a total of $55,297,000. These projects, developed for power also, would cost a total of more than $100,000,000, according to the present plans of the engineers, and the $25,000,000 ceiling placed in the 1938 act virtually precludes any progress on the plan. I will come back to that again in a minute. Two of these projects, in fact the two largest, are in my district. They are the Norfork and Lone Rock. Incidentally, the only reason, I understand, that no projects were authorized in 1938 for the main stem of the White was that there had not been adequate surveys and reports at that time, due to the fact that certain power companies held licenses from the Federal Power Commission, which have since been canceled, to construct hydroelectric projects on the main stem. It is putting it mildly to say that we feel that the situation has gotten to the point where a tragic error will be committed, to the very great detriment of our people, unless this committee and the Congress revise the 1938 authorization.

OUR REQUESTS FOR FURTHER AUTHORIZATIONS NOW

Mr. Chairman, we are making three specific requests for authorizations at this time, at least two of which we feel are imperative.

The CHAIRMAN. We recall your former statement, and without meaning to interrupt we have had under consideration here the matter of changing your authorization with respect to the Norfork Reservoir so as to provide for the power. Would you favor that change or modification?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, indeed, we favor it. Everybody in that country favors it.

I

First, we are asking that the $25,000,000 ceiling placed in the 1938 act be raised. Clearwater and Norfork, authorized in the 1938 act, have already been selected and are regarded as started. For instance, there was a Budget allotment this year of $2,400,000 for Clearwater and $2,200,000 for Norfork, on the basis of a $70,000,000 appropriation for flood control. Clearwater will cost an estimated $15,900,000 and Norfork an estimated less than $10,000,000 for flood control only.

The CHAIRMAN. With respect to Bull Shoals and Table Rock and other allied interests, as you know, we have not a report on those projects yet, and, as the gentleman knows, we are without authority to include any of those projects in the committee report which it may or may not make on these projects.

Is there any other recommendation on any other projects except the modification at Norfork you wanted to bring particularly to our attention?

Mr. ELLIS. I understand not, except we want the ceiling raised, unless the reports get in on Bull Shoals or Table Rock.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is not your fault, because I know you have done everything in your power to see that it got here.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And the engineers have done a swell job.

II

Secondly, we are asking authorization for Bull Shoals (substitute for Wild Cat Shoals) and Table Rock Reservoirs. Much to our disappointment, the report on these projects, on which the engineers have now been working for some 2 years—although they have been made by the district and division offices to the Chief of Engineers—have not as yet had time to clear through the Board and to reach the Congress in the form of a formal report. It is generally known that favorable recommendations are coming through for dual-purpose reservoirs at these sites—that is, flood control and power—and that the two reservoirs, completed, will cost around $72,000,000. If you deem it advisable to authorize these projects in substantial accordance with plans now on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, then we would like very much to have such an authorization at this time. These projects are both on the main stem of the White.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the amount needed for Norfork to provide for the additional authorization?

Mr. ELLIS. $5,000,000, Mr. Chairman, not including the powerhouse, equipment, and transmission lines.

The CHAIRMAN. You wish to provide an additional authorization of $5,000,000 for the dam?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

III

Thirdly, we are asking specific authorization of an additional $5,000,000 for the Norfork project, as provided in my bill, H. R. 9037, and Senator MILLER'S companion bill, S. 3668, on which favorable reports and recommendations have been received by this committee from both the War Department and Federal Power Commission.

IV

We are also requesting a resolution from this committee for further surveys on the upper White, and particularly at Beaver, and on the upper Buffalo, and particularly for the proposed site near the mouth of Mill Creek.

I will discuss these requests further in a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to now call your attention to the general situation in the White River Basin.

FLOOD-CONTROL BENEFITS

The Army engineers tell us in their various documents that at the height of the record flood of 1927 the White River was discharging 440,000 cubic feet of water per second into the Mississippi, or approximately one-fifth of the floodwaters below that point. They tell us that for 12 days, from April 23 to May 5, it averaged a discharge of over 300,000 cubic feet per second and that during the 16 highest floods for the past 50 years its contribution has averaged from 50,000 to 440,000 cubic feet per second. This means, of course, that not only the 7,000 square miles of the alluvial valley of the White but an additional 50,000 square miles in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, below the mouth of the White, are subject to the floodwaters of the White.

If you look, gentlemen, at this map of the basin which I hold in my hand you can see that the rainfall over this tremendous mountain region finally forces itself through a funnel-stem into these lowlands. The average fall of the river in the upper three-fourths of the basin is approximately 4 feet per mile. In the lowlands the fall is barely one-third of a foot per mile. It takes no stretch of the imagination to see these floodwaters piling up with terrific force the instant they hit the plains.

It is not possible, as you know, to adequately estimate flood losses. However, the engineers have arrived at a few figures which are worthy of consideration. They tell us that this region has experienced seven floods during the period from 1927 to 1938, inclusive, and that the average annual direct flood losses exceeded $2,500,000, the major portion of which are crop losses. Think of it, gentlemen, $2,500,000 average per year in the valleys of the White alone. The six small reservoirs authorized will control a total of 2,730,000 acre-feet or only 24 percent of the drainage area of the White. These six, it is estimated, would lower the height of the White at the Mississippi approximately 1 foot.

It would serve no point here, Mr. Chairman, for me to review for this committee the horrible scenes—scenes in which homes and human life are always destroyed—which come to us in Arkansas in each of these floods, but I would like to remind you that gradually and year by year the floods are making it increasingly difficult for the people to survive in the valley, because of the reasons, first, that they are wiping out property and crops and human life; and, secondly, that they are gradually covering the lowlands—not with rich silt as in the ages past—but with sand and clay; and, thirdly, that there is now a more irregular stream flow, due to the clearing away of the highlands and the quick run-off which now manifests itself in the floods. This is further magnified by the filling of the river bed with sand and gravel. The water level of the vast irrigated rice lands in the lower White is gradually going down to the point of the impossible. There is testimony in the hearing here now that

today they are having to pump water an average of 100 feet. Only a few years ago it was much less.

POWER BENEFITS

Gentlemen, regardless of how some of you feel toward the development of multiple-purpose dams, and even if you should be opposed to them as a general proposition, we believe that the peculiar circumstances here involved entitle us to special consideration. First, because in this vast area, a region 700 miles long and several hundred miles wide, there is not a ton of coal, a barrel of oil, nor a cubic foot of gas. In other words, we have no natural power. In this region there are several counties in my district alone that have no electricity whatever even in the larger towns, except from local power plants, most of which are selling their current at a rate upward of 15 cents per kilowatt-hour, and not giving efficient service either. Underlying this whole mountain region are vast and valuable mineral resources in commercial quantities, none of which are being developed because of the lack of power. In other words, our people are, and have been for a long, long time, crying out for hydroelectric development along the White. Power companies held licenses over decades but never built dams, except one small, 50-foot dam at Ozark Beach in Missouri.

The comprehensive development of the White River Basin includes flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation, navigation, and irrigation for rice culture. It is true that there is little demand for flood control in the hilly or mountainous three-fourths of the basin, for the valleys are generally narrow, rocky, and little cultivated near these proposed dam sites.

Incidentally, I might say here, too, that these would all be comparatively low-cost undertakings for the reason that there would be practically no valuable lands inundated as compared with the average reservoir projects, no highways to relocate, except the raising of one across one reservoir, no railroads to relocate, and no towns to relocate, except one town of 100 or so people.

The Federal Power Commission and the Army engineers agree that "more than 500,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power are potentially capable of development in the White River Basin, with an output of more than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually." The Federal Power Commission advises me that there is a ready market in this region for more power than any one of these dams would generate and that there would be sufficient market for the power of the second largest dam by the time it could be completed.

The Federal Power Commission, for instance, advises that:

"In the power supply areas, which include St. Louis, southern Missouri, southeastern Kansas, Arkansas, and northern Louisiana, the load requirements in 1936 were about 805,000 kilowatts and 4,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

"The rate of growth of energy production, which is representative of the rate of growth of consumption or requirements, for the 15 years from 1921 to 1936 (both inclusive) in Missouri, Arkansas, and Kansas, has been as follows: Missouri, 6.13 percent annually; Kansas, 7.25 percent annually; Arkansas, 4.85 percent annually."

I wish to point out, too, that these growths are compounded, or the rate of increase over the previous years.

"The weighted rate of growth for the three States is about 6 percent annually It may be seen that the 175,000,000 kilowatt-hours which could be generated at Norfork is about only 4 percent of the 4,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours consumed in this general area in 1936. Based upon the rate of growth experienced in the 16 years stated, it is probable that the consumption during this year will increase to approximately 5,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours."

The rich minerals of the basin include lead, zinc, manganese, aluminum, marble, phosphate, silica, sulfur, iron, commercial clays, limestone, glass sands, and many others. Just as one specific instance of how the high power rates are holding us back—and incidentally the power rates of the larger power companies operating in this country are enormously high, due partially to the fact that they have to transport the power for such long distances—I call your attention to the fact that a silica plant operating at Rogers, Ark., has recently been forced to install its own power plant in order to keep operating.

Right here I would like to answer some of the questions which were propounded during the hearing on the proposition of this power being generated in competition with power now being sold in Arkansas.

Mr. Tom Fitzhugh, chairman of the State utilities commission, when testifying before you, told you that more than half of the power generated in Arkansas is imported from outside the State. Some of it is being purchased from the Tennessee Valley Authority, but this is only peak power, which is taken in the rainy season. Except for the lower region of the White, it is between two and three hundred miles from this area to the nearest power source on the Tennessee, including Gilbertsville, now under construction. Part of our power is being produced in Oklahoma. This is 150 miles to the nearest point of the White and more than 300 miles from what we might call the center of the basin, where these proposed projects are to be located. By far the outstanding power source for Arkansas, however—and two other major companies have first claim on this—is Monroe, La., a distance of more than 200 miles to the nearest point of the White River Basin and a distance of nearly 400 miles to the center of the basin. In other words, gentlemen, any power we use in that basin, with a few minor exceptions, comes more than 200 miles, and we just can't survive under these circumstances.

If the Creator ever intended that the White River Basin be settled at all, he must have planned hydroelectric development. As was testified to here in the hearings, there are more springs on the upper White than on any other two rivers of its size in the United States. According to the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, in its publication entitled "Large Springs in the United States" (1927), the Nation's springs have been identified and classified. Those yielding 100 cubic feet of water per second are classified as springs of the first magnitude. A second-foot of water is equal to 646,000 gallons daily. According to this document there are only 65 springs in the United States having an average annual discharge of 100 cubic feet per second, and 6 of those, as shown on page 17 of that document, are in the upper reaches of the White River in Missouri and Arkansas. There is only one spring of the first magnitude, according to this document, east of the Mississippi and north of Florida, and it, Mr. Chairman, is in northwest Alabama. There are only 12 such springs in the whole Mississippi Valley, 3 in Montana, the 1 in Alabama, and 8 in this Ozark region. There are springs of the first magnitude in only 9 of the 48 States. Most people don't know what a big spring is. Some of the largest in the world feed this White River 12 months of the year. More than half a hundred of them are virtually rivers gushing from the mountainsides.

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have all of those significant names out there: Bull Shoals, Wild Cat Shoals, Eureka, and so forth. Now, give us the names of some of your big springs and tell us how big they are.

Mr. ELLIS. We have Mammouth Springs in Arkansas, which has 161,500,000 gallons daily flow; and we have Big Springs in Missouri, which has 276,488,000 gallons flow per day—sizable rivers gushing out of the ground. And so I repeat the statement, Mother Nature seems to have provided the White River with a more even year-round flow, which is so much desired for water-power production.

I may call your attention to the fact that so far as we know there is no opposition to this hydroelectric development by power companies operating in this region. Officials of these companies have recently made the statement that it is absolutely necessary for them to look for new power sources and that it is their hope that they will be able to buy power produced at these projects. This is some evidence of the emergency which exists.

Here is another thought, gentlemen, in connection with power. When you develop a flood-control dam that costs, let us say, $10,000,000, the benefits that come manifest themselves in property held by individuals. When you expend, let us say, an additional $10,000,000 for power, the benefits that come manifest themselves first in increased standards of living for individuals. But what is perhaps more important right now, they pay for themselves in direct returns to the Federal Government not only the full $10,000,000 but more. There is also a new thought concerning power development, which I have observed in recent reports, not only of the Federal Power Commission but of the Army Engineers, that it is often the case that when the floods come not only the flood-control head on these reservoirs will be empty but a portion of the power head will also be empty, and therefore both the flood-control head and part of the power head can be used to store floodwaters. The power head, therefore, also facilitates flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any greater possibilities for power facilities west of the Mississippi River and east of the Colorado?

Mr. ELLIS. I understand that is right. With the exception of the Tennessee there are no such possibilities.

The Federal Power Commission says 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours can be developed there annually.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the estimated cost if this $5,000,000 is added to Norfork?

Mr. ELLIS. Twenty million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. And what would be the estimated cost of the Bull Shoals Reservoir providing for power, on which we have not yet received a report, according to the information?

Mr. ELLIS. Seventy-two million dollars for the two projects.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Bull Shoals and what?

Mr. ELLIS. Table Rock.

The CHAIRMAN. How far are they apart?

Mr. ELLIS. About a hundred miles.

The CHAIRMAN. Table Rock is up in the district by Mr. SHORT?

Mr. ELLIS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And Bull Shoals is represented by the gentleman speaking at the present time.

Mr. ELLIS. That is right.

NAVIGATION BENEFITS

Another thing that is retarding the development of the White River Basin is the high freight rates which we endure. Our rates are 75 percent higher than in the official zone. We do have certain minerals and natural resources that are peculiarly adapted to water transportation, and it could be developed without interference with railroad traffic. One would enhance the other, as I see it.

The White is considered navigable to Branson, Mo., a point 520 miles from the mouth. As a matter of fact, it is navigable only to Batesville, Ark., 301 miles above the mouth. However, the gradual lowering of the water level and the filling of the river with sand and gravel are virtually destroying water transportation. If this river were made navigable to Forsythe, Mo., as can easily be done according to the engineers, the low water rates would not only increase water transportation but would bring lower transportation rates and would greatly increase railroad transportation, and all this would add to the normal development of the region.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

The Ozark uplift in the White River Basin has long been noted for its recreational attractions. At the Ozark Beach Dam on the

White it is estimated, as was testified here by Rex Allman, of Forsythe, Mo., who lives near the dam, that the investments and improvements around the lake shore far exceed in tax revenues which they yield the tax revenues of the area inundated. However, this is happening to us: The vast tourist trade which we have enjoyed in these mountains for now more than a century is rapidly falling off, and for no other reason than that we have no water in the Ozarks. By that, I mean bodies of water; for conveniences cannot be built along a river as they can be built along a lake shore, and even mountain streams are not attractive if there are mountain lakes available. We have no mountain lakes except the small one at Ozark Beach in Missouri.

PUBLIC WORKS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT

The 21,000 square miles of the Ozark uplift is a diversified farming country. A large percentage of the people own their own homes, but they are relatively poor. Because we do not have any of the major cash crops we have not participated to any great extent in the Nation's agricultural program. I have recent figures indicating that we have gotten less than half the benefits per acre in cultivation which have been received by the farmers in any direction, north, south, east, or west, of the Ozark uplift. This, perhaps, has no place in this argument except to point out that our people feel they have suffered some discrimination and the building of these dams would vastly overcome such discrimination, for they would provide work for thousands of people over a period of years. Money spent in this way not only serves to increase the purchasing power and to relieve persons in distress but it adds to the capital wealth of the Nation. It is unfair to call it a Government expenditure, except that part over and above benefits derived, and there would be none in these instances as we understand it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The President has made various references to the necessity for adequate power reservoirs in case of war. Certainly we think it is advisable to have, not a crying need for power but an adequate power development in the very region of the source of at least five strategic war materials—lead, zinc, phosphate, manganese, and iron.

THE EMERGENCY AT NORFORK

If for any reason, gentlemen of the committee, you are not able to give us at this time the authorization for Bull Shoals and Table Rock, then we feel that this is all the more reason why there must be immediate action to clarify the Norfork authorization. There is no doubt in our minds but that the project is authorized for power, except for the limitations that were placed in the 1938 act, but if something isn't done the Army engineers will let the contract shortly for only 189 feet of the dam when a 225-foot dam is desired. My bill, H. R. 9037, which I am appealing to you to incorporate in the general act, will not necessitate one penny of additional expenditures for some 3 years, but will provide that the contract be let now for the full height and in order that the full power resources may be developed. This is the height proposed by the engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

The Secretary of War in his report to you on this bill says:

"It is desirable from an engineering standpoint to build the dam to full height now rather than to have to raise it later, and it is believed that money will be saved in the long run if the proposed authorization is granted.

"Insofar as the interests committed to this Department are concerned, no objection is seen to the enactment of H. R. 9037.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report."

The report of the Federal Power Commission to you on this bill is in part as follows:

"Enactment of this bill would increase the authorization for reservoirs in the White River Basin from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 and would authorize the construction of the North Fork to a height of approximately 588 feet above sea level in order to provide for the development of the possibilities of the site, which include the production of hydroelectric power.

"Studies by the staff of the Commission show that the Norfork project is strategically located to serve the power markets in Arkansas and adjoining areas and that the power developed at this project could be absorbed readily in these areas when the project is completed. Based upon the estimates of cost prepared by the War Department for the Norfork project, an increase in the authorization to $30,000,000 will permit the construction of a dam of height sufficient to preserve the power potentialities. An additional authorization of $7,500,000 for power generating facilities would be required before advantage could be taken of the higher dam for the production of hydroelectric power.

"Therefore, the total authorization for power development would amount to $12,500,000, including the $7,500,000 authorization for generating facilities and the $5,000,000 increase in the cost of the dam. The studies by the Commission's staff show that this total cost for power would be well justified on the basis of the anticipated returns from the sale of the power. The net returns from this sale of the power would, in fact, be sufficient to justify a considerably greater investment for the power available at this site.

"The Commission believes that the Norfork project should be utilized for the dual purposes of flood control and power development, that a substantial saving would be effected in the cost of the high dam by constructing it initially to the greater height proposed in H. R. 9037, that it would be in the public interest to effect this saving now provided that the additional $7,500,000 necessary to complete the project for the dual purposes contemplated is authorized when required to assure installation of generating facilities at approximately the time when the dam is completed. The Commission therefore recommends early and appropriate action to permit these desirable alterations in the Norfork Dam and Reservoir project.

"The Norfork Dam and Reservoir project is one of the most important units in a plan to develop comprehensively for all desirable purposes the wonderful water resources of the White River Basin."

I am advised both by the engineers and the Federal Power Commission that there will be an ultimate saving of approximately $1,000,000 if my bill is passed. The Federal Power Commission advises me that the Norfork project, strategically located as it is to serve the power needs of this vast region and producing a minimum of 175,000 kilowatt-hours annually, will yield returns sufficient not only to carry all the charges against the power features but to support a considerable portion of the project cost chargeable to flood control.

Mr. Tom Fitzhugh, chairman of the State utilities commission, told this committee that he believed it advisable to construct all these projects for full power development. Mr. L. A. Henry, director of the State planning board, made a similar recommendation. Mr. R. E. Overman, chairman of the State flood-control commission; Mr. Layton Coffman, the member of the flood-control commission for this region; Mr. Charles Christian, chief engineer for the commission; and Mr. W. C. McClure, secretary of the commission, all testified that these flood-control projects are necessary, but that it is also necessary and advisable that these choice power sites be developed at the same time as multiple-purpose projects.

It was the Norfork project which, you will recall, Chairman Leland Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, used yesterday in his testimony here, as an example of multipurpose dams, the power from which, he says, will largely repay the total cost. Figuring on the basis of 6 percent, this project costing ultimately $28,000,000 for flood control, power, and transmission, would actually repay, he told you, not only the $12,500,000 allotted to power, but $9,500,000 more, or a total of $22,000,000. This would make the flood-control costs neglible.

Among the others who came here to testify in behalf of Norfork and the other projects from Arkansas and Missouri, were Mr. John T. Woodruff, secretary of the chamber of commerce of Springfield; Mr. Rex Allman of Forsythe, Mo., president of the White River Development Association; Mr. Arthur N. Wood, county judge of Marion County, which is located near the proposed dams; Mr. John Fee, county treasurer of Marion County, and Mr. Henry Young, State representative from Marion County; County Judge R. M. Ruthven of Baxter County—three of the proposed dams would be in, or bordering, Baxter County; Mr. Tom Shiras, editor of the Baxter Bulletin; Mr. Hugh Hackler, mayor of Mountain Home, the county seat of Baxter County; Mr. T. J. McCabe, automobile dealer in Baxter County; and Mr. Ralph Ferguson, revenue collector of Searcy County, in which one of the dams would be located.

I think it no breach of confidence, gentlemen, to tell you that Senator MILLER and I went down and talked with President Roosevelt specially about this Norfork project, and that he agreed with us that it certainly should be developed to the full height now. I think it is no breach of trust to tell you, too, that he sent a special note to the Budget on the matter. It was after that that we became aware of the fact that the new report of the engineers might not reach this committee in time for consideration, and it was then decided to introduce this H. R. 9037, and its companion bill (S. 3668). I can tell you also that when the Secretary of War and the Federal Power Commission submitted their favorable reports to the Budget, as they are required to do under Executive order. that the Budget then called the matter again to the President's attention and that he personally placed his O. K. on this bill.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT

I make you this statement concerning the public sentiment of the people in the White River Valley, that so far as I know there is not one single person in all that vast region with a population of 750,000 people who is opposed to this dual-purpose development. As an evidence of the overwhelming demand for it, I call your attention to this voluminous report of the Army engineers of a hearing held at Harrison, Ark., in the basin, on January 10 of last year, which was attended not only by the engineers but by representatives of the Federal Power Commission. Notices were sent out to all parts of the basin that people interested would be heard. However, the matter was not widely advertised and notices went out only a few days in advance. There was no organized effort to swamp the hearing. I believe you will agree that what happened there would be pretty good evidence of how the people feel. I hold here in my hand the record of that hearing as reported by Lt. Col. Stanley L. Scott, district engineer of Little Rock. In the beginning here he lists the names, the addresses and the interests represented of all people attending. They came from every nook and corner of the White River Valley, from the lowlands, the mountains, and the plains. They came asking flood control. They came asking navigation, irrigation, and recreation. They came asking power. More than 1,000, from outside the city of Harrison, poured into this hearing. They testified one after another and they submitted scores of pages of data to support their appeals. Here it is. As Colonel Scott reports, the people in the lowlands want flood control and the power that can be generated at the dams. The people in the uplands want flood control but

they don't want the dams built for flood control only. The sentiment, he reports, is almost unanimous for this multipurpose development, and it is strong.

As Editor Tom Shiras, of Mountain Home, Ark., so appropriately pointed out in his testimony before you, we have 750,000 wild horses running wild in the gorges of the White River. They are killing people and destroying property that runs into millions of dollars' damage annually. The people want these horses corraled, but they don't want the corral to cover what bottom land we have unless the horses are at the same time put to work. If put to work they will return to the Government every penny expended and at the same time give to our people a source of cheap power so badly needed in the basin.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to the Fortune poll for April. They report 13,062 votes on their questionnaire for the most popular public works. Their question to these people was: "Of these kinds of public construction—Federal power plants, flood control, big national highways, or airports—which do you think the most important on which to spend money in order to build up a better and stronger Nation?" Thirty-eight percent voted flood control first, 21 percent voted highways first, 18 percent voted airports first, and 13.9 percent voted Federal power plants first. The question was unfair with regard to Federal power plants because there are strictly speaking, no such things. The item "Federal power plants" should have been included with flood control, and this would give you a total of 51.2 percent of all the people voting this type of public works first.

In other words, gentlemen, I think that in spite of recent articles in which the press has quoted the President as not favorable to increased authorizations at this time, you are wholly justified in proceeding with this program, and I confidently believe Mr. Roosevelt will sign whatever bill is passed. President Roosevelt, great humanitarian that he is, cannot consistently veto a bill that will save millions annually in property to the people of Arkansas, that will save untold human lives, a bill that will bring light and happiness and development and progress to an impoverished people in a vast region filled with all kinds of natural resources, but those essential for power—and what this general bill will do for us it will do for practically every other valley in the Nation. Your revision of the present authorization which we request, and the President's ultimate approval of it, is almost a life-and-death matter with us in the White River Basin, and I appeal to you with all the power at my command to do the very best for us you possibly can.

Again thanking you from the bottom of my heart for your patience and endurance, I leave much of our fate in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have had your statement.

Y. W. C. A. National Convention Endorses the Geyer Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Christian Science Monitor. The article is replete with information that the world should know. Can you read this and still say that we live in a democracy?

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, 1940]

Y. W. C. A. PLEDGES AID IN CIVIL RIGHTS DRIVE

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., April 17.—The Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States, with 2,866,797 active constituents, were pledged today to support the antilynching and anti-poll-tax bills as part of their civil rights campaign.

The associations also will continue local experimenting in the health education field for members, comparing notes on their findings, in order to work out a Nation-wide program that can be fitted into the national Y. W. C. A. budget.

These actions were authorized by final vote on resolutions as the sixteenth national biennial convention closed here. Besides the stands on lynching and poll tax, delegates pledged the Y. W. C. A. to work for equal opportunities for all races "in all relationships of life" and for the "ultimate elimination of all segregation and discrimination." In this connection a resolution stressed that the National Student Council of the Y. W. C. A. "has been basically interracial in membership" for 18 years through its Negro and Indian members.

DATE FOR CONVENTION

The national board will meet in New York next month and is expected to decide whether the next national convention shall be called in 2 or 3 years from now. Majority sentiment at the sessions here favored the longer term, which would make the entire platform a 3-year program.

Mrs. Austin L. Kimball, of Buffalo, N. Y., retiring national Y. W. C. A. president, and Mrs. Cleveland E. Dodge, president of the New York City Y. W. C. A. and national board member, were chosen as new American members of the World's Council of the Y. W. C. A.

Mrs. M. C. Migel and Miss Elizabeth K. Lamont, both of New York, were reelected to that body. The World's Council maintains headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, and has 15 elected and 2 ex officio members from this Nation.

In the antilynching resolution delegates stressed that they were devoted to the task of realizing in our common life those ideals of personal and social living to which we are committed by our faith as Christians.

POTENTIAL VOTE REDUCED

The anti-poll-tax resolution was telegraphed to Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, a House Judiciary Subcommittee chairman. It supports a bill introduced by Representative LEE E. GEYER (Democrat), of California, prohibiting the use of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.

Mrs. T. H. Eckerson, of Los Angeles, who introduced this resolution, reported that the 8 Southern States imposing poll taxes have a total potential voting population of 11,606,406, yet in the 1936 election they cast only 2,679,473 votes, or only a few more than were cast by Pennsylvania alone. Percentages of the eligible vote that is actually cast in those poll-tax States range from 33⅓ down to 14.

"Millions are thus disfranchised in violation of the Constitution," she said.

Mrs. Eckerson reported that average gross annual income in 13 Southern States ranges from $186 a person for farmers down to $73 for tenants and from $38 to $87 for sharecroppers. Large numbers of tenants and sharecroppers get no money income at all, their share having been advanced in food or supplies, she declared.

SOME TAXES CUMULATIVE

"In order to vote they must pay out of such scanty income a poll tax of $1 a year in South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Arkansas; $1.50 a year in Alabama and Virginia; $1.50 to $1.75 a year in Texas; and $2 in Mississippi," she continued.

"That is not all. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia allow their counties to add another $1, and the tax is cumulative for 2 years in Mississippi, 3 years in Virginia, and without limit in Alabama and Georgia. Thus, if a tenant farmer has missed several elections in hard times, the cost of catching up back poll taxes to be eligible to resume voting becomes prohibitive.

"In Texas, where the tax is not cumulative, the delinquency penalty is 3 days' road work or $3 fine. In South Carolina it is not cumulative, but the delinquency penalty is $10 and costs or 20 days' hard labor. In Texas, in 1936, 26 percent of the potential vote was cast, and in South Carolina only 14 percent.

"Lifting the poll tax in Florida practically doubled the vote cast, and in Louisiana it doubled the number of women voters."

Stop, Look, and Listen—History Is Repeating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, everyone should be familiar with the manner in which we were dragged into the last war by Anglophiles in our own Government and among our representatives abroad. These facts are now recorded in State papers, intelligence memoranda, and in reports from our foreign representatives.

Nineteen hundred and twelve was the beginning of an era when LL. D.'s and DD. L.'s began to run the Government of the United States by direction of the internationalists. This faculty of educators has now run the Government successfully away from the Constitution and into the hands of communism. It appears that all of them are radicals, perhaps innocently, but the result is just the same.

We had the same gentry running us during the World War, and they were then, as now, related to international teaching groups and philanthropic organizations. Our most well-versed Anglophiles were the late Mr. Edward M. House, gypsy Ambassador, and Mr. Walter Hines Page, our British Ambassador, both of them apparently awe-struck by the splendor of the British throne. Those who have the opportunity should read the works of these gentlemen, because they are very illuminating and expressive as to where their interests were at that time.

We are facing the same situation, with another gypsy Ambassador just having returned from a war-mongering trek through Europe, and the result of his trip is now evident in the invasion of Scandinavia.

It is unfortunate that we cannot mind our own business, and it is still more unfortunate that the Democratic administrations are tied to the apron strings of the British Crown. One may ask, What has Great Britain done for the United States? The echo comes back, "What?"

However, it is not my purpose to discuss this crusade for the British internationalists at this time; but I shall, instead, ask leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Mr. Griffin, in the New York Enquirer, April 15, 1940, which I now quote:

[From the New York Enquirer of April 15, 1940]

SHALL WILSONIAN TORIES SUCCEED IN WAR SCHEMES?

The other day a prominent Senator arose in our National Capitol to defend Woodrow Wilson from any imputation of having plunged the United States into the World War for ulterior purposes.

This embattled statesman unreservedly affirmed that Uncle Sam was not tricked into the conflict, but that, on the contrary, President Wilson placed the Republic militarily on the side of the enemies of Kaiser Wilhelm solely because he had no alternative as a result of German aggression against the United States.

Here is a matter which is of far more than academic interest to America at the present time, when history is repeating itself in this land with alarming accuracy.

History will deal sternly with the men who, on Good Friday, April 6, 1917, on the sacred day of the prince of peace, justice, and charity opened the floodgates of war upon the United States of America and set in motion a train of events which were to inflict uncalculable damage, political, economic, and social, upon the American people for generations to come.

History will be compelled to hand down the verdict that those immediately responsible for our declaration of war in the spring of 1917 escaped the penalty entailed by their foul betrayal of the Republic, which, among other consequences, resulted in the mass murder of thousands of American boys.

Yes, history is repeating itself with amazing exactitude.

Those who are now engaged in a conspiracy to bring about another declaration of war by Congress would, however, do well to sit down and consider whether they can expect to avoid having visited upon them the legal retribution which the conspirator of 1917 escaped.

In 1917 the American people were cruelly deceived by propaganda. They had no precedent and no experience, such as they have today, to forewarn and guide them.

No one can deny that America is being prepared for another colossal betrayal. If the American people allow the plotters to succeed this time, they will be able to blame nobody but their own selves.

The betrayal of 1917 accomplished what the Tories of the War of Independence, in their most fanciful visions of the future, could never have foreseen.

It was the toryism of the Revolution which so strenuously upheld Britannia against George Washington, and not the aggression of Kaiser Wilhelm that encompassed our involvement in the World War on the diabolically false plea that we were to assist in making the world safe for democracy.

Let us consider the role of Woodrow Wilson, Tory in chief of the conspiracy which involved this Republic in the armed contention of rival European imperialisms on Good Friday 1917.

Thomas Watt Gregory was Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Wilson, and as such had an ideal opportunity of knowing just what factors motivated the man who turned his back on George Washington and entangled Uncle Sam in Europe's interminable outbreaks of gangsterism.

On January 29, 1925, Gregory addressed a letter to the New York Times in vindication of Woodrow Wilson's war policies and acts. This missive is an invaluable document—invaluable for a reason which the one-time Attorney General of the United States did not notice. No more damning evidence of Woodrow Wilson's un-Americanism, false neutrality, and disdain for the American people could be penned. Listen to Mr. Gregory:

"Sometimes through ignorance, and sometimes through malice, the war President has been charged with having had no sympathy with the Allies, with having improperly delayed the entry of the United States into the war, and with having failed to vigorously prosecute that war."

Let those who would have us believe that Woodrow Wilson was impartial toward the belligerents and that he had no reason other than German aggression for driving us into the war, give careful consideration to Mr. Gregory's very next statement:

"A single incident furnishes a complete refutation of the first charge. Up to the time that Germany began its atrocious submarine warfare, culminating in the sinking of the *Lusitania*, we had far less cause for complaint against her than we had against Great Britain.

"The latter had repeatedly seized on the high seas our vessels bound for neutral ports; it had appropriated these vessels and their cargoes; it had opened our mail and prevented its delivery; it had ignored our protests, and in some instances had for weeks and months even failed to acknowledge their receipt.

"These were substantially the same acts that brought on the War of 1812."

The trouble was that in 1917 we had a scion of the Tories of the Revolution in the White House, who permitted Britain to do as she pleased with American rights and national self-respect, while in 1812 we had in the Executive Mansion on the Potomac an American who stood boldly for the Republic against British aggression and was not afraid to tackle the British Empire in war.

In 1812, President Madison was not so traitorous as to condone England's aggression against the Republic and join with her in arms against "the mad dog of Europe," Napoleon (the Hitler of that day), with whom she was battling.

Of course, Britain burned the White House and the National Capitol. But had Wilson been in Madison's shoes, there never would have been a Battle of New Orleans, nor would the Republic have experienced the preeminent advantages which the War of 1812 brought it.

Woodrow Wilson's Attorney General goes on to relate, in his letter to the New York Times, that while the condition of things described by him in the statement just quoted prevailed, a Cabinet meeting took place wherein several of the President's counselors voiced great indignation over what they regarded as infringement of America's international rights, and urged that we pursue a more vigorous policy.

The Tory in chief who sat in the White House declined to accede. He had one set of rules for the Allies and another set of rules for those with whom they were waging war.

This was true Wilsonian impartiality, the impartiality of the man who, tongue in cheek, admonished the American people to be neutral not only in act but in thought.

While Americans render homage to the patriotism, valor, and statesmanship of George Washington, they should not neglect to ponder the record of Woodrow Wilson, the man who scorned the counsel and example of the Father of his Country, raised high the unholy flag of internationalism in this land, plunged our country into a ghastly adventure in Europe, piled up billions of dollars of public debt, and set in motion a chain of events which have brought the Republic disaster after disaster from our entry into the Great War until the present hour.

Two extracts from addresses delivered by Wilson visualize in dramatic and masterly fashion how void of actuality were the reasons advanced by him for leading us into war in 1917, after he had been reelected to the White House as the man who "kept us out of war."

Speaking to our National Legislature on April 2, 1917, just 4 days before Congress declared war, the President expressed himself in this manner:

"The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundation of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves. * * * We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind."

Read again the words just quoted from Wilson's address to Congress a few days before this Nation dishonored Washington, the man who made it a nation, by taking sides in the Great War and enmeshing itself in foreign entanglements. And having read them again, consider these words of Wilson, uttered at St. Louis on September 5, 1919, after the war was over:

"The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them."

Surely the American people have learned and taken to heart the lesson of Wilson's trickery, and surely they will not permit themselves to be betrayed again as they were betrayed in 1917.

This Republic will follow the example and advice of a real American, George Washington, not the hypocrisy and disloyalty of Woodrow Wilson, whose Tory forebears the Father of his Country squelched in the ever-glorious days of 1776.

And in following in the footsteps of the first American they will let the mad dogs of Germany, France, England, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the rest tear themselves to their hearts' content and save America from dictatorship at home and another catastrophe abroad.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN.

Republic Steel Corporation against the National Labor Relations Board and Steel Workers' Organizing Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1940

OPINION OF THE CIRCUIT COURT

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is the practice of the Supreme Court in refusing certiorari to uphold the opinion in the lower court rather than to write a formal opinion of its own. Because of this practice I have asked and obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the opinion of the United States circuit court of appeals in the case of Republic Steel Corporation et al. against the National Labor Relations Act.

The opinion follows:

[In the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. No. 6907. March term, 1939. Republic Steel Corporation, petitioner, and Central Council of Steel Plants, Northern District, Republic Steel Corporation; and 1,50 or more employees of Upson Division of the Republic Steel Corporation, intervenors-petitioners against National Labor Relations Board, respondent, and Steel Workers Organizing Committee, intervenor-respondent. On petition for review and enforcement of an order of the National Labor Relations Board. Opinion. Filed November 8, 1939]

Before Biggs, Maris, and Clark, circuit judges.

Maris, circuit judge:

Upon a complaint based upon charges filed by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (hereinafter called S. W. O. C.), a labor-union organization affiliated with the Committee for Industrial Organization, the National Labor Relations Board found the Republic Steel Corporation (hereinafter called Republic) guilty of unfair labor practices, and ordered it to cease and desist from them and to take certain affirmative action which the Board found would effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act. Republic thereupon petitioned this court to review and set aside the order as contrary to law.

Republic is a large manufacturer of steel, having plants at Youngstown, Canton, Massillon, Warren, and Cleveland, Ohio, among other places. In June 1936 S. W. O. C. began a campaign to organize Republic's employees. Three years before, in June 1933, Republic had introduced into each of its plants a plan of employee representation. These plans, company imposed and dominated ones, were doubtless a concession to the mandate of section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, "that employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing * * *." At least the record of Republic would indicate that this modest concession to the right of collective bargaining was not wholly voluntary.

Almost immediately after S. W. O. C. commenced its organization campaign Republic, in its turn, began a counter campaign to crush the union. It announced to all its employees at once that "Republic stands for the open-shop principle," that "No employee has to join any organization to get or hold a job," and that "Every Republic employee owes a duty of loyalty to the company, so that its best interests may be served. Conduct detrimental to the interests of the company and which may disrupt the satisfactory relations between employees and management will not be tolerated." The union was denounced and vilified. From the beginning the organizers of the union were followed and spied upon by Republic's company police. The latter also maintained surveillance over union meetings, thus discouraging employee attendance. Employees were threatened with discharge if they accepted union literature outside the plant gates. Union organizers were attacked and brutally beaten.

When, in March 1937, the employee representatives under the representation plans then in effect in Republic's plants, proposed to amend them so as to eliminate company domination and provide for real collective bargaining, Republic refused its consent. On the other hand, it caused many of the employee representatives to spread anti-union propaganda and to campaign actively against the union in its plants. On March 17, 1937, the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries signed a union contract with S. W. O. C. as the representative of its members who were employees of those companies. The next day Republic called a meeting of the central council of its employee representatives at which a motion was unanimously adopted that all the representatives back the management in opposition to all outside labor organizations.

Employees were coerced by foremen and representatives to sign petitions supporting the representation plans and opposing S. W. O. C. Meetings of employees were held by the management at which the virtues of the representation plans were praised; employees were threatened with discharge if they joined the outside union, and antiunion literature was distributed. At least 18 employees, Cikah, Arias, Popik, Pirichy, Troyanovich, Naletrich, Korecky, Exall, Petak, Babich, Neuman, Ugranovich, Armeli, White, Fagan, Wright, Shaban, and Mouyios, were discharged because of their activity in behalf of the S. W. O. C.

On March 30, 1937, Golden, regional director of S. W. O. C., requested a conference with Girdler, chairman of the board of Republic, and submitted a proposed union contract containing provisions respecting wages, hours, vacations, seniority, and methods of handling grievances substantially equivalent to those then in force in Republic's mills. It also contained the following provisions:

"SEC. 2. Recognition: The corporation recognizes the union as the collective-bargaining agency for those employees of the corporation who are members of the union. The corporation recognizes and will not interfere with the right of its employees to become members of the union. There shall be no discrimination, interference, restraint, or coercion by the corporation or any of its agents against any members because of membership in the union. * * *

"SEC. 8. Management: The management of the works and the direction of the working forces, including the right to hire, suspend, or discharge for proper cause, or transfer, and the right to relieve employees from duty because of lack of work, or for other legitimate reasons, is vested exclusively in the corporation; provided that this will not be used for purposes of discrimination against any member of the union.

"SEC. 9. Discharge cases: In the event a member of the union shall be discharged from his employment from and and after the date hereof, and he believes he has been unjustly dealt with, such discharge shall constitute a case arising under the method of adjusting grievances herein provided. In the event it should be decided under the rules of this agreement that an injustice has been dealt the employee with regard to the discharge, the corporation shall reinstate such employee and pay full compensation at the employee's regular rate for the time lost. All such cases of discharge shall be taken up and disposed of within 5 days from the date of discharge."

No reply to the request for a conference was made until May 5, when Republic's director of industrial relations wired, "In view of Wagner Act, see no necessity for signed contract," and suggested May 11 for a conference. A conference was held on that day without result, whereupon Republic issued a statement to its employees that it adhered to its policy not to sign a contract with the C. I. O. At about the same time Republic shut down its Canton tin-plate mill, a stronghold of the union, and nearly all the mills of its Massillon works, and locked out all but the maintenance employees. These lockouts, coming after a long period of continued drastic antiunion measures, placed the union in a position where it could not hope to preserve itself without immediate resort to action. Accordingly, on May 25 and 26, the union employees of Republic's Canton, Massillon, Youngstown, Warren, and Cleveland plants went on strike.

The strike resulted in the closing of all of these plants and they remained closed for more than a month. Upon their reopening toward the end of June, a great many of Republic's employees were refused reinstatement because of their union membership. Among these were Green, Hite, Lazer, Krill, Chismus, Haren, Nevedusky, and DeLong. From the time the strike began Republic undertook to secure, and did secure, the aid of local police officials to break picket lines, enlisted workers in back-to-work movements, and in other ways endeavored to defeat the strike by reopening its plants without any concessions to the union. By threats to remove its plants Republic succeeded in causing municipal authorities and businessmen to turn against the union. Violence and hysteria were incited deliberately by Republic in order to terrorize union members. Tear gas and firearms were donated to the police department of Massillon.

This course of conduct had its tragic result on the evening of July 11 in Massillon. The city police had been augmented by a number of specially deputized Republic foremen and other employees. On this evening the chief of police was absent. In his absence command of the police was taken by one Curley, who had come to the force with the hearty recommendation of Republic's district manager. Under Curley's leadership, the augmented force made an unprovoked attack on an unarmed crowd of strikers at their headquarters, killing three of them and wounding many others. During the shooting, which continued for half an hour, none of the policemen received any sort of injury. Immediately after it was over one of the special policemen, who was a Republic foreman, led a group of his fellows in a round-up in which all persons in the neighborhood of union headquarters were arrested without warrants. These policemen in the early hours of the morning broke into rooming houses occupied by union members, dragged men from their beds, and hauled them to jail, where they were kept for several days.

Meanwhile, on April 21, 1937, the Supreme Court had upheld the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act. Republic immediately took steps to eliminate some of the obviously objectionable features of its employee-representation plans. In some plants these were replaced by new organizations, but in each case they were dominated by Republic. After the strike a third group of

organizations appeared in the Massillon, Canton, and Youngstown plants. In form they were independent but in fact they were formed and officered in whole or in part by those who had been officers and representatives in the prior plans and who were known to be under Republic domination. They were accorded the use of Republic's time and property for organization purposes, including the solicitation of memberships and the collection of dues. Republic, through its superintendents and foremen, assisted in persuading employees to join them. Each of the three organizations was in fact but a continuation of its predecessor and was under the domination of Republic.

The foregoing brief recital is an epitome of the findings of fact made by the Board in an elaborate opinion (9 N. L. R. B. 219). To further detail them would serve no useful purpose. Republic strongly urges that they are not supported by substantial evidence, and must therefore be set aside. It points out evidence which is inconsistent with the findings. A great mass of testimony was taken in the case, much of it directly conflicting. The duty of reconciling this evidence was placed by the act upon the Board, however, and not upon this court. Our sole duty is to determine whether there is in the record substantial evidence to support the Board's findings. Examining the record we find ample evidence to support these findings, and they must therefore be sustained (*Washington Coach Co.* v. *Labor Board*, 301 U. S. 142; *Labor Board* v. *Fansteel Corporation*, 306 U. S. 240). They, in turn, fully support the conclusion of the Board that Republic had engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1), (2), and (3) of the act (29 U. S. C., sec. 158), (1) by interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7[1] of the act; (2) by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of the employee-representation plans and associations of its employees which succeeded them and by contributing financial and other support thereto; and (3) by discriminating in regard to the hire and tenure of employment of the 26 employees above-mentioned.

Upon these findings and conclusions the Board ordered Republic to cease and desist from (a) dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization of its employees or contributing financial or other support thereto; (b) discouraging membership in S. W. O. C. or any other labor organization of its employees, by discharging and refusing to reinstate employees, or otherwise discriminating in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment or by threats of such discrimination; or (c) in any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act. It is clear that under the Board's findings and conclusions this order was proper.

It remains for us to consider the validity of that part of the Board's order which required affirmative action to be taken by Republic. In this connection it is to be remembered that section 10 (c) of the act (29 U. S. C., sec. 160 (c)) authorizes the Board, if it finds that an employer has engaged in an unfair labor practice, to require him to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act. Section 1 of the act (29 U. S. C., sec. 151) declares that it is the policy of the United States "to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection."

The directions for affirmative action are contained in section 2 of the Board's order. The section is subdivided into paragraphs which will be considered consecutively. Paragraph (a) directs Republic to withdraw recognition from and disestablish the labor organizations of its employees which the Board found it had dominated, interfered with, or supported in violation of section 8 (2) of the act. Paragraph (b) directs the posting of notices that this has been done. As we have already indicated, the evidence supports the Board's finding that these organizations were dominated, interfered with, or supported by Republic. The original employee representation plans were imposed by Republic upon its employees and as originally drawn they were incapable of serving as collective-bargaining agencies representing the employees. The changes in form made after the decision of the Jones & Laughlin case and after the strike did not change their nature. They continued in charge of employees who had been active in the original organizations and who were known to be under Republic's domination. The organizations continued to enjoy the sunshine of Republic's favor in many ways. Employees were made to feel that membership in them was advisable in order to hold their jobs. They were undoubtedly what have come to be known as "company unions." It is clear that so long as these organizations exist Republic's employees will be unable to exercise and enjoy that free choice of bargaining agents which the act intends that they should have. The Board's order of disestablishment was, therefore, proper. *Labor Board* v. *Greyhound Lines* (303 U. S. 261); *Labor Board* v. *Pacific Lines* (303 U. S. 272); *Labor Board* v. *Fansteel Corporation*, supra; *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.* (105 F. (2d) 167); *Tuan Metal Mfg. Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (106 F. 2d 254).

Since the order ran only against Republic, the so-called company unions, some of which were permitted to intervene in this court, were not entitled to notice and hearing before the Board (*Labor Board* v. *Greyhound Lines*, supra). Their application to this court for leave to adduce additional evidence must be denied (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.*, supra).

Paragraphs (b) and (c) of section 2 of the Board's order require Republic to reinstate with back pay 14 employees, 6 who were discharged for union activities, and 8 who were refused reinstatement after the strike because of union membership. In the cases of 12 other employees who were similarly discharged and subsequently reinstated or offered reinstatement, Republic is required to make them whole for pay lost for the period before the strike. Paragraphs (d) and (e) direct Republic to make whole those employees of its Canton and Massillon mills who were locked out in May 1937 for the pay lost during the period of the lock-outs. The Board's findings of discrimination as to these employees are sustained by the evidence, as we have already pointed out. It follows that the order is justified under section 10 (c) of the act in order to effectuate its policies. *Labor Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin* (301 U. S. 1); *Labor Board* v. *Mackay Co.* (304 U. S. 333).

One phase of this part of the order requires special mention. The order provides that any sums which these employees may have received in the interim for work performed upon Federal, State, county, municipal, or other work-relief projects shall be deducted from the amounts ordered to be paid to them by Republic and shall be paid over to the appropriate governmental agencies which supplied the funds for the work-relief projects. Republic urges that this provision is beyond the Board's jurisdiction. We think, however, that it is within the discretionary power of the Board and that it is not unreasonable. A similar order was enforced in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Planters Mfg. Co.* (105 F. (2d) 750).

There remain for our consideration paragraphs (f) and (g) of section 2 of the Board's order. These paragraphs require Republic to offer to employees who went on strike reinstatement in their former or equivalent positions, or if positions cannot be provided for them by dismissing new employees taken on since the strike, then to place them upon a preferential list for employment when available, and if they are not thus reinstated or placed on the preferential list, to reimburse them for wages lost for the period beginning 5 days after their application. These provisions raise the major controversy in the case. This controversy is as to the cause of the strike. Republic vehemently contends that the strike was caused solely by its refusal to sign the contract submitted by S. W. O. C. This refusal the Board concedes was not an unfair labor practice. Consequently, if Republic is right as to this, the Board had no power to order the reinstatement of the strikers.

The Board, however, found "that the underlying cause of the strike, and a substantial factor in its precipitation on May 25 and 26, was" Republic's "campaign to crush the union by means of the unfair labor practices" in which the Board found Republic had engaged prior to the strike, and which we have already described. We think that this finding is supported by the evidence and must be sustained. It is true that the strike was precipitated by Republic's refusal to sign the union contract and thus to recognize the union as the bargaining agent for its members. It is equally clear, however, that the signing of the contract was sought by the union not to raise wages or improve working conditions, for it purported to do neither, but solely to put an end to the warfare between the union and Republic which had resulted from the latter's unfair labor practices. What was sought, as the clauses of the contract hereinabove quoted demonstrate, was a formal declaration and agreement by Republic that it would not continue those practices but would recognize and not interfere with the right of its employees to become members of the union.

It is thus seen that the proposal to sign the contract was but a phase of the union's struggle against Republic's unfair labor practices and that the latter's refusal to sign was but one more indication that it proposed to continue those practices. The union contract in such a case as this becomes merely the symbol of the employer's acceptance of the union. If the contract is refused, we cannot say that the refusal is the cause of the ensuing strike, even though doubtless its acceptance would have averted it. The causes of the strike remain the unfair labor practices which the employer, by his refusal of the proffered covenant of peace, indicates that he will continue. As the Congress, in section 1 of the act (29 U. S. C., sec. 151) significantly said: "The denial by employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest * * *."

Republic further contends that the order for the reinstatement of the strikers was invalid because the complaint did not tender the issue of the reinstatement of the strikers. The complaint did, however, enumerate certain unfair labor practices and allege that because of these practices and of the refusal to sign the contract the strike took place. Section 10 (c) of the act specifically authorizes the Board to direct reinstatement of employees if unfair

[1] SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

labor practices are found. Republic was, therefore, sufficiently informed that such action might be required by the Board.

It is argued that none of the strikers should be reinstated since they were all members of a combination and conspiracy and as such responsible for the acts of violence committed by some of their fellows. This argument, however, fails to take into account the provisions of section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C. sec. 106), which prohibit courts of the United States from holding members of a union participating in a labor dispute responsible "for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof." The act applies to this proceeding for the enforcement of the Board's order. No proof of actual participation, authorization, or ratification was offered with respect to the strikers generally. Equally untenable is the contention that the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement because they have not come into court with clean hands. This principle is not applicable to a proceeding in which a governmental agency is seeking enforcement of its order in the public interest. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Remington Rand, Inc.* (94 F. (2d) 862, cert. den., 304 U. S. 576); *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Carlisle Lumber Co.* (99 F. (2d) 533).

Finally Republic contends that the Board had no power to require the reinstatement of the individual strikers who had been guilty of criminal conduct in connection with the strike and it sought from the Board and from this court leave to present evidence on this subject. While leave was refused by the Board it treated Republic's offers of proof as evidence in deciding the case and we have done the same. Republic's petition for leave to adduce additional evidence will accordingly be denied.

In *Labor Board* v. *Fansteel Corporation*, supra, the Supreme Court had before it a case involving the reinstatement of strikers who had been guilty of unlawfully seizing and holding their employer's buildings in a sit-down strike. The Court held that their reinstatement would not effectuate the policies of the act and that it was, therefore, beyond the power of the Board to order it. In that case Chief Justice Hughes said (p. 253): "The employees had the right to strike but they had no license to commit acts of violence or to seize their employer's plant. We may put on one side the contested questions as to the circumstances and extent of injury to the plant and its contents in the efforts of the men to resist eviction. The seizure and holding of the buildings was itself a wrong apart from any acts of sabotage. But in its legal aspect the ousting of the owner from lawful possession is not essentially different from an assault upon the officers of an employing company, or the seizure and conversion of its goods, or the despoiling of its property or other unlawful acts in order to force compliance with demands. To justify such conduct because of the existence of a labor dispute or of an unfair labor practice would be to put a premium on resort to force instead of legal remedies and to subvert the principles of law and order which lie at the foundations of society."

In the Fansteel case the Court was dealing with a case which involved a sit-down strike in which the strikers forcibly and unlawfully deprived their employer of possession of his plant. The Court made it clear that unlawful conduct of that character deprived the participant of the right of reinstatement. We think it must be conceded, however, that some disorder is unfortunately quite usual in any extensive or long-drawn-out strike. A strike is essentially a battle waged with economic weapons. Engaged in it are human beings whose feelings are stirred to the depths. Rising passions call forth hot words. Hot words lead to blows on the picket line. The transformation from economic to physical combat by those engaged in the contest is difficult to prevent even when cool heads direct the fight. Violence of this nature, however much it is to be regretted, must have been in the contemplation of the Congress when it provided in section 13 of the act that nothing therein should be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike. If this were not so the rights afforded to employees by the act would be indeed illusory. We accordingly recently held that it was not intended by the act that minor disorders of this nature should deprive a striker of the possibility of reinstatement. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.*, supra.

In the present case there was evidence of violence and disorder on the part of many strikers. Numbers of them were convicted of crimes in the State courts. The Board accordingly undertook to determine which of these were sufficiently serious to bar reinstatement. This it did without the benefit of the Fansteel opinion, which was not handed down until 4 months later. In making its determination the Board confined itself to evidence of convictions and properly refused to try accusations of violence which had not resulted in convictions in the criminal courts. It decided that all strikers who had been convicted of possession and use of explosives, malicious destruction of property to the value of $300, and possession of a bomb, all felonies, should be denied reinstatement, but that all others who had been convicted of less serious offenses should be reinstated. Among these others were 9 convicted of unlawfully obstructing and retarding the passage of the United States mail, 3 of discharging firearms, 7 of malicious destruction of property to the value of less than $300, 1 of unlawfully interfering with telegraph or telephone messages, 1 of transporting explosives, 5 of interfering with and obstructing railway tracks, 13 of carrying concealed weapons, and 1 of assault and battery sufficiently serious to call for the imposition of a fine of $200 and costs and a suspended sentence of 6 months.

Whether all of these defendants were striking Republic employees does not clearly appear from the record although it seems that they were all affiliated with S. W. O. C. We think, however, that their offenses were sufficiently serious to render the reinstatement of those of them who were Republic employees inappropriate and improper under the rule laid down in the Fansteel case. Paragraph (f) of section 2 of the order of the Board is accordingly modified to this extent. As to the remaining offenses proved to have been committed we are satisfied from their character and from the small penalties imposed that they were all sufficiently minor to come within our decision in the Stackpole case and the order of the Board directing the reinstatement of the persons involved in them will be enforced.

Republic raises certain objections to the form of the order. Its principal complaint is to a provision that employees directed to be reinstated for whom no positions are presently available shall be placed on a single preferential hiring list for all of Republic's plants in Ohio, in Monroe, Mich., and in Pittsburgh and Beaver Falls, Pa. The objection is as to the provision directing possible reinstatement at a plant other than that at which the employee formerly worked. The Board has power to make such an order, however. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Remington Rand, Inc.*, supra. We do not think that its use in this case was an abuse of the discretion vested in the Board. We have also carefully considered Republic's other objections to the form of the order. Finding them without merit we will not discuss them further.

Finally Republic contends that it was not accorded procedural due process by the Board. We think that this point also is wholly without merit. After lengthy hearings the Board issued its findings and order on April 8, 1938. On June 14, 1939, after proceedings in this court and in the Supreme Court (304 U. S. 486) the Board set aside its findings and order. On July 8, 1938, it issued a draft of proposed findings and order. Thereafter both Republic and S. W. O. C. filed exceptions to the proposed findings and order and also filed briefs in support of their exceptions. Oral argument upon the exceptions was had before the Board on August 11, 1938, participated in by counsel for Republic and S. W. O. C. On October 18, 1938, the Board issued the findings and order now before us for review. It is obvious from this recital that Republic was not denied due process. See *Labor Board* v. *Mackay Co.*, supra; *Edison Co.* v. *Labor Board* (305 U. S. 197).

Paragraph (f) of section 2 of the order of the Board is modified as hereinabove indicated. In all other respects the order is affirmed. A decree enforcing it will be entered.

Schools and Training Courses in Government Departments—National Labor Relations Board and Bituminous Coal Commission Take Issue With Acting Comptroller General's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

LETTERS FROM NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, the Acting Comptroller General, R. N. Elliott, submitted to you a report on schools and training courses in Government departments, and independent agencies. You referred that report to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman. Several Government officials have already lodged complaints with my committee, maintaining the report contained many inaccurate statements. I have already placed in the RECORD the answer of those in charge of the school in the Agriculture Department.

In view of the publicity given to this report at the time it was submitted, I feel it is only proper those criticized in the report have their answer given to the public.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include letters received by me from the National Labor Relations Board and the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department

of the Interior. The letters, which speak for themselves, follow:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Government Departments, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Under date of April 12, 1940, R. N. Elliott, Acting Comptroller General, submitted to Congress a report on schools and training courses in Government departments. This report, as you know, was referred to your committee.

The report, as its title indicates, purports to deal with schools and training courses which are being conducted in or by Government departments and agencies. In a subdivision of the report entitled "Teaching by 'Interneships'" there is a discussion of interneship in the office of Abe Fortas, general counsel of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior. Thereafter the report goes on to make the following statements:

"The letterhead of the International Juridical Association, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City, discloses that its national committee representatives for the District of Columbia are John P. Davis, Thomas I. Emerson, Abe Fortas, Dr. Charles H. Houston, Henry T. Hunt, Joseph Kovner, Joseph Padway, Lee Pressman, Anthony Wayne Smith, Ruth Weyand, Nathan Witt, and David Ziskind.

"A circular letter dated April 27, 1939, published by the International Juridical Association, discloses that efforts were being made to influence consideration of, and possible amendments to, the National Labor Relations Act.

"Nathan Witt and Thomas I. Emerson, mentioned above, are secretary and assistant general counsel to said Board, respectively, as disclosed by the departmental register, 1939, and by the hearings on the National Labor Relations Board, yet being conducted. Witt is listed as receiving a salary of $7,500 and Emerson a salary of $7,000 per annum.

"The names of several members of the International Juridical Association's national committee are to be found on the list recently published by the Committee Investigating Subversive Activities as the alleged list of members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Among the names on that list are those of Fortas, Witt, and Emerson."

I wish to call your attention to the following matters:

First. The paragraphs just quoted have no conceivable relevance to the supposed subject matter of the report, namely "Schools and Training Courses in Government Departments." Nor, so far as I am aware, do they have any relevance to any matter which the Comptroller General is authorized by law to investigate and report to Congress. Section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act (42 Stat. 25), under which Mr. Elliott purports to be acting, authorizes the Comptroller General to investigate only "matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds." By no stretch of the imagination does the above discussion of the Board and its officials relate to the "receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds." I can only conclude that Mr. Elliott has made a gratuitous incursion into matters which are none of his business with the deliberate intent to damage the public credit of the Board.

Second. The statement that Mr. Emerson's name appears upon the Dies list of alleged members of the American League for Peace and Democracy is pure fabrication. Mr. Emerson's name does not appear upon that list either as published in the official reports of the Dies committee or in any of the newspapers. Mr. Emerson informs me that he is not now and has never been a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Third, while it is true that Mr. Witt's name appears upon the list of alleged members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the fact is that he also is not and never has been a member of that organization. Upon publication of the Dies list Mr. Witt immediately denied publicly that he was a member of the league and that denial was carried in many of the newspapers which published the original list. The report of the Acting Comptroller General, however, makes no reference to Mr. Witt's denial and apparently the Acting Comptroller General made no effort to ascertain the truth of the matter prior to the issuance of his report.

Fourth, the implication of the report is that there is something improper in the fact that two officials of the Board are members of the national committee of the International Juridical Association and that the association has expressed itself upon the issue of amending the National Labor Relations Act. The International Juridical Association is an organization of lawyers which publishes a monthly bulletin upon labor law and which otherwise interests itself in various phases of labor law. Its work has been highly praised by Felix Frankfurter, now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; by James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School; by Lloyd K. Garrison, dean of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin, and by other authorities upon labor law. Neither Mr. Emerson nor Mr. Witt had anything to do with the policy of the International Juridical Association upon amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, as could readily have been ascertained if any inquiry had been made into the matter. The fact that they are members of the national committee of the International Juridical Association has no more significance than the fact that I and other officials of the Board are members of the American Bar Association, which has likewise expressed itself upon amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. It is perhaps not out of place to call attention to the fact that Col. O. R. McGuire was extremely active in the American Bar Association and elsewhere in support of the Walter-Logan bill, in fact was one of the chief protagonists of that bill, at a time when he was employed in the General Accounting Office itself.

Finally, I wish to point out that the report was based either upon an ex parte inquiry into the facts or upon no inquiry at all. I am unable to comprehend how any supposedly responsible agency of the Government could undertake to report to Congress upon the affairs of another Government agency without affording such other agency an opportunity even to know that charges were being made against it, much less an opportunity to answer such charges.

We have requested the Acting Comptroller General to rectify the injustice done to the Board and its officials by his report. He has declined to take any action. Under the circumstance I request that this letter be made a part of the official record of your committee upon this matter.

I am sending a similar letter to Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am also sending a copy of the letter to the Acting Comptroller General.

Sincerely yours,

J. WARREN MADDEN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION,
Washington, April 25, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: There has come to my attention the report of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States on the subject of Schools and Training Courses in Government Departments, dated April 12, 1940. Since I note that this report has been referred to your Committee on Expenditures, I wish to call your attention to certain errors in this report which affect me and matters within the scope of my official duties.

A segment of the report is devoted to a criticism of the appointment of Tucker Dean as a so-called intern in connection with the legal staff of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior. In the fall of 1939, a member of the Chicago Law School faculty visited Secretary Ickes and expressed a desire to work out an arrangement whereby one or more University of Chicago law students would spend a few months observing and studying the legal work of some branch of the Department of the Interior. The professor was referred to me, and I reported back to the Secretary and recommended that we cooperate in the project. The Secretary agreed to try the project on a limited, experimental basis.

Tucker Dean was the only person appointed or who served pursuant to this arrangement. He was appointed on an uncompensated basis. His appointment was expressly conditioned on the understanding that he was to perform work which would not otherwise be done by regular personnel, but which might be useful in connection with the legal work of the Division. Dean traveled to and from Washington and lived here at his own expense. He was here for a period of about 3 months, occupying a desk which was not otherwise in use, and engaged in studying various public records of hearings, observing public proceedings before the Division, and consulting with members of the staff when they were available, generally at luncheon or after hours. His activities did not cost the Government one penny either in supervisory time, facilities, or otherwise. He completed a memorandum on his work after he returned to Chicago, which surveys various technical problems under the Coal Act. We have found his memorandum to be useful and of high quality. This survey would not and could not have been made by any of our regular personnel, because they are engaged on other and pressing problems.

In his discussion of this matter the Acting Comptroller General implies that the Department was without authority to make this appointment (Rept., p. 41). The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 authorizes us to "accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services of any person" (sec. 2 (a)). This provision clearly authorizes the appointment of Dean on the basis upon which it was made. Assistant Secretary Burlew advises me that he expressly pointed out this statutory authority to the investigator from the General Accounting Office, but it is nowhere adverted to in the report.

The report further states that my name appeared on the "alleged list of members of the American League for Peace and Democracy" published by the "committee investigating subversive activities" (by this I assume the report intended to refer to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities). My name never appeared on this list either in the committee's official report or in any newspaper. I have never been a member of the league, and I have never been connected with it in any way, directly or indirectly, nor has any member of my family.

In any event, reference to this matter and to my membership on the national committee of the International Juridical Association are utterly immaterial and irrelevant to the subject matter of the report. Incidentally, I have never participated in the affairs of the association, and my committee membership is entirely nominal. To the best of my information and belief this is solely and exclusively

a professional organization devoted to the study of legal problems incident to labor relations. The bulletin which it publishes is a recognized legal authority in the field.

I am informed that the Department furnished the investigator assigned by the General Accounting Office a full and complete statement of the Tucker Dean project. The investigator was advised (as is the fact) that this project did not involve the receipt, disbursement, or application of any funds whatsoever. No fees, tuition, emoluments, remuneration, or any funds whatsoever were received by the Government or any official or employee thereof or paid by the Government or any official or employee thereof, directly or indirectly, in connection with this matter. No mention of this fact is made in the report. Indeed, this fact demonstrates, in my opinion, that the General Accounting Office and the Acting Comptroller General were without authority to investigate or to report on the Dean project. Section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, under which the report was issued, is limited to matters relating to "the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds." No such issue was involved, directly or remotely, in the Dean case.

It is perhaps significant that the investigator who looked into this matter is a former employee of the Department of the Interior who was involuntarily separated from the service. After his dismissal, this gentleman filed voluminous charges with the Department which, after careful investigation, were found to be without any basis in fact.

In conclusion, may I say that I would welcome public and congressional discussion and criticism of the modest Tucker Dean project, and of the idea of placing law students in Government agencies for training on an uncompensated, carefully restricted basis. The idea is closely akin to the practice which has been advocated and fostered for many years by the National Institute of Public Affairs, sponsored by the great Rockefeller Foundation, with respect to college (but not law school) students. It has the obvious advantage of building a reservoir of trained personnel from which the Government can recruit lawyers of proven ability and high character, in a field in which the Civil Service Commission is without power under its present statutory authority; and it doesn't cost the Government or the taxpayers a single cent.

Respectfully yours,

ABE FORTAS, *General Counsel.*

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL BY GEORGE E. DUNN

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief but thought-provoking editorial by George E. Dunn, publisher of the Half Moon Bay Review, in Half Moon Bay, Calif. It has drawn widespread attention and comment in my State and is certainly worthy of recognition here in Congress:

[From the Half Moon Bay (Calif.) Review]

(CENSORED)

This blank space represents a thoughtful pause in the lives of all of us. The above is common in European newspapers. It is the opposite of what we cherish: Freedom of speech and the right of peaceful assembly. Censorship means dictatorship, which in turn means a people ridden by hate and fear and violence. See to it that it doesn't happen here.

As the chosen representatives of a free people, it behooves each of us to reaffirm our faith in the ideals of true democracy and traditional Americanism. It is our task to be constantly on the alert against any and all attempts to undermine our constitutional liberties or to take from us our hard-won heritage of freedom.

Embargo Export of Munitions and Matériel of War to Japan—Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

STATEMENT BY HARRY B. PRICE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our continuation of shipment of matériel and munitions of war to Japan is very disturbing to all peace lovers in the United States. We are, in fact, participants in Japanese aggression against China. It seems to me to be of the utmost importance that we should embargo the exportation of matériel of war and munitions to Japan, particularly as there may be exigent need for their use by our own Government for defense purposes in the near future. We must ourselves be prepared to resist aggression from outside. A very interesting statement has been issued by Harry B. Price, executive secretary of the American Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression, which I think would be helpful to all students of this important question, and especially to those who have been following the oriental crisis. Personally, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5432, which, if enacted into law, would eventuate in the very results sought by those who believe we should cease forthwith directly or indirectly being partners in aggression by the Japanese toward the Chinese people. This bill has had hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and is somewhat similar in purport and objectives to bills now pending in the United States Senate and which were introduced by Senators PITTMAN, of Nevada, and SCHWELLENBACH, of Washington.

I cannot urge too vehemently the imperative importance of the Congress considering a compromise combination of any of these bills in debate on the floor of both Houses. The statement of Mr. Price speaks for itself, and is as follows:

[From the American Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression, New York, N. Y.]

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 18.—Japan's large secret naval construction program revealed recently in statements from Washington, has been made possible by plentiful supplies of American materials, especially iron and steel scrap, according to a statement made today by Harry B. Price, executive secretary of the American Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression.

Based on Department of Commerce figures, the statement points out that from 1934 to 1939, inclusive, American exports of scrap iron and scrap steel to Japan reached a volume of 8,520,811 tons, a total export greater than that to all other nations combined, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy. The statement follows:

"American materials, especially scrap iron and scrap steel, and American machinery have made possible Japan's huge secret naval construction program, exceeding in some categories that of the United States itself, according to facts made known in Washington recently.

During the 6 years 1934 to 1939, inclusive, Japan obtained from the United States 8,520,811 tons of scrap iron and scrap steel, or 52 percent of America's total export to all countries of 16,498,906 tons. Thus, American exports to Japan of these materials, fundamental for naval construction, have exceeded those to Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Italy, and all other countries combined, according to statistics published by the United States Department of Commerce.

"In 1939, 57 percent of all American exports of scrap iron and steel went to Japan.

"In 1938, according to careful studies, Japan obtained approximately 90 percent of her imports of these metals from the United States. The proportion for 1939 was probably higher, although statistics of Japan's imports from other countries in that year are not yet available; with other sources restricted, due to the European conflict, Japan imported from the United States in 1939 an all-time high of 2,022,958 tons.

"During the previous 6-year period, 1928 to 1933, inclusive, Japan's purchases of these metals averaged 216,075 tons per year. In 1934 Japan denounced her naval treaty with the United States and Great

Britain and in that year her scrap iron and steel purchases from the United States more than doubled. From that year onward her purchases of these metals have exceeded a million tons annually, averaging approximately 1,420,000 tons per year, an increase of 527 percent over the previous 6-year period. During the first 2 months of 1940 exports of scrap iron and steel to Japan totaled 210,337 tons, approximately half of America's exports to all countries of 421,173 tons.

"Only a portion of these extensive exports of iron and steel scrap would be needed for the construction of between 400,000 and 500,000 tons of warships in Japan's battle fleet now reported to be completed or nearing completion. The balance has been available for the development of war industries and for the conduct of Japan's war against China.

"Thus the United States has furnished indispensable help, not only for the invasion of China but also for the building up of a navy reported to be almost equaling our own in strength. While this export trade continues, further depleting valuable and strategic American resources, it becomes necessary to impose huge additional tax burdens upon the Nation for naval construction in order to meet the competition which American exports are making possible.

"Pending legislation, introduced by Senators PITTMAN and SCHWELLENBACH, would authorize the placing of restrictions upon those strategic exports, on the basis of American rights and obligations under the Nine Power Treaty."

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Ross, published recently in the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1940]

BARDEN BILL "FARM RELIEF" RIDICULED—NO MERIT SEEN IN THIS MOVE TO AMEND WAGE AND HOUR ACT

(By Charles G. Ross)

One of the favorite pieces of legislative shenanigan, now, as always, is to wrap up a bill in the guise of aid to the farmer. High-tariff measures have always been put across as panaceas for the farmer's ills. The varied interests that oppose the Hull reciprocal-trade policy take shelter behind the argument that it hurts the farmer. Now it is the Barden bill to amend the Federal Wage and Hour Act which is being pressed on Congress as a measure of farm relief.

Stalled off last year, the Barden bill is scheduled, along with other proposed amendments to the act, to come before the House late this week.

Now the Federal Wage and Hour Act is not sacrosanct. Amendments have been proposed by the House Labor Committee which clearly should be adopted, particularly the amendment which would exempt well-paid white-collar workers from the hours provisions of the act. But the bill of the North Carolina Representative, Mr. BARDEN, proposing the exemption of more than a million workers engaged in the handling and processing of farm products, ought to be given short shrift.

WORKERS ARE LOW PAID

The workers whom Mr. Barden would take out from under the protecting wing of the act compose one of the lowest-paid groups in the country. They perform industrial, not farm labor. They are the people who work at canning, packing, and other processing jobs that intervene between the growing of farm products and the time they reach the retailer's shelves. It would be as logical to exempt shoe-factory employees from the operation of the act, on the ground that they are engaged in preparing the stockman's hides for the market, as to leave out these workers in canning and other processing plants.

What are the provisions from which relief is sought? They have nothing to do with farm labor, which is entirely outside the scope of the Wage and Hour Act. The requirement is simply, so far as the categories affected by the Barden bill are concerned, that there shall be a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour for a 42-hour workweek, or payment at the rate of $655.20 a year. This is the minimum standard that Congress has set for the industrial workers covered by the Wage and Hour Act. It doesn't appear on its face to be a standard calculated to wreck the American industrial system. The question may fairly be asked whether any industry dependent for its existence on the payment of less than $655 yearly wage deserves to survive.

That question, however, may be waived. Congress has fixed the standard. In an effort to protect marginal labor—labor which, by and large, is unable to protect itself through collective bargaining—Congress has fixed a floor for wages and a ceiling for hours. It has done this not only to benefit the individual worker, but to benefit the industrial system—including the farmer—through increasing the buying power of the group at the bottom of the economic heap. Limited control over wages and hours, with these ends in view, is no longer mere economic theory; it is the law of the land.

FAVORITISM QUESTION ARISES

The question, therefore, which the sweeping Barden bill poses for Congress is whether or not this control is to be broken down for the advantage of certain favored employers.

Passage of the Barden bill would not only tear a gaping hole in the Wage and Hour Act, it would be a signal for further powerful drives to gain exemptions. The end could well be a complete riddling of the act. If it is to be knocked out or radically changed, let that result be achieved through an open and aboveboard revision of policy by Congress, not through the adoption of killing amendments at the behest of pressure groups. Meantime the act represents the will of Congress and it ought to be given a chance.

The plea that the Barden bill would help the farmer is wholly specious and should be met with a shattering vote against the bill.

Democratic Convention at Bristol, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ADDRESS OF T. B. FUGATE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. T. B. Fugate at the Democratic convention at Bristol, Va.:

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, and friends of democracy, ladies, and gentlemen, I sincerely appreciate the impulses and the splendid motives that have actuated this occasion. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for us to dwell together in unity."

A very inquisitive little fellow approached his mother with the question, "Where was I born, mother?" "You were born in California, dear." "Where were you born, mother?" "Mother was born in Maine." "And where was papa born?" "His birthplace is England." There was a silence for a moment, during which time the little fellow's face wore an expression of deep study. Finally he remarked, "Isn't it funny how we all got together."

Now, since we have had the privilege of getting together, let us make the most of this gathering.

I am glad to be with you and to be one of you. We have reason to be proud of the great Democratic Party.

The principles of the Democratic Party, as laid down by such men as Jefferson and Jackson, cannot be too often reiterated or too familiar to those who hold the trusts committed to us by our forefathers. It is from the rich legacy of thought that these patriots have left us that we submit a few of the principles upon which true democracy rests.

Thomas Jefferson, with an abiding faith in the average man—a faith of tremendous significance in American history, in his first inaugural address, stated that in his administration he would be guided by the following rules:

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.

"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliance with none.

"The support of the State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrators of our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antidemocratic tendencies.

"The preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

"A jealous care of the right of election by the people.

"Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principles of republics.

"A well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace, and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them.

"The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

"Economy in the public expenses, that labor may be lightly burdened.

"Encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid.

"The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason.

"Freedom of religion.

"Freedom of the press.

"Freedom of the person under the protection of the habeas corpus."

"These principles," said Jefferson, "form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through the age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

Andrew Jackson gave utterance to Democratic axioms during his administration, only a few of which can be given here. He said:

"In every case advantage must result from strict and faithful economy in the administration of public affairs.

"In the adjustment of a tariff for revenue a spirit of equity, caution, and compromise requires the great interest of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, to be equally favored.

"That the patronage of the General Government, which had been brought into conflict with the freedom of elections and had disturbed the rightful course of appointments and selections by continuing in power unfaithful and incompetent public servants, should no longer be used for that purpose.

"That integrity and zeal of public officers would advance the interests of the public services more than mere numbers.

"That it was the right of the people to elect a President, and it was never designed that their choice should in any case be defeated by the intervention of agents.

"Commerce should be unfettered, free from the restrictions of tariff laws, and left to flow into those natural channels in which individual enterprise, always the surest and safest guide, might direct it.

"Specific tariffs should not be imposed, because, subject to changes produced by selfish motives, they could never be just and equal.

"That proper fostering of manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agriculture products.

"He declared in favor of the principle that no money should be expended until first appropriated for the purpose by the legislature.

"The operation of the General Government should be strictly confined to the few simple but important objects for which it was originally designed."

The Democratic Party consists largely of those who live by the work of their hands, and whose political action is governed by their sentiments or imagination.

It results, therefore, that the Democratic Party can readily be molded to the support of reform measures, which involve a sacrifice of selfish interests. Is it any wonder that we are Democrats?

There has never been a time when the human race and the nations of the world needed intelligent, careful, thoughtful common-sense leadership as they do today. Therein lies a challenge to all of us, to bring forth the best, the most substantial traits which we possess, and apply them to the solution of our future problems which are just being opened up by our present situation.

With President Roosevelt conditions continue to improve.

We have climbed out of the mire of the world's worst depression. We are on our way to a dependable prosperity—not the hectic mad period from which we were suffering in 1929, but that which is substantial and dependable.

When the President first assumed his official duties we were on the verge of revolution. Conditions in America were not unlike those that prevailed in Europe before the French Revolution. The citizenship of America was possessed with terror. Businessmen everywhere were fearful of the future. No one knew what tomorrow would bring.

And then a new, powerful leader—courageous, confident—lifted us out of the slough of discouragement and hopelessness. How well we remember how our hearts burned within us as he talked to the Nation on that eventful day in March 1933. His words were like those of the Master when He walked and talked to His companions on the road to Emmaus. They were seared into our consciousness. We heard him gladly and hopefully because he spoke as one having authority, and not as his predecessors. There was a note of sincerity and authenticity in his spoken word that former leaders did not possess, filled with their vanity.

As a nation we were not unlike a man without a head, moving swiftly toward wreckage and ruin, realizing fully the fate that was before us and yet powerless to avoid the inevitable crash.

Every thoughtful, considerate American is grateful to the President of the United States for much of the change that has been wrought in the business status of this Nation. He saved us from national bankruptcy; he saved us from something far worse—for an unorganized people in which there are millions of unemployed would soon have been ruled by gangs and reckless hungry mobs.

Immediate and strong action was necessary to save the Nation from ruin. The closing of the banks proved to the country that we had a daring, self-reliant leader at the helm. The Nation that was wobbling like a chicken with its head off was quickly supplied with an intelligent and powerful directing force. Orderly regulations were substituted for chaotic confusion.

An example of the outstanding efficiency of our Chief Executive was demonstrated in his settlement of the automobile strike. Both business and labor were satisfied with his decisions. The rights of the citizens—constitutional government—were upheld.

The great majority of the American people desire and have determined that there shall be no interruption to the processes of recovery which have brought us so far in the direction of general prosperity.

Our critics will say that this is politics and not economics. Well, politics and economic success at this stage of national progress are inseparable. It was politics to accomplish the retirement of an administration that had miserably failed, and to bring about the election in 1932 of Franklin Delano Roosevelt with a mandate from the people to correct the abuses, that had left our Nation tottering on the brink of catastrophe.

Seven years of constructive leadership have made things immeasurably better. They are not perfect by any means, but industrial and commercial enterprises, large and small, are making money and the total of our well-being is constantly improving. The elements that are fighting the administration are not helping in bringing about this state of affairs. We would be much further on our way if it had not been for the incessant clamor of our political foes, who have fought every detail of our program. Their constant effort is to replace the impulses of faith and hope, engendered by the revival of business activity, with the philosophy of fear.

That has delayed complete recovery, delayed the reinvestment of profits. That is why there are so many still unemployed even in the face of rising markets and increased income.

There are three ways of cooperating. One is to do less than your half of the job, which is really not cooperating at all. The second is to do exactly half, depending on the other fellow to do as well as you. And the third is to do as much more than your share as you possibly can. Then, if the other fellow does more than his share, too, what a cracking good job you will turn out.

Early in life I caught the inspiration of cooperation. I realized full well that if I were to succeed in any great measure, I must necessarily not rely upon my own hands alone. One man can do only so much, but when he identifies himself with others for the accomplishment of a certain purpose, not only does his work become easier but the results more certain.

Membership in any organization means an essential part of the whole. Each member of a society has his individual part to play. If he is the right sort of an individual he is going to realize that the progress of the society may depend on how well he has taken care of his minor part.

In the theatrical world the star that shines the most brilliantly must have the wholehearted support of the other members of the cast. By the production being pronounced a success all have their reward—a satisfaction of knowing that they have performed their parts in such a manner as to assure success.

A good member of a society or organization places faith in the leader and battles for the true principles of his organization.

The Democratic Party is a party that encourages independent thought among its members. If they all thought alike it would be proof conclusive that they did not think at all. Parties exist because parties emphasize the points of difference. Harmony exists in parties because the members emphasize the points of agreement rather than the points of difference. In this Nation the things that the whole people have and hold in common are more numerous and more important than the things on which they differ. Today those who stand for the Democratic Party are able to go before this Nation and give a reason for the faith that is in them.

Let us always remember that coming together is a beginning; keeping together is progress; and working together is loyalty and success.

A house divided cannot stand. Its enemies, the opposition, seek to make divisions so they may enter in. As a party let us be militant, presenting a strong, undaunted front and follow our ideals to victory.

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, never have I undertaken a duty more pleasing to me than that which I am now endeavoring to perform. Nevertheless, I sincerely regret that this part of the program has been assigned to me. The occasion is deserving the support of much greater ability of speech than I possess.

However, today we are making history. This is a momentous hour in the annals of our State.

We are met to choose a candidate to represent the Ninth District of Virginia in the Congress of the United States, who will uninterruptedly and faithfully carry out the duties and the responsibilities of that important office.

Such a person must have certain qualifications. He must be a real leader. He must be a man who has been trained for such tasks as will confront him. He must be trained in the school of experience.

Moreover, he must be a man of unquestioned integrity and honesty; he must be one who is known as fearless and who is pledged by both word and past service to the faithful enforcement of all laws. He must stand in the open on all issues. The searching light of closest investigation must not reveal compromise with wrong, no effort to shield or bargain with wrongdoers, and no apology for our Constitution and its provisions.

Such a man we must have and such a man I gladly proffer.

He is honored at home, trusted everywhere. There is no need to portray the profound love which goes out to our candidate from

every class and section of this great mountain district. If you would know the heart of the Anglo-Saxon people, free from the conventions and restrictions imposed by urban society, go into the hill country and live with its honest and simple folk. There you will observe the elemental nature of man and his close relationship to Mother Earth. There you will feel the throb of the mountains, the combined heart of its people, beating in unison with the great heart of God. Men of ambition, in such surroundings, inevitably become great. My friend and your friend, the friend of all the people, had as an essential part of his education years of schooling in such an environment.

The immortal spirits whose hands guided the infant steps of this Republic, whose blood consecrated and made this land liberty's dearest shrine, cry out again to each of the million of voters into whose hands the destiny of this Nation is lodged, "Watchman, what of the night?" From the orange groves of Florida to the waving wheat fields of the Northwest; from the nodding pines beyond the Alleghanies across the Great Plains and the Rockies to the slopes by the peaceful sea, men and women with ballot in hand, answer, "The morning cometh," the morning of the Republic's hope.

Thomas Jefferson had the courage to write in the presence of a tyrant and his army, the immortal words: "That governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Our candidate knows the dangers of monopolies, combinations, and trusts—institutions formed and fostered by privileged groups. His voice has been raised for oppressed humanity. He has charmed the common people with the plain truth of democracy. He is one of the ablest and most eloquent champions of the rights of the plain people.

On our candidate's behalf, I can promise faithful service and the prompt discharge of every duty. Others may have as much zeal for the cause; some may have as long a training for the duties of the office; a few may possibly have as legitimate a claim upon any honors or rewards in your gift; but where can you find in the District a man with such a combination of claims?

Recently, I heard of a rare old hand-written copy of the Bible, the first page of which was beautifully illuminated; a charming design of many-colored flowers and leaves surrounded the record, while the initial letter was embellished with a leaf of pure gold. The gold was not essential to the record or to the charm of the artistically colored decoration which formed its frame, but this added touch of pure gold provided an unmistakable glow and enhanced the importance of the whole. It was a plus sign on the recorded page.

The pure gold of a fine character shines as the morning sun and lends a rare dignity to the achievements of man. It is the plus sign which illuminates the beauty of his record in the theater of life which he adorns.

I nominate one of America's great Democrats as our candidate for Congress from the Ninth District of Virginia—JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.

Lincoln Group Observes Important Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE F. ARNOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY KING V. HOSTICK

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by a distinguished son of Illinois and well-known Lincoln student and writer, Mr. King V. Hostick:

LINCOLN GROUP OBSERVES IMPORTANT ANNIVERSARY

(By King V. Hostick)

This writer has been privileged to attend some highly interesting Lincoln group gatherings in various parts of the United States on many different occasions, but one which will stand out in his memory for many years to come was a meeting held in the William Petersen House in Washington, D. C., on the early morning of April 15, 1940. The date was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the day Abraham Lincoln breathed his last, and the place, the house to which his bleeding body was carried after the tragedy at Ford's Theater.

Accompanied by Mr. Bert Sheldon, well-known Lincoln enthusiast and prime mover in the formation of the Washington, D. C., Lincoln Group, we arrived at 511 Tenth Street NW. at approximately 7 a. m., there to be met by several other gentlemen, among them Dr. Stewart McClelland, president of the Lincoln Memorial University of Harrogate, Tenn.; Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, himself a devoted admirer of the Emancipator and present owner of the famous Grace Bedell letter written to Lincoln asking him to grow a beard; Randle B. Truett, of the Lincoln Museum of Washington; Carl W. Schaefer, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Robert Lee Kincaid, executive vice president of Lincoln Memorial University.

At exactly 7:22 a. m.—the moment Lincoln breathed his last and became part of eternity—Dr. McClelland stepped forward and asked that we bow our heads in respect to the memory of our Civil War President. After a full minute of silence, Dr. McClelland offered a prayer. Here in the gray morning stillness of a tiny room, nearly a century later, one was acutely conscious of the spirit of this great man among those who had assembled there to do him honor and the memorial service was dignified and touching. Several men's eyes were tear-filled and one gentleman openly wept. Written words fail to describe adequately the emotions of the group who took part in this early morning meeting.

An interesting discovery which came to light was the fact that Mr. Schaefer had been in the same room at the same moment 25 years previous, but at that time only Mr. Schaefer and his friend, Mr. O. H. Oldroyd, the then custodian of the Petersen House, were present.

As this group of some 10 or 12 gathered on this memorable occasion the writer could not help but let his mind drift back to that fatal evening several score years ago when, then too, men had gathered in this room and spoke in hushed tones and on the bed lay Abraham Lincoln, his life diminishing, his spirit waning. Strange that this child of the people who had achieved the heights, who had been born in a small and humble room, should be destined to pass from this world among similar surroundings. What a tragic sight it must have presented. But the world is well aware that Abraham Lincoln did not die that night, nor will his memory ever fade. He has taken his place among history's immortals and the ideals he exemplified shall live forever.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK H. BUCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal about the damage that reciprocal-trade agreements were doing to the dairy industry of the United States, during the course of the recent debate on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

It is refreshing, therefore, to note that statistical proof that reciprocal-trade agreements directly benefit the dairy industry of the United States by stimulating exports of American dairy products is contained in a recent report of the United States Tariff Commission.

The direct export benefits are seldom mentioned. Opponents of the trade-agreements program prefer to make it appear by false implications, fragmentary statistics, and direct misstatements that the program has been nothing but an injury to the dairy industry of this country.

It is a fact that exports and imports of dairy products together are ordinarily almost negligible in comparison with domestic production and consumption. It is a fact that the prosperity of the dairy industry in the United States depends almost entirely upon the level of industrial activity and employment in the United States. Opponents of trade agreements know this. They also know that trade agreements stimulate and maintain industrial activity and employment, thereby creating a bigger and a better domestic market for American farm and factory products. But they ignore these facts, as well as the facts about benefits of trade agreements indirectly facilitating the foreign marketing of American dairy products.

I insert an article from the New York Times of April 23, 1940, calling attention to this direct benefit through increased exports of surplus United States dairy products to countries which, through trade agreements, have granted concessions on these products.

[From the New York Times of April 23, 1940]

TRADE TREATIES LIFT DAIRY EXPORTS—TARIFF COMMISSION COMPLETES SURVEY OF EFFECT OF AGREEMENTS ON SHIPMENTS—CONCESSIONS ARE STUDIED—IMPORTS OF PRODUCTS ROSE TO $14,143,000 IN 1939 FROM $12,095,000 IN 1938

WASHINGTON, April 22.—A substantial increase in exports of dairy products to 11 countries which have granted the United States concessions in trade agreements was reported today by the Tariff Commission.

Figures compiled by the Commission in a survey of the effect of trade agreements on dairy products showed the value of dairy products exported to countries which granted tariff concessions increased from $1,673,000 in 1938 to $2,815,000 in 1939, while exports to countries which have not granted concessions declined from $4,411,000 to $4,321,000.

Total dairy exports to all countries in 1939 amounted to $7,136,000, against $6,084,000 in 1938.

"The value of exports for which concessions have been obtained," the Commission said, using the 1938 figure for comparison, "represented about one-third of the exports of dairy products to all foreign countries. The principal concessions obtained have applied to dried milk."

The Commission said exports of dairy products comprise mainly condensed and evaporated milk, dried milk, infants' food (malted). Three of the countries which granted concessions on these products were the leading markets for the United States.

"Venezuela, by far the largest foreign market," the Commission said, "granted concessions affecting all but a small part of the United States exports to that country. Eight other Latin-American countries granted concessions on about four-fifths of the United States exports to these countries."

The United States granted reductions in duties under trade agreements now in effect to about two-fifths of the total imports of dairy products, the Commission reported.

"More than 95 percent of the imports affected by the concessions have consisted of cheese," the Commission said. "On the basis of imports in 1938, the average reduction in duty on imports of all dairy products was 15 percent. The average reduction on concession products alone was 33 percent."

Figures compiled by the Commission showed the value of imports of dairy products on which concessions have been granted increased from $5,156,000 in 1938 to $6,214,000 in 1939. The value of total dairy products imported in these years was listed as $12,095,000 in 1938 and $14,143,000 in 1939.

The Commission said more than one-half the imports of cheese, including nonconcession items, consists of types "which are of minor importance in domestic production. Cheddar cheese and Swiss cheese are produced in substantial volume in the United States. There is little or no domestic commercial production of the other concession items."

Although duties have been reduced twice in agreements with Canada on imports of Cheddar cheese, the Commission said "imports coming almost entirely from Canada have been irregular recently, but in no year have they exceeded 2.2 percent of domestic production."

The Trojan Horse in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD OF APRIL 22, 1940

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 22, 1940:

[From the Philadelphia Record of April 22, 1940]

THE TROJAN HORSE IN CONGRESS

If the American people want a first-hand example of the kind of "boring from within" tactics which really menace their interests they may observe the attempt now under way to kill the wage and hour law.

It is not too much to say that the wage and hour law faces a fight for its very life.

Opponents of the measure do not, however, attack it directly. Instead, they pose as friends of the wage and hour law who want to amend it so as to improve it.

How much they would improve it may be estimated from the fact that if the Barden bill—their Trojan horse—should be enacted it would remove wage and hour protection from 1,500,000 workers at one swoop.

That's not our idea of improving the wage and hour law. Our idea of improving that law is to make it apply to more workers, to broaden its scope so the wage and hour levels of the Nation will further increase purchasing power, further increase employment—and by so doing, further increase the volume of American business.

The bill offered by Representative BARDEN of North Carolina, is attractively dressed up. It would "protect the farmer" and "clear up certain ambiguities in the statute." And the actual changes sound quite innocent—until one examines their actual effect.

This bill would not have any effect upon farm labor, despite its pretensions. The wage and hour law does not cover agriculture. But the bill would strip the law's protection from all employees who perform industrial work on agricultural, horticultural, or dairy products—from the time they have left the farm until they have reached the consumer.

Think what that means. That means taking away wage and hour protection from every worker in every cannery, from every worker in milk-processing plants, and even from the men who deliver milk to your door. The provision would drive a mighty wedge into the very heart of all wage and hour protection because, if reaction can get away with this, it will be encouraged to go on to destroy the entire act in its own good time.

To deprive 1,500,000 industrial workers of wage and hour protection simply because they are engaged in factories which process foods is to say, in effect, that no worker has a right to such protection unless he somehow is able to organize to compel Congress to give it to him.

The wage and hour law was enacted to put a floor under wages in our minority of shamefully underpaid industries and at the same time to put a ceiling on hours. In each instance the standards were extremely mild, working no hardship upon anyone. The law, indeed, was generally regarded as only a first step.

And now Congress is asked to retrace at least half that.

The seriousness of the situation is that the proponents of the Barden bill appear strong enough to force their amendments to a vote.

We hope Congress will answer them with an overwhelming rejection.

National Youth Administration in the University of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

EXCERPT FROM REPORT BY KARL W. ONTHANK, DEAN OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in proof of the excellent work that is being done under the National Youth Administration at the University of Oregon, I call attention to the following excerpt from a report dated April 19, 1940, which I have received from Karl W. Onthank, dean of personnel administration, showing honor grades of undergraduate N. Y. A. students as compared with total undergraduate enrollment at the university:

You will be interested to know that 15.2 percent of N. Y. A. students in the university last quarter were on the honor roll, as compared with 5.1 percent of the entire student body, and that 33.5 percent of all students getting on the honor roll come from the N. Y. A. group. Of the students making straight A records, 53 percent this last term, 60 percent fall term, are N. Y. A.-aided students; only 0.59 percent of the whole student body earned straight A records. Those figures are much the same as those every term since N. Y. A. aid was started.

The point of this, of course, is not that N. Y. A. aid guarantees high grades, but that N. Y. A. is keeping in the university students who can do outstanding work, and who, with this aid, actually achieve outstanding records.

I presume not all institutions have quite this proportion of N. Y. A. students on the honor roll, but from what I know of the operation of N. Y. A. in other colleges and universities, approximately this situation is relatively common. That is, college aid is not only, at a comparatively small cost, keeping thousands of youth off an already overcrowded labor market but, more important, is helping a great many superior young men and women to carry their education to a point where their superior abilities are more fully developed. This is obviously desirable both for their own advancement and for the public welfare.

A report of honor grades of undergraduate National Youth Administration students as compared with total undergraduates enrollment at University of Oregon, 1937–38, 1938–39, and 1939–40

[Total less auditors and graduates]

Term and year	Total university enrollment	Number on National Youth Administration	Number of National Youth Administration students on honor roll	Number of total enrollment on honor roll	Percent of National Youth Administration students on honor roll	Percent of total enrollment on honor roll	Percent of total honor roll students on National Youth Administration	Percent of A students on National Youth Administration	Percent of A students whole university
Fall 1937	3,120	280	31	117	11.1	3.8	26.5	------	------
Winter 1938	3,027	280	50	143	17.9	4.7	35.0	------	------
Summer 1938	2,870	263	47	153	17.9	5.3	30.7	29	0.24
Fall 1938	3,334	311	42	129	13.5	3.9	32.6	36	.42
Winter 1939	3,194	305	42	136	13.8	4.3	30.9	46	.41
Summer 1939	3,018	305	36	111	11.8	3.7	32.4	43	.46
Fall 1939	3,417	351	30	119	8.5	3.5	25.2	60	.29
Winter 1940	3,240	361	[1] 55	[2] 164	15.2	5.1	33.5	53	.59

[1] 10 A students. [2] 19 A students.

Logan-Walter Bill—Editorial Reaction Unfavorable to the Decision of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is clearly evident from editorials appearing in the metropolitan newspapers that the dangerous precedent set by the provisions of the Logan-Walter bill is now foreseen. Editorial writers are now viewing with alarm the effect of such legislation.

The passage of this bill was clearly due to propaganda. To date over 10,000 bills and resolutions have been introduced in the House and Senate. It is, as we all know, absolutely impossible for Members to examine, let alone carefully study, all these measures. The propaganda that came to my desk in support of the Logan-Walter bill was inspired because, hardly without exception, all letters favored the passage of the bill. My suspicions were aroused when I gave some thought to the source of the propaganda. It was then that I secured copies of the bill and report, as well as the hearings, and I could see the dangers embodied in the provisions of the bill. Some Members have told me their mail indicated it was popular legislation and agreed to support it without careful study.

Editorial writers are now accusing the Congress of shirking its responsibility by providing for a review of administrative decisions, which, of course, will clog the Federal courts and result in Congress being required to create many additional judgeships.

I am not alarmed over the situation even though the bill passed the House by a large majority, which I think was due to the one-sided propaganda, because I am confident that the measure will never reach the archives of the Department of State. Somewhere, either in the Senate or the White House, it will meet its death, as it should.

After the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure makes its final report, then the question can be properly approached.

The action of the House in passing legislation while such an outstanding committee was thoroughly investigating and discussing the subject is beyond me to understand. For instance, let us put the shoe on the other foot. Assume the Congress was considering some important question and a bill is about to be reported. The President, knowing this and being opposed, having the power under some law the Congress has passed, issues an Executive order which would practically nullify the recommendations made by a congressional committee. Ask yourself how Members of Congress would feel. Would they resent such action by the President? Of course, they would.

During the debate it was insinuated that certain members of the Attorney General's committee were interested in delaying the report because they were receiving substantial salaries. I replied to this insinuation at the time, especially as to the director of the committee, Mr. Walter Gellhorn, and Mr. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, one of the members. It so happens that Mr. Gellhorn is, or was, a St. Louisan, the city I have the honor in part to represent in this body. I have never met the gentleman in my life, but I do know of his activities and of his outstanding ability. I do know Mr. Gellhorn did not seek this assignment, but the Attorney General sought Mr. Gellhorn, because he is recognized as one of the foremost authorities in the country on administrative law.

I further know that before Mr. Gellhorn consented to serve as director, it was necessary for him to make it perfectly plain that, no matter what might be the stage of the work at the time, he could not remain as director beyond September of this year, when he would be required, as he desired, to resume his permanent career at Columbia University, where he is a full professor in the law school.

Several times since accepting the assignment I am advised that he has announced under no circumstances would he remain in Washington beyond the end of the summer. This shows it was foolish to say he was engaged in dilatory tactics in order to preserve a job for himself. It was a reckless statement, to say the least, because I further know those engaged in the work for the Attorney General have been going at a rather uncomfortable pace in an effort to complete a very large undertaking in the space of a single year.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence that editorial writers are viewing this legislation with alarm, I include as part of my remarks the editorial in the Washington Times-Herald of Wednesday, April 24, which follows:

The Walter-Logan bill does not look so good to us.

This is the bill which passed the House of Representatives last week by the heavy majority of 282 to 97, and on which a showdown in the Senate is expected within the next few days.

The bill has had considerable publicity, but it should have a lot more before the Senate votes on it. And if the Senate passes it, we hope the President will veto it.

The Walter-Logan bill, backed by a combination of Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats, is a bill to hamstring a large part of the New Deal.

The background of the story is this:

Ever since there was a Federal Government, Congress has been setting up administrative boards, bureaus, and agencies to handle various branches of the Government's business.

There are, to mention a few of the best known of these boards, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board.

The number of these agencies has now passed 130. Some of them are useless and outworn. Some others are tyrranical and Peck-sniffish—the Federal Communications Commission (radio) being an example. Most of them perform necessary Government work.

The Walter-Logan bill seeks to bring these agencies under the control of the courts.

It would do so by permitting appeals from these boards' decisions to any United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

It would also make the rules and procedure used by these boards subject to review and approval of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

A few long-established Government boards and bureaus are exempted, among them the Interstate Commerce and Federal Trade Commissions. Practically all the New Deal's new administrative agencies are covered by the bill.

The bill looks bad to us, because we believe this is the wrong way to cure what bureaucratic evils there may be in our Government. They should not be remedied by the judicial branch; that is a job for the legislative branch. The courts should not be empowered to supervise these agencies; Congress should perform its plain duty in proper cases by abolishing the board, or by firing or disciplining the bureaucrats who run it.

To repeat, we think the Walter-Logan bill is a bad one, and we hope it loses out somewhere along the line from the House to the President's desk.

Congress Our Mainstay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EVENING LEADER, ST. MARYS, OHIO

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Mr. A. C. Buss, editor and manager of the Evening Leader, of St. Marys, Ohio, which was published on April 13, 1940:

CONGRESS OUR MAINSTAY

The people of the United States will soon be called upon to elect a President as well as representatives to Congress. It is proper that they measure well their step, in order that no miscarriage in their cherished notions takes place. The importance of electing a strong Congress is greater than that of electing a President, as it is the former that exercises the will of the people, the bulwark of the Nation's weal. Our Congress has been prone to delegate much of its power to the Executive, and that would mean passing it on to the bureaucrats. This has resulted in government in reverse, in that hirelings essay to point the way, instead of the Congress. Since ours is still a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, interventions of whatsoever sort must have no place and should not be allowed. The President's function is to propose and that of the Congress to dispose. The President may recommend certain legislation, but before adopting any of them, our Senators and Representatives must first take advice with the people back home and follow their edicts in preference to any other. This is not always done, hence the general unrest and dissatisfaction pervading the country.

By some manner of means, the chart and log book in administrative affairs has been molded into an inflexible pattern, not as the dictation of Vox Populi, but by policy-forming agencies, in and out of Congress. The clamor of the people has made no impression on them as if citizens needed no consideration or didn't know or care very much about public conduct. Some were lulled into a sense of complacence by the doling process. Money has poured freely from the Nation's Treasury for purposes of relief, without affecting the forlorn conditions. Private initiative and enterprise have been stymied in the forward pass and the "devil may care" spirit has invaded the arena of activity, until no one really knows or cares less about the outcome. Unless the people awaken from their slumbers and take things really to heart, there will be a story to tell about the decline of American ingenuity and the fading away of American stamina. Lord forbid that this Nation, brought into being by the unflagging devotion of patriots and dedicated to the arts of liberty and freedom, shall forfeit its birthright by contrariwise habits and demeanors.

The peoples' sounding board is the Congress of the United States. There their influence may be applied directly and implicitly. When good men and true are selected for a seat in this great deliberative body the reaction will be good and wholesome, for there is not a Congressman who would deviate very far from the expressed wishes of the people if he knows his business. Popular approval of things done gives authority and power to regimes as nothing else can and drives for continuities of quality-tested programs. In casting our vote for a President we have only a forty-five millionth part, but in casting our vote for a Congressman we have a one hundred and twenty-five thousandth part, which denotes greater influence in the selection of Congressmen than that of a President. Whenever we impress Congressmen with the propriety of consulting the people instead of with bureaucrats hanging around Washington, we will have impounded a force that will be productive of sound legislation and general welfare. There are not many George Washingtons, but there was one who in his first inaugural address did not recommend any particular measure but preferred to pay tribute to the talents, the rectitude, and patriotism of Members of Congress by delegating all legislation to them.

A slogan worthy of adoption would be "list not to executive officials but to the great body of American citizens" if real constructive effort shall be your aim. The real mastership rests with the people, who would not that anything deleterious to the welfare of the Nation be done. Our Congressman comes nearest divining the heart desires of the people he represents and his voice should carry conviction. Strong and righteous men should therefore be sent to Congress that people be served in the highest degree of satisfaction. Now, on the advent of the one hundred and ninety-seventh birthday (which occurs today) of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of American Independence and third President of the United States, may be cited his version of the sanctity of our partite form of government, in which he intonated his friendship with Congress and his aversion to usurpation of freedom of judgment and conscientious pursuit of men serving in Congress. Congress may be considered our most formidable mainstay of freedom and solidarity when we elect dutiful and trustworthy Representatives. There our safety and welfare rests.

State Democratic Convention in St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. FRIES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON, of St. Louis County, Mo., as permanent chairman of the Democratic State Convention in St. Louis, Monday, April 15:

Fellow Democrats, the Democratic Party stands at the bar of public opinion about to hear judgment pronounced upon it. This is the most important and crucial year in the entire history of our great and beloved party, for we have been at the helm through 8 long years of perilous journey, through a sea that has not been calm for a moment. The people of this Nation are about to pass judgment upon our navigation and take account of our stewardship.

A victory in November will be a vindication of all our efforts and a token of approval from the American people. A defeat may well mean the very end of the Democratic Party. Let's not even think of defeat, but only of the means by which to achieve a glorious victory. But let the specter of defeat lie in the background, and may it stare us straight in the eye if we become lax and lazy in this great campaign. Naturally, none of us believe that we will run second next fall, and I feel confident in predicting an overwhelming Democratic victory in the State and all over the Nation. Nevertheless, now, as never before, our party must present a united front, and the command staff of our forces must act as one with but a single purpose in mind—victory in November.

The enemy will be strong, make no mistake about that, and our chances of success lie solely and completely in our ability to unite under the glorious banner of our great party, and show conclusively to every voter that his Nation, himself, and his family, and his posterity can look forward with security and confidence only if we have a Democratic victory. Our party alone is capable—our party alone is willing—to carry on the great social and economic reforms that have been inaugurated during the 8 years we have held the reins.

No party has ever besought the approbation of the American people with such a magnificent record of accomplishment as we do today. No party has ever achieved so much in such a short time. I know the American people will reflect their knowledge of this fact, and their appreciation of our efforts, at the ballot box next November.

It is the task of our party and all its candidates and all of its devoted followers to see that the accomplishments of our administration are kept constantly before the public eye. Let no one forget that the Democratic Party alone and single-handed brought order out of utter chaos in American banking; it has given the farmer of the Nation his first real chance of parity with the other classes; it has given security to the aged; it has instilled hope in the youth; it has recognized and fortified the rights of organized labor; and it has put the Nation back on the road to recovery. And greatest of all—the Democratic Party has insured peace for all our people.

To you, my friends, in whose hands lies the fate of our party, I say, first educate yourselves in the accomplishments of our party during the past 7½ years. Get a firm grasp of what we have done so that you can present a strong case to all of the people with whom you come in contact. When you are able to point out and reiterate the multitude of achievements made by our party you will then be presenting the strongest and most convincing argument possible for all our candidates from the lowest to the highest.

No political party ever won such overwhelming victories as we have during the past 8 years and yet we have demonstrated time and again that our party puts the national welfare far above and beyond partisan considerations. Perhaps this fact is nowhere better demonstrated than right here in Missouri where our party has made tremendous strides in the interest of better and cleaner

government. In the Federal Government we have broadened and extended the civil service and have placed a strong prohibition against political manipulation in public office by the adoption of the Hatch laws. No clearer evidence can be adduced than these instances which show conclusively that the Democratic Party looks upon the Nation's welfare as its primary consideration. Our record is untarnished by any cloud however small and we can be proud that the Democratic Party has succeeded in bringing about momentous political reforms where our predecessors of the Republican Party failed so miserably.

At a party gathering of this kind it is always well to check back over the record to acquaint ourselves with the facts. Just because we have been "in" for two terms, let's not assume we are "in for keeps." I have already mentioned in broad outline the generally acknowledged achievements of two Democratic administrations. Let us be a little more specific. Let's get the facts in mind so that we can let everybody know about them. If we are able to present the case based on our record, no voter who is conscious of his own and his Nation's welfare will ignore us.

I don't think anybody takes particular pleasure in talking about the condition of our banks prior to the present Democratic administrations. The situation was so bad that we don't like to even mention it. But lest we forget, lest the people forget, what our party did to improve this situation, let's take time to remind them. Today our banks are safe and our deposits are insured against loss. Bank failures have been reduced from more than 6,000 a year to less than 50. This alone is sufficient to enshrine the Democratic Party in the hearts of Americans for generations to come. But we didn't stop there. Among the first major accomplishments of the Democratic administration was repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act which had saddled the Nation for 12 years under Republican rule, giving rise to a powerful criminal element that grew rich out of the illicit trade in liquor.

Today, after repeal by the Democrats, a great brewing and distilling industry has been revived, giving employment to thousands of people, helping the farmers and all forms of transportation. In addition, the Government, Federal, State, and city, reaps immense returns from legitimate taxes upon these industries. It will long be remembered that the Republicans promised repeal but never delivered. The Democrats promised repeal and made their word good within a few weeks of inauguration.

Tremendous strides have been made to save the American farmer from the certain destruction to which the Republican misrule and neglect foredoomed him. Production has been wisely planned in conjunction with a great program of conservation. After more than a century and a half of national existence we have at last seen an administration that recognizes the soil as one of the greatest of all our natural resources and its conservation as one of the greatest needs of our civilization. The accomplishments of the Democratic Party in solving the complex farm problem and in helping the farmer to get back on his feet will live forever in the annals of "democracy in action." No greater calamity could befall the farmer of this Nation than a Republican victory at this time. Only our party can—only our party is willing—to go forward with the magnificent program now well under way. The Republicans threaten and even promise to destroy that program if elected. The welfare of our farmers is of the greatest concern to us all, and if they are neglected now I hesitate to predict the future or its consequences.

The Democratic Party has extended a helping and saving hand to the unemployed and the aged through its vast system of social security and unemployment insurance. History does not record even a simple recognition of the needs of these people by the Republican Party.

We have sought with success to aid the laboring classes by providing a floor below which wages may not fall and a ceiling above which hours of work may not extend. We have recognized and fortified the rights of workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining. The only recognizable contribution of the Republican Party in this field was to close its eyes while unscrupulous and avaricious employers defeated every effort of the working classes to help themselves.

They closed their eyes while employers perfected elaborate systems of industrial spies and other devices which are wholly inconsistent with democracy. The Republicans would make much of their sympathy for labor but let the people remember and recognize the fact that the Republican Party has selected as its man to raise its campaign chest and handle its funds one of the most bitter enemies of organized labor in America; a man who steadfastly refuses to recognize labor organizations and who employed every possible means to undermine public confidence in the progressive legislation of the Democratic administrations. The people of America can judge for themselves.

Perhaps there have been a few mistakes along the line in providing for the millions who now depend upon the Federal Government for even the barest necessities of life. But corrections have been made all along the line. Let us remember that the Republican inauguration gift to the Democrats back in 1932 was 10,000,000 unemployed and starving people. Never before had such a problem confronted any administration and in spite of the tremendous task involved we have achieved remarkable success. The great public-works program, including the C. C. C., is proving to be of immeasurable benefit in preserving the faith of our people in our form of government, which was seriously threatened by years of Republican misrule.

It is impossible to consider the welfare of our beloved country today without some mention of the means whereby we hope to remain at peace in a troubled and war-torn world. The Democratic administration has demonstrated its sincere desire to keep us out of all foreign entanglements. We realize, of course, that war in Europe and Asia is a serious blow to American commerce and trade; but in the interest of peace, in the interest of preserving Democracy here in America, we have been willing to make appropriate sacrifices in the certain knowledge that we will survive the tempest only by remaining free of all entanglements.

While resolutely determined to remain free of all wars that do not concern us, the Democratic Party has not neglected the obvious necessity of augmenting our defense system in this world gone mad. This administration has done everything humanly possible to strengthen the national defense consistent with the efficient carrying out of so vast a program. During the years of Republican rule, from 1920 to 1932, our national-defense system was neglected woefully. You cannot hope to defend this vast Nation in this day and age with a conscript Army and Navy built up in a few weeks or months. Modern machines of defense require skilled and scientific handling. Therefore, under Democratic leadership we have given new life and impetus to a well-trained Army and Navy backed up by an excellent system of Reserves and National Guard.

Under Democratic leadership we have been careful to retain for our own protection and defense many scientific devices and weapons which are not known or possessed by other countries.

The leadership of the Democratic Party in these critical days of civilization has been demonstrated, tested, and proven. Wisdom dictates that we stay on the course. The Democratic Party offers the people concrete example and proof. The Republicans offer hollow promises and platitudes.

As Americans, as Democrats, we are sincerely and justly proud of our service to the Nation during the past 7½ years. But we all realize that we have only done what was expected of us. The people of America are entitled to a government that recognizes their needs and problems and does something to help them achieve the full growth of life that this Nation holds out to them. If the Republican Party recognized these things, history does not record the fact. All we know is that they pursued the do-nothing policy unto its bitter end.

So, my friends and fellow Democrats, we can gird ourselves for battle in the spirit of good deeds well done and fortify our beloved party with the record of the glorious victories we have wrought during the years of our stewardship.

The War-Trade Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News under date of April 23, 1940. The editorial forcefully presents the picture of war trade. Buffalo is experiencing an increase in exports and imports. The sad part of it is that the business is war business. The peacetime trade is all too small and at the expense of the American farm and other non-war-making materials with automobile exports the lowest since 1933. Significant in the editorial is the statement that records show the greatest volume of foreign trade in our history comes not during wars but in peacetime. The 1914–18 era and the year 1939 were eclipsed by the peaceful years from 1919 to 1929. Here is what the editorial says:

THE WAR-TRADE PICTURE

The changing character of United States foreign trade and the demand for American products in the markets of a war-torn world is shown strikingly in an exhaustive analysis of this country's exports and imports during 1939, just issued by the foreign commerce department of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The report shows the dislocations and diversions of foreign trade which have resulted from war conditions, as well as an accelerated trend toward exporting manufactured goods and the importing of crude products. Nearly 80 percent of exports by value for 1939 were products of manufacturing industries. Of this amount, 53.4 percent consisted of completely finished manufactures, the largest share reached in more than 50 years by any of the five economic

groups into which American exports are broken down. Exports of crude materials and foodstuffs accounted for only a fifth of the total exports of $3,123,869,000. On the other hand, imports of crude materials and partly finished manufactures for the American industrial plant made up 54 percent of the total of $2,276,294,000.

The report naturally shows heavy increases in exports of aircraft, heavy machinery, metals, chemicals, and similar items related directly or indirectly to the prosecution of the war. Since the outbreak of war last September these exports have increased still more rapidly, at the expense of agricultural exports and other goods whose purchase has been curtailed or diverted to other markets in the effort of belligerent nations to save dollar exchange for cash-and-carry munitions buying. Aircraft exports advanced from thirteenth place in 1938 to third in 1939, and there is no doubt that they will rank first in 1940 on the basis of Allied purchase plans. Automobile sales abroad, in contrast, declined sharply to the lowest point since 1933, though still retaining first place in value.

An interesting local sidelight of the report has to do with Buffalo's place in the improved foreign-trade picture. The Buffalo district showed the second largest increase in exports of the 20 chief customs districts in the United States, namely, 21.7 percent, and the third largest increase in imports, or 47.8 percent. Buffalo ranks seventh in the value of exports handled, totaling $110,000,000 in 1939, and sixth in its imports of $70,247,000. Considering the diversified nature of Buffalo industries, and the increased foreign demand for its aircraft, chemicals, steel, and machinery products, there is good reason to hope for a war boom in this area. However, one sobering thought should be kept in mind. The greatest volume of foreign trade in the history of the United States was not in the war years of 1914 to 1918, nor in the war year of 1939. It was in the peaceful years from 1919 to 1929. Peace and prosperity are a combination which no war economy has ever beaten.

The American people will bear these facts in mind when propaganda greets their eyes and ears with the financed and studied intention of getting Uncle Sam into war. No utterance of any official, whether he be an admiral or a minister of our Government, can change the bald facts that war does not pay. The businessmen and labor of this country know that war profits are fleeting; that peacetime business is the best; and striving to solve our shameful domestic problems, putting our nine or ten million unemployed men and women and the Government-frightened American dollars back to work is our salvation. Accomplishing that, we will be in a better position to help bring about a fairer and more lasting world peace when the war ends and when we are wanted. Americans, study the war-trade picture.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short article from today's issue of the Washington Daily News, written by John T. Flynn:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 25, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, April 25.—It is nearly 2 years since Congress ripped the control of our aviation industry out of the Department of Commerce and put it under the independent Civil Aeronautics Authority, with an also independent Air Safety Board.

Many people have forgotten why Congress did that. The President now wants to put aviation back under the Commerce Department. He has proposed his plan to Congress under the reorganization law. Under that law Congress has 60 days in which to nullify any part of the President's proposals. If it does not, the plan will become law.

In the midst of so many alarms, most people will wonder why this proposal has caused such a storm of protest, even from such good New Deal supporters as Mayor LaGuardia. The matter is so serious that this is a good time to recall the story of air control when the Department of Commerce had it, and why the editorial on this subject in the next column is so truly titled "Calamity."

Here is just one sample. I propose to give some more in subsequent articles. Jay A. Mount was an official in the Air Commerce Bureau of the Department of Commerce. He had had long experience in aviation and was appointed superintendent of maintenance of all airways by Secretary Roper. His Department administered safety measures over 22,000 miles of airways. They were protected by beacon lights, radio beams, intermediate landing fields, weather reports, etc.

The Department had authorized pilots to fly by means of instruments alone, guided by radio beams. This meant flying blind save for the instruments. It meant also that radio beams must be accurate. Mr. Mount, who was an aviation engineer, made an elaborate inspection of these radio beams. And late in 1934 he submitted a report to the Department revealing shocking conditions from neglect, inefficiency, incompetence. The radio beams, in fact, he found, despite ample appropriations, were operating at only 50 percent efficiency.

Mr. Mount's report, instead of provoking action, produced deep resentment in the Bureau. His reward was to be subjected to spying, trailing, minute investigation even of his personal life by Government agents. Flimsy charges were made against him to get rid of him.

The personnel committee of the Department heard a trial of these charges and unanimously rejected them as groundless. At the hearing Mr. Mount pleaded with his superiors to heed his warnings about those radio beams. He predicted terrible disaster if he was not listened to. But Mr. Mount had attacked the bureaucrats of the Department—the unforgivable sin—and Secretary Roper and his administrative assistant sided with the bureaucrats.

Mr. Mount was removed from his position, demoted and sent to an obscure post in Georgia. A man who had been recommended for dismissal a few months before by the Director of the Bureau was put in his place.

And—here is the pay-off—only 5 days after the hearing of the Mount charges and his earnest appeal for attention, a plane went down in the West. Five people were killed, eight seriously injured. One of those killed was United States Senator Bronson Cutting. And a Senate investigating committee ascribed the cause of the crash to the very condition Mr. Mount had reported.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce at the time was Ewing Y. Mitchell, who supported Mr. Mount and was himself later punished for his interest in this and other irregularities in the air service in that strange Department of Commerce. There is plenty more to this.

Dictatorship Rules and Ruins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. BUCKLEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago I had the occasion to discuss the deplorable condition of the oppressed and persecuted people in Austria and Germany. I was shocked to see that Austria had become a victim to the menace of nazi-ism, and I set forth the protest of men and women of all religious faiths against such violations of human rights and liberties. I also discussed the problem of refugees and showed the contribution that these people had made to America in the past. I also expressed my opposition to communism, fascism, and nazi-ism, and declared my belief that this country would always remain the respecter of all religious faiths, a place where liberty would always prevail.

The flames of hatred and intolerance, fanned by grasping dictators, have spread so rapidly since then that we stand by in amazement and wonder if it all can be true. At first, it was Czechoslovakia, then Memel in Lithuania fell prey to Nazi domination; and then Poland sliced in two by Germany and Russia, and we all know what happened and is still happening in Poland—a systematic and total destruction, a taking away of all political and economic existence, even their history and culture. The people are treated worse than cattle—massacres, taking away of all property, and, even more, the right of the people to their spiritual guidance and religious beliefs. These people are deprived of every means of moral and material happiness. For them there is only the right to work for their executioners, who give them hardly enough to exist on in order to continue working for their masters.

It is estimated that thousands of Poles have died from starvation, exposure, or were killed since invasion by Ger-

many. Not alone were Jews persecuted, and we know that they are among the first to feel the brunt of persecution at the hands of the Nazis, but there was a deliberate attempt made to destroy the Catholic religion. In January of this year a report from Auguste Cardinal Hlond, primate of Poland, to Pope Pius XII cited many instances of churches being profaned, parish houses invaded, funds stolen, and priests shot and killed; priests and nuns being humiliated, beaten, and maltreated; others deported to Germany and some sent to concentration camps. When I read excerpts of this in the newspapers I wondered whether we were still living in the twentieth century or if I were experiencing a nightmare. The experience of the Protestant religion in Germany was a sad and depressing one.

The flames swept on and then Russia dominates the countries of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. It does not stop here for the Bear sweeps into Finland, one of the most democratic nations in the entire world, and takes it without any semblance of reason. Although valiant in their defense, a nation so small as Finland, necessarily capitulated.

And only recently Denmark and Norway became victims of the same scourge. Poor Norway, through no choice of her own, has now become a bloody battleground for other fighting nations to settle their conflict. Every other nation in Europe wonders when its number is next.

This can all be traced to the beginning of the rule by one dictator and his henchmen some 7 years ago. Hitler and his newly acquired "red" partner, Stalin, in the east, have attempted to plant the seed of their godless philosophies in democratic countries, including our own United States. By means of propaganda of every form and manner they have preached these doctrines of hatred here. But, our people, who are in the main a tolerant one, have quickly seen through their deceit and have stopped them in their tracks.

In the United States we still believe in the principles upon which this country was founded, namely the equality of rights of man, the right to worship as one believes, and the freedom of speech, press, and assemblage. Despite the economic set-back which we have passed through in the last 10 or 11 years, no one can say that these rights were abridged in any way. Our efforts, energies, and moneys are being directed in those channels from which we believe the people of the United States will benefit. Legislation has been enacted in the various State legislatures, as well as by the Congress of the United States, to improve the economic lot of every man, woman, and child of the United States.

While on the subject, I would like to express my opinion on America's position. Although I am in favor of spending funds in strengthening our national defenses, as that seems to be necessary, I am opposed to having the United States embroiled in a war on foreign territory, regardless of where our sympathies may lie. The administration and the people of the United States are opposed to America's entry in any war. We have learned from bitter experience. We do not propose to shed our young people's blood again. The American people will defend our country from attack by a foreign nation but will not allow ourselves to become the spearhead of foreign conflicts.

I can foresee, and I certainly do not put myself up as a prophet, that these iron-fisted pagan rulers and their followers, who believe it necessary to subject people to and practice upon them every known brutality, who spend millions of dollars for useless war materials instead of for constructive improvements for the benefit of mankind, who believe that human rights mean nothing and that God and religion mean less, must meet with ignominious defeat. And let us hope that it will be soon.

There is no room in this country for communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or for any "ism" except Americanism.

And when the cannons will have ceased firing and men will have retired to their homes to heal their wounds and again engage in peaceful occupations, the United States will be an example to the world that only a Nation founded on the principles of liberty, neighborliness, and peace can long endure.

We in the United States will guard our freedom and continue our united efforts in preserving our tolerance and liberty, which we know to be the most priceless possession of mankind.

Production of Rubber in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE PREPARED BY THE SALINAS, CALIF., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, various attempts have been made in the past to interest the Federal Government in the possibilities of producing rubber in the United States. In view of the present chaotic condition of a world at war, I believe it would pay us to take another look at the sources of our present rubber supply.

The bulk of our rubber is now imported from British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. Under present conditions how can we be sure that this supply will be constant and unfailing? If there is an opportunity to produce domestic rubber at a cost that is in line with current rubber prices, I firmly believe that it should be seized upon at once and developed to the fullest extent.

Hundreds of thousands of acres of idle land might well be used in the producing of a new crop, such as rubber, and land that is now producing surpluses of various agricultural commodities could be profitably withdrawn. Not only that, but thousands of unemployed might well be put back to work and idle capital invested in productive enterprise.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following news article recently released by the Salinas Chamber of Commerce. I urge my colleagues to read it carefully as it contains information of tremendous importance to the entire country:

WAR! RUBBER! FARMERS! SURPLUSES! MARGINAL LANDS! EMPLOYMENT!

The possibility of war in the Pacific, thereby shutting off the rubber supply to America, brought forth the discussion of the development of guayule rubber in the United States at a meeting of chamber of commerce secretaries of California, held at the Administration Building on Treasure Island, Friday.

With increased interest in the Executive, War, and State Departments, and wires from many Congressmen asking for further information, the local chamber of commerce in Salinas is busy gathering together printed matter, pictures, and samples of the guayule shrub to forward to Congressman JOHN Z. ANDERSON. This material was taken to San Francisco and displayed while the matter was discussed before the meeting of the secretaries.

It was brought out that when Arthur M. Free was a Congressman from this district he secured a rider in the Army appropriation bill requiring the purchase of American-grown rubber, but that later this was eliminated from the bill. Five years ago Fred McCargar, secretary of the Salinas Chamber of Commerce, was sent to Washington at the suggestion of Senator McAdoo to confer with Secretary Wallace and members of the Department of Agriculture, but after several days of conference he was told that the administration was opposed to upsetting any of the fixed friendly relation trade agreements with other countries and that if the Government assisted in the development of the growing of rubber in the United States it would upset such friendly relations with the Netherlands and Great Britain.

Ex-Congressman John McGrath again worked on the subject, but was unsuccessful in getting governmental support so that farmers in the Southwestern States could grow rubber. A year ago Congressman JOHN Z. ANDERSON started a campaign to encourage the growing of guayule rubber, either by a tariff on rubber or a direct subsidy to the farmers, guaranteeing them the price of production over a period of 4 years necessary to grow the rubber. Again the administration, through Secretary Cordell

Hull, in a letter to JOHN Z. ANDERSON, discouraged the development on the ground that, "another consideration of importance to Californians is the relationship of rubber imports to our foreign trade. There is a close relationship between our imports and exports, and if we exclude by embargo tariffs the products of other countries the people of those countries will be unable to buy our products. The importation of the large quantities of rubber which we now get from British Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies, and other rubber-producing areas, provides in part the purchasing power necessary to maintain the exportation to the British Empire and other markets of the large amounts of petroleum, lumber, fruits, machinery, and other products of which California is a leading producer."

Following the failure of the American Government to assist in the development of this plant, the American Rubber Producers Co. have gone to Italy and have sold the Italian Government on the proposition. They are planting and arranging to plant in Italy, northern Africa, and Ethiopia 10,000 acres this coming year, under the direction of Dr. W. B. McCallum, botanist and manager of the company at Salinas.

It was explained that the guayule plant is a native of Mexico and has been harvested in Mexico for a great many years, and that over 175,000,000 pounds of this rubber have gone into the manufacture of tires and other American products. The development at Salinas started in 1922, and 6,000 acres have been placed in production in the Salinas, Santa Maria, and San Joaquin valleys, and in Southern California. It has been proved conclusively that they can produce rubber as cheaply in the United States as in the Orient, even with the difference in labor costs, because the process of harvesting the guayule rubber consists of plowing the plant out of the ground, grinding it up under water in the pebble-mill process, the same as is used for making cement, the wood fiber becoming a silt and going to the bottom, and the rubber being lighter than water, floating on top where it can be skimmed off. This is contrasted with the harvesting of tree rubber which consists of tapping a tree every day and boiling down the juice.

It also was brought out that any light, sandy soil suitable for raising beans, barley, or similar crops could produce good rubber. It requires 8 to 10 inches of rainfall in the rainy season, but this can be augmented in drier areas with irrigation during the rainy season. The rubber requires a dry, dormant summer; therefore there are potentially millions of acres suitable for raising rubber in the Great Valley of California, in southern California, in Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. The use of these acres would lower the quantity of many crops that are now being produced by the farmers at a loss and put into production thousands of acres not now growing crops of any kind. It would give employment to thousands of unemployed on farms and many more people in manufacturing plants to make the machinery necessary in the planting, harvesting, and milling of the guayule rubber.

By cross-breeding and developing of the guayule rubber plant itself the new weight of rubber in the plant has been increased from 5 to 10 percent as in the native plant to over 25 percent in the improved shrubs. The tonnage per acre has been increased from less than a thousand pounds per acre to an average of 1,800 pounds per acre at the end of 4 years, and over 2,500 pounds per acre at the end of 8 years. This would indicate that the rubber can more than pay its way in storage costs by leaving it in the ground. Dr. McCallum reported that in all of the acreage in and near Salinas and the Santa Maria Valley the average production for plants that were in the ground 5 years was 1,852 pounds per acre, that production for plants in the ground 10 years was 3,434 pounds per acre. With the present price of about 20 cents per pound for rubber, one can figure the gross income. The cost of production is very low, because it is a simple process of setting out the plants, cultivating them a few times the first year or two, and then plowing them out any time after 4 years and up to 30. It would, therefore, be a source of rubber in case of an emergency, and could remain in the ground as long as 30 years. It was also explained by Dr. McCallum that in case of an emergency the plants could be harvested at the end of 2 years with a small amount of rubber, but that this would be less than half of the amount the 4-year plants could produce.

McCargar was assured the support of the secretaries of California in an endeavor to secure the planting of guayule rubber on marginal and submarginal lands and on those lands now producing surpluses and causing losses to the farmers.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this rule. It is first of all an example of the usurpation of power by the Rules Committee that is unprecedented in the legislative history of this House. It is a glaring example of vaunting ambition overleaping itself, and I sincerely hope that the House will, by voting it down, administer to the majority of that committee the rebuke they so richly deserve.

If these gentlemen are desirous, and I believe they are, of repealing the Fair Labor Standards Act, popularly known as the Wage and Hour Act, why in God's name do they not bring in a repeal resolution and openly and honestly show their colors as advocates of sweatshop-labor standards in the mill, mine, factory, and farm—that would be the honest, decent, frank course—instead of coming in here with a group of camouflaged amendments intended to accomplish their purpose by trick and device?

This resolution, vicious to the core, should be voted down.

Outline of Social Problems in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY MISS ANA MARIA O'NEILL

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Miss Ana Maria O'Neill, of the University of Puerto Rico:

Ladies and gentlemen, in accepting Miss Brainerd's invitation to speak here today I expressed my rejoicing that women as a group were going to look into the problems of Puerto Rico, because, as I said to her in my letter, the problems of Puerto Rico have become so intricate and so pressing that it takes a mother's heart to see into them.

When you consider that to live in an island is to be marooned, that you have to depend on the outside for transportation services at least; when you consider that for these services the shipping companies will charge what the traffic will bear and more; when you hear from the economists here that every cultivated square mile of land in Puerto Rico must support 1,300 inhabitants; when you hear these economists discuss the unemployment caused by the enforcement of the quota restrictions, the reciprocal-trade agreements and the wage and hour law; when you realize further that there is no unemployment compensation and no direct relief in Puerto Rico, you will realize why I said that it takes a mother's heart to see into the problems of the island.

Someone has said that eyes must be washed in tears in order that they see. I do not know if it is tears or what that is required, but something must happen to the physical eyes so that they see into relationships, and something must happen to the physical ears so that they hear meaningfully. The eyes that see and the ears that hear are the eyes and ears that have been touched by love, and love is nothing but the maternal spirit manifesting.

In American history this maternal spirit has fought and won the two noblest of the social battles. It was the maternal spirit flowing through Harriet Beecher Stowe that freed the slaves of this country. You know what her weapon was: A child's book, Uncle Tom's Cabin. And if men had not interfered with a war about it, the slaves would have been freed without the resentment and the unadjustment which still lives on. It was the maternal spirit manifesting through Helen Hunt Jackson that gave the Indians their Emancipation Proclamation. Again she used a book as a weapon. She called it a "Century of Dishonor."

And it is this maternal spirit which will make you see the suffering of girls and boys and men and women behind and beyond the statistics of the economist, behind and beyond the statistics of the social worker.

It is to that maternal spirit that I am addressing myself today.

Some time ago I read somewhere an article written by a woman. The article is about a boy which she and her husband had adopted. The couple, as I remember, had two other children. As the adopted child grew he began to show signs of maladjustment. As the boy's maladjustment became noticeable this woman decided that she would sit with the boy and, in the fashion of a psychoanalyst, try to explore his soul. She heard him with her heart, and she discovered that the boy's maladjustment was due to his acute sense of not belonging. Someone had been telling him that he was a child casually picked up from an orphan asylum, that he did not really belong in the family with whom he was living. When the boy finished his exposition, then the lady told him these words:

"James, there is no question about your belonging. As to Mary and John we had no choice. They came and we had to take them. But with you it is different for we went out deliberately to get you."

Had this situation been handled by her husband he might have gone to the wife and told her that they probably made a mistake in adopting this child; that the child really did not belong, and that it was better to face the fact as it was. And if after that the child showed a desire to leave the home he might even have turned the child loose in the streets without a single penny in his pocket.

The turning of the child loose without any sort of provision for his making any kind of a headway. Such, ladies, was the independence bill for Puerto Rico, which was presented by two gentlemen of Congress. When you hear of unrest in Puerto Rico, remember the story of the adopted child and his acute sense of not belonging

And remember that Puerto Rico's sense of not belonging must be much stronger than that of the boy, because Puerto Rico has repeatedly asked Uncle Sam this question: "Uncle Sam, do I belong?" And Uncle Sam, who is usually such a charming person to talk to, has sat very stiff on a judge's chair and has delivered speeches about the Constitution following the flag or not following the flag.

Many times the answers to the child's question are not at all pertinent. To the question, Do I belong? the answer has sometime been something which in spirit is this: "Child, why you don't talk like us. You say Puerto Rico while we say Porto Rico." I have over-simplified for brevity and for clearness.

I enjoy listening to American speech. I am fascinated by the liquidity of your l's, the softness of your t's, and the combination of your long and short vowels. I love to hear an American say, for instance, Anita Naldi, or even say my name. But I cannot get my l's and r's and t's as you get them. However, children from Puerto Rican parents here in the States get them as you do. The secret why they can and I cannot is because English is the language of their play life, while in my case Spanish was the language of whatever play life I had. It is only when a language is the language of play that you can get the r's and l's and t's and short and long vowel sounds in their places. The language of play can do more than simply making it possible to get all the elemental sounds in place. It can displace and replace the mother tongue. All the children I know in the States, from Puerto Rican parents, even when these children were born in Puerto Rico and started with Spanish as the mother tongue, all these children use English in preference to Spanish, and gradually the language of the child becomes the language of the household. The play life is the psychological key to the vernacular. For us in Puerto Rico to be able to get the l's and t's and r's and short and long vowels straight, English would have to become the language of play, but as play is not play without the playmates, you would have to provide the playmates; American children in sufficient quantities to outnumber the Puerto Rican children and make English the language of their play. The language of play, let me repeat this statement, is the psychological key to the vernacular. Whatever the ultimate political destiny of the island shall be, don't let anyone entangle this very simple fact, the language of play is the vernacular.

In this brief outline of the social problem of Puerto Rico I must stress the language question because language is the social tool, and because the language question lends itself to a great deal of misunderstanding. For instance, I remember the case of an American teacher in the high school where I taught. One day she got furious at her class, dismissed them, rushed to the principal's office and reported that her pupils refused to learn English. You know how much news value a thing like that can have and how much it can be exploited by people anxious for political capital.

She happened to speak to me about this, and then I asked her: Was not that the same class you were so enthusiastic about last semester? I remember you said to me that they did much better work in English than your pupils in the States. "Yes," she answered, "that same group did excellent work in Julius Caesar." When did the change come about? I asked her. And she said: "As soon as we started the Lady of the Lake." Do you want to know the secret? I asked: Shakespeare uses a latinized diction, English words with Latin roots. We Puerto Ricans are at home in Shakespeare. But Sir Walter Scott uses the Anglo-Saxon words for which we have no other key than the dictionary. And, of course, when you have to look up too many individual words in the dictionary you lose track of the context. It is a case of the trees not letting you see the woods.

When you hear that groups of Puerto Rican children do not want to learn English, remember this teacher. All Puerto Ricans want to learn English for very obvious reasons. What you will find is a great deal of disagreement as to the methods of teaching it. Many conscientious people in Puerto Rico believe that to make a language the medium of instruction is not the best way to teach that language. When a language is used as the medium of instruction all the emphasis falls on the subject for which this language serves as channel, and not on the language itself, and the constant practice in errors which of necessity follows perpetuate these errors, they insist. Besides teaching French, for instance, through English to Spanish people, unnecessarily increases the burden of teaching and learning French, to use just one example.

The best way to learn English is for the educators to determine, not for the politicians. Make it a specific aim of your active program for Puerto Rico to permit no further political tamperings with the language question.

The last one to find fault with our English was my much-admired President Roosevelt. He said that we do not have a mastery of English. Well, very few Americans have a mastery of English. He, of course, has it. But even at that, let President Roosevelt enter a contest in essay writing in English, a written contest where the "l's" and "r's" and "t's" and the long and short vowel sounds will not count in his favor; let him enter a contest with us where his beautiful radio voice will not be an asset, and he may find himself defeated by an obscure Puerto Rican. There are many aspects to the mastery of a language. And Puerto Rico has as much a right to a peculiar local accent as Kentucky or Maine or New York.

I have started at the parlor end of the social problems of Puerto Rico. I call it the parlor end because it touches only that privileged 50 percent of our population for whom we have schools. For the other 50 percent of our population we have no schools, either public or private.

Let us now leave the parlor end and go to the kitchen end of the problems of Puerto Rico—the family budget. Mrs. Frances Adkins Hall, from the Bureau of Social Welfare in Puerto Rico, writing in the Health Bulletin of Puerto Rico for July 1939, says that she finds a gap between the income of the Puerto Rican family and its ability to buy adequate food.

How wide is this gap? Let us measure it. The school of tropical medicine is authority for the statement that a family of five in Puerto Rico must spend $11.45 weekly in food in order to receive an adequate diet. That is, a person must spend at least 33 cents daily in food in Puerto Rico in order that he will get an adequate diet. But you will hear from the economists here today that if the total income of the island of Puerto Rico is divided by the number of its inhabitants, each inhabitant will receive 17 cents daily. Mind you, that everyone would receive 17 cents if income in Puerto Rico were equally divided and if there were no absentee ownership.

But you know that income is not equally divided. To use just one example: When the sugar growers were paid for not planting sugar the workers thrown out of employment were not paid for not working. Great inequality in the division of income and absent ownership make the gap, which Mrs. Hall points out, much wider. It is so wide that many people consider it miraculous that the masses exist. One day I heard a preacher preach a very beautiful sermon in which he called attention to the fact that the miracle of the loaves and the fishes was being repeated in Puerto Rico every single day of the year.

But sometimes the loaves and fishes will come via the garbage can. For instance: "Gumersindo sleeps in passageways and habitually reaches into the garbage can of the streets for something to eat." This is not an imaginary case. It is case No. 152 of the census of abandoned children published by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico in March 1938.

So, in the gap which Mrs. Hall noticed, there is hunger. What else is there in that gap? There is the violation of a child's inalienable right to grow: "Casimira is 16 years old, but she looks like 10. * * * She lives with a woman owner of a cheap eating place who illtreats the child and makes her work beyond her strength. She does not provide either shoes or clothing for the child, and Casimira walks about barefooted and in rags" (case No. 203).

What else is there in that gap? There is disease and death. Diseases of the digestive organs kill off the greatest number. Physicians call these diseases enteritis and other technical names. Men, whether in the profession of law or that of medicine, enjoy technicalities. But it is all very simple. The stomach is a sac which was made to put food into, and if you try to pack this sac away it will in turn try to pack you away. The next disease in importance is tuberculosis. If the child succeeds in inducing his stomach into acting as though it had received real food, he may not succeed at cheating the whole organism. Consumption awaits him. Consumption takes its greatest toll in the years from 24 to 35.

Tuberculosis can be cured, but tuberculosis requires for its cure plenty of room—that is, of air—plenty of wholesome food, and plenty of rest.

In a study of 757 consumptive individuals taken at random by the antituberculosis centers in Puerto Rico it was found that 49 percent of the families of these patients had weekly incomes of $1 or less. A weekly income of $1 or less for a family of five. And 82 percent had a weekly income of $3 or less. How far from the $11.45 budget below which the School of Tropical Medicine considers diet inadequate.

But what about their opportunities of recovery through rest? It was found that of these 757 patients, 48 percent were they themselves the breadwinners. And of these that are themselves the breadwinners, 70 percent receive weekly incomes of $1 or less.

In the gap that separates income from purchasing power we have found hunger and starvation and disease and death. Is there anything else in that gap? There are prison doors opening upon youths.

Ladies, man does not live by bread alone; but how important bread is!

Commenting the report of abandoned children, the commissioner of education for Puerto Rico says: "Although it may seem utterly incredible, there are children in Puerto Rico who have not found even a provisional dwelling. * * * Some of them * * * are struggling honestly to earn a piece of bread with the sweat of their brow; other * * * not so fit for the struggle follow the line

of least resistance—stealing, begging, gambling, filling up gradually our jails * * *."

These boys should know very well the difference between mine and thine. They should know very well that mine means privation and thine means comforts. But sometimes, as the commissioner of education reminds us, sometimes they forget it. Once two of these boys stole two pairs of trousers from a wealthy home—two pairs of trousers costing about $5—and got a prison term of 15 years. They had forgotten that difference between mine and thine before. The relapse explains the 15 years for $5. I am quoting this case from memory and there might be some slight inaccuracy. Fifteen years' imprisonment for $5. Such is technical justice, ladies.

We women have contributed very little along the line of invention in this world, but at least we have not invented technical justice. Technical justice is a thought-saving device. Justice becomes as easy to apply as playing Chinese checkers.

The Commission of Education informs us that some of these children try hard to get out of this situation. If they do, they must have left the fingerprints of their efforts in our statistics, and here they are: We have schools for only 50 percent of our population of school age. So normally only 50 percent of our young people should be able to read and write. Yet 90 percent of the children of from 15 to 19 in cities and 80 percent of those in the country are able to read and write.

Our youths show themselves to be deserving of help. And title IV of the Social Security Act would come in handy to help them. Title IV is for dependent children. Under this title we would receive $58,000 yearly from the Federal Government if we could contribute $175,000, but as we could not, we got nothing. In other words, we were too poor to receive aid, too poor to be helped. Technical justice, ladies.

Laws are not made with Puerto Rico's ability to pay in mind, and because they are not, Puerto Rico, which needs more Federal aid than any other part of the United States, has received a per capita Federal aid of $26.51, while the average for the States has been $68.41.

In general, laws take too long to travel to Puerto Rico if they get there at all. This is especially serious in the case of those laws, like for instance, the social-security law, which are intended to serve as Red Cross for the casualties created by other measures like the quota restrictions and the wage and hour law. The tardy application of titles V and VI of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico deprived the island of much needed help. By the late application of title VI alone it was deprived of more than $1,000,000. And in his last report the Governor of Puerto Rico comments on the speed at which the Highway Act traveled. He says it took 20 years to get to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is only 3½ days away from the United States. Do not permit legislators to put it 20 years away from your hearts.

It seems to me that if the Puerto Rican Representative had a vote, this condition would be improved. I should say, rather, that his condition would be improved if we had a Representative in Congress. A Representative is not really a Representative unless he can vote. And depriving a Representative of the vote is like depriving a worker of his bargaining power.

The reason for not giving the Puerto Rican Representative a vote is based on a false premise and a wrong conclusion. The false premise is distance. Americans think that Puerto Rico is as far away as the farthest star. Puerto Rico is only 1,300 miles away. As far away as Miami. The wrong conclusion is that because we are 1,300 miles away, we are not informed on your affairs. But how inconsistent men are. If a distance of 1,300 miles makes it impossible for us to vote intelligently on American issues, how dare they vote on our issues, and not only vote on them but decide them without even the vote of our Representative? One thousand three hundred miles is always 1,300 miles, whichever way you measure it.

Make it a specific aim of your active program for Puerto Rico to give the Puerto Rican Representative his vote. A Representative must have a vote, otherwise he is a guest. Of course, giving our Representative his vote requires amendment of the organic act. But, ladies, will He have to be born again to repeat that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath? Will He have to be born again to say to legislators that laws are made for men and not men for laws?

There is no royal road to the problems of Puerto Rico. Ours is the hard way. We can no longer function on technical justice. We need a justice from the heart. And this justice from the heart will lead you to a many-sided attack on the problems of Puerto Rico. It is not a case of one solution but of many solutions.

For instance you will hear our economist speak of the importance of coffee to Puerto Rico and of the present state of the industry due among other things to the lack of a tariff protection like that enjoyed by sugar. Perhaps you can never get a tariff protection for our coffee, but you can get for it a social protection. It will do just as well. Make Puerto Rican coffee fashionable. North and south and east and west make Puerto Rican coffee the coffee of your luncheons and teas. Begin with tomorrow's luncheon. There is no better coffee in the world than Puerto Rican coffee. You will find it in this market under the name Cafe Rico.

And above all there is the question of the Puerto Rican personality. More important still than helping the Puerto Rican is helping the Puerto Ricans to help themselves. It is doing things for themselves that give individuals that much-needed sense of their importance. People learn to help themselves by the formation of consumers' cooperatives. If you go to Nova Scotia and if you succeed in making Father Tompkins, that self-effacing figure which lies behind this great movement, say something, he will tell you to look for the intangible elements behind the obvious social and economic change that has been brought about by cooperation.

I saw those intangible elements in the personalities of fishermen and miners, and in fact, of all workers. Observing at close range the workers of Nova Scotia, listening to them, I felt this: I felt that Christianity was coming back to this world, Christianity as it first spoke to man in words whose spirit is this: Bondsman, hold up thy head, thou art the equal, nay, the brother of thy emperor.

Let it be a specific aim of your active program for Puerto Rico to make the island a cooperative commonwealth. Get after the Federal Government to give you back for Puerto Rico that difference between the $26.51 per capita which the island has received and the $68.41 which it should have received. Or let Uncle Sam make up for this difference in some other fashion. And see that this money is used for the teaching of cooperation in Puerto Rico. And please try to convince Consumer Distribution Corporation to give Puerto Rico a share in that fund for the development of cooperatives which was left by the late Mr. Edward A. Filene, a millionaire Boston merchant. The address of Consumer Distribution Corporation is 420 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

Ladies, when Americans went to Puerto Rico 40 years ago they were received with flowers. Flowers is the language of love, and we said it with flowers. But flowers have a special meaning in Puerto Rico. They are the message of children for the Three Wise Men. As children, on the eve of the Epiphany, we placed at the altar freshly cut flowers for the Three Wise Men, and these flowers were changed by the holy touch of the Three Wise Men into our heart's desire: candies and toys. Flowers can be transmuted. Flowers are miraculous.

The flowers thrown at the American soldiers 40 years ago have not behaved miraculously because they were not thrown at wise men. Otherwise they would have been transmuted into the wisest of social legislation for the better adaptation of the adopted child.

Ladies, I have come here today to ask you in the name of the children of Puerto Rico to perform the miracle of transmuting these flowers. I have come to present Puerto Rico to you as child, not as country. It is a country of children—more than 40 percent of our population are children under 15 years of age.

The child has turned to you, and is asking you through me today his old question. But now it has become: Mother, do I belong?

And when you have your answer ready for the child, let one woman in Puerto Rico hear that answer first. Her name is Beatriz Lasalle, head of the Social Welfare Bureau in Puerto Rico. She is our own Jane Addams.

Transportation of Prison-Made Goods in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, has introduced a bill (H. R. 8853) entitled "A bill to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate and foreign commerce." Unquestionably, the fact alone that our distinguished colleague's name appears on this bill as its author carries a great deal of weight in this House, for no man in the history of this body commanded a wider respect and admiration than our friend from Texas, Judge SUMNERS. We are all aware of the many splendid contributions made by our distinguished colleague to the system of law under which we live and work.

At the present time there is pending H. R. 8853, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS. This bill is a milestone in the solution of a serious problem that has confronted the Federal Government and the governments of the States for many years; namely, competition between prison-made goods and the output of free industry.

As far back as 1886 the gravity of the problem was apparent. In that year the Commissioner of Labor Statistics began the first study and survey of the competition that

existed between convict-made goods and the output of free industry. Periodical surveys have been conducted on the average of every 10 years since 1886, with the last complete and exhaustive study being completed in 1932.

Having in mind these competitive conditions the Congress and the legislatures of the several States have made a fruitful, if not altogether successful, effort to minimize the economic inconsistency of this situation. Notable among the first victories are the Hawes-Cooper Act of 1929 and the Sumners-Ashurst Act of 1935.

The Hawes-Cooper Act divested prison-made goods transported in interstate commerce of their interstate character and thereby permitted the States into which such goods entered to establish regulatory measures regarding the disposition of prison-made goods irrespective of their place of origin. Thus, the States were no longer hindered in their efforts to reduce competition with their industries resulting from the glutting of their markets with convict-made goods from outside.

Since the passage of the Hawes-Cooper Act more than one-half of the States of this Union have acted to prohibit the sale of prison-made goods upon the open market.

In an effort to reduce competition still further in 1935 Congress passed the Sumners-Ashurst Act requiring all prison-made goods flowing in interstate commerce to be labeled to indicate their prison-made character.

As another step in that direction and in the direction of a sounder national economy, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, introduced in this House on March 10, 1940, H. R. 8853, making it a crime against the United States "to transport convict-made goods in interstate commerce." I feel that we as a nation have progressed to a point where passage of such a law is our conscientious duty and obligation to free industry which we have tried so strenuously these last few years to revive and keep alive.

In considering legislation on this highly controversial subject, it is only fair to recognize the fact that it is impossible to prevent completely and in every instance competition between the products of the prison and those of free industry and labor. So long as convicts are employed in any kind of useful work whatsoever, their products will, in one way or another, actually be in competition with commodities of a similar nature made outside by free industry. Almost nothing which prisoners do or make might not be done or made instead by free labor and industry. In the last analysis, this is true even of the prison laundry, kitchen, bakery, farm, and so on. The real economics of the problem are to reduce this competition to the lowest point so as to affect the products of free labor and industry as little as possible. That is all we can possibly hope to attain.

Despite the fact that more than half the States of the Union have restricted or prohibited the sale of prison-made goods on the open market, and despite the efforts of the Federal Government represented in the Hawes-Cooper Act and the Sumners-Ashurst Act, millions of dollars' worth of goods are still produced in prisons and sold on the open market, in direct competition with the products of free industry and labor.

From the last full study of the problem by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics in 1932 it is shown that the value of prison-made goods for that year was $75,369,471. These figures do not include such prisoners as are assigned to ordinary prison duties, such as laundry, cleaning, and cooking. The extent of this competition was clearly indicated in the days of the N. R. A. when the cotton-garment industry was seriously and in good faith undertaking the establishment of a 36-hour workweek. Members of this industry, as one of the strongest reasons for their inability to comply with the 36-hour standard, pointed out the extensive competition they were receiving from convict-made goods. It is unquestionably true that substantially the same condition exists today under the wage and hour law.

Recognizing the justice of the defense thus raised by industry, the President appointed the Prison Industries Reorganization Board, with wide powers to conduct, in cooperation with the States, surveys of industrial operations and allied activities carried on by State penal institutions and to formulate and recommend remedial measures. This Board was faced with the formidable task of devising ways and means to relieve free industry and labor of competition from prison-made goods and, at the same time, assist in the establishment of a program to eliminate idleness and to provide an adequate and humane system for the rehabilitation of the prison inmates. One can readily appreciate the formidable nature of the problem, especially when we stop to consider that our conception of a prison requires us to make every reasonable effort to aid the offender to embrace the proper mode of life upon release, as well as to punish him for his transgression.

No fair and just consideration of the problem at hand can be undertaken without some reference to the prison inmates and their future welfare, which very often involves our own future welfare.

Great progress has been made in prison administration in this country. Under the able and intelligent leadership of men imbued with foresight and conscience. We have come to realize that the prison serves not only to punish the offender for his transgression against the laws of society but also as a place to teach and point out to the unfortunate men and women within the walls the proper way of life; and to show them that, by acquiring a trade, a skill, or other qualification, they can conform to the laws of God and man and live a decent and useful life after leaving the "big house." The success of our prison rehabilitation program has been far greater than many people realize, much less appreciate.

In making a success of the rehabilitation program, inmates have been schooled in the proper exercise of their ability and resourcefulness. In this course of training the inevitable result has been the production of commodities that must be disposed of. This is part of the price our Nation pays each year as part of the annual crime bill. But our zealousness to aid in rebuilding the character of those who have strayed from the path should not blind our eyes to our obligation to those who have remained on the course and who have not sinned. Ours is the problem of providing useful work for prison inmates and yet keeping down to the lowest possible minimum the competition between the products from within the walls and those produced outside by free labor and free industry.

We have progressed to a point now in the administration of prisons and penal institutions where the inmates can be put to useful work, work which will pay dividends upon release, but at the same time keeping the products of the prison off the open market. Therefore, I feel that the time has come for Congress, in its wisdom, to pass the bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and prevent altogether the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce. We owe this to free industry and to free labor.

William I. Sirovich

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute by Senator MEAD on the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from

New York, in memory of the late Honorable WILLIAM I. SIROVICH, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives:

The death of the Honorable WILLIAM I. SIROVICH came as almost a tragedy to his army of friends and admirers. Here was a man who felt that the greatest stake in life was the accumulation of friends. A man of science, of culture, and of the higher attainments, he enjoyed nothing more than serving his fellowmen. He was a true public servant in every sense of the word.

Dr. SIROVICH remained a figure in the public eye from the day he graduated from public school in the populous lower East Side of New York. He entered the City College of New York and, subsequently, graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University with the degree of doctor of medicine. At this point he accepted membership on the school board of the fifth district of Manhattan, and he remained there as chairman and member for nearly 25 years. During this time he devoted himself constantly and unselfishly to the public service. He did much valuable work with the hospital commission, the State prison commission, the State charities conference, and other bodies which framed the workmen's compensation laws and which inquired into the subject of adequate pensions for widows and orphans.

By 1918 he had become vice president of the child welfare board of the city of New York; he had been superintendent of the People's Hospital since 1910; he had lectured extensively on educational problems; he had been appearing at large hearings in Albany to advocate social and economic improvements; he had established himself as a leading figure in the pursuit of public improvement.

Vigorous, courageous, intelligent, and liberal, Dr. SIROVICH was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. His speeches in the Congress were literary and intellectual gems, and his foresight commanded legislative attention and respect.

I felt a deep personal loss in the death of this friend and adviser. He made service in the House pleasanter and easier and more fruitful for us all. Keen of wit, lovable of personality, and ever forceful in character, his name and his memory are deeply engraved in the hearts of all of us who knew him.

Chester C. Bolton

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CHESTER C. BOLTON, our late colleague from Ohio, was in many ways a most unusual man. He was in the public service, not for financial reasons or necessity, but because he believed that any American who possesses wealth and ability and culture owes much to the Nation in which he has been able to achieve such wealth and ability and culture. CHESTER BOLTON was a man of extensive wealth, very great ability, and very fine culture.

At one time he most ably fulfilled a function which it is now my privilege to exercise—chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. In his dealings with his colleagues he had every opportunity to win their friendship—or their dislike. He won their friendship. CHESTER BOLTON left a career which will always be the greatest monument that could be erected to his memory. His high standards of public service, his fine principles of government, his civic pride and generosity, his social consciousness, all were such as to mark him as a genuinely fine legislator and a really great man, one whose friendship was well worth while, indeed.

Our friend had a varied experience in his career. Modest, quiet—almost shy—in his contacts with his fellow men, he took responsibility very seriously. In peace or in war he wanted to serve his home city, his State, and his Nation by giving the best he had. Not only was he willing to give generously to philanthropy and the arts, but he also wanted to be a worker, and as a consequence he was a leader. It is said of him that there was hardly an institution in his home city of Cleveland but that recognized in him a friend who could be called upon at any time and one who would never fail to answer. Back in 1916 he was at the first citizens' training camp at Plattsburg, N. Y. Later, because of his wide business experience and great ability, he was on the first War Industries Board when we entered the World War. Later he was an aide to The Assistant Secretary of War. But he was not satisfied with service in the Capital at Washington. He therefore entered the Army as a field officer, rising to the rank of colonel, and becoming assistant chief of staff of the One Hundred and First Division.

Being a wealthy man, CHESTER BOLTON might have disdained service in the Ohio State Legislature, but he did not. He was a State senator of great ability and conscientiousness, and was president pro tempore of the senate while he was a member of it. He was a member of the State senate which effected the last great reform in the Ohio tax structure.

He was elected to Congress first in 1928 as successor to that great statesman, Theodore E. Burton, and it is to the credit of our late lamented colleague that he proved himself wholly worthy of the great man who preceded him in his seat.

I shall not endeavor at this time to list all of the virtues and the outstanding services rendered by this able and conscientious man to his city, his State, and his Nation. It would require more space than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD affords, because only in a book could the achievements, the ideals, and the excellent work of this able Ohio legislator be adequately set forth in detail. Suffice it to say that wherever he found duty, he performed it well; wherever he thought duty might lie, there he went, eager to give the best that was in him for his constituents. He was one of the hardest workers in the Congress of the United States, and I am one of those who find it in my heart to wish that he might have worked less strenuously, that he might have conserved his strength a little more, so he could have remained with us longer.

No words that we may utter here can add to his stature. We can only voice our deep respect for him, we can but put into words the pleasure each and every one of us knew in our associations with him; and we can confidently trust to history in the future to accord him his rightful place, which he so richly earned by his unselfish and devoted efforts throughout his life to render service to his fellow men.

John Andrew Martin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado on the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN ANDREW MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to the memory of our late colleague, JOHN A. MARTIN, by Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Senator from Colorado:

Truly JOHN MARTIN'S remarkable and singular qualities not only have distinguished him among men, but have destined the void bequeathed by him to go unfilled. His letters and his speeches bore a peculiar, simple, and eloquent style that required no other mark to identify them as his work. He was author and sincere student, historian and genial companion, orator and patient listener, soldier and sympathetic humanitarian, patriot and idealistic philosopher—these were the paradoxical qualities of his nature and talent. Forthright in his convictions, he held no malice and was quick to overlook the untoward thought and act. He reverently communed with the spirits of his country's great in the shadows of the old historical landmarks of colonial America and never ceased to be thrilled to the depths of his responsive soul by their patriotic implications. JOHN MARTIN found perfect contentment in the quiet fullness of his home, a good book dealing with the tribulations and hopes of his people, his cherished pipe and tobacco, and above and beyond all, the devoted companionship of his loving wife and family. The inspiration of his wholesome personality lives, vibrant and strong.

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in each session of the Congress there comes that day when it is our somber privilege to pay tribute to those colleagues who have passed over into that mystical realm to which death is the vestibule.

It is with a heart saddened by a sense of parting from a dear friend, a much respected colleague, an able legislator, and a real patriot, that I pay my humble tribute today to our cherished colleague, who has passed over to the other side, the late CARL E. MAPES, of Michigan.

I think no eulogy, whatever its length, however many its words, could better describe CARL MAPES, the man, and CARL MAPES, the legislator, than a simple sentence—"His conscience was ever his guide." That was the outstanding characteristic of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who but lately left us. Quiet, firm, unwavering, he stood fast, not only in his friendships as an individual, but he stood fast to his principles as a Member of the Congress for 27 years.

For a long time dean of the Michigan delegation, and in the present Congress acting assistant minority leader of the House, CARL MAPES was unfailingly courteous, always kindly, never moved by impulsive emotionalism, but always exercising a calm, cool judgment based on logic.

In these days of peril this Nation can ill afford to lose a man like Representative MAPES. Since, however, death waits on no man and consults the wishes and needs of neither nations nor individuals, we must bow in submission to that fate which has overtaken our respected and esteemed colleague, as it must overtake all men, and rest in the hope that infinite wisdom has raised him to a higher plane to continue his work, and that he and we shall meet again.

Harry Wilbur Griswold

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY WILBUR GRISWOLD, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, the greatest shock I received during my years in Congress was when on the evening of July 4, 1939, I happened to turn on the radio and the announcer stated that Congressman GRISWOLD, of Wisconsin, had died suddenly an hour or so ago while driving his car in the city of Washington. I will never forget that feeling, because only on the day before we had visited and talked about things that happened while we were both members of the Wisconsin Senate.

HARRY GRISWOLD was one of my very best friends long before either of us served in public office. He was one of the outstanding farmers and breeders of purebred Guernsey cattle of southwestern Wisconsin. I was associated with his father for several years as an extension worker for the college of agriculture in farm institute work. That is how I first met Harry and learned to admire him and respect his views. Later, as members of the Wisconsin Senate we worked very closely together on all agricultural problems. While we did not always agree politically, that fact never interfered with our friendship, each respected the other's views, and I never once questioned HARRY GRISWOLD's honesty and sincerity on any political controversy.

The people of Wisconsin and the Nation have lost a true American and a public servant that never shirked his duty. My sincere condolence goes out to his wife, son, and daughters who will have a hard time forgetting the love and devotion of a husband and father.

Cassius C. Dowell

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CASSIUS C. DOWELL, late a Representative from the State of Iowa

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad privilege that we who remain in the House have on this memorial day to pay a brief tribute to our departed colleagues.

One of those departed Representatives was a man for whom I had a very deep respect and a very great esteem. The Honorable CASSIUS C. DOWELL, of Iowa, was a quiet, conscientious, industrious, able legislator, who came from humble beginnings, who was one of the common people, and who in his kindly simplicity achieved the distinction of being one of the ablest Members of this House without saying much about it.

Our lamented friend, CASSIUS DOWELL, performed his duties and pursued his way with little agitation or acclaim. He was a faithful servant of his people. He was a sincere and able representative of his constituency. That fact is, I think, exemplified in his record. He was a Member of the United States Congress for 23 years; previous to that, a member of his State legislature for 12 years. That is a long period in the human span for a man to be returned, election after election, to serve his people. Only those who have gained the deep confidence and the undying affection of their neighbors and friends and fellow citizens in their own States ever achieve the distinction of such a long and able career as was granted to our colleague, CASSIUS DOWELL.

He had one pleasure and privilege during his career which most of us never have. When CASSIUS DOWELL came to Congress, he was an advocate of good roads. He had envisioned a system of highways for this Nation that would bring the farm nearer to the city; that would give to those living in the rural districts easier access to the cultural and spiritual values found in the cities, towns, and villages; he envisioned highways that would make it easier for neighbor to visit with neighbor, easier for the boys and girls of the rural districts to get to schools; the kind of highways that would for all time eliminate for the citizens of his country the laborious effort of traversing hub-deep mud, drifted snow, or overflowed roads in their necessary journeys.

CASSIUS DOWELL lived to see his vision come true. As chairman of the House committee having most to do with roads, he worked unceasingly for the highway system which now blesses this Nation. He did as much, perhaps, as any one individual to make his dream a reality. And no more unselfish dream was dreamed by any man, because CASSIUS DOWELL could get from a good-road system for himself and his loved ones no more than could any other citizen.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa did his work well. He performed his duties faithfully. His country is better because he lived. His fellow citizens, including his associates

in this House, gained much from their association with him. And I think we are fully justified in indulging in the hope, from the very depths of our souls, that CASSIUS C. DOWELL has gone on to a higher work, a nobler activity, and a greater happiness.

Harry W. Griswold

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY W. GRISWOLD, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, months have passed since the death of our friend and colleague, HARRY W. GRISWOLD. But the passing of time cannot erase the memory of his sincerity and legislative sagacity; of his kindness and sympathetic understanding; of his simplicity and unostentatious behavior. HARRY GRISWOLD championed a cause only when it was right. He supported legislation only when it was sound. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a number of his speeches which demonstrate the care and study he gave to a legislative problem. We who knew HARRY GRISWOLD will cherish his friendship and our memories of him.

Bert Lord

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. BERT LORD, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege I shall cherish so long as memory remains with me to be able to recall that I have served in this body with our late esteemed colleague, the Honorable BERT LORD, of New York.

It has been said of him that Representative LORD knew his people not only as groups but also as individuals; that he knew the veteran and the veteran's widow and the veteran's orphan; that he knew the farmer, the wage earner, and the businessman of his district. This meant, of course, that Representative LORD knew the problems, the hopes and the fears, the ambitions, and the visions of his constituents in these different walks of life; and I think it is entirely accurate to say he never passed an opportunity to aid in any reasonable and proper way the aspirations of his constituents.

It was a pleasure to serve in the House with BERT LORD because of his fine, genial personality. Not only was he a good legislator; he was a good friend. Not only was he congenial as a Member of the House but he was congenial as an individual in his social contacts.

None of those who knew him questioned for a moment the fact that he was a conscientious and valued public official; his personal qualities were such as to win him the warmest friendships.

His professional, business, and social relations were always marked by geniality and a consideration that made both personal and official contacts with him always more than ordinarily pleasant.

Representative LORD was always faithful to his duties. He was a good citizen, a good legislator, a real patriot, and the type of citizen the Nation can ill afford to lose.

Edward W. Curley

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute of Senator MEAD on the life, character, and public service of Hon. EDWARD W. CURLEY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York, in memory of the late Honorable EDWARD W. CURLEY, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives:

The death of the Honorable EDWARD W. CURLEY was a saddening event. I held him in warmest esteem, both as a true friend and as an indefatigable legislator. He was one of those rare examples of men who work with ceaseless energy, and with an apparent untiring strength. No man in Congress was more devoted to his constituency, nor more exacting in the performance of his duties.

Born in Easton, Pa., he moved to the great city of New York and established himself as an outstanding citizen in the Bronx. After his graduation from the College of the City of New York, he engaged in the building industry for a quarter of a century. In 1915 he was elected a member of the Board of Aldermen for the City of New York, and he served in this responsible position with ability and distinction for nearly 20 years.

In 1935 EDWARD W. CURLEY was elected to the Congress of the United States. Many of us had known him previously, for he had become a leader in civic, legislative, and political affairs in his home district. In the House he served on the Committee on the Civil Service and Labor, and, while his health permitted, he was an active force in the work of those committees.

His prestige and popularity among the voters of his district carried him back to Congress by splendid majorities, even when he lacked the physical vigor to mount the platform and give an account of his stewardship.

Truly, the State and the Nation suffered with the passing of this outstanding public servant. His zeal, his tolerance, and his wisdom gave him the qualities of statesmanship. As one who came to love and admire him, I find it difficult to pay him the tribute he so richly earned.

Thomas S. McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when I heard of the death of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, Member of Congress from South Carolina, it was with great sadness and regret.

While I have not served on any committee in the House in company with him, I enjoyed his long friendship and acquaintance and many personal conferences with him. He was truly one of the solid, substantial, level-headed Members of this body.

He was not given to exhibition or show, or display, but was sincere at all times in his labor and undertakings.

He served for some time on one of the important committees of this body and always gave a good account of his time, and rendered a most valuable service to his State and to our country in general. His elevation to this body left him plain, considerate, and friendly and always anxious to be helpful when he could possibly do so.

It is indeed a great loss to the people of his district, his State, and the Nation that he should be called away at a time

when he was just in the prime of life and when he was rendering such distinguished and valuable service as he was doing at the time of his passing.

He was a fine and loyal servant of the people and will long be missed by the membership of this House.

A prince once said of a king struck down:
"Taller he seems in death."
And the word holds good, for now, as then,
It is after death that we measure men.

Strange and mysterious are the ways of Providence as we look at them from the mere human standpoint; but when the Master uttered that sentence he opened up before us a new significance to life. We are told of the patriarch Abraham that when he was called on to lead his country and go into a land to which he was a stranger, he went out not knowing whither he went. And so it may seem to us as we think of life and its problems, its manifold necessities, and the grave duties which confront us along each step of the way.

Thank God that in the mystery of these years there was the unfolding of character. Thank God that those who knew him best will speak the highest concerning him. We drop our tears; we wonder what it all means; but, friends, Whittier was right when he wrote that sentence:

I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.

J. Will Taylor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. J. WILL TAYLOR, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, while the passing of a relative, a friend, or a colleague is always an event that strains the heartstrings and opens the wellsprings of grief, yet there is a consolation that always remains to us. Gone though our colleagues may be—among them the Honorable J. WILL TAYLOR, of Tennessee—yet the memory of our long association with them, like a melody, lingers on. As someone has well put it, their personalities remain to us in memory as the fragrance of roses that are faded and gone.

J. WILL TAYLOR was an able man. He was a quiet man. He was a forceful man. He was a fighting man among fighting Tennesseeans. It is a fact, however, that he never fought for anything except that which he believed in; he always fought fairly; he carried no rancors in his heart against his fellow men because of the legislative battles through which he passed.

He is gone now from our councils to the realm beyond the grave. He is not alone, of course, because those of us who at this moment live on this earth are as but a few as compared to the myriad men and women and children who have passed over throughout the long history of man.

J. WILL TAYLOR was not only an able legislator, he was an able lawyer. He did not choose to employ his talents as a representative of any special interests. He did not attempt to parade his powers as a statesman; but he possessed an ability with which few are blessed. He was honored by being repeatedly elected to office, because his constituents—his people—had full confidence in him. They knew that in J. WILL TAYLOR there was no shadow of turning. He was generous, hospitable, and tender in his affections. He always sought an opportunity to benefit and help his fellow men; he never failed to stand by a friend, to support a cause, or to defend a principle he believed in.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the most fitting thing we can say of a colleague like J. WILL TAYLOR is that we who knew him well loved him much, and we shall never cease to miss him from our councils.

Wallace E. Pierce

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute by Senator MEAD on the life, character, and public service of Hon. WALLACE E. PIERCE, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York, in memory of the late Honorable WALLACE E. PIERCE, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives:

I pay respectful tribute to the memory of the Honorable WALLACE E. PIERCE, Member of Congress from the Thirty-first Congressional District of New York State, whose death came as a shock to his many newly found friends in the Congress. We served together only a short time, but I recognized his fine ability, his splendid talent, and his unquestioned integrity.

WALLACE E. PIERCE was born in Black Brook, Clinton County, N. Y., and grew up in the vast northern area of the Empire State. He served as a legislator in New York State and won high honor in the pursuits of law.

Lawyer, legislator, and statesman, he was well known and beloved in the city of Plattsburg, which he claimed as his home. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1938, succeeding the Honorable Bertram Snell who had retired, but unfortunately, Representative PIERCE'S career at Washington was brief. However, during his service here, he collected many friends in both political parties and established himself as a man of great character, superb qualities, and earnest ability.

Needs of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address delivered by me last night over a Nation-wide hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject The Needs of Our Navy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What are the needs of our Navy? I prefer to state the question in another way. What are the needs of the Navy to assure our security and to prevent invasion of America by any nation or group of enemy nations? First, let me emphasize certain views that I think should underlie our naval policy. I am decidedly of the opinion that America should not be drawn into the European war and we should not consider our naval needs with this objective in view. I cannot see how we could possibly accomplish anything worth the sacrifices of human lives, of resources, and possible loss of our free institutions, that will be demanded of us by participation.

Neither am I of the opinion that we can bring peace to the world by engaging in the war in Europe, nor do I believe that

we should interfere in trying to settle the problems in the Far East. Our naval experts agree that the only possible way we could be certain of a military victory in the Far East would be through cooperation of the British and French fleets and, obviously, any such military alliances are contrary to our American traditions.

In my opinion, we could not act effectively in the absence of adequate naval bases in the Pacific in the event—which I strongly oppose—that we became involved in a war with Japan over the Dutch East Indies. In my opinion, any war waged by us in the Far East would be fraught with very serious consequences as to the outcome and would be extremely costly. I am speaking now of our offensive military operations in the Far East, not of defensive operations against threatened invasion of any of our possessions.

Nor do I see any possibility of any of the belligerents now waging war in Europe obtaining a position at the end of this war when they can assail us so long as we maintain an adequate navy. The belligerents who some allege might attack us would have to have command of the ocean. To be a menace they would have to transport their armies across the sea in ships, or have them flown across the ocean and operate from bases in this hemisphere. Our naval strength must make this impossible.

But let me say again and with all possible emphasis the determination of our naval needs rests chiefly upon a national-defense policy based upon coping with any possible aggression and repelling any possible invader. So far as my voice and vote are factors it rests solely and exclusively upon this consideration. This in itself is a stupendous task without planning for or engaging in the wars of other nations.

It is my confident belief that the American people do not desire to maintain naval or other military armaments for purposes of aggression or conquest. Our uppermost thought in these momentous and tragic days in world affairs must be the high resolve to keep our country out of the conflagration now devastating Europe, come what may.

But one cannot look out upon the world at large without witnessing ruthless violation of treaties and international good faith, greed, oppression, terror, and madness. We are forced, unfortunately, to conclude that under existing conditions our safety lies in the power and might of our armaments, in order that we may face any future eventuality with the assurance of our own ability to repel any attack from any quarter—indeed to be so prepared and fortified that no attack will be attempted.

These basic considerations—noninvolvement in war, no aggression, no conquest, and no role of international policeman—should underlie our naval policy and should relate directly to the question of our naval needs.

Our Navy is solely for our national defense, but that means a navy equal to the task of meeting and defeating the enemy—any enemy—at sea. Then only may we rest secure in our knowledge that we are safe from invasion from overseas.

A navy adequate to our needs of national defense is a larger navy than ever before in our history. We are in a world dominated by brute force. Treaties afford no security. As respects limitation of naval armaments, all treaties to that effect expired 4 years ago, and the race in naval armaments is on in every part of the world today.

We know of the enormous expansion of naval construction in England and in Japan, and which is continuing at a feverish pace. We know Italy and France have been progressively enlarging their navies. We know Germany has dreamed of a day when it will be a great naval power and has laid its plans to that end. We cannot close our eyes to these realities.

It became apparent some years ago that unless we accelerated and expanded our new ship construction and our naval aircraft the United States must face the prospect of being outmatched in naval strength, must discard a policy of naval parity with Great Britain and a ratio of 5 to 3 with Japan, must be content to maintain an inferior navy and circumscribe our activities and take the risks that such a policy involved. To be frank with you, the overwhelming evidence before the Congress is that, except for the efficient and able personnel of our Navy, we are woefully weak in naval power compared with the present and building naval program of the other powers. While this is a revelation to most Americans, it is not entirely discreditable. It is due to the fact that our confidence in other nations to stop expanding their navies had been misplaced. Not until a few years ago did we awaken to the gradual steady inferior place in naval strength into which we were drifting.

The view which I have maintained for many years during my chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the yardstick of our naval needs was admirably expressed in the testimony before our committee a few days ago by a well-known expert in this field—Maj. George Fielding Eliot. Let me quote his words:

"The military policy—using the word 'military' in its broadest sense—that our country should adopt," he said, "is one that will give this country entire freedom of action under any and all circumstances. No one can foresee what is going to happen in the next 2 or 3 years. If we attempt a policy which would enable us to command the sea approaches to the Western Hemisphere, we shall have freedom of action, without being under foreign compulsion or foreign threats, so that our Government from time to time can pursue a course of action without being threatened, without being bullied, without being pushed around."

Major Eliot in the course of his testimony gave expression to another statement of sound truth and profound importance. He said:

"In my judgment, the view sometimes expressed that we ought to fight now while we have allies is a complete fallacy simply from the cold, plain, military point of view. Our military power can always be exercised more effectively and to much better advantage and effect within a reasonable radius of our shores than it can by fighting on the continent of Europe, thousands of miles away, with an improvised army, as we did the last time, because we always have to improvise when it is necessary to hasten the expansion of our forces."

I subscribe most heartily to that declaration. I view our Navy as in the nature of an insurance policy—an insurance against war and against invasion. We have had to increase the amount of the insurance in view of circumstances and conditions beyond our control. Our risks have increased and with them the cost of our insurance. So, too, the premium which we are paying for our protection has been and is likely to be further increased.

We have materially expanded our naval program and the end is not in sight. We increased the authorized limits of our naval strength in a bill passed by the Congress 2 years ago and since that date have been engaged in translating these ships from blueprints into realities just as rapidly as our physical facilities permitted. We thought in 1938 that the limit then set measured the extent of our naval needs. Events since then have proved otherwise. Congress at the present time is moving to increase the authorized strength of our Navy by approximately 11 percent and by what is referred to as a 2-year program. It is not claimed that the present bill measures the full extent of our needs. It measures rather the full extent to which, as a practical matter, we can proceed with the building program during the coming 2 years. In approving the present bill and in making the present appropriations we are proceeding in the light of present circumstances.

The American people have the will to build whatever size Navy is needed. They are prepared to make the enormous monetary sacrifices. Congress understands and appreciates this sentiment and will grant the necessary authority. In the last analysis, it is up to our naval experts to give us, in detail, the naval program necessary to protect our homes, our lives, and our free institutions.

What our naval needs will be in the years to come is not within the range of present prophesy. We can only say, in framing our naval policy, that the lives, and the homes, and the happiness of 130,000,000 Americans are at stake and that no price can be put upon their safety.

The Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post relative to the Farm Credit Administration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of April 26, 1940]

EXPLANATIONS IN ORDER

Secretary Wallace recently issued a statement harshly criticizing the credit policies of the Federal land banks under the former independent management and asserting that the Department of Agriculture "now is taking steps to place the credit policy of the Farm Credit Administration on a sound basis."

Following his indictment of past policies, Mr. Wallace outlined a plan of action for the future calling for lower interest rates to farmer-borrowers, the placing of responsibility for losses entirely on the Federal land banks, and the elimination of the requirements that borrowers acquire stock equal in amount to 5 percent of their loans.

This statement, together with a covering letter from Governor Black of the F. C. A., was sent free of charge through the mails to over 600,000 farmer-borrowers from the land banks.

Every one of the three proposals listed by the Secretary as a basic need is authorized under the Jones-Wheeler bill, now before the House Agriculture Committee. There are strong reasons for concluding, therefore, that the chief purpose of the official circularization was to secure farmer support for this measure which had previously been endorsed by Secretary Wallace. That belief is strengthened by the closing paragraph of the Wallace memorandum expressing confidence that "when farmers understand what is going on, they and the organizations which represent them will support moves for sound credit and away from soft credit."

This, of course, is Secretary Wallace's way of replying to critics who, for good reasons, insist that the Jones-Wheeler bill would

destroy existing safeguards against unsound loans and encourage "soft credit" policies. However, the merits of the pending legislation have no bearing upon the charges of unauthorized lobbying which have brought an invitation to Messrs. Wallace and Black to appear before the House Committee on Agriculture. The committee wants to know whether their communications to farmer-borrowers constitute a violation of the Antilobbying Act, as well as the law forbidding dissemination at public expense of documents designed to influence legislation, except on request.

If the existing antilobbying legislation does not cover the activities of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the F. C. A., it should assuredly be amended specifically to forbid the kind of indirect pressure employed in the present instance. Whatever the verdict of the House committee may be after listening to the explanations of these two officials, it is obvious that the spirit, if not the letter, of the Antilobbying Act has been violated.

Since the Department of Justice has made no effort to suppress official lobbying, the House Committee on Agriculture is performing a much-needed service in asking Messrs. Wallace and Black "under what authority" they distributed their thinly veiled endorsement of a pending bill.

The Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES BY SENATOR NYE AND SECRETARY EDISON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, recently there was conducted through the columns of the Washington Daily News, issue of Saturday, April 20, 1940, a forum by Mr. Theodore Granik, director of the American Forum. The question pertained to our Navy.

In making announcement of this forum, participated in by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Granik said:

With the spreading of the European war and the reports of major naval engagements in Scandinavian waters the eyes of the Nation are focused on America's first line of defense—the Navy.

I take issue with Mr. Granik, in that I am of the opinion that today America's first line of defense is not the Navy, but is the airplane; and particularly will this become more true and more thoroughly appreciated if and when we have been sufficiently farsighted to acquire for ourselves certain island possessions in the Atlantic and in the Pacific upon which we can establish air bases, thus providing a greater area for the purpose of protecting American shores and prohibiting enemy forces from ever landing upon continental United States, so that if we ever are so unfortunate as to become engaged in enemy combat none of the fighting will take place upon the soil of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the views of my colleague, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and those of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Charles Edison.

I have observed in reading the statements of these two eminent gentlemen that Secretary Edison states that he believes with John Adams that "naval power is the natural defense of the United States." John Adams never heard of an airplane; and I believe that if he were here today to witness the phenomenal development of air power he would agree with me that our first line of defense lies in air power.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NO," SAYS NYE

(By GERALD P. NYE, United States Senator from North Dakota)

What the United States needs in naval preparation is a navy sufficient, in cooperation with our land forces, to keep the strongest potential foe from successfully invading our country.

There is a long way from meaning that we must have a navy second to none. We don't need any such navy to accomplish the stated purpose.

These times of conflict abroad perhaps challenge us to a larger preparation in our Military Establishment, though it is worthy of suggestion that by the time the foreign powers have spent themselves in their present wars we are going to need considerably less of preparation against attack than has been true in the past. But perhaps we're not supposed to view our needs these days with any degree of sanity, and should instead get on the band wagon and whoop it up for the world's mightiest war machine, as some Americans are already doing.

Perhaps we should follow that American leadership which seems to ascribe no value whatsoever to the mightiest fortifications the world has ever beheld, namely, two great oceans with an expanse of thousands of miles, one on each side of us, each separating us from potential enemies.

Some foreign powers would lay down their annual national income several times over for possession of equal fortifications, while we are quite expected to forget them, go crazy on a naval-expansion program, and frame our minds fearfully to accept Orson Welles' dreams of possible attacks against us.

We have no need for a navy second to none to afford ourselves an adequate national defense. All we need to accomplish that is a larger preparation in the air and enlargement upon our defensive preparation on land. Of course, that isn't going to be enough to let us go bullying and bluffing and swinging a club at other parts of the world, but it will be enough to insure us very adequately against the chance for any power, or group of powers, to start running over our lawns and cluttering ordinary traffic in our streets or on our highways.

Cabinet Secretaries and Assistants talk about the need for navies second to none, armies second to none, the time it will take to equip an Army of 1,000,000 American fighters, and in general about our utter lack of preparedness (even though the bill for preparedness annually is about seven times as much as it was before we went into the last war to end war, destroy militarism, save democracy, and raise hell for generations to come). Preparedness for what, let's ask. Preparedness for what?

I fear that many voices in leadership in our country today are having their wishes dictated by voices like those of our Minister to Canada and the Provincial Attorney General in Canada, whose doctrines would put and drag us into Europe's wars.

What is this call for an army of a million men, a navy second to none, greater preparedness? Preparedness for what?

Preparedness for what may result from Presidential scoldings being administered frequently across the Atlantic and Pacific—scoldings that may be followed by desire to administer spankings instead?

Preparedness such as will enable us to fulfill assurances or insinuated commitments by our Bullitts abroad?

Preparedness to strengthen the arm of the modern Colonel House in his speed journeys to and through Europe?

Preparedness to make stronger its force when Jimmy Cromwell "tells" the world what we should and ought and shall do?

Preparedness for that day which Attorney General Conant, of Ontario, declares must be brought about, the day we move into Europe's war?

Of course, if it is preparedness for our participation in Europe's newest war over who shall be the powers in Europe and where the border lines shall be for the next 20 years, then we need not only a navy second to none but a navy at least equal to the combined navies of all the world multiplied by 8 or 10.

Of course, if we are going to practice dictating how the rest of the world shall live and behave, then we need a navy second to none, and then some.

Of course, if we are going to launch our country into participation in the hates and jealousies of other lands, if we are going to try to maintain one imperialism as against another, by all means we must have more and ever more of a navy than we've got or ever expect to have.

But if we will but pursue that course which the overwhelming millions of Americans are asking and praying for—the course of minding our own business, of which we have so much to mind—we don't need to be breaking our national back and neck in the building of a navy that is second to none.

We would instead be content with a navy which, in conjunction with our land forces and machinery, would be enough to repulse surely any foe that ever undertakes that hopeless job of attacking and conquering the United States or any of its neighbors.

The two oceans are the equivalent to any second-to-none navy the world knows today. Can't we be content with what we've got and can quickly have if and when need arises? We had better be.

"YES," SAYS EDISON

(By Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy)

I believe in a navy second to none, and I believe in a navy strong enough to back up the will of the people as expressed in laws and approved policies. I believe with John Adams that: "Naval power is the natural defense of the United States."

The subject of a navy second to none is not new. It is the will of the majority of the people that we have a navy second to none, and so approved in the naval bill of August 29, 1916. In 1922, in the greatest gesture ever made to the cause of peace, the United States by the Washington Limitation of Armament Treaty scrapped 755,380 tons of ships. The cost of these vessels scrapped, after deducting the value obtained by the sale of scrap, was $277,695,944.

We were given by that treaty the right to build a navy second to none, or a 5–5 ratio with Great Britain. Money was never appropriated by the Congress to build this navy, but Congress never disputed in the majority our right to parity with Great Britain. That principle remains as a yardstick and is favored by most of our citizens.

Our course for sea power cannot be charted without taking into account world conditions and world morality. We, of this country, have been reluctant to admit unpleasant facts about the structure and the workings of international society. We are now disillusioned and alive to the fact that the importance and security of a nation are measured directly in terms of her ability to defend her interests.

We believe in democracy; we have fought to perpetuate our democratic institutions, and if we are not strong, our interests, our treasured liberties, and our wealth are almost certain to be targets for nations that may show no regard for treaties or what we consider national integrity.

With a navy second to none forceful notice will be served on all possible aggressor nations that the United States intends to protect itself and its interests in the most powerful and effective manner.

Today wars are seldom declared: International alinements are speedily and secretly made. The protection of our great Nation cannot be based on wishful thinking. We must be realists, and a navy second to none will give us reasonable strength for our first line of defense with a fair security margin.

We require a navy second to none because of the following national policies:

1. The United States would support an international agreement for naval limitation, but it is the policy of our Government to maintain the 5–5–3 ratio.

2. A recognition that the United States has vital interests in the Atlantic and Pacific that can only be protected by sea power.

3. The United States intends to maintain a navy capable of defending its Territories and its vital interests, wherever they may be, and that this defense shall include outlying bases, such as Hawaii, Alaska, Panama Canal, Puerto Rico, and the lookout posts in the Aleutians, Midway, Wake, Johnston, Palmyra, and the Virgin Islands. If the Congress should decide to provide an outlying lookout post at Guam, our defensive position in the Pacific would be greatly strengthened.

4. The United States proposes to maintain the Monroe Doctrine. This means that any change in the status quo which would involve a threat to flank our trade routes to South America or to establish new foreign bases in the Americas, controlled in fact though not in name by non-American nations, would be resisted.

The United States Navy has the following tremendous task that requires a navy second to none and possibly one larger than any:

First. The positive protection of the continental United States and its possessions. (The United States has the largest coast line of any naval power—3,860 miles.)

Second. The possibility of joining with the other American republics in preventing any hemispheric invasion or penetration.

Third. Sufficient naval strength to maintain and defend our commerce.

Fourth. Insurance of the uninterrupted flow of strategic raw materials.

Fifth. The maintenance of our neutrality at a time when intelligent men realize that only force maintains neutrality.

Woodrow Wilson said: "There is no navy in the world that has to cover so great an area of defense as the American Navy * * *."

The sanctity of treaties has been violated. Nonaggression pacts are more honored in the breach than in the observance. Power politics is the rule of the day. Great wars rage in Europe and in Asia. The rights of neutrals are flagrantly violated. Fundamental principles of our civilization are at stake. What is the answer for us?

Preserve our peace with honor. That may be done with adequate military and naval strength. That means a navy second to none.

War is not a mathematical set-up. Every possibility must be studied. If our fleet is weaker than the combined naval force of our potential enemies, then our fleet is too small. Viewed from that angle, we consider it too small and have so reported to the Congress. The recommendations of the Navy Department are now being thoroughly investigated and considered by the Congress of the United States, and it is our hope that it will authorize a sufficient increase over the present tonnage.

I feel that the majority of the American people are of the opinion of Theodore Roosevelt when he said:

"The United States Navy is the best guaranty the Nation has that its honor and interests will not be neglected; and, in addition, it offers by far the best insurance for peace that can by human ingenuity be devised."

Senator McNary and the Republican Presidential Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE RICHMOND (VA.) TIMES-DISPATCH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the April 26 issue of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on the mock Republican convention held by the students of Washington and Lee University at Lexington, Va., April 25.

The Democrats are very happy over what happened. We think coming events cast their shadows in advance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of April 26, 1940]

MCNARY WINS 'NOMINATION' ON SEVENTEENTH BALLOT

LEXINGTON.—Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, won the Presidential "nomination" of the Washington and Lee mock Republican Convention yesterday on the seventeenth ballot.

The "dark horse" walked away with the nomination with 624 of a possible 877 votes after many southern delegations in the miniature convention switched to the Senate minority leader.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, was chosen on the third ballot for Vice President.

Westerners' six-shooters and southerners' yells resounded through the hall as the break in the 3-day-long meeting came with the shift of votes to MCNARY.

COMPROMISE DEVELOPS

The stage was set for a dark-horse winner when the contest among the students over Senator Robert Taft and Thomas E. Dewey developed a "compromise" movement that all but landed Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, in the banner-carrying position. He received 439 votes, a majority of one, on the fourteenth ballot, but a delegate's claim that his vote was "coerced" and its subsequent withdrawal wiped out the momentary "nomination."

There were 16 "favorite son" nominees placed before the convention.

Washington and Lee students have been holding similar mock conventions each Presidential election year, except one, since 1908. It has been the custom to hold the convention of the party out of power.

There was one harmonious theme throughout the 3 days of nominating speeches, parliamentary maneuvering and backstage politicking—Keep out of war.

American Defense Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered in New York City on April 13, 1940, under the auspices of the American Defense Society.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Please know that I deem it a privilege to be provided the opportunity to speak with you today concerning the subject of national defense because we are all equally interested in providing an adequate national defense for our country particularly at a time when the world is in such a chaotic condition attributable most largely to the unfortunate wars that are raging today in both Europe and Asia.

And may I say that it is my hope and certainly I may presume to the extent of saying that I am sure it is your hope that these wars will not spread to such an extent as to engulf us in the flames of hatred and destruction of millions more of human lives.

I wish to speak to you concerning an adequate national defense, with emphasis upon the word "adequate." As to an adequate national defense there is, in my opinion, two phases. The first interests itself in providing a defense adequate to protect ourselves against an attack and an invasion by an enemy or enemies from without; the second interests itself in an adequate national defense in respect to the matter of defending ourselves against the enemy from within.

Surely at this hour when the most powerful nations of the earth are exhausting and depleting themselves in actual warfare which will take as its toll, unfortunately, millions of lives, we should now devote an equal amount of attention to matters of defense within the confines of our country.

In considering a program that is genuine we should take into consideration the actual facts that make up the conditions that exist in our country today, as well as in every other country. This dual national defense program must be based on the thinking, fears, and desires of the masses of the people for in the end we must agree with Thomas Jefferson (the third President of the

United States, whose birthday this is, April 13) to the extent that governments derive their just power from the consent of the people.

Our peacetime expenditures for war, as you know, are greater today by far than at any time in our history.

In support of our present policy we have vastly expanded this defense spending in recent years. In 1934 a total of five hundred and seventy millions were spent on the Army and Navy. Last year cash outlays for defense aggregated one billion two hundred million, and in the current fiscal year approximately one billion five hundred million is being spent. In the fiscal year, which begins next July 1, it is proposed to spend about two billion. The question arises, Can this Nation reduce its present defense program and still make good its tacit offer to defend the Western Hemisphere? Or should we prepare to spend more for defense purposes?

As ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, I recall that our Regular Army now consists of 227,000 men, with an addition of officers to the extent of 13,500. This force is fortunately backed by our National Guard to the extent of 242,000 men, a Reserve Officers Corps of 110,000, and, in addition, an Army Reserve of about 26,000 men. In all, therefore, the United States has a trained fighting force of approximately one-half million men.

These enormous expenditures which I have just cited give rise to another important question. Is it necessary that we continue to spend billions in strengthening our national defense when our potential enemies are daily being weakened economically and physically by the wars they are waging throughout the world?

I am strongly in favor of an adequate national defense for defense purposes only. War in Europe and in Asia has made the world a dangerous place in which to live. The fate of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, Finland, Denmark, and Norway stresses the need for adequate armed forces to defend national interests against all possible attacks by an enemy or enemies.

I am equally as strong against the development of our armed forces for the purpose of attacking any other country in the world. I favor only such development of our armed forces as will insure our success in case we should be attacked by a foreign enemy. I am opposed to the development of our armed forces with a view to attacking any other country or participating in the quarrels or wars of other nations of the world to the extent of sending our boys to foreign shores.

I am firmly of the opinion that the great majority of the citizens of our country share this view. I am absolutely certain that the mothers of America, who would be called upon to furnish the fodder for the cannon, are unalterably opposed to their sons participating in any wars beyond the borders of our country. It is therefore the duty of our Government to make it clear to our own citizens and to the people of the world that we are not going to send our soldiers across the seas to settle the disputes of other countries.

The United States is the most powerful nation in the world today. Our geographical position makes us safe from attack. No nation or group of nations can successfully attack us. This is not an exaggeration. No military man of any rank will sign a statement saying that this Nation can be successfully invaded.

One great military lesson of the last war was learned by the failure of England to land sufficient troops and establish a permanent base in their attempt to force the Dardanelles. When we know that troops cannot easily be landed on an enemy shore and that a nation cannot be subdued without troops, then, and then only, can we begin to reason without fear of attack. The different processes of getting troops from the ship to the shore leaves them so exposed that a very little military activity can destroy them. The last time the United States went to war in Europe it had a friendly Asia at its back, and it had a safe Atlantic on which to travel. Even so, it took us 13 months to get 500,000 men across, with the aid of the greatest body of naval and merchant-marine force in history.

Those men landed at friendly ports, had friendly lines of communication, friendly supply bases, and safe conduct right up to the line of battle.

The American expedition to France was the most gigantic military maneuver in world history. It could not be repeated except under similar easy conditions.

An army of 500,000 men would be an insignificant force with which to attack the United States. It would take millions of men to make any impression on this country. They could not come as we did, 7,000 at a time, for our ports are fortified and our coast lines are strongly protected; so may I say that I hope you will not permit anyone to excite you to the extent of making you believe that any nation could attack, with success, the shores of this country, even now. As the wars abroad progress, as I have previously stated, those nations at war will be materially weakened, and consequently, there is less likelihood of our experiencing an attack from any country in the world, for many years to come.

If Canada or Mexico permitted an enemy of the United States to establish a base or bases on their lands they would be offering their countries as battlefields, and no government would voluntarily do that in this hemisphere. The American people are determined to pay any price to protect our shores from invasion, but not to wage war in other countries. Permit me to repeat, that I am unqualifiedly in favor of an army for defense purposes only. We should develop our unified defense departments for defense purposes only—land, sea, and air-defense forces.

Let us weld an iron ring around us. Let us safeguard ourselves by the establishment of outposts in the Atlantic, the Pacific, and elsewhere. If we are to be attacked, and if there must be fighting, let's provide for ourselves with such outposts as will successfully bar the enemy or enemies from our shores, thus prohibiting fighting within the confines of continental United States.

Now, as to the Panama Canal. It must be protected in order to provide uninterrupted ship negotiation from the Pacific to the Atlantic, or vice versa. This is extremely important. At Puerto Rico we are spending millions to strengthen our military position in the Caribbean, with a view particularly to defending the Canal which lies to the west. Those defenses at Puerto Rico should be further strengthened to the north and in the south by our acquisition of British and French Islands in the Caribbean, extending from the Port of Spain in Trinidad, just off the coast of Venezuela in South America, northward to Bermuda in the North Atlantic. With the acquisition of Bermuda we would have provided for ourselves the first and only outpost in the North Atlantic.

In the far north Atlantic we should acquire from the French, St. Pierre and Miquelon Islands, just off the coast of Newfoundland. There we could construct valuable air, and, if necessary, naval bases, from which bases we would be in a position to meet any attack from the northeast.

With a view to welding stronger this iron band in the Atlantic, I have but recently introduced a resolution in the Senate of the United States, which authorizes the President to enter into negotiations with Great Britain and France for the acquisition of these island possessions to be credited upon their indebtedness to us, which is about $10,000,000,000.

And in passing, since I have taken occasion to mention foreign obligations as a result of World War No. 1, it is appropriate that I recall to your minds the fact that Italy is indebted to us in the excess of $2,000,000,000. Germany—the people of Germany owe the people of the United States something more than $3,000,000,000. These sums were advanced to aid a stricken nation in its rehabilitation. The indebtedness is represented by various note and bond issues of the German Nation and its subdivisions. This money, intended to rebuild Germany, has largely been used in its giant public-works administration. It has rebuilt railroads, lighting and power plants, their cities and their streets. Today practically all of it has defaulted beyond hope of recoupment. All we received in payment from these debtors has been sneers and expressions of ingratitude. This indebtedness of Germany has no inference to the huge obligations of Czechoslovakia. In that instance, within the last year Germany has seized all assets and confiscated $20,000,000 worth of gold bought with American funds, and really the property of the American people. Nor does it include the tens of millions likewise advanced by Americans after the war to Poland. This vast sum far exceeds the total indemnity paid in money to the Allies by Germany.

To the west, in the matter of outposts in the Pacific for the purpose of protecting the entrance to the Panama Canal, I suggest the leasing of islands of the Republic of Colombia, just south of the equator, and the leasing or purchasing of Goose and Cocos Islands—owned by Costa Rica.

I would also suggest that our Government endeavor to acquire Lower California by peaceful negotiation from our sister republic to the south so as to provide more protection for the Panama Canal, in that if this were done it would be impossible for any submarine or battle cruiser to be sheltered in the waters between the mainland of Mexico and the peninsula of Southern California.

Our fortifications in the Hawaiian Islands are splendidly located as protective outposts in that portion of the Pacific. At Honolulu we have one of the finest and strongest military establishments in the world.

Now, let's proceed further northward to the Aleutian Islands. We purchased these a number of years ago from the Russians at the same time we acquired Alaska and other islands of that far northern country, for a consideration of $7,200,000. At Unalaska, or Dutch Harbor, one of the Aleutian group, we have established a naval air base. These islands extend for more than 700 miles in the direction of Japan and Russia. Attu, the westernmost of the Aleutian group, is only about 2 hours' flying time from Japanese territory, and only a short distance from Russia. A base should be established on Attu Island.

We are now engaged in the construction of a central air base at Fairbanks in Alaska. That is well. Further north at Nome we will eventually find it expedient to erect a military base in view of the fact that Siberia, part of Soviet Russia, is a distance of a mere few hours by boat from American territory. Fact is, the two Diamede Islands near Nome belong to the Russian and American Governments. They are only a mile apart.

North of the Diamedes in the Arctic Ocean lies Wrangell Island. It is about the size of Jamaica. It is located between the mainlands of Alaska and Siberia. As the crow flies it is virtually on a line from the metropolis of New York to the capital city of the Philippines Commonwealth, Manila. As a result of its geographical position it has great potential military value on account of the miraculous and phenomenal development of air power.

The first flag was planted on Wrangell Island by members of the American Jeanette expedition around 1880. It is now occupied by Soviet eskimoes and a few Russian soldiers. Its legal possession is really in dispute (we claim it), and recognizing its potential military value a few days ago I introduced a bill in the Senate of the United States requesting the Secretary of State to ascertain the legal status of this island.

With the acquisition and development of outposts in the Atlantic and the Pacific and the far North where our territory is in the immediate proximity of both Japan and Russia, I believe that the Panama Canal would be secure from attack and that these outposts would unquestionably provide an iron ring so firmly

welded in our portion of the Western Hemisphere that no enemy from foreign shores, regardless of strength, could successfully penetrate this iron band to the extent of waging war upon us, upon our shores.

I believe firmly in air power. Truly one of the most valuable military lessons we have learned from the present European war is the vital importance of air power. With these outposts which I have mentioned, they will have become our first line of defense, and those lines of defense in the Atlantic and Pacific will be carried many miles farther into the two oceans by the utilization of aircraft. Air power has displaced already, to a very large extent, the Navy. Battleships, cruisers, or what not. For instance, it takes a battleship approximately 10 days to proceed from San Francisco through the Canal to New York. A battleship costs around $80,000,000. A fleet of battleplanes, bombers, transporting tons of high explosives, can be purchased for an amount not in excess of the cost of one battleship. A fleet of fast-flying battleplanes, deadly in attack, can negotiate the distance from San Francisco to New York City within a period of 11 hours. Make your own comparison. Ascertain for yourself by comparison the potential value of each—11 days as against 11 hours.

Concerning the enemies within, against whom we must likewise protect ourselves. These enemies are ignorance, illness, unemployment, crime, etc. Then there are alien enemies and potential alien enemies in the form of noncitizens. Aliens who have entered this country legally and have remained here illegally and those who have entered illegally and have remained here illegally. Mind you, I cast no reflection whatsoever upon our friends who have come from foreign shores legally and have remained here legally and are now here legally. I refer only to those who are in our country in violation of our laws. How many there are we do not know. Where they are we are not advised. From whence they came we have not been informed. What they are doing we do not know. But all of that is our business, the business of you Americans who are interested in the safeguarding of your country against the acts of those who are not the friends of America but who, to the contrary, are the enemies of America.

I have introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill calling for the mandatory registration and fingerprinting of all aliens in this country. By the enactment of this bill we could ascertain as to how many noncitizens there are here, when they came, from whence they came, how they came, whether they entered legally or illegally, or whether they entered legally and have remained here legally. Of all times, this information should be available now to governmental officials particularly, and to the American people as a whole.

There should be no objection to the enactment of such legislation. The President and the members of his Cabinet, and every one of the 4,000,000 men in uniform and under arms during our brief participation in the World War were fingerprinted. Every soldier, sailor, and marine of our armed forces is fingerprinted. Millions of high-school boys and girls in the East and the West have voluntarily submitted to fingerprinting, as well as those citizens who have requested that they be fingerprinted for their own protection and benefit. So why should any alien object to subjecting himself to this process of identification?

We are at peace; yet today the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice is receiving daily approximately 240 complaints of espionage and sabotage, while prior to the breaking out of war in Europe on September 3, 1939, only about 240 complaints of espionage and sabotage were received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation annually. Think of it, and at the same time reflect further upon what might be the results in case we were unfortunately sucked into the war that now rages across the Atlantic.

How, therefore, could we defend ourselves against any foreign enemies within unless we knew who they were and where they were. It would be impossible.

In conclusion, may I say that the problem of protecting ourselves against the enemies from within is as great and is as serious as the problem of developing an adequate national defense for the purpose of protecting ourselves against the enemy from without. We are spending billions for armaments for the latter purpose and at the same time we are spending in comparison only a few dollars for the purpose of defending ourselves against the enemies from within. When and if we are attacked the enemy will be observed and located and met by our mighty bombers. Those enemies will be easily located, whereas, on the other hand, the enemies from within cannot. They will be working in the darkness like a lot of termites, and now is the time to enact a registration and fingerprinting law for the purpose of locating all noncitizens, so that if the necessity arises we can locate any alien enemies in the form of saboteurs or spies.

Leagues of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, as I looked upon the picture on the cover of the anti-Nazi bulletin I received the other day, and saw certain persons portrayed as apes, I wondered if the internationalist looks upon Christian gentiles as animals, and if he treats them accordingly when he obtains the power to act without restraint and responsibility. I realize that he is a victim of his own philosophies as expressed in political laws which we mistakenly suppose are his sacred beliefs. I also recognize that the proponents of these philosophies are not in any sense comparable to the clergy as we know it, but they are instead the dispensers of his law and the judges of his own court.

With these things I take no issue, because I grant to all the same rights and privileges which I in my own beliefs consider my right. I have in my travels always held to such opinions and have never taken issue with Shintoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Mohammedanism, or with the practices of the Parsi, the Zoroastrian Persian refugees living in India. I have, as a matter of fact, broken bread with the Buddhist priests in the temples of India and been received in a private audience at the Vatican. In all these wanderings and contacts with people subscribing to doctrines different from my own I have been treated with the greatest courtesy experiences in my life, to which I always look back with great pleasure.

It is therefore strange to me that I cannot, here in my own home, freely subscribe to our own doctrines and principles without criticism by the internationalist. He appears to look upon himself not only as a person of special privilege but one superior to his host. With this I take no issue until these doctrines become a reality, for he then becomes a part of a minority of misled people who threaten majority rights. It is to preserve these liberties and to protect our rights that I have taken issue with those who are now actively engaged in the destruction of this Republic of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the remarks that I have inserted in the RECORD I have confined myself to authenticated or tabulated information obtained from Government sources or from the writings of those whom I have discussed, and I have at no time made accusations that were not based upon such authenticated documents.

During the past month I have received much vicious propaganda, which can be for no other purpose than to create dissensions and hatreds among our own people, and to climax this orgy of hatreds I have now received a document in which the Christian Front—and I take this to represent the Christion people—are caricatured as "Apes of wrath." Ordinarily a person would look upon this simply as an expression of the mentality of those who disseminate such literature, but knowing their philosophy, I realize that this picture is a true expression of the internationalist's real opinion of the American people.

The publication to which I refer is entitled "The Anti-Nazi Bulletin," and it is published by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights, Inc. This slogan is rather interesting, for, knowing their philosophy, I realize that they look upon themselves as "humans" and upon the Christians as "apes." So this picture should be informative to the American people.

Let us now without prejudice examine these "champions of human rights" and this Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, which was organized by the late Samuel Untermyer in 1933, and in 1939 listed the following officials:

Vice presidents: Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Rabbi Leon Fram, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Frank P. Walsh.

Simon M. Goldsmith, acting treasurer; G. Egerton Harriman, executive secretary.

Board of directors: Dr. S. William Kalb, chairman; Michael G. Alenick; Flynn L. Andres; Abraham Cahan; Dr. Edward Spencer Cowles; Prof. Paul Douglass; Dr. B. Dubovsky; Dr. Mitchell Salem Fisher; Jacob Fishman; A. Gallen; Simon M. Goldsmith; Frank P. Granat; Abraham I. Harkavy; Mrs. Mark Harris; Sidney Hillman; Rev. Dr. Harold R. Husted; Rabbi Edward I. Israel; Rev. Dr. Burris Jenkins; Robert G. Jones; Mrs. Samuel Koestler; William Leege; Rev. P. Luecke; Rev. Dr. Victor H. Lukens; Jacob Malmuth; Irving Maness; Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Dr. Nelson P. Mead; Mrs. L. Myers; Judge Henry P. Nelson; Henry Portnow; E. Rabinowitz; Dr. Morris M. Rose; Myron F. Schlater; Dr. Guy Emery Shipler; Prof. Charles E. Skinner; Hon. Rawghlie C. Stanford; Dean William E. Taylor; Charles Tomashek; Frank P. Walsh; Dr. Max Winkler; Max Zaritsky.

This personnel is from one organization in New York City, and there are, according to a letter which I received on May

8, 1939, some 700 of these leagues of hate. I shall now, to make the picture more complete, list the members of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League for the Defense of American Democracy, and I want you to note that this league is not organized in the defense of our Republic but in defense of democracy, which is, as the name implies, synonymous with a communistic government such as now prevails in Russia.

This letter is addressed to the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., and is signed by Michael Elkins, chief of investigations. This is also interesting, for what private organization in the United States has the right to maintain an investigation organization or intelligence service to spy upon the American people? This is something that should be investigated and would be if it were not for the internationalistic background of these organizations.

These are the officers:

Donald Ogden Stewart, chairman; Marian Spitzer, vice chairman; Alan Campbell, secretary; Bern Bernard, treasurer.

Sponsors:

Dr. Eric Beecroft, Herbert Biberman, Mrs. Sidney Buchman, Eddie Cantor, John Cromwell, Florence Eldridge, Francis Edwards Farago, Mrs. Bernadine Fritz, Jay Gorney, Oscar Hammerstein 2d, Rupert Hughes, Charles Katz, Senator Robert W. Kenny, H. S. Kraft, Richard Lert, Ernst Lubitsch, Frederic March, A. Calder Marshall, Dr. Rudolf Marx, Edwin Justus Mayer, Ray Mayer, Elizabeth Merrell, Lewis Milestone, Paul Muni, Dudley Nichols, Judge Isaac Pacht, Mrs. Charles Page, Dorothy Parker, Irving Pichel, Frank Scully, Maxwell Shane, Viola Brothers Shore, Sylvia Sidney, Gloria Stuart, Frank Tuttle.

This is one of the leagues on the west coast, and I shall now take you back to New York the center of communism and the home of those who furnish the money for these destroyers of our liberties and rights. In order to complete this picture so that we, "the apes," may have a better understanding of the sort of humanity these leagues sponsor, let me quote from the Joint Boycott Council of the American Jewish Congress and Jewish Labor Committee, 151 West Fortieth Street, New York City, branches all over the world. This is the purpose of the league:

Hitler has said: "We must export or die * * *." By supporting the anti-Nazi boycott you help destroy the greatest menace to democracy and world peace. By refusing to trade with the enemy you aid American industry and American labor. Boycott Nazi Germany.

I wonder what sort of humanity these leagues sponsor when their sole object is to bring about starvation of men, women, and children in order to satisfy an insatiate hatred for one man. Surely this is not the championship of human rights.

In this propaganda of hatreds I have another letter which is rather interesting, sent out by the Jewish People's Committee for United Action Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism. The officers of this league are as follows:

Reuben Brainin, honorary president; William Weiner, president; Ephraim Schwartzman, national secretary; Rabbi J. Greenfield, chairman, executive board; Reuben Saltzman, treasurer; M. Gertner, New York State secretary.

Vice presidents: Rabbi J. Greenfield, New York; Rabbi Judah L. Hahn, New York; Ben Meyers, Chicago, Ill.; Harry Mintz, New York; M. Pizer, New York; Irving Potash, New York; Arthur Rock, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. Sultan, New York; Charles Zuckerman, Newark, N. J.

The link of connection between these organizations may be found in these statements from this letter:

During the last months you have undoubtedly noticed that an unprecedented wave of anti-Semitism is sweeping the country. It is estimated by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis that there are no less than 800 anti-Semitic organizations functioning in the United States.

You probably have had some personal experience with the activities of some of these organizations, or came across some anti-Semitic literature published by them. Or perhaps you have listened to some of the anti-Semitic utterances of Father Coughlin. Their propaganda is calculated to weaken the foundations of our country by dividing our people and undermining our national unity, by planting race hatred and intolerance, and aiming to substitute fascism for our democratic way of life.

The letters to which I have referred show definitely not only the connection, but the very background of this movement. It is these people who through their leagues of hate have depicted patriots as "apes of wrath," and in this picture appears the Christian Front, which may be assumed to represent all Christianity. I realize that public officials are supposed to tolerate libel and character assassination in loyal performance of their sworn duty. I do not, however, believe it is fair to place in this category a gentleman who served in the United States Army during the World War and was twice honored by distinguished-service citations by Congress. I am positive that there is not even one individual connected with these leagues of hate or their thousand subsidiary organizations, who is more patriotic than General Moseley, who, as I said, has served faithfully in the Army of the United States.

The propaganda pamphlets that I have received are more or less alike, for they deal with hatreds, venom, and falsehoods. This propaganda is misleading, because it would have us believe that certain individuals whom they have designated want to take possession of the United States, when nothing could be more ridiculous or further from the truth. These leagues of hate do not only advocate boycott of one of the belligerent powers but advocate in addition to that the boycott of many industries and businesses within the United States.

The question may be asked, What right has any minority to disseminate such wild and obscene pamphlets, and why should the Postal Department permit such filthy printed matter the privilege of the United States mails?

As I look over this literature I am astounded, for here is a self-elected group that, in order to satisfy its hatred for one person, ridicules, satirizes, and libels each and every one who fails to agree with its viewpoint. If that is not minority attempt to control the very life of the majority, I stand to be corrected.

What does the Anti-Nazi League shout? Well, let us see: When it was first organized its motto was "Nazi Germany is the enemy of civilization. Refuse to trade with the enemy." In addition to this the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League made the plain statement on its propaganda matter that it has been fighting nazi-ism since 1933.

I shall also call attention to the fact that at this time the league is, in a sort of half-hearted manner, including communism with nazi-ism. Now what are the facts? The fact is that these very leagues and their proponents are the sponsors and creators of socialism and communism. Let us make no mistake about this: It was the internationalists from the United States and Europe who promoted and financed the Russian revolution. This is clearly documented by Ambassador Frances and Ambassador Edgar Sisson. Let me quote from one of the documented intelligence reports:

DOCUMENT NO. 64

STOCKHOLM, September 21, 1917.—Mr. Raphael Scholan (Schauman) Haparanda.

DEAR COMRADE: The office of the banking houses M. Warburg has opened in accordance with telegram from president Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate an account for the undertaking of Comrade Trotsky. The attorney (agent) purchases arms and has organized their transportation and delivery up to Luleo and Varde. Name to the office of Essen & Son, receivers, and a person authorized to receive the money demanded by Comrade Trotsky. J. Furstenberg. Note. This is the first reference to Trotsky and connects him with Banker Warburg and Furstenberg. Luleo and Verde are Swedish towns, the former near to Haparanda, which is on the border of Sweden and Finland.

I have tried to complete this step by step, and you now find that the House of Warburg is connected with the Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate, a German concern.

I have, of course, called attention to this in previous remarks, and shall not repeat too much at this time, but I do want to call attention to the fact that it was the internationalist in Germany who controlled the banks and controlled the imperial army during the World War. Do not forget that an army cannot fight unless it has gold, and gold was in the control of the internationalist.

It was the same financiers who furnished money for the Russian revolution, and it is the same financial group, with a few changes, that is now furnishing money for communism in the United States.

In order to complete this picture, I shall now quote again from part I, The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy:

DOCUMENT NO. 1

[Very secret]

PEOPLE'S COMMISSARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Petrograd, November 16, 1917.

To the CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS:

In accordance with the resolution passed by the conference of People's Commissars, Comrades Lenin, Trotsky, Podvoisky, Dybenko, and Volodarsky, the following has been executed by us:

1. In the archives of the Ministry of Justice from the dossier re "treason" of Comrades Lenin, Zinovieff, Koslovsky, Kollontai, and others, has been removed the order of the German Imperial Bank, No. 7433, of the 2d of March 1917, for allowing money to Comrades Lenin, Zinovieff, Kameneff, Trotsky, Sumenson, Koslovsky, and others for the propaganda of peace in Russia.

2. There have been audited all the books of the Nia Bank at Stockholm containing the accounts of Comrades Lenin, Trotsky, Zinovieff, and others, which were opened by the order of the German Imperial Bank No. 2754. These books have been delivered to Comrade Muller, who was sent from Berlin.

Authorized by the Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

E. POLIVANOFF.
F. ZALKIND.

Note by Edgar Sisson.—The Russian Council of People's Commissars was dominated by the president, Vladimir Ulianov (Lenin); the then foreign minister, Leon Trotsky, now war minister; and the ambassador to Germany, A. Joffe. The marginal endorsement in writing is: "To the secret department. B. U." This is the fashion in which Lenin is accustomed to initial himself. The English equivalent would be V. U., for Vladimir Ulianov. So, even if there existed no further record of German Imperial Bank order No. 7433, here would be the proof of its contents, and here is the link connecting Lenin directly with his action and his guilt. The content matter of the circular exists, however, and herewith follows:

Order of the 2d of March 1917 of the Imperial Bank for the representatives of all German banks in Sweden:

"Notice is hereby given that requisitions for money for the purpose of peace propaganda in Russia will be received through Finland. These requisitions will emanate from the following: Lenin, Zinovieff, Kameneff, Trotsky, Sumenson, Koslovsky, Kollontai, Sivers, and Merkalin, accounts for whom have been opened in accordance with our order No. 2754 in the agencies of private German businesses in Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland. All these requests should bear one of the two following signatures: Dirshau or Milkenberg. With either of these signatures the requests of the above-mentioned persons should be complied with without delay.

"7433, IMPERIAL BANK."

I have not a copy of this circular nor a photograph of it, but Document No. 2, next in order, proves its authenticity at once curiously and absolutely. Particular interest attaches to this circular because of Bolshevik public denial of its existence. It was one of several German circulars published in Paris in the Petit Parisiene last winter. The Petrograd Bolshevik papers proclaimed it a falsehood. Zalkind, whose signature appears not only here but on the protocol (Document No. 3), was an assistant foreign minister. He was sent in February on a mission outside of Russia. He was in Christiania in April, when I was there.

Have photograph of the letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 2

[Secret]

G(EAT) G(ENERAL) S(TAFF), INTELLIGENCE,
(NACHRICHTEN) BUREAU, SECTION A, No. 292,
February 12, 1918.

To the CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS:

The Intelligence Bureau has the honor to inform you that there were found on the arrested Capt. Konshin two German documents with notations and stamps of the Petersburg secret police (Okhrana) which show themselves to be the original orders of the Imperial Bank, No. 7433, March 2, 1917, concerning the opening of accounts for Messrs. Lenin, Sumenson, Koslovsky, Trotsky, and other active workers on the peace propaganda, by order No. 2754 of the Imperial Bank.

These discoveries show that, at the proper time, steps were not taken to destroy the above-mentioned documents.

For the head of the Bureau: R. Bauer.

Adjutant: Bukholm.

NOTE.—Observe the thoughtfulness with which Bauer, a careful man, set down exactly what was in the document, thereby permitting the contents to rise again from the ashes to which perhaps he committed the damaging paper. He admits that the documents found were truthful originals. The world will thank him and Germany will not.

I have the original letter. It bears marginal endorsements: "Referred to the Commission for combating counter revolution. Demanded documents. M. Skripnik"; and an illegible comment by N. Gorbunoff, Lenin's other government secretary. The letter is directed to Lenin. Did Skripnik get the documents? I do not know.

The letter is remarkable otherwise, for the arrested Captain Konshin mentioned is a German officer; Lieutenant Otto, who appears elsewhere as an agent in the German double-crossing intrigue in the Ukraine. What was behind the mystery of his arrest? What was his fate?

This, in brief, is a part of the intelligence report turned in to our State Department during or shortly after the Bolshevik or communistic revolution in Russia. It establishes beyond doubt connection between the international financiers of the United States and the Imperial Government of Germany. This same group, by withdrawal of gold from Germany, brought about the inflation that destroyed the German currency system. These internationalists have, since the advent of Hitler, shouted Nazi at every patriotic American who has taken issue with subversive activities, as they are now trying to divest themselves of communism, but like the shirt of Nessus, it will cling to them to the bitter end.

The question now arises, Who are the progenitors of socialism and communism? To this question, I shall let a most distinguished and learned gentleman, the president of the University of Jerusalem, reply in his own words, spoken shortly after Lenin and Trotsky succeeded in destroying the Russian Government:

[From an address delivered by Dr. J. L. Magnes at the opening session of the first Jewish Labor Congress, January 16, 1919, at Yorkville Casino, New York City]

The Jewish people, traditionally and through its experience, knows the meaning of internationalism, and it must apply the method of internationalism to its own national life as well, sharing the destiny of every people, free and oppressed, in freeing the world in order that it itself may be free. * * * When they become captains of industry or international traders and financiers, they are apt to go to first principles to help in the development of their great enterprises and become, among other things, stanch, conservative upholders of the existing status quo. Jews are closely identified with the beginnings of capitalism in its development from the feudal state. It was Friedrich Julius Stahl, a born Jew, who laid down the classical theory of the German Nationalstaat based upon * * * the politics of power. It was Benjamin Disraeli who is the father of the latter day Tory democracy of England. Just so, when the Jew gives his thought, his devotion, his spirit, to the cause of the workers and of the dispossessed, of the disinherited of the world, the radical quality within him there, too, goes to the roots of things, and in Germany he becomes a Marx and a Lasalle, a Hasse and an Eduard Bernstein. In Austria he becomes a Victor Adler and a Friedrich Adler; in Russia, a Trotsky.

Just take for the moment the present situation in Russia and in Germany. The revolution set creative forces free, and see what a large company of Jews was available for immediate service. Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviki and Bolsheviki, majority and minority Socialists—whatever they be called; and I assume that it is not a question at all at this moment of agreeing or disagreeing with any one of them—Jews are to be found among the trusted leaders and the routine workers of all those revolutionary parties. * * * Suppose anti-Semitism does lift its ugly head in Germany and the Jews there and here and everywhere be made to suffer because of the prominence of Jews in the glorious German revolution. * * * This is not a new principle in the Jewish tradition. Among the world's great revolutionaries and servants and dreamers of new heavens and a new earth are the Hebrew prophets.

May I call your attention to the fact that it is this people that proposed the League of Nations and that now proposes a world union, or international state. Read that closely, and you will find that they contemplate domination of this state. Let me now finally call your attention to the fact that the gentleman I have quoted actually brags of their having established nazi-ism, or the present national socialistic state of Germany, which he calls Nationalstaat. The question now arises, Why should these people, after having established the present regime in Germany, namely nazi-ism or national socialism, cry out against their own monstrous creation?

Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

LETTER FROM DAVID L. BEHNCKE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the president of the Air Line Pilots Association:

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, April 24, 1940.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: On April 16 I wrote you voicing the unanimous protest of the men at the controls of the Nation's airliners against reorganization plan No. IV calling for the abolishment of the Air Safety Board and the new Air Authority, and placing the independent duties of the entire C. A. A. back under the Department of Commerce.

In this letter the pilots pointed out that during the years that civil aeronautics and air transportation were regulated by the Department of Commerce 473 lives were lost in air crashes of which number 146 were line pilots. We contrasted this with a world's safety record of no air-passenger fatalities in this country for 12 months and no pilots killed for 16 months. By the time you receive this letter the record will be no passenger fatalities in 13 months and no pilot fatalities in 17 months. This adds new emphasis to the argument, why not leave well enough alone.

In view of the fact that reorganization plan No. IV calls for the abolishment of the Air Safety Board the question naturally arises, what has this agency done, since assuming its independent duties of investigating crashes and making air-safety recommendations, to prevent recurrences? In a little more than a year and one-half the record shows that the Board has investigated 2,947 air crashes, the large majority of which occurred in so-called miscellaneous flying not on the airlines, 268 of which resulted in fatalities. As a result of these investigations, the Air Safety Board has transmitted 115 air-safety recommendations to the Authority, pointing out what should be done to prevent recurrences. This will give you an idea of the amount of work that has been accomplished by the Air Safety Board in a remarkably short period of time, in addition to all the other work of getting organized under the new law, etc.

Obviously, it would be impossible to describe all of the air-safety recommendations that have been made, but I would like to tell you about just one, so you will have an idea as to just how important the work of this Board is to the preservation of human life in air travel.

On March 26, 1939, a crash occurred on one of the air lines which, incidentally, was the last crash since the Air Safety Board and the new Authority took over, that resulted in loss of life either to passenger or crew. Twelve persons were on board this ill-fated airliner. Eight were killed outright or burned to death in the wreckage. Four were thrown clear when the plane struck the ground. All were injured. The pilot is still convalescing and, unless a marked improvement takes place shortly, one of his legs will have to be amputated. The Air Safety Board made an immediate investigation, which revealed, among other things, that the plane was not equipped with the latest, safest type of propellers, commonly referred to as the full-feathering type. This new type of propeller is controllable from the pilot's cockpit, and when something goes wrong with a motor the pilot in a flash of a second can, by touching a control in the cockpit, turn the blades parallel to the line of flight of the plane. This has two immediate effects: First, it stops the propeller on the disabled engine from rotating, bringing all moving parts of the crippled motor to a standstill, and thereby eliminating the terrific vibration which usually develops under such conditions when the aircraft is equipped with the older type two-position or constant-speed propellers. The vibration has on several occasions resulted in loss of control of the airplane, further structural failures, and in some cases fire in the air. Second, when a propeller is feathered, head resistance is reduced to a minimum and the performance of the airplane with one engine dead is greatly increased. The Air Safety Board not only found that the airplane involved in this accident was not equipped with the safest type propeller, but that the propeller-control mechanism for the type propeller employed was obsolete and inadequate to meet safety requirements under the circumstances. If the airplane involved in the accident I have just described had been equipped with full-feathering propellers, there can be no reasonable doubt that the accident would never have occurred.

Just how many crashes have been caused for the same reason is, of course, unknown, but it is felt that the number is quite substantial. Immediately after investigating the crash in question the Air Safety Board recommended to the Authority that it require all airliners to be equipped with full-feathering propellers. This is just one concrete example of what has been done to make air travel safe. There are many others.

It is argued that abolishing the Air Safety Board would save a few top salaries. What these savings really amount to are the salaries of the Air Safety Board members. There are three and they receive $7,500 a year each, making a total of $22,500 annually. Assuming that this amount is saved is an error because if reorganization plan No. 4 is approved someone connected with the Federal Government must still investigate accidents and they must be paid so, in reality, the savings are really zero unless a much lower type of personnel is used for this highly important work of preserving human life, which certainly would not be wise.

Let us contrast this with what air crashes have cost the air lines and the Federal Government during the period from the late twenties to 1938 when the Air Safety Board and the new Authority took over. It costs the Federal Government because air transportation is a subsidized industry and in the final analysis this subsidy which comes from the public fluctuates with the earning power of the industry. During the period the Department of Commerce controlled air transportation and civil flying there were 130 fatal air-line accidents. It is well known that the cost of one air-line accident is, conservatively, $150,000 to $250,000, representing the loss of equipment and the cost of damage suits, death and injury claims, etc., to say nothing of many more thousands of dollars lost because of loss of patronage resulting in the fact that a crash-scared public does not patronize air travel. This has been proven. We have only to multiply the cost of 1 crash which we will conservatively estimate at $200,000, by 130, the total number of fatal air-line crashes during the period that the Department of Commerce controlled air transportation, to give us the startling figure of $26,000,000. Properly to evaluate the situation there must be added to this figure the amount of money lost in patronage to the air lines due to the public being afraid to ride during the period that the Department of Commerce regulated air transportation. Of course, it is not possible to estimate what this figure really is but obviously it amounts to a staggering sum.

Safety is the axis around which everything vital to the success of air travel revolves. People were not born with wings but they have learned to use them and the extent to which this use will reach is limitless, depending only on one factor, and that is the safety factor. People have traveled on the surface of the earth and on water since the beginning of time. To get them to take to the air depends entirely on the psychology of self-preservation which is again the one and same thing—safety. The ultimate question, as far as the public is concerned, is, Is it safe? This question must be answered conclusively in the affirmative and stay answered if air travel is to succeed.

When Congress created the Air Safety Board and the new Air Authority it had a twofold effect. First, it destroyed the psychology of fear of air travel on the part of the public. Second, it replaced this fear with confidence in the safety of air travel.

The history of politically involved and perfunctory control of air transportation under the Department of Commerce is well known. The startling number of terrible crashes that occurred during this perior involved the loss of thousands upon thousands of dollars and 473 lives. The price of present safety standards has been high. It must not be in vain. We must go forward. It is a question that is vital and far-reaching to the Nation, and it is vital to the Nation's defense, because the best security that our people can have as a reserve to our air fighting force is an extensive, highly developed, and well-patronized air transportation network. The record since the Air Safety Board and the Authority took over under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 definitely proves this can be done. We must not go back to the old order.

Nearly all of us fly and, therefore, this is not only the problem of the pilots but the problem of all of us as well.

Briefly, this is once more a fight to save an industry and to save human life.

Again, the pilots that fly on the most extensive civil air network in the world earnestly and respectfully appeal to you for your support to set aside the President's proposal to abolish the Air Safety Board and the new Air Authority.

Respectfully,

AIR LINE PILOTS' ASSOCIATION,
DAVID L. BEHNCKE, *President.*

Colorado-Wyoming Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a very active controversy between the State of Colorado and the State of Wyoming concerning the respective amounts of water that each is entitled to take for irrigation purposes from the Laramie River, an interstate stream.

Those States have litigated in the United States Supreme Court their respective contentions for many years and that Court has rendered numerous decisions on the subject.

On the 22d of this month the Court rendered another decision which is quite important to both States. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Chief Justice Hughes. The Court did not determine the controversy between Colorado's Governor, Ralph L. Carr, and Attorney General Byron G. Rogers, as to the authority of the Governor or the rights of the attorney general to represent the State in this matter holding that question was not necessary for decision in the case.

The most important question determined by this decision to both Colorado and Wyoming, as well as all other Western States, is that the Court does specifically recognize the exclusive authority and right of each State to determine the question of priority rights and the respective rights of the citizens to the use and apportionment of the waters within its boundaries; and that there is no violation of the rights of an adjoining State so long as the aggregate amount of water taken from the interstate stream does not exceed the total amount to which that State is entitled by the decision of the Supreme Court.

That is a principle that is very vital to all of the Western States and because of this specific recognition of that right of local self-government, I feel that the decision should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be permanently available to irrigators throughout the arid region of the West.

The decision is as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 10, Original.—October Term, 1935.—*The State of Wyoming, Complainant* v. *The State of Colorado, Defendant.* April 22, 1940]

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes delivered the opinion of the Court.

The State of Wyoming sought leave to file its petition for a rule requiring the State of Colorado to show cause why it should not be adjudged in contempt for violation of the decree in this suit, restraining diversions of water from the Laramie River (259 U. S. 419, 496; 260 U. S. 1; 286 U. S. 494; 298 U. S. 573).

In response, Colorado asked that evidence be taken to determine the amount of return flow to the Laramie River from the diversions at the headgates of meadowland ditches and that Colorado have credit therefor. This matter had been considered by the Court in framing its decree (298 U. S. pp. 581, 582) and the motion was denied. Leave was granted to Wyoming to file its petition and Colorado was directed to show cause accordingly.

Two returns have been filed on behalf of Colorado, one by the Governor of the State setting forth his executive order directing the withdrawal of the appearance of the attorney general and appointing special counsel to represent the State, and another return by the attorney general who challenges the authority of the Governor to supersede him. In the view we take of the material matters presented, we find no such differences between the two returns as to require us to determine the question of authority.

Wyoming charges that from May 1, 1939, to June 18, 1939, Colorado diverted from the Laramie River 39,865.43 acre-feet; that is, somewhat in excess of the total of 39,750 acre-feet allocated to Colorado by our decree; that thereupon, and on June 19, 1939, Colorado closed the headgates of the various ditches involved; that on June 22, 1939, in violation of the decree, Colorado opened the headgates and permitted the diversion, between June 22, 1939, and July 11, 1939, of 12,673 acre-feet in excess of the 39,750 acre-feet allowed; and that in particular, with respect to meadowland ditches, Colorado permitted the diversion, between May 1, 1939, and July 11, 1939, of 24,775 acre-feet above the 4,250 acre-feet (measured at the headgates) specifically allowed for the meadowland appropriations (298 U. S., p. 586).

In defense, Colorado contends that the meadowland diversions in excess of 4,250 acre-feet were in accordance with Colorado law and were not inconsistent with the decree of this court until a diversion by Colorado from the Laramie River for all purposes reached the allocated total of 39,750; that the diversion of an amount greater than that total during the period above specified was with the acquiescence of Wyoming; and that Wyoming has not been injured.

Colorado pledges that hereafter its officials will administer the flow of the Laramie River in that State in accordance with Colorado laws and adjudication decrees until a total amount of 39,750 acre-feet, measured at the headgates, has been diverted, and when that total has been reached in any year Colorado can and will close the headgates and keep them closed during the remainder of the irrigation season.

In support of the contention that the diversion of more than 4,250 acre-feet for the meadowland appropriations should not be regarded as a violation of our decree, if the aggregate diversions in Colorado do not exceed the total allowed, Colorado presents a declaratory judgment of the district court of that State for the county of Laramie, entered February 2, 1939, in the suit of *Adelrick Benziger* v. *The Water Supply & Storage Co. et al.* That suit was brought on behalf of the meadowland appropriators in Colorado, and the defendants were the other appropriators in that State whose respective appropriations had been the subject of consideration in the suit in this court. Our rulings were examined by the State court, which concluded that they were intended to, and did, determine only the relative rights of the two States to divert the waters of the Laramie River and its tributaries and that it was not our purpose to withdraw the appropriations and water claims in Colorado from the operation of its local laws or to restrict the utilization of the waters in any way "not affecting the rights of the State of Wyoming and her water claimants." Accordingly the State court held that the fixing in our decree of the meadowland appropriations was intended only to bear upon the relative rights of the States and was not intended to be an adjudication of the relative rights of the decreed appropriations in Colorado; hence, that so long as the aggregate of the water diverted in Colorado does not exceed the total of 39,750 acre-feet accredited to the Colorado appropriations, as stated, they are subject to the laws of Colorado. In that view the court adjudged that the meadowland appropriators and the defendant appropriators were entitled to divert according to their respective priorities until they reached the amount of 39,750 acre-feet, and that when that amount had been diverted "all headgates are to be closed for the balance of the season."

A review of our decisions confirms the construction thus placed upon them. Suit was brought in 1911 to prevent a proposed diversion in Colorado of the waters of the Laramie River, an interstate stream. Voluminous evidence was taken, the case was thrice argued, and a final decision was rendered in 1922 (259 U. S. 419). After an elaborate consideration of the physical features of the region and the principles applicable to a determination of the rights of the respective States, the Court concluded that as both States had adopted the doctrine of appropriation, it was equitable to apply that doctrine and to determine their respective rights according to the rule of priority. The Court examined the evidence with respect to the flow of the stream, its variations, and other relevant matters, and found that the available supply—288,000 acre-feet—was not sufficient to satisfy the Wyoming appropriations and also the proposed Colorado appropriation. The Court found that there were some existing Colorado appropriations entitled to precedence over many of those in Wyoming. These included 18,000 acre-feet for what was known as the skyline ditch and 4,250 acre-feet for meadowland appropriators. These were not to be deducted, as the 288,000 acre-feet was the available supply after they were satisfied. The proposed Colorado appropriation which was in controversy in the suit was that known as the Laramie-Poudre Tunnel diversion, a part of an irrigation project known as the Laramie-Poudre project. The evidence showed that the Wyoming appropriations, having priorities senior to the one in Colorado, and which were dependent on the available supply above specified, required 272,500 acre-feet. Deducting that from the available 288,000 acre-feet, there remained 15,000 acre-feet which were subject to the proposed appropriation in Colorado. Accordingly a decree was entered enjoining the defendants from diverting more than 15,500 acre-feet annually from the Laramie River through the Laramie-Poudre project. The decree provided that it should not prejudice the right of Colorado, or of anyone recognized by her as entitled thereto, to continue to divert 18,000 acre-feet through the skyline ditch and 4,250 acre-feet through the meadowland appropriations (259 U. S. pp. 496, 497). Soon after this decree was modified so as not to prejudice a diversion by Colorado for the Wilson supply ditch (260 U. S. 1), a diversion which amounted to 2,000 acre-feet (298 U. S. p. 580). In this way the total allowed to Colorado amounted to 39,750 acre-feet.

In 1931, Wyoming brought another suit in this Court, alleging that Colorado was permitting excessive diversions and seeking the protection and quieting of Wyoming's rights under the former decree. Wyoming asked provision for accurately measuring and recording the quantities of water diverted and also an injunction re-

straining excessive diversions, if it were held that the former decree related only to the diversion by the Laramie-Poudre Tunnel appropriation. Motion to dismiss the bill was denied. We held that the former decree should be taken as determining the relative rights of the two States, including their respective citizens, to divert and use the waters of the Laramie and its tributaries; that the limited injunction did not warrant an inference that it marked "the limits of what was intended to be decided," but that the decree did define the quantity of water which Colorado and her appropriators might divert "from the interstate stream and its tributaries and thus withhold from Wyoming and her appropriators" (286 U. S. 494, 506–508).

Final hearing was had and the case was decided in 1936 (298 U. S. 573). Wyoming contended that while the decree fixed the amount of the diversions under the meadowland appropriations in Colorado at 4,250 acre-feet, the actual diversions had ranged from 36,000 to 62,000 acre-feet. Colorado answered that the greater part of this water was returned to the stream through surface drainage and percolation and that the part actually consumed did not exceed the amount which the decree allowed. The Court said that the amount of 4,250 acre-feet had been fixed as the measure of the meadowland appropriations because it was deemed sufficient for that purpose "when the water is rightly and not wastefully applied." The Court referred to the wasteful process that had been used. It was said that when water is so applied a considerable portion ultimately finds its way back into the stream, but that it was also true "that a material percentage of the water is lost by evaporation and other natural processes and there is no way of determining with even proximate certainty how much of the water returns to the stream." The Court then held that the decree referred to the water taken from the stream "at the point of diversion, and not to the variable and uncertain part of it that is consumptively used." As it was plainly shown that diversions were being made under the meadowland appropriations in quantities largely in excess of the amount fixed in the decree, an injunction issued forbidding further departures from the decree in that regard (id., pp. 581, 582).

With respect to the request for an order permitting Wyoming to install measuring devices for the purpose of determining the amount of water diverted in Colorado, the Court recognized that the problem of measuring and recording the diversions was a difficult one and the hope was expressed that the two States by cooperative efforts would find a satisfactory solution. Leave was granted to Wyoming to make a later application if the States were unable to agree (id., pp. 585, 586). It seems that measuring devices have been installed.

While an injunction was thus granted with respect to diversions for the meadowland appropriations in excess of 4,250 acre-feet, this was manifestly upon the assumption that Colorado was otherwise using the total amount of water allocated to that State. That it was not intended to restrict Colorado in determining the use of the water of the river, according to Colorado laws and adjudications, provided the diversions did not exceed the aggregate amount of 39,750 acre-feet to which Colorado was entitled, is clear from the ruling upon another branch of the case. It appeared that the diversion for the Skyline ditch had been above the amount allowed therefor, but that other diversions were less, so that, eliminating the excessive meadowland diversions, the aggregate allowance to the State would not be exceeded. Hence the Court found that it must consider Colorado's contention "that, consistently with the decree, she lawfully may permit diversions under any of the recognized appropriations in excess of its accredited quantity, so long as the total diversions under all do not exceed the aggregate of the quantities accredited to them severally" (id., p. 583).

The Court noted that in both Colorado and Wyoming water rights were transferable, and that the use of the water may be changed from the irrigation of one tract to the irrigation of another, if the change does not injure other appropriators; that these rules were but incidental to the doctrine of appropriation, prevailing in both States, upon which the decree had been based. The Court observed that it was not its purpose "to withdraw water claims dealt with therein from the operation of local laws relating to their transfer or to restrict their utilization in ways not affecting the rights of one State and her claimants as against the other State and her claimants." It was found that the diversions through the transmountain ditches had been made with the consent of the owners of the water rights and with the full sanction of Colorado, and hence the situation was not different from what it would have been if the owners of other claims had formally transferred parts of their water rights to the skyline owners. The Court said: "But the skyline owners are now permitted by the owners of the other claims and by Colorado to take and use part of the waters included in those claims. Wyoming and her claimants are in no way injured by this. No departure from the decree is involved. The thing which the decree recognized and confirms is 'the right of the State of Colorado, or of anyone recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, * * * to divert and take' the water included in the designated appropriations." The Court concluded that in the circumstances shown the skyline ditch diversions did not constitute an infraction of the decree (id., pp. 584, 585).

It is plain that the principle of this ruling, as applied to the transmountain appropriations which diverted the water of the Laramie River to another watershed, would certainly also apply to the meadowland appropriations within the same watershed, where part of the water diverted may find its way back to the stream. The limitation of the meadowland appropriations to 4,250 acre-feet was to keep the diversions in Colorado within the amount allowed to that State, not to prevent the distribution of the water thus allowed, according to Colorado laws, where there was no infraction of the rights of Wyoming and her water claimants.

We conclude that the decree is not violated in any substantial sense so long as Colorado does not divert from the Laramie River and its tributaries more than 39,750 acre-feet per annum.

In 1939, however, Colorado diverted more than that total amount. Apparently no question had been raised by Wyoming as to the diversions in 1937 and 1938. It is undisputed that when the diversions in 1939 reached 39,865.43 acre-feet on June 19, Colorado closed the head gates of the various appropriations within that State. But Wyoming alleges that Colorado wrongfully permitted the head gates to be reopened on June 22 and to remain open until July 11, thus permitting the diversion of 12,673 acre-feet in excess of the aggregate amount allowed to Colorado, despite Wyoming's protest. That there was this excessive diversion is not controverted.

Colorado insists that Wyoming has not been injured. But such a defense is not admissible. After great consideration, this court fixed the amount of water from the Laramie River and its tributaries to which Colorado was entitled. Colorado is bound by the decree not to permit a greater withdrawal and, if she does so, she violates the decree and is not entitled to raise any question as to injury to Wyoming when the latter insists upon her adjudicated rights. If nothing further were shown, it would be our duty to grant the petition of Wyoming and to adjudge Colorado in contempt for her violation of the decree.

But Colorado insists that the diversion of more than the allocated total during the season of 1939 was with Wyoming's acquiescence. That is the sole available defense. To support it, Colorado has presented affidavits showing communications between an association of meadowland appropriators and the special hydrographer of Wyoming and also stating that at a conference in the office of the Governor of Colorado on July 1, 1939, the officers of Wyoming said that they had no objection to continued diversions being made through the meadowland ditches for the reason that a great portion of the water so diverted returned to the Laramie River to be used downstream by Wyoming appropriators. Wyoming presents affidavits to the contrary, setting forth her demands. It is unnecessary to review in detail the points in controversy. In the light of all the circumstances, we think it sufficiently appears that there was a period of uncertainty and room for misunderstanding which may be considered in extenuation. In the future there will be no ground for any possible misapprehension based upon views of the effect of the meadowland diversions or otherwise with respect to the duty of Colorado to keep her total diversions from the Laramie River and its tributaries within the limit fixed by the decree.

For the reasons stated, the petition of Wyoming is denied, the costs to be equally divided.

It is so ordered.

Provisions of Reorganization Plan No. IV Affecting Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Civil Aeronautics Authority since its establishment by the Congress in 1938 has been an enviable one, and in my remarks of April 11, 1940, I referred to the recent celebration of a new achievement in the progress of air transportation—the completion of more than 87,000,000 plane-miles and about 815,000,000 passenger-miles flown without a single fatality.

I stressed in that speech the need for enactment of my bill—H. R. 9049—which would authorize $125,000,000 to be expended by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the development of landing areas, because it is my belief the Federal Government must participate to a greater degree in the development of a national airport system to keep abreast of the rapidly growing needs of air commerce and national defense and to retain leadership in world aeronautical affairs.

It was with great astonishment that I read of the President's proposal to transfer the Civil Aeronautics Authority

to the Department of Commerce and consolidate the functions of the Air Safety Board, which would be abolished, with the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Prior to the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the record of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, under the Secretary of Commerce, was intolerable—there was crack-up after crack-up, deficits of air lines were mounting, expansion and development of air transportation was at a standstill, the loss of lives and equipment was appalling, and the traveling public actually feared air transportation. There can be no justification under the name of reorganization, or any other, for a return to anything that remotely resembles the chaotic conditions prevailing at that time.

As far as can be learned, there has been no demand from the public, the air lines, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Department of Commerce, or in the Congress for this sudden and unheralded reorganization plan. The C. A. A. has gone ahead with its work without fanfare, but with exceptional efficiency, and a model agency is the result.

It is my opinion that we simply cannot afford to risk a change in the regulation of air transportation, but the opinion of the trained and efficient air-line pilots, who are in much better position to positively know whether or not anything would be lost or gained by the proposed reorganization, should be given more serious consideration.

Housing Program in Peoria, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Peoria is a thriving, aggressive middle western city in the heart of Illinois, with a population well in excess of 100,000. It was one of the first cities to take advantage of the housing legislation enacted by the State legislature by setting up a Peoria Housing Authority to deal with the problem of slum clearance and large-unit housing construction.

It was therefore possible for the United States Housing Authority to make an award of funds to the Peoria Housing Authority for the construction of an approved low-cost housing unit. This project is in most competent hands, and has been advanced with skill and vigor.

A recent staff report from the Peoria Housing Authority indicates that 1,093 units are presently under construction for a total contract cost of $3,616,700. The construction cost per unit is 12 percent below the estimated average for comparable units being built in that area by private industry and, therefore, compares most favorably. The project is moving ahead of scheduled time and it is interesting to observe that so-called credits and extras which so often run up construction costs, have not been approved up to the present time.

One of the difficulties often encountered in the razing of old structures to make way for a housing project is that of rehousing tenants without undue complaint. It would appear that every tenant who was dispossessed as a result of the demolition of existing old structures has been rehoused with little or no complaint.

About 82 percent of all labor and material which is being supplied by the general contractor on this project is being obtained from local sources and serves as a stimulant to local business. This project has no doubt served to stimulate private building in the residential field because the volume of residential building permits for the first 3 months of 1940 has exceeded the number of permits in any year for the last 10 years. Truly this is a compliment to the progress of the city; to the alertness of builders and developers; to the growing need for housing in Peoria and to the aggressiveness of this great city in moving forward.

It is reported that during the last year the combined efforts of the Housing Authority and the city health board has resulted in the elimination of more than 600 substandard structures. It is an indication of what can be done to improve housing standards throughout the country.

There has been a fine degree of cooperation between local banks, business enterprises, realty firms, social agencies, and public officials in giving support to the present housing program in Peoria. This is a fine testimony to the confidence reposed in the competency and integrity of those who constitute the Housing Authority and of the staff which drew the plans and is supervising the work.

The Bonus Army Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

ARTICLE BY STANLEY HIGH

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, under the permission to extend my remarks in the Record which I obtained today, I wish to insert an article which appears in the current issue of the magazine American Mercury. I believe that the article will be of particular interest to the Members of the House in view of the fact that it indicates what we may anticipate in the way of veterans legislation in the event that the bill, H. R. 9000, is passed by the Congress. Not only does this article appear in the American Mercury, but Readers' Digest likewise prints the article in condensed form in the May issue. The article by Stanley High is as follows:

[From the American Mercury for May 1940]

THE BONUS LOBBY RIDES AGAIN

(By Stanley High)

A new tentacle from an old octopus quietly slithered into the Capitol during this session of Congress. If allowed to grow, it will suck from the Treasury of the United States an estimated $35,000,000,000. The money will be sucked from all the people; it will go to a minority who have no honorable claim upon it. That they will get it—the public be damned—seems likely. They will get it, barring the uprising of a public damned too often, because the power behind the octopus is the ex-soldiers' lobby. Between it and the till is only the Congress of the United States, which that lobby, despite the patriotic good sense of the vast body of ex-soldiers for whom it presumes to speak, long ago learned how to cow.

The tentacle itself looks harmless enough. Its first cost to the Government may be no more than $25,000,000 a year. Small change. That sum is for widows and orphans and dependent parents. Gallant gesture. In fact, so plausible has it been made to appear and so quietly has it been maneuvered that its approach has caused none of the outcry which, when it is too late, is almost certain to arise. Close up, the twenty-five million involved turns out to be important, not for what it is but for what it threatens. And the widows and orphans are first, not because of chivalry but as a shield. This particular arm is not operating in front of the women and children, but behind them.

The measure embodying this devious strategy provides pensions to widows and orphans of World War soldiers. The pension will not be confined to widows of soldiers who died because of disabilities incurred in the war. They are rightly pensioned already, none too generously, and nobody begrudges that outlay. Neither will it be limited to widows of men who went overseas. If on the eve of the armistice the Government drafted a young man into the Army, and if for 3 months he served his country in some pleasant cantonment, his widow—regardless of when or how he later died—will be qualified to collect. If she had a child by the former soldier, she will be qualified if her marriage to him took place at any time up to the passage of the measure, though it is 21 years since the war. If childless, she must have been married prior to July 3, 1919, when the war officially ended.

The amount she can collect will be limited, at this come-on stage of the game, to $20 a month, with $6 added for one child and

$4 each for additional children. The unpretentious $25,000,000 first-year cut will increase as time takes its added toll among ex-soldiers of the war. Within a decade the bill may be a billion a year.

If the ex-soldiers' lobby succeeds in getting this pension it is almost certain to be back next year, or some year thereafter, to push through pensions for all widows regardless of when they married. Such a procedure will conform both to the time-tried tactics of the lobby and to the precedents already set for widows of the died-in-bed soldiers of previous wars. At this session, for example, the House Committee has reported favorably a bill to pension, at $50 to $75 a month, widows who married veterans 40 years or more after the Civil War. The last pension-drawing widow of the American Revolution died in 1906. One pensioner of the War of 1812 is still collecting. On such a basis some purposeful young woman who marries a World War soldier late in his declining years will be collecting as a World War widow in the one hundred and twenty-eighth post-war year of our Lord, 2046.

But if history, precedent and the off-the-record statements of the ex-soldiers' lobbyists mean a thing, then it is not pensions for World War widows that are most portentously on the way, but pensions for the World War soldiers themselves. The ultimate, additional cost of that to the American pocketbook will exceed twenty billions. Already, bills to pension World War veterans 60 years old and above are before the House Committee. One, calling for $60 a month, would cost $112,000,000 a year at the outset, rise steadily for 10 years, then dwindle.

II

Soldiers' pensions are not a new American phenomenon. It has been a long-standing assumption that after every war we should have to pay our heroes. The northern veterans of the Civil War were pensioned. Two years ago Mr. Roosevelt signed a bill which granted $60 a month to all soldiers 65 years and beyond of our 100 days' war with Spain. That, said Mr. Roosevelt, was to set no pension precedent for the World War soldiery. "Theirs is a different case." The difference was not because patriotism among the organized soldiers of the World War had no monetary value. It was because Congress, with what proved to be futile foresight, adopted a nonpension plan by which to pay them.

Basic Army pay was fixed at $30 a month. That was twice the pay for the Spanish-American War. To every soldier honorably discharged the Government gave $60. That cost $244,000,000. War-risk insurance policies were taken out on the men in service. Three-fourths of the cost of this came from the Treasury. To date more than $2,000,000,000 has been paid out on those policies. Policies still in force (converted now to straight life insurance) total $2,500,000,000. To help the soldiers in their return to peacetime occupations, the Government organized a vast vocational training program. That cost $645,000,000. All in all, to protect itself against postwar raids on the Treasury, the Government spent $3,000,000,000. It was the fond, patriotic hope that with this unprecedented liberality the ex-soldiers would be satisfied.

They were—for something less than a year. When an American Legion caucus met in May 1919, the delegates rousingly agreed with "Young Teddy" Roosevelt that their objective was "to put something into the Government instead of subtracting something from it." But by November, when the first Legion convention met, the professional veteran had put in his appearance. The patriotism he preached had a golden glow. The convention plumped for the bonus—more palatably described as adjusted compensation. Since then the professional veterans and their supporting minority have had things pretty much their own way. Since 1919 they have bowled over, one after another, the obstacles which stood between the already well-rewarded ex-soldiers and a blanket pension.

The bonus itself was such an obstacle. In the bonus law, forced from Congress by the ex-soldiers—and over the veto of President Coolidge—the men received $1 for each day of service, $1.25 additional for each day served overseas, on the theory that this adjusted the difference between soldiers' pay and the wages of civilians. The grant was made in bonus certificates due to mature in 1945. But the far-sighted professional patriots were aware that by 1945, with the veterans passing middle age, the time would be ripe for a pension drive. They were aware also that such a drive could not very well be staged with the bonus falling due. The conclusion was inescapable; cash the bonus early, give the country a spell in which to forget, and then clear the decks for the supreme clean-up.

Consequently, and over the veto of President Roosevelt, the bonus agreement was broken under duress of the most arrogant lobby this country ever has seen, and the bonus was paid in 1936—9 years ahead of schedule. That cost the Government $3,732,000,000.

But there were other pension obstacles to be cleared. Early legislation had put the veterans actually disabled in the service of their country in a class by themselves. Laws were passed, none of them too liberal, to care for them and to compensate their dependents. The country emphatically approved. The service-disabled soldier was, to the extent of his disability, a just charge upon the Government.

That charge has been grudgingly met. Until 1938, when the amount was raised to $38, a bona fide World War widow—whose husband's death was a result of war service—received only $30 a month. The country undoubtedly would support congressional measures aimed at dealing more liberally with the actual casualties of the war. But since the dead do not vote and the votes of the war-wounded are few, the politicians are likely to continue to economize at the expense of the authentic veterans and open the spigot for the ex-soldiers. The first step in this direction came when the professional veterans began to force acceptance of the assumption that all ex-soldiers, war-disabled or not, are permanently privileged and a charge upon the Government. Part of their maneuvering went on, as at present, behind the widows and orphans. Prior to 1933, a widow could collect monthly compensation averaging $29.21 only if her ex-soldier husband had died from causes connected with the war. That sensible distinction was wiped out.

First, the lobbyists put through a bill which made it unnecessary for the widow to prove that her husband's death had any connection with the war. All she had to prove was that war had inflicted upon him a 30-percent disability. The coffers were opened, regardless of whether that disability had anything whatsoever to do with his passing. But the 30-percent-disability item made too great a distinction between the authentic and wounded veterans and the unharmed millions of ex-soldiers. Consequently, in 1937, the degree of disability necessary to permit the widow to collect—and regardless of the cause of death—was reduced to 20 percent. In 1938, it was further reduced to 10 percent. Last year regulations were further liberalized. The law once provided that the widow could not collect if the soldier's death was due to his own misconduct. That provision was eliminated. The law required that the widow should have had at least one child by her ex-soldier husband. That restriction was likewise removed.

The widows and orphans were the screen for a bigger maneuver. In 1933 Congress, wincing under the screws, decreed pensions to all permanently disabled soldiers regardless of whether or not their disability was traceable to war. Thus, ex-soldiers were lifted into the permanently privileged classification once reserved for the war-wounded. Thus, also, the principle of the Government's permanent obligation to support them was established.

This accumulated partial-pension legislation, up to June 30, 1939, had netted the ex-soldiers and their dependents $3,838,000,000. Then the drive was extended.

III

Immediately after the war the Government instituted a program of hospitalization to care for the bona fide war casualties. Today it is no longer necessary for ex-soldiers to have war-connected disabilities to secure free hospitalization in 84 institutions. In fact, since 1924, 75 percent, or 1,206,966, of all those admitted into veterans' hospitals have been treated for ailments not traceable to the war. The percentage is increasing. Last year it was 92 percent. For good measure, free dental service is also provided. Last year 72,000 ex-soldiers were given free dental treatment, at a cost to the Government of $1,000,000. Likewise, the Government guarantees, up to $100, a hero's burial for every ex-soldier. That, in 1939, cost $220,000 a month.

Thus, in addition to the $3,000,000,000 which the Government spent to provide just compensation and to protect the public till, the ex-soldiers have collected seven billion. And in the process the lobbyists have managed to get the ex-service man about where he needs to be to score his final and biggest killing: on a par with the pensioned war-wounded and with the pensioned dependents of the war-dead. The current measure for widows and orphans will just about complete that strategy. The widow will not be required to show that her husband was in any degree injured in the war, or that he ever got within 5,000 miles of the fighting. What she will have to show is an honorable discharge indicating that her late ex-soldier served, somewhere, for as long as 90 days.

It is already clear that pensions for all are hard on the heels of this proposal. The concluding plank in the current legislative platform of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is this: "Honorably discharged 65-year-old, 90-day World War veterans to receive pensions of $60 a month." Thus, after this long and costly maneuvering, the threat is in the open.

The most important personalities behind the threat are Col. John Thomas Taylor, head Washington lobbyist for the American Legion; Millard W. Rice, head lobbyist for the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Taylor, handsome and husky, has grown gray at his post. The walls of his unpretentious office are lined with bound volumes which contain, as far as it is humanly possible to collect them, every important word that has been spoken on World War veterans' legislation. They will go, after the veterans' lobby has tottered from the scene, to the Library of Congress for posterity to view and marvel at. Almost single handedly, Colonel Taylor has made the Legion's legislative committee what it is today: the Capitol's most fear-provoking lobby. The colonel's friendliness has a hard-boiled undertone. He shrugs off his critics, sidesteps premature commitments, and chooses his words with political discretion. At an earlier period he eschewed "the bonus," preferring instead "adjusted compensation." Nowadays, he does not speak of "pensions." His word for it is "protection."

Millard Rice, of the V. F. W., is short, voluble, and emphatic. He is also less choosy. He "knows" that the Legion, behind the

scenes, is moving toward pensions. "The records show," he says, "that we generally anticipate the Legion's plans by about 2 years." Colonel Taylor, on that point, is suggestively wary. "This year," he says, "we are not pushing for pensions. As for the future, who knows?"

On Capitol Hill Mr. RANKIN swings in his swivel chair, ruffles his thinning but still unruly hair, and views the developing tide without alarm. Tides of this sort do not engulf him. He rides them. In defense of the current legislation which will pension the widows of the 90-day heroes he recently let Congress know that "this great country of ours does not neglect the man who bared his breast to the enemy in time of war." He, like Colonel Taylor, dislikes to speak of pensions. What he prefers to speak of is the necessity of granting "something" to the ex-soldiers at once lest "something bigger" be irresistibly demanded too soon.

When, generaled by this trio, the organized ex-soldiery of the World War get their pensions, they and their lobbyists will have sold patriotism for more money than it ever brought before in all the record of mercenary soldiering. It can be safely assumed that a majority of the World War's ex-soldiers, a majority also of the American Legion, desires no such highly dubious distinction. This developing crisis, as much as that of 1917, is theirs to meet. Only they can stop the threat of this new depredation. Only they can preserve, untarnished, some part of the uncalculating idealism with which their generation went forth to war.

The organization of Disabled Veterans, numbering 50,000, is not supporting the pension drive. The American Veterans' Association, 17,000 strong, is waging a gallant fight against it. But they are not enough. Officers and members of local capital Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars posts and State organizations should realize what their Washington lobbies are doing in their name and take their stand against it. Many Legionnaires call themselves conservative, protest against Government spending, demand Budget balancing. Here is a chance for them to show their true colors.

The Relief Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, on the subject, The Relief Problem, April 21, 1940:

Ladies and gentleman of the radio audience: The relief problem is one of the major problems confronting America today. It is not just a cold governmental business proposition. It is a problem dealing with the unfortunate people of this country. It is the problem of seeing that they receive the basic necessities of life—food, shelter, and clothing. Unfortunately, providing relief and assistance to our unemployed has developed into the Nation's biggest business and has become the Nation's worst political football. It has been made so by the present New Deal administration itself.

Under this administration's conduct of relief, the exploitation of relief workers has become a demoralizing national scandal. This is not merely my opinion. The Senate Investigating Committee of 1938, which was composed, with one exception, of Democrats and was headed by an able and conscientious Democrat, MORRIS SHEPPARD, summed up this situation as follows, and I quote:

"The funds appropriated by Congress for the relief of those in need and distress have been diverted from these high purposes to political ends."

The issue to be discussed this evening is not whether we are to provide relief for the millions of unfortunate citizens in this Nation. Of course we are! The need must and will be met, regardless of the political party in power, so let us start off on that basis.

To my mind there are three questions which we are interested in tonight. They are—

(1) What is the most efficient method of providing relief?
(2) What is the most economical method?
(3) How can we eliminate politics from relief?

I believe that the answer to these three questions lies in the return of administration of relief to States. Why do I think this? Because the present centralized Federal administration of relief is clearly not the answer.

Let me discuss in a general way the defects of the present administration of relief and the improvement that would follow if that administration were returned to the States.

It was very necessary that the Federal Government acknowledge its responsibility to the Nation and take the first steps toward providing Federal assistance. But it was not necessary to make a permanent Federal bureaucracy which has lost sight of its primary purpose and has become a political weapon of power and control.

The New Deal has centralized relief as it loves to centralize everything. They have sacrificed initiative, local responsibility, and efficiency much to our national detriment. The more we centralize our Government, the more we remove responsibility from the States, counties, cities, and towns, the more we weaken democracy.

Some new dealers say we cannot decentralize our relief set-up. They say there is too much politics in local government. Why, I could give them national relief scandals all night here and continue indefinitely.

The job the various relief agencies have been doing in the country varies in different States, due to the integrity and efficiency of the State and local administrators. Some have been doing good jobs. They have refrained from political activity as much as possible and still maintain their own jobs. For those administrators I have the highest respect, for I know the conditions under which they have had to work. I know the pressure which has been exerted on them by the political bosses of their State and the Nation.

The President's removal, after the exposure of the W. P. A. scandals in 1938, of Mr. Harry Hopkins as Administrator, and Mr. Aubrey Williams, as Deputy Administrator, as well as lesser henchmen, were good political moves. The need for their services along this line was ended. They had carried out the work of the master faithfully, but with rather poor results. In the last elections, the people awoke. State after State, district after district, as a result of this issue, went against the administration in power.

But still the administration hasn't learned its lesson. The President, in his Budget message, promised that work relief expenditures this year would be reduced $500,000,000. From an economy point of view, I think any reduction in national spending is fine, provided our needy do not suffer by it. But this arbitrary reduction plan was based only upon the President's hope that private business would take up the slack.

And again, Congress is faced with the administration's new plan to appropriate a year's relief money to be spent in 8 months starting July 1. Could the fact that this huge appropriation could be mostly spent just prior to the coming very important national election have anything to do with it? I hope not.

There is no need for me to keep repeating the past sins of the relief problem except for a background for constructive action.

My belief is that our relief system should be decentralized. The responsibility for the administration of relief should be returned to the States, the counties, the cities, and the towns.

My definite suggestions are as follows:

First. That the present Federal relief set-up should be abolished. It has cost $18,000,000,000. It has used all the 26 letters of the alphabet to make a complicated, contradictory, inconsistent, and wasteful bureaucracy. It has dealt with a situation which has not yet been solved, and has tried to do a job that has been only partially done.

Second. The Federal Government must provide funds to supplement those of the local governments. I am not advocating that the States and the communities bear the entire cost of relief. Of course they cannot and I am not suggesting that they should or could. Federal assistance should be in the form of grants in aid to States and the subdivisions thereof, upon a proper basis, upon a definite formula, and as the need arises.

Third. A definite formula can be set up for the apportionment of these funds in order to fairly meet these needs in an American way. They can be met efficiently, without waste, and without political corruption. The formula to meet these needs should be based upon such factors as the number of unemployed, the population, the resources of the State and local units, together with any other factors which measure a unit's ability to meet its own relief problems.

Fourth. The prerequisite to receiving Federal grants should be the establishment of local nonpartisan agencies for the administration of relief, and last:

A Federal agency should be set up limited in personnel, and bipartisan in character, to check the governmental subdivisions receiving grants; to see that the money has been spent for the purpose for which it was granted, and to maintain the minimum standards for the relief program.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, it is my earnest hope that in the years to come the relief problem will become less pressing. But as long as it is a major problem, I believe that we must decentralize and return the administration of relief to the States.

Westover Field, Chicopee, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES R. CLASON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made at the breaking of the ground for the first permanent building, the laboratory for photography, at Westover Field, Chicopee, Mass., on April 6, 1940:

We have gathered here today for the breaking of ground in preparation for the construction of the first permanent building at Westover Field. This act marks the beginning of another era in the military life of New England and the Northeast.

Three hundred years ago this great reservation was controlled by the people of another race and of another color. In the inexorable march of progress, with the coming of the white race to western Massachusetts, these lands became prosperous farms which the early pioneers developed. Out of the wilderness of those early days a great peaceful farming community developed. For two centuries many generations descended from these early pioneers tilled these fertile acres. Now the Federal Government has found it necessary, in order to provide adequate military defense for its people, to establish huge air bases at strategic points. Chicopee was selected as the site for the northeast air base. This selection was made only after the most careful study and examination of all possible sites for such an extensive airport from Maine to Pennsylvania.

A few years ago the Wilcox bill was passed, which permitted the Secretary of War to select such sites for these air bases as he believed best located and suitable for the purposes of the Army. Because of this legislation it was not necessary for the War Department to secure the approval of Congress for any particular bases which it determined to use. An Army board, consisting of officers believed to be the most expert and able for that purpose, spent many weeks checking on all the information which was placed before it before selecting the location of the northeast air base. Many months ago former Mayor Stonina and Secretary Pimental, of the Chicopee Planning Commission, brought a part of this location to my attention. They furnished me with blueprints. This information I brought to the attention of the War Department, and it was turned over to this board. Thereafter, on several occasions I went to the office of the Chief of Air Corps, Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, to bring to his attention some new advantage which had been disclosed about this site. Today Major General Arnold stands out as the foremost authority in the United States on any military matter having to do with the science of military aviation. It is inconceivable to me that any man can be beset with more intricate and difficult problems than confront him. Starting without any adequate historical background, it has devolved upon him in the midst of a great European war to develop and to expand one of the three great branches of our national defense.

The people of the United States are indeed fortunate to have the services of General Arnold in this crisis. With all of his problems, he is, nevertheless, a kindly and a friendly man. Perhaps I might be pardoned if I mention one of the many trips I made to his office. On this particular occasion former Mayor Stonina and Postmaster Kennedy accompanied me. After I had made arrangements for our conference the three of us planned exactly what we desired to learn, if possible, from General Arnold, and what we intended to bring to his attention. When the interview started the Chief of the Air Corps was invariably addressed as major general. As the interview proceeded I recall that Mr. Stonina wanted to know what advantages Chicopee could expect from having the airport in its midst, if this site were selected. General Arnold told us that there would be the advantages of a large monthly pay roll, and also that a large share of the supplies used at the post for food and other purposes would undoubtedly be bought in its vicinity. Toward the end of the meeting General Arnold led the three of us over to a wall map of the United States. He produced a pencil and gave us to understand that in selecting a site for a base of this type there were several different things which had to be taken into consideration. One of them apparently was the distance that a field should be from foreign territory and from the ocean. With his pencil he somewhat hastily drew a line down through the northeastern section of the United States to emphasize the point that the site had to be north of that line. I think the eyes of all three of us were glued intently on the progress of that pencil as it approached the city of Chicopee, and to this day I doubt whether any of us knows whether or not General Arnold drew that line north, south, or through the center of this reservation. At least we felt, as we left the conference, that no other place in Massachusetts would be selected if that was a dominating factor. To my chagrin my constituents had become so interested and so excited in the course of the long interview that they apparently lost their military senses. During the last 5 minutes that we were in the office I would wager that each one of them, not once but on several different occasions, addressed General Arnold either as colonel or major. When they demoted General Arnold to the title of major I discreetly ushered them out of General Arnold's presence, fearful that such a gross indignity as they were inflicting upon him might react unfavorably on our mission. I know that General Arnold enjoyed the situation from the twinkle in his eyes. We certainly had a good laugh over it as we drove away from the War Department. Colonel Speaks likewise spent much time and effort in bringing this matter properly to the attention of the War Department.

At that time it was not possible to determine what efforts proponents of sites in other States were making. I was acutely aware, however, that Congressman CASEY, of the Third District, and Mrs. ROGERS, Congresswoman from the Fifth District, across the borders of whose districts Fort Devens extends, were exercising every effort to have the base located at Fort Devens. I was attending a session of the House when two or three newspapermen called me into the lobby one day to tell me that President Roosevelt had just announced that the Army board had decided that Chicopee was the best site for the northeast air base, having made this fact known at the White House while Congressman CASEY and Congressman MCCORMACK were there to press the advantages of Fort Devens.

From that day on the selectmen of Ludlow, the city officials of Chicopee, former Mayor Stonina and your present mayor, Leo Senecal, the county commissioners, and Governor Saltonstall have attempted in every way to iron out problems which confronted the Army officials in preparing this site for actual construction. That they have done their work well is attested by the ceremonies which are being conducted here this afternoon. Last fall, I first met Major McFadden, who had been placed in charge of the construction at Westover Field. Major McFadden is one of those persons whom you like from the moment you first meet him. In Washington I was told that he is one of the outstanding and coming Army officers in his field. He has already been given the difficult task of supervising the early stages of construction at other important Army posts. A great tribute was paid to his ability by his superiors when they selected him for the similar difficult task at Chicopee and Ludlow. Already we see about us the beginnings of the temporary barracks which will be ready for the use of the enlisted men to be stationed here. We see the results of the arduous labor of many hundreds of men during recent weeks. Shortly, at this spot where we now stand will arise a permanent laboratory for photography, one of the many structures planned to be built in the months to come, until such time as this air post shall become an established unit.

It is with real pleasure, and I am sure it is a source of gratification to all of you who are here, to know that the old and highly respected local construction firm of J. G. Roy & Sons Co. was awarded the contract to construct this building. Members of the Roy family have been leaders in our community for many years, and we all know that this building will typify the high standards which they have set in all the construction work they have carried on.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the great House Military Affairs Committee, it was my privilege and duty during last November and December to inspect 18 Army posts, 14 air bases, many coast defenses, and 8 private airplane factories in a trip by air transport along the Gulf States and Texas, at the Panama Canal, along the Pacific coast, and across the central and northern part of the United States. Having Westover Field in mind, it was particularly interesting to me to see the great improvements which have been made in the construction of the later air bases as compared with the earlier ones. I am sure that all of us are going to be astonished at the great military institution which will rise on this national reservation during the next few months. I was also amazed to see the great airplanes of various designs which were under construction in the factories. I was gratified at the precision of our air forces as they maneuvered at different posts and at the accuracy of the bombing tests which I witnessed. Within a short time all of us will see similar maneuvers carried on in Hampden County. From the headquarters established at this point activities will radiate through New England and the Northeast States. Chicopee has already become known as one of the most important aviation centers wherever such matters are discussed.

In closing, I wish to congratulate the Army officials upon the progress which they are making in bringing this air base into being, and I am sure that all of us in western Massachusetts are grateful to them that they have made it possible for this air base to be established here.

The War Department has selected the name of Westover Field for the Northeast Air Base. When I first went to Washington as your Congressman, Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover was the Chief of the Air Corps. I was fortunate in being associated with him on many occasions when matters concerning the Air Corps came up before the Military Affairs Committee and at air events in New York and elsewhere which both of us attended. He was a man of the highest ability, with a very keen interest in his lifework of bringing

the Air Corps to the highest state of efficiency. He was respected as a most sincere man by all who came into contact with him. The people of the United States suffered a great loss when his career was brought to an untimely close in an accident which occurred in the line of his duties. I know that all of us will be proud of Westover Field, not only because of its own merits but because it will always stand as a memorial to a brave soldier and patriot.

More "Spinach"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President is reported to have said that all arguments against Reorganization Plan IV, insofar as they apply to the contemplated return of aviation to the political domination of the Department of Commerce, are "a lot of spinach."

More "spinach" continues to pour into my office every day from those within the aviation industry and who must, therefore, be justly considered as knowing something about the past and present, and regulation of that great, comparatively new method of transportation, and therefore are justly alarmed about any future regulation.

This morning, as did other Members of this House, I received the following telegram from Mr. Moss Patterson, president of the Southwest Division of the Air Congress of America, now assembled in convention at Tulsa, Okla.:

The directors of the Southwest Aviation Conference, representing New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, in meeting today, unanimously agreed that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has gone far during its existence to justify the faith placed in it by the people of the United States. Therefore, the directors of this conference, in annual session in Tulsa, Okla., with over 500 delegates in attendance firmly believe that the Civil Aeronautics Authority should continue to operate as an independent agency and urge that the Congress of the United States oppose the placement of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board under the Department of Commerce. More complete consideration and study of this matter will be placed before the conference for action on Saturday, April 27.

Respectfully.

If this is "spinach," I sincerely recommend it to my colleagues in the House and suggest that they digest it carefully. I am sure that this, and much other "spinach" I have received, if properly digested will give them more than enough strength to vote their honest convictions in opposition to Reorganization Plan IV.

It has been said that the air-line operators have not expressed themselves in opposition to Reorganization Plan IV. Mr. Speaker, one is very often meek and quiet when the sword of Damocles hangs heavy over one's head. Therefore, it seems to me that it is conceivably possible that the fact that these air lines are now indebted to the Government, through its Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to the extent of $11,548,268 may in some small measure at least account for this strange silence.

It was reported to me today by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that they have outstanding direct loans to the air lines in the amount of $8,260,768, in addition to which, $3,287,500 of R. F. C loans have been taken up by the banks. These latter loans are of two types; one, where the banks agree to make the loans authorized by the R. F. C., with the latter agreeing to buy back a certain part of the bonds, up to as high as 80 percent, if the bank must liquidate the loan; and in the second case it includes those loans where banks and the Corporation each agree to buy up a portion of the bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I also suggest to my colleagues in the House that they carefully digest the "spinach" contained in a letter which many, if not all, of us received today from Mr. David L. Behncke, President of the Air Line Pilots Association, and which has just been inserted into the Record as part of the remarks by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

The Rankin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT, OF NEW YORK

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I beg to insert an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of April 19, 1940, and my reply to this editorial made at joint installation exercises of Casimir Pulaski Post 1397, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the ladies auxiliary thereof, on April 23, 1940. Speaking before the above-mentioned joint installation exercises I briefly discussed Veterans' Day at Erie County Fair, the war situation, and the Polish relief measures before the present Congress. Following these items, I took up the matter of veterans' legislation, my remarks being as follows:

Comrades, your invitation asked me to discuss the matter of veterans' legislation before the present Congress. I have sent a brief résumé of this legislation to the commander of every post of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Erie County. In addition to this résumé, probably the best explanation I can furnish you this evening would be by using the balance of my time in making direct reply to an editorial appearing in last Friday's Buffalo Evening News. In order to do this I read you the entire editorial, as follows:

"SCHWERT FOR PENSION GRAB

"Representative PIUS L. SCHWERT has given his support to the 'pension push.' He has signed the petition to discharge the House Rules Committee from further consideration of the Rankin bill. Under this measure childless widows who married veterans before July 2, 1921, when the war officially ended, would receive $20 a month, those with one child $28, and so on. These are women whose husbands died from no causes connected with the war.

"It is hardly believable that the Rankin bill has the support of a majority of the World War veterans. Most of them must hold that the greatest peacetime service they can render is to throw all their influence on the side of governmental economy and reduced expenditures. The American Veterans' Association says that the Rankin bill is 'an election-year assault on the Treasury adroitly conceived while the attention of the country is focused on European hostilities.' The people of the Forty-second District may well believe that political considerations prompted Representative SCHWERT to sign the Rankin petition for this pension grab."

Taking up the reply to this editorial, I will proceed in an orderly manner from the beginning to the end thereof.

In the heading and in the first sentence the words "pension grab" and "pension push" are the same terms used by the bigger income-tax payers and big business, which have always been opposed to every single piece of veterans' legislation ever passed in this country. Possibly the writer of the editorial is representing this group. At any rate, I doubt if he is a veteran; and the veterans may always expect opposition from these sources.

Replying to the next sentence, I am glad to admit that I signed the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the Rankin bill. If the writer of the editorial will contact me at any time he will find that I am not one to alibi for any action taken, and it will not be necessary for him to guess as to the reasons for said action. First of all, a petition to discharge a committee from further consideration of any bill is simply a method used to bring that legislation onto the floor of the House for discussion. A Representative, as a matter of fact, might be opposed to legislation covered by a particular discharge petition; and yet he might deem it worthy of consideration by the entire House membership rather than by an additional small committee of the House. Bringing it before the House membership as a whole for general discussion and debate often results in amendments to legislation covered by discharge petition, said amendments making the legislation more satisfactory; and it is possible to make good legislation out of what might not appear to be exactly what the signers of the discharge petition desired in that particular bill. In this

case we had a discharge petition covering new veterans' legislation. Legislation of similar type was passed in this country at a shorter interval after the Civil War than the time which has now elapsed since the World War. I considered this legislation worthy of further consideration and debate and therefore signed the discharge petition bringing it to the attention of the entire membership, though final passage may not result.

As to what H. R. 9000, known as the Rankin bill covers: The editorial partly covers the measure's contents in the next sentence. May I give the following additional information: The provisions of this bill are more restrictive than similar existing legislation applicable to widows and children of prior wars, and this bill requires a widow to prove dependency under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The bill provides an income limitation, but from a practical standpoint this will affect solely the rights of children. A further restriction requires that the widow must have been married to the veteran prior to July 3, 1921 (prior to or during the World War). Compensation shall not be allowed a widow who has remarried, nor shall it be allowed in cases where there has not been continuous cohabitation from date of marriage to date of death of the veteran.

Thus, briefly, this measure allows compensation to widows who can prove their dependency, whose marriage to the veteran occurred prior to final ending of the World War, and who can properly satisfy other marital-relationship requirements, in the sum of $20 per month and an additional small allowance for children of these widows up to a limited amount. In my humble opinion, these requirements give us a type of legislation which has been brought to the minimum in every way: (1) Proof of dependence is necessary, and this is not true in veterans' legislation covering previous wars. (2) The widow must have married the veteran prior to the official ending of the World War. This in comparison with recent legislation covering Civil War widows, which allowed marriages 65 years after the Civil War. (3) Continued marital relationship must be proven, and this is a new feature in this sort of legislation. (4) Compensation under this legislation amounts to $20 per month to widows. This in comparison with widows of the Civil War veterans, who have received $40 per month for years; and the last legislation introduced would increase this sum from $40 to $50 per month. Thus, in my humble opinion, from every possible angle, this first bill covering pensions to widows of the World War has been reduced to what we might term an irreducible minimum.

As to the cause of death of the husbands of these widows, practically everyone agrees that legislation pertaining to our older people is necessary. These widows will soon be in that classification. The veterans of the country believe that widows of veterans should be under the care of the Veterans' Administration and not subject to local relief agencies. Such action would afford them all treatment of the same character. A widow in Mississippi would receive the same consideration and compensation as a widow in New York State, and this is not true under present relief agencies. We believe that any veteran's widow is entitled to the same treatment and the same consideration as any other veteran's widow, regardless of place of abode. Let's treat them all alike. At present many veterans' widows are on relief or on W. P. A. rolls. This measure would simply remove this group from those rolls and place them under supervision of the Veterans' Administration. I believe that the widow of a veteran who served his country honorably in time of war ought not to drag his orphan children through the breadline to get something to live on after he has passed away, especially when, as is true in many cases, the disease from which he died or the trouble which caused his death was incurred in line of duty, though he might not have been able to officially prove "service connection." Having served as a member of the review board, I know how difficult it is to prove service connection. This was true as far back as 1933, and it is even more difficult now, due merely to the lapse of time and the inability to procure affidavits necessary to establish service connection.

Now, as to the next two sentences: I believe every veteran favors economy insofar as it is practicable. At the same time they do not favor economy legislation detrimental to the welfare of veterans, their widows, or their orphans. As to the support of the Rankin bill by the majority of the veterans who served in the World War, may I state that having had the privilege of serving on the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, I know that every possible opportunity is given everyone who desires to be heard on any bill under consideration by that committee. At the conclusion of these hearings and a report from the Veterans' Administration, a bill is drawn up by the committee comprising items satisfactory to these groups. H. R. 9000, referred to in this editorial, was drawn up in this manner, after legislative representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and other groups and individuals had been heard by the committee. The membership of this committee is almost 100 percent veterans, and the Rankin bill was voted out of committee unanimously. The discharge petition was placed on the Speaker's desk April 15 at about 3 p. m. I had been called out of the House Chamber for a conference at about 2:30 p. m. Returning to the Chamber at about 4:30 the discharge petition was called to my attention. I went immediately to the Speaker's desk and found that in the hour and a half preceding 90 Members had signed the petition and that I was ninety-first thereon. On Wednesday the required 218 signatures had been secured, and when the two hundred and eighteenth signature was placed on the petition 8 or 10 more were waiting to sign it. Much could be said about those who signed this petition. Time does not permit sufficient enlargement thereon. Some of those signing the petition are amongst the strongest-minded economy group in the House. Practically every veteran who had the petition called to his attention signed it. The list of signers included approximately 125 Democrats, 1 representative of American labor, with the balance of the signers being Republicans, including my friend, STEPHEN BOLLES, who recently addressed the Lincoln Dinner in Buffalo, and my friend and colleague from Erie County, the Honorable J. FRANCIS HARTER. This brief statement of facts should show the support the discharge petition had both from the viewpoint of the veteran and from the viewpoint of the House membership generally.

As to the statements made by the American Veterans' Association, the writer of the editorial is probably not aware of the fact that the representative of that organization was expelled from committee hearings during this session of Congress; and therefore that organization would be expected to make just the sort of statement made in the editorial. If the writer is really desirous of obtaining veterans' views I would suggest that he obtain statements from other veterans' organizations—such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a unit of which I now have the pleasure of addressing.

And now to the final sentence of the editorial: First of all, I note that immediately following this editorial is another one beginning, "A free press." Under the freedom of press allowed in this great country of ours this last sentence is, of course, permissible. By the proper use of words the writer remains within the law, but he presupposes certain things and thereby puts words or ideas which are absolutely false into the minds of the public. He may believe himself to be a mind reader. If so, this sentence is a poor sample of his ability. On other occasions when the News has desired individual views or information they have sent a representative to obtain them. This is the proper method of handling such items, rather than using the method of presupposing, reading one's mind, or whatever you want to term it, and then publishing false inferences rather than facts. No newspaper representative has ever found me ducking him or being partisan. As a matter of fact, while serving in public office, either as county clerk or as Representative, my actions have been strictly bipartisan and nonpolitical. If the editorial writer would act in like manner he would be better serving his great paper and our excellent community which that paper serves. I believe these statements will explain my position relative to reasons for signing discharge petition on the Rankin bill, and I assure you that I am pleased to have had this opportunity of discussing this subject with the veterans and the Ladies Auxiliary of the Casimir Pulaski Post, 1897, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION AND LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1940.*

Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you support Barden bill amendments to Wage-Hour Act. Unreasonable construction of "area of production" by Wage-Hour Administrator makes amendment of act imperative. Farmers producing perishable and seasonal commodities already receiving less than parity prices and income, cannot stand increased costs in marketing of such commodities.

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1940.

To Members of the House of Representatives:

In the interest of all agriculture our organization, which represents approximately 350,000 dairy-farm families, urgently requests the passage of the Barden bill (H. R. 7133) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Barden bill not only clarifies the wage and hour exemption provisions of the law but reiterates and carries out the original intention of Congress to exempt operations of employees engaged in the preparation of farm products for market. While specific exemption of such operations was provided for in the wage-hour

law, the unwarranted and unreasonable definitions given "area of production" and other terms contained in that act by the Wage and Hour Administration have, for the most part, nullified these exemptions and have deprived farmers of their benefit.

Denial of these exemptions results in saddling increased production costs on the farmers. This tends to widen the existing disparity between prices farmers receive and pay at a time when farm prices and income are still below the parity level which Congress in the general farm program has provided as the goal to be reached.

It is vital to American agriculture that the Barden bill be passed. The passage of the bill gives needed relief to agriculture and insures preservation of the specific exemptions which Congress provided in the original wage-hour law with respect to employees engaged in preparing farm products for market.

The bill has the support of the major farm organizations of the country which are sincere in their belief that the wage-hour law has not been administered consistent with the express intention of Congress when it passed the law.

We accordingly respectfully urge that you support the Barden bill, H. R. 7133.

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

Statement on State-wide Unemployment Insurance Reduction Plan as Provided in Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 (H. R. 6635) as Passed by the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

STATEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The State-wide unemployment insurance reduction plan (so-called McCormack or Massachusetts plan) as passed by the House of Representatives in 1939 (H. R. 6635) provided that any State could make a flat or horizontal reduction in contribution rates if the State law provided certain reserve and benefit provisions. These were as follows:

1. Reserve fund: 1½ times highest contributions or benefits in preceding 10 years.
2. Duration of benefits: 16 weeks or one-third of wages in base year, whichever is less.
3. Minimum: $5 per week.
4. Maximum: At least $15 per week.
5. Benefit rate: 50 percent of earnings.
6. Waiting period: 2 weeks.
7. Partial benefits: Required.

Any State which did not wish to take advantage of this plan was required to maintain contributions averaging 2.7 percent.

It was estimated at the time this plan was discussed by the Ways and Means Committee that all but about five States would have been able to take advantage of the reduction plan during 1940. If these States would have reduced their tax rates to about an average of 2 percent the savings to employers would have been between $200,000,000 and $250,000,000. It is possible that the States might have reduced employers' contributions even more than this amount on the basis of the present favorable employment conditions which have materialized.

Practically no criticism was directed at the benefit provisions included in the plan. In fact, many States have provisions substantially more liberal than those required by the plan. For instance, in six States (Maine, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, and Tennessee) benefits are paid for a flat duration of 16 weeks. In Massachusetts benefits are payable for as long as 20 weeks. In California, benefits range from 16 to 26 weeks.

It is estimated that the benefit provisions if required of all States would have increased benefits about 20 percent on the average for all States in the country. But the plan was an optional plan and only those States would have had to take advantage of the plan that felt they could reasonably and safely do so.

Since 1939 the State reserve funds have continued to grow. The reserve funds of the States already exceed $1,600,000,000 and by July 1, 1941 (the earliest time any State legislation normally can be effective), it is estimated that the reserves will total about $2,250,000,000 at the present rate of contribution collections and benefit payments. In Massachusetts, the reserve fund is already twice the highest tax collections, while in Wisconsin the reserve fund is over three times the highest tax collections.

The inadequacy of the existing benefit provisions and the growth of the State reserve funds indicate the need for Federal legislation to remedy this paradoxical situation.

As One Editor Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

ARTICLE FROM APPEAL TO REASON

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the following article from a paper entitled "Appeal to Reason" is a brief description of the manner in which the rulers of the British Empire operate to satisfy their own greed. This article, I would say, is a fair, unbiased viewpoint, and even favorable to the British Empire, for the writer has not revealed all that could be said about the rulers of England. I have asked to insert this in the RECORD in order that the people throughout this Nation may be informed of the manner in which the internationalists conduct business in the British Empire.

[From Appeal to Reason, Syracuse, N. Y., April 6, 1940]

WHY WE HAVE WARS

First let me admit that I am scared stiff when I think of bringing before our people some of the following explanations of "why we have wars," for being called a "Hitlerite."

Let me tell you emphatically that I am not a Hitlerite.

The foundations and motives of all modern wars are economic. In other words, "trying to get something to eat."

In some countries they get a handful of rice and a bit of dried fish. In another they get pig hockies and sauerkraut, or mutton. In France, horse meat is considered a delicacy, while we in America prefer porterhouse steak, pork, and lamb chops. We have radios and refrigerators and our own automobiles to ride in. The general method of locomotion is very different in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany. In these countries the workers and their families ride on bicycles. But the English still walk.

Why is this a fact when Great Britain has access to all necessary raw materials and food supplies to supply her peoples. The largest metropolitan city in the world is in England and its three outstanding factors are slums, poverty, and unemployment. A most beneficent Lord has blessed London with a perpetual fog to hide its poverty, misery, and squalor. England has never been without its great army of wretched unemployed and the dole. Being blessed with all these raw materials and food supplies from natural resources, England and her vast empire have the lowest standard of living of any of the other modern countries.

During the last 150 years the British Empire has been engaged in 55 wars, with France next on the list, having had 32. Germany, Russia, and Italy have gone to war less than 10 times during that time.

Beginning with the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, Prussia needed the coal and iron deposits in Alsace-Lorraine for the development of machinery and the steam engine. She went to war against France and wound up with Alsace-Lorraine and its coal and iron deposits. "Might having always been right," as so adeptly proven by the British Empire's history, should justify Prussia in this conquest of Alsace-Lorraine because it was an economic necessity to cope with their dire need of iron and coal.

Then came the Boer War of 1900. With it the rape of Transvaal and the Orange Free State in South Africa by England. The reason was again because of economic necessity.

The diamond market is controlled by the Beers Co. through their close control of the rough-diamond market in London. Therefore the price of diamonds is controlled by this company. The principal market for polished diamonds is in Amsterdam, Holland, where two-thirds of the diamonds in the world are cut and polished. The cost of production of a 1-carat stone is about $10, but through the strict control of scarcity the Beers Co. makes them highly valuable.

In the Transvaal and Orange Free State were large sections of diamond and gold deposits. They were of little interest to the Boers because they were a simple people who were content to cultivate their fields. However, the British harbored a fear that other foreign capitalists would gain control and exploit these deposits

that would result in a price war. That is why the British decided to rape these small independent countries.

Having been born in Holland, we were aroused to the heights of emotionalism at that time, as we are today over Finland. While morally Great Britain was not justified in destroying these two Republics, economically she was; by attempting to preserve the price structure of the diamond market throughout the whole world.

In 1905 Japan went to war with Russia of economic necessity in order to gain a foothold in Asia and accomplished this end by acquiring the port of Port Arthur and Korea.

Prior to 1914 Germany had raised her standard of living until it was second only to ours, through her ingenuity, efficiency, technological development, and perseverance. For a country of poor natural resources this was very remarkable and became as a thorn in the side of the British Empire, where the standard of living was so far below the German standard. British jealousy flared and resulted in a campaign of connivance with other countries to promote the economic strangulation of Germany. Germany resisted as best she could by going east with the famous road to Baghdad. Stopped by the British again, Britain allied herself with France through a promise of the return of Alsace-Lorraine, which she fulfilled. Italy came in later with similar promises which were forgotten after the war was over.

The military war ended in 1918 and the economic war started all over again immediately. The German people were promised a just peace if they would get rid of the Kaiser.

They sure gave them a just peace by the usual double cross. Through impossible reparation demands the German people lost their homes, farms, and life savings through necessary currency inflation in order to abolish the national debt of Germany.

The various pressure groups, such as the industrialists, trade-unionists, Catholic clericals, absentee landowners, social democrats, and Communists, made it impossible to resist the economic strangulation by Great Britain.

Then came the beer-hall "putch," and Adolf Hitler. He was a nondescript house painter with a political program and economic system which could be supported by all the German people, including the many pressure groups. In this manner Hitler established a united front and national unity. The first order on the program was the destruction of the Versailles Treaty, and secondly the national planned economy and German rearmament program.

By the Treaty of Versailles three countries were established by Lloyd George and Clemenceau which would be constant troublemakers for Germany. First came Poland. Instead of creating a Poland of purely Polish they tried to assimilate three German provinces with the corridor and Danzig. Poland needed an outlet to the sea was their excuse. The only thing ever to come out of Poland were some Polish hams which were very much needed at home. More than half of Lithuania, including the capital of Wilna, was then included in Poland, White Russia and the Ukraine on the east and Galicia and Bohemia on the south. So we have a Poland consisting of a conglomeration of seven nationalities, languages, and cultures.

In Czechoslovakia we had Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians, and Bohemians, as well as Germans. This was another country embracing six different nationalities, languages, and cultures. Both of these are now temporarily liquidated.

Now Rumania is left. Only one-third of the population is properly Rumania. Bessarabia was taken from Russia, Dobrudja from Bulgaria, Transylvania from Hungary, and Bucovina from Poland. Here again we find five different languages, nationalities, and cultures living in one country. Rumania is the next trouble spot which has to be settled, either by force or peacefully.

The reason these three countries we have just mentioned were organized by Lloyd George and Clemenceau in this manner is very plain to see. Both of them did not want any peaceful countries on the east of Germany to exist. They prefer to have continual troublemakers who will hamstring the economic development of Germany by isolating her. Hitler, being smarter than Daladier and Chamberlain, negotiated his famous deal with Russia, which leaves Great Britain with her back against a wall.

It is essential for Great Britain to win this war by next spring or they can never hope to because time will help Germany to organize the economic resources of Russia. Once these are organized, Britain and France can never win a decisive victory over Germany for the simple reason that Germany is going to sit tight on the western front. The Allies would find it impossible to launch an offensive as they would have to have a 3-to-1 preponderance, which they never could obtain. The best that can be expected is a stalemate and which is most desirable because it will be conclusive proof once and for all the uselessness of force. All these assertions that the Allies are going to win the war and strike back blow for blow is just poppycock. In the last World War Russia and Italy were both against Germany. The war lasted 4 years and Germany would have won that war if the United States had not intervened and won it. Therefore, it seems utterly ridiculous that France and England can win this war. The best they can expect is to fight the Germans to a standstill and vice versa.

This funny and phony war is different than all previous wars, because it is primarily a war of economic forces. Any unbiased person, leaving sentimentalism, emotionalism, and wishful thinking in the dog house, must admit that in spite of all the British propaganda passed out by our press and commentators, neither side can win and must not. Joe Stalin does not say a word, and all the barking done by Hitler, Chamberlain, and Daladier is just to put on a show for their citizens. They may be compared to two lawyers representing opposite sides of a case, verbally tearing each other apart to impress the jury and after the case is over walking out of the courtroom arm in arm, or having a few drinks together while bragging about the show they had put on.

The disgrace and futility of our much-touted civilization is shameful when a handful of men can send the bloom of the youth of their countries to war to have their guts blown out. Many come back crippled for life, without having settled anything, either by victory or defeat.

The blubbering of the war aims are so sickening that persons with any reasoning at all must vomit when listening to or reading them. Those Dutchmen in Holland tore off the mask of hypocrisy from "Windy" Churchill as to war aims. "Britain and France, and not the neutrals, have killed collective security."

The war was not started in the interest of civilization, for the rights of small nations, but for a specific purpose. England is not fighting for the Jews, or Ethiopia, Albania, Austria, or Czechoslovakia; neither is England fighting for Poland, but for her own self, her vital rights. What is that specific purpose? The answer is, economic domination of continental Europe. A permanent peace can never exist in Europe unless Great Britain gets the hell out of continental Europe. Britain is whining for a federation of Europe, but she must hold the whip hand and be the big boss.

That would mean that Europe would be condemned to economic slavery by a handful of Tories.

Liberty, freedom, and democracy are empty phrases and a hollow mockery to a person without a job and on the dole or relief.

All the chatter about moral, spiritual, religious, and political regeneration is useless unless we have an economic regeneration first. Instead of blabbering about war aims, why isn't something said about peace aims? Because of an abject ignorance of the economic forces that came with modern machinery and mass production, these have proven to be a curse instead of a blessing to civilization.

With the development of modern machinery and capitalism the struggle for raw materials began. Economic and trade wars came as a necessary evil with it and is bound to culminate in military wars as we had from 1914 to 1918 and is with us today, so why talk about disarmament and peace conferences when they are useless?

To obtain peace, military as well as economic, an economic conference should be organized by the leading nations, such as the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Italy, and Japan. Of these, Germany and Italy, as well as Japan, must be classified as "have not" nations and these nations must be given opportunity to acquire raw materials and markets for their finished products without interference by other nations.

This is the foundation of a permanent peace and none other will do. Resurrection of Poland and Czechoslovakia will be necessary. Territories which were given to Rumania after the last World War must also be returned to the nations from which they were taken.

In order to enjoy a permanent peace other boundaries may have to be rectified, which could be accomplished by the larger nations.

Customs unions must also be organized to insure peace and make it more secure. An economic alliance between China and Japan would settle the Far East difficulties.

Germany and Italy must be given a chance to develop their trade with the Balkan states unmolested, and temporarily with the South American Republics until the economic resources of Russia are organized for the interchange of the raw materials and food supplies for German and Italian manufactured products.

The United States is almost self-sufficient and should be the most powerful force in an economic conference where fair play and justice should reign supreme.

Scheming diplomats and all those with intentions of international intrigue must be ejected and barred from the conference.

This is the only open road to a permanent peace program and insures abolition of the fear of future wars, none other will do.

Safety in Air Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM TED JOHNSON, AMERICAN AIRLINES PILOT

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 25, 1940.*

Hon. MELVIN MAAS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Let's not throw away safety in air-line travel. This is what will be done if the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board are abolished in

accordance with President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plan No. IV. Under the C. A. A. and Air Safety Board a year of safe aviation has just been accomplished, and it is a fact that many more similar records will be accomplished if the C. A. A. and Air Safety Board are kept intact. Abolishing these two agencies would be abolishing safety in air-line travel, and if there is no safety in air travel, we might just as well not have this quick means of transportation. I respectfully request your aid in defeating President Roosevelt's reorganization plan to abolish the C. A. A. and Air Safety Board.

Pilot TED JOHNSON,
American Airlines, Chicago.

H. R. 9141, Peeler Log Bill—Important to Plywood Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 23, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me April 19, 1940, before the Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate being granted this privilege to appear before your committee this afternoon in support of H. R. 9141, the so-called peeler log bill, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

This is a compromise bill intended to meet some of the objections urged against S. 1108. It changes the log dimensions from 24 to 28 inches in diameter and allows a 5-percent tolerance on exports which would be exempted. I am advised that the bill in its present form has received the approval of the Northwest Loggers Congress, who found fault with the Senate bill. The pending House bill, I am informed, is favored by the American Federation of Labor, Committee on Industrial Organization, Northwest Conservation League, Washington State Planning Commission, Washington Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and a number of other organizations whose members run into several millions. There is no known opposition to this bill, with the exception of the Department of State.

It is apparent that the Department of State did not have the facts as relating to the timber conservation involved in the export of peeler logs, since the State Department's views are in direct opposition to the testimony given by the Chief Forester of the United States. Furthermore, the Department of State is also in opposition to the views as expressed by the President of the United States in his letter to the Governor of Washington under date of March 18, 1939, reading as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1939.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR MARTIN: I have personally considered the subject matter of your letter of March 1 dealing with the effect on labor and industry of exporting high-grade Douglas fir peeler logs.

I am very much in sympathy with the idea that exports of high-grade raw forest material, of which our domestic supply is limited, should not be encouraged. The continued existence of wood-using industries on the Pacific coast, particularly of the plywood industry, depends upon an adequate supply of high-quality raw material in the form of standing timber—a supply which is all too limited.

It is hardly necessary for me to assure you that I am in favor of sound proposals that redound to the benefit of American labor and industry. I am particularly impressed with the fact that organized labor is actively supporting the measures which have been proposed to protect its source of raw material upon which the pay rolls of industry are built.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

His Excellency CLARENCE D. MARTIN,
Governor of Washington, Olympia, Wash.

I desire to call the committee's attention to arguments in favor of the bill, based upon facts and data compiled by Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, manager of Pacific export industries, comprising the Douglas-fir plywood mills on the Pacific coast who are engaged in the export business. These arguments are advanced to meet objections from the Department of State.

Every country possessing choice softwood logs suitable for plywood manufacturing purposes has already, through embargoes, export duties, or other restrictions, reserved this raw material for domestic uses. Even Canada has made the exportation of logs from British Columbia and cut on private lands subject to export license.

The proposed embargo on high-grade Douglas fir logs of large dimensions is advocated on the same basis of forest conservation and unemployment relief as caused foreign countries to take the same step. Under the bill all logs less than 28-inch top diameter or logs of any size unsuitable for plywood manufacture in the United States of America may be exported. Since wages in foreign log-importing countries vary from 3 cents per hour (Japan) and up to 40 cents per hour, compared to 62½ cents per hour minimum in the United States plywood industry, it is obvious that foreign countries can afford to use smaller logs and more defective logs than the American mills. The latter cannot afford to repair defective veneer on account of the high labor cost. The embargo would therefore not deprive foreign mills of raw material but would merely effect a fair division of logs reserving the high-quality logs for the American industry unable to utilize small or defective logs.

As far as trade agreements are concerned no country importing American plywood logs has in a single instance been willing to give any concessions in its import tariff covering plywood. As a matter of fact several countries, notably Germany, Australia, Norway, Italy, Japan, and others have years ago practically ceased to import American plywood, because they take our logs, but at the same time they permit the importation of foreign plywood when they are unable to buy logs from the plywood exporting countries.

It is therefore evident that this American log-export trade has counteracted any effort on the part of the Department of State to secure equitable foreign import duties covering American finished wood products produced from these logs.

Conservation: Conservation means wise use and close wood-utilization practice. Plywood is recognized by the United States Forest Service as representing a very high degree of wood utilization. One ton of plywood involves $25 in wages. One ton of logs for export involves $2 in wages. The manufacture of plywood is highly desirable from the point of view of timber conservation since only the thin face veneer must be of high grade, while the interior core and back veneer may consist of low-grade wood. In other words, in the form of plywood by far the largest percentage of wood used is of low-grade quality. The Department of State has overlooked this important point.

The United States Forest Service has recently presented to Congress a proposed plan of public regulation of timber cutting. This matter is of major national importance. The execution of this plan means greatly curtailed production of plywood logs. It is not reasonable to expect that our American plywood mills should willingly submit to this curtailment of their raw material supply as long as foreign countries can buy such logs as are needed by our own industry and which can never be replaced. Recently the national parks have taken in large bodies of commercial high-grade timber areas thereby creating very serious problems for the American plywood industry. It seems incongruous that the United States Government should not compensate these industries for the loss they have sustained by supporting the bill for the embargo of high-grade Douglas-fir logs.

The Northwest plywood industry is the most rapidly growing industry on the Pacific coast. In less than 10 years its annual production has grown from 200,000,000 square feet to more than 1,000,000,000 square feet. The raw material situation is already critical in certain localities. At the same time the demand made by foreign countries for our plywood logs is largely based on their desire to save their own forest resources. When our timber is exhausted our mills will not be permitted by foreign countries to buy their logs.

Reforestation as a private enterprise must be financed through the cutting of high-grade timber, which is the most profitable item of logging. By placing an embargo on the exportation of high-grade logs the remaining supply of high-grade timber will be prolonged and consequently there will also be a financial incentive for reforestation.

From every angle an embargo of peeler logs is an integral part of forest conservation which is so strongly advocated by the administration. Through the exportation of peeler logs an annual pay roll of $1,000,000 is lost to American labor in a district already seriously affected by a large roll of unemployed.

Labor: The Northwest plywood industry is paying the highest wages in the world for such work (62½ cents per hour minimum and 78 cents average). The excellent quality of timber—which has no equal anywhere in the world—is the main reason for this high wage standard. Premature exhaustion of this resource through export of logs will inevitably in time reduce wage and living standards.

Logging industry: The organized loggers and timber owners in the north Pacific have reached an agreement with the sponsors of the bill not to oppose its passage. They realize that their interests are inseparably linked with the building up of our local industries. As far as is known there is no opposition from any organized group to this bill and the Department of State therefore finds itself in the position of being the only organization blocking its passage.

The plywood industry in the Pacific Northwestern States is now joining hands with millions of citizens in a petition to Congress to reserve its most valuable raw material—high-grade timber—for our Nation's own industries, because without this raw material the American industry cannot exist. Already tobacco seed, scrap tin, helium, and other products have been embargoed and every country possessing softwood peeler logs has taken the same action as now proposed.

This entire subject has been covered very fully by Mr. MOTT, Mr. COFFEE, and Senator HOLMAN. I am anxious to have you hear Mr. Oxholm, and also my old friend and neighbor, Mr. Henry B. Steer, economist for the Forestry Department, who spent 15 years out in our region, and who is very familiar with the entire situation as it applies to this legislation. I think he will be able to give the committee some very valuable information.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer very briefly to the alleged opposition of the State Department. I think that there is no opposition to this legislation from any source of which I am aware, and there is an entire unanimity of support in favor of it, with the single possible exception of the State Department. Personally, I cannot understand why the State Department should be opposed to this legislation.

Mr. CULLEN. If you stay here long enough you may get some information.

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me that it is not in conflict with the trade-agreements program. If I am correctly informed, there is not a single foreign nation which imports peeler logs from the United States which has made any concessions to our country in tariff duties or otherwise in regard to imports of finished plywood or forest products into those very same nations. In other words, they enforce embargoes and duties against us on a finished product and they buy from us without any restrictions the raw material. They buy their peeler logs, and these nations who used to buy plywood from us, I think Australia, Germany, Norway, Japan, and Italy, now import the peeler logs and no longer import the plywood which they used to import.

Mr. CULLEN. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, this program, Mr. Chairman, is reacting very strongly against the best interests of our country, and I think it is contrary, as I understand it, to the spirit of the trade-agreements program, because it is having the exact opposite effect of what the proponents of the trade-agreements program claim is the main purpose of the trade-agreements program. Of course this has been going on for many years, before there was a reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. CULLEN. Does that even go down to the South American republics?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman, but I think it does apply to all of these nations who are directly affected, that is, those nations who are importing from us peeler logs which we export, and who are manufacturing the finished product over there and depriving us of the employment of labor, and giving us little in return for it.

Mr. KNUTSON. To what extent does it affect your labor situation out there?

Mr. SMITH. I think it affects it very seriously, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does it affect it to the extent of 20,000 in the two States?

Mr. SMITH. I think that would be very conservative, because there is hardly any business or industry out there in that section of the country that employs as much labor as the plywood industry. It is a highly technical, skilled industry, and it employs a great deal of labor. In some of the plants of which I have some knowledge they employ between 500 and 600 men. Mr. Oxholm will be able to give you all of the details concerning that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I notice in the illustrated booklet that was passed around to the members of the committee there is an illustration here of four men sitting on a pile of plywood, weighing one ton, which represents 1 day's output for four men, and $25 in wages and that there are thousands of skilled American plywood workers who receive the highest wages paid anywhere in the world for such labor.

Mr. SMITH. That is true; the wage scale is the highest paid anywhere.

Mr. KNUTSON. The record should show that.

Mr. SMITH. The record shows it. It seems to me folly and almost criminal, and certainly a dereliction of duty to permit those foreign nations to benefit any longer, as they have been doing many years, at the expense of American labor and American industry, because that is exactly what is happening.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do you not think it is possible to carry this good-neighbor policy too far?

Mr. SMITH. I am in favor of a good-neighbor policy, provided that we get fair returns. That is, if the benefits equal, or nearly equal, the concessions that we make, and there is a fair balance of benefits with concessions and vice versa in our relations with foreign nations and our foreign trade. Then, I think it is a laudable and beneficial program, but not if, as in the case of these peeler logs, and this entire matter we are considering here today, the foreign nations have the foresight to protect their raw materials and we do not, and they take advantage of our neglect, and they import from us the raw materials and deprive us of that employment to labor and investment of capital and business and industrial activity and then they turn around and make no concessions to us, when we leave our door wide open to them. In the case of Japan, I think it can be demonstrated, they have actually shipped finished plywood back to the United States to compete with our own domestic product. That is a deplorable state of affairs and is another emergency that this administration should correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is, according to the statements made. It may be that they buy fruit from you folks in sufficient quantities to offset this transaction.

Mr. SMITH. If they do they would buy it anyhow, probably.

Mr. KNUTSON. That was not testified to before, was it? We were told that it was necessary to have a reciprocal arrangement. I am in harmony with this proposal, but I was just wondering what your outlook was, whether you are in favor of this whole program for the rest of us but not for your immediate section of the country.

Mr. SMITH. I am in favor of it wherever it can be justified, and wherever it proves itself beneficial to our Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. We had a lot of those spot protectionists come before us, and none of them said where they were hit it was justified.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, that is always a matter of opinion, based on the facts and all of the information available.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, it makes a big difference whose ox is gored.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, that makes a lot of difference, and when we come to the tariff question, I think we all realize the soundness of the philosophy of Gen. W. S. Hancock, Democratic nominee for President in 1880, I believe, who said, "The tariff question is a local issue," which has become a political axiom.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Robertson desires to ask you some questions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Have you made any examination of the claim made last May by the Secretary of State, that if we put an embargo on the export of our Douglas fir, Canada could supply all the markets that now buy from us?

Mr. SMITH. I will say, in reply to the gentleman from Virginia, that Canada has already put into effect the very terms and philosophy of this legislation, in their own country, in their own behalf. They have made the exportation of peeler logs from British Columbia, cut on private lands, subject to an export license.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Canada would be the principal competitive nation supplying peeler logs, would it not?

Mr. SMITH. I assume so; yes, sir; but their peeler logs are not of as good a quality as ours.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then if they have an embargo the observation of the Secretary of State last year to the Senate committee that we would not get the employment because Canada would ship logs and the business would go on just the same except that we would lose that export market, would not apply?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think that is accurate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to know definitely whether or not Canada has an embargo on the shipment of these peeler logs.

Mr. MOTT. Canada has an export license penalty on the exporting of peeler logs purchased on private lands in Canada, but Canada can import peeler logs from the United States and then reexport them to England, Japan, or anywhere else without any penalty.

Mr. SMITH. That is substantially what I said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The appendix to the Secretary of State's report showed in 1939 there were considerable exports of peeler logs from Canada.

Mr. MOTT. Yes; but they were American logs. You see, Canada does not produce the same high-grade clear logs we do.

Mr. CULLEN. Have you finished, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am through, Mr. Chairman, and I desire to thank you and the committee.

Mr. CULLEN. We are thankful to you. Who is the next witness?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Steer.

Postage Rates on Second-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE DAILY CALUMET

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Daily Calumet, "How'll you have it—straight or mixed?" which is in answer to the article "Take second-class mail off the dole" from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 1, 1940. This I included in the RECORD of April 16.

The article is as follows:

[From the Daily Calumet]

HOW'LL YOU HAVE IT—STRAIGHT OR MIXED?

For many moons past, the Philadelphia Inquirer has been trying to make hay crusading for a bill to "relieve taxpayers of footing the stupendous postage bills for newspapers and magazines." Your reading material which comes to you as second-class matter has been on a dole for 89 years, the Inquirer reveals, and then proudly proclaims its own head is ready for the block to end this annual raid on the Public Treasury.

Before we wade deeper into this momentous question, let it be said that the Daily Calumet, too, is willing to pay more postage—or put it another way—we would as soon leave matters as they are and abide by the wishes of the taxpayers themselves.

It won't make any difference to the taxpayer which ever way it comes out. You can keep the newspapers on the public dole—so to speak—which represents a few cents in your annual tax bill, or you may reduce taxes in the United States $27,000,000 per annum and pay more for your newspaper delivery. Too, the mediums will have to up advertising rates a bit, which will be passed right along to the last man in line. So, it's like asking a man "Do you want your whisky mixed or straight?" The alcoholic content is the same.

The Inquirer points out the newspapers and magazines are getting a free ride like this: It costs the Government 8.41 cents a pound to carry and deliver, whereas magazines and newspapers pay only 1.8 cents per pound—a deficiency, you will notice, of 6.61 cents per pound.

Newspapers in America are sleepless sentinels of our free institutions. Theirs is a public service and trust that comes daily to your door at a ridiculously low cost. It would not be asking too much in the light of governmental giving to permit your guardians of liberty to ride the mails free!

We have a feeling, judging by the Inquirer's philanthropical attitude, that its advertising and subscription rates are too high. We'll have to string along with the present rate system, but we don't give a tinker's dam which way it goes—we leave it to you, dear customer—write your own price tag.

Wage-Hour Absurdities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1940]

WAGE-HOUR ABSURDITIES

The Fair Labor Standards Act, better known as the wage-hour law, promises, as written and administered, to rival the Wagner Act in its injury and disruption of the Nation's industry. Its object, as we all know, is to prevent sweatshop conditions in the so-called marginal trades, prescribing for the purpose a minimum hourly wage and a maximum workweek beyond which the employer must pay a premium for overtime. But it is so drawn that, by interpretation of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, its administrative agency, it is held to govern all industry, marginal or other, which by any stretch of the imagination can be considered in interstate commerce.

We referred in these columns recently to a test suit brought by the Wage and Hour Division against a loft building in this city to force its proprietors to pay arrears in overtime wages to their employees. Under contract with the building-service employees' union the employer in this instance pays his workers an average weekly wage of $29, far above the minimum required by the Fair Labor Standards Act, in return for which they work, by agreement, 48 hours a week. But the wage and hour law stipulates a 42-hour week. Wherefore its enforcement agency says, "to blazes with the fact that these toilers are not engaged in a marginal industry, that by collective bargaining they have made their own terms, and that they are employed by a purely local enterprise." Some of the tenants of the building may be engaged in interstate commerce, so those who serve them—elevator operators, scrub women, and what not—are entitled to time-and-a-half wages for the extra 6 hours of their week, retroactive to October 1938, when the wage and hour law became effective. Is this contention fantastic or not?

Within a month a field inspector for the Wage and Hour Division addressed an audience of businessmen in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, telling them that investigations in that State had shown 24 instances of violation of the law in 25 cases. Only 1 was willful, the others being unconscious transgressions on the part both of employers and employees. If a local business advertises over a radio station heard outside its State it has been construed to be in interstate commerce within the meaning of this grotesque statute. If an employee, though ordered to quit, insists upon working overtime, his employer, so the bureaucrats have argued, owes him overtime rates. There is really no limit to the absurdities of the law's application.

That it needs amendment to prevent its destruction of free enterprise, including the independence of organized labor, is self-evident. Unfortunately the problem is not a simple one, as the House of Representatives is learning at the moment in its consideration of the Barden bill. This bill, in its main provision, would correct the basic weakness of the act by exempting from its restrictions with respect to hours and overtime all workers receiving "a guaranteed monthly salary of $150 or more." The purpose is perfectly obvious—to make the act apply, as Congress intended it should in the first place, only to sweatshop labor incapable of effecting through organization proper standards of its own devising. But only a small percentage of our working population earns salaries of $150 a month. The bill then would definitely condemn the major portion of the act's strait jacket.

It has other objections, but this one, it seems to us, is fundamental. There can be no solution in an arbitrary salary line, which suggests in turn that there can be none short of a repeal of the act and an approach to its objective either by way of State laws, more responsive as they are to local conditions, or on the order of the British formula. In Great Britain when the government finds that an industry or trade is sweating its workers, it appoints a trade commission which confers with the employers, the employees and what labor organizations, if any, are involved, and after a thorough canvass of the situation, proposes a remedy. This the authorities are empowered to enforce. Absent are the rigidities which under our system threaten the entire industrial fabric.

Philippine Travel Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had the opportunity to vote to pass H. R. 289 over the President's veto. I am sure if the President personally knew the underlying facts surrounding this legislation it would have received his approval. It has passed Congress three times, usually unanimously, being vetoed each time. There are some 8,000 veterans, and their widows or dependents, who will participate in the fund provided by this bill, receiving approximately $300 to $400 apiece from an aggregate total estimated to be some $3,200,000.

I recall vividly as a student in the University of Oregon when many of my associates marched away to join the Spanish-American War. We all recall with pride the fine service they rendered to their State and Nation, many of them paying the supreme sacrifice. At the termination of the war, those volunteers in the Philippines were promised that if they would continue in the service, when they were finally discharged they would receive their travel-pay allowance as was paid to all other soldiers mustered out at that time. They relied upon this promise and remained in the service and made it possible for our Government to put down the rebellion on the islands and not be subjected to the heavy expense of mustering into service other men here at home and bear the heavy expense of transporting them to the islands. These men eventually were mustered out of the service but their travel pay was not forthcoming.

As I have stated, the Congress on three separate times has passed a bill providing for this pay. These men who are still living are past well beyond middle life, many of them in need of this small travel allowance. Many of them have passed on and have left dependents who are actually in need. The Government can afford to pay these veterans but it cannot refuse to do simple justice and keep its promise to the veterans who were loyal to their country in time of need. I hope the bill will soon become a law and this injustice righted.

An Expert Analysis of the Economic Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

LETTER FROM COMFORT A. ADAMS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the writer of the article hereinbelow appended has presented a factual statement of conditions obtaining today which is worthy of study, I have sought permission to include it in my remarks. Mr. Comfort A. Adams, consulting engineer of the Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co., is an electrical engineer; was Lawrence professor of engineering at Harvard University from 1914 to 1935; Gordon McKay professor of electrical engineering, 1935 and 1936, emeritus since 1936; dean of the Harvard Engineering School, 1919; fellow of American Academy of Arts and Sciences, American Institution of Electrical Engineers (president, 1918–19), A. A. A. S.; member of National Academy of Sciences, Institution of Electrical Engineers, Verein Deutscher Elektrotechniker, Société Francaise des Electricienes; author of Dynamo Design Schedules and articles on kindred subjects; received first award of Miller medal for conspicuous contributions to the art of welding, 1929.

The letter is as follows:

EDWARD G. BUDD MANUFACTURING CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 17, 1940.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: This is to thank you for the reprint of the article by Benjamin Marsh which I have read with much interest.

A long time ago it was said that "facts are stubborn things." It has seemed to me for a long time that many of our political and economic leaders were either ignoring some of these facts or that they failed to see them as a whole in their proper setting or perspective.

I am an engineer rather than a politician or economist but in the solution of any engineering problem it is absolutely vital to do exactly this, namely, to gather all the essential facts, arrange them in order of importance or in their proper perspective, and then to apply the laws of nature logically for the determination of the desired but as yet unknown relationships which we call a solution of the problem.

After many years of experience in this process, one realizes that such a solution can be sound only under two conditions which are, (1) that the premises or pertinent facts are not only true but comprehensive and (2) that the logic employed in connection with the underlying scientific laws is rigid.

The result of such experience is the realization that no amount of wishful thinking based upon desire, prejudice, or convention will cover up any deficiencies in either premises or logic.

I often wish that this habit of mind prevailed to a much larger extent amongst our politicians, economists, and the Members of Congress.

With this introduction I am presenting below a perspective picture of our present economic set-up, which is the result of what might be called engineering thinking or analysis of the essential facts gathered and sifted throughout an unusually long and active life in very intimate contact with industry and its problems.

My excuse for taking time out of a very busy life to make this presentation is the fact that the following picture is based largely upon the kind of facts presented in Mr. Marsh's article which you distributed as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The picture follows:

Over a period of many years during which our abundant natural resources have been largely appropriated by a very small group, we have built up a capital structure which is made up partly of real wealth in the economic sense and partly of claims to wealth sometimes referred to as "water." Few people realize the magnitude of this latter part. In certain natural monopoly groups it has run as high as 75 percent, although at the present time it is probably not much over 50 percent.

The struggle to pay interest or dividends on this top-heavy structure is the source of the instability of our present economic order and also the source of the economic conflict between what might be called the privileged class and the masses.

The way this operates is as follows:

Of the total income of the country under normal conditions, about two-thirds may be classed as wages, including salaries and other direct payments for services rendered, and about one-third in the broad realm of interest. The trouble is due, not primarily to the fact that a part of this is in the form of interest, but rather to two other considerations.

1. A large part of this interest goes to a group so small as to be absolutely negligible as a part of the population.

2. This small group cannot and does not wish to spend any considerable part of their incomes on articles of consumption which are the only ultimate product of industry. That is, they put it back into capital where it calls for more interest.

This leads to the natural division of the total income into two parts, consumption and saving. By articles of consumption I mean anything that one buys to use whether or not it be commonly referred to as durable goods. On the other hand, the savings, unless they be put in a stocking, are always placed as far as possible where they will draw interest.

If at any stage the total savings exceed by ever so little the demand for capital, every dollar of this excess is taken out of the consumer market and reduces the demand for the only ultimate product of industry which means a further reduction in the demand for capital.

If these savings were in small sums by the masses of people, they would immediately go back into consumption in any emergency at least in part, but as such a large part of the total is in the hands of such a small group they simply pile up and create a claim on the earning power of the country which cannot be satisfied since the goose that laid the golden egg is ill or dead.

Another phase of the picture is this which may be likened to the proverbial row of bricks. If depression comes or begins, labor is discharged, consumption drops, more labor is discharged, since labor is the major consumer, and so on until the bottom is reached unless the Government steps in with pump-priming tactics. During the early stages of this same process dividends are maintained as long as possible, but the small group which receives the major part of these dividends not only do not increase their consumption but actually economize and reduce the consumption which simply accelerates the row of bricks. Although if experience permitted I could present plenty of statistics on this point, I can assure you that the picture is unquestionable and that neither the pump-priming process nor anything else short of a radical change in our economic structure can possibly remove its present instability, which has grown to a point so dangerous as to threaten the very foundation of the Government.

All this I have seen for many years. Twenty-one years ago in my presidential address to the American Institute of Electrical Engineers I said, "Unless we are willing to take one at a time and in a peaceful fashion the steps of inevitable economic evolution, we will eventually be forced into a revolutionary stride." The time for that stride is near at hand unless members of our privileged class show more intelligence than they have in the past.

I am not a Communist or a Fascist, but definitely a conservative and an individualist, and I can assure you that our present economic order is not only fatally unstable, but brutally unfair to the masses and that if our present privileged class wish to maintain any of their privileges, including that of independent thought and free speech, they had better prepare to take some of the steps above referred to.

Finally, I am convinced that the only reform which will save any remnant of our present capitalist system is that proposed by Henry George more than 50 years ago.

If you have time, I shall be glad to get your reaction to my point of view, which is very similar to that of Mr. Benjamin Marsh, and to know what you think about the prospects of action by the Government in the taking of steps sufficiently fundamental to forestall serious trouble.

Very sincerely yours,

COMFORT A. ADAMS.

New Deal Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a letter written and mailed postage free to 630,000 Federal land-bank borrowers by Gov. A. G. Black, of the Farm Credit Administration under date of April 10, 1940, enclosing a memorandum written by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, to Governor Black was in defiance of two statutes prohibiting political or lobbying activities by Federal officials.

The memorandum from Secretary Wallace to Governor Black, as well as the letter from Governor Black to the borrowers, show on their face that they were a subtle effort to

influence borrowers to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress in support of the Jones-Wheeler bill, which, among other things, would absolutely destroy the present cooperative farm-loan system, and would place governmental farm loans under control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am shocked by these letters. Every proposal contained in the memorandum of Secretary Wallace is embraced in the Jones-Wheeler bill. The letter sent out by Governor Black not only admits that it breaks a precedent but expresses his intention of continuing to do so from time to time by sending out other letters of this character. Governor Black's letter is as follows:

To Stockholders of National Farm Associations:

This letter probably breaks a precedent, but here goes? I know of no better way of stimulating thought and discussion than writing to you. In fact, I plan to send you from time to time pertinent information about the farm-loan system.

Secretary Wallace and I have talked over repeatedly many of the problems confronting the Farm Credit Administration. I take it that you as a borrower and farmer also are interested, so I am passing on to you one of his memoranda in which he asks some very pertinent and far-reaching questions.

I hope this will stimulate your own thought, that there will be discussion of these problems among the farmers, and that many farmers will have things they will wish to contribute to our thinking on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

A. G. BLACK, *Governor.*

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR A. G. BLACK, GOVERNOR, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

DEAR GOVERNOR BLACK: Our discussions of the various problems connected with the administration of the Farm Credit Administration have raised certain questions in my mind which I would like to pass on to you for consideration.

Your outline of conditions that have persisted for some time in the affairs of the land bank system raises some grave questions and I hope the facts have been laid before the borrowers. You say you have some doubts as to whether the borrowers are well informed. I was astounded to learn that more than half of the local national farm loan associations in the United States are insolvent and that only 40 percent of them are sufficiently solvent to be able to accept applications and sell their stock to members. Does this not raise the issue as to whether the stock which farmers have had to purchase in order to obtain loans has not carried a liability much larger than it should have borne? Also, I wonder if the borrowers have always been informed of the exact financial position of the association before they purchased stock?

What is troubling me is that many associations have been operating in territories where there seems to be a good deal of hazard and consequently the borrowers assumed a liability which they should not have been asked to carry. After all, are not the loans made by the Federal land banks and not by the associations, although, of course, they are endorsed by the latter?

If, in the future, loans were to be made without farmers having to buy stock the losses which might be incurred as a result of loans in a particular area would be spread on the books of the bank and not be confined to a single association. Of course, if loans were to be made in the future without requiring farmers to purchase stock, would it not be the equitable and just thing to pay off at par all the stock now owned by borrowers whether or not such stock is impaired?

In looking over the record of the Federal land banks and the so-called Commissioner loans made from the funds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, I am greatly impressed with the amount of delinquency on the part of borrowers, totaling about 22 percent for the land bank and about 30 percent for the Commissioner loan. We have discussed the very heavy delinquency in some States, but I didn't quite realize the situation throughout the country was as bad as these figures indicate. Part of this condition, of course, is due to long-continued adverse climatic conditions, but that is by no means the only cause.

Interest rates charged borrowers of the land banks have been reduced temporarily now for several years by Congress appropriating from the Federal Treasury and paying to the land banks the difference between the interest rate which the farmers contract to pay and the emergency rate established by Congress. I doubt if this can go on indefinitely. We have discussed many times the cost to the Government of a continued subsidized farm-mortgage interest rate, which is costing the Federal Treasury a good many million dollars a year. As the land-bank system is now set up the banks obtain their funds from the sale of Federal land-bank bonds not guaranteed by the Government. Would it not be worth while to explore with responsible persons the possibility that if the Government should guarantee these bonds, they could be sold at a sufficiently lower rate of interest to give the farmers permanently the same low emergency rates they are now receiving or even, perhaps, lower, without costing the Government the subsidy?

In the current money market I believe a Government-guaranteed land-bank bond would bear a much lower rate of interest than is borne by the non-Government guaranteed land-bank bonds outstanding. Why, then, couldn't the outstanding land-bank bonds be replaced as rapidly as possible with the lower-rate bonds and give the farmers the benefit of the difference in rates?

Since the Farm Credit Administration is now a part of the United States Department of Agriculture and not an independent agency or under a loan board, I personally am particularly impressed with the need for improving the farm-mortgage situation along these lines and not limiting our thinking to the existing system and procedures.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

These two letters, when read in connection with section 201 of the Criminal Code, speak for themselves. The statute reads in part as follows:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

The second statute, which in my opinion, is involved is section 6 of Public, 160, act of June 30, which states in part:

On or after July 1, 1939, no executive department or independent establishment of the Government shall transmit through the mail, free of postage, any book, report, periodical, bulletin, pamphlet, list, or other article or document (except official letter correspondence, including such enclosures as are reasonably related to the subject matter of the correspondence * * *) unless a request therefor has been previously received by such department or independent establishment.

The real purpose, in my opinion, behind this obviously flagrant disregard of these two statutes is that this letter and other propaganda being disseminated by Secretary Wallace is to build up support for the so-called Jones-Wheeler bill now under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture. This bill appears to be an effort on the part of Secretary Wallace to distract the attention of the farmers of this country from the fact that the New Deal farm program has failed to give farmers parity prices, or, in fact, income sufficient to enable them to pay even the low rates of interest now being charged on Federal land-bank loans.

Manifestly this action on the part of Secretary Wallace and Governor Black furnishes the best possible argument in favor of the Gillette-Kleberg bill, which would restore the Farm Credit Administration as an independent, nonpolitical, governmental agency. These letters indicate that the temptation for the Department of Agriculture to play politics was too strong to be resisted in a campaign year. It is impossible to imagine a nonpolitical, independent, governmental agency carrying on lobbying activities of this character.

Disaster at Shenandoah, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

APPEAL FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 last I informed the Members of the House concerning the situation caused by mine subsidence at Shenandoah, Pa., emphasizing that we are not only faced with the necessity of providing safety for our miners during actual mining operations, but are now confronted with the problem of safety for the homes of our people. In again appealing for Federal assistance, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from Mr. John J. Miller, president of the Shenandoah Disaster Relief League. A petition which

accompanied the letter was signed by 6,327 citizens, and the foreword of the petition follows the letter.

APPEAL FROM SHENANDOAH

SHENANDOAH DISASTER RELIEF LEAGUE

Hon. IVOR D. FENTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FENTON: We respectfully direct to your attention the attached petition of the citizens of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa.

The plight of the citizens of this entire community is indeed immediately serious and grave apprehension is felt for their safety and health in the continued subsidence of the earth's surface within the borough.

You will note that the foreword of this petition gives a brief word description of the effects of the disaster. In order that you might become more fully acquainted with the extent of the suffering brought about by this disaster, we earnestly ask that the reports, which have been submitted in connection herewith, be read.

This organization, acting for the citizens of the borough, has applied for Federal aid, under the terms of the Emergency and Disaster Act.

The signers of this petition, as residents of this borough, appeal to your great humanitarian spirit to assist them in their hour of need, and they earnestly solicit the prestige of your high office in a complete effort of cooperation in their appeal for Federal aid.

Respectfully yours,

SHENANDOAH DISASTER RELIEF LEAGUE,
JOHN J. MILLER, *President*,
A. A. FLECK, *Secretary*.

FOREWORD OF PETITION

On March 4, 1940, an earth subsidence devastated one-fourth the total area of the borough of Shenandoah.

Six hundred and forty-one private, industrial, and public buildings were damaged at a loss of several million dollars.

Senior and junior high-school buildings housing 1,350 pupils were closed, placing 85 percent of the total school population on part-time education. These pupils are losing more than 20 percent in time alone, and are deprived of educational facilities such as gymnasium, health rooms, adequate toilet facilities, auditorium, assembly rooms, science classrooms, and other conveniences deemed necessary for the maintenance of a minimum program of education. Children are being deprived of a type of education which many never again will have the opportunity to receive.

Streets and highways, sewers, and water and gas mains have been damaged and destroyed, creating serious health hazards. The present situation is a menace to the life and health and safety of thousands of people in the affected area.

These damages have cost a tremendous loss in wages and have seriously affected the real-estate values in the community. The subsidence is continuing and the area is expanding, defeating all efforts to restore the public morale.

The petitioners feel that failure to receive the aid of the Federal Government in this emergency will eventually bring about the destruction of considerably more real estate by subsidence, and a total break-down in the community of real-estate values, and might conceivably result in the migration of its residents because of fear, panic, or lack of confidence in the future economic life of the borough.

Having made application to the Federal Government, through the W. P. A., for immediate assistance in correcting the present damage and in forestalling future damage, your petitioners through their agent, the Shenandoah Disaster Relief League, respectfully ask you to use the power and influence of your high office to secure for them this urgent and much-needed assistance.

Educational Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. JOSEPH SMITH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR OF APRIL 22, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1940:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1940]

EDUCATIONAL ORDERS

When the Senate Appropriations Committee begins consideration of certain cuts made by the House in the War Department appropriation bill, it is certain that Army officials will make a determined effort to effect restoration of a little-publicized but all-important item labeled "educational orders." The history of these orders goes back 20 years—to a period when memories were fresh regarding the sorry lack of industrial preparedness which existed at the time of our entry into the World War. Congress agreed with our national-defense experts that steps should be taken to prepare industry as well as the military and naval establishments to respond quickly and efficiently in another emergency. There was born out of this agreement a far-reaching industrial mobilization plan, an important phase of which was to be the awarding of certain orders for military supplies to various manufacturing plants primarily for educational purposes.

Congress placed its stamp of approval on the educational program by authorizing the expenditure of a total of $42,500,000 on the special orders, to be spread over a 3-year period. Of this authorization, $26,000,000 was appropriated for 1939 and 1940. The remaining $16,500,000 was sought by the War Department in its 1941 supply bill, but the House slashed $14,500,000 off the item, upon recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee, which felt that the money could be better used for actual production of ordnance and for equipment needed by the engineers and Signal Corps. But the House committee, in its laudable desire to minister to the immediate, peacetime wants of the Army, apparently lost sight of the original purpose of the educational orders program. This purpose was to prevent a recurrence in any future national emergency of the deplorable confusion, waste, inefficiency, and grave delay which marked the conversion of our peacetime industries into producers of implements of war.

It is said that there are more than a thousand necessities of war, from shells to gas masks, which cannot be turned out readily except in a few factories. The educational orders awarded in 1939 and 1940 have provided numerous plants with valuable experience in producing hundreds of these war materials. Thus, the machinery for manufacturing vital items has been expanded and craftsmen needed in an emergency to man the machinery have been given valuable training. This educational program is just as important to future security as the strengthening of the military and naval branches of national defense. It would be unfortunate if Congress failed to recognize that fact in an era of world history already replete with tragic lessons in unpreparedness.

Safety of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1940

TELEGRAMS OPPOSING TRANSFER OF CIVIL AERONAUTIC AUTHORITY

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 23, 1940.*

Representative J. THORKELSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Worth of present Civil Aeronautics and Safety Boards has been definitely proven. Contrasted with old Commerce Department supervision with its many catastrophes is outstanding. Please do your best to retain present set-up.

Capt. FRANK C. JUDD,
Northwest Airlines.

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 25, 1940.*

Representative J. THORKELSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Arguments of penurious economy do not justify present effort to abolish effectiveness of Civil Aeronautics Authority. The real price paid in lives of passengers and pilots must not be lost by such tampering. Depending on you to prevent it.

Capt. EARL HALE,
Northwest Airlines.

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 21, 1940.*

Representative J. THORKELSON: Faulty and politically minded Commerce Department can be blamed for Bozeman and other Montana air crashes. No similar fatalities have occurred under Authority of Civil Aeronautics law and Safety Board. Any tampering with present efficiency of Board will be disastrous and should be strenuously opposed.

Capt. E. J. CORRIGAN.

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 21, 1940.*

Representative J. THORKELSON: Under faulty supervisions of politically minded Commerce Department 3 air-line crashes occurred in Montana whereby 11 passengers and 4 pilots met terrible and fiery deaths. Under supervision of Air Safety Board no fatalities have occurred. Is further proof necessary for your opposition to plan of abolishing Safety Board?

Capt. M. B. CAHILL.

It Can't Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

LETTERS FROM MR. FRED S. WILLIAMS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following two letters are of interest to all who believe in preserving the rights guaranteed to all under the Constitution. It appears to us that this is going quite far. We are hopeful that incidents such as this will not occur again. If they do, it may be in order to have an investigation, for this is not the first instance of violations such as this on board ship. The letters follow:

STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT GARFIELD,"
Boston, Mass., April 22, 1940.

Representative LEE GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to our union paper, The Voice of the Federation, as the incident related directly concerns you.

I am not a student of law and therefore am unfamiliar with the legal aspects of this case but it does not seem right to me or my shipmates that a sea captain should have the right to delay or prevent the sending of, or to censor messages that are addressed to a Member of the House of Representatives or Senate of the United States of America.

In our opinion, it is more reprehensible when you consider that the American President Lines, which owns and operates this ship, is subsidized by, and a big proportion of the stock owned by, the Maritime Commission, a United States Government agency.

If you can use your influence in any way to rectify this situation it will be greatly appreciated, not only by the crew of this vessel, but by all union seamen in the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

FRED S. WILLIAMS.

STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT GARFIELD,"
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1940.

EDITOR, VOICE OF THE FEDERATION,
24 California St., San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: While at sea, en route from Genoa to New York, on Sunday April 7, at a regular meeting of the M. F. O. W. & W. on the steamship *President Garfield* a motion was passed that a radiogram be sent to one of the California Members of the House of Representatives protesting any change in the Wagner Act.

The following radiogram was drafted by a committee, submitted to the other departments, concurred in by them, signed by the three delegates and filed by myself at the purser's office that evening:

"Representative LEE GEYER,
"*Washington, D. C.*

"Crew *President Garfield* vigorously protest any change in Wagner Act.

"F. WILLIAMS, *Engine.*
"D. GREENBERG, *Deck.*
"L. RANDALL, *Stewards.*"

I was told at the time that the message would first have to be censored by Capt. A. W. Aitkin. An hour later the message was returned with the information that the captain would not authorize its transmission.

The other two delegates and myself immediately went up to see him. We explained to him what the Wagner Act is and how important it is to labor that the act remain unchanged. We suggested that his objection might lie in the use of the word "crew" and offered to substitute the words "unlicensed personnel." He replied that that was not his objection, but that "we do not want any politics on this ship."

We could not persuade him otherwise, and there the argument rested for the time being.

The gang was pretty indignant about the whole thing, and several courses of action were proposed upon our arrival in New York.

Rumors of these proposals must have reached the captain's ear—we made an effort to insure that they would—because, 2 days later, when we again approached him on the subject, his manner had visibly changed. After 15 or 20 minutes' argument about the political rights of American citizens and the status of seamen on ships of a Government-owned steamship company, he finally O. K.'d the message. To save his face, he had us make the change which we had originally suggested—substitution of the words "unlicensed personnel" for the word "crew."

I can understand how he as a "loyal stooge" for the steamship owners, would not desire to see any political action on the part of labor, but to use such dictatorial methods in an attempt to suppress such action savours more of a Fascist country than of the United States of America, where we are all supposed to enjoy equal political rights.

Captain Aitkins' action has directly infringed upon our constitutional rights as American citizens. The Bill of Rights explicitly guarantees us the right to petition Congress and our message to Representative LEE GEYER certainly would be considered as such.

In addition, his action constituted direct interference with legitimate union activity.

The fact that our message was finally sent does not alter the case one whit because for 2 days the captain dictatorially denied us our rights. A delay of 2 days under different circumstances could have made our message useless.

It seems to me that the question raised in this case is very important and especially to the seagoing unions. Our main battle is on the legislative front, not the water front. If practices like this are allowed to continue unchallenged we will be seriously crippled in our efforts to retain our present conditions and to make our future gains.

I believe that this should be taken up by the federation and the several seagoing unions with the steamship companies and our rights to send such messages clearly established. All ship's masters should be instructed that they are not to censor, delay, or stop any crew messages that can be construed as legitimate union business.

I hope that this letter may serve to start the ball rolling and am

Fraternally yours,

FRED S. WILLIAMS,
No. 1040, Delegate, Steamship President Garfield.

Actors and Theater Projects Should Not Be Proscribed

Memorandum requested by Subcommittee on Appropriations on application of Actors' Equity Association to permit the allotment of Government relief funds to professional workers in the theater.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the committee requested answers to the following questions:

First. If relief to the theater is to be allowed, how is relief money to be administered, and by whom?

Second. What plans does Actors Equity Association recommend for the use of relief money?

Third. If there are box-office receipts, how are they to be distributed?

I. IF RELIEF TO THE THEATER IS TO BE ALLOWED, HOW IS RELIEF MONEY TO BE ADMINISTERED, AND BY WHOM?

The situation is now entirely different from that existing when the Federal theater project was alive.

If relief projects for the theater are now to be set up there must be a local sponsor and this sponsor must be responsible for approximately 25 percent of the total relief expenditure. These sponsorships will be local, and have full local responsibility and will be a prime factor in keeping the project wholesome and unobjectionable.

Not only will there be local sponsorship, but the Actors Equity Association cannot anticipate that sponsors can be

secured for amounts anywhere near as large as those expended by the Federal theater project.

In matters of administration we have, therefore, the following checks and balances:

(a) The rules laid down by the administration in Washington with the limitations they prescribe.

(b) The responsibility of local sponsors to their local constituency.

(c) Limitation of funds.

(d) Where projects are sponsored locally, administration must be handled in cooperation with local advisory boards and committees composed of persons of experience in the work of the project, and who know what efficiency and economy is—and who are competent administrators.

All of these factors coordinate to secure an administration which will be efficient and economical. They represent the best set-up to obtain proper administrative personnel, to choose for production appropriate plays, to determine economic methods of production.

Equity—and this is important—will cooperate with these groups to certify to the local administration the standing of all applicants for relief; it will on request give the administration full information as to whether the applicants are or are not genuine professionals.

II. WHAT PLANS DOES EQUITY RECOMMEND FOR THE USE OF RELIEF MONEY?

When Equity first took hold of relief administration it started with $28,000 a month. It did such an effective and economical job that continually that appropriation from the city and State of New York was increased. In the end they were distributing several times this amount.

In determining what to do, Equity brought together the very best brains in the theater, and from their experience they now present the following proposed plans:

First. Equity will recommend the revival of its project, successfully carried out by it, of presenting plays approved by the teaching staffs in the high schools of the larger cities in connection with the class work in English and history and other studies which may be helped by visual education. No admission fee charged.

Second. Equity will recommend the continuance of the very successful project of using the traveling theater to bring drama to large audiences outdoors in summer and in large auditoriums in the winter. Admission fee, if any, nominal.

Third. Equity will endeavor to revive its most successful project, unqualifiedly approved by Dr. Fechner, of bringing drama to the C. C. C. camps, with full practical instructions to camp members in organizing community theaters back home. No admission charge.

Fourth. Equity will sponsor the organization of groups of dramatists to write plays, not for Broadway, but of especial value to educational groups. If local sponsors may be secured, groups of dramatists in the several States will be organized to write plays, visualizing State history and local dramatic events.

Fifth. Equity will not endorse productions to be given in competition with regular commercial productions.

Sixth. Consistent with the above, Equity will assist in testing out new methods of production, aiming to bring good theater to smaller communities, such as rotary stock, repeat stock, and so forth.

Seventh. Equity will assist in promoting a children's theater project.

Eighth. Equity will assist in promoting projects to improve the technical experience of younger actors.

III. IF THERE ARE BOX-OFFICE RECEIPTS, HOW ARE THEY TO BE DISTRIBUTED?

The primary idea will be to produce plays for their cultural and educational value and wherever possible to the largest audiences. In most instances admission will be free or at a nominal price. Any receipts will have to be divided according to agreement between Colonel Harrington and the local sponsors. All service contribution by Equity will be free.

STATEMENT OF FACTS—NEED FOR RELIEF

There is no use hiding the fact that employment conditions in the theater are simply brutal. The condition among legitimate performances is about the same as in the other branches, vaudeville, presentation houses, radio, and so forth. In the legitimate field Equity has a membership of approximately 4,200. We have given the number employed a careful count and it does not exceed 800. In another month about 400 of these will be idle and will not have employment worth mentioning until next October. For a year and a half before the Federal theater project was abandoned, Equity maintained a bureau to pass on applications for relief—any kind of relief. Approximately 2,500 members applied, asking for some, any form of relief or help. The terrible fact revealed, outside of unemployment, was that less than 1 percent of these applicants had any bank account, any insurance, or any personal property having any value exceeding $50. During the depression they were stripped of them all.

Our conservative estimate is that more than 75 percent of Equity's membership is without employment of consequence.

PEOPLE OF THE THEATER ARE SUBSTANTIAL TAXPAYERS

In the first place, our product pays an admissions tax, which increases the price and lowers patronage. The Government realizes several million dollars annually through this tax.

Our important people are heavy income-tax payers and pay a larger proportion than successful businessmen. This is because their earnings are concentrated in a few short years, and therefore their surtax is concentrated in these few years.

It is conservatively figured that the tax contribution of all classes in the theater is a minimum of $10,000,000 annually. And yet, under present conditions, our abnormally assessed taxpayers have to support their own unemployed.

THE THEATER MAKES UNUSUALLY LARGE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE WAY OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND CHARITIES

There is no need to go into this. Everyone knows it. Who sold millions upon millions of Government bonds during the last year? Who is at the beck and call of our foremost charities? Who is always ready to help every educational or cultural effort? The actor.

If it were not for the voluntary services of the actors, hundreds—yes, thousands—of entertainments given every year would be unknown.

EQUITY'S RELATION TO THE INITIAL RELIEF PROJECT

Equity was the sponsor of the first relief project. At the time this project started there was an insistent demand all over the city and State of New York for a part of the relief funds. Equity was promised $28,000 monthly just to pay wages. It was required to raise all other expenses of production, including scenery, transportation, lights, royalties, and so forth. Equity raised the money for this. It culled out 150 actors from 1,500 applicants and had 10 fine plays in rehearsal within 10 days after it assumed sponsorship. Its work was so commendable that the city and State gradually increased its appropriation until within a few months 40 companies were presenting plays in the public high schools, in the camps, and wherever production would have an educational or cultural value.

It turned over to Mrs. Flanagan a marvelous organization administered for and by professionals. Its efficiency and economy were generally and highly commended.

Under point II Equity again urges the adoption of plans formulated and wholly or partially carried out under its administration. Sufficient it is to say that its educational work in New York City secured the unanimous approval of the supervisors and teachers in history and English courses. When put into operation the outdoor theaters, the traveling platform theaters, were patronized by audiences reaching twelve to fifteen thousand, all of whom, through the use of sound amplification devices, were able to see and hear. The

group of dramatists which were gathered together did some outstandingly successful work and were on their way to doing more.

Every one of the projects now being recommended were carefully considered by the best technicians in the business and were all considered to have merit.

CONCLUSION

The theater should play a definite role in the life of the Nation. Assuredly the theater should not be signaled out for proscription. Differences arose last year concerning conduct of the Federal Theater Project. It is hoped that such differences can be cleared up and removed to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The way is now clear for projects with local sponsorship and local contributions to start with a clean slate and do work that in true worth will stand on a par with the other splendid efforts of Equity in matters of charitable and public concern.

Equity, therefore, asks that the subcommittee recommend that the prohibition in the law against the theater be removed, and that the Administration, headed by Colonel Harrington, be permitted to make allotments under proper conditions with responsible sponsors who desire to be helpful to the theater.

Y. W. C. A. Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. ELEANOR C. ANDERSON, INDUSTRIAL SECRETARY

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the demand for the removal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is spreading all over the country. This tax remains in but 8 States of the Union. The States are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The reason for the increase in interest is no doubt because the citizens of the Nation are beginning to realize that the votes of Representatives from States where the low-income groups cannot pay the tax as a prerequisite to voting count just as much as those from the States where democracy exists. The eyes of the Nation, the next few weeks, will be watching the votes of us all on the amendments designed to weaken the wage-hour and the Wagner labor laws, but there will be especial attention given to the 78 districts in the 8 poll-tax States, to determine the contribution from each toward bringing a greater measure of justice to our low-income groups. This contribution will help to determine whether or not the poll-tax issue is strictly local or of Nation-wide consequence. If representative government really functions we would not expect much support from these 78 districts. However, all know that in spite of the few voters to benefit by these laws there will be support from those sections.

The letter showing the new recruits to the cause of democracy is printed below.

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE
YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1940.

Representative LEE E. GEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the National Industrial Assembly of the Y. W. C. A., representing 35,000 industrial workers, held in Atlantic City last week, the following action was taken: "Since the poll tax denies the right of citizenship to individuals in many States, be it resolved that the National Industrial Assembly urge the passage of the Geyer bill and that local clubs be urged to take action in support of this bill."

We shall be glad to have you use this resolution in any way you see fit.

We have been working in our southern groups on this matter for over a year. We will now urge our local units over the country to become active. We would appreciate suggestions from you as to the status of your bill. If there are additional hearings, perhaps we can get people there. I wrote to a good many people in the South, but fear the hearings conflicted with our convention.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR C. ANDERSON,
Industrial Secretary, Leadership Division.

Registration of Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 26, 1940

RESOLUTION BY HAROLD JOYCE POST, NO. 1116, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the United States of America has suffered greatly in times both of peace and of war from pernicious activities of insidious groups working under the dictation of foreign interests; and

Whereas it is vital to the protection of this country that such activities be curbed, without, however, infringing on the individual liberties guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the United States of America, nor on the rights of foreign citizens to protect and advance their interests in this country; and

Whereas protection against anti-American activities requires a knowledge of the groups which may be engaged in such activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Harold Joyce Post, No. 1116, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That it endorses the action of the congressional committee investigating un-American activities (commonly known as the Dies committee) and urges the adoption of its recommendation for the enactment of legislation to require the registration of all groups having foreign connections and the filing with proper authorities of lists of the names of all persons affiliated in any way with such organizations, together with adequate penalties for failure to comply with said law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared by the adjutant of this post and be forwarded to Chairman DIES and also to Senators B. K. WHEELER and W. R. MURRAY, and to Representatives J. THORKELSON and J. R. O'CONNOR.

James Willis Taylor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES WILLIS TAYLOR, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the Honorable J. WILL TAYLOR, the Congress sustained a grievous loss. Through his many years of service here Mr. TAYLOR had become one of the most valuable Members of the House, regardless of party. Mr. TAYLOR for years had been one of the colorful figures in Tennessee politics and was unquestionably the most dominant figure in the activities of his party not only in Tennessee but in the entire South. He was essentially a partisan and fought hard but he never struck below the belt, and his regard for personal friendship transcended party politics.

When I first came to the House I took the immediate opportunity of renewing and extending a friendship which had existed between us for nearly 20 years. Prior to the time I came to Congress I never visited Washington without calling to see Mr. TAYLOR and on many occasions he gave me, with the most complete unselfishness, valuable advice and friendly counsel. He was one of the senior statesmen of Tennessee

and I mourn his going. I was very happy that his family requested that I be named on the official committee to attend his funeral and at those exercises I saw men of every political creed and religious faith and there was universal sorrow at the untimely passing of this beloved figure.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in these remarks a prayer for those who have been promoted to a higher life, recently made over the radio by the brilliant and eloquent Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld of the Washington Hebrew Congregation:

God giveth, God taketh away, blessed be the Name of God, blessed be the righteous judge. As we recall the beloved ones who have passed away, these words come to heal the hurt that death has wrought. Our loved ones have answered the summons that sounds for all mankind, for we are all sojourners upon the earth and our times are in His hands. We loose our hold upon the tree of life when our time is come, as the leaf falls from the bough when its hour is done. The deeds of the righteous enrich the lives of men as the fallen leaf enriches the soil beneath. The dust returns to the earth, the spirit lives on with God's eternal years. Like the stars by day, our beloved dead are not seen with mortal eyes, but they shine on in the untroubled firmament of time. Let us be thankful for the companionship that continues in the love that is stronger than death and spans the gulf of the grave. Treasuring their memory let us, in the presence of God, sanctify His name.

Extolled and hallowed be Thy name throughout the world which Thou has created according to Thy will. And mayest Thou speedily establish Thy kingdom of righteousness on earth.

Praised be Thy glorious name unto all eternity.

May the Father of peace send peace to all who mourn, and comfort all the bereaved among us. Amen.

WILL TAYLOR is gone but a Nation which produced him and men like him has nothing to fear from the future.

Samuel Davis McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MARVIN JONES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about SAM MCREYNOLDS, of Tennessee.

I shall not undertake to discuss his record of service in the House of Representatives, outstanding though it was. That will be done by others. I simply want to pay personal tribute to a man whom I knew and admired as an official and loved as a friend.

In all my years of service in the House of Representatives I have never known a man of finer pattern, nor have I known anyone whose character and ability I respected more. Then, too, I knew him as a friend, for whom I had a great personal affection. It seemed that almost everyone in the House felt the same way. Somehow it was always a joy to meet him and to receive his cordial greeting. His very character inspired confidence in everyone. I like to remember him for the bright, worth-while, sterling character that he was.

SAM MCREYNOLDS possessed a rare personal charm that is seldom found in one of his rugged strength of character. That combination would make him a noteworthy man in any company.

No one that I knew was more skilled in the art of legislative service. Artistry in the legislative branch is not built on ability alone. Integrity, loyalty, patriotism, love of country, tolerance, understanding, information, and many other qualities are a part of the make-up of a successful legislator.

A worth-while record is not built just on mechanical things. Behind the mechanical is the spiritual make-up that gives life to the worth-while things and gives understanding to the character and motives of men.

SAM MCREYNOLDS possessed these various qualities to a degree that few men possess them.

I should like to see him again.

Emmett Marshall Owen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MARVIN JONES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EMMETT MARSHALL OWEN, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during a period of 20 years' service in the House of Representatives one has the privilege of associating with many Members. Some of them remain but a short time, while others serve for a period of years. As the nature of the work brings us together in a common purpose, the House soon gets the measure of the men who have been selected to serve in that body.

There is an especially close relationship between the Members who serve on the same committee. They not only have their work together in the House but they also meet face to face day after day in the formulating of the terms and purposes of legislation. There both the weak and the strong points of men are frequently brought to light.

It was my privilege to serve a number of years on the same committee with EMMETT OWEN, of Georgia. I learned to know and appreciate the fine qualities of mind and heart which he possessed. Modest, affable, able EMMETT OWEN was a man of deep convictions. At the same time he had the ripe judgment and good sense that made it possible for him to cooperate in a reasonable way in working out the practical phases of legislation.

The men who knew him best were the ones who appreciated him most. He believed in the American philosophy of government, and he had a sense of loyalty that kept him always close to the principles for which he stood. His kindly, generous nature endeared him to everyone whose privilege it was to serve with him on the committee or in the House.

Often in the busy realm of life we neglect to express to people the appreciation and affection we have for them. We grow used to precious things and they seem commonplace to us. Only when we are deprived of them do we have a full appreciation of what they mean to us.

The association with EMMETT OWEN is one of the bright memories of my service in the House of Representatives.

Emmett Marshall Owen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EMMETT MARSHALL OWEN, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have met in this body to pay our respects to the memory of a distinguished Member of the House, Hon. EMMETT MARSHALL OWEN, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, and who passed away June 21, 1939.

It was not my pleasure to have known Congressman OWEN but a few years, as he had not been a Member of this body but for a few sessions. He rendered to the people of his district and to his country honest, faithful, and distinguished service. Before coming to Congress he had been honored by the people in his State and had served them efficiently and well and with distinction.

He was quiet in demeanor, but loyal and thoroughly dependable to his constituents and his friends.

It is one of the greatest honors that can be conferred upon an American citizen to be elected to a membership in this body. It is the greatest legislative body in the world, inasmuch as it is the greatest law-making body of the greatest government on this earth. It is indeed not only a great honor, but a great privilege. Friendships and associations are formed here which bind us close together and remain with us as long as we live.

EMMETT M. OWEN was a man of right and sound judgment. He thought far more deeply on public questions than that which casual acquaintance might cause to be suspected. He was one of the most considerate and courteous men among our membership, always ready to be helpful when opportunity arose when he conscientiously felt that he could properly do so. He numbered among his acquaintances many warm, loyal, and personal friends, and no one was more loyal to those whom he trusted and could call his friends than was he. He had a distinguished political career and gave good account of his stewardship. He was of that type of man that preferred to help others rather than to have them help him. It can be truly said of him that he was faithful and loyal to his friends and to the official duties assigned to him by his constituents. He was honest, capable, and efficient. He is greatly missed as a Member of this House, as well as by his Georgia constituents. He was not one who desired to seek notoriety or applause, but he was a brilliant advocate, a wise legislator, an able counselor, and a gentleman of high order. He put more into the world of value than he took away, and a man of that type may be said to have been a success. Few men, taking into consideration the time in which he served in this body, have more warm, personal friends who could be depended upon and trusted than did he. He preferred to grant a favor than ask one, and as I think of him as he was these lines come to me:

The best will come in the great "To be,"
It is ours to serve and wait;
And the wonderful future we soon shall see,
For death is but the gate.

Sam D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute by Senator MCKELLAR on the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAM D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Memorials, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR and a letter in memory of the late Honorable SAM D. MCREYNOLDS, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives:

I first knew the Honorable SAM D. MCREYNOLDS when he was a circuit judge in Chattanooga, more than a quarter of a century ago. He was handsome, courtly, affable, genial, and delightful then and remained all that and more until his death. He was always gracious and friendly to me. I did not serve in the House with him, as he came to that body after I was elected to the Senate, but from the beginning of his career in the House, in 1923, I knew him and his lovely wife very well. Immediately upon his becoming a Member of the United States House of Representatives he took a fine place in that body and became one of the outstanding Members.

Congressman MCREYNOLDS' service on the House Foreign Relations Committee gave him great prominence, and he made a number of trips to foreign lands, all of which broadened his experience and observation and gave him greater opportunity for serving his country.

During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations the Congressman did not have opportunity to show the real stuff of which he was made, but when President Roosevelt took office in 1933 he became one of the President's warmest supporters and was made chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. As such he enjoyed the esteem and confidence of our great President, who repeatedly honored him.

In addition to the performance of his duties on the floor, Congressman MCREYNOLDS was ever ready to help his constituents, secured positions for many of them, and aided them in all their affairs in which the Federal Government was concerned. He was most attentive to the affairs of his district. He was unrelenting in his labor for the people of his district and enjoyed their fullest confidence and esteem, as his long career indicated.

Congressman MCREYNOLDS' name was frequently mentioned for the position of United States Senator and at one time I am quite sure he could have become the nominee of his party, but he had become very much interested in foreign relations and did not wish to give up his chairmanship of that committee.

The home life of the Congressman was very beautiful. He and Mrs. McReynolds had but one daughter, whom he idolized, and she was lovely. I think I never knew a more charming family relationship than was his.

Personally, SAM MCREYNOLDS was one of the most genial of men and was good company in the cloak room, in conference, at his home, and anywhere else. He loved people and rarely, if ever, spoke unkindly of anyone. His fine disposition made him a favorite with everyone who knew him. Congressman MCREYNOLDS died full of honors, with his loved ones around him, and after a successful and splendid life.

J. Will Taylor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

Tribute by Senator MCKELLAR on the life, character, and public service of Hon. J. WILL TAYLOR, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks and letter by the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR in memory of the late Honorable J. WILL TAYLOR, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives:

The late Hon. J. WILL TAYLOR was an unusual man. When I first met him he was the secretary of former Governor Ben W. Hooper. At that time he was a comparatively young man, ambitious to a degree, intelligent, energetic, vigorous, determined, and never afraid to take a position on any matter. He was then living in La Follette, Tenn. He had a lovely wife and two lovely daughters to whom he was very devoted.

Congressman TAYLOR early became tremendously interested in politics and was thus interested all his life. At that time the Honorable Richard W. Austin was Congressman from the Second District. He was commonly known as "Dick" and was exceedingly popular. When Mr. TAYLOR ran against Congressman Austin very few thought he had a chance to win. Congressman Austin had long been Congressman from this overwhelmingly Republican district, and was regarded as unbeatable. J. WILL TAYLOR made a most vigorous campaign, however, and won. He remained in Congress for more than 22 years. After his election he moved to Knoxville and became Tennessee's most popular Republican leader. He soon was selected as the national committeeman of his party, and during the Coolidge and Hoover administrations absolutely controlled every Republican office in Tennessee. No one could be appointed who did not have his support. He ruled with a strong hand. If members of his party differed with him he fought them in the open and, as a rule, they were beaten and accepted his suzerainty.

Personally, Congressman TAYLOR was a delightful, affable, and accomplished gentleman. If beaten at any time he took his defeat with a smile. If he won he took it as a matter of course. And he usually won.

While adviser to Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, Congressman TAYLOR brooked no interference with his plans. He was an uncompromising Republican, devoted to his party, ever ready to fight for it, but he bore no grudges. Probably no stronger Republican has arisen in Tennessee during my time.

Congressman TAYLOR was devoted to his district and worked strenuously and vigorously for its every interest. At first, he did not think highly of the work authorized by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, but later on he became one of its vigorous advocates and aided in the advancement of that development.

Although he was an uncompromising Republican and I was and am an uncompromising Democrat, when it came to matters of inter-

est to the whole of Tennessee we frequently joined forces and worked for Tennessee. But there never was an agreement express or implied of any nature or description between us. He was loyal to his party and fought me politically as vigorously as he fought any other Democrat. Personally, we were always friends, even when we differed most widely. He was a natural-born political organizer, and his organization in the State was probably the best his party ever had.

Congressman TAYLOR was very active on the floor whenever his interests were involved. He was a good speaker, a fearless speaker, and a fearless man. I was opposed to him politically but I always honored and respected him personally. I admired his courage and his frankness at all times.

When J. WILL TAYLOR died enormous crowds attended his funeral, and I believe every county in the State was represented.

1940 Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on April 23, 1940, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] delivered a very interesting address to the Carolina Political Union at Chapel Hill, N. C., which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The speech is entitled "1940 Liberalism." I ask that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate your invitation to address the Carolina Political Union. The very existence of such an organization evidences a most commendable interest in national affairs. Your example could well be a guide for American youth—upon whom sooner or later will fall the responsibility for good government.

North Carolina—one of the Original Thirteen Colonies—was one of the last to adopt the Constitution, and then only after inclusion of the Bill of Rights. Having felt the iron heel of the royal governors and executive dictation, you are today the only State to deny your elected Governor the power to veto an act of the Legislature. With cotton fields and textile mills, with acres of tobacco and your cigarette production, you are at once both a leading agricultural and industrial State.

For the farmer you have rich and fertile acres; for labor, the most advanced legislation in the South; for the youth, full-term schools and fine universities; and a visitor like myself is enthralled with the grandeur and beauty of the Great Smoky Mountain Park. North Carolina is truly a most American State. It is the natural cradle for a political union whose prestige and whose liberalism is hailed the width and breadth of our land.

But during these critical times, when the world-wide drift in government is toward a totalitarian state, when a Browder, a Taft, a Dewey, a Willkie, each calls himself a liberal, when ancient and reactionary ideologies are clothed in streamlined robes, all studded with palatable catch phrases and proclaimed as modern liberal principles, then the time has come to ask ourselves, What is true liberalism? In 1923 I was in Europe. At that time you were a liberal if you stood for democracy. Today if you go to Germany, Italy, or Russia and are for democracy you are a reactionary, a Tory, and are living in the "horse and buggy" days.

You and I are Americans. For your ancestors, and for mine, liberalism had only one meaning—democracy. They spilled their blood and sacrificed their all in 1776 that you and I might live in a Republic. To them liberalism meant democracy; and to my mind, in 1940, the very term still irrevocably connotes democracy, political and economic.

The real liberal of today is governed by the same fundamental principles that governed Thomas Jefferson, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Henry Clay, and Andrew Jackson. Today as then a liberal would preserve civil rights, democracy, and parliamentary government at all costs. Today as then a liberal would resist and oppose concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.

A liberal believes in a limitation of the power vested in any individual. Any deviation from this basic concept is destructive of democracy and the American way. The trend toward a greater and greater concentration of wealth necessitates greater and greater centralization of government—a departure from democracy and liberalism. Power, political or economic, begets power. A liberal believes in competition and would regulate or control business only to prevent injustice and to protect the weak from strangulation by the strong. He believes there must be equality in economic opportunity.

A liberal loves and reveres each liberty expressed and guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. And with equal force he hates any infringement of civil rights. He believes in freedom of expression. He would maintain a free press, free in the sense that it dares to speak the truth unhampered by Government or economic pressure. A liberal is tolerant. Above all else a true liberal detests intolerance. He knows it is prima facie evidence of ignorance. A liberal welcomes opposing views. He recognizes the democratic worth of disagreement, the right of every person to differ, and a liberal extends and applies this philosophy to the workaday world. Political, economic, religious, racial, or any other form of intolerance is abhorred by those who would bow at the shrine of liberalism.

A genuine liberal did not see German airplanes flying over the Rocky Mountains or U-boats lurking in the waters of Lake Michigan during the last war. He is not swayed by every wave of hysteria that sweeps the Nation. Today he does not believe that Hitler or his ideology will come over here if we have sufficient sense not to go over there—and to devote our energies to domestic problems. In this country a liberal is not pro-French, pro-English, or pro-German; he is pro-American and pro-democratic.

Not by definition but by achievement the United States is the greatest nation in all the world. We are the greatest, not because of any single asset; other nations are possessed of a greater area, a larger population, and even more natural resources; but no other nation has the same combination of assets.

Democratic government, an ambitious and progressive population of diverse origin and talents with an inventive genius unequalled in the history of the world, fertile and productive acres, great forests, rich deposits of gold, silver, and other minerals—all are the factors that have made ours the richest and freest country in the world. These assets permitted us to solve by mass production the problem of food, clothing, and shelter; and with them at our command we can, by the exercise of unselfish intelligence, solve the problems of agriculture and unemployment that today blight our national existence and even threaten our democracy.

Unemployment, anti-social and uneconomic, continues today as it has for a decade. It is a national problem of the first magnitude, and like the farm problem must be solved before this Nation will enjoy a balanced economy or any real prosperity. As a nation we have said that those in need are entitled to adequate relief, but the unemployed who are willing to work are entitled to far more than mere relief; they have a more basic and fundamental right—the right to a job.

There is no single panacea for the unsolved and comparatively untouched problem of unemployment. But this does not mean that its solution is impossible. The leaders of industry, labor, agriculture, government, and, yes, of the church, forsaking their individual or selfish interests for the national welfare, could meet, confer, and hammer out the answer.

The inability of the low-income groups, underprivileged farmers, the jobless workers to consume the products of factory and farm increase the present economic turmoil. Although production is approaching 1929 peaks, fewer workers are required, but the labor supply is increased each year by nearly 600,000 young men and women. The increased productivity of labor has not always brought shorter hours and better wages, the dividends of progress for the worker. Continued and inevitable technological improvements seem to mean less and less opportunity for employment. Labor ever seeks a more equitable division of the wealth it creates, higher wages, and improved working conditions. But these alone are not enough; the national good demands that workers be assured of something more basic, something that transcends good wages and decent conditions—jobs.

Work for the unemployed—the Government must furnish it until private industry does.

Jobs for the jobless and parity for agriculture with industry is the bilateral goal toward which labor, business, agriculture, and government must strive. The welfare of agriculture with its 30,000,000 people directly concerns each of us—worker, doctor, lawyer, manufacturer, educator, and politician alike. This is no theory. Facts speak for themselves. Statistics indicate that our national income over a period of years has increased at the ratio of seven billion to each billion increase in agricultural income. Twenty-five percent of our population is engaged in agriculture, and they receive only 11 percent of our national income, and so long as this is true a balanced economy is impossible. Labor, through organization, has obtained higher wages. Industry has been afforded the protection of tariff walls. In some instances industry has been able to maintain artificially fixed prices, but the farmer, while selling on a world competitive market, buys on this protected and too often noncompetitive market.

There must be either a substantial rise in farm prices or a substantial reduction in industrial prices.

Fair prices for the farmer are essential, but there is something more basic for agriculture, even as an opportunity to work is more basis than relief for labor—and that prerogative for the farmer is the right to have, to hold, and to own his farm.

Ours is a democracy which has its roots in the individual ownership of land by millions of independent farmers. Two rights a liberal holds to be self-evident—the right of every man to own a plot of ground, there to earn his living and rear his family, and the right of every man to a job at decent wages. These two rights are in reality but twin aspects of those sacred, inalienable human rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The right to own a farm and the right to a job are closely linked one with the other. We cannot drive thousands of farmers from the land and onto the open road without at the same time forcing countless thousands out of work and into the streets of the cities.

Are we today preserving these rights in this land of ours—the hope of all the earth? Have we, the inheritors of this vast land with its untold riches and of the principles to which the pioneers of democracy consecrated it, have we maintained and reaffirmed these rights, as each succeeding generation must? The liberal answers we are failing. We must have the strength and the will to deserve and to maintain democracy. Free institutions and ideals are being stricken from the map of Europe by militaristic gangsterism. They may be stricken here, unless each of our citizens is assured those economic rights which are the promise of American life.

Let us look for a moment at what has been happening on the land, the land from whence comes our strength as a nation. Until recently throughout most of the history of the United States the vast majority of our farmers have owned the land they worked. That is no longer the case. In 1880 about three-fourths of our farmers owned the land they farmed. Today only a little more than half of the Nation's 7,000,000 farmers own their farms. The number of farm tenants increased from about a million in 1880 to over 2,800,000 in 1935. Farm tenancy is not growing in North Carolina. You have checked it, and as a nation we must check and reverse this trend toward a modern agricultural feudalism.

Not only is farm tenancy on the increase, but farmers are being driven from farms. This is dangerous and un-American; it is perilous economically and socially. Foreclosure, drought, and mechanization since 1930 have pushed hundreds of thousands of farm families from the land. These uprooted families have few alternatives. They have taken to the road in a hopeless nomadic search for work; they have swelled the relief rolls. They have added new recruits to the army of unemployed.

Congress would not retard progress, and there is no complete human solution for drought, but there is something that can be done to prevent cruel anti-social and uneconomic foreclosures. Dispossession has been one of the great factors in the creation of a migrant problem that has reared its ugly and monstrous head in California. Farmers dispossessed in Oklahoma or Arkansas or elsewhere, moving from county to county and State to State in a desperate search for economic opportunity, have converged on our Pacific coast.

What is taking shape in our Nation faster than perhaps any of us realize is the creation of a large landless class, mobile and migratory, totally lacking economic security or the equality of economic opportunity that should be theirs.

A farm-credit policy that creates new tenants through foreclosure faster than any Government agency can rehabilitate them must be altered.

A new philosophy of agricultural credit must be adopted—a philosophy whose application will keep the farmer on the farm and afford to him a measure of security hitherto denied him.

Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and I have introduced legislation which would establish lower interest rates on Federal loans to the farmer. Congressman JONES has introduced a companion bill in the House. This legislation would do more than reduce interest rates, it provides a formula for the adjustment of farm debts. It would take the whole problem to the farm, there to attain its solution by giving a farmer the opportunity to remain on the farm and to meet debt obligations adjusted to the productivity and economy of his farm.

This legislation is liberal, it is far reaching, but it attacks a tremendous and shocking evil, one that is dangerous to the American way of life. If agriculture as we know it is to continue, definite and corrective steps must be swiftly taken. Opponents have denounced the legislation as radical, as socialized credit, and as a confusion of money lending and charity. But let me remind those who make such charges that great banks, railroads, insurance companies, corporations, and even cities have enjoyed and utilized the same type of credit. The so-called Wheeler-Jones bill extends the principles of R. F. C. credit for industry to the farmer. We seek to save agriculture, to save homes, lives, and souls, not just giant corporate enterprises.

Failure to take liberal action on the farm-debt problem today will mean drastic action, fascist or communistic, tomorrow.

Liberals who see the Nation's economic and political ills, who have diagnosed the malady, and who can offer sound remedies, are the real conservatives and the real patriots. And those who would do nothing, those who would let the patient limp along, they are the dangerous radicals, for sooner or later the system would crumble and in its stead would come the extreme as it came in Germany and in Russia.

Economic injustice to the underpriviliged in every walk of life has led farsighted people to devote themselves to its correction. During the last few years we have made great progress. We have extended the borders of economic justice. Liberals must continue to devote themselves toward the objective of more and more economic democracy, but in so doing the overwhelming and fundamental importance of political democracy cannot be overlooked. Economic democracy and justice can be attained only through democratic processes.

The youth of today are thinking—thinking in terms of economics and politics—in an effort to determine what fate holds for them. Today you are at military age. To the east and to the west there is war. Today you are about to leave the academic world for the practical and real one. Here depressed economic conditions limit your opportunities. But your fate in a democracy—in the United States—depends greatly upon yourselves. Be realistic, be progressive, be guided by the fundamental concepts of liberalism. Maintain your sanity and thus aid the Nation to keep its sense of balance. Have courage and keep your faith in democracy. We can and we will remain at peace. We can and we will restore economic opportunity.

Problems Affecting the Motorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is now recognized that vacation travel is a great factor in economic conditions. On April 22 and 23, there was held in Knoxville, Tenn., a regional conference of A. A. A. motor club executives from 11 Southeastern States and southern Ohio. The purpose of this gathering was to appraise travel facilities in the Southeast and to gear travel service machinery to meet present-day demands. It was my pleasure to deliver the banquet address at this conference, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to speak at this conference. When the invitation was extended to me by my long-time friend, Russell Singer, I was informed that your meetings have a twofold purpose: First, to appraise your respective motor clubs in the light of demands in this new era of highway use, and, second, to consider the many problems facing car owners with a view to new and vigorous action.

There are many reasons why your conference is most timely. We are today going through another of those periods of national readjustment. Everyone is thinking in terms of our institutions, our methods of living, and our economic practices in relationship to the future of our democratic system. As never before, our people are seeking to understand the vital forces which affect their welfare, their income, and, in fact, every phase of their day-to-day existence. This new interest may be attributed in part to a better understanding of conditions. The radio and the press are helping our people to become better informed about things which affect them.

Out of it has come a new appreciation for organized effort. Group action is providing leadership in meeting the problems which individuals cannot solve alone. The conference table has become a symbol of American progress. All elements of our economic and social life are becoming well organized. Great benefits are accruing to groups of high purpose and with intelligent leadership. No better evidence of the trend toward organization can be found than the fact that some 20,000 conventions are scheduled for 1940. At these gatherings wil' be discussed problems confronting all our citizens. It goes without saying that public support is readily forthcoming for organizations which are filling an important need and which are rendering real service to the people they represent. Thus it is reasonable to believe that motorists will respond quickly to more aggressive action in their behalf.

The automobile is now an integral part of American life and a vital necessity. Highway use is the very lifeblood of our economic and social fabric. Yet attempts are being made to confuse public thinking on transportation issues. Thus the problems of highway transportation loom large on our "must list" for National, State, and local action. There are, of course, two phases of highway problems—the problems in connection with commercial highway use and the problems which affect private motorists. Involved in the latter is the daily movement of 26,000,000 passenger cars, in the hands of more than 30,000,000 owners and drivers, and over 3,000,000 miles of roads and streets.

Sometimes I fear that too many of us never view our highway transport as a great national industry but rather in terms of the individual automobile. The great mass of our citizens have never appreciated the tremendous advances in the progress of our Nation that are directly attributable to the cheap and flexible transportation offered by the motorcar.

To say that it is the very basis of our national well-being is not putting it too strongly. One has only to consider that the annual retail turn-over in our highway transport system is in the vicinity of $9,000,000,000 a year, or roughly one-fourth of all consumer expenditures, to realize the deep-rooted effect highway transport has on our country. To think of the motor vehicle merely as a speedier substitute for the horse is to underestimate its range.

The invention of the automobile and its wide diffusion has influenced the shift of our population, aided the growth of suburbs, and affected the size of villages; marketing areas have completely changed; the isolation of the farmer has been lessened; our educational system has been revolutionized, with the rural consolidated school replacing the one-room schoolhouse and its limited facilities; highway transportation, along with electricity, has dispersed our factories, with the result that manufacturing is no longer limited to certain regional areas, and, equally as important, the American people have learned to play and now enjoy a new-type vacation.

Travel is today an objective of every man, woman, and child. It is evidence of national restlessness—the urge to go places and see things. We have literally come to the point where "hop in" is more than an expression; it reflects a state of mind.

This new desire for travel is, of course, an outgrowth of individual transportation. Its effect upon attitudes and ideas cannot be accurately summarized. But there is clearly an entrancement of geographic consciousness. The farmer departs from the Kansas wheat field to see the cities, the mountains, and the ocean; the resident of the seaboard leaves home to see the wheat fields and the plains. The New Yorker comes South to see the Great Smokies and the Tennessee Valley. Our residents go northward to see the World's Fair. Except in very isolated sections of our country, it would be difficult to find those persons, quite common a century ago, who had never left the counties of their birth. Today our people from every section are constantly meeting. They are the motorists.

It is of the problems of the motorist about which I wish to speak. He is the one car owner who uses his automobile to go to work, to send his children to school, to ride to church on Sunday, and to take the family on vacation. He was here first. He is the one who looks to the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs to assure him maximum efficiency, convenience, and economy in the use of his car. In other words, I want to speak briefly for the motorist.

First, however, let me position myself as regards my right to speak on this subject. Travel has been one of my lifetime hobbies. I was one of the pioneer car owners in this mountain country in which we are now meeting. I enjoyed the thrills and adventures of driving in the roadless era. About 16 years ago I made a trip around the world, visiting many places where the people had never before seen an automobile. I had ample opportunity to gain first-hand information on the vital force of motor clubs in many lands.

As a vice president of our national association for the last 9 years, I have had a chance to see at close range what our organization and its 725 affiliated clubs and branches are doing in behalf of car owners. Since I entered the United States Senate in 1932 I have observed the prestige and influence of our association in official circles in Washington and elsewhere. Five years ago I made a tour covering the broad face of the United States and witnessed conditions affecting motorists in virtually every State. So whatever you may think of senatorial speeches in general, I believe that I can, with pardonable pride, say that I can speak on my subject with a degree of authority.

For the sake of the record, suppose we also position our organization with regard to its qualifications to represent the motorist. It was organized in 1902. There were less than 23,000 automobiles in use at that time. Cranks on cars and "cranks" were yelling "get a horse." It was the A. A. A. which conducted reliability runs to prove the automobile was feasible. These encouraged public acceptance. It was our association which led the movement for good roads, resulting in our progressive plan for Federal aid for highways. It was the A. A. A. which made automobile racing a laboratory for testing machines and materials. It is the A. A. A. which has been in the vanguard of forces seeking constructive motor-vehicle laws and regulations. It has stood as the rallying group for all things designed to improve motoring conditions. In legislative circles it has never been looked upon as a lobbying group, even an aboveboard and constructive association acting for the motorists. All this has been for the common good of the steadily increasing millions of private-car owners. It is in addition to the direct services and protection given to individual members.

Thus our association has over a period of nearly four decades had a constructive part in the development of highway transportation. It has justly earned a place in the hall of fame of organizations rendering a valuable service to the American people. Now what about the future? To my way of thinking the opportunities for the motor club have just begun. There is a new appreciation for the institutions which merit the right to have a part in planning for the future. Merited the right because of distinguished service rendered in the past—because of experience which can be translated into beneficial action.

There are some who contend that the motor club is not as essential as it once was. These people belong in the class with these who believed the automobile would never replace the horse, that planes would be used only by dare-devils, and that radio would never be more than a toy. I am convinced that the motor club is today on the threshold of its greatest opportunity. Its field of service is virtually unlimited. Its experience is needed in attaining the things necessary to assure the full advantages of highway transportation. It is the only organization well equipped to enlist national support essential to advancing the cause of the car owners.

Fortunately, our people seem to be getting a better appreciation of the basic importance of highway transportation. They are more and more visualizing the automotive industry as a user of raw materials and employer of labor. They are getting a new conception of the truck and bus as a necessary utility of service. As individuals travel more, they see the tremendous progress being made in building roads and handling traffic in some sections. It makes them more elert to the advantage of these things in their home section.

What are the contentions of those who think the motor club has outlived its usefulness? They say that we have reached the saturation point in car ownership and use. This is error number one.

Foresighted authorities are already predicting 40,000,000 cars on the roads by 1960. As better cars are built at lower prices, one-car families are becoming two- and three-car families. People are using their cars more and travel horizons are being broadened. Transcontinental journeys and trips to Canada and Mexico are the rule rather than the exception. Thus demands for motoring services are becoming greater. While the luxury and economy of the modern car has made travel easier, it has also made motorists more intelligent and demanding travelers. A map is not enough for the car owner of today. He wants full and complete travel service.

It is contended that with a million miles of paved roads our highway system has been built. This is error No. 2. The job of rebuilding roads for current and future traffic needs is perhaps greater than was the original job of providing roads. Virtually our whole highway system needs to be modernized. Express highways in areas of heavy traffic, divided-lane highways, better sight distances on many existing roads, and many other improvements are needed. Motorists are now realizing that 30-miles-an-hour highways are not sufficient for 60-miles-an-hour vehicles.

Fortunately, highway-planning surveys now under way in 47 States are providing a factual basis for road building. Political expediency and guesswork have no place in modern highway construction. They must go. Having come through the whole motors era as the public defender of the motorists' rights, the American Automobile Association is well qualified to continue leadership in the highway movement.

It is claimed that such things as signposting of highways has been done. This is error No. 3.

Some sections of the country are over-signposted and others are under-signposted. In many areas signs are not properly placed from the standpoint of either facilitating travel or assuring safety of travel. It is often difficult for motorists to know which road leads to where. Federal markers are often left on little-used roads when better and heavier-traveled roads are built. Here community pride must give way to the general good. The motor club has and is doing much to clarify this difficult and confusing situation.

It is said that every State and city now has traffic laws and regulations. This is error No. 4.

Every State and city does have rules governing the movement of vehicles and requirements for operators. But they are as varied as the theories for national recovery. I dare say that a Tennessee motorist driving to New York and following Tennessee traffic rules would violate many hundreds of traffic laws. Full convenience from the use of the automobile demands that States and municipalities standardize basic traffic regulations. It is essential to eliminate confusion and thereby add to traffic safety.

But time does not permit listing all the errors in the viewpoints of those who are blind to motoring needs. I could go on from errors 4 to 400. The simplification of our motor-tax structure, with some degree of equity, is long overdue. The motorist is the special target for tax grabbers who bow to expediency. That goes for the Congress, which has pyramided Federal gasoline taxes on the already topheavy State gasoline taxes. We now have the highly questionable practice of using license-plate issuance as a blackjack to collect other taxes having no relationship to car use. Tremendous sums of motor taxes levied for highways are diverted to other than road purposes.

The motor-tax situation has been well described as follows:

The motorist arises in the morning. He goes to the garage to get his Federal-taxed car. He inspects his Federal-taxed tires. Driving out, he stops to buy some Federal- and State-taxed gasoline. He glances at his mail while waiting and is reminded that he must buy his license plates and renew his driver's license. Two more taxes. Near the office he steers into a parking-meter zone and pays another tax. Then he reads in the paper that a nearby road cannot be improved because the road funds—his taxes—have been diverted. But he gets really mad when his secretary mentions the joys of owning a car as a prelude to asking for a raise.

I could go on indefinitely as regards motoring problems. However, I believe that I have touched upon enough to indicate that stringent and organized action is necessary to safeguard the benefits we

have obtained from the automobile. I have also tried to indicate my confidence in the motor club as an agency of service in this respect.

While I recognize the fact that broadly speaking, highway transportation knows no State lines, I am particularly concerned with the problems of the motorists in the South. They have an important bearing on travel development, a subject in which I am vitally interested.

The South has always been an objective for vacation-bound tourists. As the number of automobiles in the country has increased and as roads have been built, there has followed a steady increase in the tide of southern travel. However, it is only within recent years that our section has become truly alert to the opportunities of travel development. Many States are spending large sums for advertising. New vacation objectives are being created. New emphasis is being placed on the historic areas which have survived from the Old South.

It is now the opportune time for the New South to reap full advantages from promotion of our recreational advantages. This conference, with travel and travel services looming large on the program, has been well timed. It is you men and women here tonight who will meet and serve our visitors. You will be our ambassadors in the travel movement.

There are many reasons why the southern travel outlook is encouraging. President Roosevelt has proclaimed 1940 as Travel America Year. World conditions permitting, the President will shortly dedicate the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. It will focus national attention on this matchless area. Here in the Tennessee Valley has been developed another great playground. It offers recreational facilities and natural and man-made wonders sufficient to challenge the imagination. Closing of the travel gates of Europe has awakened more interest in seeing America. The South has done an extremely fine job of bringing its vacation resources to the attention of the country. All these things mean that the travel urge is running strong and the movement of adventure-bound travelers during 1940 is expected to exceed all previous records.

In appraising travel opportunities and at the same time considering the conditions necessary for full benefits, this conference is on a constructive basis. Travel development places a great responsibility on sections which are catering to vacationists. These sections must keep abreast with the times if they are to maintain a steady and continuing tide of travel.

Over a period of years, I have been intensely interested in every activity having to do with bringing the South's attractions to the attention of travel-minded millions. I have made many travel speeches. While I must confess that on most occasions I have urged people to come to North Carolina, I have not overlooked entirely the great attractions of Tennessee and our sister States. After all, Tennessee was carved from North Carolina and we "tar heels" still feel an obligation for the welfare of our neighboring State.

In concluding my remarks tonight, I want to touch on a phase of travel development which we in the South have partly overlooked. It has to do with the responsibility we owe our visitors. I shall speak frankly because I feel the subject is of vital importance to our section.

At times I have been somewhat embarrassed by some of the questions asked me by people in other States. Such questions as these: Senator, why do some of the Southern States permit cattle to roam the highways and endanger motorists? Bob, why do you southerners permit vehicles with one light to be on the roads at night? Senator, I enjoy going to the South, but why are some of your roads so narrow. I said these questions were embarrassing. They are, because they indicate that we are not as progressive as we should be in tackling some really acute problems affecting both our own people and visitors.

Here is a typical case in point. As many of you know, I am a lawyer. I do not want to appear critical of our system of law enforcement. On the whole, the Southern States have done a fine job of creating and operating highway patrols. They are composed of trained men, alert to the safety of motorists and appreciative of their responsibility. Thus, from this standpoint, enforcement methods have improved. But the situation as regards the motorist who runs afoul of the law is not so good. He can either plead guilty and pay a fine, or not guilty, and is bound over for later trial. A delay of a week or two is necessary. The motorist may live a thousand miles away, and the cost of staying over or returning for trial would be too heavy. Some method should be worked out to give both visitors and residents immediate trial, particularly in minor cases. Any other plan borders on denying a nonresident due process of law. Swift, speedy trial before a judge paid on a salary basis is a primary need in order to give fair treatment to the visiting motorist, and to do away with speed traps, exorbitant fines, excessive costs, and other abuses that grow up when justice operates on a fee basis. The motorist has no alternative to pleading guilty. It is a situation which should be corrected.

It has been a pleasure to attend and participate in this conference. I know that your discussions will be productive of much good in the direction of better motoring conditions. There is no greater opportunity for real public service today. I can pledge to you my wholehearted coöperation in any and all movements to advance the interests of highway transportation. Such undertakings further a cause which has a vital bearing on every phase of our whole national economic and social system.

Senator Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM BOSTON SUNDAY POST

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article with reference to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], published in the Boston Sunday Post, of April 14, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of April 14, 1940]

BURTON K. WHEELER—THE YANKEE FROM THE WEST—YOUTHFUL PIONEERING AND POLITICAL BATTLES OF FAMOUS LIBERAL SENATOR FROM MONTANA, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENCY, WHO WAS BORN IN HUDSON, MASS.—HOW HE EXPOSED TEAPOT DOME SCANDAL AND DEFEATED SUPREME COURT PACKING BILL

(By A. Lawrence MacKenzie)

A tall, lean, sandy-haired young man stepped off the train at Butte, Mont. Butte was not his particular destination, but he had only enough money in his pocket for food and a night's lodging, none for further train fare.

The lad was 23 and very far from his Hudson, Mass., home. Butte was a wide-open town in 1905, headquarters for hard-bitten miners and harder-bitten mining companies.

Wandering into an eating joint, the young fellow got invited into a poker game by a slick card sharp named Bill Gadney. He lost what little he had.

That was BURTON K. WHEELER'S introduction to the city that has been his home ever since. It was a good introduction, because it left him entirely on his own, gave him a swift lesson in what was profitless, and left him to use his wits. He did—to the advantage of Montana and BURTON K. WHEELER.

The year before the San Francisco earthquake Marcus Daly had caused another kind of bouleversement in the West. He had sunk a mining shaft only 100 feet and made the name Anaconda magic around the world, started many men on their way to millions by way of gold, silver, and copper, and drew thousands of workers to Montana.

NEEDED 2 DAYS' REST

Young WHEELER'S assets were a law-school diploma from the University of Michigan and plenty of confidence in himself. His spur was a girl he had met in the Middle West, Lulu M. White, of Albany, Ill. The rangy youth had earned that diploma by waiting on tables and selling books; in fact, he had met the girl when trying to sell her mother a cookbook, so he knew from experience that one rarely gets what he wants unless he goes after it.

During his initiation to Butte he had met a lawyer, Billie Meyer. Shrewdly persuasive, he convinced Meyer that it would be good to let him have a table and chair, some space, and the use of law books in Meyer's office until he got a client or so.

With his shingle out, WHEELER waited for a client who could pay. There was plenty of corporation work in Butte in those days, but the young Quaker from Massachusetts had already decided that he was going to be a champion of labor. Not till 6 months had passed did he get his first jury case. He doesn't remember any details of that ordeal.

All he recalls, with a quizzical grin, is that the court officers told him he talked for three-quarters of an hour and that he spent the next 2 days in bed recovering from his nervous excitement.

Democratic candidate for the United States Presidential nomination, Senator from Montana since 1922, BURTON KENDALL WHEELER was born in the typically New England town of Hudson, Mass., on February 27, 1882. His father, Asa L. Wheeler, was not a cobbler, as has been so often reported, but a shoemaker. Both he and his wife, the gentle Mary Elizabeth Tyler Wheeler, came from old Quaker stock that had settled and been persecuted in Massachusetts Bay Colony before the Revolutionary War.

THE WANDERLUST

Young "Burt" led the ordinary life of a country schoolboy. The youngest of 10 children, 8 of whom lived, he wasn't overburdened with home chores, and the family lived in their white-painted farmhouse in quiet comfort.

Not until he had finished high school did he exhibit the wanderlust that was later to send him to the wild and woolly West and to national fame. His first job, after graduating from the Hudson Commercial College, was with a wholesale hardware firm in Boston.

Restless, he shifted twice, first to an optical company, and later to the office of a textile machinery plant. There are shrewd blue eyes behind BURTON K. WHEELER'S rimless glasses. They were shrewd then, and there was ambition in his long, gangly frame.

Two stories account for his going where Horace Greeley advised young men to seek fortune. An apocryphal tale claims that he asked for a $3 raise, was refused, and decided to find more liberal lands far from home. He says that New England climate didn't agree with him, that he was asthmatic, and went to the dry uplands of the West for his health.

In any case, with $750 of savings in his pocket, and the family blessings on his head, he boarded a train for Ann Arbor, Mich., with the intention of entering the law school. Almost immediately he met a discouragement that would have stymied the run-of-the-mine student. He put most of his money in a bank, and the bank promptly folded.

That catastrophe took $500 from his kitty. But WHEELER wanted a law diploma. He got himself a job waiting on table, and while the rest of the undergraduates were out playing ball or having a good time "Burt" juggled a tray from table to table, mumbling to himself the law principles he wanted to memorize.

Summers he combed the rural communities of the Middle West selling cookbooks that would instruct the country marms how to concoct fancy dishes for their hungry men. He had fair success at selling the book but better success at selling himself.

MET "THE GIRL"

Landowner and farmer White of Albany, Ill., had a lovely daughter who was then a student at normal school. Mrs. White, who went to the door to talk to the book agent, was interested but she didn't buy a book. That bothered Salesman WHEELER not in the least. Over her shoulder his eyes met those of her pretty daughter, Lulu, and it was love at first sight.

That was why he particularly wanted to make good when he hung out his shingle in Butte, Mont., a few years later. He won the jury case that had sent him to bed for 2 days and during the following year had sufficient success to make him feel justified in considering marriage.

BURTON WHEELER had a memorable experience when he returned to Albany, Ill. Miss White's father owned quite a territory of land. The homestead lay across the river and could not be reached by train. The expectant bridegroom went down to the ferry and found it crowded with passengers dressed in their best finery.

"Where's everybody going?" he asked a gawky countryman.

"Wall, stranger," the countryman explained, "seems like old man White's daughter is to marry some no account from the West and the old man's right furious. He says the young man don't amount to anything and never will, and we're all getting there to look him over."

WHEELER never has gotten over that.

Ahead of WHEELER lay victories in such battles as the Teapot Dome scandal, the rabid "red" scare of the first World War, and the court-packing bill, battles that were to bring out all the Quaker honesty and all the Yankee fighting power of this adopted son of the West. But how was Papa White to know that?

FOR THE PEOPLE

The young Lochinvar from out both the East and the West took his bride back to Butte with him and settled down to domesticity and hard work. With meager savings they made a down payment on a small frame house and proudly invited friends in to exclaim "how cozy."

WHEELER, with his quick understanding mind, and always an easy man to meet, worked with New England industry and had a fair share of success that first year of married life. Butte was on the boom. Anaconda, producing $1,000,000 a week, shook the State from end to end with mining litigations.

The keen young lawyer threw his lot with the people who worked for the great corporation and also thrust himself into local and State politics, always on the progressive side. Montana was just beginning to appreciate the disadvantages of having powerful corporations control its political affairs, and WHEELER was earning the reputation of being a wild and even radical reformer.

The first shyness at addressing a jury that had sent him to bed with nervous exhaustion had long since worn off. Now a dynamic and persuasive speaker, a champion of the less privileged, the people of Montana sent him to the State legislature in 1911. He took his gloves off there and really fought—for laws to better working conditions in the mines, to compensate victims of mine disasters, for everything he felt would benefit those he defended.

When he was boosted in 1913 to a Federal district attorneyship by President Wilson, mine operators sighed with relief. That promotion came about through his work to elect the redoubtable Thomas J. Walsh to the Senate at Washington. Though many of Walsh's pledged supporters switched at the last minute, WHEELER stuck.

BITTER BATTLE

The sandy haired lawyer-politician, with a growing family and a burning ambition to prove that his father-in-law was as wrong as a man could be, didn't know it but he was to face tremendous trials and tremendous upheavals in his State during the next 7 years.

Shortly after the boots of thousands of German soldiers began raising autumn dust on the roads that lead to Paris, things began booming in the Bonanza State. Orders began pouring in for copper, lead, manganese, and other products from the mines. For the new high explosive shells had to be banded, bullets were needed by the millions and tough steel was more valuable than bread.

Business profits soared, but outside the mining industry the State was not prosperous. A long series of droughts, followed by one of the most severe winters the State experienced in all its history, livestock men had to pay $60 a ton and more for hay. Every day in the courthouses throughout the State sheriffs read long lists of foreclosures while gloomy people stood around and listened.

The people didn't take it lying down. The hard-pressed farmers organized their nonpartisan league and the laborers their unions, and both groups chose as their leader the 39-year-old lawyer, BURTON WHEELER, and nominated him, in the Democratic primaries of 1920, their candidate for Governor.

BURT WHEELER then took on one of the toughest and bitterest battles of his life. The opposition, with oodles of money to spend, an ace organization to carry on its work, took up cudgels against him and throughout the length and breadth of Montana he was denounced as an advocate of free love, a red radical, and a hater of the Government.

Feeling ran so high that at one town he had to be protected by husky guards and hurried out of town in a boxcar. The outraged farmers wanted to tar and feather this man who would ruin their sons and daughters with "pernicious doctrines."

CALLED A "RED"

That fact that he already had a sizable family of his own, was an ideal father, the kind that relaxes with a baseball bat and his own youngsters, a devoted husband, the kind who interests himself in building up a real home about his wife—all this didn't seem to penetrate. All the irate electorate remembered were the propaganda sheets and the evil tales whispered from ear to ear across the State.

He was defeated, badly defeated.

But BURT WHEELER knew how to take it. Several other amazing episodes in his political career showed that the direct-spoken, uncompromising Yankee from the Bay State knew what Henley meant when he wrote Invictus.

Two years previously, as United States district attorney, he had been given the task of finding out the cause of the violent labor conflicts in the mines and why the flow of vital munitions material was being interrupted.

He found out what he thought was the truth but he spoke it too loudly. He reported that the strikes were being provoked by the mine owners as part of a scheme to force the Government to boost the fixed price for copper.

It was the time of the I. W. W. scare and the "red" ogre lurked in every corner of the country. Just as today the epithet "Communist" is irresponsibly flung at many of those who disagree overloudly with existing evils or reactionary political philosophies, the term "red" was one to bait with in 1918.

Voltaire's famous line, "I wholly disapprove of what you say but will defend to the death your right to say it," had fallen into disrepute. Attorney General Palmer, already convinced that the subversive forces were about to take over the Government forced WHEELER to resign.

Few men have survived such political bludgeoning. Out of it came the grim motto that WHEELER coined for himself, "If I don't get them, they'll get me," and a set-jawed determination to battle on.

TEAPOT DOME

For 2 years he relaxed, enjoying home life with his family, indulging one of his favorite hobbies, reading political history and the history of law, fishing in the marvelous trout lakes of his State, and riding horseback through mountain trails.

In 1922 he went to bat again and this time backed by warrior Tom Walsh, knocked a home run. He was elected to the United States Senate and has been there ever since.

Charming, quiet Mrs. Wheeler has been an influential asset in the Senator's Washington career. Remaining in the background of his political life she became from the start one of the Capital City's most popular hostesses. Primarily interested in the problems of bringing up her fine family she has also found time to talk over things with her admiring husband.

Bay State's Senator DAVID I. WALSH, once when discussing WHEELER'S personality, said, "I don't believe I ever talked any matter over with him when he didn't say at least once, 'Now, my wife thinks.'"

Mrs. Wheeler, motherly, sweet-faced, and friendly, is an accomplished musician and many an evening her noted husband for relaxation sits and listens to her play.

Shortly after he took up his duties as Senator, BURTON WHEELER needed that relaxation, all the relaxation he could get. He fired the opening shot in one of the biggest scandals in national history

by presenting a resolution demanding the ousting of Attorney General Daugherty.

Back in his home State the resolution was taken as a joke. Nobody thought there was a chance of Senate approval. But WHEELER is a knock-down, drag-out, two-fisted fighter. His thoughts come with machine-gun rapidity and his invective speech is devastating. Time and again he left the Senate breathless in his Philippics against the most shocking graft and corruption that had been exposed for decades.

THE SAME MAN

The story of how he drove the infamous "Ohio gang" in disgrace from Washington is now fairly well known history. The name of Jess Smith and "the little green house on K Street," and "the little black bag," are all a remembered part of that amazing looting business known as the Teapot Dome scandal.

THE FRAMERS

The gang fought back. WHEELER was charged with failing to report a fabulous fee for his part in a smelly deal, a set-up framed by the "gang." The Senator demanded an immediate trial but the "gang" held it up. WHEELER was nominated for Vice President on the La Follette Progressive ticket, running against Cal Coolidge and "Hell-and-Maria" Dawes. On the day of his first campaign speech the Department of Justice called for his trial.

WHEELER had to ask for a continuance, which was just what the "gang" wanted. Not till the following April was the alleged testimony against the Montana Yankee presented. Ten minutes later the jury brought back a verdict of acquittal.

His next great battle was a cleaner one, one that involved differences in logical ideas rather than moral. That was the fight he led against the so-called Court-packing bill of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

After one of his speeches during that 1937 revolt the wife of one of Montana's very wealthy and very influential citizens elbowed her way to his side.

"Let me congratulate you, Senator, on your fight against that man," she gushed. "Now that you have changed, you are our candidate for President."

Senator WHEELER turned to look at her and his clear, cool voice was incisive.

"I haven't changed, Madame," he said. "You may have changed, the times may have changed, but the WHEELER you now want to put into the White House is the same WHEELER you wanted to put in jail a few years ago."

That is WHEELER, liberal and dynamic. He doesn't change in his essential principles because they are a part of him. They were bred in him by his New England ancestors who first conceived the ideal that Lincoln put into immemorial words when he said "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

NO WAR FOR US

Characterized by all who know him as able, fearless, and a master of congressional procedure, Senator WHEELER has become, during his 17 years of service in the Senate, a widely known national figure.

One of the most pressing problems that faces any legislator or Chief Executive these days is the war in Europe and its effect on us. WHEELER has expressed himself on that issue with all the forthrightness a man could summon.

"If we must hate," he said, "let's not hate each other. If we have to make war, let's not fight each other—let us make war on poverty.

"We must never lose sight of the fact that our entry into war cannot be measured in terms of lives lost and dollars spent. The price would surely be the loss of democracy and Christianity.

"Our problem is to solve our economic difficulties at home and not the politics of Europe. Our problem is to preserve American democracy and not the balance of power or the boundaries in Europe. To my mind, the most heroic qualities, the most noble emotions, the highest glory come not in wars won or lost but from wars prevented.

"I will never vote to send a single American boy across the water to fight on foreign soil. Neither will I approve of a single step that in my judgment may lead this country down the road to war."

Wheeler is well acquainted with the peace and tranquility of American home life. Both he and his wife have always been closely associated with their six children, Marion, the youngest; John, a lawyer in Los Angeles; Edward, in a law firm in Washington, D. C.; Dick, a junior at Dartmouth; Elizabeth (Mrs. Edward Colman) lives in Milwaukee, and Francis, in San Francisco.

MAKES OWN BREAD

Mrs. Wheeler, an excellent cook, still makes her own bread because the family won't eat any other. She is a pretty fair golfer and gets up to play nine holes with the Senator before he goes to the office.

On Sundays they go to the Methodist Church. Mrs. Wheeler is an interested Bible student. The Senator belongs to two men's organizations, the Masons and the Elks.

In Washington they live in a simple white clapboard house and are rated by those on the street as "very good neighbors." In Montana they have a lodge at Glacier National Park and a home in Butte, where guests enjoy the whole family.

Further down the list of presidential possibilities you will find names of other notables whose chances are considered slimmer than those whose stories have been so far told.

Perhaps first on this list is United States Attorney General Robert Houghwout Jackson, often spoken of as President Roosevelt's choice as a Democratic dark horse. Jackson's political career is only 5 years old. Before that he was an executive and counsel for traction, utility, and banking interests in Jamestown, N. Y.

The 48-year-old Attorney-General was born in Spring Creek, Pa. Graduating from the Albany Law School in 1913 he was admitted to the bar and has been practicing ever since. He maintains a large model farm at Jamestown and his hobby is breeding and training horses. He is married and has two children.

Another Democratic possibility, if the convention goes haywire with its welter of candidates, is slim, loose-jointed, 6-foot, 41-year-old William O. Douglas, Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

"Bill" Douglas, who first saw New York with 6 cents in his pocket, became "the Nation's outstanding law professor," after working as a farm hand, newsboy, junk dealer, and janitor to pay his way through school. After establishing a successful practice, he taught at Yale and Columbia Law Schools. He is one of those calm, rapid workers, who never notice the time; often works 16 hours a day. Roosevelt appointed him to the S. E. C. to "boss" Wall Street in 1937 and later to the Supreme Bench.

When he finds time, he enjoys golf, fishing, tramping, bridge, and poker. In 1923 he married his boyhood sweetheart, Mildred M. Riddle, of La Grande, Oreg., and they have two children, Mildred, 10, and William, 8.

OHIO'S OTHER CANDIDATE

Ohio has another candidate besides "BOB" TAFT, if BOB doesn't make the nomination. He is Republican Governor John William Bricker. A big man, in his late forties, Bricker made a name for himself as a lawyer in his native State. He went to the Ohio State University and a year after graduating entered the United States Army for the war as a first lieutenant.

Married, he has one son (John Day Bricker), and the family lives in Columbus.

In New England the candidacy of Senator H. (for HENRY) STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is mentioned. Good-looking Senator BRIDGES, in his middle forties, is a native of Maine. He graduated from the University of Maine in 1917 and began his career as a teacher at Sanderson Academy, Ashfield, Mass.

One of the young Republican liberals, his chief platform is to put recovery ahead of reform and to trim Government expenditures to an equitable limit. He served as Governor for his State, 1935–37 and was elected to the Senate for the term that expires in 1943.

Married to Sally Clement, of Concord, N. H., in 1928, they have three children, all boys.

Supreme Court Justice Owen Josephus Roberts, big, grim-faced, and 65 years old, won his great national fame for prosecuting the wrongdoers in the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil reserve scandals for President Coolidge.

Republican Roberts held his first public office when, in 1901, he was made first assistant district attorney in Philadelphia County. In 1904 he married Elizabeth Caldwell Rogers, of Fairfield, Conn. They had one daughter.

Large boned and muscular, he is one of the most robust men on the Supreme Court. He has a full thatch of gray hair that was once black. During the war he was an assistant United States attorney in charge of enforcing the Espionage Act.

Democratic and modest, he dislikes the formalities and pretensions of Washington life. His hobby is his 700-acre farm, Bryncoed, in Chester County, just outside Philadelphia, over which he loves to ride on his favorite horses.

Democratic possibility BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, husky and jovial Senator from Missouri, and son of the redoubtable old James Beauchamp Clark, who made the name "Champ" famous, came out of law school in 1912 and went to the House in Washington. An A. E. F. veteran, he is one of the men who helped found the American Legion in Paris.

Also mentioned are Massachusetts famous Democratic Senator, DAVID I. WALSH, one-time Governor, who has been going down to Washington since 1919 [Senator WALSH'S rise to prominence from his newsboy days are now well known to every Bay Stater]; youthful, handsome, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, the Republican junior Senator, and Republican Governor Leverett Saltonstall.

The race is on. Who will receive the two nominations, the second greatest political honor that can be given a man in these United States, depends much on what happens between now and the conventions.

Predictions and prophecies are futile because the riddle of this, the most disconcerting Presidential campaign in all our history is not yet solved. That is: Will President Franklin Delano Roosevelt run for a third term?

If President Roosevelt runs, many a Democratic star that has risen high in the political skies will abruptly fall. If President Roosevelt runs, it will mean a whole new realinement of the Republican forces.

The Church—Democracy's Safeguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the conference brotherhood banquet held in the vestry of the Augustana Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., on April 27, 1940, in connection with the Seventieth Annual Convention of the New York Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod of America. The topic of the address is The Church—Democracy's Safeguard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Insofar as I am concerned, the text of my address might well be Democracy—the Church's Safeguard, for one is the safeguard of the other, even though they be two completely separate and distinct institutions.

I do not know which came first, the hen or the egg, but I do know that without both you can have neither, and I am convinced that unless we have the Christian church and a courageous democracy working side by side we will have neither for very long. To be impressed by that fact we need but to read current history. A democracy provides a fertile field for the growth and development and the progress of the Christian church, and the Christian church, proclaiming the principles of brotherhood and cooperation, instills in man the proper attitude and the necessary discipline to meet the responsibilities incumbent upon him as a citizen of a democracy.

THE RELIGION OF DEMOCRACY

An Italian statesman with great truth once said: "Whosoever shall discover the religion of democracy will have found what is required to make democracy work." The religion of democracy was discovered by the Three Wise Men in the lowly manger in Bethlehem, 2,000 years ago; and without the assistance of the church founded upon that religion and serving as its safeguard, I am convinced that no democracy will ever prove to be a permanent institution.

ANCIENT GREECE FAILED

Ancient Greece had a democracy that flourished for a time, but that democracy had no opportunity to become permanent because the religion of democracy had not yet been discovered, and so it presently passed into the dust of oblivion. The democracy of ancient Greece had as its great objective not the unselfish principles of the brotherhood of man and the Golden Rule but the ultra-selfish personal gratification growing out of the perfection of art, culture, and learning. Under the benign influence of powerful government these three reached the golden age of their development, but art, culture, and learning even at their best cannot rise to the sacred sphere of a religion, much less the religion of democracy, and when evil times came upon Greece, its art, culture, and learning founded upon paganism were blotted out overnight. Let me point out that learning is not necessarily wisdom and there was no deep religious inspiration in the hearts and souls of the people to keep the passion for liberty alive until it might take root again.

ANCIENT ROME FAILED

Later on the Roman Republic came into being. It had no opportunity to succeed, either, because THE religion of democracy still was unknown. The Roman Republic was builded around utility. Everything was sacrificed for efficiency, and more and more efficiency became the passion of the populace. Anything in Roman art, culture, and learning which did not contribute to efficiency was rejected with disdain and contemptuously discarded. The Roman passion for utility strangely enough was the direct cause of the fall of this glorious Republic. When the Romans discovered that greater efficiency could be had under tyrants, dictators, and aggressors, they promptly changed their form of government to a personal standard and gave up their liberties without a struggle. Utility and efficiency and art and culture and learning are all very desirable and serve fairly well as a goal toward which human beings may strive, but as a religion of a people they have never proved sufficient.

A DEMOCRARY WHICH WILL SUCCEED

I would now call your attention to the third great experiment in democratic government—the experiment in which the people of the United States have the privilege and honor to participate. Now, for the first time in the world's history, in my opinion, a democracy has a good chance to become a permanent institution, because today this Republic is safeguarded by the true religion of democracy, the Christian religion. America and her colonies did a lot of floundering around before the Christian church asserted her influence and caused the new nation to arrive at a sound basis upon which to build a mighty republic.

The responsibility of the citizens living in a democracy is very great. They must be cooperative by nature; they must be unselfish; they must have a broad outlook upon life and its purposes; they must be patient and tolerant; they must be courageous and intelligent; and they must be deeply religious with the highest of ideals if the democracy is to succeed. The Christian church and the Christian religion intelligently promote all of these things. Three great institutions have made it possible for this Nation to have experienced stability and balance. The Christian church, the great fraternal orders, and the education of the masses each have played an important role in the success of our democracy. The basic principle of our great fraternities is brotherhood and is, therefore, closely allied with the Christian doctrine. Another important pillar of the Christian religion is the education of the masses, for ignorance and Christianity do not work well together. It takes a well-educated man to comprehend Christianity. It was discovered by wise men and it must be perpetuated by wise men. A stupid fellow cannot grasp its intrinsic values, therefore education is a counterpart of Christianity. Broadly speaking, then, these three institutions are more or less merged into one and act as a single manifestation of a most vibrant human influence. It is true that no reference to the Christian church is to be found in the Constitution of the United States, but it is nevertheless also true that the Constitution of the United States is founded upon the broad, cooperative, and unselfish principles of Christianity.

PROPER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

Since the day the star of stars shined so brightly over Bethlehem much difficulty has been experienced by mankind in his groping for the proper relationship to be maintained between the government as an institution of his and the Christian church as an institution of God. The Christ realizing the confusion that habitually creeps into man's mind to plague and harass him laid down a simple formula and one easily understood, completely disposing of the whole controversial subject, but man would not listen. The great teacher directed that the citizen "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Had governments and their citizens accepted in all sincerity that simple rule, all of the unspeakable torture of the centuries visited upon human beings by men who were trying to adjust the operation of the Christian church to the operation of civil government could have been avoided. Christ's formula is so vital in this respect that without its complete application the church is neither the safeguard of democracy nor any other wholesome thing, but to the contrary despoils government and causes man to be more beastly.

PILATE'S MISAPPREHENSION

Pilate, the Roman judge, did not understand Christ's simple rule and he sentenced the Saviour to death on the charge that he was a threat to the supremacy of Caesar and that he was attempting to set himself up as a rival to challenge the authority of Caesar. There was no evidence whatever to support that suspicion or that charge, but Caesar was so jealous of his authority and so fearful of any uprising against his will that executions were ordered on the faintest kind of suspicion. If the mob desired to have anyone destroyed the expedient charge was to make it appear that the authority of Rome was involved. Pilot could not have been expected to understand that Christ was promoting God's kingdom which had nothing directly to do with Caesar's little temporal throne. A good Christian automatically is a good citizen.

NERO DIDN'T UNDERSTAND

Nero and the other tyrants of Rome did not comprehend this point either, nor were they wise enough to grasp the fact that the Christian church if left strictly alone would contribute more to law and order and the stability of government than any other influence affecting the passions of man. Christians were fed to the lions on every festive occasion and on every holiday, and Christians burning at the stake illuminated the streets of Rome. They were hunted down in the catacombs like wild beasts, tortured, burned and dragged behind chariots because the Christ was thought to be a threat to Roman authority. One of the mighty Roman emperors noting the meekness of his Christian victims, their courageous acceptance of his most terrible vengeance, their utter lack of resistance to his brutality, and the completeness of their beautiful faith which did not desert them as they suffered torture and death at his hands cried out, "Thou hast conquered, Man of Galilee, and yet I despise thee."

UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Time moved on and new centuries were added to man's experience, and the Christian church, in the most difficult circumstances, continued to make progress and gain in strength and favor with God and man. New kings, wiser than the Caesars, decided that since they could not very well stamp out this doctrine which had such a strange hold upon mankind, they might better utilize it to their own ends and accordingly they made themselves the head of the church. Christianity under their instruction was taught with the sword, and heathens were forced to subscribe to its tenets upon the penalty of death. One would naturally think that now the Christian religion would reach the heights, and that government compelling the practice of the blessed sacraments would give mankind a most beneficent regulation. Strange as it may seem, the

contrary is true. History records that in this unholy alliance between church and state, the Christian religion reached its lowest ebb, and government sank to the very depths of demoralization and degeneracy, and mankind, instead of becoming kindly and full of love, became possessed of the most bitter hatred and developed a frenzied cruelty which he gleefully visited upon all who disagreed with him. Conversion with the sword is completely out of harmony with God's plan to give each of his creatures freedom of choice. He has ordained that one may accept Him or that one may reject Him. When mere man attempts to improve upon God's plan only disaster can follow.

ROGER WILLIAMS

The early colonists in America, following the custom in vogue in Europe, tried to impose upon everyone their own particular conception of the correct form of religious worship. Ears were chopped off, noses split, faces branded, men pilloried, whipped, and banished to compel them to subscribe to some particular Christian church form. Roger Williams was banished in the dead of winter into a wilderness infested by savages and wild beasts because he dared to preach that church and state should be kept separate. God was with this courageous minister of the gospel, however, and old Chief Massasoit, the heathen savage with more humanity than his civilized Christian brethren possessed, gave him land for a colony at Providence. Others driven from their habitations by Christian zealots for having a true conception of Christ's law to "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" joined Roger Williams, and a successful colony was established. We should be very grateful in America for Roger Williams and his accurate conception of the proper relationship between the Christian church and the state, because without that conception America never could have reached the heights. In due time the Rhode Island system, which is the true application of Christ's law, was adopted by the whole United States of America.

I love to stroll through Statuary Hall in the Capitol Building and visit the statue of Roger Williams holding in his hands a book upon which it is written "Soul Liberty 1636," for America never produced a greater statesman. When the State of Rhode Island placed his marble statue in the Hall of Fame it honored itself and showed a proper appreciation of this devout man and his great contribution to the cause of religion and government.

BRUTE FORCE OR COOPERATION

Either brute force or the rule of reason is common to all governments, and when the rule of reason is based upon a conception of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man the basis for a successful democracy is at hand. No one can be a student of the spiritual implications of Christianity and the philosophy of democracy without being impressed by the contribution each is capable of making to the other. Christianity teaches and espouses the highest ideal of human cooperation and democracy depends for its very existence upon such a practice. The Golden Rule must of necessity be the first law of a democracy.

THE MODERN DICTATOR HATES GOD

The modern dictator marching in Europe today hates God because he is jealous of God and he hates the Christian church and would supplant it with atheism because its doctrine is in direct conflict with his evil purposes and designs. Il Duce Benito Mussolini, in a recent speech to his cheering black shirts, deliberately spoke these savage sentiments: "What are the three words which form your dogma? Believe, obey, fight! * * * No matter how things go, we wish to hear no more about brotherhood, sisterhood, and such other bastard relationships because relationships between states are relations of force and these relations of force are the determining elements of their policy." "The Italian motto," Il Duce continued, "must be more cannon, more ships, more airplanes"; and now this significant warning: "Woe to the weak." The motto of a democracy and the Christian church, on the other hand, is more charity, more humanity, more cooperation, and better protection for the weak and the lowly. I am not criticizing Mussolini. I quote him to emphasize the fundamental differences between his despotism and democracy. He has made a very frank, honest statement. He is not a hypocrite. He has given to the world in forcible, understandable language a true description of the nonreligion of the totalitarian system of government. Under that severe disciplinarian despotism Italy may become rich for a brief time in material things, but what shall it profit her if she "gain the whole world and lose her own soul?" Italy has many desperate problems with which I do not pretend to be familiar, and desperate problems sometimes require desperate methods. It is not for me to choose Italy's form of government; it is enough for me to strive with all my might to keep such a system out of America. I do not want America to quarrel with Mussolini or go to war with him over the political philosophy and the political system which he has every right, with the consent of his own citizens, to adopt, but I do want Americans to realize their own good fortune, and I do want to predict that America, if we cling to our democracy, will make more permanent progress than will any land under the sword of a dictator.

DEMOCRACY BEGINS IN THE HEART

We should learn from a study of the historical experiences of men that a preparation has to be made in their hearts before the kind of government to which we are so wholeheartedly devoted can exist. It is idle to believe that either Christianity or democracy can be spread throughout the world by the sword or that it can be bestowed upon a people by any outside influence. If there be not an overwhelming desire in men's hearts for these things, if they do not have a religious fervor for their virtues, and if they are not willing to devote thought and time and energy to them, and if need be, die for them, then of their own weight both must fall.

If one be a believer in the democratic processes as applied to the practical functions of government, he must necessarily have faith in his fellow man, an intense interest in his welfare, a genuine respect for his ideals, a willingness to accept the verdict of the majority and a firm conviction that spiritual things are far more to be desired and sought after than material things, and above all, he must have a passion for truth which carries with it the conviction that honesty and square dealing establish the proper foundation for all harmonious human relationships. The Christian church instructs its membership with all the energy it possesses in each and every one of these imperishable truths. The good church member is the good citizen, and the more devoted he is to his church the better he serves his country.

DEMOCRACY IS NOT AN END BUT A MEANS

I desire to make it perfectly clear in this discussion that democracy is not an end in itself, but rather that it is a means to an end. Neither is the church nor the Bible, for that matter, an end in themselves; each in fact is a vital means toward a great purpose. The end which both democracy and the church so devotedly serve is the salvation of the human soul by bringing it into complete harmony with the purposes of the Creator. Under a democratic form of government, wisely undertaken political, religious, and economic liberty may be experienced by its fortunate citizens; and liberty, if it be understood by man, will inspire and promote his faith in his God because without God there can be no liberty. God has decreed that man shall have complete freedom of choice without divine interference, since the whole theory of the development of the human soul, is based upon the principle of the "soul liberty" espoused by Roger Williams.

THE UNFINISHED MURAL

I love to visit the rotunda in the Capitol Building and in that beautiful and sacred place study and examine in minute detail the many works of art which appear there. About halfway up on the inside of the dome a band of murals encircle it. In those murals are depicted the complete history of our country from the landing of Columbus to the present hour. Its industrial, its economic, its technological, its social, and its political development are pictured there. The last event depicted is a mural of the World War, but the circle is not complete. A small space is left to illustrate some future important event in our history. As one looks upon the vacant space yet remaining he cannot help but wonder what will one day be written there. Will it record the conquest of this country by some aggressor? Will it record the overthrow in a great revolution of this Government by communism or some other subversive "ism"? Will it record there that this great democracy voluntarily abandoned the safeguard of the Christian Church; that its citizens turned their backs upon God and floundered and failed? Will it record that the people of this great Nation became so imbued with art, culture, and learning that they made these things their god, and permitted their spiritual ideals to wither and die from dry rot? Will it record that Americans became so devoted to efficiency and utility that we adopted a personal government like ancient Rome and abandoned our liberties? Or, will it record that we set up a golden calf to worship and lost our souls in our passion for material things? I do not know what will be written in that small space yet remaining, but I love to think that the golden age of mankind will be depicted there; that peace, cooperation, brotherhood, the Golden Rule, and universal happiness will be carved into that empty space. I love to think that the last unit of this great mural will depict the millennium of human experience, lighted and warmed by the everlasting glow of Christian love—the safeguard of democracy.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY AT MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the

United States, at the State convention of the Alabama Branch of the National League of District Postmasters, held at Montgomery, Ala., on Saturday, April 6, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to meet with you in Montgomery tonight, and I am grateful to your national officers and to the officers of the Alabama Branch of the National League of District Postmasters for the invitation. Permit me to congratulate you on the fine attendance here and to thank you for coming. I also want to congratulate your host, Roy Nolen, a real fellow who has been most attentive to his job, as his record in the Department will show.

We are most fortunate in being permitted to share in the management and in the operation of the United States Postal Service. I feel that each and every one connected with the Department has a justifiable pride in our accomplishments. Few people realize the tremendous influence asserted by the Postal Service in the daily lives of our citizens.

According to reports of the Comptroller General the Postal Service is operating an $8,000,000,000 business. By that I mean that the total money handled, the financial turn-over in the post offices of the Nation, amounts to more than $8,000,000,000 annually. This is more than all of the money in circulation in the United States, exceeds the total appropriations made for the maintenance of the combined agencies of the Federal Government, and amounts to more than $60 per year for every man, woman, and child in America.

The ordinary postal revenues; that is, the money derived from the collection of postage and other incidentals, broke all records last year for the third successive year and reached the all-time high of $746,000,000. The income received so far during the current fiscal year indicates a further increase of approximately $10,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940. This means that for the fourth successive year postal gains will exceed the revenue of any previous year in history.

During the fiscal years of 1937 and 1938 the increases in postal business came largely from the smaller cities and towns. We were lagging somewhat in the great industrial centers. However, during the fiscal year 1939 and the present year business has picked up materially in the large cities and we are still going along all right in the smaller communities. Therefore, I can say to you that there has been no business recession insofar as the Postal Service is concerned, and our revenues are ordinarily accepted as a pretty accurate barometer of business conditions. The mail volume is increasing daily, weekly, and monthly when compared to the same periods last year.

We have kept pace with this increased volume by adding additional employees. We now have on our rolls and at work in the post offices more people than have ever been employed at any previous time in the history of the service. Working conditions are better. The average salary of postal employees in the field is greater than the average salary in other Government establishments and certainly higher than the average income of employees in private industry. This indicates a steady gain in business, confidence on the part of the people, and shows that the patrons are taking advantage to a greater extent than ever before of the wonderful facilities of the United States Postal Service.

I am indeed proud to be able to make this report to you, and I honestly feel that you as public officials are pleased to know and accept this report as evidence of the progress that is being made in this Nation. This report clearly indicates that the American people are increasing their business activities, that they believe in their Government, and that they are living up to the good-neighbor policy. This is definitely indicative, for when postal business is increasing in the smaller cities and towns a good part of the national postal revenue comes from the ordinary social correspondence carried on between families and friends. So I say to you in all sincerity that, while we could do better, we are getting along all right in America.

The Post Office Service has been generally improved during my administration as Postmaster General, and I want to give credit where the credit is due—to the postmasters, to my most efficient staff in the Department, and to all of the postal employees.

The Postal Service has been the most respected of all Government agencies for many, many years. Before we were born postal officials and employees, thousands of them, had devoted the best years of their lives and their best efforts to the development of this Service. All praise to my predecessors and your predecessors, and to the loyal army of workers that has given, and is continuing to give, such a fine example of courage, loyalty, and efficiency. We make but one claim—that we have accepted our positions as a public trust. We have one important objective—that in the administration of this public trust we shall at all times safeguard the interests of the people and pass on to our successors an improved service in keeping with the progress of the Nation.

Our greatest asset is good will—good will of the patrons and good will of the employees. I am happy to say to you that all reports coming to the Department concerning postmasters and postal people show that we are reaping the benefit of our many campaigns to encourage courteous and efficient service. I hear many expressions and receive a number of letters commending postal people on their industriousness, their tactfulness, and their courtesy. I want to thank each and every one of you for this and urge that you continue your efforts along the same lines.

Eternal vigilance is required if we are to meet our obligations and attain our objectives. We in the Department feel that the need for politeness is more pronounced in the post office than in most any other public service. We operate a monopoly, at least in the transmission of letters. A citizen has no choice but to deal with us. Consequently it is fundamental that we exercise great care and painstaking effort in dealing with our customers, who are in reality our employers.

May I suggest that you as postmasters constantly strive to secure the cooperation and good will of the employees in your office? Make each and every person in your establishment feel that the part he plays is an important part. Be firm when necessary and always point out in private the mistakes made by your subordinates. Let them feel that they have an individual responsibility and encourage them to assume that responsibility. Keep before you always the fact that authority should never assume the privilege of transgressing the laws of common courtesy of man to man. Be sure that your supervisors are properly trained, and regardless of the circumstances do not permit humiliating incidents to occur to any employee in maintaining discipline.

Let me also suggest that you give personal attention to the matter of training employees for their tasks. The importance of this part of your job cannot be overemphasized. Adequate and understandable instructions should be furnished to all newly appointed employees and such instructions should be repeated occasionally. For even those who are presumed to thoroughly understand their work are often helped by having their minds refreshed on some important point. The average postal employees want to learn more and more about this business, and if proper instructions are given in an effective manner they will do much in quickening the purpose and energy of our personnel.

It is important to recognize good work. When some member of your staff has caused favorable comment on the part of a patron let him know that you are pleased with his work. It does not take long to pat him on the back and commend him. To do so urges him to continue his efforts along that line. I feel very strongly on this matter of tact and courtesy and shall appreciate your continued cooperation.

We in the Department have no direct contact with our customers but leave that most important privilege to you. In the final analysis, therefore, no matter how high our purpose may be, unless we can secure the enthusiastic support of the field forces we cannot be successful.

I think that these meetings offer us an opportunity to have a better understanding. For this reason, I encourage the administrative officials in the Department to attend them whenever possible. At your meeting here you have had others from the Department and post-office inspectors available for counsel and advice concerning your service problems. Postmasters have responded in an enthusiastic manner to every appeal that has been made to them by the Department. They have given freely of their time and in some instances have been out of pocket personally in performing extraordinary tasks. Your work in connection with Air Mail Week several years ago will be of lasting benefit to the Department. We still notice the effect of increased air-mail poundage. Last year the Department inaugurated a program of actively publicizing the Postal Service and it has proved beyond a doubt to be not only an effective method for increasing the use of postal facilities but it has also created a national spirit of good will.

Experienced postmasters who have served faithfully should be permitted to continue in that service. For that reason the Congress has by law discontinued the short term for postmasters. This undoubtedly enables the postmaster to take his place as an important individual in the business and social life of his town or city. I trust that you will continue to serve for many years to come.

I regret that other engagements, principally my scheduled appearances at other State meetings, prevented me from being with you earlier during your convention, and I hope that I will have an opportunity to meet with you again. In conclusion I want to assure you again of my sincere appreciation for the fine work you are doing.

Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

TELEGRAM FROM MOSS PATTERSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

a telegram addressed to him by Moss Patterson, president of the Southwest Division of the Air Congress of America.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *April 26, 1940.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The directors of the Southwest Aviation Conference representing New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri in meeting today unanimously agreed that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has gone far during its existence to justify the faith placed in it by the people of the United States. Therefore, the directors of this conference, in annual session in Tulsa, Okla., with over 500 delegates in attendance, firmly believe that the Civil Aeronautics Authority should continue to operate as an independent agency and urge that the Congress of the United States oppose the placement of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board under the Department of Commerce. More complete consideration and study of this matter will be placed before the conference for action on Saturday, April 27.

Respectfully,

MOSS PATTERSON,
President, Southwest Division, Air Congress of America.

Salvage of Hurricane Timber in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM J. F. CAMPBELL

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to me from J. F. Campbell, Acting Director of the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, relating to the salvage of hurricane timber in New England. It contains valuable information affecting the future conduct of operations, and I should like to give it publicity in this way for the benefit of those who are interested in the future transactions of that Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1940.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AUSTIN: We are very desirous of keeping you informed as to the progress being made in the salvage of hurricane timber in New England so that you may, in turn, pass on whatever portion of the information you wish to any of your constituents.

As you know, the program got under way in December 1938. Records show the following log receipts, the majority of which is white pine, for Vermont:

Receipts from beginning of project to Mar. 30, 1940

White pine	29,906,366
Other softwood	8,954,259
Hardwood	10,624,801
Total	49,485,426

We feel that we have accomplished the first two points in our salvage program objective, namely—

1. To bring to the owner of down timber the maximum amount in conformity with good business practices.

2. To offer to purchase any and all logs which meet our specifications, and establish the price of logs, and prevent speculation.

It is now evident that the majority of logs the project expected to receive has been delivered, and the average delivery and the merchantability have fallen off to the point where it is not economical to maintain receiving stations with scalers in attendance. Private industries are purchasing an increasing amount and should easily consume the major portion remaining after our stations close down.

With this in mind, all active vendors have been advised by letter that the receipt of logs will cease on April 30. However, in a few cases, because of poor hauling conditions near the end of this month, some logs and pulpwood which have been prepared to our specifications will still remain in the woods. To take care of such scattered cases, the following procedure has been adopted:

1. All timber-purchase agreements were executed to be completed by April 30, 1940, and no new agreements will be written.

2. Extensions beyond that time may be granted upon written request of the vendor and will not be issued until an authorized agent of the Administration has made an on-the-ground inspection to determine the approximate volume of material which will be accepted under the extension and the date of final delivery. This provision is made so that vendors who really have logs or pulpwood cut but were unable to complete delivery because of hauling conditions will not be put to expense without an opportunity to realize on the expenditure. It also gives us an opportunity to check on deliveries and determine how soon a receiving station can be closed.

3. Under no conditions will deliveries be accepted after May 29, 1940. This sets a definite dead-line date on all deliveries and again gives us an opportunity to control our costs of scaling, etc. Logs will start to stain shortly after this date.

4. In allowing any extension the Administration further reserves the right to indicate the receiving station to which delivery is to be made. There may be cases where only one vendor who has been delivering to a particular station has logs to be delivered after April 30. This provision will give us an opportunity to concentrate deliveries.

A field check indicates that there will be very few vendors who will ask for an extension of time beyond April 30.

We trust that the above information may be of assistance to you in answering any inquiries you may receive. We shall be glad to answer any questions that may occur to you.

Very sincerely yours,

J. F. CAMPBELL,
Acting Director.

Addresses in Honor of American Artists Who Contributed Toward Decorations in Federal Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO PROGRAM OVER N. B. C. NETWORK, APRIL 25, 1940

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it is indeed refreshing and reassuring in times like the present to turn on one's radio and listen to a program dealing with those fundamentals which contribute so basically to the advancement of culture and, therefore, of understanding in our troubled world.

On the night of April 25, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network, there was given a program in honor of the American artists who have contributed toward the decorations in our Federal buildings. Those taking part on the program were Mr. Edward Bruce, Section of Fine Arts, Public Buildings Administration; Prof. John Dewey, department of philosophy, Columbia University; Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr.; Mr. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency; Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles; and our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Robert M. La Follette.

Because of the universal interest in this program, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDWARD BRUCE

I should like to begin this broadcast by thanking my old friend General Harbord and the National Broadcasting Co. for another friendly act in the interest of American culture in giving this time to a program honoring American painters and sculptors. I presented the plan for this broadcast to General Harbord on my own initiative and so the responsibility is mine.

Some 20 years ago I took advantage of an opportunity I had to try to carry out a boyhood ambition to become a painter. To do this I went to Italy to live and stayed there for a number of years studying art and traveling through that country. I came to realize far more than I had ever before what an enormous enrichment art can be to a country.

When I reached Rome and visited the Sistine Chapel painted by Michaelangelo I had an overwhelming feeling of the last contribution a great artist makes to a nation. In these paintings I saw the evidence of one of those periods of high achievement which comes to nations over the centuries.

There is another side of the story, however, for during the years I lived in Italy I spent most of my time in a very beautiful little hill town in the Sabine Hills, and while I was there I saw the growth of the Facsist regime. With my own eyes I saw a group of simple young peasants beaten to insensibility. I saw one of them fatally shot. Their only crime had been their failure to fall in with the Fascist regime. Quite simply the significance of the Bill of Rights and the civil liberties our ancestors fought and died for came to me to have an overwhelming meaning. Certainly when I got back to America it was a vast pleasure to me to hear a man cuss a politician without having his jaw broken for doing so.

The conviction was born in me, perhaps unconsciously, that if the time ever came when I could help to restate in this country the meaning of the Bill of Rights I would feel compelled to do all in my power to do so. When the Secretary of the Treasury was kind enough to invite me to organize a program to decorate Federal buildings I saw in this project a means of proving the democracy of art.

I believe that every American artist who wishes to share in the work has the right to have his qualifications judged by a jury of his peers through absolutely honest, anonymous competitions. As a result of 5 years of work, the Section of Fine Arts has held anonymous competitions for 724 projects in decorating 1,043 Federal buildings, and the artists have submitted over 14,000 designs. In every one of these competitions the artists have been asked to send in their designs with the only identification mark sealed in an attached envelope. These envelopes have never been opened until a jury of artists has selected what they regarded as the most suitable design for the decoration of the proposed building. In looking back over this work it seemed to me in the beginning, and it still seems to me, that Secretary Morgenthau offered me the opportunity to do as useful a service as I would ever be able to render.

Time does not permit this evening for a discussion in detail of the quality of the work which the Section of Fine Arts has achieved, but through the courtesy of General Harbord there will be a subsequent program on painting and sculpture to be discussed from the viewpoint of the artists creating them.

Nobody could have worked as I have worked with the artists of America for the last 5 years without being deeply impressed by the superb effort they have made to create something that will become a permanent contribution of distinction to this country. They have responded to our call for competitions with an almost religious enthusiasm, realizing to their fullest the superb opportunity which this country of ours has given to its artists in commissioning them to decorate with murals and sculpture the buildings used by the Federal Government.

To anyone interested in the development of our native art and the amazing growth of the interest in the art of America, it must certainly be a source of satisfaction now to be able to travel through the country and find here and there blossoming throughout the breadth of the land little spots of beauty which are contributing to the charm and the cultural taste of America.

In many cases these decorations in post offices are the only original works of art available to the entire community. Many postmasters throughout the country have appealed for decorations in their post offices and for instructions how to proceed in order to procure them.

I do not know how much the Pope paid Michelangelo for painting or sculpture, but we all recognize that whatever the amount it was a good investment. In the program of the section, 1 percent of the total limit of cost of a building may be reserved for its decoration; this in itself is a modest sum and reflects a kind of decent thrift of which we may be rightfully proud.

It interested me to learn that 1 hour of war costs England more than the 5-year peace program of the Section of Fine Arts costs us. The enthusiasm with which the American artist has accepted the challenge to do his best work for his country and his people has resulted in work of so high a standard that the amount paid for it is unquestionably surpassed by its actual value and its value for future generations.

Our artists, through their fine work, have brought about a new appreciation of this great country of ours, and this in turn speaks of a new and deeper patriotism.

Tonight one of the nicest groups of people in the world has gathered to pay tribute to the artists of America and to congratulate them for the work which they have done over the last 5 years in decorating Federal buildings.

This country's most cultured citizen has graciously consented to come out of his retirement to join this tribute to the work of the artists of America, and I have a very deep sense of my privilege in being able to introduce to you Prof. John Dewey.

ADDRESS BY PROF. JOHN DEWEY

During the early years of the depression, when I was crossing the Atlantic, I fell into conversation with a fellow passenger. She was a gracious white-haired woman, and in telling her plans she said that since she had lost a great deal of her money because of bank failures and bad stock investments, she was now going to buy herself something nobody could take away from her—she was going to Athens to see the Acropolis and the Parthenon. She knew what too few persons know—the difference between an investment in physical things that are perishable, at the mercy of external accidents, and an investment in something that is imperishable because it enriches personal life and becomes a part of one's very self.

But the incident has another face—a face which has a real bearing upon the cause that has brought us here together this evening. It was the art of Greece which was taking this woman on her pilgrimage—just as the cathedrals and public buildings, the paintings, statues, and literature of Europe have taken countless thousands of Americans there. The art, the vision of which was an enrichment of her personal life, is that which has given Greece her enduring glory among nations. Material acquisitions and possessions have by themselves never given any people a sure place in the memory of mankind or an assured place in history. It is by creation of the intangibles of science and philosophy, and especially by those of the arts, that countries and communities have won immortality for themselves after material wealth has crumbled into dust. What has been true of other peoples will be true of our own. Creation, not acquisition, is the measure of a nation's rank; it is the only road to an enduring place in the admiring memory of mankind.

There is a good reason why achievement in science and art is the criterion by which a nation's place in civilization is finally judged. In the case of material things possession by one excludes possession, use, and enjoyment by others. In the case of the intangibles of art the exact opposite is the case. The more the arts flourish, the more they belong to all persons alike, without regard to wealth, birth, race, or creed; the more they flourish, the less they are privately owned and the more they are possessed and enjoyed by all. This is what is meant when we say that art is universal—more universal than is that other intangible, science, since the arts speak a language which is closer to the emotions and imaginations of every man.

Accordingly, whether we like it or not, even whether we believe it or not, the question whether this country of ours is to be narrow and provincial, or whether it is to attain to that which is universal, will be finally decided by what we do and what we are capable of appreciating and enjoying in those intangible things of which the fine arts are the outstanding examples. It is on this account that I esteem deeply and gratefully the opportunity to be here this evening and to express as best I can not only gratitude as a citizen to Edward Bruce for initiating and conducting the Section of Fine Arts in the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, but also my sense of the great significance of this work in the development of a worthy American civilization.

The work is significant both as a symbol and as an actual force in inspiring and directing activities which will extend as time goes on far beyond what is done in post offices and other public buildings. As a symbol it is an acknowledgment from official sources, with the active encouragement of persons high in the Government, of the importance to our Nation of the development of art and of ability to enjoy art products.

Ned Bruce has shown me a letter from the postmaster of one of the smaller towns whose public building now has a mural upon its walls. In his letter of enthusiastic thanks for what has been done for his town, he included a sentence which might almost be a motto of the whole project: "How can a finished citizen be made in an artless town?" How, indeed, can an all-round and complete citizenry be developed without that development of creation and enjoyment of works of art to which the Government itself must contribute? Our public buildings may become the outward and visible sign of the inward grace which is the democratic spirit, while too often, especially in municipal halls and county courthouses, they have not even been kept clean. As a symbol, the work carried on by the Section of Fine Arts is a service to democracy so important, even in its present comparatively limited scale, that to starve it or allow it to lapse would be a defeat for democracy as genuine as one taking place on a physical battlefield.

For the same reason, this governmental activity is more than a symbol. Hundreds of thousands of persons all over this broad land now have opportunities to see and enjoy works of art which they had not before. They are developing within themselves germs that were part of their being but which never had a chance, because of lack of nourishment, to grow. If the arts come forth from museums to which they have retired, if they become a living part of the walk and conversation of the average man, and thereby parts of the legitimate heritage of a democratic people, a great debt will be owed to the stimulus provided by this governmental section in the buildings which belong to the common people and where they daily assemble.

Old World countries have been able to develop the fine arts by means of the patronage of the nobility and the wealthy. Their healthy development in our country will depend upon the active response of the civic consciousness of the common people. For this reason I do not want to close without mentioning a fact which I could bring home to you only if television were at my command. For if you could see for yourselves reproductions of the murals which are now found in public buildings from Maine to the Gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, you would see that the paintings combine the values of the arts which nourish the human spirit with

the accomplishment of our past history which strengthens that legitimate pride which enables one to say, "I am an American citizen." Secretary Morgenthau, Mr. Carmody, and Mr. Bruce, may your work go forward to even greater triumphs.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you from the bottom of my heart, Professor Dewey. Your noble statement of the ideology of art will make the hearts of our artists sing and lead them all, I know, to finer things.

Five years ago Secretary Morgenthau called me to his office and outlined to me the program which he had in mind for setting aside 1 percent of the cost of Federal buildings for their decoration with painting and sculpture. He proposed to create a Section of Fine Arts to be in charge of this work.

Secretary Morgenthau specified that our duty was to secure, by a thoroughly impartial method, the best American art for our Federal buildings.

He introduced me to Mrs. Morgenthau and told me of her great interest in the project and said he felt sure she could help me. I found Mrs. Morgenthau a delightful and inspiring associate. She was so inspiring, in fact, that I often succumbed to the temptation to telephone her in the early mornings to discuss the problems of the Section of Fine Arts. This happy system worked wonderfully until one day Secretary Morgenthau told me that he hadn't had one uninterrupted shave since the Section of Fine Arts began.

The enthusiastic and wise collaboration of the Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. Morgenthau with the Section of Fine Arts guided us through the early formative years of the program. Their help in the frequent administrative problems which are inevitable in making a place among the regulations of Government procedure where artists would feel at home has been unfailing. They have been partisans of the artists' point of view and have defended it through situations that would otherwise have been difficult. It is a great regret to me that Mrs. Morgenthau cannot be with us this evening but I have the honor to introduce the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY MORGENTHAU

I am afraid Mr. Bruce gives me much greater credit than I am entitled to, although I would increase rather than lessen the importance he gives to the establishment of the Section of Fine Arts in the United States Treasury. There is a man in the picture who deserves the glory of a great accomplishment but it is not myself. It is Mr. Bruce. There is a woman in the picture, too, and the tribute Mr. Bruce has paid to her I will let stand.

But in the case of everybody concerned I believe it is a matter of having wrought more wisely than they knew. I doubt if anybody actually realized the greatness of the task they had set themselves when the Section of Fine Arts was created.

Everybody knows that art is an eternal source of enjoyment and enrichment, that art is a great force in education, and a true measure of civilization's progress.

It is one of those things we know historically, yet do not fully understand in our own time. The Romans built their great aqueducts to live throughout the ages, but it is not the aqueducts that have survived—it is the sculptured art of that same period and it tells us more of Roman civilization, perhaps, than the writing of the period. Buildings which the Greeks expected to live forever are outlived by Greek masterpieces of sculpture.

So it may be with us and the art being produced in America today.

The importance of the Fine Arts Section lies in the fact that it provides the means of fostering and developing creative art in America—an all-important element in our lives that was threatened a few short years ago with starvation through the collapse of our material prosperity. The genius of Edward Bruce was revealed when he turned this threat of disaster into a triumph of the ideas he had long held. What might have been, if not the end of American art, at least a long period of stagnation, has become instead the period of its greatest development, the period of recognition of its value by the American people, a period in which an enduring foundation has been laid for all time.

The Treasury's part in this has been a simple and a natural one. For 100 years the Treasury had built the greater part of our Federal buildings. We were coming to appreciate more and more how much the painter and the sculptor could add to the work of the architect and builder. This resulted—and if I have any cause for pride it is that it resulted in my time—in the setting up of the Section of Fine Arts, with Mr. Bruce as its chief.

I am one of those benighted persons who sometimes say, "I don't know much about art, but I know what I like." And I like art that enriches the life of the community. That is the chief purpose of the Section of Fine Arts, and I truly believe it is fulfilling its purpose.

In the absence of Mrs. Morgenthau, who was not able to come here tonight, although she had counted on being present, it is now my great privilege to read a letter to her from Mrs. Roosevelt:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 20, 1940.

DEAR ELINOR: I am so happy to have been at the first meeting of the Public Works of Art Project, which has since accomplished such great things. At that time I said "It is unbelievable that a great nation could fail to utilize the services of its creative talents to the fullest." I have never wavered in this belief, and now feel that we have shown that we can use these creative artists. They have contributed greatly to the general education of the Nation, and to the appreciation of the arts.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I also want to thank Mrs. Roosevelt for her wonderfully kind letter. The artists of America owe much to Mrs. Roosevelt. She has never failed to be constructive when the opportunity offered. We are very disappointed not to have Mrs. Morgenthau with us here tonight.

When the Secretary of the Treasury announced the organization of the Section of Fine Arts, we of the Section sat back with a comfortable feeling that men may come and men may go, but that we would go on forever. But, at best, man proposes and God seems to dispose, and so one day Congress passed a reorganization plan whereby we sailed out into the cold world minus the Treasury Department.

However, in our new home in the Federal Works Agency, we found an old friend who has followed our work with interest since the early days of the program. I have the great pleasure of introducing to you the Honorable John M. Carmody, the man who has the biggest construction job in the world as Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

ADDRESS BY JOHN M. CARMODY

I am not an artist. I am a layman. I was born on a farm. It was a hill farm. My grandfather and grandmother had cleared much of the land. The farm buildings were those customarily built by local workmen and neighbors a generation ago. At five I trudged a mile along a country road to a one-room, drab schoolhouse. It was devoid of art of any sort whatsoever.

At seven we moved into a small town, population 700. The name is Dushore, Pa. Try to find it on the map. I hope the situation has changed, but at that time the only traces of art were in the church, with the exception of the unforgetable Home Sweet Home with the dark frame found in every home. Music was not wholly neglected, but the one thing about me that appeared to win complete approval of my boyhood friends was my neglect of my piano lessons. Boys might sing in the choir, but beyond that, no art.

We moved again. This time to a medium-sized city. The horizon widened. Choirs were better. Church art was better. One of my seat mates in school was an embryo cartoonist.

One of my teachers, a man, was actually and boldly taking painting lessons. Once a year a metropolitan symphony orchestra came to town. I always went. I began to notice variations in architecture. The richest banker in the city collected works of art. His collection was open to the public for a day or two twice a year. I never got up enough courage to go. It was a beautiful home, but somehow it looked forbidding, and except on those exhibit days I never saw anyone about it. The art that really intrigued me was the art of baseball and football and boxing.

In spite of that, I grow up. I am on my way. I find a job in a Pittsburgh steel mill. What a revelation! Work and smoke, yes; but the Carnegie Institute of Art. Open Sundays, too. World-famed artists. Sculpture from the ages. An art school. The Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra, under the direction of Paur, recently from the Boston Symphony. The beginnings of a new architecture, too. And then Chicago and another job in another steel plant. The Chicago Museum of Art, open Sundays and free. More paintings and more sculpture. Lorado Taft at the height of his fame. Theodore Thomas at his peak, and the precise Frederick Stock coming into his own. Choice bits of architecture. Sullivan was still alive to inspire young men, and Daniel Burnham had not burned himself out in spite of the World's Fair. I began to notice excellent paintings in larger measure in restaurants and private homes.

But here, as in Pittsburgh and in Elmira, and in my old boyhood home in Dushore, public buildings were bare of any semblance of art. They were characterized by not very clean floors, ugly desks or tables, dry inkwells, and broken pens, and by walls that were bare except for sales notices and two-view pictures of some criminal citizens were urged to identify and apprehend. Art of a sort, perhaps, but not especially inspiring as we stood about to get our mail or transact other business.

On some other occasion, perhaps, Mr. Bruce, I shall tell you about the impressions made upon me by similar observations during the years I lived in Detroit and Cleveland and Havana, Cuba, and in New York City. I realize how superficial this is, but remember the beginning. Remember the hill farm. I was a lucky country boy. All of this has been incidental to my pursuit of a living.

It was available to me and to others only because men and women possessed of wealth fostered the arts and brought artists and their work into large centers. Millions of our people cannot or do not care to live in these larger centers. The arts must be taken to them. They deserve not only to see and hear the best but opportunity must be presented to them to participate in the creation of beauty. One step is the wholesome decoration of public buildings.

I end as I began. I am not an artist but I have discovered that millions of plain people like myself on the farm and in small towns

love beauty. They should see it inside our public buildings as well as outside. And now, thanks to our artists, they can.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Carmody.

No department of the United States Government has had a more distinguished succession of executives than the Department of State. On this Department rests the delicate and weighty problems of international relationships. For many years the Department of State has recognized the importance of encouraging between countries an understanding of each other's accomplishments in education and the arts.

We have with us this evening a gentleman who clearly recognizes the significance of cultural relations between countries, and one who occupies in the great tradition of the Department of State a position of acknowledged distinction. I refer to the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State.

ADDRESS BY HON. SUMNER WELLES

With the single exception of music, art in Europe today is a complete black-out. So far as I know, every gallery in Europe is closed. Paintings and sculpture, tapestries, and objects of art have been hidden to escape the damage of destructive war. The causes which have brought about this temporary cutting off of the life of art in the countries at war affect every civilized human being, whether he lives in the Eastern or the Western Hemisphere, in North or South America.

Deep as is every American's sympathy for those citizens of other countries, who would only too gladly continue their creative activities if they could, we cannot be satisfied unless we do more than sympathize. When others are forced to take up arms rather than to create art or music or literature, it becomes all the more our duty to keep alive the culture of the world.

Tragic as conditions are in those portions of the world which in the past have contributed so richly to the culture of America, we ourselves will be truer—both to ourselves and to our inheritance—if humbly and gratefully we do our best to continue the cultivation and stimulation of the art of our country.

Art knows no national prejudices. It crosses all frontiers, and everyone capable of receiving the artist's communication is enriched by it. We can go into our great museums and see paintings and sculpture by Germans, French, Italians, Scandinavians, Russians, and British—indeed the art of all peoples. Looking at these masterpieces, we shed our prejudices and are conscious only of the highest form of communication which one man can bring to another.

We go to symphony concerts and hear the music of other nations, and if at that time we are more conscious of our prejudices than of the music, we are unworthy of our good fortune. So when we find that we have the good fortune to be able to continue to use, uninterrupted by the miseries of war, our libraries, our concert halls, our museums, we should not be proud—we should be quietly and deeply thankful.

As other nations have given to us abundantly from the deep wells of their cultivation, let us hope that we shall do all in our power to prepare a gift for them during the days of their unhappiness.

The more we create of literature and art and music, the more frontier-crossing communications we can make to the peoples of other countries. I can think of no better method to carry out these ideals in their application to art than through the continuance of the Section of Fine Arts.

The Secretary of State regrets that he is unable to be here this evening to participate in this program. From him I bring to Mr. Edward Bruce, and to the other members of this program, a message of appreciation for the work which the Section of Fine Arts has accomplished during the last 5½ years. It is his hope and it is my hope that this work will continue. For not only is it a source of pride to the American people and stimulation to the American artists; it is also a power to encourage communication in its most civilized form between our people and the people of other countries.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Welles. I have a hunch that you feel more at home tonight than you have at times recently.

Feeling as I do so deeply about the significance of civil liberties and the Bill of Rights, it was inevitable that in my early days in Washington I should come to know and admire that gallant gentleman and learned legislator, the Senator from Wisconsin, Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE. He is a leader among those people who stand for the rights that we, as a Nation, hold most dear. I know that every artist in the country would like to ask Senator LA FOLLETTE one question. The question is: "What is the attitude of Congress in reference to the program of the Section of Fine Arts and will the program be continued?"

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

Thank you, Mr. Bruce. The last time that I spoke over the radio in connection with the Section of Fine Arts was at the Corcoran Gallery of Art last autumn. At that time, I quoted a phrase from a letter addressed to Mr. Bruce by President Roosevelt. That phrase is: "At this time it is essential to emphasize the arts of peace."

I would like now to point the meaning of this phrase beyond the obvious physical destruction of war. Censorship is one of the essentials of modern war. Art is not only the enemy of censorship, but it is also its victim. Or worse, it becomes the tool of propaganda. In art it is the free spirit that counts above everything else. The artist whose rights are prescribed, whose expression is stunted by imposed ideas, loses his stature, both as an artist and as a man. In the past the little artist has always been the conformist. The whims of royal courts or private patrons have dictated his art. But the great artists have always led the way as they saw it—often a lonely struggle financially and spiritually. In our democratic system the artist should be free to express himself to the fullest capacity of the understanding of his audience. In a democracy the artist must be free to express democracy.

The Section of Fine Arts, by its democratic method of selection of artists, reaches the many as well as the expert. The Section works on the assumption that art is not a mystery, it has only to be seen to be understood. This Government-commissioned work, representing contemporary art in all its variety, finds an audience numbered in millions.

Art that belongs so wholly and impartially to the people must be judged without political partisanship. I am happy to announce that Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, the able leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, shares this feeling about the work of the Section of Fine Arts. He has asked me to state that he, too, believes that the support of the work of the artists of America should be proudly shared by all, regardless of political affiliations. I think his statement should answer your question, Ned Bruce.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you very much, Senator LA FOLLETTE. Such a message coming from you and Senator MCNARY must be a reassuring note to the artists.

I would be ungracious to conclude this program without expressing to President Roosevelt my very sincere belief that in all history the artists of a country have never received from a nation a wiser nor more democratic patronage. It is to me a proud boast that any artist may demand the right to receive a commission which the Government has to give if judged worthy in the opinion of a competent jury of artists. That plan, in my opinion, is an accomplishment in democracy of which a nation may well be proud, and for this wise cultivation of our artistic talent, we have to thank President Roosevelt.

To my fellow artists, I would like to say that I am deeply grateful for the fine sportsmanship you have shown. To decide which artist's work shall win in a given competition is a close question and you, the artists, have accepted the decisions of our juries in the spirit in which they were made. I can solemnly assure you that the integrity of the decisions of the Section of Fine Arts is a sacred thing to all of us. And so, to you my friends, the artists, I say good night and good work.

Civic Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT OF COMMISSION ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement of the civic education program of the Commission on American Citizenship. I have the honor to be one of the members of the Commission; and I ask that the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Commission on American Citizenship sponsored by the Catholic University of America is a group of representative Americans, organized for the purpose of fostering good citizenship. It is composed of more than a hundred men and women—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—joined in the common purpose of maintaining the American Nation as an effective agent of democracy. The immediate aim of the Commission is to prepare a civic education program for the Catholic schools of America which will broaden the scope and enrich the spirit of their existing curriculum.

This program, made necessary to fortify the new generation against false and subversive theories of government, will correlate religious teaching with civic living. It will further develop in the Catholic children of the Nation a deep and abiding consciousness of their moral obligation to live as good Americans and good Catholics.

From the time of the establishment of the colony of Maryland in 1634, Catholics have been integral factors in the building of American citizenship. With their fellow-Americans, Catholics took part in the War for Independence, signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, voluntarily enlisted in our wars of defense, blazed trails in the geographical and industrial wilderness, and generally assumed those duties and responsibilities which have been the basis of American progress.

Since it is good Catholic doctrine as well as good American doctrine that all men are created free and equal and therefore entitled to certain fundamental civil rights, the Catholics of the Nation have consistently labored to uphold the standard of an honest, responsible, moral citizenship consonant with basic American principles. In the period of our Nation building great bishops of the Roman Catholic Church—John Carroll, John England, John Ireland, John Lancaster Spalding, James Cardinal Gibbons—pushed forward the frontiers of American democratic thought as well as the frontiers of their Catholic faith.

The industrial revolution, transforming the western world economically, created civic problems which have unquestionably been the cause of many of our modern social and political conflicts. The great social encyclicals of the Catholic church have challenged all thoughtful men and women to give consideration to means of improving the social system.

In direct line with this consciousness of the need of moral affirmation of civic attitudes the late Pope Pius XI in September 1938, a few months before his death, addressed a letter to the American Catholic bishops, in which he condemned "any civic philosophy which would degrade man to the position of a soulless pawn in a sordid game of power and prestige, or would seek to banish him from the human family or set him at the throats of his fellows in a blind, brutish class struggle for existence." Warning of the errors of totalitarianism and the immorality of the doctrine of race supremacy, the Pope urged American Catholics to formulate "a constructive program of social action, fitted in detail to local needs, which will command the admiration and acceptance of all right-thinking men."

The American Hierarchy in response to the Pope's appeal instructed The Catholic University of America to prepare a program of civic education based on ethical principles; for ethical principles alone, the bishops held, "would make men respect their own rights and the rights of their fellow citizens."

To sponsor this program of good citizenship the Commission on American Citizenship was organized by the Catholic University under the presidency of the rector of the university, Bishop Joseph M. Corrigan. Among those invited to join the commission were citizens of many different racial, religious, and social groups, whose otherwise diversified interests were united in a common desire to improve our American democracy.

The Commission as of March 15, 1940: William H. Albers, Edward C. Bailly, S. A. Baldus, Mrs. M. C. Banning, Mrs. G. H. Bradford, Joseph I. Breen, Mrs. George E. Brennan, Louis Brownlow, John S. Burke, Nicholas M. Butler, Thomas H. Cannon, Mrs. H. F. Chadeayne, Dennis Chavez, Eugene A. Clark, Elbridge Colby, J. V. Connolly, Ralph Adams Cram, Walter J. Cummings, Mrs. Anna R. Downes, Miss Mary C. Duffy, H. P. Drought, John Elbeck, Charles W. Elliot II, James A. Farley, Mrs. Herbert F. Fisher, Mrs. Mary P. Fischer, Miss P. J. French, Mrs. Anna D. Gamble, Hugh Gibson, William I. Green, Miss May Haverty, Miss Mary G. Hawks, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Will H. Hays, Sidney Hillman, Miss Jane Hoey, Frank J. Hogan, Miss Anne S. Hooley, Herbert Hoover, Mrs. Margaret A. Hull, William Jeffers, Miss Elizabeth Jordan, F. P. Kenkel, Louis Kenedy, Joseph P. Kennedy, Joseph E. Kerrigan, Mrs. Frances P. Keyes, Miss Mary A. Kinsella, R. M. La Follette, Jr., Miss K. F. Lenroot, John L. Lewis, Breckinridge Long, Miss E. W. Loughran, Francis Maloney, Mrs. C. B. Manning, Francis P. Matthews, Patrick McCarran, Mrs. J. W. McCollum, Edward F. McGrady, John Steven McGroarty, James M. Mead, Miss Mary V. Merrick, J. P. Michalski, Mrs. Emma G. Miller, Henry Monsky, Mrs. Arthur M. Mullen, Frank Murphy, Philip Murray, Miss Agnes Nestor, Miss A. M. Nicholson, Mrs. Mary T. Norton, Herbert R. O'Conor, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Frederick D. Patterson, J. J. Pelley, Martin Quigley, John J. Raskob, Miss Agnes G. Regan, Richard Reid, Charles H. Ridder, Leo S. Rowe, Miss Vida D. Scudder, William H. Siefen, Leonard Simutis, Alfred E. Smith, A. A. Sprague, Foster Stearns, Harold W. Storey, Roger W. Straus, John J. Sullivan, Daniel J. Tobin, Thomas W. Turner, Mrs. Allen L. Vories, Robert F. Wagner, David I. Walsh, James E. West, Burton K. Wheeler, Miss Helen C. White, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Thomas F. Woodlock.

The following fraternal organizations also have endorsed the Commission's aims and program: American Lithuanian Roman Catholic Federation; Ancient Order of Hibernians in America; Ancient Order of Hibernians Ladies' Auxiliary; Catholic Central Verein of America; Catholic Daughters of America; Catholic Knights of St. George; Catholic Order of Foresters; Catholic War Veterans, Inc.; Daughters of Isabella; International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, Knights of Columbus; National Council of Catholic Men; National Council of Catholic Women; Polish Association of America; Women's Catholic Order of Foresters.

The Commission has opened offices on the campus of the Catholic University of America and recruited a staff headed by Robert H. Connery, Ph. D., as director, and Mary Synon as editorial consultant. Direct supervision of the program rests with the executive committee consisting of Msgr. Francis J. Haas, Rev. George Johnson, and Robert H. Connery.

Aiding the executive committee is the advisory committee consisting of: Herbert C. F. Bell, professor of history, Wesleyan University; Franklin Dunham, educational director, National Broadcasting Co.; Charles G. Fenwick, professor of political science, Bryn Mawr College; James L. Hanley, superintendent of schools, Providence, R. I.; F. Ernest Johnson, professor of education, Columbia University; Jerome G. Kerwin, professor of political science, University of Chicago; David A. McCabe, professor of economics, Princeton University; Florence Stratemeyer, professor of education, Columbia University; Henry C. Taylor, director, Farm Foundation; Howard E. Wilson, professor of education, Harvard University.

To be successful this project must be the cooperative undertaking of the whole Catholic educational system in America, aided by the best advice obtainable from other sources. Consequently diocesan superintendents of schools, religious community supervisors of teachers, and Catholic college faculties have been consulted on the proper scope of the program in terms of educational needs. Many of these consultants have submitted extensive and thought-provoking memoranda.

Upon the basis of these suggestions the program of the commission has gradually taken shape. A statement of philosophic principles in regard to civic education, courses of study and text materials are in process of preparation. Teacher education is also recognized as an important factor. Consequently round tables in connection with teachers institutes, summer schools, and study clubs will be held whenever practicable. In its larger sense the program will deal with many different phases of education and should be of direct value to the whole educational system in the United States.

Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES AND A TELEGRAM FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials and a telegram relative to the recent reorganization order of the President.

There being no objection, the editorials and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from American Aviation of May 1, 1940]

BOMBSHELL

(By Wayne W. Parrish)

The lightning invasion of Denmark and Norway by Germany a few weeks ago was no more startling to the civilized world than was the President's Reorganization Plan IV to civil aviation in the United States.

In a world in which stability and tradition are being thrown to the winds, civil aviation in the United States has learned that it, too, is subject to lightning upheavals. The constructive permanence which aviation believed had been ingrained within the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has proved to be but a mere hope. The marching orders are out again.

For 5 long years civil aviation waited while Congress carefully studied and considered aviation's knotty legislative problems. For 5 long years the constructive elements within aviation bided their time until the Government's promotional and regulatory agency could be removed from the sorry political plight in the Department of Commerce.

There was a feeling of relief when the Civil Aeronautics Authority was created in that summer of 1938. Tension relaxed. The battle had been won. At last civil aviation had come into its own with its own agency through what was hailed then as a model piece of legislation.

But not for long. Two years to the month that Congress voted the new agency into existence the President would shift the Civil Aeronautics Authority back into the politically ridden Department of Commerce. Two short years of respite. And now the battle lines are forming again. Congress has but 60 days to disapprove. If it does nothing, the Civil Aeronautics Authority in June becomes a mere puppet bureau within a Government department. It is a difficult task this time, for the President does not seek the approval

of Congress to effect a reorganization. The order goes into effect unless both Houses of Congress on their own initiative disapprove.

Why, in the midst of an election year, should the President suddenly decide to destroy the independent Civil Aeronautics Authority? What are the motives behind a move which all Washington knows may be political dynamite just at this time? The answer, apparently, is simply that in the background of governmental maneuvers there looms the plans for a single transportation agency to regulate all forms of carriers, and the shift of aviation's agency is the first step in a series of moves to bring about one governmental unit to regulate all transportation.

It may well be that Congress is becoming disturbed at the prospective loss of its legislative prerogatives. For it is not Congress, the people's legislative agency, which is bringing about far-reaching changes within government. The changes are coming, piece by piece, through Executive orders, in a manner which might well raise the eyebrows of lovers of democracy. Civil aviation is bewildered by the intricacies and political manipulations in our National Capital, but civil aviation has been bewildered before. It is learning now, as it has learned before, that civil aviation is the guinea pig, the line of least resistance, in the curious, mysterious fantasy which comprises government in a vast democracy.

He who believes that civil aviation will retain an independent status within the Department of Commerce is naive indeed. He who thinks that civil aviation can hold its head high and find an important place in the sun while dominated by the Department of Commerce is an optimist indeed. The day the Civil Aeronautics Authority is transferred to the Department of Commerce, civil aviation becomes again fair prey to all of the multifarious political machinations about which it remembers much. Regardless of whatever good intentions the President may have in asking for this transfer, it is worth every ounce of energy civil aviation can expend to fight to the last for independence. Railroad, truck lines, waterway operators—none of these wants a Government coordination of transportation into a single unit. And neither does air transport. Neither do the aircraft manufacturers want to face again the costly red tape with which they struggled in the miserably incompetent Department of Commerce. Neither do the pilots and the fixed-base operators want the headaches, the sorry inspection system, and the unconstructive regulation of the old Commerce Department.

It won't be "going back" to the old conditions, the President's workers say. Ah, no? What an illusion. There is one evil of all Government departments which is never absent—and that evil is the specter of politics. The Civil Aeronautics Authority came the closest to being a nonpolitical institution that Washingtonians ever expect to see. Such agencies come too rarely to have them overthrown so quickly.

The marching orders are posted again. All civil aviation has been drafted to fight again. Stronger in Congress than ever before, strengthened by all that is right and constructive, civil aviation looks to the people's representatives to defend it from the inroads of insecurity, red tape, costly inefficiency, and politics. Let the people's representatives know how you feel.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 15, 1940]

AIR SAFETY AND ECONOMY

President Roosevelt's reorganization order proposing to do away with the Air Safety Board and leave its functions to the Civil Aeronautics Authority seems to have stirred up a small hornet's nest. Actually it presents one of the questions which reduction of Federal bureaucracy often presents.

Assistance to aeronautics and regulation of air transport are among the more recently added functions of the Federal Government, and the agencies charged with these duties have expanded rapidly in personnel and expenditures. If economy can be achieved by consolidating bureaus and centralizing responsibility, this mushrooming field would seem a place to apply the precepts. This apparently is what the President has done, saving a couple of top salaries.

But is that all there is to it? A few weeks ago Senator ROBERT A. TAFT posed a query as to whether the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics, among a number of other Federal agencies, was a necessary institution. Mr. Roosevelt immediately came to the defense of the council by saying that it fosters research which contributes enormously to the development and safety of air travel.

If this is true of the Council, it seems just as strikingly true of the Air Safety Board. Some years ago when the Aeronautics Division of the Department of Commerce was its own investigation agency, a rather bad situation arose, represented in a series of crashes. The Air Safety Board was set up with independent authority to investigate such occurrences and to place the responsibility where it might belong, whether on the operating company, the plane manufacturer, the pilot, or on the Government units supposed to maintain airway aids, to test airworthiness of planes, or to make flying regulations.

On these various points the Board has made some significant reports. Men who fly the ships believe its presence has had something to do with the magnificent safety record of air lines in the United States during the last year. Once more economy presents the question, How far do Americans wish the Government to curtail new functions?

[From the Annalist of April 18, 1940]

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT: NEW DEAL SEEKS TO REGAIN POLITICAL CONTROL OF AVIATION

(By Kendall K. Hoyt)

WASHINGTON.—Government Reorganization Orders Nos. III and IV have plunged the administration into new controversies. Transfer from the Department of Agriculture of the Food and Drug Administration to the Federal Security Administration and the Weather Bureau to the Department of Commerce will meet with resistance. The President did not take the further step of shifting the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior and thus avoided one point of congressional attack. But the change in status of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from an independent agency to a subsidiary of the Department of Commerce has outraged Members of Congress interested in aviation.

This is important because it is a blow to the progress of one of our few expanding industries which has given great promise of contributing substantially to economic recovery. It is important also because the C. A. A. was intended as a pattern for the so-called Government reorganization plan of administrative control over all quasi-judicial agencies. The Reorganization Act specifically exempted such regulatory and control agencies as I. C. C., the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office, which are not wholly under the thumb of the White House, and were aimed at in the original reorganization bill, which failed to pass. But the proposed exemption of C. A. A. lost out last year by a close vote. In last week's message the President favored reenactment of the present law, expiring January 20, 1941, with no agencies exempted from the President's power to reorganize. Meanwhile here is what happened to C. A. A.:

Order No. III made internal shifts to strip the five-man board of C. A. A. of almost all powers except rate making and rule making in the air-transport field. It concentrated the powers in the hands of the Administrator, whom the President can remove, and therefore can control. This idea of all-powerful administrators subservient to the White House, rather than the old plan of bipartisan boards with some degree of independence to perform their judicial functions, is the primary aim of reorganization rather than increased efficiency, which the New Deal claims, and economy, which the New Deal admits is slight under its merger plans.

Order No. IV shifted the whole C. A. A. set-up under the moth-eaten wing of the Commerce Department, hungry for the restoration of functions which it had lost through the grossest maladministration. Further, the order destroyed the independent three-man Air Safety Board of C. A. A. and put a single administrator in its place.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN of Nevada, father of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, has filed resolutions whereby Congress can disapprove the two orders by a majority vote of both Houses within 60 days. There is a good chance that the Senate will pass the McCarran resolutions. Considerable support is developing in the House. But the lack of a majority in either Chamber will allow the orders to take effect within 60 days unless Congress adjourns meanwhile.

The air-transport industry would be forced back into the dark period of political control from which it has but recently emerged. The story of the political cancelation of the air-mail contracts, after a smearing investigation by a committee headed by Senator Black; the banishment from the industry of the executives who had pioneered aviation; the flying of the mail by the Army Air Corps, with the consequent death of 13 pilots and the return of the air mail to the reorganized air lines is well enough known. But the public is little aware of what happened in the next 4 years.

Under the Air Mail Act of 1934 the air lines were placed under the divided jurisdiction of three Federal agencies. The Post Office handled the air mail and thus wielded despotic control. The development of new air routes and additional trips on existing routes was frozen within a limited mileage of mail flights. The Post Office had a way of making the air lines carry a large part of the mail almost free. So the domestic air-mail "subsidy" finally became no subsidy at all since the Government was breaking even on the service. The Interstate Commerce Commission was empowered to adjust rates, but the Post Office, holding "kangaroo court," often ignored its findings.

Air safety was under the old Bureau of Air Commerce of the thoroughly political Commerce Department, under the benign rule of Uncle Danny Roper as Secretary, and "Rowboat" Johnson as Assistant Secretary. The Department was in charge also of maritime safety. One remembers the series of terrible ship fires, among the most disastrous in history. There were frequent air crashes, too. The Bureau was never responsible. It investigated the accidents and laid the blame on weather conditions or on the dead pilot. Safety is of vital importance to the air lines. After every accident there was a sharp drop in passenger traffic.

Yet the industry was afraid to fight. Under the thumbs of two political departments, any line that dared criticize New Deal policies could easily be squeezed into silence. Bound against expansion, the

air lines operated at heavy losses. Investors shunned the industry. Some of the lines were on the verge of bankruptcy by 1938 when the C. A. A. took over.

Two years have brought great changes. New routes have been opened. Passenger and express service has increased by leaps and bounds. For more than 12 months there has not been one fatality in the scheduled services of the air lines.

The credit should go to Senator McCarran, who was a Member of the Senate investigating committee in 1933, saw the injustice that was being done, and fought for years to place aviation under fair public regulation so that it could expand and become a great industry. McCarran proved himself a statesman by refusing to compromise with principle. His present fight to prevent the destruction of his work is among the most important issues of the session both in its effect on a growing industry and in its broader implications as to New Deal control of the Federal agencies which regulate American enterprise.

The C. A. A., as now constituted, is not perfect. But it has done its job and can stand on its record, as few Federal agencies can. The unexpected order to break its independence and place it under the Hopkins regime in the Commerce Department would inaugurate another period of strangulation of the air transport industry. This whole intolerable story makes it hard to believe that the New Deal is not trying deliberately to wreck the private-enterprise system.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 21, 1940]

AIR SAFETY BOARD ENDED PUBLIC FEARS, GREEN SAYS—A. F. L. CHIEF URGES CONGRESS TO REJECT TRANSFER OF AVIATION CONTROL

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, last night joined the fight against the proposed transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Commerce Department and the abolition of the Air Safety Board.

Green said:

"I am deeply concerned about the part of President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plan No. IV in which he proposes to abolish the Air Safety Board and the new Civil Aeronautics Authority, and to place the control of civil aeronautics and air transportation back into the Department of Commerce. Surely, we all well remember what the record of civil air regulation by this Department was.

DISTRESSING PERIOD

"The air-line pilots of the Nation are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. That period between the late 1920's and 1938, when the new Civil Aeronautics Act was passed, was a distressing one for the pilots and the air carrying companies that were struggling to build a new industry.

"Because of the high death rate of the pilots and their passengers, there was created a genuine fear on the part of the public to use air travel. Frequent crashes emptied the passenger seats in the planes from which the carriers derived their revenue. The public could not be blamed for this, especially when it is remembered that 473 lives were lost, of which 146 were air-line pilots.

"The air-line pilots are a brave lot. They never complain. I often worried about their high death rate. Even the president of their organization who was an air-line pilot almost lost his life in an air crash during the period that the Department of Commerce controlled air transportation.

FOUGHT AGAINST POLITICS

"Pilot leaders discussed the situation with me personally many times. They pointed out that air transportation could be made safe and the loss of life was needless and could be stopped. They said that first politics must be swept clean from any civil air regulatory agency before real air safety could be achieved.

"They went further and pointed out that the functions of regulating civil flying and investigating accidents would have to be separated and made entirely independent of each other. In this way those making the regulations would not be sitting in judgment on themselves when something happened.

"Several years ago the Federation of Labor and the air-line pilots joined hands in a Nation-wide fight to increase the safety of air travel. Federation representatives testified before congressional committees and pointed out in unmistakably clear terms what the situation was. They stated that air transportation could not possibly hope to succeed financially unless confidence in the safety of air travel was first established.

WANTS PLAN REJECTED

"Congress took heed and established a new law, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. They also established an Air Safety Board, independent of the regulatory functions of civil flying. Today it is a different story. Instead of blazing headlines telling of another terrible air crash involving wanton destruction of human life, only a short time ago we saw the headlines 'World Air Safety Record Established.' During the last 12 months America's air-line pilots flew 87,325,145 plane-miles and carried 2,028,817 passengers without a single fatality. Why not leave well enough alone?

"The American Federation of Labor is making a special appeal to all Congressmen and Senators to set aside Reorganization Plan No. IV, which proposes to abolish the Air Safety Board and the new Civil Aeronautics Authority."

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 14, 1940]

ALONG AVIATION LANES WITH BOB HELMER

PRESIDENT CRITICIZED FOR REVAMPING MOVE TO PUT C. A. A. IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT—AGENCY'S EFFICIENCY IS APPLAUDED

Some folks can't leave well enough alone. And President Roosevelt will fall into that meddlesome class, so far as airmen are concerned, if he succeeds in carrying out another reorganization program he set in motion last week.

Among other things, in order to save a paltry $300,000 annually—and that's a paltry figure compared to some we've seen tossed about up Washington way—he proposes to bury the 1½-year-old Civil Aeronautics Authority in the somewhat lethargic structure of the Department of Commerce.

The C. A. A. shift is one of four proposed. Unless both branches of Congress defeat the President's plans, the Weather Bureau and two other agencies, which may or may not be functioning efficiently, also will be affected.

Airmen are in accord that the C. A. A. has been doing a good job.

Among programs initiated by the C. A. A. is the Nation-wide college-youth pilot-training program, which will graduate 10,000 new flyers this June. If it did nothing more, the agency at least accomplished a major point of its objective—to foster the growth of aviation.

In addition, President Roosevelt ordered the abolition of the Air Safety Board, a C. A. A. agency, and a transfer of its function of investigating airplane accidents to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Last month the commercial air lines completed a full year of operation without death or serious injury to any passenger or crew member. During that period passenger traffic for the first time exceeded 2,000,000 persons, an increase of 600,000 passengers above the patronage of the preceding 12-month period.

The C. A. A. and its Safety Board were as much responsible for that remarkable achievement as the air lines. It isn't just luck that such a record was established.

Two years ago aviation leaders from over all the Nation convened in Cleveland to plan for the future of aviation. The confab was termed "the First National Aeronautic Planning Conference."

One of the first things the airmen agreed upon was that aviation control should be lifted out of the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department; that a separate agency be set up to permit aviation to grow naturally. They wanted a fast-acting, independent agency to keep pace with aviation's growth.

Although the idea of a separate agency long had been fostered by Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat, Nevada, the first to present the argument in its behalf at the Cleveland confab was Herman A. Bayless, chairman of the aviation committee of Cincinnati's Chamber of Commerce.

The C. A. A. subsequently was established. It differed from similar agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, in that it consists of an independent Administrator as well as a Commission. The Administrator is responsible to the President and exercises all the agency's executive authority. The Board is responsible to Congress and its duties are confined to quasi-judicial and legislative actions.

But it has had a hard row to hoe ever since. Politican bigwigs, apparently disgruntled because the new agency is competently carrying out its program, have been attempting to wreck the agency and send it back into the Department of Commerce.

Just why the President ordered the changes was not fully explained in Washington dispatches, except that he claimed "more effective service" would result. C. A. A.'s outstanding record should be enough evidence that it is operating efficiently. Yet, unless both branches of Congress intervene, the C. A. A. and the other agencies will be scrapped.

There is one thing in the C. A. A.'s favor. That is the second National Aeronautic Planning Conference is slated to be held May 27, 28, 29 in Washington. It's a safe bet that the unannounced program will have among its objectives the retention of the C. A. A.

[From the Washington Star of April 17, 1940]

THE CAPITAL PARADE—STREAMLINING OF AERONAUTICS CONTROL PRODUCES BITTER GOVERNMENT ROW

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

The President recently issued two Executive orders streamlining the Civil Aeronautics Authority. He transferred much of the power of the bipartisan five-man Board to a single individual, the C. A. A. Administrator. He abolished the previously independent Air Safety Board and he placed the revamped Aeronautics Authority under the Commerce Department.

There is obviously much to be said, both in favor of and against the plan. Its proponents argue that the reorganization will produce clear-cut responsibility for the first time. Its opponents see the possibilities of political control of aviation. But, ignoring the merits, the hubbub at the C. A. A. gives an amusing, though somewhat tragic, insight into the workings of Government.

DEMON PLOTTER

The hubbub revolved around two men, Robert H. Hinckley, the Board chairman, and Clinton M. Hester, the Administrator. Hinckley was a successful Utah automobile dealer when he was drafted into Government in 1933. A year or so ago he was named C. A. A. Chairman. He sponsored the civilian pilots' training program and is generally conceded to have done a good job. Hester is a Gov-

ernment career man of some years who earned promotion from the Treasury after he helped draft the Aviation Act. He is a close friend of James Rowe and William H. McReynolds, two of the White House "secret six," and of Louis Brownlow, the President's adviser on Government reorganization. Hinckley and Hester have gotten along well enough except for some natural jealousy.

But in Government everyone holds on to his power with dear life, and the President's first Executive order had hardly reached Congress before a real feud was touched off at the C. A. A. A very circumstantial and rather convincing story was soon circulated, picturing Hester as a demon plotter determined to increase his own power. Hinckley was vacationing in Utah and his sympathizers were honestly convinced that Hester had seized this advantage. As they pictured it, through good friends Rowe, McReynolds, and Brownlow, Hester had gotten White House entree to persuade the President to better his own position.

Hester protested that he knew nothing of the order, but his denial was taken with several grains of salt. Hadn't Hester visited a Board member shortly before the order; hadn't he reported a rumor that the White House would decrease his own authority; hadn't he even threatened to resign if this happened? True, the President's order had the reverse effect, but Hinckley's friends were convinced that Hester's rumor was merely a cover-up for the plot. There was much strong talk at the C. A. A. on both sides. At least one Board member threatened to resign. Representatives of the industry heard the story and naturally became concerned that the C. A. A. was about to be made a political football.

A SILLY BUSINESS

If the people who actually worked with the President on the orders are to be believed, Hester had nothing to do with them. And, in fact, it was the President's own wish that no one at the C. A. A. be consulted. Some months ago when the White House received reports of friction at the authority, Budget Director Harold Smith sent in experts from his administrative management section. They reported that the law did not make a clear demarcation of power, and recommended that there be a reshuffling to give the administrator all "administrative" activity and to confine the Board to purely "quasi-judicial" functions. They also recommended the abolition of the Air Safety Board.

Smith took the plan of the experts to the President, who was impressed by their reasoning, perhaps because he has long felt that the independent agencies should be more directly responsible to the White House. The plan has this effect since the Board members are appointed for fixed terms while the administrator can be removed practically at the will of the President. To the experts' plan, the President added an idea of his own, the transfer of C. A. A. to the Commerce Department. Neither Rowe nor McReynolds knew the details of the order, and were not consulted. Brownlow was shown the plan at the last moment, and objected to its main feature, the transfer to Commerce.

No doubt the ruffled feelings of everyone will soon be calmed. In fact, Hinckley's prestige was somewhat restored on the second order transferring the Aeronautics Authority since his great and good friend, Edward I. Noble, is Undersecretary of Commerce. But the whole episode remains a silly business.

[From the New York Sun of April 13, 1940]

ACROSS THE SKYWAYS—WHAT IS BEHIND MOVE TO SWITCH THE C. A. A. INTO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(By Sherman B. Altick)

The possibility that civil aviation may again become a political football in the hands of the New Deal caused no little concern today as the aeronautical industry studied President Roosevelt's reorganization plan killing the Air Safety Board and transferring the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce.

In flying circles the plan to restore regulation of civil aviation to the Commerce Department is called "the biggest double-cross" of the present administration. Both air-transport officials and aircraft manufacturers fear the worst if the industry goes back to the highly political Department headed by Harry Hopkins.

EFFECTIVE IN JUNE

According to the Reorganization Act, the plan which the President sent to Congress on Thursday will become effective in 60 days unless the two Houses during the intervening period pass a concurrent resolution against it.

Members of the C. C. A., Administrator Clinton M. Hester, and the Air Safety Board were so stunned by the plan that they could not speak. It was said that none of them had any idea about the movement to put the independent C. A. A. under the domination of Secretary Hopkins. Senator PAT MCCARRAN, who fostered the legislation that took the administration of civil aviation away from the Commerce Department, has launched a fight against the plan, but it is believed here that he will be able to accomplish very little, especially during an election year.

Important resignations from the C. A. A. are expected if the plan becomes effective, and if these take place, the Government organization of civil aviation may be broken. In aviation circles it is believed that C. Stuart Guthrie, former general counsel of the C. A. A., and a protégé of Tommy Corcoran, who now is in the Department of Commerce, is one of the prime movers to put control of aviation in the Hopkins domain. It also is believed that Edward J. Noble, former Chairman of the C. A. A. and now Under Secretary of Commerce, also may be one of those working behind the scenes.

WHAT IS BEHIND MOVE

While the air lines are concerned mainly with the high factor of safety made possible by the political-free C. A. A., the aircraft manufacturers fear that they again will be faced with the licensing grief that cost them a fortune under the old Bureau of Air Commerce set-up.

Since the C. A. A. made a splendid record and accomplished much toward making air travel safe in the United States, experts believe that the delay of the Bureau in handling new air-line route and route-extension cases may have been responsible for the new move. A lot of pressure has been brought to bear on political leaders in Washington for new routes by the various lines.

Most of the requests have been shelved, and very few new route certificates granted. All of the lines now are fighting for new places to go. American, T. W. A., United, Eastern Air, Braniff, Pennsylvania Central, Canadian-Colonial, and Northwest Air Lines all have applications before the C. A. A. for extensions of service. Some of the routes encroach upon those now being flown by some of the other lines, and it would take a Solomon to make a fair decision.

For example, United and T. W. A. have applications to enter the Boston territory, which now is exclusively American's. American, in retaliation, or what have you, has applications for new routes which cut into the territory now served by the other lines.

All of the lines are kept busy lobbying in Washington for Government favors. The C. A. A. seemingly has turned a deaf ear on the pleas of the lines, and it may be that the move to shove the entire Bureau over into Mr. Hopkins' domain is just another way of giving C. A. A. members a good spanking.

There also may be something in the fact that this is election year. It may be that some of the vote getters want some action on the air lines, and if that is the case there will be wholesale granting of new route certificates to the favored air lines if Senator MCCARRAN is unsuccessful in halting the transfer.

Everyone in aviation knows why the Air Safety Board is being killed. There has been friction between the Board and the C. A. A. ever since the former stepped into the Boeing-307-crash picture and gave out its own findings for the plunge of the big plane which was being tested for licensing by the C. A. A. They were at variance with the findings of the licensing agency.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 23, 1940.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As president of one of the country's small and independent air lines which owes its continued existence and stability to a nonpolitical agency of Congress, I voice the earnest hope that no reorganization plan will be permitted to destroy the complete independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Any plan which places this Authority under the direction of an Executive department, whether as to procurement or personnel or otherwise, must weaken the detachment and absolute freedom of decision so necessary in such a body. Air transport in particular should be entirely free of any trace of political influence or control. There can be no greater safeguard against the destruction of free enterprise in this young industry than the assurance of protection for all companies, both large and small, which resides in an independent Authority. I have seen the need for this protection through the years and have witnessed its achievement in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. I trust it may be maintained inviolate.

CARLTON PUTNAM,
President, Chicago & Southern Air Lines.

Ethyl Patents Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM LABOR

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article from the April 2, 1940, issue of Labor, relating to the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called ethyl patents case. This article refers to one phase of the very interesting work which has been conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee under the able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I ask that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor of April 2 1940]

HIGH COURT CURBS USE OF PATENTS TO CREATE MONOPOLY—DECISION IN ETHYL CASE IS HELD THE MOST IMPORTANT ON SUBJECT EVER MADE—WEAPON FOR GOVERNMENT—STARTLING DISCLOSURES OF O'MAHONEY PROBE SHOW IRONCLAD CONTROL OF INDUSTRY

The Supreme Court ruled this week that a patent monopoly cannot be used to fix prices and control an industry all the way down the line, from producer through middleman, to the consumer.

The decision was hailed as the most important one on the use of patents ever issued by any court. It is expected to aid the Government in its war on numerous monopolies based on patents.

The court ordered the Ethyl Gasoline Corporation, owned by the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey and other big oil concerns, to stop its system of licensing jobbers who distribute gasoline treated with the patented product Ethyl. The licenses, the court held, have been used to control the prices at which the jobbers sold the gasoline to dealers and the public.

FAR-REACHING SIGNIFICANCE

The far-reaching significance of this decision can be better understood by recalling the constitutional provision under which Congress created the patent system long ago, and some disclosures made by Senator O'MAHONEY's Monopoly Committee at its December 1938 hearings on patents.

The Constitution says that the purpose of granting patents is "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, by securing to inventors exclusive rights to their discoveries."

In other words, patents are to encourage and reward inventors, not to enable great corporations to monopolize whole industries and rob consumers.

DIVERTED FROM PURPOSE

How far the patent system has been diverted from its real purpose was revealed by several examples explored by O'MAHONEY's probe. One example was the huge glass container industry, which levies tribute on the pocketbook of every man, woman, and child who buys milk, preserves, perfumes, or anything else that comes in a glass jar or bottle.

The committee found that this industry is controlled from top to bottom by one corporation, the Hartford-Empire Co., through its ownership of more than 700 patents on machinery which makes glass jars and bottles automatically.

CONTROL IRONCLAD

So ironclad is the control of this monopoly that its profits steadily increased throughout the depression, when almost all other industries were losing money. In 1937 Hartford-Empire's profits reached the fabulous height of 67 cents on each dollar of investment.

O'MAHONEY summed up the testimony on Hartford-Empire in these words:

"Here is an industry where patents have resulted in a sort of private N. R. A., controlling production and prices. Through refusal to grant licenses, persons desiring to enter the industry have been barred out. By litigation producers have been eliminated from the business, thus limiting the number of producers.

CONTROL INDUSTRY

"Those in control of the patents issue or refuse to issue what amounts to a 'certificate of convenience and necessity' to those who desire to enter the industry. The original intention of patents, to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, has been obscured."

As a result of these disclosures, the Government began prosecution of the glass container monopoly on charges that it is violating the antitrust laws. This suit is pending in a Federal court at Cleveland, and its decision may be influenced by the Supreme Court ruling in the Ethyl case.

A Dissenting Opinion of Mr. Justice Story Enacted As Law Within 36 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE VIRGINIA LAW REVIEW

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by George Stewart Brown, entitled "A Dissenting Opinion of Mr. Justice Story Enacted as Law Within 36 Days." The article is reprinted from the April 1940 Virginia Law Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the April 1940 Virginia Law Review]

A DISSENTING OPINION OF MR. JUSTICE STORY ENACTED AS LAW WITHIN 36 DAYS

(By George Stewart Brown)

There has been much discussion as to the value of dissenting opinions. There are those who contend that, except in cases of close divisions among the judges, they should not be filed at all. It is claimed that they weaken the prestige and authority of the court without accomplishing anything substantial; further, that they express a form of judicial egotism better suppressed than exhibited. It is urged that unless the subject matter is of vital importance to the future Government structure, which is seldom the case in ordinary constitutional or statutory construction, lone dissenting judges should refrain from expressing their individual views and go along with the majority of the court.

On the other hand, others contend to the contrary that dissenting opinions are often extremely valuable and necessary. They assert that, in the struggle for law under changing conditions in society, dissenting opinions have frequently become the entering wedge which has finally resulted in a complete change in the prevailing judicial construction of particular constitutional or statutory provisions; again, that they frequently, and incidentally, point out or suggest necessary statutory changes of a remedial character, which the legislature has subsequently adopted, amounting to a very important contribution and aid to subsequent legislative policy. They thus, it is contended, call attention in a vivid fashion to needed changes in the law which are subsequently adopted.

Frequent instances can be pointed out where positions taken in dissent by distinguished judges, the first time a question arose, have finally, after further discussion and more elaborate debate in subsequent litigation, become the settled view of all, or nearly all, of the judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Justice Brandeis in a most illuminating marginal note in Burnet against Coronado Oil & Gas Co.[1] has a list of cases, startling in the number of instances cited, where the Supreme Court has changed its mind upon an important question of construction. In this list there are many instances where a vigorous dissent subsequently became the majority view of the Court.

Dissenting opinions indicate another thing which is of public importance. They show that the Court where they are filed is not a "one judge court," i. e., that under the pressure of business and the give and take of modern life in such circumstances the Court has not left the case, by a division of labor, entirely to one of its members, with the remaining members giving scant attention to the principle involved or to the factual details, often of a complicated nature. In other words, sharply divided opinion, and even small minority dissents, tend to show that each and every member of the Court is performing his full duty, by study and research, in the cases which come before the Court. This is something which is little appreciated by the general public. While lawyers often complain about "one judge courts," the public is apt to scoff at 5-to-4 or 6-to-3 decisions as indicating something wrong about the Court or its members. As just pointed out, exactly the contrary is true. The public should welcome that evidence that each and every member of the Court is fully performing his duty in every case and not dividing up the work and responsibility by common consent and acquiescence.

Mr. Justice Story, however, seems to be the only judge to whom was to be accredited the very remarkable honor of having his dissenting opinion in Cary against Curtis[2] become the law of the land before the volume which noted it as a dissent was published.

In 36 days Congress passed, and President Tyler signed, the Declaratory Act of February 26, 1845, which recalled the majority ruling in Cary against Curtis and made Judge Story's opinion the law of the land. When we consider the ordinary delays in legislative procedure, that was accomplished in the shortest possible period of time—as nearly instantaneous action as could well be performed. The entire credit in this matter is not due to Justice Story as Justice McLean also filed a less elaborate separate dissenting opinion supporting Justice Story's position. The decision in Cary against Curtis was rendered on January 21, 1845, as the records of the Supreme Court show.[3]

Previously importers had always enjoyed a full judicial review of all questions of fact and law involved in the decisions of the collector of customs in classifying imported merchandise. As Mr. Justice Lurton says in Louisiana against McAdoo:[4]

"There have always been remedies by which an importer may recover an excess rate of duty exacted from him by a customs collector, either by common law action against the collector, as in *Elliott* v. *Swartwout* (10 Peters 137), or by statute, section 2931, Revised Statutes, act of June 10, 1890; Act of August 5, 1909."

When the collector of customs was sued individually at common law he withheld the duties which the court might compel him to

---

[1] 285 U. S. 393, 406–407 (1932).

[2] 3 How. 236, 252 (U. S. 1845).

[3] The writer obtained this date by letter from the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United Ssates. The Howard reports did not give the dates of the decisions at that time, only indicating that they were of the January term, 1845.

[4] 234 U. S. 627, 632 (1914).

repay instead of turning them over to the Treasury. Some collectors defaulted and did not account for the accumulations. To prevent this, Congress passed a rider to an appropriation bill which compelled collectors to pass the money over to the Treasury as soon as collected. A majority of the Supreme Court in Cary against Curtis held this destroyed the common law remedy. Congress did not establish a new statutory remedy but promptly recalled the decision by a new act[5] declaring in so many words that nothing contained in the appropriation rider—

"shall take away, or be construed to take away or impair, the right of any person or persons who have paid or shall hereafter pay money, as and for duties, under protest, to any collector of customs, or other person acting as such, in order to obtain goods, wares, or merchandise imported by him or them, or on his or their account, which duties are not authorized or payable in part or in whole by law, to maintain an action at law against such collector, or other person acting as such, to ascertain and try the legality and validity of such demand and payment of duties, and to have a right to a trial by jury, touching the same, according to the due course of law."

Thus Congress immediately restored a full judicial review of all questions of fact as well as all questions of law involved in customs taxation.

In De Lima against Bidwell[6] a common law action brought by Coudert Bros. in the Supreme Court of New York State for a matter falling outside the customs administrative act, Mr. Justice Brown, speaking for the entire court, reviewed what had happened in the following language:[7]

"An act was passed in 1839 requiring moneys collected for duties to be deposited to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, and it was made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to draw his warrant upon the Treasurer in case he found more money had been paid to the collector than the law required. It was held by a majority of this court in *Cary* v. *Curtis* (3 How. 236), that this act precluded an action of assumpsit for money had and received against the collector for duties received by him, and that the act of 1839 furnished the sole remedy. It was said of that case in *Arnson* v. *Murphy* (109 U. S. 238, 240): 'Congress, being in session at the time that the decision was announced, passed the explanatory act of February 26, 1845, which, by legislative construction of the act of 1839, restored to the claimant his right of action against the collector, but required the protest to be made in writing at the time of payment of the duties alleged to have been illegally exacted, and took from the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to refund conferred by the act of 1839.'"

The Supreme Court were sharply divided on the merits of the so-called insular cases of which De Lima against Bidwell was one. They were all of one mind on the proposition that where there was no statutory remedy the common law remedy revived. After discussing the common law remedy which had been invoked, they said:[8]

"We are all of opinion that this action was properly brought." They had previously said:[9]

"Conceding then that section 3011 has been repealed, and that no remedy exists under the Customs Administrative Act, does it follow that no action whatever will lie? If there be an admitted wrong, this court will look far to supply an adequate remedy."

Lowell, C. J., a distinguished Massachusetts Federal judge, in *United States* v. *Schlesinger*[10] described this interesting bit of legal history as follows:

"In *Cary* v. *Curtis* (3 How. 236), the Supreme Court modified this rule by holding that a public officer who was absolutely bound to pay into the Treasury every dollar which he received, so that he could not protect himself in case of suit, was not liable to an action. Congress, then in session, approved of the dissenting opinion of Story and McLean, JJ., in that case and promptly reversed this decision by St. 26, February 1845 (5 Stat. 727). This statute gave no new rights. It simply removed the obstruction of *Cary* v. *Curtis* and left the importer to his remedy at common law."

Mr. Justice Cardozo, in *Moore Ice Cream Co.* v. *Rose*,[11] an income-tax case, also mentions the matter:

"As the law stood before later statutes, the taxpayer's protest was notice to a collector that suit was about to follow, and was warning not to pay into the Treasury the moneys collected. * * * Statutes first enacted in 1839 and progressively broadened made it the duty of collectors to pay the money over to the Government, whether there had been protest or no protest. At first this was thought to have relieved them of personal liability (*Cary* v. *Curtis*, 3 How. 236), but later acts of Congress established a different rule, though maintaining the duty to make remittance to the Treasury."

In view of the remarkable circumstances of its immediate approval by Congress this dissenting opinion by Judge Story is probably the most important dissenting opinion ever delivered by a justice of the Supreme Court. This is also true because it protected and preserved the fundamental right of a taxpayer in a free country to compel his government to deal honestly with him in the levy of taxes. Ever since that time this right of the customs taxpayer has been protected by Congress with meticulous care.

The present statutory judicial review in customs taxation which has succeeded the common law action covers a complete review of the facts involved as well as the construction of the law.[12] The judicial review in income taxation is equally broad. The latter suit may be brought if desired in the appropriate United States District Court with an optional jury trial of the controverted facts[13] or, in the alternative, without paying the tax, before the Board of Tax Appeals.[14]

The gist of Judge Story's dissenting opinion which so impressed Congress and caused it to act so quickly to insist on the continuation of the broad judicial review in customs taxation on both questions of fact and law, which position Congress has consistently adhered to ever since, is as follows:[15]

"I know of no power, indeed, of which a free people ought to be more jealous than of that of levying taxes and duties; and yet if it is to rest with a mere executive functionary of the Government absolutely and finally to decide what taxes and duties are leviable under a particular act, without any power of appeal to any judicial tribunal, it seems to me that we have no security whatsoever for the rights of the citizens. And if Congress possess a constitutional authority to vest such summary and final power of interpretation in an executive functionary, I know no other subject within the reach of legislation which may not be exclusively confided in the same way to an executive functionary; nay, to the Executive himself. Can it be true that the American people ever contemplated such a state of things as justifiable or practicable under our Constitution? I cannot bring my mind to believe it; and, therefore, I repeat it, with the most sincere respect for my brethren, who entertain a different opinion, I deny the constitutional authority of Congress to delegate such functions to any executive officer, or to take away all right of action for an admitted wrong and illegal exercise of power in the levy of money from the injured citizens. I am further of opinion, as I shall endeavor presently to show, that Congress never had contemplated passing any such act, and that the act of the 3d of March 1839 (Chap. 82, sec. 2), neither requires nor in my humble judgment justifies such an interpretation.

* * * * * * *

"An action for money had and received being then the known and appropriate remedy of the common law, applied to cases of this sort, to protect the subject from illegal taxation and duties levied by public officers, what ground is there to suppose that Congress could intend to take away so important and valuable a remedy and leave our citizens utterly without adequate protection?

"It is said that circuitously another remedy may be found. The answer is that if Congress have taken away the direct remedy, the circuitous remedy must be equally barred. But in point of fact no other judicial remedy does exist or can be applied. If the collector is not responsible to pay back the money, nobody is. The Government itself is not suable at all; and certainly there is no pretense to say that the Secretary of the Treasury is suable therefor. Where, then, is the remedy which is supposed to exist? It is an appeal to the Secretary of the Treasury for a return of the money, if in his opinion it ought to be returned, and not otherwise. No court, no jury, nay, not even the ordinary rules of evidence, are to pass between that officer and the injured claimant to try his rights or to secure him adequate redress. Assuming that the Secretary of the Treasury will always be disposed to do what he deems to be right in the exercise of his discretion, and that he possesses all the qualifications requisite to perform this duty among the other complicated duties of his office—a presumption which I am in no manner disposed to question—still it removes not a single objection. It is, after all, a substitution of executive authority and discretion for judicial remedies. Nor should it be disguised that upon so complicated a subject as the nature and character of articles made subject to duties grave controversies must always exist (as they have always hitherto existed) as to the category within which particular fabrics and articles are to be classed. The line of discrimination between fabrics and articles approaching near to each other in quality or component materials or commercial denominations is often very nice and difficult, and sometimes exceedingly obscure. It is the very case, therefore, which is fit for judicial inquiry and decision, and falls within the reach of that branch of the judicial power given by the Constitution where it is declared 'that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties, etc.' If, then, the judicial power is to extend to all cases arising under the laws of the United States, upon what ground are we to say that cases of this sort, which are eminently 'cases arising under the laws,' and of a judicial nature, are to be excluded from judicial cognizance and lodged with an executive functionary?

"Besides, we know that, in all revenue cases, it is the constant practice of the Secretary of the Treasury to give written instructions to the various collectors of the customs as to what duties are to be collected under particular revenue laws, and what, in his judgment, is the proper interpretation of those laws. I will venture to assert

---

[5] 5 Stat. 349, 727 (1845).
[6] 182 U. S. 1 (1901).
[7] Id. at 178.
[8] Id. at 180.
[9] Id. at 176.
[10] 14 Fed. 682, 683 (C. C. D. Mass. 1882).
[11] 289 U. S. 373, 380 (1933).
[12] See Brown, The United States Customs Court (1933), 19 A. B. A. J. 333, 416; and Judicial Review in Customs Taxation (1933), 26 Law. & Bank. and Cent. L. J. 263.
[13] *McCaughn* v. *Real Estate Co.* (297 U. S. 606 (1936)); *Higgins* v. *White* (93 F. (2d) 357 (C. C. A. 1st, 1937)).
[14] *Helvering* v. *Terrell* (303 U. S. 218 (1938)).
[15] *Cary* v. *Curtis* (3 How. 236, 253 (U. S. 1845)).

that, in 19 cases out of 20 of doubtful interpretation of any such laws, the collector never acts without the express instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury. So that in most, if not in all, cases where a controversy arises, the Secretary of the Treasury has already pronounced his own judgment.

"Of what use, then, practically speaking, is the appeal to him, since he has already given his decision? Further, it is well known, and the annals of this Court as well as those of the other courts of the United States establish in the fullest manner that the interpretations so given by the Secretary of the Treasury have, in many instances, differed widely from those of the courts. The Constitution looks to the courts as the final interpreters of the laws. Yet the opinion maintained by my brethren does, in effect, vest such interpretation exclusively in that officer.

"These considerations have led me to the conclusion that it never could be the intention of Congress to pass any statute by which the courts of the United States, as well as the State courts, should be excluded from all judicial power in the interpretation of the revenue laws, and that it should be exclusively confided to an executive functionary finally to interpret and execute them—a power which must press severely upon the citizens, however discreetly exercised, and which deeply involves their constitutional rights, privileges, and liberties.

"The same considerations force me, in all cases of doubtful or ambiguous language admitting of different interpretations, to cling to that which should least trench upon those rights, privileges, and liberties, and a fortiori to adopt that which would be in general harmony with our whole system of government."

This brilliant opinion by Judge Story is seldom quoted by lawyers in their briefs, and by judges in their opinions, probably because of the conventional report of it as a dissent, although it would often be appropriate authority in cases dealing with the intent and purpose of Congress in establishing a statutory judicial review in matters of taxation, in substitution for the common-law remedies. This is probably because the legal incident, the subject of this paper, through the prompt action of Congress, which made it the law of the land so soon after being filed, is not generally known. Certainly a dissenting opinion which thus immediately became the law is sound authority to quote.

The original common-law remedy for the recovery of taxes illegally collected was so broad and all inclusive upon both questions of fact as well as questions of law that to give a narrower, less inclusive construction to the present statutory remedies would seem to be inadmissible as in degradation of the common law. Statutes giving a right to sue the Government where no remedy existed before, such as many matters coming before the Court of Claims, are, of course, subject to a strict construction. The converse, however, is true about statutes which perfected and improved and made applicable to modern conditions, an ancient common-law remedy which had always existed, to protect the citizens' elementary right not to be taxed illegally.

There is a widespread and spirited discussion now going on in the law reviews over what is called administrative law, governing suits between the Government and its citizens. The particular phase of administrative law now being extensively debated is how far, that is, to what extent, should there be a judicial review of administrative governmental action. Mr. Justice Story in the quoted opinion presents seemingly unanswerable arguments that, so far as taxation is concerned, which may be in a class by itself, such judicial review of administrative action must necessarily include a review of the facts as well as the law in order to be effective and to establish complete justice between the citizen and his government.

GEORGE STEWART BROWN.

NEW YORK CITY.

Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Ernest Lindley, entitled "Ironic Sequel," in which he discusses some phases of the Walter-Logan bill. The article is published in the Washington Post of today, April 29, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 29, 1940]

IRONIC SEQUEL

(By Ernest Lindley)

WHERE CRITICISM IS DUE

For 7 years one of the commonest lines of attack on the New Deal has been: Its objectives are good. But it has tried to achieve them through hastily drawn unworkable legislation. And it has floundered in poor administration.

Obviously, there is much ground for this criticism. Extenuating circumstances can be pleaded. Haste was necessary, especially in the critical days of 1933–34. No great new venture, such as social insurance, or the regulation or minimum wages and maximum hours, or supervision of the securities markets, can be laid out perfectly in a single law. Experience will always reveal the need for amendments. And no new agency can be organized and put into operation without a certain percentage of inefficiency and error.

Those are explanations, not denials, of the core of truth in the indictment.

Now, however, has come a strange, and ironic sequel: The Walter-Logan bill, which passed the House by a 3-to-1 vote last week and is now before the Senate. The purpose of the Walter-Logan bill is indisputably noble. It is to protect the citizen from the arbitrary or unfair exercise of power by administrative agencies. Its original sponsor was a committee of the American Bar Association, and endorsements of it have come from a host of State and local bar associations, and other organizations, ranging from the American Federation of Labor to the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

The ordinary citizen would presume that with such backing this bill was carefully written and considered. But the opinion of the few qualified experts who have really examined it is overwhelmingly to the contrary. It is doubtful whether in all 7 years of its existence the Roosevelt administration has presented to Congress a bill so poorly drafted to achieve a noble purpose as the Walter-Logan bill is. The administrative errors or deficiencies of the Roosevelt regime are nothing beside the havoc which, in expert opinion, this bill would create in the machinery of Government. Not in decades, if ever, has Congress seriously considered a bill which, in the view of qualified experts, would so seriously disrupt the Government of the United States.

The bill has been condemned not only by experienced men in the Federal Government, but by such conservative leaders of the bar as John Foster Dulles and Alfred Jaretzki, Jr., of the New York firm of Sullivan & Cromwell.

In drafting the bill, lobbyists for the American Bar Association seem to have relied heavily on the research work done by F. F. Blachly, of the Brookings Institution, for Senator BYRD's Government reorganization committee. But Mr. Blachly rakes the bill from stem to stern as wholly incompatible with his findings, unworkable, destructive of efficient government, and possibly unconstitutional.

Louis G. Caldwell, formerly general counsel for the old Federal Radio Commission, was cited by Representative WALTER as one of the original drafts of the American Bar Association recommendation. So he was. But Mr. Caldwell, a highly conservative Chicago lawyer, has denounced every important feature of the Walter-Logan bill.

Here in brief summary are some of Mr. Caldwell's comments:

Section 1, dealing with definitions, is so hazy as to "require a lot of judicial interpretations before it makes sense."

Sections 2 and 3, dealing with rule making by Federal agencies, subjects "the rule-making process to a very heavy burden, whereas, so far as I know, there is no evil calling for so drastic a measure."

Section 4, dealing with procedure in Government agencies, is in some respects "a step backward and not a step forward from the point of view of bringing order out of chaos in administrative law." No existing evil in any independent agency would be cured, and many agencies already have procedures superior to those which would be imposed on them by the Walter-Logan Act.

Section 5, providing for judicial review of proceedings, adds little or nothing to the protection of the individual already available.

Contrary to the claims of its proponents, the bill "does not promote uniformity to any serious degree."

It exempts certain agencies, without rhyme or reason, except that they "protested loudly enough" to the American Bar Association.

Why, in the face of the opinion of experts, to the right and to the left, that it is a monstrosity, has the Walter-Logan bill been able to muster support among bar associations and in Congress? There are, I think, two reasons. One is ignorance of what it would really do. The other is the feeling that something ought to be done to give the citizen greater protection against high-handed actions by Government agencies.

There may be a third reason: it would create a lot of business for lawyers. One analyst estimates that it would produce from 150,000 to 200,000 lawsuits per annum.

There may be still a fourth: that powerful interests believe that in this way they can nullify the Federal regulatory power.

There is no emergency justifying the enactment of a half-baked, destructive bill. By passing it the House has jolted the complacency of some of the New Deal agencies. After the next election it may be possible to deal with the question intelligently. If the Senate is not carried away by sheer emotion it will defeat the bill or recommit it for further study.

Logan-Walter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of April 29:

[From the Washington Star of April 29, 1940]

LOGAN BILL PASSAGE HELD VITAL—JUDGE'S OPINION CITED AS SHOWING ITS IMPORTANCE

(By David Lawrence)

People who say they can't understand the Logan-Walter bill which passed the House of Representatives by a 3-to-1 vote and is now pending in the Senate, and people who say they don't know what is meant when citizens insist on a fair hearing before administrative boards, commissions, and agencies may have some light thrown on the subject by reading a rather remarkable opinion which has just emanated from a United States court for the western district of Missouri.

Strangely enough, the opinion which was written by Judge Merrill E. Otis, is a dissent which upholds Secretary Wallace's ruling and declares that the wording of the statute in question is such that the courts now must affirm rulings even though they know there is a denial of justice in them.

What Judge Otis says is an explanation, incidentally, of why so many courts are upholding the National Labor Relations Board these days. According to Judge Otis, the courts really have no alternative. The language of the law is so binding that it is what the commissions and boards and bureaus declare to be a finding of fact that the courts must uphold. Judge Otis, who has been on the bench since 1925, in a sense twits his two colleagues who overruled Secretary Wallace's position recently in the F. O. Morgan sheep commission case, which was turned back by the Supreme Court of the United States to the district court for retrial.

CALLS IT "FORM"

Says Judge Otis:

"My colleagues, I think, have not been able to accept a certain new philosophy—nor do I accept it, although I recognize it, and I bow to it when Congress incorporates it into a valid statute—a philosophy that exalts the administrative agency and correspondingly lessens the powers of courts of justice. Congress has said that, on judicial review, findings of fact made by such an agency, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. And so the judicial review becomes largely without significance. It looks not to substance, but to form.

"The overwhelming weight of the evidence—the testimony of 20 witnesses—may support one finding, a minimum of substantial evidence. The testimony of a single witness may support the opposite finding. If the administrative agency, actuated by pique or prejudice or class interest or a consideration of the number of votes to be gained by 'the party' finds against the weight of the evidence the reviewing court is helpless.

"And if, under compulsion of law, the reviewing court affirms the agency, it is proclaimed to the world that the United States District Court or the Circuit Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court of the United States has endorsed and approved what the agency has done, it is not unnatural that judges should look with disfavor on such a consequence.

"COMPARED TO A COURT

"How superficial it is to compare such an arbitrary, possibly even dictatorial, fact-finding power with the fact-finding power of a jury. The jury is constantly under the supervising control of the judge. The judge excludes evidence that is irrelevant, immaterial, or otherwise incompetent. He reviews and sums up the case. He inspires the jury at the hour of its final functioning with the high ideals of justice and truth. And he may set aside whatever verdict the jury has returned.

"I think my colleagues have not been able to accept the new philosophy seen in another aspect. To them the 'full hearing' which the law requires an administrative agency to give the parties means a hearing comparable in all important details to the historic judicial hearing, a hearing in the solemn and dignified atmosphere of a courtroom, where the testimony received under the time-tried rules of evidence is presented orally to a trained judge, to an impartial judge (the parties may have him removed for bias and prejudice if he is deemed not impartial), to a judge who hears the arguments of opposing counsel and thereafter decides the issue.

THE CONTRAST

"It is a far cry, my colleagues think (and so think I), from that kind of hearing to such a hearing as that contemplated by, for example, the Packers and Stockyards Act, where the testimony is taken by an examiner (who may also be in fact active counsel for one of the contending parties), where the deciding power is vested in an official who never sees a witness, where the ultimate authority cannot practically read the evidence (although he may be compelled to say that he has done so), where there is no satisfactory way under heaven to dislodge a biased and prejudiced agency and secure another, and where the decision of the agency, so functioning, as to every issue of fact, if supported by any evidence (however defiant of the weight of the evidence), is made as conclusive as the command of a despot. My colleagues find it difficult to see 'due process of law' in such a medley of ritual and form and shadow. I honor and respect them for their steadfastness."

PASSED BY REPUBLICANS

The law under which the case was decided was passed by a Republican Congress. It is like many another statute passed in the days when scant attention was given to the growing economic complexities of governmental regulation. That's why the Walter-Logan bill seeks to revise the procedure for all the major Government commissions and boards which do not already have fair system of procedure to protect the citizen against despotic powers and arbitrary rulings. That's why, too, the House is about to consider the giving of a fair hearing to employer and employee in connection with the pending Smith bill to amend the procedure under the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The New Deal bureaucrats are fighting hard to prevent the passage of these amendments and revisions. This is understandable. They want no curb or check on their own powers at all. The bureaus and commissions and boards, however, must bow to the will of Congress, which is the only elected body really intended by the Constitution to make the laws governing the exercise by the citizen of his rights. If Congress abdicates to the bureaucrats and such measures as the Walter-Logan bill are ultimately vetoed by the President, the people will have a real issue this coming campaign—fair play and a fair deal for all citizens. The issue touches the heart of the democratic process which has heretofore been extolled as a protection of the minority against the excesses of intolerant majorities.

Administrative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN MINTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 24, 1940, entitled "Object and Effect of Walter-Logan Bill."

There being no objection, the edtiorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 24, 1940]

OBJECT AND EFFECT OF WALTER-LOGAN BILL

If Congress fails to pass the Walter-Logan bill, or if the bill is vetoed, Frank Kent assures Republicans they will have been "furnished with one very sound plank and one fairly good issue."

That is a challenge the national administration might not be loath to accept. It would add to the piquancy of the campaign if we could have this issue debated by Mr. Kent and Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, who has given us the best reasons for defeating the Walter-Logan bill.

Justice Frankfurter, to be sure, wouldn't debate it on Kent's erroneous statement of the purpose and effect of such a law. Kent said it will "impose a decent restraint on members of regulatory boards" by "providing for judicial review of acts and decisions of these boards which appear based on unfair or illegal procedure. It will protect individuals from arbitrary and prejudiced disregard of their rights. It will enable a man who has been treated unjustly and without proper hearing or consideration of the facts to appeal to the courts."

It is sufficient answer to these allegations and their implications to say they are refuted by court records. The right of appeal on the grounds he enumerates not only exists but has been exercised against the ruling of every board to which the law would apply. Moreover, the specific exemption from the bill's provisions of the I. C. C., Federal Trade Commission, Federal Reserve Board, and lending agencies proves that these constitutional rights are not involved. The bill is

aimed at such regulatory bodies as the S. E. C., which protects investors from stock and bond market rigging, the Wage-Hour Administration, the Labor Board, and T. V. A.

The Walter-Logan bill would permit the transfer of the business of these agencies to court at any stage almost from the initial step. That would do precisely what Justice Frankfurter said should not be done, reduce regulatory boards to the status of inferior judicial tribunals. Successive appeals could suspend a board's procedure by litigation for years. The brief, stormy career of President Taft's commerce court, supervising the I. C. C., and the ultimate acquiescence of parties in the settled practice before the I. C. C., confirm the reasoning of Justice Frankfurter in the Federal Communications Commission case.

The Justice said the functions and jurisdictions of administrative agencies and courts differ, with methods of procedure adapted to the purposes of their respective functions. Citing the fact that Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence underwent a long process of development, he made it plain that he believed the development of administrative technique should be unhampered by judicial assumption of the responsibilities entailed.

These agencies, beginning with the I. C. C., were created because law courts and their procedure were found not to be adaptable to administrative functions.

Increase of Corporation Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the New York Times of April 28, showing that the first 250 corporations to report for the first quarter of 1940 had average profits 50 percent greater than in the same period a year ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1940]

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY CORPORATIONS RAISE PROFITS 50 PERCENT—FIRST-QUARTER INCOME UP TO $272,291,000 FROM $181,375,000 A YEAR BEFORE—ALL MAJOR GROUPS GAIN—RAIL EQUIPMENT, OIL, AND STEEL PRODUCERS LEAD IN SURVEY BY ASSOCIATED PRESS

Profits of the first 250 corporations to report for the initial quarter of 1940 were 50 percent greater than in the same period a year ago, a compilation of their statements disclosed today. Net income of the group amounted to $272,291,000, compared with $181,375,000 in the first 3 months of 1939.

Excluding the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose large earnings weigh heavily in the total, first-quarter profits went up 60 percent.

All major industrial groups for which comparisons could be made showed larger incomes than a year ago. The biggest gains were recorded by manufacturers of railroad equipment and by the petroleum and steel industries.

Food and finance companies, public utilities, and manufacturers of business machines showed the smallest improvement.

BACKLOGS RAISE EARNINGS

A large backlog of unfilled orders from late 1939 enabled nine railroad-equipment companies to report earnings of $4,365,000, compared with $906,000 in the first 3 months of 1939.

Eight petroleum companies more than quadrupled last year's results, showing net income of $13,269,000, compared with $3,256,000 in the March quarter last year. Heavy demand for heating oils, plus good profit margins, made it an excellent quarter for the petroleum industry, making the climax to a year of steady improvement in earnings from a relatively unsatisfactory level a year ago.

Twenty-six steel companies rolled up profits of $25,134,000, against $6,865,000 a year ago, despite the decline in operations since November.

Fourteen food companies, on the other hand, increased their first-quarter net income only slightly from $17,091,000 to $17,656,000. Several companies in the group showed smaller profits than a year ago as prices of wheat, corn, and other raw materials rose faster than prices obtained for manufactured food products.

PAPER AND PULP PRICES UP

Earnings of pulp and paper manufacturers reflected the higher prices prevailing since the war jeopardized shipments from the Scandinavian countries. Profits of seven companies made a total of $2,544,000, compared with $1,267,000 a year ago.

First-quarter earnings of other industrial groups compare as follows:

	1940	1939	Percent gain
15 chemical companies	$43,836,000	$30,230,000	45
13 auto accessories	7,280,000	4,372,000	67
12 public utility	17,073,000	15,821,000	8
11 metal mining	6,958,000	5,387,000	29
10 building material and equipment	3,908,000	2,384,000	64
8 railroads	13,767,000	6,141,000	124
7 finance	8,672,000	8,002,000	8
7 coal	1,366,000	386,000	
4 business machines	3,732,000	3,458,000	8
4 electrical equipment	16,548,000	9,884,000	67
85 miscellaneous	84,373,000	66,059,000	28

In Fairness to Those Who Feed America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in all probability, some time this week this House will have an opportunity to vote on the agriculture appropriations bill. The biggest question to be decided at that tme is whether the Government is to continue making the so-called parity payments to American farmers. It is in behalf of these payments that this talk is devoted.

The question of whether or not the present farm program of restricted production and Government checks is wise or unwise is not involved as we make our decisions on the matter of voting these payments to American farmers. The simple fact remains that the present farm program is the law of the land and that unless these payments are forthcoming under the existing program, our farmers will be driven into bankruptcy. I happen to be one of those who believe that there is a better approach to the American farm problem than the existing program, but until and unless the basic formula of our present program is changed to bring a greater degree of independence and prosperity to the farmer, it is essential that Congress follow the example of the Senate in this connection and approve the appropriation bill for agriculture with the parity payments included. To do otherwise would be to drive the dagger of despair into the back of American agriculture and to impoverish such a large segment of our farming population that our whole national economy would suffer from the effects. It is for this reason I shall vote for these payments and that I am urging you to join me in this vote.

FARM CHECKS ARE NOT SUBSIDIES

These annual appropriations for the Government checks forming an integral part of the existing agricultural program, are carelessly referred to as subsidy checks or parity payments by many Members of Congress and writers for the press. Such names are inaccurate when used with reference to these checks for they neither subsidize agriculture up to the point where farmers receive the cost of production for their labors nor do they provide parity for the producers of farm products. Even after receiving these Government payments, the American farmer is today feeding America for returns which would be called sweat-shop wages or worse if they were given to men and women working equally long hours and at similarly hard labor in any other industry in this country. The ugly truth of the matter is that for the past 10 years the city dwellers of America have been mooching their living from the American farmer and—even including these checks—have been slowly sapping away his vitality and independence by giving him a buying power which is wickedly insufficient to enable him to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit as a matter of basic honesty that this Government is not giving the American farmer a subsidy and it is not taxing its people to provide parity payments for the farmer when the cash returns from farm produce plus the Government payments are still grossly inadequate in providing our farmers with an equitable opportunity with other phases of American business, industry, and labor. These Government checks help the farmer to survive—they are far from adequate to enable the farmer to succeed.

FARM CHECKS DO NOT EVEN "COMPENSATE" OR "EQUALIZE"

A much better name for these checks would be "compensation checks" or "equalization checks" except for the fact that they neither "compensate" the farmer for the losses he is suffering by competition from cheap foreign food imports nor "equalize" the disparity between the price of what the farmer buys and the price of what he sells. When a man's dollar will buy 75 cents' worth of what he needs to survive, it is not giving him a subsidy or favoring him with parity to give him 10 cents in change—he will still wind up in the poorhouse or die of starvation if he cannot get the other 15 cents he needs to hold body and soul together and come out even. These Government checks will not develop successful farming as a long-term program but they do help to keep the farmer's family from suffering and to bolster up his hopes while a more equitable farm program is being developed which will have as its goal "a successful farmer on his own farm" rather than "a control to help the farmer survive." American farmers need these Government checks today to survive; but you and I owe it to them to develop a program under which American farmers can once again succeed.

AMERICA HAS BECOME A NATION OF "MOOCHERS"

Mr. Speaker, the cold, unerring logic of arithmetic tells its own story as to what is happening to the American farmer. It should convince every member of this House as to the justice and necessity of approving the Agricultural appropriations bill with its farm payments included. It points out the truth involved in my earlier remark that America is "mooching" its foodstuffs from our farmers without paying them a living price for supplying the products basic to a living America.

Recently representatives of nonfarming States forced through this body and the Senate the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Extension Act, which has since been signed by the President. This means that foreign countries using coolie and peon labor earning a few cents per day will continue to ship into this country in increasing amounts foodstuffs to sell in direct competition with the products of American farms. We have seen the effect of these treaties in the past; we have seen the price of American turkeys and of American dairy products forced down in almost direct relationship to the reduced tariffs offered producers in Canada, South America, and elsewhere. What has happened will happen again. After all is said and done, the law of supply and demand determines the price. Increase the supply by encouraging foreign imports of eggs, cheese, beef, wool, and other farm products and the demand for American products is lessened in American markets. Down drops the price, and our American farmer who has been encouraged to produce less to hold down the supply receives still less for what he does produce. Surely the appropriation of these Government payments is very small compensation, indeed, for the injury wreaked upon our farmers by the Government program of increased farm imports.

IF TRADE TREATIES HELP BIG BUSINESS, BIG BUSINESS SHOULD HELP THE FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, in simple justice those who voted to extend these treaties cannot now refuse to vote these appropriations needed so desperately by the American farmers who are the principal sufferers from this import policy. If, as they argue these trade treaties help the industrial regions and increase profit to the commercial bankers and brokers in the big cities, these selfsame beneficiaries of the Government tariff policy should not complain if they are required to share a small portion of their windfall with the American farmers whose distance from parity continues to expand as competitive farm products continue to flood American markets in ever-greater quantities. Big business cannot have its foreign trade cake and eat foreign food products too. At least, if it does so violate the ancient axiom it should not be unwilling to share a few of the crumbs with its farmer friends—and customers—by approving of these Government checks which come under the heading of earned income instead of parity payments for American producers.

THESE GOVERNMENT CHECKS ARE IN REALITY EARNED INCOME

So that it may be made perfectly clear that these appropriations for Government payments to American farmers are actually earned income to which the farmer has established his just claim by feeding America at a direct, personal loss to himself, I offer a few statistics in the attached table which tell their own story from the official records of the United States Department of Agriculture Marketing Service. This service is not part of the long political arm of the Department of Agriculture—it is the highly efficient statistical division operated by career men motivated by the sole desire to record and reveal the facts.

What are the facts? Are Government checks "earned income"?

Product	Year	Price received by farmer average in United States	Parity price (price needed to give farmer a dollar purchasing power for a dollar received)	"Earned income" (earned by the farmer but not received by him)
Wheat.....bushel	1938	$0.60	$1.12	$0.52
Hogs.....hundredweight	1938	7.72	9.17	1.45
Oats.....bushel	1938	.24	.51	.27
Corn.....do	1938	.47	.81	.34
Barley.....do	1938	.41	.78	.37

Conclusions from above table: The last column at the right indicates in each of 5 farm commodities America failed to pay the farmer a parity price by a wide margin during the year of 1938. The same general ratio holds true of practically all farm products. This disparity has continued without interruption for 10 years. Thus Government checks are "earned income" due our American farmers.

GOVERNMENT CHECKS ARE PARTIAL PAYMENTS OF EARNED INCOME LOST BY THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. Speaker, any Member making an impartial, justice-serving analysis of the foregoing table must agree with my argument that the appropriations for farm payments upon which we shall vote this week are necessarily fair and highly essential if the farmer is to receive even a small degree of justice under existing conditions. In the case of most farm products we have to go back to the year 1930 or 1929 or even farther to find a time when the American farmer last received a parity price for his products. I say again American city dwellers have been "moochers" off of the American farmers to the extent that they have filled their dinner buckets or loaded their tables with foodstuffs bought for less than parity prices. The Government payments we are now asking as a temporary stopgap to prevent the disintegration of American agriculture while a more equitable farm program and a just relationship between the farmer, the laborer, and the businessman of this country are being developed cannot be discredited as subsidies; they are a long-overdue partial payment to the farmer of the earned income to which he is entitled but which has been denied him for the past 8 to 12 years, depending upon the products in which he specializes.

GOVERNMENT CHECKS REALLY JUST SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

Give the American farmer a fair price for a full crop; give him the right to supply the American market at an American price level to the full extent of his ability to do so; give him a dollar for what he sells which will buy a dollar's worth of what he needs; give the American farmer an equitable opportunity with protection from sweatshop farm products from abroad; yes, give the American farmer the American chance to which he is entitled as an American, and the day when Congress will be asked to appropriate money for farm

checks will be gone forever. But, Mr. Speaker, until that time comes or until we do something to make a closer approximation to that bright era, we must not shut our eyes to the plight of agriculture. Call them what you will, parity checks, subsidies, compensation checks—these payments will help serve as subsistence payments to buoy up the American farmer and give him courage to fight on for a better day until such time as Congress succeeds in developing an economic pattern which will provide a fair chance for all under a government in which men will again be free.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in concluding these remarks, I urge you to support the appropriations this year for farm payments, and I also plead that you do so with a realization that you are not voting charity to the American farmers, nor are you even voting equality of opportunity. You are voting him a part of what he has been underpaid—and only a small part of this underpayment—and this payment will help him weather through for another year. In the meantime all of us are charged with the responsibility of developing a permanent, self-financing, justice-producing farm program which will give the farmer parity prices for what he sells and rehabilitate him as America's best customer so that there will be more jobs for labor at better wage levels and more business for industry at fairer rates of profit. Prosperity begins for all when prosperity includes the American farmer.

UNFAIR FARM PRICES RESULTS IN ECONOMIC INFANTICIDE

Until and unless the products of the soil—the real new wealth of this country—are started through the channels of trade by exchanging them for an honest buying power, we are shutting off our economic stream at its source and committing economic infanticide by killing the first small germs of recovery before they leave the cradle of the farm.

While the rest of the world fights for farm products, which we enjoy in abundance, you and I must find a way to free our farmers from disaster and give to the folks who feed America their inalienable right to enjoy the blessings which are America's.

Sheep States and Goat States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short editorial printed in the New York Sun of April 23, 1940, commenting upon data prepared by the Honorable FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, which appears in the RECORD for April 11, 1940:

[From the New York Sun of April 23, 1940]

SHEEP STATES AND GOAT STATES

Representative SMITH of Ohio is a physician and surgeon, but it may be doubted whether, in the pursuit of his profession, he ever did a smarter job of dissection than one he has just done on certain data concerning Federal receipts and expenditures. Some of the results appear in tabular form in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11, 1940, pages 4376–4377, where they may be consulted by anyone curious about the mysterious processes whereby the New Deal has in effect divided the Union into sheep States and goat States and has made the goat States pay, whether they liked it or not.

One table shows that from June 30, 1933, to June 30, 1939, 30 States, having 37 percent of the country's population, have "paid and obligated themselves for" about $5,270,000,000 in Federal revenue but have received in grants, payments, subsidies, and the like, $11,113,000,000—in other words, have had all their payments on account of Federal taxes and debt returned to them, with a "bonus" of $5,843,000,000. The other 18 States, including New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, have paid and obligated themselves for $35,227,000,000 and have received some $20,000,000,000 less than that in grants and subsidies.

In Mississippi, for example, Dr. SMITH shows that the average citizen has paid $25.60 into the Federal coffers but has received therefrom $222.20. The per capita cost for New York, at the opposite end of the list, was $670.50, but the average return in benefits was $192.60, a per capita "loss" of $477.90. Farm-benefit payments in New York represent approximately 1 percent of the value of the State's farm lands and farm buildings; but in Mississippi such payments represent approximately 23.8 percent of that value.

Another curious fact emerges from Dr. SMITH's tables. It is that, "on a population basis," the farmers' share of the increase in the Federal debt in the 6 fiscal years 1934–39 is greater than the amount they have received in benefit payments. That is, of course, something for farmers in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and a few other States to worry about. It is not likely for the immediate present to trouble the rest of the farmers in some 13 other States, where benefit payments are the equivalent of a dividend of anywhere from 23.6 percent to 10.7 percent on the value of farm lands and buildings.

Father Duffy and the Fighting Sixty-ninth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY RT. REV. DAVID T. O'DWYER

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tribute to Father Duffy and the Fighting Sixty-ninth which appeared in the Salve Regina, a publication of the Catholic University, and which was written by the distinguished scholar, Rt. Rev. David T. O'Dwyer. The article is such a fine appraisal of a noble character, great patriot, and splendid priest that I am glad to accede to the request of several of Father Duffy's friends to incorporate this excellent article in the RECORD. My pleasure in doing so is rendered all the greater by my own precious memory of his warm, rich friendship. The article follows:

[From Salve Regina for February 1940]

FATHER DUFFY AND THE FIGHTING SIXTY-NINTH

(By Rt. Rev. David T. O'Dwyer)

Ever since The Fighting Sixty-ninth was filmed I have been wondering how Father Duffy would have taken it. There is no doubt he would have been pleased; he enjoyed hero worship and affectionate regard in a certain naive way, without a grain of vanity or conceit. Modesty did not compel him to suppress these demonstrations; and he was not for a moment overcast by the concern certain people display in safeguarding their humility. The appreciation of his fellows just opened up for him some of the gay surprises of the human comedy. But I think, had he foreseen his statue in Times Square, he would have indulged in a certain tender wistfulness, his eyes would have filled up, and he would have been somewhat bewildered over the thought of transition from a house on Forty-second Street to the center of one of the most populous, energetic, and varied crowds in all the world.

Father Duffy was not the creation of publicity. He had endearing and fascinating gifts, and the spontaneity of their exercise and their never-failing resourcefulness won him a multitude of admirers among all classes in life. Publicity recorded his greatness; it did not make it. In analyzing the appeal he made, such words as "genial, humorous, kindly, tactful" would suggest themselves. He knew men and loved them with Christian ardor; and yet he was capable of indignation and disdain. A certain smug person got into difficulties involving penalties which Father Duffy felt were excessive. Father Duffy came to his rescue and was rewarded by a most embarrassing breach of confidence, whereupon he telephoned the indiscreet ingrate to strain himself to cultivate the honor that prevails even among harlots.

Father Duffy was what is popularly known as a "good fellow." This role has peculiar difficulties for the priest; as the world only too often indulges in a mirth in which the priest may not participate. The priest's frown on the unseemly is often interpreted as puritanical narrowness. And, on the other hand, should he compromise in any way, he will find his most captious critics not among his brethren in the clergy or among the Catholic laity, but among that not inconsiderable part of the general public who find in the lapses of priests occasion for righteous indignation and prurient glee. Father Duffy had a readiness of wit, a gift of irony, and a commanding superiority which could turn the tables on anyone who attempted to embarrass him by the unseemly, and yet leave the offender not so much stung by the rebuke as

ashamed of his indiscretion. Father Duffy's humanity, sweet and engaging though it was, was fortified by a certain unobtrusive austerity. His charm always recommended, never detracted from his virtue. Father Duffy was not merely good—he was holy.

The "good fellow" is not often a cultivated or a learned man. It would seem as though his good nature is not equal to the strain of attaining knowledge, or the discipline necessary for culture. A lack in these departments is easily condoned in the amiable. But Father Duffy was a man of solid learning, wide reading, and a literary discrimination that enabled him to hold his own among the most fastidious and the best informed. He had such competence in philosophy and theology that he could instantly perceive the significance of the trends of the day. He knew whither we were going, and why. And he had such serenity of conviction, and clarity of exposition that the bewildered invariably became composed in his present. He had multitudinous visitors who came from all walks in life. They included successes and failures, saints and sinners, and he had only one preferred list, those who had any connection whatsoever with the Sixty-ninth.

His chaplaincy did not end with the war; the soldiers still clung to him as friend, philosopher, and guide, and his ministrations were extended to their families in every difficulty and crisis. A friend on a purely social call would be offered a comfortable seat and given such refreshment as time and need suggested, and then Father Duffy would walk up and down the room with his hands behind his back in the pockets of his cassock, and would discourse with animation on every subject broached, while occasionally he stood still, and with a curious sidelong glance and far-away gaze, would reveal the deep mystic that was part of his fascination. His good humor was never failing; there was nothing pontifical about his utterances; he had no relish in deploring things; he had a quick eye for the silver lining in the dark cloud; he knew that God provided a remedy for every ill, and it was his great aim to get men to avail of that bounty.

He had wonderfully expressive eyes; mirth and humor reveled in them, but they seemed made for pity. His genius for friendship enabled him to win such men as Will Rogers, Heywood Broun, and Alexander Woollcott. I close with some extracts from the latter's obituary on him, and I leave to those skilled in research the task of discovering any more delightful tribute paid to priest or prelate.

"One had only to stop for a moment and speak to him on the street to go one's way immensely set up, reassured by what he was that there might be a good deal, after all, to this institution called the human race. * * * For he was the great New Yorker. Born in Canada, Irish as Irish, schooled in Maynooth, he was surely the first citizen of our town. This city is too large for most of us. But not for Father Duffy. Not too large, I mean, for him to invest it with the homeliness of a neighborhood. * * * Father Duffy was of such dimensions that he made New York into a small town. * * *"

Somebody Is Lying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD an editorial submitted to me by Mr. Ovid Butler, executive secretary of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C.

One of the great troubles in this country today is that we have too many organizations and associations which do not produce anything on the face of the earth except to send out magazines and propaganda of all types in the interest of the groups which they represent.

Of course, there are thousands of people connected with these associations or organizations, many of whom are drawing handsome salaries, which might indicate that to this extent these associations and propagandists are creating purchasing power.

The pitiful thing about it is that the unorganized producers of farm products and the consuming public are paying the bill.

At the forestry hearings held in every section of the United States, we had dozens of representatives of associations and large operators. They all spoke the same language. To listen to them, and if you will read their statements in the hearings, you will readily agree that we have no forestry problems other than the need for more Federal money for fire protection, more Federal money for research, and more Federal money for disease and insect eradication; otherwise, the Federal Government is too far removed to have anything whatsoever to do with what is going on today and what has been going on during all these years, wherein our forest resources, which should belong to the people, and which should be utilized for the people, are being ruthlessly destroyed.

Listen to this—I am quoting from the editorial:

> The ghosts of forest scarcity have been driven from the woods by the forest survey and its accumulation of facts about our remaining timber supply, its current growth and drain.

Now, if you will read the hearings, this is exactly the language used by these witnesses representing large operators and associations, which are composed of large operators.

You should read the statements made by Secretary Wallace and Dr. Klapp, who is Acting Chief of the Forest Service, wherein they have given to us an altogether different picture about the serious condition of our forest resources. I am sure that you will immediately realize that somebody is lying.

The only remaining stands of timber to amount to anything are in the North Pacific region, hardwoods, California redwoods, and the Douglas fir. I understand that about seven operators own all of the California redwood.

We have other large operators owning individually around 200,000 acres, while thousands of acres in that area are becoming tax delinquent.

While holding a meeting at Portland, Oreg., one of the local county papers had to add 52 pages for the purpose of advertising tax-delinquent lands.

Take a look at the north Lake States. In 1890 they furnished 35 percent of the total lumber supply of the United States. Today they furnish about 4 percent, with millions of acres cut clean, million of acres tax delinquent, farm tenancy and unemployment running rampant.

In the South practically every acre of virgin pine timber has been destroyed, and they are chewing up the second growth either for sawmill purposes or for pulpwood, at a rate that will place this section in the same sad condition of the north Lake States and other sections of the United States within the next few years unless something is done to overcome the propaganda which is being put out by these selfish groups.

They bitterly oppose any type of regulation as to proper forestry practices, especially, if the Federal Government should even have the right to have the last word, in the event the States fail to legislate and properly enforce the carrying out of proper forestry practices.

I am sure that every member of the Special Forestry Committee is absolutely for the States having complete control over the regulations and the supervision of proper forestry practices. However, it is my firm belief that every member of this committee has agreed that if the State legislatures are going to be dominated by these representatives of selfish groups to the extent that they refuse to pass proper legislation dealing with forestry problems of the country, or if the States refuse to enforce proper legislation, then, either the Federal Government should have the right to see to it that proper forestry practices are carried out, or they should withdraw the furnishing of any money whatsoever to the States for any of these purposes.

You will note in the editorial that I am submitting to you that they are now wanting to bring pressure to bear on the members of this committee, as well as the Members of Congress, that we should for the next 5 or 10 years sit down and wait for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not during this period the States will make any effort to do the things that will have to be done if we are going to restore and properly preserve our forest resources in the interest of all the people.

I realize that practically all of these large operators and large owners of forest areas, amounting to several hundred thousand acres in the ownership of one operator in some instances, are, in some cases, carrying on proper forestry practices. They realize that it is good business to do so, and they realize what it means to them to get all of the Federal fire-protection money that they can get so as to be able to preserve these resources which are being held intact, while they are buying everything else in sight at fixed prices, cutting everything clean.

Each of these pulp and paper mills own anywhere from two to three hundred thousand acres of growing pulpwood.

We had a gentleman from New York, connected with some national association representing the pulp and paper mills, stating that they were cutting about 10 percent of their holdings. In other words, they are holding their pulpwood in reserve, so as to be able to have some place to cut after they have ruthlessly destroyed the pulpwood belonging to everybody else; not only that, but they have leases on thousands of acres which they will be able to fall back on later.

In investigating the pulpwood situation in the South we found that they had buyers in every pulpwood section checking up on tax-delinquent lands for the purpose of buying and leasing same. If this is not a pitiful picture, then I am unable to paint one.

As previously stated, we have 40 or 50 pulp and paper mills in the South. Under the monopolistic program that they have in buying pulpwood, wherein, unless it is a very large landowner, they have allotted areas wherein they have an actual contractor who proceeds to hook up with one, two, or more subcontractors, without any responsibility to anyone, buying the pulp products from farmers, very often, hog round, at a price not per cord of 128 cubic feet, but for from 15 cents to $1 for 160 cubic feet, called a unit. Farmers are not permitted to sell direct, and, because of operating as individuals, having to sell because of their financial condition, they are just as helpless as thousands of wage earners who are hired by these contractors to cut this pulpwood, who are not receiving a sufficient wage to feed and clothe their families.

No wonder we have millions of farm tenants and unemployed people in this country, and unless Members of Congress decide to pay more attention to the passing of constructive legislation in the interest of the unorganized, instead of listening to these writers of magazines, these highly paid lobbyists who are putting up at the best hotels in Washington, and thousands of propaganda, including telegrams, coming in when the Congress would attempt to do something in the interest of the real people, we are going to have something in this country that a liberty-loving people would not like to see.

BREAKING THE FOREST DEADLOCK

The Little Orphan Annie phase of forestry crusading has passed. Informed persons no longer believe that the timber famine goblins will get us if we don't watch out. The ghosts of forest scarcity have been driven from the woods by the forest survey and its accumulation of facts about our remaining timber supply, its current growth, and drain. These facts are broadly reassuring and drive home that the time has come to have done with controversy and to move forward in completing a national program of forestry that in its larger outlines will have the united support of all forest interests, public and private.

Certainly progress on a wide front turns upon that achievement. For too many years forestry in terms of a national program has been water-logged between crusading of the past and controversy of the present. Different forest interests have remained locked in argument over this or that phase of program policy until forestry to the lay public at least has become pretty much a confused picture of all trees and no forests, all controversy and no agreement. No wonder so many people have turned their interest and support to the simpler and less complicated movement for parks and complete preservation.

Two years ago the President of the United States asked Congress to appoint a Joint Commitee on Forestry to try to break the controversial deadlock. During 2 years the members of this committee have turned from time to time away from more pressing tasks to study the forestry problem in its national aspects. Now the committee has decided that the task of digesting the great mass of testimony taken and of recommending new legislation to Congress requires more time. So we may not know for another 12 months whether the committee has an answer to the Nation's forest stalemate.

But whatever may be the committee's ultimate findings, we believe it already has made a distinct and significant contribution to the situation. Serving as a common screen upon which all interests could throw their views, it has brought into focus not only the major parts of a needed national program but major differences of opinion as to how these parts should be forged into a program of the whole. And the significant and hopeful thing in this focusing process is the revelation that the forest interests, in spite of the thunder-rumbling clouds that have hung over them these last few years, are not so widely apart after all.

A review of the testimony given the committee by representatives of forest industry and those of the Federal Government shows that both groups are pretty much in agreement on all major policies. Differences lie in methods and extent of application. Even on the question of public regulation of private forest operations which has long been the spear head of controversy, there seems to be common acceptance of principle, and difference only in detail of application. Both accept public controls provided they are developed and exercised through the States. The Forest Service, however, holds that if the States within a reasonable period do not put into effect local regulations sufficient to keep forest land productive, the Federal Government should be authorized to step in and do so. And it would condition Federal aid to the States upon regulatory action by the States. Although the record of the hearings is not clear, the industry, one concludes, is opposed to Federal pressure that will force action by the States or will ultimately open the door to direct Federal regulation.

Having brought years of forest controversy and disagreement down to this major difference, the committee has set the stage for closing the breach and forwarding the national program upon a commonly accepted course of action. The views of both industry and the Forest Service represent compromises of past positions and are encouraging evidence of a desire at long last to free the forest question of its controversial shackles and to make orderly progress. It would appear that only a little more give and take is needed to effect this end. If the industry on its part would accept the proposition that Federal financial aid for forest protection, reforestation, and management benefiting private forest owners be made contingent upon satisfactory guarantees that forest devastation will cease and private forests will be handled by practices that assure continuous forest growth; and if the Forest Service on its part would accept trying out for a period of five or ten years regulation through the States without provision for Federal step-in, the whole forestry program could at least move forward.

Nothing would be lost by such a resolution of differences. If at the end of 5 or 10 years, or whatever period might be agreed upon, enough States have not put into effect regulatory controls to assure satisfactory progress, the question of direct Federal participation could then be taken up and considered in the light of results shown and experience gained. It is better to make progress slowly than not at all.

What Do You Think and What Do You Intend To Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a table put out by the Sun Bureau, Washington, D. C., on January 6, 1940. Its accuracy has never been questioned.

This table sets forth the complete financial record of every President of the United States from the adoption of the Constitution in 1789 to date. The figures given up to 1939 show the actual receipts, expenditures, and deficits recorded in the annals of the Treasury Department and certified to Congress in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Figures for 1940 and 1941 are the estimate presented to Congress by President Roosevelt in his Budget message last Thursday.

The totals show that Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 8 years, has spent 58½ percent as much as all of his predecessors put together in 144½ years. He received in taxes in these depression years 44 percent as much as all of his predecessors together have collected, and he has almost exactly doubled the national debt.

President	Number of fiscal years served	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt at end of administration
George Washington	8	$32,665,765	$34,088,506	−$1,422,741	$83,762,172
John Adams	4	34,984,839	34,262,668	+722,171	82,976,294
Thomas Jefferson	8	113,400,835	72,424,289	+40,976,546	65,196,318
James Madison (War of 1812)	8	130,311,080	176,473,974	−46,162,894	127,334,934
James Monroe	8	171,895,953	147,237,899	+24,658,054	90,875,877
John Quincy Adams	4	94,831,286	65,427,037	+29,404,249	67,475,044
Andrew Jackson	8	252,061,371	152,969,098	+99,092,273	336,958
Martin Van Buren	4	102,219,579	122,325,262	−20,105,683	5,250,876
Harrison and Tyler [1]	4½	104,430,540	108,904,688	−4,474,148	15,925,303
James K. Polk (Mexican War)	4	123,139,658	175,477,220	−52,337,562	63,061,859
Zachary Taylor	1	43,603,439	39,543,492	+4,059,947	63,452,774
Millard Fillmore	3	163,993,174	140,088,047	+23,905,127	59,804,661
Franklin Pierce	4	282,172,928	255,154,264	+27,018,664	28,701,375
James Buchanan	4	197,716,370	272,933,490	−75,217,120	90,582,417
Abraham Lincoln (Civil War)	4	763,026,123	3,352,380,410	−2,589,354,287	2,677,929,012
Andrew Johnson	4	1,825,248,460	1,578,557,655	+246,690,805	2,545,110,590
U. S. Grant	8	2,670,905,586	2,253,386,783	+417,518,803	2,107,759,903
Rutherford B. Hayes	4	1,225,899,968	1,032,268,057	+193,631,911	2,019,285,728
Garfield and Arthur	4	1,474,023,408	1,027,742,757	+446,280,651	1,578,551,169
Grover Cleveland (first administration)	4	1,474,159,137	1,077,629,099	+396,530,038	1,249,470,511
Benjamin Harrison	4	1,536,450,844	1,412,315,899	+124,134,945	961,431,766
Grover Cleveland (second administration)	4	1,316,948,887	1,441,674,184	−124,725,297	1,226,793,713
William McKinley (Spanish-American War)	4	2,076,208,146	2,093,918,534	−17,710,388	1,221,572,245
Theodore Roosevelt	8	4,676,747,962	4,655,450,515	+21,297,447	1,148,315,372
William Howard Taft	4	2,794,065,060	2,799,211,874	−5,146,814	1,193,047,745
Woodrow Wilson (World War)	8	24,375,781,688	46,938,260,143	−22,562,478,455	23,976,250,608
Warren G. Harding	2	8,116,239,632	6,667,235,429	+1,449,004,203	22,349,687,758
Calvin Coolidge	6	23,959,941,899	18,585,549,136	+5,374,392,763	16,931,197,748
Herbert Hoover	4	11,453,002,513	15,490,476,656	−4,037,474,143	22,538,672,164
Total of all Presidents up to F. D. Roosevelt	144½	91,586,076,130	112,203,367,065	−20,617,290,935	22,538,672,164
Franklin D. Roosevelt	8	40,089,857,957	65,628,526,692	−25,538,668,735	44,938,577,622
Grand total, all Presidents	152½	131,675,934,087	177,831,893,757	−46,155,959,670	67,477,249,786

[1] Up until 1843 the fiscal year coincided with the calendar year. In the administration of President Tyler, however, it was changed to run from July 1 to the following June 30, thus making President Tyler accountable for 4½ fiscal years instead of 4.

Some have found fault because I have often criticized the New Deal and its policies. Today I am not criticizing. I am just giving you the facts.

Please note that the deficit incurred by Lincoln's Civil War administration was $2,589,354,287; that the deficit incurred by Wilson's World War administration was $22,562,478,455; that the total deficit created by these two great wars was $25,151,832,742; that Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 8 years of peace, will have created a deficit of $25,538,668,735, or $386,835,993 more than the total deficit of these two wars.

Of the last 16 administrations, 4 have been Democratic, and all but 1, the first of Grover Cleveland, have given us a deficit. Of the 12 Republican administrations, but 3, those of McKinley, Taft, and Hoover, gave us a deficit, and McKinley's deficit was the result of the Spanish-American War.

What do you think about it? What do you intend to do about it; remembering that President Roosevelt told us in substance that many a government has been wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy; that the Government's only source of income is through taxes, which, as he told us, are paid in the sweat of the man who works; remembering that he told us that the Nation which continued to pile up deficits was on the road to bankruptcy?

Paste these figures in some convenient place where you can read them day after day; where you will be constantly reminded of what has happened, of what is happening, in our country.

Unemployment National Problem No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, businessmen from every corner of the United States are in Washington this week to attend the meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Millions of unfortunate citizens in this country who have for years been unable to secure employment in private industry will be heartened by the announcement the slogan of the business executives is "Build America, Keep America First." Let me express the hope that when the gentlemen leave for their homes they will remember that slogan and start the wheels of progress going in their establishment at a pace that will provide employment for those who are anxious to resume their place in private industry.

As I continue to read the article I note the convention will consider a number of our progressive laws and their effect on business, such as the Wage and Hour Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Security and Exchange Act, as well as the Logan-Walter bill which provides for a review of administrative decisions.

Not only businessmen but public officials must consider unemployment as problem No. 1 in this country. It will be problem No. 1 until it is solved. Better still if it is labeled public enemy No. 1.

It will not be long, as a result of the census, that we will have real figures on unemployment. The sooner that information can be furnished to the country the better and I express the hope that the President will see that a recapitulation is available at the earliest date possible. Regardless of the figures it will be just that many millions too many.

No matter who is President, or what political party is in power, unemployment must and will receive attention until work is found for all who desire and are willing to work. Somewhere we must find the cure for this terrible disease that is destroying the lives and lowering the vitality of so many of our fellow men, women, and children. Consultants must be called in, there must be general cooperation, but the desired result will never be accomplished until the very businessmen now in Washington and their associates see the wisdom of using their best efforts to place the unemployed back to work.

If it means shorter hours or a shorter workweek, then that must come. To what extent labor-saving and labor-displacing devices have brought about unemployment is information we must have.

No one will say progress must be retarded. As Isadore Lubin, the statistical expert of the Department of Labor, a member of the monopoly committee, said last week, inventions, labor-saving machinery, and technological advances must be continued and encouraged but that the Government

and industry must find some way to see that loss of jobs as a result does not fall upon innocent victims.

Mr. Lubin pointed out that the States as well as the Federal Government provide for the worker who is disabled, while on duty, through workmen's compensation laws; but those who are disabled because a new machine or process throws them out of employment are not now taken care of. It is such questions as this that businessmen and public officials must solve, but one set cannot bring about a solution without cooperation of the other.

Men will not be placed back to work by destroying progressive legislation. That must be distinctly understood.

The billions of dollars that have been spent by Federal, State, and local governments has not remained in the pockets of those who have been employed as a result. Eventually that money reached the cash registers of the employers.

About 200 percent has been added to the value of stocks quoted on the New York Stock Exchange since 1932. July 1 of that year the stocks had a value of fifteen and one-half billion dollars. The 1st of April of this year the same stocks had a value of nearly $47,000,000,000.

Bonds on the stock exchange in 1932 showed a market value of over $37,000,000,000, while April 1 of this year those same bonds had a value of over $50,000,000,000.

Does this look like the present Roosevelt administration has retarded progress? Remember also this increase comes during a period the Security and Exchange Act has been in force.

Millions have been placed back to work, but millions are still idle. As I said, this problem cannot alone be solved by Congress, State legislatures, or public officials. The businessman can, and must, help bring about a cure. If we will all forget our likes and dislikes, put the brains of the country together, then we can "rebuild America and keep America first."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement issued by Col. F. C. Harrington, of the Work Projects Administration. The statement follows:

HARRINGTON URGES COOPERATION IN NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT WEEK

Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of Work Projects, disclosed today with the approach of National Employment Week that 1,250,000 workers have left the W. P. A. rolls voluntarily during the last 12 months.

He urged that the week, proclaimed by President Roosevelt for May 1 to 8, be made a period for accelerating the return of W. P. A. project employees to a regular place in the industry and business of their communities.

Nearly half of the 2,000,000 persons now on the W. P. A. rolls, the Commissioner said, are 40 years of age or older and belong to the group of stable and experienced workers, many with heavy family responsibilities, with which Mr. Roosevelt's proclamation is especially concerned.

"It has been the purpose of the Work Projects Administration not only to provide a living for needy, employable persons and public improvements for the communities which sponsor our projects," Colonel Harrington said, "but also to retain the habits of work which an employer naturally expects of the men and women he hires.

"The fact that W. P. A. project employees are now working—maintaining their skills on the kind of jobs for which their experience fits them—makes our rolls a natural reservoir of labor from which employers may draw during the spring seasonal increase in work and especially at this time when the drive for jobs is highlighted by President Roosevelt's proclamation of National Employment Week.

"I urge those who can provide employment to appreciate the uniform desire of 2,000,000 men and women on W. P. A. to go back to regular jobs in industry and business. The fact that these people are anxious and able to leave W. P. A. for private jobs is well illustrated by the fact that an average of approximately 100,000 have been leaving voluntarily each month, even in times of declining industrial activity. About 1,250,000 left of their own accord during the last 12 months, and it must be assumed that most of them accepted jobs elsewhere.

"It is true that many of these persons have had to return to W. P. A., but they do not hesitate to accept even temporary work for a private employer. The regulations under which a man, when a new job is terminated after some days, weeks, or even months, may return to W. P. A. without red tape, make him glad for the opportunity of private employment.

"The President has given particular emphasis to the situation of seasoned workers of 40 and over. Nearly half of our rolls are made up of such people, and this is not by their choice. Experience is on their side, and we have found generally that they are able workers driven by heavy family responsibilities. To overlook them this week and hereafter will not lessen their misfortune."

The Place of Farm Credit in the National Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WALLACE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace delivered before a mass meeting of farmers called by the National Farmers' Union and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, at St. Paul, Minn., Saturday, April 27, 1940, and broadcast on the Farmers' Union Hour by the National Broadcasting Co. and associated stations:

The fight for agricultural equality seems to be never ending. It is a battle fought on many fronts.

You remember how the wheat farmers of the Northwest began this fight 20 years ago. Through their farm organizations, through their cooperatives, through such movements as the McNary-Haugen crusade, they tried to put their own industry on an equal footing with the rest of the country.

At last, in 1933, we won the opportunity to go ahead with a program of our own. In the last 7 years, we have built the first effective national farm program we ever had.

But all through these years, we have had to work against the bitterest kind of opposition. The forces which defeated the original McNary-Haugen bills fought Triple A, farm security, commodity loans, and almost everything else we have tried to do. They fought these programs in town and in country; in Congress and out of Congress; in the courts and in the press; by prophecies of disaster, and by cries of communism; by half truths and by outright falsehoods. They used all the methods which had defeated farm legislation in the past. But this time they failed. The farmers went ahead in spite of them.

The success of the national farm program can be measured by the substitute programs that are being offered. Insofar as these substitutes get down to definite proposals, they are mostly carbon copies of what already is being done—though, of course, the persons offering the substitutes claim they would do everything much better than we are doing it.

But while much of the heat has gone out of the attacks that used to be made on the Triple A, the enemies of agriculture are just as implacable as they have ever been. They are just as watchful. They will lose no opportunity to weaken the programs we now have or to prevent them from being extended or improved so they will give greater service to agriculture.

Now the enemies of agriculture, instead of making a frontal attack on Triple A, are driving at our farm-credit flank.

They seized a new opportunity to attack the farm program when the Farm Credit Administration was transferred last summer to the Department of Agriculture by Congress and the President.

Many farmers looked upon this transfer as a chance to make the farm-credit program a vitally important part of the national farm program, and thereby improve the entire farm-credit situation.

What is that credit situation today? There is plenty of room for improvement. More than one-third of all the farms in the country are mortgaged for a total of more than $7,000,000,000. This is 20 percent of the value of all farm land and buildings. It is true the farm-debt load is $3,000,000,000 smaller than it was 17 years ago. But how was this reduction brought about? A large part of it was brought about at the expense of the farmers—by foreclosure and bankruptcy. When depression drove down farm prices and farm-land values, thousands upon thousands of farmers were pushed off their farms.

One of the principal reasons for the increase in tenancy is that the farm-debt load is too great and interest rates are too high.

Sixty years ago, three out of every four farmers owned the land they cultivated. Today nearly half our farmers are tenants or sharecroppers—and tenancy is still increasing.

If we want to keep farmers on their farms, we must do something about this debt burden. We must do something about it in order to strengthen the whole national farm program.

But our enemies don't want to see the farm program strengthened in this way. They don't want farm credit to serve farmers better. The moment the farm-credit system was put in the Department of Agriculture, they began to view it with alarm. Recent events have set this opposition chorus into full cry.

You know who these enemies are. They include the same financial, journalistic, and political interests which always gang up against anything which really will help the farmer. Even some of our friends have been deceived by the false picture which the enemies of the farm program have been spreading over the coun-

try. I shall repeat some of their falsities, so that you may recognize them for what they are.

No. 1. They say the farm-credit system has been perfectly sound, but that now it is going to be wrecked by the Department of Agriculture.

No. 2. They say that we are going to hand out money to farmers without any regard to whether or not it will be repaid; that we will use "soft credit" or "loose credit" policies.

No. 3. They say that the value of the land-bank bonds will be impaired.

No. 4. They say we are going to pass a "death sentence" on the cooperative features of the so-called farmer-owned credit system.

No. 5. They say that charity and relief are going to be all mixed up with sound banking.

In one breath they say the Secretary of Agriculture is too busy to think about the farmer's credit needs and in the next breath they accuse him of trying to be a credit dictator.

After the Farm Credit Administration came to the Department of Agriculture last fall, I began to find out things about this farm-mortgage situation. I found it much worse than was generally realized. I found also that any proposals for improvement were met by a campaign of misrepresentation—and vilification was begun, and was carried on with increasing virulence. Nothing could be any more destructive to the confidence of investors or the welfare of the land-bank system than such a campaign.

Under such circumstances, I decided to give the farmers and the public the full picture, just as I have found it, and so I am here to speak out today.

I propose, therefore, to take up these misrepresentations one by one and answer them as briefly as I can. What I say along this line will have to do with the land-bank system. None of the following comments applies to the bank for cooperatives or the production credit associations, both of which are functioning well. But with regard to the land banks some changes will have to be made—and the quicker they are made, the better it will be for everyone concerned.

In reply to misrepresentation No. 1 that the land-bank system was sound but is now being wrecked by the Department, the answer is that the land-bank system has long been in weak position. Farmers were saddled with mortgage debts which were too great. As a result, 25 percent of all the farm-mortgage loans held by the land banks today are delinquent, and 60 percent of all the national farm-loan associations are either insolvent or their capital stock is so badly impaired they cannot make any new loans. Since the Farm Credit Administration was organized, more than 85,000 of the farm borrowers have been foreclosed off their farms and many thousands more are in immediate danger of being foreclosed. The Secretary of Agriculture was in no way responsible for this mess, but he will have to help clean it up.

Neither were the directors of the farm-loan associations as a group responsible. The farm depression of the last 20 years has hurt the land-bank system just as surely as it has wrecked many thousands of country banks. In a few States the wreckage of farm-loan associations has been almost complete, because in addition to the farm depression there has been year after year of unprecedented drought. It is against the destructive after effects of war and weather that we are battling, as well as against misrepresentations of bitter enemies. In the forties we are going to hear a lot about the bad loans on land made by the Government during the twenties and thirties. For the record I want to make it clear that the Department of Agriculture should not be held responsible for loans made before the Farm Credit Administration was transferred to the Department on July 1, 1939. But we are responsible, in view of the trust placed in the Department by the President and Congress, to do everything we can in a sound way for those human beings who have been victimized by the excessive loans of the twenties and early thirties. We must do everything we can in a sound way for those who have suffered from war and weather.

And now what about misrepresentation No. 2, that we will make the land banks into "soft credit" or "loose credit" institutions, loaning excessive amounts to farmers who either can't or won't pay back. Several of the land banks have been dealing in "soft credit" for several years. If this is not true, why are 25 percent of the loans of the system delinquent, and why has it been necessary to foreclose on so many farmers? My reply is that excessive credit never did anyone any good. "Soft credit" or "loose credit" in the form of excessive loans will have to come in the future from some other institution than the Farm Credit Administration. We aren't going to sink the farmers again with a millstone of excessive debt.

Misrepresentation No. 3 is that the Department of Agriculture will impair the value of the land-bank bonds. If there has been any impairment of these bonds, it was caused by the loose credit policies of the past, and not by anything that has been done since the Farm Credit Administration became a part of the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture believes that the guaranty of the Federal Government should be put squarely behind the land-bank bonds. If this is done the land-bank bonds of the future, instead of being weaker, will be as strong as the Federal Government itself.

Misrepresentation No. 4 claims that we are going to destroy the so-called farmer-owned credit system. We all believe in cooperation, but we don't like to see the word used where it does not apply. Those of you who have borrowed money from a Federal land bank know just what I mean. As a borrower, you are a member of a farm-loan association, and yet I wonder how many of you have so much as attended an annual meeting in the last 20 years. Perhaps one in four of you has turned out to one of these meetings. In recent years the Farm Credit Administration has tried earnestly to breathe some life into the dry bones but without so very much luck.

You members of cooperatives describe a cooperative in very simple terms as an enterprise owned and controlled by the group affected. You farmers never have owned the land banks. The Government, not the farmers, has provided and has been responsible for the huge part of the capital used by the land banks. The Government has never been willing, and probably never would be willing, to give to farmers control of a system in which it has such an enormous investment. The land banks have never been true cooperatives. The thing to strive for is a cooperative spirit and technique in administration, but we should not be deceived into thinking that even that makes a real cooperative like your grain cooperatives.

Under the present system I don't think it will ever be possible to make cooperation in the farm-loan associations a really living thing. To put a genuine cooperative spirit into the farm-loan associations it will be necessary for the directors to have something real to do, something corresponding to what the county committeemen in Triple A have to do. And so we stand for creating, not destroying a cooperative farm-credit system.

In reply to misrepresentation No. 5, to the effect that the Department will mix up charity and relief with sound banking, I say that instead of mixing these two things we propose to do some unscrambling that ought to have been done a long time ago. Where a man's neighbors judge him to be a good moral risk but where many years of bad weather and bad luck have made him seriously delinquent, the wise course would be to let that man continue on the land as a self-supporting citizen on a rental basis, obtaining a loan or grant, if necessary, from the Farm Security Administration. Thousands of competent, hard-working men with the best kind of an attitude toward paying their obligations are delinquent today through no fault of their own. Bad weather and farm depression have ruined them. Should they be kicked off their farms when in the judgment of their neighbors they have learned to know those farms better than anyone else? Is it true economy for the Government to kick them off? We must remember that it costs over $500 a year to care for a family when it goes on work relief in town. The Farm Credit Administration has repeatedly sold farms it secured by foreclosure to new owners at much less than it had in them. Would it not have been better to readjust matters so the original owner could have stayed?

I am convinced that in many cases the cheapest way out for the Government is to avoid foreclosure losses and scale down the principal of the excessive loan, in keeping with the probable productive value of the farm. I don't call this either relief or charity. Of course, any such reduction should be made only after we have the recommendation of local farmers who know whether the mortgages are excessive and whether the borrower is competent and honest. Properly administered by hard-headed farmers in the respective communities, I believe such common-sense reduction will save money for the Government. It may not be sound banking from the standpoint of lending agencies that want to keep a fictitiously high value on their mortgages. But it is definitely sound banking from the standpoint of a government which is interested not only in the permanency of the soil, the people who live on the soil, and the communities which those people build, but also is interested in protecting the Federal Treasury.

The principle which I am now talking about should be written into law. If the enemy wishes to call this principle an illustration of the way in which the Department mixes up charity with sound banking, he is welcome to his side of the argument. For my part, I believe we can demonstrate that this principle is not only more humane than short-sighted, cutthroat banking but, in the long run, will save more dollars for the Federal Treasury.

I am satisfied that local farmers will not allow this principle to be abused by the scalawags. The man who is able to pay should pay, even though he took out a loan at the high point in 1920. But I do think it is fair that even the well-to-do farmer who bought a farm in 1920 for four times what it is now worth, and who has a land-bank mortgage at 6 percent, should have an opportunity to get his interest rate cut to 3½ percent. This man has kept up his payments all these years. He should not be released from the high mortgage he agreed to in 1920, but I do say that we ought to put such a man in position to get a lower interest rate on his high loan. By easing his interest payments only we may be able to cut his annual amortization payments by 25 percent, and that may make all the difference in the world to a man who has demonstrated under the most difficult circumstances that he is an upright, contract-keeping citizen. Otherwise even that man may be ruined, although he has kept up his payments all these years.

The time has come now to get to the hot spot in this controversy—interest rates. There was a time when farmers had to pay 6, 7, or even 8 percent to borrow money on land. In those days the private lender, the insurance company, and the local bank had things their own way. Then, in 1916, the land banks started. Their competition brought interest rates down, and especially has this been true since 1933. Farmers will never forget the debt of gratitude which they owe the land banks for reduction in interest rates.

It should be clearly understood that I am not attacking the land-bank system. That system is of real value to agriculture. But I am attacking those selfish interests which oppose efforts to improve the system and put it on a better basis for serving farmers.

Every year for 7 years there has been a special act of Congress reducing interest rates on a year-by-year basis. At first the rate was reduced to 4½ percent and since 1935 it has been 3½ percent. This has cost the Federal Treasury nearly $40,000,000 annually. Many farmers would have paid their land bank 5, 5½, or even 6 percent in interest in 1939 if it had not been for this aid from Congress. The same farmers will go back to 5, 5½, or 6 percent in 1941 if Congress does not pass a similar law.

I want to see all the borrowers in the land-bank system get the benefit of a rate at least as low as 3½ percent without the necessity of legislation every year and without the necessity of having nearly $40,000,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury. This can be done by Government guaranty of land-bank bonds. It will take 6 or 7 years to pay off all the present land-bank bonds, but once these are out of the way the land-bank system can be put on a self-financing basis which will enable the American farmer to get permanently the benefit of a 3½-percent interest rate.

It is because of our determination to get this 3½-percent rate permanently for farmers that there is so much shooting going on these days. In the eyes of some people the greatest crime of the New Deal is the reduction in interest rates. We are making in the Department of Agriculture commodity-credit loans at 3 percent, tenant-purchase loans at 3 percent, rural-electrification loans at less than 3 percent. We are putting money to work at lower wages and some people don't like it. They are determined to get back to the good old days of 5-, 6-, and even 7-percent interest. Now I don't object to seeing interest rates go up a little in times of great prosperity. Some increase in interest rates may occasionally be necessary to put a brake on a runaway market. But in times like these, and in times as they are likely to be when the war comes to an end, it is vital to have low interest rates.

The New Deal stands for low interest rates. The old deal stands for high interest rates. The battle is on. I did not choose this field of battle, but I do accept the challenge. And I am sure every real farmer in this room is ready for the fight.

The campaign against lower interest rates for farmer borrowers and against other proposals for changes in the farm-credit system has been waged as vigorously as any other campaign against the farm programs since 1933. Among those most prominent in this fight have been the American Bankers Association and some of the State bankers' associations.

I hold in my hand a circular sent out by the Minnesota Bankers Association under date of April 12, 1940. The mortgage situation in Minnesota and surrounding States has been so bad that it would seem desirable for the bankers to join gladly in a sound effort to relieve debt-burdened farmers. I am sure if the bankers understood their own interests better, they would be helping us in lightening the farmers' mortgage debt load.

The bankers call these proposals—and I quote—"a step toward the complete socialization of agriculture in this country."

To farmers who have gone through this farm fight since the early 1920's this language has a most familiar sound. It is the type of misrepresentation that has been used in an attempt to block every effort to help the producers of this country.

If the people had taken this kind of propaganda seriously, there would be no farm programs at all. You can be pretty certain that when the interests raise the cry of socialism they are trying to drag a whole carload of red herrings across the trail that leads to the real issues.

Few farmers and few friends of farmers are going to be fooled very long by this kind of "bunk."

The big money groups, who are fighting desperately against lower interest rates for farmers, profess to be great believers in the cooperative feature of the farm-loan associations. You know how it is. If you take out a $4,000 loan, you don't get $4,000. Instead, you get $3,800 and a receipt for $200 in stock. The financial groups claim that makes you a cooperator. Actually, in most cases it means that you pay interest on $4,000 even though you got only $3,800 in cash. As a rule you get no return whatever on your stock. If a Wall Street firm undertook to sell stock on the same basis as the farm-loan associations, investors who lost money by this process would be demanding all kinds of investigations. I don't think the word "cooperative" should be applied to a transaction in which the farmer in the majority of cases is bound to lose money.

I know something about this 5-percent stock provision because my wife and I have long paid interest on an $8,000 land-bank loan, although we got only $7,600 in cash. I have our $400 stock receipt here in my hands. I doubt if one farmer in a hundred thousand has even seen his stock certificate. How many of you have ever read the receipt for your stock?

Mine reads: "This receipt represents your investment in stock on which dividends will be paid." My association is 90 percent impaired. It doesn't pay dividends.

The receipt goes on to say, "It will be accepted at face value on final payment of the loan." In view of the 90-percent impairment this simply is not true.

I read further, "If you sell your land this receipt should be transferred to the purchaser and you should collect not less than face value therefor." The fact is that it is impossible for most farmers when they sell their land to get face value for their stock simply because the stock isn't worth its face value.

Finally, this notice ends up by saying, "It cannot be legally transferred to anyone other than the purchaser of the land mortgaged, on account of which this stock is issued." I don't know how it happened, but the facts are that 20 percent of the receipts have become separated from the mortgages.

This kind of receipt, valueless in a majority of cases, is the basis for all the talk you have been hearing about the cooperative character of the land-bank system which they say we are destroying.

I would like to see the land banks made more cooperative, with an interest rate to farmer-borrowers set high enough to provide an ample margin to cover the cost of money plus all operating expenses. Then, after proper reserves are built up, whatever profits are made could be pro rated back to the borrowers as a patronage dividend.

Such a policy will give the land-bank system a cooperative spirit and method such as it has never had before.

If the land banks are thus improved, it will be possible, with the Farm Credit Administration in the Department of Agriculture, to work out a united national farm program. A sound Triple A program means a lot to the success or failure of the land banks. Those who operate the land banks both locally and nationally should be sympathetic toward the Triple A insofar as it influences soil fertility and farm income. The most successful Triple A programs can be operated only in those counties where there is considerable stability of tenure. The Triple A and all other cooperative movements are strengthened if farmers are more permanently anchored on the land. What a mighty team Farm Credit and the Triple A can be if they pull together steadily for conservation of the soil, stability of farm communities, and increase in farm income.

This farm credit issue is an issue which cuts deep. It vitally concerns the welfare of farmers, not only here in the Northwest but all over the United States. We hope it will be settled this year. But if it isn't, the issue will go on until it is settled, and settled right.

The farm-credit fight, bitter though it may be, is only one of many fights, all of which are of the utmost significance to the future of our Nation, and the future of world democracy. Fundamentally, the one thing for which we are all battling is the right to live in our homes year after year, with enough money to feed and clothe our children properly and give them a decent education. In order to enjoy these rights, we must pay the price of cooperation, of study, of watchfulness, and of understanding.

We want no dictator from either Wall Street or Washington telling us what to do. But, we do welcome a government which gives us the machinery for expressing our wishes through local leadership and through which the local leadership can combine for united national farm programs. This is the very soul of an efficient modern democracy capable of standing up against threats, whether from within or from overseas. Trojan horses have worked in certain countries overseas because of the attitude of bitter minorities opposed to the rank and file of the common people. The dictators, in their vaulting ambitions, think they can place Trojan horses in this country and in Latin America. They think they can build a Trojan horse out of unemployment, out of bitter old dealers, out of Communists, out of racketeers. To meet the challenge of the dictators we need to be fully prepared, not only in the military sense, but also in an economic sense. The farmers are the very backbone of democracy. But, if the farmers, because of reduced income and burdensome debt, are forced to leave their land, then democracy is threatened at its very source.

This war is certain to have the most serious repercussions on all agriculture. Since last September 1, the outside world has taken about 20 percent less of our food and tobacco than it did during the corresponding period a year ago. For political and economic reasons, England and France are not likely to buy nearly as much of our farm produce as we might wish. So far as possible they are going to try to buy within their own empires, from countries like Rumania and Turkey, for political reasons, and from countries like Argentina, where the English pound and the French franc will buy more than they will in this country. The British and French wish to use their precious American dollars to buy things in this country which they can't get any place else, notably airplanes. If to win the war the British and French are forced to buy farm products from the United States, they will do so. Otherwise not. It is all a question of hard, military, business necessity.

Whatever happens, there is trouble ahead for American agriculture. We might as well recognize it and begin to prepare for it. For example, if we hold completely aloof from Europe and Asia after this war comes to an end, it is obvious that our exports will rapidly dwindle to the merest trickle. That means that Triple A, Farm Credit, Farm Security, and all of the other agencies of the Department of Agriculture will have the biggest task on their hands which they have ever faced. If, because of unusual European war buying of farm products there should be a temporary agriculture prosperity, we must fight attempts that are sure to be made to destroy essential parts of our agricultural-adjustment machinery. For after the war buying comes to an end, we will need this machinery more than ever. There must be agricultural preparedness as well as military preparedness. There must be preparedness for peace as well as for war. The agricultural problem can be made much simpler if the provisions of the peace make room for the far-visioned approach of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull through the trade-agreements program. But in any event, whatever the American people may decide on with regard to the peace, it is obvious that the Triple A, Farm Credit, and the whole farm program must be improved and not weakened. Farm

income must be maintained and farm expenses must be reduced. The farm interest burden must be cut down and must not be allowed to pyramid again.

I fear the world problem is so great and will be so long continued that the Triple A and Farm Credit will need a lot of help by Farm Security. There are nearly a million farm families who can be helped only slightly by Farm Credit and Triple A. These families need loans from Farm Security and in drought years they may have to have grants. Until the world settles down and excessive unemployment ceases, we shall have to continue with the food-stamp plan for distributing farm surpluses to needy in the cities. Several million families in the city are spending less than 5 cents a meal per person and we intend to do all we can to see that these people get at least an extra 2½ cents per meal per person with which to buy the farm surplus which otherwise would go to waste.

What goes on among the farmers and workers of the United States during the next few years will probably determine the course of world history during the next hundred years and possibly for a thousand years to come.

Efficient, modern democracy was perfected only recently in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. These countries, over the years, have been making the changes necessary to keep democracy working. In adapting their social and economic system to the necessities of the modern world, they have been far in advance of the United States. They were succeeding. But now ruthless hands have been laid upon the Scandinavian democracies.

In western Europe democracy will be handicapped for long years to come by the war and the inevitable post-war reaction. Only in this hemisphere do we have the possibility of building in peace an efficient, yet tolerant, democracy, based on hard work, cooperation, and free speech. And the very essence of all this, as they found in Scandinavia, must come from farmers and workers, efficient in their job and filled with the spirit of cooperation. We, like the Scandinavians, must be ready and willing to make changes necessary to make democracy workable. We must do whatever is necessary to make our farmers and workers secure.

We must be watchful and strong or the day will come when forces opposed to such necessary changes will prove to be the Trojan horse within our own gates. We must be watchful and strong or the day will come when a Trojan horse will capture some nation in this hemisphere and we shall have to undergo the endless agony which has so long convulsed Europe. Pan Americanism, democracy, cooperation, and peace are the fires we must keep alight on this hemisphere until such time as the madmen disappear into the whirlpool which they themselves created, and the world can slowly start rebuilding.

In all of this effort to strengthen our own democracy, credit on land is only a part. But in connection with the rest of the agricultural program, it is vital because it contributes so greatly toward stable farm communities. And so in closing, I urge you to organize to fight for your homes. Fight for a better credit system. Fight to guard your farm program against every kind of attack. I trust this meeting is not just another meeting. It should and must lead to action.

Fourth Reorganization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOW W. HARTER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with the President's fourth plan on Government reorganization he has transmitted a message in which he recommends the reenactment of the Reorganization Act, which expires on January 20, 1941. Furthermore, he recommends that in such reenactment there should be no exemptions. In other words, the President proposes that power to reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other independent agencies, be conferred upon the Executive.

In the fourth plan the President has reorganized one independent agency, the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The reorganization of the Authority is, of course, a matter entirely different from the reorganization of other nonregulatory agencies. In the treatment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority we have some clue to what the President has in mind in asking for power to reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission and other related agencies.

The proposed reorganization of the Authority deprives it of its independence. All its functions are transferred to the Department of Commerce, and the present Authority is abolished, becoming a subordinate board. The order states that the new board shall exercise its functions of rule making, adjudication, and investigation independently of the Secretary of Commerce. But at no point in the order is there any statement that the board shall continue to have any functions at all.

The order states merely in section 7 (a) that the functions of the present Authority are transferred to the Department of Commerce. It does not state that the new board will continue to exercise the functions of the present Authority. So far as can be discerned from an examination of the order the Secretary of Commerce will be free to distribute the functions of the present Authority wherever he wishes in the Department of Commerce. Only in the event that the new board receives some functions of rule making, adjudication, or investigation will those functions be exercised independently of the Secretary of Commerce. As a matter of fact, although the functions of the present Authority are transferred to the Department of Commerce, the functions of rule making, adjudication, and investigation which the new board may have will be independent only of the Secretary of Commerce. It remains to be seen whether they will be independent likewise of other agencies in the Department of Commerce.

If it had been intended that the new board will receive all of the present functions of the Authority and that certain functions would be independent not only of the Secretary but also of the remainder of the Department of Commerce, it would have been easy to say so. The order is either badly or shrewdly drawn, and in its very wording constitutes a threat not only to the independence but even to the continued life of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

However, the threat to the independence of the present Authority is clear enough without reading between the lines or without analyzing what it is that the order does not say. For the order states in terms that the new board will be independent of the Secretary only with respect to rule making, adjudication, and investigation. Thus with respect to the expenditure of money, the appointment of personnel, and all the other functions which the agency exercises, the protection even of a nominal independence is not to be afforded. Moreover, the order states expressly that the Secretary of Commerce, through whatever facilities he may designate, must direct and supervise both the budget and the personnel functions of the board. Furthermore, the new board will be unable to report either to the President or to the Congress except through the Secretary of Commerce; the President's order makes this limitation upon the board explicit. The Civil Aeronautics Act requires the present Authority to make an annual report to Congress and permits it to transmit recommendations more frequently. This provision of law, so necessary to assure truly independent advice for Congress in matters relating to civil aeronautics, is repealed by the President's order; hereafter Congress can be spoken to only by a member of the Cabinet.

Thus the Secretary of Commerce, with his control over the money, the personnel, the reports, and other activities of the new subordinated board, can effectually defeat whatever independence may be thought to exist by virtue of the provision that the board shall exercise its functions of rule making, adjudication, and investigation independently of the Secretary.

What independence is there in the members of a board who have to depend upon the Secretary for the very desks at which they work, for the telephones they use, for the secretaries they trust? Independence means nothing unless it includes not only the will but the ability to defy the Secretary of Commerce where such defiance is dictated by consideration of the public's interest. If by a wide stretch of the imagination we assume that the members of such a subordinated board would have the will to defy the Secretary of

Commerce, even imagination will not help us to discover on the part of the board the ability to defy the Secretary. Whatever the Secretary may do, whatever interpretations he may give to the vague words of the President's order, the board must remain silent and suffer with closed lips unless, through the magnanimity of the Secretary, it is permitted to speak. For it can report neither to the President nor to the Congress except through the Secretary. In these degrading limitations there is the mantle not of independence but of subservience.

Why is it that for 50 years the Congress and the country have entrusted peculiarly delicate and important tasks to independent agencies of government? It is because there are certain administrative functions which require a special competence, which require courage in administration, and which require absolute freedom from political pressure. It is not only a matter of determining impartially the rights of private parties. It is also a matter of assuring conditions under which technical and complex questions can be dealt with in the cold light of reason and with the special ability which comes from expert knowledge and experience. To assure the sway of reason and to assure the free play of expert knowledge and the untrammeled accumulation of expert experience, Congress cannot depend upon the political departments. It must create agencies, equipped to perform the tasks of regulation and protected absolutely from the forces of politics. It must have not only men of courage to man those agencies but also the freedom for the exercise of courage.

These conditions cannot be found in the reorganized Civil Aeronautics Authority.

No task recently undertaken by government so urgently demands the virtues of an independent agency as is true of the regulation and development of civil aeronautics. Highly technical, notoriously appealing to politicians because of the headline and dramatic potential of aviation, the regulation and development of civil aeronautics upon which the lives of millions depend must be given the protection which can be found only in an independent agency.

Western Pennsylvania Businessmen Against St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE ALLEGHENY REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Allegheny Regional Advisory Board, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa., speaking for the largest as well as many of the smallest industrial and commercial operations in Pennsylvania, is decidedly opposed to the consummation of the proposed St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty with Canada.

The members of the Allegheny Regional Advisory Board adopted the following resolution, which represents the views of the industrial traffic managers of the various industries holding membership. The position taken by this group of businessmen is typical of the strong opposition throughout the United States to stop the development of another Government subsidized competitor of the rail and coal industries.

Resolution with respect to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty

That the Allegheny Regional Advisory Board, a voluntary organization of shippers with membership embracing western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, northern West Virginia, and western Maryland, whose object is to promote and maintain efficient and adequate transportation service for the mutual benefit of carriers and shippers alike, at its meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 14, 1940, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas there is now renewed agitation for the consummation of the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty, commonly known as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project;

"And whereas the railroads are the lifeblood and backbone of our transportation system and their adequate maintenance is essential to the welfare of the country as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allegheny Regional Advisory Board go on record as against ratification of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project for the following reasons:

"1. That the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, either as a navigation or power enterprise or both, is unsound, uneconomical, and injurious to the welfare of the Nation as a whole and to the industries of this district, as well as to the railroads of this Nation;

"2. That the cost of construction of the proposed project would place a very heavy additional burden on the taxpayers of the country at a time when such a burden is unjustifiable from the standpoints of any benefits that could possibly accrue from the vast expenditure necessary therefor;

"3. That this Nation has now reached the legal limit of indebtedness and the further addition of an expenditure of a sum variously estimated to be from $200,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 as called for in the premises is unwarranted if not in fact illegal;

"4. That originally proponents of the project presented it as desirable and necessary on account of needs of transportation; that when this reason was exploded they changed front, and now support it as a project to produce hydroelectric power; that this ground is also untenable because power is now being generated in the United States in sufficient volume as not to call for any further development as proposed by this treaty; and that the present facilities of the power-producing industry of our Nation are such as to be able to satisfy any increasing needs of consumers for years to come, thereby making the construction of this seaway and power project absolutely unnecessary in the public interest, and merely a useless waste of public moneys;

"5. That the loss of traffic to transportation carriers of this country would cause such a loss of revenue as to jeopardize efficient transportation service and adversely affect their workers, resulting in unemployment for many thousands of men, with its collateral effect upon business due to loss in purchasing power, and thus only increase the relief rolls of the Nation, and, in turn, to sustain such additional heavy relief appropriation necessary, increase taxation;

"6. That the production of additional cheap hydroelectric power as proposed under this project will bring about an immense reduction of electric power produced by coal, which, in turn, will cause a great loss in tax revenues to Federal and State Governments on account of decreased coal production; that competition of imported fuels and materials handled by ships under foreign flags using said waterway would only increase, to the detriment of American ships and operators; and that extensive development of hydroelectric facilities will seriously disrupt the present status and retard future industrial growth in all States; and

"7. That since the camouflage has now been removed from the new treaty and it has been stripped of its imaginary help to industry in the United States, it can now be viewed in its true light; that is, in one phase just another hydroelectric power project, entirely unnecessary except as another specious way of spending hundreds of millions of dollars of public money at a time when neither the law nor the necessities of this country as a whole warrant it."

Our Wise Neutrality Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of April 26:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of April 26, 1940]

OUR WISE NEUTRALITY PROGRAM

During discussion of the neutrality law last autumn Mr. Roosevelt successfully insisted on discretionary authority in regard to invoking the law toward other people's conflicts. For this he was roundly denounced by professional isolationists, who charged he would misuse his discretion in favor of the Allies. The isolationists wanted to compel him to invoke the law whenever fighting broke out between nations anywhere in the world.

Events in Scandinavia in the past 5 months vindicated the President. They have proved the wisdom of a flexible policy which allows responsible administrators to judge our proper actions in relation to specific events.

The neutrality law never was invoked against Finland and Russia, though these two nations certainly were engaged in military conflict. No state of war was formally declared by either belligerent. And at no time during the brief but savage combat was this country's peace endangered. Proclamation of the neutrality law would simply have deprived us of even the opportunity to aid Finland in ways which would have been safe had Congress chosen to authorize them.

Yesterday, however, Mr. Roosevelt invoked the neutrality law in its full force in regard to Norway, which has been dragged into war by the German invasion. Norway's war, just as Finland's, is undeclared, except in statements from King Haakon. The Nazis call their invasion merely a "protective occupation."

But the position of Norway is very different from that of Finland in December. The Norwegians in fact are alined with Britain and France. Norway is, willy-nilly, the battleground of the armies of Germany and the Allies. Unless we prohibited credits and loans to Norway, there would be a great gap in the barriers we have erected to prevent loans to the other belligerents.

Mr. Roosevelt's proclamations declaring our neutrality, and forbidding sales to Norway except on a cash-and-carry basis, were clearly necessary. Further, they should serve to silence some of the ambitious Republicans who, exploiting the desire of the people to keep out of war, have the impertinence to contend that they, and they alone, represent the "party of peace." Before the coming Presidential campaign is ended they may find that such exaggerated claims have a dangerous backfire.

Mississippi River Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY WATCHMAN-ADVOCATE OF APRIL 26, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis County Watchman-Advocate of April 26, 1940:

MISSING—THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY—A WORTHY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM—WILL THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION COOPERATE IN A SURVEY?

There is no great national park or parkway located in the 10 States adjacent to the Mississippi River, and it would seem logical that the 30,000,000 people living in these 10 States should be given consideration for a great national parkway. This green ribbon would be only a fractional size of the Smoky Mountain National Park in the East and the Yellowstone National Park in the West. One-fourth of the population of the Nation resides in these 10 States. They are finding more leisure on their hands. They naturally wish to go places and see things. They desire to go by attractive, scenic routes. They want to see all the great improvements which have been constructed along the Mississippi River. Public interest has been aroused by the 26 locks and dams recently created in the upper Mississippi. Great dikes and floodways of the South are equally interesting. People desire accessibility to this mighty waterway.

Since the Mississippi River parkway project was proposed about 2 years ago, much headway has been made. All the State legislatures that met in 1939 endorsed the project, and some have passed enabling acts authorizing their State highway departments to cooperate with Federal authorities in a survey for such a parkway. The legislatures of the States that assemble in 1940 are also giving this matter their attention. There is a universal approval from the source to the mouth of the Mississippi River for a great rural national parkway.

This Mississippi River project has resulted from planning by various State planning boards in accordance with congressional act of June 23, 1936, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, to make a comprehensive study with the several States, with a view toward developing a coordinated, adequate public-park, parkway, and recreational-area plan and program for the people of the United States. The State planning boards of the 10 States along the Mississippi River have prepared various State plans. Recognizing the need for coordination, representatives of these planning boards through committees appointed by the governors of the Mississippi River States, are cooperating in an interstate parkway planning committee. They logically envision a great tourway from North to South and from South to North. It will serve as an important market-to-farm route for tourists all over the Nation.

When the World War came to an end and our soldiers were returning to their native States, the problem of their reemployment was a vital issue. Consideration was then given to many possible constructive programs. The one most civilizing influence at that time seemed to be to get America out of the mud. With that thought ever in mind, the United States Bureau of Public Roads cooperating with the highway commissions of the various States, the county courts, and the highway engineers of the respective counties, conceived and have constructed a national civilizing system of commercial highways. They very properly then concentrated on commercial highways between commercial centers for commercial vehicles. At that time, automobiles were relatively few in number. Today, there are over 25,000,000 passenger cars. Over one-fifth of these are owned by citizens of the 10 States along the river.

These millions of passenger cars, enclosed against all kinds of weather, with ever-increasing speed travel the highways of America. Within the last two decades, commercial trucking has grown by leaps and bounds. It is this mixed traffic which has created a traffic muddle. This muddle has resulted in thousands of deaths annually and tens of thousands of injuries. It seems timely to us that this muddle be corrected. America seems ready for a new auxiliary system of passenger travelways.

This seems to be a thoroughly sound, practical, and economic solution. It seems obvious that either the two or more lane mixed trafficways be widened or that the through passenger traffic be separated from the commercial traffic. Certainly, it would seem to be timely for a survey of this situation. Unless a solution is found the traffic-accident and death rate will continue.

As a representative newspaper of river country, we are all gratefully mindful of the exceptionally fine highway surveys and the resulting roadway systems created under the supervision of Thomas H. MacDonald, Chief of the National Highway Administration, and his famed staff of highway engineers. Together, with the highway department of the several States and counties, a truly remarkable highway system has resulted. We reiterate, this Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the Congressmen who authorized the program that granted Federal aid to help the States make this system possible. Progress never ceases. The world continues to turn. Perhaps history will again repeat itself with respect to reemployment. When these overhanging war clouds blow away, perhaps those now engaged in the production of war materials will need some civil reemployment project upon which to rely. If we have learned anything in the 20 years that have elapsed since we first started our present highway system, we should have learned the value of preplanning. We should not be caught short the second time. Let us initiate a plan for suitable travelways. All the experts who have been consulted with respect to the proposed Mississippi River parkway agree that such a national trunk rural parkway is a "natural."

In cooperation with various officials, planners, and highway-minded people, there was introduced into Congress a year ago a bill, H. R. 3759, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Public Lands of the House. The corresponding Senate bill (S. 1978) has been introduced into the United States Senate. These companion bills for the first time in the history of the Nation, define a national rural parkway, specify its requirements and stipulate the responsibilities of both the State and Federal agencies. It is purely an enabling act. It proposes a survey. It asks for no funds in the 1941 Budget. As, if, and when Congress passes such a parkway bill and the President signs it, it will take the State planning agencies and other public officials months to gather together all the existing data on surveys and plans now available. When these various materials are ready they will be turned over to the proper Federal agency. Such a survey will not be expensive.

All the possibilities of the proposed survey of this parkway fit in with the proposed De Soto four hundredth year anniversary celebration to be initiated in 1941. It will take months to make the survey, for the State to acquire the needed rights-of-way and easements, and years to finish such a parkway.

It is not proposed to follow the shore line of the river mile after mile. That indeed would be monotonous. It is generally agreed that the parkway would be constructed over or under the cliffs and caverns and across riverbends and through back country. Such location also would tend toward the most economical cost of land acquisition, parkway road construction, and maintenance. Where more than the main route of the parkway is initially warranted, the Government may designate subsidary branches or alternate routes for the purpose of providing connections with the approaches of the various trans-Mississippi River bridges, or for the purpose of reaching sites for recreational, scientific, or other parkway purposes.

Numerous cities and towns along the banks of the Mississippi River came into being with the early river-boat trade. They were stabilized by the railways which followed the river. They flourished and grew as the river and rail traffic gathered raw materials and finished products from the farms and factories along the river. As the Nation developed from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, transcontinental highways, railways, and airways were built. The Panama Canal came into being permitting intercoastal shipping. Industry spread throughout the Nation. The Mississippi River towns therefore need reinvigoration.

This proposed parkway would constitute a "conservation-recreation corridor." In an emergency it would serve as a military highway relief measure. It would provide relief for commercial thoroughfares. It would assure accessibility to the river at all times. It would prove of universal benefit. It would help the urban and rural population and increase its income from the travelers along this parkway.

These bills are now before this Congress. The States have pledged or are rapidly pledging their cooperation to assist in surveys and to furnish the right-of-way if and as needed. The parkway will injure none, but will help many. It is so worthy that we deem it appropriate that a survey be made. A survey can be made and should be based on the specifications contained in the enabling act in the congressional bills.

Will the Roosevelt administration cooperate in such a survey? The people of this valley want an answer. Since actions always speak louder than words, the appropriate answer is action at this session. Congressmen, it is up to you. If this is a government with imagination, courage, and faith in America, it should act.

Now is the time for Congress to pass this enabling act. Now is the time to assure the millions in the Mississippi Valley that they will receive due consideration for such a tourway. The proposed parkway is not a luxury, but a logical necessity. It is timely to survey its possibilities before too much money is spent in the widening of existing commercial highways. It is timely to think in terms of an employment project that is worthy, useful, economically sound, and humanly desirable. It is obvious that parkways are more useful than pyramids. National employment projects and programs are problems facing all of us. Planning should precede projects. Surveys should precede plans. Specifications should precede surveys. Congress should enact these specifications. Then and not until then will State or Federal agencies be in a position to move forward.

Congressional action is the next step. Thirty million people deserve consideration.

Public Defender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the public-defender idea is neither revolutionary, novel, nor impracticable. It is amply justified by historical precedent and by the procedure in foreign countries. It has stood the test of time and experience. An official called pauperus procurator appears to have existed under the Roman Papal Government—Browning's poem, The Ring and the Book, volume III, page 279. There was such an official in Spain in the fifteenth century.

In the cortez of Madgiral (1496) and still more in the celebrated one of Toledo (1480) many excellent provisions were made for the equitable administration of justice, as well as regulating the tribunals. The judges were to ascertain every week, either by personal inspection or report, the condition of the prisons, the number of the prisoners, and the nature of the offenses for which they were confined. They were required to bring them to a speedy trial and afford every facility for their defense. An attorney was provided at public expense, under the title of advocate for the poor, whose duty it was to defend the suits of such as are unable to maintain them at their own costs. * * * Severe penalties were enacted against venality in the judges, a gross evil under the preceding reigns, as well as against such counsel as took exorbitant fees, or even maintained actions that were manifestly unjust. (Prescott's History of Ferdinand and Isabella, vol. I, p. 194.)

The Spanish law now provides for the employment of counsel to represent indigents in both civil and criminal cases—"Las Leyes de Enjuiciamiento Civil y Penal." In every district a lawyer is registered who takes charge of the cases of indigents in turn.

In the Argentine Republic the defense of accused persons unable to employ counsel is entrusted to the "defensores de pobres y ausents"—defenders of poor and absents. These counsel are lawyers appointed by the Supreme Court of Argentina for life at a monthly salary. There are also public defenders for infants and insane persons.

In France there exists an organization called "L'Assistance Judiciare," through which persons without sufficient means are entitled to avail themselves of the protection of the courts. The bar in that country is unified into an order, assignments to the defense of indigent prisoners are made by the executive head of the orders from the bar in general, and accepted as obligatory. This insures to the defendant dignified and competent counsel.

In Belgium, in accordance with the law of July 30, 1889, covering judicial assistance to the poor, an indigent person has the right to choose a lawyer, who gives his services gratuitously. He is called a "Pro Deo" lawyer. A petition for such free procedure must be sent to the judge, who has the right to dismiss the petition or allow the "Pro Deo" lawyer's appointment, according to what his investigation as to the prisoner's circumstances develops. The procedure has this advantage, that the prisoner, by selecting his own attorney, cannot be heard to complain that he was dependent upon counsel who is unsatisfactory to him for any reason.

The Constitution of Mexico provides for the free public defense of its citizens, through the "Defensores de Oficio," the number of whom is stipulated in the "Ley Organica de Ministerio Publico." The constitution of each one of the Mexican states provides also, with the jurisdiction of the state, for the "Defensores de Oficio," whose number is specified in the "Codigo de Procedimientos Penales" in some jurisdictions, and in the "Ley Organica" in others. The same general principle is followed, although the various states have different forms and laws.

The Norwegian act of May 22, 1902, concerning "procedure in criminal cases," prescribes that a lawyer must be assigned by the court for the defense of any person who is being tried for crime, the expense thereof to be borne by the state. This method of compensation insures a more adequate defense than a system of free counsel.

In England, counsel assigned to the defense of an accused person is paid by the Government.

Under the criminal system in Denmark, the court appoints, in each case, a prosecutor and a defender for the accused person. Both of these are selected from a staff of public attorneys in the particular city or district, who have been appointed beforehand by the king to handle public cases.

We can learn much from foreign jurisprudence with respect to securing to accused persons the right to a fair trial, despite the so-called safeguards of our personal liberties.

This idea is also abundantly justified as humane, just, and economical by the successful operation of the public defender's office in various American communities.

While the present movement is based primarily on the necessity for extending adequate and proper legal assistance to indigent accused persons, it is a mooted question as to whether or not all accused persons should not be defended by the State.

I, of course, do not approve of such course. But it is interesting to note in this connection that, according to the Wetboek von Strafvordering—Code for Administering Penal Law—of the Netherlands, any person accused of crime may have counsel assigned to him, and that the privilege is not restricted to indigent persons. This counsel is chosen by the president of the court from among the lawyers in his district.

THE PUBLIC-DEFENDER SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

When the city of Los Angeles, in the year 1914, created the office of public defender this action was regarded by the majority of the rank and file of the bar throughout the country as a novelty, like Lochinvar coming out of the West. For some time to come the advocates of the public defender remained few and far between, and their solitary expressions were like a voice crying in the wilderness.

Although the legal profession has a tendency, because of the very nature of its activities, to be somewhat deliberate in accepting modifications in traditional forms and systems, nevertheless experience has shown that when in the course of time, as a result of observation and experience, it becomes convinced of the desirability of reform, it does not hesitate to champion such a proposal and even lead in its attainment. This is just what has happened to the idea of the public defender.

The action that Los Angeles took in 1914 was shortly followed by its northern neighbor, San Francisco. Other large cities gradually followed the example of the two metropolitan centers on the Pacific coast. For example, Omaha acted in 1916, and Minneapolis in 1917. Chicago installed the public-

defender system in 1933, with splendid results. In the meantime, the State of Connecticut established the public-defender system on a State-wide basis. Such officials are appointed by the court in each county.

State and local governments can frequently act as experiment stations for new ideas. They are sometimes in a better position to do so than the Federal Government, because of the vast extent of the activities of the latter. In this instance, the Federal Government has lagged behind the progressive communities. Consequently, the Federal Government is still without a public defender. A movement to provide such an officer in every Federal court has, however, been inaugurated and is making strong headway.

In the fall of 1937 the conference of senior circuit judges, which constitutes the governing body of the entire judicial system, adopted a resolution approving in principle the appointment of a public defender, where the amount of criminal business of the district court justifies the appointment. In the fall of 1938, and again in the fall of 1939, the conference renewed this recommendation.

In his Annual Report for 1938, Attorney General Cummings recommended the adoption of the principle of the public defender for the Federal judicial system. He remarked that—

> Wherever such a system has been in operation it has proved successful, both in preventing possible miscarriage of justice and eliminating dilatory tactics and technical obstructions on the part of defense attorneys.

Attorney General Murphy, in his report to the Congress for 1939, made a similar recommendation. Within a few weeks after taking office, Attorney General Jackson urged the enactment of a bill to establish a system of public defenders in the district courts of the United States. His statement on the subject is exceedingly illuminating and should receive the sympathetic attention of all those who are interested in improving the administration of criminal justice. Attorney General Jackson said:

> Public defenders are no longer a novelty. The subject has long passed the experimental stage. For some years the office of public defenders has been in existence and operation in a number of communities, and in at least one State it has been in existence in every county. Observers and students of the subject generally reach the conclusion that in every instance the institution has been beneficial. Not only does it assure proper representation by counsel to an individual defendant, but it makes a considerable contribution in the direction of eliminating delays and technicalities and expediting trials. This has notably been the experience in Chicago, where the office of public defender was established a few years ago.

The organized bar of the country, speaking through the American Bar Association, has likewise officially gone on record as endorsing the plan of creating public defenders for the Federal courts.

I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to create the public-defender system throughout the Federal courts. It is known as H. R. 4782, and is now pending before the House Judiciary Committee. A companion bill (S. 1845) was introduced in the Senate by Senator ASHURST.

We recognize the fundamental principle that a person accused of a crime is entitled to be represented by counsel. In fact, this right is guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so far as the Federal courts are concerned.

The Supreme Court 2 years ago, in a case that has become a cause celebre, held that the constitutional guaranty is not satisfied by merely according to the prisoner the right to hire counsel if he can afford to do so. The constitutional guaranty goes further and requires, so the Supreme Court holds, that the court appoint a lawyer to defend a prisoner who is impecunious and unable to pay for counsel. The system of having the court assign counsel to indigent prisoners is a traditional practice that has been in existence for a great many years. How much better it is, however, to provide a standing official whose duty it will be to act as defense counsel in such cases rather than to have the court select some lawyer, frequently more or less at random, to defend a case when the necessity arises.

THE INADEQUACY OF OTHER REMEDIES

Various opponents of the public-defender idea have enthusiastically proposed three plans which it is claimed will be an effective cure-all for the present difficulties.

These plans are as follows:

First. That the local bar associations should furnish a corps of reputable attorneys to volunteer their services as counsel for indigents.

Second. That legal-aid societies or other voluntary charitable organizations should undertake the defense of such persons.

Third. That the trial judge should be empowered to fix compensation to counsel in each case, such compensation to be paid by the county.

Not one of the proposed remedies, in my opinion, affords an adequate solution of the problem. Let us examine each proposal:

I. If the situation could be materially improved by the cooperation of the bar associations in supplying a list of volunteer attorneys to the court, is it not singular that they have not heretofore adopted such a course? Certainly they cannot plead ignorance of criminal-court conditions. Why have not the judges, who know the need for competent counsel in assigned cases, and who have the power to designate proper counsel, requested the assistance of the bar associations in an endeavor to promote the administration of justice? The answer is a very simple one—reputable and busy attorneys do not care to volunteer their services for this unproductive work, and the judges are not inclined to assign them, except in rare instances and in capital cases. And, as many of you will surely agree, it is unfair to expect a lawyer to devote his time and skill to such gratuitous service.

II. While legal aid societies have done splendid work and should be encouraged, the argument that they will afford a sufficient substitute for, and render unnecessary the establishment of, public defenders is wholly without merit. In the first place, such associations are generally handicapped by lack of sufficient funds, as has been evidenced by their frequent and urgent appeals to the public for financial support. Aside from this, however, there is a more potent and fundamental objection to the plan. An accused person should not be dependent upon any form of charity, indivdual or organized, for the resources or opportunity to present a merited defense. He should be entitled as a matter of abstract right to be defended by a sworn public official, who would have a positive duty, as well as the power and standing, to protect properly his interests. Neither private nor public charity, no matter how meritorious, will avail as a sufficient substitute for the denial of a legal requirement. Justice, not charity, is the universal need.

III. As regards the third plan, that of compensating assigned counsel: This, too, is open to serious objection, since it makes possible the showing of favoritism by the judges to certain lawyers, and thus leads to abuses, of which the "referee system" in civil cases is a conspicuous example. The compensation awarded would be hardly sufficient to induce experienced trial counsel to accept the cases. Furthermore, the aggregate of fees paid to counsel under such form of assignment would most likely result in a greater expense to the community than the creation of a public defender—without the benefits accruing from such defender. There is no reward, except he may figure that at some time when the judge gets into motion a bankruptcy part, he may remember him. But such are only pious hopes usually. The assigned lawyer has not inherently the interests of his so-called client at heart, a client, as it were, thrust upon him. He grumbles mayhap to himself, "Why in thunder did the judge pick on me?" At best, the defendant gets a raw deal. The defendant, be he guilty as sin, is entitled to better treatment.

Experience has shown that the creation of public defenders is not only a reform theoretically desirable but is also a step of major importance in the direction of improving the administration of the criminal law. First and foremost, it assures to indigent defendants suitable and proper representation by counsel. It has, however, another and much more far-reaching result—one possibly not intended by those who first

devised the plan. It leads to a much more effective and expeditious disposition of criminal cases. The public defender has no interest in pursuing dilatory tactics. He is under no temptation to present highly technical or ill-advised defenses. He certainly does not adduce perjured testimony, as unfortunately is occasionally done by some types of lawyers. Wherever the new system has been adopted, the result has been a speeding up of the administration of justice and a reduction of technical obstructions to decisions on the merits. This has been the case notably in Chicago, where all competent observers, including those who were skeptical when the reform was first proposed, acclaimed the beneficial results that have accrued to the community from the appointment of a public defender.

The time is ripe for the enactment of such legislation for the Federal courts, and if public opinion in support of such legislation becomes sufficiently articulate it is bound to pass.

House Joint Resolution 519—To Authorize Sale and Charter by Maritime Commission of Vessels for Intercoastal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me Wednesday, April 24, 1940, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of appearing in behalf of Mr. BUCK'S resolution as modified House Joint Resolution 519. I am certain all of us who are from the Pacific Northwest appreciate the promptness with which your committee has called these hearings. This is a matter of utmost importance throughout our entire section of the country, and it particularly affects the industries in my district. Unless we can obtain some of these vessels for our intercoastal trade, it is going to cause serious curtailment of employment in the lumber, wood pulp, flour milling, canning, and other industries throughout the entire Pacific Northwest.

The gentleman from California, Congressman BUCK, has outlined very clearly, I think, the purposes of the resolution and the situation which it is intended to meet. There is very little that I can add to what he has said. I merely want to emphasize the emergency which exists and which, of course, is thoroughly familiar to at least two members of your committee, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], who has served so ably for so many years on this committee. It is a real emergency. I know that your committee is going to give it very sympathetic consideration, and, of course, this is one case where time is of the essence. If we are going to be relieved, and if the emergency is going to be met, it will have to be done soon, before we have too many of these industries curtailing their operations. I am very hopeful that the matter can be acted upon soon in the House, so that the Senate will have time to act on it before Congress adjourns. I am in hearty accord with what Mr. WELCH has stated in regard to the importance of providing in this legislation, which, it seems to me is now covered by the amendment proposed by the Maritime Commission, proper safeguards to absolutely obviate and certainly prevent, if possible, any speculation or any profiteering in the sale or chartering of these vessels. I believe that the amendment, as proposed by the Maritime Commission, as now incorporated in Mr. BUCK'S modified resolution certainly should cover that very effectively.

I would like the privilege, Mr. Chairman, to read into the record at this point a brief statement issued by a group of the largest manufacturers and shippers in the State of Washington, setting forth cogent and compelling reasons for the immediate enactment of this legislation, and also a letter from one of my constituents.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH (reading):

"MEMORANDUM ON INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING SITUATION

"All industries in the Pacific Northwest which use intercoastal shipping to domestic markets on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts are seriously affected by the withdrawal of ships from those services—for more profitable employment created by the European war. Twenty-seven ships, or 25 percent of the fleet plying between the Pacific Northwest and the Atlantic coast, will be out of the intercoastal service by May 1940. It is probable that the bottoms available for this vital domestic trade will be further and progressively depleted as long as war continues.

"The tidewater sawmills of Oregon and Washington, which have heretofore shipped their product largely to intercoastal markets, are now being compelled to reduce such shipments to less than 60 percent of their normal volume; and face imminent curtailment in production and employment.

"The wood-pulp industry of the Pacific Northwest normally ships each year 300,000 tons intercoastally by water. These shipments have now been reduced to a rate of 120,000 tons annually.

"Oregon and Washington have shipped up to 300,000 tons of flour annually through the Panama Canal; but today this industry is unable to obtain adequate space for the firm orders now received. This directly cuts down the market for Northwestern grain.

"A similar curtailment of intercoastal outlets runs through all the water-borne commerce of the Pacific Northwest. It is causing unemployment which is rapidly growing to serious proportions.

"The joint resolution introduced by Representative BUCK (H. J. Res. 509) and Senator JOHNSON (S. J. Res. 246) is designed to relieve this situation. It would suspend, for the duration of the proclamation of the President under the Neutrality Act of 1939, the section of the Merchant Marine Act which reserves from use Government-owned ships which have passed an age limit of 20 years.

"The joint resolution would make this fleet of some 109 old ships available for disposition by the United States Maritime Commission, for either foreign or domestic trade, as the Commission may find the vessels needed.

"The joint resolution does not propose any wholesale releasing of the reserve fleet; and would not imperil the stability of the existing commercial water carriers or their rate structures. It would simply authorize the Commission to make these boats available, individually or in small groups, for designated trades, when and as satisfied of the need for additional ships.

"To accomplish the purposes of the joint resolution, it is believed desirable to provide authority for the Maritime Commission to make the ships available for commercial use under charter as well as through sale, and to give the Commission full authority as to the terms and conditions of chartering which may seem advisable in arranging for the use of these old vessels under the present emergency.

"The legislation should be drawn in broad and simple terms which place these reserve boats under control of the United States Maritime Commission, as to the extent of, and the ways and means by, which they may be placed in commercial service.

"G. V. Hayes, North Pacific Millers Association; C. B. Morgan, Rayonier, Inc.; R. E. Seeley, Puget Sound Associated Mills; W. B. Greeley, West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 19, 1940.*"

I would also like to read to you a letter received by me from Mr. C. H. Kreienbaum, executive vice president of the Simpson Logging Co., Shelton, Wash., bearing date March 7, 1940, which also describes the present emergency as it affects one of the largest operators and employers of labor in my district. The letter is as follows:

SIMPSON LOGGING CO.,
Shelton, Wash., March 7, 1940.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The lumber industry is fast feeling the effects of a situation which has been more or less of a theory but is now realized to be a fact. It is a problem that will affect every employer and employee in the industry, to some extent.

Your help in the past has always been promptly and cordially given, although my requests have been small. The problem I am putting before you now is of so great importance that I am sure you will give it your best thought and every possible assistance when the time comes.

Of course, you are aware of the fact that a good many steamships have been taken out of the intercoastal as well as the coastwise routes, and sold or chartered into the trans-Atlantic trade. Consequently many of our sawmills on Puget Sound and Grays Harbor are finding it difficult to move lumber, and therefore are faced with the drastic curtailment of their operations and the enforced idleness of much labor.

We feel there is a possible partial solution to this problem, and our group is moving in the direction of that solution. We have a sales company on Puget Sound, owned by 18 operators who employ upward of 4,000 men in their plants, besides the 4,000 or 5,000 men involved in producing the logs which these plants cut. This sales company has been shipping between 17 and 19 percent of all the lumber that is shipped into the Atlantic-coast market by the sawmills of western Washington and Oregon. It has chartered upward of 200,000,000 feet of steamship-carrying space per year for the past 2 years, besides using approximately 200,000,000 feet of tonnage of other carriers.

After the end of March, this sales company will find itself with practically no tonnage available. This briefly is our problem.

This situation affects the McCleary interests, our logging operations and our sawmill, as well as the other operators previously mentioned. The Simpson Logging Co. is now in the process of curtailing its logging operations, which will affect both Grays Harbor and Mason Counties.

The solution to this problem, we feel, lies with the Maritime Commission, and the ability we may have in convincing our steamship people that they should risk taking over serveral surplus ships of the Maritime Commission, which now lie in the so-called boneyard. The Maritime Commission has about 20 vessels which are less than 20 years old, and which they can dispose of in an emergency. They have, I believe, about 109 vessels which are more than 20 years old, which they cannot sell without an act of Congress or Executive order from the President. We are interested principally in 4 or 5 of the 20 vessels which are less than 20 years old and which the Maritime Commission can sell.

The Commission has indicated reluctance to sell these vessels without an emergency which would warrant the placing of these vessels in the intercoastal trade. Inasmuch as our sales company and its sawmills are not in the steamship business, it will be necessary for us to convince our former steamship connection that they should risk the hazard of taking 4 or 5 of these vessels and placing them in the intercoastal trade.

Mr. Robert E. Seeley, the president of the Puget Sound Associated Mills (which is the sales company of which I speak), is leaving here Monday for New York to discuss this situation with our steamship people. If the steamship people are disposed to take the risk, they will go to Washington. If they should do so, I have requested that they call upon you for whatever help you may be able to give us.

In fact, it is quite possible that I might fly East to assist in their efforts before the Maritime Commission. If so, I will again have the pleasure of personally discussing our mutual problems.

In case I do not have the opportunity to go East, I know that you will do everything in your power to be of assistance to Mr. Seeley.

With kindnest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

C. H. KREIENBAUM,
Executive Vice President.

In conclusion I would like, with your permission, to also present the statement of the Puget Sound Associated Mills, Mr. R. E. Seeley, president, which contains a fair analysis of the entire shipping situation in our section of the country, which is most critical. (The statement followed.)

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Evening News of April 26, 1940:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 26 1940]

BOARD TERMS ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY UNSOUND, RUINOUS

The proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project was conclusively demonstrated as unsound today in a comprehensive economic survey promulgated by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board.

After a broad study of the economic ramifications of the project and its possible consequences from a national standpoint, the survey pointedly draws this conclusion:

"The seaway would be so generally ruinous to American commerce and industry, labor, and capital that its Nation-wide deleterious effects would far exceed whatever claimed advantages might redound to certain special interests from the waterway or to New York State and the Province of Ontario from the power plan."

Prepared over a 5-month period by Bertram D. Tallamy, chief engineer of the planning board, and Miss Tess M. Sedweek, executive secretary, the 140-page survey was presented to members of the board at a meeting in the home of Chairman Chauncey J. Hamlin, 1014 Delaware Avenue, this afternoon and was unanimously endorsed. Copies will be sent to the President, Members of Congress, and other officials.

SAYS REPORT WILL WARN UNITED STATES

"I feel that this report will unequivocally demonstrate to the American public how detrimental the St. Lawrence Seaway would be to the national welfare," Mr. Hamlin told the board this afternoon.

It embodies its major findings in 24 points. They follow:

1. The minimum total cost of the whole St. Lawrence project for both the United States and Canada would be $1,120,588,000. This figure is founded on Government estimates. It is about three times the cost of the Panama Canal.

2. The St. Lawrence project, on the basis of experience with similar works, probably would cost more than the $1,120,588,000. A total of $375,000,000 was spent on the Panama Canal, although it had been estimated to cost only $160,000,000; the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal cost $53,000,000 instead of $16,000,000; and the Suez Canal cost $80,000,000 instead of $30,000,000.

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS WOULD SUFFER

3. At least 85 percent of the United States share of the project's cost would be borne by American taxpayers, who would be the victims of unfair discrimination: These taxpayers live in the region which could not be benefited by the St. Lawrence Seaway even if claims of proponents were valid.

4. American labor, transportation and industry, on the Government's estimates of probable seaway traffic, would lose $109,647,000 a year: Diversion of business from American transportation systems to foreign carriers, diversion of Canadian export grain movement from the United States and loss to American coal producers account for this figure.

5. The net loss to the United States would be $76,595,000 each year on the basis of the Government's estimates of seaway traffic: This sum represents the difference between two factors: One is the loss to established American commerce and industry plus the expense to American taxpayers; the other is the possible ratio saving by shipping via the St. Lawrence.

WOULD BE CLOSED PART OF YEAR

6. During 42 percent of the year, the St. Lawrence Seaway could not be fully utilized: The route would be closed because of ice conditions.

7. The American farmer would not gain from the St. Lawrence Seaway: Export grain would be the chief American agricultural product to be shipped through the waterway. Even if a possible maximum saving of 3 cents a bushel were realized, this would be absorbed by the foreign purchaser and vessel owner.

8. American manufacturers, who have cultivated this country's great inland market, would be seriously damaged by foreign competition resulting from the St. Lawrence Seaway: Alien tramp steamers would dump cheaply produced commodities on this currently protected Great Lakes market.

9. Foreign tramp ships would have almost exclusive use of the St. Lawrence seaway: American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 5 percent of the world's merchant-ship tonnage.

NO COASTAL BENEFITS EXPECTED

10. No route for more profitable trade between American ports would be offered by the St. Lawrence seaway: The location of the St. Lawrence is such that no appreciable coastal or intercoastal commerce would occur.

11. The St. Lawrence seaway would not carry the volume of traffic nor bring the savings in shipping rates to the exaggerated degree cited by many proponents: They have set the probable tonnage at 11,496,000 and the probable savings at $45,516,000 annually. The more accurate estimate is 3,873,000 for tonnage and $8,822,000 for savings.

12. The net loss each year to American commerce and industry and to the American taxpayer, on the basis of more accurate figures for estimated tonnages and savings, would be $42,233,000: The United States investment in the St. Lawrence seaway would result in lower earnings and higher taxes.

13. Maintenance of wholly cordial relations between the United States and Canada might be endangered by the St. Lawrence seaway: Serious questions could arise as to responsibility for defense of the waterway in times of war as to preservation of water levels in Canadian harbors on the lower St. Lawrence River.

MICHIGAN SOVEREIGNTY

14. Surrender of United States sovereignty over Lake Michigan would result from any treaty which, like the proposed treaty of 1938, limited the withdrawal of water from the lake at Chicago: It would prevent further development of the Great Lakes-Gulf of Mexico waterway by the United States.

15. The proposal for restoration of Niagara Falls beauty and for further power generation there has been inexcusably made contingent on the whole St. Lawrence project. There is no engineering demand for tying up the needed Niagara Falls project with the St. Lawrence development.

16. The United States would subsidize Canadian power to the extent of $48,860,000. This figure is reached by taking the minimum cost ($90,000,000) for the Canadian share of the power, under the least expensive plan yet advanced, and deducting costs strictly chargeable to power ($41,140,000) under the present plan.

SHOULD DIVORCE TWO PLANS

17. It is perfectly practical to divorce the seaway and power portions of the general St. Lawrence plan. There is no justification for burdening the proposed power development with the unsound seaway proposal.

18. The amount of power which would be created on the United States side of the river for $206,065,000 under the present St. Lawrence scheme could be produced for only $90,000,000 without the navigation project: The St. Lawrence Power Development Commission set $90,000,000 as a reasonable cost of power works on the American side of the International Rapids section.

19. Whatever power benefits might result from the St. Lawrence project would affect only the State of New York and eastern Canada: The St. Lawrence plan does not envision sale of United States power beyond the confines of New York State.

20. Neither New York City nor western New York is a practical market for St. Lawrence power. Under existing delivery conditions power from nearer sources is more practical and economical for these areas.

ESTIMATES TOO OPTIMISTIC

21. Previous estimates of increased power demand in New York State are too optimistic: The Niagara Frontier Planning Board finds that the demand in 1952 probably will not exceed 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

22. Overdevelopment of hydroelectric power is a dangerous policy to pursue: When generating plants are built without an adequate market for the power the capital charges accumulate to such an extent that the project never pays.

23. Adequate and economical power potentialities, apart from the St. Lawrence River, exist today in New York State and eastern Canada: Two outstanding examples are the Ottawa River in Canada and Niagara Falls.

24. Progressive development of Niagara Falls power potentialities independent of the seaway and in step with power requirements is the most practical plan: This would eliminate economic hazards to the new developments and to existing plants.

The report points out that the United States' share of the cost will be a maximum of $573,221,000.

From my own study I find that the suggested plans would give Canada full credit for the entire cost of the Welland Canal, which is completed and has been in usage for many years. It is my belief that we should not give credit for a waterway already in existence unless our authority over that waterway be extended at least to the center of same.

Michigan Chiefs of Police Laud Work of F. B. I. and Protest Against Smear Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent attempts of certain elements in this country to discredit the splendid work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation appear to be melting under the spotlight of the facts. Milton once said, "Truth is as impossible to be soiled by any outward touch as the sunbeam." When one compares the recorded facts concerning the great accomplishments of the F. B. I. in protecting the citizens of this Nation against underworld and subversive groups, the distorted claims of the latter collapse under their own weight.

Those launching this attempted smear campaign against the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, would hardly dare claim that the great law-enforcing groups of this Nation are in some sort of a conspiracy against the citizens. Persons making such claims would be laughed into the ocean and told to hike for their home abroad. Yet the F. B. I., which is being attacked, does have the support of the law-enforcement groups.

I hold in my hand a letter I have received from Chief of Police Fred H. Genske, of Saginaw, Mich., which contains a resolution adopted by the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, praising the cooperation of the F. B. I., endorsing the leadership of Director Hoover, and criticizing movements to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Whose word shall we take? The leaders selected and supported by the taxpayers to uphold law and order or the mud slingers with sinister motives?

I am satisfied the Michigan Chiefs of Police know what they are talking about. I wholeheartedly approve the resolution they have adopted.

Their views and the resolution follow:

CITY OF SAGINAW, MICH., *April 23, 1940.*

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Member of Congress, 1008 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAWFORD: Following is quoted verbatim a resolution unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police during a meeting at East Lansing, March 12, 1940:

"Whereas the police departments of Michigan have always received the utmost cooperation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the police chiefs of Michigan that an unwarranted attempt is being made to curtail the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, through criticism aimed at its Director: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, through its executive committee, in meeting at East Lansing on March 12, 1940, hereby endorse the splendid work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the able direction of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and protest any movement seeking to discredit this organization or curtail its activities."

In addition to a sincere endorsement of sentiments contained in this resolution, I want to state that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the able leadership of Mr. Hoover, has been of invaluable service to this department. Hardly a day goes by but we have evidence of the efficient work of the Bureau. We have always found its agents to be gentlemen, sincere in the pursuit of their duties, and always ready to lend aid wherever possible within the scope of their authority.

It would be distressing indeed to be deprived of even a small part of the services of Mr. Hoover and his organization.

Sincerely yours,

FRED H. GENSKE,
Chief of Police.

Western Association of State Highway Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Western Association of State Highway Officials has just completed its nineteenth annual meeting. The association adopted resolutions which are of great importance to the western portion of the United States and have an important bearing on our highway systems. As a part of my remarks I ask leave to extend these resolutions. They are as follows:

RESOLUTION I

Whereas, for the past 25 years, through cooperation between the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration, there has been constructed in the United States a system of highways which is outstanding in the world; and

Whereas, from the funds allocated, the people of the Nation now have a capital investment of at least 75 percent of such funds which is still paying returns to them; and

Whereas there is an apparent tendency on the part of other agencies to create a duplicating agency to carry on similar types of work; and

Whereas, through the cooperation of the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration, basic data have been compiled which now are available to determine comprehensive State highway programs; and

Whereas, through the present cooperative arrangement there has been developed in the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration a trained engineering personnel and organization competent to carry on highway-building activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials, representing the highway-construction activities of the 12 Western States, does hereby vigorously oppose any change in the fundamental procedure, organization, and methods of allocating funds and designating road systems and mileage; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of this association that any Federal funds in the future to be used for highway construction should be expended through the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration and no other Federal agencies.

RESOLUTION II

Be it Resolved, That in the future the Western Association of State Highway Officials shall include the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and that no further reference to the 11 Western States in correspondence or otherwise will be made.

RESOLUTION III

Whereas under the existing law and regulations there is unnecessary and definite confusion with respect to the availability of forest-highway funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials recommends to the consideration of the Congress the separation of forest-highway funds from other forest-road funds in making future authorizations or appropriations.

RESOLUTION IV

Whereas the Federal Government is collecting from the highway users more special taxes than are being returned to the various States and subdivisions thereof for the purpose of systematic and coordinated highway construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully recommend to the consideration of Congress that it make available all of the highway user taxes collected by the Federal Government for such systematic and coordinated highway construction through State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

RESOLUTION V

Whereas there has now been introduced into Congress proposed legislation providing aid to the States from the Federal Government in the acquisition of rights-of-way upon application by the State highway departments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials endorse in principle such proposed legislation.

RESOLUTION VI

Whereas existing authorization for Federal participation in highway construction expires at the end of the fiscal year of 1941; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced continuing such Federal participation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials respectfully urge early and favorable action on such pending legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the amount of authorization for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 be not less than the amounts of the 1938 and 1939 authorization; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be telegraphed to the members of the House and Senate Roads Committees and to the congressional delegates from the 12 States in the association.

RESOLUTION VII

Whereas there have been many meetings of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, and from these meetings have come the outstanding ideas regarding our future highway programs as expressed by those highway officials most vitally concerned; and

Whereas this information is of great value to the people of our States, especially road users and those interested in road-building activities; and

Whereas in the past proper methods of acquainting these interested people with these facts have not been taken: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be the duty of each State highway department represented to give full publicity, information, and explanation to the public of these important matters which have been brought out in the convention; and be it further

Resolved, That it be the duty of each State in the Western Association of State Highway Officials to continue throughout the year a campaign of publicity to keep these matters before the public.

RESOLUTION VIII

Whereas the actions taken by this meeting of the Western Association of State Highway Officials should be in the hands of the congressional delegates from each of the States of this association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be the duty of each State highway department in this association to immediately forward copies of these resolutions to each Member of their respective congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION IX

Whereas Robert A. Allen, president, of Nevada; Burton G. Dwyre, vice president, of New Mexico; and E. C. Knowlton, secretary-treasurer, of Utah, retiring officers of this organization, have given a large amount of their time and abilities to furthering the work of the Western Association of State Highway Officials and specifically have appeared before committees in Congress and promoted by their efforts the furthering of the highway program and the States represented in the Western Association of State Highway Officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend to them a vote of thanks for their faithful and diligent services.

RESOLUTION X

Whereas the Nineteenth Annual Convention of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, held at Santa Fe, N. Mex., has been outstandingly successful; and

Whereas the success of this convention has been due to those who made the arrangements and furnished the finances for carrying it on: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association extend its thanks and appreciation to the Honorable John E. Miles, Governor of the State of New Mexico, the Honorable Mayor Alfredo Ortiz, of Santa Fe, to Burton G. Dwyre, State highway engineer, and his splendid highway organization, to the New Mexico representatives of the public roads administration, together with their ladies, and to their efficient, courteous, and charming stenographic help; and be it further

Resolved, That the newspapers of Santa Fe and Albuquerque, N. Mex., be complimented for the excellent publicity which they have given the convention; and be it further

Resolved, That the New Mexico State police be commended for their efficient and courteous service rendered to the convention.

Respectfully submitted by:

C. F. SEIFRIED, Wyoming,
Dr. W. I. HEWES,
Public Roads Administration, San Francisco,
H. R. FLINT, Idaho,
D. A. MCKINNON, Montana,
IVAN J. HILTON, New Mexico,
Resolutions Committee.

A Labor View of Management's Present Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY WILLIAM L. HUTCHESON

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years prior to my coming here as a Representative of the Third District of Ohio, it was my privilege to serve as a representative of organized labor—as trial attorney for the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at the head of which was and is its general president, William L. Hutcheson. Mr. Hutcheson also is first vice president of the American Federation of Labor.

Throughout those 10 years of service in the cause of labor, by my frequent contacts and association with him, I learned to know, love, and respect Mr. Hutcheson. Mr. Hutcheson is an ideal labor leader. He is ever alert and vigilant in the advancement of labor's cause—a militant, two-fisted fighter in behalf of organized labor and the laboring men and women of this country. At the same time he is reasonable, just, fair, and square with industry and the employers of labor.

Above all, he is a real American—stands foursquare for the American system of government, its constitution and laws, its traditions, and the guaranteed rights of its citizens.

As a champion of organized labor and its advancement in accordance with the form of government adopted and bequeathed to us by the framers of the Constitution, he has been the spearhead against radicalism and its insidious invasion of the high places of labor, its offices, as well as bold interjection among its rank and file.

Mr. Hutcheson further believes that labor and industry, working together, can put the idle back to work, allay industrial strife, and restore prosperity solely through noninterference from government and by being left alone to solve the labor problems between themselves.

That you may have the opportunity, my colleagues, to reflect on the wise and timely counsel of a great labor leader, I quote an address by Mr. Hutcheson, broadcast on April 23, 1940, over the National Broadcasting Co. The subject of this address was A Labor View of Management's Present Duty. It follows:

At the outset, I want to make plain that I am not here to discuss any of the controversial points between labor and management. There are many subjects which labor and management approach with naturally different views.

Tonight I intend to confine myself solely to that wide field where labor and management have a common interest. It is my purpose tonight to bring a charge against the executives of American industry. It is a charge that I make, dispassionately, and in a spirit of helpfulness. And it is a charge that is written large in the hearts of millions of workers, who stalk unemployed through the streets of the United States.

As a preface to this charge, I want you to cast your recollection back to the turn of the century. I want to trace with you the course which industry and labor alike have followed since 1900.

Long before that labor had been working and planning to improve the lot and the prospects of the average worker. Labor was striving for better conditions of employment, for a saving wage, for shorter hours, and for the general recognition of collective bargaining.

Management, too, had a goal that it was seeking. It was thinking in terms of more efficient production through new tools that were being placed in its hands.

The electric motor was beginning to be used in industry, the automobile industry was starting—4,100 cars were produced that year—the movies were in the making and aviation was waiting to be born. America was on the threshold of its real industrial growth.

Through the combination of American invention, American executive genius, American management, and American labor, the America of 1900 was transformed into the America of 1920. During those 20 years management and labor, capital and investment, were left reasonably free to solve their own problems, to settle their own differences, to make their own mistakes, and to attain their own objectives.

Out of the experiences of those 20 years American management and American labor worked out a new and an inspiring theory of industrial economics. They asserted that the higher the wage that could be paid to American labor, the greater market there would be for American goods. The larger market thus created, they declared, would pave the way for the efficiencies of mass production. Mass production of American goods would permit the reduction of selling prices to the consumer. We called that theory the theory of high production, high wages, and low prices.

Through this system we were able to raise the average standard of living in the United States to the highest level that this or any other country had ever known. Through that system the average worker's family was able to secure a larger share of the fruits of industry. Through that system, the average American home had bathtubs, electric lights, pianos, phonographs, radios, and all the things that make for comfortable living.

The point I am trying to stress is that while management and labor were left to their own devices, while they could exercise to the full the rights and responsibilities of free enterprise, without interference from bureaucrats, America went forward and all classes of Americans prospered.

As an aftermath of the Great War, however, certain strange and alien theories began to creep into the relations between management, labor, and government. So much achievement had not been won by labor and management in so many directions without abuses of power. Compared to the magnitude of America's accomplishments, those abuses were the exceptions and not the rule. Yet viewed solely as abuses some were real and important. They gave government a reason for stepping actively into the industrial scene.

As always, government's hand was heavy. It pressed the innocent to attack the guilty. It began to make itself felt in the relations between management and labor, in the taxes it imposed on the operations of industry, and in control of the mechanism by which old enterprises are expanded and new enterprises are financed.

Labor is much more sensitive to changes in the industrial field than is either management or capital. Labor viewed this incursion of government into the field of free industrial enterprise with suspicion and distrust. Labor has a greater stake than either capital or management in the progress and the expansion of industry. Capital can change from one field to another. Management can move freely from one part of the country to another. Labor, however, with specialized skill, with meager reserves, and with limited alternatives, depends for its very bread and butter upon the solidity and permanence of its jobs. When trouble comes to industry, capital and management may lose money, but labor loses work.

Labor apprehends and opposes dangerous trends long before they are apparent or important to management.

So that at a time when unemployment was relatively small, when the country was already in the upswing of post-war prosperity, labor issued a solemn warning to management and to the public.

In the 1923 convention of the American Federation of Labor, in Portland, Oreg., the following declaration was unanimously adopted. I quote in part:

"The largest freedom of action, the freest play for individual initiative and genius in industry cannot be had under the shadow of constant incompetent political interference, meddlesomeness, and restriction.

"The threat of State invasion of industrial life is real. The continual clamor for extension of State regulatory powers under the guise of reform and deliverance from evil can but lead into greater confusion and more hopeless entanglement.

"The ambition to build must be saved; the abuses must be eradicated by means of organizations befitting the state of our development and the demands of our time. In no other way can industry continue that growth which is required to satisfy our ever-growing demand for commodities and avoid submersion in a wave of blighting political domination.

"The organized functional elements in industry will find easy of solution those problems to which politicians now turn their attention in futility. Industry must organize to govern itself, to impose upon itself tasks and rules, and to bring order into its own house. Our people cannot live and thrive under the regime of bureaucracy that threatens unless industry solves its own problems."

Seventeen years ago labor issued that warning. Seventeen years ago labor prophesied the disasters that were latent in government interference with the processes of free industrial enterprise.

Again and again in its yearly conventions labor has repeated that warning. It has again and again boldly asserted that bureaucratic domination paralyzes industry. In season and out of season it has fought to keep the dead hand of government away from the wheels of industry. Even at the cost of temporary advantages it has steadfastly held true to its convictions and its traditions.

In the past decade labor has seen some of its cherished dreams come true. It has seen its right to bargain collectively embodied in the law of the land. It has seen the establishment of reasonable standards for hours of work and for scales of wages. It has secured reasonable standards of hours and wages on Government contracts. It has been courted and comforted by those in power. It has even been led up on a high mountain and promised the domination of industry if it would follow obediently wherever government led.

In spite of all this, labor has held fast to its independence. For it has known that what government gives government can take away. And in spite of the gifts of government to labor, it knows there are still 10,000,000 idle workers walking the streets.

And today labor is openly challenging the theory that government can cure America's industrial ills. Labor today is surer than ever before that only through the stimulation of industry and business can employment become stabilized and unemployment reduced. The meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami on January 31, 1940, issued the declaration that—

"We urge that all government actions that tend unnecessarily to discourage business expansion cease, and that a positive effort be made to encourage greater industrial activity. We have learned a lesson that when opportunities of profit diminish, opportunities for jobs likewise disappear."

I have dwelt on labor's fight for independence and labor's struggle for free enterprise as an introduction to the charges I would present tonight against management. While labor has been enduring the sweat and the toil of battle, what has management been doing to resist government domination of business? What has management done to protect the freedom of industry and labor?

I charge the leaders of American business with failure to be leaders in the fight against bureaucratic control of industry.

I charge them with lack of effective action, while the shackles were being laid on free enterprise.

I charge them with lack of effective organization to resist policies which they knew were disastrous to the public and to labor.

I charge them with spending hundreds of millions of dollars to extol the merits of their products and practically nothing to tell the public the needs and the necessities of business.

I charge them with failure to drive home to the public and to the politician that restrictions on business inevitably bring in their train contraction and unemployment.

I charge them with timidity in resisting the mounting taxes, which reduced the ability of business to expand pay rolls.

I charge them with short-sightedness when they failed to awaken the public to the results they knew would flow from the infiltration of government into competition with private enterprise.

Finally, I charge the executives of American business with mass cowardice in permitting key industries to be purloined and broken one by one, with resulting unemployment to labor, without rushing in unison to their defense.

Four months ago, in a congress of American industry, the National Association of Manufacturers formulated a declaration of principles in which they stated the objectives which they believed industry should set for itself.

I quote from that declaration:

"The contribution that American industry can make to the national welfare depends upon the preservation of free enterprise and individual initiative. Laws to protect society from abuses are necessary and desirable, but in the public interest it is essential that any law or any other process affecting industry shall not limit the authority of management as to render it unable to fulfill its responsibilities."

Four months have passed since that pronouncement was made. But what has management done to defend free enterprise? What has it done to drive home to government and to the public that national progress depends upon liberating management and labor from the clutches of bureaucracy?

Pious words will get us nowhere. Assembled management can generalize forever, but it will never accomplish anything until it creates a public sentiment that will sweep away the political grit that is clogging the machinery of employment.

Labor has the right to demand that the leaders of industry should do more than talk. Not only should every individual executive do his part to protect the system of free enterprise, but in addition, and equally important, the executives of American industries should practice what they preach.

I should be the first to admit that there are many individual leaders who could successfully defend themselves against these blanket charges. There are many exceptions to the general rule, men who have risked much to proclaim the crimes that were being perpetrated on American business. I pay tribute, for instance, to the group of small businessmen who dared to stand up in Washington and tell the truth about the policies that were destroying them and their employees.

Management, able and efficient as it is in its own particular field, has floundered and retreated in its defense of the broad principles upon which the whole structure of America rests.

The appeal that I would make to you tonight, as a labor man, is that the executives of America's industries should face realities, just as labor has faced them.

It is not a theory but a fact that 10,000,000 workers are unemployed.

It is not a theory but a fact that the forward surge of American industry has been halted by Government incompetence.

It is not a theory but a fact that new enterprise has been stifled by the clumsy dictation of bureaucratic commissions and boards.

It is not a theory but a fact that capital which once went into the development of old industries and the creation of new ones, has gone into hiding because of fear of what Government may do

It is not a theory but a fact that as industry languishes, employment declines.

It is not a theory but a fact, apparent to anyone who has studied the course of industry and labor during the past decade, that the experiments of Government upon industry have made a bad situation infinitely worse.

Through those experiments we have seen saddled upon industry and labor a burden of Government taxes and debt which must be reckoned with by present and future generations.

None of the things that have been accomplished by labor and management in the past has been simple or easy. The men who developed the industries in this country, who created our railroads, who gave us the automobile and the electric motor, had each their difficulties and their heartaches before they won through to achievement.

Where Government has failed, labor and industry can succeed, today, just as they did in the past, in spite of every handicap that Government may place in the way.

The first responsibility of labor and management is to remove the handicaps under which they are laboring. After all, the basis of the American Government is that Government is the servant and not the master of the citizen. It is for the executives of industry today to be as brave and determined as their fathers before them. They have the facilities and the knowledge to chart a path back to the industrial policies which have made this Nation great. They have the power to tell the public and the politician that only through free labor and free management can national progress ever be resumed.

Labor has done and is doing its part to drive the lesson home. Management has an obligation to devote itself to the solution of the employment crisis which is stagnating progress and pay rolls.

There is still time for industry to act. America has always shown recuperative powers that have amazed the world. After every depression America has come back to higher levels of employment and prosperity.

America can do it again if labor and management, each in its own field, measures up to the dignity and the importance of its responsibility to the Nation.

"The Menace of Idle Dollars"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that outside of Washington the people generally, and especially the editors of the smaller dailies, know what is happening to us is evidenced from the following editorial from the Sturgis Daily Journal, Sturgis, Mich., of April 27, 1940:

[From the Sturgis (Mich.) Daily Journal of April 27 1940]

THE MENACE OF IDLE DOLLARS

Concern of the Federal Reserve Board over the unprecedented amount of idle bank funds in the United States is symptomatic of what ails this country. There is no mystery about it. It does not require anything more than an elementary understanding of the habits of money to figure out why there is now $6,000,000,000 lying idle in banks while business hunts the cyclone cellar.

The money is idle because there is no place that its owners can invest it safely under the conditions that the Roosevelt administration has created. No man today with a few thousand or a few million dollars has any incentive to invest it in a new enterprise or to expand an old one. He knows that if his enterprise should succeed the Government will take all the gravy and if he loses he takes the loss.

Men who could and would give employment to hundreds of thousands of workers by using their idle money or borrowing it from the banks have learned from bitter experience that they can expect no return commensurate with the risk. To a new dealer a businessman is a bum. It's heads I win and tails you lose.

The banks of this country have on deposit six thousand million dollars that they would be only too glad to loan to any responsible businessman or corporation for job-making enterprises. Instead the money lies inert and unproductive, an appalling symbol of governmental folly.

Every one of those six thousand million idle dollars is a potential threat to the economic security of this Nation. Every dollar could be used by an irresponsible Government to create a credit inflation of eight times its normal value. One shudders to think of what a credit expansion of $48,000,000,000 would do to the integrity of the American dollar.

The incomprehensible thing about this deplorable situation is the attitude of Congress. Congressmen and Senators are assumed to have better than average intelligence and they should have a pretty fair idea of what makes the wheels of industry go round. Yet they persist in harassing industry by impossible restrictions and refuse to remove the shackles that now impede free enterprise.

Abolish the N. L. R. B., amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act on a fair basis, modify the detrimental restrictions of the wage and hour law, and watch those idle dollars come out of hiding.

Every dollar spent on a privately initiated enterprise is worth a hundred spent on futile relief.

If this administration will cease its senseless, vicious attacks on business; if it will muzzle some of the administrative agencies which are seeking to destroy private business; if it will abolish the N. L. R. B.; amend the wage-hour law so as to make it fair and reasonable; do the same with the N. L. R. A. and give business not only a breathing spell but time to recover, we will be on our road toward a solution of the unemployment problem.

Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND WASHINGTON STAR

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials, one from the Washington Post and one from the Washington Star:

[From the Washington Post]

CONFUSED PROCEDURE

Three bills are now before the House carrying amendments to the Wage and Hour Act—the Norton bill, the Ramspeck bill, and the Barden bill. The extraordinary procedure by which the latter, the most controversial of the three measures, was brought to the floor of the House precipitated a heated debate on Thursday in which little attention was paid to the merits of the proposal.

Representative COX, of Georgia, who is leading the fight for the Barden bill, made no secret of his hostility to the regulatory principle of the Wage and Hour Act. "I cannot conceive of a worse mistake," he said, "than the thrusting of Federal power into the activities of the people as is done by this law. You seek to regiment, you seek to regulate, a relationship that should forever be kept free."

Admitting that he was opposed to any law setting a uniform wage scale for the entire country, Mr. COX charged that the businessmen of the industrial East were responsible for enactment of the law because they hoped it would kill off competition from the South and West.

Of course, there is more than a modicum of truth in charges that sectional self-interest played a large part in saddling the country with the rigid minimum-wage provisions of the present act. But that does not justify amendments instigated by other selfish sectional interests to exempt from the act large groups of low-paid workers in need of protection against exploitation.

Mr. COX is obviously not interested in making the wage and hour law more workable, with a view to eventual achievement of its major objectives of raising living standards and improving working conditions in the South as elsewhere. In advocating the Barden bill he is espousing discriminatory exemptions from the provisions of the wage and hour law, and, judging from the sweeping character of his attack upon the law, he regards the Barden bill as an entering wedge which may open the way for further extensive exemptions.

It is evident that no constructive, well-balanced plan for revising the wage and hour law can possibly emerge from the present confusion. The House has its choice of three revisionist bills, and it may amend at will any one of the three in any way it chooses. Not one of these bills undertakes to do a thorough job of overhauling the existing law and it is virtually certain that any attempt to amend them from the floor will only introduce fresh complications.

Under the circumstances President Roosevelt's appeal for postponement of plans for amendment to next year should be heeded. By that time, as he says, "we shall know a great deal more about the subject." Meanwhile the Wage and Hour Division will have had opportunity to strengthen its administrative machinery and should be in position to offer good advice as to how to make the law more practical and easier of enforcement.

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1940]

WAGE-HOUR LAW

The wage-hour law is not perfect, but its main objectives are sound, and the House should weigh carefully the various amendments that will be offered before the pending battle for revision ends.

In this complex economic era, with millions still unemployed and new labor-saving devices speeding up the output of factories, the Wage-Hour Act offers hope of spreading employment by shortening hours and of raising the buying power of the lowest-paid workers by fixing reasonable minimum-wage rates.

It is not surprising that its wide application to industries engaged in interstate commerce should lead to early demands for changes in the act, and there can be no doubt that some of these changes are logical and desirable.

For example, the basic purpose of the act would not suffer if white-collar workers, earning $150 or $200 a month, were exempted, as proposed by some of the amendments.

On the other hand, there does not appear to be any real justification for singling out the processing of agricultural products and exempting hundreds of thousands of workers in such plants from both the wage and hour standards, as proposed in one of the pending bills. It is estimated that this step would exclude more than 1,950,000 persons from the benefits of wage-hour standards.

As the law now stands, these agricultural operations are exempt in the "area of production," and it may be that this definition needs some clarification. The House Labor Committee has made a concession in that direction by proposing partial exemption from regulation of hours for 16 operations not performed on the farm, but a drive is on in the House to take these occupations out from under both wage and hour limits. Supporters of the law have good grounds for fighting this proposal which goes far beyond the clarifying stage.

Some farm groups are said to favor this complete exemption on the theory that if the law increases processing costs it will add to the farmer's marketing costs. Even if this is true, it is taking a narrow view of the economic problem confronting the country today. Unless the buying power of the millions of low-paid workers and the unemployed is restored the farmer will not find a market for his crops. And if one large field of processing is excluded it may be difficult for Congress to resist demands for similar treatment of other industries.

Wage-hour regulation, like any new venture in Federal control, could be carried too far, but the present standards of 30 cents an hour and a 42-hour week are not drastic if applied with reasonable provision for unusual situations.

In Order To Have Food People Must Have Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in her article of April 29 Miss Dorothy Thompson says:

The Danube is a river of destiny. Once it rose in Austria, almost at the Swiss border. Now its source is German. It flows through Germany, Hungary, Yugoslavia, then forms the border between Rumania and Bulgaria, until it empties into the Black Sea in Rumania again.

From Rumania Eugene Kovacs, of the New York Times, writes in the Washington Post of April 29:

The Germans today dominate the Danube.

Along the whole length of the river from Sulina to Turnu Severin, that is to say, from the Black Sea to the frontier of the Rumanian Danube, the German colors predominate. With few exceptions, all the international traffic is German. The Danubian ports are packed with German tugs, barges, and tankers, and German agents fill the harbors. And they not only dominate the business traffic in Galatz, Braila, and Turnu Severin but keep watch on the security of the river.

The French colors have totally disappeared from this international artery.

* * * * * * *

The British still keep their merchant fleet on the Danube but only in the ports of Macin and Ghecet and these boats, with the exception of those which took part in the unfortunate excursion at Giurgiu and were forced to return, are idle and will probably remain so.

Braila is the center of the cereal trade, and since the ban on exports of barley, oats, and wheat, trading has fallen almost entirely on corn. The Germans, however, do not buy this commodity, most of which is shipped to Italy. For the time being the wheat the Germans bought on contracts which are allowed to be filled is still being loaded in this port as well as soybeans and sunflower and other vegetable-oil seeds.

Some seven German firms control almost all the traffic and the German consul is extremely busy. Galatz, only half an hour away by train, is the timber center. The goods on the Danube are all going to Germany. Larger transactions are only held up through the shortage of rail cars.

This is no time to suffocate our waterways with restrictive legislation such as the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill.

Norton-Ramspeck-Barden Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a few of thousands of letters and telegrams that I have received protesting against the emasculation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These communications refute the statements of the advocates of the Barden bill that that measure aims to aid agriculture. The fact is that agriculture is not affected and Members from agricultural districts are being misled by these false representations. The underlying reasons of those pressing for the passage of the Barden bill is to exempt from the operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act the unorganized and poorly paid wage earners. Organized labor is able to protect itself from unfair employers, and it is in the interest of those workers who are not organized that I take this opportunity of inserting these letters, telegrams, and statements which uphold the fairness and justness of the present act, which has established a minimum-wage floor level, and surely a sufficient time should be allowed to prove the operation of the act before amendments to exempt certain working groups are considered:

I insert a letter from the National Consumers League, signed by its general secretary, Mary Dublin, and by nearly 600 of its members:

NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE,
New York, N. Y., April 24, 1940.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABATH: The undersigned 750 men and women, well known in public life, are convinced that passage of the Barden bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act would emasculate a law which has rescued hundreds of thousands of defenseless wage earners from hunger and want.

The act would be a mere sham, were it to be amended to apply only to those workers who already receive more than the wage rates prescribed by the act. Yet that is what the Barden bill proposes to do in exempting over 1,000,000 workers most in need of its coverage. These men and women in the lowest-paid industries in the country can in no sense be called agricultural workers. It was to protect just such employees as these that the act was passed, and there is no reason in having the law unless it applies to those most in need.

We believe the Barden bill would seriously injure the farmer. By returning over a million workers to starvation-wage levels, the farmer would be deprived of an essential market for his products.

In subjecting them to unfair competition, the measure is equally injurious to the interest of all employers who today maintain fair standards. Further, it would discriminate against many employers engaged in businesses similar to those the bill exempts. For example: Canning establishments engaged exclusively in canning fresh fruits and vegetables have a complete wage exemption, but canneries which can fresh fruits and vegetables and also can "dry lines," such as pork and beans and soup, receive no wage exemptions.

The Barden bill runs counter to consumer interest. In the food-processing industries even a 25-percent rise in wages above the present level set by the act would not add 2 cents on the dollar in costs to the consumer. Fair wages will not add to food costs. On the other hand, unfair wages cast immense burdens upon the community. In the words of Supreme Court Justice Hughes: "What these workers lose in wages the taxpayers are called upon to pay. The bare cost of living must be met. * * * The community is not bound to provide what is in effect a subsidy for unconscionable employers. The community may direct its law-making power to correct the abuse which springs from their selfish disregard of the public interest."

In the interest of health, decency, and fair play we urge you to vote against the Barden bill. Give the Fair Labor Standards Act a

chance to prove itself that hundreds of thousands of pitifully underpaid workers may have an opportunity to earn at least the meager living the act assures.

Respectfully yours,

Cleary Dublin, general secretary; Dr. Harold Aaron, New York City; Etheldred, Abbot, Illinois; Charlotte E. Abbott, Nebraska; Mrs. Paul Abelson, New York City; George A. Ackerly, Washington, D. C.; M. W. Ackerson, Jr., Pennsylvania; Adeline E. Ackley, Connecticut; Dr. Thomas Addis, California; Mary V. Alexander, New York; Elizabeth C. Alling, Illinois; Mrs. Frederick S. Allis, Massachusetts; Mrs. Mary P. Ames, New Jersey; Mrs. G. E. Andrus, Colorado; Robert C. Angell, Michigan; J. B. Anthony, New York; Mrs. M. S. Armstrong, Wisconsin; Sinclair W. Armstrong, Rhode Island; Mary Arnold, New York City; Jacob B. Aronoff, New York City; Joseph Aronstam, New York City; Louise Autz, New York City; Rabbi Michael Alper, New York City; Helen S. W. Athey, Maryland; Jessie M. Austin, Illinois; Ruth Baker, New York City; Roger Baldwin, New York City; Alexander Baltzly, New York City; Frances Barnes, New York City; Fred Asa Barnes, New York; Mrs. Richard R. Barrett, Virginia; Oskar Barshak, New York City; Harriet M. Bartlett, Massachusetts; Anna Baumgarten, New York City; Mabel Baumgarten, New York City; Mrs. John P. Beach, California; Louise L. Beachboard, Pennsylvania; Elfie R. Beale, California; Emma B. Beard, New York; Minna D. Behr, New York; L. Ames Beigen, New York City; Alice E. Belcher, Wisconsin; Harriet J. Bender, Ohio; Fanny E. Benjamin, Missouri; Arthur F. Bentley, Indiana; Sidney J. Berger, New York City; Viola W. Bernard, New York City; Frederick Bernheim, North Carolina; Bernice Bernstein, New York City; Alfred Bettman, Ohio; Anthony Billini, New York City; Alfred M. Bingham, New York City; William J. Blanneman, New Jersey; Anne Ames Bliss, New York; Mary C. Bliss, Massachusetts; Anita Block, New York City; S. John Block, New York City; G. Blood, Pennsylvania; Margaret Blossom, New York City; R. E. Blount, Illinois; Ida Blucher, Michigan; Hyman J. Blumstein, Connecticut; Franz Boas, New York City; Marion P. Bolles, New York City; Irene K. Bondy, New York; Mrs. Stephen Bonsal, Washington, D. C.; Alexina G. Booth, Kentucky; Gratia Booth, Connecticut; Elizabeth G. Bowerman, New York; Mrs. W. Russell Bowie, New York City; LeRoy E. Bowman, New York City; Dr. Leopold Brahdy, New York City; Anne Cary Bradley, Maine; Elizabeth Brandeis, Wisconsin; Mrs. Jules Brenchard, New York City; Prof. Paul F. Brissenden, New York City; Prof. Emily C. Brown, New York; James L. Brown, New York; Mabel P. Brown, Connecticut; Thomas K. Brown, Jr., Pennsylvania; Eleanor O. Brownell, Pennsylvania; Mrs. W. Buckner, New York City; Richard Bunch, Indiana; Prof. Arthur R. Burns, New York City; Gertrude E. Bussey, Maryland; J. R. Butler, Tennessee; Harold S. Buttenheim, New Jersey; Evelyn Gray Cameron, Massachusetts; Kingsland Camp, New York City; Annie Campbell, Ohio; Mrs. Henry White Cannon, New York City; Mary G. Cannon, Connecticut; Mrs. A. Morris Carey, Maryland; James B. Carey, New York City; Mrs. Winslow Carlton, New York City; Mary Casamajor, New York; Warren Catlin, Maine; Central Conference of American Rabbis, Maryland; Herbert M. Chalmas, New York; Mrs. Allan Knight Chalmers, New York City; Russell Chew, Pennsylvania; Ruth L. S. Child, Massachusetts; Gerard Chiora, New Jersey; Olive E. Clapper, Maryland; Mrs. Charles E. Cliff, Pennsylvania; Peggy Cobb, New York City; O. P. Cochran, Connecticut; Hetty S. Cohellen, Massachusetts; Frederick Cohen, Massachusetts; Naomi S. Cohn, Virginia; John Coleman, Pennsylvania; Mabel A. Colter, Minnesota; Daniel H. Colton, New York City; Olive A. Colton, Ohio; Laetitia M. Conard, Iowa; Morton S. Conrad, New York; Pauline K. Connell, New Jersey; Consumers League of Cincinnati, Ohio; Leonore Cook, Massachusetts; Morris Llewellyn Cooke, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Francis R. Cope, Jr., Pennsylvania; Mrs. Walter Cope, Pennsylvania; Grace M. Cortis, New York City; Mrs. Edward P. Costigan, Colorado; Maud W. Costigan, California; Cornelia C. Coulter, Massachusetts; Jerome Count, New York City; Agnes Cowing, New York City; Grace L. Coyle, Ohio; Alberta J. Crombie, Connecticut; Weldon L. Crosman, Massachusetts; Elizabeth Crowther, Massachusetts; Harriet B. Crump, New York City; Dorothy T. Cummings, New York; Edmund Ely Curtis, Massachusetts; Muriel S. Curtis, Massachusetts; Mrs. W. E. Cushing, Massachusetts; Leif Dahl, New York City; Louise Dahl-Wolfe, New York City; Rev. E. LeRoy Dakin, Wisconsin; Irving Davidson, New York; Betsey B. Davis, New York; Helen E. Davis, Washington, D. C.; Helen H. Davis, Massachusetts; Horace A. Davis, New York City; Paul J. Davis, Pennsylvania; Margaret W. Davis, California; Florence W. Davol, Massachusetts; Lillian A. Dean, Iowa; C. C. Delafield, Jr., New York City; Eleanor Deming, New York; A. DeNeysin, New York City; N. E. Derecktor, New York; Mrs. N. E. Derecktor, New York; Edward T. Devine, New York City; Mary W. Dewson, Maine; Mrs. Robert H. Dibble, Pennsylvania; Harriet A. Dillingham, California; Esther M. Dixon, California; Effie E. Doan, Illinois; Mrs. Richard E. Dodge, Connecticut; Mrs. Henry H. Donaldson, Pennsylvania; Laura R. Donnell, New York City; Prof. Dorothy W. Douglas, Massachusetts; Ruth N. Dow, Massachusetts; Ella J. Draper, Massachusetts; Mary E. Dreir, New York City; Amos Dublin, New York City; Mrs. S. Naudan Duer, Pennsylvania; Cressida C. Durham, Illinois; Commissioner Martin P. Durkin, Illinois; Cartharine H. Dwight, Massachusetts; Lucia W. Dwight, New York; Mrs. C. A. Duvall, New York; Lucy P. Eastman, New York City; L. C. Edson, New York City; Mrs. Tracy Edson, New York City; Bertha J. Ehrich, Indiana; Mrs. Walter L. Ehrich, New York City; Dorothy Meigs Eidlitz, New York City; C. Emanuel Ekstrom, Rhode Island; Deborah Elton, Connecticut; Frances Elton, New York; Augusta C. Ely, Massachusetts; Mrs. Annie H. Emerson, Massachusetts; Helen T. Emerson, New York; Mrs. Kendall Emerson, New York; Morris Engel, New York City; Henry Epstein, New York City; Rev. Sebastian Erbacher, Michigan; Alice C. Evans, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Charles R. Faben, Ohio; Mrs. Richard V. Fabian, New York; Mrs. Powell Fauntleroy, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. E. B. Featherstone, Ohio; Benjamin Fee, New York City; Mrs. Charles N. Felton, California; Fannie C. Ferry, Massachusetts; Mrs. W. D. C. Field, New York; Mrs. J. W. Fillman, Pennsylvania; Julius Fischer, New York; Eunice F. Fisher, Wisconsin; Zipporah L. Fleisher, New York City; Lillian P. Fletcher, New York City; Elizabeth L. Folbert, New Jersey; Robert C. Folconer, New Jersey; Dorothy Fontaine, New York City; Elizabeth G. Fox, Connecticut; Mary H. Fox, New York City; Mrs. E. Frankel, New Jersey; Aaron Friedell, Minnesota; Natalie C. Friedman, Illinois; A. Anton Friedrich, New York; Harlan L. Frost, Ohio; Alice P. Gannett, Ohio; Mrs. William W. Gannett, Massachusetts; Helene P. Gans, New York City; Minnie May Gauther, Wisconsin; Joseph W. Gavitt, New Jersey; Margaret J. Gemmill, Pennsylvania; Anna M. Genung, New Jersey; Augustine M. Girardot, Colorado; Susan Glider, New York City; Harriet Goddard, New Jersey; R. Goldberg, New York; Victor Goldberg, New York; S. Goldhagen, New York; Pauline Goldmark, New York; Minnie Goodnow, Mass.; Jean Goldstein, Connecticut; Dr. A. L. Goldwater, New York City; Mrs. A. L. Goldwater, New York City; Mrs. S. S. Goldwater, New York City; Sidney S. Grant, Massachusetts; Adele Greene, Washington, D. C.; Irma H. Gross, Michigan; Mrs. Edward A. Grossman, New York City; Ralph H. Gundlach, Washington; Mathilde C. Hader, Virginia; Dorothy Quincy Hale, Massachusetts; Ellen Hale, Massachusetts; Adele P. Hall, New York; John Hughes Hall, Massachusetts; Marie Hall, New York; Mrs. Mary Hobson Hall, Virginia; Priscilla Perry Hall, Massachusetts; Mrs. B. Haller, Washington, D. C.; Emma E. Halloway, New York; Annie A. Halleck, Kentucky; Dr. Alice Hamilton, Connecticut; Esther Fiske Hammond, California; Mrs. W. A. Harbison, New York; Commissioner W. Rhett Harley, South Carolina; Arthur H. Harlow, Jr., New York City; A. Harris, New York; Mrs. Carter H. Harrison, Virginia; Marion J. Harron, Washington, D. C.; Lauribel Hart, New York; Mrs. W. G. Hawley, New York; Rhoda A. Hayes, New York; A. D. Hays, New York City; Marcia Health, Wisconsin; Annie Hegneman, New York City; Yandell Henderson, Connecticut; Rebekah G. Henshaw, Rhode Island; Henrietta Hepburn, West Virginia; Marjorie Herford, Washington; Dorothea C. Hess, New York; Regina M. Hess, Illinois; Emilia Hesse, Michigan; Prof. Amy Hewes, Massachusetts; Eleanor M. Lickin, Ohio; Sarah C. Hill, New York City; Clifford W. Hilliker, New York; M. L. Hills, California; Harrison S. Hires, Pennsylvania; Jessie Lindsay Hober, Wisconsin; Mrs. H. L. Hodge, Pennsylvania; Florence J. Hoe, Wisconsin; William E. Hoeflin, Missouri; Irving Hoffzmier, New York; Mary Shirley Holmes, Ohio; Anna B. Holt, New York City; Mrs. Edward C. Hood, New York; Gertrude F. Hooper, Massachusetts; Eloise M. Holton, Massachusetts; A. D. Hoover, New York City; Miriam Horner, New York City; Caroline S. Hosley, Massachusetts; Mary Houghton, Wisconsin; W. M. Houghton, Massachusetts; Dr. John R. Howard, Jr., New Jersey; Julia S. Huggins, California; Pauline Hummel, Ohio; Vida J. Hurst, Pennsylvania; Laetitia P. Huston, Pennsylvania; Mary Perot Huston, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Edmund N. Huyck, New York; Mrs. A. P. Hyatt, New York City; Arthur M. Hyde, Kentucky; Samuel N. Ilsley, California; Rev. William Lloyd Imes, New York City; George Ingersoll, Minnesota; International Broom & Whisk Makers Union, Illinois; Augusta Irving, New York City; Georgine Iselin, New York City; Rabbi Edward L. Israel, Maryland; David Jacobson, New York; Martha G. Jacobson, New York; Joseph S. Jacoby, New York City; Mrs. C. G. James, Michigan; Mrs. Ada L. James, Wisconsin; Mrs. Irene S. James, New Jersey; A. Natalie Jewett, Massachusetts; Mrs. A. A. Johnson, New York; Constance W. Johnson, New York; Rev. F. Ernest Johnson,

New York City; Wendell F. Johnson, Ohio; Hattie Jones, New York City; A. L. Joslin, Massachusetts; Journeymen Tailors Union, New Jersey; Dorothy Kahn, New York City; Sol D. Kapelsohn, New Jersey; David Kass; Florence H. Kauffmann, New Jersey; Mrs. T. W. Keating, Texas; David Keeble, California; Clara N. Kellogg, California; Helen J. Kellogg, California; Paul Kellogg, New York City; Clarence W. Kemper, Colorado; Priscilla Kennaday, New York City; Edith Wynne Kennedy, New York; M. T. Kennedy, Illinois; Rockwell Kent, New York; Clark Kerry, California; Eugenia Ketterlinus, Pennsylvania Mrs. Alice F. Kiernan, Pennsylvania; Xenia Kilbrick, New York City; Mrs. Edith Shatto King, New York City; Freda Kirchwey, New York City; Dorothy H. Knapp, New York; Dr. S. Adolphus Knopf, New York City; S. Kohn, Connecticut; Isabella A. Kolbe, Ohio; Joseph K. Kotter, New York; L. S. Kramer, New York City; Sadie S. Kulakofsky, Nebraska; Mary B. Ladd, New York City; C. P. Lahman, Michigan; Corliss Lamont, New York City; Margaret F. Lamont, New York City; Rev. Leon Rosser Land, New York; Ruth Lander, Illinois; Dr. Grace W. Landrum, Virginia; Antoinette C. Lanfare, Connecticut; Dr. Linda B. Lange, Pennsylvania; Bruno Lasker, New York; Dr. John Howland Lathrop, New York; Florence M. LeClear, Wisconsin; Amy Lee, New York City; Helen A. Lee, Illinois; Murray G. Lee, New York City; W. M. Leeds, Pennsylvania; Mr. William T. Leggett, Connecticut; Mrs. William T. Leggett, Conecticut; Mary W. Lemmon, Alabama; Sally Lennick, New York; Shirley Leonard, New York City; Jack Lerner, New Jersey; Ralph T. Levin, New York City; M. N. Levine, Minnesota; J. Maxwell Levinson, New York City; Fay Lewis, Illinois; Mary H. Lewis, Ohio; Irene Lewisohn, New York City; Ruth Lichtenstein, New York; Mrs. William Liddell, New York; Mrs. Robert A. Lightburn, New York; Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, New York City; Mrs. Mary H. Loines, New York; Roger S. Loomis, New York City; Paula Lotterman, New York City; Lizzie C. Loveder, Nebraska; Lucy Lowell, Massachusetts; Elsie Lowenberg, New York; Mrs. H. Spencer Lucas, Pennsylvania; May Ely Lyman, New York City; Charles J. MacDonald, New York City; Prof. Lois MacDonald, New York City; Charlotte G. MacDowell, New York; Martha Mackay, Pennsylvania; Elizabeth S. Magee, Ohio; Elizabeth K. Maley, Massachusetts; Blanche Mahler, New York; Theodore Malmud, New York City; Mary S. Malone, Pennsylvania; G. P. Manchester, California; Mrs. Morris Manges, New York City; Mrs. C. Marnitz, Wisconsin; Benjamin Marsh, Washington, D. C.; Mulford Martin, New York City; Lucy R. Mason, Georgia; Margaret C. Maule, Pennsylvania; Clifford T. McAvoy, New York City; Mary N. McCord, New York City; O. McCord, Jr., New York City; Mrs. Winifred M. McCosh, Delaware; Frank McCulloch, Illinois; Frank D. McCulloch, Illinois; Mrs. J. S. McDowell, New York; Mary S. McDowell, New York; Elizabeth A. McFadden, New York City; Louise Leonard McLaren, New York City; Mrs. J. M. Mecklin, New Hampshire; Mrs. John Meigs, Pennsylvania; Dina Melicor, New York City; Evelyn Mellen, New York City; William Menke, New York City; Lewis Merrill, New York City; Cornelia M. Metz, New York; Dr. Alfred Meyer, New York City; Elizabeth A. Might, Massachusetts; Mrs. Maude B. Miller, New York City; Prof. H. A. Millis, Illinois; Rev. Joseph N. Moody, New York City; Jane T. Mooney, New York; Florence Rees Moore, Oregon; A. W. Morganfield, California; Lois I. Morganfield, California; Charles Moos, Pennsylvania; Stelle W. Moos, Pennsylvania; Mary Agnes Morel, New York City; Mary Morris, New York City; Grace L. Morrison, New Jersey; Ruth Morrison, Colorado; G. J. Morse, Massachusetts; Josiah Morse, South Carolina; Dr. Bessie L. Moses, Maryland; Minnie L. Moses, New York; Amelia B. Moorfield, New Jersey; Ethel P. Moore, Massachusetts; Leonard S. Morgan, New York City; Nannette Morrell, New York City; Mrs. Charles G. Morris, Connecticut; Johanna K. Mosenthal, New York City; W. E. Mosher, New York; Mrs. C. R. Mueller, Michigan; Greta E. Mueller, Washington, Edith Noyes Muma, New York; Mrs. W. L. Murdoch, Alabama; Henrietta Murphy, New York; Virginia Mussey, New York City; Mrs. Max W. Myer, Missouri; Jay B. Nash, New York City; Raymond Nelson, Virginia; Janet E. Newton, Wisconsin; Nina Nicas, New York City; M. C. Nice, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Louise Nichols, Pennsylvania; William I. Nichols, New York City; Alice B. Nicols, Minnesota; L. M. Novogrod, New York City; Joseph North, New York City; Leah Okune, New York; Charles E. Ozanne, Ohio; A. Packer, New York; Aida Paderefsky, New York City; Mrs. R. T. Paine, 2d, Massachusetts; Haiganoth Papazian, New York City; Gladys M. Park, New York City; Mary Jane Park, California; Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, New York City; Leo M. Parsons, New York City; David Paulson, Jr., New York; Philip A. Paulson, New York City; Edward Payazion, New York City; Endicott Peabody, Massachusetts; Harriet R. Pease, Massachusetts; Lillie M. Peck, New York City; Harriet S. Peirce, Massachusetts; L. C. Perera, Jr., New York City; Mrs. L. C. Perera, Jr., New York City; Mrs. Herbert F. Perkins, Illinois; H. Pestry, New York City; E. C. Peters, Georgia; Tallahatchie Pettingill, California; Laura A. Pierson, New Jersey; Rose Pletman, New York City; Esther S. Podoloff, Connecticut; J. Podoloff, Connecticut; Edna Pogrotsky, Connecticut; Mrs. Francis D. Pollak, New York City; Eric Pomerance, New York City; Mrs. Ralph L. Pope, Massachusetts; Mrs. Carroll J. Post, New York City; Jacob S. Potofsky, New York City; Mrs. David Potter, California; Dr. Herman F. Prange, New York City; Miriam Sutro Price, New York City; Reverlea Price, New York City; Edward Pringle, Illinois; Kate E. Putnam, New York; Mrs. Wilmot Quinby, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Harold R. Rafton, Massachusetts; Armando Raimirez, New York City; Anna Randolph, Pennsylvania; John E. Raney, Ohio; Beulah Amidon Ratliff, New York City; Carl Raushenbush, New York; Elizabeth E. Reed, New York City; Rebecca Reid, South Carolina; Lillian E. Reiner, New York; A. F. Reinhardt, New York City; Elizabeth C. Reinhardt, Pennsylvania; E. B. Reuter, Iowa; Bertha Richardson, New York; David S. Richie, New Jersey; Reba E. Richter, New York City; Sadie Rinch, New Jersey; Kingsley Roberts, M. D., New York City; Mrs. A. H. Robinson, New Jersey; Benjamin M. Robinson, New York City; Lydia G. Robinson, Illinois; Mildred S. Robinson, Illinois; Dr. S. C. Robinson, Illinois; Martha Robison, South Carolina; Anne M. Roby, Michigan; Josephine Roche, Colorado; Wm. E. Rodriguez, Illinois; Viola C. Rolf, Ohio; C. C. Roosa, New York; Mrs. Maud H. Rosenau, North Carolina; Arthur Rosenberg, New York City; Mrs. S. J. Rosensohn, New York City; Samuel Rosenveise, New York; William Ross, New York City; Mrs. Louis J. Roth, Ohio; Mary Swain Routzahn, New York City; Victoria Rowe, New York City; Mrs. Justus Ruperti, Florida; Harriet Ruppert, New York; Mrs. J. M. Russell, Massachusetts; H. G. Sahler, New York City; T. H. P. Sailer, New Jersey; Mrs. Millicent Sapolsky, New York; George Sarton, Massachusetts; Mrs. F. A. Saunders, Massachusetts; H. W. Saunders, Iowa; Mary Hall Sayer, New York City; John N. Sayre, New York City; Mildred Clark Scars, New Hampshire; Margaret Scattergood, Pennsylvania; W. S. Schlauch, New Jersey; Mrs. W. S. Schlauch, New Jersey; Judith Schoellkopf, New York; J. L. Schoen, Missouri; Hyman Schroeder, New York City; Adelaide Schulkind, New York City; David Schulman, New York City; Pearl Schwartz, New York City; Mrs. Genevieve B. Scott, Michigan; Mrs. George T. Scott, New Jersey; Vida D. Scudder, Massachusetts; Francis L. Seibert Pennsylvania; Marie A. Serramoglia, New York; Mrs. W. E. Shafer, Nebraska; Louis Shelvington, New York City; Henry W. Shelton, California; Bernard Sherk, New York; Alice H. Sheperd, New York; Rea Shiff, Connecticut; Rose Keane Shumlin, New York City; James E. Sidel, New Jersey; Frances Sikellanos, New York City; Mildred R. Silver, New Jersey; Ida Silverman, New York; Helena N. Simmons, New Jersey; Mary N. Simmons, New Jersey; Elsie H. Simonds, Massachusetts; Margaret F. Sloss, New York City; Alice H. Small, Maryland; John H. Smaltz, Pennsylvania; Alexander Smith, New York City; Bruce Lannes Smith, New York City; Frederica Smith, New York; Margaret H. Smith, Indiana; Myrtle L. Smith, California; Nellie M. Smith, New York City; W. Stuart Smith, California; Winifred Smith, New York; Barbara Snyder, New York City; Social Service Employees' Union, New York; Morris Soldester, New York City; Isobel Walker Soule, New York City; George Soule, New York City; Southern Tenant Farm Union, Tennessee; Margaret Spahr, New York City; R. L. Spaide, Pennsylvania; Mary Judson Spencer, New York City; Mrs. Lama L. Sprague, Massachusetts; Anne Stanley, California; State, County and Municipal Workers, New York City; Mrs. J. Rich Steers, New York City; Emanuel Stein, New York; Dr. Sam I. Stein, Illinois; Eliza Stevens, Oregon; Mrs. Horace N. Stevens, New Jersey; Louise Stitt, Washington, D. C.; St. James Presbyterian Church-Social Service Committee, New York City; George Maychin Stockdale, New York; Helen Phelps Stokes, Vermont; Harry Stone, New York City; Olive M. Stone, Virginia; Aubrey N. Straus, Virginia; Cornelia Straus, New Jersey; Emelia T. Strauss, New York City; Irvin Strauss, New York City; B. Strivelman, New York City; Jeanette Studley, Connecticut; Sidney Sulkin, New York City; Mrs. T. Russell Sullivan, Massachusetts; Ruth Suydacker, Illinois; Joel Swensen, New York City; Mrs. A. L. Swift, Connecticut; Mrs. Eda B. Taft, Illinois; Ellen B. Talbot, Massachusetts; Marion Talbot, Illinois; Mary Montgomery Talbot, New York; Rev. Paul Tanner, Wisconsin; Mollie Tarter, New York; C. Fayette Taylor, Massachusetts; Helena Taylor, Illinois; Jeanette S. Taylor, New York; Lena D. Taylor, Illinois; Louis Tekulsky, New York City; Caroline B. Thayer, Massachusetts; Sherman R. Thayer, Massachusetts; Anne M. Thomas, Massachusetts; Louise M. Thomas, Pennsylvania; Robert

F. Thomas, M. D., Tennessee; Juliet Thompson, New York City; Mrs. Leroy S. Thompson, Rhode Island; Anne L. Thorp, Massachusetts; John H. Thorpe, Michigan; Margaret Thum, California; Elizabeth Todd, New York City; Norman L. Torrey, New York City; Isabel Totten, New York City; John G. Touzeau, California; Rebecca D. Townsend, Connecticut; Blaine E. Treadway, Tennessee; Constina S. Trees, Pennsylvania; K. L. Trevett, Oregon; C. Allen True, Texas; Annie E. Trumbull, Connecticut; Grace Tyndall, New York; Mrs. Carl J. Ulmann, New York City; United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, New York City; Charlotte A. Van Cortlandt, Connecticut; Eleanor S. Van Etten, New York City; Dr. P. W. Van Metre, Iowa; Undine Van Pelt, Washington, D. C.; Ellen M. Van Slyke, New York; Bonnie Vene, New York; Matilda Wakshul, New York; Sylvia Wallach, New York; Marion E. C. Walls, New Jersey; Phoebe Walkind, New York City; Mrs. Douglas Waples, Illinois; Mariana DeC. Ward, Massachusetts; Mrs. W. Lee Ward, New York City; Colston Warne, Massachusetts; E. Brooke Weaver, California; Mrs. H. St. John Webb, New Jersey; A. G. Weidler, Kentucky; George E. Weir, New York; Roberta Wellford, Virginia; Anne Wenneis, New York City; Henry N. Wenning, New York City; D. H. West, Illinois; Ida M. West, New York; Mrs. S. Burns Weston, Pennsylvania; Jane H. Wheeler, Vermont; Harriet D. White, New York; Millie V. D. White, New York; John B. Whitelaw, New York; Mrs. John B. Whiteman, Massachusetts; Oliver M. Wiard, Connecticut; Elsie G. Wickenden, New York; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., New York; Dr. M. A. Willcox, Massachusetts; Ada L. Williams, New York; Helen Williams, Iowa; Mrs. Janice L. Williams, Connecticut; Hyman Willinger, M. D., New York City; Charles Wilson, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Luke I. Wilson, Maryland; Helen R. Winans, New York; Florence E. Winchell, New York; Frederick Winkhaus, New York City; Richard S. Winslow, Massachusetts; Frances M. Wintringham, New York City; Elizabeth Wisner, Louisiana; Benjamin Witken, Connecticut; Edwin E. Witte, Wisconsin; Howard P. Woertendyke, Kansas; Benedict Wolf, New York City; Mrs. J. R. Wolff, New York City; Mildred H. Wolfson, New York City; Cyrus F. Wood, Pennsylvania; Mrs. George B. Wood, Pennsylvania; Helen Wood, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse, Connecticut; G. H. Woodhull, Kansas; William Woods, New York; Harvey A. Wooster, Ohio; Edward N. Wright, Pennsylvania; Elliott F. Wright, New York City; Geraldine Kemp Wright, New York City; Edith Franklin Wyatt, Illinois; Y. W. C. A. Business and Professional Girls League, Ohio; Y. W. C. A. Social and Economic Legislation Committee, Ohio; G. D. Yeager, Pennsylvania; Anna Young, New York; Anne S. Young, California; Josephine Zeitlin, California; Gertrude Folks Zimand, New York City; Yetta Zinner, New York City; Marion O. Zucker, New York City; Dr. Leon Zussman, New York City; Mrs. R. A. Zwemer, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I next insert a letter and accompanying statement received from Nina P. Collier, secretary, the Emergency Committee for Preserving the Fair Labor Standards Act:

THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVING
THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1939.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: The Emergency Committee for Preserving the Fair Labor Standards Act was formed to voice the sentiment of a substantial number of the American people represented by a wide range of church, consumer, and labor groups. This committee is opposed to any change in the Fair Labor Standards Act at this session of Congress. A statement of the committee's purpose is enclosed.

There has been brought to our attention the possibility of the consideration by the House Rules Committee of proposals to amend the act before the adjournment of Congress.

Our committee respectfully begs the House Rules Committee to grant us a hearing if any consideration is given to this rule.

The importance of a public hearing on this act cannot be overestimated.

Cordially yours,

NINA P. COLLIER, *Secretary.*

THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVING
THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT,
Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This committee, representing church groups, consumer groups, labor organizations, and other public-spirited groups and organizations, has come into being to help organize effective resistance to a concerted attempt of the original enemies of the Fair Labor Standards Act to destroy the act, under pretense of intention to improve and strengthen it.

Recent developments and current legislative maneuvers leave no room for doubt that the old enemies of the Wage and Hour Act are determined, if at all possible, to scuttle this act, and ruin it now before it has had even the beginning of an opportunity to prove its practicability and its economic worth.

The same powerful lobbyists who continuously fought the bill before its enactment into law last year are now seeking to make new alliances and obtain support in attempting, under the guise of "clarifying" amendments, to exclude members of sweated industries, and to destroy the very foundations of the act.

The Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act has publicly stated, "It is now clear that the high-priced lobbyists are not going to let any clarifying amendments go through the Congress unless these amendments carry along with them the emasculating exemptions which they seek for the special groups they represent."

The Secretary of Agriculture has also pointed out the harmful character of the amendments advocated by representatives of the large agricultural processors and industrial employers.

This emergency committee, in view of the present legislative situation, is unqualifiedly opposed to the consideration of any amendment to this act in this session of Congress.

These same groups have also proposed a resolution for a special investigation of the Wage and Hour Administration, intending by that device to force a reopening of the act, to create an opportunity to undo this legislation, which was won last year only after years of struggle.

All available forces for the support of this law must be reorganized for its defense now. It may require as much force to defend the act as it required last year to pass it.

The victory achieved last year is lost unless this law is effectively protected now. This committee, in taking this stand, believes that it represents the true sentiment of the vast majority of the voting population of the country.

Nina P. Collier, National League of Women Shoppers, secretary; Father R. A. McGowan, National Catholic Welfare Council; Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Rabbi Barnett Brinckner; Elizabeth Christman, National Women's Trade Union League; W. D. Johnson, Railway Labor Executives Association; Gardner Jackson, Labor's Non-Partisan League; James McNamara, Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance (American Federation of Labor); Donald Henderson, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations), Charles H. Chase, American Association for Economic Freedom; Daniel Driesen, American Communications Association (Congress of Industrial Organizations); John P. Davis, National Negro Congress; Marion Bachrach, Washington Commonwealth Federation; Mildred Riemer, American League for Peace and Democracy; Leo Goodman, United Shoe Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations); John J. Abt, Congress of Industrial Organizations Wage-Hour Bureau.

An organization of agricultural workers, who have studied the proposed legislation, have wired me as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1939.*

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
Chairman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge your leadership in opposing all amendments to wage and hour bill.

MAGDALENA GALE,
Secretary, Agricultural Local, No. 2, United Federal Workers of America.

Omnibus Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, at the time the conference report on the omnibus transportation bill, S. 2009, was being prepared, it was held that the rules of the House do not permit a minority report or an additional statement in regard to the bill by a member of the conference committee. I therefore stated that I intended to make an additional statement in the House in regard to the conference decision which would appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The following is the matter to which I refer:

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY MR. CROSSER

Considering as a whole the bill as submitted by the conferees, I have decided to sign the conference report.

I do, however, express disappointment at the elimination of section 8, relating to consolidations, and so forth, which I felt was helpful to the general public interest and to the welfare of employees.

War Debts Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE UNITED IRISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the United Irish-American Societies of New York, at a meeting held at Eighty-sixth Street Garden on Wednesday evening, April 24, 1940:

Whereas a joint resolution has been introduced in Congress—in the Senate by Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, and in the House by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia—requesting and empowering the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the British Government for the acquisition of certain British possessions in the Caribbean and Central America for the purpose of national defense, in part payment of the debts which Britain owes to the people of the United States; and

Whereas it is the established business practice for a debtor who cannot pay his indebtedness in cash to turn over real estate or other property in settlement of the claims against him; and

Whereas it is unfair and unjust to impose steadily increasing tax burdens on the people of this country while nations in debt to the United States are allowed to evade their solemn obligations; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, delegates to the United Irish-American Societies of New York, acting as American citizens whose interests, like those of millions of other Americans, are affected by those unpaid debts, wholeheartedly endorse the joint resolution introduced by Senator REYNOLDS and Representative RANDOLPH and appeal to Members of both Houses of Congress to support the proposition, in justice to their constituents; and we recommend and urge that a similar demand be made on other debtor nations that have possessions on the American continent, the acquisition of which would increase facilities for this country's defense.

Thomas S. McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. BUTLER B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man in public life who led a busier or more active life than that of my lamented colleague the Honorable THOMAS S. MCMILLAN. From the days of his early boyhood to the time of his death he was enthusiastically active in every undertaking whether it be in recreation or at work. He was born near the little town of Ulmers, S. C., November 27, 1888, being the son of James C. and Mary K. McMillan. The first 6 years of his school days he and his twin brother, the Honorable John B. McMillan, walked daily during the school term to Hickory Hill, a one-teacher rural school, a distance of 3 miles from their home. During 1902 and 1903 they attended the grammar school at Ulmers, which was also about 3 miles from their home. From 1904 to 1907 they attended the Orangeburg Collegiate Institute at Orangeburg, S. C., a coeducational institution with a curriculum corresponding to that of the present-day high school. During the scholastic year of 1908–9 THOMAS S. MCMILLAN taught school at Perry, S. C., and entered the State University at Columbia, S. C., in the fall of 1909, where he received his A. B. degree in 1912.

While at the university he was active in athletics and took a leading part in literary society work. On two or more occasions he was elected by the student body as the best all-round man in the university, and the most popular student. Prior to and following his graduation he played professional baseball during the summer months, where he earned sufficient funds to meet expenses in both his academic and law courses at the university. He received his LL. B. degree in 1913, and opened an office at Charleston, S. C., the following year, with James B. Heyward, under the name of McMillan & Heyward. In 1916, at the age of 27, he was elected to the House of Representatives of the State legislature from Charleston County, where he served until 1924, when he was elected to Congress from the First Congressional District of South Carolina, which he served continuously until his death, September 29, 1939. He served as Speaker pro tempore in the State legislature from 1921 to 1923, when he was elected Speaker, being the youngest member ever to serve a full term as Speaker.

He and his twin brother were not only alike in appearance, size, and action, but were quite similar in their likes and dislikes, and were boon companions up to the completion of their high-school work. They were both outstanding young men in every activity, and the success that followed both can be ascribed to their honesty, hard work, square dealing, and right living.

Mr. MCMILLAN and I were elected to Congress in 1924. We came here together, and, as we represented adjoining districts, with similar problems, we soon developed a very close friendship. He possessed a most congenial disposition, was enthusiastic in any undertaking, and could be relied upon in any contingency. He had a positive and highly cultured conception of his obligations to his family and fellow man, and was always ready, willing, and glad to assist a friend or neighbor at any time and under any circumstance.

His success as a Member of Congress is a matter of record and is one to which any Member could point with pride, for very few, if any, was more rapidly promoted in the minds and affections of his friends and colleagues. At the beginning of his services he was assigned to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, later to the Committee on Rules, and finally was assigned to the Appropriations Committee, where, within a short time, he became chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. It was here that he had an opportunity to demonstrate his ability and those diplomatic qualities and virtues that made him a most useful and successful Member of Congress, and where he was able to demonstrate those virtues that made him universally admired by members of both political parties.

Mr. MCMILLAN was a man of many parts. He inherited and developed the cardinal virtues from his youth up. He was always honest, sincere, and courageous in the discharge of his studied convictions. He was clean in his personal life and adhered to a sound political philosophy in which he demonstrated frankness, fairness, and unusual political integrity. In his private and public life he demonstrated those virtues worthy of emulation by anyone who is ambitious to be of service to his fellow man and his country.

Chester C. Bolton

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. DARROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, our departed friend and colleague, CHESTER C. BOLTON, during the 10 years of his service in Congress attained a position of vast influence, and by his recognized ability, his fine moral character, and his genius for friendship, won a permanent place in the affection and mem-

ory of his colleagues. His unselfish devotion to duty, sincerity of purpose, as well as undying loyalty to each and every cause he espoused, established for him a high place among our country's statesmen.

I mourn his loss sincerely, but, with his family and friends, console myself with the reflection that his labors have not been in vain. He has left a record worthy of any man.

Sleep on, dear friend, such lives as thine
Have not been lived in vain,
But shed an influence rare, divine,
On lives that still remain.

Chester C. Bolton

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on this memorable occasion in paying tribute to the memory of a fellow Member of Congress from an adjoining district in the State of Ohio. Though of opposite political faith, I considered him as a friend long before he was honored with the responsibility of representing the Twenty-second Congressional District of Ohio.

If I were to single out any one attribute in his character, I would designate kindness as the outstanding quality that drew to him so many friends and admirers. Reared in an atmosphere of culture and refinement, possessed of the world's goods as measured in a material sense, there was nothing of the aristocrat in the life and character of our friend. Lavishly he scattered his beneficences among the lowly and needy of society in an effort to improve their conditions. Race or color were never considered by him when dispensing charity, and there was no ostentation in the manner of his giving.

I indicated to the House on the occasion of his death that while he would be missed by his splendid family and his host of personal friends, the one group who perhaps would miss him more were the crippled and disabled children of the Nation, who were the principal objective of his bounty.

He served well his native State in the General Assembly of Ohio, and gave untiring of his strength as a Congressman from the Twenty-second District of Ohio. If at times I differed with him on measures under consideration in the Congress, it was because of divergent viewpoints men hold on legislation. Every vote he ever cast on any measure representing the welfare of his country was an honest vote according to his convictions.

I recall distinctly his courageous fight against the hypocrisy of national prohibition. It was my privilege to work with him and labor for the repeal of this hypocritical piece of legislation. The issue of national prohibition transcended all party lines, in my opinion. In the congressional elections of 1932 it was my privilege as a Democrat and believer in tolerance and personal liberty to speak for him and urge his reelection to Congress against an opponent who was advocating national prohibition. The strain of public service has been terrific in the Congress of the United States during the past 10 years. CHESTER C. BOLTON'S loyalty to his official duties caused him to expend his energies to an extent that jeopardized his health, bringing about his untimely death.

One does not measure the value of an individual's worth by longevity, but rather by the accomplishments, even though measured in terms of a few hours or a few years in the span of an ordinary life. Our friend left a legacy in the form of a splendid contribution to his country, his church, and his home. His family and his friends may mourn his passing, but they will find consolation in surveying the record of his humble, sincere devotion to his duties.

John Boyle O'Reilly has epitomized the dominant characteristic of our friend, CHESTER C. BOLTON, in his beautiful poem entitled:

WHAT IS GOOD?

What is the real good?
I asked in musing mood.
Order, said the law court;
Knowledge, said the school;
Truth, said the wise man;
Pleasure, said the fool;
Love, said the maiden;
Beauty, said the page;
Freedom, said the dreamer;
Home, said the sage;
Fame, said the soldier;
Equity, the seer

Spake my heart full sadly.
"The answer is not here."

Then within my bosom
Softly this I heard:
"Each heart holds the secret;
Kindness is the word."

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL E. MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when the present session of Congress convened in January, there was missing at the Republican leadership table in this Chamber one of the outstanding Members of the House, the Honorable CARL E. MAPES.

On December 12 last, while in New Orleans, serving in his official capacity as a member of a committee of this House, he was suddenly stricken and passed away before his loved ones could reach him.

I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved when I heard over the radio the announcement of his death, for during the more than 16 years of service I had with him in the House, while we belonged to different parties, I had formed a deep attachment and affectionate regard for him.

During his service here he had always been one of the leaders of his party; and while he was active and diligent in the discharge of his duty, he was always kind, courteous, and considerate of the rights of others.

He was splendidly well-poised, of judicial temperament, and in frequent debates in the House, when feeling was running high, he was always calm, self-possessed, and never displayed the slightest anger or animosity against those who opposed him. He was an able parliamentarian, possessed a keen, logical, and analytical mind, and was always fair and a perfect gentleman in his deportment. I have often commented upon his calm and the sedate manner in which he dealt with difficult problems under the most trying circumstances.

He was never known to take any unfair advantage or make demagogic appeals, but discussed all questions, both of parliamentary procedure and of legislation, upon the highest intellectual plane.

He possessed the confidence, esteem, and affection of the entire membership of the House, and his party, his country, and his friends miss his wise counsel and leadership.

He was devoted to his wife and children.

I knew him intimately and well, and his passing is to me a distinct personal loss.

William Albert Ashbrook

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM ALBERT ASHBROOK, late a Representative from the State of Ohio

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, death took 18 Members of the House during the year just past, and on this roll are the names of many who had served for many years and whose presence and service here will be missed by their colleagues. Among these, none will be more sadly missed than the Honorable WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK, of Ohio.

We occupied adjoining offices in the House Office Building, he was my neighbor and friend and I had an affectionate regard for him.

His district, his State, and Nation will miss his wise counsel and able leadership as a national legislator. He was capable, courageous, honest, sincere, and earnest in the performance of his duties, and I wish to pay this brief tribute and express my personal sympathy and sorrow at his passing.

John Andrew Martin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN ANDREW MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic passing of the late JOHN MARTIN, Colorado lost a great and distinguished son, this body a statesman of profound attainments, and the United States of America a legislator of sound liberalism and a warm heart.

It was always a glorious sight to see the silver-haired JOHN MARTIN standing in the Well of the House courageously championing the rights of minorities, of the worker, of the farmer, of the underprivileged—always with good humor, his speeches ever marked with chuckles and a pleasant manner. We miss him in this body. We need him here now. His record is an inspiration to those of us who follow after him.

In the liberal bloc of this House, JOHN MARTIN took an active part. His counsels were always welcome and valuable. His advice sprang from a life of public service and of varied contacts. He was a man of industry, of engaging personality, of infectious charm.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep sense of sorrow in the death of JOHN MARTIN. Often I have thought how much I would like to have advised the citizens of his home city of Pueblo of the high regard entertained for JOHN MARTIN by his colleagues here of all political parties. No matter how pointed were his attacks upon political adversaries, the sting was not a personal one, because the javelins of satire and criticism with which his speeches were replete were always barbed with good humor.

JOHN MARTIN, you have gone to your eternal abode, but your spirit lingers with us. You have tossed the torch to us. We hope to continue for a time, God willing, as evangels of that new day and new order which will bring decorum out of chaos, equity out of injustice, and provide opportunity for all in this land we love so much. You have carved your name in our hearts and minds. You have made an indelible contribution to legislation. Your work will endure.

Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest features of one's service in this great legislative body is the time when a colleague, by the stroke of an inscrutable destiny, is removed from our "clubby" midst. The handclasp which once gladdened our day is no more, and we know that the eyes which once lighted when they saw us are dimmed in death's depressing pose. The mind which illumined and inspired is sequestered in the sepulcher—yet the memory of the fellowship and of the statesmanship lingers with us throughout the years. We are the product of the cumulative inspiration given to us by our fellows. I know that my life has been brightened and my lot made easier because of intimate contacts and genial fellowship with a grand and great Congressman such as indubitably was the late JOHN ANDREW MARTIN.

Chester C. Bolton

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when CHESTER C. BOLTON answered the final summons, the House of Representatives lost one of its most beloved and influential Members. Mr. BOLTON had a definite place in public life and as a businessman in his own State of Ohio before he ever came to the House. His outstanding service in the War Department during the World War, and in the readjustment months that followed, gave him a national acquaintance and standing enjoyed by few.

On this memorial occasion others have discussed in detail his accomplishments. Born in his home city of Cleveland, he came from pioneer stock. His ancestors had much to do with the building of that great city, and Mr. BOLTON creditably carried on. A man of integrity, wealth, education, refinement, ability and industry, he used well the talents he had. To CHESTER BOLTON wealth was valuable only as it could be used to do good for others. He was in public life because he was a patriot and was willing to contribute of his time and his means to make this country better. No man among us was more gentle, more courageous, or more democratic. He liked people and, in turn, people liked him. His very character inspired confidence in everyone. It was a joy to meet him and many a dark day has been made just a little brighter by his cheery presence and association.

Possibly no man in the Congress was more familiar with our Military Establishment and the workings of the War Department. Mr. BOLTON specialized along this line and those who knew him best felt assured that in time he would be our Secretary of War. Politically he was a Republican and few men in his generation did more for the advancement of his party and the things for which it stands. As chairman of the Republican congressional committee, he was an indefatigable worker. As a member of the Appropriations and other committees of the House, the length of the day depended entirely upon the work to be done. He was effective in debate. He was a dynamic figure in any task he undertook. He was a leader who inspired. He has left a splendid heritage to a splendid family and their loss is the Nation's loss.

Cassius C. Dowell

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. DARROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CASSIUS C. DOWELL, late a Representative from the State of Iowa

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, CASSIUS DOWELL, answered the final roll call on February 4, 1940. His death was a personal loss to me. We had been closely associated for many years, having started our congressional service at the same time in 1915 as Members of the Sixty-fourth Congress. I knew him intimately, and was proud to have enjoyed his friendship and to have worked with him.

Mr. DOWELL was a sincere and conscientious legislator and public servant. His judgment was keen and dependable, and he was zealous in the interests of his constituency. He was among the most regular attendants of sessions of the House and took an active part in its proceedings, being well versed in parliamentary procedure and an able debater.

I deeply mourn the loss of a close friend.

Thomas S. McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of TOM S. MCMILLAN the House lost one of its most popular and most beloved Members.

During his entire membership in the House I had the pleasure and the privilege of serving with him, and through frequent contacts and association with him learned to know him intimately and well.

In September 1937 we were both delegates to the Interparliamentary Union in Paris, France, and he and I were traveling companions, and this afforded me opportunity of becoming even better acquainted with him than I had been before.

I recall an incident on this trip which demonstrated his deep affection and loyalty to his boys. After he reached Paris, opportunity was afforded him of making an extensive trip in Europe, with other members of the delegation, and while he very much desired to avail himself of this wonderful opportunity, and others insisted that he do so, he declined the invitation because he had promised to return home in time to take his boys on a summer vacation fishing trip, and he said that this was his first duty and greatest pleasure, to be with his boys, and he promptly returned home to keep this engagement. This was typical of TOM MCMILLAN, for his loyalty and devotion to his friends was second only to his love and devotion to his wife and children.

He had a big heart, a sympathetic and understanding nature, and a winsome and pleasing personality that drew men to him, and it is not strange, therefore, that he had such a large number of friends, and his influence in the House was most potent.

He was capable, courageous, and with a fund of common sense, so essential in the discharge of the duties of a national legislator. It is not surprising that he took such high rank as a Member of this House, and that his passing caused such universal grief upon both sides of the aisle.

His district, the State of South Carolina, and the Nation lost an able and distinguished legislator when he passed away.

I was one of those who loved him, and shall miss him, and shall forever cherish the memory of my friendship and association with him.

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. DARROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL E. MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, when the soul of CARL E. MAPES took its flight and passed on to its reward a useful life came to a close. His passing was most unexpected and spread deepest gloom among his friends and colleagues, who loved him for his deeds of kindness and achievements.

CARL MAPES was a hard-working and painstaking legislator with a mind that was keen and alert. He had the indomitable quality of courage and a skillful, fair, and convincing manner in presenting arguments. He had unbounded energy and was never happier than when engaged in some task which required close and earnest attention.

When I came to Congress in 1915, Mr. MAPES was entering his second term. During the long period of our association there developed a close personal friendship between us. I valued his opinions and counsel, respected his sincerity, and regarded him as an outstanding statesman and public servant.

He is gone, but his memory liveth;
He is dead, but his example is here;
The sweetness and fragrance it giveth,
Will linger for many a year.

Samuel D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many touching and eloquent tributes have been paid to the memory of the late SAM D. MCREYNOLDS, who was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, and I wish to speak of my own deep feeling of sorrow at the passing of this true friend. Those of us who served with him upon this great committee knew so well of his great devotion to the cause of peace, his untiring efforts to keep our country neutral in a world bent upon strife. A most unselfish man, he looked upon his congressional duties as a public trust. I shall always remember his patriotic, unselfish decision in declining to run for the United States Senate at the time the Committee on Foreign Affairs was considering neutrality legislation, and when his experience and leadership was so badly needed. It was typical of the man to sacrifice personal ambition to what he considered his duty. His passing was a great personal loss to all of us who knew him and worked with him. Our country can ill afford to lose the services of a man so fine and so patriotic as was Judge MCREYNOLDS.

William I. Sirovich

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of the brilliant Dr. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH was a poignant blow to me. I enjoyed immensely his friendship, the inspiration of his scholarship, his unfailing liberalism, his courageous championship of dissident minorities, and his unalloyed statesmanship.

On frequent occasions he would give me the benefit of his considered counsel on matters of pending legislation. In my first term in this House he rendered me invaluable aid in connection with my official duties. His thorough familiarity with the classics never failed to thrill me, as revealed in the speeches he made on the House floor. I was always inspired and filled with awe by the erudition with which his orations were studded. Dr. SIROVICH possessed a marvelous grasp of science, literature, the drama, history, sociology, medicine. He was conversant with the discoveries of the past; he was alert to the lesson of the centuries. He was keenly attuned to the contributions made by bygone ages.

His passing created a vacancy hard to fill. He was a colorful figure of pleasing appearance and personality. He was always well dressed, a man of sartorial impeccability, at whom one was proud to point as a Member of Congress of the United States.

We miss him in this body, Mr. Speaker; we need him with us today. And so I say, BILL SIROVICH, your physical presence may no longer be with us, but the work which you have done lives on.

I recall on many occasions, when BILL SIROVICH felt impelled to take up the cudgels for some unpopular cause at the very risk of his life, aware as he was of the impending doom which awaited him as a result of the disease with which he knew only too well he was grievously afflicted. Dr. SIROVICH'S championship of indigent actors and artists was well known. His understanding of their problems was complete. We need more men in this body who are endowed with such versatility, such a warm heart, such unique scholarship as was this remarkable son of New York City.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND TELEGRAMS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD certain publications, telegrams, and letters opposing the fourth reorganization plan because of the transfer of certain functions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and Safety Board.

These data were presented to me by the secretary of my colleague [Mr. MCCARRAN] who is absent today.

There being no objection, the articles, telegrams, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 30, 1940]

NOTED PILOTS HERE TO FIGHT SAFETY PERIL—AVIATORS OF 11 AIR LINES LAUNCH "LOBBY TO SAVE LIVES"

(By Edmond Monk)

Convinced that defeat of the Presidential plan to abolish the Air Safety Board and transfer the C. A. A. to the Department of Commerce is vital to the future of American aviation, famous pilots of the Nation moved into the Capital yesterday to confront Congress with a second "lobby to save lives."

From 11 of the Nation's leading air lines came uniformed flyers representing 1,500 pilots. In chorus they voiced their fears that adoption of President Roosevelt's proposal would seriously menace safety of millions of Americans who travel by air.

NEW ATTACK IN SENATE

The first "lobby to save lives," the flyers explained, was partially aimed at setting up the C. A. A. and their Air Safety Board. It is to hold this ground gained that they are here today, they said.

Meanwhile the Senate yesterday echoed with a new attack on the President's proposal as time for a show-down appeared set for late this week.

Senator HARRY TRUMAN, Democrat, of Missouri, told the Senate that adoption of the proposal of the President would result in a serious blow to aviation; he praised the record of the two agencies. He cited particularly the record of no fatal accidents on air lines for more than a year.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, will arrive in Washington today. A bitter foe of the President's latest reorganization plan, the Nevadan is expected immediately to map lines of battle against the proposal.

M'CARRAN MAPS FIGHT

Senator BENNETT C. CLARK (Democrat), of Missouri, charged that the old Bureau of Air Commerce was saturated with politics which prevented its effective operation in promotion of air safety.

"Under the old system," he said, "United States Senators were killed in air crashes." His reference was believed to be to the death of former Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, several years ago in an airplane crash.

Representing 1,500 highly trained pilots on American passenger and mail lines, the 11 flyers were unanimously outspoken in protest against the change in status of the Air Safety Board and the C. A. A.

MENACE TO FLYING PUBLIC

Several of the flyers testified at hearings which led to creation of the safety agency and the C. A. A. All said they believed a change as proposed would constitute a step backward and a menace to the air-traveling public.

Today the second "lobby to save lives" will move on Capitol Hill, where a large number of legislators will be contacted by the pilots. The group will also gather with Senator MCCARRAN sometime today.

"I certainly do not think the American public desires a return to the crash-ridden days when the Department of Commerce regulated aeronautics," said Art Mills, veteran pilot of 1,250,000 miles of passenger travel.

WARNS OF TRAGEDY

Representing pilots of the Braniff Airways, flying from the Great Lakes points to the Gulf of Mexico, Mills said:

"If the proposal goes through, we will have a recurrence of the tragic situation which occurred when the air-mail contracts were canceled in 1934 and the Army detailed to fly the mail. Then there were 66 crashes and 12 pilots lost their lives in less than 2 months."

Ray T. Elsmore, Western Air Express pilot with 12,000 hours as a passenger-transport pilot, was equally emphatic in his protest.

EMPHATIC AGAINST CHANGE

Twenty-two years in aviation, a World War flier, and commander of the Three Hundred and Twenty-ninth Observation Squadron, Army Air Reserves, Elsmore said:

"We know of the many fatal accidents under the old Department of Commerce supervision. The present proposal would put the air lines under regulations similar to the former status. Why make a change which statistics and records show would effect a menace to the air-traveling public?"

D. W. Ledbetter, American Airlines, 12 years' experience and 12,500 air hours, and now flying the New York to New Orleans trip:

"Hard facts and statistics prove that it would be impossible to improve on the perfect record for safety that the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board have brought about in the aviation field. We're not just assuming the efficiency of the Board and the C. A. A. Records prove our case."

H. L. Smith, Pennsylvania Central Airlines, who has 9,000 hours and flies the Washington-Detroit trip, said:

"It represents very definitely a backward movement. It will make air travel more hazardous. I think it would be well to maintain the status quo. The record speaks for itself."

James H. Roe, T. W. A. flyer, with 10,000 hours and who flies the Kansas City-New York trip:

"We pilots are not concerned so much for our own safety, but for the public whose lives are in our hands. Nearly 3,000,000 passengers will be carried by air this year. It is our obvious duty to oppose reorganization plan No. 4."

C. F. Luethi, Northwest Airlines, Naval Reserve aviator, flying the route from Minneapolis to Billings, Mont., 10,000 hours:

EXPANSION ENDANGERED

"I am carrying on for 'Cash' Chamberlain, who was here with the first 'Lobby to Save Lives.' Shortly after creation of the

C. A. A. and the Safety Board—but before their effect could be felt—'Cash' crashed to his death near Miles City, Mont. The need for greatest safety regulation, such as now provided, cannot be overemphasized."

R. C. Young, Eastern Airlines, 9,000 hours, pilot on the New York-Miami trip:

"The air lines now are on the verge of the greatest expansion program yet undertaken as a result of the increase in public confidence. This was brought about through the splendid safety record set up under C. A. A. and A. S. B. regulations. Under the expansion plans many of the giant four-motored planes carrying 42 passengers will be utilized. If we ever needed rigid safety regulation it will be from now on."

"Hi" Little, United Air Lines, 12,000 hours, New York to Chicago pilot: "I was a member of the first 'Lobby to Save Lives.' The results of the legislation we advocated then have been far above our highest hopes."

DEFINITE BACKWARD STEP

G. E. Rodieck, Mid Continent Air Lines, 7,000 hours, who pilots the Tulsa-Minneapolis flight:

"We pilots here in Washington today speak for practically all of the Nation's passenger-line pilots. In the interest of the public's safety we hope to convince Senators and Representatives that Reorganization Plan No. IV represents a definite step backward in aviation."

Gilbert Blackmore, Pan American Airways, former Navy aviator with 9,000 hours of passenger flying, now a pilot of the American Clipper flight from New York to Lisbon, Portugal:

"Preservation of safe conditions is vital to air transportation, especially long-distance flying such as the Clipper transoceanic routes. The C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board have done an excellent job, so why turn backward?"

RECALLS PILOT'S DEATH

S. H. Hopkins, Chicago & Southern Airlines, 6,500 hours, pilot on the New Orleans-to-Chicago passenger hop:

"All pilots of the Chicago & Southern strongly protest against Reorganization Plan No. IV. For the past year it has been a pleasure not to buy funeral flowers for some pilot every 28 days."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 30, 1940]

WHY TAKE A CHANCE?

Flying low and blind into heavy weather, a transcontinental transport plane came scudding east into the dawn of May 6, 1935, on the regular run between Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Kansas City, Mo., with 13 people aboard.

It was an hour behind schedule, and the radio was not working very well. Only 30 minutes of gasoline were in the tanks. The pilot finally got through to the weather information service furnished civil aviation by the Federal Government, and was told he would find a clear ceiling at Kirksville, Mo., where there was an emergency landing field.

He put his rudder over and banked through the fog toward where he thought Kirksville was. The left wing snagged a tree, turned the plane into a snarling cartwheel, and hurtled it into a roadbank 16 miles south of Kirksville, which, contrary to what the pilot had been told, was smothered in fog.

Four persons, including the pilot, were killed instantly. One more died shortly thereafter. Eight were badly hurt.

IT TOOK A SENATOR'S DEATH TO ROUSE THE SENATE

There was only one exceptional fact about this crash, for it was otherwise only another in a succession that lasted from 1933 to 1939. The exceptional fact was that the late Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, had boarded the plane at Albuquerque, and so had died on the roadbank.

Citizens had been petitioning the Congress to do something about civil aviation ever since President Roosevelt, in 1933, had canceled the air-mail contracts and then restored them after a disastrous interlude that nearly wrecked the Army Air Corps. Civil aviation had never really recovered from that episode. But Congress still would not act.

Senator Cutting's death changed all that. Members of Congress came to realize that what had been happening to people whose names meant nothing could also happen to them. The reaction was exactly that of a policeman who sees another policeman shot.

Congressional investigations followed for a year.

AIR BUREAU WAS JUDGE, JURY, AND PROSECUTOR OF ITSELF

It was demonstrated that the Bureau of Air Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, was being saddled with an impossible assignment to make the rules for civil aviation, enforce them, and then punish anybody whose neglect should cause a failure of service. The Bureau was prosecutor, judge, and jury, not merely toward the aviation industry but toward itself as well.

In consequence, it was a subservient creature of the Secretary of Commerce and the complete victim of rascally politics. Civil aviation was teetering into bankruptcy. Public confidence was shattered.

To correct this terrible condition, Congress took control of aviation away from the Department of Commerce and set up an independent agency, the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Within the Authority it provided an Air Safety Board.

The Board had just one duty—to investigate all accidents involving civil aircraft, and publish its findings as to responsibility. It was free to criticize the C. A. A., Congress, the air lines, the pilots, the plane manufacturers—anybody.

The C. A. A. and the Board went into action on August 8, 1938. They made the aviation business stable and successful. On March 27, 1940, the industry could and proudly did celebrate the passing of 1 full year free of disaster. Not a single life had been lost in the air transport business, yet the industry had progressed technically and was fulfilling more schedules at faster speed than ever before.

YOU MAY SAVE LIVES BY SAVING THE C. A. A.

On April 11, 1940, the President's fourth plan for the reorganization of the executive branch of government provided that the independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and the independent Air Safety Board be abolished.

Their functions would be telescoped into the Department of Commerce under control of the Secretary. And the civil aviation business would be right back where it was in 1935 when Senator Cutting was killed.

This reorganization program comes before Congress soon for ratification. There is no merit in the proposal to wreck the C. A. A. It is doing a good job.

Members of Congress, remember Senator Cutting. You have corrected the conditions which brought him death. You have an opportunity to return to those conditions or to preserve the present safer way of flying.

Why take a chance? Save the C. A. A. and the Safety Board. You have every reason to say that you will save human life by doing so.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 29, 1940.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of all certificated personnel of the American aviation industry, and in the best interests of the entire aviation industry, as well as the general public of the United States, we protest in the strongest terms against the President's proposed Reorganization Plan No. IV, which would abolish the Air Safety Board and scuttle the Civil Aeronautics Authority. We especially protest the high-handed manner in which the Executive seeks to set aside, by mere stroke of the pen, an act which was adopted only after 5 years of consideration by both Houses of Congress. In the best interests of constitutional democracy we demand the defeat of this destructive proposal.

PAUL W. HAIRGROVE,
President, Licensed Airmen of America.

GREAT NECK, N. Y., *April 29, 1940.*

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The undersigned are aviation underwriters for a large group of insurance companies, writing a substantial part of all aviation business in this country. Drastic reductions in rates have been made during last year due to excellent experience which our unemotional analysis indicates due in no small measure to present Civil Aeronautics Authority and Safety Board arrangement. Therefore urge you strongly resist suggested transfer to Department of Commerce.

ASSOCIATED AVIATION UNDERWRITERS.
By D. R. SCARRITT, *Underwriting Manager.*

SAN FRANCISCO, *April 26, 1940.*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce heartily supports the position which you have taken in leading the opposition to the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV, now before the Congress, and which plan proposes to put the Civil Aeronautics Authority into the structure of the Department of Commerce and to abolish the Air Safety Board.

The Civil Aeronautics Act is the most progressive step ever taken in this country in the cause of civil aviation. We thoroughly oppose any proposal which affects the present status of the Authority and the Air Safety Board, whose fine work is evidenced by the recent perfect record of freedom from air-line accidents.

Very truly yours,

SAN FRANCISCO JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
TRUMAN R. YOUNG, *President.*

Copyright Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RESOLUTION OF LEAGUE OF AMERICAN PEN WOMEN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a

resolution adopted at the biennial session held in the city of Washington, April 20 to 26, 1940, of the National League of American Pen Women. The League of Pen Women, by this resolution, are on record as favoring the ratification of the Copyright Convention, which now heads the list of treaties on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is altogether just and proper that creative authorship should receive, in most generous measure, protection of copyright, as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the Government of the United States is greatly handicapped in its effort to protect American authorship from literary piracy in other countries because the United States lacks sufficient treaty guaranties from other governments;

Whereas the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and is now pending on the Senate Executive Calendar, is the best available instrument for the safeguarding of American authorship from infringement of copyright in other countries;

Whereas the present copyright law of the United States was framed before substantial progress had been made in the revolutionary developments of the present century respecting the utilization of literary and artistic works;

Whereas among many other alterations, it is necessary for reasonable protection that authors be accorded copyright in all manuscripts, that the divisibility of copyright be fully recognized by law; and

Whereas an excellent beginning in copyright reform has just been made in respect of one important item, namely, the vesting in the author of renewal privileges and ownership of copyright, for the period following the original 28-year term of copyright in magazines, periodicals, and other composite works, regardless of whether such articles have been separately registered at the copyright office, for which enactment the National League of American Pen Women expresses its cordial appreciation to the Congress and President of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National League of American Pen Women, assembled in biennial session in the city of Washington, April 20–26, 1940, That—

(1) The Senate should give immediate and unconditional approval to the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.

(2) General legislation for the modernization of the copyright should be prepared by the appropriate committees for enactment at the next session of Congress.

Peace as a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday, from the pen of Barnet Nover, entitled "Peace as a Policy." The experience of the Scandinavian country should be a warning to us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 29, 1940]

PEACE AS A POLICY

(By Barnet Nover)

A LESSON FROM SCANDINAVIA

When the present war began no region in Europe was more definitely and wholeheartedly committed to a policy of peace than Scandinavia.

Neither Norway nor Sweden, neither Denmark nor Finland, had any designs on any nations. They were content with what they had. They harbored no open or secret territorial ambitions. They were wholly free of the false belief that a nation's greatness can only be reckoned in terms of size or martial prowess. They wanted only to be let alone to pursue the arts of peace as they had done for so long and with such remarkably constructive results. And to win the right to remain at peace they were prepared to treat and did treat the opposing belligerents with even-handed impartiality.

What has been the result? The record speaks for itself and it is a grim record indeed.

Finland was invaded by Russia and despite fierce resistance was finally forced to cede to the aggressor an economically important and strategically invaluable stretch of territory. Denmark has been overrun. Norway is now a battlefield, indeed the major battlefield of the war. Only Sweden has avoided invasion but its immunity may be only temporary.

What the Scandinavian nations most feared has come upon them. Neither a long and fruitful record of well-doing nor a careful neutrality policy has saved them. Their crime was to be small and weak and more or less helpless. Their very virtues have been turned against them.

Yet as a group they are not wholly free from blame for what has happened. Their present tragic plight is in part, at least, the result of a prolonged and excessive addiction to the belief that if a nation wants peace earnestly enough it will have it regardless of the tides and tempests sweeping over the rest of the world.

In other words, the four Scandinavian nations made peace the be-all and the end-all of their foreign policies. That was noble of them. It showed how completely civilized they were. But it ultimately led them as it has led other nations down the path of disaster.

The events of the past decade have made it clear that peace cannot safely be made the basis of policy but if it is to be achieved it can only be as the resultant of policy. Its fulfillment does not belong in the realm of will but in that of action.

On October 19, 1939, 7 weeks after the outbreak of the European war and 6 weeks before Russia's attack on Finland, the sovereigns of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, and the President of Finland met at Stockholm to discuss the situation facing the four nations of the North.

"Our consultations," said King Gustav of Sweden on that occasion, "have confirmed the solidarity of the governments of the northern states." This theme ran through all the other speeches made at the meeting. "I am convinced," said King Haakon of Norway, "that our collaboration with the other northern peoples in the interests of peace has been consolidated and strengthened in these days," while President Kallio of Finland gave hearty thanks to "our friends for all the support and sympathy which have been extended to us."

When the successive tests came in the months that followed, the unity of sentiment which bound the four Scandinavian nations proved inadequate to save any of them. Sweden and Norway did send a good deal of unofficial assistance to Finland. But that aid was insufficient. The kind of assistance that might have proved decisive was never rendered; to have done so would have endangered that very policy of peace which each of the other Scandinavian nations had made the cornerstone of its foreign relations.

What would have happened had these four nations not limited their cooperation to the moral and diplomatic sphere, but had formed a solid bloc to defend any one of them against any and all aggressors, is conjectural. But there is at least a possibility that it would have had a deterrent effect on Russia last September and on Germany more recently. Certainly the lot of the Scandinavian nations would not be worse than it already is. For together the four nations have a population of close to 17,000,000 and a combined fighting force capable of giving any aggressor a run for his money. The Scandinavian nations refused to hang together, with the result that they are hanging separately.

The tragedy of Finland and Denmark and Norway, the impending tragedy of Sweden, are but the latest chapters in a sorry tale that began in Manchuria in 1931 and has since circled the globe.

Like the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain and France also wanted peace and also made it, for years, the be-all and the end-all of their policies. The result was Ethiopia and Munich and war. Nor can the people of the United States view developments taking place in Scandinavia with any measure of complacence. Quite the contrary. These developments have a lesson for us which cannot be disregarded with impunity. For there are loud voices raised in this land which repeatedly insist that peace is something you can achieve by wishing, by legislation, by oratorical legerdemain. The struggle in Norway shows how dangerous an illusion that can be.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Post:

[From the Boston Post of April 29, 1940]

MILLION HIT IN PROPOSED BARDEN BILL—DENIES THESE WORKERS 30 CENTS AN HOUR MINIMUM

(By Robert L. Norton)

About as raw a piece of legislation as has come before the House in this session is the so-called Barden bill fixing certain exemp-

tions in the Wage and Hour Act. Behind the bill is a combination of the packing, canning, sugar, and cotton lobbies, which are seeking to deny more than 1,000,000 workers a minimum of 30 cents an hour.

FARM TALK BUNKUM

The drive to break down the act is camouflaged under the pretext that it will aid the farmer. This is the sheerest sort of bunk, since the wage and hour law does not regulate the working hours of the farmer's hired man or girl, or specify the wages that must be paid them.

As a matter of fact, the amendments proposed by the North Carolinian remove the benefit of the legislation from the very people it was intended to help most, the unorganized and helpless workers, who, prior to the time that the law became effective, were paid a dime an hour, and even 5 and 3 cents for the hardest kind of work, under the worst possible conditions.

The effect of the passage of this bill would be to put an end to the application of the entire minimum-wage principle. It would drive great groups of people back to starvation wages, and increase relief costs. These workers are just as necessary to the processing of agricultural products as the shoe-factory worker is to prepare the stockman's hides for the market. It would be as logical to exempt one as the other.

GUARANTEED $665 YEARLY

At the top figures today they are guaranteed a minimum of 30 cents an hour for a 42-hour workweek, or payment at the rate of $665 a year. Certainly this is not a standard calculated to wreck American industry—$12.60 a week.

The chief elements supporting the bill are southern Tories, northern Republicans, and reactionary employers in parts of the Northeast, bent upon an attempt to break down the wage scale in an attempt to exploit both the poor white and colored labor in those sections of the country. It is essentially the same group which, until the passage of the Wage and Hour Act, made it impossible for the textile industries of New England to compete with those of the South.

It's the same sort of blind opposition that the original Black-Connery bill faced when it was proposed to fix a "floor" for wages and a "ceiling" for hours. Every court that has passed on the validity of the act has sustained it. Consequently, the scene of attack is shifted to Congress.

NEEDS HONEST REVISION

In lieu of repealing the act, the first move was to deny the Administrator sufficient funds to enforce it, and now the proposal is to exempt without social or economic justification these miserably paid workers who need its protection most. A large percentage of these workers are women.

Obviously the present law is unfair in some instances; for instance, in the way it works out in the case of small telephone exchanges. It also operates to the hardship of employers in the case of overtime paid to many white-collared workers. As Mr. Roosevelt states, the law is in an "evolutionary stage."

There is no doubt that many amendments are necessary, but these may be achieved through an open and aboveboard revision and not through the adoption of killing amendments at the behest of pressure groups.

The plea that the Barden bill would help the farmer is wholly specious.

Liberal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ELKHART (IND.) TRUTH

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, Ind. It is an excellent summary of the futility and the failures of the New Deal.

The editorial follows:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth]

"LIBERAL" GOVERNMENT

Mr. Roosevelt in his address to the Young Democrats on Saturday evening, called on them to support the "common sense" and the "liberalism" of his regime and stated that all the Republicans had to offer was repeal of his progressive laws and return to pre-depression measures and methods.

Fortunately, many people will remember our pursuit of "the more abundant life" by a program of scarcity; the killing of the little pigs; our paying the farmers for not producing food while at the same time we are spending immense sums to provide more agricultural land; our subsidizing exports so that foreigners can buy our produce cheaper than we can buy it ourselves; our importing agricultural products when we can't sell what we produce ourselves; our buying, at artificially inflated prices, billions of gold and silver for which we have no possible use; our—but why go on? If this is common sense, it is not strange that there are many people who want no more of it.

Then the liberal government. Mr. Roosevelt's idea of "liberal" is apparently a Government more and more centralized in the Executive, with Congress and the States reduced to little more than ratifying bodies; a Government by a lot of little "star chambers," who make and enforce their own rules without let or hindrance, even by the courts; a Government taking a larger and larger proportion of the national income in taxes until these taxes are becoming confiscatory. Charles I lost his head for operating this kind of a "liberal" government.

There is one phase of Mr. Roosevelt's government, however, which is truly "liberal." That is his liberality with our grandchildren's money. There are no doubts on this score. It has been well said that a new beatitude has been written. It is, "Blessed are the American youth, for upon them shall be saddled the national debt."

When a man is about to die from strangulation with a rope about his neck, obviously the first thing to do to save his life is cut the rope. This is what Mr. Roosevelt's opponents advocate, but to say that they advocate nothing else is simply not the truth. Everyone who has heard or read the speeches of his opponents or the report of the Frank committee knows it is not the truth. There have been many sound and constructive suggestions as to how to restore sanity to our Government, but first the rope must be cut.

Evidence is accumulating that Mr. Roosevelt's sophistry is becoming less effective. Fortunately the American people have brains, and they are beginning to use them.

Intrigue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda which is now disseminated in the press is so bewildering that one hardly knows what to accept or expect. According to the press a naval battle has been raging between the German and the English fleets somewhere in the southeastern part of the North Sea for over 2 weeks. Everyone who has the slightest familiarity with a naval battle knows that such engagements do not ordinarily last over 45 minutes without severe damage to one side or the other. We also know that Germany has no fleet large enough to engage the British or French fleet, so we wonder what sort of naval craft are involved in this "press" battle.

According to the press, German and English forces are in death grips from the Arctic Circle to the Skagerrak, all of which is pure fiction and should never appear in the press. What is the purpose of this propaganda? The purpose is to arouse sympathy for Norway and the Scandinavian countries. Has any one of these countries asked for sympathy? Certainly not. And if they had it would make no difference, for the administration's sympathy is not with Scandinavia but with Great Britain instead. The Scandinavian countries know that, and so do the Scandinavians in the United States, so the press may as well close up and fill its pages with something worth while.

Norway is situated on the western side of a great mountain which separates it from Sweden. The coast line of Norway is rocky and unfit for landing any war machinery, except in harbors adaptable for such purposes. An air force entrenched in Norway with strategically located coast defenses is liable to make the landing of troops an expensive procedure with tremendous sacrifice of lives and property. Little or nothing is to be gained by such occupation except extension of the battle front and the base of operation against Germany. No doubt this is held by England as the most desirable procedure, for it takes the war away from her shores and shifts the battlefield into a neutral country which is defenseless and unprotected. England is responsible for that, for she was the first one which invaded the neutral waters of Norway with her navy and mine fields.

If the English war is to be fought in Norway, it can only end in destruction of that country; but it may also, if England persists in this foolhardy venture, end in British defeat. However, it is her pudding and she should eat it without asking us for help and without annoying us with jabber from her incompetent and meddling statesmen. They are like all internationalists—filled with chatter to distract and confuse while they reach out to pull others in to pay the penalty for their own sins.

We should not forget that it is the English starvation blockade that is responsible for the widening of battle fronts, for no people with the slightest respect for themselves will meekly sit and wait to be starved by the internationalists who rule Britannia. No one should lose sight of the fact that boycott and starvation of noncombatants and neutrals is an oriental or Asiatic weapon. The blockading power does not care about the suffering a blockade may bring or how many lives it may destroy by starvation. The only question at issue is that of winning the war. Is such procedure justified today, and particularly by powers which set themselves up as champions of human rights? It is a question to which all of us may give serious consideration, and it is also an issue which the newspapers ignore.

Norway has been under internationalistic rule for a number of years. It strikes me they are sick and tired of that rule, and therefore prefer, if they must be invaded, an invasion by Germany instead of England. England can only add to their trouble, for Britannia has been ruled by the money changers for several hundred years, and the stronghold of this unholy tribe is now in Great Britain and the United States. They are even moving out of Holland, for I have papers from that country in which the people complain of unreasonable withdrawal of gold from the Netherland banks. This same thing happened in Norway, for the Hambro regime has, I understand, withdrawn the gold. Some of it has been shipped to England and the greater part to the United States. I now quote from the New York Post, April 15, 1940:

The *Bergensfjord* left Olso 2 days before the German invasion. Captain Anzjon said he had received no instructions since the invasion. The ship carried 380 passengers, including 131 Americans citizens, and $19,500,000 in gold, part of $80,000,000 sent here from Norway for safekeeping in the last 10 weeks. The shipping of so much gold just before the invasion suggests that persons in Norway expected the invasion, although Captain Anzjon said everything had been calm when he sailed.

We do not appreciate the value of gold because we are practically self-sufficient, except in a few articles such as coffee, tea, and rubber. It is different with European nations, for they must import to live; and to buy they must have gold. It is in such nations that the power of gold is felt, and it is the lack of this metal which is now forcing them to engage in exchange of commodities or barter. Is it possible that those who now own and control the gold may become an instrument that will bring about a closer understanding among neutrals, an understanding that may promote a friendlier relationship based upon mutual trading of commodities and necessities to sustain life? It is possible that gold may become the very weapon that will destroy those who have sold their souls for such wealth.

Since the invasion of Scandinavia I have received a number of letters, all of them more or less typical, and from one of which I shall quote, without giving the writer's name:

APRIL 23, 1940.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN THORKELSON, OF MONTANA: About Norway—do you know of the story of "Terje Vigen"? It tells of the hard times in the Napoleonic wars and how England oppressed the Norwegians, as epitomized in the sufferings of Terje, who had to row across to Denmark from Norway for a few barrels of corn or wheat. On his return, just as Terje brought his boat to the shore of Norway, he was seized and sent to England, where he was put in jail for 5 years.

Do try to read this classic epic to your colleagues in Congress to inform them how Britannia rules the waves and waives the rules.

Folklore further has it times were hard in Norway during the Napoleonic wars because of the blockades and trade upsets in Europe. The poor Norwegians were the innocent bystanders and were even reduced to using the bark of trees in the making of bread. So that when the Rothschilds offered to help Norway with their gold, if also the Norwegians would let the chosen people in, the unsuspecting Vikings could not foresee the year 1940. Perhaps the Rothschilds only wanted a few of the chosen people to enter Norway to keep a weather eye on the gold. In the year 1940 so close an eye did the chosen people keep on the gold of Norway that it is reported $150,000,000 of it has suddenly appeared in England and another $50,000,000 of it arrived in New York just before the outbreak of the battle between the British and the Germans for Norway. And a week ago Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau announced he was "trustee" of all Norwegian and Danish assets in this country. The Norwegians probably have no more title to the gold which they were under the illusion belonged to the people and the banks than the Poles had title to their gold which landed in Paris. And I wonder if the English really own their gold, and if we here in the United States are not acting as a treasury and safety-deposit box for the international bankers temporarily. Some day they may clear out of here with the gold and dive down another "rat hole."

To get back to the Napoleonic days and the opening of the door of Norway to the wandering Jew, a Norwegian poet wrote a beautiful and heart-rending poem about the Jews. Did you learn to recite it as a schoolboy in Norway? So much did the Norwegians not suspect that they accepted the Rothschild gold. Now, more than 100 years later, one Hambro said to be of the Rothschild tribe, arrived as president of the Norwegian Storting (Parliament).

All who run may read. Could it be that the international banking interests of the Rothschild Hambro conflicted with the interests of Norway? I enclose an enlightening newspaper clipping from the New York Post of April 4, 1940, which tells about the last card played by the British via London's powerful Hambro bank with connections in Norway and Sweden. It may turn out that the prowling lions of Judah overplayed their cards. The clipping further states that the sister of the Norwegian Storting's (whereabouts now unknown) president, Hambro, is married into the Wallenberg family in Sweden, and that the Wallenbergs are the uncrowned kings in finance in Sweden. It is fascinating, is it not?

I can begin to understand one of the causes of our national ills here in the United States lies in the anaconda of finance, from which we are suffering, and which weighs us down. The Jews, themselves, admit in their own writings, that they control the gold trade. Such control amounts to tyranny when used to oppress and enslave peoples.

When a small alien minority, alien in customs and at home everywhere, and yet regarding no place as home, when such a minority penetrates and dominates a vast majority, such dominance represents intolerance by the minority of the majority. Sooner or later the tables will be turned.

The struggle is so unnecessary. A majority will always seek the services of a minority when that minority excels and specializes in certain fields. It is a law of economics and of nature that the fittest survive. But it is intolerable for a minority to spread out everywhere in a network. Then it happens, as among the Jews, those in the minority are placed in positions for which they are not qualified, and for which they are not recognized as capable.

It is a peculiar power that control of the gold gives the Jews. Just as when one is apt to use a pistol in a quarrel if one carries it on one's person, or if it is too handy, so the Jews resort to the use of their gold to serve their purposes. Injustice will meet a day of reckoning.

Speaking of gold, the recent book by Littlepage entitled "In Search of Soviet Gold" hints of mystery when mention is made that Stalin, the ruler of Russia, is not satisfied with Serebrovsky's lack of information about the financing (?) of gold mining in Alaska. Serebrovsky was the head of the Russian Gold Trust for the Government and was sent to Alaska to make a survey of mining there. In the end the "Jew" Serebrovsky was executed for sabotage in the gold industry in Russia, and the above-mentioned book tells of this. Who knows whether or not he knew more about the control of Alaska than he cared to give out to a "nontribesman"?

I like to think there may be more "Congressmen ———" in Norway in her hour of need. And where are those squareheads and greenhorns who made way for the Guggenheim interests in Alaska? The enclosed clipping in the New York Herald Tribune dated November 16, 1939, gives, shall I say, a modest estimate of Murry Guggenheim, only one of many of his kind.

I make no apologies for being very fond of the real English, and my heart bleeds for them in this hour of their death struggle with the international bankers and vultures using England as a base.

An alien minority has brought about the decay of England by exploiting it and using it as a countinghouse. It is a sign of decadence, with too many in England living on the dole since the World War and with too many unemployed and with too many of the younger generation never having been employed and with blighted areas in mining and factory towns. Need I go on?

If the decay of England was the fruits of victory from the last war, could the lot of England have been worse in defeat? And what will the fruits of victory for the Allies be in this war that may turn into a second World War? Just the thought of the precipice should make all the belligerents lay down their arms. It is up to those who "have" to compromise.

There is an undercurrent of unexpressed fear in the world of the Jews, not because of the Jews, per se, but because of what they seem to have the power to do. When and if they take flight from the shores of Albion, it is not impossible that their golden treasures will have been removed to the care of the United States of America.

I am sure the Norwegians only wanted to be neutral in the current struggle. The British mining operations roused old fears in Norway. And it is extraordinary that fear of blockades and of lives and ships meeting a watery grave did not lead the Norwegians into the arms of the English of whom the Norwegians are

fond, as English society often vacations in the Land of the Vikings, and the late Queen of Norway was an English princess.

The Norwegians were nearer to the English sphere of influence. Yet there must have been some fear of those ruling England today, a fear that took away the will to fight the invading Germans, a fear that paralyzed the natural instinct to protect a proud and ancient land.

And if fear rules this world, the home of the brave and of the free will become the house of fear and of the enslaved. The "newly arrived" are almost succeeding in placing their calf of gold on the top of the United States Capitol Building in Washington, in enslaving the people by means of a stamp plan whereby all of us will have to stand in line from the time one is born until one dies, and in order to hasten the rotting process agents of destruction via communism, under whatever label, are abroad in the land, and apostles of indecency are glorified.

Something as trifling as the "lack of a horseshoe nail" will upset the best-laid plans, and I am reminded there is no such thing as a perfect crime.

We shall see what we shall see. Time moves swiftly today and we are just one lap behind the "swindlers."

Very truly yours,

J—— T—— B——,
(The Viking's Daughter.)

This letter gives one Scandinavian angle, and I have had a number like it. Not one writer has expressed himself in favor of the past or the present attitude of Great Britain. Surely there is no one of us who does not deplore the German invasion of Scandinavia, but we are not fooled as to the cause of this invasion. English relief to Norway is tantamount to destruction, and England should, in respect to herself and humanity and to protect innocent lives from useless sacrifice, stay home and mind her own business.

I shall now quote from the New York Post, April 4, 1940. Reading this you will find that England was planning to invade Norway and the internationalist prepared the road for invasion. His hand is the one which drips with blood and it is he now, as before, who is urging the world to fight another war so that he may rule the "goyem" dupes.

COMMONS TO DEBATE ECONOMIC WARFARE IN SECRET SESSION—DIPLOMATS IN BERLIN WORRIED OVER POSSIBILITY OF HOSTILITIES IN SCANDINAVIA

LONDON, April 4.—The House of Commons will meet April 11 for a secret session to debate the allied program for economic warfare against Germany, Prime Minister Chamberlain announced today.

"I quite recognize that the subject is one of great importance," Chamberlain said, "and one which perhaps might be difficult to debate in public."

There has been only one other secret session in the present war, held December 13.

Establishment of a government trading corporation to deal with neutrals, particularly Hungary and the Balkan nations, was announced by Sir John Simon. The company, it was said, would embark on barter transactions.

BERLIN ENVOYS FEARFUL OF SCANDINAVIAN WAR

(By Wallace R. Deuel)

BERLIN, April 4.—Grave anxiety regarding developments in Scandinavia in the near future was voiced in diplomatic quarters here today as signs multiplied that Anglo-German rivalry for domination in Norway and Sweden is assuming ugly proportions.

The most extreme fears here took the form of apprehension lest actual hostilities between the Reich and the Allies might break out in the north.

These fears are based on the possibility that France and England might intervene in Norway or Sweden, or both, to prevent shipment of raw materials, notably Swedish iron ore, to Germany. If this should happen, most qualified observers feel the Nazis would intervene as well.

There are several considerations which would seem to militate against such a development, but these do not suffice to reassure some Scandinavian quarters.

MUST HAVE SWEDISH ORE

For one thing, hostilities in Scandinavia would appear to be contrary to Germany's interests because hostilities would interfere with deliveries to the Reich, no matter who might emerge the victor from such hostilities, and interference with its supplies of Swedish iron ore is the last thing Germany wants.

For another thing, the Reich also wants to keep the theater of military operations restricted to the western front for other reasons.

For still another thing, a front in Scandinavia would be geographically more inconvenient for the Reich to defend than it would be for its enemies.

Finally, Allied interference with Swedish deliveries would be more difficult in summer, when much of the ore comes through the Baltic, than during the winter when all of it comes down the Norwegian coast.

Apprehension is acute here, nevertheless.

BRITON IN STOCKHOLM TO DISCUSS IRON EXPORTS

(By Leland Stowe)

STOCKHOLM, April 4.—As the latest move in the Allies' determined drive to choke off Swedish iron exports to Germany, an exceptionally influential British representative has quietly arrived here after pausing to confer with Norwegian authorities in Oslo.

Through her intermediary Great Britain is reliably reported to be asking Sweden either to eliminate completely or to reduce sharply her iron shipments to the Reich.

This man is Charles Hambro, head of London's powerful Hambro Bank and one of Britain's most astute financiers. Reputedly, he has been dispatched to the Norwegian and Swedish capitals as a spokesman for the British Ministry of Economic Warfare.

What Hambro seeks is an important downward revision of the quota of Swedish ore allotted to Germany as supposedly normal trade.

What Britain and France are offering the Swedes as an inducement for lopping off several million tons of their iron-ore sales to Germany is not yet known.

HAS VALUABLE CONTACTS

The choice of the head of the Hambro Bank as Britain's representative in these delicate negotiations underscores London's desire for a new settlement without benefit of controversy or extreme blockade measures unless they cannot be avoided. In British quarters here considerable optimism is expressed over the prospects of success.

Hambro possesses extraordinarily valuable contacts in both Sweden and Norway. He is related to Joachim C. Hambro, president of the Norwegian Parliament, while his sister is married to one of the Wallenberg brothers, who are the uncrowned kings of Swedish finance.

PLAYING LAST CARD

London is now counting upon Hambro to enlist the Wallenbergs' support—and, largely through them, the consent of the Stockholm Governments—for drastic reductions of iron exports to Germany.

It appears that the British are playing a last business-financial card before resorting to such extreme measures as an imposition of their blockade inside Norway's 3-mile limit.

There remains, however, the uncertainty as to what Germany may do to meet the British challenge in Sweden.

This quotation from the New York Post is informative, as it shows that Great Britain had representatives in Norway and Sweden before April 4, 1940.

According to Mr. Deuel's report in the same article, Berlin expressed great fear that France and England might intervene in Norway or Sweden, or both, to prevent shipment of raw materials, notably Swedish iron ore to Germany.

Reports from Stockholm by Mr. Stowe reveal the fact that Mr. Charles Hambro, head of London's powerful Hambro Bank and one of Britain's most astute financiers, was in Norway and Sweden as England's representative. The article further states:

> Hambro possesses extraordinarily valuable contacts in both Sweden and Norway. He is related to Joachim C. Hambro, president of the Norwegian Parliament, while his sister is married to one of the Wallenberg brothers, who are the uncrowned kings of Swedish finance.

No one should be fooled. Mr. Hambro and his delegation were in Scandinavia to promote an alliance with England, an act which could not but result in German invasion. This is admitted by the English Government, and that should be sufficient evidence, I am sure.

How closely this crowd of money changers cooperates when gold is in jeopardy is evidenced by the fact that the complete gold stock of Norway was removed before the invasion and $18,000,000 of Swedish gold was recently landed in New York. That, if nothing else, is the most conclusive evidence that the international money changers had prepared Norway for invasion and anticipate the same thing may happen in Sweden.

We are informed by the President that from now on Norway, and I presume Denmark, goes on a "cash-and-carry basis." This, if it were not so terribly tragic, would be laughable, for how can either Denmark or Norway buy from any nation without gold or gold credit? This gold, which actually belongs to the people of Norway, was removed or taken by the international financiers, apparently as their own property. The Norwegian people, as well as we, should know this, for they will then, like us, have a clearer understanding of the power of gold and how they, like us, are dupes of Shylock.

The Secretary of the Treasury is now looking after the belligerent's property. Will any of this be returned to Norway or credited to the Norwegian people? My guess is no. It is held for the money changers.

This is the cash and here is the answer to the carry message of the President:

BRITISH HOLD DANISH SHIPS

LONDON, April 24.—The Admiralty today said 135 Danish ships have been detained in the United Kingdom ports since the German invasion of Denmark. The ships are to be used by the British for the duration of war, the announcement said.

This is self-explanatory, and means that the international bankers have not only removed the gold, but, in collusion with England, have made it impossible for Norway and Denmark to carry on international commerce.

Those who have followed my remarks will recall that I made a statement that everything was set for us to finance the British war, with all the gold in the United States Treasury. I have already called attention to the fact that England requisitioned 60 American stocks and bonds. Let me now quote an article which is self-explanatory. As you read this, I want you to bear in mind that England is holding about fourteen billions of these stocks and bonds.

BRITAIN CALLS 117 UNITED STATES ISSUES

The British Treasury has requisitioned 117 more United States stocks and bonds owned by English subjects in its drive to obtain dollars to pay for purchases of war supplies here.

Announcement of the mobilization was made last night in London and it is understood the Treasury will pay for the securities at prices ruling Saturday. This is the second requisitioning of securities; the first covered 60 issues and was dated February 18.

The new list includes some of the best-known securities, such as United States Steel, Chrysler, Bethlehem Steel. There are 92 stocks and 25 bonds.

Additional mobilization of United States issues will be announced from time to time, it is said. The British Treasury in its order emphasized that the mobilization is "precautionary" and that it is simply continuing its previously disclosed policy of taking over private holdings of United States securities from time to time with the object of selling the issues as the Government needs new dollars.

Is it possible that Great Britain, being as poor as she pretends to be, has been able to buy fourteen billions of American bonds and securities with gold and is still unable to pay one cent on her war debt to the United States; or is this a transaction in which the international financiers connive to defraud the people of the United States? It is quite evident that we have already paid for England's preparation and are selected to pay for the present war. This will be done with securities and bonds and not with money.

The Scandinavian people in the United States understand British intrigue as well as that of other European countries and are, therefore, not unduly excited over happenings in Norway. Americans of Scandinavian descent regret the invasion of Norway, but we also realize that this invasion was only made possible by a division in the ranks of the Norwegian people. The old and stable Norwegians, who are nationalistic and opposed to internationalism, no doubt preferred invasion by Germany. The internationalist and his dupes preferred invasion by England. Norwegian lives and property can best be saved at this time by keeping England out, so that Norway will not become a bloody British battlefield.

However, one thing stands out in bold relief. The Scandinavians in the United States are not hyphenated, but are instead Americans, as is right and proper. I believe I speak for them when I say that we do not want the United States to become involved in the European war, no matter who is invaded.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Ross which was printed in last night's issue of the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Star of April 29, 1940]

OPPORTUNITY KNOCKS FOR REPUBLICANS—WAGE-HOUR CHANGES HELD CHANCE TO AID PARTY, PROGRESSIVISM

(By Charles G. Ross)

The Republicans in the House of Representatives are confronted with a great opportunity. They have a chance to do something for the cause of sane progressivism, and, at the same time, to do something important for the good of the party. They can show that the Glenn Frank report, "A Program For a Dynamic America," is something more than a form of words. It will be interesting to see whether they seize the issue which a group of Southern Democrats are trying to hand them, in the fight over the proposed Barden amendments to the wage-hour law, or whether, out of blind opposition to the administration, they go along with these destructive amendments and so cancel out the issue.

The question is whether or not more than a million workers engaged in the "processing" of agricultural products shall be deprived of the benefits of the wage-hour law. This is the aim of the drastic Barden amendments—to make it possible for this group of industrial workers, of the very class that the wage-hour law was designed primarily to protect, to be paid less than the modest minimum scale fixed under the act.

THOSE WHO WOULD BE HIT

The people who would be affected by the exemptions are not doing farm labor. Farm laborers are already exempt. Those who would be put outside the pale of the act by the Barden amendments are performing industrial operations on farm products. They are working in canning and packing plants and other processing plants, and the beneficiaries of the change, though it is offered in the guise of "farm relief" and is mistakenly supported by a number of farm organizations, would be the owners of those enterprises, not the farmers.

Not all the southern Democrats, it should be added, subscribe to the short-sighted thesis of Mr. BARDEN. Notable in the opposition to his amendments is Mr. RAMSPECK, from the deep South—from Georgia. Mr. RAMSPECK is one of those who see clearly that the way to help the farmer is to increase the purchasing power of the people who buy the farmer's products. Mr. RAMSPECK is also of that group of southerners who believe that "the time has come when the South can no longer live on a stratum of economic life different from that in other sections"; that under the wage-hour law "we have taken a step in a direction which will be more beneficial to the South perhaps than to any other section of the United States."

HIS THE EXCEPTIONAL VIEW

But Mr. RAMSPECK'S, if one may judge by the debates now going forward in the House, is the exceptional view among his southern Democratic colleagues. On the ground of the supposed sectional interest of the South, these Democrats, by and large, want the Barden amendments.

Here is where the opportunity of the Republicans comes in. Here is a plain case where political expediency, from the standpoint of the G. O. P., jumps with the larger public interest.

I am going to let part of this column be written by a Republican, Representative BARTON, of New York, who is standing on the wage-hour issue with Mrs. NORTON, the Democratic chairman of the House Labor Committee. Mr. BARTON has an independent mind.

BARTON'S STAND

What follows is condensed from his remarks in the current House debate:

"I favor the Norton amendments, which were worked out with painstaking care in the Labor Committee. They remove hardships without weakening the act. The Barden amendments would exempt hundreds of thousands of the poorest paid and most helpless workers, including large numbers of Negroes and underprivileged white workers, especially in the South, for whose protection the act was especially designed.

"I believe we now have (in Colonel Fleming) a reasonable, intelligent, and cooperative Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act who appreciates the problems of both employer and employee. For this reason I favor adopting the conservative amendments of the Labor Committee and giving him another 6 months or a year to deal with such individual situations as can be ameliorated by changes in the regulations and definitions. At our next session the Administrator, who is directed to make recommendations from time to time to the Congress, may have discovered certain other ways in which the act can be perfected and unnecessary hardships and criticisms removed.

CHANGES WILL BE MINOR

"But such changes, I believe, will be minor. Neither the next session of Congress nor any session will be willing to repeal or undermine this legislation.

"It has commended itself to the social conscience of our people and has even in these few months been cheerfully accepted by the overwhelming majority of forward-looking employers throughout the land."

Thus Mr. BARTON, from the so-called silk-stocking Republican Seventeenth District of New York.

Mr. BARTON is talking the language of the Glenn Frank report, which came out in terms for governmental wage-hour regulation in situations where workers are unable to protect themselves through collective bargaining.

He is talking the language of Alf Landon in his recent Wichita speech warning the Republicans against "blind" antagonism to the social-reform measures of the New Deal.

Are the Republicans of the House going to throw off partisanship and stand behind the progressive views of Mr. BARTON on the wage-hour issue? Or are they going to line up for the economic Bourbonism represented by the Barden amendments?

Federal Blitzkrieg Against California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I have asked for unanimous consent on several mornings to address the House on what I have termed a Federal blitzkrieg against the State of California. To you who do not live in the State of California, I would like to say that if you lived within the State you certainly would resent some of the things that I am going to outline here, the same as we in California resent them. For instance, within a very short period of time, we have had to face the following things: The threat of the enactment of the Neely bill, which many people have been led to believe was moral censorship, but as a matter of fact contains nothing whatever pursuant to censorship. This matter of censorship has been entirely handled by the moving-picture business, better than the handling of any other parallel conditions by any other business in the country. This bill would destroy at least half of this industry in California and would throw some thirty or forty thousand people out of work in Los Angeles County alone.

The second threat comes from a so-called second Neely bill, wherein the bureaucrats wish to provide that those who produce motion pictures and know the most about it cannot stage them for the public but must put them in other hands. It is far easier for these bureaucrats and those who do not know anything about this particular business to destroy it than it is to build it up and to furnish jobs for our people.

The third thing is that Mr. Ickes, of the national parks, has hit upon the new idea of charging these moving-picture companies $500 a day to use our national parks for moving-picture companies of over 25. Is it coming to a point where the heads of our bureaus feel that this is their personal property, or do they see fit to recognize that those of the moving-picture industry have equal rights with all other citizens to go into these parks, and that these same moving-picture producers pay the salaries of these same bureaucrats? Do the bureaucrats want the exclusive rights for staging scenes in their propaganda in our national parks, or do these parks belong to the people?

The fourth thing that they have attempted to do to the moving-picture companies is to make a charge on range lands and reclamation areas of $100 a day. In the making of these areas the Federal Government has never done anything except to declare them "public domain" and charge the stockmen so much per head for the grazing of cattle and sheep. Some of these things approach the point of being ridiculous.

Is it quite possible that all this pressure is being brought against the moving-picture business with the future idea in mind of coercing them to such an extent that it will have the effect of a real censorship? If this is true, Congress ought to remove and take out of circulation such heads of bureaus as this.

The next item would be the endeavor to enforce a Federal oil-control bill on California. California has had what is known as voluntary prorating of its oil, and the industry has worked successfully under this, but it is very peculiar how these different governmental agencies want to have at least partial control over the tremendous finances of these companies. They are using this oil-control bill as a wedge to confiscate some of our lands in California, which brings us down to the next point of this Federal blitzkrieg, and that is the Department of Justice threat to claim the tidelands in California and take them for the Navy without payment therefor. This is plain out-and-out confiscation, because the Department of Justice knows, and every lawyer knows, that every single decision handed down by the Supreme Court is against the Federal Government in this. It has been stated that the Federal Government is relying upon the so-called liberal interpretation of the new Supreme Court to write new laws which would permit the confiscation of property. If this is true, it should be nipped in its inception.

In connection with this threatened oil suit, which I understand is now on the President's desk for decision, I understand that there is an attempt to isolate California and fight California alone. Let me say to every single coast State that the precedent established in connection with California will be used to "blitzkrieg" every other State in the Union where similar conditions exist, and those States are: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Oregon, and Washington. Every single one of these States have an interest in this deal, and under no conditions should we permit the confiscation, without payment, of property in California, because if it is done there it will be done in these other States under the same rule.

We are also facing the destruction of our community property laws in California. In California women have certain property rights that we believe they are entitled to, and we are going to do everything we possibly can to see that those rights are maintained. The only reason that I could conceive of motivating those who conceived the idea of destroying these rights is this: That in California an income-tax return may be filed by the husband and also by the wife. This would, of course, make both pay taxes, but would bring them down in the income-tax brackets so that the taxes might be somewhat less. The thought occurs to me that the spenders in this country have gone to great lengths to find additional money to spend. Our members of Appropriation Committees, and others, in my opinion, would do well to look for ways and means to stop the spending of money rather than to look for new sources of revenue with which to pay for this terrific, terrible spending program.

Of course, we know that this country owes $45,000,000,000, but we never dreamed that they had used up all sources and were going to such great lengths to see what could be additionally taxed.

This brings me down, then, to further discrimination against the Pacific coast, in which the Federal Government of the United States is the chief offender. The Panama Railroad Company operates three American-flag steamships, and I understand the rates on cement from Atlantic coast ports to the Panama Canal are approximately $3 a ton. The same rates from Pacific coast points are $8 a ton. This means that our cement mills, our lumber, lime, brick, and all construction commodities cannot be sold in competition with Atlantic coast points, primarily on account of the Federal Government having broken up the equity of the rate structure.

I am the Representative of this territory, and I am appealing to you for help in the correction of these things, and expect to get it, the same as I would give it to you if the conditions were reversed.

I am including as a part of my remarks the following article from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times:

ICKES IN ANSWER TO DISCRIMINATION CHARGE

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Ickes said today that if Congress would appropriate enough money to maintain the national parks he gladly would permit movie companies to use public lands without cost. This was in reply to press-conference questions concerning a resolution introduced by Senator ASHURST (Democrat, Arizona) calling for a Senate investigation of Interior Department charges ranging from $100 to $500 for use of the public lands in the filming of motion pictures.

Ickes recently ruled that movie companies must pay for the use of public domain on which they established "sets" and operated with casts of 25 or more actors. He excluded news reels and travelogs.

ASHURST characterized Ickes as a "lord paramount" over public lands and proposed that the Senate investigate.

"If the Congress doesn't want us to make these charges and will give us enough money to maintain public parks," Ickes said, "I gladly will take off all charges on special privileges to the movie companies.

"I hope we do have a Senate investigation. I'd like to say something about discriminations against the Interior Department in congressional appropriations.

"The motion-picture moguls make big profits and I thought we'd get a little money out of them for using public property. I don't see why anyone except those at the top of the Hollywood industry should get excited."

Reserve Board Member Warns of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a clipping that states that the British are growing impatient over the neutrality of America, and the headline further states: "Political leaders say war would never have started if the United States had stuck by Allies; 'Uncle Shylock' denounced." I can only say to this that we have not been neutral, and we are not neutral now, in any sense whatsoever. We are shipping war materials of all kinds to Great Britain and France, without even a blush. The British do not mean neutral. They mean, instead, when are we going to fight the war for them? Our reply should be, never again.

I quote, Washington Post, April 15, 1940:

For weeks there has been an increasing impatience over American neutrality in this country. It found complete expression tonight in the address of Maj. A. G. Church, treasurer of the National Labor Organization, who, speaking at Bristol, said that if the United States had stood by their natural Allies—Britain and France—since 1918, Adolf Hitler would not have been heard of, and the present war would not have been fought.

"It is," he said, "a melancholy reflection of the spirit of the times that it is upon Great Britain, France, and small communities in comparison with the great American Republic, that the responsibility for safeguarding free institutions and liberties of the peoples throughout the world falls, and that the numerically greatest democracy in the world can justify from the safe distance of 4,000 miles its policy of aloofness.

"It is inconceivable to those in Britain who have any respect for principles, any regard for justice, any enthusiasm for ideals, any prejudice against slavery, to find the great American Republic unresponsive to their appeals for help in a conflict which is to determine the fate of the world.

"Isolationism of America has created the present situation. It is time that the statesmen of America realized they must align themselves with Great Britain and France in this conflict against a slavery worse and more insidious than that against which Abraham Lincoln thundered and fought."

The author is, of course, aware of the fact that England has never treated the United States with common courtesy, and should, therefore, expect little from us. However, when he makes the statement that it is upon Great Britain and France and small communities that responsibility falls, as compared with the great American Republic, I cannot refrain from smiling. He evidently forgets that Great Britain owns over 13,000,000 square miles of property, with a population of nearly 496,000,000, and France has nearly 5,000,000 square miles and over 113,000,000 population, as against our 3,000,000 square miles, with approximately 125,000,000 people. So I say, what is holding Great Britain back if she wants to fight?

As a matter of fact, nothing is going to happen, no matter who wins the war. That is clearly evident as we observe the present invasion of Norway. Norway is separated from England by 400 miles, and I venture to say that England will find it very costly to get into Norway. It follows, therefore, that invasion of the United States by a power 3,000 miles from our shore is too silly to speak of. The only invasions we need fear are north and south of us, and I am sure they would be cared for should necessity arise. As to slavery, it would be well for the speaker, Major Church, to bear in mind that such conditions prevail in the British Empire.

What we should do is to look after ourselves and provide for equipping our own Army and Navy instead of those of foreign countries. At one time Russia received all our Army and Navy secrets for the asking, and today they are handed over to Great Britain and France. Congress is requested to appropriate more money for protection against espionage and stealing of Army and Navy secrets, yet the heads of the administration hand them out like a piece of pie at lunch. The administration acts like a group of irresponsible children with a new toy. I shall now quote an article by Maj. Al Williams, and I want to say that he is absolutely 100-percent right in his statement about Congress and about the administration, and should be commended for telling the truth. Washington Daily News, April 24, 1940:

SALE OF UNITED STATES PLANES TO ALLIES CRITICIZED

(By Maj. Al Williams)

Before we can have air power or the machinery for adequately defending the air over and around the United States, I think we will have to conjure up or even coin some statesmen for Congress.

We sadly need some political leaders who will base decisions on what is right and what is wrong.

The selling of American air power down the river was conducted on the national counter in full view of everyone, and with only one or two weak and notice-seeking protests in Congress, although the naval and military committees of House and Senate are supposed to be composed of men who know something about national defense, its machinery and its technical aspects.

I have no doubt as to where the idea of selling our latest war planes to the Allies originated. A few leaders of the administration—chiefly Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Morgenthau—had decided to sell our best air fighters, without restrictions, and those who should have protected the interests and safety of the American people stepped into line like good little boys, selling as they marched.

QUESTIONS REASON

The excuses given to the public seemed to me to be based on the premise that said public is composed of addle-pated fools. By selling our planes, the boys in Washington were going to save us some money, get us later designs, and expand our aircraft-production facilities. "No secrets to be sold," was the keynote. It might have been true, in one sense, since everything is to be sold before any new and valuable invention could be tagged "secret."

Now, weeks after the sell-out there are squeaky protests out of Congress about the dangers of turning the finest products of American aeronautical genius over to the Allies. One says:

"The theory being pursued by our Government that this foreign business is going to help us by providing means for expanding our aircraft production is an error of fact and fundamentally unsound."

STRAIN ON NEUTRALITY

When we go into this business as a neutral nation we are immediately subjecting our neutrality (what a travesty) to a severe strain. When the United States permits our factories to take orders from foreign governments that are at war or threatened with involvement, we at once have a stake in that war. The next step will be that we will find ourselves financing the war and then, perhaps, becoming an active participant with our men and munitions.

If we had to go to war today, I doubt if we could put more than 1,000 combat planes in the air. A fleet without control of the air never can attain its full effectiveness and the same applies to the Army. It must have control over the air where it is fighting.

Why wasn't such a protest voiced when it might have done some good?

This article by Major Williams is self-explanatory so I shall make no further comments on it.

Let us now see how well prepared we are financially to fight another war. Let us first bear in mind that England and France will use American industrial bonds and stocks as money to pay for merchandise which they buy in the United States. These bonds and stocks are set up against the gold in the United States Treasury and will remain in the hands of the international bankers. These stocks and bonds can be used as they were in 1928 and 1929, to be sold on a climbing stock market, but this I do not believe is possible as we remember our experience of 12 years

ago. It is, however, to the interest of the international bankers to sustain the price of this stock, for such act on their part will render greater aid to England and France, their brothers in crime.

However, the point to bear in mind is that the American producers will never receive anything but an inflated and valueless dollar for work, merchandise, or other commodities, and that in itself is a most hopeless outlook.

Congress set up two classes: First, the aristocratic internationalist, who is secured with gold and uses gold credit and currency without restriction; and second, we, the common people, whom Congress placed upon a debased money standard, without security and without value anywhere or any place. Some may not believe this statement, but I defy anyone in the administration to contradict it, and prove that it is not true.

I shall now quote a short article from the Washington News, April 19, 1940, which in itself says a "mouthful":

UNITED STATES DEFICIT NEARS $3,000,000,000 MARK

The Treasury net deficit is within a few millions of $3,000,000,000 today. Hope has been abandoned for additional tax revenue at this session of Congress to avoid exceeding the national-debt limit.

President Roosevelt, however, believes the debt-limit issue may be avoided at this session of Congress by a combination of favorable circumstances which he hopes will come about. He told reporters yesterday Congress might reduce spending in the next fiscal year $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 below the Budget figure of $8,424,000,000. And he said it is possible Treasury revenue in the next fiscal year may be up $200,000,000 or so beyond budgeted expectation of $5,547,000,000.

In that event, he explained, $460,000,000 of new taxes asked in his Budget message will not be necessary to prevent Government borrowing from hitting the $45,000,000,000 limit which is fixed as the maximum national debt permitted by law.

This statement is the same buncombe we have had for the past 7 years and should not be taken seriously by anyone. Our national debt will be up to the limit at the end of next June, if all debits were placed in their proper column. We have lived on promises ever since the administration took office, and the the end is not yet, for we are going to meet with complete inflation and repudiation before the whole mess is over. The President knows that, and so does the Secretary of the Treasury, and it serves no purpose to kid the American people, for they are entitled to be informed of the truth.

If anyone should question this statement, let me now quote another little article from the Washington Post, April 23, 1940:

RESERVE BOARD MEMBER WARNS OF INFLATION—DRAPER SAYS AGENCY WOULD BE POWERLESS IN SUCH AN EVENT

Ernest G. Draper, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, warned yesterday against a potential injurious inflation and said the Reserve System was powerless to cope with such a contingency.

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau suggested, meanwhile, that the problems mentioned by Draper might well be studied by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is preparing for an investigation of the whole monetary and credit situation.

Morgenthau said the problem of idle bank funds and its potential effects were being constantly studied by the Treasury.

Draper spoke before the Economy Club of Detroit.

"With excess reserves or idle funds of Federal Reserve member banks at around the $6,000,000,000 mark," he declared, "our volume of bank credit could be raised by an additional $35,000,000,000 or $40,000,000,000."

He pointed out that there was no immediate prospect of an inflation of this kind. "In fact," he said, "with more than 8,000,000 unemployed, how is it possible to generate a continuous, general, and injurious price rise without such a rise being nipped in the bud by competitive forces?"

"But we all realize," he added, "that conditions have a way of changing rapidly in days like these."

"The Reserve System's monetary powers," he declared, "are inadequate to deal with an unhealthy boom."

This article is the final admission by the Secretary of the Treasury that neither of them knows when inflation may take place.

Can anyone ask for a clearer statement than that? "The Reserve System's monetary powers are inadequate to deal with an unhealthy boom." What does that mean? It means that we will always remain as we now are, without any possibility of progress, increase in wages, or even increase in employment, because when that happens, and prices go up, our currency will collapse.

The fact is that our currency system is today in a much more serious condition than it has ever been in the history of the United States. This might appear like an open statement, but I challenge anyone on the Federal Reserve Board, in the Treasury Department, or the Federal Reserve banks to controvert this statement. Surely, if I am wrong, someone in these organizations will have the courage to come out and contradict me.

This truth must come out sooner or later, and it is my purpose as a Representative in this Congress to let the people know that it is going to happen, so they may be prepared to protect themselves in this catastrophe.

It should be clear, and the same group to which I have already referred may contradict this if they can, that we are operating on a purely inflated dollar since the Gold Reserve Act was passed in 1934—a dollar with no background except its purchasing power, which can only be controlled by holding price levels at a certain level. Is it possible that anyone in these three institutions will contend for one moment that these prices can be controlled indefinitely by the Treasury Department or any other Department of the Government? If anyone believes that, I will ask him to publish the manner in which it is to be done.

The fact is that price levels are maintained by importing and keeping surpluses on hand so that there will be no possibility of price raise, or increase in wages. We are doomed to go on forever on a W. P. A. schedule of $50 per month. It means simply that we are consigned to definite price fixing regulated by departments and bureaus in Washington. Should anything happen to create scarcity, the price will go up and the dollar will collapse like a toy balloon, and we will be in exactly the same condition that the German people were in when the mark collapsed after removal of gold.

Various Government officials appear to worry over the possibility that we might have a credit inflation or a currency inflation because of the accumulation of money in the banks. The statement is made that no one appears to be interested in using this money. Let us look at this from a practical standpoint: Why should I or anyone go to a bank to borrow money to engage in business, and leave in the bank valuable security for such loan, when we do not know the minute this "phony" money is to collapse? Surely I would be foolish to leave real estate or other permanent property as security for a loan of money that has no value and no character, a currency that may collapse the next day and leave me without property and flat broke. This is the reason why people do not want to use the money, and in this I believe business is right.

There is another angle also. Why should the people of this Nation engage in business and subject themselves to continual prosecution, persecution, fooling, and meddling by the most incompetent government that ever sat at the helm of the ship of state? There are thousands of reasons why business should not jeopardize any valuable property in order to expand or engage in business, and the best reason of all is the government itself, that is highly conspicuous for its incompetence.

The present war agitation is for no other purpose than an attempt and hope to cover up the blunders of the past 8 years; and should the people foolishly allow the administration to engage in such suicide, it can only end in a most horrible and bloody internal strife. It requires no prophet or son of a prophet to visualize what may happen. The handwriting is on the wall.

I earnestly hope that our people—and I mean the common people of this Nation—will take an interest in the coming election and elect men to office who are capable and who will adhere to the fundamental principles expressed in our own Constitution. We need a man at the helm of this Government, not a puppet. We need a man who has sufficient courage to take the bull by the horns and put this Government where it rightfully belongs, namely, securely upon the Constitution of the United States.

An International Angle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, since my first address in the House, January 20, 1939, I have inserted in the RECORD remarks on different national and international problems. In these remarks I have referred to the League of Nation's Bank of International Settlements and the International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Co. These two organizations, under the direction of the League of Nations, comprise a plan which has for its background a world government dominated by international rulers. It is interesting to know that the bank and the League of Nations are American contributions to an international government which is to supersede our Republic. However, it is most interesting for all of us to know that the draft of the League of Nations had its beginning in Paris. This draft finally reached President Wilson and became his contribution toward a world government. In other words, it was an international shell game. The Bank of International Settlements was the brain child of the international bankers, but was proposed by the United States as the Young plan.

I shall now quote from the eleventh plenary meeting, September 10, 1929:

> The guiding principles I have just quoted make it clear that this bank was devised by the authors of the Young plan to be a central financial institution of great importance in world economy, an institution which directly and indirectly will be in a position to influence the economic and financial life of individual States, even those not directly concerned in the settlement of debts and reparations.

Mr. Raestad of Norway said, in speaking of the bank:

> On the whole, even supposing that it had the power to do so, the League of Nations would certainly not wish to establish at present too close relations with the bank for fear of being obliged to approve activities which might later on become a source of embarrassment for the League. On the other hand, if we confine ourselves to complete inactivity, we run the risk of delaying our action until it has become too late to act. * * * He also viewed with alarm the idea that all the changes in the statutes of the bank would be left entirely to the discretion of the directors, however great the confidence placed in their prudence and wisdom.

It is quite evident that many of the delegates suspected the motives of those who proposed the Bank for International Settlements, as well as each other, and it was this shyness that troubled the French delegate, M. Loucheur, as he preferred to have some definite proposal. He voiced his suspicion in the following words:

> A connecting link with the bank! No control! These were the suggestions. Personally he distrusted connections with banks. One did not know what might happen; there were periods of prosperity for banks, but, as with all things human, there were also periods of difficulty. Such a connection might at a given moment compromise the political body which had desired to establish it.

This to a certain extent reveals how the international money changers suspect each other, so why should not we, the people, who have been shorn and fleeced, suspect them? It is clearly evident in studying this plan that the international financiers, while desiring a league of nations, did not want to jeopardize their control of gold by placing the bank in a subservient position to the league. This same thought is carried out in the International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Co., for its transactions are clearly based upon the gold standard, and so expressed in article 5, which I now quote:

> In order to permit the International Co. to establish a special reserve as provided in article 21 of the statutes, the contracting governments undertake to make, as provided below, advances to the company, which it shall repay as provided in its statutes and which shall amount to 25,000,000 gold Swiss francs, equivalent to 7,258,064.516 grams of fine gold.

This clearly shows that gold, instead of being obsolete, is as it has always been, the standard international medium of value, and we should not be fooled by newspaper propaganda making statements to the contrary. I shall now quote from the convention, charter, and statutes of the International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Co., as approved by the Council of the League of Nations, and signed on May 21, 1931. I may also say that these documents are somewhat similar to the inter-American bank, which I recently discussed in the RECORD.

> ART. 2. The registered office of the International Co. shall be situated at Geneva. Its duration is not limited.
>
> ART. 7. The capital of the International Co. is expressed in gold Swiss francs, the gold franc being equivalent to 0.290,322,580,640 grams of fine gold.

This is also interesting for it shows that nothing but gold is to be used as capital for this company. I shall now quote article 28, in order to show that the bank will be entirely under private control:

> No person shall be appointed or hold office as president or vice president or as a director who is a member of a government, or a member of a legislative body, unless he holds such position for life.

It should be obvious that no government official has a position for life, except he be a king or emperor. I shall now quote from an English publication, Action, an article by H. T. Mills:

MONEY AND FEDERAL UNION

(By H. T. Mills)

Early in 1933, the minority report of the League of Nations' gold delegation predicted that "millions of people in this economically interlocked world must inevitably die of starvation, and it is indeed doubtful whether our present civilization can survive."

This nonsense was the work of so-called experts who appeared, or pretended, to be unconscious of the fact that the world's troubles were caused by inability to distribute plenty, rather than by shortage. International money power, which dominated the world after the Great War of 1914–18, determined more than ever to make money short, so that promoters of all activities on the planet would be obliged to borrow at rates of interest dictated by the creators of the money monopoly. The natural sequence of such a policy was that goods and services everywhere had to be cut to meet the available supplies of money, instead of the opposite being the case, as one might expect in a sane society. Money became the master of man, instead of his servant.

DESTROYING GOODS

One of the most common excuses put forward in defense of this procedure was that it kept up prices. But this involved sabotaging production and even destroying goods—200,000 cows burnt up in Holland; 100,000 bags of coffee per day destroyed in Brazil, each bag containing 132 pounds; Chile "rids herself" of 3,000,000 gallons of "surplus" wine; United States of America wheat crop reduced by a hundred million bushels, although millions lacked food in that country; vineyards uprooted in France; milk in Britain poured down drains, surplus made into buttons and umbrella handles; British farmers fined for growing too many potatoes; and complaints to the effect that there was too much corn, too much beef, too much mutton, too much bacon, too much butter, in spite of a report by Sir John Orr in 1936 stating that about 20,000,000 people were underfed in Britain. A more natural remedy would have been to create more money, had the money monopoly not forbidden it. Possibly the artificial shortage thus engendered so confused the minds of the League's experts that they wrote the nonsense referred to above.

B. I. S. AT BASEL

For the League of Nations, as everyone knows, was the child of international finance, being Jewish in outlook and operation. The actual League itself, like our House of Commons, might be compared to the lungs of the money power, but the real heart, or power house, was the Bank of International Settlements at Basel.

A short examination of some of the principia clauses in the B. I. S.'s original charter makes its objects quite plain. It was prohibited from working in currencies not based on gold or gold exchange, and so countries such as Germany, Italy, Japan, and Spain, because of their monetary experiments in basing their money upon production and refusing to receive international loans, became rebels to the system and left the League, although retaining representation in the B. I. S.

An intensive economic and financial struggle developed between these two monetary systems—the system of reality, which enabled states relatively poor in resources to accomplish marvels of rearmament and all sorts of improvements denied to much richer empires; and that of so-called democratic governments, who allow their boundless resources to be kept down to the level of a "managed" system of money, partly based on gold. Those states which had seceded from the League rearmed to defend their new money system; they spent on armaments what otherwise would have been spent on consumable goods, whereas the democracies, when they started rearming, purposely increased their supply of money in order to do

so. Had they not rearmed, it is almost certain that this increase would not have been effected in order to raise the ordinary standard of living.

USURY DEFIED

From 1935, when, during the Abyssinian war tension, the rearmament of this country was decided upon, to the end of 1935, when the program was in full swing, the note issue increased from £450,000,000 to £525,000,000. It is now £580,000,000. This bitter economic struggle made war inevitable; the usurious system centered in the Bank of International Settlements was being defied by countries who refused to borrow and get into debt, and consequently it became more and more difficult for England, who has to foot a food bill of more than £400,000,000 annually, to pay her way because her exports tended to diminish and interest tribute from abroad to decline. In the Far East the struggle led to friction with Japan over the silver bullion lying in the French and British concessions at Tientsin, which was made the security for loans to Chiang Kai-shek.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the aim of the international money lender, if he comes out on top at the peace, is to keep control of money. The plan for doing this is called "Federal Union," and is being boosted under various disguises from pulpit and platform throughout the democracies, although it is anything but democratic, being a grinding financial tyranny. It is the old League of Nations planning for shortage all over again in a much more violent form, since it would extend international monopoly to all activities of life.

Mr. W. B. Curry, a well-known advocate of this policy, states in his book, The Case for Federal Union:

"Lastly, the world community must ensure the means of development of world public opinion. I do not, of course, mean by this that everyone in the world should think alike. * * * What could be realized, and is not merely desirable but essential, is that everyone should have full and free access to the same sources of information. It must be possible for Germans and Englishmen * * * to argue about the same problems in terms of the same data * * *."

To render this effective the nations must be, so to speak, emasculated in an attempt to reduce their natural resistance. They are then to be effectively held in leash by a (presumably) well-armed international police force.

REAL CAUSE OF WAR

The books and pamphlets making out a case for federal union falsely claim that war is produced by national sovereignty. Money, the real cause of war, is only vaguely alluded to. The result of such an unnatural society would be, no doubt, the reduction of all peoples and standards to a mixed, humdrum, and low-caste mediocrity. Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, in his book Practical Idealism, states: "The man of the future will be a cross-breed * * * of Eurasian negroid race," over which the Jews will form a "new aristocracy of spiritual grace." Such ideas as these, joined up with the efforts of organizations like New Commonwealth Union, with its international police force, and international finance in the background, merge into the policy of federal union, which is fast becoming the real war aim of the Allies.

War is caused by the dishonest manipulation of material things, like commerce and money, not by the inherent sense of nationality latent in every healthy people, which is a spiritual quality and cannot be abolished. A good money system based on national production and issued debt free would soon permit an exchange of goods and services along normal international channels, but without a supreme international authority to control it. The British Empire would then stand firm as a unit, prosperous, free, and self-supporting. But if we persist in fighting for the establishment of federal union and all that goes with it, we shall surely antagonize the most powerful nations, so far neutral, with the possible exception of the United States. The writing on the wall is plain for all to see.

This article is from an English viewpoint and is opposed to a world union, and this is also my viewpoint, for I am equally opposed to a world government no matter whether it be called world union or anything else.

I shall now discuss another pamphlet which, I believe, is printed in the United States, as the address given is Box 251, San Bernardino, Calif. This pamphlet contains discussion of several subjects, but I am particularly interested in two—namely, that on gold and the one that refers to the United States of Europe. The reason that I am interested in the discussion of gold is due to the fact that the author is apparently a German and should therefore appreciate how it feels to be deprived of gold and gold-secured currency. He no doubt remembers the withdrawal of the gold from Germany and the following collapse of German currency. He also appears to be familiar with the condition that confronts us today, and that, when expressed from a foreign viewpoint, is also interesting to me.

Another article that I shall quote discusses a United States of Europe based upon the same principles as the Constitution of the United States. I am particularly interested in that, for should this book fall into the hands of some person who is not informed about the Federal Union, as discussed by H. T. Mills, he may be confused when he is confronted with the United States of Europe. The two, however, are entirely different and as a matter of fact, this is the first time my attention has been attracted to a United States of Europe.

The book to which I refer is entitled, "Interpretation of the German-English Conflict. Speech delivered by Price B. zur Lippe, M. A., before various American societies, clubs, and organizations, and an accompanying article by John H. Rand, Lusitania-Churchill-Athenia."

Gold, the powerful weapon in the hands of a few masters with which they could whip the common man in every nation on earth into submission, is no longer a value in itself. In fact, it never really has been that, but certain people managed to persuade us to see in it the all-powerful golden calf—or Mammon, god of the materialists. Poor old England is nothing else today but the lamb on the sacrificial altar of materialistic capitalism. The British Empire has for the last 150 years never been regarded by the masters of the earth as but the means to an end. Whatever nation should still be willing to enter this war on the side of Great Britain may, therefore, rest assured that she will not be sacrificing the best of her manhood for the welfare of the British Commonwealth or even for the rights of man or for liberty of mankind, but solely for the moralless masters of the age of capitalistic imperialism (cunningly referred to by them as the age of British democracy).

Not a single nation can be found in Europe to again get "the chestnuts out of the fire" for Great Britain, which has been doomed by her international masters and her servile statesmen, whom we Germans rightfully call "the gravediggers of the British Empire." France, we know, is too deep in the clutches of the financial overlords of Fleet Street, London. She cannot escape this firm hold except by following the one and only advice which we Germans try to make plausible to France, and this simply runs: "Do not fight." Whereas England intends to fight "to the last Frenchman."

The last World War was not won by the Allies. The United States of America won it for them. It cost the lives of 80,000 Americans and the heroic sacrifice of blood and health by another 200,000 of America's best manhood to uphold and preserve the already tottering system of capitalistic world imperialism. In comparison with Europe's 4,000,000 dead and approximately 8,000,000 wounded and crippled, the sacrifices of this great nation were really rather small. In a new world war they will go beyond all comprehension.

Most Americans know or at least they suspect that the propaganda in this country, conducted by the statesmen of Great Britain and paid for by the international money lenders, hoping to drag the best of America's manhood again upon European or maybe this time on Asiatic soil is simply terrific. In order to learn what British propaganda amounted to in the last war, I wish to recommend to you a book written by an American professor, Propaganda for War, by H. L. Peterson, Oklahoma University Press.

It might serve well to review very briefly what material gains or losses the United States of America got out of World War No. 1.

(1) England and France got practically all the German colonies, America none.

(2) The Allies received enormous shipments of arms, coal, and other raw materials and finished products. They got the entire German Navy, all of our merchant marine (with the exception of four little ships), and all of Germany's foreign trade. America received two or three German ships—otherwise nothing.

Now, what did America get for winning the last war for Great Britain and the internationally minded money sharks?

(a) A war debt of $27,000,000,000. In 1917 the total American national debt amounted to just $1,000,000,000; today it is $47,000,000,000 and is increasing year by year.

(b) America was handed the panic of 1921 that closed 6,000 banks and bankrupted 35,000,000 people in agricultural communities. And you know that after 18 years the farmers are still bankrupt.

(c) America was given an army of 12,000,000 unemployed, who, with their wives and children, mean 45,000,000 Americans depending upon Federal and State relief; this means about one-third of the entire population.

(d) These losses are, of course, all material losses and can, in the course of time, be regained. But America also suffered one tremendous loss of spiritual nature. Ever since the last World War this country has been swamped by alien "isms" and ideologies. The confidence and belief of many Americans in the one ideology which is theirs by heritage has been badly shaken. American democracy is tottering; in world war No. 2 it will vanish. In its place the people of this country will find dictatorship and communistic chaos. Senor Trotsky is biding his time. He didn't move so close to the American boundary for nothing.

Material losses can be regained in comparatively little time; spiritual losses only in years and years of terrific sacrifices; losses in life—never.

In order to complete this, which to me is a most interesting piece of information, I shall quote part 4 of this address, for it mentions the United States of Europe, based upon the same principles as our own Republic.

Again, Germany and Great Britain are at war. This time they oppose each other practically alone. British statesmen are foaming

at their mouths because national Germany succeeded in concluding a nonaggression pact with national Russia. Britishers call this "The most unholy alliance on earth." Had they themselves succeeded in calling Russia their ally, they would call it, I assure you, "The most holy alliance." Such is the game of propaganda.

Nevertheless, 100,000,000 Germans and their Government are determined to rescue war-torn Europe, once and for all, from the clutches of the financial overlords of Great Britain and the world. Such concepts as "world domination" and "world conquest" belong to the past. International capitalistic manipulations will no longer prevent the unification of Europe. We Germans and our Government are resolved: There shall be peace.

Ever since an American President brought the ideal of a League of Nations to our shores, and ever since Allied statesmen have misused this instrument for peace, changing it into a mere instrument of power politics, have we Germans been waiting for a chance to continue where the American idealist was forced to leave off. But we know that no one man, not even a single nation, will ever be able to accomplish this gigantic task—only through cooperation can this "palace of mankind" be built. All that we Germans, under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, wish to contribute is one of the cornerstones, namely the United States of Europe. The other three are: The United States of Americas, of Asia, and of Africa. How many years it will require we do not know. This much is clear, however: The basis of such a United States of Europe can never be political but purely economic. We must expect to have some sort of a federal government, which will consist of representatives of all European nations and which will regulate the material needs of Europe. Yet, at the same time, each nation must be enabled to live her own spiritual life. The Constitution of the United States of America provides just these needs—a Federal Government and protection for the "inalienable rights of States." It might well serve as a model for the future "United States of Europe."

The author mentioned the fact that President Wilson brought the idea of a league of nations to Europe. With this I take issue, for the League of Nations was a French idea, which came to the United States through the medium of our foreign representatives. The League of Nations was suspected by some of the European powers and even by us, for we did not join other European nations in establishing such world government. The League of Nations has been promoted by various philanthropic organizations and particularly through the influence of a source that should not be intermingled with the Government. I shall quote:

(a) Urge the Nation to make such concessions of national sovereignty as are necessary for the establishing of the kind of world commonwealth of nations which would facilitate peaceful change in the interest of justice and which would be able to exercise genuine police power on behalf of the welfare of the total world community.

(b) Urge the Government, when appropriate occasion arises, to tender its good offices in initiating international conference, at the same time indicating its willingness to make economic concessions of immediate national interest where they are necessary in order to establish justice for other peoples.

This quotation comes from an organization that has its headquarters at 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City. Read this carefully and you will find that this organization advises that the United States must concede national sovereignty to establish a world commonwealth of nations, that in turn should exercise a world policing power in the interest of peace and justice. This organization furthermore advises that we must disregard nationalities and make economic concessions to establish justice for other people. I can only say that we have conceded everything we can for peace, for we are now the world's most gullible Santa Claus.

The proponents of a federal union or world government advocate that we abandon our present Government in order to become a member of this big union.

Let us now return to the article under the authorship of Prince Lippe. At the end of his paragraph he suggests a United States of Europe based upon the Constitution of the United States; but I am very much afraid that he may not be familiar with the fact that we are not, since the seventeenth amendment was adopted, operating within the Constitution of the United States, but are, instead, a government in which there is no balance and little control. I have often called attention to this before, but I believe it bears repetition.

The Constitution of the United States provides that our Republic shall be composed of a number of States, whose government is represented by two Senators in the Senate of the United States. This is the United States of America. In our Republic the people are represented directly by representatives in the House and indirectly by State representatives in the Senate. The States are represented directly by their own representatives in the Senate and indirectly by representatives in the House. This is our dual form of government and comprises both elements that are necessary for balance, namely, the aristocratic side in the Senate and the democratic side in the House. This is the best government that has ever been provided for any people at any time. We destroyed this when we adopted the seventeenth amendment, and should for our own security repeal the seventeenth amendment, so that it may be restored as it was given to us by the founders of this Republic.

The proponents of the World Union, or whatever it may be called, require that the United States abandon its sovereign government in order to become a member of this international dream world, which is to be policed by a combined force of all member nations, under the dictates of an international ruler. Those who have heard speakers for this government should "take five" before they become enthusiastic about the plan, for are there any patriotic and loyal Americans who are willing to abandon the rights and liberties that we have had for 152 years and subject themselves and our Nation to being ruled by an international king?

I know what we would do. We would kick this king overboard the first week, because the American people will never tolerate such government as that. What then? This king will order his international fleet to attack the United States, and we, having been deprived of our fleet and our Army, will become vassals to this international monstrosity. Do we want that?

The Dies Committee Versus the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

OPINIONS BY JUDGES OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein two court opinions, one by Hon. George A. Welsh, of Philadelphia, judge, United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania; the other by Hon. F. Dickinson Letts, judge, United States District Court, District of Columbia, both relative to the illegal activities of the Dies committee.

ORDER OF HON. GEORGE A. WELSH, JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA—TAKEN FROM THE OFFICIAL NOTES OF TESTIMONY

Well, it would appear that the only way that the aggrieved persons have of raising this question fairly and squarely, a question that I say is as fundamental as could be possibly raised in a Federal court, and without attempting to pass upon the merits or demerits or the guilt or innocence of anyone involved, but because the court believes that a probable cause has been shown for the issuance of a warrant, the court directs that a warrant issue.

Now, I don't know just what to say. Maybe I ought not to say anything. But I can't sit here, 61 years of age, gentlemen, with all my experience in public, without being somewhat moved, and I do hope that our people or all of us will try and remember that these rights of ours, so fundamental, given to us as the result of the battle of humanity through the centuries, must be preserved. Only toleration, only forbearance on the part of all our people can enable us to maintain those rights unimpaired. I know how sincere, truly sincere, many people are today in feeling that our institutions are in danger. I know that there are lovely men and women who wouldn't want to do an injustice to another living soul who feel all that we have struggled for through the ages stands in peril by reason of certain borings from within. There are people, whether correctly informed or not, who believe that agencies and influences from overseas are trying not to advocate a new philosophy of human government only, but they are trying to destroy the pillars and the foundations of the freest government that God has given to people.

Now, sometimes in our zeal to guard that which we love most and cherish most, we may become somewhat intemperate, and our vision may be blurred, and our judgment beclouded. Tolerance,

tolerance on all sides, is necessary today. We know the hatreds that are sweeping over the land, class prejudice, racial hatreds; we see many things done that we deplore. We see the press imperiled, we see editors jailed for expressing the God-given privileges of the free press, and today we have seen evidences given of something that no matter how we view the situation, I think in our calmer moments we must deplore.

I was hopeful that we could have found some other means of testing this great question out, and I regret that some other method could not have been adopted by very wonderful Government agencies in getting at facts. And as I said a few minutes ago, I hope we will not sacrifice freedom and liberty on the altar of patriotism, no matter how wonderful that may be.

I am directing the issuance of this warrant because I feel that not to do so would be to put the seal of approval on what has been done, and in granting it I am not putting the seal of disapproval on what has been done. I am not sitting in judgment on this particular case, but I do want the facts to be brought out before other men in the proper, legal way, to decide what is just and what is right. And again I say, America needs to be on guard.

OPINION BY HON. F. DICKINSON LETTS, JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

These relators are held under authority of a warrant issued by United States Commissioner Turnage authorizing their apprehension. They are charged with a violation of section 192, title 2, of the United States Code. Specifically it is said that they have violated the statute by refusing, when before a special committee of the House of Representatives, called the Committee on Un-American Activities, to answer certain questions propounded to them, questions said to be pertinent to the subject then under consideration.

I find that section 192 of title 2 defines as an offense the failure of a witness who has been summoned before a House committee, such as the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, to answer questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry. That statute not only defines the offense and denounces it but prescribes the penalty therefor.

That was not all that Congress did with respect to this statutory offense. By section 194 of title 2 the Congress prescribed the procedure by which one said to be guilty of the offense denounced in section 192 should be brought to trial.

In the first place, I think we must recognize the fact that Congress by these enactments was dealing with political questions and had in mind the necessity of protecting citizens who might be summoned as witnesses from unfair treatment by reason of the fact that differences in political opinion might prevail and that, by reason of such differences, unjust action might be taken.

I am of the opinion that Congress, seeking to prevent such unjust treatment of one summoned to testify upon a public question, determined that there should be a prescribed course by which the charge should be preferred, and through which the one accused could be brought before a proper court for trial. Congress did prescribe that when a committee such as this was confronted with an obdurate witness, a willful witness, perhaps, the committee should report the fact to the House, if it be a House committee, or to the Senate, if it be a Senate committee, and that the Speaker of the House, or the President of the Senate should then certify the facts to the district attorney.

It seems quite apparent that Congress intended to leave no measure of discretion to either the Speaker of the House or the President of the Senate, under such circumstances, but made the certification of facts to the district attorney a mandatory proceeding, and it left no discretion with the district attorney as to what he should do about it. He is required, under the language of the statute, to submit the facts to the grand jury.

I take it that Congress, by this careful manner of prescribing the course to be followed in a case of this kind, intended to protect its citizens in their political rights and intended to set up as a safeguard against unfair treatment or unfair attack a method mandatory in its nature which required the action of the grand jury before one so accused could be placed on trial.

In this case the warrant had for its basis the affidavit of one Robert E. Stripling, who is described as the secretary of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It seems obvious that Congress intended no such action to be taken by an individual. Stripling was not a member of the committee, he was an employee of the committee. It seems plain to me that he has no power to institute proceedings of this kind. I am likewise of definite opinion that a member of the committee would have no such right. Certainly a bystander could not institute proceedings of this kind. Congress intended to place the responsibility upon the committee itself, and it has prescribed what proceedings may be had when the committee has reported to the Congress, the House or the Senate, as the case may be, the fact of a witness' refusal to answer.

The only way a member of the committee of the House of Representatives can report such refusal to the House is by formal action of the committee itself. Here no such action was taken. Certainly Congress did not intend that any matters of this kind, that are political in their nature, should be left to the discretion of persons not charged with the responsibility involved. A bystander might, because of his own political beliefs and because he disagreed with the witness, rush off to the office of the Commissioner and swear out a warrant for the arrest.

The offense rests in the refusal of the witnesses to answer questions which are pertinent to this subject under consideration. The use of the word pertinent indicates that anyone in preferring a charge of this kind must, acting within discretion which a witness refused to answer was pertinent to the subject under consideration. That could not be left to a bystander or to the secretary of the committee or to a member of the committee. That is a function that must be performed by the committee in the authorized way, as is prescribed by the Manual of Rules of the House, in this case.

I think that Congress certainly intended to set up a safeguard for its citizens against the abuse of due process and intended to accord a degree of protection for political rights.

Upon consideration of the whole matter, I have concluded that these relators are not held by due process, that they are unlawfully restrained of their liberty, and that they should be released from custody.

The Legion's Widows and Orphans Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, several Members of the House have asked me recently how I thought the average World War veteran felt about the provisions of H. R. 9000 or, as it is more commonly called, the Legion's widows and orphans bill. In addition to the experiences I cited on the floor of the House on Thursday, April 18, I have tried to talk to as many veterans as I could contact in the limited time I have had available.

At this point I am inserting quotations from letters I have received from World War veterans, and one from a Spanish War veteran:

Congratulations upon your firm stand against the Rankin bill. Let every cent necessary be spent for the care and pensions to those that saw service on the other side during the World War.

Naturally, those men, and their families, who were actually injured or killed in service or later disabled as a direct result of their service should be generously taken care of.

In behalf of every patriotic taxpayer of this country may I offer you my warmest congratulations upon the fine, courageous stand which you took yesterday.

It is gratifying to note the position which you have taken in connection with the above bill (H. R. 9000). * * * As an ex-service man I am wholeheartedly in favor of certain benefits for those veterans who were actually wounded or disabled while in the service of their country, and certain pensions for the widows and dependents of such veterans, but am positively opposed to giving any further benefits to any ex-service man or his dependents who was not actually wounded or disabled in the service of his country.

I am thoroughly opposed to this bill (H. R. 9000) notwithstanding the fact that I am a Legion member in good standing and have served in the Twenty-sixth Division for 1½ years. * * * I am sure that every veteran who gives a serious thought to this subject will commend you on your action.

As a veteran of the Spanish-American War I feel that this country should take the best possible care of all veterans of any war in which they were engaged, who were in fact disabled in service in line of duty, and like care should be taken of the dependents of those who lost their lives because of wounds, injuries, or disease sustained in line of duty, but I cannot for a moment believe that we should provide for others, and I strongly urge that you do your very best to stop any proposed future pension legislation which will provide anything other than to take care of veterans who were disabled or their dependents.

Today's mail brought me a letter from a member of the American Legion residing in my own district, and in whose judgment I have a good deal of confidence. I quote from his letter:

Here goes for what little reaction on H. R. 9000 I have picked up. I inspected ——— Post of the American Legion last Friday night, and, under "good of the Legion," Comrade ———, who is and has been, I understand, an active Legionnaire, asked if I could explain the widows' and orphans' bill, for which the Legion was getting a lot of unfavorable publicity. I tried to present both sides fairly, and at the conclusion he announced his opposition to it; the rest of

the membership seemed to know little or nothing about it, and unless I am greatly mistaken, cared less. Comrade ———'s opposition was based on two points—that if the deceased veteran did not suffer disability, the proposed beneficiaries are not entitled to such privileged treatment, and that the country's finances could not stand it anyway. After the meeting I drew another very active member of the post aside and asked him his opinion of this proposed legislation, and his reply was, "Don't know much about it, but after what I heard, I consider the bill inadvisable."

The same Legionnaire further writes me that after attending a district meeting representing all posts of the American Legion in the county, he was coming more and more to the conclusion that there were comparatively few members of the Legion who really knew what legislation the organization was pushing, even though their posts were bombarded with circulars urging them to have members write "to your Congressman about this."

I am further convinced that most Legion members and veterans generally are unaware of the full import of this bill by the fact that I have received letters from Legion posts asking my support of H. R. 9000, "to provide for veterans' pensions."

In closing I might mention that the letters from which I have quoted herein are open to the inspection of any Member who might desire to see them.

Let Us Build Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has thought over the problem of unemployment seriously and who is not over-selfish, has come to the conclusion that a widespread home-building and garden-making program is the first step, and the best step, which can be taken to constructively and most economically cure the depression for the Nation, and also at the same time best help the 10,000,000 unemployed and their dependents.

Not only that but it is also agreed that satisfactory family life—home life—is a first essential if we wish to preserve and perpetuate freedom and our excellent constitutional form of government. But how can we have satisfactory family life when one-third of our people cannot even pay rent because they have no job, much less have or enjoy the benefits and privileges of a permanent home?

I say agreement seems general on the above propositions, still we sit here with folded hands, dejected countenances, and fearful hearts after 10 years of meddling, fiddling, and wasted motion and wonder what to do and how to do it, although the answer is clear and evident.

I suppose some of you will immediately conjure up visions of the United States Housing Administration and of the F. H. A., or Federal Housing Administration, and with satisfaction or disapprobation, as the case may be, depending on your viewpoint, will feel that we have done something along the line I have above suggested, or will feel that these Federal so-called housing projects have disproved the theory of home building as an answer to unemployment.

I will not take the time to debate either of those viewpoints at this time, except to say there are some grounds for both opinions; but I do wish to insert a letter from Federal Housing Administrator Stewart McDonald, and then to add thereafter a few observations applicable in the case of Minnesota and undoubtedly equally so in other States:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 29, 1940.

The Honorable JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: The semiannual summary of F. H. A. operations reveals that 53,699 families in Minnesota have received loans of $47,410,808.47 for home-financing purposes. These loans were made by private lending institutions and had been insured by Federal Housing Administration as of the close of business December 31, 1939.

Of this amount 45,937 families obtained $17,637,154.47 in order to improve, repair, and remodel their properties under the property improvement provisions of title I of the National Housing Act.

In addition, F. H. A. insured loans totaled $29,773,654 in Minnesota for the purpose of financing home ownership for 7,762 families.

At the present time approximately 12,000,000 people in the United States are receiving the benefits of the F. H. A. program.

The F. H. A. insured mortgage has been a most instrumental factor in developing new home construction, the year 1939 breaking all records in volume of loans insured. The 1940 volume thus far exceeds even last year and I feel confident in forecasting that 1940 will show the greatest small-home-building program since 1927.

If you desire, I shall be very glad to send you a further summary of F. H. A. operations in Minnesota, broken down by counties through the close of the year 1939.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART MCDONALD,
Administrator.

Several things are evident if we do a little analyzing of the above letter. In general we can say that the F. H. A. is functioning and apparently there was or is a need for the type of service being offered. However, I think it can be said that the interest rate and charges made, although cut some as compared to similar extractions from the borrowing would-be home owner a few years ago, are still much too high to be conducive to a real activity, or productive of widespread accomplishment along the lines promised by sponsors of these laws.

When we consider that there are some 650,000 family units in Minnesota and compare that with the 53,699 families serviced as per this letter, we can see it is a relatively small proportion of the total, especially if most people need mortgage money, as I assume is the case.

We also find the average grant per family out of the $47,410,808.47 is only $882.90, so we get a much smaller average figure if we divide the $17,637,154.47 item by the 45,937 families aided. We also find the average mortgage allotment to the 7,762 families given help to own a home to be $3,835.82, which took up nearly $30,000,000 of the total of $47,000,000.

Several evident conclusions are easily seen: First, 7,762 families out of 650,000 is a very small quantity to help to home ownership; secondly, if the average is $3,835.82 per loan, it would indicate that the homes were an average $5,000 property, which is manifestly not the type to be built or occupied by an unemployed family, which means that little, if any, aid to rehabilitate the economically dispossessed in a permanent and direct way can be expected from the present type of operation of the F. H. A. And likewise I think it can be said that the loans to improve, repair, and remodel were not made to unemployed or for the purpose of encouraging home ownership, as their prospective ability to pay would doubtless eliminate them on the ground of their being poor credit risks. So about all we can get from the F. H. A. as an unemployment aid is from the temporary work provided.

On that basis I have supported the F. H. A. program, and I think we must continue to support it until a real program for solving the unemployment problem is formulated along the line I am suggesting.

But it is apparent from the analysis above that we cannot expect much from the present governmental housing activities in the way of a real and permanent unemployment solution on a sound and constructive basis not only for the unemployed but also for the people who still have jobs and/or pay the taxes.

Let me ask you, Is not that what we all want? Then why do we not get down to business and stop wasting time, money, lives, and democracy with half measures, makeshift programs, and false cures?

I am informed that in Minneapolis alone we have a need for 25,000 family unit homes, and that in Minnesota we need 50,000 new homes at once. Why do we not start something? But doubtless not all of these 50,000 homes needed are to replace those now occupied by unemployed people. So actually the potential home-building need in Minnesota is probably nearer 100,000 units, which means that the matter must

be approached from a two-way angle, which indicates we could have a considerable boom in business if we would give this matter some constructive thought and planning.

We hear a lot about idle money and idle men. What better place could we put our idle money? Is there any better security than a modern home? And where could we put our unemployed to work and to live to better advantage than on such a project? We have subsidized everything and everybody in this country, and we have been fairly successful doing it and have made a lot of little businessmen and businesses bigger by doing it. Why not now subsidize the unemployed a little bit by giving them help to provide themselves with a modern home and a garden? If we did, we would immediately solve the biggest share of that problem, and we would at least have something to show for our investment. What have we got now after 10 years of spending and lending to show for our aid to the unemployed? Very little—as we now have as big a problem, or bigger, as many unemployed, or more, and consequently, in terms of real accomplishment or a solution, about all we have to show is a bunch of debts and some receipts for wasted effort. True, we have fed and clothed and sheltered them after a fashion, but in an un-American style. Do we want to continue that mistake?

In pioneer days we subsidized our surplus population by giving them a 160-acre homestead. Why not do some modern pioneering by subsidizing our less fortunate brothers with a modern home and a garden?

How the American Taxpayer Is Helping To Support Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MOUNT VERNON (OHIO) NEWS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News for April 27, 1940:

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News of April 27, 1940]

PAYING WAR TAXES

If the Roosevelt administration were to come out flatly and demand that Congress levy taxes against American citizens for the purpose of raising revenue to help the Allies fight Germany, there would be a veritable uprising.

But, in effect, this very procedure is being followed in the United States today, under a New Deal measure.

Here's how it works:

The United States Treasury, under authority of the law enacted at the request of President Roosevelt, is paying $35 an ounce for gold, in contrast to the world price of around $21.

One of the main gold-producing countries of the world is British South Africa. In common with the rest of the gold-producing centers, South Africa is shipping its gold to the United States to take advantage of our beneficence.

But the South African producers don't reap the profit from our artificial price on gold. They must consign their gold to the Bank of England, which, in turn, ships it to the United States, and the Federal Treasury sends its check to the Bank of England.

The Bank of England pays the African producers in sterling, but when the Bank of England receives its payment from the American Treasury, it gets good American dollars. And the Bank of England pockets a tidy profit of some 25 percent.

This profit goes into the British Treasury, and the money is used to help finance Britain's part of the war against Germany.

As the United States Government pays for this imported gold out of the Federal Treasury, the money for these purchases actually comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

President Roosevelt requested the law which authorizes the payment of $35 an ounce for gold. It is this law which compels the American taxpayer to foot part of the bill not only for the European war, but for the war of conquest Japan is waging against China, and the war of aggression Russia forced upon Finland.

This can be considered in no other way than a tax against the American people to help support wars which do not concern them.

In view of these facts, plus the dangers of our vast accumulation of gold, which economists have frequently pointed out, Mr. Roosevelt's refusal to retreat from his gold policy is indefensible.

National Employment Week, May 1 to 8, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

LETTER FROM DAN CAMPBELL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, National Employment Week, May 1 to 8, 1940, is being conducted by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and other veteran organizations in cooperation with the Federal Employment Service and its veterans placement service and with all State employment services.

An employment week serves, first, dramatically to focus public attention upon unemployed older workers, particularly unemployed veterans; and, second, to increase the placement of unemployed older workers, particularly veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States through its employment and civil service preference committee chairman, Mr. Dan Campbell, Washington, D. C., pledges full cooperation in the conduct of the National Employment Week in a letter addressed to President Roosevelt dated April 27, 1940. The letter follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Veterans of Foreign Wars is again pleased to pledge, as we did a year ago, our full support and cooperation as to the suggestions in your splendid recent proclamation designating the first week in May 1940 as "National Employment Week," for the purpose of arousing more active interest in the employment of qualified older workers, including veterans.

Our organization has long been aware of the increasing unemployment, proportionately, among persons over forty. For more than 5 years, the solution of the distressing problem of increasing unemployment among aging veterans—still well qualified to render satisfactory service—has been one of the major policies of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Each annual National Employment campaign conducted during the last 2 years, by the several veteran organizations and others, in cooperation with Federal and State employment services, resulted in greatly increased active registrations and placements of employable veterans and other older workers. Based on past experience we are hopeful that National Employment Week this year will result in many more thousands of veterans, and other workers, being placed in gainful employment.

New technological processes cause more displacement of workers over forty than among younger workers. Although all male employables above the age of forty constitute about 45 percent of all available male employables, those actually employed represent only about one-third of all employed males. Among other repercussions caused by this condition, the most striking is the introduction, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, of more than 1,100 bills to provide some form of pensions for older unemployed workers. The only alternative for pensioning unemployed workers is to provide them with the opportunity for self-supporting employment.

Two years ago last January, after we brought this problem to their attention, the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers urged its members not to set up "any arbitrary age limits in the hiring or employment of workers below any which might be fixed for permanent retirement," and that their qualifications to perform the task, rather than any maximum age, should be used as the basis for their employment.

May we therefore again venture to suggest, Mr. President, that the adoption of such a policy by all employers—and consequently the employment of a much greater number of qualified older workers—would be greatly encouraged by the issuance of an Executive order providing for the examination, appointment, and promotion of all employees for all Federal agencies on the basis of their ability to perform the duties involved, without regard to any age less than that set for permanent retirement.

Your continued active interest in constructive steps to bring about the greater employment of employable older persons, including veterans, should have far-reaching helpful results.

Respectfully yours,

DAN CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Employ. and C. S. Pref. Committee.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

The Patent Office and the Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES KRAMER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CHARLES KRAMER, of California, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Saturday, April 6, 1940, at the Patent Office Society Dinner, celebrating the sesquicentennial anniversary of the signing of the first Patent Act by George Washington, in 1790:

Mr. Toastmaster, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of the Patent Office, at this time, when Congress, manufacturers, scientists, inventors, and others, are collaborating to commemorate in a suitable manner the sesquicentennial anniversary of the signing of the first Patent Act by George Washington in 1790, it is appropriate that the Patent Office Society, composed as it is of the personnel of the Patent Office, should join in the celebration. We who are familiar with the scope and importance of the work of the Patent Office are cognizant of the benefits that flow to mankind in many ways—better living conditions, creation of jobs, and other blessings. Our awareness, however, is not shared by all the people; in fact, the Patent Office is an institution that is more or less obscure in various parts of the United States, and despite participation in the enjoyment of the fruits of inventive genius, many men and women are not acquainted with the source of stimulation and encouragement which rewards those who by their research and discoveries are responsible for the development of our country.

There are others, who, familiar though they may be with the Patent Office and the patent system, are of the opinion that inventions in labor-saving machinery and devices should be suppressed by taxation of the inventions or by legislation constraining the Patent Office from issuing patents on these inventions, the theory of this group being that such inventions tend to destroy jobs in the industry displaced by the new invention. There is, in my opinion, scarcely any need to answer such an argument, as it has been refuted many times. While there is always need for readjustment when a radical basic patent is commercialized, we have only to look about us to see many examples of exploitation in industries that support millions of our citizens where formerly thousands were employed, and in every instance the general public is an even greater beneficiary.

The further advancement of our country is dependent on the continuation of the exploitation of patents. Inventions, to be exploited, must be stimulated by patent laws granting adequate protection and reward. It follows that our patent laws must keep step with the progress with which their initial institution has blessed us. They must not be allowed to become antiquated by lack of pertinent amendments. Just as Congress, in 1930, granted an entirely new protection by the act to provide for plant patents, so we must be alert to avoid any stalemate of progress that might result by an obsolete statute. Undoubtedly the necessity for amendments from time to time will be recognized; our current traffic regulations illustrate the development of laws to meet a necessity which was nonexistent 50 years ago. To summarize, our patent legislation, as well as our technological achievements, must be current with the march of time.

It is my thought that if in the future we can look back on this celebration and number among its attainments a consciousness of the American patent system impressed indelibly on the general public, then indeed will all the ceremonies have been eminently successful.

The Patent Office, as a bureau in the maze of departments and agencies, is to many just another function of our Federal Government—singling it out and as the best of its kind in the world—no amount of praise and honor, such as is now being accorded it, fully credits this great institution.

Many thousands of words are being written and spoken during this commemoration, developing all phases of the history of the Patent Office—from its humble beginning with one clerk down to the present time, with a personnel of some thirteen or fourteen hundred examiners and clerks. You men and women of the Patent Office here tonight, who as cogs in the great Patent Office machine are responsible by your prompt, capable, and intelligent criticisms of the works of our inventors, for the well-known efficiency of your Bureau are worthy of public commendation. It is therefore my pleasure to salute you this evening, and I include all your illustrious predecessors whose achievements undoubtedly are patterned in the resultant quality and quantity of patents as they issue today.

May you have every happiness in your work, and may you, through your efforts, continue to aid the prolific and fertile brains of American inventors, so as ever to keep us abreast and apace of the whole world in providing the best betterments of life.

America at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR H. JAMES, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Arthur H. James, Governor of Pennsylvania, before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association in the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Ind., Friday evening, April 26, 1940:

Fellow Republicans and fellow Americans, as in any free nation, the American newspapers are the sentinels of American liberties.

No audience could be better than a group of newspaper publishers for my purpose tonight, which is to discuss with you the present crisis in our national life—to discuss it from the point of view of the Republican Governor of the largest Republican State.

Two years ago I went before the men and women of Pennsylvania with the message that our State stood at a crossroads. On Pennsylvania soil that spring and summer was fought the first critical battle between the New Deal and the American way of living.

The Republican Party, campaigning on a platform of Americanism, battled against the exponents of extravagance and experiments. Pitted against us were the ablest shock troops of the New Deal—the crooners and the hate singers. We fought mud and we fought money.

And when the votes were counted it was found that the men and women of the Keystone State had chosen between issues that transcended party lines. The Republican cause at that election not only revived the faith and zeal of those who had always been Republicans. It attracted to it thousands of men and women who considered themselves independent of party ties. It attracted also thousands who were Democrats but not new dealers.

We won that fight—and I say "we" advisedly, because it was a Republican Party victory, and by no means merely a personal one for Arthur James. We won that fight by a majority of nearly 300,000, a change in majorities of approximately a million votes from the New Deal sweep of 2 years before.

Tonight my message to you is that America herself stands at the same crossroads Pennsylvania faced 2 years ago.

May I point out to you some of the signposts which I see at that crossroads? One says "Dictatorship." Another says "Financial chaos." Another says "Continued unemployment."

One of these signs will strike terror to the heart of every mother in this Nation, for it foreshadows the day when a man in uniform will knock at her door. He will say: "We've come for your son. We need him for cannon fodder." That signpost spells "war."

For each of these highways there is an alternative. There is not only a highway to "war," but also one to "peace." Really, there are two sets of roads. One is the broad and tempting road laid out by the New Deal in the name of expediency, which skirts the chasm of war and loses itself eventually in the slough of despond. The other is the straight and narrow trail charted by the compass of American tradition, the path by which the Republican Party seeks to lead this Nation again to the high ground of traditional American life.

I cannot express myself too emphatically. The New Deal is a dead-end street. It contains self-limiting factors. The fight between the New Deal and the Constitution has gone too far to be compromised. The New Deal has started a debt program that is going up like a skyrocket, and ultimately must collapse just as fast. The New Deal has established a policy of consistently spending more than it earns, and there isn't anyone who really believes that can go on forever.

Billion after billion of American money, your money and mine, has gone out the window. It is gone but not forgotten. What we have to show for it, in the main, are these three things: a hole in the ground full of gold that nobody wants; a handful of costly experiments which already have greatly interfered with our economic life; and a $45,000,000,000 mortgage on our future earnings and present liberties.

The bulk of the money wasted in this country was spent either on a program of planned scarcity, or in the name of pump priming. Scarcity we now have—scarcity of jobs, scarcity of happiness,

scarcity of opportunities; scarcity of everything that offers hope of the new dealers ever bringing us to their promised more abundant life.

The pump priming hasn't worked, and now the new dealers are telling us that our frontiers are gone—telling us in effect that the pump is broken, and that what we need is a new pump modeled on the European lines of limitless power centralized in one pair of hands. They do not remind you that from such pumps in foreign nations tonight are flowing streams of blood.

I say to you that America needs no such new pump. The old one worked for us for a century and a half, and made us the greatest Nation in the world. What we need is to stop trying to prime that pump with the earnings of the years to come, and to prime it instead with the warm fluid of faith and hope and confidence.

What, except confidence, does America lack? She has men and women, the finest in the world, whose hands are aching for useful work to do. She has untouched frontiers of enterprise and opportunity, of resource and capacity. She has in her banks, driven there because the New Deal has consistently discouraged private enterprise, the accumulated savings of the thrifty middle class of America—money enough, once revived confidence summons it to work, to solve the financial and social problems of this Nation almost overnight.

Idle men and idle dollars! Are they not the roots of our long depression? The New Deal has experimented with every conceivable program except one of finding jobs for idle men and jobs for idle dollars. Everyone except the braintrusters has come to realize that the only hope for America is to try to get those men and dollars back to work.

They can be reemployed. Not under the New Deal—for the New Deal has destroyed the key to confidence, and without confidence the task cannot be accomplished.

Jobs can be found for idle men and for idle money only by a new administration at Washington. They can be found only when new voices of hope and faith and courage take the place of the 7-year dirge of hate and mistrust and suspicion and greed which has been the theme song of the New Deal.

Only one political party in the United States has at once the opportunity and the responsibility of raising that voice of confidence, and that is the Republican Party.

If we as Republicans can strike the spark which will light America's path through the present wilderness, we can do this Nation the most important service in her history. The alternative is simple; the New Deal took the election of 1936 as being a mandate; it would take a similar vote in 1940 as being nothing more nor less than a bill of sale. "Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide in the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side."

The election next fall is one moment when America must decide—and it is one moment which will never again return. The choice will be final and irrevocable. After it is made, we will have either America of the glorious past, or a new America of most doubtful future.

After 7 years of meddling, of chasing rainbows, of rabbit-in-the-hat administration, the New Deal is coming face to face with the fact that the only solution it can think of for the twin problems of idle men and idle money is war.

Is the New Deal toying with the idea of war? Let me reverse that question: Is the New Deal making a firm stand for peace? Have we fixed upon a policy of giving the rest of the world a first-class example of tending to our own business and tending to it properly?

The unequivocal answer is "No." Internationally we are meddling and muddling. We are playing the same international game which in 1917, under a Democratic President who had been elected on a platform of peace, brought us into the first World War. Our international program is a mixture of quarantines and good neighbor promises; of most-favored nations being set off against nations which are in the New Deal dog house; of neutrality and taking sides; of trade agreements and inflammatory utterances. Once again we are burning our fingers at the fires of Europe.

Who are our representatives at the frontiers of war, our ambassadors who should be bending every effort to but one purpose, that of keeping America at peace? Are they men of probity and experience, men filled with the sentiments and convictions of the America of tradition, or men toying with the same isms and experiments which put Europe where she is today?

America's interests abroad are not being safeguarded by typical Americans at all, but by millionaire playboys, by men whose deeds and words have unfailingly stamped them as being more at home in the parlors of Europe than at the firesides of America. They got their office after they had done favors, financial or otherwise, to the New Deal.

Call the roll. George Earle, whose inherited sugar money helped sweeten Pennsylvania for the Little New Deal 5 years ago, and whose administration as Governor of Pennsylvania offered scant evidence of his capacity, his judgment, or his calmness under pressure. Jimmy Cromwell, Doris Duke's husband, whose reckless tongue almost talked him out of his job in Canada before he even had a chance to get his feet on his desk. Willie Bullitt. Tony Biddle. Able enough defenders of radical and un-American doctrines, exponents of all isms except patriotism, but bold and brash firebrands where fire extinguishers are needed.

America's foreign policy! The New Dealers boast that there has been little criticism of it. How can anyone either criticize it or praise it when no one knows what it is? Roosevelt has no more made clear his foreign policy than he has made clear whether he proposes to run for a third term.

Who, in theory, is the chief of our custodians of peace? Next to the President, himself, it is the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. But it has been amply demonstrated that Hull knows more about mountain music than he does about mounting guard in the watch-tower of American neutrality. If Cordell Hull was really running our foreign relations, Jimmy Cromwell either would have kept his mouth shut in Canada, or come home quicker than he went, once he demonstrated how undiplomatic a diplomat he actually is. Hull is not chairman of our national board of peace directors. At best, he is just a member.

Again I ask, What is our foreign policy? We've waited since September to learn. We have seen a display of steeplechase diplomacy, have heard promises of peace, and seen provocations that could lead to war. We have been told that America would stay out, and we have seen preparations to go in. Even these preparations are disquieting, for they have consisted not in getting our defenses ready for a possible invader, but in completing plans for using any such emergency as the excuse for a centralization of power which no previous administration ever found necessary for winning its wars.

We in America do not know the foreign policy of the new dealers. We have been kept in the dark. We do not know whether secret agreements have been entered into with other nations nor, if such agreements exist, the extent to which they may pledge our lives and our resources.

We do know, however, that if the New Deal is no more successful in keeping us out of the war than it has been in getting us out of the depression, we might all as well begin getting fitted for our uniforms.

Two years ago the Republican Party swept to victory in Pennsylvania on a program of jobs and peace. Since then it found jobs enough to cut the State's burden of unemployment one-third, to reduce the relief rolls half a million persons. It has restored peace to the tangle of contention which marked its governmental, industrial, and labor relations. Reemployment and harmony have walked hand in hand.

What better watchwords could there be for our national Republican program than jobs and peace?

Let us on the one hand take the sprags from the wheels of industry and the shackles of fear from our money, and on the other undertake a program of peace and harmony abroad and at home.

Cornered by its long record of blunders and fruitless experiments, facing the wrath of the American people for its plottings for power, the New Deal has resorted to one of its favorite defenses—name calling. It is merely trying to cover up its own greed and ambition.

If the New Deal was interested solely in the forgotten man, why was the court-packing bill necessary? Why did the New Deal demand the reorganization bill? Why did President Roosevelt try his famous and unsuccessful purge of Senators whose only sin was to express views contrary to the Executive mind?

If it was merely a question of preventing rule by overlords of business, why did the New Deal try to set up rule by overlords of labor?

If the New Deal isn't opposed to the United States Constitution, why hasn't it run the country under that Constitution for the last 7 years? Why have we had more new and untried ideas of government fresh from "Red" Russia and Nazi Germany in those years, than the tried and true American ideas which worked so well for a century and a half?

It is because the Republican Party believes in the Constitution, and is demanding that its principles be observed by the public servants who are sworn to observe them, that the new dealers day after day are calling us reactionary.

Is the Republican Party the party of reaction? Concerning the States of my fellow stepchildren in the national family, those administered by Republican Governors, I am in no position to speak. But of Pennsylvania I can speak with authority. The Republican Party has been the party in control in Pennsylvania for 15 months.

I challenge anyone, new dealer or otherwise, to point to one good law which was on the statute books when we came into office which we have repealed or undermined. What is it that we did? We banned sit-down strikes, we altered the workmen's compensation laws so that they would work; we changed the role of the State government from being the tool of labor bosses to being the impartial friend of both labor and capital. We ripped politics out of relief and relief out of politics, and built up a system fair to the needy and to the employees and to the taxpayers. Even Roosevelt himself has referred to our relief administration as a model.

So far as labor is concerned, not for years has there been more harmony between State, labor, and capital than during the past 15 months. We have had fewer strikes and no riots. You may quote to me the dire predictions of the New Deal labor spokesmen who said we were putting labor in chains, and I reply to you that these same spokesmen have made no concerted effort to restore so much as one of the changes we made. Union men are demonstrating daily in Pennsylvania that their rank and file wants fairness more than favors and that they most desire to have in the State government an impartial friend to help arbitrate their differences.

Again I ask, Is the Republican Party reactionary? And again I answer:

If it is reactionary to believe in the Constitution, to believe that the American doctrines which worked so well for a hundred and fifty years are worth trying again in this present crisis, then we are reactionary.

If it is reactionary to believe in common sense and common honesty in government, then we are reactionary.

If it is reactionary to believe that a nation which grew to wealth and greatness on the foundations of its industries cannot afford to stifle those industries with overregulation and overtaxation, then we are reactionary.

If it is reactionary to believe that the arm of the States and of the Nation can be kept around the unfortunate without sealing their liberties and killing their personal initiative, then we are reactionary.

If it is reactionary to believe that peace, even at the price of isolation, is better than the war which is sure to follow the New Deal's international meddling, the Republican Party is reactionary.

If it is reactionary to think that it is wrong for a national administration to govern by edict and name calling, by cultivating hates and capitalizing misery, by playing class against class and race against race—if opposing these things is reactionary, then we are reactionary.

If it is reactionary to value liberty more than expediency, then the Republican Party is the most reactionary party in America today—reactionary, and proud of it.

I have looked into the faces of far too many American men and women to believe that they are not alive to the dangers in our national situation—too well aware of the true issues in the approaching campaign to be confused by such clumsy political strategy as the New Deal defending itself by calling its critics names.

If what the Republican Party believes in is reactionary, then so is patriotism and love and religion and all the other human springs from which flow those elements that sustain human life and courage in a troubled world.

As our party prepares for the critical campaign we are about to undertake, one serious task awaits us at the outset. We must select our leader and our spokesman.

Tonight I have been discussing principles rather than men, and that is because I believe that the question of who the candidate will be is of far less importance than what he will stand for. Nevertheless, for our cause, however splendid that cause may be, we must have a champion.

Our own Pennsylvania delegation is going to the Philadelphia Convention uninstructed. We shall go there to help pick the best man we can find, the man best qualified for the heavy tasks before and after the November election.

What will be the yardstick we will use? What will be the shoes which our candidate must fill?

First, he must be a man of courage and conviction, a man of fidelity and diligence, experienced both in the affairs of government and in the competent expression of his principles and intention. He must be a Republican—must believe in the Republican principles and know why he believes in them; must hold so firmly to them that he is unwilling to compromise those principles in the name of expediency of personal advancement. This is no year for halfway men or halfway measures.

Since he is to be our spokesman, and since he will be campaigning against the fireside chats of the sweetest crooner of them all, he must be a man who can say what he means and mean what he says.

Further, since this bids fair to be the political battle of the century, we will need a champion in whose courage and faith we can all take shelter—one who has never let his standard trail in the dust, one who proposes to nail his flag to the mast and keep it there.

That is the sort of champion Pennsylvania is looking for, and the kind which is needed for the success and future welfare both of the Republican Party and the Nation itself. The Republican Party, since it began, has specialized in finding men to meet emergencies.

This year the Republican Party stands where that little band of courageous soldiers stood who wore the tattered livery of the Continental Army during the dark days of Valley Forge, when American independence faced its first crossroads.

The Republican Party is the last safeguard between the men and women of America and European chaos.

We have not only the opportunity for leadership but likewise the responsibility for demonstrating our ability to pick the kind of leadership 130,000,000 people want. I know that the Republican Party will meet its responsibility as fearlessly and as ably as that other band of patriots met their responsibilities at Valley Forge.

Tremendous Response to My Appeal for a Peace Plank in National Political Platforms

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 last, speaking in the Well of this House, I proposed a peace plank for insertion in the national political platforms this year, and I am now reporting the reaction to my suggestion.

The plank I propose is as follows:

Resolved, That we favor a Nation-wide referendum before declaration of war, except in case of invasion of the United States or some other country of the Western Hemisphere or internal rebellion.

The reaction has been tremendous. I cannot adequately describe the fervor and enthusiasm for the proposal that runs through a vast volume of correspondence that has come to my office since the proposition was first stated. The deluge of telegrams, postal cards, and letters endorsing the proposal and demanding such a plank in the national platforms would more than fill an entire issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PEOPLE SHOULD BE THE JURY

In this flood of correspondence, coming from all parts of the Union, there is evidenced a determination of the people that they themselves should be the jury to decide if and when our boys shall again be sent into the slaughter pens of foreign wars.

Throughout the mass of correspondence there is reflected this outstanding viewpoint, namely, that when it comes again to a question of throwing the lives of our young men and the treasure won from the sweat and toil of our people into the maelstrom of a foreign war, it should be the principal and not the agent who should make the decision, and in this case the principal is the 130,000,000 people who comprise the American Nation.

There is noticeable also a general belief that next year will bring us squarely up against the issue as to whether we are going to send our boys into foreign trenches and that if we are to protect America from war and save our democratic institutions, which will be hopelessly sunk in oblivion if another war comes, we had better be moving in the direction of committing both the Democratic and Republican national platforms to a definite peace policy. Our citizens are not blind in regard to what is going on. They have just read an official statement that the Allies are increasing their American purchases of war materials "enormously"; that our Government has released designs of the Army's latest tanks, guns, and other weapons for sale abroad, and they know that so much of this sort of thing has been going on since the embargo was repealed that we are being drawn up to the very edge of war.

Love of country is a dominant strain throughout the entire correspondence. Over and over again, in countless repetitious forms, the writers reveal their deathless devotion to America, stating that they would gladly make the supreme sacrifice to defend our homeland, but that they are opposed to sending a single soldier overseas to die in the settlement of the quarrels of other nations. As my appeal was especially directed to the youth of the land—the Nation's potential cannon fodder—many of the replies are from young men at the threshold of life. Bravely do these boys offer their lives for home and country while they eloquently plead to be spared the horrors of foreign slaughter pens.

In the space I may properly occupy it is impossible even to scratch the surface of this great volume of approving correspondence, but I will present a few excerpts to show the trend of thought.

VIEWS OF AN ARCHBISHOP

A great archbishop of the Catholic Church writes:

I am 100 percent with you and endorse your youth movement for democracy. It is Americanism of the true kind, and, if adopted, will be our best guarantee for staying out of all European wars.

Robert Morton, president of the American Radio Institute, of Detroit, Mich., writes:

Following your address over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night, this writer received a total of 93 telegrams from members of our listening committee, living in 14 States, emphatically approving your position, and urging us to hasten to assure you that this organization stands with you to the last man, as true Americans who believe, without equivocation or mental reservation, in the principles of freedom as enunciated in the Bill of Rights; who believe that we all should be willing to give everything we possess, even to our lives, to preserve our Constitution and our country, but not a dime for foreign aggression. We believe that, in the event of invasion, every mother's son capable of bearing arms should be enlisted under the colors, to die for our country if need be, even without his consent. But we believe that the people—men and women—have an inalienable right to decide whether our Na-

tion shall go to war overseas. Any other way would constitute a form of totalitarian government in contradistinction to the fundamental principles of democracy, which we are sworn to uphold at all costs.

This morning's mail brought scores more reports of listeners, every one of these eloquent in praise of your patriotic stand, and the writer is certain that thousands more listeners will similarly approve your attitude in writing before the week is passed.

Why not a plank in each of the political party platforms to be adopted this summer upon which candidates for the Presidency will stand for election as our Nation's Chief Executive? Why not?

This organization is proud to number among its members, from coast to coast, a vast number of men who are veterans of wars under the American flag; it is proud that every officer and even every member of every one of our numerous committees, from coast to coast, has taken a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution, and to defend it against all its enemies whomsoever. We are certain there is not one among the many in the organization who is not in favor of what was designated as the Ludlow amendment. As a cold matter of fact, sir, we are persuaded that there are not 10,000 men or women in the country who are not in favor of that proposition, particularly as expressed in your present proposed bill, which would require political parties to go on record as to whether they would permit the men who would die—and their mothers and wives—to decide whether we should fight a foreign foe.

Dictatorships can survive only by war. Democracies can survive only if there be peace. * * * If there is to be a perpetuation of our free institutions, the United States must be kept out of war, except in the case of invasion of our shores, or the shores of our neighbors in this hemisphere.

God bless you, sir. The support of this organization can be depended upon in the fight you are making—to the utmost. We are Americans.

Yours for the Bill of Rights,

AMERICAN RADIO INSTITUTE,
By ROBERT MORTON, *Chairman.*

PASTOR OF COMMUNITY CHURCH SPEAKS

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, pastor of the great Community Church, New York City, wrote:

APRIL 1, 1940.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have read your speech of February 28 last with the greatest satisfaction and the warmest approval. I have long been a supporter of the so-called Ludlow amendment, and welcome this opportunity of expressing to you my gratitude for your brave and devoted leadership in this great work for peace.

I say for "peace," for we won't be having so many of these wars in the future if we can once get the war power in the hands of the people. I know this is no perfect guaranty against war, as there are times and circumstances in which the people themselves are swept away by the war mania. But I know of no better guaranty and no surer way to peace, especially in these days when the common people know that wars are not only horrible but "phoney," and that they are the ones who always pay the price in blood and treasure.

If there is anything more ghastly than the use of the people as counters on Mars' gambling table I don't know what it is. Your picture of governments betting "a million boys" against one another is as true as it is ghastly. And don't let it be forgotten that the American Government makes its bets in those terms, too. It has done so and will do so again when the occasion arises.

If there is anything elementary in this war business it is that the common people, the fathers and mothers of our boys, should be consulted before the Nation goes to war. Once fix it so that every father and mother going into the voting booth knows that he is voting life or death for his own son and the war business is going to become immensely difficult all of a sudden.

I beg you to continue your superb campaign for your referendum amendment. Now is the time when the people will rally to your support and carry this cause through to victory.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Other expressions:

DEATH IS SO PERMANENT

Edward Petermichl, 2725 North Talman Avenue, Chicago:

As I am in the cannon-fodder class, I certainly would like to have a voice in the matter of having my person shipped off somewhere and shot. Getting killed is so permament. For the United States I will give everything, for Europe not a burnt match. I wish you every success with your peace plank.

SENATORS GIVE VIEWS

United States Senator VIC DONAHEY:

I certainly would support such a declaration in our party platform, but I doubt if we could ever get it in. I have always followed you and your talk along this line.

United States Senator GERALD P. NYE:

I share with you most heartily that need you see for including within the political platforms this year declarations favoring a popular referendum on the issue of going into foreign wars. Extremely challenging is this subject today, and I should be most happy to be one of those privileged to further this effort to entertain the subject in platforms of the national parties this summer.

United States Senator HOMER T. BONE:

Not only do I favor this principle, but I would like to see my own party go definitely on record in favor of it in its next national platform, and this without weaseling or reservations that might rob the declaration of the significance that I believe the mass of people attach to the principle. The argument that a measure of this character would interfere with national defense is utterly frivolous. I sincerely hope that the Democratic Party will be courageous enough again to declare that those who must yield up their bodies in war should have something to say about the matter. If we were even half as considerate of our prospective cannon fodder as we are of property and profits in wartime, there would not be a moment's hesitancy in giving to the country such a declaration in our party platform.

United States Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN:

Thank you for your letter of recent date in which you asked for an expression of my views concerning declarations being injected in national political platforms this year whereby the people would be given the right to vote on proposals to send our boys overseas to fight in foreign wars. I am very much in favor of such a proposal.

United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD:

Our participation in foreign conflicts is unthinkable; our desire for peace is universal. Having this in mind, I shall prevail upon our platform committee to recommend the adoption of the strongest possible plank to effectuate our insulation from war.

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

I am in favor of the adoption of a plank in the national platform of the Republican Party proposing as an amendment to the Constitution the text of Senate Joint Resolution 140, which I introduced in the Senate on May 29, 1939. In closing, may I say that I believe we share a common desire to keep the United States out of any European conflict.

A GALLANT SOLDIER SPEAKS

United States Representative ED. V. IZAC, a medal-of-honor man:

I want to compliment you on your speech of February 28 regarding a suggested plank for all political platforms for this year.

We are all, of course, endeavoring to find a way to guarantee the people of our country, and I agree with you that we should not consider the sending of our boys across the water to fight in either Europe's or Asia's wars.

I have consistently supported the amendment suggested by you, but I believe it is really not understood by the great majority of those who oppose it. If we could make it clear to everyone that this does not in any way nullify the authority of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to use existing Military Establishments in the best interests of the people of the United States; but rather does it make it necessary that before we can raise and equip an Army and send that Army out of the Western Hemisphere to fight on foreign soil we must have the approval of the men and women of the United States. This, to me, seems a most democratic step, and certainly should be resorted to before we permit any one man or any small group of men to compel the youth of our country to make the supreme sacrifice.

United States Representative FRANCIS H. CASE:

Certainly I am with you in your efforts to do something to protect our youth from the age-old handicap of a war, as you know.

United States Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE:

Your suggestion that both major political parties include forthright declarations in their 1940 platforms favoring the principle of a national referendum on proposals to send our soldiers overseas to fight in foreign wars is a splendid one, and I am for it 100 percent. Such a plank should have the support of all Americans, regardless of party, who are honestly opposed to a repetition of the tragedy of 1917.

United States Representative COMPTON I. WHITE:

I am heartily in support of your plan and will cooperate.

United States Representative HAROLD KNUTSON:

I strongly feel that the platforms adopted by both national conventions should contain a plank favoring a popular referendum on the question of America's entrance into any war. It is the people who pay the bills and must do the fighting.

United States Representative USHER L. BURDICK:

I approve of this with emphasis.

United States Representative STEPHEN BOLLES:

I am certainly in favor of platform declaration permitting the people to vote on war proposals. I like the idea of this nonpartisan youth movement for the purpose of aiding in such declarations.

United States Representative JERRY VOORHIS:

As you know, I have always supported your amendment to the Constitution and would support it today or any other day that I

had an opportunity to do so. I want to congratulate you on the fight you have been carrying on throughout the years on all of these matters.

United States Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH:

Be assured of my cooperation in this matter, and I trust you will not fail to call upon me if I can assist in any way.

MASTER OF THE GRANGE

Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange:

I can assure you that the National Grange will cooperate in every movement that has the threefold purpose of keeping America out of the war in Europe, of providing adequate national defense, and curing our economic problems at home.

Ex-United States Representative Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas:

I want to commend you for the splendid fight you are making to allow mothers and fathers, who in war suffer worse than death at home, and their sons, who are sacrificed on battlefields of horrors, to have a voice in deciding whether the United States shall send the flower of young American manhood across oceans to fight other nation's foreign wars. You are a fearless fighter for what you believe to be right. Every father and mother in the United States should get in behind you.

LEADER OF TEACHERS

Dr. Jerome Davis, president of American Federation of Teachers:

There never was a time when America was more seriously threatened than it is today. Taxation without representation was tyranny. For Americans to fight and die in Europe without being given a chance to vote on whether they want war or peace is also tyranny. Let us make our country truly democratic in peace and in war.

Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired:

Your suggestion is, I am sure, an excellent one, which the people at large will approve. I should think that both the great political parties would have such a plank in their platforms.

MISS DOROTHY DETZER

Miss Dorothy Detzer, national executive secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom:

May I congratulate you on your splendid address before the House in February, proposing a peace plank for the major political platforms this year? As you know, the Women's International League has consistently and wholeheartedly supported your proposal for a war referendum, and we are glad to endorse a move to make it a political issue in this crucial 1940 campaign. I agree with you that our citizens have intelligence and wisdom enough to vote on whether or not American boys should ever again be sent to fight in a foreign war.

VIEWS OF A MARINE

Corp. Leo B. Shinn, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va.:

Being the ones who would have to bear the direct brunt of war, I think we should by some means have a voice in the matter of whom and for whom we should fight. The fairest means by which we could have that say, in my opinion, is your amendment providing direct referendum to the people of the United States (who are our mothers, fathers, relatives, and friends) before declaring war. Fighting to defend our beloved country against invasion or to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine is, of course, another matter, and I am sure we would all be proud of the opportunity to serve our country for such a reason.

Ex-United States Representative Herbert S. Bigelow, Cincinnati:

I have read your referendum on war address. It is a clarion call. I am for your plan 1,000 percent.

Catharine Sedgwick, director of the Foreign Affairs Forum, New York City:

I can agree with everything you say and I think that you expressed the sentiment of the people very eloquently. The two great national parties would only be expressing the sentiment of the people by adopting the plank you suggest in their party platforms.

CHIEF OF THE PAWNEES

Chief Natachee of the Pawnee Indians:

Your long talk was good and all good people should stand for your words and bill. May the Great Spirit help you to pass your bill to be a law soon.

I wish I might quote from the hundreds and hundreds of other letters I have received from soldiers who fought for their country and who would still willingly die to defend it from attack; from fathers and mothers who have sons sleeping in Flanders Field and from prematurely aged women who have sweethearts lying under the popples; letters many of which are filled with tears and heartthrobs. Space will not permit me to do that, but if anyone wants proof that the people of America are demanding and insisting upon action by the Democratic and Republican National Conventions pledging that the people of our country shall have a right to vote on future proposals to participate in overseas wars I invite him to an inspection of my files.

Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

LETTER FROM THE ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to Mr. E. A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, written by Mr. Earl C. Smith, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association and vice president of the A. F. B. F.

Mr. Smith is one of the country's leading authorities on agriculture and a student of all legislation affecting the farmer. His views on farm credit, as set forth in this letter, should be of extreme interest to the Members of Congress.

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, March 28, 1940.

MR. E. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. O'NEAL: I have had a number of my associate officers review H. R. 8748 in addition to the study I have been able to make of this proposed legislation and in accordance with the understanding reached by the board of directors when last in session, I am taking this means of informing you of the results of our study and position we believe the American Farm Bureau Federation should take on this proposed legislation. The American Farm Bureau Federation is committed by resolution to the building and maintenance of a fair, effective, sound, permanent, and independent farm credit system. The federation is also committed by mandate of its delegates to use its every influence to maintain and to strengthen the cooperative features of the present farm credit law. A careful analysis of H. R. 8748 compels the conclusion that this measure does not serve or further these objectives. As you are well-informed, the federation has during recent years consistently worked to secure and maintain interest rates on land-bank mortgages at 3½ percent, even though recognizing that such an accomplishment would require some assistance from the Federal Treasury until such time as farm prices could be brought to a level consistent with and to justify higher interest returns.

The federation has been subjected to rather severe criticism because of this continued effort during a period of low farm prices and has been charged with seeking to secure and maintain interest rates on a basis that was not consistent with sound credit practices. I believe that every effort of the federation should be put forth to continue 3½-percent interest rates on land-bank loans until much more substantial progress is made in improving farm prices, even though to do so would require annually rather substantial assistance from the Federal Treasury; but I cannot by any stretch of the imagination see justification for the federation supporting H. R. 8748, nor do I know of any sound basis of defense for such support should it be given.

The proposed legislation would ultimately remove or destroy such limited elements of independence as the present farm-credit law provides, and its cooperative features would be completely nullified, and if for no other reason, could not qualify as the basis for a sound or permanent system of credit.

Without attempting any detailed analysis of the bill, I mention only the following:

1. It will result in Government ownership of large acreages of farm lands. This is contrary to our well-accepted policy of encouraging and preserving independent private ownership. That the drafters of this bill recognized this is evidenced by the care with which they have provided that debtors conveying to the governmental agency may remain on the land with the hope of being able to repurchase. It has always been the policy to discourage, and within limits to require the liquidation of, large landholdings by insurance companies and similar institutions. It would seem to be just as unsound to permit large holdings by a Government agency and certainly more unsound to encourage it. It is noted that while the mortgagor-tenant may repurchase, no provision is

made requiring the sale of the land in case the tenant does not attempt to repurchase.

2. The requirement that the borrower subscribe for stock is eliminated, thereby removing the borrower's interest in the maintenance of a sound institution. Control is largely placed in the hands of debtors who do not have substantial financial interest in the success of the lending agency. All experience with successful cooperatives demonstrates that substantial financial investment and interest is the best assurance for continued membership interest and support.

3. The powers vested in the proposed local committees in connection with refinancing are such as to be fraught with favoritism and susceptible to personal and partisan influences. Farmers will not, and, in my opinion, should not, be expected to support a system where there is no assurance of equitable treatment to all borrowers.

4. Over a term of years the proposed system will undoubtedly be much more expensive and result in much greater cost to the Treasury than heretofore. Bonds would be fully guaranteed, both as to principal and interest, by the United States Government. With such a system of credit largely controlled by borrowers who have no direct financial interest in its success, with local committees determining the basis for refinancing, with sales back to the mortgagor-tenant at the productive value or the amount of the mortgage, whichever is less, and with the administration of the system wide open to political influences, it would be impossible to even start to estimate the financial drain upon the Treasury of the United States. It is certain, however, that over a period of years the cost would very greatly exceed the amount appropriated during recent years to provide land-bank borrowers with an interest rate of 3½ percent.

5. Over all, it is reasonable to expect that the large amounts required from the Federal Treasury to carry out the Government's guarantee obligations would furnish another instance of large appropriations charged to agriculture, even though none of the amount required was directed toward improvement of farm prices. No interest rate can be low enough to provide debtor-farmers with an opportunity to retain their property with farm prices at present levels. Individual farm ownership, sanctity of purchase contracts, restoration of reasonable contentment, and agriculture's normal contribution to general welfare cannot result from low interest rates, loose purchase contracts, or Government supervision of tenants on farms conveyed to the Government. These essential virtues can only be restored and maintained through the restoration of farm prices to a basis of fair exchange value to the products of industry and labor, and every emphasis and influence of the federation should be continued in this direction.

In the meantime, every reasonable effort of the federation should be put forth for the passage of S. 3480 and H. R. 8825, which will return the present Farm Credit Administration to an independent basis, and, in addition, present interest rates of 3½ percent should be continued, at least until such time as success is attained in restoring farm prices to a reasonably fair basis.

In expressing this view and opinion, I have not overlooked the fact that H. R. 8748 will appeal to many farmers who are hard-pressed and unable to meet their obligations. It is only natural that such farmers will grasp any straw which appears to afford temporary relief. On the other hand, the bill will not appeal to the great rank and file of farmers who are interested in the establishment and maintenance of a sound farm-credit system.

Taking together all of the above-mentioned facts and consideration of much other detail involved, I am forced to the conclusion that the American Farm Bureau Federation must record its opposition to H. R. 3748, while at the same time give its aggressive support to S. 3480 and H. R. 8825, and, in addition, use every influence it has with the present Congress to continue for at least another 2 years the 3½ percent interest rates by the Federal land banks of the United States.

Very truly yours,

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
EARL C. SMITH, *President*.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call my colleagues' attention to an article which appeared in the Evening Star of April 29, 1940, in which I, along with Senators WHEELER, VANDENBERG, and REYNOLDS, was mentioned as being acquainted with Mr. Bishop, who appears to be an agent of the British Government.

It is my opinion that no one of those he mentioned knows him any better than I do, and I have never, to my knowledge, seen him.

As to the confusing testimony which has evidently passed through the hands of two or three people, and is no more than fabrication and hearsay evidence, the whole thing appears ridiculous and should never have been headlined in any paper that has respect for its own veracity. This is particularly true since I was called up three times during the day by the United and Associated Press, and I stated clearly each time that I knew nothing about it. Still, and in spite of that, the paper came out with what appears to be a well-laid plan to smear without justification.

It is not my desire to make this article very long, and the subject is, in reality, not worth discussion, were it not for the deliberate attempt by the press to smear Members of Congress.

Let me quote from the New York World-Telegram of January 15, 1940:

> The first tip on him, which eventually led to the investigation that resulted in the arrests of the plotters, came to the G-men from Scotland Yard.
>
> Bishop was in England toward the end of 1938 and approached a British Army officer on a subject which caused the officer to report to his superiors immediately. Bishop was deported and attracted no more attention until last spring, when Scotland Yard uncovered some information on his activities, which was passed on to the G-men.
>
> The G-men began to watch him, and in July found that he had become active in the Christian Front. In August more G-men were assigned to the case, several of them, apparently, being assigned to become members of the Christian Front.
>
> Before long they reported that the members of the Sports Club were planning assassinations and bombings. One plan they had was to cause a reign of terror against Jews that would result in such disorder that troops would be called out to protect the Jews. The Sports Club members hoped, said the G-men, that this would cause such anger among anti-Semites that the country would be in turmoil and the Sports Club would be able to seize power.
>
> Bishop has been questioned since Saturday night, when he and the 16 others were arrested. He has told several conflicting stories, in which the G-men put little credence.

Is it not possible that Mr. Bishop might have been a provocateur to bring about internal strife by agitating racial hatreds? It would appear so as one reads this article and I believe such was the intention of the plan, but it failed to register as expected. In other words, it fizzled, for no one was excited over these stupid theatricals in which the F. B. I. was involved.

The paper, however, states that the F. B. I. had been advised by Scotland Yard that Mr. Bishop was here. What could be a better procedure than to start this agent working to bring about dissension among our own people, and then tip our own F. B. I. off to discover this in order to bring about greater dissension and hatreds and probably internal strife.

This, of course, is one view, but let me take you to the end of the article and quote from a paragraph entitled "Rapidly Growing":

> The Christian Front and Cassidy have been investigated for months by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, 20 West Forty-seventh Street. Spokesmen for the league said today that although Father Coughlin had repudiated the Front, in the July 31, 1939, issue of Social Justice, Coughlinite publication, the Front was described as "a highly organized and rapidly growing militant Christian Front" and as "a defense mechanism against 'red' activities and as a protector of Christianity and Americanism."
>
> The spokesmen said they had obtained a code used by the Christian Front to describe the occupations of members and several were employees of city departments. The investigators of the Anti-Nazi League believe that the Sports Club members obtained their rifles, with the help of a physician, from the National Rifle Association.

Who is behind this movement? According to this paper, it is the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, 20 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City. I have referred to this league before. It presumes to champion human rights, but is in reality a league of hate. Here we find the Nonsectarian League again bragging over the fact that it was their investigators who had investigated the Christian Front.

Anyone who is interested in the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League should read the RECORD of April 26, under the heading, "Leagues of hate." The statement in the World-Telegram confirms what I said in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 2442. In investigating all attempts to bring about racial hatreds, animosities, and strife among our own people we always come back to groups like the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League.

Looking at this from an international angle, what could be more appropriate? For is not the British Government ruled and controlled today by the international financiers and by the same group which sponsors the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League?

This answers the whole story. It is purely an internationalist scheme to break down Christian principles, and in this war on civilization anything goes.

The papers, unfortunately, even when advised differently, as they were yesterday, labor under such control that they cannot avoid joining a movement of character assassination.

Unfair and Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on Monday, April 29, entitled "Unfair and Dangerous." This article will, I am sure, prove very interesting to every Member of the House, not only because of its timeliness but also because of its commendable sincerity.

The time has arrived, at the very outset of the Presidential campaign, when various spokesmen for the Republican Party, including Pennsylvania's Governor James and District Attorney Dewey, of New York, have initiated political tactics of an unfair and un-American character for the sole purpose of inflaming and terrifying the American people by their charge that "the Republican Party is the last safeguard between the men and women of America and European chaos." Such a reckless attack overlooks the important distinction that the Constitution provides that the Congress, and not the President, has the power to declare war. I wholeheartedly subscribe to the views expressed by Postmaster General Farley in the editorial below that "no politician should attempt to gain the favor of the electorate by making believe that one man can keep out of war better than the other fellow." Even the most violent critics of the New Deal have been loud and generous in their praise of its foreign policy; and, in my opinion, the efforts of the present administration under President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull establish beyond a doubt that the interests of the American people have been served in a flawless manner and with positive assurance that there will be no war for America.

I quite concur in the views expressed in the following editorial to the effect that the Republican Party would do well to base their campaign on political common sense and elimination of war talk. Should they persist in dwelling on a subject which is of no concern to this country at present, political candidates should be mindful that the intelligence of the American people will not tolerate deliberate false statements involving such a serious issue as war. The practical application of common sense will eliminate war for this country. If America's war is with unemployment, hatred, and disease, its future happiness will be assured. The editorial follows:

UNFAIR AND DANGEROUS

Pennsylvania's Governor James, who fancies himself as a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, journeyed to Indianapolis over the week end to make a speech in which, among other things, he said:

"After 7 years of meddling, of chasing rainbows, of rabbit-in-the-hat administration, the New Deal is coming face to face with the fact that the only solution it can think of for the twin problem of idle men and idle money is war. * * * Internationally we are meddling and muddling. * * * Once again we are burning our fingers at the fires of Europe. * * * The Republican Party is the last safeguard between the men and women of America and European chaos."

This, in our opinion, is dangerous stuff.

If there were evidence that President Roosevelt is taking America to war, through "meddling or muddling," or with deliberate intent because he can think of no other "solution" for domestic problems, we should condemn his course in stronger, plainer words than Governor James has used. But we know of no such evidence.

The Republican Party can find legitimate issues, plenty of them, on which to attack the New Deal. Neither Governor James nor any other Republican should seek to make campaign material out of generalized charges, unsupported by specific proof, that the President's leadership is betraying his country into the horrors of war. "No politician," as Postmaster General Farley said the other day, "should attempt to gain the favor of the electorate by making believe that one man can keep out of war better than the other fellow."

Equally true, no party should make foreign affairs a domestic political issue by claiming to be the only peace party.

Wages and Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to state, most emphatically, my opposition to the passage of this legislation which has for its sole purpose the exploitation of labor. This legislation—Barden amendments—in reality is intended to authorize a few gigantic nationally known canning concerns to add to their profits by permitting such concerns to pay starvation or pauper wages to their workers.

If time permitted I would like to point out and to enumerate instances where it has been necessary for communities to pay relief to workers employed by some of the concerns who favor the passage of this legislation—the reason the communities were forced to pay relief to employees of these exploiting concerns being that the wages paid were insufficient to keep body and soul of the workers together.

The present law makes mandatory the payment of 30 cents an hour, or $12.60 per week, to workers. Surely no decent, self-respecting employer of labor will ask that his employees live decently on less than $12.60 per week. Especially is this true, Mr. Chairman, when in many cases the work is only temporary.

We have been exhorted to favor this legislation in the name of the small farmers. If this bill were to apply to the small farmers—the farm cooperatives—why is it that the supporters of this bill have not limited it to factories located in the rural communities? The real reason is that the promoters of this legislation are not the small farmers or the farm cooperatives, but the exploiters of labor who too often refuse to pay the farmers fair prices for the product of American farms.

I sincerely trust that the House will defeat this attempt to stifle the wage and hour bill. The wage and hour bill is one of the most meritorious pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress of the United States, and it is my belief and my hope that it will not be nullified by this tricky legislation we are asked to enact.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the Barden amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act I fully realize that the act is not perfect. I believe, however, that under the fair and able direction of that splendid soldier, Colonel Fleming, that if given a reasonable amount of time the Administration will improve and such parts of the act as

appear to need amendments will be definitely known and Colonel Fleming can then come to Congress and suggest amendments that will enable him to administer the act with as great a degree of equity as is possible under the complex conditions existing.

What I most strenuously object to in the Barden amendments is the fact that their adoption would not make the act any more easy to administer, but would, because of the broadening of the exemptions, remove from the protection of the wage and hour provisions of the act a million or more inadequately paid workers. In fact, a careful analysis of these amendments warrants the assumption that they were designed not to improve but to destroy the act.

It is desperately hard to be tolerant of such measures as the Barden bill. This bill comes to the floor trumpeted as a measure designed to aid the farmer, in spite of the fact that its passage would mean a drastic lowering of the earning power of a great group of already poorly paid unskilled workers who, because of their inability to earn a decent wage, are unable to purchase such essential products of the farm as milk, butter, cheese and pork, cotton, and wheat in their finished form.

The plain truth of the matter is the Barden bill is both an antifarm and antilabor bill. It is a bill designed to aid packers and processors of farm products and does not affect farm labor, which is exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

If the proponents of this bill were frank, they would bring in a resolution asking for the repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but this they dare not do. Instead they bring us a Trojan horse, so to speak, inside of which are a group of legislative daggers, parading as clarifying amendments, but designed to stab the act in the back, all the while proclaiming it as a measure to aid the farmer.

This is a dastardly back-alley attack on an honest law. It seeks by the use of trick and device to accomplish what its sponsors dare not attempt in the open. It is a thoroughly vicious measure, and it should be defeated.

Citizens of Washington, D. C., and the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a resolution from the Conference of Civil Rights, Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

This resolution is perhaps as near the point on the iniquitous effect of the poll tax for the Nation as a whole.

THE POLL TAX

In 8 States (Georgia, Texas, Arkansas, Virginia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and South Carolina) the requirement of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting deprives more than 7,000,000 citizens of the ballot, results in taxation without representation and government without the consent of the governed, fosters fraud at the polls and corruption among the people, concentrates power in an oligarchy of wealth and bureaucracy, and tightens political-machine control through the traffic in votes and offices.

This condition permits the narrow constituencies of these States to send to the Federal Congress biennially 78 representatives, 70 of whom have received no effective opposition at the polls, who thus attain long tenure and through seniority acquire a plurality of committee chairmanships and ruling positions in House and Senate, whence they subvert the popular will by blocking necessary social legislation endorsed by a vast majority of the citizenry.

Because so very few can or do vote in elections for these poll-tax Congressmen, 57 more enjoy seats in the House than their States are entitled to under the fourteenth amendment. In 1938, 16 won their seats in districts where less than 6,000 persons voted as against 87,000 in the tax-free States, and the average obtained only a third of the winning votes cast for his colleagues from the rest of the Union. Since 1 vote for a winner in a poll-tax State is thus worth three votes elsewhere, the poll tax that disfranchises 83 percent of the voters in eight States also nullifies the ballots of two-thirds of the voters in the other forty. Where restrictions on the franchise for some thus become at once shackles on the suffrage for all, it is obvious that the poll tax is a national issue.

We citizens of the District of Columbia feel the injustice of poll-tax disfranchisement particularly keenly on account of the plight of our neighbors across the Potomac in poll-tax Virginia, and because, in spite of our residence in the Capital of a great democracy, we ourselves are deprived of the ballot; and we resent and reject a recent suggestion in Congress that a partial District suffrage be further fettered by a poll tax: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference for civil rights condemns the poll tax as undemocratic and dictatorial, commends those statesmen who are fighting to wipe away this national disgrace, and pledges itself and its members vigorously to aid the campaign for the passage of the Geyer bill (H. R. 7534) that would outlaw the poll tax in Federal elections; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the House Judiciary Committee, to Congressman LEE E. GEYER, the majority and minority leaders in both Houses, and be made available to the press.

The New Deal Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1940

LETTER FROM JOHN L. OSWALD AND REPLY

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from John L. Oswald, Forsyth, Mich., dated April 8, 1940, and answer to the same, dated April 23, 1940:

FORSYTH, MICH., *April 8, 1940.*

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received a copy of the speech you made in the House of Representatives on March 13. It seems to me you do a lot of talking about what Russia has been doing to Finland, but when the misnamed Loyalist Government in Spain was murdering Catholic priests and nuns by the thousands, and Catholic lay people by the tens of thousands, I failed to hear you or any of the other new dealers raise your voice in protest.

Everyone with the reasoning of a child knew that this Loyalist Government of Spain was nothing but a horde of murdering Communists controlled by Russia, but I failed to hear you pleading with the people of this country or our Government to loan money to General Franco, who was fighting to save his country from communism. Instead, that great Christian President of ours tried to get Congress to lift the embargo so this Government could sell arms and ammunition to the Communist government of Spain.

The New Deal, it seems, was more interested in seeing the munition makers get their profits than in saving the lives of the innocent Spanish people.

I think it is about time for our Senators and Representatives to do something for the millions of starving people in this country instead of pleading for the people of Europe; or possibly they think if they do enough talking about Europe the people will forget about the rotten conditions at home; but if I am any judge of the American people I think they are just about fed up with the cheap politicians and that there will be a number of new faces in Washington after the November election.

Cordially yours,

JOHN L. OSWALD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1940.

Mr. JOHN L. OSWALD,
Forsyth, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 8 and note that you are misinformed with regard to my attitude and my actions. For your information I was one of the very few Members of Congress that was not sucked in by the petition that was signed in Washington in the interest of Loyalist Spain. I have condemned in no uncertain terms the very things you mention in your letter. Before you make statements of the kind you have made in your letter you should look up the facts. It seems to me you are one of those who have been referred to in the very wise saying "There are none so blind as those who will not see."

I have always been and always will be a champion of free speech, free press, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. I am one of those who believe that we as a Nation should work within the Constitution of the United States and especially at all times preserve and protect in the most vigilant manner the Bill of Rights which is the basis of our freedom. I will oppose any person I think is in any way sabotaging the Bill of Rights and considering himself above the law. I sometimes get out of patience with people who use the right of free speech to assassinate characters of innocent people and assassinate the principles for which they stand and therefore take exception to your statement "The New Deal, it seems, was more interested in seeing the munition makers get their profits than in saving the lives of the innocent Spanish people." Nothing is further from the truth and if you do not know it you should know it. I should think that you as an American citizen would be ashamed to accuse an administration that has kept us out of war and has done everything under the sun to promote peace of the things you accuse them of in your letter.

Might I further add that Voltaire once said: "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it." You have a right, thank God, in this country to say what you please but so that we may keep that right it should be used with discretion and be based on facts. You should not be swayed by vicious propaganda that has no foundation.

I note the last paragraph of your letter in which you state: "I think it is about time for our Senators and Representatives to do something for the millions of starving people in this country instead of pleading for the people of Europe, or possibly they think if they do enough talking about Europe the people will forget about the rotten conditions at home, but if I am any judge of the American people I think they are just about fed up with the cheap politicians and that there will be a number of new faces in Washington after the November election."

No administration has ever done more for the suffering people than the present administration that you refer to as the New Deal. President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration have provided work-relief programs and relief prcgrams to the utter limit of the Federal Treasury. I trust and hope that business will cooperate with that administration so that we will no longer have the suffering millions of unemployed.

For your further information I have in every instance voted in the interest of the suffering millions in this Nation and at times I have been thoroughly disgusted to see the solid Republican minority coupled with conservative Democrats from the South sabotage that program to such an extent that there are suffering millions.

Neither you nor anyone else can tell me what suffering and hunger really are. I have felt the pangs of hunger. I have been among the unemployed, and I have labored with my hands from daylight until dark. I have not always been an attorney. I have not always been a Member of Congress. I have worked my way through school by the sweat of my brow, and I intend to protect those who are now in the same position that I was in at one time myself. It is only by the grace of God that I have been able to gain the position I am in, and were it not for the grace of God I would probably be swinging a pick with the W. P. A. workers. I do not intend to let you or anyone else challenge my sincerity in the interest of the suffering masses.

I am a liberal who hates communism and all other "isms" that are the antithesis of Americanism, and it is my ardent hope that we will get to the bottom of the cause of poverty and thereby eliminate un-American activities.

I think you owe an apology to the men of both parties who have labored in the interest of humanity. There are a few on the Republican side, but very few, who are not controlled by the conservative element. As I stated before, practically a solid Republican vote is cast continuously against all measures that are in the interest of progress and liberal government.

In closing, may I say that in my opinion you are not to blame for the statements you have made in your letter, but have been swayed through ignorance of the real facts and vicious propaganda that are being spread throughout this country to mislead unsuspecting people.

I do not expect this letter to make an impression on you, because I believe that you are among those who do not want to see the light and are just misled. It is rather unfortunate, and I do not blame you but blame those who have misled you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK E. HOOK, M. C.

Poll Tax Is Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote in a Federal election is a privilege guaranteed by the United States Constitution, and is not subject to State taxation. In other words, as a Memphis, Tenn., newspaper, the Press-Scimitar, puts it: "States cannot—but they do." Southern newspapers have given considerable publicity to the recent testimony of Attorney Crampton Harris before the House Judiciary Subcommittee in arguing the constitutionality of the poll-tax requirement for Federal elections. The following account of Attorney Harris' testimony is given in the Birmingham Post, April 11, under the heading "You can't tax right to vote":

"The right to vote in a Federal election derives from the Constitution," Mr. Harris contended. "States are permitted under the Constitution to set up qualifications for voters, but I maintain that the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification.

"Legitimate qualifications include, for instance, a minimum age which sees to it that the voter has attained an age of responsibility, a residence requirement, which serves an obvious purpose, and in some instances even an educational requirement, which also has a bearing on the qualifications of the voter.

"But the payment of a poll tax has no bearing at all on the fitness of a person to vote. Often, in fact, the tax is paid by another. * * *

"* * * No State has a right to overthrow the method set out in the Federal Constitution for selecting the representatives of our Government. Suppose a State passed a law saying that no one could vote who had less than $50,000 or $1,000,000. It shocks the mind. It would be an encroachment on an essential Federal right, yet so is the poll tax. Some may say it is a matter of degree, but in such matters there is no such thing as a question of degree. The right to vote cannot be taxed, no matter what the amount."

The constitutionality of the poll-tax requirement is, as you know, being attacked through the now famous Pirtle case, mentioned in the following excerpt from an article by Ernest Lindley in the April 3 Birmingham News:

Pirtle—Henry Pirtle—is a white man from a Tennessee mountain county. Being otherwise qualified, he has requested a judgment declaring that he was entitled to vote for a Member of Congress, despite the fact that he had not paid his poll tax. Two years ago the Supreme Court upheld the poll tax in the somewhat similar Breedlove case. But since then the composition of the Court has changed, and the Pirtle case is based less on Pirtle's right to vote than on the right of the Federal Government to have the benefit of his vote in a Federal election.

Road to Recovery and Conservation Through the Industrial Use of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it would be an ambitious boast on my part if I were to tell you that I had digested the vast compilations of material which have been placed at my disposal during the past several weeks. I have, however, weighed well parts of the testimony of various persons before the T. N. E. C. body now investigating monopoly and have done a little research on my own part. All of which convinces me that a few of my ideas might be workable as a partial solution to some of our economic problems.

The problem which has been claiming the attention of a special group of us here in Congress has been, How can we, as a people, plan on full utilization of our great capital, our vast natural resources, and our manpower?

There are about 130,000,000 persons in the United States. Our peak of employment has included about 50,000,000 persons, of whom never more than 10,000,000 were employed in the heavier industries. Statistics show that less than 4 percent of the working population of the United States work with or about machines. Three million men are normally employed in making, selling, and servicing cars. Approximately 30,000,000 persons live on farms and are normally engaged in agriculture and about 10,000,000 persons are unemployed at the present time.

From these figures it can be readily shown that technological unemployment—machines—is not the prime cause of our present dilemma, but only one of the many contributing factors. For instance, failure to utilize our land and water

resources could be considered a greater loss to our country's income.

But nonuse of our vast agricultural resources is an even greater tragedy. Planned and utilized intelligently, these millions of untilled acres could be harnessed to attract and create new capital and business. And it would, moreover, put thousands of men back to work.

We have ample evidence to show that great masses of men and women have been displaced by machinery. On the other hand we have the paradoxical evidence that it was mass machines, working on a production basis, that created new jobs. Anyone who starts out to solve the problem of unemployment by an outright condemnation of the machine is bound sooner or later to get tripped up in his reasoning.

America has achieved her present preeminence in the family of nations by her ability to invent and to apply this inventiveness so that the greatest good could be accomplished for the greatest number.

It is thoughtless, indeed, and inaccurate, to blame the Fords, the Knudsons, and the Kellers because men have walked the streets in idleness for the past 10 years.

One of the most enlightened statements it has ever been my privilege to read along this line was placed in the record of the T. N. E. C. Committee recently by Dr. James Thomas, president of Chrysler Institute of Engineering in Detroit. It is a rather long statement but so ably does it bring out this point that I am taking the liberty of quoting a portion of it:

I should say that the width and the depth and the beauty and the glory and the influence of any cultural period in the world's history is measured entirely by the ability of the commerce of that day to carry the freight and not succumb to the load. It is an interesting thing.

In 1790 we had an interesting country here, but it wasn't a big country except geographically. Yet in 140 years, up to 1930, we find some interesting statistics. I know you don't like statistics. There are three sorts of liars: Liars, damned liars, and statistics. If you are interested in classifications, after the golf players and the fishermen and the husbands who stay out late we have all the liars there are. I am not unmindful that Abe Martin says that it's funny how a man with facts can break up an argument. Now, you listen.

In 1790 we took a country that had four hundred millions of income, and in 140 years we raised that to eighty billions; we took a country that had a new wealth of five hundred million, and in 140 years we raised that to three hundred and seventy-five billions; we took a country that had three millions of population and raised that to one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and twenty-seven millions; we took a country with no roads at all and built 600,000 miles of paved roads, 3,000,000 miles of roads, and we put 25,000,000 automobiles on those roads in our anxiety to get somewhere, only exceeded by our anxiety to get back to where we started that we might start somewhere else. We produce 85 percent of all the automobiles produced in the world. And did you know that we have more radios than all of the rest of the world combined? And it is certain that we listen to more stuff over them, but that, too, can be cured. We have more bathtubs than all the rest of the world.

They say that 7 percent of the population of the planet, living here in the United States, tilling 5 percent of the tillable acreage of the world, produce half of the food crops produced on earth. One English authority said we had created and owned half of the wealth of the world since the Revolutionary War. Whether that is true, 60 percent of all the minerals extracted from this planet are taken out of the ground of the United States. And I know this: That half of the world's communication facilities are here in America and that we have nearly half of all the railways and nearly half of all the electrical energy on the planet, and this 7 percent of the population of the planet enjoys such high standards of living that we drink half of the world's coffee, use half of the world's tin, a little over half of the world's rubber, three-fourths of the world's silk, one-third of the world's coal, and two-thirds of the world's crude oil, and 80 percent of all this wealth we have created, which enabled us to use all this, has been the result of technological development.

My intelligentsia friends say to me, "Well, I know, but this is only crude, crass materialistic culture." Thinking you would say something of that sort, I looked up some facts for you, and what do you suppose I found? Interesting facts: That in the 140 years we built three times as many colleges and endowed them with nearly five times as much money as all the rest of the world in any period of 140 years; we built three times as many libraries and put nearly five times as many books in those libraries as all the rest of the world in any period of 140 years. In 1933, when we were right at the bottom of that other depression, we found we had 29,500,000 boys and girls and young people in schools and colleges in this country and employed 1,000,000 teachers to teach them. That is 30,500,000 people working at this thing we call idealistic culture, and if we aren't getting on with it, it is time we school teachers reexamined our jobs, because you boys have certainly paid the freight.

But that isn't all of the story. With colleges and extensions, evening classes, evening schools, radios, lectures, whatnot, we are literally hurling learning at the masses, and that is an educational opportunity, that is a marvelous cultural chance, and if it doesn't work it isn't the fault of the machine and the modern technology and the economic management we have had which has produced the stuff to carry it. Somebody said, "It puts people out of work." Philosophically this is the glory of the machine, not that it puts men out of work numerically, but abolishes labor.

Here in our own country, between 1870 and 1940 (use these figures because that is the period of our most rapid technological development) our population increased 218 percent in that 70 years. Would it surprise you if I told you that was 20 times as fast as populations ever grew anywhere else in the world? That is so. In spite of that, the gainfully employed increased 291 percent right at the period when we were making our most rapid technological development. Would it surprise you if I told you that more people are gainfully employed in 1930 than was true in 1870, 1880, 1890, 1910? That is what our census shows. Would it surprise you if I told you that in 1875 only 324 people out of each thousand were gainfully employed, and in 1900, 100 out of every thousand, and between 1900 and 1930, that is, the 30-year period of our most rapid technological development, we created 20,000,000 new jobs, and that now 1 workman out of every 7 is making things his father never saw if he is past 55, and 1 man out of every 4 is making things his grandfather never saw if he is past 60? It is just the new jobs we have created, that is all. The only infinite thing is human want, and as human want grows this machine must continue to supply the demands or we can't possibly live under our present standards. We are working more people, building roads and transportation equipment, in proportion to our population than was ever true before in the history of the world. So the machine has not put people out of work in that field. It has put them back to work.

Mr. Edsel Ford testified before the Temporary National Economic Committee recently that machines have lowered the cost of production of an automobile from $3,500 to $600, and machines have created millions of new jobs.

This is all well and good. We are willing to concede that the machine and the men who have wielded this great machine power have from the outset been motivated by the most honest of business ideals.

But it seems to me there are even more profound ideals and considerations that have been lost sight of in this careening course ever onward to greater and greater production levels.

I maintain there has been little consideration given in the last two generations to the general economic policy, and this economic policy, I maintain, has entirely different objectives than the business policy which has been dominant.

I grant you that a business has to make profits, but these profits should not endanger the competitive opportunities under our particular kind of economy.

There should be at all times a maximum chance for business to grow. But there should be maintained likewise at all times something like full consumption and more nearly total employment.

American business, despite all its lofty motives, can never wholly exonerate itself of its lack of regard of the human agencies that helped in its growth.

Human values—problems affecting the mass of humanity thrown out of work by mass production and machines—is the concern of both business and government.

On this point, Dr. Kreps declared before the Temporary National Economic Committee:

Similarly, so far as technology is concerned, technology involves certain definite economic costs that may not be met by the individual business, may not have to be met by them, such as the cost of occupational obsolescence, or the cost of retaining workers whose skill has been supplanted, or finding jobs for workers who are no longer needed. Even though the business can get rid of them, and even though the industry can get rid of them, the economy cannot. You have got to support these men. There are costs involved.

"Ghost towns" is a term used to describe cities in which entire industries have moved their plants and equipment to an entirely different community than that in which they have been operating. They have been known in recent years to pull up stakes, as it were, and leave entire laboring populations dependent upon governmental agencies for sustenance. In many instances employees who had owned their homes, or worse yet, were buying them, lost whatever investment they had, in many instances their life savings. It would seem that

company responsibility to the men who had made their success possible should dictate that they consider what was to become of these families.

These are not remote considerations. They are constantly in the process of happening. Today a more enlightened labor leadership is deeply concerned with problems such as these "ghost towns," which multiply from year to year.

Labor today is anxious to sit in with business in the solution of these grave matters. And it is a responsible type of labor leadership, whose offer of cooperation, I believe, business cannot afford to spurn.

Every generation has its pioneering to do in order to solve its special problems. Certainly we all have the spirit of cooperation in us to transform this period into the beginning of a great era of scientific advancement. The various abuses of capital can be adjusted by changing a few of the rules of the game so that a greater number of Americans may share in our national wealth.

As President Roosevelt has said:

> Industrial efficiency does not have to mean industrial empire building. And industrial empire building, unfortunately, has evolved into banker control of industry. We oppose that.
>
> Business enterprise needs new vitality and the vitality and flexibility that comes from the diversified efforts, independent judgments, and vibrant energies of thousands upon thousands of independent businessmen. The individual must be encouraged to exercise his own judgment and to venture his own small savings, not in stock gambling but in new enterprise investment. Men will dare to compete against men but not against giants.

Unemployment is the chief concern of most of us and we are all vitally interested in each new approach to its solution. Many of us, I am sure, are in accord with the objectives of the 30-hour week, as proposed by labor. To me this seems a step in the right direction for a partial solution in industrial areas. It will increase consumption and will absorb some of the unemployment slack.

Another step toward decreasing industrial unemployment should concern itself with a more broad use of apprentice schools such as are now working successfully in the Ford and Chrysler Motor Cos. in Detroit. Youth is clamoring—and rightfully so—for an opportunity to prove itself. I can think of no better way in which industry can serve the community than by establishing these vocational schools in industries which require certain skilled labor. I think, furthermore, that all new industries that are in the process of evolving should include these apprentice schools as a requisite part of their program.

So well has the program worked in the Ford and Chrysler trade schools that they have a waiting list of thousands of applicants, I am reliably informed. This proves that youth is only too anxious to take its place in the work world if the opportunity is available.

If you notice, I am speaking of remedies that are applicable to industry alone. I fear that this is a failing common to many city-bred students of the problem. All too often the city observer is prone to think in terms of factory jobs when he discusses unemployment.

Once upon a time I approached the problem with a characteristic city man's viewpoint, but those days are long past. I have realized fully for some time that the problem of unemployment is wrapped up inextricably with agriculture.

Already there are skeptics who question industry's reluctance to avail itself more fully of nature's vast and endless store of inorganic wealth and energy. It has seemed to these skeptics that business has been altogether too slow in forsaking its old ways of using organic materials solely for its productive purposes.

Science has demonstrated conclusively that these processes can be served most ably if industry awakens and begins to avail itself of our agricultural bounties and their natural resources.

For years science has been showing industry how, in hundreds of ways, this inorganic wealth can be used to create new jobs, cut costs, and even bring new enterprises into being.

And, on the other hand, industry's inability or unwillingness to comprehend these new scientific revelations and apply them is doubly destructive. This neglect—to my mind at least—has contributed largely to maintaining our present high unemployment levels.

But just as alarming has been the resultant waste of our great natural resources. The heedless drain upon our oil reserves continues unabated, despite the fact that these reserves are close to the depletion point.

In fact this extravagant waste of one of our greatest natural resources is rapidly nearing the calamity stage. The productive years of these reserves is already numbered. And there does not seem to be any doubt that we should do everything within our power to retain what is left of this strategic material.

To me it seems good business logic that we keep what is left of nature's diminished accumulation of petroleum and follow the scientist who shows us a better and more economical way to obtain our motor fuel. Besides the conservation aspect involved in such an innovation, an untold number of jobs would be created and the door would be opened in general to a more universal acceptance of science's new and significant discoveries.

In several European countries, as well as in some of our South American republics, conservation of petroleum by blending alcohol and gasoline has been in successful use for a number of years.

That this alcohol can be obtained from soil-grown, self-replenishing agricultural material, such as corn, is a well-established chemical principle.

But the fact remains that despite these precedents, and the general approval of the plan by our American engineers, powerful interests here in the United States are bitterly opposed to adoption of the plan.

They oppose it bitterly, despite the added prosperity that would follow its acceptance. Like ostriches with their heads in the ground, these special interests can be expected to maintain this opposition until that fast-approaching day when our petroleum reserves will have been exhausted.

Let me quote what Dr. William J. Hale, eminent chemist of Midland, Mich., has to say in one of his reports on the attitude of the petroleum interests to this program:

> If our petroleum corporations had any foresight at all, they would understand how the introduction of this fuel would conserve their petroleum holdings and increase markedly the purchasing power of farmer and hence reduce unemployment and increase automobile sales, thereby calling for more and better fuel and a much extended use of lubricating oil.
>
> But the petroleum corporations are intent upon burning up all the petroleum in this country at earliest moment in order that they may develop their foreign holdings in petroleum fields and import as much therefrom into this country as quickly as possible.

Deeply concerned over the rumors that our reserves are approaching exhaustion, I wrote to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, with regard to our oil and gas reserves, and I received the following information from Mr. R. R. Sayers, Acting Director, Bureau of Mines. I quote as follows:

> Concerning oil reserves, page 134 shows a table prepared by H. J. Wasson in which the petroleum reserves in 1938 were estimated at 10.2 years' supply, in terms of future production, and at 12.7 years in terms of current production. Current production is based on the ratio of reserve at end of year to production during the year.
>
> The estimated life of natural-gas reserves, in terms of 1937 production of 2,370,000,000,000 cubic feet is about 28 years if Davis' estimate of reserves of 66,000,000,000,000 is used. The president of the American Gas Association estimated reserves as 62,000,000,000,000 cubic feet and pointed out that, at the rate of withdrawals during 1936, the reserves would have a life of 28.5 years, whereas, at the rate of withdrawals of 1937, the life would be reduced to somewhat less than 25 years.

Additional evidence that our oil reserves are dangerously low and that an alcohol blend is workable, is herewith offered in the form of statements from two of our leading governmental authorities:

> Secretary Wallace, May 1933: Most engines now in use appear to be able to handle a 10-percent alcohol-gasoline mixture without adjustments and without much change in mileage per gallon of fuel. Corn would provide an abundant supply of suitable raw material for the production of alcohol. Other farm products, such as wheat, rice, and potatoes, could be utilized when there were large supplies available at low prices. In fact, the manufacture of alcohol could be used as a material aid in taking care of surpluses and stabilizing the markets for farm products.

Secretary of Commerce to Secretary of Agriculture—letter, December 20, 1935:

The continued adequate supply of fuel for motor vehicles and airplanes is one of the essentials of national prosperity in which the Department of Commerce is directly interested. Despite the present supply of petroleum, authorities agree that the country must look forward to a diminishing supply, which condition may shortly make necessary importations of foreign crude oils. In order to be of significance in relation to the present motor-fuel demands of the United States, alcohol must be produced, not from a limited supply of waste products but from farm crops which can be raised and handled in quantity for the main purpose of producing alcohol, or other suitable fuel.

Use of an alcohol blend for motor fuel has long passed the stage of theorizing. The following are some statistics gathered by the American Good Government Society, who have been interested in this movement:

Germany is the largest user of alcohol blend as a motor fuel. The Government decree of an alcohol blend went into effect in 1932 and its use grew 340 percent in 7 years. In 1937 they consumed 75,000,000 gallons. They use chiefly potatoes in their alcohol.

France uses beet roots, fruits, and molasses in their making of alcohol. The French Government pays 38 cents a gallon for alcohol and sells it for around 17 cents a gallon to oil companies, which is the approximate cost of gasoline. This loss is made up by a government tax on all gasoline and kerosene, while the blended fuel is exempt from the tax. The product there is a 50–50 blend of half alcohol and half gasoline.

Sweden uses a blend of 25 percent alcohol with 75 percent gasoline—largely a byproduct of wood pulp. Their output rose 110 percent in their 6 years under the plan. One of the interesting facts about Sweden is its use of an alcohol blend without compulsion.

Czechoslovakia did not have compulsory regulations of alcohol blends when they had their own government. Their blend is composed of 30 percent gasoline, 20 percent benzol, and 50 percent alcohol. In 1935 they used 20,000,000 gallons as motor fuel. This was done in spite of the fact the blend sells for about 12 percent more than straight gasoline.

Japan: According to a recent press release, the Department of Finance of the Japanese Government, dated last February, a million yen have been appropriated to begin construction of five alcohol factories. When her expansion is completed she expects to make 10,000,000 gallons in Formosa alone. She uses sugar for her alcohol blend and is expanding her crop production. She pays out $50,000,000 a year for petroleum imported into Japanese frontiers.

Brazil: It is understood their present blend is 10 to 15 percent alcohol to the remaining parts of gasoline. Petroleum imports amount to over $20,000,000 annually.

Italy: The Government has decreed a 25-percent part of all alcohol produced to be marked for motor-fuel use. In 1937 they used 7,500,000 gallons of alcohol for motor fuel, 5 percent as much as gasoline. Their 1936 production was 35 percent from sugar beets, with an unspecified amount from wines and other sources. The methods of obtaining alcohol vary widely from year to year, depending upon the quality of their wineries. With a varying quantity of poor wines depending more or less upon natural causes, governmental policies are flexible and adjustable in order to be successful.

Peru: A beginning has been made in Peru in using alcohol in fuels. Although the quantity of alcohol used is small, we find that the increase amounted to about 30 percent, as compared to a rise of 8 percent in total gasoline consumption.

Poland: The Polish Government in 1933 decreed that the producers of petroleum buy an amount of alcohol equal to 9 percent of the amount of gas sold. The increase in alcohol used as fuel has been tremendous in Poland rising from 270,000 gallons in 1931 to 2,400,000 in 1936, a growth of almost 800 percent in 5 years. The actual consumption of gasoline was 25,000,000 gallons. This gives an approximate 9-percent proportion of alcohol legally required to be used as motor fuel.

Philippine Islands: They are one of the leading producers and users of alcohol fuel. In 1930 they used 4,200,000 gallons of alcohol, or 15 units of alcohol to every 100 units of gasoline. In 1936 they used 8,600,000 gallons of alcohol, increasing their proportion of alcohol to 21 units for every 100 units of gasoline.

The British Empire: The Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., at Billingham, England, is a Government-subsidized plant. When completed it will cost $55,000,000 and will have a capacity of 45,000,000 gallons of petrol a year from the process of hydrogenation of soft coal. An alcohol plant could have been built for $7,000,000 to produce the same amount of alcohol, but England desires self-sufficiency and is therefore turning her coal deposits into liquid fuel.

A blend of alcohol and gasoline is being marketed today in England without Government compulsion but with encouragement by tax exemptions. Except for certain special cases, alcohol blends of gasoline are tax free. In the case of the new Billingham plant, the Crown will pay the firm a subsidy of 8 pence (16 cents) a gallon of gasoline petrol for 9 years to encourage the enterprise.

Hungary: This country is a substantial consumer of alcohol fuel. According to 1930 figures, the latest available, over 3,000,000 gallons of alcohol were used in blends, as compared with about 21,000,000 of gasoline, giving a ratio of about 14 gallons of alcohol for each 100 gasoline sold. The blend is called Motalco and consists of 20 percent alcohol to 80 percent gasoline.

It may be of interest here to note that when Germany entered Poland and took possession of the country none of the alcohol plants were destroyed and are, in fact, working double their usual schedule.

For some time I have investigated the economic potentialities that a blended motor-fuel program would offer the United States. In one instance I traveled 500 miles back to Detroit to consult with an authority. I have talked with dozens of Washington officials and I have read dozens of books and pamphlets. I might say in passing that my college chemistry has returned to me in satisfactory measure, although it is not necessary that one have any specialized knowledge to comprehend these facts, so readily apparent are they.

I assert that universal use of a blended mixture of alcohol and gasoline, even if a minimum blend of 2 percent alcohol were adopted at the outset, would require an alcohol output the United States could not immediately supply. I further assert that the adoption of such a program would utilize every scrap of surplus the farms of this country could produce at their present crop capacities, and there still would not be enough agricultural material to supply even a minimum 2-percent blend.

I assert—and I am bulwarked by the conclusions of scores of authorities—that millions of acres of land now idle would necessarily be converted into productive farm lands overnight if motor fuel blended with alcohol were to propel our American automobiles.

Every kind of agricultural product raised in the United States would in theory be grist for the industrial-alcohol distilleries. Corn, apples, barley, sorghum, plums, potatoes, sugar beets, wheat, and yams, to name only a few of our diverse farm products, could each supply in varying quantities its yield of alcohol. Corn, however, has gained highest approval in scientific and agricultural circles.

Following is a break-down of two tables prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, showing the yield per ton and per acre of various commodities:

Average yield of 99.5 percent alcohol per ton

	Gallons
Wheat (all varieties)	85.0
Corn	84.0
Buckwheat	83.4
Raisins	81.4
Grain sorghum	79.5
Rice, rough	79.5
Barley	79.2
Rye	78.8
Prunes, dry	72.0
Oats	63.6
Sweetpotatoes	34.2
Yams	27.3
Potatoes	22.9
Jerusalem artichokes	20.0
Sugarcane	15.2
Grapes (all varieties)	15.1
Apples	14.4
Pears	11.5
Peaches	11.5
Plums (nonprunes)	10.9
Carrots	9.8

Average yield of 99.5 percent alcohol per acre

	Gallons
Wheat (all varieties)	33.0
Corn	88.8
Buckwheat	34.2
Raisins	101.7
Grain sorghum	35.5
Rice, rough	65.6
Barley	47.9
Rye	23.8
Prunes, dry	82.8
Oats	36.3
Sweetpotatoes	141.0
Yams	94.0
Potatoes	178.0
Jerusalem artichokes	180.0
Sugarcane	268.0
Grapes (all varieties)	90.4
Apples	140.0
Pears	49.3
Peaches	84.0
Plums (nonprunes)	21.3
Carrots	121.0

If the blend were to be raised eventually to 10 percent, it is conservatively estimated that 800 new industrial distilleries would have to be built. And if these 800 distilleries worked on a full-time capacity throughout the year, each would have to produce a 10,000-gallon daily output to satisfy the demand for the blended motor fuel.

Again, conservatively speaking, 1,000,000 men would find work on land now idle and thousands of additional workers would find employment in the hundreds of scattered refineries. Each section of the country would have to erect these plants to meet the requirements of the program.

Another point I would like to make is that there would be a minimum of waste involved in this agricultural distilling. Quantity, not quality, would govern the acceptance of the product intended for distillation. That is, it would not be necessary that the cream of the crop be offered to the distillery. Products of lesser quality could be converted just as readily into industrial alcohol as the more select products.

Nor is that all. After the alcohol would have been extracted from the crops, the end products would be available to the farmer for livestock fodder.

This is no Utopian dream that I project but a plan whose workability has been proved in the testing laboratories of a dozen countries. I am willing to grant that promise of the reemployment of 1,000,000 men does not totally solve our domestic unemployment problem, but it is a step in the right direction—a step along the scientific path.

And without getting too optimistic about the prospect, I feel certain that it is the scientist—the soil chemist especially—who is destined to lead us out of the economic quicksands that have bogged us down for half of a generation.

To expedite the arrival of the day when blended motor fuel will be an actuality in this country, thus helping to conserve our natural wealth and contribute in no small way toward economic recovery and reemployment, I have this day introduced a bill in the House of Representatives.

My bill stipulates that it shall be deemed unlawful for any person to ship or transport in interstate commerce any type of motor fuel unless it contains a specified percentage of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

Realizing that it would be physically impossible to produce, at the outset, enough alcohol to supply the preferred 10-percent blend, I have specified that a graded scale be followed during the introductory years. The first year, I specify a 2-percent blend be used; 4 percent the second year; 6 percent the third; 8 percent the fourth; and in the fifth year the desirable 10-percent solution.

I have said it would be a physical impossibility to produce in the beginning enough alcohol for the 10-percent blend. Let me be more specific. According to figures from the Independent Petroleum Association, we used for motor-fuel purposes in the United States during 1938–39 approximately 24,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline. A 10-percent blend would require annually 2,400,000,000 gallons of alcohol.

Speaking in terms of the alcohol-producing ability of the corn crop, this would mean that approximately 32,000,000 additional acres would have to go under cultivation. In 1938, according to figures from the Agricultural Department, 91,792,000 acres of corn were planted for harvest. Corn yields about 75 gallons of alcohol to an acre.

It is my firm conviction that the soil offers the only remedy for our present social and economic ills. And if we were to begin by using blended motor fuels we would be only scratching the surface. Its adoption would represent the acceptance of only a tiny part of an inspiring program for economic rehabilitation that the agricultural engineers have been busily drafting for years. Words like plastics, chemurgy, and many others, coined in the laboratories of the scientists, are beginning to spell out the magic sesame that, to me at least, seems destined to open the door upon a new prosperity that will be enduring and stabilized.

I wish to add just one more thought in concluding. It seems to me that any recovery program would be greatly aided by a central planning body—a group which would be established to plan and direct rather than to govern.

Purely an advisory board, such a group should, I believe, be represented by business, labor, and Government and should be chosen by their own selected groups.

The purpose of this board would be to effect a national economy for the people of the Nation so that full utilization of our national resources would result. This board, as I envisage it, would also present factual statistics to those who control the wealth of the Nation, in order that idle capital, idle land, and idle manpower could be put to work for the continued growth of our country.

The Panama Canal Society of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ADDRESS OF THE PANAMANIAN AMBASSADOR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 20 there was held in Washington the fifth annual dinner reunion of the Panama Canal Society of Washington. The society's membership is made up of old-timers, that is to say, of citizens of the United States residing in and near Washington, who, in varying capacities, participated in the construction of the Panama Canal. The President of the society, and chairman of the occasion, was our former colleague, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, for 10 years the Representative from the Louisville, Ky., district. During the construction period of the great Isthmian waterway Mr. Thatcher served several years as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and head of the Department of Civil Administration (Governor) of the Canal Zone. The guest of honor and principal speaker at the dinner reunion was the able and popular Ambassador from Panama to the United States, Dr. Jorge E. Boyd.

At the conclusion of his address the Ambassador, on behalf of the President and Government of Panama, and because of the considerations stated by him, presented to Mr. Thatcher the diploma and insignia of the Order of Balboa—a distinguished honor, indeed—for the bestowal of which the recipient is to be heartily congratulated.

As regards Dr. Boyd, it may be interesting to note certain important contacts or assocations he has with our country. First, his grandfather, Archibald Boyd, was a citizen of the United States who made his final home, and married in, Panama. This was about the time of the California gold rush. In cooperation with his brother James, he founded the Star and Herald in Panama, and this newspaper survives to this day as one of the leading publications of Central America. Next, the Ambassador's attractive and popular helpmate is a Virginian by birth, the former Miss Elizabeth Bolling, niece of Mrs. Woodrow Wilson.

Under leave accorded, the address is herewith included:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished friends, I am not going to try to make any speech here this evening, it not being usual nor customary to make speeches in family gatherings, and we really are congregated around this table as members of the Panama American family.

However, I am going to have the pleasure of chatting with you informally, not as the Ambassador of my country but as the true friend of all of you who have contributed so much personally to the grandeur of the United States while in the Canal Zone, and to the establishment of the most intimate and cordial relations between our two peoples. Above all, may I express to you my sincere appreciation for the thoughtful and gracious invitation to be your guest at this beautiful reunion.

In these troublesome moments through which the world is passing, due to the abuse of power and utter lack of respect for the law of nations on the Old Continent, it is most gratifying to all the inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere to be enjoying all the constitutional rights that guarantee their liberty, freedom, lives, and personal possessions. It is most fitting to make a short review on this occasion of the traditional peaceful history of Panama and of its continuous policy of international cooperation.

Ever since the colonial days when the peoples of the neighboring republics were fighting bloody battles against the Spanish armies in Central and South America, Panama obtained its independence without any bloodshed and in a peaceful manner, due to the sagacity of its leaders. It joined spontaneously the Republic of Colombia in order to form a big nation with Ecuador and Venezuela.

For the first time in this continent, in the year 1826, the Congress of Panama was convoked by Simon Bolivar to proclaim the ideal of cooperative peace by means of a system of international unity unparalleled in history, and invitations were sent to all of the American nations to take part in its deliberations. It directed the establishment of the organism which was to settle by peaceful means any discords or disputes that might arise between themselves. In other words, for the first time the principles of arbitration were proposed.

Also, the notion of a League of American Nations to defend themselves by joint action against any possible European territorial ambitions that might threaten their peace was discussed. This conference led to what later on has come to be the actual Pan American Union of American Republics, whose fiftieth anniversary of existence we have celebrated on the 14th of this month, and it also served as a basis for the League of Nations that today sits in Geneva.

Unfortunately, the doctrine of pan-Americanism therein advocated did not find fertile ground among the rest of the young nations of this hemisphere until a very short time ago. Following the Congress of Panama a period of unrest, foreign aggression, and inter-American wars took place. It was during this time that France invaded Mexico, civil war was ravaging the United States of America, and there was war between Mexico and the United States.

The spirit of American unity had died away, and, in order to revive it, James G. Blaine called the Congress in Washington, and the Bureau of the Pan American Republics was created, which has been working tirelessly to foment trust and understanding between all these countries; but it was not until the recent Conference of Foreign Ministers of Panama of September 1939 that there was realized the necessity of unity of ideals and policies. It was at this congress that there was established for the first time the effective effort in practical form of true continental solidarity of the 21 American republics, and there was unanimously approved the determination to act as one nation in the defense of each other against any outsider.

Due, in great part, to the broad-mindedness and brotherly attitude of the illustrous Chief Executive of the United States, Pan Americanism, that is to say, inter-American unity, is no longer a phophecy nor a dream, but a reality.

We are all identified in the necessity of holding together in the defense of our sovereignty and territorial integrity. Continental public opinion has resolutely reached the conclusion that although in America there does not exist the germs of hatred, terror, jealousies, and narrow-minded nationalisms, but the spirit of generosity and of peace, the only way in which to maintain our democracies and the peace of our continent is by being prepared, and by presenting a common front, so that if one of the 21 American democracies should ever be attacked, the other 20 will join in its defense. The unity of the Americas means their safety.

Again turning back to the Isthmus and its generous desire to serve the world, in 1903, when the Hay-Herran Treaty, negotiated between the United States and Colombia for the construction of the Panama Canal, was not ratified by the Colombian Senate, the populations of the Isthmus rose as one man and separated from that sister nation whom it had spontaneously joined when it separated from Spain, and resolved again to assume the direction of its own destinies.

The new republic was then formed, again without any bloodshed, which was the traditional peaceful attitude of the Panamanian people. A new treaty was negotiated with their older sister of the north for the construction of the eighth wonder of the world, the Panama Canal. In the carrying out of this colossal enterprise, it became the true and only ally of this great country.

In this tremendous undertaking, all of you have taken part, more or less, to the honor of both nations, and for the welfare of the world at large. It is a very happy thought to congregate annually in the Capital of the largest democracy on earth to commemorate that achievement. Your names have been written with indelible ink for posterity, and we are grateful to all of you for your patriotic contribution.

To carry out this heavy task you have faced almost insurmountable obstacles, fighting not only against rival commercial interests, but against nature itself. You have contributed to the transformation of a line of mountains into an artery of communication that has shortened long distances from the remotest corners of the world to our American shores; and you have converted an unhealthy region into a healthy resort, free from tropical diseases.

Yellow fever is now unheard of; and the sanitary conditions are such that Panama is today the center where people from Central and South America go to recover their impoverished health, and to obtain the best and most advanced medical treatment for all kinds of illnesses. Among the first scientific men who discovered the origin of the malignant yellow fever was General Gorgas, who served as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission during the construction era. This plague was brought to our shores from other ports, the Panamanian people being immune to it; and it was one of the causes of the failure of the French enterprise.

The rivalry of commercial interests, I repeat, threatened to prevent the completion of this waterway. Powerful organizations—it was alleged—lured away almost every Chief Engineer who was placed in charge of its construction, and it was only through the tenacity and wisdom of the great American President, Theodore Roosevelt, that it was finally carried to its conclusion, by charging the Army with the task, not only of achieving this engineering feat, but of organizing its administration in such an efficient manner that not a single case of graft or any scandal has ever been heard of. To all this work the civilian forces contributed in the largest degree.

To the American people, then—civilian, as well as to units of the Army—is due the success of the greatest waterway of history.

Among us here tonight we have our distinguished chairman, the president of your society. As a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and chief of the civil administration of the Canal Zone, during construction years, he performed his duties in a creditable manner. Included among them were the representation of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Canal work in their relationships with the Government of Panama. After the completion of his period of Isthmian service, and return to his country, and in the discharge of his new and important obligations as a Representative in Congress from his State of Kentucky, he continued—and he yet continues, with all the means in his power—to strengthen the friendly bonds that unite our two nations.

In Congress he sponsored and procured the enactment of the legislation that brought about the construction and operation of the permanent ferry across the Panama Canal and the building of the modern roadway extending from the western terminus of the ferry through the Canal Zone. These works bear his name, and the Thatcher Ferry and Thatcher Highway constitute vital links in the inter-American highway, whose completion will mark a new and important step in the promotion of inter-American relationships. Also he was the author in Congress of the act creating the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, located in the city of Panama, and which is becoming one of the outstanding institutions devoted to the study of the causes and prevention of tropical disease. It is thus serving the entire world. In these and in many other ways he has endeavored always to promote the friendly and, I should say, fraternal relations that exist not only between our two Governments but, as well, between our two peoples.

His Excellency the President of Panama, a son of one of the founders of the new Republic, who was in office—first as President and afterward as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—during the period that Congressman Thatcher served in the Canal Zone, and who had the highest regard for his integrity, honesty, broadmindedness, and intelligent work, has charged me with the very pleasant duty of delivering to this eminent American the high distinction of the well-deserved decoration of the Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, in its degree of Comendador con Placa, with which the Government of Panama rewards the virtues of distinguished citizens.

It is a privilege and an honor to me, another son, to deliver to my dear friend Mr. Thatcher the insignia and corresponding diploma with sincere congratulations for this high distinction.

One Man's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 26, of this year, there appeared in the editorial columns of the Catholic Telegraph-Register, of Cincinnati, Ohio, an editorial which I think every American should read.

It expresses my sentiments on the subject, and is one of the strongest arguments which can be presented against a third term for any President of the United States.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Catholic Telegraph-Register of April 26, 1940]

ONE MAN'S POWER

This is the age of one-man strong-arm governments. The most notable products of the times are Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin among the major powers. Smaller nations, especially in Central Europe, have had their strong political figures guiding their destinies. Fortunately for their subjects and, perhaps for themselves, not all dictators have always used their authority tyrannically. But the danger is forever present that the dictator will become a tyrant, the more so when his rule is based upon the ideology of the absolute domination of the totalitarian state.

Hitler and Stalin are the classic examples of the modern absolute state. Men of little training in the art of ruling, they have ridden

to the heights on the catchwords of a popular enthusiasm and maintain their domination by the ruthless removal of all opposition. Their word is law even over life. Their closest associates must be sacrificed if they are threats, real or fancied, to the security of the state, identified in the person of the dictator.

In our own country the growing centralization of power in the Federal Government at Washington is a disguised trend to place more and more absolute authority in the hands of one man in the position of Chief Executive. In national emergencies we have allowed temporary dictatorial power to be exercised by the administration in control of the Federal Government. Such authority has never been wholly relinquished once the crisis was passed.

We wonder what may have been the turn of events in our own country if Hughes had been elected over Woodrow Wilson and if Senator JOHNSON had accepted the Vice Presidency and had become President instead of Calvin Coolidge. The story of the depression years may have been quite different if Al Smith had been chosen President instead of Hoover. Certainly we were headed for some let-down after the false boom of the twenties. No President could have avoided the depression, but a Chief Executive of Al Smith's character would have dealt with realities far differently than did Hoover.

The 7 years of Roosevelt have been, on the whole, disappointing. He has enjoyed more power in office than was ever yielded to any other President. After a whirlwind beginning that promised a steady fight against the depression and the evils that caused it, Roosevelt's administration bogged down. In recent years the President has seemed much more concerned about world affairs than about our own domestic problems. Temporary measures have been prolonged year by year until they seem permanently necessary. The powers so generously conferred on rulers to lead the country back to normal conditions are now assumed to be the prerogatives of democratic representative government.

We are drifting rapidly away from our precious heritage of free citizens. If the demands of the times make it necessary that we relinquish temporarily some of our rights owing to emergencies, it becomes all the more urgent that we give over these rights to the keeping of leaders of high moral principles. We are facing another crisis in a Presidential election year. Our duty as citizens is to choose our best candidates for office.

Did Someone Say "War Credits"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the following news article indicates that our exports of war materials are increasing rapidly. More and more we are becoming an arsenal for certain warring nations of Europe. Our internal economy is being disturbed to such an extent that soon we will hear the cry, if we do not hear muffled tones already, that an economic collapse will befall the United States if we do not extend credit to European belligerents.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 26, 1940]

UNITED STATES EXPORTS BOOM AS WAR GETS WORSE

The war-stimulated boom in foreign trade increased American exports during the first 3 months of 1940 to $1,068,773,000, more than one-third the amount for all of 1939, the Commerce Department announced today.

Sales to foreign customers in the first quarter exceeded this country's purchases abroad by $410,349,000.

Demands for American airplanes, machinery, chemicals, raw cotton, and copper, and iron and steel products have increased sharply since the war. The United States, in the same period, has increased its purchases of foreign crude rubber, tin, and wool.

With the intensification of war in Europe, the report said, the sharply expanded demand for this country's merchandise continued unabated in March.

Although imports during the first quarter failed to extend the steady and substantial rise of the second half of 1939, the Department said, the fact that they exceeded the same period last year indicated a higher volume of domestic business activity than a year ago.

Wood-pulp imports dropped during March to 74,000 tons valued at $3,500,000, the smallest for any month since April 1933. Most imported wood pulp comes from Norway and Sweden and is generally used by the American rayon industry.

Shipments of agricultural products in the first quarter comprised 23 percent of total exports; 52 percent of this country's imports represented agricultural products.

Note well that, although certain war industries are thriving because of war orders, the farmer is getting little benefit at the present time. Hugh S. Johnson ably expressed the probable turn of events if the war in Europe continues in the following news article:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 26, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This is the way to get mixed up in other people's wars. First, you sell them your goods. They become your best customer. They make jobs for your unemployed and dividends for your stocks. When their purchases have become an important part of your economy, they run out of cash.

Your business is threatened. They ask for credits. Some old boat rockers begin to croak about this. Some say, "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also. This will surely compel you to send armies to protect your dollars."

Your politicians reply: "We shall never send an American mother's son to bleed on foreign shores." Your best customers add: "We don't want your military assistance. You are too far away. Your efforts to equip and transport armies would interfere with your value to us as a base of supplies."

The assurance of repayment of such loans is so slender that no private funds are available. No one person wants to risk, but if Congress authorizes the Treasury to loan all the people will be forced to risk collectively what nobody would be willing to risk individually.

That is reckless statesmanship, but by this time hysteria and emotion have ousted both prudence and judgment.

From the beginning of this sequence there has been growing a sloganeering stupidity. "They are fighting our war. They are paying in blood. We shall only pay in dollars. It is the least we can do." When we opened a credit of $3,000,000,000 to the Allies in the World War, the votes in the committees of the House and the Senate were unanimous. To the suggestion that Allied bonds were selling below par the answer was, "All the more necessary to loan them this money at the lowest possible rate of interest." When one Congressman said, "They will use it to retire private loans elsewhere." Answer was, "Do not limit or qualify the use of this money." When mutual guaranties among borrowers was suggested, the reply was (prophetically), "If we get this money back at all * * * we shall get off cheap."

Thus, we buy an interest in a war we are going to fight with goods and dollars, but not with blood—"just a few divisions as a token and a symbol to show the flag."

Then the going gets tough. We are in to the eyebrows on the economic and sympathetic side. Our friends' backs are "at the wall." The whole tune changes. "Send us men. If they haven't equipment, send them in their undershirts."

The demands on us become almost insulting to abandon our organizations and commands and conscript men to fight under foreign flags and officers.

So we finance most of the cost of the war from this point out for ourselves and our Allies. We pack men by the millions like sardines into transports and send them untrained into battle. We are cursed for tardiness, stinginess, and timidity. Then comes victory, maybe, and we learn that we have been fooled on the war's objectives. The victors didn't share our ideals and under secret treaties they take all and leave us nothing—and then repudiate all debts and vilify us for even asking for repayment.

This is our actual World War experience, neither distorted nor exaggerated. We are going through it again, step by chuckle-headed step. We have now reached the stage of "we don't want your men, only your dollars," and "they are fighting our battles," and "we will help them by everything short of war, but not an American mother's son will be sent abroad."

"As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly" (Proverbs, XXVI, 11).

Agriculture Under the New Deal and the Effect on Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the major objective of the New Deal agricultural program has been to raise farm prices to parity levels and to achieve a sound adjustment of agri-

cultural production by restricting crop acreage. This program has been carried out under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The New Deal farm program, however, has failed to accomplish this objective. In the first place, prices of wheat, corn, cotton, and hogs as of August 1939, or just prior to the outbreak of war in Europe, were in many instances as far below parity as they were when the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was approved in 1933. As of August 15, 1939, corn was only 59 percent of parity, hogs 60 percent, wheat 49 percent, and cotton 56 percent. Beef cattle, a commodity which was not controlled, was at parity.

Nor has the New Deal succeeded in controlling production by restricting acreage. Wheat production in 1939 was 754,971,000 bushels compared with 551,000,000 bushels in 1933, a prerestriction year. Corn production in 1939 was 2,619,000,000 bushels compared with 2,399,000,000 bushels in 1933, a prerestriction year.

Supplies of leading agricultural commodities were also larger in 1939 than they were in 1933. Total wheat supplies in 1939 were 1,050,000,000 bushels compared with 929,000,000 bushels in 1933. Total corn supplies in 1939 were 2,952,000,000 bushels compared with 2,786,000,000 in 1933. United States supplies of commercial cotton in 1939 totaled 23,122,000 bales as against 22,541,000 bales in 1933.

The United States Department of Agriculture's index of total agricultural production—1924=100—stood at 104 in 1939 as against 97 in 1933, an increase during the 7 New Deal restriction years of 11 percent.

One of the most serious aspects of the New Deal farm program, however, relates to the decline in farm exports. The following table indicates the percentage net exports are of domestic production of important agricultural commodities.

Percentage net exports are of domestic production of specified commodities, 5-year average, 1926–30, and year 1938 [1]

Commodity	Average 1926–30 (percent)	1938 [2] (percent)
Cotton, including linters [3]	54.0	28.1
Wheat, including flour	18.3	11.4
Corn, including meal	.7	2.6
Oats, including meal	.8	.4
Rye, including flour	29.5	1.4
Barley, including flour and malt	11.7	3.3
Rice, in terms of rough	23.5	19.0
Tobacco, unmanufactured	33.8	28.8
Pork, excluding lard	3.4	.8
Lard, including neutral lard	31.6	13.7

[1] Years beginning July.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Crop years, August to July.
Source: Agriculture Department appropriation bill, 1941.

This situation exists in spite of tremendous spending on the part of the New Deal for agriculture. Total expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in 1933 were $79,000,000, compared with $1,607,000,000 for 1940. Total expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for agricultural recovery for the 7 years, 1934 to 1940, are estimated at approximately $6,000,000,000.

Not all farmers, however, have been equally favored in the distribution of Government funds. In 1936 Secretary Wallace, in response to a Senate resolution introduced by Senator VANDENBERG in the spring of that year, made public the names of individuals, firms, and corporations who received in any one year benefit payments in excess of $10,000. For the 3 years 1933, 1934, and 1935 combined, a total of 715 persons or firms received $36,871,000, or an average of $51,567 for the 3-year period.

Large payments were continued under the 1936, 1937, and 1938 agricultural programs. For example, under the 1938 conservation program 14,886 payees received over $1,000, while 524 payees received over $5,000, and 113 payees over $10,000. Under the same program 2,437,000 payees received $40 and less, while 1,251,687 received $20 or less. While a limitation on payments over $10,000 was imposed by Congress when it passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, this limitation only serves to lessen the inequality and does nothing to remove it.

Great inequality also exists in the distribution of Government funds as between farm products. For example, dairy products are second only to meat animals as a source of cash farm income. Yet dairy farmers receive little in the way of Government payments. The largest share of payments under the agricultural conservation program go to the wheat, cotton, corn-hogs, tobacco, peanut, and flax growers; and dairy farmers receive no parity payments, which are estimated at $236,000,000 for the fiscal year 1940.

In my study of parity payments I wrote to Mr. A. W. Manchester, director, northeast division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, requesting a tabulation of parity payments made for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 to the approximately 9,000 dairy farmers who reside in the New York Thirty-first Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. I ask permission to quote from his letter, addressed to me, of April 2, 1940:

> This will acknowledge your letter of March 27, in which you requested a tabulation of parity payments made for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 in the counties of Clinton, Essex, St. Lawrence, and Franklin, in New York State.
>
> We are informed from our examining section that no parity payments have been made to farmers in any of these counties, for the reason that the crops on which parity payments are made are not grown in them.

Therefore, if the principle of parity payments is right, it is grossly unjust and unfair not to include the production of milk in the list of agricultural occupations to be benefited. I believe that dairying is the most vital branch of the industry of agriculture, and yet the dairymen have faced a crisis throughout all this New Deal spending. Again, these same dairy farmers are paying their share in taxes for parity payments, from which they derive no benefits.

In concluding let me say there is one way for this Congress to aid the farmer, and that is reduce his cost of government and thereby the heavy burden of taxation that he bears.

Senator Wheeler and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT BENDINER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert Bendiner on Men Who Would be President—BURTON K. WHEELER appearing in the April 27 issue of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation for April 27, 1940]

MEN WHO WOULD BE PRESIDENT

BURTON K. WHEELER

(By Robert Bendiner)

Motorists driving through Montana in the fall of 1920 found the roads lined with posters depicting a huge bloody hand. Those who slowed down enough to read the legend beneath the gory emblem may have been reassured to learn that the State was not in the grip of some nameless terror; that the road signs were merely a device of the Republican Party and Anaconda Copper to warn the good citizens of Montana against voting for that pro-German, wobbly, anarchistic Bolshevik BURTON K. WHEELER, Democratic candidate for Governor. The Harding tidal wave enveloped WHEELER as it swallowed up all Democrats in 1920, but he polled 17,000 more votes than Cox, the Presidential head of his ticket, and displayed a political virtuosity that 20 years have heightened and refined.

BURTON K. WHEELER has what it takes to make a good gambler—the shrewdness to gage chances and the nerve to take them. Bold enough to be a flaming liberal in the early twenties, when only "Bolsheviks" were liberal, he was daring enough to lead the anti-Roosevelt forces in the middle thirties when only "economic royalists" were anti-Roosevelt. In both cases he staked his political fortunes on a hunch that public opinion was about to shift. His hunch in the twenties, despite his initial defeat, was to gain him a star role in the Senate for 17 years; his hunch in the thirties may win him or lose him the Presidency of the United States.

Little about BURTON KENDALL WHEELER reminds one of his New England origin; nothing more, in fact, than a hint of Massachusetts in his enunciation. The language itself and the Wheeler history are those of the West in which he has spent nearly 40 of his 58 years. Born in the village of Hudson, the tenth son of a desperately poor Quaker shoemaker, WHEELER managed during his school days to amass $750 with which to study law at the University of Michigan. Shortly before he was to leave for Ann Arbor he lost $500 of his fortune in a bank crash and had to go on working throughout his college days. In 1905, fresh from law school, he moved on to Colorado, partly for his health, and set out to find himself a practice. "Neither at Telluride, at Ouray, or Montrose—in fact, nowhere on the western slope," he says, "did they seem to recognize my legal talents, so I went my way to Montana."

Montana looked scarcely more promising. Offered nothing better than a bill-collector's job at $50 a month in Butte, the young attorney faced west again, determined for no good reason to try his luck in Spokane. But four poker sharps in search of a sucker decided his fate otherwise. Inveigled into a session of stud, the wandering lawyer lost every cent he had and missed his train as well. The latter misfortune hardly mattered, however, since his ticket was included in the last pot. In his penniless state even the $50-a-month job looked good. He settled down and in time opened a cubbyhole of his own.

Most of young WHEELER's practice consisted of personal-injury suits brought by miners against the copper companies. To stem a growing dissatisfaction, the copper barons in 1910 staged one of their periodic fake "reform" campaigns, in which the usual procedure was to single out an ardent champion of the miners, turn his head with the promise of office and the sudden wealth, comparatively speaking, of a legislator's salary, and then mold him into a tractable servant of the companies. It usually worked, and WHEELER must have looked like a natural. He wasn't. He rebelled almost immediately against orders to oppose the election of Thomas J. Walsh for United States Senator. Walsh lost, but 2 years later he tried again and won. A notable byproduct of his victory was the appointment of BURTON K. WHEELER as Federal district attorney.

No respecter of precedents, WHEELER proceeded to set the State of Montana by the ears. His term as Federal attorney was marked by a spate of prosecutions for all the kinds of corruption that flourish in a frontier society dominated by powerful absentee industrialists. It was a period of germination for the causes and antipathies that were to govern his future political life. He started out by smashing the practice of using decoys to catch saloonkeepers in the act of selling firewater to Indians and ended up by fighting against the manner in which the wartime espionage laws were being applied. He repeatedly refused to indict "wobblies" as such and spoke out boldly against the persecution of German-Americans. He made no secret of his opposition to American entry into the war, and was rash enough to advocate, in a mining State, government ownership of natural resources and the railroads. Small wonder that his bid for the governorship in 1920 was greeted with the show of bloody hands.

One of the chief Republican talking points in that campaign was that if WHEELER were elected, the mines would close. WHEELER lost, but a year later the mines closed anyway. So when he ran for the Senate in 1922 the Republicans were hard put to it for an issue. The pendulum had begun to swing away from the fierce militarism of the early post-war days, and the best the local G. O. P. could offer was the suspicion that WHEELER wanted to introduce free love into Montana. It wasn't nearly enough, and he went to the Senate by an overwhelming majority.

WHEELER brought to the Senate a brash pugnacity which he was quick to put on display. On his first day the young man from Montana had to be told not to smoke on the floor of the Senate; 2 days later he was overriding party whips to precipitate a first-class row over a committee assignment. In less than a week he had established himself as a scrapper and the despair of his advisers; within 3 months he was spokesman for a group of "New Democrats," corresponding roughly to the LA FOLLETTE group among the Republicans. By the end of his first session he had dug deep into the noisome doings of the Ohio gang and had greased the chute for its ultimate retirement from public life.

Mr. Smith going to Washington could not have asked for a more perfect target than the looting apparatus that was the Harding administration. The "Little Green House on K Street," where Attorney General Daugherty and his chief henchman, Jess Smith, directed fleecing operations amounting to millions, was history's gift to BURTON K. WHEELER. His demand for an investigation was a speech that Paul Y. Anderson described as "an attack so savage that even the Senate flinched." Senator Willis, of Ohio, pleaded that the Attorney General was "as clean as a hound's tooth," but WHEELER carried the day. He was made prosecutor for a congressional committee of investigation.

WHEELER did his work well. Before the first echo of his challenge hit the public ear Jess Smith was dead—ostensibly a suicide though some think that he was murdered; before the last echo faded away four principals of the Ohio gang, as well as Secretary of the Interior Fall, had found their way to Federal penitentiaries, and the easygoing President of the United States had died in an odor that could hardly be called one of sanctity.

Before Daugherty finally abandoned the Little Green House on K Street he managed to make himself something of a nuisance to WHEELER. Since there seemed no other way of stopping the Montana Menace, Daugherty combed the WHEELER record for something that would discredit him. Secret Service men under the command of W. J. Burns went to work on the case; at one time 29 of them were on the scene in Montana. The net result of their prowling was a charge that WHEELER had accepted a fee for using his influence as a Senator to obtain oil concessions from the Interior Department for a friend and client. WHEELER had, in fact, acted in behalf of a client named Campbell, who was an oil promoter, but had limited his activity, he said, to representing the man in a suit brought in the State courts of Montana. He was promptly cleared by the Senate, but the Department obtained an indictment against him in Montana in April 1924, just in time to embarrass him in his campaign as La Follette's running mate on a third-party ticket. The case came to trial the following April, and the jury took two ballots—one to go out to lunch and one, after 13 minutes' deliberation, to acquit WHEELER.

From the point of view of traditional American liberalism WHEELER goes to the 1940 convention with a cleaner political record than any Presidential candidate has been able to show since the La Follette campaign of 1924. Antimilitarist to the core, he has opposed every major arms appropriation on principle. The National Labor Relations Act and the wage-hour law had his active support. Almost single-handed he pushed through the Public Utilities Holding Company Act with its "death sentence" intact, though several stanch New Deal wheel horses had yielded to pressure and even the President wavered. He has always been an exponent of the tax-the-rich school and fought repeatedly for the highest possible relief appropriations. He warmly supported the Wagner Act, Social Security, S. E. C., and T. V. A., and went along on the A. A. A. despite his antitrust objections to price fixing. Aside from his voting record and his magnificent job on the Ohio gang, his chief claim to senatorial distinction is the monumental work he has done as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in unraveling the intricate railroad tangle.

At first blush the WHEELER record would seem to establish him as the logical man to carry on the New Deal. Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, leader of the third-term movement, looks upon WHEELER as Roosevelt's only plausible alternative. Yet a great gulf separates him from the new dealers, and it will be bridged only if the Roosevelt lieutenants conclude that they have no other choice. In part the issue is personal, in part ideological.

WHEELER was the first important liberal to push Franklin D. Roosevelt toward the White House. He spotted the New York Governor as his man as early as 1929 and worked hard to line up the Northwest for him. Through NORRIS he won over the powerful Huey Long, who at WHEELER's request paid Roosevelt a preconvention visit in 1932 and later reported to WHEELER: "I don't like your ——— but I'll be for him." Six years later WHEELER was to reflect bitterly: "I'm the last man on earth Jim Farley and Roosevelt would let have the nomination."

Interpretations differ as to what happened between 1932 and 1938 that wrought such a change in the relations between BURTON K. WHEELER and Franklin D. Roosevelt. * * *

Whatever the personal factor involved, there is enough genuine difference between WHEELER's liberalism and the New Deal to warrant a breach on objective grounds. There are two great areas of conflict: concentration of power in the Government and foreign affairs. WHEELER is fully prepared for a substantial degree of Government regulation, but he is alarmed at the world-wide trend toward centralized political control, and it is noteworthy that practically every brush he has had with the administration has been over an issue involving Federal encroachments that he considered dangerous. He opposed the N. R. A. as Government-sponsored price-fixing, fought the administration on its reorganization bill, voted to end the President's devaluation powers, and was with Borah in every attempt to block a Federal antilynching law. The issue reached a climax in the fight over the President's plan to perform a blood transfusion on the Supreme Court—a fight that marked a turning-point in WHEELER's career.

The most skilled hand would find it hard to disentangle the motives that led BURTON K. WHEELER not merely to oppose the Roosevelt court-reform plan but to command the forces of opposition. Never a believer in judicial impeccability, he was well aware of the social passions that throbbed beneath the black robes. He believed thoroughly that the Supreme Court's measuring rod of constitutionality was a slide rule, and he knew, too, that the current Court was rapidly choking the breath out of the New Deal, most of which he himself believed vital to the country's welfare. Yet long before the rip tide of opposition had set in WHEELER waded out and attacked with a savagery he had hitherto reserved for the Daughertys and the Falls. On the death of Senator Robinson, Democratic majority leader, which WHEELER attributed to the strain brought on by the battle over the Court, he became almost hysterical. "I beseech the President to drop this Court fight," he exclaimed, "lest he appear to

fight against God." I believe that WHEELER was genuinely moved by what he conceived to be the dangerous casuistry and unconstitutionality of the President's plan. At the same time there were apparent in his slavishness to theoretical purity signs of personal rancor—and something of a holy satisfaction in being able at last to pitch into the administration for the kind of deviousness he had long suspected but never openly encountered. To satisfy his own frequently expressed conviction that "judicial oligarchy" was a bad thing for the country he offered a constitutional amendment whereby Congress, following a general election, could by a two-thirds vote override a Supreme Court decision. But, as many who had no love for the Roosevelt plan pointed out, it might take 10 or 15 years to get an amendment ratified by three-fourths of the States, assuming Congress could agree on one. In the meantime, what would become of the New Deal—and of the country? To which WHEELER replied, "The trail of true progressivism is long, but it is right."

Whether or not WHEELER wanted to command the anti-court-plan forces, the leadership was forced upon him. The enemies of "that man" would not overlook the opportunity of having a crusade against him led by a sworn progressive. As a result WHEELER soon found himself in a weird position. The copper moguls, who had detested him for a quarter of a century, flooded his office with sticky congratulations. Editorials appeared in the most primitive Republican papers lauding him as the "man who saved the country." He even received letters commiserating with him on the publication of a newspaper picture of his daughter snapped in the act of passing out C. I. O. leaflets to Government employees. And acquaintances asked him what they were expected to say when Wall Street men who had always called him a Bolshevik remarked, "What a wonderful fellow, your Senator WHEELER!" Conversely, the tributes of Anaconda and the blessings of the Liberty League sat poorly on the chests of WHEELER's working friends back home. From Dillon came the bitter complaint: "We find you in bed with Hoover, Mills, Mellon, Morgan, and others right down to the little tories who tried to mob you years ago." WHEELER had indeed been mobbed in Dillon back in the 1920 campaign, but the reference was infelicitous; it enabled WHEELER to remind his critics: "When I was driven out of your town, you did not have backbone or nerve enough to stand up and protest." As for his new admirers, WHEELER says he is "realistic" and confidently predicts they will run for cover before he is through.

WHEELER's leadership in the Court battle and his almost rabid isolationism combined to draw on him a withering fire from the left, which the current bear hugs of John L. Lewis and a shift to isolation in certain leftist quarters have only now begun to damp down. Most vocal in the left opposition has been former Representative Jerry O'Connell, whom WHEELER helped to beat for reelection in 1938. O'Connell's Montana Liberal keeps up a hysterical drumfire of personal attacks on the Senator's integrity which are chiefly a rehash of accusations first served up by the puppets of Mr. Daugherty. * * *

Much of the ammunition used by O'Connell and other left-wing foes of WHEELER consists of the assertion that he has "sold out to Anaconda." No evidence has ever been offered in support. His voting record down to date, particularly on labor, has not been calculated to give copper-mine owners or any other vested interests the least comfort. WHEELER critics—even the New Republic—point to his opposition to the Hull reciprocal-trade program as a sign that he is wearing the Anaconda livery. The reverse is true. Anaconda has heavy stakes in Chilean copper. A reciprocal-trade treaty means that Anaconda can bring its Chilean copper to New York for less than it can market the top of its Montana mines. On the other hand, Montana miners have a sliding-wage scale and see no advantage at all in a declining price for their product. Much of this sell-out talk has died down since the fiery Court-fight days, and if WHEELER recently has not been the butt of the Anaconda press, the most likely explanation is that his enemy wisely, and traditionally, adopted the policy, "If you can't lick him, join him."

Some of the bad blood between WHEELER and Roosevelt has subsided, and WHEELER is doing his best to effect a reconciliation. Two years ago he was telling audiences that he wouldn't support his own brother for a third term. Now he says he will support Roosevelt again if he seeks a third term, but he hopes—and believes—the President won't. Not only does he oppose a third term on principle, but he believes it would be politically unwise on Roosevelt's part, and has told him so. The trend is to the right, he argues, and even if Roosevelt were elected, the country would plague him with a still more conservative Congress than the Seventy-sixth. For that reason he doesn't think the strategy would be worth the sacrifice of principle involved. Nevertheless, if that is the way things work out, he will go along "rather than weaken the liberal group in the party"—a consideration that did not disturb his fight for the principle of an "independent judiciary."

Concerning his own chances, WHEELER is a bit coy. "If they handed me the nomination on a silver platter and a certificate of election with it," he says, "I'd be pretty worried." If Roosevelt abandons the field, it may well be that the 58-year-old Montanan with the shambling gait, the frank tongue, and the eternal cigar will have something to "worry" about. To be sure he committed the cardinal sin of party irregularity in 1924, and he comes from a State that has only four electoral votes, but in the internecine war in the Democratic Party, WHEELER is the only big figure with friends in both camps. His conduct in the court fight and his veiled antipathy toward a third term have made him the favorite of large sections of anti-Roosevelt Democrats without costing him the support which a lifetime of prolabor activity has won for him from the trade unions. The violent courtship of John L. Lewis has made Green a bit sour, but WHEELER is experienced enough not to throw himself into the Lewis embrace, particularly since he is more than a little suspicious that the C. I. O. chieftain is using him merely as a reminder to the Roosevelt forces that there are other places to go. The railway brotherhoods are WHEELER's for the asking. As for Montana's puny electoral vote, WHEELER men will tell you that Montana shares WHEELER with the whole region of the Mountain States, which means 30 votes, and that he can count on entering the convention with no fewer than 125 pledged delegates. His stand against the reciprocal-trade treaties and his long fight for a parity price act, coupled with farm-debt adjustment, make him a better bet in the Farm Belt than Cordell Hull.

WHEELER's bitterness in the Court fight, the loose charges that he has sold out to Anaconda, the row with O'Connell, and the responsibility for THORKELSON have all served to surround him with a fog of doubt and vague mistrust as far as liberals are concerned. But his voting record, his speeches, and his remarks in the course of a recent talk I had with him convince me that neither Hull nor McNutt nor any other candidate with half a chance would carry on as much of the New Deal. "The social reforms that have been inaugurated by this administration," he told the National Association of Manufacturers, "have my hearty approval." Social security, T. V. A., wage-hour legislation, S. E. C., and Government relief for the unemployed would all be safe under WHEELER. Civil liberties would probably be guarded with a zeal never before seen in this country. All WHEELER's experience has developed in him a detestation of secret police. He has been hostile to the F. B. I. ever since the Daugherty days and is even now engaged in an investigation of wire tapping by that agency.

WHEELER was widely reported as having told the Congress of American Industry that he favored a balanced budget, but he went on to remark that "periods of national emergency, such as we have been experiencing, put the possibility of a balanced budget beyond the power of either a liberal or a conservative administration." And privately he affirms with even more conviction that as long as we have 10,000,000 unemployed, the Government must continue its spending policy.

His thoughts on unemployment have more conviction than clarity. He believes that people who want to work and are given no opportunity are "entitled to Government relief," but they have "a greater right—a divine right—the right to a job." And "either private industry must employ them or the Government will." When I asked him what he would do in the face of this most crushing of all problems, he admitted that he was at a loss. "I owe my people more than demagogy," he said. "I can't go to them with a panacea." If elected President, he would call outstanding business and labor leaders into an immediate conference. He would say, particularly to business, "You have been knocking everything the New Deal tried to do. What do you want? What do you think can be done?"

Where WHEELER breaks most sharply with the Roosevelt administration—and the breach is probably enough to lose him any hope of administration support—is in the realm of foreign policy. He is profoundly against American participation in the war under any circumstances short of an invasion of this country and against any steps that might lead to such participation. Would he have the United States take any part in the peace? He doesn't think we would have a place at the peace table without having engaged in the war, but he would be willing to have us take part in an international conference for economic reconstruction after the war. In fact, he would like to see Franklin D. Roosevelt go as an American representative, along with a Republican or two, to prevent a repetition of Wilson's sad experience. He is too antagonistic toward the Nazis to consider himself neutral in thought; anti-British though he admittedly is, he would like to see the Allies win. But he would not like to see them subjugate Germany. Along with his passionate isolationism goes a dangerous naïveté concerning foreign affairs. He spoke to me of the possibilities of Britain's accepting a Goering peace, and intimated that such an eventuality would not be entirely distasteful to him.

BURTON K. WHEELER is not a great statesman, nor does he think of himself as one. He is a politician with principles. If he lacks the sense of history of a Roosevelt or a Wilson, he is likewise free of their willingness to be devious in the present for the sake of future gains. He is extremely sensitive to public opinion, and rather than attempt to mold it and give it direction he is for sounding it out and conciliating it at every turn. If a National Labor Relations Act is good medicine but hard to get down, the patient should be cajoled and given small doses, he believes, until he is used to it and ready for stronger treatment. WHEELER would slow the tempo of the New Deal, a policy which might mean a breathing spell for the patient but which, that tempo being what it is, might mean rigor mortis for the doctor. The risk is great, but when it comes to political gambling few players have a surer hand or a cooler head than BURTON KENDALL WHEELER.

The Urgent Need for Flood Control on the Washita

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MONRONEY, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am asking unanimous consent to incorporate my remarks in regard to the urgent need of flood-control work on the Washita River, made recently before the House Committee on Flood Control, as follows:

Mr. MONRONEY. The hour is late, and I don't care to take up too much time of the committee. You have been very nice in letting us appear this late.

I would like to heartily endorse everything that my colleague, Mr. MASSINGALE, has said regarding the Washita. I think it is almost the forgotten river, as far as Oklahoma is concerned, on flood control. Yet, as he says, it affects the living of approximately 25 percent of our people and 450,000 acres of land.

Recurring floods each year cause an average annual damage of $2,500,000 within Oklahoma as a result of the failure to work out any kind of a flood-control program on the Washita. These figures have been carefully compiled and tabulated in a report by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, a State government bureau.

The number of persons directly affected by these floods total 250,000. In addition, the devastation to agriculture and business will indeed affect added thousands indirectly through interruption of agricultural marketing and business.

Because of the suddenness and sweep of the Washita floods, the State and counties affected continually have to replace bridges, highways, roads, and drainage structures as the high water rushes down the Washita Valley.

The Washita floods, because of the rapid fall of the river, the large number of big tributary streams that empty into it, are sudden and devastating. Not only do the floods thereon cause much property damage, but in 1937 following a cloudburst in the western part of the State 17 persons lost their lives in one rapid sweep of the stream.

We have been trying for 18 months to get the Army engineer's report in, and it was promised to us as far back as last fall. I believe they are working in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, and we are very hopeful that the system of tributary dams that the Department of Agriculture has surveyed and planned for, will be authorized by the Flood Control Committee.

To understand the necessary program on the Washita, one should know of the valuable, fertile lands in this valley. It flows through the richest farming country in the State, and although the valley is considered narrow, the widespread number of farmers living therein is great. The immense value of this fertile bottom land is not subject to the construction of so-called "main stem" dams. To build a series of two or three main-stem dams would inundate the richest portion of the valley.

Because of the lack of good main-stem dams, this would cause most expensive construction to be undertaken and in the end would reduce greatly the cultivatable acres in this valley.

All parties along the Washita are agreed and have so stated in resolutions that they do not want a series of "main-stem" dams. They are advocating a plan, also approved by the State planning and resources board and by engineers of the Department of Agriculture, for a series of tributary dams.

In the surveys, some 20 to 25 tributary dams of varying size have been suggested and tentative locations selected. These tributary dams range from 17,000 acre-feet capacity to the largest of 102,000 acre-feet.

Because of the geographic situation, both State and agricultural engineers agree that these dams will properly control the flood waters and at the same time will not take out of cultivation vast amounts of the finest agricultural land.

The converse is true, rather, in that tributary dams will destroy little tillable land where reservoirs are located—and by building them proper distances from the Washita River, will salvage thousands of acres below the proposed dams now almost worthless because of recurring tributary floods that occur from one to three times each year.

I am particularly interested in one dam called Purdy Dam on Rush Creek, one of the large tributaries of the Washita, which endangers the city of Pauls Valley to a very great extent because it is at that point in the low valley that these two rivers converge and should we have a flood of equal proportions on both it would wipe out the entire valley there.

Frequently during heavy rains, portions of the county-seat town of Pauls Valley are under water from Rush Creek alone. Should flooded Rush Creek meet the Washita River at flood stage at their junction, I fear there would be great loss of life, livestock, and property damage running into the millions.

I have personally inspected the proposed site of Purdy Dam and know it to be an ideal location for such a tributary development. Land for more than 15 miles up the Rush Creek Valley could be reclaimed and put into valuable use. Now crops are destroyed so often by the sudden floods on the creek as to render cultivation of this valley hazardous and futile.

Other fine sites also have been surveyed by the Department of Agriculture and the State planning and resources board along a similar line.

As my colleague, Mr. MASSINGALE, has said, there is no portion of Oklahoma that produces better crops, more alfalfa, and other farm products than this fertile valley, and I sincerely hope that no longer delay will be occasioned than necessary before the Army Engineers will be able to have this report for consideration of the Flood Control Committee.

It is my understanding that some $4,000,000 is now available for tributary flood-control work by the Department of Agriculture. They are reluctant to undertake this work on the Washita, however, without a general authorization by the Congress.

Since, in order to start actual work on at least three of these dams for which money appears to be already available under previous appropriations, I respectfully ask that your committee include proper authorization for work to be started on the Washita at this Congress and let us get under way.

The people are decided on the type of control they need—this plan has the approval of two important surveys, as I have pointed out—namely, the Department of Agriculture and the State planning and resources board. Soon the report of the Army Engineers, who have delayed the transmissal of their report on the Washita, will be in.

Because of the need for immediate action, I sincerely hope and respectfully request that authorization be given for this important work on the Washita.

I thank you very much.

Federal Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

EDITORIAL BY DR. CHESTER D. SWOPE

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Dr. Chester D. Swope:

[From the Journal of the American Osteopathic Association for March 1940]

FEDERAL HOSPITAL PROGRAM

(By Chester D. Swope, D. O.)

The fact that the P. W. A. is being liquidated, combined with the fact that the national health bill is temporarily grounded on the shoals of election year economy, has served to pare the Federal health program down to hospital and sanitation aids.

More than 200 applications for P. W. A. loans and grants for hospital construction to cost in excess of $100,000,000 were returned to public bodies last fall due to lack of funds. Since its establishment in 1933 P. W. A. has aided in the construction of hospital projects sponsored by State and local bodies in all the 48 States and Territories, involving 743 projects, 2,056 hospital buildings, and 107,849 additional beds. The Federal share in the cost of those projects amounted to more than $150,000,000 in out-and-out grants and nearly $26,000,000 in loans. In addition, P. W. A. financed the construction of 152 Federal hospital and sanitarium projects for veterans, Indians, the military service, and at Federal prisons, representing some 13,911 beds. During the last several years its program constituted 35 percent of all hospital construction. The folding up of P. W. A. now in process obviously creates a void in hospital construction.

It was in 1938 that Congress outlined the final program of P. W. A. It was in that same year that the President's Interdepartmental Committee called a National Health Conference in Washington for the consideration of a health program which had been proposed by the committee's technical committee on medical care. One of the proposals called for a $1,500,000,000 program of hospital construction and maintenance to be supported by Federal grants-in-aid of 50 percent of the cost. The National Health bill (S. 1620), was an outgrowth of the National Health Conference.

It contains a permanent program of Federal-subsidized hospital construction and maintenance. The financial outlay necessary to implement the full-health program of the bill is so large and has been subjected to so much criticism that its enactment piecemeal apparently is in order.

PRESIDENT'S HOSPITAL MESSAGE

Characterizing hospitals as "essential to physicians in giving modern medical service to the people," and stating that in addition to improving health services, attracting competent doctors, and raising standards of medical care, the new hospitals would provide "laboratory and other diagnostic facilities for the use of local physicians, as well as accommodations for local health departments," President Roosevelt, on January 30, recommended that Congress authorize a program for the construction and equipment of small hospitals in needy areas of the country, the Federal Government to retain title in the property and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to prescribe the standards for their organization, staff, and operation. He suggested that some 50 such hospitals, each having a 100-bed capacity, could be built and equipped for between seven and one-half and ten million dollars. To carry out the President's suggestion, Congressman LEA of California and Senator WAGNER of New York, for himself and Senator GEORGE of Georgia, introduced companion bills, each designated as the "National Hospital Act of 1940." Since that time two additional versions of hospital legislation have been introduced under the headings of the "Health Security Act of 1940." Aside from these three versions of hospital legislation, the hospital title of the National Health bill is still pending before Congress.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL BILL

The Lea and Wagner bills (H. R. 8240 and S. 3230) are identical and will be referred to as the national hospital bill. This bill authorizes an appropriation of $10,000,000 to build federally owned and equipped hospitals in areas where needed, upon the application of public bodies. The applicants would be required to show the need for such a hospital, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that the applicant-public body would be able to maintain the hospital in furnishing services of a satisfactory quality in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General. The hospitals would be built and equipped by the Federal Government, and title to the physical property and equipment would remain in the Government. When so built and equipped, the Federal Government would lease the hospital to the public body for an indefinite period, the consideration for the lease being the maintenance and operation of the hospital in accordance with standards and rules prescribed by the Surgeon General. If at any time the maintenance and operation by the applicant fails to meet such standards and rules, the Surgeon General is required to terminate the lease upon 6 months' notice.

The Surgeon General is directed to conduct and foster surveys regarding needs for hospitalization and problems of hospital operation. In addition he is required to provide training and instruction of personnel who will be required in connection with the hospitals, to cooperate with State and local health and welfare authorities and with professional agencies, and to secure reports and make inspections with respect to professional service and standards of maintenance of the hospitals.

The bill provides for a National Advisory Hospital Council to consist of the Surgeon General as chairman, and six members outstanding in matters pertaining to hospitals and public health, to be appointed by the Surgeon General. The purpose of the council would be to advise the Surgeon General in reviewing project applications, and formulating appropriate professional standards and rules and regulations for operation and maintenance of the hospitals, and in carrying out inspections to determine compliance by the public body applicants.

The term "hospital" is defined to "include the physical facilities necessary for the prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of disease, and for the protection of the public health."

HEALTH-SECURITY BILL

H. R. 8288 and S. 3269 [S. 3269 is a corrected form of S. 3246] are identical and will be referred to as the Schulte-Mead bill. They constitute the first version of the health-security bill.

The Schulte-Mead bill would make $100,000,000 available for hospital loans to public bodies and nonprofit organizations. In the words of Senator MEAD: "This means that privately owned and operated and nonprofit institutions, such as those operated by religious, fraternal, or educational organizations, which have heretofore been denied Federal public-works assistance, will have an opportunity to benefit under the provisions of the bill."

The bill authorizes the Federal Works Administration to loan money for hospital construction, equipment, repair, alteration, extension, improvement, and in conjunction therewith the temporary operation and maintenance for a period not exceeding 4 years. It authorizes no public grants, such as were made by P. W. A. It is exclusively a loan measure. The hospitals constructed with the money loaned would not be Federal-owned, as in the case of the national hospital bill. They would be owned and operated by the public bodies and nonprofit organizations who obtain the loans.

As a condition precedent to making a loan, the Federal Works Administrator must determine that such facilities are now inadequate or nonexistent in the particular area to be served. The loans are authorized to run for a maximum of 50 years at 2-percent interest.

The term "hospital" is defined to mean "any institution or facility for the treatment of illness or disease, and includes any health, diagnostic, or treatment center, station, institution, or clinic."

The Havenner bill (H. R. 8439) is substantially the same as the Schulte-Mead bill. The chief difference is that where public body applicants are unable to furnish enough security, the Federal Works Administrator may grant them the use of W. P. A. labor up to the value of $50,000. In that respect it is a loan-and-grant measure. The labor grant does not extend to nonprofit corporation applicants. The term "hospital" is defined to include "health, diagnostic, and treatment centers, institutions, and related facilities."

Both the Schulte-Mead and the Havenner bills, in addition to authorizing loans for hospital construction, also authorize loans to public bodies and nonprofit corporations to construct sewage-disposal plants, such loans to run as long as 40 or 50 years, at 2 percent interest. In that connection it might be noted that the P. W. A. has participated in financing 1,525 sewer projects by grants in excess of $170,000,000 and loans in excess of $106,000,000.

HOSPITAL TITLE OF NATIONAL HEALTH BILL

Title XII of the national health bill (S. 1620) authorizes Federal grants-in-aid to States to construct and improve needed hospitals, and to assist the States for a period of 3 years in defraying the operating costs of added facilities. The real estate, improvements, and equipments would be owned by the State or political subdivision, and the States would be required to prescribe such standards of management as the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service finds necessary for their efficiency of operation. The Federal money would be granted under State plans approved by the Surgeon General. State advisory councils to be composed of the professions furnishing services under the State plans and other persons informed on the need for hospitals, and Federal advisory councils to be composed of members of the professions and agencies concerned with construction and operation of hospitals and other persons informed on the need for hospitals, are required by the bill.

During the first year, for general hospitals, $8,000,000 would be authorized as hospital grants-in-aid. No certain amount is mentioned for mental and tuberculosis hospitals. The bill provides for a "sum sufficient to carry out, in respect to such hospitals, the purposes of this title."

The term "hospital" is defined to include "health, diagnostic, and treatment centers, institutions, and related facilities."

The health security bills (H. R. 8288, S. 3269, and H. R. 8439) permit public bodies and nonprofit organizations to get Federal loans for the construction and temporary maintenance of hospitals. The applicants must convince the Government that there is need for the institution in the locality and that the applicant can furnish security for the loan. Under these bills the Government exercises no authority over the hospitals unless some control can be found necessary in the case of the temporary operation loans.

The Federal Government would exercise control over the operation of hospitals financed under the provisions of the national hospital bills (H. R. 8240 and S. 3230) and the hospital title of the national health bill (S. 1620). The national hospital bill authorizes the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to formulate standards necessary to insure proper conduct of the hospitals and care of the persons served by the hospitals. And in the case of the hospital title of the national health bill the States are required to prescribe such standards as the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service finds necessary for efficiency.

The attitude of the American Osteopathic Association on such legislation is already a matter of record. As a follow-up to the National Health Conference, which was attended by a delegate of the American Osteopathic Association at the invitation of the President's Interdepartmental Committee, the Government's Technical Committee on Medical Care invited the association to make written suggestions regarding the proposed national health program, including the hospital plans, and a special osteopathic committee appointed for the purpose filed its suggestions. The hospital suggestions made by the osteopathic committee at that time (December 28, 1938) are equally applicable today to the national hospital bill and the national health bill, as follows:

"Existing hospital facilities, including osteopathic hospital facilities, should be utilized to capacity before any new construction is sponsored in the areas served by existing hospitals. Any system of hospital care supported in any part from public funds should contain legal restrictions against discrimination due to the school of practice in managerial control of the hospital or on account of the class of the hospital, viz, public, nonprofit, and proprietary.

"It is the aim of the American Osteopathic Association, the American Osteopathic Hospital Association, and the American College of Osteopathic Surgeons to promote the maintenance of high standards in osteopathic hospitals, just as it is the aim of similar organizations to promote high standards in medical hospitals.

"There should be basic minimum standards for hospitals, the meeting of which would qualify a hospital for use by the hospital indigent, and for participation by the hospital in any system of

general hospital care supported in whole or in part from public funds. The basic minimum standards so set should apply equally to osteopathic as to medical hospitals. We offer our cooperation for the definition of such a standard.

"The osteopathic committee requests that Federal grants-in-aid for hospital construction and maintenance be made under certain conditions to be set out in the Federal law authorizing the grants, and that one of the conditions be that the applicant shall agree that patients shall have the right to be treated therein by regularly licensed practitioners of a school of practice of their own choosing."

Russian Misadventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herbert Hoover, which was published recently in Collier's:

[From Collier's for April 27, 1940]

RUSSIAN MISADVENTURE

(By Herbert Hoover)

The safety and defense of the United States in a world armed to the teeth does not wholly consist of being properly armed ourselves nor of maintaining our neutrality in the present wars.

It depends upon maintaining the respect of other nations. It depends upon our giving vigorous moral support to decent standards of conduct between nations. It depends upon our freedom from the pitfalls of power politics. It depends upon our keeping free of propaganda and interference in our domestic affairs by foreign governments and foreign ideologies.

In other words, our safety and defense depends greatly upon the wisdom of our foreign policies.

In these lights I propose to analyze Mr. Roosevelt's recognition of the Communist Government of Soviet Russia, and its consequences to the American people and to mankind.

The events of the past 6 months have further illuminated this policy and point to two major reasons for a reexamination now.

Errors in foreign policies often cannot be fully corrected. But because errors are made is no sign that nothing can be done about it. When we see that the consequences result in continued disintegration of decent standards in the world and at home, we should at least reassert our position on these standards.

The recognition of Russia is a test of statesmanship. With two-thirds of the world at war, vast problems will arise daily, the solution of which will determine our peace abroad and our peace at home. The capacity and judgment in the past should be examined before we elect leadership for the difficult years before us.

Recognition or nonrecognition of new governments and the exchange of ambassadors or ministers is one of the protections to international decency that nations have developed over centuries. These measures are not merely to provide afternoon teas for cooky-pushers in foreign service or avenues for the redtape of ponderous verbiage in communications. These are measures designed to safeguard nations from grave consequences.

At once let me make it quite clear that in analyzing the recognition of Russia and its consequences I am not advocating war with Russia. Nor am I advocating that we in the remotest degree interfere with the internal affairs of Russia. That is the business of Russia alone.

When our neighbors choose to live a life of disrepute, we do not shoot them up. But we can hold up the moral and social standards in the community a little better if we do not associate with them. Or take part in their parties. Or invite them into our homes. Or present them to our children.

Recognition of new governments is thus more than a reestablishment of legalistic or trade relations. It is a sign that we believe they are respectable members of the family of nations. It gives to them right of entry into our homes. It gives them a recommendation to our neighbors.

Further, let me say that I am not interested in red-baiting. I have no anxiety that the Communists will pull off a Communist revolution in the United States. That is not what happens. What does happen is that a people get annoyed and indignant over Communist sabotage of national life and poisoning of the wells of liberty. Then in a rage they go Fascist and put the Communists down by cruelty and violence. Or in milder form they go vigilante. Both of these reactions are the defeat of liberty. That is the Communist contribution to the abandonment of democracy in a number of nations outside Russia. Communism everywhere has paved the way for fascism. And daily we see the two systems approach the same form of sheer tyranny and despotism.

We may summarize some first-hand history.

For a number of years before the Great War I, as an American engineer, practiced my profession in Russia. In the building of large industrial works I came to know only too well the sufferings of a people under the Czarist despotism. I came to know the gentle character of the great mass of the Russian people. I knew their strivings toward better family and community life. I saw their rising aspirations of liberty. I saw their frustrations against the repression of an intolerable aristocracy.

Finally, in 1916, due to the internal demoralization of the Great War, the Czar was compelled to recall the parliament (the Duma) of the people to ward off rebellion. At that I rejoiced. In March 1917 the courageous men of this parliament overthrew the Czarist government. These were not Communists—they were liberal-minded patriots. They created a representative republic under Kerensky. I felt that even the dreadful losses of the Great War might have compensations in the glow of rising liberty that dawned across the bleak Russian steppes.

In November 1917, however, the Communists, as the Bolshevik Party, in cooperation with Czarist forces, overthrew the democratic government. A bloody curtain descended upon the Russian people. The hope of liberty in Russia had been assassinated. The four modern horsemen of hate, terror, atheism, and imperialism were started on the march in the world.

MASSACRE, NOT REVOLUTION

The Communist revolution was not a revolt against the Czarist regime. It was a massacre under the softer word "liquidation" of all the liberal men and liberal women in Russia. Nearly every member of those brave parliaments who raised the banner of liberty against the Czarist regime was executed without a semblance of justice or compassion. The remaining few still live in exile abroad.

Incidentally, this Communist government deserted the United States in the Great War and gave support to our enemy.

We move on to 1919.

With the Armistice arose the question of the recognition of the Communist government of Russia by the United States. President Wilson requested from me a memorandum upon the matter. It contained these lines:

"* * * The Bolsheviki most certainly represent a minority * * * as such they constitute a tyranny that is the negation of democracy * * * they have resorted to terror, bloodshed, and murder to a degree long since abandoned even amongst reactionary tyrannies. * * * We cannot even remotely recognize this murderous tyranny * * * without transgressing on every national ideal of our own. * * *"

Woodrow Wilson, in fact, needed no such advice. In August 1920 his views and those of the Democratic Party were ably reviewed by Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby—which I condense:

"* * * at the moment when the work of creating a popular representative government based upon universal suffrage was nearly completed, the Bolsheviki * * * an inconsiderable minority of the people, by force and cunning seized the powers and machinery of government, and have continued to use them with savage oppression. * * *

"* * * The responsible spokesmen * * * have declared that * * * the very existence of bolshevism * * * depends * * * upon revolution in all the other great civilizations, including the United States.

"Moreover, it is within the knowledge of the Government of the United States that * * * the Third International * * * is heavily subsidized by the Bolshevist Government from the public revenues of Russia, has for its openly avowed aim the promotion of the Bolshevist revolution throughout the world.

"* * * There can be no confidence * * * if pledges are to be given * * * with a cynical repudiation * * * already in the mind of one of the parties.

"We cannot recognize * * * a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions."

IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY

And now we come to 1921, and the 12 years of Republican administrations.

A great famine descended upon south Russia. The lives of 20,000,000 people were threatened. This famine was in large part due to the undermining of national productivity by the Communist Government. But the Communist leaders appealed to America in the name of humanity. They had expropriated hundreds of millions of American savings invested in Russia. They had repudiated their debt to our Government. But we, being a democracy, listened only to the cry for compassion. We had no desire to punish the Russian people for the wickedness of their oppressors. It fell to me to organize and direct the distribution of more than $75,000,000 worth of American food to those helpless people. We saved the lives of those millions.

And now, after all these years, opens a revealing incident. It appears from disclosures before the Dies committee that during that famine, under a false-front organization, "The Friends of Soviet Russia," absolutely controlled from Moscow, the Communists in the United States in competition with the American relief organizations raised $1,000,000 from the American public for relief of Russia. They now confess that they never sent a cent to Russia but used it for Communist propaganda in the United States. There is

no better commentary on the morals or cruelty of the Soviet Government.

During this period, from 1919 to 1933, the Moscow Government was busy everywhere in the effort to destroy democratic governments. These destructions were a large part of the rise of nazi-ism in Germany and of fascism in Italy. In England Soviet officials were arrested and expelled for conspiracy against the Government.

The Republican administrations for 12 years refused to give the Soviet Government recognition, despite constant propaganda on its part and that of its fellow travelers.

During this time we held to the ground, first, that the Communist government of Russia, with its foundations in cruelty, terror, destruction of liberty and religion and murder, should not be given the dignity and respectability of recognition from free men. Such recognition would increase its destructive power against all free nations and all free men.

Second, that such recognition would open the floodgates of Russian-subsidized Communist propaganda and conspiracy upon the American people.

And third, we knew from a thousand evidences that promises were valueless from a government that openly flaunted all the decencies of men.

While it was not our business, yet such recognition would further cement the hold of 2,000,000 Communists upon 150,000,000 suffering people in their own country.

Thus four Presidents and four Secretaries of State concurred in these views.

We move on to November 16, 1933.

On that date President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia.

The same conditions still prevailed in Russia as when President Wilson denied recognition and they had been confirmed by 14 years of bloody terror. They had been confirmed by the constant effort of Moscow to destroy democratic government everywhere.

Upon that recognition by President Roosevelt there was this explicit agreement:

"* * * the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (agree) to respect scrupulously * * * to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States * * * to refrain and to restrain all persons * * * under its direct or indirect control * * * from any act * * * liable in anyway whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security * * * or any organization or propaganda * * * in any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions. * * * Not to permit the formation * * * of any organization or group * * * which has as an aim the overthrow * * * of the political or social order * * * of the United States * * *."

President Roosevelt, in announcing this great step, said:

"I trust that our nations henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world."

SIX YEARS OF OUR "GOOD NEIGHBOR"

We move on to 1940 and inspect the consequences.

We have now had 6 years of these good-neighbor relations with the Soviet Government.

Overnight we were flooded with conspiracy to overthrow our institutions. The number of actual members of the Communist Party in our country increased at once by 100 percent. But these numbers were trivial. Of more importance is that under the sympathetic attitude of this recognition a score of camouflaged "fellow traveler" and "front" organizations grew apace, controlled by inner cells of Communists. A dozen of them have been exposed, which influenced ideas among millions of people who did not know their origins and control. I need not relate the whole horrid chapter.

As to the fidelity of the Communist Government to its agreement, the unanimous report of the Dies committee, based upon exhaustive research and testimony, says:

"* * * The Communist Party is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party. * * * The party's activities constitute a violation of the treaty of recognition."

That is the one made by President Roosevelt in 1933. The report continues:

"* * * The Communist Party, under instructions from the Comintern (Moscow), has from time to time pursued policies in direct violation of the laws of the United States. * * * Moscow has from the very beginning of the Communist Party in the United States supplied the party here with funds for its subversive activities."

Now let us look at the Communist government at work against nations of free men in its "cooperating * * * for the preservation of the peace of the world."

On August 22, 1939, the world was startled by an alliance of Fascist Hitler and Communist Stalin. This was no surprise to thinking people to whom the blood brotherhood was well known. It was embarrassing to a vast number of pseudoliberals who had tried to envisage fascism as the sole living devil of civilization.

Nine days after this injunction these governments simultaneously attacked independent Poland. They destroyed the freedom of a great people.

Fourteen days later the independence of Latvia and Estonia was destroyed.

We move on again for 60 days. On November 30 last came the unprovoked attack by Russia upon little Finland. Here the might of 160,000,000 Russians was thrown against 3,500,000 peace-loving and liberty-loving Finns. Do I need to describe these scenes? Where before in all civilized time has the slaughter of women and children been applied in an attempt to force the surrender of courageous men?

Is all this "cooperation for the peace of the world"?

We may explore certain other consequences of this recognition of Soviet Russia directly upon American life.

As a sop for the recognition, an appeal was made to the cupidity of the American people. We were told in 1933 that upon this recognition Russia would buy a vast amount of American goods. A good part of American business was brought to support recognition by huge promises of new business.

What is the record? During the almost exactly 6 years from the day of Russian recognition down to the day Poland was attacked we sold a total of about $200,000,000 worth of goods to 160,000,000 people in Russia. That is less than 7 percent of what we sold 10,000,000 people in Canada in the same period. It is a curious commentary that in the 6 years prior to the recognition we sold Russia almost $500,000,000, or more than twice as much.

The copybooks one time said that good does not come out of evil.

Nor should I neglect to mention another item. Prior to 1934 we refused to allow the import of Russian gold. Since recognition we have bought directly and indirectly over $300,000,000 in gold from Russia at $35 per ounce. A large part of this gold is produced by the bleeding fingers of hundreds of thousands of farmers who have been condemned to Siberia for no reason but that they wanted to farm their own farms. That gold is produced by forced labor. It helps the Soviet Government finance the destruction of small nations.

And another commentary on this whole bloody trade is that in the 5 months since Poland was attacked our sales of goods to Russia have increased 300 percent. That represents a large addition of gasoline, copper, alloys, etc., to aid in the subjugation of the liberties of the Finns and the Poles or other peoples.

LABOR PAYS THE PRICE

But there are still more overriding consequences. One result of recognition of the Soviet Government is its interference in American domestic life.

That recognition in 1933 was vigorously protested by such responsible leaders of American labor as William Green, John Frey, Matthew Woll, and others as endangering the whole American labor movement. It was protested by thinking men and women everywhere.

Benjamin Stolberg, in a notable article a few months ago, gave an illuminating exposure of the subsequent Communist penetration of American labor unions under Moscow's direction, and the consequences:

"They organize whispering campaigns of unprintable character-assassination against critics. They bring pressure to bear on every worker. * * * In unions which have employment departments they never send a known anti-Communist to a job. * * * They try their best to get him fired. * * * Their two principal techniques are organized confusion and organized terrorism. * * * The Communists have never hesitated either to break strikes or to precipitate irresponsible walkouts. * * * The Communists called almost 200 unauthorized sit-downs.

Similar evidence has been given by labor leader after labor leader struggling on one hand to maintain the fundamentals of free men against the Communists and on the other to maintain the rights of labor with employer.

The free speech and free press that are essential to liberty give the Communists the full right to expound a fantastic philosophy under which free speech would be suppressed. But they have not been content with peaceful exposition. They have repeatedly organized disturbances of the public order as a means of propaganda.

"Hunger marches" of well-fed men, stimulating riots, were a specialty of the Communist front "unemployed councils" in various parts of the country.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE "BONUS MARCH"

It is now established by their own confessions that it was the Communist front Workmen's Ex-Service League that organized the "bonus march" of deluded veterans on Washington. After Congress had refused their proposals and the administration had paid the fare home of all veterans who had come in good faith, the Communists provoked attacks upon the police in the streets of the National Capital. At that time we identified hundreds of Communists among them who were not veterans at all.

The District authorities finally demanded troops to prevent the killing of men in these riots. After the troops took charge, not one shot was fired, not one man injured.

The lie that a Republican administration had slaughtered innocent veterans of the American Army was made a part of the campaign in 1932.

These are only samples.

There has been much interference in our American political life. Not content to follow democratic processes by organizing their own open political party and seeking change of government through the ballot, they, their fellow travelers, and their false-front organizations have been active within other political parties. I do not for a moment suggest that the New Deal is Communist. But it has neither refused their aid nor properly exorcised them from New Deal support. It is unnecessary to recite the now publicly known labors of Earl Browder, Moscow, and the Communist press to attain this end.

And not the least of their services were as distributors of sewer literature, lies, smears, slander, and libel, with which they flooded

the ignorant. They emerged into the role of organized poisoners of the minds of the American people.

If it were not for the backdrop of tragedy there might be grim humor in President Roosevelt's wishes and warm congratulations to the Soviet Government on its seventeenth anniversary.

Of far deeper importance than all this is the corruption of the spirit of liberalism itself. The basic philosophy of our national life is liberalism in its historic sense. The first pillars of liberalism are intellectual and spiritual liberty. That is freedom of thought, speech, press, and worship. Through representative government, equality of rights, government by law, not by men, we sought that minorities and individuals may live in security. Around this structure were built all the details of justice, of trial by jury, of regulation against oppression and exploitation.

Essential to intellectual and spiritual liberty is also economic freedom. That is the right of men to choose their own jobs, to undertake their own adventures, to receive and enjoy the reward of their own efforts, to save for their families and for their old age.

We stand for economic liberty, for free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse, not because it is a property system or a capitalist system or a profit system or a chamber of commerce slogan. We are for it because we know that it is inseparable from intellectual and spiritual freedom. It has been proved a thousand times that economic liberty cannot be suppressed without suppressing every other liberty. And the most monumental proof of all time is communism and its great exemplar is Soviet Russia.

Liberalism calls for more than even intellectual, spiritual, and economic liberty and the security of these rights. It calls for respect for the dignity of men. It calls for the development of the individual character in men and women, free of fear and filled with hope. It calls for mercy, for compassion, for tolerance. It holds that the sum of individual accomplishments and character of men makes the sum of human progress.

Having stated these perhaps commonplaces of liberalism, does anything of this sort exist in Russia under communism?

What have been the reflexes of this clash in fundamentals upon American liberalism? We have always possessed a large group of sympathetic, idealistic minds who are impatient with the slow and ofttimes discouraging processes of democracy in remedy of injustices. They sincerely welcome each new human hope.

From the outbreak of communism in Russia the ranks of American liberals were at once split. A considerable group gave sympathy and credulity to the Communist revolution, sincerely believing it was the new hope for Russia. Soon they were justifying every atrocity, every phase of this despotism. From the gradual drinking of this poison men who believed themselves liberals fell into support of collectivism in some form. At once went up the cry of "recognize Russia." It became a slogan whereby those who did not bow down were denounced as "reactionary."

In any event, we have seen a strange hybrid that can be called "totalitarian liberalism." We have seen it in so-called liberal publications. We have seen it in some college professors. We have seen it in some misled youth. We have seen it in the halls of Congress. We have seen statism planted in the American Government.

THE NEED AND THE REMEDY

This attitude of the mind—the belief that the expansion of government dictation creates liberty—appears to be the philosophy of these totalitarian liberals.

And yet many such people become indignant if one suggests they are not liberals. Some of them in the past few months have drawn back in horror from the picture now exposed. Our newspaper columns are full of explanations and some forthright apologies.

Today the need among intellectuals in the United States is to conserve liberalism from this totalitarian aberration. For a demon has entered into the minds of many liberal men and women that, like the demon of the Gadarene swine, will plunge them and us over a precipice.

What does all this add up to?

Soviet Russia, since the New Deal formally granted recognition to Stalin's government, has been poisoning vigorously the intellectual and spiritual life of this country. Moscow has maintained in this country a vast propaganda machine, not to make us friendly to Russia but to control and dominate the political and economic life of America. It seeks to foment race hatred among those of our own citizens whom they call the minorities—that is, the Negroes and the foreign-born. It seeks to stir up class hatred among the American people.

Soviet Russia through this machine seeks to influence the attitude of the United States in its relations to other countries that would involve us in power politics.

The facts that I have related become plainer every day. Yet we are holding in friendship the "red" hand that grabbed a part of Poland and forced a treaty that despoiled Finland.

The recognition of Soviet Russia was a gigantic political and moral mistake. It was not a mistake proved from change of circumstance. It was a mistake obvious from the beginning.

Would it not establish self-respect, would it not contribute to reestablish moral standards in a sorry world, if we took some action?

To withdraw technical recognition at this time of a world aflame might be misinterpreted as warlike. But the moral equities would be at least reasserted if we withdraw our Ambassador and left the technical representation of a Chargé d'Affaires. Why are we more tender of tyranny in Communist Russia than in Nazi Germany?

We criticize some of our youth because we say they are "red." We criticize certain labor unions because we say that they are dominated by Communists. We arrest certain Americans because they serve Soviet Russia in this country illegally. Yet we do not stop to think that it was our own Government that set the mark of respectability on Soviet Russia and the things these people advocate.

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

LETTER FROM P. K. GRAVELY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter which I recently received from the president of the China American Tobacco Co., of Rocky Mount, N. C., Mr. P. K. Gravely.

I have known Mr. Gravely all of my life, and I have a very high regard for his views.

In the hope of prevailing upon the Members of the House to adopt the amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act proposed in the Norton bill, which provides an exemption of employees engaged in handling, drying, stripping, grading, redrying, fermenting, stemming, packing, and storing leaf tobacco I am submitting for your consideration the letter I received from Mr. Gravely in which he discusses the effect of the present law upon employees.

CHINA AMERICAN TOBACCO CO.,
Rocky Mount, N. C., April 15, 1940.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just received the copy of the Barden amendments to the wage and hour law, known as H. R. 7133. I want to say I hope you and your colleagues will support these amendments to the end that they may be enacted into law.

I am interested in them from the standpoint of a leaf-tobacco dealer and exporter and it is that feature of the amendments which concerns me most. I know more about the class of labor employed in that business than the other labor involved under the amendments and am in better position to express an opinion as to the effect upon the laborers as well as upon the leaf-tobacco dealers or employers.

Since the enactment of the original law there has been a very decided swing toward the installation of machinery to do the work of the laborers, particularly the stemmers, but also among all the other classes of labor employed.

In the past tobacco season, during which we operated under the wage and hour law, the entire industry handled the largest crop of tobacco ever produced without employing any additional laborers. It was done by machinery.

In my own company we handled 33⅓ percent more tobacco than in previous years and yet employed less labor. That was done by the use of machinery. We are now contemplating the purchase and use of still additional machinery for the coming season.

In the use of machinery there are more female employees used than men employees, and under the wage and hour law as it operates at present the female employees actually earn more money per person than heretofore, but there are employed a greatly reduced number.

Likewise, under the present law the male employees earn more wages per hour but they are not receiving the benefit of overtime as in former years when wages were less, and, consequently, are not earning more money per week than they did in previous years. They are, consequently, the losers. Although they are the heads of the families they are actually earning no more money than in previous years, and in many instances less per week.

The initial cost of the installation of machinery is a great burden on employers, but once the machinery is installed it is a matter of economy to add to it and use it because it reduces the number of employees required, until ultimately I believe the number of employees will be reduced to a minimum; and the class of labor necessarily used in this community by the tobacco industry is the class which actually is in need of more employment at less pay per hour.

During the past year the tobacco industry has handled the largest crop on record and we are now faced with a greatly reduced crop, not only for the ensuing year, but more than likely for several years to come. If the labor in the industry has not been benefited during the past year we naturally may expect they cannot possibly be benefited under the wage and hour law during the years immediately in front of us.

Unless there is some relief for the employees in the tobacco industry of this section I have grave fears for them in the future. I am sure the employers of labor can and will overcome the increased hourly wage by the use of machinery; in fact, I know it has been done in a great many instances. I believe the employers would rather see a change in the law for the benefit of the employees, and for my own part that is the point with which I am most concerned.

I hope you will pardon the length of this letter but I wanted to give you my ideas, in the hope that you may find something therein of usefulness. I can, if you think it is beneficial, give you some facts and figures to substantiate the things I have mentioned herein.

With my kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

P. K. GRAVELY, *President.*

Farm Tenancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, when I last addressed this House a few days ago I discussed in brief the situation with reference to the appropriation to continue the farm-tenancy program in the country and called attention to the fact that the House conferees on the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, would bring the so-called farm-tenancy amendment among others back to the House for a vote probably this week.

In my brief talk to this House, I pointed out that the Senate had put a loan provision in the bill which authorizes the R. F. C. to lend $50,000,000 next year to farmers of the Nation to assist them in the purchase of farms for homes.

At the conclusion of my last remarks on the subject I requested all Members especially interested in continuing the farm-tenancy program to meet Monday of this week to discuss ways and means of organizing in order to make sure that the farm-tenancy amendment would have a fair opportunity to be discussed and voted upon and passed by this House. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that about 50 Members, representing some 30 States, met last Monday to discuss farm tenancy and the other 10 Senate amendments to the bill in question in which a vast majority of those Members representing agricultural districts are also interested. Aside from these 50 Representatives in Congress who attended our meeting I have had over a dozen letters and many telephone calls from other Members who were unable to attend the meeting assuring me of their loyal support of all of the 11 Senate amendments to the agricultural appropriation bill.

I cannot at this time discuss all of the 11 amendments in question, but I do wish to say that our farm group is especially interested in parity payments to farmers, the continuance and expansion of the popular surplus-commodities set-up, the water-facilities program, the loan to the R. E. A., in addition to continuation of the farm-tenancy program.

Many Members present expressed the belief that a goodly number of the Members of Congress who had not heretofore supported a direct appropriation for the farm-tenancy program will support the Senate amendment of permitting such loans to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It has been pointed out that there is not a more careful or conservative official in the entire Federal administration than Hon. Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

May I again call the attention to Members that soon the House will have an opportunity to decide whether to destroy or to continue on a conservative basis the Bankhead-Jones farm tenant loan program. A relatively small appropriation for this program, under which able and energetic tenants can borrow money for the purchase of farms, is one of the important items in the agricultural appropriation bill, on which the conference committee was unable to agree.

It is possible that some Members of the House are not thoroughly familiar with this program simply because it has never been the subject of criticism or partisan discussion. With the possible exception of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, no measure enacted in the last decade, or no governmental agency or set-up, has won such widespread acceptance in all sections of the country and among the members of both parties. Even the most outspoken enemies of the New Deal have usually refrained from serious attack on the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant program. Abcut the only objection has been that it does not reach a sufficient number of farmers to make a dent in the solution of the perplexing farm-tenant problem.

The reason for this general acceptance is clear. These loans to help tenants buy farms of their own constitute a cautious, conservative method of making small capitalists and landowners out of one of the most unstable elements of our population. Because it gives deserving tenants a stake in the country, it is an extremely effective method of combating radicalism and discontent. Moreover, it is accomplishing this purpose with little or no drain on the Treasury, since the borrowers are repaying their loans promptly and in many cases even ahead of schedule.

As an illustration of the widespread support which the Bankhead-Jones farm tenant loan program has gained throughout the whole United States, I would like to call to your attention a few excerpts from editorials recently published in leading newspapers and farm magazines of the country.

Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, March 6, 1940:

Congress, ostensibly economy-minded in an election year, has stricken the appropriation of $50,000,000 for the farm tenant purchase plan, now in its third year of operation, apparently abandoning one of the best pieces of legislation of the Roosevelt administration. * * * Economy in government is much to be desired, but there are so many other ways that expenses could be reduced without striking at a plan which can do more fundamentally for the American way of life than any other conceived by the New Deal.

Troy (N. Y.) Record, December 28, 1939:

One of the least publicized, but one of the most commendable innovations of the New Deal, is the tenant purchase loan plan which permits farmers of ability to emerge from the farm employee or sharecropper class into the landowner class.

Mobile (Ala.) Register, March 2, 1940:

Farm tenancy is on the increase in the United States, and for Congress to withdraw Federal support from the corrective program at this time is like withholding serum during an epidemic. * * * Of all the money allotted agriculture by the Federal Government, none is put to more worthy or careful use than that to reduce the number of farm tenants. Loans are limited; they are not promiscuously granted. Nor is over 5 percent of farm-tenancy allotments used for administrative purposes. * * * Farm tenancy long has been one of the Nation's major problems. Federal attempts to eliminate this economic evil must not be abandoned at a time when satisfactory strides are being made toward its eventual correction.

Jacksonville (Fla.) Times Union, March 7, 1940:

Congress, it would seem, could find many items in the huge appropriation bill from which to cut $25,000,000 instead of lopping off that sum from the funds to aid farm tenants and sharecroppers in buying land. Soundness of this program has been demonstrated. The money is not advanced as a gift but as a loan, and the record of repayments shows comparatively few delinquencies. It is much better than the F. H. A. record. Instead of striking out the appropriation, experience should teach the Congressmen that the better plan would be to increase it to several times the amount that was proposed. As operated during the last 2 years the program has more than justified its existence.

Wisconsin Agriculturist, February 24, 1940:

Spokesmen for reducing the Federal fund for giving well-selected tenant farmers a chance to buy farms at 3-percent interest, amortized for 40 years, raised the cry in Congress that such work was futile and slow. * * * To argue that a small start in such loans, well placed and supervised, is useless sounds exactly like the old arguments advanced to discourage the rural-delivery bill, Federal highway aids, and C. C. C. camps. Luckily, others do not take this defeatist attitude.

Nashville (Tenn.) Southern Agriculturist, March 1940:

To taxpayers who have been increasingly and justifiably alarmed by the rapid and uncontrolled growth of the national debt during

the past few years the current activities of the economy bloc in Congress are a source of renewed hope. The fly in the ointment, however, is the tendency to slash the Budget at the expense of the farmer. * * * Particularly is it unfair to invalidate the almost self-liquidating Tenant Purchase Act, cornerstone and symbol of a new day of owner-operated farms in the South, by failure to vote the comparatively small appropriation asked for its continuance.

Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, February 20, 1940:

It would appear, from some actions of the economy bloc in Congress, that the popular demand for reduction of Federal expenditure is, as have so many other fundamentally commendable movements, being used by some political factions to serve selfish purposes. * * * Elimination of funds for continuance of the farm-tenant purchase plan is a startling case in point. Of all the developments in the national agricultural program there is none more soundly based or holding forth greater promise of ultimate benefit to the Nation and its people than this. * * * There is more wisdom in a program which seeks to reestablish the landless upon their own home farms than in all the plans for subsidies, for equalization, and for crop bounties combined. Of all the efforts of the Federal administration to improve the economic lot of the rural population of the country, there is none which can be of greater value than this program to make farm owners, once again, out of worthy, but landless, farm workers.

Austin (Tex.) American, August 30, 1939:

There have been only a few delinquencies. Payments thus far are ahead of maturities. Credit for such a marvelous record must go not alone to the lending agency for its exercise of sound discretion in making the loans, but to the tenants. The record is sufficient to show that among tenants there are many who appreciate Government aid, and who are capable of making a farm of their own profitable.

Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, February 1940:

Penny-wise and pound-foolish economy was seen at its worst when Congress struck out the appropriation for helping farm tenants become farm owners. That was like canceling a fire-insurance policy to reduce the cost of a building's upkeep. * * * For 2 years now the program has been operating, under the Farm Security Administration, with highly satisfactory results. * * * It is not a burden added to the cost of government, but a bulwark for national economy and security. The great majority of the loans will be repaid, and the farm ownership they make possible will net the common weal returns valuable beyond measure Far from destroying or stinting such a project, Congress should give it liberal support.

Greenville (S. C.) News, February 1940:

Shall the farm-tenancy program be stopped? While looking with genuine approval upon the congressional efforts for greater economy in Government spending, numerous citizens and newspapers of the South regard with regret the total elimination of the relatively small item to carry on the work of reducing farm tenancy under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. * * * The program is meeting a real need and placing thousands of families in possession of their own farms. * * * There cannot be any question that if this program is successful in reducing the number of tenant farmers by turning them into successful farm owners an inestimable benefit will accrue to the country.

Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald, February 10, 1940:

There is every indication that a large proportion of the purchasers of homes will carry through their obligations successfully for themselves and the Government. This program combats a deep-seated, basic, and highly dangerous evil of long standing. It is a conservative attempt to reverse a trend that, unless checked, is surely fraught with gravest disaster for this country. What do you think would become of this country if increasingly our farmers continued to lose their means of making a living? It would be a calamity for our whole way of life. Yet, the House of Representatives has voted to discontinue, at this critical stage, this promising attack on a fundamental evil. Such action seems almost incredibly short-sighted. Surely a wiser reconsideration of this decision should come.

Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, February 22, 1940:

To us it seems ridiculously short-sighted of the present Congress to restrict, if not completely halt, the one most constructive program begun for restoration of ownership of the soil to the tillers who must gain their living therefrom and supply the Nation's needs of agricultural products—the farm-tenant loans made through the Farm Security Administration. Funds for the continuance of this program have been cut from the Budget by the lower House; an effort will be made in the Senate to repair the omission, and the general citizenry, we think, should evince great interest in full restoration of the sinews of the program. * * * We can see no economy whatsoever in the restriction. The farm-purchase loans, in the scant time since Congress authorized them 3 years ago, have proved as nearly self-liquidating as any federally financed project.

Greensboro (N. C.) Record, February 28, 1940:

Farm tenancy has long since come to be recognized as one of the greatest handicaps of our national economy—particularly so in the South. * * * Under the Bankhead-Jones Act many capable and deserving farmers are being assisted in buying farms of their own on long and favorable terms.

Chattanooga (Tenn.) Evening Tribune, April 16, 1940:

Something real is being done about tenancy. The Farm Security Administration has embarked upon a long-term program to make farm owners out of tenants. This involves much more than merely buying a farm for a man, taking his notes, and forgetting him until the sheriff puts him out. It means careful selection of the tenant risk; stocking the new farm with the essential animals and equipping it with the minimum tool needs. It means educating the selected tenant in the methods of subsistence farming and supervising his efforts toward a better way of life. This program represents the most effective effort being made today to get rid of peasantry in America.

Clyde Harold Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CLYDE HAROLD SMITH, late a Representative from the State of Maine

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the memorial exercises for Representative CLYDE H. SMITH, of Maine, I include the following tributes paid to him at the exercises in his memory at Skowhegan, Maine; also an address delivered by Representative SMITH as a young man of 21, when a member of the Maine Legislature, at memorial exercises for Hon. Thomas B. Reed, a former Representative from Maine and a former Speaker of the House.

SERVICES FOR REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE H. SMITH AT SKOWHEGAN, MAINE, APRIL 11, 1940

REMARKS BY REV. THOMAS S. CLEAVER, PASTOR, THE FEDERATED CHURCH, SKOWHEGAN, MAINE

We have gathered in this home this afternoon to pay our respect and tribute to one whose name is known to many from Maine to California. At the service which was held in Washington his associates in the United States Congress and Senate paid tribute to his worth as a statesman.

When we come to this hour which is common to mankind we would want to be remembered by our family, loved ones, and friends. No one wants to be forgotten. We are all eager for immortality, here as well as in the hereafter, and we want to be remembered at our best.

Today I must speak of him as I knew him and met him in this town, where he lived for so many years, where he did so many fine things, and where he was loved by all.

Skowhegan has lost a good citizen. At all times he did his level best for its welfare. He not only gave a full measure of his time, energy, and talents to this town but also to this great State in which he was born and where he served through many years with marked ability.

The name of CLYDE H. SMITH is known from Kittery to Fort Kent. In these more recent years he has represented our district most acceptably at Washington.

We are known to our fathers by different traits of character. Our fellow townsman had a rare faculty of making friends with all classes of society. The words of Sam Walter Foss come to my mind in this connection:

"Let me live in a house by the side of the road,
Where the race of men go by;
The men who are good and the men who are bad,
As good and as bad as I.

"I would not sit in a scoffer's seat
Or hurl a cynic's ban.
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man."

A natural outcome of his ability to make friends was his constant desire to be of service to his friends, to the unfortunate and needy and unemployed. His heart went out to the man who found it hard to make ends meet. He always seemed to be at his best when he could help somebody. While he never was a Boy Scout, he had learned to do a good turn daily. Moreover, he carried his friends' well-being on his heart, and out of a clear sky conferred many favors and kindnesses.

The genuine and sincere hospitality of this man and his good wife could not be surpassed. They were gracious hosts and left no stone unturned to make their friends feel at home both here and

in Washington. This trait can best be expressed by one word—others.

"Lord, help me live from day to day
In such a self-forgetful way
That, even when I kneel to pray,
My prayer shall be for others.

"And when my work on earth is done
And my new work in heaven's begun,
May I forget the crown I've won,
While thinking still of others."

One of the finest examples of teamwork that I have witnessed was that which existed between our fellow townsman and his wife. They shared their daily experiences. There was a delightful give and take, both in the home and public office. His heartaches and disappointments, his joys and successes have been hers. May God's richest blessing and his divine comfort and the peace which passeth all understanding ever be hers. May the memory of this many-sided man continue to bless and inspire her and us as the years come and go.

If he could say a few words, I feel sure that he would couch them in the words of Robert Louis Stevenson:

"Though he that, ever kind and true,
Kept stoutly step by step with you
Your whole long, gusty lifetime through,
Be gone a while before,
Be now a moment gone before,
Yet, doubt not, soon the season shall restore
Your friend to you.

"He has but turned a corner; still
He pushes on with right good will
Through mire and marsh, by heuch and hill
The self-same arduous way—
That self-same upland hopeful way,
That you and he through many a doubtful day
Attempted still.

"He is not dead, this friend; not dead,
But, in the path we mortals tread,
Got some few trifling steps ahead,
And nearer to the end,
So that you too, once past the bend,
Shall meet again, as face to face, this friend
You fancy dead.

"Push gayly on, strong heart! The while
You travel forward mile by mile,
He loiters with a backward smile,
Till you can overtake,
And straining his eyes, to search his wake,
Or, whistling as he sees you thru the brake,
Waits on a stile."

Mankind has always believed in the immortality of the soul. He knew that his work was not done. He leaves it for others to complete. Now, we must learn the discipline of living with the spirit of our loved ones and friends. Death is all gain to him. It is true that we have lost the sound of his voice and the touch of his hand and the joy of his fellowship. But, we must carry on and bring to pass his ideals and unrealized dreams. This makes us richer in capacities for understanding and service in helping others and stronger because we have shared a common sorrow.

"There is no death! the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

"There is no death! the forest leaves
Convert to life the viewless air:
The rocks disorganize to feed
The hungry moss they bear.

"There is no death! the dust we tread
Shall change, beneath the summer showers,
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

"There is no death! the leaves may fall
And flowers may fade and pass away;
They only wait through wintry hours,
The coming of the May.

"And near us, though unseen,
The dear immortal spirits tread,
For all the boundless universe
Is life—'there are no dead.'"

PRAYER AND POEMS PRESENTED BY REV. ALBERT I. OLIVER, MINISTER OF THE CENTENARY METHODIST CHURCH, SKOWHEGAN, MAINE

GOD'S TOMORROW

(A poem by John Oxenham)

The night is very black and grim,
Our hearts are sick with sorrow—
But on the rim of the curtain dim
A pulsing beam, a tiny gleam,
Whispers of God's tomorrow.
Beyond the night there shines a light,
Our eyes are dim with sorrow—
But Faith still clings, and Hope still springs,
And Love still sings of happier things,
For Life is flighting strong new wings
In search of God's tomorrow.

O God, Lord and Father of us all, we turn to Thee in our need, for in Thee we may find help that no one else can give. We realize that Thou hast wondrously endowed us with gifts of body, mind, and soul to enable us to attend to the duties of life as we make our way on through the years. But in an hour like this, we discover that all these ordinary powers of ours are quite inadequate to meet the more serious experiences of life, to solve its more difficult problems, and to face these great realities of life and death and immortality. So we turn to Thee, and pray that Thou wilt bestow upon us in this hour Thy divine help, granting unto us the strength and wisdom and courage as Thou seest there is need.

Our hearts are heavy as we think of the things that are not—but we find comfort and peace in our confidence in the things that still are. We believe that Thou art, that Thou art Father of us all, that we are Thy children, and that we may come to Thee as any child turns to its parent for comfort, protection, and help. Faith is still ours, and hope, and love. Friendship is ours, and life is ours. We cling to these things that still are, and thank Thee for these great gifts.

We thank Thee for this man, for his courageous spirit, for his busy, active days, for the outreach of his life out beyond himself, into the needs and interests of other lives. We thank Thee that we live in a land where a life like his is possible, a land where life may be freely expressed as his was in so many different directions of value.

And now we pray that Thy richest blessing may rest upon this entire company of people assembled here this day. May Thy spirit come to these friends and neighbors who by their presence and gifts of flowers are seeking to express their sympathy for those who mourn his loss. Thank God for our friends who stand by in our hours of need—this is a gift of life that really is. May Thy spirit, too, rest upon these who have been associated with him in town and State and Nation—these with whom he has taken counsel in the guidance of civic affairs. And upon those who belong to the inner circle of family life—those, who by ties of blood and marriage, stand a little nearer to his life—upon these may Thy spirit rest in abundant measure. And especially upon her who, as his companion, shared with him the cares and responsibilities of his life, may Thy spirit come with comforting power, upholding her and keeping her not only in this present hour but in the days to come.

Upon us all may Thy spirit rest, prompting us so to live that when life shall close for us we shall be entitled to the approval of those who have known us best, as well as Thy divine favor.

We ask all this in the name of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

GOOD-BYE, TILL MORNING

"Good-bye, till morning come again";
We part, if part we must, with pain,
But night is short, and hope is sweet;
Faith fills our hearts, and wings our feet;
And so we sing the old refrain,
"Good-bye, till morning come again."

"Good-bye, till morning come again";
The thought of death brings weight of pain;
But could we know how short the night
That falls and hides them from our sight,
Our hearts would sing the old refrain,
"Good-bye, till morning come again."

Memorial address on the life and character of THOMAS BRACKETT REED, former Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, in the house of representatives at Augusta, Maine, at a joint session of the Maine Legislature on January 28, 1903

REMARKS OF HON. CLYDE H. SMITH, REPRESENTATIVE FROM HARTLAND

Your Excellency and gentlemen of the assembly: It is not my purpose to attempt any extended eulogy on the illustrious life work of this illustrious statesman. It is not for me to seek to penetrate the veil and speak of him in that sphere as husband and father, as neighbor or townsman. More eloquent lips than mine can tell that which was his noblest calling and highest attainment; his love and affection for family and home. Others are here to tell the story of his kindness and loyalty to friend and kinsman. It is sufficient for me to contribute but a word, to bring a single flower of tender memory, to add my little wreath of affectionate admiration in behalf of his sacred memory. Who of us that have not observed while scanning the blue heavens above, with her millions of sparkling worlds, scattered sparingly here and there, a majestic star, pouring forth her richer and more radiant rays, surpassing all others. How true we find this of mankind. The laws of creation, having heir to us now and then a great and natural leader, towering far above his fellow beings, conspicuous among the distinguished sons reared from the rugged hills of the old Pine Tree State, is one whose name is not only familiar to the children of our every village, hamlet, and town, but of the South beneath her sunny skies, in distant California amid her fields of golden rocks, and yea, in far away New Zealand the name of Thomas Brackett Reed is written there.

A soldier has fallen. A hero is dead. Not while on the battlefield, amid the rush of contending parties; nor while in gallant leadership, leading his party onward and onward in her every charge, with victory ever in hand, for he had laid down the gavel,

and ceased to participate in the great political arena of his life. But we can never forget how we have known of him in this very hall, a leader of leaders, champion of champions. How we have known of him at Washington, confronted with the fiery blasts of jealousy and a divided house. How we have known of him as emancipating his people from the shackles of a filibustering contingent in the National House of Representatives. How we have known of him when our very hearts were beating that he might be selected as our standard bearer and chief magistrate over the grandest Nation ever visited by mankind. But he had met his final conqueror, and sank beneath his icy breath. Though silent is the grave, death can claim no victory. For that master mind, the handiwork of the eternal God, will shine brighter day by day, while others may grow dim with the space of time. His works are ended. No man can tell the results of his labors. But from memory's shrine his name can never be effaced. The dreams of childhood and visions of old age vanish. Flowers bloom, blush, and fade away. Stars fall from the heaven and leave no trace behind them. But a life like Thomas Brackett Reed can never run its course and be forgotten, and when the fettered fangs of eternity were bearing his soul away, his life was just beginning.

Wallace Edgar Pierce

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WALLACE EDGAR PIERCE, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when WALLACE E. PIERCE left us the Congress lost one of its most promising Members. One's ability of accomplishment in the Congress depends primarily upon one thing; that is, he must have the confidence of his colleagues. It matters not how capable, industrious, or clever a Member may be, if he lacks integrity of character, his associates here soon find it out. Although Mr. PIERCE had not yet finished his first term when he answered the final summons, he had established himself in the confidence of his colleagues. The fact that he succeeded and was sponsored by an illustrious predecessor—the former chairman of the Rules Committee and minority leader, Bertrand H. Snell—was most helpful to him. He lived up to every prediction made by Mr. Snell. He received the unusual honor of being assigned to the Judiciary Committee during his first term, and it was in this committee where I became intimately acquainted with him. He was a gentleman in every particular. He was an outstanding lawyer—made so by broad and practical experience. He was a resourceful debater. He possessed splendid judgment. Unlike many Members, he knew when to speak and when not to speak. He was, therefore, effective and appreciated.

His own congressional district, the great State of New York, and the country at large lost a worth-while Member of Congress when WALLACE E. PIERCE was called away.

Thomas Sanders McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. PAUL H. MALONEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS SANDERS MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day when we are called to assemble and pay tribute to those of our colleagues who have been called into another service by their Creator, our hearts again are filled with the deepest sympathy for their loved ones, whom we join in sorrow.

Among the illustrious names of Members of the Hall of Congress who departed this life last year is the name of THOMAS S. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this House lost one of its most capable and energetic Members in the passing of THOMAS MCMILLAN.

When I entered as a Member of this great body some years ago, TOM MCMILLAN was one of my first congressional acquaintances, and as the years went on I saw much of him, and I learned much from him and much about him. He was a real gentleman who worshiped his family, loved his friends, and was loyal to his constituency and their interest to the last degree.

TOM MCMILLAN was an energetic worker and he had much ability and influence that he used to great advantage for the common good; we miss him, Mr. Speaker.

His life was one of service, he has gone, but his deeds remain and will be here many years to come, to evidence his unselfish service.

I think TOM MCMILLAN's life was a true example of the life of a good citizen as exemplified in the following words of a philosopher:

He worked every day like he was going to live forever,
And lived every day like he was going to die tomorrow.

Should Relief Administration Be Returned to the States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix articles appearing in the Washington Daily News for April 27, 1940, entitled "The American Forum: Should Relief Administration Be Returned to the States?"

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 27, 1940]

THE AMERICAN FORUM: SHOULD RELIEF ADMINISTRATION BE RETURNED TO THE STATES?

THE QUESTION

(By Theodore Granik, director, the American Forum)

In 1935 the relief policy of the Roosevelt administration was crystallized in the program of W. P. A. From the outset the program has been beset with controversy.

1. Has the W. P. A. program been a success or a failure?

2. Should administration or management of relief be vested in the States?

3. Would Federal grants-in-aid for relief, administered by the States and localities, be more efficient, more economical, and more nonpartisan than the present W. P. A. program?

These questions are being asked by every citizen and debated on every political forum. They are likely to become an election issue. The opposing views of two outstanding national figures, Members of the United States Senate, are set forth in these articles, written exclusively for the American Forum, as the question comes under renewed discussion in Congress.

"NO," SAYS WAGNER

(By ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator from New York)

The oft-repeated cry that relief should be "returned" to the States in itself raises no substantial issue. The Federal Government has not forcibly taken the problem of relief from any State; nor has it ever prevented any State from assuming the full burden of relief and meeting it in its own way.

The Federal Government has assumed a large share of the relief burden upon the overwhelming demand of the States and localities

themselves, under the impact of economic conditions affecting the economic welfare of the Nation as a whole.

This demand for substantial Federal participation continues unabated. The low level of direct relief benefits now paid by the localities—averaging less than half the W. P. A. wage payments per worker for the country at large—and the recurring crises in relief administration in Ohio and other States, scarcely inspire confidence in the ability of the States to take on any larger share of the relief burden.

The fact is that under pending legislation sponsored by Senator TAFT and others, the Federal Government would assume two-thirds of the cost of all relief assistance—direct relief as well as work relief—with the Federal appropriation of $1,250,000,000 next year. Manifestly this is a plan, not to return relief to the States, but rather to impose on the Federal Treasury a larger proportion of the total relief burden than it currently bears.

The localities play an important part in the financing and administration of relief under the present set-up. In addition to bearing the entire cost of direct relief, each State must now contribute at least 25 percent of the aggregate cost of W. P. A. projects within its borders. Practically all W. P. A. projects are sponsored by States and localities, and are selected by these local agencies according to local needs. Finally, the W. P. A. workers on each project are certified as to need by the local relief authorities.

At the same time, the W. P. A. program has all the advantages of centralized administrative and engineering control—efficiency of management, savings in overhead expense, and flexibility in shifting project operations from locality to locality depending on rapidly shifting needs. These advantages accord with the essentially national character and effects of mass unemployment, which is often greatest where local resources are least able to bear the strain.

Of every Federal dollar expended under W. P. A., only about 3 cents go toward administrative costs, 10 cents go for materials, and 87 cents go directly into the pockets of W. P. A. workers as wages earned on the job. Even if the works program were continued under local auspices, it could not possibly achieve these economies in administration. Experience under F. E. R. A. between 1933 and 1935, as well as under existing local relief programs, indicates clearly that administrative costs under any proposed Federal grant-in-aid program would be at least three times as great as the Federal administrative cost under W. P. A.

Such a grant-in-aid system would be operated in practice by 48 separate States delegating authority to thousands of local subdivisions. It could only result in confusion where there is now efficiency and order; high administrative cost where there is now Federal economy, and local political pressures where there is now rigid nonpartisan administration, enforced by the criminal sanctions of the Hatch Act.

In 4½ years of successful operation, W. P. A. has developed 250,000 separate projects. The program has produced rather than consumed wealth. Over 450,000 miles of highways have been constructed or improved. Over 33,000 school buildings and 1,600 hospitals have been newly built or modernized. Thousands of other permanent national assets—armories, bridges, waterworks, airports—have been constructed throughout the country, for the use of this and future generations. Health, welfare, recreation, and cultural projects have brought countless benefits to people in every walk of life.

The wages paid W. P. A. workers, and the vast funds expended for materials, have invigorated every line of private enterprise; W. P. A. has been of special assistance to hard-pressed small-business men in the retail trades. The job skills of millions of American workers, unemployed through no fault of their own, are being maintained until they can again be absorbed by private industry. The confidence, morale, and health of millions of families have been fortified by employment of the breadwinner on useful public improvements.

In the preservation of its human and material resources, no democracy could have made a better investment or enjoyed so rich a return.

The contention that the return of relief administration to the States and localities would bring substantial economies, can only be sustained by drastically cutting work-relief wages, or by scrapping the entire works program and substituting the philosophy of charity.

The American people have again and again expressed their opposition to leaf-raking projects, or the return to the bread line, the soup kitchen, and the dole. With democracy on trial here and throughout the world, we cannot afford to say to millions of men and women that they shall have neither jobs in private industry nor the help of their Government in earning a decent livelihood in a self-respecting and useful way.

Because W. P. A. has not absorbed all the able-bodied unemployed is an argument for larger Federal appropriations, which I have advocated; it is no argument for dragging our sound, successful W. P. A. program down to the level of local direct relief.

The W. P. A. program embodies the progressive economic and social ideals translated into national action by the Roosevelt administration. It represents a policy tested by experience, and found essential to the maintenance of business stability and the satisfaction of human rights.

"YES," SAYS TAFT

(By ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio)

For 5 years the Federal program of relief has been frozen under a system which at huge expense can carry only a fraction of the army of unemployed. In adhering stubbornly to the W. P. A. system, now thoroughly discredited, the New Deal has become reactionary in its resistance to all changes and improvements in its plans.

Last year the total expense was reduced from two and a quarter billion to about one billion and a half for the current year. At the beginning of this session we were told that only a billion dollars would be required for the year ending July 1, 1940. But now the administration is apparently back of a proposal to increase this by another half billion dollars.

The truth is that the W. P. A. system is extremely expensive and yet inadequate. It does not meet the problem, but it increases tremendously the public debt.

W. P. A. is not really relief; it is a Federal work program. Politics being what it is, it is necessary to conduct that program in practically every county in the United States, whether it is really necessary or not. Furthermore, regardless of certifications by local authorities, many men apparently get on W. P. A., even in the cities, who are not relief cases.

From November 1938 to November 1939, W. P. A. cases in Cleveland were reduced from 75,000 to 30,000. Fifteen thousand went on city relief; 15,000 were absorbed by industry; but 15,000 apparently found odd jobs or other work, indicating that they never need have been on W. P. A.

Furthermore, when a particularly acute relief situation has arisen, as in Cleveland, the apportionment of W. P. A. jobs was not sufficient to take care of the extraordinary unemployment situation existing there, and threw back on an already overburdened city a large number of relief cases.

W. P. A. proceeds on the unsound premise that the Federal Government will look after employables, leaving unemployables to the States. As a matter of fact, because of the great cost, the Federal Government has never taken care of all the employables. Furthermore, there is no such distinction. We should never admit that there is any class of unemployables for whom some work cannot be found.

Relief is a single problem, covering employables and unemployables alike. Administration must be unified, and also unified with the employment services and unemployment insurance.

A man who loses his job should first be helped by the employment agency to find a new job. After a brief interval he should draw unemployment insurance. When that is finally exhausted, he should go on direct relief. If private work is still unavailable, there should be some form of work relief.

The needs of each man must be met by a sympathetic administration in the district where he lives. Any Federal organization becomes hidebound with rules and red tape. Our experience with W. P. A. shows that it is likely to be saturated with politics.

The best form of administration we ever had was that before the W. P. A. began, when relief was operated by cooperation between local authorities with community chest personnel and Federal funds.

Relief has always been a local responsibility. There is only one excuse for Federal interference, and that is the limited financial resources of the States and local governments, resulting from their restricted powers of taxation.

Their revenues are already absorbed in current needs for county, city, and school services, and they are unable to meet the extraordinary cost of relief in a depression. The fact that the Federal Government has to put up some of the money is no excuse for Federal administration.

The only sound solution to the relief problem is to return relief to the States, with a Federal grant amounting perhaps to two-thirds of the total cost of direct and work relief. This percentage might be increased in special cases, after a hearing before a Federal board.

If the locality has to put up some of its own money, it will not engage in unnecessary work projects. The law should condition the Federal grant on each State's setting up a complete plan of relief under civil-service personnel, which does not discriminate between race, color, or creed, and provides both direct and work relief.

The total number of cases would be reduced in some districts, and the cost per case will be substantially lower, if we can judge by the relief systems now administered in many cities. There will be much greater equality between the different recipients of relief, and a much more coordinated plan for dealing adequately with the whole field of relief.

The Federal Government should assume some special responsibility for the transient problem which it has badly neglected.

A plan substantially like the one I suggest has been urged on the President by the community chest organizations of the United States for several years, but no step has been taken to consider a scientific method of dealing with relief. It would take some time to make the change. Apparently, if the present administration remains in power, it will never be made.

Operations of Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM STEWART McDONALD

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration, Mr. Stewart McDonald. This letter presents a brief summation of the splendid record of this effectively administered Federal agency.

In the field of home building this agency has made a most remarkable contribution. As an aid to the building industry its efforts have been noteworthy. In creating employment opportunities it has accomplished every objective its sponsors hoped for. The Administrator and his associates of the F. H. A. merit our commendation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 29, 1940.

The Honorable JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MEAD: The semiannual summary of F. H. A. operations reveals that 377,831 families in New York have received loans of $360,355,615.67 for home-financing purposes. These loans were made by private lending institutions and had been insured by Federal Housing Administration as of the close of business December 31, 1939.

Of this amount 342,598 families obtained $183,279,506.67 in order to improve, repair, and remodel their properties under the property-improvement provisions of Title I of the National Housing Act.

In addition, F. H. A. insured loans totaled $177,076,109 in New York for the purpose of financing home ownership for 35,233 families.

At the present time approximately twelve million people in the United States are receiving the benefits of the F. H. A. program.

The F. H. A. insured mortgage has been a most instrumental factor in developing new-home construction, the year 1939 breaking all records in volume of loans insured. The 1940 volume thus far exceeds even last year, and I feel confident in forecasting that 1940 will show the greatest small-home building program since 1927.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART McDONALD,
Administrator.

A Great American Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO, BEFORE WEST VIRGINIA LIFE UNDERWRITERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered before the West Virginia Life Underwriters Association by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], at Charleston, W. Va., on April 19, 1940, on the subject "A Great American Institution."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to come to Charleston, the capital of a great State looking west across the Ohio River to my native State of Ohio. West Virginia's interests are largely the same as those of Ohio, and the natural channels of transportation connect our cities. We suffer jointly from the depredations of a great river. Of course, West Virginia is to blame, because that river at low water is entirely your property and lies within your boundaries. Cincinnati has taken a great part in the development of the coal, oil, and gas fields of West Virginia and is accused of having more business interest in West Virginia than in Ohio.

It is an honor to be invited to address the Association of Life Underwriters. You are members of a profession which is well known in America, but not much in the rest of the world. You represent in this State one of the greatest of American institutions, embodying the processes which have made America what it is today, thrift, saving, and investment in private enterprise.

The size and the growth of the life-insurance business is almost unbelievable. In 1906 the assets of the legal reserve companies were about $2,900,000,000. On the 1st of January 1939 they were about $27,700,000,000, multiplied 10 times in 33 years. The face amount of the insurance in force has multiplied 30 times in 50 years, from $4,000,000,000 to $120,000,000,000. The lives of over 60,000,000 individuals are covered by insurance. In 1937 the total income of life-insurance companies amounted to $5,257,000,000, only slightly less than the total ordinary receipts of the United States Government. Of these life-insurance receipts, $3,731,000,000 represented payments voluntarily made by policyholders, money saved and set aside to protect their families and their own future. Life insurance is a great savings institution, not merely an insurance plan. The net increase in assets—that is, the receipts less the payments on policies—the net savings of the policyholders has been approximately a billion and a half dollars a year during the past 3 or 4 years, money put aside by millions of individuals and invested for their benefit in securities and mortgages.

America has been built up by the thrift and industry and daring of its people. If every cent earned had been spent as soon as earned, there would be little today in this country except wilderness or waste. It is because people have been thrifty and have saved money and invested it in improved farms, in buildings, in factories, in machinery, in railroads, in steamships, in utilities, in public buildings that America is a civilized country. It is because Americans have been willing to put their time and money into new enterprise, and into new projects, and into new inventions that America has grown more rapidly than any other country has ever grown, and in 150 years has become the greatest and most powerful nation in the world. This is the process which has developed the country and increased the population and given jobs to millions of people. It is because this process has largely come to an end during the past 10 years that we are still in the midst of a depression, with 10,000,000 citizens unemployed and a smaller total income than 12 years ago.

Now we hear that saving is no longer a virtue but a vice. There is said to be an excess of savings because money is piled up in the banks. How foolish. In the first place, excess reserves are created by the inflationary processes of government borrowing and purchase of foreign gold, not by any real savings. In the second place, they would melt rapidly away if anyone were willing to invest money in equities, speculative or otherwise. A very mild attack of prosperity and business confidence would exhaust the available capital of the Nation. They say it takes $7,000 of capital to give a man a job, and we have a lot of men who want jobs.

Life insurance has been one of the great means of carrying out the process of stimulating production. It presents in the most appealing way the advantage of saving. It brings home to every husband and father the plight of his family in case of death and in old age. It affords a fund which can be more safely and wisely invested than any individual can invest savings. The funds thus saved have assisted in the construction of public utilities of all kinds; they have stimulated the construction of homes; they have encouraged the development of industry.

Life-insurance reserves must be safely invested, and so ordinarily they have not been available for investment in common stocks and those involving risk. But to a certain extent, all capital is one reservoir, and the flow of life-insurance money into bonds makes available capital which individuals can invest in the speculative enterprises so essential to further progress. We lack today the capital required for speculative enterprise, due in part to the unwillingness of individuals to save, due probably in greater part to their unwillingness to invest in new business under present Government policies.

We see today the institution of life insurance under attack. There is no doubt in my mind that the New Deal philosophy which dominates the Government at Washington is hostile to life insurance. It has not dared to propose its destruction, but there is a clear indication that the Government proposes sooner or later to strangle it with bureaucratic regulation. It is not surprising that this hostility should exist.

In the first place, the New Deal has been animated by a spending philosophy. The doctrine was openly proclaimed that we could spend ourselves into prosperity. Money was poured out not so much for relief or public works as to create purchasing power to prime the pump. Statements of President Roosevelt and of Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, show that this fallacy still dominates the thinking of the Government. A deficit of $4,000,000,000 a year shows that it is still in full swing.

No theory has been more clearly disproved by results. The spending of $20,000,000,000 of borrowed money, in addition to all

taxes collected, only led to the depression of 1937; only failed to solve the unemployment problem. Obviously any brain truster who believes in Government spending must equally believe in private spending. If the Government is to create a deficit to stimulate buying power, then private saving and thrift will obviously counteract the Government's efforts. The new dealers would rather have inflation than investing. The billion and a half dollars saved every year through life insurance represents probably one-half to one-third of the genuine savings of individuals in this country today.

In the second place, the New Deal philosophy, while satisfied with Government regulation of a whole industry where an abuse occurs, prefers Government operation of any specially important function. It has started a so-called insurance plan of its own in the old-age-pension title of the Social Security Act. The only trouble is that it doesn't perform any of the best functions of life insurance. The premiums are obtained through a pay-roll tax, a compulsory saving. There is no such thing. Thrift must be voluntary or it is not thrift. Compulsory deductions from pay-rolls are taxes, not savings. The man who suffers that deduction is inclined to save nothing else because the Government is going to look after his old age and his family. Real thrift is discouraged.

The wise man, however, will do his own saving. The Government plan is not sound as an insurance plan. To provide old-age pensions in the future, taxes will have to be raised to supplement the income from the reserve. The expense is so great that old-age pensions will never be more than enough for a bare living because of the taxpayers' objection to supporting other people.

The plan does not perform the investment function of life insurance. The reserve is invested only in Government bonds. That is, the Government lends itself the money collected and spends the money to pay current deficits. Life-insurance companies have been subject to the same kind of criticism, for they have invested their money in $5,000,000,000 of Government bonds. The savings of the people have gone in part to pay Government deficits; but the pay-roll taxes go that way 100 percent.

As a matter of fact, the old-age reserve plan is no substitute for insurance. It ought to be recognized as an old-age pension plan. I don't believe a whole nation can set up a real reserve except perhaps for a year ahead. We might as well recognize that the only people who can support those who live without working are the people who are working at or about the same time. A reserve only provides a fund, regardless of safeguards, constantly at the mercy of politicians who wish to spend it. We might as well pay old-age pensions without requiring contribution, and pay them as we go out of current taxation. But let's keep the Government out of the insurance business. It does not promote thrift, and it provides no funds for investment in needed enterprise.

In the third place, life insurance has been subject to attack on the theory that it concentrates excessive power in a few people, who use it for their own advantage. Fortunately the revelations produced by the Securities Exchange Commission before the Temporary National Economic Committee have failed to prove that any real danger exists. They have shown companies carefully and honestly managed for the benefit of the policyholders; they have shown a service which no Government can give. The agency system has been attacked as being too expensive for the policyholders. The Government, it is said, would have had no such expense. But the Government would never have increased the volume of life insurance as it has been increased; the Government would never have produced real savings at the rate of a billion and a half dollars a year during the depression.

Reading the hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee, one cannot help feeling that the insiders would like to destroy the system of life insurance by private companies, or subject it to such complete detailed control by the Government that it would be operated practically by Government officials. We are now considering before the Banking and Currency Committee a bill to regulate investment trusts. Some regard it as a preview of what the insurance companies are to receive from the Securities Exchange Commission. It overrides all questions of interstate commerce and state control. It requires a license for all directors and officers. It prescribes detailed rules of action, and gives the Securities Exchange Commission power to make still more detailed regulations. It forces capital structures to be changed, and leaves wide discretion to the Securities Exchange Commission to say what dividends shall be paid. Elaborate provisions aim at the removal of directors who might conceivably have some interest which might conceivably be conflicting.

If this bill is passed, it is an excellent precedent for Federal regulation of insurance companies. The abuses in your industry are not as bad as those in investment trusts. You are already subject to state regulations as most investment trusts are not. But these are minor differences to those who yearn to extend Federal power.

The idea that excessive power exists in the directors and officers of these companies seems a mere excuse for transferring that power to the Government. The vision of a few men sitting around a table in New York, determining the economic course of this country has always seemed ridiculous to me. They would have no effective means of putting their conclusions into force if they ever attempted to reach such conclusions. The Government, with all its power, found under the N. R. A., and since the N. R. A., that it is almost an impossible task for any man or group of men to direct the lives and daily transactions of millions of men and women in a tremendous nation like the United States. The idea that a few men can do it with no government behind them is fantastic.

There is, however, a real danger in the concentration of economic power. But it is not the danger of concentrating that power in the directors of life-insurance companies; it is the danger of the concentration of all economic power in a few Government officials. Such concentration is just as likely to be used for selfish purposes; it is more likely to be used for political purposes; it is less likely to be used for the benefit of the policyholders.

The truth is that the motive power behind the attack on life-insurance companies is supplied by those who wish to change the whole American system of individual enterprise. Life insurance, advertising, and salesmanship are criticized because they provide the present system with life and growth, and make it succeed.

The American agency system is a typical example. It has sold thrift and individual self-reliance to the people of the United States against every force that was operating through the midst of the depression. It has contributed to our standard of living just the way the automobile, electrical appliances, the radio, and other modern inventions have contributed to our standard of living and our increased national wealth. These are present satisfactions. People see them and want them, and yet there would not be many sold and these industries would not have developed as they have except for advertising and salesmen.

Of course, salesmanship is even more essential in the case of life insurance. No matter that its principles are humanitarian, and that application of these principles produces great good for the individual and for the community. It is harder to persuade a man to forego some present enjoyment than it is to sell him the means of enjoying himself. People save because the advantage of saving is pointed out to them and sold to them by the life-insurance agents. The spendthrift philosophy has met little organized resistance during the depression except from the life-insurance agents.

I wonder what the condition of many families would be, what the cost to all the rest of us as citizens would be, if the life-insurance agent had failed to seek them out and to divert their thoughts from today's immediate needs to tomorrow's possible emergencies. I wonder how many of these families would have gone into bankruptcy or on W. P. A. if there had been no agency system to carry to their doors the benefits of life insurance. The depression would have been less severe, the hardships of individuals easier to bear, the demands on Government less, if life insurance had grown even more rapidly than it did.

We owe a debt of gratitude, therefore, to the agents for their work. The people of West Virginia owe a debt of gratitude to your association for educating and training the life-insurance agent so that he may know his job. You have raised his standard of performance.

The agency system is worth the money that it costs. Present attacks on life insurance are likely to become less violent. But I should still advise you to keep a close watch on Washington. Your policyholders need protection from Government regulation. They need protection from inflation of the currency which would destroy their life's savings. You will find many more friends in Congress than were there 2 years ago, and you will find those friends more active.

Life insurance is an inspiration to democratic government. So long as the people insist on its continuation, so long as they are willing to put aside present satisfactions for the future welfare of their family, we can look forward with confidence to a country which will grow. So long as the industry stands on its own feet, does a good job, we can know that it will not degenerate into a bureau of the Government. So long as the dead hand of bureaucracy leaves some independence and elasticity to the life-insurance companies, life insurance will remain one of the greatest of American institutions.

Louisiana Strawberries and the Chain Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES H. MORRISON

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent address made by Mr. James H. Morrison, an attorney of Hammond, La., at the American Legion strawberry festival held at Gonzales, La., on April 20, 1940. Mr. Morrison discusses a problem of major importance which now faces the strawberry and other fresh-fruit and produce growers of Louisiana and other States of our country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The more than 9,000 berry growers of the State of Louisiana who make up the largest strawberry belt in all the world may have many problems, but the biggest problem that you face in your endeavors to provide yourselves and your families with the necessities of life is to market your strawberry crops at a fair and justifiable profit in the face of the unfair, unjust, illegal, and disgraceful trade practices of the Nation's three largest food chain stores, namely: Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., and Safeway Stores. Each of these chain stores has its own buying subsidiary. The Atlantic Commission Co. is the buying subsidiary of the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., the Wesco Foods Co. is the purchasing subsidiary for Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., the Tri-Way Produce Co. serves in a like capacity for the Safeway Stores, and the buying power of these chains and their subsidiaries represents such a great power that the average American citizen has no conception of its vastness. With their almost unlimited buying power, these chains not only buy for their own group of chain stores, but they also buy for jobbers throughout the United States.

Here in Louisiana, where shipping and marketing of the 1940 strawberry crop has just begun with less than 1,000 cars out of an anticipated 4,000 already shipped, the price you farmers have received for your berries has been far from satisfactory. The principal contributing factor for this unsatisfactory price that you have received has been the use of Louisiana strawberries by these major food chain stores as "loss leaders." In using the term "loss leader" I mean the chain-store practice of taking a product such as strawberries, which is appealing to the retail consumer, advertising and selling this product without the usual or customary profit, and in many instances, at a price less than the actual cost.

The purpose of the chain stores in so doing, of course, is to attract customers into the thousands of retail stores owned by them that are located throughout the country. Louisiana strawberries are a "natural" for these chains to use as "loss leaders." When the snow has melted in the North and with the first sign of spring, the only fresh fruit available is the pretty sun-red strawberry. Louisiana strawberries have little competition, since the quality is the highest, due to the expert and expensive method of grading and packing them. Every housewife in the North is delighted to know that she can purchase Louisiana strawberries in her locality. Because of this unusual demand, a special low price on strawberries will pack the customers in. The chains know this and use these strawberries as "loss leaders" to fill their stores with customers. Because of the high quality, these strawberries cannot be produced by the grower to sell at the price that these chains sell them.

This "loss leader" practice by the chain stores has a depressing and ruinous effect on the price of strawberries or any fresh-fruit product that is so sold as a "retail sales bait." The housewife is the victim of a "come on in" scheme, where she walks into one of these chain stores and buys "cheap" strawberries (sold as a "loss leader"), together with other articles that she pays a real profit on. The real profit on these other commodities more than offsets the loss on the strawberries used as a "loss leader."

Ultimate result of this practice by the chain stores, which is a definite violation of the Robinson-Patman Fair Trade Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1936, is that the price you farmers receive for your produce gets lower and lower because of the fact that independent retail merchants who have to compete with the chain stores also naturally have to try to meet the chain-store prices. Because of the loss that must be sustained by the independent retailers to compete with the chain stores in the sale of strawberries, the independent retailer handles as few strawberries as possible, and does so only to accommodate his regular customers.

Food chain stores purchase but 15 to 20 percent of the Louisiana strawberry crop, yet their practices during the past several years have ruined, and are again this season ruining, the markets of the remaining 80 to 85 percent of the crop.

Many years ago a farmer could buy a new Ford automobile for $500. Today that farmer here pays over $800 for a Ford automobile. Why? Because the Ford automobile is merchandised by a smart industrialist who has sold the people on the idea that a better "low-priced" automobile should sell for $800 instead of $500. This industrialist was highly organized in the selling, and no chain stores sold his Ford as "loss leaders." As for the Louisiana strawberry farmer, the opposite is true. Today this farmer gets less for his strawberries while his production costs have increased. Why? Because he is disorganized and the chain stores help merchandise and sell his strawberries. Before these chains used his strawberries as "loss leaders" the farmer sold his product for more money than he does today. If the chains had used the Ford automobile as a "loss leader," like they have the Louisiana strawberries, instead of Ford automobiles selling for $800 or over, the Ford would be selling for $300 instead. And don't forget that the farmer is a consumer. When the farmer makes money he buys the products of industrial labor. When he doesn't, the industrial plants are idle and people are unemployed.

The proof of the pie is in the eating. Before the chains used your strawberries as "loss leaders" you made money. Today, with a higher cost of production and a better product, you don't make money. The chain stores call their "loss leader" practice "streamline distribution." What you farmers need is less of this so-called "streamline distribution" and more of the old, homespun, independent retail merchandising.

The price of most commodities depends on the law of supply and demand, but because of the chain-store "loss leader" practices this whole marketing principle does not apply to the Louisiana strawberry crop for the reason that, regardless of the supply, no matter what the demand, when your berries are used as "loss leaders" the market is depressed.

I do believe that I am being ultra conservative when I say that in the past several years the "loss leader" practices of the three major food chain stores in America has deprived you farmers of receiving at least $15,000,000 more for your crops than you did receive. Think of what this revenue would have meant to the prosperity and well-being of the people of this part of Louisiana. Think of the products that you could have bought for $15,000,000.

Our Louisiana strawberry belt, of which you men are the backbone, was until 1932 the third richest agricultural area in the United States of America. Today many of you, your fellow farmers and your neighbors, are but a few fence posts from poverty. The sad economic degeneration and diminished income of this section is due principally to the exploitation of your toil and your strawberry crops by the illegal practices of the chain stores.

The plight of you Louisiana strawberry growers has been brought about by the unscrupulous, unfair, and unlawful practices of the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., and Safeway Food Chain Stores.

However, you strawberry farmers are not alone in your plight. What these chains are doing to you they are doing to every fresh fruit and vegetable farmer in the United States. The fresh fruit and vegetable-farming industry is larger than the cotton-farming industry, the wheat-farming industry, or the corn-farming industry. When the fresh fruit and vegetable farmer doesn't make money he can't spend money, so United States industry loses a tremendous consumer's purchasing power. For the few pennies that a laborer saves in buying a "loss leader" may result in his being laid off because the farmer who produced that "loss leader" product couldn't make a profit and couldn't buy the tractors or other products of industrial labor that that laborer's work produced.

Thus, as long as these chains use your strawberries as "loss leaders" you berry growers can never expect to make a profit on your labor of producing them. What then can be done to stop this "loss leader" practice by these chains? The Robinson-Patman Act was passed for that purpose. But does it? No. I hold in my hand a copy of the Commercial Appeal newspaper, dated April 18, 1940, where the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co. sold Louisiana strawberries in their Memphis stores for 4½ cents per pint, which figures $1.08 for a 24-pint crate. The lowest strawberries have sold this season per 24-pint crate in carload lots has been $1.50 f. o. b. Louisiana. The transportation charges to Memphis would have to be added to this price. This is just an example of what is happening in many States where these three large chain stores operate. There is pending before Congress now the Patman bill. This bill will dissolve these three gigantic chains or make them help support a government by taxation; that gives them the only opportunity in this world to build an empire to enrich themselves at the expense of the fresh fruit and vegetable farmers, who are becoming poorer each day.

These chain stores are not necessarily just big businesses. They are gigantic empires that day by day and week by week are producing an unbalance in our Nation's economic system, and, unless they are checked, the result of their practices may become so disastrous that it will completely ruin our whole American system of distribution and of business.

These monopolistic manipulators of merchandise must be checked. They must be made to obey the laws of our Nation, and if there are petty technicalities behind which they can hide in their program which is pauperizing hundreds of thousands of farmers in America, then our Federal trade laws must be made more stringent. You farmers and hundreds of thousands of other fresh fruit produce growers like you must look to the Congress of the United States for protection and for a fair chance to make a profit out of the products of your toil if our American mode and manner of life are to survive.

Let us all hope, work, and pray that the Patman chain-store bill will be enacted by our Congressmen.

Ems Dispatch; Ribbentrop Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Ems Dispatch; Ribbentrop Version."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

EMS DISPATCH; RIBBENTROP VERSION

(By T. H. Thomas)

Herr von Ribbentrop came forward as an intruder among the career men of German diplomacy—a fresh and unconventional product of the new governing classes. But he is learning the game. It was no light matter to have to shift ground completely within 3 weeks. After landing in order to protect Norway's innocence, it was not easy to set up a wholly different set of motives as a historical explanation. But he has at least moved quickly. In 1914 the German Foreign Office suddenly found itself without presentable motives for a military undertaking which had been decided upon 16 years before.

The Kaiser's promise to support Austria was given (on July 5) without consulting the Army or Navy. But the word was passed quickly around and, on July 17, a week before the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, the Foreign Office was privately informed that the general staff was waiting and ready. General von Moltke and his deputy chief of staff were both on leave, but the latter took the precaution of inquiring informally at Vienna as to the arrangements of the Austrian staff for the impending attack on Serbia. In forwarding the reply to the Foreign Secretary, General von Waldersee added: "General von Moltke expects to return to Berlin on the 25th instant. I shall remain here ready to jump; we are all prepared, here at the general staff. In the meantime, there is nothing for us to do."

Moltke returned to Berlin on July 26, just before Austrian mobilization was ordered, and when the Austrian Government had not yet considered seriously the German idea of declaring war on Serbia immediately. After gathering the latest news, he wrote his wife next day that the crisis would not come before a fortnight. With this unhurried prospect before him, Moltke drafted the text of an ultimatum which the Foreign Office might present to Belgium in the event of war. At this date (July 26) Austria seemed far from declaring war, so that even the preliminary rumors of French or Russian mobilization had not come in; and the German plan of campaign was based on the conviction that the French Army would concentrate for a decisive battle in Lorraine.

But, for lack of a better reason, a certainty of French aggression through Belgium was the best Moltke could offer as a public explanation of the motives impelling Germany's long-arranged campaign. He personally had the strongest hopes that England would remain aloof (even a fortnight after war actually broke out he still believed that no British Army had landed in France). But on July 26 Moltke was struggling with a wholly hypothetical situation, and to make his ultimatum fit all contingencies he included the still unmobilized British Army among the hordes of soldiery marching on the Belgian frontier. In workmanlike fashion he put in brackets the words alluding to British participation, so that they could be easily struck out if things turned out that way. (The careful editors of the Kautsky documents saved even the brackets.) With all this foresight, the ultimatum began as follows:

"The Imperial Government is in receipt of reliable information to the effect that French forces intend to march on the line of the Meuse via Givet and Namur. This leaves no doubt as to France's intention [after joining with an English expeditionary force] to advance against Germany through Belgian territory.

"The Imperial Government cannot rid itself of the fear that Belgium, in spite of the utmost good will, will be unable to repel without assistance so considerable a French-[English] invasion with enough chance of success to afford an adequate guaranty against the danger to Germany. It is essential, for the self-preservation of Germany, to anticipate the hostile attack. The German Government would, however, feel the deepest regret if Belgium were to regard as an act of hostility the fact that these moves by Germany's opponents force her, for her own protection, to enter Belgian territory."

Plans for advancing across Belgium had been in force ever since 1898—16 years before the "reliable information" Moltke now suggested to the foreign office. By 1898 the steady increase of the Germany army, made possible by Caprivi's military law, was coming into play, and Schlieffen could bring into line far larger forces than those at the disposal of the elder Moltke. The German Army, in fact, had outgrown the legitimate Lorraine frontier—it became necessary to spread out into Belgium in order to deploy the effective strength of the army at the outset. In the first book, which set forth in print the development of Schlieffen's plans, General von Kuhl made this point clear: "The space between Switzerland and Luxemburg was too narrow for modern million-armies. The theater of war had to be widened if such masses of troops were to be deployed." The army of 1914 was much larger than that of 1898, and the roads through Belgium were all the more needed for quick action against France.

But these reasons were unlikely to appeal strongly to the Belgians when the hour arrived, and no one at Berlin had devised an explanation which could be offered to the world at large. In 1905 Prince Bülow had suggested a point-blank 6-hour ultimatum—quite in the Hitler manner, but now, even 20 days after the Kaiser had opened the box of Pandora, the foreign office had overlooked the problem of a public justification of their impending crashing of the gate at the Belgian frontier. Moltke's contribution was accordingly welcomed with alacrity, and during the next 2 days his draft was worked over by the Chancellor, Von Jagow, Zimmermann, and Herr von Stumm, of the foreign office.

As soothing efforts at London were still under way to persuade England to remain an outside spectator, von Stumm deleted the allusions to British participation in the impending outrage, and various minor changes were made in Moltke's draft. A fair copy was finally written out by Count von Mirbach, and on July 29 this perfected document was sent off by special messenger, as a sealed enclosure within a letter of instructions to the German Minister at Brussels. The Minister was ordered not to open the sealed enclosure until he received telegraphic orders. In the meantime it was to be kept safely locked up—like a freighter filled with German troops, waiting at anchor in a Norwegian harbor.

But sad confusion now arose. Late in the evening of July 31, after sending off the canned ultimatum to Brussels, Bethmann-Hollweg sent for the British Ambassador and made the famous bid for British neutrality in which he disclosed the prospect of the German move through Belgium. Having thus let the cat out of the bag, and with the Belgians already setting to work to put the Liege forts in order, Bethmann realized that as things stood the excuses neatly written out in the sealed ultimatum would not hold water: Germany was not at war with France, and it was a matter of public knowledge that France had not yet ordered mobilization. Even 2 days later, on the evening of July 31, when Bethmann had completed the draft of his declaration of war on Russia, Viviani had not yet mobilized the French Army. The ultimatum ready and waiting in the legation at Brussels was completely stymied.

To break through this impasse Bethmann dispatched to Paris his ultimatum summoning the French to declare promptly whether or not they intended to remain neutral; in case they did, they were to be spurred into action by demanding the fortresses of Toul and Verdun as a pledge of neutrality. Viviani obligingly ordered mobilization for the following day (August 1), but Bethmann could wait no longer. On the next day, without waiting to regularize the situation (according to the principle he had laid down) by first declaring war on France, he telegraphed the Legation at Brussels to open the sealed ultimatum and present it. "Please assure the Belgian Government most earnestly that there is absolutely no doubt of the accuracy of our information as to the French plans."

In this telegram there appeared a detail which Herr von Ribbentrop may well have noted with close attention: "The Belgian Government must be left under the impression that all of the instructions relating to this affair had reached you for the first time today." Having watched the building of German military railways opposite its frontier ever since 1898, the Belgian Government did not accept this impression. But with true foreign-office thoroughness, on the copy of the ultimatum written out for publication in the press a week or so later, Herr von Stumm altered the date to August 2.

For an untrained beginner, Herr von Ribbentrop has stepped fairly quickly into the Bismarckian tradition.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a most timely and most interesting article by the pen of Mr. Raymond Clapper. The article is entitled "United States Defense," and was published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEFENSE

(By Raymond Clapper)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—I sat down at dinner not so long ago beside a young lady who promptly turned a bright smile at me and asked, "Are you an isolationist?" The proper answer is, "Damned if I know."

What is more futile than the parlor arguments which rage between "isolationists" and "interventionists"? The terms don't mean anything. It is pointless and academic to attempt to decide upon wise policies for the United States by trying to fit them to labels like "isolationism" or "interventionism." That is trying to think backward. How can you say a policy is wise or unwise by labeling it as "isolationist" or "interventionist"?

Only one consideration counts—national self-interest. First of all, national self-interest, as I see it, rests primarily upon military

and economic defense of the Western Hemisphere. If that is not properly attended to nothing else will help us much in the long run. If it is properly attended to, then our activities beyond that become secondary, desirable in some cases, but not vital.

As the war proceeds it is apparent that we shall have plenty to engage our attention in the matter of military and economic self-defense of the Western Hemisphere. We may face more situations like that created by the German occupation of Denmark. Greenland is a Danish possession which is strategically situated on our side of the Atlantic, almost touching Canada. Greenland was one of the stepping stones used by the Italians in the mass flight of Marshal Balbo to the United States. President Roosevelt's expressions of American interest are sufficient to provide the tip-off that this Government would not look with favor upon German occupation. Regarding Iceland, which is just to the east of Greenland, Winston Churchill told Parliament that "no German will be allowed to set foot there with impunity."

If Germany should take Holland, we certainly would not permit the German flag to go up in the Dutch West Indies. Several questions of that kind may be raised if the war spreads.

Then we have, right at our border door, a not too nice Mexican situation. This Government has been patient and conciliatory toward Mexico over the seizure of oil property. Finally, when private negotiations having failed, Secretary Hull suggested arbitration, the Mexicans flew into a rage. A Mexico City dispatch to the New York Times reports a demonstration of 20,000 Mexicans carrying banners denouncing the United States and urging closer relations with Soviet Russia. One poster showed a Mexican worker on top of an oil derrick, squirting oil into Uncle Sam's eye, with the caption, "Here's your oil. Take it."

The American Embassy was guarded, but no incident was reported. President Cardenas said the demonstration was "the most moving and greatest I have ever seen." He said Mexico had a "just cause which the whole nation must defend."

With Japan pressing southward toward the Straits Settlements and the Dutch East Indies, our sources of rubber and tin there are none too secure. Encouragement is being given here to development of rubber in Central America. Some form of subsidy from the United States will be needed if this development is to get anywhere.

Any number of trade problems are reaching the acute stage in South America, where export trade, interrupted by the war, is producing economic trouble that may become political in time. Beyond that is the question of trade relations between these countries and the European powers after the war, when all, whether victors or losers, probably will be on an authoritarian basis with strict trade and exchange controls.

What has any of this to do with isolationism or interventionism? If we keep our eyes fixed upon the requirements of our national self-interest, bearing in mind that this rests primarily upon the military and economic integrity of the Western Hemisphere, there is less danger of our becoming lost in a fog of parlor dialetics which attempts to translate the practical realities of our situation into metaphysical patterns.

Achievements of the Roosevelt Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY TO NEW YORK YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at a dinner tendered him by the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., on their twenty-fifth anniversary, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on April 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the members of the New York Young Democratic Club I am deeply grateful for the compliment they pay me at this their twenty-fifth anniversary dinner. To them and their friends who have come together here I find it difficult to express in words my feelings. An extra pulsation of satisfaction always is generated by a reception in one's own city. That you, who know me best and have been my friends for a longer time, are here in such numbers and with such evidences of warmth and friendship is to me a source of encouragement and inspiration. I will never forget this happy occasion.

Though many of us may be a generation older than our hosts of the evening, I am sure that all cling to the idea that we are still young. We elders, mellowed some by experience, are just as interested in the problems of humanity as are those of the generation pressing so closely behind. But whether young, middle-aged, or old, in the light of what we have learned during the past 10 years, we are probably unanimous in the opinion that the progress of our country can best be assured only by keeping in power a liberal Democratic administration.

Do you remember the year of 1929? We were 11 years younger then—possibly half a life time for some of you—and certainly an important part of it for all of us. Then we accepted the stock market as the barometer of business. Bulging prosperity for those at the top gave those at the bottom three meals a day and an occasional movie. I will not pause to discuss my views that those at the bottom might reasonably expect more. Be that as it may, the top blew off in 1929 and crashed in on the bottom. For the next 2 years we were fed on the hopes of prosperity just around the corner. By 1932 we decided that this prosperity was indeed just around the corner but it was parked there waiting for the red light to change to green, and the red ink to change to black. Fifteen millions were unemployed and the purchasing power of most of the Nation had almost completely vanished.

The Roosevelt administration moved through the green light in 1933. A prostrate country was lifted to its feet. Confidence revived. The Government dutifully used the public's money for the public's benefit. Business immediately improved. Interrupted only by readjustment fluctuations, the trend has been upward ever since.

Despite the progress, we have not entirely rehabilitated the wreckage handed over to us by the Republicans. We still have more than a million young people out of school and out of work. It takes an average of 19 months for many of them to find any kind of desirable job. Marriage is becoming a matter of economics instead of the sacrament of happiness.

Such a situation seriously dislocates the economy of the Nation. Our political system is menaced so long as our youth is a liability rather than an asset. Idleness destroys morale and produces resentment.

The Roosevelt administration has been fully aware of the problem and is doing its utmost to alleviate the condition. The C. C. C. camps have taken thousands of young men out of the haunts of idleness and placed them at useful work in wholesome surroundings. The National Youth Administration has assisted young men and young women who wished to train themselves better for the future. Indeed, the youth of America can be thankful that during these problematical years they have had as their champion no less a personage than President Roosevelt.

Such measures as I have mentioned are only temporary expediencies. The real problem must be solved by completing the processes of economic readjustment so that our system will be in tune with all the needs of our present-day concepts of liberal government if capitalistic democracy is to survive. However, even these emergency steps have served to impede definitely the spread of subversive propaganda among our young people. In this connection let me advise our juniors to think things through. Be guided by logic. Think freely but do not think loosely. Draw your distinctions sharply. Do not be misled by destructive theory. Be liberal but be sensible. There is a whale of a difference between free thinking and loose thinking, and between liberalism and radicalism. Loose thinking and radicalism have no place in America.

There is no doubt that the terrific upheaval between 1929 and 1932 accelerated the normal speed of the readjustment that started with the change of administration in March of 1933. This was the result of a necessity begotten by lack of foresight during the twenties. So serious was this necessity that the laws relating to economic rehabilitation were legislated with a celerity that was as much of a shock to business as it was a surprise to labor. That the benefits flowing from this legislation have not been fully harvested is admitted. To achieve its objectives is the most pressing task confronting us today.

We may well refresh our memories as to the evils of the outworn system of conservative economy which was responsible for the chaos of only 10 years ago. Even the most partisan Republican admits the errors of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era. That was a fool's paradise, with its exploitation of both capital and labor, its inflation of values beyond all reasonable bounds, its rampant speculation, its wasteful overproduction, and its insane optimism.

It is stupid for anyone to even intimate that the genius and enterprise which brought us from struggling colonies to our world position of preeminence cannot, if properly directed, bring forth a balanced economy wherein 130,000,000 citizens may live and prosper. Only two obstacles stand in the way.

The first of these is selfishness. In order to retain advantages they had under the old order there are individuals and groups who would impede the progress of the new order with every means at their disposal, blind to the fact that should their efforts succeed they would achieve the dubious victory of being themselves destroyed in the wreckage.

The other obstacle is ignorance. There are people who refuse to recognize true conditions. Theirs is the type of blindness that was typical of the power-drunk monarchies of pre-World War Europe and of the dictator cliques which today are responsible for the terrible conditions prevailing abroad. Lust for economic

power in this New World of ours can bring about results just as disastrous.

Liberal laws have been legislated to prevent such an eventuality. The administration of these laws is beset by the difficulties that usually accompany the adjusting of any basic change in the economic machinery before it will function as intended. But if our citizenry rises to its responsibilities with the initiative and energy for which we are noted we have nothing to fear. Our whole course of action should be controlled by a single admonition. We must always strive to do what is best for America and we must do it in the American way.

The solution of our economic problem appears to me to be a simple one. Why not bring together in frank discussion the leaders of industry, transportation, finance, agriculture, and labor? Let them submerge their selfishness. Let them acquaint each other with their problems. If they do, and are frank with each other, I am confident that out of such a discussion a workable plan that will fit in with the liberal economy of the present day can be formulated. This solution is possible and sound.

There might be some difficulty in bringing about a meeting of the leaders of such divergent groups. Public opinion alone can do this. If the owners of industry and transportation, the depositors of banks and the policyholders of insurance companies, the tillers of the soil and the workers in the ranks can be informed of the necessity of harmony among their leaders, then, and only then, will these leaders learn of the power of public opinion. Once sensitive of this power, they will soon find the answer to the pressing problems that disturb us on our economic front.

The Government has shown the way; let the leaders outside of Government travel by that way, and we will soon reach our destination. Thus will democracy work in our economic system as it has worked in government for a century and a half. Then we will have our era of good feeling.

There are young men traveling our land today who are magnifying the faults of the immediate past, while at the same time shielding behind a curtain of silence the greater faults of the little more distant past. In metaphor they condemn but suggest no correctional procedure. They speak words of brave import, tuneful to the ear, but empty of substance. They attract the curious as does a clowning Barrymore, with phrases as devoid of logic. Their spearhead would go to the battles with all the fire of youth minus the weapons of experience. Such is the optimism of inexperience, when ambition overcomes common sense and aspiration dares the impossible.

Better can reasonable youth aid in promoting a meeting of minds among the leaders of the various components of our economic system along the lines I suggested. Young men and young women are present in every one of our many groups of endeavor. Let these young people carry the message of cooperation among their fellow workers and keep pounding on the subject until a weight of mass influence reaches the top, and it will not be long before there is a meeting of minds in high places. Then, and only then, will our complex economic machinery produce the contentment and prosperity its designer intended. Once the end is attained, unemployment will no longer be a problem, budgets will balance themselves, taxation will cease to be a burden, and living will be easy. Further legislation is not needed to bring about this era of good feeling. Leadership can do it; leadership in government, supported by cooperative leadership all the way down the line.

If this era can be brought about within our borders, it will, by its example, be a contribution to world peace more potent in its possibilities than anything that has ever occurred since the inception of the capitalistic system.

Our great Nation is an empire of States. Our population is a mixture of every race. We have diverse ideas and diverse interests. Yet we live together in peace and tolerance. America can thank the whole world for contributions to our greatness. Let us so conduct ourselves that all the peoples of the world can be thankful for America.

We stand 100 percent behind the Roosevelt policy of foreign relations. We want no part of the war in the other hemisphere and we will permit no part of it to come to this hemisphere. We are as one in building up our defense forces to protect the peace of the Americas; and we are likewise as one in demanding that these forces be kept at home. We devoutly pray that the power plutocrats will soon be forced out by their own peoples so that the world can go back to its way of progress under normal conditions. When that day comes, the people of America will be glad to cooperate with any nation that is sincerely desirous of promoting peace and amity among all the peoples and for all time.

You have done me a great honor in having me here tonight. We are all of the same mind as to what are our aims. We all seek the best course toward their achievement.

I offer a program of cooperation as an admirable way out of our difficulties. Cooperation among the Thirteen Colonies brought forth our Nation. Cooperation among individuals built our cities, our industries, and our railroads. Cooperation among the farmers built rural America to a preeminence that is the envy of agriculture the world over. Cooperation of the workers have built their great labor unions. Cooperation has built our charities, our universities, our hospitals, our churches, our press and our radio facilities, and our social organizations. During the century and a half of our growth from Colonies to Empire, cooperation has been the foundation of our success. Why look further afield? We now have the laws to make easy the use of cooperation. Let our leaders sincerely try to use it and I prophesy that the America of the future will be a land of progress in keeping with the best traditions of the America of the past.

Federal Home Loan Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the most far-reaching and dangerous pieces of legislation that has been proposed to the Congress in many a day is H. R. 6971, a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The bill has been before the House Banking and Currency Committee for some time, and missed being tabled in committee by 1 vote. The measure is very ably described by the minority members of the committee. As they set forth in their report, the purpose of this bill is to set up a Nation-wide banking system, to monetize mortgages, and to centralize the management of credit under a politically controlled Federal bureau.

No more dangerous step could be taken by the United States Congress than to put under the control of the New Deal bureaucracy in Washington the credit facilities of the United States. The New Deal bureaucrats, judging from past experience, would not fail to use this new power freely and on every occasion possible more firmly to entrench themselves in control of governmental affairs.

This bill represents the type of power cunningly contrived by the master minds in the New Deal bureaucracy to take control in ever-increasing degree of the Government and of business.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Act was approved June 22, 1932. It was enacted to provide a more flexible means by which building and loan associations, savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, homestead associations, insurance companies, and savings banks might furnish credit for home building. It was never intended to apply to big multiple-dwelling projects.

Under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, created by that act, 12 home loan banks were formed, with a minimum capital of $5,000,000 for each bank subscribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The act provides that these banks might make advances to their members on the security of home mortgages. As an indication of the intent of Congress that this act was primarily to encourage home ownership and was not designed to invade the investment field, the term "home mortgage" was defined as a mortgage on real estate upon which there is located a dwelling of not more than four-family capacity.

This new bill would remove this limitation and authorize each Federal home-loan bank to make advances to its members on collateral secured by any first mortgage. This would put the members of the Federal home-loan bank system in direct competition with banks, insurance companies, and other institutions making first-mortgage loans on business as well as home properties.

Federal home-loan banks are authorized to issue bonds and debentures. This proposed bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase these obligations and the bonds issued for this purpose would have to be treated as a public transaction. Thus the Secretary of the Treasury would not only subscribe to the capital of the Federal home-loan banks, but he would be authorized to obligate the United States Treasury for payment of all the bonds and debentures of such banks. This would create a contingent public-debt liability equal to the aggregate amount of the

capital, bonds, and other obligations of the Federal home-loan bank.

It has been properly said that credit is the lifeblood of the Nation. To allow any individual, or any group of bureaucrats, to control the national credit, as this bill proposes to do, would be to place in the hands of that individual, or those bureaucrats, powers which, if improperly used, could create economic chaos.

This is another concrete evidence of the necessity for constant vigilance on the part of the people and on the part of the Members of Congress to prevent these designing New Deal bureaucrats from thus cunningly arming themselves with more and more powers by which to maintain themselves in control of affairs. The bill will be the subject of a terrific battle in the House.

Present Set-up of Federal Civil Aeronautics Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to reorganize the Civil Aeronautics Authority and to return the regulation of civil aeronautics to the Department of Commerce will, unless it is defeated, represent a serious set-back to the safe and sound development of civil aeronautics in this country.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, in its important investigation of the old Bureau of Air Commerce in 1936 and 1937, found that one of the faults of that Bureau was that in the investigation of aircraft accidents which it conducted it was in effect investigating its own work. Hence impartial reports and recommendations and criticism were not forthcoming from these investigations. Instead politics entered into the appraisal of the cause of accidents.

INDEPENDENCE WILL BE GONE

Under the proposed reorganization the independent Air Safety Board, which Congress made an independent agency for the investigation of accidents, will be abolished. Thus once more the Department of Commerce will be investigating itself.

It is no answer to say that under the reorganization the new Civil Aeronautics Board will be able to exercise its function of investigation independently of the Secretary of Commerce. It is true that the order of reorganization provides that the function of investigation will be exercised independently of the Secretary.

But the new Board will be making the rules under which the operation of aircraft will be conducted. Thus in its accident investigations it will be investigating itself.

Moreover, under title VII, section 702, of the Civil Aeronautics Act there are four functions with respect to the aircraft accidents. Not all of those functions are investigation.

They are: First, investigation of the accident. Second, making the report concerning the accident. Third, making recommendations, not concerning the accident, but concerning matters to prevent accidents in the future. And fourth, making special studies of aeronautical safety.

The new Board will be independent of the Secretary under the reorganization order only with respect to the single function of investigation. It will not be independent with respect to making the report and publishing the report, making the recommendations and publishing the recommendations, and making the special studies, all of which are separate and distinct from the investigation.

VITAL TO AIR SAFETY

Yet these other functions are vital to safety in the air. Their free and independent exercise is of first importance. But they cannot be exercised freely and independently under the proposed reorganization. They must be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce.

In other words, the control of a political department, which was so roundly and justly condemned by the Senate Committee on Commerce, is being restored with respect to a matter which should be absolutely free of all considerations except the truth.

Such a reorganization should not be permitted by Congress. The independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the integrity of the Civil Aeronautics Act and of the Air Safety Board should be preserved and protected.

Poll Tax Designed To Preserve Minority Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, many people believe that the purpose behind the poll-tax requirement in Southern States is to disfranchise the Negro, but actually the tax results in a minority control reminiscent of the controlled plebiscite in Nazi Germany. This point is ably set forth in the following excerpt from an article by John Moutoux in the April 4 Washington Post:

Dr. C. Van Woodward, author and historian, visiting professor of history at the University of Virginia on leave from the University of Florida, recalled that when enactment of a poll-tax law in Alabama was debated in the legislature proponents argued that it was designed to eliminate from the polls the weak and vicious, or again, the vicious and the ignorant.

"The poll tax," said Dr. Woodward, "was designed to disfranchise a class—the agrarian masses."

"The result of this disfranchisement," he said, "has been that the poorest sections of the South, where the people are most in need of liberal social legislation, are represented in Congress by the most conservative Members who do not at all represent the sentiment of the majority of the people in these sections."

The same point is also made in an article by Ernest Lindley in the Birmingham (Ala.) News, April 3. The following excerpts from this article also stress the fact that the whole country has an interest in the South's fight over the poll tax because of the authority wielded by Senators and Representatives from the poll-tax States:

The whole country has an interest in this effort to abolish poll taxes in Federal elections, because of the immense authority wielded by the Senators and Representatives from the poll-tax States. These 8 States provide the chairmen of 5 of the 12 most important committees in the House and 5 of the 11 comparable committees in the Senate. * * *

Most of the present poll taxes were enacted during the period of Populist unrest. While the emotions surrounding race supremacy were mobilized to bring about their adoption, discerning Southern observers have asserted that one of the main purposes, if not the primary one, was to preserve political control in the hands of the conservative property-owning classes.

Anyway, the poll tax keeps the vote from white men as well as Negroes.

In his address to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, decries the fact that the poll-tax requirement automatically debars from voting the very people who are in greatest need of the vote. An excerpt from his address reads as follows:

The thing that shocks me is that "interest in the affairs of the state" has to be measured in terms of the money in a man's pocket. If he hasn't the cash to pay his poll tax he automatically falls into the group who are supposed to have no interest in the affairs of the state. And who is there to say that such a man is any less patriotic, or any less conscientious as a citizen than his richer brother? Since when was patriotism measurable in terms of dollars and cents? The very man who cannot afford to vote because of poll-tax restrictions is the man who needs to vote the most. He needs to maintain his little stake in this democracy. He needs to help elect men who will try to improve the lot of the underprivileged. What is the psychological effect on these struggling Southerners without enough money to pay a poll tax when

they are classed as undesirable citizens, people unworthy of being allowed to vote, just because they are short on cash? Does it give them much love for democracy, or doesn't it make them into potential victims of the forces that would overthrow democracy?

I have said that the real purpose of the poll tax is to keep people from voting, rather than simply to raise money. That argument is borne out by the methods of collection that are employed in the Southern poll-tax States. No bona fide revenue measure is subjected to such curious treatment. Alabama and Mississippi, for instance, legally forbid the enforcement of poll-tax collections, though before the tax was tied up to the suffrage, both States did a regulation job of enforcing its collection. In other words, if a man does not offer to pay his poll tax at a certain specified time, it is actually against the law for the State to try to collect that tax from him. What is the answer to that? It can only mean that the State is more interested in keeping the poorer class of citizens from voting than it is in raising funds from this source for its schools.

Seventy-five Years of Negro Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. McLEOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the past 75 years has seen many great and wonderful changes in the life and culture of the Negro people of the United States. This period has rightly been called the era of Negro freedom and citizenship. At this time it is well for all to stop and examine the accomplishments and progress of our colored citizens, as it is only then that we can fully appreciate the full significance of their contributions to the building of our American institutions.

Today our colored citizens can look back with pride upon three-quarters of a century of unbroken progress—a progress which is reflected in every field of human endeavor; a progress which is destined to carry them upward and onward to greater triumphs.

These 75 years, which we now celebrate, have seen the birth and development of a new racial self-respect. A whole people have been reborn. Thus it is that over 12,000,000 colored people now look forward with renewed confidence to all that is best in the life and future of this great American Republic.

The most casual glance at American history will reveal and emphasize the importance of this people in the building of our Nation.

The first contribution of the Negro to the development of America was toil. They cleared the forests of our Southland, drained the swamps, prepared the soil for the production of its staples, and dug from the earth coal, iron, and precious metals. These workers shod horses, cast farm implements, made vehicles, constructed boats, and built railroads, which provided the South with a network of transportation facilities. Today, of the 48,000,000 gainful workers employed in this Nation, more than 5,000,000 of these are of the colored race.

In spite of low wages, lack of credit in many sections of the land and intolerant handicaps, they have built homes, churches, and schools worth more than $2,000,000,000. Likewise, in agriculture, progress has been most impressive as colored people now own more than a million farms.

In all our history there are no pages more heroic nor more thrilling than those dealing with the exploits of the colored man as a great soldier. In all campaigns and in all branches of the military establishment they have served their country well. We recall their valiant deeds at Port Hudson, Fort Pillow, Fort Wagner, and the sieges of Richmond and Petersburg. We remember the brilliant work at Santiago and the equally brilliant charge at San Juan Hill during the Spanish-American War. In both engagements the colored soldier acquitted himself with unusual distinction. In the Mexican campaign the Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth Infantry distinguished themselves at Carizal and were heralded as the heroes of the hour. During the World War colored troops and officers held sectors at St. Mihiel and Verdun with such singular success as to win the highest praise of the commanding general.

In peace or war, in victory or danger, the colored soldier through all our wars has demonstrated a loyalty and a bravery that ranks as the highest manifestation of patriotism. All Americans are justly proud of these heroes.

Looking into the field of education we are at once reminded of the great names which are landmarks in the progress of our American school system. The founder of Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Booker T. Washington, is one of the best-known men in the history of education in America. The impetus he gave to the movement for higher education among the colored people has gained such momentum through the years that we now have such fine institutions as Howard University, Wilberforce, Morris Brown University, LeMoyne, Morgan College, and many, many other advanced schools of higher learning.

The trend toward higher education among the colored race has been most impressive in the past decade. It has spread throughout the land, until today there are over 42,000 students graduating each year from our 108 schools for colored people.

While at toil, the Negro entered the field of science and invention, and his inventive genius has been given world-wide recognition. Colored artisans assisted Eli Whitney with his cotton gin, and McCormick with his reaper. James Forten perfected a machine for handling sails; Henry Blair patented his two corn harvesters; Granville T. Woods stimulated industry with his electrical patents; Elijah McCoy, of Detroit, brought machinery nearer to perfection with his many lubricating appliances for engines; Norbert Rillieux revolutionized the manufacture of sugar with his vacuum pan; Jan E. Marzeliger gave the shoe industry the lasting device for making shoes with machinery. Dr. George W. Carver, of Tuskegee Institute, has amazed the scientific world in developing hundreds of new and practical products from the plants and clays of the South. All of these men have lent honor and distinction to their race by their scientific creativeness.

As we look out over the fields of literature, oratory, and art, we cannot but realize that colored people are natural artists. We find the name of Phyllis Wheatley; we read the works of Paul Laurence Dunbar, James Weldon Johnson, and Henry Highland Garnet, and are delighted with the descriptive detail which brightens every page. Others, such as Charles Waddell Chesnutt, W. E. Burghardt DuBois, and William Stanley Braithwaite, have added to America's wealth of great literature.

The field of oratory still rings with the voices of Frederick Douglass, the patriot; J. C. Price, the master of eloquence; and Booker T. Washington, the educator.

In art, the masterful works of such artists as Edward M. Bannister, Henry O. Tanner, William E. Scott, Lois M. Jones, and many more assure us that the colored American is on the threshold of great things in fine arts.

Of the value of Negro music, the testimony is almost universal that the colored race is the master of harmony and spiritual feeling in song. It has been the inspiration for such great artists as Marion Anderson, Roland Hayes, Florence Cole Talbert, Anita Patti Brown, Caterina Yarborough, and Paul Robeson.

In organization and business the colored people have moved forward rapidly through the virtues of thrift and self-reliance. Such organizations as the National Negro Business League, founded in 1899, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, organized in Chicago in 1915 by Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and many other similar groups reflect the progress in cooperation and self-advancement which has taken place within the past 75 years.

The last 20 years in particular has witnessed the advance of many Negro business enterprises. The race has excelled in medicine, law, dentistry, banking, and insurance, and the other essential occupations which go to make for racial happiness and economic success.

As we look back upon these 75 years of uninterrupted social and economic progress on the part of the American colored people it becomes increasingly evident that if such progress is to endure it must continue to be nurtured upon the tenets of democracy. Every true, patriotic American knows in his heart that the United States is the hope of the world. Into its civilization and glory have entered not one but many races. All must shoulder the obligations a democracy places upon its people if they are to enjoy liberty's benefits. In such a country as ours the Government can recognize no difference of race, creed, or class, providing all are working for the maintenance and general welfare of the Nation.

The eyes of this troubled, war-weary world are upon us. We stand as one of the last remaining democracies. All races, creeds, and colors which go to make up the American fabric of living must unite still closer under the banner of tolerance and freedom and, by our discerning actions and thoughts, exemplify the true meaning of democracy.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Barden amendments come before this House as a challenge, a fresh threat to the right of millions of low-paid industrial workers to enjoy an improved standard of living. Reject these amendments, I urge, because they are both economically unsound and socially backward.

The economic soundness of the Fair Labor Standards Act lies in the fact that under its provisions wages for thousands of low-paid industrial workers are increased; and increased wages means increased purchasing power which in turn means increased consumption. It all adds up to the benefit of farmers, as well as other groups, who find industrial workers able to purchase the products of farm and factory.

But the Barden amendments—which are being advanced under the guise of helping the farmer—work in reverse order; that is, they begin by reducing wages for thousands of low-paid industrial workers now covered by the act, and reduced wages will mean reduced purchasing power, which in turn will mean reduced consumption, all of which will add up to the detriment of farmers, as well as other groups, who will find the market for their products curtailed as a result of reduced purchasing power. What a fallacy, what an economically unsound theory, this idea that you are going to help the farmers by hurting the industrial worker.

Farm labor does not come under the provisions of the wage-hour law, but this has been inferred time and again in the arguments of proponents of the Barden amendments. Of course those familiar with the operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act realize that it does not apply to farm labor; but the pity of it is that a great many people throughout the country are being misled on this point. Much good might be done if the whole truth about the Barden amendments were more generally known.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read and have inserted in the RECORD the main points of an article by Raymond Clapper which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Washington Daily News:

HELPING THE FARMER

Neither political party would attempt to repeal outright the Wage and Hour Act, which seeks to place a floor under the lowest-paid employees and to protect decently minded employers from wage-sweating competitors. The principle is one of the heritages of the N. R. A., and its social desirability has been affirmed in Supreme Court decisions.

No, this and many other pieces of social legislation won't be repealed outright, but they can be gutted by destructive amendments. That is what is being attempted this week against the wage-hour law, through the Barden amendments.

These are not amendments to improve the workability of the law but to exempt large groups of low-paid employees from its modest standards. It is being done under the guise of "helping the farmer." But farm labor is not under the act, and the proposed amendments seek to exempt employees of packing houses and other establishments which process farm products. Why the packing-house employer should be excused from paying a minimum of 30 cents an hour while the textile-factory employer is held under the law is not clear. But that is the kind of inequality that is proposed by the Barden amendments.

A study of the Barden amendments made by the Wage and Hour Administration shows estimates of the numbers of employees exempted under the act as it stands and under the proposed amendments. In dairy products, 22,000 employees are exempted, but the Barden amendment would exempt 254,000. Exemptions in fruit and vegetable processing would be increased from 68,000 workers to 321,000 workers. Timber and lumber, not exempt now, would have 110,000 employees exempt. In all, the army of employees exempt from wage provisions, now numbering 256,000, would be increased to 1,183,000.

They would not have to be paid the minimum of 30 cents an hour which, for the 42-hour week permitted under the law, means a wage of $12.60 a week at full time—$650 a year for the lucky man who has a full year's work. It is from that not very onerous requirement of paying the help $12.60 a week that groups of employers are seeking to escape by their intensive lobbying here for the Barden amendments.

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace has cut the ground out from under the argument that these amendments are needed in the interest of the farmer. He takes note of the point that higher wages or shorter hours in creameries, canneries, packing plants, groceries, or other concerns engaged in processing or marketing farm products would increase the spread between producer and consumer and lead to either lower prices to farmers or smaller sales.

In answer, Mr. Wallace says that changes in the ability of consumers to buy have much greater effect on farm prices than do marketing costs. Workers receiving 30 cents an hour or less spend almost half of their income for food and clothing. If their pay is cut, half of that must come out of expenditures for farm products.

As Mr. Clapper points out, not even the Republicans, who spend so much of their time directing shafts of criticism at the accomplishments of the present Democratic administration, would attempt to repeal outright the Wage and Hour Act. Opponents of the Fair Labor Standards Act realize that public opinion is too solidly alined with the principles and objectives of this and other great pieces of social legislation to permit an open frontal attack. In a speech several weeks ago I remarked that it was at least significant that every serious attempt on the life of the wage-hour law had been of an indirect, nicely concealed nature.

I am no advocate of these Barden amendments, because, in effect, they tell low-paid industrial workers that their families must live on less than $12.60 a week, or $650 a year. To employers who are willing to pay fair wages, they say you cannot be protected against wage-sweating competitors. I am not going to support any proposal which says to the laboring man you are not entitled to a salary of $12.60 a week. Nor will I support any measure which would let down and leave unprotected the employer who is making an honest effort to pay his employees a decent wage—such employers are certainly entitled to protection against the "chislers."

If we approve the Barden amendments, which are supposed to exempt employees of packing houses who are processing farm products, how long will it be before we are asked to extend these exemptions to textile-mill employees who are processing cotton? Start taking steps backward, and it will only be a matter of time before the legislative gains of recent years are wiped out.

This attempt to destroy the Fair Labor Standards Act is economically unsound and socially backward. I say hurl it back; cast it aside. In doing just that, not only shall we remove a threat to the right of millions of low-paid workers to enjoy an improved standard of living but we may also set the tide firmly against all efforts to thwart the forces of social and economic progress in America.

Transportation Bill Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, according to the schedule for the week's activities in the House, the conferees' report on the so-called Wheeler-Lea transportation bill, S. 2009, is due to come up for consideration next Friday or shortly thereafter.

There is little justification for such speed in this case, the conference report having barely been given us, but it is apparently realized by the sponsors of this legislation that opposition to the bill is growing so rapidly among the folks back home, who are the ones really to be considered in this or in any other legislation, for that matter, that they must put it over as a fast one or not at all.

It is the consensus of opinion among the average person, of which category I am glad to say we still have a preponderance in this country, that this bill, if made into law, will completely finish the job of ruining the railroads, as well as to decrease jobs for railroad employees. Perhaps that is actually what is intended to be accomplished, that is, the final financial collapse and ending of the present private ownership and operation of the railroads—and in place of it Government purchase and operation. But I do not believe the sponsors of this bill among the railroad owners, executives, and bondholders desire that objective.

However, we must admit there are large numbers of people satisfied that not only railroads but all public utilities should be taken over by the Government, and on that basis they could gladly—even gleefully—hope for the passage of S. 2009, because it will result, not in the hoped-for salvation and rehabilitation of the carriers by rail but, instead, in their final demise as a part of our struggling capitalistic system.

As I say, to large numbers of people that would not be an unhappy event, but I do not believe it is at all in the interest of Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen to, in the meantime, say over a period of 15 years or so while the railroads are gradually losing their revenue-producing business, also kill off the water carriers and truck carriers, who would be brought under the Interstate Commerce Commission and thrown into the jackpot by this bill along with the poor railroads, who have been in such a spot for years.

It takes no prophet or seer to see what the net result of such action on the part of Congress will be if we pass the Wheeler-Lea bill. All big concerns, as protest against such action and the hoped-for and planned higher rates all around, will immediately provide their own fleets and haul their own freight in whichever manner is most economical. Pipe lines will also increase by leaps and bounds, and they already have taken a considerable percentage of the transportation business.

Industrial and commercial activities will be more and more concentrated in the hands of a few large concerns as a result of the moves above described, because the little fellow would be unable to finance the purchase of his own fleet or to provide sufficient freight of his own to operate it profitably, as would the larger concerns.

In turn this would result in the loss of more and more business in the less densely populated areas, such as our own in the landlocked Northwest, and more and more concentration in the seaboard areas.

For the reasons above listed every Member of the House should think twice before voting for the adoption of any such bill, and especially should the Members from the Northwest areas be on their guard, as we are already seriously and definitely handicapped and discriminated against by the rule of the Interstate Commerce Commission under which we are now operating. Why turn complete control of all forms of transportation over to the same oligarchy and thus complete the job of destruction?

From the large number of letters and petitions I am receiving daily opposing this legislation I have selected and ask consent to insert two of them herewith as being representative of the viewpoint and opinion of the people of my State, and I hope we may have a majority of the Members with us in support of the attitude expressed. The letters are as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 29, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For more than a year we have been very much concerned over the so-called Wheeler-Lea transportation bill. We are today in receipt of a copy of the new bill reported from the Conference Committee under S. 2009. If anything, this bill is worse than either of the original House or Senate bills. It discriminates most unfairly against water transportation as well as against carriers upon the highways. The passage of such legislation is most inimical to all business. During the past 6 or 7 years we have persisted in a constant revision of laws until today it is hardly likely that most of us really appreciate where we are at in connection with certain of such legislation. It is no more than just that further consideration of an important matter such as the revision of the Transportation Act should be given more consideration than is apparently the desire of those who are promoting this new bill. Some of us who have bought transportation for a good many years realize just what would come to us if it is carried into effect. We hope to have your very earnest opposition either to eliminate it altogether or to at least postpone for several months a further consideration of the matter. We shall be very glad to hear from you at your early convenience.

Yours very truly,

JANNEY SEMPLE HILL & CO.
H. M. HILL.

[Minnesota Highway Users Conference. L. A. Rossman, president; H. M. Whisman, vice president; J. R. Schroeder, secretary; W. F. Lynch, treasurer; John M. Keefe, field representative; directors: G. C. Axelrod, Ivan Bowen, Howard Brissman, E. Ray Cory, Hugh M. Craig, Pierce Fleming, Robert Gray, E. E. Hadlick, Gordon Healow, T. A. Horrocks, Lou Hosking, H. A. Jackson, W. J. Kay, W. F. Lynch, Arthur Randall, L. A. Rossman, Milton Rosen, Joseph R. Schroeder, P. J. Schroeder, E. H. Sherman, A. K. Tice, H. M. Whisman, Frank W. White, Edgar F. Zelle]

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 23, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: S. 2009 and its companion bill in the House, known as the Lea bill, proposing voluminous changes in proposed regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of various transportation facilities, are now ready to be reported out of conference committee.

We view with the utmost alarm the further reports that Senator WHEELER and other sponsors of this bill, backed by the administration, intend to press for immediate enactment.

So complicated a measure (200 pages or more of highly technical matter) ought not even be brought to a vote unless or until the individual Members of Congress have adequate opportunity to study its provisions and analyze its effects. Likewise your constituents, including ourselves, should have an opportunity to know something about this bill so that we can advise you as to our views.

Therefore, we urge that you unite with other Members of Congress to demand that when this bill is reported out, it be printed and an adequate period of time (at least 30 days) be given, so that all Congressmen and their interested constituents can study its provisions and decide whether or not they represent proper legislation.

If the sponsors of this bill will not extend this courtesy then we urge that you do all in your power to defeat the bill. Regulation of transportation already is overcomplicated and 200 pages of new legislation to further burden an already overworked Interstate Commerce Commission and to further confound and confuse our citizens who are interested in transportation should not be enacted unless good cause is clearly shown and proven.

In addition it must be kept in mind that this bill was originated by and is being sponsored and pushed by the railroads in their own selfish interests.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH R. SCHROEDER,
Secretary.

Acquisition of Forest Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture held hearings on H. R. 6853, which I introduced in the House, which bill has for its purpose the giving of authorization for the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed, in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes. I appeared before the committee and made a statement in behalf of this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein my statement before the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I thank you for this opportunity to speak briefly in support of H. R. 6853, which I introduced in the House, and which is a companion bill to S. 231, which passed the Senate on June 13, 1939.

This bill is for the purpose of giving authorization for the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed, or which are hereafter to be constructed, wholly or partially with Federal funds, in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes.

Our early work in constructing our highway systems throughout the United States was concerned chiefly with the roadbeds themselves. The project was so immense and funds meager that it was impossible to find revenues with which to carry out a completed project by landscaping in connection with road construction. It has now, however, come to be recognized generally that roadside improvement is a necessary element of highway construction. The joint committee on roadside development of the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Highway Research Board have made the following recommendations with reference to roadside improvement:

"1. Every road-building agency should include a person competent to design and carry out roadside-development work. His work should be considered an essential part of the design, construction, and maintenance.

"2. Absolute control of the highway right-of-way and all its appurtenances should be vested in the highway authority.

"3. Highway authorities should have power to acquire adequate right-of-way for present or future roadside development. They should also be empowered to keep or acquire title or easements in strips or parcels of land along the highway for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.

"4. Highway authorities should budget a definite part of their funds for roadside development and its maintenance.

"5. There should be cooperation by the highway authorities with individuals, organizations, and local communities interested in roadside development."

The Bureau of Public Roads has recognized the necessity of roadside improvement and beautification and the preservation of the natural scenic beauties of our highway borders, and has not only cooperated with the States in beautifying our roadways as well as preserving the natural scenic attractions, but has, in some instances, required minimum expenditures of Federal-aid funds for public highways.

Section 6 of the rules and regulations for carrying out the emergency road construction provided for by the National Industrial Recovery Act even provided certain classes of work as worthy of prior consideration in the planning of the program for expending the $400,000,000 appropriated by the act, and listed for preferential consideration the appropriate landscaping of parkways or roadsides on a reasonably extensive mileage. On June 30, 1933, the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads issued a memorandum to district engineers, as follows:

"It will be required that each State highway department include in its program of construction on the Federal-aid highway system a definite number of projects that will provide for the appropriate landscaping of parkways or roadsides. Projects of this character should preferably be selected adjacent to the corporate limits of the larger cities in the State, particularly where sufficient right-of-way is available to undertake work of this character. This work shall embrace the selective cutting or pruning of existing growth; the removal of stumps, dead material, etc.; the obliteration of borrow pits, traces of old roads, and other construction scars; the flattening of slopes; the rounding of slope intersections; the seeding or sodding of shoulders and slopes; and the planting of a sufficient amount of suitable material to accomplish a reasonably comprehensive roadside improvement. The planting of trees at regular intervals without regard to their environment or the composition of adjacent plant growth will not be considered as satisfactory roadside-improvement work. Properly qualified landscape architects or horticulturists should be employed by the State highway departments to determine the proper kinds of plant material to be used in different soil and climatic conditions and the most effective arrangement or grouping of such material for any particular location."

While no maximum limit has been fixed on the amount of the Federal funds available to a State that may be used for roadside work, State highway departments have been notified that not less than 0.5 percent of the sums allotted to each State must be reserved and expended for such purpose. This, however, is a minimum required to carry out the rules and instructions of the Bureau of Public Roads.

This legislation provides that a sum not to exceed 5 percent of the moneys appropriated by Congress for carrying out the provisions of law relating to the Federal-aid highway system may be used for the purpose of preserving, restoring, improving, and protecting the natural beauty along the highways, roads, and trails constructed or to be constructed, wholly or partially with Federal funds. The expenditure is directed to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture in acquiring forest lands or interest therein, by purchase, gift, devise, or condemnation, adjacent to highways, roads, and trails now constructed or over which they are hereafter to be constructed.

Lands thus acquired are limited to an area within one-quarter mile from the exterior boundary of the right-of-way. The option is left with the highway department of each State as to whether, and the extent to which the act shall be put into effect. Under existing laws there is no authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture to expend these moneys for such purpose.

In many States, and particularly in the West, our highway systems pass over virgin forest areas abounding in great natural beauty and scenic effects. Large trees, shrubbery, and other natural growth which will cost large sums to reproduce are being ruthlessly destroyed along the roadsides of many of these highways. In my own State of Oregon roadways crossing the coast range and the Cascade Mountains, running north and south, and the Siskiyou in the south, proceed through virgin forests the beauty of which is unsurpassed anywhere. In extreme south, bordering the Roosevelt Highway and other connected highways, are growing a large number of magnificent redwood trees. Many of these giants of the forest were growing before Christ was born. They are the oldest living things on earth. Tourists from all parts of the world journey over our magnificent highways to view these wonder trees. Many of them are now being destroyed. There is no provision in law to use these highway funds for the purchase of the areas bordering our highways for the preservation not only of the beautiful redwoods, but also of the Douglas fir, Fort Orford cedar, sugar pine, and various other types of trees which adorn our highways in the West. Last year I had occasion to pass over one of our scenic driveways leading from the Willamette Valley to the Pacific Ocean on what is known as the Grand Ronde Highway. It passes through a beautiful stand of virgin forest in the coast range. I was grieved to see that logging operations were in progress which were denuding these lands bordering the highway of the natural growth of fir and other types of trees, leaving only stumps, debris, fallen and broken timber to greet the eye of the motorist.

With the law under discussion in force, the highway department of our State, in conjunction with the Federal Government, could purchase sufficient areas bordering this highway to make it a thing of vast beauty and preserve the aesthetic values of an outstanding highway. To restore the roadside lands to their natural state or to make sufficient plantings and landscaping for beautification to approach its original state would require immense sums of money many times larger than the funds received from the commercial timber now being logged along the highway. As Joyce Kilmer wrote:

"I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree.
A tree whose hungry mouth is prest
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;
A tree that looks at God all day,
And lifts her leafy arms to pray;
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair;
Upon whose bosom snow has lain;
Who intimately lives with rain.
Poems are made by fools like me,
But only God can make a tree."

We pride ourselves on our excellent highway systems throughout the United States. They are of immense value. In many States the tourist trade is the most beneficial activity we have. The funds expended by tourists traveling our highways more than compensate for the costs, not only in surfacing of the highways but in landscaping and beautification. From the purely commercial standpoint we will be making a good investment to authorize the expenditure of the moneys provided by this bill for acquiring roadside areas for beautification, landscaping, and preservation of the natural scenic beauties of our roadways.

The additional areas thus acquired would serve a double purpose: First, to prevent billboards and unsightly advertising, improper roadside stands, and other commercial enterprises; and, second, to provide ample areas for parks, parking facilities, recre-

ational areas, and service areas, supervised and properly located so as to preserve the aesthetic values of the highways.

I trust you gentlemen of the committee will approve this legislation so that it may be speedily enacted before this session of Congress adjourns.

Amendments to Wage-Hour Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, so far as the proposed amendments to the wage-hour bill are concerned, I can state my position very briefly. I believe an exemption for bona fide agricultural workers is necessary because of the fact that farmers are not in a position to control the prices at which they sell their products and because agriculture as a whole receives far less than its fair share of national income. But I am against wholesale amendments for canneries, and similar establishments processing agricultural commodities. Almost all manufacturing could eventually be taken out from under the law if we set about denying protection to all workers who are employed in working on products the raw material for which came originally from the farm. The Barden bill would exempt many thousands of workers in industrial establishments simply because they work on raw materials which came originally from the farm. Therefore, I am against it.

I am also of the opinion that a clear distinction should be made between the obvious reasonableness of exemptions from the hours provision for certain establishments dealing with perishable and highly seasonal commodities and the very different question of proposed exemption from the minimum-wage provisions. On the matter of wages not only does it seem to me that 30 cents an hour is certainly as low as any worker should be paid but I also find that the enforcement of such a minimum would be to the clear advantage of those employers now paying 30 cents an hour or more.

In the matter of citrus packing, for example, authoritative figures recently released show that whereas over 21 percent of all workers in the Nation employed in packing citrus fruit receive less than 30 cents per hour, only 3 percent of those employed in the State of California receive less than that amount. It appears obvious to me that the competitive position of the California citrus industry would be improved if a 30-cent minimum wage were brought about for the Nation generally.

This Wage and Hour Act has been intended all along to protect, not the well-paid, but the lowest-paid workers of the Nation. These are the people whose consumption of farm commodities would rise if they had a few dollars a month more to spend, for they are the people whose families need more food.

The Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES M. LANDIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by the Honorable James M. Landis, former head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and now dean of the Harvard Law School, on the Walter-Logan bill. The article is published in the Harvard Law Review for May 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Law Review for May 1940]

CRUCIAL ISSUES IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

(One of a series of public lectures, under the auspices of the faculty of the Harvard Law School, delivered on March 27, 1940, in Langdell Hall. The text is as delivered; footnotes have, however, been added which have availed themselves of material subsequent to that date)

THE WALTER-LOGAN BILL

"Crucial Issues in Administrative Law" is one of those large topics that permits one to deal substantially with anything that he chooses in a broad and indeterminate field. For administrative law is such a field with very little of moment in it that cannot be thought of in terms of a crucial issue. So a topic such as this would permit a speech upon the merits or demerits of the National Labor Relations Act, a harangue upon the wonderland of bureaucracy,[1] or a discourse upon tendencies toward absolutism in this country as manifested by the New Deal programs of economic and political reform.

It interests me that this should be so, that this is an area where epithets and encomiums play such a part. For surely the rise of the administrative process is by all odds the most significant development in legal history in the last century; yet its implications, its significances are handled by scholars as if these issues were political in nature rather than fit for careful, scientific scrutiny. It becomes important to understand why this is so.

At least two reasons may be adduced. The first is that differences of political faith exist among us as to the principles underlying many of the economic reforms of the last decade. In the main, these reforms have relied upon the administrative process for their realization. Because we hesitate somewhat to take issue upon the basic questions of principle that they raise—such as the desirability of imposing a duty to bargain collectively upon industrial management, or the subordination of the private control of such matters as investment banking and security exchanges to the supervision of public authorities—the focal points of attack and defense become the administrative measures employed for translating these principles into reality. It is not accident, for example, that the American Bar Association flanked by regional and local chambers of commerce is alined in an effort to curb the development of the administrative process; and that the National Lawyers' Guild has thrown itself athwart that movement. It is not possible, for example, to view the recently proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act as simply intended to deal with procedural defects and not recognize that the outcry against the procedure is made partly by those whose desire is radically to alter substance. The scene is thus confused by these strong cross-currents of political and economic stress, that not only muddy the possibilities of scientific inquiry but at the same time tend to traduce them.

A second reason for the lack of the scholarly approach to this subject is the newness of the rise of the administrative process and the lack of knowledge concerning it. Until 1930 students of the subject were few and far between, the literature was scanty and generally poor in quality. Leaders in the legal profession had infrequently come in contact with the process, for it was still operative only in specialized fields. How rarely the subject has been the continuing concern of our law schools is illustrated by the fact that today of the 80 teachers of the subject, only 8 or 10 percent have lived with it for more than a period of 10 years, and of these 8, 2 are active only in the Philippine Islands and 2 are part-time teachers, so that of the regular members of law-school faculties who are concerned with administrative law, the experience of only 4 or 5 percent goes back more than a decade.[2] This percentage contrasts strongly

[1] It is worth remembering that Mr. O. R. McGuire, the chief draftsman of the American Bar Association bill (progenitor of the Walter-Logan bill currently before Congress) claims to be co-author with former Solicitor General Beck of the latter's Our Wonderland of Bureaucracy (1932). But cf. p. XIV (1933 ed.) The thesis of that book is difficult to portray in brief, but it avowedly sought to be America's counterpart to Lord Hewart's New Despotism (1929). One will remember its condemnation of the Interstate Commerce Commission as affording the best illustration "of the pernicious effects of excessive interference by Government in business" and guilty of "mischievous activities," its recommendation for the abolition of the Federal Trade Commission, its conclusion that the Tariff Commission was not only unconstitutional but also "the greatest potential menace to the protective tariff that could be devised." Pp. 155, 160, 196 (1933 ed.). It is odd—to say the least—that in the light of these conclusions the author of this legislation should from the beginning exempt two of these three agencies from its operation.

[2] These figures are taken from the Directory of Teachers in Member Schools of the Association of American Law Schools for 1939–40. The figures are, of course, casual and incomplete, but they do serve to illustrate the experience of the law schools with administrative law as a subject for instruction and research.

with similar percentages that prevail in other fields. In evidence the same figure runs to 44 percent, in partnership and real property to 50 percent, in contracts to 55 percent, and in that most elusive subject of international law, we hit the high ratio of 60 percent. The concern of the bar with administrative law reveals the same trend. It took the first 2 years of the last decade to accumulate 2 bar association addresses upon the subject, whereas last year alone produced 14, exclusive of my own several utterances in the general field.[3]

These casual figures stand rather starkly against the fact that today one administrative agency alone disposes of 42,000 cases per year,[4] more than half as many as the whole Federal judicial system taken as a whole,[5] and that the total number of controversies determined by the Federal administrative agencies runs to several times those determined by the Federal courts.[6] Nor are these controversies so adjudicated negligible in significance. They range all the way from claims for veterans' benefits to inquiry into the way in which our present system of private government of public enterprise discharges its major responsibilities.

The scene of administrative law is thus a large one. Moreover, it is a variegated one, for one of the chief pressures lying behind the development of administrative agencies was the desire to introduce a modicum of expertness into the disposition of those controversies that had been entrusted to them. Thus, where the tendency in the development of the judicial branch of our Government has generally been to create tribunals with an over-all jurisdiction, the reverse has been true of administrative development. For the railroads we created the Interstate Commerce Commission, for private finance the Securities and Exchange Commission, for aviation the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Just as the architect follows different conceptions when creating a railroad station and building a hangar, the administrative agencies we have created have had both their organization and procedure shaped largely by the tasks with which they were confronted. It would be silly, for example, to build the same structure for a bank as for a railroad station; equally absurd is it to insist that the details of organization and operation of the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Reserve Board shall be alike.

And yet just as the architect, whatever his structure, must follow certain laws in his planning, because stresses and strains have a known calculable quantity, certain principles run through this field of administrative law. What they are, what their range of application is, what we know from experience and study as to their worth—these are, perhaps, the questions that give real content to any study of the subject. An effort to articulate them and to weigh them should certainly be the purpose of any scholarly scrutiny of the subject; for their discovery is obviously a prelude to any measure of "reform" that pretends to be based upon other than political and casual considerations.

A few efforts in this direction have been made during the past decade. Because the Lord Chief Justice of England in 1929 launched an attack upon the development of what with characteristic judicial calm he called the "new despotism," an eminent committee was created by the Lord Chancelor of England to examine into the rise and consequences of administrative law. In 1932 this committee reported, absolving the administrative in the main of the charges that the Lord Chief Justice had heaped upon it, making an attempt to enunciate certain principles that ought to govern its growth and adding some few practical suggestions for the alteration of its procedures.[7] Despite the fact that this report was received in this country with that uncritical praise that we are accustomed to heap even upon the minor performances of our British cousins, it has, in the opinion of most observers, little value beyond the minutes of evidence that underlie it.[8] There for the first time is a series of convenient working papers that tell of the operation of the various administrative authorities, their difficulties, their successes, and their failures. From an examination of these it might be possible in the light of that experience to evolve some blue prints along which the administrative process might be patterned. But it seems superficially wiser to turn to our own experience and see whether there is food there for thought, or—to mix the metaphor—a hewing out of concepts that might be deemed to govern in this field.

Beginning in 1933, the American Bar Association, through a special committee, started an examination of the field.[9] It suggested one bill which so split both its committee and other professional groups who had a concern with it, that support for that line of attack was withdrawn in 1939 in favor of a new bill[10]—

---

[3] These figures are taken from the Index to Legal Periodicals. Incomplete as they are, they demonstrate the quantum of literary output upon the subject. Their patent inadequacy illustrates again the unfamiliarity of index-makers with the new topic of administrative law.

[4] This figure has reference only to the cases coming before the Board of Veterans' Appeals. See McAllister, Administrative Adjudication and Judicial Review (1940) 34 Ill. L. Rev. 680, 683. The complete dispositional work of the Veterans' Administration has considerably greater volume. "Well over 100,000 claims come before the Veterans' Administration for adjudication each year. During the fiscal year 1939, action was taken on original compensation and pension claims, excluding reopened claims and cases involving termination, claims for increases, and insurance, in a total of 73,232 cases. It has been said, 'more cases [are] decided by the Veterans' Administration than by all the courts combined in an equal period of time.'" Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, The Veterans' Administration (1939) 4, citing McGuire, Criticisms of the System of Administrative Tribunals (1938) 12 U. of Cin. L. Rev. 147, 151.

[5] The Attorney General's figures for the year 1937 would indicate that the Federal judicial system as a whole (excluding the "legislative courts") disposed of 76,886 cases that year.

[6] See Blachly & Oatman, Administrative Legislation and Adjudication (1934) II.

[7] (1932) Cmd. 4060.

[8] For a scholarly and critical weighing of the methods employed by the committee in evolving the broad and sweeping conclusions contained in its report, see Jaffe, Invective and Investigation in Administrative Law (1939), 52 Harv. L. Rev. 1201.

[9] See 58 A. B. A. Rept. (1933) 197, 407. The original committee was appointed in May 1933 and consisted of Louis G. Caldwell (chairman), Pierce Butler, Jr., Walter F. Dodd, O. R. McGuire, and Melvin G. Sperry. Messrs. Butler, Dodd, and Sperry were succeeded that year by Messrs. Thomas B. Gay, Felix Frankfurter, and Charles B. Rugg. The report of this committee in 1934 recommended among other matters the establishment of a Federal administrative court and the abolition of the existing independent boards and commissions. 59 A. B. A. Rept. (1934) 538. This report was not signed by Professor (now Mr. Justice) Frankfurter, the committee stating that, due to his absence in Europe, he had been unable to participate actively in the work or to examine the report. Id. at 564, n. 1. Despite this explicit statement, Mr. Walter, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, twice stated upon the floor of the House that the revised bill, the Walter-Logan bill, had the support of Mr. Justice Frankfurter. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1940, at 4535; April 18, 1940, at 4733.

Mr. WALTER made the same statement with reference to Mr. Louis G. Caldwell, the former chairman of the Special Committee on Administrative Law of the American Bar Association, despite the fact that Mr. Caldwell is publicly on record as opposed to the bill. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2122.

Mr. WALTER'S irresponsibility of statement in this debate is almost beyond belief. Twice we find him stating that the bill and the work of the American Bar Association with reference to administrative law originated in 1932. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1940, at 4535; April 17, 1940, at 4655. The statements were made to call the House's attention "to the fact that this bill was proposed in 1932, before there was anything known as the New Deal," a statement that carried currency with other Members of the House. Cf. e. g., Mr. CREAL in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 17, 1940, at 4662. Actually the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association was created in May of 1933. See 58 A. B. A. Rep. (1933), 407. The Walter-Logan bill in anything like its present form saw the light of day in 1937. See 62 A. B. A. Rep. (1937), 789. Again Mr. WALTER stated that the bill had the endorsement of every bar association in America, "except one, and that is the Lawyers' Guild." See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 18, 1940, at 4738. The printed record of Mr. WALTER'S own subcommittee contains the unanimous report of the committees on administrative law and on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York disapproving of the bill. See hearings on H. R. 4236, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), 124. Misstatements of this character, in which the debate abounds amply, justify the following statement of former Chairman Caldwell: "Notwithstanding these obvious defects in the bill, its proponents are making the most astounding claims, and bar associations throughout the country (including the American Bar Association) have endorsed the bill, apparently, on the basis of the claims rather than its actual contents. Among the claims that are frequently heard are that the bill is aimed against the prosecutor-judge combination, that it cures administrative absolutism, that it provides an opportunity for hearing where none is now available, that it curbs the agencies, and other extravagant assertions. So far as the quasi-judicial functions of agencies are concerned, it would appear that, on the contrary, none of these claims is well founded. With minor exceptions, it is difficult to know just what agencies and what quasi-judicial functions are reached by the bill that are not already equipped with at least equal and usually superior machinery." Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2123.

[10] In 1936 the committee's resolutions in behalf of a Federal administrative court were opposed by the Federal Bar Association, the Customs Bar Association, the patent and trade-mark section of the American Bar Association, and the committee on Federal taxation of the American Bar Association. 61 A. B. A. Rep. (1936) 221, 225, 233, 234. A compromise resolution referring the matter back to the committee but expressing general approval of its endeavors was adopted. Id. at 235. At the midwinter meeting of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association in 1937, the committee with the assent of the board of governors offered a resolution authorizing it to prepare a bill to establish a Federal administrative court and to have it introduced in Congress but with the curious proviso "that for the present at least such bill shall be without the official approval of the American Bar Association, the house of delegates, or the committee on administrative law." Id. at 1042. A substitute resolution was, however, adopted authorizing the committee to draft a bill for presentation to the summer meeting. Both a report and a draft of a bill were prepared. These threw over the proposal for an administrative court and suggested instead a draft embodying the outlines of the present Walter-Logan bill. Id. at 789. The draft was referred back to the committee after the association's summer meeting by

the so-called Walter-Logan bill [11]—now pending before Congress.[12] Ordinarily a detailed examination of a bill is only a matter of limited concern. But this, a bill purporting to be the fruit of years of work by a learned and nonpolitical organization and avowedly covering a vast area of administrative action, deserves more than mere cursory or casual treatment.[13] Indeed, one would hope that here at last a real effort is being made to deal with the soft spots of the administrative process, and that principles for the direction of its evolution have here been carved out. So one needs no excuse to turn to this bill as illustrating the truly crucial issues of administrative law.

Perhaps the way to begin an examination of any bill is to follow the technique suggested by the King of Hearts in Alice in Wonderland; that is, to begin at the beginning and go on until you come to the end and then stop. But this method proves quite useless for our purpose. If we begin at the beginning—the title to the bill—we learn that it is "to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States and for other purposes." Unless the phrase "for other purposes" conceals something of real moment, I assume that the real crucial issues of administrative law, that lurk beneath such phrases as "bureaucracy" and "absolutism," do not center about the theme of expedition, which Webster tells me is synonymous with ideas such as promptness, haste, and dispatch.[14] Surely the present outcry is not one against the want of speed and haste; nor will the antiabsolutist, or absolutionist, as the most vociferous purveyor of that phrase has recently amended it,[15] be satisfied merely with the introduction of further haste and hurry.

The King of Hearts' method having failed, we might try to reverse the process and begin at the end. This, indeed, seems to look quite promising, for the very last subsection eliminates from the operation of the bill numerous administrative agencies. Whatever the provisions of the bill may be, then its general program of reform has no extension to this catalog of exempted agencies. Why, the natural inquiry is, should this be so? Several obvious answers come to mind. One is that the antiabsolutist principles of the bill may need no application to this group of agencies because their procedures already contain the kind of safeguards that the bill seeks to impose upon the others. Another may be that we know so little about the workings of these excluded agencies that it might be best to let them go—to use a nautical analogy—upon their shake-down cruises before we start to redesign their procedures. A third—a rather ugly one—is that political considerations of the type from which the scholarly approach should be immune may have dictated these exemptions.

To examine these hypotheses as to the principle of inclusion and exclusion that governed the writing of this section, it is best to turn to the category of the agencies that are exempted. They include the conduct of military and naval operations and courts martial—presumably a group of cases where traditionally different principles for the administration of justice have almost immemorably held sway and where a measure of absolutism, even in times of peace, has always prevailed. This exemption one can readily understand, but as I go on with the list, I find the catalog continues as follows: The Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of State, certain aspects of the Department of Justice, matters relating to the internal revenue, customs, patent, trade-mark, copyright, or longshoremen and harbor-workers laws, or any case where a party has been denied a loan or an agricultural grading service, or has failed to receive appointment or employment by an administrative agency.[16] As one surveys that list, the natural inquiry is, What intelligible principle underlies it?

Perhaps the principle is in part the theory that the controversies determined by these agencies are not appropriate to general procedural treatment and judicial review. That is certainly true of the case specified of a party who has failed to receive appointment or employment from the agency to which he may have applied. But consider the case of the party who fails to receive an administrative promotion or reclassification of the type to which he claims he is entitled under the applicable rules governing promotions, wage scales, and the like. Certainly, unless every traditional canon of statutory interpretation is to be thrown into the discard, here is a matter not upon the excluded list and subject to the mechanisms for administrative and judicial review provided for by the other sections of the bill.[17] A controversy over a refusal to employ is therefore not justiciable; a controversy over a refusal to continue employment or to promote would seem otherwise. But, I wonder to myself, can I fairly draw this concept from the bill—for I suddenly begin to realize that my young man who is denied his promotion fares differently depending upon the agency with which he is associated. The Federal Trade Commission, for example, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, are identically organized so far as regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission affect their employees. Yet the former is an exempted agency whereas the latter falls within the provisions of the bill. The result of this, of course, is that the failure of an employee in the former to get an administrative promotion gives rise to no justiciable matter, whereas the same controversy in the latter agency brings into operation all the other machinery of the bill providing for administrative and judicial review. This, I feel sure, even Alice would regard as somewhat queer and, perhaps, comment upon it in severer terms.

But let us throw this illustration aside as being one of those casual oversights in draftsmanship that characterize even the best of legislative ideas. Perhaps some exemptions are truly dictated by the principle that the administrative determinations are not rightly justiciable in character, or, if they are, that adequate and appropriate means for their review has already been provided. To test this thesis, we might take the exemption provided for the Department of State. Toward the close of the last decade the program of the Lucy Stoners met little sympathy at the hands of that venerable Department. The customary action pursued by the Department of State in those days was to deny a passport to such married women as insisted upon refusing to take the name of their husbands. To the individual the denial of a passport may be a truly serious matter, not involving merely the privilege of a pleasant summer but going to matters that strike at the opportunity to pursue one's living or the dictates of one's heart. Should this type of administrative action be the subject of judicial review, and, if it should be, is there now adequate provision for such review? The question raised by the Lucy Stoners is obviously one of law and not of fact. It would seem as definitely capable of judicial review as questions relating to the exclusion or deportation of aliens. But it is almost impossible to say today how that question would be raised in court, even if it could be so raised.[18] Yet the bill excludes any consideration of what appropriate action could be taken with reference to this by its blanket exemption of the Department involved.

Perhaps, however, the bill, though failing to include some administrative actions that should rightly be made the subject of judicial determination, at least does not include those where for very definite reasons final action is left with the department concerned. Suppose we test this hypothesis by turning to the Board of Veterans' Appeals. This Board is the important appellate branch of the Veterans' Administration that handles annually some 42,000 cases. Except with reference to claims arising under insurance contracts—a minor category of the cases involved—the decisions of this Board were made final.[19] Some principle, other than a mere desire to be arbitrary, must presumably have underlain this congressional determination. But since the Veterans' Administration is a nonexempted agency, it follows that all these 42,000 cases are now opened up for judicial scrutiny. I confess, therefore, to not being particularly surprised when I read the statement of the Administrator of that agency that "the proposed legislation would not only prove to be an expensive practice from the standpoint of the Veterans' Administration but would materially interfere with prompt and efficient administration of benefits."[20]

Perhaps, here again we have another mere oversight even though its effects are rather weighty, dealing as it does with almost a quarter of the administrative business of the Federal Government. So we might try again to test this hypothesis by reference to an

---

a motion which, however, approved the principles of the report and the contents of the bill subject to such later approval as might be given it by the board of governors. Id. at 290. That approval was later given and the bill was introduced in Congress. 63 A. B. A. Rep. (1938) 334. That bill, however, was still not accepted by the house of delegates at its annual meeting in 1938. It again referred the bill back to the committee. Id. at 156. The committee once more reported the draft bill with minor changes to the house of delegates at its January meeting in 1939 and this time secured the approval of the house. Id. at 518. See also (1939) 25 A. B. A. J. 93–102.

[11] The bill was introduced in the Senate as S. 915 and in the House of Representatives as H. R. 4236, 76th Cong. In the House it has since become H. R. 6324. As such by a renumbering of sections and the addition of definitions it corrects in part the patently poor draftsmanship of the American Bar Association committee's bill.

[12] Since this lecture was delivered the bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 282 to 97. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 18, 1940.

[13] The fact that the bill had the sponsorship of the American Bar Association, a nonpolitical and learned association, was relied upon greatly during the House debate. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1940, at 4591, 4592, 4598; April 17, 1940, at 4668.

[14] That the title of the bill is a misnomer is substantially admitted both by the reports of the special committee of the American Bar Association on administrative law and sponsors of the bill in the Congress, for both agree that delay may be entailed by its provisions, however justifying that delay by the better dispositions that would thereby result. Some query, however, naturally attends attaching a misleading title to a bill.

[15] See McGuire, Opposition to the Administrative Law Bill (1939), 23 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 143, quoted from Lane and Blair-Smith, The S. E. C. and the Expeditious Settlement of Disputes (1940), 34 Ill. L. Rev. 699.

[16] The list of exemptions in H. R. 6324 differs somewhat from that in the draft of the American Bar Association and that differs again from the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

[17] Mr. WALTER made the statement in the House that the words applying to the failure to receive appointment or employment would also cover the cases of failures to receive promotions. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 17, 1940, at 4657.) But every traditional principle of statutory construction would exclude such an interpretation.

[18] *Cf. Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325 (1939)).

[19] See 44 Stat. 828 (1926), 38 U. S. C. sec. 620 (1934). *Cf. United States* v. *Williams* (278 U. S. 255 (1929)).

[20] Hearings on H. R. 4236, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), 114.

important and well-known administrative tribunal, the Federal Communications Commission. Congress by statute has vested in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia exclusive jurisdiction of appeals from the Communications Commission in regard to the grant or denial of licenses to construct or operate radio stations.[21] The purpose of thus centralizing review over actions always national in their scope and involving a consideration of the interrelation of other claimants in one integrated system of radio network seems obvious. But this centralization of appellate jurisdiction falls before the provisions of the association bill, which scatters this review among the 11 circuit courts of appeals. To pass upon the wisdom of such a change is not within my competence, but it seems fair to ask for some articulation of the reasons that may have dictated it.

The principle of exemption hardly rests then upon a distinction between justiciable and nonjusticiable controversies. It may rest, however, upon the adequacy of existing procedures for judicial review provided elsewhere. To test this hypothesis we might examine further the administrative powers of the Department of State as we have before. But, in order not to be partial, let us turn to the Comptroller of the Currency. A rigid examination of the national banks is constantly being conducted under the supervision of the Comptroller's office. These reports, which reflect the condition and the operations of a bank, are not made public. They furnish the basis, however, for criticism by the Comptroller of the bank's practices. Banks are required to conform to the Comptroller's suggestions. A sanction that the Comptroller possesses to enforce his suggestions is his power to make public the report of the bank's condition. Such a power is an enormous power, for the publication of this report by undermining public confidence may destroy the bank. When one turns to the statutes to discover what judicial restraint, if any, there exists upon the exercise of this truly significant power, the statutes as they stand are silent.[22] Neither court, manner, nor scope or review is mentioned, and a genuine doubt exists as to whether any review can be had anywhere. Yet here the bill is also silent, thus hardly leaving a basis for inferring that the principle of its exemptions rests upon the adequacy and clarity of the existing procedures for review.

That this principle does not govern the carving out of the area to which the bill is applicable is apparent when one examines the exemption that it blandly affords to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The original Interstate Commerce Act was signally deficient in providing for the manner in which the various orders of the Commission were to be subjected to judicial supervision. The method of review by a bill for an injunction in a Federal district court developed outside the confines of the act. The abuse of judicial powers in this connection led, after the unhappy experience of a commerce court, to the present three-judge statutory court with direct review to the Supreme Court of the United States. The institution works well enough in actual practice because in its major outlines it resembles the prevailing type of review now provided by statute for appeals to the circuit courts of appeals from the various independent statutory agencies, with the difference that a review by right and not by grace is provided in the Supreme Court. What virtues the three-judge statutory court device possesses over the prevailing type of review in a circuit court of appeals has always puzzled me. The existing device possesses the obvious defect of calling district and circuit judges away from their district work in order to constitute an ad hoc circuit court of appeals. It maintains the anomaly of a review by right in the Supreme Court where only a review by certiorari is provided over comparably significant orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. As one surveys this institution, clearly the consequence of historical accident, there could be a justifiable inclination to make judicial review over the Interstate Commerce Commission synchronize with the prevailing characteristics that pertain to judicial review over the orders of comparable independent agencies. But this patent anomaly remains untouched.

The search for principle thus tends to fade as one examines the scope of this exempting section. Instead not only are old anomalies preserved but new and truly curious ones are created. What, then, is the principle that underlies the patterning of the area of operation of this proposed legislation? Some suggestive ideas may be developed from cataloging some of the major administrative agencies to which it applies. These are the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Communications Commission, the Federal Security Agency, the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly in connection with his work under the Commodity Exchange Act, the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act, the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board; need I go further to indicate just why the threat of absolutism is deemed to be found in these newer administrative agencies and not in the older ones?[23] Motifs in symphonic movements are more frequently carried by the sinuous thrilling of the violins than by the blaring of the brass.

It is clear that no one can defend today our variegated scheme for judicial review of administrative action, sometimes invoked by appeal directly to the circuit courts of appeals and by way of grace to the Supreme Court, sometimes by bills for injunction before a three-judge statutory court and then by way of right to the Supreme Court, again by a bill for an injunction before a single district judge, then to the circuit court of appeals, then by way of grace to the superior court, or the variation of this latter scheme by writ of habeas corpus, by criminal indictment, or mandamus.[24] To remold this scheme, to preserve the variations where reason calls for them, is one thing. But to assume that the suggestions advanced come even close to this goal is to confuse promise with fact.

The suggestions, however, seem to do worse than heretofore surmised. With regard to the agencies to which they are applicable, they follow, it is true, the prevailing method of review in the circuit court of appeals upon the record made before the agency below. But at the same time specific provision is made for maintaining simultaneously the existing procedures for review, whatever they may be, both as to forum, manner, and scope. Instead of one complicated system for review, a second system is now added. Nothing archaic or confusing is swept away; no old learning as to the tricks of appellate practice is jettisoned. Instead, a new, coordinate system is introduced. This truly amazes.

What, in general, is that system? To discover it we shall follow our initial practice of reading from end to beginning rather than beginning to end. The court of review is well defined—a choice being possible between the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and the appropriate circuit court of appeals. But two other questions remain: (1) The actions subject to review, and (2) the scope of that review.

First, as to the actions made subject to judicial review: The traditional type of administrative action subject to judicial review is normally described in existing statutes as an "order." Judicial interpretation has by now fairly definitely confined its meaning to the final adjudicative mandate of the administrative agency, so as to prevent both cost and delay by reviewing an administrative proceeding piecemeal. Occasionally some difficulty has arisen with reference to the content of the term "order," as was true of so-called valuation orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission[25] or so-called certification orders of the National Labor Relations Board,[26] and of so-called negative orders until the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Rochester case.[27]

These difficulties, if one can judge by the reported cases, have proved far less an obstacle than those surrounding the term "final judgment," which still remains the test for judicial review by the Supreme Court of the actions of the inferior Federal courts and the State courts. But this known, catalyzing concept of "order" is thrown aside by the new proposal for the concept of "decision,"[28] which is defined as "any affirmative or negative decision, order, or act in specific controversies which determine the issues therein

---

[21] 48 Stat. 1093, 47 U. S. C. sec. 402 (1934).

[22] 48 Stat. 192 (1933), 12 U. S. C. sec. 481 (1934).

[23] Singularly outspoken on this question was Congressman Cox, of Georgia, one of the chief proponents of the legislation. Compare the following colloquy on Mr. FORD's attempted effort by amendment to add the National Labor Relations Board and the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department to the list of exempted agencies:

"Mr. Cox. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say for the benefit of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] that these are the two agencies which are most responsible for the pending bill.

"Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And for which this bill was framed to cripple.

"Mr. Cox. And ought to get." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 18, 1940, at 4732. Considerations of this character have their place in legislative assemblies but hardly in bar associations. Yet the explanations of the Special Committee on Administrative Law of the American Bar Association hardly give one comfort that other than logrolling dictated the framing of this section. Thus, it reports that "the proposed exclusion of internal revenue, customs, patents, trade-mark and copyright matters from the entire act is in keeping with an agreement reached at Kansas City and again at Cleveland with the association's committees on taxation and on customs and the section on patents, etc.," and that "Indian-land matters have been excluded due to requests on behalf of some members of the Oklahoma Bar." 63 A. B. A. Rep. (1938) 620. Of the conduct of the association in this connection Mr. L. G. Caldwell, the former chairman of the Special Committee on Administrative Law, says: "Most of them [the exceptions] are due simply to the fact that at the Kansas City meeting of the American Bar Association in 1937, all Federal agencies which had representatives at the meeting and which protested loudly enough were included in the list of exemptions as approved by the association. One independent agency, the Federal Trade Commission, secured its exemption by a similar process after the bill had been introduced in Congress." Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2224.

[24] See generally McAllister, Statutory Roads to Review of Federal Administrative Orders (1940), 28 Calif. L. Rev. 129.

[25] *United States* v. *Los Angeles & Salt Lake R. R.*, 273 U. S. 299 (1927).

[26] *American Federation of Labor* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 308 U. S. 401 (1940); *N. L. R. B.* v. *International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers*, 308 U. S. 413 (1940); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Falk Corporation*, 308 U. S. 453 (1940).

[27] *Rochester Tel. Corporation* v. *United States*, 307 U. S. 125 (1939).

[28] The term "decision" is to be found in the Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1093, 47 U. S. C. § 402 (1934), but the context there makes plain its meaning as contrasted with its use in the proposed bill.

involved." True, there must be a final decision, but the introduction of such a new concept is inexplicable save upon the supposition that its intention is to broaden the scope of administrative acts that shall be subject to judicial review. A decision by the administrator of a resettlement project denying a particular tenant a renewal of his lease is not an order. Is it a decision by nature amenable to judicial review? A refusal of the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend a regulation so as to exempt a particular type of holding company from the operation of one or more provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act is certainly not an order, but is it a decision? A refusal by the National Labor Relations Board to institute a particular proceeding upon the complaint of a discharged employee is not an order. It may, however, be a decision. These illustrations suffice to show the nebulous character of the concept and the danger it involves of departing from that stern admonition of Mr. Justice Stone that "courts are not the only agency of government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern."[29] Indeed, to inject the courts into a host of controversies either petty in character or unamenable to judicial determination is to run afoul of traditional concepts of judicial power and to endanger the dignity and efficacy of the judicial process itself.

I pass to the second question as to the scope of judicial review. Normally the scope of judicial review over administrative action is limited to questions of law and to whether or not the findings of fact underlying the administrative conclusion are based upon substantial evidence. This rule—the substantial-evidence rule—is not of legislative origin, despite its inclusion in the more recent statutes dealing with judicial review.[30] Its creation was, rather, the work of the judiciary. One can trace its evolution in the deportation cases, in the Interstate Commerce Act cases, in the early cases reviewing the actions of the Secretary of War in connection with his jurisdiction over bridges and purprestures. It evolved naturally as an appreciation arose of the undesirability of trying cases de novo in the courts and of the value of having the tribunal, informed by experience, assume a real responsibility for weighing and considering the facts in the fields where it had a peculiar competence.

Under the proposed legislation administrative orders are to be set aside in this connection upon two grounds: (1) That the findings of fact are clearly erroneous or (2) that the findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence. A difficulty of interpretation immediately arises in this connection. Is there any difference between findings of fact being clearly erroneous and findings of fact not being supported by substantial evidence? At first glance, it would seem difficult to think of a finding of fact being clearly erroneous if there was substantial evidence to support it. But this view would eliminate the whole content of the first standard, and it is a well-known rule of statutory construction that redundancy is not to be imputed to the legislator. One possible differentiation is to regard a finding as being clearly erroneous, even though there is substantial evidence to support it, because the reviewing court does not consider that the substantial evidence is credible. If one accepts this view—and it is the only alternative to redundancy that seems perceptible—the result would in substance make for independent judicial determination of the facts.[31] That is an end devoutly sought by many members of the bar, particularly those whose distrust of the administrative process in its newer fields is deep and intense. If that be the result of this proposal, it is, perhaps, the most important innovation in the bill.

There are a very few situations now in existence where, as a result of constitutional considerations, independent judicial determinations of fact are required. I have had occasion before to comment upon the judicial constructions and attitude that evolved this doctrine, and I have also had the temerity to prophesy that a reversal of that doctrine will occur the next time the Supreme Court has an opportunity to consider it.[32] I need not repeat those comments here. But the implications of such a rule generally applied are large in regard both to the issue of expedition and the place to be accorded to the administrative process as a whole. Upon the question of expedition, I need refer only to the operation of the rule of independent judicial determination of fact in the field of rate regulation as sketched by Mr. Justice Brandeis in his concurring opinion in the St. Joseph Stock Yards case.[33] He detailed there at length its effects in expanding the size of records, in increasing the opportunities for delay, in piling up costs and effort. "Congress," he protested, "concluded that a wealthy and litigious utility might practically nullify rate regulation if the correctness of findings by the regulating body of the facts as to value and income were made subject to judicial review. For that conclusion experience," he added, "affords ample basis."[34] What the rule has done in the way of making for delay in those few fields in which it is operative is now a matter of history; that it would promote the same delay elsewhere is not only foreseeable, but certain.

But the implications of the adoption of such a rule strike far deeper than the issue of expedition. They strike at the very heart of the administrative process itself. For the creation of the administrative has been responsive to the desire for expertness both in the development of policy and the sifting of the underlying facts upon which the shaping of policy must rest. To subject this fact finding again to independent judicial determination is to make pointless the process itself. Arbitrariness no one can defend; but against arbitrariness of judge, jury, or administrator, the substantial evidence rule is ample bulwark. To press further and to impose not only a vast new duty of judicial review over administrative decisions and over administrative fact finding is, to use the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "to disregard the origin and purposes of the movement for administrative regulation and at the same time to disregard the traditional scope, however far-reaching, of the judicial process."[35]

I pass the other stated grounds for judicial review, for, in the main, with the exception of the last residuary bequest to the judiciary that it shall reverse an administrative decision if it "is otherwise contrary to law"—a completely unknowable command—they represent standards now in effect. So still reading backward over the bill, I come to its provisions concerning the manner in which matters should be heard within the administrative agency itself. Here, perhaps, lies the core of what should be our concern with the administrative process. Fair and adequate disposition down below is, perhaps, more important that adequate supervision from above. Just as the capacity of our judicial system to administer justice is better tested by the work of its nisi prius judges than by the doctrine hewn out by many and expensive appeals, the capacity of our administrative system is best tested by the ways that it provides for the doing of justice within itself.

Two types of administrative procedure are provided by the bill, one for the single-headed administrative agency such as the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Labor, the other for the multiheaded agency such as the various independent regulatory commissions. Just why one type of procedure is the ideal type for an administrative agency headed by a board of three or more and another type is the ideal type for an agency headed by one administrator, is somewhat of a puzzle, but let us pass that to consider the type suggested for the single-headed agency. The purpose of prescribing adequate procedure for the initial stages of a controversy is obvious, but the test of any mechanism of procedure lies in whether it secures its objectives of fair, adequate, and prompt consideration of the matters involved.

The suggested mechanism requires the creation within the single-headed agency of an intra-agency board of three individuals of whom one, at least, shall be a lawyer and its chairman. It then provides that when any person is aggrieved by a decision of any officer or employee of that agency, a complaint may be made to this board which shall then conduct a full and fair hearing as to the matters involved. Perhaps, it is best to stop at this point and examine the bearing of this simple device. Again, one notes here the use of the term "decision," thereby admitting reference of matters not heretofore believed within the justiciable class to judicial methods of determination. The refusal to promulgate a rule, the refusal to render advice with reference to the meaning of a statute, indeed the refusal to make an appointment with a complainant at a particular time and place, all may fall within that concept of decision and thus call into operation this intra-agency reviewing board. It is important to note, moreover, that the use of the term "final decision" is carefully avoided, thus permitting endless prolongation of any contested controversy by resort to this internal administrative review at every point where decision is involved. Interlocutory administrative review is both clearly envisaged and encouraged, and this under the guise of seeking to promote "expedition."

But, perhaps, more serious than this is the misconception of the working of the administrative process embodied in this suggestion. It is patent that underlying the conception of the creation of the intra-agency boards of review is the conception that significant decisions are made by officers or employees. The reverse, however, is generally true. The deportation procedure long established in the Department of Labor will suffice to illustrate this point. Upon information and belief a warrant is issued by the Secretary or Assistant Secretary of Labor charging that the alien is deportable upon specified statutory grounds. The apprehended alien is then held or released on bail or on his own recognizance, pending examination upon a rule to show cause why he should not be deported. Thus far no decision other than the initial tentative issuance of the warrant by the head of the Department has been made by any officer or employee. The examination is then conducted before a local immigration inspector, who transmits the stenographic record of the examination with or without his own comments to the central office in Washington. Opportunity for representation of counsel together with the right to cross-examine and adduce witnesses has generally been accorded the alien upon

[29] Dissenting in *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U. S. 1, 87 (1936).

[30] For a collection of statutes embodying this rule, see McAllister, Administrative Adjudication and Judicial Review (1940), 34 Ill. L. Rev. 680, 691, n. 35.

[31] This is the view taken by the minority of the committee. See H. Rept. 1149, pt. 2, 76th Cong., 3d Sess. (1940), 11. The majority makes no mention of its understanding of the phrase. The American Bar Association's special committee justifies its use of this phraseology by reference to Rule 52 of the New Federal Rules, but still gives no hint as to the purpose for including this standard in addition to the substantial-evidence standard. See 63 A. B. A. Rep. (1938) 612.

[32] See Landis, The Administrative Process (1938) 141. Cf. *South Chicago Coal & Dock Co.* v. *Bassett*, 60 Sup. Ct. 544 (Feb. 26, 1940).

[33] *St. Joseph Stock Yards Co.* v. *United States*, 298 U. S. 38, 73 (1936).

[34] Id. at 93.

[35] *F. C. C.* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.*, 60 Sup. Ct. 437, 442 (Jan. 29, 1940). The particular expression quoted is used in another connection, but the thought is apposite.

the original examination.[36] Thus far, however, no decision has been made by any officer or employee of the Department. The central office, upon this record, may suggest that further testimony be taken and thus remand the case to the local office for further hearing. Otherwise it is forwarded to the Board of Review. Thus far again no decision has emanated from any officer or employee of the Department. At this stage a second hearing is held before the Board of Review, the alien or his representative being entitled to inspect the record complete with the comments thereon that may have been made up to then. The Board of Review, after hearing the case, reports its observations upon the matter to the Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of the Immigration Laws. Still no decision has been made by an officer or employee of the Department. The Assistant Secretary of Labor, if he then is convinced that a ground for deportation exists, issues an order for the execution of the warrant, and thus for the first time a decision has been made by an officer or employee of the Department.[37] Here then is the first moment where the operation of the mechanism for an intra-agency board would come into play.

We can then trace the operation of the new proposal at the instance of the complaining alien. Once more the case goes to an intra-agency board. Written findings and a decision are then made and these in turn are subject once more to the approval, modification, or disapproval of the head of the agency, the Assistant Secretary of Labor. The fundamental misconception of the bill is patent as one describes this process, for now two intra-agency or administrative appeals, coordinate in quality, have been introduced in a system that already provides for one. Not expedition but delay has been the result.

This procedure of the Department of Labor is not unique. It is characteristic of a great portion of the whole Federal administrative process that "decisions," except the minor ones—to call this witness and not that, to postpone this hearing for a day, to exclude this or that evidence—are not made by officers or employees but by the head of the agency involved after a long preliminary process that provides prior administrative revision but not prior administrative adjudication. This procedure, for example, is characteristic of that which prevails in the Department of Agriculture as regards the regulatory function of the Secretary under such acts as the Packers and Stockyards Act and the Commodities Exchange Act. It is the procedure that was pointedly outlined to the bar by the Supreme Court of the United States only recently in the first two Morgan cases.[38] And yet it has been fundamentally misconceived by the proponents of administrative reform with the curious results that have just been described. Reform of the internal administrative procedure is one thing; but the road of reform is hardly to leave it as it is and superimpose upon it one further hierarchy of internal administrative appeals.

It is impossible for me to complete my project of beginning at the end and ending at the beginning of this proposal and seeing what principles it evolves for administrative reform. I am afraid that the search for them would continue as elusive and as surprising as that already made. Instead, it might be worth while to sketch in brief a general blueprint of the manner in which a search for those principles might be made.

Clearly two general problems stand out in considering the general question of administrative reform. The first relates to the internal procedure of the administrative both as regards its exercise of its rule-making power and its exercise of its adjudicatory power. The second problem concerns the relationship of the administrative to the other three departments of Government. I say three advisedly, for I think that lawyers, merely because they are lawyers, tend to concentrate only upon the relationship of the administrative to the judiciary, believing that the proper solution of that problem will bring an end to all ills. But it is clear that the relationships of the administrative to the executive and to the legislative are at least of equal importance, for policy and supply derive directly from the legislature, and personnel, with all that that implies, together with a modicum of policy, are the content of the administrative-executive relationship. Furthermore, these relationships tie in with each other, for modification that may outwardly seem merely procedural in character may have profound and unanticipated effects because of its alteration of these basic relationships.

Consider, for example, the common suggestion made that the prosecuting and adjudicating functions of the administrative should be divorced from each other and placed under different heads.[39] This idea stems naturally from the judicial system with its district attorney and the court. But the analogy applied to the administrative mechanism, because of its alteration of the relationship between the administrative and the executive, carries implications not present in the judicial system. There the prosecuting attorney, save in a negligible number of States, is avowedly a political official. If elected he runs upon a political platform; if appointed he changes with every change in the political fortunes of his master. Why we tolerate and thrive under such a system, I leave to the political scientist to answer. But to introduce that system into certain branches of the administrative, even at the assumed gain of divorcing prosecution from adjudication, gives one some pause and leads to the inquiry as to whether internal systems for that divorcement cannot be devised which will leave unchanged the relationship between the administrative and the executive.

The problems surrounding the relationship of the administrative to the executive and the legislature are far more difficult to grasp and define than those affecting its relationship to the judiciary. This latter relationship breaks down upon analysis into three issues: (1) The problem of the category of administrative acts that should be subject to judicial review; (2) the manner for invoking that review; and (3) the scope of that review. Historic and traditional concepts of judicial power help to answer the first; considerations of expediency tend to dictate the manner of review; and considerations that have reference to the relative expertness of administrator and judge should govern the scope of review.[40]

With these considerations in mind, a survey of the operations of the administrative process should be undertaken. Where and how and in what manner are those general canons departed from? Such a survey would have merit; arbitrarily excluding older agencies because of vested interests in the procedures they have evolved and turning the blunderbuss upon the new, as the existing proposal does, has none. In such a fashion and only in such a fashion will the problem of adequately molding this relationship ever come about.

The other major problem of the internal procedures of the administrative with regard to its rule-making and adjudicatory powers is far more difficult of analysis. Procedure tends frequently to blend itself with substance. Errors of substance, when exposed, tend to blacken the whole procedural mechanism from which they emanated. For example, critics of the decision of the National Labor Relations Board in the Fansteel case[41] quite generally attribute that result to administrative procedures when at most it was an error of law of the type that judge after judge in the lower courts makes daily without bringing the judicial procedures into disrepute. Any true consideration of internal administrative procedure must divorce the substantive result from the manner in which it was arrived at, and do so conscientiously and without bias.[42]

But when we come to a consideration of the principles that should govern administrative procedure, we find only vague generalities. "Full and fair hearing" is a common phrase and yet its content is not easy to define. The Supreme Court of the United States in the Morgan cases and in the Mackay Radio case[43] enunciated certain conceptions which have affected internal administrative procedure greatly, but which in their application to certain situations not envisaged by the Court have left the circuit courts of appeals in considerable confusion.[44] How much help may the administrator employ in studying the record? How safeguard him and his staff from going beyond the record? What staffs may he employ in that connection? What decisions may he delegate? None of these questions, for example, are yet answerable. Nor is the slow process of litigation the method for answering them, for the judicial answer that evolves out of the litigious process is limited to insisting upon the minimum requirements of fair procedure whereas the goal should be the maximum requirements of fair procedure consistent with the efficient discharge of administrative responsibility.

---

[36] The question as to the extent to which the right of cross-examination must be accorded the alien is now before the Supreme Court. *Singh* v. *Haff*, 103 F. (2d) 303 (C. C. A. 9th, 1939); cert. granted, 308 U. S. 533 (1939).

[37] See Van Vleck, The Administrative Control of Aliens (1932) 83.

[38] *Morgan* v. *United States*, 298 U. S. 468 (1936); *Morgan* v. *United States*, 304 U. S. 1 (1938).

[39] This problem, which has been conceived by many as the central problem of administrative law, is only casually dealt with by the Walter-Logan bill.

[40] "The determination of utility rates—what may fairly be exacted from the public and what is adequate to enlist enterprise—does not present questions of an essentially legal nature in the sense that legal education and lawyers' learning afford peculiar competence for their adjustment. These are matters for the application of whatever knowledge economics and finance may bring to the practicalities of business enterprise. The only relevant function of law in dealing with this intersection of government and enterprise is to secure observance of those procedural safeguards in the exercise of legislative powers which are the historic foundations of due process." Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring in *Driscoll* v. *Edison Light & Power Co.*, 307 U. S. 104, 122 (1939).

[41] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation*, 306 U. S. 240 (1939).

[42] In the House debate on the bill, for example, much was made of the fiery language of Mr. Justice Sutherland in *Jones* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission*, 298 U. S. 1 (1936), without recognition of the fact that the quoted language was obiter dictum of a kind subject, according to traditional conceptions of the function of courts, to criticism; without notice of the fact that a vigorous dissent was entered by three justices; and without appreciation of the fact that a slight alteration of circumstance would justify the very practices of the Commission condemned in that case. Cf. *Resources Corporation International* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission*, 97 F. (2d) 788 (C. C. A. 7th, 1938).

[43] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Mackay Radio & Tel. Co.*, 304 U. S. 333 (1938).

[44] Cf. *Eastland Co.* v. *F. C. C.*, 92 F. (2d) 467 (App. D. C. 1937), certiorari denied, 302 U. S. 735 (1937); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Biles-Coleman Lumber Co.*, 98 F. (2d) 16 (C. C. A. 9th, 1938); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Cherry Cotton Mills*, 98 F. (2d) 444 (C. C. A. 5th, 1938); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Am. Potash & C. Corporation*, 98 F. (2d) 488 (C. C. A. 9th, 1938), certiorari denied, 306 U. S. 643 (1939); *Cupples Co. Mfrs.* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 103 F. (2d) 953 (C. C. A. 8th, 1939); *Inland Steel Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 105 F. (2d) 246 (C. C. A. 7th, 1939).

Here is no simple field to which answers can be made by speculation in vacuo or by reasoning from abstract principles derived from one's reactions to the growth of undemocratic governments elsewhere. There is certain to be no simple patent formula in this field. There has proved to be no such formula in the judicial process. Fair procedures governing the trial of a breach of the peace differ from those where the charge is a felony. The variant jurisdictions and procedures of the variant courts in the judicial hierarchies of our States volubly testify to the absence of one single, simple formula. Administrative procedures designed to determine whether or not a public utility holding company should be broken down into integrated operating units are certainly not those that should be brought into play to consider whether a cosmetic has been properly labeled. For both, however, a full and fair hearing should be the tradition of our system, and yet obviously the content of that concept must vary.

How then are answers to be made? Here again there is no solution but the painful device of overhauling critically each phase of the administrative process, made more painful because the very canons that should govern must still in the main be discovered. In some situations the issue to be determined may not be amenable to the customary procedures of judicial determination and thus the criterion of a full and fair hearing requires the discovery of others. Only of one thing can one be certain and that is, that to apply the procustean formula suggested by the association's pending propcsals is to cut off here a foot and there a head, leaving broken and bleeding the processes of administrative law.

The blueprint I sketch, it is true, presents only primarily a scholar's challenge and that challenge will offer no opportunity for ringing speeches against the rise of arbitrary power for the postprandial delight of bar-association audiences. Nor will it furnish a base for fervent denunciations of things as they are by those candidates for public favor who still toy with the hope of making things as they were. But the acceptance of such a challenge seems the only prelude possible to achievement. In 1933 I had the opportunity of watching fairly closely the evolution of a piece of legislation put together with war cries and shouts. No intensive survey had antedated it; no working papers had been consulted so as to delimit the scope of its operation. It, too, was superimposed upon an existing administrative scheme with only fleeting concern given to the problem of its joints. It, too, was shot with exceptions dictated by the happy thought of the moment or the desire not to come to grips with vested interests that it necessarily affected. When in *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States*,[45] the Supreme Court of the United States declared the National Industrial Recovery Act unconstitutional, it expunged from the statute book an act that was bound to fail of its high purpose because behind it was none of that understanding essential to the effectiveness of reform. It is this need of understanding which must be uppermost. Its want posits the truly crucial problems not only of administrative law but of all measures of law reform. It and it alone offers the royal road to attainment.

JAMES M. LANDIS.

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL.

[45] 295 U. S. 495 (1935).

House Joint Resolution 509 and House Joint Resolution 519

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which held hearings on House Joint Resolution 509 and House Joint Resolution 519, introduced by Congressman BUCK, of California. Under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks I include my statement before the committee.

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, APRIL 24, 1940

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before your committee in support of House Joint Resolution 509 and House Joint Resolution 519, introduced by Congressman BUCK, of California.

The district which I represent, the Third District of Oregon, has within it the port of Portland, which is the outlet for intercoastal and foreign shipping through all of the Columbia River territory.

This legislation has for its purpose the suspension of section 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 during the present European war, which section restricted the use of vessels in the laid-up fleet of the Maritime Commission. It has particular reference to intercoastal shipping from the Pacific coast.

A very serious condition has arisen there by reason of the sale and charter of many vessels which formerly were used in intercoastal trade. The demand for these ships by foreign shippers, growing out of the needs of the European war, has practically robbed the west coast of its shipping facilities. At the present time it takes from 3 to 4 weeks for west-coast shippers to secure shipping space either for east-bound or west-bound cargoes.

One-fifth of the lumber produced in the Northwest goes through Panama Canal, and averages one and one-half million tons annually. Forty-six percent of the softwoods used in lumber production originates in Oregon and Washington, for eastern consumption. Federal records show that one-third of the ships formerly used in this intercoastal industry have either been sold or chartered out of this traffic. As a result, curtailment of production on tidewater mills in the Pacific Northwest has been reduced over one-third, owing to lack of bottoms for handling the intercoastal trade. As a result, it is curtailing production. Indications are that this summer during the building period there will be a very marked advance in building operations, not only in carrying forward the Federal Housing program, but also in various other industrial activities which require considerable quantities of lumber products. The war trade has developed a considerable demand also for lumber. Low-cost housing requires large quantities of lumber products, as low-ccst building utilizes lumber largely for construction. Unless shipping facilities for intercoastal trade are made available, there will be a critical shortage of lumber production, with the failure of quantities with which to carry forward these programs. As a result, not only will mills in the Pacific Northwest be shut down and large numbers of laborers thrown out of employment but various allied industries will be curtailed and building operations generally slowed up, resulting in increasing the unemployment rolls.

One of the large forest-product industries in the Pacific Northwest is the chemical pulp industry, which manufactures high-grade pulp material used in various types of high-grade paper, rayon, plastics, and other similar products. This pulp is made largely from hemlock and waste material from lumber operations, much of which would be entirely lost unless devoted to this or a similar use. From sixty to seventy million dollars are invested in this industry alone in the Pacific Northwest. It manufactures some 800,000 tons per annum, requiring 780,000 man-hours alone to produce the logs. Thirty-five percent of the cargoes originating in this industry are water-borne. Twenty-five thousand tons of shipping space are needed but only 10,000 tons are available under existing conditions. These cargoes all go to the eastern seaboard.

The purpose of this legislation is to lodge in the Maritime Commission sufficient power to make available vessels which, under existing law, are now tied up. They are old, outmoded ships, but could be utilized in this emergency to prevent serious interruption of an essential industry in the Pacific Northwest. Shippers have entire confidence in the effectiveness of the Maritime Commission to meet and solve this situation, if power is given them under proper legislation.

The situation is so critical that it is most essential that immediate action be had so that the House may pass the necessary legislation without delay so it may go to the Senate for action before Congress adjourns.

Philadelphia Raids of the Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

STATEMENT FROM CITIZENS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The guaranty against "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press" and the protection from "unreasonable searches and seizures" contained in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution, form the basis of freedom and democracy for the American people. Any attack on these principles is an attack on the American people as a whole and strikes at the very foundation of their rights.

The actions of the Dies committee and in particular the conduct of its agents in raiding the headquarters of the Communist Party and the International Workers Order in Philadelphia on April 2 constitute a threat to these rights. Federal agents acted under cover of a State warrant; everyone who entered the offices was held incommunicado till the raid was over; those who were subpœnaed

were not allowed to get in touch with their attorneys; material not mentioned in the warrant was illegally confiscated. The practice of such methods by the very agencies empowered to defend the Constitution aims a double threat at our national security and freedom.

As stanch supporters of democracy, we urge that steps be taken to prevent a recurrence of these invasions of the privacy of American citizens. The President, the Civil Liberties Unit of the Department of Justice, and the House of Representatives should use their powers to terminate such practices.

Rev. J. A. MacCallum, of the Walnut St. Presbyterian Church; Dr. William Draper Lewis, director American Law Institute, former dean University of Pennsylvania Law School; Dr. Alexander H. Frey, professor of University of Pennsylvania Law School; Josephine Truslow Adams, author; Ruth Wanger, principal, South Philadelphia High School for Girls; Dr. Arthur Huff Fauset, principal, Joseph Singerly School; Mary Foley Grossman, national vice president, American Federation of Teachers; Rev. Fred D. Wentzel, director youth work, Evangelical and Reformed Church; Eliza M. Cope; Christian Brinton, art critic; Natale Masi, international representative Amalgamated Meatcutters, A. F. of L.; Francis C. Taylor, former chairman Philadelphia Lawyers Guild; A. McMurtrie Biddle; Georgina Biddle; W. Edwin Collier; Professor Brand Blanshard, Swarthmore College; Alice F. Liveright; Anna M. W. Pennypacker; Elizabeth H. Fetter; Dr. John H. Gibbon, Jr.; Rev. Pious Barber; Leon T. Stern; Winifred N. Prince; Ruth McKenny, author; Allen R. Freelon; Prof. Harry Helson, Bryn Mawr College; Richmond Page, Pennsylvania School of Social Work; Prof. Philip Hicks, Swarthmore College; Prof. Herbert Fraser, Swarthmore College; Prof. Walter J. Scott, Swarthmore College; Alexander Portnoff, sculptor; Lester Cohen, author; Millen Brand, author; Marc Blitzstein, composer; Raymond Pace Alexander, attorney; Louis F. McCabe, attorney; Bruce Minton, author; Wm. Blake, author; Frances Serber, ceramist; E. Lewis Burnham, attorney; Robert MacLeod, Swarthmore College; Frederic Klees, Swarthmore College; Edwin Neuman, Swarthmore College; Merle Hirsh, dancer; Dr. H. A. Witkin, Brooklyn College; Elsie Rogosin; Dr. Philip Eisenberg; Selma Schick; Prof. Hanna M. Faterson, Smith College; Prof. Eleanor J. Gibson, Smith College; Dr. Richard S. Crutchfield, Mount Holyoke College; Prof. Bernard F. Reiss, Hunter College; Prof. H. C. Hamilton, Temple University; Dr. Ralph K. White, Cornell University; Prof. S. E. Asch, Brooklyn College; Dr. C. E. Tuthill, Temple University; Lita Alexander, Swarthmore College; Holly Ross, Swarthmore College; Prof. R. Gleason, Temple University; Prof. Barrows Dunham, Temple University; Maurice Mandelbaum, Swarthmore College; Van Dusen Kennedy, Swarthmore College; Dr. H. B. Lewis, Brooklyn College; Patrick Malin, Swarthmore College; Helen Krasnow; Eden Gray; Prof. J. J. Gibson, Smith College; Dr. W. E. Seybold, Swarthmore College; Dr. Richard Brandt, Swarthmore College; Eleanor Morton, columnist; Dr. E. M. L. Burchard, Temple University; R. W. Bornemeier, Bryn Mawr College; Dr. E. H. Rodnick, Worcester State Hospital; R. S. Morrow, Vocational Guidance Division, B. of E., New York; Dr. Rosalind Gould, Brooklyn College; Dr. Mary Henle, Swarthmore College; Prof. Robert C. Challman, Teachers' College, Columbia; Dr. Evelyn Raskin, Randolph Macon Woman's College; Solomon Machover, Bellevue Psychiatric Hospital; Dr. W. S. Neff, College of the City of New York; Dr. I. S. Ravdin, Medical School of U. of P.; Dr. Herbert T. Webster, Temple University; Kenneth L. M. Pray, Pennsylvania School of Social Work; Alvin R. Guyler, Public Charities Association; Nicholas Marsicano, president, United Artists of America, Philadelphia; Ruth McClung Jones, Swarthmore College; Norris Jones, Swarthmore College; Marion Monaco, Swarthmore College; Virginia Safford, Swarthmore College.

Federal Farm Loan System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

RESOLUTIONS BY THE SUSSEX COUNTY NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION, GEORGETOWN, DEL.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Sussex County National Farm Loan Association, held at Georgetown, Del., on April 25, 1940:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, known as the Wheeler-Jones bill (S. 3509; H. R. 8748), under which, inter alia, the cooperative features of our Federal farm-loan system would be abolished and absolute power and control with respect thereto concentrated in the Government; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States another bill, known as the Gillette-Kleberg bill (S. 3480; H. R. 8825), to provide for the establishment of the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency of the Government, under the direction and control of an independent bipartisan board; and

Whereas the Sussex County National Farm Loan Association of Georgetown, Del., was organized under the Federal Farm Loan Act and has functioned as a part of the present cooperative Federal farm-credit system for a period of 18 years, serving approximately 300 members and Federal farm-loan borrowers in Sussex County, Del.; and

Whereas we believe the best interests of agriculture will be served by preserving, strengthening, and improving the present cooperative Federal farm loan credit system, and by establishing the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency of the Government; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby oppose the Wheeler-Jones bill (S. 3509; H. R. 8748) in its entirety, and we do hereby request and urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress from Delaware to work against and vote against the enactment of said bill, for the following reasons:

1. We are opposed to this bill because it would abolish the cooperative features of our present Federal farm-loan system and deny the land banks and existing borrowers, as well as future borrowers, through the system, any voice or participation in the control and operation of the system.

2. We are opposed to the centralization of power and control in the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, as provided for in this bill.

3. We are opposed to this bill because we believe it would establish unsound credit practices.

4. We are opposed to this bill because it would establish a bureaucratic Government lending agency in the place of an independent cooperative credit system we now have.

Further resolved, That we do hereby favor the passage of the Gillette-Kleberg bill (S. 3480; H. R. 8825), to establish the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency of the Government, under the direction and control of an independent bipartisan board, and we do hereby request and urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress from Delaware to support and vote for said bill.

Further resolved, That the president of this association is hereby directed to forward copies of these resolutions, which the secretary-treasurer is hereby directed to certify, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress from Delaware.

Army Promotion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate on the floor of the House this afternoon on the Army promotion bill, H. R. 9243. I am happy to learn that the speakers on both sides of the aisle agree with me that this is an excellent bill and have not offered a single criticism or objection to it.

As you know, H. R. 9243 received the unanimous approval of your Military Affairs Committee. Prior to the acceptance of this bill many solutions to the problem of promotion stagnation were offered, but had to be rejected because of the many elements involved. The experience and labor which went into this bill goes back nearly 20 years. In 1920, when thousands of officers were commissioned in the Regular Army, it became apparent that sooner or later steps would have to be taken to enable these officers to obtain a normal rate of promotion. These officers, who entered the Army between 1917 and 1920 were of approximately the same age. At the present time they number over one-third of all of the officers in the Army. They are junior lieutenant colonels, all of the majors, and the 900 senior captains. It would take many of these captains, who entered the Army at approximately the

same time as the lieutenant colonels, about 14 years to reach the grade of lieutenant colonel. It must be evident to all of you that something must be done to correct this condition. H. R. 9243 is a simple and logical cure. This bill is not offered because of any particular group of officers in the Army or because it merely assists many officers in obtaining additional rank. The bill is primarily to strengthen the national defense.

During the last war the colonels in our Army who were in command of combat regiments averaged 43 years of age. The reports of every nation engaged in that war show very clearly that the only officers who can stand combat conditions are young men. The officers who will lead the troops in the field must be young and vigorous or they cannot stand the constant grind and pressure. Older officers become fatigued and are unable to make the quick decisions so necessary to successful campaigns.

Under the present law, these World War veterans, who are now captains, will be 62 years of age before they become colonels. This is too old. It is very necessary that the officers of our Army be given a normal rate of promotion so that they will have experience in the various grades at an age when they are most suitable for those grades. In time of emergency, some of the young majors may be put in command of regiments; but what experience have those majors had at commanding a regiment? If this bill is passed, the officers of our Army are assured a normal rate of promotion, because they are promoted after a definite number of years' service. At the present time, a second lieutenant is promoted to a first lieutenant after 2 years of service. He is then promoted to a captain after 7 years' service. This bill does not change this, but continues it so that the captain is promoted to a major after 17 years' service; to a lieutenant colonel after 23 years' service; and to a colonel after 28 years' service. The only restriction placed on the number of officers in a grade is that of colonel. Here the limit is set at 705, which is the number of colonels now in the Army. It was necessary to set this limit, because the War Department found it very difficult to find suitable stations for more than that number of colonels.

At the present time some of our officers will not be promoted as rapidly as I have stated, because the bill requires that an officer serve 6 years in the grade of major and 5 years in the grade of lieutenant colonel. This was necessary or some officers would practically skip these grades. If an officer has served an excessive time in a junior grade, he is given credit toward the required service in the higher grade of 1 year for every 2 years he serves in excess of the required time in the junior grade.

On the surface you might assume that promotions in this manner would add greatly to the cost of our Military Establishment. This is not the case, because under the present law an officer's salary does not depend entirely upon his grade but upon his length of service. Under the present law a captain with 17 years' service draws a major's pay and a major with 23 years' service draws a lieutenant colonel's pay. This bill simply promotes these officers when they reach the pay period of the higher grade. For example, the 900 senior captains in our Army today are drawing majors' pay because they have been in the Army over 17 years. Under this bill these officers would become majors and draw the same salary they are drawing today. For the first 4 years the average cost will be about $300,000 and for the next 12 years will save about $2,300,000 a year.

This bill also makes it mandatory for all officers to be retired at the age of 60 except brigadier generals, who are to be retired at 62 and major generals at 64. A provision of the bill authorizes the Secretary of War to retain 5 percent of the colonels until they reach the age of 62. The present law requires all officers to retire at 64. This change was incorporated in the bill for several reasons. In the first place, the Armies of Great Britain, France, and Italy retire their colonels before they reach the age of 60—so such a requirement in this bill is not without precedent. In the second place, every colonel in our Army, who has reached the age of 60, has been jumped one or more times for selection to brigadier general, and at 60 he will not be selected because of his age. In the third place, unless some requirement of this kind is contained in the bill, the grade of colonel will be filled with older and older officers.

I know that all of you will agree with me when I say that this is a fair and just bill. It does not work an undue hardship on any officer. Many of these World War veterans would have very little opportunity for promotion unless a bill of this kind becomes law. Not only the veterans of the World War but all of those officers who entered the Army since 1920 find themselves blocked by the World War "hump" and are faced with years of service in the junior grades. The passage of this bill will relieve this situation and will greatly increase the efficiency of our national defense.

Some Accomplishments and Purposes of the Democratic Party During the Past 8 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. W. C. CAUDILL

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Senator W. C. Caudill, of Pearisburg, Va., before the Ninth District Democratic Convention at Bristol, Va., on April 6, 1940:

Ladies, gentlemen, and fellow citizens, I am happy to greet you with good will and personal felicitations, and to remind you of some accomplishments and purposes of the Democratic Party during the past 8 years.

As I speak to you I feel very much like a guide in a museum trying to show to a group of visitors the treasures of the building, but provided with only a small box of matches in the way of light. He would strike a match, hold it for an instant before a picture or a statue or a case of jewels, and then it would flicker out, and another match, in the same feeble way, would provide just the hastiest glimpse of another beautiful and valuable object. So in trying to tell you a little of the theme which is so broad, I can give you only a bare and rather kaleidoscopic introduction.

No man can entirely compass my subject in all its magnitude. I suppose that you will listen to me in the spirit of that small boy in the country who came in and told his mother he had set the old brindle hen on 2 dozen eggs. "Why," she said, "you don't expect her to hatch 2 dozen eggs, do you?" He said, "No; but I just wanted to see the old thing spread herself."

No person should attempt to address an intelligent audience unless he can do at least one of several things. He should be able to (1) impart new information, or (2) rehearse that which is already known, or (3) stimulate thought by asking questions, or (4) bore his audience until they take a good nap and be wide awake to appreciate the next speaker they hear.

It is at least with the hope of doing the latter that I bring to you the recital of some accomplishments and purposes of the Democratic Party during the past 8 years.

I appreciate the privilege of appearing before you, but I must confess that my feelings of pleasure are somewhat dimmed by the enormity of the task assigned me. Surely anyone who will today attempt to speak upon our modern problems is either a very brave person or he must approach the job with fear and trembling. For these very good reasons I am not going to attempt to deliver a complete address to you, but shall merely invite you to think along with me about these great problems. If we can somewhat clarify our thinking on this subject and bring some degree of order out of the chaos, we shall not have wasted our time. I am sure we can all agree that individual happiness must be based upon a reasonable degree of prosperity, of conscientious thought and planning about money matters, and efficiency in conducting business affairs. The same is true of a nation; our present and future happiness depends upon a conscious recognition of our problems and a courageous and thrifty program to overcome them.

The object of my address is to proclaim the accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration as the most constructive and far-reaching program attempted by any administration within the memory of any of us, and the most effectively responsive to the demands of a great emergency that was ever inaugurated in this or any other country.

Eight years ago our country was in bad circumstances. Agriculture was prostrate, industry in collapse, and financial institutions

bankrupt. These conditions of misfortune had risen because Congress and legislation had been dominated, manipulated, and controlled by the bourbons of great wealth at the expense of the farmers and the working people.

The farmers are now enjoying a prosperity they have not had in many years. Industry and business have been taken out of the red and are now earning a profit. The banks have been saved from utter collapse. These benefits are the product of Franklin D. Roosevelt's leadership, and such beneficial policies in no way contravene the liberty of the American people.

The Roosevelt regime is not opposed to fair profits by industry and business—a theme that has been sounded frequently of late by those who speak for the President. The New Deal constitutes no threat to wealth. It does not seek to confiscate it or to injure business. On the contrary, it seeks to improve it. It does not deny to anyone the fullest opportunity honestly and legitimately to acquire wealth or to enjoy it.

It seeks to give to everyone, including the average man, a greater measure of prosperity, peace, and better living for himself and his posterity.

If the public debt has been increased there is at least something to show for it in comparison with Hoover's increase of $4,500,000,000 and negligible results.

Let no one be terrified by the rising clamor of complaint from the politician outside of office who wants to get in, or from the once-again vocal representatives of privilege who find their privilege being forcibly removed.

When you realize the progress toward a real recovery that has been made since March 1933 you will probably have no more patience than I have with the partisan critics who are clamoring that the administration has no program or does not know where it is going.

The individual businessman must determine what part he wishes to play in this recovering Nation of ours. He can play the part of a beast of prey, or he can be a partner in the great task of providing his fellow men with the materials of life.

We are choosing between a moral order of life based upon the principles inherent in the charter laid down for us by the man who founded this Republic, and a renewed disaster ending only in chaos. There can be but one choice.

There are two aspects of the agricultural problem as we have it today. One is to produce enough. The other is to market the products of the farm at a price that is reasonable and fair.

The farmer has taken care of the problem of production. He has produced an abundance. A fair price to be maintained over a period of years, is the problem that cries for solution.

When manufactured products exceed the demand, factories slow up or shut down so as to permit demand to catch up with production. That is possible in manufacturing industries, because such industries are controlled by a comparatively small number of men. They are well organized and can get together on short notice.

Not so with agriculture. When the prices of farm products fall, because of over-production, the farmer does not decrease his production; instead he increases production. He does so because it is his only method of meeting fixed and urgent expenses. He must live, he must pay taxes and interest. He must buy necessities. Therefore, we have in agriculture the exact opposite of what happens in other industries. In industry, when demand falls off, production falls off; in agriculture, when demand falls off, production increases.

Unless we keep this simple law of agricultural economics clearly in mind, we cannot intelligently deal with the farm problem.

And while we have been cutting down price-destroying surpluses, we are using the meat from the cattle and hogs bought from the farmers to feed not only the bread lines in the larger cities, but also the stranded farmers in the stricken areas.

We have brought back farm prices. The price thermometer of what the farmer sells has been rising steadily and will soon reach the point fixed by the agricultural recovery program. Our farm problem is now well on the way to solution. We are now concerned with maintaining year after year, a fair price level which will give us long years of continuous prosperity instead of the disastrous ups and downs that have almost destroyed us in the past.

Farmers are just now getting their eyes open. They understand that the administration program is not only honest and sincere, but that it works, and that it is the only practical solution in sight.

The farmers of America have a firm, fast, and true friend in Roosevelt. For the first time in our history the eyes of Washington are turned with sympathetic understanding upon the farmer and the serious problems that in late years have fallen to his lot.

Look back with me for a minute to that day in Washington when President Roosevelt took the oath of office. Americans then heard the clear, strong voice of command, and they took heart. They lifted up their heads and thanked God that here at last was the confident voice of courageous, constructive leadership.

You remember how the silly Republican assurances that conditions were improving, when the blind could see that they were growing worse, finally were greeted with cries of derision. And how the quack promise, reiterated constantly as the night grew darker, that prosperity was "just around the corner," was hooted into silence. Such was the leadership to which you are invited to renew allegiance, a leadership too blind to see, too ossified mentally to think, too paralyzed to act, too weak and fearful to face and tell the truth. Isn't that your recollection?

Which would you prefer—to stand with these reactionaries for privilege for a few, or to move forward to a sounder and more equitable prosperity than we have ever had before?

What do voters want this year? Do they want more hokum and bunkum, do they want evasions and oratory, do they want drivel and ranting? No! The people are earnest about things today. They have passed and are passing through critical times. They are interested in vital things. What the people want is straight-from-the-shoulder talk, the sort of sincere talk that tells things and does not evade.

The people want, as never before, to put the best citizens in office. They see that this is a crucial period in the life of the Nation. They see the world in turmoil and anything possible. They see that strong, intelligent men, men of superb judgment, men of purpose and high principle, are needed in high places. The citizens realize that the ballot is a thing of tragic importance; that politics is vastly more than a scramble for office among the self seekers. And they are thinking these things as they look the candidates for office over, listen to their sayings, and observe their actions and scrutinize their records.

Americans have the vote. They are the masters of their own destiny. If they have bad government, it is because they stand for it. They have the right to think for themselves, form their own conclusions, and vote for whom they please. And their vote will be counted. An American citizen is the greatest achievement of man.

In our country and in our times no man is worthy the honored name of statesman who does not include the highest practicable education of the people in all his plans of administration. He may have eloquence; he may have a knowledge of all history, diplomacy, jurisprudence, elevated rating, and by these he might claim in other countries, the rank of statesman, but unless he speaks, plans, labors, at all times and in all places, for the culture and edification of the whole people, he is not—he cannot be—an American statesman.

The amelioration of the condition of mankind, and the increase of human happiness ought to be the leading objects of every political institution and the aim of every individual, according to the measure of his power, in the situation he occupies.

Our fight is for the Democratic Party. The party for you and for your neighbor, for the average man and woman of this country, for the farmer, for the laborer, for the merchant, and for the banker. We are all one. We are all together in this serious fight in which we are engaged, and we must not let any other party or faction, new or old, halt us on our way.

Republican advice brought us only misery in the days of Hoover, and there has been nothing in the record that shows that their advice is any better now than it was then. They were the engineers of ruin then; what is your guaranty that they won't be the same now? I tell you frankly, and I speak with every bit of sincerity I can muster, the Old Guard isn't in step with any measure of the New Deal. They are against relief—they cannot but understand the very vital problem of feeding the hungry and housing the homeless, and yet they protest against the humane function and duty of the Government to take care of its people. They are against recovery, for they protest and shout extravagance at every expenditure that is calculated to bring an ordered stability to the industrial and agricultural world. They are against reform, for they fight tooth and nail for the preservation of customs and practices that fed their greed for so many generations in a day that, I hope, has gone forever.

I count them like the Bourbons of Napoleon's time; they cannot learn, neither can they forget.

When they set up their wails of unconstitutionality and usurpation of liberty and other high-sounding and equally meaningless protests, the real reason is not hard to understand. They are against the spirit of the New Deal; they are against the rights of the many as opposed to the privilege of the few; they are against it without sincerity of purpose or honesty of mind.

Charges have been made recently that the Democratic Party has taken away the liberty of the American people. Truly, what a ridiculous label to place upon a party, a party to which human liberty has always been a cardinal tenet. One hundred and forty years ago Thomas Jefferson first enunciated the liberal doctrines that definitely took form as the Democratic Party organization. That party still survives, and by harmony and cooperation we can keep it in power.

Human life came from the soil. Tradition has it that a Greek giant received his strength from touching the ground. At any rate, man gains strength of character from contact with the earth. Since the days of Abraham the farm and ranch have been the groundwork of all human progress.

The keystone of the Democratic Party is a recognition of this age-old fact. In spite of genius, in spite of individuals, in spite of machines and combinations, cotton remains the clothing of the masses, no substitute has been found for a beefsteak, and bread still remains the staff of life.

What were the conditions when the present administration took charge and what caused these conditions? For many years selfish groups had sought to ignore these simple rules of life. They secured control of the Government. They manipulated the finances of the country. They unloaded worthless securities on the public. They pyramided holding company upon holding com-

pany. They bled the agricultural sections white and exploited industry as ruthlessly, and caused a lopsided development in America. They forgot the average man.

What were the results? This headlong speed of an engine without a governor had almost produced chaos by 1932. Banks were closing by the thousands. Hundreds of thousands of farm and city homes were being foreclosed, smokestacks were rusting in idleness and millions of blameless people were shuffling in the breadlines—helpless, hungry, and despairing.

What has the New Deal administration done to remedy these appalling conditions? First, it has furnished a leader, a leader who is unafraid, one whose heart is right, one who lifted up his eyes so that he could see all the way across this broad, big country. With that engaging candor which is characteristic of him, he has taken the American people into his confidence and caused them to become interested in their Government. He mapped a program of action, a program that neither he nor any other thinking individual expected to be 100-percent perfect, but one that in his own language has made more hits than errors.

A few years ago, the President delivered an address at the Commerce Building in which he made a significant statement which should not pass without grateful commendation by the women of America. He was defending national planning, and in the course of his remarks, as reported by the press, pointed out that Federal Government must act as "father and mother" to the States. The expression is unique in Presidential utterances and in masculine circles. What I admire is his sense of balance. The country needs "mothering" as well as fathering. There has been too much of one element and too little of the other. Creative ideas which men might never have are locked up potentially in the minds of women, which if released and blended with masculine views, would give birth to a higher expression of intelligence than would be possible with either element alone. This furnishes a scientific clue to the best method of achieving national balance.

In the words of Susan B. Anthony, a woman grown wise in statecraft through a lifetime of struggle and observation, until men and women "stand upon a plane of perfect equality of rights and privileges, there can be no such thing as a fair solution or adjustment of the issues of the day, either great or small; in other words, that these cannot be satisfactorily and permanently settled through the judgment and decision of only one-half of the people."

Roosevelt has led the way, and more and more he will be aided by others. The aims of the New Deal will never be changed, nor will the Democratic Party be frightened from the solid position it now occupies, representing the American people and nullifying any claims that it is becoming un-American.

Is it un-American to feed the hungry? If it is, then Americanism as I know it has become stunted and stultified.

Is it un-American to be a good neighbor, to lend a helping hand to those other Americans, and there are millions of them, who, through no fault of their own, found themselves not wanting for luxuries but for bread? If it is, then they preach a different brand of Americanism from mine.

Is it un-American in a land of plenty to see to it that the benefits of prosperity are shared by all and not merely the privilege of the few? If it is, then the word has degenerated into a catch phrase and has become the shibboleth of a dream that failed.

Is it un-American to see to it that the weak are not exploited by the strong, to give the laboring man the right to bargain, and, mind you, only the right to bargain? Then, if it is, America has failed in its high purpose and government among men has become a sham and a shackle.

Is it un-American to strive to make this land of ours a land of peace, contentment, and happiness, far from the maddening hates and alarms of the older world? If it is, then we have permitted the torch of liberty to grow dim and sputter in the dead ashes of our own lost faith and indifference.

Air Safety for the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, the National Safety Council was founded in 1912 and has since then devoted its efforts to promoting the safety of life and limb.

It is an impartial organization, which has for many years been an active force in improving safety in all our social and business activities.

It regularly makes awards and grants certificates in recognition of outstanding accomplishments in the improvement of safety.

This year, on April 8, it awarded a certificate of special commendation to the Civil Aeronautics Authority on account of the remarkable record made by the Authority during the last year in improving safety in air transportation.

Never before has the National Safety Council made such an award to any agency of the Federal Government.

This unprecedented action of the National Safety Council recognizes that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has made an unprecedented record. That record shines like a beacon among the achievements of Government in recent years.

The National Safety Council's praise of the Authority is echoed on every side in the press and among the public.

The proposal to reorganize the Authority and return civil aviation to the Department of Commerce will be a blow at the power and position of the Authority.

The record speaks for itself.

No step should be taken to impair the work of the Authority.

The proposed reorganization would be a disastrous mistake.

Gold and Silver Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT JAMES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of the keynote speech of Hon. Albert James at the Republican convention at Dover, Del., on April 24, 1940:

GOLD AND SILVER POLICY

If we are to go forward in '40, if we are to defend our national currency, we must call a halt to subsidizing the rest of the world through purchases of foreign silver and gold at the expense of the American taxpayer.

No better summary of this situation can be found than that made by our own Senator JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr., who has so ably led the Nation in advocating a sound foreign and domestic monetary program. He says: "The alarming increase in the Nation's gold hoard, due chiefly to a torrential inflow of the yellow metal from abroad, constitutes a problem of real and pressing importance. There is no doubt that it will be impossible to again dispose abroad of the gold we have been importing, unless at a material loss. To value this gold on the Treasury's books at $35 an ounce complies with the statutes of Congress, but conceals the fact that this value is a fictitious value.

"The gold we buy, like the silver, is paid for with American wealth. In 1929, this country attained a high degree of business activity on a gold stock valued at $4,000,000,000. In 1934, after the price of gold had been lifted, virtually overnight, by 60 percent, we had a $7,000,000,000 gold stock. Today our national gold pile has grown to $18,412,000,000. More than $11,000,000,000—a sum so large that it is hard to conceive—has been added since January 1934.

GOLD STOCK

"How this country could ever get rid of that $11,000,000,000 increment in its gold stock without a shameful loss is impossible to foresee. The problem of future gold acquisitions should be examined with a view to early formulation of a policy in keeping with our national requirements."

Senator TOWNSEND also says, "The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 should be repealed at once, and all purchases of foreign silver terminated without further delay. While, as is claimed, the Treasury of the United States is not out of pocket a penny as a result of the foreign-silver program, under it foreigners have received approximately $1,000,000,000, and as they have spent that money they have carried away real American wealth in exchange. The country, as distinct from the Treasury, has paid, and paid dearly for this program, and will continue to pay so long as it remains unrepealed.

"To defend the silver program by saying that foreign-silver buying helps our export industries is just deluding ourselves. If the purchase of foreign silver at 35 cents an ounce were 'good because it makes employment here,' it would be sensible to argue that the buying of foreign silver at 10 times that price would make 10 times as much employment here. But that is not sensible.

"It is not a question of whether or not silver is worth 35 cents an ounce. When we have absolutely no conceivable need for monetary silver, the metal simply is worth nothing to the American people who are bearing the burden of the program.

"Since the spending by foreigners of newly printed silver certificates here is merely a form of unashamed inflation or dilution of the currency of the United States, it should be emphasized that inflation robs the poor, the workingman, the pensioner, the widow, and endowed institutions like universities and hospitals, which cannot speculate against changes in the value of the currency.

"When the Nation owns more than $18,442,000,000 of gold, there is no just excuse for the purchase of foreign silver."

Two National Problems—To Maintain Peace—To Pay the Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, there are two grave problems confronting the American people: One is, how to stay out of war; the other is how to pay the national debt. Everywhere we hear good Americans deploring war and its awful consequences and expressing a strong hope and desire for peace in this country. We also hear them talk of the tremendous national debt which has piled up quickly during the last 8 years.

Let me point out that this country has practically reached its legal debt limit. We are now about $45,000,000,000 in the red. If we were to take 45,000,000,000 dollar bills, lay them end to end, and side to side, we could construct a roadway 25 feet wide that would not only run around the earth, but 10,000 miles out into space. This gives us a good picture of our debt burden. And when we start paying back, as we will have to do someday, where will this money come from? It will come from the pockets of the people in the United States. We know that somebody will have to dig down deep to put back into the Treasury $45,000,000,000 plus the interest that is accruing. Somebody will have to do it. And the sad part of it is, that somebody includes you. Just think of it, every day your Government is spending $15,000,000 more than it takes in. Every time the clock ticks, every second, this administration is spending $293. Every hour it spends $1,000,000. I know that the average man does not appreciate the fact, that when we talk about the public debt, we are talking about a financial situation in which he must be vitally interested since he owes part of it.

A short time ago a letter from the President was read to Congress. In this message Roosevelt asked that the sum of $975,000,000 be appropriated for W. P. A., and this sum was to be placed at his disposal during the 8-month period starting July 1, 1940, and spent as he saw fit, if necessary. The Woodrum amendment, now a part of the law, and written into the law because of mishandling of W. P. A. funds in 1936 and 1938, requires such funds to be prorated over the entire fiscal year like funds in other departments. Those who unfortunately need the help of W. P. A. funds do not wish to see a repetition of what happened during the election years of 1936 and 1938, when large numbers of men throughout the country were added to W. P. A. pay rolls in September and October, only to be dropped after early November and left without work throughout the freezing and most trying months of the year. This appropriation bill has not as yet come before the House, but the President's unusual request gives me an opportunity to repeat my frequently stated position concerning the handling of the W. P. A. This is another bureau of the Federal Government which has been built up with a bulging personnel of high-salaried Washington officials who have been reckless in using the funds at their disposal for administrative expenses. Last year the records showed that they spent for telephone and telegrams alone about $150,000 monthly—get that, $150,000 month after month. We must cut down the heavy telephone and telegraph charges and excessive administrative expenses, so that the dollars appropriated will go a longer way in helping to take care of the needy.

Now, let us take the Civilian Conservation Corps, with its 270,000 enrollees, for an example. In 1940 they and their families will receive $101,185,000 in pay, while the 32,000 individuals who are on the administrative pay rolls will draw in salaries $58,234,000. The administrators will take an amount more than one-half of the total cash paid the enrollees.

A break-down of this large sum of money discloses that the average cash pay received by the Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees themselves, is only $374 per annum; whereas those charged with the administration of the C. C. C. program receive an average annual salary of $1,797, nearly five times as much as the boys for whose benefit the program is primarily intended. Too much of the money is spent at the top and too little of it gets down to the bottom where it is needed.

You and I want to see this money spent to relieve distress and not for excessive overhead; spent for worth-while projects, and not for those for which there is little or no necessity. I am just as much concerned over the plight of those who must seek relief from W. P. A. and other agencies as anyone can be, but I demand that a stop be put to the present needless waste. I want the money spent on actual relief. So do you.

There is another kind of debt, which is chiefly a moral obligation, due those individuals who suffer today because of the wars this country has heretofore waged. This debt, in one sense, will always remain unpaid, because it is beyond human compensation. I refer to what we owe the sick, crippled veterans, those killed in action, and their widows and orphans. A bill (H. R. 9000), which provides for pensions for widows and orphans of World War veterans, will soon be brought before the House of Representatives for consideration. Legislation of this type is a timely reminder to all of us, what a terrible price war makes us pay. It seems to me that so long as this country goes to war just so long will its taxing power be used for payment of pensions to veterans and their dependents. There is a solution to this problem. That solution can be summed up in these words, "Stop having wars." I am no defeatist, and I believe this can be done. However, it means a willingness on the part of our manufacturers to forego good war profits; it means getting along without war prosperity; it means remaining neutral when war propagandists work night and day to enmesh us; it means a careful attitude on the part of our State Department in handling our affairs with the warring nations; it means adequate national defense against potential enemies so no one would dare attack us. If we concentrate on our own security, we will remain at peace; and if we remain at peace we can rest assured that there will be no veterans conscripted, wounded, and killed. We can rest assured that all citizens will have opportunity to make a living in peace, rather than to have a select group of men serve their Government as gun fodder, while others receive high war wages, salaries, and profits; and finally we can rest assured that no additional pensions for veterans or their dependents will be required. Until then, history tells us, there is no assurance against paying war pensions.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of the world want to live in peace. They want to give their energy to the arts and sciences, to agriculture and manufacturing, that they may enjoy life by creating and building. They do not want to produce military planes, bombs, machine guns, poison gas, and cannon for the destruction of property and human beings. They believe as did the signers of the Declaration of Independence "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." People crave for that peace which will give them a common opportunity to live in security, to maintain and rear their families, to guarantee for themselves and their children the right to live as God had

intended them to live, in peace and love for one another. But how dark is the picture today, with many parts of the world at war. Men of supposedly civilized nations are striving with all the cunning they can command to kill one another. It seems that the world has forgotten the sacred message of love, peace, and sanctity of human life.

We as Americans cannot be blind to this mad travesty of civilization. But we can and must stay out of the wars now going on in the world.

War propagandists in this country seek by vicious means to involve us in the European conflict. Through the radio and the press, they circulate deliberate falsehoods with emotional appeal to excite our sympathy or stir up hatred of such intensity that it might induce us to stifle our strong desires for peace and take up arms for war.

We must avoid the snares of these paid warmongers and actively work to keep the United States at peace. Those who guard their country's welfare will follow the precepts stated by the Father of his Country in his Farewell Address:

> Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests * * *.
>
> Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Jefferson, too, was most outspoken against involvement in Europe. He said:

> I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. * * * They are nations of eternal war.

We cannot disregard those words of wisdom and advice. We as Americans owe a sacred duty to our country to preserve those liberties which our forefathers willed to us. It is our job to make democracy work here rather than to enter wars over there.

We should detest war for the lies it lives, for the deaths it brings, for the hatreds it arouses, for the dictatorships it creates, for the starvation that stalks after it, and for the undying misery produced by it. As Americans, first, last, and always, we should pray and actively work to preserve peace for the United States.

There can be no more fervent prayer from the lips of a patriot than the following written by my respected friend, William Tyler Page, former Clerk of the House of Representatives:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

> I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.
>
> I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Tenant Purchase Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION OF APRIL 29, 1940

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution for April 29, 1940:

[From the Atlanta Constitution of April 29, 1940]

TENANT PURCHASE PROGRAM

The House of Representatives is expected to vote this week on restoration of funds for the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant program.

It is important to the future of this country that these funds be restored. The House Appropriations Committee reported the bill out some months ago without the tenant purchase program. A vigorous fight to restore it was lost, probably because it came late at night and when many Members were absent.

The Senate then amended the bill to provide for $50,000,000 during the next fiscal year in the important program of making farm owners out of desirable and carefully selected tenants. This amendment was approved without a single dissenting vote.

The House now must vote. If it again refuses to provide for the program, one of the most successful of the farm-program features will have been lost. It will halt the steady progress which is being made in stabilizing the small farmer on the land at a time when the problems of tenancy and farm-labor migration already are serious.

No burden would be imposed on the Federal Treasury for these loans as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances them and the loans are self-liquidating.

As evidence of the fact the program is working, those who had borrowed during the first year of the act paid back their maturities at the rate of 165 percent. Many were able to make substantial payments in advance. In addition to the fact the plan is working the Government further is guaranteed because of the first-mortgage loan on the real estate.

Action of the House in striking out this important, and successful, feature of the farm program was a distressing move and one which should be corrected.

An Appeal for Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the attention of the House has been called to the picketing which has been carried on at the cafeteria which is operated in the Methodist Building, just across the street from the Supreme Court Building.

You may remember that, although 13 of the 28 employees who work in this cafeteria belong to a union, there is no labor dispute between those employed and the owner of the cafeteria. The only dispute which exists is between the union to which they belong and the owner of the cafeteria. The employees are not making any demands as to wages, hours, or working conditions. The union is making certain demands, and what it is trying to do, and what Mr. Mink, its representative, is apparently trying to do, is to get himself or the union in a position where it can levy dues upon the young men and women who work there.

The pickets have carried placards which contain false statements, but here is what to me is the latest in intimidation. In a letter on the letterhead of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, sent out to some tenants in the Methodist Building, that organization, through its secretary, makes an appeal to the tenants to force Mrs. Mueller to submit to arbitration the demands of this union agent.

Now, remember, there is no dispute between Mrs. Mueller and her employees, but the union, or Mr. Mink, whichever it is, has horned in, and this organization sends out a letter which, after requesting the recipients to urge Mrs. Mueller to submit to arbitration, contains this sentence: "In case she does not, will you consider other methods of inducing her to observe the spirit of the Social Creed of the Methodist Church?"

Just what do the words "other methods" in this sentence mean? Does this organization, using the name of the Methodist Church, imply that, if Mrs. Mueller does not yield to the "urging," those who reside in the building do something more drastic to her? Do they want her tarred and feathered, coerced by threats? Or just what do they want us to do to her?

So that you may have the situation in mind, I insert the letter, and my reply thereto, which reads as follows, and note especially the last paragraph of the federation's letter:

Our Washington, D. C., members have requested me to call your attention to the fact that the labor situation in The Dining Room, Inc., which is located in the Methodist Building, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., is a clear violation of the statements of the Methodist Church in regard to labor problems.

In an election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board the employees of The Dining Room, Inc., chose the United Cafeteria Workers Union as their representative to negotiate with the management as to wages and other working conditions.

The union then signed an agreement, presented to them by a representative of the Bureau of Conciliation of the United States Department of Labor, to submit the dispute to arbitration. The union also agreed not to insist on the closed shop.

The management of The Dining Room, Inc., however, when asked by the representative of the Bureau of Conciliation to submit the dispute to arbitration, refused. By so doing, Mrs. J. C. Mueller, the manager, acted contrary to the 1908 Social Creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which declares: The Methodist Episcopal Church stands for the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions. She also acted contrary to the 1912 Social Creed of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which declares: "The churches must stand for the right of employees and employers alike to organize, and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes."

Will you please urge upon Mrs. J. C. Mueller that she submit her controversy with her employees, organized into the United Cafeteria Workers Union, to arbitration? In case she does not, will you consider other methods of inducing her to observe the spirit of the Social Creed of the Methodist Church?

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. WEBBER,
Executive and Field Secretary.

APRIL 26, 1940.

Mr. CHARLES C. WEBBER,
Executive and Field Secretary, The Methodist Federation for Social Service, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

DEAR MR. WEBBER: Many thanks for the copy of the mimeographed letter of April 18, referring to the operation of The Dining Room, Inc., which is located in the Methodist Building, which is located 100 Maryland Avenue, not 110, this city.

Apparently you know as little about the conditions in the dining room as you do about its location.

Having lived in the Methodist Building for 3 years, am fairly familiar with the services rendered by the cafeteria and I know personally several of the employees. I am not familiar with the "statements of the Methodist Church in regard to labor problems." However, I do know what is fair, just, and reasonable and why a church organization, or perhaps more accurately, probably just a few busybodies using the name of the church, should attempt to drive a woman who is trying to earn a living, give jobs and pay wages, out of business, is something that I cannot understand.

If you are familiar with the facts, you would know that of the 28 employees, but 13, and several of those because they were overpersuaded, joined the union. You should know that there is no dispute between the management and the employees. Apparently you are not familiar with the fact that the union and its officials are the ones who are making the complaint; that they are the ones who want to collect dues of the girls who work in the cafeteria. The dispute, if there is any, is between the union, or perhaps Mink, and the woman who is trying to operate the cafeteria.

The person who tried to operate a cafeteria in this building, prior to the time Mrs. Mueller took over, failed.

What you are apparently trying to do now is to intimidate her and destroy her business.

I will speak to Mrs. J. C. Mueller, as you describe her, but my advice will be that she still has a right to try to conduct her business without submitting to either your domination or the tribute-levying activities of Mr. Mink.

Just what do you mean by the last sentence of your letter, which reads as follows:

"Will you please urge upon Mrs. J. C. Mueller that she submit her controversy with her employees, organized into the United Cafeteria Workers Union, to arbitration? In case she does not, will you consider other methods of inducing her to observe the spirit of the social creed of the Methodist Church?"

Just what are you trying to get at; do you want me to threaten her; do you want me to tell her that I will no longer patronize her cafeteria if she does not submit to Mink's demands or do you want me to go in and "bust her in the nose"; the latter course would be no more unfair, no more un-American, no more unjust than the suggestion in your letter to me.

Perhaps your letter can be explained by noting that one of the secretaries of the organization is Harry F. Ward; was not he an official in the American League for Peace and Democracy?

You might suggest to Bishop Francis J. McConnell, connected as he is with the American Civil Liberties League, that he get his organization to act in behalf of Mrs. Mueller and of her employees, who are denied their civil rights by Brother Mink.

In conclusion, please advise just what the last sentence in your letter, which I quoted, means; that is, if Mrs. Mueller does not yield to the "urge" which is put upon her and, if your letters bear fruit, just what do you want the tenants in the building to do to her?

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Of course, everyone realizes that the Methodist Church, as a church or as an organization, has nothing to do with such a letter as this. It only illustrates how an organization can assume a name and pretend to be something that it is not.

As pointed out in my reply, you may recall that Harry F. Ward was one who received considerable publicity as an official of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

President Roosevelt Friendly to Grays Harbor—The Real Facts Regarding the Olympic National Park

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, few communities in the United States were hit harder by the Hoover depression than Grays Harbor, Wash. By the end of 1932, industry and business had come to almost a complete standstill. The few industrial plants still operating were running only 3 days a week. The relief load for the unemployed had become so heavy that the cities, school districts, and county were facing bankruptcy. School warrants were going begging at a big discount. Banks and financial institutions had failed and closed their doors. Savings and loan associations had suspended payment. Thousands of citizens were unable to pay even their water and light bills. In the harbor cities, 1,100 families were not paying rent, according to W. O. McCaw, realtor, of Aberdeen.

Although owners are unable to keep up taxes and repairs, they do not desire to evict. The welfare board here has been offered a free supply of surplus oranges from California. Schafer Bros. of Montesano have offered to bring a large supply of these oranges in their next northbound ship. (Hoquiam Washingtonian, April 23, 1933.)

Hundreds of citizens who had purchased houses on contract lost their homes. Merchants and businessmen had extreme difficulty in surviving. The losses, misery, hardship, and suffering of those years will never be forgotten by the people of Grays Harbor. Had these conditions continued, Grays Harbor and all its people would have been ruined.

HOW PICTURE CHANGED UNDER ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Immediate steps were taken in 1933 by the Roosevelt administration to alleviate and correct these unhappy and terrible conditions. Work relief for the unemployed was provided, and the financial load shifted from the cities, school districts, and county to the Federal Government. Consequently these local units of government are today in the soundest financial condition in their history.

Numerous activities to create new purchasing power were carried on. Conditions improved so rapidly that by October 13, 1936, the Aberdeen Daily World published the following headline: "Basic harbor industries reach six-year high in pay roll and employment," and in the news article stated:

Employment in logging camps has reached a new peak for recent years; sawmills have the largest crews employed since the curtailment began in 1929, with trained keymen in demand.

At the present time in 1940 there are more men employed, and they are receiving higher wages, than at any previous time in the history of Grays Harbor. Bank and savings and loan deposits were insured by the Federal Government, and as a result these institutions are flourishing. Instead of banks failing, a new bank has been established in Aberdeen.

Useful projects of permanent value and lasting benefit to the communities have been constructed through the aid of the Federal Government—streets, sewers, flood-control dikes, schools, gymnasiums, playgrounds, stadiums, cemetery beautification, soil conservation, and other public improvements too numerous to mention.

From 1919 to 1934 the citizens and taxpayers of Grays Harbor paid annually $58,000 for dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor, amounting to approximately a total of $1,000,000. In 1934 we had this burden shifted to the Federal Government, not through the W. P. A. or the P. W. A., but regular river and harbor appropriations, approved by the Army engineers and the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, on which we have been represented since 1933. In the past 6 years this action has resulted in a total saving of $348,000 in actual cash to the citizens and taxpayers of Grays Harbor. This sum is more than the entire cost of paying all the salaries of all the county officials of Grays Harbor County during this period.

For many years our citizens have realized the importance of securing high-water jetties, which have been advocated by such prominent citizens as Judge William E. Campbell, Phil J. Mourant, Werner A. Rupp, the late John W. Clark, and the late Phil S. Locke, and, of course, our highly efficient port manager, W. J. Murphy, and port commissioners, Capt. Matt Peasley, C. N. (Bud) Wilson, and Frank H. Lamb. Every attempt failed until 1935, when my resolution was approved by the Army engineers and by the Rivers and Harbors Committee after extended hearings, and construction of the south jetty was commenced. Nearly $5,000,000 has been expended and we are making fine preliminary progress in getting work started on the north jetty, at an estimated cost of $2,365,000, or a total investment by the Federal Government of over $7,000,000.

The present national administration has provided the people with the Bonneville hydroelectric project, the legislation for which I had the honor to sponsor in the House, and our citizens will soon be enjoying the benefits of low-cost Bonneville electricity. This project will prove a boon to our local communities and result in much industrial development throughout southwest Washington.

THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Notwithstanding this record of service and accomplishment for Grays Harbor, a few politically minded persons have the effrontery to circulate the malicious propaganda that President Roosevelt and the Washington congressional delegation, including myself, have conspired to injure Grays Harbor by the establishment of the Olympic National Park. This park is located almost wholly within Clallam and Jefferson Counties, the district of the gentleman from Washington, Congressman WALLGREN, not within our district. The so-called Queets corridor is in Jefferson County, where 16 families are said to be affected. The main area in Grays Harbor County is a small strip within the national-forest, primitive, or wilderness area at Lake Quinault, already withdrawn from commercial use by the Forest Service, and not subject to any cutting. In other words, no commercial timber in Grays Harbor County has been included within the area of the park. There are only 12,664 acres in Grays Harbor County included within the area of the park, consisting of 835,411 acres. The timber in Grays Harbor County which is included is 318,555,000 board feet, out of the total estimated timber stand in Grays Harbor County of 16,685,000,000 board feet. It has been acknowledged that the remaining timber around Lake Quinault makes Lake Quinault one of the most beautiful scenic spots in the State of Washington. Are there vandals who would want to destroy this timber and give us another desolate picture similar to the one we behold in traveling between Hoquiam and Lake Quinault? What are the true facts in regard to this entire park matter?

Establishment of the park was first proposed in Congress in 1904, when Theodore Roosevelt was President. In 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt set aside an area of 620,000 acres as the Mount Olympus National Monument. On October 5, 1927, by proclamation of President Calvin Coolidge, this area was closed to hunting and trapping and the Aberdeen Daily World stated: "It will become a great game preserve."

On March 28, 1935, the bill to establish the Olympic National Park was introduced by the gentleman from Washington, Congressman WALLGREN, at the request of the National Park Service, because the area was in his district, this being a departmental bill, otherwise it would have been introduced by the chairman of the Public Lands Committee. On April 2, 1935, I notified in writing the committee chairman that I desired to be heard whenever committee hearings were held, and on April 3, 1935, received his written acknowledgment. Committee hearings were not held until a year later, so those who desired to oppose the park had an entire year in which to organize opposition in each of the six congressional districts and throughout the State.

The committee hearings were held April 23–May 5, 1936, and were the most complete ever held on a park bill in the history of Congress, comprising 304 closely printed pages. I testified at considerable length and although not a member of the Public Lands Committee was granted the unusual courtesy of asking questions of the witnesses. I am placing in the Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Montesano, and Elma public libraries copies of these hearings, so they will be available in the reading rooms to those citizens who may desire to read same.

F. W. Mathias, at that time manager, Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce; managing secretary, Hoquiam Chamber of Commerce, and manager, Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, testified as follows:

Mr. MASSINGALE. There is a considerable supply of timber there, is there, yet?

Mr. MATHIAS. It will never run out.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Up to the park area?

Mr. MATHIAS. Up to the park area.

Mr. MASSINGALE. How long, in your estimation, will it take to exhaust the merchantable timber lying between the southern proposed boundary of this park and that Grays Harbor River line?

Mr. MATHIAS. It would depend on what you will use it for, whether saw logs or pulp.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Just figuring on the use to which it has been put until now.

Mr. MATHIAS. Up until 1926 the principal industry in Grays Harbor was the manufacture of lumber, doors, shingles, and that type of product. Now we have changed our operations very materially. Instead of producing a lot of lumber, our biggest production now is in plywood, veneer, pulp, paper, and furniture. We are using types now that were never considered, that were not even carried on the tax rolls or used.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Figured on the basis that that timber is being used now, how long in your estimation would it take to exhaust that region down there of timber?

Mr. MATHIAS. It will never be exhausted.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The mills will have an inexhaustible supply?

Mr. MATHIAS. Absolutely.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Without going into the park area?

Mr. MATHIAS. Without necessarily going into the park. It depends upon the type. For veneer you have to use a large tree. For pulp you use a small tree.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Is there any need for the lumber interests to be complaining about the extension of the park area because of the exhaustion of timber?

Mr. MATHIAS. Well, we want more pulp and paper mills and we are trying to get them.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is all.

Mr. Mathias' testimony was corroborated by witnesses representing the United States Forest Service and the State of Washington. (See hearings.) Witnesses of the United States Forest Service pointed with pride to the fact that they conserved and protected the timber and other national resources against commercial exploitation better and more effectively than the National Park Service could do, which was borne out by the figures submitted by them showing that the amount of logging permitted within the Olympic National Monument during the past 30 years was infinitesimal. They showed how unlikely it would be under their system of selective logging permitting only the cutting of isolated and widely scattered trees that any firm could afford to spend millions of dollars in constructing a common-carrier railroad to carry on such limited operations.

Witnesses from Port Angeles and Clallam and Jefferson Counties were present and testified in favor of the park, which

was highly significant in view of the fact that 98 percent of the area was in their counties and their congressional district. In other words, Grays Harbor "fell down" completely on the very essential task of arousing opposition to the park in her two neighboring counties in which the park was to be located. These witnesses from Clallam and Jefferson Counties also made it very clear that if there was to be any commercial development it would be by interests in their counties and not by interests in Grays Harbor or any other outside counties. The Public Lands Committee reported the bill favorably.

The late Speaker, Joseph W. Byrns, refused to recognize the author of the bill to bring it up under suspension of the rules, so it would have to be passed by unanimous consent. I quote from an editorial published after it had failed to pass, in the Aberdeen Daily World, Tuesday, June 30, 1936:

The Wallgren park bill did not pass at the recent session of Congress, a fact which was due in large part to the watchfulness of Congressman SMITH, who stayed on the floor every minute during the last 2 weeks of the session to prevent action by unanimous consent.

In 1937 park legislation again came before Congress and it was again delayed by every possible parliamentary maneuver in order to give those who were opposed to it still further opportunity to influence and organize public opinion in the State against it. How utterly they failed is proven by the fact that the other five Congressmen and two Senators from the State of Washington, acting in accord with what they had reason to believe were the wishes of their constituents, favored the big park.

In 1938 I secured a reopening of the committee hearings to afford Gov. Clarence D. Martin an opportunity to come to Washington, D. C., and be heard before the Public Lands Committee in behalf of the State of Washington. These hearings were held April 19, 1938, and both Governor Martin and Hon. Ben H. Kizer, chairman of the Washington State Planning Council, testified at length. That same day Governor Martin, Mr. Kizer, Senators Bone and Schwellenbach, the gentleman from Washington, Congressman Wallgren, and I conferred with President Roosevelt at the White House. At that conference it was agreed that the park bill was to pass the House unchanged and be reduced in the Senate with the proviso that after the lapse of 8 months from the date of its passage the President, after consultation with the Governor of the State of Washington, might by proclamation increase the acreage to 898,292 acres. This procedure agreed upon at the White House was followed. The bill in that form was signed by President Roosevelt June 29, 1938.

This action came more than 3 years from the time the first bill was introduced in Congress, and 8 additional months were then allowed the State of Washington, through the Governor, for still further presentation of its case. As a matter of fact, it was not until December 9, 1939, that the final consultation took place at the White House between President Roosevelt, Governor Martin, Mr. Kizer, and Hon. George F. Yantis, regional member of the National Resources Board, to agree upon the final boundaries. On January 4, 1940, President Roosevelt issued his proclamation. This was approximately 5 years from the time the first bill was introduced in March 1935. The State of Washington and Grays Harbor had that length of time in which to be heard. Governor Martin's statement issued to the Associated Press is as follows:

MARTIN SATISFIED ROOSEVELT IS COOPERATIVE ON PARK PLAN

OLYMPIA, December 12.—Governor Martin said today he is "completely satisfied" President Roosevelt's attitude toward the Olympic National Park is one of "cooperation and mutual benefit."

The chief executive conferred with the President in the National Capital for 2 hours Saturday on the permanent boundaries of the Olympic Peninsula playground.

He said the State is willing to cooperate on the basis of the President's expressed ideas, that he hopes any action taken will be justified, and that any errors can be taken care of in the future.

"Our industries and resources will not suffer," the Governor said.

He pointed out that $100,000 in Federal money already has been spent in the park, on roads, trails, etc., and that some day in the not-distant future the State will have a wonderful recreation area there.

The Governor said the President is not greatly concerned over manganese in that district, at present; that most of the ore deposits on the peninsula are outside the park area, and that any mine claims within the area, which had been proved, are perpetual, so there was "little to worry about in that regard."

"There was no disposition on the part of any of the Federal officials to embarrass us in any way in regard to our resources and industries," the Governor said, "and the policy of the State and National Government regarding timber outside the park is for administration on a common and cooperative program of selective reforestation and conservation."

Thomas B. Hill, State supervisor of mines and mining, has recently pointed out that the manganese deposits, which it is hoped are not of too low grade to be commercially mined, are located outside of the park area. I also secured incorporation of a proviso in the law which permits for the next 5 years the location and development of mining claims, such as there might be, within the park area.

From the testimony of Mr. Mathias and others, we have a sufficient quantity of hemlock pulpwood outside of the park area without any regrowth to supply six or seven 200-ton pulp mills, and we only have one mill on Grays Harbor now. In a recent letter one of the leading pioneers of Grays Harbor wrote me that the time and energy expended in misrepresenting the park proposition and in seeking to alarm and discourage the people for purely political effect, might better be devoted to obtaining a few new pulp and paper mills to utilize the raw materials which are to be found in such abundance outside the park area. He added, significantly, that we should also endeavor to secure other industries as a result of our low-cost Bonneville electric power.

In view of the fact that politics have been injected into this issue, I am going to cite some indisputable facts which are therefore not altogether irrelevant; in fact, they are most pertinent to this whole park matter.

Practically the entire area of the Olympic National Park is within Clallam and Jefferson Counties in the Second Congressional District, represented by Congressman WALLGREN, as we have previously noted. This fact has constituted a most serious handicap to those on Grays Harbor who have opposed the park. Whose fault is that? My friends, Clallam and Jefferson Counties used to be in our congressional district along with Tacoma and Pierce County. They were a part of our congressional district until the 1930 reapportionment and redistricting acts.

The political opposition to my distinguished predecessor in Congress was largely from Tacoma in Pierce County. It continued to grow until it became quite formidable and dangerous. In fact, in 1928, Senator HOMER T. BONE came within 1,500 votes of defeating my predecessor. Thereupon a movement was launched to redistrict western Washington in order to create a new congressional district to give Tacoma her own Congressman. This, it was thought, would remove the most serious threat to my predecessor's continued service in Congress. To bring this about, western Washington had to be redistricted and consequently Clallam and Jefferson Counties were eliminated from our district and made a part of the district northwest of Seattle and tied in with Everett and Bellingham. The entire Olympic National Monument—now converted into a national park—was considered to be of such slight concern and small importance to Grays Harbor that it was unceremoniously "booted" clear out of the Grays Harbor district. That was a few years after President Calvin Coolidge has "closed the 615,000-acre tract to hunting and trapping and make it a great game preserve." (See, again, Aberdeen Daily World, October 5, 1927.) This was also before these same politicians on Grays Harbor had "discovered" how important and valuable it was to become for political purposes 12 or more years later. So far as I can ascertain, neither the press nor anybody else on Grays Harbor made any protest. Those on Grays Harbor who now "view with alarm" should explain it to our people if they can.

As the foregoing recital of facts establishes, my actions throughout the entire park controversy need no defense from me or anybody else. I could quote from hundreds of communications praising my efforts which I have received from leading civic, industrial, and labor leaders on Grays Harbor, but I will quote only from two.

In 1937–38 the Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce sent out over the State an Outline Concerning the Wallgren Bill, prepared by Mr. F. W. Mathias, and its concluding paragraph read as follows:

Congressman MARTIN F. SMITH has, practically single-handed, fought this fight and is deserving of credit for his interest in protecting the welfare of this State.

On February 7, 1938, Mr. William V. Appel, president-manager of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, wrote me as follows:

No one knows and appreciates more than we do the fine work you have been doing for us against the Wallgren bill.

Fellow citizens of Grays Harbor, we all have many reasons to agree with the opinion recently expressed by Mr. R. W. Beck, manager of the Grays Harbor Utility District:

Grays Harbor is in an admirable strategic position for industrial development. It has a very good harbor, an abundance of various raw materials, especially minerals, oil, and timber, within a relatively short distance of that harbor, and in the near future it will have plenty of power at a cost comparable to any place on the northwest grid. With these advantages, and provided they are recognized and developed by concerted community effort, Grays Harbor can expand in a way undreamed of "when lumber was king."

The F. B. I. Pledge for Law Enforcement Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AARON LANE FORD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Federal Bureau of Investigation pledge for law-enforcement officers:

Humbly recognizing the responsibilities entrusted to me, I do vow that I shall always consider the high calling of law enforcement to be an honorable profession, the duties of which are recognized by me as both an art and a science. I recognize fully my responsibilities to defend the right, to protect the weak, to aid the distressed, and to uphold the law in public duty and in private living. I accept the obligation in connection with my assignments to report facts and to testify without bias or display of emotion, and to consider the information coming to my knowledge by virtue of my position as a sacred trust, to be used solely for official purposes. To the responsibilities entrusted to me of seeking to prevent crime, of finding the facts of law violations, and of apprehending fugitives and criminals I shall give my loyal and faithful attention, and shall always be equally alert in striving to acquit the innocent and to convict the guilty. In the performance of my duties and assignments I shall not engage in unlawful and unethical practices but shall perform the functions of my office without fear, without favor, and without prejudice. At no time shall I disclose to an unauthorized person any fact, testimony, or information in any pending matter coming to my official knowledge which may be calculated to prejudice the minds of existing or prospective judicial bodies either to favor or to disfavor any person or issue. While occupying the status of a law-enforcement officer, or at any other time subsequent thereto, I shall not seek to benefit personally because of my knowledge of any confidential matter which has come to my attention. I am aware of the serious responsibilities of my office, and in the performance of my duties I shall, as a minister, seek to supply comfort, advice, and aid to those who may be in need of such benefits; as a soldier, I shall wage vigorous warfare against the enemies of my country, of its laws, and of its principles; and as a physician, I shall seek to eliminate the criminal parasite which preys upon our social order and to strengthen the lawful processes of our body politic. I shall strive to be both a teacher and a pupil in the art and science of law enforcement. As a lawyer, I shall acquire due knowledge of the laws of my domain and seek to preserve and maintain the majesty and dignity of the law; as a scientist, it will be my endeavor to learn all pertinent truth about accusations and complaints which come to my lawful knowledge; as an artist, I shall seek to use my skill for the purpose of making each assignment a masterpiece; as a neighbor, I shall bear an attitude of true friendship and courteous respect to all citizens; and as an officer, I shall always be loyal to my duty, my organization, and my country. I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and will constantly strive to cooperate with and promote cooperation between all regularly constituted law-enforcement agencies and officers in the performance of duties of mutual interest and obligation.

Grays Harbor Jetties—Inner Channel of Grays Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, when I entered upon my service as a Member of Congress in 1933 and succeeded in obtaining membership on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I had two very difficult tasks, to the performance of which I had pledged my best and untiring efforts. The first was to secure, if possible, a reversal of the previous unfavorable engineering reports and failure to secure committee and congressional action on the Grays Harbor high water jetty projects, which we of Grays Harbor had sought without success for 20 years. I introduced a resolution for review of the unfavorable reports, and after obtaining its adoption by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, succeeded in my endeavors to have the Board of Army Engineers, Washington, D. C., go to Grays Harbor and make a personal inspection of the condition of the harbor and observe the extent to which the old jetties constructed 30 years ago had been beaten down and washed away. When the district and division engineers handed down conflicting reports, it became even more difficult to obtain the desired reversal of the previous rejections of the project by the entire Board of Engineers, but this was finally accomplished. Complete hearings were then held before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, before which I made a full presentation of the project. These hearings are being inserted herein. After receiving the approval of the committee the project was subsequently included in the omnibus river and harbor bill, and the project was authorized by Congress and items included for its construction in appropriation bills, until, altogether, $4,925,000 has been expended to date for the reconstruction of the south jetty, and the first $500,000 has been secured to commence the construction of the north jetty, at an estimated cost of $2,365,000, a total investment by the Federal Government of approximately $7,290,000 on a project which had been abandoned and was considered hopeless until I came to Congress.

My second task was to save, if possible, the citizens and taxpayers the cost of dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor. This was also an extremely difficult task. From 1919 to 1934 the citizens of Grays Harbor paid annually $58,000 for dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor, amounting to approximately $1,000,000, which we paid in millage on our taxes on our homes, businesses, and farms. In 1934, after following through the protracted procedure, and finally gaining the approval of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the engineers' reports, and then securing the legislative authorization by Congress and adoption of the project, and the necessary appropriations, we had this burden shifted to the Federal Government. In the past 6 years this action has resulted in an actual total saving to the taxpayers, home owners, businessmen, and farmers of Grays Harbor County of $348,000 in cash money, which we have not had to pay in taxes as we had done in the past. This saving of $348,000 is more than the entire cost of paying all the salaries of all the county officials of Grays Harbor

County during this period, and the saving to date already would amount to the salary which would be paid to me as a Member of Congress by all the people of the United States for a period of 34 years, if the people of Grays Harbor and southwest Washington should see fit to keep me in Congress that long. I am also inserting the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on this project, following the hearings on the jetty project.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. I now rank sixth, out of a membership of 27, on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started in at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

Serving in Congress may be compared to attending school—the longer the term of service the more efficient the Representative, thus reflecting indirectly the standing of the people of the district which he represents. As Champ Clark, a former Member of the House from Missouri, and its Speaker, who established a record of honorable service, once said:

> It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if only for one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative, just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a lawyer, or a doctor * * *. Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

River and Harbor Bill

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1935.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

GRAYS HARBOR, WASH.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we will take up Grays Harbor, in the State of Washington. Mr. SMITH, I understand you wish to say something on this project.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Grays Harbor is in my district in southwest Washington, and the project now comes before the committee on a resolution which this committee adopted in September 1933 to consider the advisability of reconstructing the north and south jetties of Grays Harbor, as recommended by the engineers, to an elevation of 16 feet.

The district engineer, in his report, recommended the reconstruction of the south jetty to an elevation of 12 feet and extending it 1 mile. The division engineer took issue somewhat with the recommendations of the district engineer, and recommended in accordance with my resolution, which was adopted by the committee, the reconstruction of both jetties, but advised against extending them. Then the Board of Engineers followed the recommendations of the division engineer, and General Markham ratified the recommendation of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, to reconstruct both of them?

Mr. SMITH. That is, to reconstruct both jetties.

The CHAIRMAN. But not extend either?

Mr. SMITH. Not extend either one. The estimated cost is $4,565,000.

Grays Harbor is about 45 miles north of the mouth of the Columbia River, where the Chehalis River enters into the head of the bay. The inner channel of Grays Harbor extends about 11 miles from the ocean, and our ports of Hoquiam and Aberdeen are about 6 miles from the channel.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not that marked on the chart, have you?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; these ports are about 17 miles from the sea. We have Aberdeen here [indicating], and Hoquiam here [indicating], and we have the Chehalis River and the channel and the jetties about in here [indicating]. These jetties were first built in 1902.

The CHAIRMAN. How are they constructed? Are they constructed of stone?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; some 30 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. About how long are those jetties now?

Mr. SMITH. The north jetty is 16,000 feet and the south jetty is 13,734 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. One is about 2 miles and the other about 3 miles long?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BOLTON. Where do those jetties show on the map?

General PILLSBURY. Here [indicating] is the north jetty, and here is the south jetty.

Mr. CARTER. Gentlemen, it looks like that south jetty runs through the end of the peninsula.

General PILLSBURY. Yes; it is my understanding that the coast has built out since both of these jetties were completed.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the depth of water in the channel?

Mr. SMITH. When dredging is carried on in the summer, which is discontinued during the winter months, it is from 26 to 30 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. SMITH. From 26 to 30 feet, and then there is considerable shoaling in wintertime, down to about 24 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. How much draft is required for those large vessels loaded with lumber?

Mr. SMITH. Twenty-eight feet and more.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-eight feet?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; 28 feet at least. Grays Harbor has developed into one of the leading lumber ports of the Pacific Northwest, and——

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the ship draws 28 feet?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you want several additional feet added to it for safety?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, indeed; under the keel. In 1927 we shipped out of Grays Harbor 1,500,000,000 feet, board measure, of lumber, and the tonnage increased from 1,300,000 tons in 1923 to a maximum of 2,700,000 tons in 1926, falling off to 480,000 tons in 1932, but increasing to 676,000 tons in 1933, and I have just received the figures for 1934, and it has increased now again to 900,000 tons, and we expect, from the way we are starting the year, that it will mount to 1,250,000 and possibly 1,500,000 tons this year, because of the increased commerce—I just had a report on it, and in January we had the highest shipments we have had for 4 years—since 1931.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Congressman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Colden.

Mr. COLDEN. At the rate you are now marketing your lumber, how long will that timber supply last?

Mr. SMITH. It is estimated now that we have, in close proximity to Grays Harbor, and by practicing reforestation, which would be manufactured and shipped out of that harbor, 39,000,000,000 feet, consisting principally of Douglas fir, spruce, hemlock, cedar, and some pine.

Mr. COLDEN. You are marketing at about the rate of 1,000,000,000 feet a year?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but we are practicing reforestation and sustained-yield program, and those who should know are of the opinion that, with that program carried on, we can cut 1,000,000,000 feet a year, indefinitely.

Mr. COLDEN. Under whose auspices is this reforestation going on?

Mr. SMITH. A part of it is in the Olympic National Forest, by the Government, and by private timber owners.

The CHAIRMAN. How old would the trees have to be in order to be marketed for lumber, in reforestation; do you know the age; is it 40 years?

Mr. SMITH. Well, 40 years for hemlock, for pulpwood. We are developing a very important pulpwood industry, and we have built in Hoquiam, my home city, a pulp and paper mill, at a cost of $6,000,000, one of the most up-to-date mills in the United States, and we are expecting to have another mill constructed in Aberdeen, probably. We have an almost inexhaustible supply of hemlock pulpwood in that territory.

The CHAIRMAN. What type of paper does that make?

Mr. SMITH. Well, it makes a very high grade of book and stationery paper, and Hammermill Bond paper is made in the Hoquiam plant of the Grays Harbor Pulp & Paper Co.; and now they have been experimenting and they are making rayon very successfully.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that you want these two jetties reconstructed?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice the district engineer advises against that. He says dredging would be far cheaper, does he not?

Mr. SMITH. He does in regard to the north jetty, Mr. DONDERO.

The CHAIRMAN. The division engineer and the board all ruled against him.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; he was in doubt about the north jetty. He recommended the reconstruction of the south jetty and to extend it 1 mile, which would cost over $4,000,000, which would be just about the equivalent of what this project would cost that is now recommended by the board, to reconstruct both, to an elevation of 16 feet, without extending them.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question: Is it necessary to reconstruct the jetties to an additional height?

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of fact, the jetties now have been beaten down by the sea until they afford but little protection, as shown in the engineer's reports.

Mr. COLDEN. Your idea is to raise them, then?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; to 16 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the water run over them, the waves run over them?

Mr. SMITH. They do in some places, Mr. Chairman, at some times of the year, and, of course, the sand—a deplorable feature of the present situation is, that the sand washes through and fills up the channel, because these jetties do not serve their designed purpose now, and do not exclude the sand from the channel.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they not wash the sand over the top of the jetties?

Mr. SMITH. They do; yes.

Mr. CARTER. Would the new jetty be built in the same alignment as the old, and would the old serve as a foundation for the new?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I think that is really an engineering question that General Pillsbury could answer.

General PILLSBURY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. So you would have that old foundation still?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; we would.

Mr. CARTER. Did not the Rivers and Harbors Board of the War Department visit this harbor about a year ago?

Mr. SMITH. They did, yes; and they made a personal inspection at that time, before making their favorable recommendation of the project.

Mr. CARTER. What is that river we see on the map running into the head of the bay; is that the Chehalis River?

Mr. SMITH. That is the Chehalis River; yes.

Mr. CARTER. I have heard, at various times, something about a canal across that peninsula, would it take off from this bay, or the Grays Harbor region, a canal from Columbia River to Puget Sound?

Mr. SMITH. It would. It would go from Grays Harbor to Puget Sound, from Grays Harbor to Willapa Harbor, and from Willapa Harbor to the Columbia River.

Mr. CARTER. Would it go up the Chehalis River; would that be the direction it would take, or do you know, or has it been surveyed?

Mr. SMITH. It has, by engineers of the State canal commission, but would not affect this project.

Mr. CARTER. No, no, I appreciate that, but I was wondering if you knew about it.

Mr. DONDERO. What would be the population of the territory around Grays Harbor?

Mr. SMITH. The surrounding population is 80,000, and Aberdeen is the largest city, which has a population of about 22,000, and Hoquiam has about 12,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are they located on that map there?

Mr. SMITH. They are located there [indicating on the map], right on the harbor.

Mr. DONDERO. Have local interests been contributing anything toward past improvement of the harbor?

Mr. SMITH. They have spent, in dredging the inner channel, over $800,000—the port of Grays Harbor has.

Mr. DONDERO. Over what period of years?

Mr. SMITH. That is since 1919, and they have spent, to provide turning basins, an additional $600,000, over $600,000, and the port of Grays Harbor has built a terminal costing an additional $600,000. The local taxpayers have contributed nearly $2,000,000 to that project.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a port commission there, is there not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; the Port of Grays Harbor.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is pretty good cooperation.

Mr. SMITH. I think it is, Mr. Chairman, considering the size of the communities.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does your lumber go, export or import?

Mr. SMITH. Well, it is both export and domestic. You might be interested in the figures on that.

From the last report, the 1934 report, showing the out-bound lumber ships from Grays Harbor, we shipped to California 71,207,181 feet; to Puget Sound, Wash., 6,000,000 feet; China, 56,861,000 feet; to Japan, 68,583,000 feet; the west coast of South America, 11,211,000 feet; the east coast of South America, 1,850,000 feet; the east coast of the United States, 41,619,000 feet; the east coast of Canada, 2,083,000 feet; to Europe, 15,531,000 feet; Australia, 4,210,000 feet.

The vessel tonnage of lumber shipments in 1934 was 736,376 tons, and there were 282 vessels that transported that lumber out of Grays Harbor.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Smith, what is the nearest port to Grays Harbor of any large size?

Mr. SMITH. Willapa Harbor.

Mr. DONDERO. How far is that?

Mr. SMITH. Seventeen miles. We have had a tremendous development, I think, in vessel tonnage and cargo from Grays Harbor since the port was established, justifying all of the expenditures that have been made by the Federal Government, and the recommendations that the United States Army engineers have made in the past, and which I think indicates also the action this committee has been taking from time to time, because every time we have made an improvement we have had a corresponding increase in commerce, until when conditions were normal, starting from 1924 down to 1929, we were shipping in tonnage considerably over 1,000,000 tons each year in cargo, and in feet, board measure, of lumber, considerably in excess of 1,000,000,000 feet each year during those years, from 1924 to 1929, including 1929.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us some illustration of what 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber is? What is a large ship cargo; how many feet?

Mr. SMITH. I beg pardon, Mr. Chairman, but I did not hear your question.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not know—or I do not know—how much a billion feet of lumber is. That means a foot square and an inch thick, does it not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many feet ordinarily constitutes a ship's cargo, or can you give us any idea of that?

Mr. SMITH. I may have some figures on it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average weight of a shipload of that lumber; what does it weigh?

Mr. SMITH. In shipping to California we had a cargo of 71,000,000 feet in 91 vessels. That would be about three-quarters of a million feet to a vessel, so a billion feet might require a fleet of a thousand ships of that cargo shipment.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Washington a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Colden.

Mr. COLDEN. What are the possibilities for farming and dairying and fruit raising in the area adjacent to Grays Harbor?

Mr. SMITH. They are very good, and there is considerable dairying carried on now in Grays Harbor County and in the adjoining counties, and poultry raising and vegetable and fruit growing, and we have considerable fishing and fish canning in that immediate vicinity.

Mr. COLDEN. Are you shipping out any of these products?

Mr. SMITH. We are shipping some of these products; yes. Of course, our principal item is lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. Lumber and pulp?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Do you ship any shingles?

Mr. SMITH. We ship some shingles to California; yes, Mr. Carter, and considerable quantities to other points.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has the paper mill been in operation?

Mr. SMITH. Four years I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it shipped out anything yet?

Mr. SMITH. It has shipped considerable. I think I can give you the figures, Mr. Chairman. The water shipments of Grays Harbor Pulp & Paper Co. amounted to 21,365 tons in 1930, 23,413 tons in 1931, and 16,085 tons in 1932. They employed 506 persons.

We have 71 sawmills and woodworking plants and 31 logging camps in the vicinity of Grays Harbor; and in normal times, they have 6,000 persons employed, and the pay roll is over $20,000,000, the value of products over $50,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Have you rail facilities there?

Mr. SMITH. We have three railroads, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, the Northern Pacific, and the Oregon & Washington.

Mr. DONDERO. All of the products of this locality do not go out by water?

Mr. SMITH. No; they do not; but they do, mostly.

Mr. DONDERO. Some are shipped by rail?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; some are shipped by rail, that is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume everything for the eastern portion of the United States goes by water?

Mr. SMITH. It does.

Mr. CARTER. Everything that cannot be shipped by water is shipped by rail; and everything that can be shipped by water is shipped by water, I imagine?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it is shipped by water, if possible. Of course, the largest percentage of our products are shipped by water.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the amount of the Government's investment in this harbor now?

Mr. SMITH. I think, altogether, between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000. The jetties originally cost $2,750,000, I think.

I submit to the committee that the recommendations of the engineers should be adopted by the committee. I think there are very few projects that possess the merit that this project does.

I am reminded of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOLTON, which he made yesterday in regard to the importance of the commerce and tonnage in any harbor as a justification for an appropriation by the Federal Government, and I think that should be the test, and certainly we can meet that test in regard to this project, because we know that we have had the commerce in the past, and we know we are going to have it in the future.

Mr. DONDERO. And if this committee does not grant your request, you can go into the Public Works Administration and get it anyhow?

Mr. SMITH. I might say that the present status of this project is that it has already been recommended to the Public Works Administration by General Markham, and last July, after we had had the reports from the district and division engineers and the Board, and the general himself recommended the project, it was sent to the Public Works Administration, where it has been pending ever since, but, of course, I would like to have it adopted by this committee and have it included in our omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the report, and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BOLTON. Grays Harbor is one of the important ports in the State of Washington, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. It is; yes.

Mr. BOLTON. Can you put in the record the amount of taxes paid, and also the internal-revenue taxes paid by the State?

Mr. SMITH. I will be glad to do that, and if there are no further questions, I desire to conclude and thank the committee.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

Internal-revenue collections in State of Washington, fiscal years 1928–34

Year	Income taxes	Miscellaneous taxes	Processing taxes	Totals
1928	$12,156,274.22	$582,722.85		$12,738,997.07
1929	13,424,220.27	596,067.65		14,020,287.92
1930	13,643,704.92	659,575.39		14,303,280.31
1931	10,629,177.47	736,867.94		11,366,045.41
1932	5,371,200.87	369,685.47		5,740,976.34
1933	3,375,084.35	1,879,810.93		5,254,895.28
1934	3,592,337.63	6,555,467.68	$4,015,377.64	14,163,182.95
Total	62,192,069.73	11,380,197.91	4,015,377.64	77,587,665.28

Value of taxable property in State of Washington

[Statement compiled by State Tax Commission of State of Washington]

Year	Assessed value on assessors' books	Actual value found by State board of equalization
1928	$1,243,720,291	$2,826,515,578
1929	1,250,903,787	2,855,928,422
1930	1,263,470,429	2,893,230,930
1931	1,248,893,714	2,858,217,474
1932	1,055,099,896	2,413,783,120
1933	991,366,369	2,259,852,124
1934	965,151,234	2,171,556,620

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, if there is no further question of Mr. SMITH, we will hear General Pillsbury.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. GEORGE B. PILLSBURY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

General PILLSBURY. Grays Harbor is one of the important harbors of the Northwest. It was improved by the construction of two jetties, one of which is about 33 years old, completed about 33 years ago, and the other of which was completed some 22 years ago.

Those jetties have been beaten down by the sea until they are no longer effective. In the report presented to this committee in 1927, we considered very fully the advisability of restoring the jetties, but considered that it would be better to attempt to maintain the entrance channel by continuous dredging, at an estimated cost of $250,000. That dredging has failed to secure a safe channel for the entrance of large vessels, and with the progressive deterioration of the jetties, the department is now convinced that the proper method is to incur the larger cost of rebuilding them and raising them.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the general a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. General, how do you propose to prevent the sand from drifting through the jetties?

General PILLSBURY. The jetties are very massive, reaching to a height of 16 feet above low water, and it has been our experience that sand will not go through a well-constructed jetty.

Mr. COLDEN. That is, you have got to block the openings.

General PILLSBURY. Yes; they are to be built very compactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, when this work is completed, how will the jetties compare with what they were when they were originally completed?

General PILLSBURY. They will be higher.

The CHAIRMAN. Higher?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; the original jetty on the north side was brought up to an elevation, upon high tide, of about 9 feet above low water. The south jetty was brought up only to midtide, which would be an elevation of about 4½ feet, and it is now proposed to raise it up to 16 feet above low water, or about 7 or 8 feet above high tide.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the general a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. Where would you secure your rock for building those jetties?

General PILLSBURY. It is secured from the back country.

Mr. COLDEN. Brought in by rail?

General PILLSBURY. Brought in by rail; yes. There are, within the region, good rock quarries.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if you will allow an interruption, I might say there is rock available in Lewis County, and Thurston County, from whence some of the rock that was used originally was brought.

The CHAIRMAN. How far is that away?

Mr. SMITH. Mayfield, in Lewis County, is about 60 miles from Grays Harbor, and Tenino, in Thurston County, is about 70 miles, and there are rail connections to both of those points, from which some of this rock would come, and perhaps closer in Grays Harbor County.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the general?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Carter.

Mr. CARTER. Did the Federal Government build the first jetties originally, General?

General PILLSBURY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Do you know the approximate cost of the jetties?

General PILLSBURY. $2,750,000. The report, beginning with page 1360, gives the report on Grays Harbor and the bar entrance.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, yes; I see. And the total amount appropriated to June 30, 1934, there, is $5,613,000?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; a large amount has been spent for the maintenance of the channel, in addition to the cost of the jetties.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the general a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I ask, Do the engineers, in the general policy as to the cost of maintenance of the channel, consider what they believe is proper or excessive, or does it depend on the locality?

General PILLSBURY. I think it depends on the locality.

Mr. DONDERO. There is no general rule?

General PILLSBURY. No; there are two aspects to that. After the improvement has been undertaken and the industry established on a waterway, we consider it our duty to maintain the channel as long as the commerce is carried on it, even though it may not be fully economically justified, until Congress directs the abandonment of the project, in exactly the same way that a railroad is required to maintain a branch line, even though that branch line may not return a profit.

I do not think that we would have the authority to discontinue a public utility as long as it is in use, for the benefit of the locality, any more than a railroad has the right to discontinue a branch line without the authority of the sovereign.

Also there are projects which do not return an adequate sum, but they are in use, and until Congress has directed the abandonment we consider it our duty to maintain them.

Then it depends a great deal upon the value of the commerce. A port shipping, we will say, refrigerated food—a small commerce of 50,000 tons might mean a very great saving in the transportation costs.

Mr. BOLTON. But the Office of the Chief of Engineers said it would be ready to proceed similarly to the way a railroad asks for it?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; various recommendations have been made to Congress for the abandonment of projects, but few of them have been abandoned. There were some, some years ago, that were abandoned.

Mr. BOLTON. Figuring the maximum tonnage of 4,000,000 tons per year, there would be a maintenance of about 5 cents a ton?

General PILLSBURY. Yes.

Mr. BOLTON. Compared to the Great Lakes rate of 2 mills, it seems high, does it not?

General PILLSBURY. It is high; yes.

Mr. BOLTON. Or in connection with the Mississippi at 20 cents a ton?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; but of course the value of the product that is transported will run, I suppose, somewhere about $30 a ton for this lumber.

Mr. CARTER. Obviously, from the record, you do not figure on any maintenance of these breakwaters, or jetties, do you?

General PILLSBURY. After they have been built up as proposed, we expect that they will be very permanent and that very little maintenance will be required.

The north jetty at the mouth of the Columbia River was built to approximately what we propose here. It has been 20 years since it was built, and it has not deteriorated at all. Those jetties where the waves break over are subject to very material disintegration.

Mr. CARTER. And that is the way you account for the deterioration of the present jetties?

General PILLSBURY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. These others being high, 16 feet above high water——

General PILLSBURY. They will not be subject to the particular deterioration that those low jetties were.

Mr. CARTER. Although there may be some from time to time?

General PILLSBURY. There might be some; yes; from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. My impression is that the jetties at Galveston, for instance, require very little maintenance, in the absence of hurricanes; is that correct, General?

General PILLSBURY. Very little.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and you do not have these hurricanes on the west coast, but you have heavy seas?

General PILLSBURY. We have very rough seas out there.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1934.

The committee this day met, Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WASH.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have before us the Grays Harbor project, in the district of Mr. SMITH, who is a member of the

committee. Do you wish to make a statement in regard to this project, Mr. SMITH?

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a brief statement before yielding to General Pillsbury to answer any questions that the members of the committee may see fit to ask.

Grays Harbor in normal times is one of the largest and most important lumber ports in the United States, and the two principal cities of Hoquiam and Aberdeen are located on Grays Harbor. I live in Hoquiam, the smaller of the two cities, which has a population of approximately 13,000 or 14,000, and Aberdeen has a population of about 23,000. Altogether the population of the immediate tributary territory is close to 85,000.

The port of Grays Harbor has been established for over 20 years, and the channel has been steadily deepened from a depth of probably 18 feet to the present depth of 31 feet in the bay channel and the present objective of 28 feet in the inner channel. The cost of maintenance of the inner channel has been defrayed by local interests since 1919 in addition to the large expenditures made for improvements and terminals. The port of Grays Harbor is no longer able to maintain the inner channel. There has been a steady increase of commerce, and maintenance of the inner channel is, of course, absolutely necessary. Our port officials, large shippers, and industrial and business interests justly feel that this burden should be now assumed by the Federal Government.

I would now prefer that General Pillsbury answer any questions in regard to technical phases of the project.

Mr. COLDEN. I would like to ask you to repeat the amount of the investment made by those cities.

General PILLSBURY. Eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. COLDEN. It has been a municipal enterprise?

General PILLSBURY. It is a port district. I think it is supported, as most districts are, by taxes on the property benefited, and also by revenue from the port facilities which they furnish.

Mr. COLDEN. May I ask you to what extent the Government has cooperated?

General PILLSBURY. The Government has cooperated by providing the channel over the ocean bar which affords access to the bay, and the local interests have enlarged the channel in the upper bay to afford access for deep-draft ocean vessels to those lumber ports.

Mr. MARTIN. It is proposed for the Government to take over what has been done locally?

General PILLSBURY. Yes, sir; the maintenance of the channel.

Mr. MARTIN. And relieve the local interests of the maintenance of the channel?

General PILLSBURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. The port district has expended as much as $800,000 to date.

Mr. MARTIN. How can they stand that?

Mr. SMITH. It is raised by local taxation.

Mr. GREEN. They want the Government to assume that?

Mr. SMITH. No; they want the Government to assume $58,000 in addition to the present maintenance cost.

General PILLSBURY. That is the amount estimated in addition to the main channel.

Mr. GREEN. You do not mean $800,000 annually, do you?

Mr. SMITH. No; they have spent that much to date.

Mr. MARTIN. How much altogether has been expended locally?

Mr. SMITH. Several million dollars.

Mr. GREEN. It is believed that the Government will have to spend how much every year?

General PILLSBURY. $58,000 is estimated for the maintenance of the inner channel.

Mr. DEROUEN. It is $58,000 over the present cost.

General PILLSBURY. Yes, sir. The present cost of maintaining the channel over the bar is $212,000 per annum, and if we take over the maintenance of the interior channel to the head of the bay, the cost will be increased by $58,000.

The commerce ranged from 1931 to somewhat over 2,000,000 tons per annum over the bar. For 1931 it was about 1,000,000 tons.

Mr. DEROUEN. I see that for 1926 it was over 4,000,000 tons.

General PILLSBURY. I think that probably included logs, as well as the amount that went over the bar in deep-draft ships.

Mr. MARTIN. How much water do you have over the bar?

General PILLSBURY. About 28 feet. In summer, when it is dredged, it is over 30 feet, but during the winter, when the dredge cannot operate on account of the swells of the North Pacific, which are considerable, it shoals up somewhat. They start in again about this time and dredge the channel out. At the beginning of the year, I believe, it is about 26 or 28 feet.

Mr. PARSONS. You mentioned the port district, and stated that they derived revenue from taxation. Is there any tax levied on the tonnage in the harbor? Is that the principal source of this revenue, or for any portion of it?

Mr. SMITH. No; it is raised by local taxation. It is direct property levy.

Mr. PARSONS. It is not a rate charge or tariff charge?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MARTIN. The property owners have to pay the tax.

Mr. DONDERO. What rate of taxation does this port district have to impose to raise that money, per thousand dollars?

Mr. SMITH. Several mills.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not more than that?

Mr. SMITH. I would not be certain. Last year I think it was about 4 mills.

Mr. BEITER. What would be the assessed value of the property to raise $800,000 at that rate? What is the assessed value of the property?

General PILLSBURY. I think you will find that the $800,000 was raised by a bond issue, without doubt. It was expended in deepening the channel, and also in providing for those anchorages at the termini in those towns.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. GREEN. If the tax district has had to raise $800,000, how can we maintain it for $58,000?

General PILLSBURY. They started out with a channel 18 feet deep, and they have enlarged it to 26 feet. It is simply a question of holding what we have.

Mr. GREEN. In other words, a part of that sum went for improvements and a part of it for maintenance?

General PILLSBURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREEN. That is, a part of the $800,000?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; quite a considerable portion of it went for improvements.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that the only part of the sum that is for maintenance of the inner channel is the $58,000 per annum, which we are asking the Federal Government to assume.

(Thereupon, after some time spent in executive session, the committee adjourned to meet tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1933, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.)

Dr. R. R. Sayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. SCRUGHAM

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make of record, certain facts in regard to the appointment by the Secretary of the Interior of Dr. R. R. Sayers as Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines. Dr. Sayers is a member of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

He was virtually an employee of the Bureau of Mines for 14 years, during which he was detailed to the Bureau from the Public Health Service. He became chief of the Safety and Health Branch of the Bureau of Mines and was identified with its outstanding success that has received generous national recognition from miners throughout all parts of the United States.

In this service Dr. Sayers directed one of the largest groups of Bureau of Mines employees, including those engaged in health research, mine safety, mine rescue and first-aid training. With Bureau engineers he personally went underground in a large number and variety of mines, collecting data and conducting studies upon the deleterious effects of rock dust, humidity, high temperature, mine gases, and gases produced from explosives. His research concerned with the health and safety of miners led to his establishment of clinics in mining camps for the detection, study, and prevention of tuberculosis and silicosis. Some of these clinics are now permanently maintained by State or local authorities, assisted by mining companies. In these activities Dr. Sayers gained knowledge of many mining operations and made many friends among miners and operators.

Dr. Sayers had been a physical chemist before he became a doctor. This proved of value in much of the work described and also in experiments for the use of helium in compressed atmospheres to be breathed by men, such as tunnelling, caisson work, deep-sea diving, and escape from sunken submarines.

The qualifications of Dr. Sayers are nonpolitical. He has played an important part in mining. He knows the field, the background, and the personnel of the Bureau of Mines. He is experienced as a Government administrator.

Mr. Ickes deserves commendation for making this nonpolitical appointment to a position where the qualifications of Dr. Sayers are obviously suitable.

Instructive Visiting Nurse Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]:

Birthdays are wonderful days—full of gay laughter, of happy ingathering of relatives and friends. They are days of eager anticipation of what is to come—of quiet consideration of what has been—that the years ahead may be rich with the fruit of understanding.

We are here to celebrate—not a first birthday, nor a sixteenth, nor a twenty-first. No; infancy, childhood, and youth have been passed through by our birthday child and the wonderful middle years are coming up above the horizon.

We, who are members and friends of this Instructive Visiting Nurse Society of Washington, are met here together to proclaim this anniversary day when our society is reborn into new life, the deepened, enriched life of full maturity; for life—we have been told—but begins at 40.

Forty years. And who knows just how long was the prenatal period that preceded this birth? For nothing in all the world just happens suddenly out of nowhere.

Who can count the men and women who dreamed of a world without pain, a world where all children laugh, where the old folk sit smiling their wisdom to the sun, and youth sings its way into productive maturity? Were they not all precursors of today's programs of public health? Who knows the birth pangs suffered by those who sent the first nurse on her way? And who cares? For like all mothers, once the babe is safely here, the agony becomes the glory of a deeper understanding.

But let us pause a moment and give thanks for those whose dreams bore such fair fruit, asking that we be given wisdom to keep faith with them.

They were but a small band of courageous people who dared to take hold of their vision, shape it, discipline it, meet its discouragements, and offer its joys to all who reached out in poignant need. How much we owe them. Yet they ask only that we take hold of that same vision in our turn and fashion it to meet tomorrow's dawn.

Forty years ago there were but 130 visiting nurses in all these United States. Most of these had stepped out into wholly unblazed trails, without maps of any sort. Courageously they had set their feet upon the way and kept their eyes upon the stars. What courage it took.

Have you ever stopped to think of what the problems were with which they had to cope in those early days? They went into the homes of the needy to give bedside care to the sick. Many carried bags of supplies weighing 30 and even 40 pounds. They rode bicycles, they walked, they rode in street cars, in season and out of season, tirelessly pursuing their heartful way. And at each bedside there was more than just pain to be alleviated, more than just physical care to be given. The agonized questions of the patient and of the family had to be answered as well: "What does it mean, nurse?"—"I can't be sick, there are the wife and kids."—"Oh, nurse, I can't leave my baby—make me well, oh make me well!"—"Show me how to take care of the baby—he frets so—he doesn't eat—he cries all the time and lets nobody sleep."—"Say nurse, look at Johnnie—he's all bruck out."

Natural, simple questions—but what momentous portent was theirs, for they had to be answered, and the answering became teaching and through such teaching the bedside nursing of the first visiting nurses became the public-health nursing of today.

Have you talked with some of these pioneer nurses and have they told you what it was that kept their courage high when the weariness of body, heart, and mind almost overcame them? Have you seen the light come into their faces when they spoke of the laymen and women with whom they counseled, with whom they shared the many problems of their pioneering? They were not alone, they were upheld and strengthened by their boards—for public-health nursing, whether it was called visiting nursing, community nursing, district nursing, or public-health nursing, has been since its inception, the combined work of doctors, nurses, and laymen.

I, who have but lately become associated with this splendid organization, can say with truth that the board of the Instructive Visiting Nurse Society of the city of Washington and its staff of 78 nurses are indeed keeping faith with those who made possible the first visiting nurse in the District. You will go far to find finer cooperation, truer consecration to the work in hand, and a higher concept of community needs and possibilities. To be a part of it, though of necessity an all too inactive part, is one of the rare privileges of my Washington life.

Now let us look for a moment at some of the differences in the field of service into which the first nurses went and that which is covered today. They were indeed pioneers, these first women who went into the homes of those who were too poor to go to hospitals or to pay for care in their homes. They went, with no special knowledge of community problems, just to give bedside care. They stayed to discover that to teach a mother how to care for her family, a "little mother" to help, were as essential as the original care of the patient himself. They found that even this care and teaching did not solve the problems, for these were often due to broken families, leaking roofs, open sewers, unpaid rents, inadequate food, alcohol, and drugs.

They were given office space with associated charity agents with whom they discussed the tangible problems of their charges. Some of these problems had to be taken to the police, others to churches, to private individuals, to the schools, and to the courts. Their solution depended largely on the ingenuity of the individual nurse, on her persistence, yes, on her faith, and the faith of her board.

How different now! These 40 years have seen the establishment of departments of health, of out-patient service for obstetrics, of clinics and sanatoria, and of the Federal Public Health Service, as well. School nurses, industrial nurses, and tuberculosis nurses carry their specialized work. But the family's need is still the unit from which all public-health agencies must work, and toward which all efforts must converge. The nurse is the natural interpreter, teacher, friend. The care she gives at the bedside is the key to the heart, to the confidence of the family. What she tells them they believe, for, has she not shown them both her skill and her knowledge? "Without the public-health nurse, the health officer would be as a man deaf, dumb, and blind to the public he must lead to health."—Haven Emerson.

No plan that separates the actual care of the sick from the teaching for health could give the results that have been, and must be increasingly, obtained. Let us adjure all those who are in authority in any and all agencies having to do with public health to keep inviolate this combined service of hand, heart, and mind, lest in an effort toward efficiency of organization the life be lost.

These many changes that have brought to our community living what we all like to feel are more intelligent methods of meeting our problems—our public-health departments of every sort and kind—have bit by bit made it appear that private agencies such as this splendid Instructive Visiting Nurse Society may no longer be necessary; that more people can be cared for by State and Federal agencies. On every hand there is also a lessening of private funds and an increased pressure toward Government absorption. Probably much of this is good. But as there is always an impersonalness about Government, there is a very real danger, for without the nucleus of close personal heartfulness that lives best in our private agencies, the light of public-health service will surely go out. Further Government agencies are dependent upon appropriations, and so are subject to insecurity; and men are seldom free from the temptation of misusing power given through control of funds. Dare we subject our people, our sick, to the results of the possible in this important field? Should we not rather insure the existence of privately managed public-health nursing agencies such as the Instructive Visiting Nurse Society, that they may be the living heart of the great body of service to our sick people?

I realize that the relative merits of privately and governmentally controlled health agencies is one of the controversial questions of today. I am merely touching upon it as there is not time for a careful presentation of the many splendid arguments on both sides. But I do want to suggest that as citizens, we consider well the amazing contribution made by such agencies as this Instructive Visiting Nurse Society before we destroy them. The trail blazing, the experimentation, the close cooperation between the professional men and women in the active field and the laity, is the first step to an intelligent, health-minded public. I want to urge that we do not thoughtlessly relinquish to Government those fields that we as Americans hold to be not just the rights, but the responsibilities of free citizenship. Is it not wise to preserve the so-called private agencies lest we lose an invaluable way by which to prove the values of techniques and treatments? Will there not always be need for training grounds, where, as in all private enterprise the individual takes the risk of the trial and experiment period and after proof, gives it to the Nation?

Standing as we do at this important milestone of our life as a health group, we have no fear of relinquishing to other agencies such parts of our work as can better serve the people by such relinquishment. It is as if they were our children, and we, their parents, rejoice that as living arrows from a bow, they go forth in their own strength. We are perhaps the bow which, as Kahlil Gibran said, "God also loves." In its desire to keep abreast and ahead of community problems, the Instructive Visiting Nurse Society has grown to believe that wherever there is sickness there is the need for nursing care and teaching service, regardless of income. So in addition to the work among the very poor, there has been established an hourly home-pay service, based upon the need

of the patient and the ability to pay. This service grows ever more acceptable as the physicians introduce it to their patients.

In closing I must speak of the nurse herself—the nurse who is the key to the whole great structure of our health services.

Granted that money is an essential, that methods for the coordination of public and private agencies must be worked out, the service to human beings is the actuality, and that is the work of the individual nurse.

Any young woman choosing nursing as her profession should be a happy, healthy, serious-minded creature with a desire to serve her fellow beings, rather than herself. She must be intelligent, for the actual knowledge she must have at her command increases with each fresh discovery in medicine, each change in community methods. Her basic training should challenge every phase of her being—and the special work she will need to equip herself for the public-health field cannot be belittled.

We may have, as we do have, the happiest cooperation with the Department of Health, the local hospitals, the private physicians for our general work, Georgetown, George Washington, and Howard University, in the care of our mothers and babies. We may have coordinated our work with that of the tuberculosis, venereal, and cancer clinics, with the new psychiatric groups—all these may be in our structure—but if the nurse is not of the highest caliber, if she is inadequately equipped, we cannot function. Is that not so?

So, in the public-health field we must help draw into the nursing schools young women of high standards and fine quality. We must see to it that these schools are adequately financed so that they may give the kind of basic training upon which specialized work can be built. And somehow we who have served these many years and know the pitfalls and dangers of a too-swift expansion, we must find ways to convince those less qualified by experience to measure these dangers, that too much dilution ruins the effectuality of the best medicines, and that building too hastily will prove to be building upon the sands.

It is the visiting nurse who sees tuberculosis, cancer, syphilis, pneumonia in the first curable stages. But she must be trained to recognize them and then must persuade the individual to go get the help that modern medicine has to give. It is the nurse who must know the community agencies so well that no moment is lost, for those lost moments take their toll in lives.

So here we stand at this wonderful fortieth milestone looking back, with both pride and humility of heart, at the work done; looking forward with high hope and fresh courage to whatever the future may hold.

We are ready to assume our rightful part in whatever changes need to be made that ever more and more people may have health. Indeed, we are constantly reaching out into the future as we have been given light to see it, adapting and readapting our methods to the fast-moving changes of this changing world. We should be faithless to the trust that is ours did we not move out into the ever-changing stream of today's living. Board members, and nurses, physicians, and lay men and women who help carry this society, we all know that underneath the surface of various methods of public-health services there is in every heart the fundamental desire to alleviate pain, to build health of body and of mind for every child of the future.

So on our birthday let us remember that nature builds slowly those things which endure, and that she makes ample preparation for each fresh growth—that as we move forward we may be building surely, strongly, wisely for tomorrow's dawn.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

TELEGRAMS IN OPPOSITION TO BARDEN AMENDMENTS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 30, 1940.*

MARY T. NORTON,

Chairman, Committee on Labor, House Office Building:

In harmony with our support of low-income wage earners through our opposition to Barden amendments to Wage and Hour Act, please advise our labor friends in the House that Great Plains wheat producers have suffered years of accumulated farm operating deficits. Please insist wheat farmers must be protected by inclusion in the agricultural parity appropriation now under consideration.

M. W. THATCHER,

Chairman, National Farmers Union Legislative Committee; President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 30, 1940.*

MARY T. NORTON,

Chairman, House Committee on Labor, House of Representatives:

Representing an unduplicated membership of 350,000 farm families, our joint national legislative committee has determined to vigorously oppose the Barden amendments to the Wage and Hour Act. We consider these proposed amendments against public and farmer interest. Labor represents the bulk of the farmers' market, and farmers are genuinely interested in protecting low-income wage earners.

M. W. THATCHER,

Chairman, National Farmers Union Legislative Committee; President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

The Monopoly Threat in Chain-Store Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

TESTIMONY OF HON. THEODORE CHRISTIANSON BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith the testimony of the Honorable Theodore Christianson, former Member of this House and three times the Republican Governor of Minnesota, on H. R. 1 before a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, March 28, 1940:

So as to clarify what I am going to say, let me explain at the outset that I have no objection to chain stores as such. If a man or group of men have the capacity, the initiative, or the good luck, to be able to operate two or three or ten stores instead of one, confining their operations to one community and retaining their net profits in that community, I wish them well. I will go further than that: I will say that there is no need for Federal interference with larger chains so long as they operate wholly within one State and thereby keep themselves within that State's jurisdiction and control.

But while I have no objection to chain stores as such, I do object to monopoly, whether in distribution or in manufacture; and I object to it particularly in distribution because, as I shall later endeavor to show, the great danger of monopoly in this country lies in control of the market rather than in control of manufacturing processes.

POTENTIAL MONOPOLY, TOO

And in order still further to define my terms, let me say that by "monopoly" I mean not only actually existing monopoly but potential or threatened monopoly. Actual monopoly is always preceded by potential monopoly, and the only way to avoid actual monopoly is first to prevent potential monopoly. We need to "lock the barn door before the horse is stolen." This, as I shall later show, we have failed to do either in the Sherman law or in the Clayton Act, but can accomplish by the means we are now considering.

The courts have recognized the distinction between actual and potential monopoly; they have held that it is not necessary, in order to justify a law designed to curb monopoly, to prove either that monopoly is an accomplished fact or that it threatens imminently to become such. It is sufficient that the practices and situations sought to be curbed "may reasonably be conceived to be promotive of monopoly and restraints of trade." Thus when the State of Mississippi passed an act prohibiting any corporation manufacturing cottonseed oil or cottonseed meal from operating a cotton gin, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the statute, not upon the ground that a monopoly had actually been established, but because the legislature was convinced "that it was the practice of corporations operating oil mills and cotton gins to depress the price of ginning, regardless of cost, until local competition was suppressed, or brought to terms, and then to charge excessive prices for ginning and to pay unfairly low prices for seed."

WITHIN CONGRESS' POWER

On the same theory, the court would undoubtedly hold that when A. & P. establishes supermarkets in certain communities and sells at lower prices in those than in other communities in which it operates, and by such destructive competition forces other grocers out of business, the Congress may assume that the ultimate result of pursuing such a policy is to create a monopoly, and may break up, by taxation or otherwise, corporations so circumstanced by reason of size that they can successfully pursue such a policy.

The State of North Dakota passed a law prohibiting motion picture producers or distributors from owning or operating theaters within the State. Although it was shown that only 10 of the 168 motion picture theaters in North Dakota were owned and operated by producers and distributors (and only 2,500 of the 16,000 theaters in the United States), a Federal statutory court, on July 14, 1938, held the law to be a valid exercise of the powers of the legislature on the ground that it was designed "to prevent a practice conceived to be promotive of monopoly with its attendant evils."

THE TEMPTATION TO DESTROY

The court declared that the evidence disclosed "the existence of the power and the temptation of such producers to engage in practices promotive of monopoly and restraint of trade," saying: "It is our opinion that the existence of unusual power to deal with competitors unfairly, when coupled with the opportunity and the temptation to use that power, is probably a sufficient basis for legislative action to prevent the possibility of its exercise. This must certainly be so where there is, in addition, evidence of past aggressions." These words from the North Dakota decision might have been used with equal appropriateness concerning every chain-store system coming under the ban of this bill. So also might the following language: "Legislative as well as judicial action to curb what may honestly be believed to be monopolistic tendencies can be based upon a reasonable and justified fear that a powerful corporation or group of corporations possessing the power to unjustly handicap competition, and faced with the temptation to use that power, may do so if not prevented."

DISPARITY IN BUYING POWER

In arriving at a definition of monopoly, let us consider not only that the term includes potential as well as actual monopoly and that the former as well as the latter justifies governmental action, but that monopoly in distribution does not necessarily imply a situation in which a single distributor is in exclusive control of any consumer market. There may be competition in retailing; yet disparity in buying power, in the opportunity to avail oneself of the big newspapers and the radio for advertising, in ability to lease the best business locations, in financial resources enabling the stronger to force the weaker out of business by temporarily operating at a loss, may be so great as to give a few distributors all the advantages of monopoly. This disparity is increased when distributors become so big and their operations so far-flung that they undertake activities outside of retailing, in many cases controlling production as well as distribution. These assume the pattern of the European cartel; they become "vertical trusts."

The first function retailers of this type assumed, was wholesaling. It is important in that connection to recognize a distinction; they did not eliminate wholesaling; any one conversant with distribution knows that wholesaling is an unavoidable function in getting goods from the manufacturer to the retail store; the chains did not eliminate wholesaling, although they have eliminated many wholesalers; they merely set up their own wholesale agencies, which they generally call regional warehouses.

BECOME MANUFACTURERS, TOO

The next step in the development of the cartel was to take over manufacturing, either by acquiring factories of their own or by taking over the output of factories owned by others. The latter procedure has provided an ingenious method of circumventing the Robinson-Patman Act. Many years ago the two great mail-order houses began acquiring factories of their own. Within the last few years the big grocery chains have gone into manufacturing. I call the subcommittee's attention to advertisements of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. in current issues of Good Housekeeping in which is featured the Ann Page brand of tinned, bottled, and packaged foods, which, we are told, is not only sold but manufactured by the biggest grocery chain. Its Eight o'Clock coffee, the sales of which are now greater than those of the three leading so-called national brands combined, is a cartel product, for A. & P.'s control of coffee extends even to the ownership of plantations in Brazil.

The monopolistic effect of the application of the vertical-trust principle to retailing is so well developed in a recent publication of The Progressive Grocer, the leading authority in the food trade, that I take the liberty of quoting from it. Speaking of A. & P., it says: "Through its continuous promotion of private-brand merchandise, on which it makes a handsome profit, the company was able to pile up tremendous private-brand profits that could be used to reduce the retail margin on standard competitive items. A. &. P. strategy was roughly as follows: It vigorously promoted the sale of private brands, particularly coffee, baked goods, canned and packaged foods. Because A. & P. controls these lines from processing to retailing, and has no identical brand competition on them, they yield an excellent profit.

ONE BUYER PAYS ANOTHER'S BARGAINS

"To illustrate A. & P.'s strategy, let us assume that the net profit on private brands in a store, over and above all operating expenses, was 5 percent of sales and that half of the store's sales consisted of controlled brands. The private-brand profit alone was more than enough for adequate compensation of the entire store's operation. That meant that the other half of the store's business, which consisted of competitive brands, could be carried on without any net profit, with a margin that barely covered and sometimes even failed to cover handling costs. The result was that A. & P. could sell from fifty to sometimes more than a hundred competitive items in a superstore at an average margin around 6 percent, with some items priced less than 6-percent margin where State laws permitted.

"While A. & P.'s contention that it never sells competitive merchandise below cost may be true (cost considered as net after all quantity discounts and advertising allowances), shrewd food operators hold that A. & P.'s margin on competitive merchandise is not sufficient to cover warehousing, trucking, and retailing expenses, to say nothing of a net profit. Competing chains whose policy it is to oblige every item to carry its proportionate operating expense and net profit or independent merchants who buy from wholesalers, obviously had difficulty in meeting A. & P.'s prices on those fifty and sometimes several hundred competitive items. The price-conscious consumer was naturally impressed by the low prices that prevailed in A. & P. stores on these competitive lines, and she increased her purchases.

AN ACCOMPLISHED MONOPOLY

"This situation and practice of A. & P. has caused a tremendous stir throughout the food trades in recent months. It has been the universal subject of conversation, from the large manufacturer on down to the tiniest retailer. The accusing finger of unfair competition is pointed at A. & P. Because of a widespread demoralization of legitimate profits and the entire food-price structure, many hold that A. & P., with its billion-dollar volume, has accomplished or is tending toward a monopoly."

To sum up what the Progressive Grocer has said, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., by adopting the vertical-trust principle of operation and controlling both manufacture and distribution of its own brands, is able to earn enough profit on those brands to sell the standard brands, in which its nonmanufacturing competitors must deal, below actual cost and thereby to drive those competitors out of the market. It has laid the foundation for the establishment of a monopoly in food distribution, and ultimately in food manufacture.

COURTS KILLED SIMILAR SCHEME

A decade ago the big packers made a more modest application of the vertical-trust principle when they opened a few grocery stores. It will be recalled that they were enjoined in what were known as the Consent Decree cases. When the packers asked to have the consent decree modified, the Supreme Court of the United States refused to do so, saying that the defendants had followed the practice of fixing the prices of groceries so low over temporary periods of time as to eliminate competition by rivals less favorably situated. The Court said: "Whether the defendants would resume that practice if they were to deal in groceries again, we do not know. They would certainly have the temptation to resume it. Their low overhead and their gigantic size would still put them in a position to starve out weaker rivals. * * * When they add groceries to meats, they will do so, they assure us, with substantially no increase of the existing overhead. Thus in the race of competition they will be able by their own admission to lay a handicap on rivals overweighted at the start."

SAME PLAN—DIFFERENT APPROACH

There is a close parallelism between what the packers were enjoined from doing and what the great national chains are doing every day. The Supreme Court was not impressed by what the packers promised to do for the consumer, knowing that the technique of monopoly has always been to acquire control of the market by cutting prices, and then to use that control to raise them. The same tribunal, in the case of *Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company* v. *Grosjean*, declared that if in the public interest a legislature deems it necessary to mitigate the evils of competition between small chains and large chains, or to discourage "chains grown so large as to menace the public welfare, it may adopt measures to accomplish those ends." In asking for the enactment of the Patman bill, we are asking Congress to adopt a measure reasonably designed to curb chains grown so large as to menace the public welfare.

Have some of the chains become so large as to constitute a menace? The opponents of this bill will undoubtedly present statistics showing that the number of chain-store units has not increased during recent years. It is admitted that some of the food chains, notably A. & P., have fewer outlets now than they had a number of years ago. It will be pointed out, too, that there has been an increase in the number of independently owned stores. These figures have little significance in the discussion of this question. Many of the additional independent stores are liquor stores which have been opened since repeal, and inasmuch as liquor stores are generally individually owned, their inclusion distorts the picture. The fact that the food chains have fewer outlets than they had is due to their invasion of the supermarket field. In 1939 they closed 5,000 neighborhood stores and opened 1,000 large super-markets. By so doing, they only accelerated the process of concentration.

GROWTH OF SALES

The thing that is significant is not the decrease in the number of chain outlets, nor a possible increase in the number of independents who are willing to enter into competition for a de-

creasing share of the market, but the steady expansion of chain volume. In 1919 the chains did approximately 4 percent of the retail business in the United States; in 1923, 6 percent; in 1926, 9 percent; in 1927, 12 percent; in 1929, 20 percent; and in 1933, 25 percent. We shall have to await the 1940 Census to get definite figures on the proportion of business done by the chains at the present time, but it will probably be about 30 percent.

Sears, Roebuck & Co., which in 1931 had a gross volume of $316,294,562, last year had sales aggregating $657,061,593. In other words, its sales had more than doubled in 8 years. That the rate of its sales increases is accelerating is shown by the fact that 1939 volume exceeded 1938 volume by 23.3 percent.

Montgomery Ward sales were $198,118,920 in 1931; in 1939 they were $501,819,199—an increase of 153.3 percent in 8 years. Its increase of 16.7 percent last year followed an even more spectacular growth the year before.

A BILLION DOLLARS' SALES

A. & P.'s sales last year passed $1,000,000,000, exceeding the previous year's total by 15 or 16 percent. In 1939 the combined volume of chain grocery and combination food stores jumped 9 percent, while that of their independent competitors declined 1.6 percent. Last year the chains did 37 percent of all business done in grocery and combination food stores, and it is a comparatively simple mathematical task to determine in how many years they will do all the business, if they continue to grow at the present rate.

As long ago as 1935, the chains did more than 90 percent of the five-and-dime business, 50 percent of the shoe business, and 28.8 percent of the drug business in the country.

LOOK AT THE CITIES

While these figures are startling, they fail to present fully the progress of the chains in concentrating business; for they are national averages, and as such they include the sparsely settled and more remote areas which the chains had not yet really invaded. The true picture can be had only by seeing what the chains have achieved in the great cities. I have here a table, compiled from figures assembled in the census of distribution for 1935:

Percentage of business done by chains in various cities

	Groceries	Drugs	Shoes	Variety
Boston	53.4	29.8	56.1	97.7
Buffalo	47.8	26.3	72.9	93.1
Chicago	56.8	47.5	69.7	98.4
Cleveland	60.2	49.9	63.4	97.2
Los Angeles	49.5	33.8	68.7	92.3
New York	41.2	26.8	64.6	94.0
Pittsburgh	50.3	44.6	63.0	97.8

As chain expansion continues, it is logical to assume that chain business will reach the same proportions in the fields that have heretofore been neglected as in those which have been exploited; and that with more and more independents eliminated, the chains' domination will also become even more pronounced in the cities I have cited.

FIVE CHAINS DO 64 PERCENT

Even more significant is the fact that most of the increase in chain business is shown by the great interstate chains with which H. R. 1 is designed to deal. The increase in the volume of A. & P. stores last year was 40 percent greater than the increases of all the other food chains combined. Thus it will be seen that there is not only a very pronounced drift from the independents to the chains, but an even greater drift from the small chains to the great ones. Last year, A. & P. did 12⅔ percent of all the grocery and combination food-store business in the United States: Safeway, 5 percent; and Kroger, 3 percent. The five national chains doing a business of more than $100,000,000 accounted for 64 percent of all the chain grocery and combination food-store business. Of the $2,900,000,000 chain volume, A. & P. alone accounted for 34.6 percent.

THEY SPLIT THE FIELD

And even yet I have presented only half of the monopoly picture. I offer for the RECORD a map prepared by Hector Lazo, executive vice president of the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, showing how the two greatest food chains have divided the United States into two spheres of influence. A. & P. dominates that part of the country which lies east of the Mississippi; the part lying west of the great river is the satrapy of Safeway. This division of the territory may have been purely accidental. There is no disposition to believe that there ever was a meeting, like that between the kings of Spain and Portugal to draw a line of demarcation for the division of the Americas. But the very existence of the line of demarcation is significant for the reason that the fact that the great power exercised by each of them is exercised within one of two jurisdictions, makes the domination exercised by each in its own jurisdiction more complete.

The Federal Trade Commission in the final report of its chain-store investigation throws some light on the methods by which Safeway spread from its home in southern California until it sprawled over the entire western half of the map of the United States and invaded the District of Columbia.

HOW THEY GREW

Safeway Stores in 1928 was operating 465 stores in southern California; Skaggs Cash Stores had 104 stores in northern California, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming; Skaggs United Stores had 203 stores in Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. That year the three chains consolidated, bringing 772 stores under the control of a new corporation known as Safeway Stores, Inc.

The new corporation the same year acquired the assets of Piggly-Wiggly Pacific Co. with 91 stores in California and Hawaii, and the Bird Grocery Co. with 224 stores in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Texas. That same year, too, it got control of several other companies by purchasing the capital stock of the Standard Grocery Co., which operated 14 stores in Texas; the Arizona Grocery Co., which already had acquired a subsidiary, Pay'n Takit Stores, and was operating 38 stores in Arizona; the Eastern Grocery Stores, consisting of 67 units in Maryland; the Sanitary Grocery Co., which had taken over the Piggly-Wiggly Stores in Washington, D. C., and was operating 383 stores in the District of Columbia and Virginia.

That was a pretty good year's business, but Safeway had only gotten fairly started. In 1929 it acquired the assets of Sun Grocery Co., with 67 stores in Oklahoma; Skaggs Cash Stores with 7 stores left in northern California; and Piggly-Wiggly Western States Co., with 188 stores in Washington and Utah.

Then it was really getting ready to go to town. By this time Safeway Stores, Inc., was operating 2,529 stores in 20 States and the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Canada. In the meantime another giant had been growing up out west. In 1929 and 1930, MacMarr Stores, Inc., had acquired some 30 other chains; and after the absorption of these various competitors it had 1,382 stores in 10 States. After MacMarr had done this fine job of mopping up Safeway, in 1931, absorbed MacMarr Stores, Inc. In this case the whale wasn't satisfied to swallow Jonah; it swallowed another whale which had already swallowed 30 Jonahs!

A DRUG MAMMOTH

In drug distribution, too, there have been some economic miracles performed. Drug, Inc., had a subsidiary known as United Drug Corporation, and the United Drug Corporation in turn had a subsidiary known as the Louis K. Liggett Co. The subsidiary of the subsidiary acquired the capital stock of the Bowman Drug chain in California, the Beacon Drug chain in Michigan, and the B. & R. Drug chain in Illinois. It took over the Wolff-Wilson chain in Missouri and the May Drug chain in Pennsylvania. It bought the assets of two Chicago drug chains, the Portes Drug Co. and the McLean Drug Co. That was doing very well for a mere subsidiary of a subsidiary. Then, whether jealous or not, the grandpa of them all, Drug, Inc., acquired the capital stock of the Owl Drug Co., which had been built up through the consolidation and absorption of several chains. And that's carrying the story up only to 1930.

I might tell the rest of the tale, about bankruptcies, reorganizations, and receiverships, but that would only divert me from my present purpose, which is to show that the methods by which the great chains have been built up are the methods monopoly has always used to extend its control and enlarge its dominion.

MUST GROW OR DIE

The great curse of the chain method of operation is that the process of consolidation and expansion must go on. The moment one of these huge entities ceases to grow it begins to die. The tendency toward monopoly is inherent—it is inevitable. First the chains, big and little, put their independent competitors out of business; then the big chains proceed to absorb the little ones; finally the big ones consolidate into great regional or national organizations.

I have cited but two examples, but I might add others illustrating the same trend. The Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.; the People's Drug Stores, Inc.; the Walgreen Co.; and the J. J. Newberry Co. are outstanding examples. I refer the subcommittee to the Federal Trade Commission's final report of its chain-store investigation, calling attention, however, to the fact that it fails to record the consolidations and absorptions of the last 6 or 8 years.

Having established that some of the larger chains have already attained monopoly proportions, at least in some of their fields of operation, and that the chain system is inherently monopolistic; let us see whether there is existing legislation adequate to deal with the situation.

Let us first consider the possibility of action under the Sherman Act. The law, to be sure, carries a broad prohibition against monopoly; but by judicial attrition its teeth have been worn down until they have little effectiveness against the type of monopoly represented by the great chain-store corporations.

LAWS DON'T FIT CASE

In the first place, that law as interpreted does not recognize that there is such a thing as economic monopoly, as distinguished from legal monopoly; under the Sherman law a corporation might have an absolute monopoly in fact, and yet be held not to have a monopoly in law. Also, the Sherman law fails to reach potential monopoly, although the courts, as I pointed out at the outset, have recognized the power of Congress and State legislatures to prohibit practices which may lead to monopoly whether or not monopoly actually results. A legal monopoly must be an accomplished fact in order to come under the ban of the Sherman statute.

Under decisions of the Supreme Court, a corporation might do all the business within its field of operation, it might have absolutely no competition, and yet not offend the Sherman law, notwithstanding section 2 which makes it a penal offense to monopolize or to conspire with others to monopolize any part of interstate and foreign commerce. "The law does not make the mere size of a corporation, or the existence of unexerted power on its part, an offense when unaccompanied by unlawful conduct in the exercise of its power." Under the doctrine laid down in United States against United States Steel Corporation, if one great chain-store corporation should acquire absolute control in its field of distribution, it could be attacked only if it had used unlawful methods in acquiring its monopoly or had exercised its monopolistic powers unlawfully after acquiring them.

LAW OPPRESSES SMALL MEN

The Sherman antitrust law as now interpreted is not adequate as an instrument for dealing with the chain-store situation. On the contrary, it is an instrument for the oppression of independent businessmen and for aiding their monopolistic competitors rather than one for curbing monopoly and preventing economic concentration. Thus an individual may with impunity so price his merchandise as to insure a return covering the invoice cost of the goods plus his cost of distribution; but if two or more individuals agree to do so, they are guilty of conspiracy. But a great corporation, being in the contemplation of the law a "person," may fix the prices to be charged in 15,000 stores. It is unlawful for two individuals operating as such to establish prices for two stores; but it is entirely lawful for a thousand persons, using the corporate device and hiding behind a legal fiction, to decide the price policies of thousands of stores. Thus the Sherman antitrust law enables individuals using the State-conferred power to create an artificial person, to do what the same individuals could not do through a more natural form of association.

What about that other statute designed to prevent monopoly, the Clayton Act? Does it afford an adequate safeguard against excessive economic concentration? Does it give us a means to deal with the chain-store problem?

We have already noted that chain-store consolidations have been accomplished in two ways: First, through the purchase by one company of the physical assets of other corporations; second, through the acquisition by one company of the capital stock of other companies. The first, the acquisition by one company of the physical property of another, is not prohibited by the Clayton Act even though the companies are in competition with each other. The Supreme Court has extended the immunity even further than the statute intended; it has held that there is no power in the Federal Trade Commission to order a corporation which has acquired the physical assets of a competitor after the acquisition of its capital stock in violation of law, to order a divestiture of those assets.

Thus the Supreme Court has opened an avenue for evasion so wide that it would seem that even a group of laymen could avoid the legal obstacle without advice of counsel.

INEFFECTIVE TOWARD MONOPOLY

What does the Clayton Act provide as to the acquisition by a corporation of the capital stock of a competitor?

In general, such acquisition is prohibited, but only when the effect "may be to substantially lessen competition," to restrain commerce in any section or community, or to tend "to create a monopoly of any line of commerce." In view of the practical difficulty of proving in court that the amount of competition in any trade area was substantial before the acquisition, or of measuring the extent of that competition, the limitations in the act make it practically impossible of enforcement. This is particularly true when the acquired companies continue to operate under their own names and in ostensible competition—the same kind of competition that would exist between two stores owned by the same individual and operated in the same block.

So far as I am aware, there is no case of record where the Clayton Act has been invoked successfully to prevent a chain-store consolidation.

HOLD DOWN ADVANTAGES

The efforts of Congress, since the enactment of the Clayton law, have been designed not so much to prevent monopoly in distribution as to deprive chain-store corporations of some of the advantages which they enjoy by reason of their semimonopolistic powers. Thus Congress passed the Robinson-Patman Act, designed to deprive the chain stores of advantages in buying; and the Tydings-Miller Act legalizing fair-trade contracts between manufacturer and distributor, designed to eliminate the use of well-known brands of merchandise as loss leaders. The legislatures of some 20 States have enacted unfair-sales laws to establish a price floor under all merchandise, branded or unbranded, and thereby to prevent powerful companies from putting their weaker competitors out of business by temporarily selling below cost.

We approve of all these measures, but respectfully call attention to the fact that they are inadequate to control the great interstate chains—the classification of chains against which H. R. 1 is directed.

The Robinson-Patman antidiscrimination law protects the individual distributor quite adequately against the small chain which must obtain its goods from the same manufacturers as the small retailer and his wholesale supplier; but it does not protect either the individual distributor or the small chain against big chains which either operate their own factories or take the entire output of factories owned by others, thereby acquiring their merchandise under circumstances in which no question of discrimination can arise.

PRIVATE BRANDS NATIONALIZED

The big interstate chains, having the resources to advertise their own private brands nationally and using the newspapers, the magazines, the radio, and all other means of publicity for that purpose, can raise those private brands to the dignity and reputation of national brands and thereby circumvent the purpose of fair-trade laws. In competition with such distributors, fair trade does not afford adequate protection.

The great interstate chain, which does its own manufacturing or takes the entire output of factories owned by others at prices that rarely cover all the costs of manufacture, can base its 6-percent mark-ups on invoice prices so low that the small distributor, chain or independent, who figures his mark-ups on costs reflecting a fair profit to the manufacturer, is hampered rather than helped by unfair-sales laws.

EFFECTIVE MEASURE NEEDED

Having established that the laws designed to prevent monopoly, the Sherman law and the Clayton Act, are powerless to stop the trend toward concentration; that the laws designed to regulate monopoly are ineffectual to equalize buying and selling opportunities between independents and small chains on the one hand and the great national chains on the other; and that therefore the latter have advantages which must inevitably result in more and more concentration, I feel that you are ready to accept my conclusion that the enactment of some such measure as H. R. 1 is necessary to prevent monopoly and preserve individual enterprise.

I indicated at the outset that I am more concerned about concentrated control in distribution than about concentrated control in production. To the generation that passed the Sherman Act, a "trust" meant a combination of manufacturers to raise prices. That was natural, for at that time there was no such a thing as integrated distribution. Distribution was in the hands of independent wholesalers and retailers, who were too small to dictate to manufacturers. The danger then was that the manufacturer should build a monopoly. To prevent that, the Sherman law was passed; and to that end I believe it is adequate whenever it is enforced.

In the last few decades the picture has changed. Big business has gone into distribution, and has built up entities much more powerful than most of the manufacturers that supply the mass distributors with merchandise.

A number of years ago I was for a time an executive in a manufacturing company. When I entered the business I naively assumed that the chief business of a factory is to manufacture. After 1 week behind my desk, I had made an important discovery: the chief business of a factory is to sell. The sales department is the most important department in a factory.

STRIKE AT NERVE CENTERS

In modern warfare, the attack is directed, not against the enemy terrain as a whole, but against certain strategic centers, such as railroad terminals, aviation fields, communication lines. Whoever controls these, controls the country.

In the American economic system, the strategic points of control are the points of distribution. He who has command of the market holds the front-line trenches of industry. It is because they realize this, that successful mass producers like Henry Ford, Chrysler, General Motors, and International Harvester have kept their products out of the hands of the mass distributors. If Ford had permitted a big chain to handle his automobiles, he probably would have been out of business many years ago; he has survived because he was wise enough to leave distribution to thousands of individual dealers.

If one distributor could get control of as large a share of the automobile market as A. & P. has of the food market, and if there were many manufacturers of automobiles instead of a few strong ones, it would not be long before that distributor, by playing one manufacturer against another, and by bankrupting one after another—as battery companies, for instance, have been bankrupted—would be in control of the manufacture as well as the distribution of automobiles.

DISTRIBUTIONAL CONCENTRATION DANGEROUS

For emphasis I repeat: Concentration in distribution is more dangerous than concentration in production because it can easily result in monopoly in both distribution and production.

I close with the thought with which I began. It is not the chain store as such that concerns me, but the menace of monopoly. The chain store problem is only a part of the greater problem, although, for the reasons I have pointed out, the most important part. The people must destroy monopoly, or monopoly will destroy them; they must insist on thoroughgoing and effective methods. Desultory prosecution, usually of the small monopolists rather than the big ones, will not stop the progress of concentration—a progress that has been accelerated every decade and every year since the Sherman law was enacted.

MUST AVOID COLLECTIVISM

I realize that some will say that the position I take is radical. I assure you I am not radical. My personal stake is in such capitalistic property as land, mortgages, and life insurance. I am

an extreme conservative, so conservative that I am willing to resort to what some would call radical measures to save capitalism from its own follies and excesses. For I am certain that the capitalistic system cannot survive unless the rank and file of the people are permitted to pluck some of the fruits from the capitalistic tree. If we shall remain a nation of individualism and free enterprise, we must avoid private collectivism no less than the Facist and Communist collectivisms of the Old World.

Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co. et al.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

OPINION OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and important opinion written by Mr. Justice Black in the case of Perkins against Lukens Steel Co.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 593. October term, 1939. *Frances Perkins, Individually and as Secretary of Labor of the United States, et al., petitioners,* vs. *Lukens Steel Co., Alan Wood Steel Co., South Chester Tube Co., et al.* On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. April 29, 1940]

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

In exercise of its authority to determine conditions under which purchases of Government supplies shall be made, Congress passed the Public Contracts Act of June 30, 1936.[1] By virtue of that act, sellers must agree to pay employees engaged in producing goods so purchased "not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work or in the particular or similar industries or groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which * * * the supplies * * * are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract." The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has held the Secretary erroneously construed the term "locality" to include a larger geographical area than the act contemplates and has ordered six members of the Cabinet, including the Secretary of Labor, the Director of Procurement, and all other officials responsible for purchases necessary in the operation of the Federal Government, not to abide by or give effect to the wage determination made by the Secretary for the iron and steel industry either as to the complaining companies or any others. In this vital industry, by action of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the act has been suspended and inoperative for more than a year.

We must, therefore, decide whether a Federal court, upon complaint of individual iron and steel manufacturers, may restrain the Secretary and officials who do the Government's purchasing from carrying out an administrative wage determination by the Secretary, not merely as applied to parties before the court, but as to all other manufacturers in this entire Nation-wide industry. Involving, as it does, the marking of boundaries of permissible judicial inquiry into administrative and executive responsibilities, this problem can best be understood against the background of what took place before the court of appeals for the District acted:

July 11, 1938, all the iron and steel companies in the United States were given notice that the Secretary contemplated proceedings for determining the minimum prevailing wage for their industry. On the 25th and 26th of that month, hearings were had before the Public Contracts Board, also functioning under the act. Many companies, and all of those involved here, were represented in the hearings. Companies from the entire United States filed briefs and submitted information and suggestions, and these producers who are parties here had notice of and actively participated in the various stages of the proceedings. After the hearing, time for filing of briefs was allowed. Following investigation of testimony, exhibits, letters, telegrams, briefs, data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and arguments of representatives of both labor and industry itself, the Board, October 27, 1938, made its findings of fact, conclusions, and recommendations: (a) Accepting recommendations of industry and labor, the Board adopted—with minor exceptions—the definition of the steel industry previously in effect under the National Industrial Recovery Act; (b) "the base rates paid to the workers classified as common laborers" was utilized as a basis for finding the minimum wage prevailing in the industry and a common laborer was defined as "one who performs physical or manual labor of a general character and simple nature, requiring no special training, judgment, nor skill"; (c) the view that municipalities be treated as the geographical limit of a "locality" and that different minimum prevailing wage standards be adopted for small as distinguished from larger companies, was rejected. The Board pointed out that "the main channels of trade in the industry take their course far beyond the confines of local producing areas"; that "conventional measurement of miles on the map to outline the marketing areas of the iron and steel producers" was unsuitable; that "geographic location does not limit the efforts of iron and steel manufacturers to secure Government business"; that "the workers being paid wages below the base rates are employed in large-, medium-, and small-size companies and in plants located in all parts of the country"; and that in fixing a "locality" all these factors as well as geographic and economic considerations were relevant.

The majority of the Board suggested two localities, one for the Southern States and another for the remainder of the steel producing States. One member disagreed and insisted upon four localities throughout the Nation, but noted that "the Board is agreed on all the essential facts before it in the case." He recognized that "the law * * * permits the division of the country into localities for the purpose of determining minimum wages. No rule is laid down to define the extent of any localities. * * * A too minute concept of locality would obviously nullify the law, for each plant must necessarily occupy a different locale or site from every other. To reduce the interpretation of locality to its most minute point would be to find a minimum wage prevailing in each plant. * * * When we depart from this interpretation we are immediately thrown upon judgment. * * * Obviously we must look for wage patterns or uniformities. * * * Again judgment must be relied upon for the answer." Excepting to the Board's recommendations, the companies now before this court urged that the Secretary make a finding of minimum prevailing wages with "locality" given the connotation of a subdivision of the respective States as originally provided in the Bacon-Davis Act.[2]

On December 20, 1938, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, acting for the Secretary, heard arguments and received briefs both from industry and labor organizations. He did not adopt the recommendations of the Board in full, but instead divided the industry of the entire country into six "localities," proceeding, however, upon the view that to construe "locality" to mean small political divisions of the States, as the Bacon-Davis Act had done in express terms would render "effective administration of the act * * * almost impossible." It was pointed out that "this narrowly restricted construction of the word 'locality' * * * is contrary to the administrative construction consistently adhered to by the Secretary of Labor in the administration of the act," and that while Congress had closely followed the language of the Davis-Bacon Act in some respects, it had carefully avoided the use of the more narrowly restrictive language of "city, town, village, or other civil subdivision." In the 22 preceding wage determinations under this act the Secretary's administrative construction of the term had been—with a sole exception—that of geographic areas no smaller than those determined for the steel industry.[3] The determination in question was made January 16, 1939, but was not made operative until March 1, 1939, "in order that industry may make necessary readjustments to comply with the decision."

In their bill for an injunction and a declaratory judgment, these seven producers of iron and steel (respondents here) sought to enjoin as individuals and in their official capacities, the Secretaries of the Labor, Treasury, War, Navy, and Interior Departments, the Postmaster General, the Director of Procurement of the Treasury Department, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Division of Public Contracts of the Department of Labor and their "officers, agents, assistants, employees, representatives, and attorneys, and anyone associated with or acting in concert or participation with them, or any of them, and their successors in office and each of them, and their officers," etc. The seven companies named as complainants by the bill did not merely pray relief for themselves against the Secretary's wage determination but insisted that all these Government officials be restrained from requiring the statutory stipulation as to minimum wages in contracts with any other steel and iron manufacturers throughout the United States.

The district court declined to interfere so sweepingly with the administration of the act, even in the temporary restraining order which it granted. Its order ran only against the Secretaries of Labor and the Navy, and specifically limited its benefits to but three of the complaining companies. Recitals in the order indicate that only the Secretary of the Navy had actually solicited bids and that only those three companies were "desirous of bidding." After hearing, this order was dissolved and the court granted a motion to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, inadequacy of the complaint, lack of standing to sue, and because the suit was one against the United States without its consent.[4]

[1] 49 Stat. 2036.

[2] 46 Stat. 1494.

[3] 2 Federal Register, 233, 1333, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1338, 1339, 2960, 2976; 3 Federal Register 64, 224, 257, 889, 1613, 895, 901, 1612, 1153, 2371, 2370, 2537, 3043; 4 Federal Register 4005.

[4] The District court's judgment was rendered without opinion.

A stay pending appeal was denied by the district court, but the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Justice Edgerton dissenting, by temporary injunction granted the sweeping prayer that all the Government officials and agents designated in the bill be restrained from continuing in effect the determination made by the Secretary of Labor. By motion for reargument, the restrained officials, represented by attorneys of the Government, asked that the injunction be clarified so as to be "restricted to enjoining enforcement of the determination against parties to this proceeding * * * and * * * not be extended to other bidders, not parties to this action, and who, for all that appears, may desire to abide by the determination." In the same motion, the Government asked that employees who might be irreparably injured be protected by "a bond or other security to pay the minimum wages if the appellants do not eventually succeed in this case."[5] The record discloses no action by the Court of Appeals on this motion or on a subsequent motion to dissolve the temporary injunction.[6] But the temporary injunction, rendering the act wholly inoperative as to the iron and steel industry, was kept in effect and, reversing the district court, the Court of Appeals, Justice Edgerton again dissenting, remanded with instructions that relief as prayed in the bill be granted.[7]

In our judgment the action of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia goes beyond any controversy that might have existed between the complaining companies and the Government officials. The benefits of its injunction, and of that ordered by it, were not limited to the potential bidders in the "locality," however construed, in which the respondents do business. All Government officials with duties to perform under the Public Contracts Act have been restrained from applying the wage determination of the Secretary to bidders throughout the Nation who were not parties to any proceeding, who were not before the court, and who had sought no relief.

As a result of this judicial action, Federal officials had no feasible alternative except to make contracts for imperatively needed supplies for the War and Navy Departments without inclusion of the stipulation which Congress had required. The Public Contracts Act, so far as the steel industry is concerned, has been suspended for more than a year, with no bond or security to protect the public's interest in the maintenance of wage standards contemplated by Congress, should the suspension ultimately appear unwarranted or unauthorized. Here, and below, the Government has challenged the right of the judiciary to take such action, alleging that it constitutes an unwarranted interference with deliberate legislative policy and with executive administration vital to the achievement of governmental ends, at the instance of parties whose rights the Government has not invaded and who have no standing in court to attack the Secretary's determination. The manifestly far-reaching importance of the questions thus raised prompted us to grant certiorari.[8]

Of the six "localities" into which the Secretary's determination divided the steel industry, respondents do business in that consisting of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, the District of Columbia, and a part of West Virginia.[9] Their stated grievance was that the construction given to the term "locality" by the Secretary amounted to "a plain error of law in interpreting the act, * * * and, consequently, in purporting * * * to determine the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed in the manufacture * * * of the iron and steel industry in the six so-called localities set forth in this determination [the Secretary] acted arbitrarily and capriciously and wholly without warrant or authority in law." In particular, the complaint alleged "respondents had been selling their products to agents of the United States for many years; they wished to continue to bid on Government contracts; their minimum wages had ranged from 53 cents to 56½ cents per hour; if required to pay 62½ cents per hour minimum rate determined by the Secretary there was grave danger that they would be unable successfully to compete with others for Government contracts; they had a legal right to bid for Government contracts free from any obligation to abide by the minimum wage determination because of alleged illegal administrative construction of 'locality'; and if denied the right to bid without paying their employees this minimum wage they would suffer 'irreparable and irrecoverable damages' for which the law provided no 'plain adequate or complete remedy.'"

In staying the effect of the administrative wage determination, the court of appeals for the district was of the opinion that "the word 'locality' is one of somewhat indefinite meaning," requiring the Secretary to exercise judgment and discretion "within the proper limits of the meaning of locality," but held that the Secretary's determination in this case went "so far beyond any possible proper application of the words as to defeat its meaning and to constitute an attempt arbitrarily to disregard the statutory mandate."

We are of opinion that no legal rights of respondents were shown to have been invaded or threatened in the complaint upon which the injunction of the court of appeals was based. It is by now clear that neither damage nor loss of income in consequence of the action of Government, which is not an invasion of recognized legal rights, is in itself a source of legal rights in the absence of constitutional legislation recognizing it as such.[10] It is not enough that the Secretary of Labor is charged with an erroneous interpretation of the term "locality" as an element in her wage determination. Nor can respondents vindicate any general interest which the public may have in the construction of the act by the Secretary and which must be left to the political process. Respondents, to have standing in court, must show an injury or threat to a particular right of their own, as distinguished from the public's interest in the administration of the law.[11] They claim a standing by asserting that they have particular rights under and even apart from statute to bid and negotiate for Government contracts free from compliance with the determination made by the Secretary of Labor for their industry. Respondents point to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and to the Public Contracts Act itself.

Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes requires for the Government's benefit that its contracts be made after public advertising.[12] It was not enacted for the protection of sellers and confers no enforceable rights upon prospective bidders.[13] "The United States needs the protection of publicity, form, regularity of returns and affidavit (Rev. Stats., secs. 3709, 3718–3724, 3745–3747), in order to prevent possible frauds upon it by others. A private person needs no such protection against a written undertaking signed by himself. The duty is imposed upon the officers of the Government and not upon him."[14] That duty is owing to the Government and to no one else.

---

[5] Sections of the Public Contracts Act provides that "breach or violation of any of the representations and stipulations in any contract for the purposes set forth * * * shall render the party responsible therefor liable to the United States of America for liquidated damages in addition to damages for any other breach of such contract, * * * a sum equal to the amount of any deductions, rebates, refunds, or underpayment of wages due to any employee engaged in the performance of such contract; * * * Any sums of money due to the United States of America by reason of any violation of any of the representations and stipulations of said contract set forth in section 1 hereof may be withheld from any amounts due on any such contracts or may be recovered in suits brought in the name of the United States of America by the Attorney General thereof. All sums withheld or recovered as deductions, rebates, refunds, or underpayments of wages shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary of Labor, directly to the employees who have been paid less than minimum rates of pay as set forth in such contracts and on whose account such sums were withheld or recovered; * * *."

[6] The Government's motion to clarify and restrict the temporary injunction and for security was filed March 29, 1939; the motion to dissolve the temporary injunction was filed April 13, 1939. No specific consideration of these motions by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is disclosed in the record. August 4, 1939, after argument on the merits, that court of appeals, per curiam, Justice Edgerton dissenting, announced that the temporary injunction would be kept in effect, that the judgment of the district court would be reversed and that the grounds for enjoining the administration of the act would be set out in an opinion "to be filed shortly." The opinion of the court of appeals came down October 3, 1939; Justice Edgerton filed a separate opinion in dissent.

[7] 107 F. (2d) 627.

[8] — U. S. —.

[9] The remaining five localities are: 1, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Oklahoma, Texas, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Virginia, and a part of West Virginia; 2, Washington, Oregon, and California; 3, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Arizona; 4, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and the area in and about East St. Louis, Ill.; 5, Wisconsin, Illinois (except the area in and about East St. Louis, Ill.), Michigan, and Indiana.

[10] *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 306 U. S. 118, 137–8; *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes*, 302 U. S. 464; *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U. S. 447.

[11] *Stearns* v. *Wood*, 236 U. S. 75, 78; *Fairchild* v. *Hughes*, 258 U. S. 126, 129.

[12] R. S. 3709 (41 U. S. C. 5) provides: "Except as otherwise provided by law all purchases and contracts for supplies or services, in any of the departments of the Government, and purchases of Indian supplies, except for personal services, shall be made by advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals respecting the same, when the public exigencies do not require the immediate delivery of the articles, or performance of the service. When immediate delivery or performance is required by the public exigency, the articles or service required may be procured by open purchase or contract, at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold, or such services engaged, between individuals."

[13] Cf. *Goldberg* v. *Daniels* (231 U. S. 218).

[14] *United States* v. *New York and P. R. S. S. Co.* (239 U. S. 88, 92, 93); *American Smelting and Refining Co.* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 75, 78). Cf. *Colorado Paving Co.* v. *Murphy* (78 Fed. 28 (C. C. A. 8th)). See 38 Op. Att. Gen. 555, 557. Bidders have not been able to contest the award of contracts as bidders or in their capacity as citizens generally (*O'Brien* v. *Carney*, 6 Fed. Supp. 761; *B. F. Cummings* v. *Burleson*, 40 Appellate D. C. 500; *Champion C. P. Co.* v. *Joint Committee on Printing*, 47 Appellate D. C. 141; cf. *Strong* v. *United States*, 6 Court of Claims, 135). And the view that bidders have no standing in the courts has been generally recognized by

Like private individuals and businesses, the Government enjoys the unrestricted power to produce its own supplies, to determine those with whom it will deal, and to fix the terms and conditions upon which it will make needed purchases.[15] Acting through its agents as it must of necessity, the Government may for the purpose of keeping its own house in order lay down guide posts by which its agents are to proceed in the procurement of supplies, and which create duties to the Government alone. It has done so in the Public Contracts Act. That act does not depart from, but instead embodies the traditional principle of leaving purchases necessary to the operation of our Government to administration by the executive branch of Government, with adequate range of discretion free from vexatious and dilatory restraints at the suits of prospecti e or potential sellers. It was not intended to be a bestowal of litigable rights upon those desirous of selling to the Government; it is a self-imposed restraint for violation of which the Government—but not private litigants—can complain. Thus, a wage determination by the Secretary contemplates no controversy between parties and no fixing of private rights; the process of arriving at a wage determination contains no semblance of these elements which go to make up a litigable controversy as our law knows the concept.[16] Courts have never reviewed or supervised the administration of such an executive responsibility even where executive duties "require an interpretation of the law." [17] Judicial restraint of those who administer the Government's purchasing would constitute a break with settled judicial practice and a departure into fields hitherto wisely and happily apportioned by the genius of our polity to the administration of another branch of Government.

This act's purpose was to impose obligations upon those favored with Government business and to obviate the possibility that any part of our tremendous national expenditures would go to forces tending to depress wages and purchasing power and offending fair social standards of employment. As stated in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on the bill,[18] "The object of the bill is to require persons having contracts with the Government to conform to certain labor conditions in the performance of the contracts and thus to eliminate the practice under which the Government is compelled to deal with sweatshops."

We find nothing in the act indicating any intention to abandon a principle acted upon since the Nation's founding under which the legislative and executive departments have exercised complete and final authority to enter into contracts for Government purchases. The committee hearings and reports and the construction of the measure by its sponsors disclose no purpose to invoke judicial supervision over agents chosen by Congress to perform these duties. And sections 4 and 5 do not subject a wage determination to such review. Provision for hearings and findings by the secretary with respect to decisions upon breaches of stipulations by contractors, once purchases have been made, is indicative of a lack of intention to create any rights for prospective bidders before a purchase is concluded.

The act does not represent an exercise by Congress of regulatory power over private business or employment.[19] In this legislation Congress did no more than instruct its agents who were selected and granted final authority to fix the terms and conditions under which the Government will permit goods to be sold to it. The Secretary of Labor is under a duty to observe those instructions just as a purchasing agent of a private corporation must observe those of his principal. In both instances prospective bidders for contracts derive no enforceable rights against the agent for an erroneous interpretation of the principal's authorization. For erroneous construction of his instructions, given for the sole benefit of the principal, the agent is responsible to his principal alone because his misconstruction violates no duty he owes to any but his principal. The Secretary's responsibility is to superior executive and legislative authority. Respondents have no standing in court to enforce that responsibility or to represent the public's interest in the Secretary's compliance with the act.[20] That respondents sought to vindicate such a public right or interest is made apparent both by their prayer that the determination be suspended as to the entire steel industry and by the extent of the injunction granted.

The contested action of the restrained officials did not invade private rights in a manner amounting to a tortious violation. On the contrary, respondents in effect seek through judicial action to interfere with the manner in which the Government may dispatch its own internal affairs. And in attempted support of the injunction granted they cite many cases involving contested Government regulation of the conduct of private business.[21] Their cited cases, however, all relate to problems different from those inherent in the imposition of judicial restraint upon agents engaged in the purchase of the Government's own supplies.

The Government can supply its needs by its own manufacturing or by purchase. And Congress can, as it always has, either do the purchasing of the Government's goods and supplies itself or it can entrust its agents with final power to do so and make these agents responsible only to it.[22] Courts should not, where Congress has not done so, subject purchasing agencies of Government to the delays necessarily incident to judicial scrutiny at the instance of potential sellers, which would be contrary to traditional governmental practice and would create a new concept of judicial controversies. A like restraint applied to purchasing by private business would be widely condemned as an intolerable business handicap. It is, as both Congress and the courts have always recognized, essential to the even and expeditious functioning of government that the administration of the purchasing machinery be unhampered. The Constitution prohibits appropriations for the Army for more than 2 years,[23] and by statute contracts for the purchase of departmental supplies are in general limited to 1 year.[24] These prohibitions emphasize the grave importance of leaving the restraint of the Government's purchasing agents to Congress and their executive superiors.

The record here discloses the "confusion and disorder" [25] that can result from the delays necessarily incident to judicial supervision of administrative procedure developed to meet present-day needs of government and capable of operating efficiently and fairly to both private and public interests. In the appropriate words of Mr. Justice Sutherland, "The bare suggestion of such a result, with its attendant inconveniences, goes far to sustain the conclusion which we have reached, that a suit of this character cannot be maintained." [26] For more than a year Cabinet officers and their subordinates have been enjoined from making the Secretary's determination of minimum wages effective. Meanwhile, iron and steel were needed for the Army and Navy. In order that the military program could proceed, the declared policy of the Congress was abandoned under judicial compulsion, and contracts without a minimum-wage stipulation have been awarded for more than $65,000,000 worth of iron and steel products since the injunction issued.[27] If the general law permits prospective bidders to challenge each wage determination of the Secretary in the courts, by a like token all employees affected could obtain judicial review. Such a possibility places in bold relief those conditions which led Congress to proceed in this act upon the belief, to which we have recently alluded,[28] that "legislatures are ultimate guardians of the liberties and welfare of the people in quite as great a degree as the courts." [29]

The case before us makes it fitting to remember that "the interference of the courts with the performance of the ordinary duties of the executive departments of the Government would be productive of nothing but mischief; and we are quite satisfied that such a power was never intended to be given to them." [30]

The district court properly dismissed the bill, and the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was in error in finding respondents with standing to bring this action, in ordering the Secretary's determination restrained, and in holding respondents entitled to declaratory judgment.[31]

Our decision that the complaining companies lack standing to sue does not rest upon a mere formality. We rest it upon reasons deeply rooted in the constitutional divisions of authority in our system of government and the impropriety of judicial interpretations of law at the instance of those who show no more than a mere possible injury to the public. The judgment of the court of appeals is reversed, and that of the district court dismissing the bill is affirmed.

Reversed.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the challenged judgment should be affirmed.

---

the Comptroller General, the Interdepartmental Board on Contracts of the Bureau of the Budget, as well as the Senate Judiciary Committee (hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 71st Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 5568, serial 4, pt. 1, pp. 16–22, 26–27; S. Rept. 433, 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

[15] *Atkin* v. *Kansas* (191 U. S. 207); *Ellis* v. *United States* (206 U. S. 246); *Heim* v. *McCall* (239 U. S. 175); cf. *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raymond Co.* (263 U. S. 565).

[16] *Norwegian Nitrogen Co.* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 294, 319, 320).

[17] *United States ex rel. Dunlap* v. *Black* (128 U. S. 40, 48); cf. *Butte, A. & P. Ry.* v. *United States* (290 U. S. 127, 136, 142, 143).

[18] House Rept. No. 2946 (74th Cong., 2d sess.).

[19] Cf. *Ex parte Williams* (277 U. S. 269, 272); *Great Northern Ry. Co.* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 172, 180).

[20] Cf. *General Inv. Co.* v. *New York Central R. R.* (271 U. S. 228, 230). See also Note 10.

[21] See e. g., *Utah Fuel Co.* v. *Coal Commission* (305 U. S. 56, 58); *Shields* v. *Utah-Idaho Central R. R. Co.* (305 U. S. 177); *Waite* v. *Macy* (246 U. S. 606); *American School of Magnetic Healing* v. *McAnnulty* (187 U. S. 94); *Gegiow* v. *Uhl* (239 U. S. 3); *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33); *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* (268 U. S. 510).

[22] *Great Northern Railway Co.* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 172, 182); *Work* v. *Rives* (267 U. S. 175); *Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Ry. Co.* v. *United States* (290 U. S. 127); *United States* v. *Babcock* (250 U. S. 328); *Louisiana* v. *McAdoo* (234 U. S. 627); *Adams* v. *Nagle* (303 U. S. 532, 540–1).

[23] Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 12.

[24] 41 U. S. C. 13.

[25] Cf. Mr. Chief Justice Taney in *Decatur* v. *Paulding* (14 Pet. 497, 516).

[26] *Mass.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447, 487).

[27] Bulletins Nos. 75 to 176, inclusive, of the Division of Public Contracts of the Department of Labor.

[28] *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.* (— U. S. —, —).

[29] *Missouri, Kansas & Texas Ry. Co.* v. *May* (194 U. S. 267, 270).

[30] *Decatur* v. *Paulding*, supra, at 516.

[31] *Aetna Life Ins. Co.* v. *Haworth* (300 U. S. 227, 340–1).

Build America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY W. GIBSON CAREY, JR., AT MEETING OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. W. Gibson Carey, Jr., president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on April 30, 1940, on the occasion of the annual meeting of that organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we gather here in Washington for this twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, it seems to me important that we review and fix in our minds certain general attitudes and objectives. It is for this reason that, as your president, I presume to outline in my own words what I know by intimate association is a true reflection of the concepts of your officers and directors. I do this, furthermore, with the hope that every man and woman here will be guided in his words, his thoughts, and his actions by these principles.

First, we come to analyze, to study, to learn, and to teach. If, as individuals, our views have been too narrow, too sectional, or too short-sighted, we seek a correction. We represent every part of our Nation and practically every phase of productive life. We accept the interdependence of our people of whatever calling or station. We seek the maximum production of goods and services with the benefits widely and fairly distributed.

Second, our belief in our Republic and its Constitution is unshaken. Nay, by the observation of trends abroad and of the activity of certain small but active elements here, our faith in our constitutional democracy is strengthened an hundredfold. As American citizens, for ourselves and for our children, we dedicate our strength to the preservation of our basic form of government and to the fundamental beliefs and institutions of our ancestors. From these we will accept only such adjustments as are necessary to attune our life to a changing world. These alterations we will ponder deeply and prayerfully that without fail we may preserve the dignity and rights of the individual, the family, and the minority.

Thirdly, we approach life and its problems with good will toward all men and with tolerance. This is the teaching of our religion and of all sound philosophy. Let no one mistake these sentiments for cowardice. It is justice and progress we seek. Every invasion of these must and shall be repelled. Leaders must lead. The requirement is that they be just and right. So, with humility and determination, we who are leaders in business and in many other fields dedicate ourselves to the fullest assumption of our responsibilities and obligations.

My belief is that we meet at a time of great crisis. As is usually true in the affairs of men, the dangers this time vary greatly from those existent at other periods of peril. There may be, nevertheless, some lesson and some inspiration from a brief reference to two great turning points in the history of this country.

In 1787 we were in a deplorable condition. Saratoga, Valley Forge, Yorktown were all of the past. We were free, but we were a perplexed and unhappy people. The Confederation of States was unsatisfactory from nearly every viewpoint and yet with the jealousies existing it was almost impossible to determine what adjustments could be made to improve the welfare of the people, to strengthen our finances, and to stimulate our agriculture, trade, and manufacture. A constitutional convention was called at Philadelphia. To it the States sent delegates to whom each succeeding generation should pay reverence for the result they achieved. When they were about to meet, the young Nation's greatest leader, George Washington, said:

"Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Was not that a noble sentiment? There was in that statement dread for further suffering of the people, an exhortation to high accomplishment, and the humility of the Christian gentleman. Perhaps you will agree with me that for us in another day and in our lesser positions, there is a stirring lesson in this incident.

When the Constitutional Convention was closing with the signing of its work, another great American, Benjamin Franklin, made an observation which describes the perplexities of the period so graphically that each of us should have it in mind. But he did more than that. He predicted the rise of the great and prosperous nation which would be built by the work and sacrifice of generation after generation living under the most inspiring type of government ever conceived by men. On the back of Washington's chair was painted a half disk of a sun. Franklin drew this to the attention of the members and then he said:

"I have often and often in the course of the sessions and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issues, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Our next great crisis was the Civil War. Despite lingering hardships and despite pride of ancestry, men of the South and men of the North are of one mind today in their thankfulness that our Nation was preserved. As one of southern lineage, I quote proudly to you now the splendid close of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. I do so because his words embody the travail and determination of a people and because there must of necessity still reside in them inspiration and guidance for our generation.

"* * * we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

In reverie and reverence, before I leave our first two great crises, I wish to repeat, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair" and "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Now it is time for us to speak of our present crisis. We shall do well to approach it cooly, factually, and logically. The three points which I think it is absolutely essential for me to make are—

(1) This is unquestionably a most serious crisis;

(2) It can be solved; and

(3) It is our duty, together with other citizens of good intention in all walks of life to forge the solution.

Having attempted the development of these points it is evident that I must leave a full discussion of many phases of our problems to other speakers who are experts in their various fields.

Our situation in the United States today cannot be disassociated either from the World War or from international affairs. So far as I know all students agree that the loss of life, the dissipation of capital, and the bitterness which gave rise to many errors of judgment are the chief underlying causes of the present strife in the world and of much of our dilemma here. Always it has been difficult to make fair and sensible adjustments of trade and other relations after prolonged conflict.

In our generation this earth is in effect a smaller place due to the growing speed and effectiveness of transportation and communication. By every rule of reason this should be accompanied by a more active trade and a closer relationship and understanding among peoples. But war, the breeder of intense nationalism, tends to offset this evident and proper destiny. Fear and bitterness turn men's minds and ambitions toward self-sufficiency. That very process lowers living standards, which is ever the cause of unrest. Then the stage is set for agitation, for demagogues, for panaceas, for opportunism, for fantasies about race and about unearned rights of nations and of individuals.

As we survey the world today the conditions are frightful. Millions of men in Asia and Europe are in deadly conflict. They are firing their hates and devouring their substance. Saying that we must assist as we may to fair solutions is but expressing the self-evident. For our future nothing transcends the desirability of peace, just and lasting peace, in the world.

Relatively our present status in America is good indeed. I for one would not change our position for that of any nation on earth. Having said that, however, it is but fair to add that we have mismanaged for nearly a decade our abundant resources. I have no desire to carp or to blame. We must, however, look at the situation judicially in order to work out corrections. The following are facts, not opinions:

(1) Our Federal debt is at the appalling level of $43,000,000,000, compared with one billion in 1914, with three billion in 1917, and with seventeen billion in 1929.

(2) Our Federal taxes are this year at the amazing peacetime total of over $5,000,000,000, as compared with $330,000,000 in 1914, eight hundred million in 1917, and three billion in 1929. Despite this we shall have a deficit this year of almost $4,000,000,000.

(3) Never in our history have we had so many on the pay roll of the National Government, excluding our armed forces. We now have nearly 1,000,000, whereas in 1929 the comparative figure was under 600,000. Unfortunately, today there are other millions who are beneficiaries of Federal subsidies and gifts.

(4) The power and scope of the executive branch of our Federal Government exceed by far any limit ever previously contemplated by our people.

(5) Many branches of agriculture are in a sorry plight despite vast and costly attempts at correction.

(6) Most durable-goods enterprises are still operating at unsatisfactory levels.

(7) Unemployment, whatever the actual figures may be, is still an unsolved problem which not only is the root of much unhappiness, perplexity, and bitterness, but also is the excuse for much futile experimentation by the Federal Government.

(8) Capital, though plentiful, is not in sufficiently active use.

There are many other facts which might be listed, but the contemplation of the eight I have mentioned are, I feel certain, more than sufficient in themselves to prove conclusively the existence of a severe crisis. Parodoxically, much of this situation has been engendered by the policies of a Federal Government which has itself, by error after error, continued the so-called emergency, which long since should have passed. By many this is recognized clearly, but it is imperative that all men of understanding and good intention comprehend fully the insidious dangers involved. An open attack or invasion brings men's minds to a focus and stirs them to action. It is the slow dissipation of resources, the gradual undermining of our institutions, and the encouragement of class feeling which are most difficult to check.

Now let us turn to the line of thought which gives rise to my conviction that our situation can be solved. These are my own views for which I take full responsibility.

We are blessed with a most favorable geographic location, with a productive people, and with truly remarkable natural resources. Our country, compared with many others, is but sparsely populated. This is especially so when the productive character of our land and our tremendous mineral deposits are considered.

Our governmental institutions, though somewhat perverted, are still intact. We still have free speech for the unintimidated and we have untrammeled religious observance. Communication and transportation are adequate. Our entire production and distribution system is efficient compared to anything ever known in the world and is suspect, in any basic sense, only by theorists, Socialists, and Communists. It is evident that we have ample capital. We have good schools. These may indulge too much in opinion. They operate probably with too great regard for the average intelligence and with too little for the exceptional mind. They might perhaps in some cases be better used in vocational training. Parents rather than the government still have control of their children. This is of immense importance.

With such conditions, one might well ask what is the trouble? There is no possible general answer save that we have faltered badly in two particulars which are, however, in every generation and every nation prime essentials. The first is leadership; the second is character. In our case, the two are for all intents and purposes one and the same. Perhaps my point is most clearly made if I say we have lacked in the character of those in places of responsibility. Some of this has undoubtedly exhibited itself in every phase of our system. The default which has, however, undermined the country has been chiefly in public life. For a decade we have had either depression or near depression. The major cause of this for 7 years has been political and still is. Opportunism, fanciful economies, threats, inconsistencies, and the assumption by our Federal Government of an ever-expanding authority have kept this Nation in a slough of despond. I make these statements with no partisan connotation. It is quite evident that both parties contain many fine public servants.

As is true in nearly every period, there has been some constructive accomplishment. Our trouble has been that we seem as a people to have been unable to sift the chaff from the wheat and thus to arrive at that net balance of judgment which is required for clear-cut correction. In analyzing this situation, thoughts such as the following come naturally to one's mind.

On the whole we have approved our foreign policy and we have believed in the encouragement of international trade. We have been opposed to any irregular financial practice, we have disapproved monopoly, and we have desired moderate and well-planned social security. Almost to a man we have wanted adequate defense without, however, the specter of aggression. We have wished our farmers to get a square deal and we have agreed that distress must be relieved. These are all fundamentals of sound policy and constructive adaptation to developing circumstance. But what of commissions which investigate, prosecute, and judge? Can we be dreaming as we recall the partisanship, the inefficiency, and the utterly disgraceful conduct of some of these? Can it be imagination that such a group, zealously expanding its function without authority, undertook recently to order the discontinuance of plans for marketing a new development, television? What of Government monopoly and Government competition with its citizens? What of sneers, threats, and attacks for those who opposed because they honestly disagreed? What of punitive taxation? What of production control and of the political use of relief? What of telling citizens how long they may work? And what of so-called pump priming, which has ruined the pump and brought insinuations that the well has gone dry? This is but half the list, but it is enough.

We are told that underneath is the objective of spreading the national income more fairly and thus sustaining purchasing power in a manner to avoid depression and unemployment. What has been accomplished, however, is distress, labor disturbance, general bewilderment, a quickening with Government expenditure of the turn-over in consumption goods, and a deadening in all capital or durable products except those sustained directly or indirectly by public funds. Private capital, which by its very nature and by the nature of man himself demands a chance for a fair profit, has on the whole sought security rather than risk. Criticize this and you but impugn good sense and judgment.

Gentlemen, what we need most in this emergency is sound leadership in government. Parenthetically, I must add that part of the blame for the lack of this rests on our shoulders. For the future, however, through our activity and that of others, we as a people must see that we effect corrections. Here are those which seem most fundamental.

Carefully, but surely, we must reduce Federal expenditure and balance our national Budget including our vast Federal corporations. Then we must begin paying our debt. In due course we should further encourage productivity and the full use of our resources by reducing taxes, which are a first charge on the standard of living of every citizen, because they inevitably are reflected in prices. As we release the present restrictions on business, substitute clear laws, applying alike to all men, for the dictates of unrestrained administrative agencies and reinstate good will and cooperation, we shall develop new industry, improve our present products, and give to our people, through lower prices, more real purchasing power. Then we may once again have good jobs for all those who want to work. Also by this very process we shall have gone a long way toward solving our agricultural situation which will be further aided as ways are found to use more farm products in industry. This statement is, of course, not to be taken as a full agricultural program. Basically, what I am pointing out is that general progress will help the farmer immensely.

If we do these things, we shall occasionally have difficult times as in the past, but with reasonably long periods of prosperity in which to save, with social security and with an unimpaired Federal credit, we shall have little to fear. These are my convictions and my reason for the statement that we can solve our problems despite such unfavorable repercussions as there may be from external conditions. And let us not forget that hand in hand with this solution will go what is of transcending import—the preservation of our liberties. For them our forefathers bled. Surely we in our time can be counted on to play our part whatever sacrifices may be required.

Do I read in some of your faces the thought that such a course is too difficult? Are your minds settling on objections and obstacles? Surely we have in our country pressure groups with hands in the Treasury, surely we have undermined to a degree the character and perspective of some of our citizens, and surely we have to carry a heavier load of taxes than previously. Even worse, we have established certain treacherous concepts of socialism and fascism in our very bosom. We know these things, but we also know discouragement will not help us.

Can we not to a man change our perspective to the end that we may exert true leadership? Can we not consider difficulties for the sole purpose of seeing how to overcome them? Can we also not remember our unusual elements of strength as a people? Our country is one of natural prosperity. Our citizens are basically sound and decent. We have a great void in construction and other durable-goods production to fill. The actual fact is that favorable factors far outweigh any possible deterrents except as may reside in indecision, trepidation, and weakness of soul. It is strength, foresight, and character which will win this struggle. I doubt not that the real leaders of America still have those qualities.

How as men of business may we make our greatest contribution? My deep belief is that we must study to be right in all of our viewpoints and policies, after which we must stand foursquare and firm. True leadership does not equivocate. It, rather, teaches, exhorts, and shows the way both by precept and example. Our policies with labor, stockholders, customers, and the public must be open and fair. We must encourage a stability, balance, and regular growth in our civilization by obtaining much wider understanding of such things as the sources of wealth and the connection between low-cost production and a high real purchasing power. Thrift, work, invention, and leadership have, with the protection of a sound Government and with the sustenance of great resources, built our economic system, and they are the only things which will continue to build it safely and soundly. With this lesson we have had in the last decade, let us never forget that the day is past when we can expect that men and women in government automatically will understand business enterprise and protect it. For the good of our souls, we should admit that we can fairly be charged with lack of foresight and in some rare cases with a degree of selfishness. Our quite human errors, however, have been chiefly those of omission, not commission. It is in the fertile field of citizenship we have failed in the past.

If my words ring true, then let us be done with pessimism for the future. Let the word go out that we work with cheer, with confidence, and with determination to fulfill our obligations. We have need of men who, despite rough waters, bring their crews and their cargoes to a safe haven. Err as they may, such men truly serve. They navigate large ships and small. They know hardship and sacrifice. They dare and they risk on the seven seas. Such men give and demand cooperation. They discipline themselves and they expect it of others. They are in varying degrees interested in education, culture, art, and religion. They are tough of fiber, but soft of heart.

These men of whom I speak actually are inventors, engineers, financiers, successful farmers, professional men, and business managers. Fortunately, they are scattered in every hamlet and town in this country. They have some unusual spark which drives them on. As they grow, their responsibilities to civilization increase in proportion. Most of them are willing and ready to assume their proper burden. It is for that reason that such men—in fact, you men and others like you—can be counted on to build America.

The National Significance of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain extracts from the proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the National Reclamation Association, held in Denver, Colo., November 14, 15, and 16, 1939. The extracts relate to an address delivered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. RALPH L. CARR. Delegates to the eighth annual meeting of the National Reclamation Association and friends of the West who are listening on the air tonight, the speaker this evening is a man of whom the West is proud. We selfish people of Colorado deny Wyoming all of the credit for the achievements and accomplishments of the man who has come from Washington to talk with us this evening.

He was a resident of Colorado, a newspaper man in Boulder before he transferred his allegiance to the State which sent him on to Washington.

It is an honor to introduce my friend of boyhood days, the man who has made a name for himself in the National Congress, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. [Applause.]

THE NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF RECLAMATION

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. Thank you, Governor Carr, and you ladies and gentlemen of the reclamation association, for this most polite greeting you have given me.

I cannot tell you how deeply I appreciate the great honor which has been conferred upon me by your officers in granting me the privilege tonight to address this organization, to speak to those of you who have assembled here as delegates, and to those interested in reclamation and the development of agriculture who are listening over the radio.

I am not the person who should be in this place tonight. I am speaking, I feel, as a substitute for the great leader of reclamation who comes from Colorado, your distinguished representative from the western slope, who, it seems to me, for almost a generation has been the leader in the effort to build up the West, Congressman ED TAYLOR. [Applause.]

We all regret his absence, and I note with great interest that upon the program tonight the officers and directors of this convention have undertaken to pay him the tribute that is his due. Let me say, therefore, now that the credit for what has been achieved on behalf of reclamation in great measure goes to men like Congressman TAYLOR, men like the Senators of Colorado, my friend ALVA ADAMS, and my friend ED JOHNSON, whose greeting I bring you from the National Capitol.

Times have changed. Things have become so busy at Washington that it is very difficult now for Members of Congress to cut loose from their desks in Washington and come home for vacations. ALVA ADAMS and ED JOHNSON are working in Washington. They send you their greetings, and I know that those same greetings come from the members of the delegations from all of the Western States, Congressmen, and Senators, whether here or absent. They have all united in the great effort to build homes in the West. But let us not forget that their efforts would not be at all successful if it were not for the cooperation which they receive from the executive arm of the Government.

I am happy to see here tonight at the table, Commissioner John C. Page, head of the Bureau of Reclamation. [Applause.]

I wish that I could describe to you the effective manner in which this mild-mannered gentleman directs the efforts of the Committee on Irrigation and reclamation in both the House and the Senate. He comes up to us at our hearings, and seated there without ever raising his voice, with the whole history of reclamation at his command, answers every question, dissolves every objection, and lays the groundwork for the arguments upon which those of us introduce the bills that he and his association arrange, build the credit which we receive when we go home.

I am happy here to greet Commissioner Page, and seated beside him I see his old boss, Dr. Work, former Secretary of the Interior.

I am glad to mention the Secretary of the Interior, and glad to mention Commissioner Page and Mr. Walter, whom I see here in the audience, head of the Denver bureau, because these men represent the continuing nonpartisan efforts of all who join in the movement to build up the West so that it shall become the home of an ever-increasing population, raising families, building schools, building churches, the very foundation of civilization. Without this cooperation from the executive arm, and in this compliment there must be included the present Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, who has displayed an understanding of the reclamation program that has never been excelled. [Applause.] And the President also—President Franklin D. Roosevelt—from whom he has received his inspiration and his direction. [Applause.]

THE GOLDEN AGE OF IRRIGATION

I say to you, my friends of the reclamation association, that the last 6 years in a very real sense represents the golden age of irrigation and reclamation under the agencies of the Federal Government.

Established in 1902 and fostered by all who have gone down from the West, the reclamation policy has experienced a steady growth. But in the last 6 years, from 1933 to date, there has been undertaken a program that exceeds all that has gone before. Twelve States have benefited, 33 projects have been undertaken, and works, the estimated cost of which amounts to $817,400,000, are now under construction.

What is the meaning of this? I did not come here to the reclamation association to tell you of the achievements of the Reclamation Bureau. You know those achievements better than I. You know the details of each of these different projects all through the country. I am talking to you about the large picture and the meaning it has for all of us; not only those who live in the West, but all who live anywhere in the broad expanse of the United States of America.

Reclamation, with its power plants, rural electrification carrying power into the distant and isolated towns, soil conservation, flood control, so well described to you by General Schley of the Army Engineers at one of your sessions, farm security, represented here by the members and directors of this region, farm security with its effort to save those who were the casualties of the great depression, and, finally, the Works Progress Administration using the labor of those who for the time being have been unable to find employment in normal lines, for the construction of irrigation projects where sponsors can be found; and so we look over the grand scope of all of these agencies working together for one great purpose, the building of farm homes.

The message that I would like to convey tonight is that that building of farm homes represents the basis upon which prosperity must be erected. The decline of agriculture has measured the failure of our economy to work, and until we find the means of putting the people back upon the land where they may have their own homes and raise their families, bringing into existence people like you, the salt of the earth, until that is done we cannot hope to solve the grave economic problems which confront us.

Sometimes, I think that because of old habits of thought we fail to realize what has been going on among us. In this period during which the reclamation movement has proceeded gradually from 1902 down to date, there has been going on another great change which has been taking the people away from the farm and carrying them to the city. How many are there who realize that in the last 40 years urban population has increased from only 17 percent of all the people of the United States until now it is over 56 percent? More important than that, the number of people who were classified by the Bureau of Census as rural inhabitants 40 years ago represented almost three-fourths of the entire population. Today they represent less than half.

INCREASE OF FARM TENANCY

More important than that, when more than 71 percent of all of the people lived upon the farms and agricultural workers represented most of the workers in the United States, almost 75 percent of all farm operators were the owners of the farms on which they worked. Today farm ownership has declined until it is scarcely 55 percent, and the number of tenant farmers 40 years ago, representing only about 25 percent of those who were operating farms, today represent almost 45 percent.

This is the change which has been going on among our population, a change which is marked by other startling facts. Do you realize that there are 3,000 counties plus in the United States, and that in 300 of those counties today are concentrated 71 percent of all wage earners and more than 80 percent of all who draw salaries? From the farm to the city. From the land upon which man can make his living with his own hands to the city pavement, where it is impossible for him to support himself and his family unless he has a job in industry and where he is economically free only so long as he can claim that job.

These are changes which have come over us almost without our knowledge, but they are marked by concentration of a character that must make us all pause, not in the sense of criticizing. Let me call to your attention what is to my mind one of the most striking comparisons that can be made.

There are 30 great corporations in the United States, 18 of them railroads or public-utility corporations, 12 of them financial insti-

tutions, each one of which has assets of $1,000,000,000 or more. All 30 together have assets in excess of $50,000,000,000. All of these corporations are efficient entities in our economic machinery. Their managers are doing a good job, but the amazing fact is that they are richer and more powerful than many States. There are 16 sovereign States in this Union, 16 of them, the total assessed property values of which do not amount to $1,000,000,000 each. Thirty great corporations with assets of over a billion dollars each, 16 sovereign States in which all of the assessed property within their boundaries all lumped together does not reach the value of a billion dollars.

More than that: There are 22 States, 22, in each of which all the real property is not worth a billion, 16 in which all property, real and personal, is not worth a billion each, and 22 in which real property alone does not reach that figure.

Here is the story of the decline of agriculture. Here is the story of the great change which has come over the United States. Here is the opportunity that is presented to all of us, you who follow private pursuits, those who are in the executive departments of government, and those of us who have the opportunity for a while to serve in the legislative branch of the Government, here is the chance to build up once more a union between the land and the people so that once again farm-home ownership may be reestablished throughout the United States.

NEW ERA HAS COME UPON THE WORLD

The whole world, I think, is entering upon a new era both here in the United States and abroad, a new era that may be difficult to see, hard, perhaps, to imagine, but a change has come. When this country of ours was founded a hundred and fifty years ago and nations were seeking to establish upon this continent and on other continents colonies from which they could draw raw materials, they were establishing an imperialism that depended upon the importation of commodities of all kinds, of spices, of gold and silver, and what-not from the colonies that were founded. With the coming of the industrial system and the building of factories, a transformation took place. Colonies were no longer valuable for the raw materials they could furnish to the mother land. They became valuable for the exportation of the manufactured goods of the mother land. A curious illustration of this situation is to be found in the development of India.

India, one of the colonies of Great Britain, was used first for her raw materials and later as a market for the exportation of the cotton and other textiles that the English mills manufactured. Beginning, however, about 25 or 30 years ago with improvement of machinery, Great Britain began to export her outworn and obsolete machines to India, and to her other colonies, and then there began to develop in India new industries which were competing with the old industries at home.

And so it is that in our day foreign trade has ceased to have the importance that it used to have. Any nation that now seeks to obtain control over foreign lands is shouldering a burden, because it is shouldering either the necessity for exploiting the inhabitants of the land it seizes or the burden of defending and protecting them. This change is exemplifying itself in every line of human activity whether constructive or destructive. People wonder why it is that upon the western front in Europe the war has been so long delayed. It is not such a great mystery when one considers what has really happened in the world.

In the old days wars were the conflicts of professional armies. They were the conflicts of leaders, military and political, who were seeking to subdue lands for the purpose of wresting their raw materials from them. We have seen the time come when wars are no longer the clash of professional armies, but the conflict of whole peoples.

Science and invention, the same science which makes it possible for my voice to go out over the radio tonight on the waves of ether unimaginable miles beyond this hall, that same science, that same invention with its accumulation of materials to make war has brought about such a change that neither of the general staffs, whether in Germany or in France and England, is willing to pay the price that must be paid if a general attack were made.

WE MUST MAINTAIN PEACE

Finally, it is dawning upon people that war is wholly death and destruction, that peace only is life and prosperity. That realization is clearly felt in Washington. The new aspect of war is so deeply understood that I can say to you tonight that there isn't a corporal's guard in either the Senate or the House who would be willing, under any circumstances, to permit this country of ours to be involved in the foreign war. [Applause.]

But the importance to you, the importance to me, the importance to the Western States, the importance to all of the States of the Union is that in this effort of reclamation undertaken here in the West, the United States is showing the way to all of the world how people may live by constructive rather than by destructive enterprise.

There is our opportunity: Cooperation. There are no classes in America. Industrialists, financial leaders, professional leaders, farmers, and workers of all kinds are bound together by one indestructible tie, and they must work together, not against one another.

In the development of the reclamation program you have one simple fact which tells the story of what this cooperation can do. On the reclamation projects of the United States the population of the little towns and communities are existing upon those projects and is three times the agricultural population of the projects. An agricultural population living on their own lands in their own homes can furnish business for a much larger nonagricultural population. A prosperous agriculture can make this whole Nation prosperous, and until agriculture is restored to complete prosperity there can be no general prosperity.

The great achievement of the National Reclamation Association is that you here in these Western States are showing how people, with their Representatives in Congress, their experts in the executive branch, carrying out the laws of Congress, and the farmers at home may work together to build for civilization and the future. [Applause.]

Hon. RALPH L. CARR. Senator O'MAHONEY, the representatives of all of the West thank you for leaving a sickbed to come to give us this message tonight. We shall always be grateful.

I call him "Joe." I was trying to be a newspaper man 30 years ago when he had already reached that position. He reformed and became a lawyer and then fell by the wayside and went to Congress. [Laughter.]

Strange parallel in our cases, using him as my example, I became what I laughingly refer to as a newspaper man, reformed as he did, tried to be a lawyer and failed, and now look at me! [Laughter.] [Applause.]

And we have a peculiar other condition with us tonight in the form of one of the great men of the West who started out and honestly went through with his early ambition, and as far back as 1895 became a part-owner in a newspaper in his own great town in the State of Montana, and fortunately for him he never reformed. He is still a newspaper man and today for the fifth time he was elected president at this eighth annual meeting—for the fifth time, mark you, he was elected president of this great organization.

I just can't make this clear, friends. I didn't intend to let politics get into this picture, but I am having an awfully hard time to find out for my own satisfaction how JOE O'MAHONEY, born in Chelsea, Mass., and the president of this association, born in that wonderful old State of New Hampshire, should be Democrats. [Laughter and applause.]

And by the same token I am wondering why it is they pass to me tonight the business of introducing a whole parcel of Democrats. Perhaps it is because I love them. I do. I want them to love me some more, too. [Laughter.]

But to get back to the man from Great Falls, Mont., the man who is the very epitome of everything of which we dream, those of us who look for the development of the West by the conservation of our resources by the construction of dams and canals and drainage ditches—O. S. Warden, the daddy of them all, president five times of this organization, Mr. Warden! [Applause.]

O. S. WARDEN. Governor Carr, Senator O'Mahoney, Mayor Stapleton, and friends of reclamation, and ladies and gentlemen, it was not intended that I should do anything in connection with this closing program of our eminently successful sessions here in Denver except to read some letters and present a memorial that we have prepared for your distinguished Member of Congress, EDWARD T. TAYLOR, but Governor Carr makes it necessary for me to say just a word along a personal line.

I am proud that our distinguished Senator O'MAHONEY and I came from back in that eastern country and that we have come out here to preach those great principles of democracy which he says, and which I believe, will save the Nation for Governor Carr. [Laughter and applause.]

Only a word more; it is true that I was born in the State of New Hampshire. It is true that when I finished my school at Dartmouth College I went to Montana intending to stay there for a little while and go back to Columbia Law School. If I had done that, perhaps I would be talking the same kind of stuff that Governor Carr is giving us here this evening. [Laughter.]

As it is, I deteriorated somewhat into being a newspaper man, and now as I come nearer to the end of my human existence, I am delighted to join hands with Senator O'MAHONEY and with Governor Carr and help to make these homes that we have heard described this evening.

I venture only one suggestion, and that is, I think Governor Carr has something on his conscience that is hurting him just a little bit. I think he belongs to a very wonderful minority. [Laughter.] I am going to do what I can to keep it that way. [Laughter.]

But I am willing here and there—once in a while—if we find a good Republican, to give him a few democratic votes (laughter), because that is what keeps democracy safe. I think it would be worth while for Governor Carr to go back and visit his old friend high up in the mountains. If he would sit down there and think it all over, I am not so sure but that he would come home and join the same party that Senator O'MAHONEY and I delight to serve. [Laughter.]

Liability to All Indigents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PALLADIUM-ITEM, RICHMOND, IND.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., on the 29th day of April 1940, which editorial follows:

[From the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind., April 29, 1940]

LIABILITY TO ALL INDIGENTS

When a citizen possessing two automobiles appeals to his township trustee for relief to keep his wife and children from going hungry, the taxpayers who dig into their pockets for relief funds have a just right to kick.

At South Bend an unemployed man regained a place on relief lists after being cut off when he pleaded his family was in need. While making this plea he refused to surrender license plates to a passenger sedan being bought by monthly payments, and admitted ownership of a truck being operated on borrowed license plates.

This reliefer told the township trustee his car payments were being met by a C. I. O. leader at South Bend, while the same leader and others were contributing gasoline. Although on relief or public works most of the time since 1930, the indigent two-car owner refused to divulge the amount of his earnings with his truck.

Abuses of this kind cast a shadow over the entire relief system. The family of this "chiseler" is being supported by earnings of many taxpayers who own no automobiles, but have their money invested in homes upon which heavy taxes are assessed. This tax bill is high these days largely because of public relief in its many forms.

The idea has grown in recent years that the Government owes its citizens a living. Persons inclined to adopt this form of thinking must remember that the Government is the people. There is no magic about Government financing. Most funds expended by Government must be raised by levy on men and women who work for a living. These workers are not obligated to provide soft living for others.

Thomas Sanders McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS SANDERS MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of my colleague, the Honorable THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, the State of South Carolina has lost one of its most beloved citizens and Congress one of its most valuable Members.

"Tommie," as he was affectionately called by his numerous friends and colleagues, possessed that type of character and friendly personality which endeared him not only to his friends, but to all those with whom he came in contact.

This was wonderfully demonstrated to me on one occasion when I had the privilege and pleasure of visiting his home city, Charleston, S. C., on an occasion when President Roosevelt visited this old, historic city.

On a parade through the streets of the city and navy yard I had the privilege of riding in the car with my colleague. The streets were lined with his friends and constituents, and Tommie, with his hat in his hand, was continuously saluting them with that gracious, friendly smile and with that friendly greeting which he used so often on the floor of the House, "Hey, Buddy!" On the other hand, there was the joyous shouting on the part of my colleague's friends and constituents with that well-known and commonly used greeting, "Hey, Tommie!"

Prior to the convening of the extra session, Tommie had made a visit to Europe. I remember so plainly, and always shall, when we met in extra session, he came over and spoke to me and our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina, BUTLER HARE. With that gracious, friendly smile, so characteristic of him, using both hands in speaking to us, he said, "Hey, Buddy!"

I shall always remember him as he looked upon us at that time, because it so perfectly displayed a heart overflowing with friendship, carrying with it sunshine and that which would tend to make life worth while.

I attended his funeral at old Charleston, and the large attendance from all over the State indicated the high esteem in which he was held in the hearts of his friends and his fellow South Carolinians.

Tommie was a man of splendid ability, and he was devoted to his unselfish service to his people, his home city of Charleston, and to South Carolina.

Soon after coming to Congress he was made chairman of a very important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, where he had the privilege of distinguishing himself as a leader in piloting many important appropriation bills through the House.

Our colleague will answer the call of duty no more. He has answered the summons of the highest of all tribunals, and all of his colleagues can testify that he served his State and country well.

The influence of his upright and unselfish character, his loyalty and his devotion to his country will remain, as will his memory in the hearts of those with whom he served.

As a friend, along with his loved ones, and his many friends in South Carolina, I mourn his untimely death and extend to his bereaved family my heartfelt sympathy. His, as stated, was always a friendly greeting and with a smile.

Sleep on, dear friend, such lives as thine
Have not been lived in vain,
But shed an influence rare, divine,
On lives that still remain.

You remember Jesus said, "I go to prepare a place for you." The glorious thought that I have and that I would like to leave with his loved ones and his many friends is that today Tommie is enjoying the privileges and pleasures of a beautiful heavenly home prepared for those who love the Lord, and the years will not be many before we shall be privileged to see and be with him again.

'Tis easy enough to be pleasant
When life flows by like a song;
But the man worth while is the man who will smile
When everything goes dead wrong;
For the test of the heart is trouble,
And it always comes with the years;
But the smile that is worth the praise of the earth
Is the smile that comes through tears.

Samuel Davis McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of the Honorable SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Judge MCREYNOLDS was deeply felt by his colleagues in the House

of Representatives, by those who knew him, and especially by his friends in Tennessee; and as a part of my remarks I shall quote the resolution adopted by the bar association of the city of Chattanooga on the 2d day of August 1939:

SAMUEL DAVIS M'REYNOLDS, APRIL 16, 1872–JULY 11, 1939

To the Chattanooga Bar Association:

Your memorial committee begs leave to submit to you for consideration and action thereon the following relating to the life and achievements of SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, long on the membership roll of this bar, although for many years not an active practitioner, due to the fact that he had devoted the last 36 years of his life to public service.

SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, generally called Judge MCREYNOLDS, and by his intimate personal friends called SAM MCREYNOLDS, was born on a farm April 16, 1872, in Bledsoe County, near Pikeville, Tenn. He was the son of Isaac S. and Addie Davis McReynolds.

He attended the Peoples College at Pikeville, Tenn., which was a denominational school, being supported by and under the auspices of the Southern Methodist Church. This college maintained primary grades, secondary, and higher grades of learning. He never attended any other college or school, except the law department of Cumberland University, at Lebanon, Tenn., from which he graduated with the degree of doctor of laws with the class of 1893, at the age of 21.

Two of his classmates in the Peoples College at Pikeville were T. W. Stanfield and J. Lon Foust. The friendship and mutual admiration of these schoolboys deepened as the years passed without a ripple to mar this long, golden friendship. Mr. Stanfield successfully managed every political race for office made by Judge MCREYNOLDS.

Soon after graduating from the Lebanon Law School, SAM MCREYNOLDS was appointed assistant district attorney under Attorney General George W. Sutton of the sixth judicial circuit of Tennessee. When his tenure as assistant attorney general ended, he came to Chattanooga and entered the practice of law. Soon he entered into a law partnership with the late John H. Cantrell. This is the only law partnership that Judge MCREYNOLDS ever entered into and ended in 1903, when he (MCREYNOLDS) was appointed judge of the criminal court circuit comprising the counties of Hamilton, Sequatchie, Marion, and Franklin, which court was created by chapter 361 of the Acts of the State of Tennessee, passed by the fifty-third general assembly and approved April 15, 1903, by James B. Frazier, Governor. This appointment was until September 1, 1904, "and until his successor is elected and qualified." He succeeded himself in the successive elections until he was elected to Congress in 1922. He was elected to the Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, and Seventy-sixth Congresses.

Cordell Hull and SAM MCREYNOLDS were coworkers and close friends in the Congresses, each watching after the political interests of the other. It was upon the advice of Hull that MCREYNOLDS sought and was given an appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee. He served faithfully and well as a member of that committee. In 1932, upon the death of Charles Linthicum of Maryland, MCREYNOLDS was elevated to the chairmanship of said committee. As chairman of the committee he was in position to and did render great service to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull in conducting important diplomatic foreign relationships. Because of his knowledge of foreign affairs, President Roosevelt appointed him a delegate to the International Monetary and Economic Conference held in London in June 1933.

Judge MCREYNOLDS was an inveterate worker. His friends warned him that his health was being impaired and life threatened by his constant attention to his arduous responsibilities and admonished him to take it a little more easily; but his desire to serve his constituency and his country drove him inexorably on. He was forced finally to enter a hospital but his condition grew worse, and on Tuesday morning, July 11, 1939, he died in Washington, D. C., survived by his widow, Mary McReynolds (nee Davenport), whom he married March 1, 1910, and a daughter, Margaret, now Mrs. Darrell St. Claire, to whom two daughters have been born.

SAM MCREYNOLDS achieved his distinction and political preferment through hard work and fidelity to duty. His was an aristocracy of service. He was a lifelong Democrat, but he served his constituency honestly, efficiently, and impartially, whether of his political faith or not. When appealed to for help in getting a job for an individual, or for legislation he felt was for the good of his people, or for appropriations for projects, worthy in his estimation, he did his very best to get what was wanted. He had the high virtue of following through, so often lacking in public servants, especially in the legislative branch of our Government. He was fair to every faction, true to every trust, faithful to every friend, and loyal to the last.

Therefore, premises considered, be it

Resolved by the Chattanooga Bar Association, That it, and each member thereof, has suffered an irreparable loss in the death of SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, which is shared in by all the people whom he served long and well: Be it further

Resolved, That the members, collectively and individually, of this association extend his widow, his child, and his grandchildren deep sympathy in their great bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be furnished to the family of deceased; also a copy be presented to each of the courts of Hamilton County and to the court of appeals and the supreme court at Knoxville, and to the Federal district court at Chattanooga; also to the Chattanooga press: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the request that the same be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

W. E. WILKERSON,
Chairman.
J. L. LEVINE,
SILAS WILLIAMS,
Memorial Committee.

Santiago Iglesias

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public services of Hon. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, late Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, it was with extreme regret that the Members of the House of Representatives heard of the death of Mr. IGLESIAS on December 5, 1939. During the time that he had represented Puerto Rico as Resident Commissioner, in the Congress of the United States, the Members had become attached to him very much and had recognized in him those sterling qualities which made him such a valuable representative for the Territory of Puerto Rico.

As chairman of the Committee on Memorials, I desire to make as part of my remarks, and quote, two resolutions which I have received. The first is from the Honorable Gildo Masso, acting chairman of the council of deans of the University of Puerto Rico, and the second is a resolution adopted by the National Woman's Party at its biennial conference, which resolution was adopted on the 16th day of December 1939.

RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL OF DEANS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO AT A MEETING HELD DECEMBER 6, 1939, REGARDING THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE SANTIAGO IGLESIAS

Whereas the Honorable SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico in the National Congress, passed away in the early hours of December 5, 1939;

Whereas the distinguished public man consecrated his life to dignify and to orient the forces of organized labor as a vital factor in the economic and social structure of our people;

Whereas Mr. IGLESIAS was a notable promoter of inter-American relations;

Whereas his death has deeply moved the Puerto Rican community; and

Whereas the Council of Deans of the University of Puerto Rico is thoroughly aware of the import of this regrettable loss: Now, therefore, this council at its first meeting after the sad event

Resolves, First, to participate in the country's mourning and to express its condolence publicly.

Second. To suspend all public extracurricular activities in the University of Puerto Rico during the period of official mourning set by the Honorable Governor of Puerto and to adopt other measures deemed necessary to express the sympathy of this university.

Third. To send copies of this resolution to the relatives of the deceased and to those institutions with which he was closely connected.

GILDO MASSÓ, *Acting Chairman.*

RESOLUTION OF BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, 1939, NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY, DECEMBER 16, 1939

Whereas Commissioner IGLESIAS, Puerto Rican Delegate in the United States Congress, a stanch friend of equal rights for men and women, and a consistent and active supporter of all such measures in the Congress of the United States, has recently passed away;

Resolved, That the Biennial Conference of the National Woman's Party records its sorrow at the loss of this friend and its gratitude for the memory of his devotion to their cause; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the family of the Commissioner, to the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives of the Puerto Rican Legislature.

America's Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered at Boston by Postmaster General Farley, entitled, "America's Road to Peace."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I passed by the Boston Common tonight I was impressed with its calm and peaceful atmosphere. To every American the sight of Boston Common, or even the mention of its name, revives the heroic splendor of your Revolutionary patriots; patriots whose deeds have consecrated this ground as a perpetual shrine to brave men willing to give their lives to preserve their right to live and govern themselves as they see fit.

It is my earnest prayer that Boston Common will continue to wear the halo of peace which surrounds it tonight. But I am positive, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that should the welfare of this Nation ever be threatened by the aggression of a foreign invader, the soul of Boston Common will instantly vibrate with the rhythmic marching of completely equipped, determined young Americans.

There were periods in this Nation's history when the discussion and adjustment of international relations were confined almost exclusively to our diplomatic experts. But today, under the humanitarian leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, every American citizen, from Main Street to Broadway, inclusive, has a voice in the direction of the foreign policy of this Nation and a hand in shaping its future destiny.

We have a good deal to do, by the way, with just this subject in the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department, as you know, has one of the largest international businesses in the world. To us international relations are not matters of diplomatic exchange. They have to do with how we can get the mails from the United States to every country in the world, and how every country in the world can get the mail to us. We know that a nation which cannot communicate freely is a nation imprisoned within its national boundaries, and we know that for centuries civilization has been working toward wider and not more confined international contacts.

The present administration has never considered international relations as a political matter. Americans may differ about things here, and we do. It is our sacred right. But when we look outward and face the world we are one country, and our debates here are nobody's business except our own. I am very sure that no American wants any foreign country to attempt to influence our politics in the slightest degree. We are quite capable of doing that for ourselves. It is good democracy to be deciding international policies, as well as other policies, by a process of free and open discussion. But when the Government speaks, it speaks with but one voice, for all Americans, and it is our duty as Americans to support that decision without reserve. I think every American citizen feels that and knows it.

The first end and aim of this Government has been to make sure that the United States is safe at all times and in all quarters. Whatever else happens, we must begin there. This is particularly true when other nations are at war. The ability to keep this country at peace depends not on wishing for peace but on being able to defend ourselves if anyone tries to break it. There is nothing new about this simple principle. It is as old as the Republic. Students of American history will point out that Alexander Hamilton argued for the adoption of the Constitution partly because it would put this country in a position where it could build up a strong national defense.

Other countries were at war then, as they are now, and it was the intent and aim of the United States at that time to remain neutral. But you cannot stay neutral very long if anyone can cross your borders or violate your waters at will. It was then that Hamilton made his now famous remark in reply to a critic. The critic had insisted that if we went to work to build up our Army and Navy and national defense, we were taking a step toward war and away from neutrality. Hamilton's response was: "A nation despicable in its weakness forfeits even the right to neutrality." The history of the past few years in Europe sheds much light on the wisdom of his remark.

The safety and security of the United States depend on something more important than mere possession of guns and ships and airplanes. We need those, of course. But we need something more. The first principle of American safety is that no overseas power shall gain a foothold in the New World. Defense is a fairly simple matter if the nearest potential enemy is 3,000 miles or more across the water. It is not so simple if he has a base of operations on this side of either the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean. Consequently we have to watch constantly to make sure that no such base is permitted to exist.

That is not a new doctrine. It was outlined by President Jefferson. It was set out in the Monroe Doctrine. It was the reason why President Cleveland let drive at the British when they appeared to be acquiring territory in Venezuela nearly 50 years ago.

The simplest, the best, and the most sensible way of making sure that no overseas power crosses the American base line is to see to it that everybody on this side of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans is our friend. Actually, the 20 other American republics have the same interest that we have. They propose to be safe if they can. They, too, are safe if the American base line is not crossed. And so, partly by good fortune and partly by good policy, we have a situation in which all of the independent nations of the New World want the same thing. The common sense of the situation was that we should all work together to see that we all get it. That has been the heart of the Pan American policy of this Government.

President Roosevelt, foreseeing the possible outbreak of European war, took the initiative in calling a Pan American conference in Buenos Aires in 1936, and got the work started. At the inter-American conference in Lima in 1938, Secretary Hull took it still further. The result is that all of the nations of this hemisphere made the agreement that any threat from outside this hemisphere to the peace or territorial integrity of any American country was the concern of all. In other words, the world was served with notice that the American base line shall not be crossed by any outsider. As you know, Europe did go to war a few months later; and we all got together in Panama a few days thereafter to work out the necessary means of keeping the Americas out of war and of protecting our neutrality. We had no illusions about it. Keeping neutral is mighty hard work, and it is not to be done by being weak.

I would like to carry this thought a little further. We know that while other nations are fighting each other, none of them would be particularly interested to attack us. But we cannot tell what will happen. The common sense of the situation is that we must be ready to meet any challenge to our security. That is why I am for the bringing of our Army and our Navy to the fullest possible measure of preparation; and that does not merely mean having men and ships in good working order.

It means having arrangements made so that we can manufacture rifles and aircraft, guns, planes, and shells, and whatever else we may need. If everyone knows that we have the ability and the determination to take care of ourselves, we shall not likely be called on to use the preparations we make. But we have seen plenty of situations in the last few months in which nations relied on their innocence to save them—and it has not been a very safe defense.

This also means that we have to lend such friendly assistance as we can to our neighbors on this hemisphere. Every once in a while someone says that we ought to let our American neighbors take care of themselves; that we should stick strictly to the United States. It is a good argument as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. While it is true that the other American nations need us, it is equally true that we need them. The defense of the Western Hemisphere is a cooperative proposition. For that reason I have not grudged the money that we have spent in assisting our southern neighbors to develop their own resources for the production of noncompetitive supplies, like rubber, that we need. Moreover, one of the things that has been learned in the past few years is that the more our friends to the south are developed and assisted, the better business we have with them. I do not think that you will find many businessmen who want to change the good-neighbor policy. In fact, I can say with assurance that no political party will ever change the good-neighbor policy as long as it rests upon mutual cooperation.

If we are safe in the Americas first, we can then think of events beyond the seas. Now, matters overseas are not happy, and there is no way we can make them so. There is a tragic conflict going on in Asia. Europe is tearing itself to pieces in a war which has been steadily spreading to all parts of that unfortunate continent. To most Americans, who have lived their lives in a peaceful atmosphere, the whole business is a dreadful nightmare. We know it happens in Europe ever so often. We do know also that the United States does not propose to get mixed up in the system of Europe. We have not had these periodic earthquakes of war on this side of the water; and we do not propose or wish to get into a position which ties us in any way into these affairs.

For one thing, this country has lived through several such periods before. While the country was being born, a gigantic struggle was going on in Europe; and since at that time much of North America belonged to Europe, we had fragments of the war on this side of the Atlantic. Less than 20 years after we had declared our independence, Europe headed into the wars of Napoleon, which lasted until 1815. These wars involved a large part of the Western World before they ended. So you can see that the present situation is not a new thing. We have had some experience in riding out these storms.

But it does take extremely careful handling. I think the record of the present administration in keeping America out of war is

remarkably outstanding. The President and Secretary Hull foresaw the situation long before many people wanted to face the ugly fact that war seemed inevitable. We have been building up the Army and Navy. We shall have to do so still more. But we have also arranged our neutrality laws and taken care of our shipping. The result of that has been that in the first 7 months of war the United States has not lost a life or a ship, and that even the incidental inconveniences which cannot be avoided have been reduced to a minimum.

Our first line of defense is to avoid possibilities of involvement. But when that is said, we have to face another unpleasant fact. Here I am getting ahead of the story. I don't apologize for that, because it is the business of a party leader to be a little ahead of the story. One of his recognized obligations is to be sure that there is general agreement when the time comes, so that any needed action can be promptly taken.

The unpleasant fact is that the situation abroad may change at any time. No one of us is bright enough to figure the situation out ahead of time. You cannot take anything for granted in this insane war business. For that reason I hope that every American will keep constantly in mind the necessity for making sure that the war shall not cross the American base line. If it ever does, I don't think that we should be in the position of hesitating or wobbling for a moment. We must stand ready to take whatever measures may be needed, and take them at once.

But we must also have a long-range view. Wars do not last forever. Eventually the world will have to settle down to some sort of peace basis. We shall be in the world, and the basis of peace will affect us. It will do so because there is no known way of building a fence around this hemisphere. Other nations want to buy things here, and we want to sell them. Many of our people have relatives and friends beyond the sea. In commerce the western world is very closely knit together. If you cut us off from our European markets, the southern cotton workers and cotton planters go hungry. If you cut off Europe from much of our food and metals, the European farms and factories find themselves in trouble.

Because of that the United States has to work constantly toward a world which will be at peace and in which commerce can flow freely. We have made a beginning on that with the trade agreements which Secretary Hull has been negotiating. We have kept our communications through the Post Office Department freer than any other system of communication in the world. We have avoided, in general, the vicious crime of hatred. We are still working toward a world which aims at protecting human life, and not at destroying it.

On a common-sense basis, therefore, I think all Americans can agree on a program which President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, and the officers of this Government, have carefully and firmly followed; and which has been carried out by every part of the Government, from the Postmaster General's office to the War Department. The program is simple. Anyone can understand it; nobody needs to be afraid of it. It is simply this:

Complete preparedness for American defense.

Complete exclusion of aggression or war from the Western Hemisphere.

Assistance, when necessary, to our American neighbors.

Maintenance of American neutrality and noninvolvement, without surrender of American rights.

Steady work toward mutually beneficial commercial relations with those parts of the world which will go along with us in the way of peace.

Steady insistence that the American interest calls for a world which wants peace, believes in peace, practices peace, and is willing to accept international law and good neighborship as the only means of getting it.

Without being experts in foreign affairs, all of us can understand that, and all of us can work for it. There must be no political divisions in foreign affairs. There must be no foreign influence in American politics. In foreign relations there is but one America, taking care of all Americans, and supported without reserve by every American citizen.

Recreational Opportunities in the Tennessee Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY E. S. DRAPER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject New Recreational Opportunities in the Tennessee Valley, delivered by E. S. Draper, Director, Department of Regional Planning Studies, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the southeastern meeting of the American Automobile Association, Knoxville, Tenn., April 22, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the standpoint of effectiveness, I can think of no organization I would rather address on the subject of recreation than the American Automobile Association, for it is the automobile, in my opinion, that is the greatest single factor responsible for the rapid rise of recreation as a major American industry.

With 25,000,000 passenger cars in America today—an average of 1 car for every 5 persons—with nearly half a million miles of highways in our State and Federal systems, and with the inherent curiosity and restlessness of the American citizen, it is no wonder that the provision of goods and services for tourists and other recreation seekers has become almost overnight a major source of income and employment for hundreds of thousands. New England, which has taken the lead in the regional approach to converting recreation into income, values its annual tourist crop at $500,000,000. You are no doubt familiar, through your own publications, with the United States Travel Bureau estimates of the value of tourism to the various States.

So the South, urgently in need of new sources of income, is becoming increasingly aware of the economic value of its recreational resources.

Let me tell you something of what the Tennessee Valley Authority is doing to assist in the development of the rich recreational possibilities of this region.

T. V. A. is a regional development agency. It has for its over-all objective the setting in motion of forces that will lead to the improvement of the social and economic well-being of the region it serves, and hence of the Nation as a whole.

The core of the regional development program is the unified development of the Tennessee River system, which calls for a series of 9 dams on the Tennessee River proper and 2 dams, Norris and Hiwassee, on its tributaries. Of these 11 dams, 2 were here when T. V. A. took over—Hales Bar Dam, 20 miles below Chattanooga, privately owned, and the well-known wartime Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals. Since 1933 T. V. A. has completed Norris, Chickamauga, Guntersville, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, with Hiwassee Dam virtually completed, and work now under way on Watts Bar and Kentucky Dams. Work will begin shortly on the last of the main-river dams, Coulter Shoals, which will create a lake within sight of this very hotel in which we are assembled.

In addition to these nine dams, located as shown on this map in four States, the Authority has recently acquired through purchase from the Tennessee Electric Power Co. a number of smaller dams and reservoirs on other tributaries in Tennessee and Georgia.

Now, what does all of this mean in terms of recreation? It means that where once flowed the muddy Tennessee—swirling viciously out of its banks at times of flood, shriveling up almost to a series of stagnant pools in time of drought—there is now being formed a 650-mile chain of interconnected deep-water lakes. And on the tributaries are the storage reservoirs, their sparkling blue waters reflecting the tree-clad slopes of their mountain backgrounds.

It means that in a region rich in all other scenic attractions—the highest mountains in eastern America; waterfalls, some twice as high as Niagara; the beautiful rolling hills of the valley of east Tennessee; the spectacular, rugged cliffs of the Cumberland escarpment—to all these and more has been added the one scenic feature that Nature forgot—lakes. In my own experience in 25 years of concern with recreational developments in the South the one main feature most needed in a recreational development is a body of water suitable for swimming, boating, fishing, and other water-use activities.

The T. V. A. river-development program means the creation of a chain of lakes whose total surface will exceed 500,000 acres, with an aggregate shore line of 6,000 miles, a total shore line equal to the highway distance from New York City to Los Angeles and return. Kentucky Lake alone, which will stretch across virtually the entire north-south breadth of western Kentucky and Tennessee, will have a shore line longer than that of Lake Michigan.

But the size of these lakes is not in itself their most significant recreational aspect. Each reservoir, other than those developed before the advent of T. V. A., is surrounded by a protective land strip of varying width. Most significant is the fact that every acre of water surface and every mile of shore line acquired by T. V. A. are held in public ownership. And they are being conserved and developed not to enrich any single individual or corporation, but to meet the requirements of the public at large.

Recreation, of course, is but one of the many uses of the multipurpose reservoirs and their publicly owned shorelands. Although a byproduct of the great dams, the recreation development of T. V. A. properties is exerting a tremendous influence on the region.

Our first line of contact with the recreation public is the very dams themselves. In all, more than 5,000,000 persons have visited the construction projects. At Norris Dam, perhaps the symbol of T. V. A. in the public mind, we have had approximately

three-quarters of a million visitors annually for the past several years. This is comparable to last year's attendance at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the second most popular national park, and undoutbedly the dam and park, only 65 miles apart, complement each other to constitute a dual tourist objective.

Several weeks ago the gates of Chickamauga Dam were closed and the lake began to form. On the second Sunday after the lake was up, 14,000 were counted. Relatively heavy attendance at other dams has been recorded.

The economic significance of these figures is tremendous. Seventy-five percent of the visitors who registered at Norris Dam came from beyond the borders of the State of Tennessee. Hundreds of cars crossing the dam bear license plates from the Illinois-Indiana-Ohio tier of States; undoubtedly many of them were routed to Norris Dam by the A. A. A. tour service.

By applying less than one-half of the A. A. A. tourist expenditure index of $6.40 per day per person—say, $3 per person—we get a figure of $2,250,000 annually spent by visitors to Norris Dam. And Norris is but one of the 11 dams in the T. V. A. system.

On the other side of the balance sheet, what do we do for these millions of visitors to T. V. A. projects? As custodians of public property, we eagerly recognize the obligation to provide the services and accommodations to which the American people, as owners of the property, are entitled. The size and scale of these gigantic dams and powerhouses demand an adequate setting, a treatment of the surroundings fitting the importance of the undertaking. Provision of high standards of public construction and operation will serve to stimulate like standards in visitor accommodations rapidly building through private initiative. Evidences of that are at hand.

That is why, when you visit Norris Dam, you will see the entire surroundings attractively landscaped, regulated parking spaces for 650 automobiles, information headquarters, a refreshment counter, spic-and-span rest rooms, and a craft shop which deals in locally made handicrafts.

Our second point of contact with the tourist is at the many parks and boat docks that dot the shores of the lakes. In establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority, Congress directed the President to undertake such demonstrations as seemed necessary to aid the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the valley. This mandate has, by Executive order, been delegated to the T. V. A.

To that end, the Authority has constructed a number of demonstration parks on its properties. We started with Norris and Big Ridge, both on Norris Lake. Each of these parks is provided with vacation cabins, a lodge and restaurant, and various facilities for outdoor activities such as horseback riding, hiking, and ball games. At Norris there is in addition a trailer parking area, and at Big Ridge there are a bathing beach and a bathhouse.

Results have been highly gratifying. Approximately 100,000 persons visited Norris Park during the past season, some of them on picnics, others on extended vacations, some as overnight guests en route to other destinations. During the 1938 season, 4,500 guests spent a total of 11,000 person-nights in the 25 cabins. The trailer camp accommodated 900 visitors for nearly 1,600 person-nights. Across the dam, the park includes accommodations for 200 boats at the boat harbor, the scene of an annual Labor Day regatta, drawing as many as 20,000 spectators.

At Big Ridge Park, where, unlike Norris, a 10-cent admission fee is charged on weekends and holidays, paid admissions alone totaled around 20,000 persons, with 14,000 paying an additional 15-cent charge for bathhouse privileges. During the 1938 season the cabins at Big Ridge were occupied by 1,200 persons for 7,000 person-nights. Cabins at both parks are often reserved long in advance, many occupants coming from distant States.

As demonstrations, those two parks have been highly successful. They demonstrated the need and demand for such recreation areas in an area where country parks were comparatively unknown. They demonstrated that such parks can be paying propositions; income at both Norris and Big Ridge Parks exceeds operating expenses. Furthermore, the parks provided a demonstration of standards of design.

In the opinion of recognized park authorities, the States of the Tennessee Valley region have, during the 7-year period from 1933 to date, made the greatest advance of any of the States in the Union in the provision of State park facilities. In Tennessee alone, for example, there was but one area that went by the name of State park. Today, with a network of 16 parks and forests, the Tennessee State park system is being developed into one of the finest in the Nation. It is generally admitted that the stimulation given to park and conservation activities during this period and the effective cooperation of T. V. A., N. P. S., and C. C. C. with the States of the valley has produced remarkable results. As one national-park official stated, a 5-year span has seen 25 years of progress.

I have described Norris parks in some detail because on Wednesday you will have an opportunity to see for yourselves some of these developments of which I have spoken.

There are, of course, other parks. At Pickwick Dam there is a park operated by a concessionaire, who has converted the hospital of construction camp days into an attractive resort hotel. This recreation area is but a few miles from Shiloh National Military Park, for years a prominent tourist objective; undoubtedly each park will contribute to the increased attendance at the other. At Wilson and Wheeler dams are several day-outing parks, including one for Negroes. In fact, no lake in the entire Tennessee River system will be without its fair share of recreational development.

There is also the Norris Freeway, a demonstration of a limited-access, high-speed tourist highway. Built primarily to provide access to the dam during construction, the road was designed also to meet the heavy recreation demands expected after completion of the dam. On this road we have applied freeway principles to a rural highway. The right-of-way is 250 feet, grades and curves have been kept to a minimum, consistent with the topography. In our landscape treatment the natural characteristics of the countryside were considered all important and were preserved by agreement with owners of abutting property. It is significant that the interest in freeways and limited-access highways in the United States has progressed by leaps and bounds since this demonstration freeway was observed by millions of motorists driving over it to visit the dam.

I should like to say at this point that I am in entire sympathy with the policies of the American Automobile Association regarding free-way legislation and roadside control. By adopting such policies, the association, being the unified voice of the American motorist, strongly demonstrates that the motorist today demands that the roadside be considered as much a part of the highway as the pavement itself; that the motorist demands, both in the interest of safety and scenic effect, a protected highway.

Having shown—through our experience at Norris and Big Bridge Parks, through our day-outing parks in the Muscle Shoals area, through our boat docks, visitors' facilities at dams and powerhouses, through the Norris freeway demonstration—that there exists a strong demand, both from residents of the region and from tourists, for recreational facilities, we must now step out of the demonstration role as developer of major recreational areas.

During the several years of demonstrational development of areas of State-park caliber, we have been working closely with State and local agencies. Quick to realize the importance and the significance, both social and economic, of this program, the Tennessee Valley States geared themselves to the task of developing their own park systems. Soon State parks, cooperatively developed by the C. C. C., the National Park Service, and the proper State agencies, were under way. I shall describe several interesting examples developed on lake-front lands leased from the T. V. A.

Those of you who came to Knoxville over United States Highway No. 25–W saw the development at Caryville, Tenn., where the highway bridges an arm of Norris Lake. In an ideal mountain-lake setting on this important north-south tourist route, on lands leased from T. V. A. at a dollar a year, and on additional lands donated by far-sighted citizens of the community, the State is developing a 900-acre park that will provide a tourist camp and related facilities as well as recreation facilities for residents of the immediate vicinity.

Where United States Highway No. 27, another important inter-regional tourist route, skirts an arm of Chickamauga Lake at Soddy, Tenn., several public agencies are cooperatively developing Soddy Marine Park. This, too, will unquestionably prove to be a popular stopping place for tourists. Personally, I look forward to the day when the residents of the Soddy community will find that recreation supplies the economic base that was lost when coal mining in the adjacent Cumberland Mountains was all but abandoned and the cut-over forest lands of the plateau represented a constantly dwindling source of revenue.

Also on Chickamauga Lake two of the most significant parks in the South are being built by the State conservation department on T. V. A. land through cooperation with the National Park Service and the C. C. C. These parks—obviously direct descendants of Norris and Big Ridge—are Harrison Bay State Park and Booker T. Washington State Park, the latter for Negroes. Both parks, when complete, will have such facilities as bathing beaches, playfields, lodge, and vacation cabins. Harrison Bay State Park will have a boat harbor with a capacity of 1,000 boats. I am told that this will be the largest pleasure-boat harbor on the 8,700-mile inland-waterway system of the United States. And the boats will be there—don't worry. Chattanooga expects the number of boats on Chickamauga Lake to exceed Norris.

Connecting Harrison Bay Park with Chattanooga, 10 miles away, is the Harrison Freeway, another direct result of our demonstration work.

Hiwassee Lake, in North Carolina, will also have its recreational developments. As the entire lake lies within the boundaries of the Nantahala National Forest, responsibility for recreation development has been accepted by the United States Forest Service, which, as you know, has a strong recreation program.

The city of Guntersville, Ala., on a 2-mile-long peninsula, jutting out into the blue waters of Guntersville Lake, is building a municipal boat harbor and water-front park. About a year ago Guntersville awoke one morning to find that it had a brand new resource base. The impounded waters of the reservoir had risen and the city had scheduled a dedication ceremony. Motorboat races were the main attraction on the program. Before that day was over, the largest crowd ever to attend a sports event in northern Alabama, a crowd estimated at more than 50,000 persons, had jammed into that little river town of 2,800 normal population. Waters of the lake, spouting outboard motors, cruisers, and yachts, where bottom lands formerly were devoted to corn, may be the harbinger of a new day.

Out of all this vast recreation development along the entire T. V. A. chain of lakes, there is one big question that arises—what is its effect on the region in terms of economic benefit?

Rather than generalize on the well-known fact that millions of dollars are being spent in the region for recreation, I should like to suggest the dollars and cents value of the T. V. A. recreation program by citing a few concrete examples.

We know that an average of 300 persons from far and near fish in Norris Lake every day. On the basis of interviews with these fishermen, we estimate that the average expenditure is between five and six dollars per day. Three hundred fishermen times five or six dollars is between $1,500 and $1,800 per day—between five and seven hundred thousands dollars a year. And there are plenty of fish in the other T. V. A. lakes—and plenty of fishermen after them.

In Morgan County, Ala., nearly twice as many State fishing licenses are sold as in any other county in the State, with the exception of Jefferson, the county in which populous Birmingham is situated. Morgan County borders the 60,000-acre T. V. A. Wheeler Lake.

A hardware dealer in Corinth, Miss., reported that he pays the entire overhead of his establishment by the sale of fishing tackle, most of which is sold for use on Pickwick Lake, 22 miles away.

Nine stores in the vicinity of Norris Lake reported that their sales of fishing tackle in 1939 were on the average 1,255 percent over the sales of 1935, one store alone reporting a 2,000-percent increase.

Boating: At the last count there were 1,800 boats on Norris Lake, ranging from the lowly rowboat to the majestic 40-foot cabin cruiser. Total value of these boats was placed by their owners at well over a quarter of a million dollars. The fact that most of this is new recreation business—not transferred but new—is shown by the growth in number of marine sales and service shops in Knoxville. In 1934 there were 2; 5 years later there were 9.

These are, of course, but isolated instances of the economic importance of the recreational development of the Authority's own properties. But what of regional recreation development? The viewpoint of recreation as an industry is a development of modern times.

So it was quite logical that our studies and surveys looking into regional possibilities by which the people of the Tennessee Valley could improve their opportunities should consider the relationships of the region's resource base to recreation.

In our regional recreation studies of the valley we have taken for our major premise the tenet that scenery is a resource. It is. However, unlike coal or oil, it is permanent; it cannot be used up or exhausted. But it can be, and all too often is, wasted or despoiled. A perfectly beautiful natural scenic area is thrown open for colonization and development by the building of a new highway. I do not have to describe to you the results where no control exists. You see it along most of our major highways.

As with any business firm opening up a new territory, our first major regional survey was an inventory. We took stock of the scenic and recreational resources, existing and potential, in our field of operation. From this exhaustive survey there emerged the published report "Scenic Resources of the Tennessee Valley." Thousands of copies of this volume were distributed to Government agencies, schools, libraries, newspapers, and other agencies. Copies were sent to the Washington headquarters of the American Automobile Association and to every affiliate and branch in the seven Valley States and are now on sale at all our dams.

Response to this publication was highly gratifying, particularly in terms of results. A number of the recreational areas described as "potential" have been developed, with others under consideration by State and local governments and by civic-minded citizen groups.

Incidentally, in commenting on this publication, the New York Times had this to say about scenery as a resource:

"Our forefathers would have scratched their heads in wonderment if they had come across such an expression as 'scenic resources.' Of course they weren't blind to natural beauty. Those who had time and gifts of self-expression were writing of it and trying to paint it more than a century ago. But Nature bothered the pioneer rather more than she delighted him. The mountains had to be crossed, the rivers forded or ferried, water found in the deserts, trees girdled or cut down to make clearings where corn would grow. Not until a good deal of the countryside was tamed could we really enjoy the wildness of the remaining part. Not until pretty recently have we perceived that this wildness has to be cherished or it will be lost.

"So 'scenic resources' now mean something definite to us, just as timber resources or mineral resources did a few decades ago. They are something we need to sustain or improve the quality of our lives. * * * The Tennessee Valley is one of the country's loveliest regions. If it competes unfairly with other regions, that is Nature's fault, not men's—certainly not the New Deal's.

"The White Mountains, the Green Mountains, the Sierras, the Rockies, the Adirondacks, the lavish spread of thundering coast from Maine to Florida, from San Diego to the mouth of the Columbia, the painted deserts of the Southwest, the Great Lakes, the rivers gathering and going down to the sea—these have intangible values that sometimes outweigh tangible ones. They are resources that, well-guarded, will feed the soul of man forever. It is the highest type of conservation that preserves them."

Also from our inventory of scenic resources sprang a special study of the opportunities for recreational development of the southern highlands, a mountainous region encompassing some hundred or more counties in the eastern half of the Tennessee Valley and adjoining territory.

A direct result of these studies was the formation of a committee composed of many representatives, serving ex officio, of regional and local organizations. Part of this committee's program included the preparation and release of newspaper stories concerning the scenic assets of the region. These stories, released over an 8-month period, were carried by many papers in the valley region.

Perhaps an indirect result of this stimulation was the recent formation by citizens of Tennessee and Kentucky of a southern highlands council to carry forward the promotional work which neither T. V. A. nor any other Federal agency is authorized to undertake. This is, indeed, a significant advance, for, after all, the real results must come from the people themselves.

Another study we have undertaken which I believe to be of such interest to automobile clubs that I will report it in some detail is an analysis of tourist travel in the Tennessee Valley region. This survey was undertaken through questionnaire cards distributed on a sampling basis by several States in connection with the recent State-wide highway-planning surveys.

This study disclosed, at least insofar as the sample went, that two-thirds of the "foreign cars"—and by that I mean cars foreign to the State in which they were traveling when recorded—two-thirds of all foreign cars carried persons traveling for pleasure, as against one-third business. It showed also that these recreation cars carried an average of 3.1 persons per car; business cars, 1.8 persons.

Of the total foreign pleasure cars checked, only one-third were bound for destinations within the valley, the others merely passing through—and in a hurry at that.

Approximately 30 percent seeking recreation in the valley were here to visit friends—I believe this is a higher percentage than that obtained by the A. A. A. in its 1939 poll of members.

Being interested in standards of accommodations, we inquired as to where these travellers stayed. About 33 percent said they were stopping at hotels, 20 percent in tourist homes and camps, 16 percent with friends. Only 2 percent provided their own accommodations.

We also learned from this sample that most of the tourists questioned revisit the region periodically, about half doing so annually. In all probability this is accounted for by the Florida traffic.

We discovered also that recreation travel, while naturally reaching its peak during the summer, accounts for as high as half the total foreign-car traffic in this region even in winter months.

As I have stated, the foregoing analysis was drawn from a very brief sample—enough of a sample, however, to hint strongly of the tremendous value, even more potential than existing, of tourism to the region, and to suggest the heavy flow of traffic through the region, rather than into it, that could be encouraged to linger here and enjoy our scenic attractions.

As a follow-up of this study, we are currently cooperating with the Tennessee Department of Conservation in a thorough, 12-month survey of the economic importance of tourism. In my opinion, this survey will prove as valuable to this region as a census of agriculture or industry.

To sum up in one concise volume the complete story of all activities undertaken to date by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the field of recreation, we recently prepared and submitted to the President a report on this subject.

This report, as you may have read in the newspapers, has been transmitted to the Congress and is now being printed for public distribution as a House document. In it we have traced the growth of recreation in the region from the time of early summer colonies. We have described the extent of our own activity, both on T. V. A. properties and in the region as a whole. We have indicated the tremendous economic importance of recreation to this region. And, most important, the President, in the interests of unified regional recreation development, has asked Congress to consider broadening the statutory powers of T. V. A. to permit us to undertake further limited development to meet public needs on land suitable for recreation in reservoir areas acquired by T. V. A. for primary purposes.

It is our hope that the surveys, studies, demonstrations, and cooperation of T. V. A. have shown the opportunities for recreational development in the Tennessee Valley and the part that the magnificent scenic resources of the southern highlands should play in the upbuilding of the region. Much remains to be done. Many facilities are inadequate. The fact that areas of lowest per-capita income coincide with highest scenic values renders difficult the finding of capital for local development of those resources. And we earnestly hope that the pattern of earlier exploitation of timber and other resources, with little economic benefit to the people to whom the resources belong, will not be followed in meeting tourist demands. This should be largely local enterprise. The returns can and should stay within the area, benefiting both urban and rural residents.

You who represent the American Automobile Association will, I believe, develop enthusiasm for routing tourists to visit this region. You have a unique opportunity. Your members will see new scenery and great projects. A region which has seen many natural resources decline in value will gain from the appreciation of a new resource—its mountains, lakes, and equable climate. And the Nation will gain from the steady climb upward of a group of States which can and will contribute more to the national economy as their assets improve and their opportunities increase.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. B. CHANDLER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. BRECKINRIDGE LONG

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on foreign policy delivered by Hon. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, at the Forum on Foreign Policy and National Defense at the National Institute of Government May 2, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you know, the Department of State is the agency which carries out the foreign policy of the United States for the President. At the very outset, I would like to state that the primary policy of the United States is to keep out of this war in Europe. Every single act of the Department of State has been directed to that end. That is the policy today, and that has been the policy since the war started last September.

The specific steps taken to effectuate that policy have been numerous. The first was to get American citizens out of the danger zone and to bring back to the United States just as many of them as wanted to come. The regular passenger boats were utilized, and five additional boats were diverted from their regular runs and sent to Europe for them. Approximately 80,000 persons were repatriated in the first 6 weeks of the war.

The second step followed immediately. As soon as the Congress passed the neutrality law the President defined danger zones into which American ships were prohibited to enter. The zone, as first established, ran from a point on the northern coast of Spain well out to sea, then up north of the British Isles and across to the coast of Norway below Bergen.

As other war areas developed, first in Finland, and subsequently in Denmark and Norway, the efforts of the Department were directed to getting American citizens out of those danger zones and returning them to the United States. And, as the waters in those regions became infested with naval and air activities, the President enlarged the danger zone to cover the whole coast of Norway, extending as far north as Spitzbergen and down through the Arctic Ocean to the northern coast of Russia.

Complementary to those two steps, in the first days of the war, when it seemed possible that there might be belligerent air activity directed at the centers of population and industry scattered through the countries at war, American citizens, particularly women and children, were advised to leave such centers and to seek places of refuge in smaller towns, pending the time they could be accommodated aboard ship. The object of each of these activities was to guard the safety of Americans abroad and to eliminate, as far as possible, political complications which might follow if a number of Americans should be killed or wounded.

Furthermore, in conference at Panama with all the other American republics, a complete understanding was arrived at. It was the unanimous decision of that conference to follow a similar standard of neutral conduct and with the same objective—that is, not only to keep out of the war but to keep the war away from us. With that object, a "neutral zone" was declared. Belligerents were requested to keep their naval warfare out of that zone and away from American shores.

The prosecution of the war in Europe between three or four of the most powerful nations has had its repercussions in all parts of the world. Complicated situations have developed not only in Europe but in other continents and in the islands of the seven seas and on the broad highways of the oceans. American interests have received the attention of the Government wherever and whenever they have been involved, and whether they have concerned the lives of American citizens or properties of American ownership.

In a brief few minutes it is impossible to give more than a most generalized statement of American foreign policy. That largely concerns political and economic matters. It is these which give rise to complications between nations—these and the unjustifiable use of force to solve them. As many of these complications have their bases in some injury to our citizens, we have taken steps to have our citizens leave dangerous areas and to prevent others from entering those areas. This does not apply to officers of the Government who are stationed at posts of duty abroad, like those who went through the siege of Warsaw, like those in Finland and Norway, like those in Paris, London, Berlin, and many other points in belligerent territory, who remain at their posts of duty, outposts of our policy of peace and at the same time our first line of defense.

As you have heard from the officers responsible for the activities of the Army and the Navy, the Government is preparing against any possible eventuality. The Department of State is following the paths of peace and the difficult and tortuous course of neutrality. We want to keep out of the war. We are planning to keep out of it. We have surrendered none of the rights of any individual American. However, for the benefit of the country as a whole, and in pursuance of the desire of the American people to keep out of the war, we have refrained from the exercise of certain rights because the exercise of those rights would take American citizens and American property into combat areas.

While the war in Europe is claiming constant public attention and interest, it is important that we do not lose sight of the fact that hostilities are also in progress in the Far East.

In the Far East, as in Europe, this Government has sought, by a reasoned approach and by peaceful measures, to protect American rights and interests, and to uphold fundamental principles of this country's foreign policy—and continues so to do. There, as in Europe, it has acquiesced in certain situations but it has reserved its rights in every instance when they have been challenged.

In this way we hope to prevent incidents from arising which might otherwise lead to complications. However, this waiver of the exercise of rights, and the desire of the United States to keep out of war, should not be misconstrued by any person in this country, or by any government abroad, as a supine acquiescence in the face of any injury to the American people, or as supreme indifference to any threat at the freedom and independence of this or any other American Republic.

Our voluntary decision not to exercise certain of our rights is predicated on our desire for peace—an orderly, decent peace. It is that kind of a world we desire to live in. An orderly and decent peace presupposes the observance of treaties and international commercial relations on a basis of reciprocity and fair dealing. One of the most important of the Government's functions involves the protection of our foreign trade. But the performance of this function does not require that we proceed by the law of the jungle. On the contrary, in the short run as well as in the long run, our own interests will be best served if we adhere faithfully to a policy of fair dealing in our commercial relations with other countries and, in collaboration rather than in conflict with them, work toward lowering the many obstacles to peaceful trade among nations. The policy of equality of treatment in international commercial relations is traditionally one of the cornerstones of American foreign policy. Upon this foundation we have been building, during the last 6 years, effectuating a commercial program which has as one of its principal objectives the firm establishment of the conditions necessary to a peaceful world.

The relationship of the trade-agreements program to peace and order in the world is simple. Through trade agreements in a peaceful world nations can increase their commerce with other nations. They can procure the materials they lack in their own country. They may sell the products which they may have in abundance for the things they do not have and provide for the commercial and industrial prosperity of their citizens. When these citizens are happily employed, when commerce thrives, when people are contented, and when governments are using the peaceful processes of orderly commerce to provide for the prosperity of their citizens, then there is less likelihood that those citizens can be led into the snares and delusions of aggressive warfare, either economic or actual.

We deplore the existence of war today and foresee in its trail major difficulties of many kinds if it long continues, if normal trade is further impeded by military activity, if avenues of commerce are continuingly disrupted by artificial barriers, if financial structures are more seriously impaired, if discontent is rife, and injustice heavy-handed.

To obviate those consequences so unpleasant to contemplate, our foreign policy is—

First, to keep out of war;

Second, to keep alive and preserve all American rights;

Third, to minimize during its course the evil effects of war upon commerce and industry; and

Fourth, to plan with the hope that after the war conditions will be so stabilized that in peaceful pursuits, established under a broad program of trade agreements, nations will be prosperous, peoples contented, and the causes of war reduced to a minimum.

War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. ARTHUR TALMAGE ABERNETHY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an

address delivered by Dr. Arthur Talmage Abernethy at Rutherford College, North Carolina, on the subject of war. For the information of those who read the article I should like to have the privilege of saying that Dr. Abernethy is an educator, a lecturer, and an author of North Carolina, and has the distinction of having written 52 books.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every fiber of my nature rebels against any unholy effort to involve the United States in war. If we are sincere in our proclamations as the spiritual leader of the countries of the earth, we will accept the preachments of the Great Peacemaker and turn our full powers to avert rather than to promote war. We claim to be a Christian nation. No Christian nation can afford to make war. War is hell, hell regnant and rejoicing, and no Christian can lend his services to promote hell. War is the triumph of the devil. It can find no justification amongst men nor forgiveness from God.

There never was a good war nor a bad peace. War is the rule of brute force over human reason. It is the recrudescence of barbarism. War stands stripped of its mask.

What is war? Not the flying flag, martial music, throbbing drum, flashing sword, gleaming epaulets. It is God's earth guttered with graves; the silver sea stained with blood; mangled bodies; arms and legs torn off; eyes shot out; buried alive; strangling with poison gas; stumbling through life on crutches; gaunt famine stalking through gullies and chasms which were once fertile gardens, grain fields, and orchards; ashes instead of happy homes; mourning instead of music and merriment; children tugging at empty breasts, and starving to death while mothers cry their hearts out; men trampled in the red mud under the hoofs of horses.

War is the concretion of all crimes; the sublimation of all sorrows; it is the avatar of death. War is the procurer and restaurateur of the ravenous vultures that fatten on the flesh of the sons of God. It is the apotheosis of hellish greed and cruelty. It is the incarnation of hell's archruler; the coronation of the anti-Christ. On his throne of human bones he sits, and out of empty skulls he quaffs the blood of men and the tears of women. His music is the staccato snapping of heartstrings, measuring the moans of orphans and the idle prayers of widows.

War is the pimp and pander of his majesty the earthworm. War is an epicure feeding only on the flower of manhood. His triumphal march is marked by the livid light of burning churches, galleries of priceless art, libraries, and happy homes. His trail is followed by famine, pestilence, and disease and death. Thirty-five times the number that live on earth have been sacrificed on his red reeking altars, and yet he calls for more.

War is the siren that maddens men and transforms them into beasts. It dethrones reason, kills conscience, and destroys all sympathy. It is the deification of murder. To this arch demon the taste of blood is as sea brine to the sailor, exciting more thirst. War is the carnival of all devils dancing on an isolated world and deriding the God who pronounced it good. War never settled any question; it never will. In its murky slime all vices are spawned; in its holocaust all virtues are consumed.

War is a hellish wizard; it subsidizes the press; fires the flannel-mouthed jingoes; suborns the poet and painter; dazzles the diplomat; subverts science; crazes the clergy; stampedes statesmen; mocks at peace parleys; and poisons public opinion.

War is a pirate; it takes its toll and tithe of all production; it grinds the poor into powdered dust to enrich the profiteer, the bond baron, munition makers, the Coffin Trust, makers of surgical instruments, glass eyes, artificial legs and arms, the Steel Trusts, and the undertakers.

War is an anarchist and outlaw, laughing at all conventions, tearing all treaties into strips, and planting every peace pact with seeds of subsequent struggle. War is of the devil—and "war is hell."

Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This is the way to get mixed up in other peoples' wars. First, you sell them your goods. They become your "best customer." They make jobs for your unemployed and dividends for your stocks. When their purchases have become an important part of your economy, they run out of cash.

Your business is threatened. They ask for credits. Some old boat rockers begin to croak about this. Some say, "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also. This will surely compel you to send armies to protect your dollars."

Your politicians reply: "We shall never send an American mother's son to bleed on foreign shores." Your best customers add: "We don't want your military assistance. You are too far away. Your efforts to equip and transport armies would interfere with your value to us as a base of supplies."

The assurance of repayment of such loans is so slender that no private funds are available. No one person wants to risk, but if Congress authorizes the Treasury to loan, all the people will be forced to risk collectively what nobody would be willing to risk individually.

That is reckless statesmanship, but by this time hysteria and emotion have ousted both prudence and judgment.

From the beginning of this sequence there has been growing a sloganeering stupidity. "They are fighting our war. They are paying in blood. We shall only pay in dollars. It is the least we can do." When we opened a credit of $3,000,000,000 to the Allies in the World War the votes in the committees of the House and the Senate were unanimous. To the suggestion that Allied bonds were selling below par the answer was, "All the more necessary to loan them this money at the lowest possible rate of interest." When one Congressman said, "They will use it to retire private loans elsewhere," answer was, "Do not limit or qualify the use of this money." When mutual guaranties among borrowers was suggested the reply was (prophetically), "If we get this money back at all, we shall get off cheap."

Thus we buy an interest in a war we are going to fight with goods and dollars but not with blood—"just a few divisions as a token and a symbol to show the flag."

Then the going gets tough. We are in to the eyebrows on the economic and sympathetic side. Our friends' backs are "at the wall." The whole tune changes. "Send us men. If they haven't equipment, send them in their undershirts."

The demands on us become almost insulting to abandon our organizations and commands and conscript men to fight under foreign flags and officers.

So we finance most of the cost of the war from this point out for ourselves and our allies. We pack men by the millions like sardines into transports and send them untrained into battle. We are cursed for tardiness, stinginess, and timidity. Then comes victory—maybe—and we learn that we have been fooled on the war's objectives. The victors didn't share our ideals, and under secret treaties they take all and leave us nothing—and then repudiate all debts and villify us for even asking for repayment.

This is our actual World War experience, neither distorted nor exaggerated. We are going through it again step by chuckleheaded step. We have now reached the stage of "we don't want your men, only your dollars," and "they are fighting our battles," and "we will help them by everything short of war but not an American mother's son will be sent abroad."

"As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly." (Proverbs XXVI:11.)

Work of Federal Housing Administration in Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM STEWART McDONALD

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Stewart McDonald, Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration, under date of April 29, 1940, together with a small tabulation attached thereto showing in detail, by counties, the extent of loans made by Wyoming banks and private lending agencies operating in conjunction with the Federal Housing Administration.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 29, 1940.

Hon. H. H. SCHWARTZ,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SCHWARTZ: The semiannual summary of F. H. A. operations reveals that 5,813 families in Wyoming have received loans of $9,507,736.31 for home-financing purposes. These loans were made by private lending institutions and had been insured by Federal Housing Administration as of the close of business December 31, 1939.

Of this amount 3,266 families obtained $1,613,688.31 in order to improve, repair, and remodel their properties under the property-improvement provisions of title I of the National Housing Act.

In addition, F. H. A. insured loans totaled $7,894,048 in Wyoming for the purpose of financing home ownership for 2,547 families.

At the present time approximately 12,000,000 people in the United States are receiving the benefits of the F. H. A. program.

The F. H. A. insured mortgage has been a most instrumental factor in developing new home construction, the year 1939 breaking all records in volume of loans insured. The 1940 volume thus far exceeds even last year, and I feel confident in forecasting that 1940 will show the greatest small-home building program since 1927.

In accordance with your telephonic request sometime ago I am pleased to enclose the list showing the volume of these loans for each county in Wyoming.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART MCDONALD,
Administrator.

Volume of Federal Housing Administration insuring operations, by counties, in the State of Wyoming—Net cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1939

County	Title I. Property-improvement loans insured		Title II. Small-home mortgages accepted for insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Albany	131	$64,130.27	167	$628,850	298	$692,980.27
Big Horn	321	199,804.70	79	218,310	400	418,114.70
Campbell	34	16,987.40	25	75,900	59	92,887.40
Carbon	121	68,801.80	23	76,200	144	145,001.80
Converse	104	56,802.30	81	192,000	185	248,802.30
Crook	14	11,591.20	17	36,200	31	47,791.20
Fremont	87	45,430.60	89	250,900	176	296,330.60
Goshen	214	110,132.14	149	406,440	363	516,572.14
Hot Springs	42	18,248.99	35	99,100	77	117,348.99
Johnson	25	13,495.93	41	125,300	66	138,795.93
Laramie	694	258,084.52	633	2,423,050	1,327	2,681,134.52
Lincoln	122	62,372.06	73	160,038	195	222,410.06
Natrona	610	291,491.81	520	1,371,050	1,130	1,662,541.81
Niobrara	49	27,623.21	36	79,900	85	107,523.21
Park	79	42,905.75	87	240,000	166	282,905.75
Platte	48	31,231.74	57	161,400	105	192,631.74
Sheridan	286	116,896.68	149	441,810	435	558,706.68
Sublette	20	20,366.80	14	25,500	34	45,866.80
Sweetwater	100	55,346.72	117	404,140	217	459,486.72
Teton	18	17,465.55	27	73,500	45	90,965.55
Uinta	48	33,999.25	45	139,810	93	173,809.25
Washakie	48	20,188.79	50	184,200	98	204,388.79
Weston	50	28,456.95	33	80,450	83	108,906.95
Yellowstone National Park	1	1,833.15				1,833.15
State total	3,266	1,613,688.31	2,547	7,894,048	5,813	9,507,736.31

South's Greatest Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. B. CHANDLER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM LEXINGTON (KY.) HERALD

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Lexington Herald, written by one of the ablest young editors of the country, entitled "South's Greatest Resource," in which reference is made to a speech of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald]

SOUTH'S GREATEST RESOURCE

The southeastern conference of motor clubs, conducted in Knoxville under the auspices of the American Automobile Association, attracted attention to the programs under way for the advancement of the South. Timely in connection with this conference was the announcement that President Roosevelt, from the "little White House" at Warm Springs, Ga., that he is going to visit Natchez before returning to Washington and will return later in the summer to dedicate the Great Smokies National Park area in Tennessee and North Carolina. In Knoxville at the same time for a businessmen's meeting that had no connection with the A. A. A. conference, Gen. R. E. Woods, a native Georgian, now chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., declared that the industrial expansion of the South will be the outstanding development of the next few years.

Featuring the automobile club conference was a talk by Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, one of the livest wires in the United States Senate, who "electrified" his hearers with his discussion of what the T. V. A. area may become. Senator REYNOLDS pointed out that for the cost of two battleships the United States has been able to accomplish the tremendous development of the Tennessee Valley, touching Kentucky at several points, including nearly the entire State of Tennessee and much of Alabama. What Norris Dam and the Smokies have meant to eastern Tennessee can hardly be overestimated, and the State is overlooking no opportunities to make the most of the advantages offered. Pictures of elated fishermen pulling fish out of lakes and streams that would gladden the heart of any sportsman feature all the numerous booklets and maps.

Large promotion programs have been undertaken in many of these States. North Carolina voted $250,000 for publicity and promotion; Tennessee's conservation department has some $600,000 annually from all sources including fees to spend; Mississippi has invited the A. A. A. Southeastern Conference there for 1941, with a tour of the State planned for the representatives of motor clubs; and Virginia, of course, is the Old Dominion from the viewpoint of having long ago developed its history and its charm effectively.

In view of the extensive efforts through departments of cooperation, motor clubs, and national parks and recreational development in other States, it is gratifying to have heard David H. Lasley, executive secretary-manager of the East Tennessee Automobile Club at Knoxville, pay high tribute to Kentucky's steps taken largely through the In Kentucky magazine, which he says he finds the most popular and in many respects the most effective of all promotional material of this kind coming to the desk of his office.

The war in Europe, the Nation-wide revival of interest in southern scenes through Gone With the Wind, together with the closing down of tourist traffic to Europe and the interest in so many southern tours to Mexico and the growing winter seasons in Florida and New Orleans have given an impetus to this expansion in the new South.

While much has been said of the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, there has been too little appreciation of the fact that there has developed culturally and slowly, due to the natural customs of the people, a solid foundation for peaceful, happy, contented life where there is an absence of unrest, animosity, and antagonism.

Often called the South's greatest weakness we nevertheless look upon the romance, tradition, and chivalry of the South as her greatest resource in the vision, the courage, and the strength of her people. Surely the hospitality, as immortalized in song by Stephen Collins Foster whose music with its pathos and beauty is heard on nearly every program today and who will soon figure on one of Postmaster General Farley's new postage stamps, and the home life and love of living found in the South are far to be desired over the bitterness and ambition that have led Europe to war and bloodshed. As has been said, "Give a man a home and he'll work for a home and fight for a home, but who ever heard of a man who would fight for a trailer?"

Kentucky's interest in this program that is being developed by the motor clubs was evidenced by presence at the conferences of Eugene Stuart, secretary-manager of the Louisville Automobile Club and Lexington's Glen Weinman, secretary-manager of the Blue Grass Automobile Clubs, both recognized as among the Nation's leading examples of what such organizations should be and both leading in the South in memberships and accomplishments.

Clearly and emphatically what these discussions bring out is that tourist programs must be developed for wider areas than single club areas or even State lines and, further, that all activities that are related, including conservation, park creation, maintenance, and development, waterways improvement for flood control or whatever purpose, industrial expansion and all these other activities should, by all means, work hand in hand because they are all integral parts of the same major plan.

Regulation of Modes of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement and a letter to the President of the United States, prepared and released to the press by representatives of various farm groups.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A delegation of representatives of agricultural organizations including the National Grange, National Wool Growers' Association, American National Live Stock Association, and of Midwestern cooperative farm groups today presented to President Roosevelt a written protest against enactment of the Wheeler-Lea omnibus transportation bill.

Among the resolutions given the President were the following:

American Farm Bureau Federation; American National Live Stock Association; Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.; Kansas Farm Bureau; Kansas Farmers' Union; Louisiana State-wide Conference, Baton Rouge, La.; Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation; Missouri Farm Bureau Federation; National Cooperative Elevator Association; National Farmers Union; National Grange; National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors; Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association; Vermont State Grange, Bellows Falls, Vt.; National Wool Growers' Association; United States Live Stock Association.

The delegation visiting the White House included:

J. Elmer Brock, president, American National Live Stock Association; Frederick Brenckman, National Grange; J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, National Wool Growers Association; Irvin E. King, master, Washington State Grange; T. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Oscar Heline, president, Farmer Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Marcus, Iowa; Frank Rutherford, secretary, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Omaha, Nebr.; Earl Peterson, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.

At the same time they presented a bound copy of resolutions adopted by 25 national and regional agricultural groups protesting against all legislation which would place water carriers and motortrucks under the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The communication to the President outlining the farmers' objections to the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1940.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are opposed to the adoption of the conference report on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill for the following reasons:

1. It ignores the public interest and lays the basis for a transportation monopoly.

2. It will increase the cost of distributing agricultural products, which cost the farmer has to bear, thereby reducing his income.

3. It will increase the cost of things that the farmer has to buy, thereby further reducing his income.

4. The destructive effects of this legislation upon agriculture will retard the economic recovery of the Nation, and this in turn cannot fail to adversely affect the railroads themselves, who are the advocates of this bill.

5. Those who drafted this legislation appear to have lost sight of the fundamental purpose for which Government regulation was established, namely to protect the public interest. Instead of adhering to this sound principle, under the bill regulation would be employed to stifle competition and to bring water and motor rates up to the level of rail rates, regardless of the cost of rendering the service.

The cost of transportation is the heaviest service charge that the farmer has to pay. Approximately 20 percent of all the freight revenues accruing to the railroads are derived from carrying agricultural products to market. In 1929 the farmer's freight bill amounted to $1,000,000,000. In 1937, when the farmer's income was greatly reduced, the figure was $638,000,000. These items do not include the freight charges paid on commodities purchased by the farmer, which he must likewise pay.

Last year the farmer received only 39 cents out of every dollar paid by the consumer for food. At the depth of the depression the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar dropped to 33 cents. While transportation and distribution must be regarded as legitimate and indispensable functions in the affairs of civilization, the fact remains that when those who merely transport and distribute the products of our farms receive vastly more than the share that goes to the producer, it amounts to the same thing as the perpetration of an economic crime. Instead of ameliorating the conditions that have so long handicapped agriculture in matters relating to transportation, the pending bill would most certainly aggravate the situation.

We are sensible of the fact that railroads are a necessity, and we want every properly managed railroad to be solvent and prosperous, but we must not lose sight of the fact that agriculture is also a necessity, even more fundamental to the well-being and the very existence of man than the railroads or any other agency of transportation can possibly be. Common sense should teach those who are charged with the management of our railroads that they cannot expect to benefit by reducing to bankruptcy the fundamental industry upon which their prosperity rests.

There is justification for condemning the report of the Conference Committee on the transportation bill by virtue of the fact that the Miller-Wadsworth amendment, which passed both House and Senate, was entirely eliminated from the bill. The gist of this amendment was to the effect that no form of transportation could be compelled to charge higher rates than would be compensatory. The full wording of the amendment was as follows:

"In order that the public at large may enjoy the benefit and economy afforded by each type of transportation, the Commission shall permit each type of carrier or carriers to reduce rates so long as such rates maintain a compensatory return to the carrier or carriers after taking into consideration overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier or carriers for the service rendered: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to affect the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4."

It is manifest that with the Miller-Wadsworth amendment stricken out, the declaration of policy contained in section 1 constitutes nothing but empty words because nothing contained in the bill gives the public any assurance that it will receive the benefit of transportation at the lowest possible cost. In our opinion the Miller-Wadsworth amendment was so fair and reasonable that it would be nothing short of tragic to pass the bill without this provision.

Those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits find an additional reason for dissatisfaction in the report of the Conference Committee because an amendment adopted by the House which provided for reduced rates on farm products for export, comparable to the lower rates granted to industry in this connection, was eliminated.

We maintain that there are only two legitimate grounds upon which the Government could justify itself in attempting to regulate transportation on our inland waterways and in the coastwise trade. One of these grounds would be in the interest of public safety, and the other to protect the public against monopolistic practices. So far as safety is concerned, the Department of Commerce already looks after that; and when it comes to protecting the public against monopoly the truth is that no monopoly whatsoever exists among the carriers on our inland waterways nor in the coastwise trade. The rivers, the lakes, and the seas are open to all. So far from breaking up any monopoly among the water carriers, which in reality is nonexistent, the pending legislation takes a long step toward creating a monopoly.

The carriers now operating would be permitted to continue, subject to rules and regulations laid down by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but before it would be possible to establish a new service it would be necessary to secure from the Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If this bill should be enacted, it is very doubtful if there would be any new water carriers, because the legislation is so worded as to virtually instruct the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny any person a certificate of convenience and necessity if the Commission comes to the conclusion that the present transportation facilities are adequate to take care of existing commerce. The fate that befell many of the common and contract carriers under the grandfather clause of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 furnishes an example of what may happen to many of our water carriers if the present bill is passed.

As the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission well said in a joint letter addressed to Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY on February 16, 1940, in opposition to this legislation:

"Certificates of public convenience and necessity should not be used to create a monopoly in the branch of transportation industry where monopoly is presently nonexistent, and where the public interest requires that competition, although it should be regulated to prevent abuses, should not be limited or discouraged. The great advantage of water transportation to shippers is the flexibility and variety of service it can offer. Certificates of public convenience and permits would destroy this advantage and stifle competition. The same effect of stifling competition is discernible in the provisions of the bills that, except with the permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission, no carrier can operate both as a common carrier and as a contract carrier."

We think the writers of the joint letter already mentioned are on the right track when they said:

"All the provisions of the bills seem designed to free the railroads from restraints and obligations, while imposing restrictions on their water competitors and making it more expensive for the public to move freight. Under these provisions inland water carriers can

easily be regulated out of existence without the recapture of enough tonnage to affect railroad earnings appreciably."

We also endorse the further statement of the writers of the joint letter when they declare:

"Farmers and other shippers should not be required to pay rates based on transportation costs of properties improvidently built, wastefully operated, or partially obsolete. The advocacy of thorough regulation of the minimum rates of motor and water carriers by a centralized agency appears to represent an attempt to use Government power to bring competing transportation agencies into a cartel, and in this manner to share traffic and adjust rates in such a way as to earn a return upon all transportation capital of these agencies. The present high rail-rate level would be protected from the impact of vigorous competition. Undoubtedly such a policy would also result in more rigid rates in times of depression, since the motor carrier and the boat line would no longer play their role as an effective competitive force in bringing down rail rates on commodities susceptible to rail or truck, and rail or water movement."

We are impressed by the fact that the general public has had no opportunity whatever to become acquainted with the conference report on the transportation bill; the Members of Congress as a whole have not had time to familiarize themselves with its details; there is no public demand for this legislation; it is filled with numerous objectionable features and ambiguities, and for the good of all we are strongly of the opinion that it should be defeated.

Respectfully submitted.

J. Elmer Brock, president, American National Live Stock Association; Frederick Brenckman, National Grange; J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, National Wool Growers Association; Irvin R. King, master, Washington State Grange; T. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Oscar Heline, president, Farmer Grain Dealers Association of of Iowa, Marcus, Iowa; Frank Rutherford, secretary, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Omaha, Nebr.; Earl Peterson, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.; Alfred D. Newson, master, Indiana State Grange.

More "Spinach"—An Answer to the President's Blast Against the Critics of Reorganization Plan IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in a prepared statement read to newspaper men at the White House executive offices Tuesday, the President of the United States, in item 1 of his statement, sets forth that adoption of the Reorganization Plan IV, "will provide for a program of basic significance to our national transportation and our national defense."

If that is the case, it is quite probable that Reorganization Plan IV does not conform with the basic provisions of the Reorganization Act itself. Further, if Reorganization Plan IV was really intended to make our civilian aviation ready for war, as is implied by the President, then I submit that the Civil Aeronautics Authority might better be placed under the Chief of the Army Air Corps than under the Secretary of Commerce. Certainly there is no sense to placing a growing transportation system under the direction of a body of trade boosters whose record in the field of aeronautics consists of a series of fatal fumbles.

Under Item 2 of his statement, the President states "the Civil Aeronautics Authority will continue to appoint and control its own personnel and submit its own budget." However, it appears that the President has forgotten that section 7, paragraph (c) of his own reorganization plan definitely states that such procurement of personnel and budgeting shall be "performed under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce."

Therefore, I submit that the President, in his statement, has contradicted his own reorganization order as submitted to the Congress with his message of April 11, 1940. Also, I submit that between the wording of the President's statement and the wording of the plan itself as quoted above, it is very evident that our newest and most efficient means of transportation is to be scuttled by the spoils system so long established and nurtured in the Department of Commerce. Given the power to supervise the selection of aviation personnel, the Secretary of Commerce would be given the power to hire and fire. And given control over the Budget of the Authority, he would be given control over the will of the Authority. It was the intention of the Congress, under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to make the Authority and the Safety Board relatively independent of politics. There it is now and there it should remain.

Under item 3 of the President's statement to the press, it is contended that certain phases of the proposed reorganization are intended "to eliminate a blind spot created by the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to carry out the intention of Congress." Now I submit that the only real blind spot in this proposal is the wording used by the President in his public statement to befog and camouflage the real wording and intent of section 7 of the reorganization plan. Further, if Congress has left a blind spot in the law, it can be remedied by amendment. But it cannot be remedied by junking it.

Under item 4 of the President's statement, it is said that the function of investigating accidents is transferred from the Air Safety Board to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and it is specifically stated that this will continue "the present independence of accident investigations." Now it seems odd that the President should be so zealous to carry out the intentions of Congress as he proposes in item 3 of his statement and then turn right around and specifically disregard the intention of Congress in items 1 and 4. By this time it must be known by everyone, except the President, that the intent of Congress, under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, was to separate the investigation of accidents from the Authority making the rules. Also, by this time it must be known to everyone, except the President, that the independence of the Safety Board, together with its method of investigating and reporting accidents, is one of the principal reasons why the United States air lines of today are the safest in the world.

Under item 5 of his statement to the press, the President states that "appreciable savings" will be made by abolishment of the offices of the members of the Air Safety Board. The Civil Aeronautics Act provides for three members at $7,500 per annum, a total of $22,500 a year. So far as I have been able to determine, that is the only specific saving claimed for Reorganization Plan IV.

Now I ask, is a potential saving of $22,500 annually of any consequence when it is known that a single air carrier accident costs approximately $200,000 on the average, to say nothing of the lives lost? Also, is it not true that the people of the United States have received real dividends on their investment in the Air Safety Board when it is noted that 13 months have now been completed without the loss of a single life on the air lines of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, it is my carefully considered opinion that the savings proposed and implied by Reorganization Plan IV are part of the camouflage, a part of the real blind spot—the smoke screen—intended to conceal the real intent and importance of the plan.

Moreover, in the preliminary part of his statement to the press on Tuesday, the President stated that one of the reasons for Reorganization Plan IV was internal friction "particularly within the Air Safety Board."

Several times we have heard rumors to this effect so I have inquired. And this is what I learned:

In the first place, the act wisely provides that at least one member of the Air Safety Board must have been an air-line pilot, and as a matter of fact, I find that all 3 of the original members of the Air Safety Board were veteran pilots with years of experience.

The original chairman was Col. Sumpter Smith, of Alabama, who from 1917 to 1919, during the World War, was

an officer in the Air Corps and a pilot instructor. In 1921 he was a colonel in the aviation section of the Alabama National Guard, and he still holds an active license as a transport pilot. Another original member, and present chairman of the board, Mr. Thomas O. Hardin, was a former air-line pilot and air-line executive in Texas. The third member of the board is Mr. C. B. Allen, a former newspaperman and pilot from New York and West Virginia.

Now I want to elaborate for a minute on the past history of Col. Sumpter Smith in the early days of the W. P. A., under the direction of Mr. Harry Hopkins, now the Secretary of Commerce and to whom it is now proposed to return the control of aviation. It was at his request that Colonel Smith entered the employ of the Government and was given complete charge of W. P. A. airport construction. We know something of the history of this work, some of which was good but all of which was extremely and excessively costly. Based on his previous training, therefore, under W. P. A., it is perhaps not strange that when Colonel Smith was asked to submit a budget, as chairman of the new Safety Board, that he found it extremely difficult to set any top limit and in effect, following his W. P. A. training, stated that the Board should have all the money it might find necessary to expend.

Now, to get back to this question of friction. At the outset my inquiry revealed there were a few of the minor differences which might beset any new body of men setting up an entirely new organization. But there was never any real friction, as stated by the President, until Mr. Smith, who was then Chairman of the Air Safety Board, undertook other duties which caused him to neglect his duties as Chairman of the Air Safety Board, in contradiction of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, section 702 (b), members of the Board are specifically prohibited from other duties. Nevertheless, Mr. Smith undertook to supervise the construction of the new national airport at Gravelley Point. It has been said that he undertook this supervision at the express request of the President. In any event the undertaking of that supervision, as I pointed out, was expressly prohibited by the original act of Congress. And in so doing he so completely neglected his duties as prescribed by the law governing his appointment to the Safety Board that the two other members of the Board were compelled to remove him as Chairman so they could carry on the statutory functions of the Board.

After having been removed as Chairman, Mr. Smith resigned from the Board some time last fall, and since then there has been complete harmony within the Board, and the effectiveness of its work has been widely noted, notwithstanding that two members of the Board have been compelled to carry on the work of three.

Business Moves—Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, business last week reached the lowest mark it has hit in the last 10 months. Spending averaged more than $10,000,000 a day less in the Nation's busiest areas than it has at any time during the last month.

This sharp change from the usual upturn in conditions every spring has New Deal Washington deeply concerned. With tax receipts and factory production declining, and business already feeling the impact of these conditions, the prospect for any success in living within the budget proposed by the President at the beginning of the congressional session looms dark indeed. Already the talk throughout the Nation's Capital has it that the President will shortly ask for the right to spend at least one-third more for relief and W. P. A. than he had anticipated.

Tax increases may be forestalled for the remainder of the present session, but they appear inevitable by the time the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress convenes next January, if the present national program is continued. It looks like a sad, sad year for Mr. Taxpayer, and are not we all?

Widows and Orphans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES AND EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks which I obtained 2 days ago, I am submitting for the benefit of the Members, an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on April 21, and which was written by Mr. Warren B. Francis. The article gives a very clear indication of what the effect of enacting H. R. 9000 will ultimately be, and that it is a step toward universal pensions. The article by Mr. Francis follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of April 21, 1940]

VETERANS CRACKING THE WHIP—UNIVERSAL PENSION FOR SERVICE MEN SEEN AS STRATEGY IS PERFECTED

(By Warren B. Francis)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 20.—With an organized minority cracking the whip, Congress will have gone a long way by adjournment time toward giving reality to a threat which has caused increasing alarm for two decades—a universal pension for World War veterans.

At the present moment the stage is being fixed for a drive to provide an income of $60 monthly to all veterans upon reaching the age of 65, regardless of need or disability. Establishment of the system is a foregone conclusion; the only question is how soon it will occur.

A preliminary skirmish in the House recently showed that it is merely a matter of time before regular checks start going out to the 4,000,000 men who joined the colors in 1917 and 1918. The veterans are well organized, so the result of the battle is indisputable.

The immediate issue is $30 monthly pensions to widows and dependents of all veterans—a little matter of $48,000,000 the first year and an estimated over-all outlay of $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. Stopped so far by the efforts of an unaided Californian—Representative COSTELLO (Democrat), of Hollywood—this measure is sure to pass the House before adjournment. It is almost certain to fail in the Senate this year.

Strategy in pushing veterans' legislation through Congress has been pretty well perfected, as the handling of this widows' and orphans' pension bill shows. Usual technique is for the House World War Veterans' Committee to take a half dozen bills and hold hearings at which objections are registered. The group then drafts a complete proposal, embodying different features of as many measures as possible, which it offers as a substitute for one of the original measures without further public discussion. Tactically this maneuvering is important; it means there are no adverse reports from Government agencies against the version taken up for debate.

The principal lobbyists for a universal pension are willing to take their time, not minding if the widows' and orphans' measure fails to get to the White House this year. Next session the skids will be greased—since hearings were held this year and the House already will have gone on record as favoring the proposal—and the bill will get to the Senate speedily. Then all political attention can be focused on one spot, carrying out the fundamental principle of concentrating strength on one objective at a time.

The widows' and orphans' pension is almost the climax of a long-time campaign. At first, parents of men lost in action had 20-year insurance policies. When these ran out pensions were provided.

Then widows of men who were 30-percent disabled began receiving aid. The percentage of disability was steadily reduced until almost all of this group was taken care of. Now the proposition is to provide Government benefits for those widows and children—many still unborn—of any former service man after his death. To complete the process only universal pensions will be needed.

In addition I present an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on April 27, which I believe is very timely:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 27, 1940]

ISOLATION AGITATION

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, our two biggest veterans' groups.

Almost no Americans that we know of who saw the previous show want to see a repeat performance, let alone act in one. The horrors of the former exhibit remain fresh in the memories of hundreds of thousands of Americans now in their prime.

We suggest that all Legionnaires and Veterans of Foreign Wars take to telling their families and friends about those horrors—that these veterans' groups constitute themselves committees of the whole to agitate United States isolation throughout this war.

That would be a vital public service.

It would be a great deal worthier than the present main activity of the Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars lobbyists, which is to organize raids on the United States Treasury for wider and wider World War pensions. The lobbyists have now come to the point of demanding pensions for widows of soldiers who were not injured in the war.

How about the Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars rank and file pulling the props out from under these grab artists, and getting in there and fighting to keep their country from committing another such tragic mistake as it committed when it went to war in 1917?

The Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY RAY C. KIRKPATRICK

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ray C. Kirkpatrick, assistant on labor relations, Public Works Administration, Federal Works Agency, International Union of Operating Engineers, Washington, D. C., April 10, 1940:

It is a distinct pleasure to meet with this convention. I have been instructed by Mr. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and Col. E. W. Clark, Acting Commissioner of the Public Works Administration, to extend to you their greetings and their wishes for a most successful convention.

I come before you not only as the assistant on labor relations for the Public Works Administration, but also as a friend of your officers and your organization. I have known President Possehl, Secretary and Treasurer Fitzgerald, Mr. John P. Coyne, and many others of you here today for many years and have learned to appreciate deeply these friendships. The sincerity of this relationship has been demonstrated in the splendid cooperation extended me and the administration I represent, in accomplishing the big job that has been ours. A real tribute to the caliber of the leadership of your organization lies in the selection by the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor of its president. It was, in addition, a compliment to the personal ability of the chairman of your board of trustees, Mr. John P. Coyne.

In observing this splendid organization, with its excellent leaders and extensive membership, I am reminded of the tremendous steps achieved by organized labor in the last few years. For centuries activities of organizations such as this were considered conspiracy against the state and were punished accordingly. The very assembly itself was considered illegal, regardless of the nature of the proceedings. Even far into the nineteenth century the efforts of legislatures and courts appear to have been not only to curb but also to crush all efforts to organize for self-betterment. In our own country the early judiciary declared that "A combination of workmen to raise their wages may be considered in a twofold point of view. One is to benefit themselves, * * * the other is to injure those who do not join their society. The rule of law condemns both."

Since that time, however, there have been great changes, both in the industrial life of our people, and in their social concepts. Rapid transportation and communication have been the means of such general education and mutual understanding that the people throughout the country have developed common problems and common attitudes. Thinking, in general, has become less circumspect and localized.

Even as this social evolution has tended toward a federalization of government, it has also removed the ignorance, intolerance, and the restrictions of economic monarchies that had handicapped organized labor. The type of thinking encouraged under the new democracy developed a working class that objected to the economic suppression that came with the industrial era. There thus developed labor organizations as an appropriate and necessary part of our national life.

That this position was accepted and understood is demonstrated by the following excerpts from a report by a commission appointed by the Congress to investigate labor in 1898:

"By the organization of labor, and by no other means, it is possible to introduce an element of democracy into the government of industry. By this means only, the workers can effectively take part in determining the conditions under which they work. This becomes true in the fullest and best sense only when employers frankly meet the representatives of the workmen and deal with them as parties equally interested in the conduct of affairs. It is only under such conditions that a real partnership of labor and capital exists * * *.

"If the working people are prevented from introducing an element of democracy into industrial life by way of labor organizations, they will undertake to introduce it in another way."

The problems and purposes of the labor movement, as such, were also gaining the respect of the general public. Although some steps were previously taken to further labor's position, it was not until 1933 that far-reaching measures were designed to secure to labor a position of relative significance commensurate with its importance in our national life. Under the present progressive administration, more legislation, favorable to labor, has been passed than in all the previous history of our country.

I am happy that I may refer to the construction terms and conditions of the Public Works Administration for an example of regulations permitted by legislation of this type. There are required, in every contract signed under the $4,000,000,000 P. W. A. construction program, the following, among other provisions, in which are couched guaranties favorable to labor:

1. That contract minimum rates be determined and paid in accordance with the rates prevailing in the locality in which the project is to be constructed.

2. That all employees engaged in work on the project have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and that such employees be free from interference of employers in the designation of such employees' representatives in self-organization. That no person seeking employment on the project and no person employed thereon shall be required as a condition of initial or continued employment to join any company union or to refrain from joining, organizing, or assisting a labor organization of such person's own choosing.

3. That no person under the age of 16 years, no convict labor, and no person whose age or physical condition is such as to make his employment dangerous to health and safety may be employed, although physically handicapped persons who are otherwise employable are not thus affected.

4. That there be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, or political affiliation.

5. That persons be not permitted to work more than 8 hours per day or more than 40 hours per week, except in cases of emergency.

It is undoubtedly a new day for labor—a day of recognition merited by long years of effort. You have great cause for pride in the efforts you have taken to elevate the trade, encourage a higher standard of skill among your members, and in the cultivation of feelings of friendship among members of your craft and those who may employ them. There is further cause for commendation, because of your efforts to assist your members in securing and stabilizing employment, and your attempts to consummate contracts with employers, whereby wages, hours, and conditions of work may be regulated to the benefit of both your membership and the employers.

In addition to the above, this organization has demonstrated a fine spirit of cooperation in all matters relating to national progress. As society has become more complex, it has become more interdependent. It can succeed only when based upon the far-sighted cooperation of those comprising it. In this sense, "cooperation" is more than an abstract principle; it is an economic necessity.

That the efforts of this organization are directed toward the forwarding of the labor movement by correlating its activities with the general functions of society has already been demonstrated by the remarks made by Mr. Coyne in an address some months ago to the Rotarians in Washington. He said: "All we want is our fair due.

We will fight to protect you in your due. We will, if necessary, fight to get our due. We will preferably cooperate, for in all war, by whatever name described, there is only loss to everybody."

I desire to thank again the officers and members of this organization for the assistance you have rendered the Public Works Administration through me and my office.

The Public Works Administration is now being liquidated. Created in 1933 to relieve unemployment, particularly among the building trades, it has financed in whole or in part some 34,508 projects, estimated to cost over $6,000,000,000. To carry out this tremendous program the support of organized labor was a vital necessity. Permit me to express to you the appreciation of the Public Works Administration for your part in providing this necessary support. Labor has more than justified the confidence of the Government.

I am grateful for this opportunity of meeting with you today. I thank you.

Shall We Abolish the Air Safety Board?

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, before launching on my subject, I wish to comment on the recent million-dollar prize offered for murder or kidnaping by Samuel Harden Church, president of Carnegie Institute. It would be interesting to know who the "50 wealthy Pittsburghers" are. As a matter of fact, the Department of Justice should, under the law, expose the names of those who made this offer.

I realize, of course, that a Carnegie fund, and perhaps other funds set up by Carnegie, are pro-British and pro-international. I realize that in his book, Triumphant Democracy, published in 1893, he expressed the hope that the United States would again become a colony of Great Britain. He was like Cecil Rhodes, who hoped the same. Both of them made their fortunes on slave labor. The disposition of their wealth was, of course, their own business, and so I grant are their private opinions. But when it has reached the point where their funds involve the rights and liberties of the people, or where they engage in the old tactics of putting the prize on murder and kidnaping, we are going back a long way from civilization.

The offer of such a prize may well lead to real murder and real kidnaping in the United States, and should this happen, no one should be to blame except those who are overeducated in internationalism instead of nationalism.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw the offer and that others will do the same, for this is an incident that might lead this Nation into war. Surely, if any foreign power offered a price on the life of our President or any prominent person in this country we would be ready to go to war. Yet we indulge in the very things that we would condemn and this attitude is even lauded by those who should know better.

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 7, 9, and 16, 1939, I inserted in the RECORD statements in opposition to the reorganization bill and to the unconstitutional and dangerous powers granted to the President of the United States. In order to refresh your memories, I shall quote a few paragraphs from my remarks on March 7, 1939:

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the debate on H. R. 4425, the Reorganization Act of 1939, as propounded by the gentlemen from Missouri and North Carolina, I can readily foresee a purge in the United States no different from that which caused bloodshed in Europe. It is always well to remember that the American people are beginning to think for themselves. They are not going to tolerate socialism and communism imported from Europe. The small minority who are advocates of these "isms" are sticking their necks a long way out, and I predict they will be cut off.

The many Communists who have been appointed to positions in the Federal Government is sufficient evidence to show which way the administration leans. Such appointments are un-American, and those who make them are no better than the appointees.

We have been asleep for a long time, and we are still slumbering, but when our people become thoroughly aroused, I am positive that Congress will be instructed to clean house and the people will help to perform such necessary house cleaning.

It is difficult for a new man to understand how anyone can support this reorganization bill, a bastard offspring of the last bill, and it is no better than its parent It is not to reorganize the Government. It is not to reduce expenses. It is for one purpose alone—to centralize greater control in some evil power in our Government.

How anyone can stand up and defend this measure, and state to the Members that this bill is necessary and that Congress is not capable of performing reorganization, is an insult to Congress itself.

I did not see this bill until March 6, 1939, and I believe one of my colleagues said the same when he addressed the House yesterday. I question the purpose and the good faith of a committee that brings a bill of this type on the floor without giving our people an opportunity to study a measure which is going to deprive them of their birthright. I am, however, much more alarmed at the manner in which all bills come out of the committees. They are so obscure and confusing, interwoven with legislation and appropriation, that no one can vote on them intelligently. The purpose of the bills and of the administration that backs them can only be to destroy our Government, as this administration has done in the last 6 years.

I do not like to see a bloody revolution, yet as I observe the submissiveness and blindness of some of the majority Members in their acquiescent attitude to administration leaders, I realize the end is near.

The National Health Act was introduced in the Senate February 27. It is a brother to the Reorganization Act of 1939. It is for no other purpose than to turn over full control to the President and his bureaucrats. The Democrats are in the majority and can pass any legislation they please, which they have done.

To hasten final dissolution and destruction of our Government, I advise you to pass both of these acts. After you have borrowed and appropriated $10,000,000,000 more we will be bankrupt and you may then pack your baggage and go home.

After having performed this noble deed you may in your declining years listen to your master's crack of the whip and cogitate upon the aid you rendered in the destruction of your own Government. You will not be so cocky then as you are now, because you will be despised by every patriotic man and woman who sees you.

The legislation should be passed now, while you are in power. You are responsible; you should therefore clean the slate. Your action of today may be responsible for destruction of life tomorrow. I want you to be credited with that. I want it to be a crown of glory for those who vote for this bill and betray our people. Congress should know that it cannot shift its power to others; that in the very act of passing this power it dishonors its oath of affirmation.

The reorganization bill of 1939 will reorganize and consolidate the Government under one man. It will not reduce cost, and it will not simplify. It will, instead, complicate much more than now. This bill will create a costly totalitarian, communistic state.

I now quote from the bill, section 301:

"The President is authorized to appoint not to exceed six administrative assistants and to fix the compensation of each at the rate of not more than $10,000 per annum. Each such administrative assistant shall perform such duties as the President may prescribe."

This paragraph informs you about the dictator, and the Members of Congress should know that they elected him, and not the people. This congressional fiasco will cost the taxpayers of the United States $60,000 per year for six administrative assistants. That is the beginning. The Lord only knows how much it will cost for administrators or how many it will add to the Federal pay rolls, for no administration adherent will be discharged or left unemployed.

The purpose of this act is not to reorganize or to provide reduction in the cost of operating the Federal Government. It is not to aid the people by reducing taxes. It is, instead, the opposite, for it adds more cost to the Government's operations, which, of course, will have to be met by greater taxation.

Now, what is the act for?

I quote from the bill, section 1 (a):

"The President shall investigate the organization of all executive agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes."

The question now arises, what can the President do? And the answer is "Nothing," for he must employ someone to do the work for him. If he appoints the same caliber of men that he has recently appointed, even my colleagues on the right may visualize what might happen. There is too much socialism and communism in the Federal Government now, and this bill will, if nothing else, help to promote that tendency.

What is he further supposed to do?

I quote from the bill:

"To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government."

Does this mean anything? Certainly not, for this bill has already appropriated $60,000 per year for additional help, and nothing is said about how much more is to be appropriated or if anyone is to be eliminated.

I quote from the bill:

"To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues."

For the past 7 years, I believe, the Government has spent about $10,000,000,000 per year, or between sixty or seventy billion dollars. If this was not enough revenue to meet the present attempt at efficiency, just how much will be needed to meet contemplated efficiency, if you please?

These statements which I made then are now confirmed, for we have greater centralization in Government, dissension and friction between departments, and complaints from our constituents as a result of changes of which they do not approve. In addition to this, we have increased the Federal employment list by thousands and the cost of Federal operation by millions of dollars. This, of course, is no more than what we might have expected, for when the Executive promises economy, the reverse is true, for his economy means greater wastefulness and spending. Instead of cooperation between departments, we now have dissension and friction, and instead of greater efficiency we have inefficiency. As a matter of fact, it is clearly evident that no one appears to know what it is all about. If we keep shifting departments around, no one should be surprised if some day we find the Post Office Department conducting experiments in farming.

We are now confronted with the fourth reorganization bill, which in my opinion will, if it is passed, display either extreme tolerance or ignorance on the part of Congress. For 531 Members of Congress to pass one law on top of another in which they deprive Congress of power and bestow this on some hairbrained appointee of the Executive needs a lot of explaining when the Members confront their constituents for reelection. If Members of Congress have come to the conclusion that the appointees of the President are more competent than themselves, they should, in order to save the taxpayers money, go home and leave the Government in the hands of these crackpots in the Federal Government. Just how much evidence is needed by Congress to establish incompetence is a question the Members must decide. Nothing more is needed to prove this to the people, for nearly everyone is worried over the national debt, hocus-pocus money, inflation, dying industries, stagnant business, unemployment, stupid diplomacy, agitation for war, and the persistent attempts by the Executive to concentrate all power of Government under bureaucratic control, with headquarters in the kitchen cabinet.

The stumbling block in this last reorganization bill, however, is the contemplated change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce, and the abolition of the Air Safety Board. The objection to this change is purely one expressed by the air-traveling public, for they have come to the conclusion that their families prefer to meet them at the airport in the ship instead of meeting them at home in a hearse.

The President is being quoted as having said:

Since the transmittal of Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV, a flood of misinformation has engulfed those sections dealing with the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Much of this has fallen of its own absurdity and needs no comment. This morning, however, we saw a group of well-intentioned people staking out an exclusive claim to a so-called Lobby To Save Lives.

Such a statement is immaterial to the air traveler, for he appreciates the interest the air pilots are taking in his safety. Many of them, no doubt, recall the many tragedies which occurred when aeronautics was under the control of the Department of Commerce. I, as a pilot, have not forgotten some of my friends who are now dead.

The persons best qualified to express their opinions upon this problem are the pilots who have come to Washington to plead with the Government, not for their own sakes, but for the safety of their passengers. There is not a more loyal group of men than those who sit at the controls of our air liners, and we should listen to their advice instead of listening to some absent-minded palooka or political appointee. Air travel has become efficient and safe because it has been free of politics and under the guidance of people who understand that business, so the administration should, to be fair, give these gentlemen credit for a clean record instead of belittling the work that they have done so well.

Let me quote:

Here, in simply summary, is the proposal:

1. Despite handicaps, the Federal program for civil aeronautics has now achieved a stature and an importance which justify bringing this program more closely into the Federal family. The proposal will place it within the framework of the Department of Commerce, where it will have a closer relationship with the important reporting services of the Weather Bureau, and the essential air-navigation chart service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. More than that, it will provide representation at the Cabinet table for a program of basic significance to our national transportation and our national defense. Present world conditions make the merit of this phase of the proposal obvious.

To justify this shift because aeronautics has achieved stature and importance is strange reasoning, for anyone else would reason that it should be left in the department where it had achieved its safety and importance.

That, however, is not the reason for the change, for here is the actual reason:

More than that, it will provide representation at the Cabinet table for a program of basic significance to our national transportation and our national defense. Present world conditions make the merit of this phase of the proposal obvious.

The cat is out of the bag. The President wants the C. A. A. in the Department of Commerce, so that it can be dominated by him and woven into an instrument to bring about a much-desired war.

I can only say that this makes it doubly obvious that it should be left where it is. It is there the people want it. The people of this Nation do not want to die in crashes in order to please the President, or anyone else. The people want, instead, a sensible and intelligent administration, particularly where their own safety and lives are concerned.

I do not believe the people are willing to risk the safety of air travel or to sacrifice their lives in order to help the President to build up our national defense, as he stated. In the first place, the American people do not want war, either now or after Congress adjourns. We recognize that there are certain powers that wish to pull the United States into war, and that war is favored by the administration itself, and that we are now engaged in active help to belligerents. The American people are equally sure that they shall go no further than that, and the President and his advisers should recognize that attitude now and lay their course accordingly.

I shall not waste time on reasons 2, 3, and 4, but I shall quote No. 5, because it is the same old "baloney":

Not only are we advancing the cause of air safety by these changes but we will also realize appreciable savings. Several highly paid positions on the Air Safety Board will be eliminated and other economies made possible.

The proposed change of the C. A. A. will not advance the cause of air safety, but will, I believe, bring about the same crack-ups and wash-outs we had before. However, to say that this change will bring about economy is absurd, for everyone knows that not one act of this administration has ever been economical. The President knows that, and his statement in this quotation confirms it, for he says that economies will be made possible. I can only say that so far there is no evidence that anyone now employed in the administration could now or at any future time make economy possible.

Benjamin Ryan Tillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BUTLER B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina, on May 1, 1940, at the unveiling of a monument to the late Benjamin R. Tillman:

Surely it is fitting that here in the city where many of his political battles were fought and won, you and I should meet to pay homage to Benjamin Ryan Tillman. And surely it is equally appropriate that here, on the battlefield, should be unveiled the monument which is to remind future generations of the achievements of the stalwart figure whose memory it shall enshrine.

South Carolina ranks high among the States of this Union when historians recount the deeds of those who established and nurtured this democracy. Warriors who strode across the battle scene did not always wear armor or bear muskets. Many of the battles which exerted a profound influence upon South Carolina's growth and development were fought upon the rostrum. And the conditions which necessitated such struggles imposed upon the State's leaders responsibilities as numerous and as grave as military leaders of any era have been called upon to assume.

No period in our State's history was fraught with so many momentous problems as that during which Benjamin Ryan Tillman was developing into manhood. The War between the States and the period of reconstruction which followed, brought to South Carolina tribulations which tried the souls of her harassed citizens. The State saw its most treasured ideals and institutions converted into unhappy memories. Bankruptcy had overtaken most of those who had been wealthy. The masses were restive. They feverishly sought a solution for their problems, and they wanted, above all else, a leader who had walked through the valley with them, who understood their needs and who would fight unwaveringly for their cause.

Like the Romans of old, they found that man of destiny behind a plow. Their Cincinnatus was a rugged farmer from Edgefield County, a tireless dynamo who, like those who sought his guidance, was dissatisfied with the conditions prevalent in that period.

The farmer from Edgefield led a crusade whose goal was the freedom of South Carolina's agricultural interests from what the farmers felt was virtually taxation without representation. And he led that crusade with a flaming torch that proved an inspiration to many who have followed the trail he blazed.

Tillman came from sturdy, distinguished stock. His father died when young Ben was only 2 years old, and thereafter the child was reared under the tutelage of his accomplished mother. Mrs. Tillman managed her estate in Edgefield County without the aid of an overseer, and she did it with remarkable efficiency.

By her side, young Ben learned about agricultural and other economic problems. His intimate contact with the practical phases of life on the farm groomed him for the tremendous tasks which confronted him in later years. His mental powers developed steadily, along with his knowledge of the problems of his fellow citizens, and he sensed with uncanny accuracy those economic and social changes which were occurring in South Carolina. He and thousands of other South Carolina farmers were convinced that, among other things, they needed agricultural education. With the meager weapons at their command, they were fighting a losing, hopeless battle against intolerable economic conditions. They concluded that their lot could not be improved without far-reaching changes in the State's leadership.

Francis Simkins in his splendid history, The Tillman Movement in South Carolina, writes that it was on August 10, 1885, at a joint meeting of the State Grange and the Agricultural and Mechanical Society of South Carolina, the State first learned that an Edgefield farmer had evolved revolutionary ideas concerning a State's responsibility to its agricultural interests.

In a speech replete with dry humor, yet overflowing with hard truths, Ben Tillman electrified that gathering in the Bennettsville courthouse. He offered a set of resolutions designed to advance the cause of agricultural education. He urged that the legislature establish a technical school where students might work and come forth at graduation ready to earn a living. It was from this plea that Clemson College eventually emerged.

Yesterday afternoon I visited Clemson College. From the burial ground to the cemetery more than 2,000 students lined the roadway. We passed through that human lane sorrowfully, following to its last resting place the body of another distinguished South Carolinian, Asbury Francis Lever. As I gazed into the faces of the young men on either side of that road I knew that they were the sons of Tillmanites and anti-Tillmanites, and I realized that many of them would never have received the blessings of that character of education within the limits of South Carolina but for the vision and determination of Ben Tillman.

I know that if Senator Tillman were present this morning he would have enjoyed the musical program and would have been proud of the band from Winthrop College, the institution he loved so well.

From the day of that convention until his death 33 years later, Tillman was a commanding political figure in South Carolina. At the outset of his entry into South Carolina politics he proclaimed: "If I had no peculiarities, perhaps I would be an insignificant and an unknown man. I am what I am, and God made me what I am, and therefore, if this conglomeration of flesh and bones becomes a factor in South Carolina, it will be by reason of my peculiarities."

What he chose to characterize as his peculiarities were quickly recognized as genius by the people of his State. The farmers recognized in him their unchallenged leader, and they followed the standard he bore through some of the stormiest political campaigns ever waged in the Nation.

A trained warrior on the battlefield never fought with greater skill than did Tillman in his many political battles. He aroused among his followers an enthusiasm that knew no bounds, and the majority of those who rallied around his banner in the early days of his struggles remained loyal to his cause until their leader laid down his arms at the call of the Great Commander in Chief for the last long sleep.

April 29, 1886, was a momentous day in South Carolina political history. On that date the farmers of the State assembled here in Columbia. Tillman's address on that occasion attracted Statewide attention. His broad contention was that farmers constituted 76 percent of the State's population at that time, but had little voice in government. With a thoroughness that amazed those unacquainted with his thorough grasp of public affairs, he discussed the problems of government and urged the farmers to elect to public office men who would loyally carry out reforms needed to improve agricultural conditions.

The convention selected a committee, with Tillman as chairman, to appear before the next legislature and advocate certain reforms, among them a separate agricultural annex to the State college, a tax on fertilizer for inspection and analytical purposes; a State board of agriculture, the repeal of the lien law through which so much farm property had become mortgaged, the establishment of a State college for women, and the calling of a convention to frame a new constitution for the State.

Rebuffed by the legislature at the next session, the Tillman forces redoubled their efforts to bring their program to fruition. Unaware of the powerful, irresistible movement under way, the State's lawmakers unwittingly had sown the seeds that were to grow into a rich harvest in an amazingly short time. On March 27, 1890, the farmers of the State again assembled in Columbia for the avowed purpose of nominating their own candidates for State offices.

Tillman had insisted repeatedly that he did not desire public office. But the assemblage in Columbia that March day had other plans. Time after time the audience called for Ben Tillman.

Finally he yielded to their insistent appeals. "I do not want to be the nominee," he said, "but if you ask me to fight * * * I will fight as long as I have a dollar left and the health with which to fight."

They asked him to fight. Ben Tillman kept his word.

At the age of 43, in the prime of mental and physical vigor, he waged a gubernatorial campaign which South Carolina has not forgotten. That county-to-county canvass brought scenes of tense excitement. Tillman marched across the State explaining the objectives of his fight, and his strength grew daily.

Tillman so aroused the farmers that in many counties they would not permit his opponents to speak. When those opponents denounced him, he excelled them in denunciation. When the press lectured him for conducting an undignified campaign and resorting to personalities he placed the responsibility for the character of campaign upon his enemies. He told the story of a farmer with pitchfork in his hand walking by the side of a wagon loaded with hay. As he passed a neighbor's place a savage-looking bulldog attacked him and, just in the nick of time, the farmer stuck him with the pitchfork. The owner of the dog yelled, "Why didn't you use the other end?" To which the farmer replied, "Why didn't your dog use the other end?" The illustration delighted the farmers. One of them promptly called him "Pitchfork Ben." The name stuck to him for the rest of his life.

The realization that a new power in the State had made its appearance spread like wildfire. Tillman was elected Governor by a margin of almost four to one, and on December 4, 1890, the

largest crowd ever gathered on this plaza assembled to witness the inauguration of the Edgefield farmer as chief executive.

No glittering generalities marked the inaugural address of Governor Tillman. "The responsibilities of my position demand practical statesmanship," he told his audience. "We are here to do business, not evolve beautiful theories or discuss ideal government. We come as reformers, claiming that many things in the government are wrong."

None of those who weighed and analyzed his address realized it, perhaps, but South Carolina that day inaugurated the man who might truly be termed "the first new dealer."

South Carolina needed profound changes—a New Deal—and Governor Tillman went about his task of reorganizing the State government with the same grimness of purpose that had always characterized his actions. Before his first term of 2 years had expired, the State had witnessed many changes under its New Deal Governor.

Construction of Clemson and Winthrop Colleges had been started. South Carolina College had been reorganized. Many other changes advocated by the farmers of the State had been effected, but Governor Tillman regarded his program as incomplete. He asked for another term in which to perfect the reforms he had launched.

The Governor went even further: He told the people that many members of the legislature had obstructed his program and asked that they be defeated. His request was granted. Ben Tillman went back to the Governor's chair for another term with a legislature whose overwhelming majority was in thorough sympathy with his objectives. There were many then and there will be many now who will assert that his course was wrong, that he sought to be a dictator. I do not agree. I believe in responsible government. If we elect a Governor with a definite program, we should elect a legislature that will enact it into law. If the program is successful, the Governor and the legislators should be rewarded. If it is a failure, they should be retired.

Governor Tillman put through both Houses an authorization for holding a popular referendum to determine whether a constitutional convention should be held.

His railroad regulation bill, sidetracked by the preceding legislature, was passed, providing for a railroad commission of 3 to be given power to examine all schedules and books of railroad companies in order to fix fair freight and passenger rates and prevent unjust discrimination in charges. His program of fiscal reform aroused wide opposition, but he engineered it through to enactment. Under his supervision the legislature took its first step in the direction of social legislation by enacting a law limiting the hours of labor in the cotton mills of the State.

No better indication of the speedy tempo with which America moves could be cited than by retrospection at this point. The News and Courier declared the bill would drive capital out of the State. Cotton-mill executives in South Carolina proclaimed that the proposed legislation would bankrupt every mill in the State. The law, as finally passed in 1892, provided for a limit of 66 hours work per week. Four decades later we have a 40-hour week, and last month we had more active spindles in South Carolina than in any other State in the Union.

Governor Tillman inaugurated other reforms. The legislature approved his plan for reorganization of county governments to enable these units to function more efficiently and economically. The State debt of $5,500,000 was refunded. Pensions of Confederate veterans were increased. Salaries of public officials were decreased. The tax levy was decreased by one-half a mill. The Governor's efforts to shift some of the burden of taxation from land to corporations were successful. His program was bitterly opposed by the conservatives but the best evidence of the constructive character of that program is the fact that with the one exception no important bill enacted during the Tillman administration was repealed by those who subsequently came into control of the State government.

The one exception was the dispensary law. In a State-wide referendum the people had voted in favor of prohibition. Tillman did not believe that the State was ready for this reform. He feared the violations of the law which subsequently contributed to the repeal of the national prohibition statute. As a compromise he offered the dispensary system, patterned after a municipal law in Sweden, which had worked remarkably well. The law was opposed both by liquor dealers and prohibitionists. The efforts to enforce it caused riots and bloodshed. With the persistence and courage that characterized the man, Tillman called into action all the powers of government. When several units of the National Guard failed to respond to his call he disbanded the companies. He appointed a small army of State constables and by the end of his term the law was being enforced, not with complete effectiveness, but as well as any law regulating the sale of alcoholic liquors could have been enforced at that time. Subsequently corruption in the administration of the law and the rising tide of public sentiment against the sale of alcoholic liquors under any system resulted in its repeal.

Tillman's espousal of the dispensary system was unfortunate. The tremendous task of enforcing the law diverted him from the accomplishment of social reforms which he believed to be overdue and which would have been possible under his leadership. Unfortunate, too, because the spectacular methods resorted to in order to enforce the law caused people without the State and some within the State to associate his name only with the dispensary law and to overlook the incomparable program of constructive legislation enacted during his administration.

That South Carolina ratified his acts as Governor was attested in 1894, when Tillman sought and won easily a seat in the United States Senate. In his final message to the general assembly, he listed the numerous accomplishments of his administration, and that which he was especially proud to list was the passage of a resolution calling for a constitutional convention.

Coincident with his election to the Senate, South Carolina had voted to hold a convention to draft a new constitution. At that time the State's constitution was based on that of Ohio. Its shortcomings were exasperating to Tillman, who had fought for years to bring about changes he deemed necessary. Therefore the convention which began in Columbia on September 10, 1895, represented a personal triumph for the Edgefield statesman, and the real leadership of the convention devolved upon him.

For 12 weeks this convention wrestled with difficult tasks under the unrelaxing vigilance of Senator Tillman, and the constitution which emanated from this gathering registered with almost uncanny accuracy the desires of the dominant element in South Carolina. That this is true is proved by the fact that 34 years after its promulgation it still remains as the fundamental law of our State.

South Carolina's constitution stands, in reality, as another imposing monument to Senator Tillman's vision, his tenacity of purpose and his indomitable will to win every battle for which he enlisted.

As a Member of the United States Senate, Tillman's forcefulness, independence, and honesty of purpose quickly won for him the respect of his colleagues. Senators discovered that in debate he was a dangerous opponent. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose that in the national arena he still possessed and used effectively the power of ridicule, which had been so devastating to opponents on the hustings in South Carolina.

"Pitchfork Ben" soon became as well known in the Capital City of the Nation as in the capital city of South Carolina. He contributed to the enactment of many progressive measures affecting the agricultural interests of the Nation. He was intensely interested in the United States Navy. When the Democratic Party came into power in 1913, he was made chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. He advocated measures of preparedness and when we entered the World War rendered inestimable services as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

In the field of national politics he played a prominent part. As national committeeman from this State he participated in the management of his party's battles. His liberalism placed him in the camp of another great liberal. He contributed to the nomination of Woodrow Wilson, and to the day of his death remained one of the most loyal friends and supporters of the war President.

His attitude toward Wilson was entirely different from his attitude toward the previous Democratic President, Grover Cleveland. He differed with Cleveland and in Tillmanesque language criticized his acts. But Tillman was first, last, and all the time a Democrat. He believed in fighting his battles in the Democratic Party and abiding by the will of the majority. He had no patience with those who deserted the party. He told me that after he had severely criticized Cleveland, several southern leaders who had embraced the Populist cause came to urge him to join that third party. In commenting upon his refusal, he stated: "I remained in the Democratic Party and I had the opportunity in the Senate to contribute to the accomplishment of many of the reforms the Populists advocated, while those men who deserted the party went into a political wilderness from which they have never emerged, and have been unable to help their country or themselves."

I have devoted the greater part of my remarks to the activities of Tillman the farmer and Tillman the Governor, because it is my belief his greatest public service was rendered during that period of his career. That was his own opinion. In the closing days of his life I heard him say time and again that: "I would rather be Governor of South Carolina than hold any other office in the gift of the people." He held that opinion because it was in the office of Governor he had been given the opportunity to render greatest service to the people he loved.

The statement that in 1890 reforms were overdue in South Carolina does not reflect in the slightest degree upon the integrity of those who had been in control of the State government. Even Tillman, who certainly showed little restraint in criticizing opponents in debate, never once questioned the honesty and integrity of the men who from 1876 to that date had administered the government of the State. South Carolina from the days of reconstruction had enjoyed a government free of corruption, a government controlled by men who in time of war as well as peace had demonstrated their patriotism. They were as a rule followers of the revered Wade Hampton.

The campaign of 1890 resulted in these two leaders, Hampton and Tillman, becoming political antagonists. Each possessed the power to arouse his supporters. This feud only added to the bitter feeling already engendered. Considering the intensity of feeling it is fortunate indeed that it has disappeared. If today it exists at all, it is lodged only in the hearts of a few persons who participated in those contests. It does not exist in the hearts of the

young. It matters not whether our young people today graduate from The Citadel, or from the South Carolina University, which were at one time the targets of his criticism; or from the institutions he loved so well, Clemson and Winthrop. As they visit these grounds and look upon that figure to the left or that figure to the right of the statehouse, they will join in paying tribute to the memory of those two great South Carolinians, Wade Hampton and Benjamin Ryan Tillman.

When praise is bestowed upon Tillman for having given to the State a new constitution, we are apt to overlook another achievement. It cannot be said that he initiated the demand for a direct primary for the nomination of candidates for public office. That demand was voiced before Tillman urged it upon the State in 1888, but the primary was not assured until the closing days of his second administration, when he was in absolute control of the legislature and the party machinery.

An even greater service was rendered by Tillman in arousing the masses of the people to take an interest in their own government. I have no fear for the future of this State or of this country so long as the masses of the people have the right to determine the kind of government under which they live, and freely exercise that power.

It has been said that Senator Tillman in the last few years of his life became more conservative in his views. I think that is true. It only emphasizes that great truth that the liberal of today is the conservative of tomorrow.

From 1911 to 1918, while I was a Member of the House, I spent many hours with Senator Tillman in his office and in his home. It was difficult for me to understand how the man I knew could, in earlier days, have aroused the intense hatred and animosity of men for whose judgment I had great respect. I concluded they had seen him only when he was engaged in his political battles, or that he had mellowed with age.

Certainly it was true that while I found Senator Tillman still a positive character, a man's man, whose earnestness was often mistaken for temper, I found him in his homelife gentle and kind. When aroused in a political discussion in his office or home, I have seen him at a mere word from the wife who called him "Bennie," discard his earnestness and smile in good humor. I have seen him walk among the flowers he had planted and speak of them as of children. I have watched his devotion to little children and had ample opportunity to know his respect for women and the pedestal upon which he placed womanhood.

In one of his campaigns, replying at Edgefield to cruel attacks that had been made upon him, Tillman uttered this appraisal of himself:

"I have a rough outside; God did not make me of silken material to bamboozle men, to give lip service, or to pretend what I do not mean; but my heart beats warm for the people of South Carolina; and those who know me best love me most. Although I make no pretensions to religion or to being a churchman, is there a man here who ever knew me to do an act of dishonor or dishonesty?"

There was no man there, or elsewhere, who would have made such a charge against Tillman. He hated hypocrisy and detested hypocrites. And, while he said he did not pretend to be a churchman, as I looked upon him a few hours before he left us, I recalled conversations with him that caused me to know that he had a simple faith in the Master, a faith that guided his footsteps from childhood to the grave, and imbued him with strength to march on when others faltered.

Those who knew Tillman, and those who have studied his career realize that what enabled this man to rise to the heights he attained was courage. Time and again he faced audiences of armed men who came to heckle him. He faced them without fear, and never once wavered in his attacks. He had more than physical courage. He had that courage which caused him not to falter in his course because of social ostracism or misrepresentation. Had he been less courageous, less persistent, or less dogmatic he would have been swayed by adversities and criticism and would have failed in his leadership. Possessed of a stout heart, he fought on and on, and the fight he waged for the masses of the people will ever be an abiding inspiration to all true lovers of democracy, and an enduring memorial to Benjamin Ryan Tillman.

The Relief Situation in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

LETTER FROM GOV. R. L. COCHRAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I realize the deplorable situation of the United States Treasury and that all appropriations must be handled very carefully, but I find it necessary to call the attention of Congress to the situation in Nebraska. We have had 6 or 7 years of prolonged drought. No one will ever know the actual poverty and want that prevails in many parts of my State. If a deficiency appropriation bill to further aid distressed territories is presented, I shall support it.

I feel that Federal funds for relief should be allotted to States in conformity to their needs. Since the need is very great in Nebraska, I hope that something can be done to relieve the situation. All possible waste should be eliminated in the administration of relief, and the heaviest cuts should be in those territories that have been more fortunate than my distressed State.

I have received many letters and telegrams from individuals, county commissioners, and other organizations. I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter that I received this morning from the Governor of Nebraska on this subject.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, April 30, 1940.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: The announcement that there will be a reduction of 5,000 in Nebraska on the W. P. A. rolls effective May 1 has caused considerable concern, not only among those directly dependent upon W. P. A. but also to all citizens who are familiar with our conditions.

It seems to me to be a situation that would justify a deficiency appropriation; and if a deficiency appropriation is not made, we feel that the reduction for Nebraska should be much less drastic than that announced because of our long period of drought, which has created a condition perhaps unlike that of any other State in the Union.

I am writing to the other Members of the Congress from Nebraska and to Colonel Harrington.

Very sincerely yours,

R. L. COCHRAN,
Governor of Nebraska.

The Real Friends of Labor Want the N. L. R. A. Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, certain union officials assume to speak for all labor. Certain others claim to be the only friends of labor. Both classes take it upon themselves to charge all those who disagree with their views with being antilabor.

It would be well, when listening to the statements of these gentlemen, to inquire as to what degree, if any, their expressed views are influenced by their personal interest. As an illustration: When you hear some high union official asserting that this or that law should not be amended, you might consider the amount he receives by way of salary or expenses as a union official, and whether or not, if all labor legislation was just and equitable, there would be the same need to retain him in office.

The same applies to some union organizers who seem bent upon always having a strike on the horizon and who, unless there was prospect of a strike or of a labor dispute, would be out of a job.

Then there are some politicians who must have an issue and, unless there is labor conflict, they would not be able to go out and shout from the housetops about the unfairness of the employer and how he paid a starvation wage.

It might be well, too, when listening to the statements of some of those who proclaim so loudly their friendship for labor, to consider how much of their argument is mere "flag waving" and how much of it is really in support of leg-

islation which will do something to remedy the unemployment situation.

Nor should we forget, as we listen to them, that as a rule none of these advocates ever created a job or gave industrial employment and that the force of their remarks is usually directed against those who, throughout the years, have provided the pay check which made the American workingman the highest-paid employee in all the world.

That some of the real laboring men and officials of labor organizations see the trend is quite evident, if we follow labor publications and their editorials. An editorial from Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, appearing in the current issue, is as follows:

BLAME THE "POLL"ITICIANS

The success of this Nation can be greatly credited to politicians like Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and others of their caliber, who pursued a policy of political wisdom based on equity and justice to all citizens. These politicians followed a course of action supported by the courage of their convictions, irrespective of personal ambitions. When laws were passed which proved to be of no remedial value, they did not figure in terms of how many votes they would win or lose by making amendments. They made amendments, believing that "right is might."

We have politicians today with equal courage and integrity, who can be well proud of being politicians. But we have, also, a type of opposite tendencies who believe in terms of votes, and how many they can poll through side-stepping an issue, even though it be the wrecking of our Nation. The latter are not genuine politicians; they are "poll"iticians.

If it were not for the "poll"iticians, the politicians would make amendments to some recent legislative blunders. Their first act would be to amend the Labor Act, a law that is not based on equity and justice to the citizenry as a whole. To analyze the enforcement of this law is to realize it unfairness. Three parts of our citizenry are involved by the Labor Act; the worker, the employer, and the public. But only one part is given consideration; the worker. The employer has no rights, and can be abused by the worker, with no provision allowed in the law for retaliation. He can be cited for his abuse of the law, but he cannot cite the worker. The public must take the consequences.

This law has proven inadequate in diminishing the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, making it apparent that it must be changed to benefit not only the workers but the employers and the general public as well if we are to enjoy a "government of the people, for the people, and by the people." As long as we remain in the hands of "poll-iticians," the chances of rectification of this miscarriage of justice are minute.

The Labor Act can be amended only in accordance with popular demand. The specific changes should be: First, the depoliticalizing of labor unions, making it against the law for unions to play politics in any way, shape, or form, thereby eliminating political campaign contributions; second, the abolition of the forced closed-shop and check-off system of dues collection; third, absolute equity to all parties affected by the law. With these amendments, it is doubtful if some of the newer labor organizations could survive. Which means that the present division of labor might turn out to be an amalgamation.

By and large, labor is becoming more conservative. No one realizes this fact more than the "poll-iticians" who, being strategists, know that the amalgamation would turn out to be their elimination at the next election. So, if the Labor Act is not amended this year, do not blame the politicians, blame the "poll-iticians."

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor, Railroad Workers Journal.

The Members of the House will shortly have an opportunity to get rid of the National Labor Relations Board and to correct some of the injustices of the N. L. R. A. It is to be hoped that, before it is too late, conservative labor will realize how a few Communists and a somewhat larger number of politicians have been using the labor issue to advance their own plans and interests; that the man who works remembers that neither the Communists nor the agitators nor the union officials themselves are the ones who provide the jobs; and that, after all, the old saying that we should not kill the goose that lays the golden egg contains the thought that, if you bankrupt the corporation or the individual who is operating the industry in which you work; if you destroy private business, then you know the Government will take over, and labor, every time it has fallen into the hands of the government—as in Italy and in Germany—will find itself under the control of the politicians, who are more greedy, more selfish, more ruthless, than private employers ever dreamed of being.

Six Months' Operation of Neutrality Law Has Protected American Neutrality, Prevented Loss of American Lives and Property, and Has Increased Our National Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the present Neutrality Act was signed by the President on November 4, 1939. It has now been tested for 6 months, during which foreign war has prevailed. The war has been greatly extended since the Neutrality Act was signed, but the United States remains at peace, and none of the belligerents has challenged the fairness and impartiality of this country under the Neutrality Act.

The foremost objective of the Congress, the President, and people of the United States is to keep out of war. This fixed purpose has been powerfully aided by the Neutrality Act. But for that law, the United States might by this time have become seriously involved.

Predictions were made by opponents of the Neutrality Act that it would take this country along the road to war. These predictions were honestly made, but they were not based upon reality.

It was said that the United States would become the arsenal of the Allies by lifting the embargo upon arms and implements of war, and that this policy would provoke war upon us.

The United States has not become an arsenal, and no belligerent finds fault with our old-established policy of dealing freely with all parties.

It was said that the United States was unwise in withdrawing its ships from embattled areas. We were accused of abandoning the freedom of the seas.

The wisdom of the present Neutrality Act in this respect has been demonstrated. Other neutral nations have sent ships into the war zones and these ships have been sunk, with great loss of life. The United States has not lost a single ship because of the great war. American citizens have not perished in attacks upon American ships. This fact alone vindicates the wisdom of the Neutrality Act.

It was said that Americans would lose heavily because of withdrawal of American shipping from war zones. On the contrary, American shipping to foreign ports since the beginning of the European conflict has increased sharply to its highest point in a decade. In January and February of this year 1,042 American vessels were employed, an increase of 110 from the like 1939 period. The rise was more striking in view of the diversion of American vessels from the war zone to Mediterranean, South American, African, and Asiatic ports, and the withdrawal of passenger liners from the North Atlantic. Our commerce with other peaceful nations is increasing—and this growth is permanent, not depending upon the abnormal demands of war.

By furnishing implements of war to belligerents the United States is stimulating invention and improvement in these weapons, besides building up immense productive capacity in aviation factories. These inventions and improvements, and this increased productive capacity vastly increase the effectiveness of our national defense, without any cost to us. As the war continues, the United States keeps abreast of

all new devices and mechanisms of war, so that our national defenses are stronger than would have been the case if we had maintained the embargo.

Thus, three prime objectives have been attained by the Neutrality Act.

First. We have made it less likely than ever that the United States will become involved in war.

Second. We have averted loss of American life and property and yet have maintained commerce.

Third. We have kept American national defense modernized without the necessity of spending huge sums for equipment and expansion of manufacturing capacity.

While sentiment in the United States is overwhelmingly in sympathy with the cause of the Allies in the European war, sentiment in this country is equally overwhelming against our country becoming involved in the war.

We intend to stay out of the war. We are safeguarded in this determination by the present Neutrality Act.

New England's Place In National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. JOSEPH SMITH, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. J. JOSEPH SMITH, a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, at the New England council meeting in Washington yesterday:

New England has from her earliest days taken an active part in our national defense. The traditions of our people as well as our position as the region of our country nearest Europe have kept awake in us a lively interest in the nations across the Atlantic and their relation to us.

New England's people have taken a leading part in furnishing the manpower of our armies from colonial days through Lexington and Concord down to the late World War. New England has also contributed her industrial skills and products from the days when Washington's cannon were cast in Connecticut and Massachusetts down to this age of the machine tool.

We are proud of the part our men and our industries have played in the defense of this Nation and the liberties of its people. We rightly raise monuments to the deeds of our youth from Concord to the Argonne. But it sometimes seems to me that in contemplating their heroic deeds we are too prone to forget their needless sacrifices in many of our wars.

The Revolution dragged on 8 years because of our bungling in the equipment and provisioning of our troops. The War of 1812 saw untrained and ill-equipped militia break at the approach of an enemy and abandon our Capital to the sack of the victorious invader.

Lack of equipment and training brought us Bull Run and its aftermath of 4 bloody years of rebellion. The War with Spain showed up our antiquated weapons and brought attention to worthless coast defenses. In the World War, although our factories had been making equipment for the Allies for 3 years before our entry into the war, we again were forced to throw untrained troops into battle and were unable to furnish them equipment of our own manufacture until it was all over.

We have had bitter lessons born of the failure of our people in the past to plan, provide, coordinate, and train, in time of peace, our magnificent human and industrial resources for our defense.

We have had lessons, but have we learned? Our course during the last 20 years hardly shows it.

After the World War we again abandoned any effective effort to maintain an adequate defense system. True, we drew up a blueprint of defense based on our World War experience, in the National Defense Act of 1920. It provided a Regular Army of 280,000 men, a National Guard of about 440,000, and contemplated reserves of equipment for the use of this force in the defense of the Nation and weapons and ammunition for its expansion in time of danger to whatever size might be necessary by the Organized Reserve.

The size and organization of our defense force has of necessity been modified from time to time to give us the best force possible from the funds available. At present mobilization plans call for the utilization of the existing Regular Army and the National Guard, with whatever regular reservists and recruits may be available, as an initial protective force. This would amount to something over 400,000 troops available in the continental United States. It would provide only five of the small triangular regular divisions with one full set of corps troops, with some additional regular units, and 18 National Guard divisions of the old type, somewhat larger in strength.

The act provided also for procurement and for "the assurance of adequate provision for the mobilization of matériel and industrial organizations essential to wartime needs"—both under the Assistant Secretary of War.

The National Defense Act of 1920 contemplated annual appropriations sufficient to maintain the forces provided in the act, with their arms, equipment, and necessary reserves of supplies. This has not been done.

The world knows the result on our Navy of the conferences and scrapping of the 1920's. Our own people do not realize the criminal neglect of our land forces during that time. We are paying now in cash and in huge additions to our debt for the neglect which avoided some expenditures during the 1920's and early 1930's but which left us without vital reserves of arms and ammunition, and without facilities to produce them in case of need.

In the 14 years from 1922 to 1935, our total Army expenditures ran from roughly two hundred and fifty to three hundred and fifty million dollars per year, with the average under three hundred million. Today it approaches nine hundred million and may go higher before we have made up the deficiencies in equipment which still face us.

The time necessary to produce Army equipment is usually not so long as that necessary to complete warships for our naval defense. It is a long time in the present day of lightning attack, however. It runs, in general, from 6 to 24 months, with some things such as seacoast heavy batteries sometimes taking 6 years.

Articles such as arms and ammunition can be produced in quantity within from 3 to 6 months if factories are tooled up and ready to go into production, and sufficient raw materials are on hand. If the factories are not sufficiently tooled and trained, we will have a recurrence of our World War experience, with an average time for reaching full production rate of about 2 years.

Let me cite you some examples from the World War experience:

75 mm. guns: Initial plans in 1917 called for 3,200 (2,100 at once and 1,100 a few months later for reserve and replacement). Those plans were increased in 1918 to require some 8,000 pieces for 1919. An early production of 300 to 400 per month was required if the supply was to be met within a reasonable time. Actually, no production was reached in 1917, and only 100 per month of all calibers of artillery by July 1918, and 400 per month of all calibers by October 1918, 19 months after war was declared.

75 mm. ammunition: Production in small quantity began in January 1918, but it was not until October 1918 that production neared 3,000,000 per month, approximately three-fourths of the monthly requirement. After orders were placed the average time to produce shells and deliver to shipside was 366 days. The machining of the shell body was, in itself, a huge task, requiring great industrial genius for its solution. To machine 1,000 shells in 8 hours, 78 machines, some of special design, were required. Twenty-four operations were required on each shell body, requiring 30 minutes if no delay occurred in the factory.

As to the 155-millimeter gun recoil mechanism which was new to American manufacturers: On an order placed November 1, 1917, production began in January 1919, 14 months later, and production of 45 per month was reached in July 1919, 20 months later. It was necessary to design 22 machines for this order, in addition to other manufacturing aids, and learn how to apply them to this mechanism.

The same situation prevailed in regard to many other items, which we needed in spite of the billions which were spent in those days by the Allied purchasing agents in this country.

We are fond of slogans. We have a slogan for the Army—A small well-equipped, well-trained, streamlined force. We have repeated that so often that I am afraid most of our people believe we actually have such an army in existence. They are wrong. I have mentioned the blue-print of the act of 1920. Before I came to the Congress, a little over 5 years ago, I shared the public impression that while we might be a little short of ideal preparedness we were rapidly approaching it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Including our overseas establishments, we had in 1935 an average of 118,000 men in the Regular Army. Some months it was as low as 112,000. Today it stands at 227,000. To take one example of the condition of our resources, in 1935 we had reserves of aerial bombs, of less than 1 day's supply in most types. We found the present Chief of the Air Corps, then in command of the First Wing on the Pacific coast, forced to use bombs cast of concrete for practice for his squadrons.

The Army was small. Its equipment was obsolescent and totally lacking in some modern weapons we now know to be essential—

such as effective antitank and antiaircraft weapons. Its reserves of ammunition were of World War age and deteriorated near or beyond the end of its efficient life. The industrial mobilization called for in the act was entirely on paper.

We have made great progress since that time, but we have been staggered by the cost and the time required. At the present rate of progress we are still several years away from readiness to defend ourselves.

We have increased our force of regulars from 112,000 to 227,000, including overseas possessions. We have increased the National Guard to 235,000. We are giving some of the regulars opportunity to learn to operate as divisions and corps, essential to their training for any effective defense use.

We have adopted new forms of organization which we expect to make the infantry more mobile, and more efficient with the new weapons now being provided. These divisions, of which five are now organized and under intensive training in the South, are not, however, and are not intended to be what is called mechanized or motorized divisions. They will not be fully equipped with modern weapons for many months. Again we face the great time lag in production of munitions of war in a country which has for so long a period neglected its industrial preparedness for defense—and this is the country with greater potential industrial power for war than any other nation or combination of nations.

We have appropriated for the procurement of planes sufficient to bring the Air Corps from its present strength of about 2,000 planes of all types to 5,500, which we hope to reach by June 1941.

We have provided a system of great air bases for the training of our Air Corps. Work is now under way on the Chicopee base under the Wilcox Act of 1935.

We have appropriated, or expect to appropriate in the bill which is now under consideration in the Senate, funds to complete the modern equipment of one corps and five peace-strength Regular Army divisions.

We are completing equipment for 37 antiaircraft regiments, of which we hope to form 5 in the National Guard this year to supplement the 7 Regular and 14 Guard regiments now in existence.

We are carrying on the training of industry under the program started in 1937 under the educational orders bill. The House, however, has not provided sufficient funds to carry out this program on the 55 most critical items. The amount of $14,250,000 additional will be needed to complete this part of the program and make actually available for our defense a far greater portion of our potential industrial power. We have made a start in the procurement of reserves of those few critical war materials needed in war which are not produced in sufficient quantity in this country.

New England is the key to our military industrial strength. Eighty percent of the gages required in the manufacture of munitions in the country are made in New England. The only plants equipped to make the Garand shoulder rifle for our infantry are in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

One-third of our country's productive capacity for military aircraft engines, a substantial part of our capacity for planes and propellers, fire-control instruments, guns and carriages for our artillery, gas masks and surgical instruments, searchlights for our seacoast and antiaircraft defenses, cartridges, artillery fuses and shells, and many more of the essentials of modern war must be produced in our area. Our men, our plants, and our traditions are adapted to production of those things most needed for the Nation's defense.

We must complete the job and have ready for our defense if it should be needed a small, well-equipped, well-trained force, with an industry behind it trained and equipped to give it the best tools known for the job of the defense of this country.

We must face the facts. Anything less than an adequate provision for our own security must not be tolerated. The cost is enormous. It must be met. To maintain the initial protective force now in existence after our existing deficiencies have been provided for will call for an annual expenditure of approximately $400,000,000, exclusive of the Air Corps.

The Air Corps alone, including replacements to maintain it at the strength now authorized, will cost an additional $250,000,000 annually.

Anything less will leave us in a condition inviting attack. Until world conditions are far more stabilized than they are today we cannot afford any lesser degree of preparedness.

The change in the status of Greenland, when the German invasion of Denmark first raised the question of possible air bases of an unfriendly power within reach of New England should bring us down to earth. We cannot longer avoid, postpone, or ignore the problem. The way to its solution is pointed out by the act of 1920, adapted to modern developments.

We must never again allow ourselves to reach the criminally weak condition we have fallen back so often in the past. We may not again have allies to hold off any thrust to our own shores while we make up for our neglect. Maintenance at all times of a small, well-equipped, well-trained force, backed by a trained industry and sufficient reserves of equipment and raw materials will in the long run be the soundest insurance of our future against military aggression.

Our knowledge of the problems of industrial preparedness, our necessary concern with the possible approach of the war to our shores combine with our military tradition to make New England the leader in the recognition of our needs and willingness to meet them, at whatever sacrifice.

Federal Tax Commission—Random Thoughts on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered Friday, April 26, 1940, before the conference of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as follows:

In such a representative meeting as we have here today, it may seem somewhat trite to state that taxation is one of the leading public issues of the day. Taxation is the ultimate expression of sovereignty. We know how a people are governed by the way they are taxed. Nearly all social and economic upheavals have come as the result of obnoxious taxation. Since mankind emerged from the caves there have been taxes, and taxes will continue so long as man continues to be a social creature.

Since the advent of depression, with its crop of relief expenditures, new governmental functions, mounting debts, and unbalanced budgets, most of us have gradually grown round-faced with protest, popeyed with wonder, and diminutive in all matters pertaining to finances. It is apparent from recent expressions that the majority of our citizens have become acutely aware of the knack in taxes.

The depression has emphasized several phases of taxation as it pertains to the average man, who is now more than ever bewildered. At one moment political leaders tell him that budgets should be reduced. At the next moment they demand that the Government should undertake new functions. In spite of his inexperience in financial matters, the average taxpayer recognizes the paradox. Unfortunately for him, his thinking has been clouded. He has been told that somebody else, not he, will foot the bills, and he has honestly come to believe it. He has rarely stopped to think that the increased taxes, which the merchant and bus company pay, will be passed on to him in increased prices and fares. There is a dawning realization that the men entrusted with spending his tax money have been "having themselves a good time."

In the next place the average taxpayer wonders why there are so many different taxes, which he must pay at so many agencies. Conflicting and multiple tax jurisdictions are an old and sometimes trying story to the tax official and expert, but to the average person they fail to make sense.

The United States probably has the most complex tax system known to history. Perhaps we are straining a point in calling it a tax system. In reality, the American tax structure contains 49 separate and distinct systems—one for the Federal Government and one for each of the 48 States. In addition, there are more than 175,000 local agencies which levy taxes under the authority of the State governments. Practically every variety of tax exists somewhere in the vast, conglomerate system which embraces all of these tax-levying authorities.

The inevitable result of this complexity is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding. Federal taxes, for example, often are thought of as constituting the majority tax burden. Actually, however, combined State and local taxes account for substantially more revenue than do Federal taxes. Only the huge exploitable wealth of this country has prevented a breakdown of the multiple tax structure under which Federal, State, and local governments have thus far operated. The opinion of those who believe the system should be coordinated and simplified is amply supported by the experience of less wealthy countries than our own. And I hope that no one will say that we can afford it, because we cannot. Tax money should be economically spent, or else the money should be left in private possession to promote private enterprise.

The thinking of the average taxpayer has led him to the conclusion that there is much unfairness and injustice in taxation matters. For example, frequent instances are to be found in the inequalities in evaluating and assessing real property bolstered

by exemptions and failures in collections. Then there are the difficulties growing out of sales taxes, which are even more complex, when payment can be evaded by simply driving over State lines and purchasing in neighbor States. Furthermore, the average citizen resents tax-exempt securities no matter how sound such exemptions may be. The list could easily be extended, but enough has been said to show that the average man has grievances in spite of the honest past efforts of all Government agencies.

There is one avenue for the partial improvement of the real-estate situation and thus for the correction of some of the contentions of unfairness. States might profitably set up standards which assessing and evaluating officials must meet before they are allowed to perform their duties. Manuals might be compiled by commissions and commissioners, training schools might be organized, and programs regularized. I have been told that a few States have taken steps in this direction and that the program has been adopted as fast as the respective legislatures would permit. Please do not misunderstand me. I have the highest respect for the local evaluating and assessing officials. The point I wish to make is that with a few changes in program he can be made more efficient and able to the advantage and comfort of the community, of the taxpayer, and of the official himself.

The average taxpayer feels that double taxation is unfair and in some instances illegal. The average citizen senses an incongruity in the double-tax situation. When he has once paid a tax, that should be the end of the matter. He fails to understand the duplicating and conflicting tax jurisdiction. Double income taxes; double taxes on mortgages; double taxes on dividends, wages, profits, and rents have created inequities which can be described in no other terms than discriminatory double taxation. The average man may be wrong in believing double taxation to be illegal, but he is correct in holding it to be discriminatory and in need of correction.

This overlapping of our State and Federal Governments in the field of direct and indirect taxation has come gradually without the guidance of any broad policy or plan of apportionment. It represents a complete break with the original segregation of fields. The conflict lies deeper than the duplication of particular taxes. Fundamentally, these overlapping jurisdictions are competing for the same economic resources, whatever the form of the taxes by which the different shares are obtained.

Competition is not limited to Federal and State Governments and State and local governments. Counties compete with counties, counties compete with towns, and towns compete with school districts. The competition is not even limited to jurisdictions that cover the same geographic area. One city may not tax real estate situated in another city; but it may, by granting tax exemptions for a limited period, induce a manufacturing concern to build new plants within its boundaries instead of in a neighboring city. In this way, it may ultimately add to its taxable real estate at the expense of its neighbor. States compete with one another in much the same fashion.

One State may obtain its maximum revenue from a corporation income tax by allocating all interstate income, for purposes of taxation, to the State in which gross receipts arise. Another State may obtain its maximum by allocating such income to the State where the taxable property of the corporation is located. If each State pursues its own immediate interests, some corporations may pay taxes in both States on their interstate income, while their competitors pay taxes in neither. These facts are so well known that it is hardly necessary to enlarge on them here in order to demonstrate the importance of coordinating tax systems.

With these thoughts in mind, on March 5 of this year I introduced a joint resolution calling for the establishment of a Federal Tax Commission. This is known as House Joint Resolution 483. Among the provisions contained in this resolution are the following:

(1) "To establish a stable, more permanent tax structure, so as to avoid frequent changes in tax laws and minimize the adverse effect of changes in tax laws on individual initiative, investment, and employment.

(2) "To simplify the Federal tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration.

(3) "To coordinate the Federal tax system with those of the State and local governments, to the end that double taxation may be minimized and overlapping or needless cost of administration reduced."

There are, of course, other provisions in the resolution for the establishment of such a Federal Tax Commission, which will be composed of seven members, representing Government, agriculture, labor, individual taxpayers, consumers, industry and finance, lawyers, certified public accountants, and economists. It may be desirable or even necessary to increase the number of members of the Commission to give representation to other groups not already included.

The Commission is authorized to hold hearings; to make surveys; to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and of the office of the legislative counsel.

In my opinion, Congress could do no one thing of greater importance to assure future economic stability than to create a qualified nonpartisan committee to formulate a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation. The annual revision of tax laws on the basis of political expediency and social reform is the major cause of hesitancy and lack of confidence on the part of businessmen and taxpayers. Fixed principles of taxation are urgently required to give taxpayers the necessary confidence to face the future.

A permanent tax structure should be established, with fixed principles, subject only to changes in rates to meet the varying requirements of the Federal Budget. Business can adjust itself to changing rates, so long as such rates are nonconfiscatory, but staggers under the impact of successive changes in the general scheme and incidence of taxation, a procedure which calls for new interpretations of tax provisions from year to year. Recently, before the ink has hardly become dry on revenue measures, changes have been proposed, even before time has elapsed to determine whether previous revenue measures were workable or not.

It is not intended nor is it provided in my resolution that legislative or administrative powers be delegated to the proposed commission. It is merely expected that the commission will function as a study group in examining national tax problems and, on the basis of its deliberations, recommend to Congress the adoption of such principles and methods of taxation as would promote uniformity and simplicity. It is expected that the commission would also make recommendations to remove as much as is possible of the present complexity and uncertainty, and to make recommendations to eliminate unnecessary duplication and overlapping as well as effective coordination of tax systems of the Federal, State, and local units of government.

Secretary Morgenthau, in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in May 1939, made certain suggestions representing to some extent a start toward a national commission as provided for in my bill. He proposed that the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees sit as one body during and between sessions of Congress to consider the aspects of expenditures and revenues. He said: "This joint committee would in effect be a lens through which all appropriation and revenue measures could be viewed in relationship both to what the Nation needs and to what the Nation could afford."

The Secretary also suggested a small temporary national commission to report to Congress as soon as feasible on the various aspects of intergovernmental (Federal-State) fiscal policy and propose a plan for a solution of the problems involved. He stated: "Such a commission should be made up of men of ability who command the highest public confidence, who are familiar with fiscal problems, but who will represent the public at large rather than particular Government units. The recommendations of such a commission should assist us in achieving more orderly relationship between the Federal, State, and local fiscal systems." His recommendations on that point, therefore, are on all fours with the provisions of my bill.

The real solution of our national-tax dilemma awaits the appointment of an unbiased national-tax commission, comprising individuals from business, labor, Government, property owners, agriculture, professional circles, and others who have a well-rounded knowledge of tax matters.

The strongest argument I could advance for the appointment of such a commission is supplied by the chart which I hold in my hand. This chart was prepared several months ago by the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department. It is a picture of our National, State, and local tax systems. It is a bewildering presentation of the field of taxation now occupied by these respective taxing units. The same chart also shows the bewildering maze of expenditures by the same taxing jurisdictions. Let me refer briefly to some of its contents. (I explained briefly and in an informal way, the chart.)

Of course, I am not advocating that we should cease all efforts for sound tax legislation pending the appointment of a Federal Tax Commission and the submission of its findings to Congress. There are numerous ways in which our present tax system—Federal, State, and local—can be improved. For example, there is almost complete agreement that the rates in some of our Federal tax levies today have long since passed the point of diminishing returns. This is unquestionably true of the maximum rates on the individual income taxes, inheritance taxes, and gift taxes. The net result is a drying up of sources of supply or what might be termed "risk" capital. The net result, of course, is stagnation in business and unwillingness of investors to place their funds in business enterprises where all loss would be assumed by themselves and practically all gains, if any were achieved, would be taken in taxes.

I have introduced a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to definitely limit the Federal taxing power to a maximum of 25 percent on incomes, gifts, and inheritances. This bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House. The American Taxpayers Association, of this city, has made this a part of its national program. It has laid the matter before a number of State legislatures, because if two-thirds of these legislatures adopt this resolution, it will be mandatory upon Congress, under section V of the Constitution, to call a Constitutional Convention to ratify such action.

Already both branches of 2 legislatures have adopted the resolution; favorable action has been taken in 1 branch of 3 additional legislatures; and the judiciary committees of 13 other legislatures have reported favorably on the resolution to their governing bodies. To guard against handicapping the Federal Government by such a limitation in the event of war, the proposed amendment prescribes that the limitation may be lifted in such an emergency for a period of not to exceed 1 year by a vote of three-fourths of both branches of Congress.

This is one way to eliminate confiscatory rates and to establish levies on a basis which experience has demonstrated will stimulate business and increase revenue to the taxing jurisdictions. It is not likely that the majorities in the two Houses of Congress would long defy such an expression of the popular world as would be represented by applications from as many as two-thirds of the legislatures of the States.

In this discussion it has been impossible to do more than outline some of the main points about which there is considerable agitation today. The big task of tax officials and all groups interested in taxation must be to spread correct information abroad on tax matters. The average man has very definite impressions of the right and the wrong of taxation. Most of them are couched in terms of his own pocketbook. He needs to be told the truth and the meaning of taxes. He needs to be reminded of it often until it becomes a part of his daily thinking. Not until then will he act. No greater task can be performed by your groups in the service of this country.

Civil Aeronautics Authority—It Should Remain Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the proposal under the fourth reorganization plan to place the Civil Aeronautics Authority under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and within the framework of the Department of Commerce has aroused widespread apprehension, particularly in the minds of practically all persons who are concerned with air transport in the United States or between the United States and foreign countries. I have yet to hear of a single individual directly interested in air transport who favors that feature of Reorganization Plan No. IV. The adoption of the plan would, in my judgment, have a disquieting effect not only upon those who through occupation or business are interested in air transport, but also upon the traveling public and thus the fortunes of the air-transport business as a whole and the welfare of all those engaged in it may be seriously affected. This is obviously the time to let well enough alone.

In Alaska, air transportation has become part and parcel of our economic being. We would find it hard to exist without the advantages which are afforded by air transport. Every resident of Alaska is concerned to see that the administration of the Authority is the most efficient possible. No one doubts, indeed no reasonable man can doubt, that the present administration under the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been highly efficient and scientific and the safety factor has been nowhere overlooked. To now change in supervisory control an agency of the Government which has given such excellent service would, in my opinion, be a grave and perhaps a tragic mistake. That the pilots of Alaska share the concern of most other people over the proposed change is indicated by the following telegram addressed to me by the Fairbanks, Alaska, Council of the Air Line Pilots Association:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *April 25, 1940.*

Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND,
Washington, D. C.:

We are definitely opposed reorganization plan which abolishes Air Safety Board and puts Civil Aeronautics Authority back in politics. We ask that you voice our attitude to those concerned. The C. A. A. has been very satisfactory, which was not true of the aeronautics branch of Department of Commerce. We believe that the past year's air-safety record speaks for itself.

Fairbanks Council Air Line Pilots Association, Al Monsen, Bill Knox, Walter Hall, Ralph Savory, Gene Meyring, Bert Lien, Herman Joslyn, Dick Hawley.

Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly in the protest made by the Air Line Pilots Association of Alaska against the adoption of that feature of Reorganization Plan No. IV which seeks to place the Civil Aeronautics Authority within the framework of the Department of Commerce. It should be overwhelmingly rejected.

The Verendrye Plate and French Claims in North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps, as some have said, "the most historic event in the development of South Dakota" was the exploration of our soil by the Verendryes in the early part of the eighteenth century and the claiming of the vast region west of the Mississippi for France by the simple ceremony of planting a lead plate upon a butte which now overlooks the dome of South Dakota's capitol.

The history of that period and the events leading up to the planting of the plate have been the subjects of considerable research by Doane Robinson, former South Dakota historian, and Lawrence K. Fox, his successor, and their findings are of great interest.

The French, in control of Canada, were anxious to expand their jurisdiction westward to the Pacific, and commissioned Pierre Gaultier Varennes de la Verendrye, who was experienced in war and commerce, to extend the trade to the western sea. Verendrye entered upon the enterprise with enthusiasm in 1731. His method was to enter into the wilderness a short distance, build a post and secure the friendship of the Indians and supply them with trade; thence to take another step, build another post and after securing the allegiance of the Indians, move on to repeat the process.

By this means in 1738 Verendrye had reached the present Portage la Prairie, 50 miles west of Winnipeg, where he built Fort la Reine. Having only Indian information to guide him he resolved to strike southwest from Fort la Reine, to the Missouri, which he believed to run west to the Pacific.

On October 18, 1738, having been joined by 8 white men, he set out with a party of 52, chiefly Assiniboin Indians. On November 30 they reached a Mandan post, 1 day's march from the Missouri. They remained there 5 days while Pierre, the eldest son of Verendrye, made an overnight trip to the Missouri to secure what useful information was available.

They returned convinced that the Missouri turned west to the Pacific. At this time Verendrye Senior was taken severely ill and it was deemed prudent to hasten him back to Fort la Reine. Thus ended the first attempt to reach the west from the La Reine base.

On April 29, 1742, the two sons of Verendrye—François, the chevalier—and his younger brother, Louis Joseph, accompanied by two Frenchmen, Louis La Londette and A. Miotte, departed from Fort la Reine upon the journey that resulted in planting the plate at Fort Pierre. They did not cross the Missouri, near Fort la Butte, until July 23.

They spent the remainder of the season running about from one Indian village to another probably in the western Dakotas, until the 18th of November, when they came upon a large body of Bow Indians going up to fight their enemies

in the mountains. It was agreed that the Frenchmen would accompany the Bows that they might ascend the mountains and look over to see the Pacific Ocean. They soon formed a camp in which to leave the noncombatants. Louis Joseph remained in this camp to look after their property and the chevalier and the two Frenchmen accompanied the war party. When they reached the mountains and found the enemy camp deserted, they thought the foe had flanked them and had gone to destroy the noncombatants. The Bows determined to retreat to protect their families. A terrible blizzard had struck western Dakota and 2 feet of snow covered the prairies. The Indian warriors were practically without supplies and starvation was imminent.

When the storm was over they broke camp, starting back to the southeast. En route the Verendryes left the Bows and started to the camp of the Little Cherry on the Missouri, near Fort Pierre, where they arrived on March 19.

François (the chevalier) Verendrye kept a brief journal in which he recorded:

> We arrived at that fort on the 19th and were received with great manifestations of joy.

It is while staying at that fort that the plate was buried. In his journal, Verendrye wrote of the planting, which took place the end of March 1743:

> I placed, on a hillock near the fort, on behalf of our general, a plate of lead with the arms and name of the King, and raised a pyramid of stones. I told the savages, who had no knowledge of the plate of lead which I had buried in earth, that I placed those stones as a memorial of our having come to their lands. (I should have greatly liked to take the height at that place, but our astrolabe had been out of use, from our start its ring having been broken.)

In 1913 M. Jusserand, Ambassador from France, wrote of the finding:

> Everything about the plate tallies with everything in the journal; its authenticity cannot be doubted. As a reminder of the plucky attempts of ancestors, acting under most trying difficulties, the new-found relic has a truly sacred character for Frenchmen and for Americans both.

On Sunday afternoon, February 16, 1913, a group of school children were strolling on the bluffs near Fort Pierre. Hattie May Foster, one of the group, noticed an object protruding partly from the earth and loosened it and removed it from the ground. The others all clustered around, but none, apparently, were aware of the great value or vital significance of their discovery. The plate is now in the possession of the State of South Dakota.

Today efforts are being increased to develop a monument in recognition of the Verendrye expedition and of this historic planting by which our vast Northwest Territory was claimed in the name of France. A committee consisting of Fred S. Minier, L. J. Gaugenmaier, F. J. Hodoval, G. E. Sumner, C. M. Weirauch, and Rex Terry has been especially active in developing plans for a fitting recognition of the historic Verendrye expedition, which culminated in the ceremony on the butte above the Missouri River near the town of Fort Pierre. This site should become a part of the Verendrye National Monument, and I have introduced H. R. 9460 to accomplish that purpose.

The bill proposes "to add to the Verendrye National Monument the site where in 1743 the Verendryes planted plates claiming the Northwest Territory for France." It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to an area of not more than 25 acres of land near the town of Fort Pierre, S. Dak., including the actual site where the lead plate was planted, and declare that area to be a part of the Verendrye National Monumen, to be administered under the laws relating thereto. A representative of the National Park Service visited the spot when ceremonies were held there last summer, and I am sure that he was impressed by the historical importance of the event as well as the naturalness of the site chosen by the chevalier for the planting of the plate.

Marketing America's Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no industry in the world is discussed as much or as frequently as the movies. This is no doubt because of the prevalence, fascination, and glamour of this most popular of all commercial entertainment. It has been frequently said that "everybody in this country has two businesses, his own and motion pictures." This may be quite true of the products, personalities, and publicity of Hollywood and of the local theater, but the actual business operation of the industry itself, how it operates and why it operates that way, is little understood by those not actively engaged in the business. Indeed, few of those who see a motion picture on a screen have any idea of all that was required to put it there, but every man, woman, and child who sees a picture has, and is entitled to, an individual opinion concerning it.

Although it is clearly impossible to understand motion pictures without considering the business aspects of the industry, this phase is usually brushed aside or dealt with summarily as an uninteresting, or at least an unromantic one to talk about, in order to get on to the more glamorous topics. Hence, it remains somewhat of a mystery, or is mistakenly assumed to be just like any other business.

As a matter of fact, the business operation of the motion-picture industry in many fundamental respects is quite unique and different from that of all other industries, and presents a number of economic and commercial problems peculiar to itself. Far too little attention has been given to these essential methods of operation by governmental and legislative agencies that are called upon to deal with motion-picture matters. While there are many people who are not interested in the business aspects of this or any other industry, yet to dismiss such phases of the business as being either uninteresting, obscure, or incidental precludes any fair appraisal or understanding of the motion-picture industry.

It is my purpose to set forth a more or less elementary explanation of some of the essential features of the structure and operation of this great industry, which centers its production activities in my district, so that its widespread operations may be fairly and better understood.

II

The principal and almost sole product of this vital industry is the modern motion picture. The motion-picture industry has adapted to its own affairs the methods of commercial operation generally used in the modern business world, and more particularly the business practices developed out of years of experience of the earlier theatrical enterprises—vaudeville, stage shows, road companies, concert stage, and so forth—and brought over by showmen trained in this field who engaged in the motion-picture industry in the early days. But in addition many of the unique and peculiar methods employed in the manufacture and marketing of motion pictures are due primarily to the characteristics of the article in which the business deals. Motion pictures are as intangible as the shadow on a wall, a voice in the air. The film on which both shadow and sound is recorded, and from which the fleeting illusion of reality is created in the theater when reproduced by ingenious mechanical and electrical devices, is 1⅜ inches in width, six one-thousandths of an inch thick, of fragile nitrocellulose.

Over 2 miles—10,800 feet—of such film is required to project 2 hours of entertainment upon the screen, yet this film

Already both branches of 2 legislatures have adopted the resolution; favorable action has been taken in 1 branch of 3 additional legislatures; and the judiciary committees of 13 other legislatures have reported favorably on the resolution to their governing bodies. To guard against handicapping the Federal Government by such a limitation in the event of war, the proposed amendment prescribes that the limitation may be lifted in such an emergency for a period of not to exceed 1 year by a vote of three-fourths of both branches of Congress.

This is one way to eliminate confiscatory rates and to establish levies on a basis which experience has demonstrated will stimulate business and increase revenue to the taxing jurisdictions. It is not likely that the majorities in the two Houses of Congress would long defy such an expression of the popular world as would be represented by applications from as many as two-thirds of the legislatures of the States.

In this discussion it has been impossible to do more than outline some of the main points about which there is considerable agitation today. The big task of tax officials and all groups interested in taxation must be to spread correct information abroad on tax matters. The average man has very definite impressions of the right and the wrong of taxation. Most of them are couched in terms of his own pocketbook. He needs to be told the truth and the meaning of taxes. He needs to be reminded of it often until it becomes a part of his daily thinking. Not until then will he act. No greater task can be performed by your groups in the service of this country.

Civil Aeronautics Authority—It Should Remain Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the proposal under the fourth reorganization plan to place the Civil Aeronautics Authority under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and within the framework of the Department of Commerce has aroused widespread apprehension, particularly in the minds of practically all persons who are concerned with air transport in the United States or between the United States and foreign countries. I have yet to hear of a single individual directly interested in air transport who favors that feature of Reorganization Plan No. IV. The adoption of the plan would, in my judgment, have a disquieting effect not only upon those who through occupation or business are interested in air transport, but also upon the traveling public and thus the fortunes of the air-transport business as a whole and the welfare of all those engaged in it may be seriously affected. This is obviously the time to let well enough alone.

In Alaska, air transportation has become part and parcel of our economic being. We would find it hard to exist without the advantages which are afforded by air transport. Every resident of Alaska is concerned to see that the administration of the Authority is the most efficient possible. No one doubts, indeed no reasonable man can doubt, that the present administration under the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been highly efficient and scientific and the safety factor has been nowhere overlooked. To now change in supervisory control an agency of the Government which has given such excellent service would, in my opinion, be a grave and perhaps a tragic mistake. That the pilots of Alaska share the concern of most other people over the proposed change is indicated by the following telegram addressed to me by the Fairbanks, Alaska, Council of the Air Line Pilots Association:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *April 25, 1940.*

Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND,

Washington, D. C.:

We are definitely opposed reorganization plan which abolishes Air Safety Board and puts Civil Aeronautics Authority back in politics. We ask that you voice our attitude to those concerned. The C. A. A. has been very satisfactory, which was not true of the aeronautics branch of Department of Commerce. We believe that the past year's air-safety record speaks for itself.

Fairbanks Council Air Line Pilots Association, Al Monsen, Bill Knox, Walter Hall, Ralph Savory, Gene Meyring, Bert Lien, Herman Joslyn, Dick Hawley.

Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly in the protest made by the Air Line Pilots Association of Alaska against the adoption of that feature of Reorganization Plan No. IV which seeks to place the Civil Aeronautics Authority within the framework of the Department of Commerce. It should be overwhelmingly rejected.

The Verendrye Plate and French Claims in North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps, as some have said, "the most historic event in the development of South Dakota" was the exploration of our soil by the Verendryes in the early part of the eighteenth century and the claiming of the vast region west of the Mississippi for France by the simple ceremony of planting a lead plate upon a butte which now overlooks the dome of South Dakota's capitol.

The history of that period and the events leading up to the planting of the plate have been the subjects of considerable research by Doane Robinson, former South Dakota historian, and Lawrence K. Fox, his successor, and their findings are of great interest.

The French, in control of Canada, were anxious to expand their jurisdiction westward to the Pacific, and commissioned Pierre Gaultier Varennes de la Verendrye, who was experienced in war and commerce, to extend the trade to the western sea. Verendrye entered upon the enterprise with enthusiasm in 1731. His method was to enter into the wilderness a short distance, build a post and secure the friendship of the Indians and supply them with trade; thence to take another step, build another post and after securing the allegiance of the Indians, move on to repeat the process.

By this means in 1738 Verendrye had reached the present Portage la Prairie, 50 miles west of Winnipeg, where he built Fort la Reine. Having only Indian information to guide him he resolved to strike southwest from Fort la Reine, to the Missouri, which he believed to run west to the Pacific.

On October 18, 1738, having been joined by 8 white men, he set out with a party of 52, chiefly Assiniboin Indians. On November 30 they reached a Mandan post, 1 day's march from the Missouri. They remained there 5 days while Pierre, the eldest son of Verendrye, made an overnight trip to the Missouri to secure what useful information was available.

They returned convinced that the Missouri turned west to the Pacific. At this time Verendrye Senior was taken severely ill and it was deemed prudent to hasten him back to Fort la Reine. Thus ended the first attempt to reach the west from the La Reine base.

On April 29, 1742, the two sons of Verendrye—François, the chevalier—and his younger brother, Louis Joseph, accompanied by two Frenchmen, Louis La Londette and A. Miotte, departed from Fort la Reine upon the journey that resulted in planting the plate at Fort Pierre. They did not cross the Missouri, near Fort la Butte, until July 23.

They spent the remainder of the season running about from one Indian village to another probably in the western Dakotas, until the 18th of November, when they came upon a large body of Bow Indians going up to fight their enemies

in the mountains. It was agreed that the Frenchmen would accompany the Bows that they might ascend the mountains and look over to see the Pacific Ocean. They soon formed a camp in which to leave the noncombatants. Louis Joseph remained in this camp to look after their property and the chevalier and the two Frenchmen accompanied the war party. When they reached the mountains and found the enemy camp deserted, they thought the foe had flanked them and had gone to destroy the noncombatants. The Bows determined to retreat to protect their families. A terrible blizzard had struck western Dakota and 2 feet of snow covered the prairies. The Indian warriors were practically without supplies and starvation was imminent.

When the storm was over they broke camp, starting back to the southeast. En route the Verendryes left the Bows and started to the camp of the Little Cherry on the Missouri, near Fort Pierre, where they arrived on March 19.

François (the chevalier) Verendrye kept a brief journal in which he recorded:

> We arrived at that fort on the 19th and were received with great manifestations of joy.

It is while staying at that fort that the plate was buried. In his journal, Verendrye wrote of the planting, which took place the end of March 1743:

> I placed, on a hillock near the fort, on behalf of our general, a plate of lead with the arms and name of the King, and raised a pyramid of stones. I told the savages, who had no knowledge of the plate of lead which I had buried in earth, that I placed those stones as a memorial of our having come to their lands. (I should have greatly liked to take the height at that place, but our astrolabe had been out of use, from our start its ring having been broken.)

In 1913 M. Jusserand, Ambassador from France, wrote of the finding:

> Everything about the plate tallies with everything in the journal; its authenticity cannot be doubted. As a reminder of the plucky attempts of ancestors, acting under most trying difficulties, the new-found relic has a truly sacred character for Frenchmen and for Americans both.

On Sunday afternoon, February 16, 1913, a group of school children were strolling on the bluffs near Fort Pierre. Hattie May Foster, one of the group, noticed an object protruding partly from the earth and loosened it and removed it from the ground. The others all clustered around, but none, apparently, were aware of the great value or vital significance of their discovery. The plate is now in the possession of the State of South Dakota.

Today efforts are being increased to develop a monument in recognition of the Verendrye expedition and of this historic planting by which our vast Northwest Territory was claimed in the name of France. A committee consisting of Fred S. Minier, L. J. Gaugenmaier, F. J. Hodoval, G. E. Sumner, C. M. Weirauch, and Rex Terry has been especially active in developing plans for a fitting recognition of the historic Verendrye expedition, which culminated in the ceremony on the butte above the Missouri River near the town of Fort Pierre. This site should become a part of the Verendrye National Monument, and I have introduced H. R. 9460 to accomplish that purpose.

The bill proposes "to add to the Verendrye National Monument the site where in 1743 the Verendryes planted plates claiming the Northwest Territory for France." It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to an area of not more than 25 acres of land near the town of Fort Pierre, S. Dak., including the actual site where the lead plate was planted, and declare that area to be a part of the Verendrye National Monumen, to be administered under the laws relating thereto. A representative of the National Park Service visited the spot when ceremonies were held there last summer, and I am sure that he was impressed by the historical importance of the event as well as the naturalness of the site chosen by the chevalier for the planting of the plate.

Marketing America's Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no industry in the world is discussed as much or as frequently as the movies. This is no doubt because of the prevalence, fascination, and glamour of this most popular of all commercial entertainment. It has been frequently said that "everybody in this country has two businesses, his own and motion pictures." This may be quite true of the products, personalities, and publicity of Hollywood and of the local theater, but the actual business operation of the industry itself, how it operates and why it operates that way, is little understood by those not actively engaged in the business. Indeed, few of those who see a motion picture on a screen have any idea of all that was required to put it there, but every man, woman, and child who sees a picture has, and is entitled to, an individual opinion concerning it.

Although it is clearly impossible to understand motion pictures without considering the business aspects of the industry, this phase is usually brushed aside or dealt with summarily as an uninteresting, or at least an unromantic one to talk about, in order to get on to the more glamorous topics. Hence, it remains somewhat of a mystery, or is mistakenly assumed to be just like any other business.

As a matter of fact, the business operation of the motion-picture industry in many fundamental respects is quite unique and different from that of all other industries, and presents a number of economic and commercial problems peculiar to itself. Far too little attention has been given to these essential methods of operation by governmental and legislative agencies that are called upon to deal with motion-picture matters. While there are many people who are not interested in the business aspects of this or any other industry, yet to dismiss such phases of the business as being either uninteresting, obscure, or incidental precludes any fair appraisal or understanding of the motion-picture industry.

It is my purpose to set forth a more or less elementary explanation of some of the essential features of the structure and operation of this great industry, which centers its production activities in my district, so that its widespread operations may be fairly and better understood.

II

The principal and almost sole product of this vital industry is the modern motion picture. The motion-picture industry has adapted to its own affairs the methods of commercial operation generally used in the modern business world, and more particularly the business practices developed out of years of experience of the earlier theatrical enterprises—vaudeville, stage shows, road companies, concert stage, and so forth—and brought over by showmen trained in this field who engaged in the motion-picture industry in the early days. But in addition many of the unique and peculiar methods employed in the manufacture and marketing of motion pictures are due primarily to the characteristics of the article in which the business deals. Motion pictures are as intangible as the shadow on a wall, a voice in the air. The film on which both shadow and sound is recorded, and from which the fleeting illusion of reality is created in the theater when reproduced by ingenious mechanical and electrical devices, is 1⅜ inches in width, six one-thousandths of an inch thick, of fragile nitrocellulose.

Over 2 miles—10,800 feet—of such film is required to project 2 hours of entertainment upon the screen, yet this film

wound on reels can be stored on a 2-foot shelf. The moving picture you see upon a screen as big as the theater's stage actually does not move at all, you just think it does because of an optical illusion. The film from which it is projected is a series of still pictures. Each separate picture, about the size of one of Mr. Farley's oversized postage stamps, each of these miniature photographs is reproduced upon the screen in such rapid succession that the eye cannot detect the change from one picture to the next. Thus the actors appear to move in a perfectly natural manner, but you are actually looking at a series of greatly enlarged photographs, each projected separately and perfectly still upon the screen.

However, it must be realized, this film is not really the article in which the industry deals, but is merely the mechanical means of conveying the motion picture itself from the studio to the numerous theaters. It is what is recorded upon the film, the wholly intangible dramatic and musical entertainment, with which the industry deals. This popular entertainment is the product of imagination, of talent, of many skilled technicians and arts and crafts, of long and painstaking effort in the studio. It is not machine made, nor the product of mass production. Each motion picture is specially designed and individually created by itself.

The motion-picture industry is a "style" business, fashions in pictures change as fast and as unexpectedly as in women's hats. A new and different idea in a motion picture succeeds if it strikes the public fancy, fails if it does not. But the public, sooner or later, will turn even against a new style. Thus, the constant search for new story ideas, new personalities, new types and treatments of drama and comedy, even though in the last analysis public fancy is largely unpredictable. The one thing that every style business does know is that public fancy will not remain static.

Commercial dealings in articles with the characteristics of a motion picture require protection, hence the use of the copyright law for the purpose. Without such a safeguard, the months of preparation and effort and the very substantial manufacturing investment in a modern motion picture could not be risked by the producer. It would be easy for anyone to duplicate the film on which this intangible photoplay is recorded, and for a nominal expense be able to reproduce identically the same motion picture in any theater. This is prevented by copyrighting the motion picture.

Thus protected by copyright the marketing of a motion picture is accomplished by the sale of the exhibition rights, which are in the form of a limited and restricted license under the copyright for its reproduction and exhibition in theaters, limited to a particular time and place in each instance. This exhibition right or copyright license is another intangible and should not be confused with the motion-picture film itself. Neither the motion picture nor the film is sold to any of the theaters that exhibit the picture, it is only the limited exhibition rights which they acquire.

The picturesque and colorful terms customarily used within the motion-picture business may mislead many people who seriously try to understand its structure and operation. Perhaps some of these should be explained by listing the equivalent term generally used in other industries:

"Studio": Factory.
"Producer": Manufacturer.
"Distributor": Wholesale dealer.
"Film exchange": Wholesale house or warehouse.
"Exhibitor": Retail dealer or merchant.
"Theater": Retail store or shop.
"Patron": Retail customer or consumer.
"Film rental": License fee for the exhibition rights.
"Box-office receipts": Total retail sales.
"Admission charge": Retail sale price.
"Negative cost": Total manufacturing cost of a picture, that is, all costs to the point where the "negative" is completed and ready for the laboratory to use in making the many "positive" prints that are used by the theaters.

The motion-picture industry is divided structurally into three main sections: Production in the studios, wholesale distribution in the film exchanges, and retail exhibition in the theaters. Both the wholesale distributor and the retail exhibitor are middlemen engaged in the marketing of motion-picture entertainment to the general public. Because of the pretentious and complex effort required and the extensive equipment and studio facilities necessary to produce a single successful motion picture, neither the exhibitor nor the distributor can produce a picture; hence, each of the three divisions of the industry is completely dependent upon the other two, so much so that they are sometimes integrated into the same corporate structure.

Production activities are necessarily concentrated in one place for a variety of reasons. Production of a single successful modern motion picture is a project of such magnitude financially and physically, requires such extensive, specialized studio facilities, and involves such hazards and risks, that it can only be undertaken by an organization of experience, skill, resources, and plant equipment sufficient to reasonably assure a finished product that will be up to acceptable standards of entertainment value as set by the general public and by competition. Thus, the number of studios equipped to turn out the finer grade of motion pictures in any volume is necessarily limited by economic factors.

Wholesale distribution of motion pictures today, to be efficient and economical, has to be on a Nation-wide scale by a centrally coordinated organization. But, on the other hand, retail exhibition is essentially a local activity, with multiple units of operation widely scattered all over the country, most of them with little contact with each other, and with little opportunity to become familiar with the complex operations and problems of either production or wholesale distribution.

III

On a huge sound stage inside a well-guarded studio in Hollywood a new play is enacted before the cameras, scene by scene and bit by bit, over a period of weeks and sometimes months. The final recording is the result of intricate planning, elaborate preparation, long and tiresome rehearsals, much editing, many retakes, and many headaches. While there is no audience to witness the performances, and one would be bored to tears by monotony if it were there, nevertheless, this operation is well-known and widely discussed. Hollywood receives constant attention in the public print.

A short time later this same dramatic performance of the same play, identical to the last detail of acting, scenery, costume, lighting, and even inflection of voice, is reproduced by ingenious mechanical devices in the local theaters throughout the country for the public to enjoy. Everyone is familiar with the final result upon the screen; but, I want to repeat, what goes on between the performance in the studio and the performance upon the screen is a phase of the business that receives little attention. This unseen and unsung but extremely important function is not accomplished by any magic, but by a commercial operation that functions with efficiency, speed, and precision to bring to the largest and to the smallest theaters throughout the country the finest in entertainment at a price within the reach of all. It is the wholesale distribution of motion pictures.

It should be clearly realized that neither the general public nor any part of it can buy motion-picture entertainment at the film exchanges, which are the branch offices of the wholesale distributing companies. The distributors do an exclusively wholesale business; that is, they sell motion-picture entertainment only to retail dealers for resale to the public. This plain fact is frequently disregarded or confused, sometimes intentionally, in public discussions of the commercial practices in the motion-picture business.

The wholesale distribution of motion pictures, which is what goes on between the production of the picture in the studio and the widely separated exhibitions of the motion picture in the theaters throughout the country, is vital to the operation of every motion-picture theater. The theater must secure its exhibition rights by negotiating a license agreement for each copyrighted motion picture it intends to exhibit, arrange for definite exhibition dates, and advertise the showing of each picture by dealings with the wholesale distributor or film exchange. The films must arrive at every theater in time exactly on the day the picture has been advertised and scheduled for showing.

To accomplish this continuously for approximately 17,000 theaters, scattered over 48 States, requires a highly trained organization of some 12,500 skilled and experienced workers in 431 film exchanges, strategically located in 31 or more key cities. Twenty-seven thousand miles of film is handled daily by the wholesale distributors in the United States. The precision and efficiency of this intricately organized and technical operation is attested by the fact that it rarely fails to deliver the scheduled film at the exact time for the show to go on in every theater as planned.

As I said before, motion pictures are copyrighted and the wholesale distributors market the exhibition rights to theaters. These exhibition rights are conveyed by a written limited-license agreement for the exclusive right to exhibit the film in a specified competitive area for a limited time, for which a license fee, commonly called "film rental," is paid by the exhibitor. The film, or print, itself is never bought by the exhibitor, nor is it actually leased or rented, but it is merely loaned by the distributor under the license agreement to enable the performance of the photoplay to be reproduced in the theater. The film must be returned to the distributor immediately after the booking for use in other theaters. The number of prints of the same picture is definitely limited because of the cost of each print, which is usually several times the amount of the license fee paid by an individual theater for its exhibition.

In order that 10,000 theaters might play the picture with not more than 250 prints in existence and available for use, 40 or more theaters must use the same print. Because of this, an orderly sequence of playing dates or engagements has to be arranged for each print, which also involves extensive bargaining and trading over runs and clearance, availability, congestion of bookings of other pictures at the theater, open time on the prints available, and many other factors.

While the exhibitor, or retail dealer, buys pictures in wholesale quantities, maybe 4 dozen feature pictures in a deal with one distributor, the 48 pictures cannot be shipped and billed in one lot. The wholesale distributor is required by the nature of the business to ship the pictures one by one at intervals as needed by the theater, and to collect for each picture at the time the entertainment is sold to the public for cash by the theater. Thus, the major part of the distribution operation consists of service rather than sales activity, and requires the year-round maintenance of a network of servicing establishments or film exchanges throughout the country within convenient and accessible shipping distances of the theaters.

After the sale of the exhibition rights has been negotiated and reduced to a written-license agreement, the first picture in the series to be released by the distributor becomes available. The exchange and the exhibitor then negotiate a booking date on which the theater can show the picture without conflict with other pictures that have been booked by the theater. This date must not be in conflict with the run and clearance specified in existing license agreements with other competing theaters on the same picture, and also a print must be available in the film exchange for use by the theater. When the date for exhibition is agreed upon, a print is reserved for the theater on that date. The theater then proceeds to advertise its coming attraction, frequently using posters and advertising materials prepared by the distributor.

Each distributor maintains an inspection department in its film exchange which then must inspect ever foot of the film for defects in the print, as the film is very fragile and frequently is damaged in projection at the theater which previously used the same print. Any damage found must be repaired before the film can be sent to the next theater. Adequate arrangements must be made for transit so that the print will reach the theater on time for exhibition, wherever the theater is located. The distributor at the same time bills and collects for the exhibition rights on that particular picture according to the terms as previously agreed upon in the written license agreement. Next, the distributor must get the print back from the theater promptly to fill the other engagements that have been booked for its exhibition. This whole process has to be repeated in its entirety with every theater for each feature picture and short subject licensed for exhibition. Every day some 6,000 of these 17,000 theaters in the United States change their entire programs, which consist of from 12 to 20 of the standard reels of film, which are about 900 feet in length.

The average theater requires about 250 feature pictures a year for continuous operation, plus varying numbers of short subjects and newsreels. No theater can carry films in stock for future use, nor can it produce its own films. It is thus essential that theaters license pictures far in advance of exhibition to assure an uninterrupted flow of pictures and to give ample opportunity to advertise coming attractions. Theaters do this by licensing wholesale groups or blocks of pictures for future delivery, thus securing wholesale prices for the pictures used and assuring themselves of an adequate supply of exhibition rights to fill their play dates, and to insure the uninterrupted operation of the theater.

It is not possible to have a standard pricing system for the exhibition rights to motion pictures as between the wholesale dealer and the retail dealer, primarily because it is not possible to determine the delivered unit cost of the article sold by the wholesale distributor, that is, the exhibition rights to a particular motion picture at a particular theater. In most industries the manufacturer knows the cost of the labor and materials that go into each article and can easily and accurately determine just what each article costs at the point of delivery. Accordingly, the manufacturer and wholesale dealer base the selling price on such unit delivered cost of the article offered for sale. In the motion-picture business there is no conceivable way to arrive at such a cost figure.

The manufacturer or producer of a motion picture has a production cost on each feature picture at the factory or studio ranging from $100,000 to well over a million dollars. But no retail dealer can pay more than a small fraction of this production cost for the exhibition rights to the picture for his theater. The production cost, plus sales and service expense, plus a reasonable profit, has to be recovered from perhaps 10,000 theaters, scattered over 48 States; theaters of various sizes, locations, seating capacities, admission scales, and so forth.

The wholesale distributor therefore has no possible way of determining the cost of the exhibition rights of any of the pictures he is distributing, delivered to a particular theater, on which to base the price quoted to the theater. Moreover, these quoted prices cannot be uniform, as one theater can afford to pay many times what another theater can afford, and one picture may be worth several times the value of another picture at the same theater. This presents a problem in economics that is both difficult and unique, and is the fundamental reason for many marketing methods employed in motion-picture distribution, both wholesale and retail, that are quite different from those used in other lines of business.

Since the inception of the business the price paid by the retail dealer for the exhibition rights to the pictures used in his theater has been based primarily on what the picture grosses or earns during the period it is exhibited. The formula employed is merely that the exhibitor should pay to the distributor a fair share of the gross receipts for the picture used. Sometimes this is an agreed upon percentage of the actual receipts, but more often it is a fixed amount in dollars. Either way it is based upon this fundamental formula.

It will at once be realized that this is a rather vague and uncertain basic formula on which to base definite wholesale prices, but it is the only practical method possible. The owner of the picture and the owner of the theater very frequently disagree, and violently, on what is a fair share of the gross earnings of the picture, or even on how much of the gross earnings at the theater is produced by the particular picture and how much is produced by other attractions running on the same program. And the bargain must be struck between the buyer and the seller over terms for the exhibition rights some time before the picture is shown in the theater, before either the exhibitor or the distributor knows what the actual gross receipts will be.

Years of experience have developed many shrewd traders in this field on both sides, many ingenious and resourceful tactics to secure commercial advantages in this bargaining and trading. To complicate the matter even further, there are numerous factors other than the picture itself and the theater itself that affect the value of the exhibition rights bargained for and the prices paid for such exhibition rights. Some of these are psychological, such as the efforts of exhibitors to convince the distributors that their business is bad and not up to expectations, and to keep secret the actual receipts on the distributors' pictures. And motion pictures are "perishable merchandise" in that the value of a picture as a box-office attraction or drawing card depreciates with varying degrees of rapidity after the picture goes into general circulation; the initial advertising and publicity the picture receives is gradually fogotten, and the general public eventually loses its interest in the particular motion picture.

Included in the exhibition rights bargained for by the exhibitors are such factors as "run" and "clearance." A run is what the theaters competing for the same patronage bargain for, so as to show the picture before, or after, the other theaters desiring to exhibit the same picture. Clearance is the interval of time agreed upon between runs. The more clearance secured over other competing theaters, and the less clearance sold to prior runs, within certain limitations, the more valuable the exhibition rights are to a particular theater. If the exhibitor can thus increase the value of the exhibition rights without increasing the price he pays for them by securing any change in the clearance and run, he can profit by such a change to the disadvantage of his competitors, and without additional cost to himself.

Since the earliest days of motion pictures, theater owners have insisted that directly competing theaters shall not be licensed to show the same attraction at the same time. In fact, before there were motion pictures, this principle was well established in the show business and is still retained in vaudeville and stage shows. Many motion-picture theaters today refuse to license any pictures that are licensed by certain directly competing theaters, known in the business as "opposition" theaters. The distributor of a motion picture can license it to one such theater for showing, but must forego licensing it to the "opposition" theaters.

However, other competing theaters may be willing to license the picture for exhibition after the first showing in the competitive area. These are known as "subsequent run" theaters. As I have explained, the interval between exhibitions in the vicinity specified in the license agreement is known as "clearance," the sequence of showings is known as "runs," also sometimes as "availability." A subsequent run theater may also have opposition theaters, that is theaters in direct competition which customarily play the same run, but which refuse to play the same pictures. Subsequent-run theaters pay consecutively smaller license fees for a picture and also charge lower admissions than the prior-run theaters, as a rule. In the larger metropolitan centers this run and clearance becomes very complex and is the subject of intensive bargaining and trading between exhibitors and distributors. It is an integral part of the negotiations over license fees or film rentals.

The transaction between a motion-picture exhibitor and the wholesale distributor, to whom he looks for his stock-in-trade, in nature still resembles the "horse trading" of a previous economic era; the bargaining tussle between buyer and seller arrays one against the other in a position of combat and natural antagonism as each is fighting for commercial advantage for its own immediate benefit. Since what is bartered has uncertainties and contingencies much greater than is predictable as to its ultimate value, there is an inherent premium upon attempts at sharp trading. The pull for advantage is not lessened and the sharpness of trading is in no way dulled because the parties to the bargain in many ways are mutually interdependent. It is precisely because the wholesale distributor in most situations finds only certain exhibition outlets for the display of his motion pictures, and the exhibitor must make his bargain for motion pictures with a definitely limited number of wholesale distributors, that the feeling which attends the making of a bargain is so intense.

Thus, the business of exhibiting and distributing motion pictures is kept in a turmoil of disputes, arguments, and controversies brought about by the fact that the marketing of the exhibition rights has to be on this uncertain basis which I have described, with the suspicion always present that the other fellow is getting the better of the bargain, or that a better bargain could be secured if it could be done over again.

The inherent nature of motion-picture entertainment brings about some unusual characteristics in the retailing of such entertainment by the theaters. Unlike most retail businesses, theaters cannot offer the immediate customer a wide selection of goods and articles. Every time a theater changes its program an entirely new stock of goods is on sale, with none of the items previously on sale in stock. As I said before, no theater can carry a stock or selection of motion-picture films on hand, nor can it produce any films for its own use.

It is interesting to note that, unlike most other retail establishments which are compelled to carry a substantial cash investment in merchandise in order to do business, the theater has no such investment. The "stock" of shows necessary to carry on the business is secured by merely signing a license agreement, with no investment by the exhibitor or retailer. The pictures must be delivered one at a time by the wholesale distributor as they are needed for exhibition and paid for one by one upon delivery by the exhibitor, who sells them for cash to the public at the theater.

Motion-picture theaters are considered a highly desirable economic unit for local communities because an unusually large amount of the gross sales or receipts is retained and spent in the same locality on pay roll, rent, advertising, and supplies. This runs from 65 to 75 percent of the gross receipts, as only 35 to 25 percent is sent away to the wholesale distributor for the goods (entertainment) sold. It is the local theaters' privilege to give the public relaxation and fine entertainment at a relatively low cost to the public because of the efficient operation of the industry. The most remote motion-picture theater provides a show which in costumes, scenery, talent, and technical perfection is identical with the performance given in the finest theaters in the country.

IV

For the past 12 years there have been introduced in Congress various bills intended to prohibit what is called compulsory block booking and blind selling of motion pictures. The Neely anti-block-booking bill, S. 280, is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, having passed the Senate last year. This legislation has long received the ostensible support of several worthy public organizations interested in improving the moral standards in motion-picture entertainment, in the welfare of children and adolescents, and in what is termed "community selection of motion pictures." It also has the organized support of one of the several trade associations of independent exhibitors in this country. However, the active motion-picture producers, wholesale distributors, and independent exhibitors, other than the one organization referred to, have registered strong opposition to the measure at each of the public hearings on this legislation.

Block booking is nothing more than the selling of exhibition rights to more than one motion picture at a time to an exhibitor. It is a method of the wholesale distribution of motion pictures that has been generally employed by the industry since it was first established as a commercial enterprise. Blind selling, likewise, is the licensing of a motion picture for exhibition before the exhibitor sees the picture. It is not contended that either block booking or blind selling of motion pictures is practiced by the retail dealer upon the public; only by the wholesale distributor upon the retail exhibitor. This is what the Neely bill seeks to prohibit and regulate by Federal statute under penalties of fine and imprisonment.

It is explained, however, by the sponsors of the bill that block booking as such is not objectionable and should be permitted, that it is not the intention to prohibit block booking, but only to prohibit compulsory block booking, which is defined as a trade practice whereby exhibitors are required to lease all or a specified number of an offered group of films in order to obtain any individual, desired film or films in the group.

How much compulsion is there in block booking? This question seems to be much disputed, and it may be difficult to ascertain accurately the extent of the compulsion referred to. Unsupported charges and inferences by the sponsors of the bill that this is the uniform practice throughout the industry are flatly contradicted by the booking records of the leading wholesale distributors, which have been presented at the hearings on this legislation. Attempts to explain this, by assuming that the producer-distributor controlled theaters account for the variations in bookings, fall down because there are not nearly enough such theaters altogether to match the difference in bookings for any of the distributors.

Moreover, what causes this compulsion in block booking about which complaint is made? Is it an arbitrary sales policy of the wholesale distributor? Is it the competitive struggle between rival exhibitors for the best pictures. Is it the anxiety of every exhibitor to secure for himself enough pictures to keep his theater in continuous and uninterrupted operation? Or is it the rather obvious fact that a retail dealer can secure better prices and terms by buying in quantity and thus make his business more profitable? To insist that the compulsion derives solely and entirely from the sales policy of the wholesale distributor is improbable and does not seem reasonable.

Recalling that opposition theaters in direct competition with each other ordinarily refuse to exhibit the same pictures and recognizing the perishable and intangible nature of the exhibition rights bought and sold, it would appear logical that a wholesale distributor with several pictures to license would be foolish not to accept the offer of an exhibitor who wanted to license all of the pictures offered rather than the offer of a rival exhibitor to license only part of the pictures. If this is true, is it not the competitive buying between rival exhibitors that exercises the compulsion in block booking?

Apparently the sponsors of this legislation realize that this compulsion, at least in part, is based upon the compelling desire of the exhibitor to secure the best possible terms in buying motion pictures for his theater, because the important part of section 3, the block-booking section of the Neely bill, is concerned with regulating the prices quoted by the wholesale distributor to the exhibitor on the exhibition rights offered for sale. This section of the act prohibits by penalties of fine and imprisonment some of the relationships or differentials between the separate and several prices and the aggregate price, either as quoted by the distributor or as agreed upon between the exhibitor and the distributor.

Exactly what pricing or price quotations by the wholesale distributor it is intended to declare illegal and punishable under the act appears to be uncertain and ambiguous. But, as this is the heart of the act, it should be examined carefully and clearly understood, before Congress ventures into the field of price-control legislation for an industry that has the peculiarities of the motion picture to contend with in its marketing and pricing problem.

Independent theater owners who have examined the price control provisions of section 3 of the Neely bill, and who are familiar with practical theater operation and management responsibilities, are alarmed at its possible interpretation and application to their business by the courts under the severe penalties provided for any violations. In their opinion it will arbitrarily freeze the asking prices first quoted by each distributor on its pictures, which is usually somewhat higher than those finally agreed upon, will prevent negotiations for more favorable prices and terms, and will prohibit price discounts and reductions by the wholesale distributor to secure orders for more than one picture.

It is strongly urged that such an arbitrary requirement by statute will force an artificial and very substantial increase in film costs, particularly to the smaller theaters, with no improvement likely in quality or values, which may prove disastrous to many small independent exhibitors, though possibly not contemplated or understood by the supporters of this legislation.

Exactly how the exhibition rights to motion pictures must be priced according to the specifications of section 3 of the bill when offered to an exhibitor by the wholesale distributor, what changes in the quoted prices are allowed during negotiations, and just what changes are forbidden, and specifically what arrangement of prices and percentage terms finally agreed upon will be within the law are matters of considerable doubt that have never been made explicit. To impose such uncertainties and risks of fine and imprisonment on the innumerable transactions of the motion-picture industry seems intolerable.

The only other operative and enforceable section of the Neely bill is section 4, which deals with blind selling. This section would require that a full and accurate description of each motion picture must be made a part of each license agreement for the exhibition of the picture. While the law purports to deal only with distribution, there is an overwhelming opinion, and testimony by those responsible for the production of motion pictures that this requirement would have far-reaching effects upon that complex and difficult operation. No one quite knows what would be required to comply with the prescribed "accurate synopsis of the contents of such film" and other descriptive matter specified. The objections to this section by those who operate the business and are responsible for its success are many and varied.

It is insisted by the sponsors of the bill that these restrictions imposed under penalties by Federal statutes are necessary to establish community freedom in the selection of motion pictures. The theory advanced seems to be that such selection by the community will be made from the prescribed synopsis which must be made a part of the license agreement. This agreement is a private contract between the exhibitor and the wholesale distributor. Just how the community will be assured access to the accurate synopsis and descriptive matter on which to base its selection, either before or after the contract is made, is not revealed so far.

Everyone seems to be in favor of selecting the best motion pictures and rejecting those that are not good entertainment. The community is obviously composed of individuals who are perfectly free to select and reject motion pictures as they are shown according to their own tastes and preferences. Commercial success or failure of every motion picture rests upon such selection. It is direct, potent, and effective. Most of the returns to the producer on every important motion picture come from theaters that pay a percentage of the gross admissions at the theater as the license fee for the exhibition of the picture. Is it intended to deprive the individual of the inherent right to select his own entertainment by this statute? Who is it proposed under the Neely bill is going to select and reject the pictures for the individual in the community? How can the composite taste and preference of the whole community be ascertained and expressed on a particular picture before it is shown?

Or is the complaint really that community taste as expressed individually at the box office of the theater is not high enough, that enough of the individuals who compose the community do not prefer the finest types of pictures that are shown? How can that be changed by passing another law? Is it not the responsibility of the churches, the schools, and the community organizations to educate the individuals in the community in the appreciation of finer pictures and the taste for better pictures, so that there will be public demand and support for these more artistic endeavors?

No one quarrels with the avowed purposes of this act. Everyone wants to see better and finer motion pictures exhibited, and it is not surprising that this purpose is widely endorsed. There is nothing in the Neely bill that prohibits the showing of the most objectionable motion pictures, or that will require the showing of the finest pictures. It is merely an uncertain but drastic bill to regulate wholesale prices and commercial transactions between the wholesale dealers and the retail dealers in the motion-picture business that is likely to produce quite unexpected and devastating results. It is offered as a legislative patent medicine to cure all the ills of the motion-picture industry, but it contains a slow poison as its active ingredient. I strongly urge the Members of Congress to examine the operative sections of the Neely bill carefully before taking the responsibility of imposing it upon the motion-picture industry as a Federal statute.

MOTION-PICTURE DATA

[Condensed from U. S. Department of Commerce Bulletin No. S-4 of Mar. 15, 1940]

Motion-picture theaters in the United States classified by size (seating capacity)

Seating capacity	Number of theaters	Cumulative total
Over 3,000 seats	117	
2,000 to 3,000 seats	374	491
1,500 to 2,000 seats	689	1,180
1,000 to 1,500 seats	1,646	2,826
500 to 1,000 seats	5,500	8,326
200 to 500 seats	7,303	15,629
Less than 200 seats	1,912	17,541

Average seating capacity, all theaters, 623 seats.

Theaters in United States, by location (equipped for sound pictures)

Population of town	Towns with theaters		Theaters		Seating capacity	
	Number	Cumulative total	Number	Cumulative total	Number of seats	Capacity, cumulative total
Over 500,000	13		2,251		2,426,986	
500,000 to 200,000	28	41	1,104	3,355	1,010,079	3,437,065
200,000 to 100,000	52	93	783	4,138	754,669	4,191,734
100,000 to 50,000	94	187	801	4,939	760,579	4,952,313
50,000 to 20,000	276	463	1,202	6,141	1,053,508	6,006,120
20,000 to 10,000	494	957	1,341	7,482	992,570	6,998,690
10,000 to 5,000	845	1,802	1,626	9,108	1,006,388	8,005,078
5,000 to 2,500	1,351	3,153	1,959	11,067	961,516	8,966,594
2,500 to 1,000	2,874	6,027	3,221	14,288	1,113,357	10,079,951
1,000 and less	3,160	9,187	3,253	17,541	844,533	10,942,484

Average weekly attendance at theaters in the United States (1939), 85,000,000.

Average movie admission charge, 23 cents.

Theaters in operation in the United States classified by ownership and management (in 1938)

Number of independent theaters (i. e., not affiliated with a producer or distributor of motion pictures):		
3 or less theaters under 1 management		10,722
4 or more theaters operated as a circuit (394 circuits)		3,829
Number of theaters affiliated with a producer or distributor		2,300
Number of theaters operating in 1938		16,251
Number of theatrical-film exchanges in the United States		447

Number of feature-length pictures released and distributed in the United States in 1939

Major companies:		
United States produced	367	
Imported from abroad	21	
		388
Independent companies:		
United States produced	116	
Imported from abroad	257	
		373
Total features released		761
Number of people employed in United States motion-picture theaters		241,000
Number of persons employed at all film exchanges		12,500
Number of people employed in United States production		28,500
Total number employed		282,000
Estimated cost of production, 1939		$165,000,000
Estimated annual studio pay roll, 1939		$129,000,000

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM PUERTO RICAN CITIZENS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a telegram received by me today from all important business, industrial, and agricultural associations of Puerto Rico backing the amendment to the wage-hour law as it refers to Puerto Rico:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *May 2, 1940.*

Hon. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

At meeting of leading economic organizations it was unanimously resolved to urge imperative need for remedial legislation for Puerto

Rico on matter of wages-and-hours law. It was the unanimous opinion that failure to secure relief means the total collapse of industries vital to our economic structure and thousands of wage earners dependent thereon. We look forward to your leadership and active cooperation in urging congressional action.

Sam Schweitzer, Puerto Rico Needlework Association; F. de Hostos, Chamber of Commerce; J. A. E. Rodriguez, Manufacturers Association; Rafael Rodriguez, Federation of Merchants; J. P. Klein, Fruit Exchange; M. González Quiñones, Farmers Association; R. Aboy Benitez, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico.

Increase in Personnel of Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MAMARONECK (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., of April 26, 1940, titled "You're Paying Them"—a comparison of the number of employees in the executive departments in 1933 and 1939:

YOU'RE PAYING THEM

Remember when Franklin D. Roosevelt was running for President in 1932 and pledged himself to a 25-percent reduction in the cost of Federal Government?

Here are figures, from the United States Civil Service Commission, showing the personnel increase in Government departments under President Roosevelt:

	Feb. 28, 1933	Dec. 31, 1939
State	4,664	6,249
Treasury	52,266	60,216
War	44,188	123,624
Justice	9,022	10,074
Post Office	272,550	291,114
Navy	46,879	99,024
Interior	15,018	45,844
Agriculture	26,132	86,250
Commerce	17,971	8,535
Labor	5,569	6,759

Has your business permitted any such increases in staff; that is, your private business? For this is your business, too, and you're paying for these public servants, whether you realize it or not.

Corporation Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY RICHARD C. PATTERSON, JR.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., before the Harvard School of Business Administration, at Cambridge, Mass., on March 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'd like to begin by posing this question: Have corporate directors abdicated? Have they surrendered their legitimate powers over the affairs of business and, in so doing, abandoned their responsibilities as trustees for the public interest and for the owners of business? The answer, I believe, is that certainly in some cases they have been so abdicating, imperceptibly, bit by bit, for a long time. It's true that most directors have faithfully tried to perform their duties as they understand them, and that only a minority have been negligent toward their responsibilities. It's true that directors of great integrity and ability have had an important part in bringing American business up to the high plane it occupies today. Nevertheless, I think that, paralleling the tendency toward centralization of executive powers in government, there has, in recent years, been a trend toward centralization of authority in the executive management of corporations. Business executives now carry as much responsibility as they should—often more. This, perhaps, is because the evolution of corporate business during the past 50 years has been such that sometimes the meaning and purpose of directorships have been obscured. The effect of this evolution, though not the individual intention, has been, indeed, a kind of abdication of directorial duty. And unless that trend is reversed, we may well see government and bureaucracy step in to assume some of the powers that properly belong, under both democratic and corporate theory, to the elected representatives of the Nation's stockholders—the directors.

THE HISTORY OF DIRECTORSHIPS

I hold that the main trouble with the system is not organic. I don't believe that any drastic operation upon it is necessary. I think that if the trouble is diagnosed business can cure itself by measures as simple as a change of diet. Indeed, I'm convinced that business must cure itself of whatever is wrong in corporate practice, for, if in default of that, government should step into a directorial seat in private corporations, that would be the beginning of the end of free enterprise upon which our institutions are founded. This afternoon I am going to try to make a beginning at that diagnosis and to suggest a cure that is based not upon my own wisdom but upon the common denominators of experience of hundreds of the outstanding corporation directors whose examples in office leave nothing to be desired. Let me begin by tracing very briefly how the modern American board of directors evolved, how it's likely to be made up, and why.

The idea of the corporation is, as you probably know, very old, and therefore very tested. It was written into early English civil law, and has continued to operate without serious challenge ever since. I shan't review its developments in detail. But it is interesting to notice that it probably never functioned perfectly, and more than a century and a half ago it had at least one outstanding critic. Adam Smith, writing The Wealth of Nations, in 1776, described stockholders as people who, having invested in a joint stock company, neither did nor could take much further interest in its affairs except to welcome the dividends it paid them. Then he went on to say of the directors entrusted with the stockholders' interests (I quote) that "being managers rather of other people's money than their own, it cannot be well expected that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private co-partnery frequently watch over their own. Like the stewards of a rich man, they are apt to consider attention to small matters as not for their master's honor, and very easily give themselves a dispensation from having it. Negligence and profusion, therefore, must always prevail, more or less, in the management of the affairs of such a company." Since Adam Smith wrote that, corporate practices have greatly improved, otherwise we would not have witnessed so great a growth of corporate enterprise nor so many examples of corporate efficiency. There is still, to be sure, "negligence and profusion," but these have become the exception rather than the rule. I believe that during the last century in America directorial responsibility and attention to company business probably reached its peak of performance. Since it was a period of economic growth with the industrial revolution, directors more often than not were founders, or the sons of founders, and therefore had considerable stockholdings and a personal interest in the affairs of the companies. Outside directors generally were drawn from related kinds of business and were well equipped to understand the problems of the companies for which they were trustees. And the problems were certainly simpler, in the environment of a less complicated economic system. People were not specialists then, and a businessman was simply a businessman, and stood or fell upon his record as such.

TWENTIETH CENTURY CHANGES

Then, after about the first decade of the present century, things speeded up even more. Three-quarters of the Nation's business wealth was to become changed to corporate form, and the number of corporations was headed toward its 1929 peak. There were probably 1,000,000 directorships to be filled. Stockholdings in corporations came to be more and more widely held, which meant that the owners were more numerous, more scattered over the face of the earth, and further removed from the management. The proportion of stock held by directors became, accordingly, smaller, and the holding of qualifying shares often developed into a formality rather than a factor giving directors a personal stake in their companies. Meanwhile everyone was becoming a specialist of some kind. Some dentists gave up pulling teeth, others did

nothing but that. The old family doctor was split into half a dozen parts, so that it's now supposed to take about six doctors at least completely to service one human body. Public relations became the sorcery of a new kind of science reserved to certain mystical high priests. Industrial and labor relations, once a simple concern of management as a whole, followed as the province of expert practitioners. Merchandising, and its chromium-plated sister, advertising, developed into the rarest and most intricate art of all.

THE MODERN DIRECTORATE

How was all this reflected in the composition of boards of directors? For one thing, specialization set in in many cases. Experts on this or that were elected to office for the benefit of their special knowledge. Cheek by jowl with the experts set men with names with a capital N—men whose presence was regarded as valuable solely because they were known as big shots rather than because they were expected to work. And these "honorary directors" were often willing to serve without any substantial pay, both for the slightly empty honor of belonging to as many boards as possible, and because, in a world of increasing complexity, they thought it might do them some good in their own interests to have a finger in as many pies as possible. As for the descendants of some of the founding fathers back in the nineteenth century, some of them, their blood thinned, stayed with the family business as playboy directors who didn't need or care to bother their pretty heads about the intricacies of corporate management. And along with this medley of directors, the executive management of corporations, the salaried presidents and often a number of vice presidents and other working officials, also sat on the boards. Thus was built up a practice whereby in some boards a large proportion of the members might be almost anything but actual representatives of the ownership. A director might or might not need adequate compensation for his services; might or might not receive it regardless of need or of services actually rendered.

In a great many instances the management, often represented by an ambitious and able president, took over the functions of ownership and of the directorate, running the business brilliantly, expanding it, making money, paying dividends. Some managements came to expect, and to receive, little from the boards except the expert counsel of specialist members, just as though they were on the pay roll instead of on the board. At any rate, more and more of the large questions of policy were resolved by the management of many corporations and passed upon by the boards in a purely perfunctory way because not all the directors had the inclination or could afford the time to study them in detail. One solution chosen by certain companies was the elimination of outside directors altogether and the constitution of an entire board of working executives. Standard Oil provides one of the best examples of this. But this is far from ideal as a general practice. It cuts out the opportunity for outside advice and a fresh viewpoint. And it means, substantially, that the management is merely reporting back to itself instead of to trustees for the owners and for the public interests.

Undoubtedly the whole corporate system worked efficiently in most cases. No matter how valuable individual directors were to consult on special problems, the less they had collectively to say on the broader issues, the less conflict was there with able executive management. Some of the most efficient and admirable corporations we have today are shining examples of the unshackled genius of their executive heads. But so was Philip Musica, alias F. Donald Coster, an extraordinarily efficient and successful president for McKesson & Robbins—up to a point. Let me quote from Supreme Court Justice Douglas, in a speech he made last year while he was still Chairman of the Securities Exchange Commission: "What we frequently have today is a large majority of directors who are dominated by a few management men, or men representing special interest. These directors have abdicated. It's not enough to describe them as directors who do not direct. Too often they do not even influence. * * * They ratify decisions they have not reached, based on arguments and evidence which they cannot appraise. * * * The average modern director does not direct the course of the corporation to a much greater extent than a conductor directs the course of his trolly car. Both of them go along with the vehicle, and one of them is often present only for the sake of the ride."

THE CRASH—AND STOCKHOLDER SUITS

All this time, up to the great depression, stockholders were, on the whole, uncritical, so long as they received their dividends. As for the election of new directors, they were content to vote into office the men selected by the president without much question. If their board of directors had a lot of good names on it, so much the better. If they didn't like something about the board, all they had to do was to sell that particular stock and buy another, rather than make any effective protest or send in disapproving proxies. It was as simple as that. But after the crash came, all this changed a good deal. Stockholders were reminded that directors are personally and individually liable, under a number of laws, to suit on various grounds. And the number of stockholder suits that followed, many of them against absolutely blameless and prudent individuals, changed many a directorship from an asset into a grave liability. Those liabilities are at their greatest at this moment due to such recent laws as the Securities Exchange Act of 1933 and the Public Utilities Act of 1935. So grave a deterrent has this threat become that many men of directorial timber are shy of becoming directors unless the company has taken measures to indemnify them against the costs of defending groundless stockholder suits.

THE RESULTING CONFUSION

I hope that in this quick thumbnail review I've not made too dark a picture of the performance of United States directorates up to now, or of the consequences. That would be most unfair to thousands of wise and capable men under whose guidance United States corporate business has functioned extraordinarily well during years of dire adversity as well as during the good times. What I want to impress upon you, gentlemen, is that the march of events has been so swift and so complicated that it has created in many minds a state of profound confusion as to what directors are for. We have all kinds of them, performing all kinds of general or specific functions, or no function at all. We pay some a lot, some a little, some nothing at all. According to a recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board, the average pay for all outside directors who receive any remuneration is something like $285 a year. Such a nominal rate of pay provides a busy man with an excellent excuse for rendering only nominal services, especially if, in the confusion, he has lost sight of what the original and basic functions of a director are supposed to be. So it's to the credit of United States directors that the conference board study shows that actually as many as 42 percent of the directors of manufacturing companies, and 26 percent of those of nonmanufacturing companies, had perfect attendance records at board meetings in 1938. If these men function as directors (and I am sure many of them do) their remuneration is ridiculously inadequate.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

What are we to conclude from all this? What are the things that must be accomplished by the cure to be found? In the first place, obviously, good men should be picked for directorates. Then they must be persuaded to accept election despite the liabilities of the office. Then they must be induced, no matter how busy they are, to attend the meetings of their boards. Their duties as members of the board must be clearly defined so that they may know exactly what is expected of them. The definition of those duties must be sufficiently comprehensive to mean that the directors actually do direct. And the stockholding public must be made aware of these also, so that they will understand the meaning and purpose of electing directors and be able to judge their performance. That sounds like a large order, but it must be done, and done by business, and done soon, if the danger of having the Government try it is to be avoided. For the least that Government might do is to prescribe that "public directors" be appointed by the Government to the boards of all corporations. That would amount to bringing a Trojan horse of bureaucracy into the walls of private business. It might easily end in reducing all capitalism to a state of political vassalage.

CHOOSING DIRECTORS

As for choosing directors—which is the first matter of concern in finding a solution—let us agree at once that each must have, as prime requisites, the qualities of integrity, ability, courage, and judgment, and the capacity to work in cooperation with others. But beyond this axiom, the last thing in the world that could be reduced to a formula is the classes of directors a company should have on its board. It's useful, however, to take a look at the categories into which directors on modern boards may fall.

(1) There are the inside directors chosen from among the executive officers of the company. The president is almost always one of them. In some cases the entire board consists of inside members, but on the average board inside members are half or less of the total.

(2) Outside directors who are on the board by reason of their large holdings of stock or as representatives of large interests in the company. The presence of such directors is often useful and desirable, since it gives effect to the principle of owner-representation. Only when one or two such members dominate a board is there a danger that the public interest will not be served.

(3) Outside directors chosen for their broad business qualifications and ability. They are generally men active in other businesses and are known for their knowledge of finance and public relations, of governmental and world affairs, and for their wide contacts among business leaders and officialdom. This class of director can be of inestimable value to any corporation. Whether he actually is or not depends upon the time and attention he can give to his duties. And this in turn depends upon the prior requirements of his own business affairs, and the number of other boards on which he sits.

(4) Working directors who make a full-time profession of serving on boards of more than one company. To be of maximum use such working directors must be men of the highest caliber and ability. Of them I shall speak more in a minute.

(5) Outside directors who are selected for their special knowledge of some technical field affecting the business—public or labor relations, legal matters, merchandising, patents. These men present a problem on which opinions widely differ, to which I shall refer presently.

(6) And the last class includes all the directors who ride along on the board as "supers"—the window-dressing men there only for the value of their names; the inactive "honorary" directors whose services are practically nil; the playboy, the dilettante, the stuffed shirt, and the man who belongs to so many boards that he could

not possibly discharge his responsibilities to a quarter of them. These men must be retired from the boards of American business, because so long as there is one member on a board who neither receives nor expects responsibility, all members may be infected, as by contagion, with the germ of irresponsibility.

Now, forgetting the useless directors and considering only the other five classifications that serve a valuable purpose, it becomes apparent why the confusion has grown up, since the days when all directors alike were directors pure and simple, as to what the real functions of a director comprise. There are now many kinds of directors and of functions. In my own opinion the fifth class of directors I mentioned, the men who sit on a board by virtue of special technical knowledge, have provided one of the sources of confusion. If they serve as directors their responsibility should not be limited to matters concerning their own special fields of knowledge and they should be paid as directors, not as experts. Otherwise their presence on the board would violate the basic principle that all directors are equally liable for all of the affairs of the company. But generally I believe it would be better for such experts to be retained as consultants and advisers to the board, and to be paid accordingly.

How many of each of the other kinds of directors—inside directors, outside directors, and "working" directors—should be placed on the board of any given company is not for me or anyone else to say. It depends entirely upon what business the company is in, what problems are likely to confront the management. But with the possible exception of the inside salaried executive serving on the board, all should be paid for their services, whether they are wealthy or not, if they are to be expected to give their best efforts. And all, being fairly paid, should undertake clearly defined responsibilities of such a nature as those I shall presently suggest.

I might mention parenthetically here that bank directorates usually stand high in public esteem because they contain few deadwood members, they take their job seriously, and they are so composed of various kinds of men as to contribute special and diverse values to their corporations. Also they provide a model example of division of labor within the board by director action in small compact committees, each charged with responsibility for applying institutional policy to given fields of activity, but all collectively bearing the responsibility for the total results.

Once a new director has been designated for election, the stockholders entitled to vote for or against him should be informed not only of his name but the main facts of his biography and business connections. This may be looking for trouble. But the trouble of informing the stockholders on the subject of their vote is at least preserving more than a semblance of the democratic process which underlies the whole theory of stockholder representation.

INDEMNIFICATION OF DIRECTORS

Upon accepting office a director assumes, of course, not only moral responsibilities but legal liabilities. The Government is doing more and more to impose penalties upon directors who fail to act according to high standards fixed by law. But the imposition by law of heavy penalties upon directors for technical violations is not an unmixed blessing. Responsible, able men have declined positions as directors which they were well qualified to fill. They have done so because of doubt as to the policy of law-enforcement agencies and of the ease with which strike suits are brought against whole boards by minority stockholders.

These suits are for the most part solely in the hope of securing settlements unjustified except for nuisance value. They are a constant source of annoyance, wasters of vast quantities of time, and not infrequently involve costly preparation of adequate defense. Also every suit, however slender the grounds, holds the threat of liability. A solution of the problem of protecting decent, conscientious directors against unjustified harassment without shielding the lazy or unscrupulous director against accountability to genuinely aggrieved stockholders, or public prosecution, presents many difficulties. The problem should challenge more attention than it has received from the bar associations. In certain communities a few easily identifiable attorneys appear to be retained with surprising frequency in the more odorous of these litigations.

Until a solution to this problem is found, it will stand as a deterrent to the willingness of many prudent men to become members of boards. A partial solution offered, which the conference board reports has the approval of 75 percent of business opinion, is the indemnification of directors for the expense of defending groundless suits. (Such indemnification, of course, should not operate where the suits are successful.) Only a few corporations have so far taken the step of giving their directors such indemnity. Just this week President Lewis Brown of Johns-Mansville announced not only the policy of indemnifying its directors but of paying them salaries of $5,000 a year. I think these are steps in the right direction toward a new era for active directors.

It's really up to business itself to find men who can and will direct the affairs of business. And the incentive is not measured alone in dollars and cents, or in conformity to government demands for boards that are responsible; it is, basically, the incentive of strengthening the whole American system of economy.

AN ENGLISH EXAMPLE

A few moments ago I referred to a class of directors known as the working director, who makes a profession of serving on boards for a salary. In this country the idea has not found very wide acceptance. Some believe that the professional, paid director would cause friction between the board and the management, and that the election of salaried executive officers to the board would serve the same purpose. Others declare this working director would be an added and duplicating expense, and might serve as a dumping ground for impecunious friends and relatives. There is, however, in English procedure important precedent for having professional directors who give all of their time to directorial duties for one or a few companies. English directors are paid from $1,000 to $20,000 a year. And although there is also to be found in the British business press plenty of criticism of the ornamental guinea pigs—which is the English equivalent of what we mean by stuffed shirts serving no useful purpose—Ambassador Kennedy has said:

"Directors are expected to take and actually do take an active part in supervising corporate affairs. The result is on the whole that the British enjoy a higher standard of directorate responsibility than obtains in this country. Moreover, usually the membership on a board is small, with the result that it is seldom found that directors serve on more than a few boards. The English, with a sense of reality, compensate their directors for the time and effort they are required to devote, and do actually devote, to an enterprise. In line with the duties they assume, their compensation is fairly substantial."

I submit, therefore, that although there are arguments on both sides of the case, American business should study the possibilities of employing more paid working directors who can contribute to their boards better judgment resulting from experience on a number of boards.

CREED FOR DIRECTORS

Whether a director is a company executive, spokesman for large stockholders, captain of industry and finance, specialist or professional director, there are certain standards by which he should test his own performance. These standards are capable of specific definition. Their definition cannot be drawn from any one individual's experience. But it can be based upon well-considered judicial opinions and upon the examples of the best of our business leaders. These men, who have fulfilled to the utmost their public trust who have directed much of American business to its present high plane of development, have sought to maintain standards, the definition of which may well be accepted by stockholders and directors alike as a creed for every director:

1. Before he becomes a director, he makes sure that he can exercise his own independent judgment without conflicting loyalties.

2. He accepts a directorship only where his time and other commitments permit him in fact to perform the duties of the office.

3. He resolves to discharge his obligations conscientiously under the laws of the land and the bylaws of the company.

4. He is entitled to be fairly paid for his services.

5. He familiarizes himself with the company's history, organization, set-up, products, and services, its markets, its place in industry, its properties, and its relations with government, public, and investors; and in deciding policy, he weighs the long-term economic and social trends and how they may affect the company's future.

6. He comprehends the object and effect of contracts on which the board's approval is necessary or proper; he sufficiently understands the need and uses of security issues, loans, investments, capital expenditures, and sale of corporate assets to form a judgment respecting such matters.

7. He attends meetings promptly and regularly, and examines the minutes for accuracy and information.

8. Without interference in management detail, he examines the character and ability of its keymen, the fairness of their compensation, and the reliability of the auditing agency which should be directly answerable to the board.

9. He is mindful of his trusteeship for stockholders, creditors, and employees, seeking a just treatment of the claims of each; and he insists that company reports go to those entitled to be informed concerning company operations, finances, and management.

10. He does not profit—himself, his friend, his family—by reason of confidential information gained by him as a director; nor does he allow blood or friendship to dilute his judgment of what is best for the company.

For the conscientious directors who already govern themselves according to personal unwritten creeds such as this one, there is no need in publishing these findings. For the lazy and negligent director there can be no creed or cure but replacement. Under the laws and traditions of democracy and free enterprise that go back to Elizabethan times, the final and highest authority over corporate business rests with the directors elected by the stockholders. It is up to us, if our institutions are to live, to keep it there. And the best way to keep it there is not by legislation or Government intervention, but by having clearly before us the importance of holding corporate directorates at a high level of performance, both by making them attractive to able men, and by leaving no doubt as to the nature of their stewardship. This creed is offered as a contribution toward that end.

Personnel of the Ways and Means Committee Since the First Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1940

COMPILATION BY THE ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting compilation of facts about the Ways and Means Committee personnel since the First Congress. This compilation was prepared by Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, assistant librarian of the House, and contains historical facts which I know will be of interest to the Members of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: The attached lists are compilations of various interesting facts about the Ways and Means personnel since the First Congress.

You may be interested to note that, with the exception of the 12-year term of Sereno Payne, of New York, you have served longer as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than any Representative since the First Congress in 1789.

Also attached are lists of all Members who have served on the committee since its creation, the Members being segregated into their respective States. You will notice that you are the fourteenth member to serve from North Carolina. In passing it is interesting that Mr. TREADWAY needs serve but one more term on the committee to tie the longest consecutive term of any man since the committee was established.

These lists are submitted to you with the understanding that you desired to insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of other members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Very respectfully yours,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Assistant Librarian, House of Representatives.

Ways and Means Committee chairmen, First to the Seventy-sixth Congress

Years	Congresses	Chairman	Number of Members
1789	First	Thomas Fitzsimons, Pennsylvania.	7
1795–96	Fourth and Fifth	William L. Smith, South Carolina.	14, 7, 9, 16
1799–1801	Sixth	Robert G. Harper, South Carolina.	9
1801–06	Seventh to Ninth (1st sess.).	John Randolph, Virginia	7
1806–07	Ninth (2d sess.)	Joseph Clay, Pennsylvania	7
1807–09	Tenth	G. W. Campbell, Tennessee	7
1809–11	Eleventh	John W. Eppes, Virginia	7
1811–12	Twelfth (1st sess.)	Ezekiel Bacon, Massachusetts.	7
1812–13	Twelfth (2d sess.)	Langdon Cheves, South Carolina.	7
1813–15	Thirteenth	John W. Eppes, Virginia	7
1815–18	Fourteenth to Fifteenth (1st sess.).	William Lowndes, South Carolina.	
1818–23	Fifteenth (2d sess.) to Eighteenth.	Samuel Smith, Maryland	7
1823–27	Eighteenth and Nineteenth.	Louis McLane, Delaware	7
1827	Twentieth (1st sess.)	John Randolph, Virginia, excused.	7
1827–28	do	Alexander Smyth, Virginia	7
1828–32	Twentieth (2d sess.) to Twenty-second (2d sess.).	George McDuffie, South Carolina.	7
1832–33	Twenty-second (2d sess.)	Julian C. Verplank, New York.	7
1833–35	Twenty-third	James K. Polk, Tennessee	9
1835–39	Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth.	C. C. Cambreling, New York.	9
1839–41	Twenty-sixth	John W. Jones, Virginia	9
1841–43	Twenty-seventh	Millard Fillmore, New York.	9
1843–47	Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth.	James J. McKay, North Carolina.	9
1847–49	Thirtieth	Samuel F. Vinton, Ohio	9
1849–51	Thirty-first	Thomas H. Bayly, Virginia	9
1851–55	Thirty-second and Thirty-third.	George S. Houston, Alabama.	9
1855–57	Thirty-fourth	Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio	9
1857–58	Thirty-fifth (1st sess.)	J. Glancy Jones, Pennsylvania.	9
1858–59	Thirty-fifth (2d sess.)	John S. Phelps, Missouri	9
1859–61	Thirty-sixth	John Sherman, Ohio	9
1861–65	Thirty-seventh and Thirty-eighth.	Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.	9
1865–67	Thirty-ninth	Justin S. Morrill, Vermont	9
1867–71	Fortieth and Forty-first	Robert C. Schenck, Ohio	9
1871–75	Forty-second and Forty-third.	Henry L. Dawes, Massachusetts.	11
1875–77	Forty-fourth	William R. Morrison, Illinois.	11
1877–81	Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth.	Fernando Wood, New York	13
1881–83	Forty-seventh	William D. Kelley, Pennsylvania.	13
1883–87	Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth.	William R. Morrison, Illinois.	13
1887–89	Fiftieth	Roger Q. Mills, Texas	13
1889–91	Fifty-first	William McKinley, Jr., Ohio.	13
1891–93	Fifty-second	William M. Springer, Illinois.	15
1893–95	Fifty-third	William L. Wilson, West Virginia.	17
1895–99	Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth.	Nelson Dingley, Maine	17
1899–1911	Fifty-sixth to Sixty-first	Sereno Payne, New York	17, 18, 19
1911–15	Sixty-second and Sixty-third.	Oscar Underwood, Alabama	21
1915–19	Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth.	Claude Kitchin, North Carolina.	22
1919–23	Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh.	Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.	25
1923–27	Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth.	William R. Green, Iowa	25, 26
1927–31	Seventieth and Seventy-first.	Willis C. Hawley, Oregon	25
1931–33	Seventy-second	James W. Collier, Mississippi.	25
1933–40	Seventy-third to Seventy-sixth.	Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina.	25

Members serving seven or more terms on the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congress

Members	Congresses	Term	State
Sereno E. Payne	51–63	13	New York.
Allen T. Treadway	65–76	12	Massachusetts.
William D. Kelley	41–50	10	Pennsylvania.
Henry T. Rainey	62–66; 68–72	10	Illinois.
James W. Collier	63–72	10	Mississippi.
Cordell Hull	62–66; 68–71	9	Tennessee.
John N. Garner	63–71	9	Texas.
Charles R. Crisp	64–72	9	Georgia.
Isaac Bacharach	66–74	9	New Jersey.
Frank Crowther	68–76	9	New York.
Joseph W. Fordney	60–67	8	Michigan.
William R. Green	63–70	8	Iowa.
Willis C. Hawley	65–72	8	Oregon.
Robert L. Doughton	69–76	8	North Carolina.
Benton McMillan	49–55	7	Tennessee.
Charles H. Grosvenor	53–59	7	Ohio.
Samuel W. McCall	56–62	7	Massachusetts.
Ebenezer J. Hill	57–62;64	7	Connecticut.
Nicholas Longworth	60–62; 64–67	7	Ohio.
C. C. Dickinson	63–66; 68–70	7	Missouri.
William O. Oldfield	64–70	7	Arkansas.
Charles B. Timberlake	66–72	7	Colorado.
Lindley H. Hadley	66–72	7	Washington.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses

	Congress
Alabama (entered Union 1819):	
John McKinley	23
David Hubbard	26
Dixon H. Lewis	27–28
George S. Houston	29–30, 32–33
James F. Dowdell	35
Hilary A. Herbert	48
Joseph Wheeler	53–55
Oscar W. Underwood	59–63
Arkansas (entered Union 1836):	
James K. Jones	48
Clifton R. Breckinridge	49–51, 53
William A. Oldfield	64–70
Heartsill Ragon	70–73
Charles A. Fuller	73–75
California (entered Union 1850):	
Joseph McKenna	51
Victor H. Metcalf	57–58
James Carson Needham	58–62
William E. Evans	73
Frank H. Buck	74
Bertrand W. Gearhart	76

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

Colorado (entered Union 1876):
- Robert W. Boynge — 60
- Charles B. Timberlake — 66–72

Connecticut (entered Union 1788).
- Jeremiah Wadsworth — 1
- James Hillhouse — 4
- Nathaniel Smith — 4–5
- Joshua Coit — 5
- Roger Griswold — 5–8
- John Davenport — 8
- Jonathan O. Moseley — 9; 14; 16
- Benjamin Tallmadge — 10–11
- Timothy Pitkin — 12–13; 15
- Ralph I. Ingersoll — 21–22; 24
- Samuel D. Hubbard — 30
- James Phelps — 45–46
- Charles A. Russell — 54–57
- Ebenezer J. Hill — 57–62, 64
- John Q. Tilson — 66–68

Delaware (entered Union 1787):
- John Vining — 1
- John Patten — 4
- James A. Bayard — 5, 7
- Caesar A. Rodney — 8
- Louis McLane — 16–19

Georgia (entered Union 1788):
- James Jackson — 1
- Abraham Baldwin — 4–5
- Benjamin Taliaferro — 6
- John Milledge — 7
- David Meriwether — 8–9
- William W. Bibb — 12–13
- Joel Abbott — 15
- Joel Crawford — 15–16
- Wiley Thompson — 17–18
- George R. Gilmer — 20
- Richard H. Wilde — 22–23
- George W. Owens — 24–25
- Charles E. Haynes — 25
- Charles E. Webster — 25
- Mark A. Cooper — 26
- Absalom H. Chappell — 28
- Seaborn Jones — 29
- Robert Toombs — 30–31
- Alexander H. Stephens — 30–31, 33
- Marshall J. Wellborn — 31
- Howell Cobb — 34
- Martin J. Crawford — 35–36
- Benjamin H. Hill — 44
- Henry R. Harris — 45, 49
- William H. Felton — 46
- Emory Speer — 47
- James H. Blount — 48
- Henry G. Turner — 50–54
- Charles F. Crisp — 54
- James M. Griggs — 60
- William G. Brantley — 61–62
- Charles R. Crisp — 64–72

Illinois (entered Union 1818):
- Daniel P. Cook — 19
- John A. McClernand — 37
- John Wentworth — 39
- John A. Logan — 40
- Samuel S. Marshall — 41
- Horatio C. Burchard — 42–45
- William R. Morrison — 44; 46–49
- William M. Springer — 52
- Albert J. Hopkins — 52–57
- Henry S. Boutell — 58–61
- Henry T. Rainey — 62–66; 68–72
- John A. Sterling — 65
- Ira C. Copley — 66–67
- Carl R. Chindblom — 68–72
- Chester Thompson — 74–75
- Raymond S. McKeough — 76

Indiana (entered Union 1816):
- David Wallace — 27
- Cyrus L. Dunham — 32
- William E. Niblack — 40; 43
- Godlove S. Orth — 41
- Michael C. Kerr — 42
- Thomas M. Browne — 48–50
- William D. Bynum — 50; 53
- Benjamin F. Shively — 52
- George W. Steele — 54–57
- James E. Watson — 58–60
- Edgar D. Crumpacker — 61
- Lincoln Dixon — 62–65
- Harry C. Canfield — 71–72
- John W. Boehne, Jr. — 73

Iowa (entered Union 1846):
- John A. Kasson — 38; 43; 47–48
- William B. Allison — 39–41
- John H. Gear — 51; 53

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

Iowa—Continued.	*Congress*
Jonathan P. Dolliver	54–56
William R. Green	63–70
C. William Ramseyer	70–71
Otha D. Wearin	75
Lloyd Thurston	75

Kansas (entered Union 1861):
- Dudley C. Haskell — 47
- Chester I. Long — 56–57
- Charles Curtis — 58–59
- William A. Calderhead — 60–61
- Victor Murdock — 63
- Guy T. Helvering — 65
- Frank Carlson — 76

Kentucky (entered Union 1792):
- Christopher Greenup — 4
- Thomas T. Davis — 5
- John Boyle — 8
- Richard M. Johnson — 11–12
- Thomas Montgomery — 13
- David Trimble — 15–16
- Nathan Gaither — 22
- John Pope — 25
- Thomas F. Marshall — 27
- Charles S. Morehead — 30–31
- John C. Breckenridge — 33
- Robert Mallory — 38
- James B. Beck — 42–43
- Henry Watterson — 44
- John G. Carlisle — 46–47, 51
- Joseph C. S. Blackburn — 48
- W. C. P. Breckenridge — 49–50
- Alexander B. Montgomery — 52–53
- Walter Evans — 54–55
- Ollie M. James — 62
- August O. Stanley — 63
- Fred M. Vinson — 72–75

Louisiana (entered Union 1812):
- Thomas B. Robertson — 14
- William L. Brent — 19–20
- Walter H. Overton — 21
- Lionel A. Sheldon — 43
- Randall L. Gibson — 45–46
- Charles J. Boatner — 54
- Samuel M. Robertson — 55–59
- Robert F. Broussard — 61
- Whitmell P. Martin — 65–70
- Paul H. Maloney — 76

Maine (entered Union 1820):
- Peleg Sprague — 19–20
- Francis O. J. Smith — 24
- George Evans — 26
- Israel Washburn — 36
- William P. Frye — 46
- Thomas B. Reed — 48–50, 52–53
- Nelson Dingley, Jr — 51, 54–55
- Daniel J. McGillicuddy — 64

Maryland (entered Union, 1788):
- William Smith — 1
- William Vans Murray — 4
- William Hindman — 4–5
- William Craik — 5
- Joseph H. Nicholson — 6–9
- Nicholas R. Moore — 8
- Roger Nelson — 9
- John Montgomery — 10–11
- Alexander McKim — 13
- Stevenson Archer — 13
- Samuel Smith — 14–17
- Isaac McKim — 18, 23–25
- H. Winter Davis — 34–36
- Philip F. Thomas — 44
- David J. Lewis — 72–75

Massachusetts (entered Union, 1788):
- Elbridge Gerry — 1
- Theodore Sedgwick — 4
- Theophilus Bradbury — 4
- Harrison Gray Otis — 5–6
- Samuel Sewall — 5
- Isaac Parker — 5
- Bailey Bartlett — 6
- Nathan Read — 7
- Seth Hastings — 8
- Josiah Quincy — 9
- Ezekiel Bacon — 11–12
- Ebenezer Seaver — 11
- Henry Shaw — 16
- Henry W. Dwight — 19–21
- Benjamin Gorham — 23
- Abbott Lawrence — 24, 26
- Richard Fletcher — 25
- George N. Briggs — 25
- Leverett Saltonstall — 26
- Robert C. Winthrop — 29

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

Massachusetts—Continued.	*Congress*
Charles Hudson	30
George Ashmun	31
William Appleton	32–33, 37
Alexander DeWitt	34
Nathaniel P. Banks	35, 45
Samuel Hooper	37–41
Henry L. Dawes	42–43
Chester W. Chapin	44
William A. Russell	48–49
Moses T. Stevens	52–53
Samuel W. McCall	56–62
Andrew J. Peters	62–63
Augustus P. Gardner	63–64
Allen T. Treadway	65
Peter F. Tague	67–68
John W. McCormack	72
Michigan (entered Union 1837):	
William A. Howard	34–36
Austin Blair	41
Henry Waldron	43
Omar D. Conger	46
William C. Maybury	49
Julius C. Burrows	50–53
Justin R. Whiting	52–53
William A. Smith	59
Joseph W. Fordney	60–67
James C. McLaughlin	68–72
Roy O. Woodruff	73
John D. Dingell	74
Minnesota (entered Union 1858):	
Mark H. Dunnell	46–47
James A. Tawney	54–58
James T. McCleary	59
Winfield S. Hammond	62–63
Sydney Anderson	63
Harold Knutson	73
Mississippi (entered Union 1817):	
Jacob Thompson	31
John Sharp Williams	58–59
James W. Collier	63–72
Missouri (entered Union, 1821):	
James S. Green	31
John S. Phelps	32–37
Henry T. Blow	38
John Hogan	39
Gustavus A. Finkelnburg	42
John C. Tarsney	53–54
Seth W. Cobb	54
Champ Clark	58–61
Dorsey W. Shackleford	62–63
Clement C. Dickinson	63–66, 68–70, 72–73
Charles L. Faust	69–70
Richard M. Duncan	74
Nebraska (entered Union 1867):	
William J. Bryan	52–53
Charles H. Sloan	63–65
Ashton C. Shallenberger	73
Nevada (entered Union 1864): Francis G. Newlands	56–57
New Hampshire (entered Union 1788):	
Samuel Livermore	1
Nicholas Gilman	4
Abiel Foster	5
Nathaniel A. Haven	11
Henry Hubbard	23
Charles G. Atherton	25–27
Moses Norris, Jr	28–29
Harry Hibbard	31–33
New Jersey (entered Union 1787):	
Lambert Cadwalader	1
Isaac Smith	4
Thomas Sinnickson	5
William Coxe	13
John L. N. Stratton	37
William Hughes	62
Isaac Bacharach	66–74
Donald H. McLean	76
New York (entered Union 1788):	
John Laurance	1
Ezekiel Gilbert	4
James Cochran	5
Hezekiah L. Hosmer	5
Jonas Platt	6
Killian K. Van Rensselaer	7
Joshua Sands	8
Gaylord Griswold	8
Erastus Root	11
John W. Taylor	13–14
Jonathan Fisk	13
Thomas J. Oakley	13
James W. Wilkin	14
James Tallmadge, Jr	15
Albert H. Tracy	16
Nathaniel Pitcher	17

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

New York—Continued.	*Congress*
Churchill C. Cambreleng	17–18, 23–25
Dudley Marvin	19
Gulian C. Verplanck	20–22
Aaron Vanderpoel	26
Millard Fillimore	27
Daniel D. Barnard	28
David L. Seymour	28
Orville Hungerford	29
Henry Nicoll	30
James Brooks	31–32
William Duer	31
Soloman G. Haven	33
Russell Sage	34
John Kelley	35
Elbridge G. Spaulding	36–37
Erastus Corning	37
Reuben E. Fenton	38
DeWitt C. Littlejohn	38
Henry G. Stebbins	38
John V. L. Pruyn	38
James Brooks	39–40, 42
Roscoe Conkling	39
John H. Winfield	39
John A. Griswold	40–41
Dennis McCarthy	41
Ellis H. Roberts	42–43
Fernando Wood	43–46
Abram S. Hewitt	48–49
Frank Hiscock	48–49
Sereno E. Payne	51–63
Roswell P. Flower	51
W. Bourke Cochran	52–53, 58–60
George B. McClellan	55–57
John W. Dwight	61
Francis B. Harrison	61–63
Michael F. Conry	63–64
George W. Fairchild	64–65
John F. Carew	65–70
Luther W. Mott	66–67
Alanson B. Houghton	67
Ogden L. Mills	67–69
Frank Crowther	68
Thaddeus C. Sweet	70
Frederick M. Davenport	70–71
Thomas H. Cullen	71
Christopher D. Sullivan	72
Daniel A. Reed	73
North Carolina (entered Union 1789):	
Thomas Blount	4–5
Robert Williams	5
David Stone	6
James Holland	7
Willis Alston	10–11, 13
William Gaston	13–14
Abraham Rencher	25, 27
Henry W. Conner	26
James J. McKay	28–30
Edward Stanly	32
William M. Robbins	45
Edward W. Pou	60–61
Claude Kitchin	62–67
Robert L. Doughton	69
North Dakota (entered Union 1889):	
Martin N. Johnson	54–55
George M. Young	66–68
Ohio (entered Union 1803):	
William Creighton	13
Thomas Corwin	23–24
Thomas L. Hamer	25
Samson Mason	26–27
John B. Weller	28
Samuel F. Vinton	29–31
Lewis D. Campbell	34–35
John Sherman	36
Valentine B. Horton	37
George H. Pendleton	38
James A. Garfield	39, 44–46
Robert C. Shenck	40–41
Charles Foster	43
Milton Sayler	45
William McKinley, Jr	46–47, 49–51
Frank H. Hurd	48
Charles H. Grosvenor	53–59
Nicholas Longworth	60–62, 64–67
Timothy T. Ansberry	62–63
Alfred G. Allen	64
George White	65
Charles C. Kearns	68–71
Charles West	73
Thomas A. Jenkins	73
Arthur P. Lamneck	74–75

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

	Congress
Oklahoma (entered Union 1907):	
Thomas A. Chandler	67
James V. McClintic	73
Wesley E. Disney	74
Oregon (entered Union 1859):	
William R. Ellis	61
Willis C. Hawley	65–72
Pennsylvania (entered Union 1787):	
Thomas Fitzsimons	1
Albert Gallatin	4–6
Henry Woods	6
John Smilie	6–7, 10–12
Joseph Clay	8–9
John Rea	11
Jonathan Roberts	12–13
Samuel D. Ingham	13–14, 18
John Sergeant	15, 25
John Ross	16
John Tod	17
John Gilmore	21–22
Horace Binney	23
Richard Biddle	26
Joseph R. Ingersoll	27–29
James Pollock	30
Moses Hampton	31
J. Glancy Jones	32, 35
John Robbins, Jr	33
James H. Campbell	34
Thaddeus Stevens	36–38
James K. Moorhead	39–40
William D. Kelley	41–50
Russell Errett	47
Samuel J. Randall	47
William L. Scott	50
Thomas M. Bayne	51
John Dalzell	52–62
A. Mitchell Palmer	62–63
J. Hampton Moore	63–66
John J. Casey	64, 68
Henry W. Watson	66–73
Harris J. Bixler	69
Harry A. Estep	70–72
Thomas C. Cochran	73
J. Twing Brooks	74
Patrick J. Boland	76
Benjamin Jarrett	76
Rhode Island (entered Union 1790):	
Benjamin Bourn	4
Francis Malbone	4
Christopher G. Champlin	5
John Brown	6
Joseph Stanton, Jr	8
Daniel L. D. Granger	59–60
George F. O'Shaunessay	65
Richard S. Aldrich	69–72
South Carolina (entered Union 1788):	
William L. Smith	1, 4–5
Robert Goodloe Harper	5–6
Abraham Nott	6
David R. Williams	9
Langdon Cheves	12
Theodore Gourdin	13
William Lowndes	13–15
Thomas R. Mitchell	17
George McDuffie	18–22
R. Barnwell Rhett	25–26
Francis W. Pickens	27
John L. McLaurin	54
Tennessee (entered Union 1796):	
Andrew Jackson	4
William C. C. Claiborne	5
William Dickson	7, 9
George W. Campbell	10
Bennett H. Henderson	14
Francis Jones	16–17
James K. Polk	22–23
Cave Johnson	24
George W. Jones	31–34
Horace Maynard	37, 40–42
Benton McMillan	49–55
James D. Richardson	56–57
Cordell Hull	62–66, 68–71
Edward E. Eslick	72
Jere Cooper	72
Texas (entered Union 1845):	
John Hancock	44
Roger Q. Mills	46, 48–51
Joseph W. Bailey	55
Sam Bronson Cooper	56–58
Choice B. Randell	60–62
John N. Garner	63–71
Morgan G. Sanders	72–75
Milton H. West	76

Members of the Ways and Means Committee from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

	Congress
Vermont (entered Union 1791):	
Daniel Buck	4
Israel Smith	4, 7
Lewis R. Morris	5
James Fisk	10, 12
Horace Everett	25
Justin S. Morrill	36–39
Virginia (entered Union 1788):	
James Madison	1, 4
William B. Giles	5
Richard Brent	5
Walter Janes	5
Levin Powell	6
John Nicholas	6
John Randolph	7–9, 20
James M. Garnett	9
John W. Eppes	10–11, 13
William A. Burwell	12, 14–16
James Pleasants	12–13
John Tyler	16
Andrew Stevenson	17–19
Alexander Smyth	20–21
Philip P. Barbour	21
Mark Alexander	21–22
George Loyall	23–24
John W. Jones	25–27
John M. Botts	27
Thomas W. Gilmer	27
Thomas H. Bayly	28, 31
George C. Dromgoole	28–29
James McDowell	30
John Letcher	34–35
John S. Millson	36
John R. Tucker	44–47
Claude A. Swanson	55–58
A. Willis Robertson	75
Washington (entered Union 1889):	
Francis W. Cushman	61
Lindley H. Hadley	66–72
Samuel B. Hill	71–74
West Virginia (entered Union 1863):	
William L. Wilson	50, 52–53
Joseph H. Gaines	60–61
George M. Bowers	66–67
Wisconsin (entered Union 1848):	
Charles Billinghurst	34
Jay A. Hubbell	47
Robert M. La Follette	51
Joseph W. Babcock	56–59
James A. Frear	66–68, 71, 73

Is the Wheeler-Lea Railroad Bill Being Sabotaged?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, great confusion prevails among the true friends of the railroaders in Congress because of wild rumors indicating that the railroad brotherhoods do and do not support the conference report on the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill, S. 2009.

I am unable to speak for the railroad brotherhoods or to explain this reported change of attitude of their leaders, since information received by me to this date indicates their support of S. 2009. The support of this measure may best by attested to by revealing the contents of a telegram received from Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and addressed to the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which reads as follows:

APRIL 29, 1940.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, M. C.
House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please be advised that opposition Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen to Senate bill 2009 was based upon the consolidation section of the bill. Now that conferees have eliminated that section, the source of our opposition is eliminated. However, we shall continue our earnest effort to obtain legal protection for labor in consolidation and abandonment situations.

A. F. WHITNEY.

Every Member of this House knows that all the brotherhoods, with the exception of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, indicated over a period of months that they were favorable to S. 2009. With the receipt of President Whitney's telegram quoted above and his statement therein, "Now that the conferees have eliminated that section"—Harrington amendment to consolidation section—"the source of our opposition is eliminated." This position on the part of President Whitney and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen led me to believe that the brotherhoods were unanimous in their support of S. 2009.

With the consolidation section striken from S. 2009 by the conferees, it is evident that the brotherhoods acknowledge the Washington agreement executed in May 1936 as furnishing adequate guarantee of protection to employees likely to be affected by any possible consolidation. The Washington agreement was designed to protect thousands of railroad employees and their families and was signed not alone by railroad executives but by the spokesmen and representatives of 21 brotherhoods. The signing of this agreement by the Nation's principal railroads and the various brotherhoods representing railway employees was made known to the Seventy-fourth Congress by the true friend of all railroaders, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio, when, on May 21, 1936, he made the following statement praising the Washington agreement as being mutually beneficial to both the management and employees. Congressman CROSSER's statement, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 21, 1936, page 7766, is as follows:

AGREEMENT BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes in regard to a matter of importance to the entire membership.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, with much pleasure I wish to make a statement which I am sure all Members of the House will be glad to hear.

The differences between the railroads of the United States on the one hand and the railroad employees on the other, in regard to the rights of employees in connection with proposed consolidations of terminal facilities, have been adjusted. A written agreement was signed today by the representatives of the railroads and by the representatives of the railroad workers. The agreement is for a period of 5 years, beginning on June 18, 1936, and does away with the necessity for the enactment of the Wheeler-Crosser bill which would restrict reductions in railroad employment, and which is now pending before congressional committees in the Senate and House of Representatives.

I think it proper to say that much credit is due to both the representatives of the railroad workers and to the representatives of the railroads for the rare intelligence, high sense of justice, and devotion to duty manifested by them in their efforts to reconcile their great and serious differences. In the controversy was involved the loss of the positions of possibly 200,000 men, a very serious matter, indeed, at this time. The management and men have worked out with a great deal of care an arrangement that is mutually satisfactory to management and men.

I think that we should pay tribute to the fine spirit evidenced by both parties for the satisfactory conclusion of the whole matter. When the railway labor bill was before the House for consideration, I stated that the use of the means provided in that bill for mediation in and settlement of railway labor disputes would rapidly develop a spirit of conciliation and cooperation between the workers and the management which would tend to establish good will and harmony throughout the whole industry.

The signing today of the remarkable document to which I have referred—that is, the contract between the railroad companies and their workers—fulfills in a gratifying measure the prediction to which I have referred. It is a triumph of principle over force and advances the cause of justice immeasurably.

At the time my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] made the above remarks he caused to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of his colleagues a copy of the Washington agreement, which is inserted again at this time, as follows:

AGREEMENT OF MAY 1936, WASHINGTON, D. C.

This agreement is entered into between the carriers listed and defined in appendixes A, B, and C, attached hereto and made a part hereof, represented by the duly authorized joint conference committee signatory hereto, as party of the first part, and the employees of said carriers, represented by the organizations signatory hereto by their respective duly authorized executives, as party of the second part, and, so far as necessary to carry out the provisions hereof, is also to be construed as a separate agreement by and between and in behalf of each of said carriers and its employees who are now or may hereafter be represented by any of said organizations which now has (or may hereafter have during the life of this agreement) an agreement with such carrier concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.

The signatories hereto, having been respectively duly authorized as aforesaid to negotiate to a conclusion certain pending issues concerning the treatment of employees who may be affected by coordination as hereinafter defined, hereby agree:

SECTION 1. That the fundamental scope and purpose of this agreement is to provide for allowances to defined employees affected by coordination as hereinafter defined, and it is the intent that the provisions of this agreement are to be restricted to those changes in employment in the railroad industry solely due to and resulting from such coordination. Therefore, the parties hereto understand and agree that fluctuations, rises and falls, and changes in volume or character of employment brought about solely by other causes are not within the contemplation of the parties hereto, or covered by or intended to be covered by this agreement.

SEC. 2 (a). The term "coordination" as used herein means joint action by two or more carriers whereby they unify, consolidate, merge, or pool in whole or in part their separate railroad facilities or any of the operations or services previously performed by them through such separate facilities.

(b) The term "carrier" as used herein when it refers to other than parties to this agreement means any carrier subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; when it refers to a party to this agreement it means any company or system listed and described in appendixes A, B, or C, as a single carrier party to this agreement.

(c) The term "time of coordination" as used herein includes the period following the effective date of a coordination during which changes consequent upon coordination are being made effective; as applying to a particular employee it means the date in said period when that employee is first adversely affected as a result of said coordination.

SEC. 3 (a). The provisions of this agreement shall be effective and shall be applied whenever two or more carriers parties hereto undertake a coordination; and it is understood that if a carrier or carriers parties hereto undertake a coordination with a carrier or carriers not parties hereto, such coordination will be made only upon the basis of an agreement approved by all of the carriers parties thereto and all of the organizations of employees involved (parties hereto) of all of the carriers concerned. No coordination involving classes of employees not represented by any of the organizations parties hereto shall be undertaken by the carriers parties hereto except in accord with the provisions of this agreement or agreements arising hereunder.

(b) Each carrier listed and established as a separate carrier for the purposes of this agreement, as provided in appendixes A, B, and C, shall be regarded as a separate carrier for the purposes hereof during the life of this agreement; provided, however, that in the case of any coordination involving two or more railroad carriers which also involves the Railway Express Agency, Inc., the latter company shall be treated as a separate carrier with respect to its operations on each of the railroads involved.

(c) It is definitely understood that the action of the parties hereto in listing and establishing as a single carrier any system which comprises more than one operating company is taken solely for the purposes of this agreement and shall not be construed or used by either party hereto to limit or affect the rights of the other with respect to matters not falling within the scope and terms of this agreement.

SEC. 4. Each carrier contemplating a coordination shall give at least 90 days' written notice of such intended coordination by posting a notice on bulletin boards convenient to the interested employees of each such carrier and by sending registered mail notice to the representatives of such interested employees. Such notice shall contain a full and adequate statement of the proposed changes to be effected by such coordination, including an estimate of the number of employees of each class affected by the intended changes. The date and place of a conference between representatives of all the parties interested in such intended changes for the purpose of reaching agreements with respect to the application thereto of the terms and conditions of this agreement, shall be agreed upon within 10 days after the receipt of said notice, and conference shall commence within 30 days from the date of such notice.

SEC. 5. Each plan of coordination which results in the displacement of employees or rearrangement of forces shall provide for the selection of forces from the employees of all the carriers involved on bases accepted as appropriate for application in the particular case; and any assignment of employees made necessary by a coordination shall be made on the basis of an agreement between the carriers and the organizations of the employees affected, parties hereto. In the event of failure to agree, the dispute may be submitted by either party for adjustment in accordance with section 13.

SEC. 6. (a) No employee of any of the carriers involved in a particular coordination who is continued in service shall, for a period not exceeding 5 years following the effective date of such coordination, be placed, as a result of such coordination, in a worse position with respect to compensation and rules governing working conditions than he occupied at the time of such coordination so long as he is unable in the normal exercise of his seniority rights under existing agreements, rules, and practices to obtain a position producing compensation equal to or exceeding the compensation of the position held by him at the time of the

particular coordination, except, however, that if he fails to exercise his seniority rights to secure another available position, which does not require a change in residence, to which he is entitled under the working agreement and which carries a rate of pay and compensation exceeding those of the position which he elects to retain, he shall thereafter be treated for the purposes of this section as occupying the position which he elects to decline.

(b) The protection afforded by the foregoing paragraph shall be made effective whenever appropriate through what is hereby designated as a "displacement allowance" which shall be determined in each instance in the manner hereinafter described. Any employee entitled to such an allowance is hereinafter referred to as a "displaced" employee.

(c) Each displacement allowance shall be a monthly allowance determined by computing the total compensation received by the employee and his total time paid for during the last 12 months in which he performed service immediately preceding the date of his displacement (such 12 months being hereinafter referred to as the "test period") and by dividing separately the total compensation and the total time paid for by 12, thereby producing the average monthly compensation and average monthly time paid for, which shall be the minimum amounts used to guarantee the displaced employee, and if his compensation in his current position is less in any month in which he performs work than the aforesaid average compensation he shall be paid the difference, less compensation for any time lost on account of voluntary absences to the extent that he is not available for service equivalent to his average monthly time during the test period, but he shall be compensated in addition thereto at the rate of the position filled for any time worked in excess of the average monthly time paid for during the test period.

SEC. 7 (a) Any employee of any of the carriers participating in a particular coordination who is deprived of employment as a result of said coordination shall be accorded an allowance (hereinafter termed a coordination allowance), based on length of service, which (except in the case of an employee with less than 1 year of service) shall be a monthly allowance equivalent in each instance to 60 percent of the average monthly compensation of the employee in question during the last 12 months of his employment in which he earned compensation prior to the date he is first deprived of employment as a result of the coordination. This coordination allowance will be made to each eligible employee while unemployed by his home road or in the coordinated operation during a period beginning at the date he is first deprived of employment as a result of the coordination and extending in each instance for a length of time determined and limited by the following schedule:

Period of payment (months)

Length of service:	
1 year and less than 2 years	6
2 years and less than 3 years	12
3 years and less than 5 years	18
5 years and less than 10 years	36
10 years and less than 15 years	48
15 years and over	60

In the case of an employee with less than 1 year of service, the total coordination allowance shall be a lump-sum payment in an amount equivalent to 60 days' pay at the straight time daily rate of the last position held by him at the time he is deprived of employment as a result of the coordination.

(b) For the purposes of this agreement the length of service of the employee shall be determined from the date he last acquired an employment status with the employing carrier and he shall be given credit for 1 month's service for each month in which he performed any service (in any capacity whatsoever) and 12 such months shall be credited as 1 year's service. The employment status of an employee shall not be interrupted by furlough in instances where the employee has a right to and does return to service when called. In determining length of service of an employee acting as an officer or other official representative of an employee organization he will be given credit for performing service while so engaged on leave of absence from the service of a carrier.

(c) An employee shall be regarded as deprived of his employment and entitled to a coordination allowance in the following cases:

1. When the position which he holds on his home road is abolished as result of coordination and he is unable to obtain by the exercise of his seniority rights another position on his home road or a position in the coordinated operation, or

2. When the position he holds on his home road is not abolished but he loses that position as a result of the exercise of seniority rights by an employee whose position is abolished as a result of said coordination, or by other employees, brought about as a proximate consequence of the coordination, and if he is unable by the exercise of his seniority rights to secure another position on his home road or a position in the coordinated operation.

(d) An employee shall not be regarded as deprived of employment in case of his resignation, death, retirement on pension, or on account of age or disability in accordance with the current rules and practices applicable to employees generally, dismissal for justifiable cause in accordance with the rules, or furloughed because of reduction in forces due to seasonal requirements of the service; nor shall any employee be regarded as deprived of employment as the result of a particular coordination who is not deprived of his employment within 3 years from the effective date of said coordination.

(e) Each employee receiving a coordination allowance shall keep the employer informed of his address and the name and address of any other person by whom he may be regularly employed.

(f) The coordination allowance shall be paid to the regularly assigned incumbent of the position abolished. If the position of an employee is abolished while he is absent from service, he will be entitled to the coordination allowance when he is available for service. The employee temporarily filling said position at the time it was abolished will be given a coordination allowance on the basis of said position until the regular employee is available for service and thereafter shall revert to his previous status and will be given a coordination allowance accordingly if any is due.

(g) An employee receiving a coordination allowance shall be subject to call to return to service after being notified in accordance with the working agreement, and such employee may be required to return to the service of the employing carrier for other reasonably comparable employment for which he is physically and mentally qualified and which does not require a change in his place of residence, if his return does not infringe upon the employment rights of other employees under the working agreement.

(h) If an employee who is receiving a coordination allowance returns to service the coordination allowance shall cease while he is so reemployed and the period of time during which he is so reemployed shall be deducted from the total period for which he is entitled to receive a coordination allowance. During the time of such reemployment, however, he shall be entitled to protection in accordance with the provisions of section 6.

(i) If an employee who is receiving a coordination allowance obtains railroad employment (other than with his home road or in the coordinated operation) his cordination allowance shall be reduced to the extent that the sum total of his earnings in such employment and his allowance exceeds the amount upon which his coordination allowance is based; provided that this shall not apply to employees with less than 1 year's service.

(j) A coordination allowance shall cease prior to the expiration of its prescribed period in the event of:

1. Failure without good cause to return to service in accordance with working agreement after being notified of position for which he is eligible and as provided in paragraphs (g) and (h).

2. Resignation.

3. Death.

4. Retirement on pension or on account of age or disability in accordance with the current rules and practices applicable to employees generally.

5. Dismissal for justifiable cause.

SEC. 8. An employee affected by a particular coordination shall not be deprived of benefits attaching to his previous employment, such as free transportation, pensions, hospitalization, relief, etc., under the same conditions and so long as such benefits continue to be accorded to other employees on his home road, in active service or on furlough, as the case may be, to the extent that such benefits can be so maintained under present authority of law or corporate action or through future authorization which may be obtained.

SEC. 9. Any employee eligible to receive a coordination allowance under section 7 hereof may, at his option at the time of coordination, resign and—in lieu of all other benefits and protections provided in this agreement—accept in a lump sum a separation allowance determined in accordance with the following schedule:

Separation allowance (months' pay)

Length of service:	
1 year and less than 2 years	3
2 years and less than 3 years	6
3 years and less than 5 years	9
5 years and less than 10 years	12
10 years and less than 15 years	12
15 years and over	12

In the case of employees with less than 1 year's service, 5 days' pay, at the rate of the position last occupied, for each month in which they performed service will be paid as the lump sum.

(a) Length of service shall be computed as provided in section 7.

(b) One month's pay shall be computed by multiplying by 30 the daily rate of pay received by the employee in the position last occupied prior to time of coordination.

SEC. 10 (a). Any employee who is retained in the service of any carrier involved in a particular coordination (or who is later restored to service from the group of employees entitled to receive a coordination allowance) who is required to change the point of his employment as result of such coordination and is therefore required to move his place of residence, shall be reimbursed for all expenses of moving his household and other personal effects and for the traveling expenses of himself and members of his family, including living expenses for himself and his family and his own actual wage loss during the time necessary for such transfer, and for a reasonable time thereafter (not to exceed 2 working days), used in securing a place of residence in his new location. The exact extent of the responsibility of the carrier under this provision and the ways and means of transportation shall be agreed upon in advance between the carrier responsible and the organization of the employee affected. No claim for expenses under this section shall be allowed unless they are incurred within 3 years from the date of coordination and the claim must be submitted within 90 days after the expenses are incurred.

(b) If any such employee is furloughed within 3 years after changing his point of employment as a result of coordination and

elects to move his place of residence back to his original point of employment, the carrier shall assume the expense of moving his household and other personal effects under the conditions imposed in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) Except to the extent provided in paragraph (b) changes in place of residence subsequent to the initial changes caused by coordination and which grow out of the normal exercise of seniority in accordance with working agreements are not comprehended within the provisions of this section.

SEC. 11 (a). The following provisions shall apply, to the extent they are applicable in each instance, to any employee who is retained in the service of any of the carriers involved in a particular coordination (or who is later restored to such service from the group of employees entitled to receive a coordination allowance) who is required to change the point of his employment as a result of such coordination and is therefore required to move his place of residence:

1. If the employee owns his own home in the locality from which he is required to move, he shall at his option be reimbursed by his employing carrier for any loss suffered in the sale of his home for less than its fair value. In each case the fair value of the home in question shall be determined as of a date sufficiently prior to the coordination to be unaffected thereby. The employing carrier shall in each instance be afforded an opportunity to purchase the home at such fair value before it is sold by the employee to any other party.

2. If the employee is under a contract to purchase his home, the employing carrier shall protect him against loss to the extent of the fair value of any equity he may have in the home and in addition shall relieve him from any further obligations under this contract.

3. If the employee holds an unexpired lease of a dwelling occupied by him as his home, the employing carrier shall protect him from all loss and cost in securing the cancellation of his said lease.

(b) Changes in place of residence subsequent to the initial change caused by coordination and which grow out of the normal exercise of seniority in accordance with working agreements are not comprehended within the provisions of this section.

(c) No claim for loss shall be paid under the provisions of this section which is not presented within 3 years after the effective date of the coordination.

(d) Should a controversy arise in respect to the value of the home, the loss sustained in its sale, the loss under a contract for purchase, loss and cost in securing termination of lease, or any other question in connection with these matters, it shall be decided through joint conference between the representatives of the employees and the carrier on whose line the controversy arises, and in the event they are unable to agree, the dispute may be referred by either party to a board of three competent real-estate appraisers, selected in the following manner: One to be selected by the representatives of the employees and the carrier, respectively; these two shall endeavor by agreement within 10 days after their appointment to select the third appraiser or to select some person authorized to name the third appraiser; and in the event of failure to agree, then the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be requested to appoint the third appraiser. A decision of a majority of the appraisers shall be required and said decision shall be final and conclusive. The salary and expenses of the third or neutral appraiser, including the expenses of the appraisal board, shall be borne equally by the parties to the proceedings. All other expenses shall be paid by the party incurring them, including the salary of the appraiser selected by such party.

SEC. 12. If any carrier shall rearrange or adjust its forces in anticipation of a coordination with the purpose or effect of depriving an employee of benefits to which he should be entitled under this agreement as an employee immediately affected by a coordination, this agreement shall apply to such an employee as of the date when he is so affected.

SEC. 13. In the event that any dispute or controversy arises (except as defined in sec. 11) in connection with a particular coordination, including an interpretation, application, or enforcement of any of the provisions of this agreement (or of the agreement entered into between the carriers and the representatives of the employees relating to said coordination as contemplated by this agreement) which is not composed by the parties thereto within 30 days after same arises, it may be referred by either party for consideration and determination to a committee which is hereby established, composed in the first instance of the signatories to this agreement. Each party to this agreement may name such persons from time to time as each party desires to serve on such committee as its representatives in substitution for such original members. Should the committee be unable to agree, it shall select a neutral referee and in the event it is unable to agree within 10 days upon the selection of said referee, then the members on either side may request the National Mediation Board to appoint a referee. The case shall again be considered by the committee and the referee and the decision of the referee shall be final and conclusive. The salary and expenses of the referee shall be borne equally by the parties to the proceeding; all other expenses shall be paid by the party incurring them.

SEC. 14. Any carrier not initially a party to this agreement may become a party by serving notice of its desire to do so by mail upon the members of the committee established by section 13 hereof. It shall become a party as of the date of the service of such notice or upon such later date as may be specified therein.

SEC. 15. This agreement shall be effective June 16, 1936, and be in full force and effect for a period of 5 years from that date and continue in effect thereafter with the privilege that any carrier or organization party hereto may then withdraw from the agreement after 1 year from having served notice of its intention so to withdraw: *Provided, however,* That any rights of the parties hereto or of individuals established and fixed during the term of this agreement shall continue in full force and effect, notwithstanding the expiration of the agreement or the exercise by a carrier or an organization of the right to withdraw therefrom.

This agreement shall be subject to revision by mutual agreement of the parties hereto at any time, but only after the serving of a 60 days' notice by either party upon the other.

For the participating carriers listed in appendix A: H. A. Enochs, Jno. V. Walton, Wm. White.

For the participating carriers listed in appendix B: C. A. Clements, E. Connors, C. M. Dukes.

For the participating carriers listed in appendix C: H. A. Benton, W. J. Jenks, J. B. Parrish.

For the participating carriers: H. A. Enochs, chairman, Joint Conference Committee.

For the participating organizations of employees: A. Johnston, by H. J. B. grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; D. B. Robertson, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; J. A. Phillips, president, Order of Railway Conductors of America; A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; T. C. Casher, president, Switchmen's Union of North America; E. J. Manion, president, Order of Railroad Telegraphers; J. J. Lehmann, president, American Train Dispatchers Association; A. W. Seaton, president, International Association of Machinists; J. A. Franklin, president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America; Ray Gann, president, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; John J. Hynes, president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; C. J. McGlogan, vice president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Felix H. Knight, president, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; J. F. McNamara, president, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; F. H. Fljozdal, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; E. M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; A. E. Lyon, acting president, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; M. S. Warfield, president, Order of Sleeping Car Conductors; James J. Delaney, president, National Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America; Wm. S. Brown, president, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, International Longshoremen's Association; E. M. Hanison, chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Signed at WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 21, 1936.*

APPENDIX A.—*List of carriers in eastern territory parties to agreement*

(1) Carrier	(2) Properties and operations included in the authorization as part of, and to be considered as part of, the carrier listed in column 1
Ann Arbor	
Baltimore & Ohio	
Bessemer & Lake Erie	
Boston & Maine	
Boston Terminal	
Central R. R. of N. J.	
Cincinnati Union Terminal Co.	
Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville	
Chicago River & Indiana	
Cleveland Union Terminals Co.	
Dayton Union	
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line	
Detroit Terminal	
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton	
Erie	Chicago & Erie; New Jersey & New York; New York, Susquehanna & Western.
Indianapolis Union	
Indiana Harbor Belt	
Lehigh & Hudson River	
Lehigh & New England	
Lehigh Valley	
Long Island	
Maine Central	
Monongahela	
The New York Central Railroad Co.	All leased lines.
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	
New York, New Haven & Hartford	
Pennsylvania	Waynesburg & Washington; Balto. & Eastern.
Penna.-Reading Seashore Lines	
Pere Marquette	
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie	Lake Erie & Eastern.
Portland Terminal Co.	
Railway Express Agency, Inc.	
Reading	
Rutland	
Staten Island Rapid Transit	
Washington Terminal	
Western Maryland	
Wheeling & Lake Erie	Lorain & West Virginia.

NOTE.—Agreement subject to approval of court with respect to lines in hands of receivers or trustees.

APPENDIX B.—*List of carriers in western territory parties to agreement*

(1) Carrier	(2) Properties and operations included in the authorization as part of, and to be considered as part of, the carrier listed in column 1
Alameda Belt Line	
Alton & Southern R. R	
Alton Railroad Co., The	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., The.	Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Ry. Co.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Ry. Co.
Atchison Union Railway & Depot Co.	
Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal R. R. Co., The.	
Belt Railway Co. of Chicago	
Burlington-Rock Island R. R. Co.	
Camas Prairie R. R. Co	
Chicago & Eastern Illinois Ry. Co.	
Chicago & Illinois Midland Ry. Co.	
Chicago & North Western Ry. Co.	
Chicago & Western Indiana R. R. Co.	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.	Quincy, Omaha & Kansas City R. R.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co.	Chicago, Terre Haute & Southeastern Ry. Co.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., The.	Chicago, Rock Island & Gulf Ry. Co.; Peoria Terminal Co.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Ry. Co.	
Chicago Union Station Co	
Colorado & Southern Ry. Co	
Davenport, Rock Island & Northwestern Ry. Co.	
Denver & Rio Grande Western R. R. Co., The.	
Denver & Salt Lake Ry. Co., The	
Denver Union Terminal Ry. Co., The.	
Des Moines Union Ry. Co	Iowa Railway Transfer Co.
Duluth, Missabe & Northern Ry	Duluth & Iron Range R. R.
Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Ry. Co.	Mineral Range R. R Co.
East Portland Freight Terminal	
East St. Louis Junction R. R	
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Ry. Co	
Fort Smith & Western Ry	
Fort Worth & Denver City Ry. Co.	Wichita Valley Ry. Co., The
Fort Worth Belt Ry. Co	
Galveston, Houston & Henderson R. R.	
Great Northern Ry. Co	
Green Bay & Western R. R. Co	
Gulf Coast Lines	New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Ry. Co.; St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Ry. Co.; Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Ry. Co.; Houston & Brazos Valley Ry. Co.; San Antonio, Uvalde & Gulf R. R. Co.; Sugar Land Ry. Co.; Rio Grande City Ry. Co.; Asherton & Gulf Ry. Co.; Asphalt Belt Ry. Co.; San Antonio Southern Ry. Co.; San Benito & Rio Grande Valley Ry. Co.; Orange & Northwestern R. R. Co.; New Iberia & Northern R. R. Co.; Iberia, St. Mary & Eastern R. R. Co.
Houston Belt & Terminal Ry. Co.	
International-Great Northern R. R.	
Kansas City Terminal Ry. Co	
Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Ry. Co.	
Lake Superior & Ishpeming R. R. Co.	
Litchfield & Madison Ry. Co.	
Manufacturers Ry. Co. (St. Louis)	
Midland Valley R. R. Co	
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.	
Minneapolis & St. Louis R. R. Co., The	Railway Transfer Co. of the City of Minneapolis
Minnesota Transfer Railway Co., The.	
Minnesota & International Ry. Co.	Big Fork & International Falls Ry. Co.
Missouri-Illinois R. R. Co	
Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R. Co	Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R. Co. of Texas; Texas Central R. R. Co.; The Wichita Falls Ry. Co.; The Wichita Falls & Northwestern Ry. of Texas; Wichita Falls & Wellington Ry. Co. of Texas; Beaver, Meade & Englewood R. R.
Missouri Pacific R. R. Co	Missouri Pacific R. R. Corporation in Nebraska; Fort Smith Suburban Ry.; Natchez & Southern Ry.; Natchez & Louisiana Ry. Transfer Co. (boat). The Chester & Mount Vernon R. R.; Booneville, St. Louis & Southern Ry. Co.; Cairo & Thebes R. R. Co.; Marion & Eastern R. R. Co.
Northern Pacific Ry. Co	
Northern Pacific Terminal Co. of Oregon, The.	
Northwestern Pacific R. R. Co	
Ogden Union Ry. & Depot Co	
Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka Ry. Co.	
Oregon, California & Eastern Ry. Co.	
Peoria & Pekin Union Ry. Co	
Port Terminal Railroad Association (Houston).	
Pueblo Union Depot & Railroad Co., The.	
Railway Express Agency, Inc	
Rock Island-Frisco Terminal Ry. Co.	
St. Joseph Terminal R. R. Co	
St. Joseph Union Depot Co	
St. Paul Union Depot Co., The	
St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co	
St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co	St. Louis-San Francisco & Texas Ry.; Fort Worth & Rio Grande Ry.; Birmingham Belt R. R. Co.
St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co	St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co. of Texas; Dallas Terminal Ry. & Union Depot Co.
Salt Lake City Union Depot & R. R. Co., The.	
San Diego & Arizona Eastern Ry. Co.	
Sioux City Terminal Ry. Co	
South Omaha Terminal Ry. Co	
Southern Pacific Company-Pacific Lines.	
Spokane, Portland & Seattle Ry. Co.	Oregon Trunk Ry.; Oregon Electric Ry. Co.; United Railways Co.
Spokane, Coeur d'Alene & Palouse Ry. Co.	
Spokane International Ry	
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis.	St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Ry.; East St. Louis Connecting Ry.; St. Louis Transfer Ry.
Texas & Pacific Ry., The	Weatherford, Mineral Wells & Northwestern Ry. Co., The; Texas-New Mexico Ry. Co.; Abilene & Southern Ry. Co.; Texas Short Line Ry.; Pecos Valley Southern Ry. Co., The; Cisco & Northeastern Ry. Co.
Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Terminal R. R. of New Orleans.	
Texas & New Orleans R. R. Co	Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Ry. Co., The; Texas & New Orleans R. R. Co.; Louisiana Western R. R. Co.; Morgan's Louisiana & Texas R. R. & S. S. Co.; Iberia & Vermillion R. R. Co.; Houston & Texas Central R. R. Co., The; Texas Midland R. R.; Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Ry. Co., The (Austin Division); Houston, East & West Texas R. R. Co., The; Houston & Shreveport R. R. Co.
Tidewater Southern Ry. Co	
Tulsa Union Depot Co	
Union Railway Co. (Memphis, Tenn.).	
Union Pacific R. R	Eastern District, Central District, Northwestern District, Southwestern District.
Union Terminal Co. (Dallas, Tex.)	
Union Terminal Ry. Co. (St. Joseph, Mo.).	
Wabash Ry. Co	
Western Pacific R. R. Co., The	
Wichita Union Terminal Ry. Co., The.	

NOTE.—Agreement subject to approval of court with respect to lines in hands of receivers or trustees.

APPENDIX C.—*List of carriers in southeastern territory parties to agreement*

(1) Carrier	(2) Properties and operations included in the authorization as part of, and to be considered as part of, the carrier listed in column 1
Central of Georgia Ry	
Chesapeake & Ohio Ry	
Columbus & Greenville	
Illinois Central System	
Macon, Dublin and Savannah	
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co	
Norfolk Southern Ry. Co	
Railway Express Agency, Inc	
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac.	
Seaboard Air Line Ry	
Travares and Gulf	
Virginian	

NOTE.—Agreement subject to approval of court with respect to lines in hands of receivers or trustees.

I want to repeat my former assertion that the above agreement was signed by the railway executives and representatives of 21 brotherhoods speaking for the railway employees of the country. Therefore, let me repeat again, it is not difficult to understand the indicated approval of the conference report on S. 2009 by all the brotherhoods.

In addition to the position indicated by the brotherhoods relative to the conference report, Labor, the weekly newspaper, published at Washington, D. C., in the issue of April 30, in bold type, informs their readers as follows:

BILL SEEKS TO GIVE "IRON HORSE" BREAK WITH COMPETITORS—PROVISIONS CLARIFYING LABOR'S STATUS IN ALL KINDS OF MERGERS IS DROPPED

(By Albert H. Jenkins)

Railroad legislation, frozen up in committees through the long winter, this week felt a spring thaw and began to move toward passage by Congress.

The so-called "key bill" proposes to put water carriers under Interstate Commerce Commission regulation, on an equal basis with rail and highway carriers. It also would create a special board to investigate Government subsidies to various kinds of transport, and to recommend changes needed to eliminate unfair advantages and provide a square deal for all.

This bill was passed by the Senate last year, in one form, and by the House in another form. Since then it has been in the hands of a conference committee headed by Senator BURTON K. WHEELER and Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA, chairmen of the Senate and House Interstate Commerce Committees.

CONFEREES AGREE

A few days ago WHEELER announced that the conference committee had agreed on a compromise bill and that it would be promptly submitted to the Senate and House for a final vote.

Both versions of the key bill contained provisions modifying the procedure followed by railroads in mergers and consolidations and providing additional protection for railroad employees affected by such changes.

All these provisions were left out of the bill finally agreed on by the conference committee. If it is passed by Congress, as seems likely, railroad labor will neither gain nor lose protection in mergers and coordinations. The situation will remain the same as it has been since the Supreme Court, in its recent decision in the famous Rock Island case, ruled that the I. C. C. has power to require railroads to compensate employees who lose their jobs or suffer other hardships as a result of consolidations.

PACT MAIN PROTECTION

In that case, and others like it, the Commission required railroads to give their employees compensation like that provided by the Washington job-protection agreement, which was negotiated by the standard railroad labor organizations with almost all the carriers.

The employees' main protection is the Washington agreement, but it is reinforced by the I. C. C. orders and the Supreme Court decision.

Labor is the weekly publication that is recognized as the mouthpiece for all labor organizations, and the above quotation clearly reveals their attitude in support of this legislation.

The people of my district up until this date have informed me in no uncertain terms that they are favorable to this legislation. Fifteen thousand railroad employees and their families in the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, with an annual pay roll of $25,300,000, are typical of the railroad groups throughout the Nation who have suffered for years because of Government subsidized competition principally in the form of inland waterways that have taken the bread and butter out of their mouths and threatened to reduce former prosperous communities to veritable ghost towns.

As one of the two practical railroad men in this Congress I am determined to keep faith with the rank and file of the vast army of railroaders and their families who, if this bill is defeated, will have a right to demand an explanation of these rumors of so-called collusion and high-handed tactics of those opposed to this legislation.

The Republican Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT, GOVERNOR OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, every well-intentioned American is deeply interested in the solution of the present perplexing problems of government. Likewise, all are interested in bringing our Nation from its chaos and uncertainty into an era of sound and progressive prosperity. None would seek to retreat and return to the days of the twenties or thirties. In 1940, benefited by the experiences of the past, we hope to lay the foundation for a better future. I believe the Republican Party is the instrument by which such can be accomplished. Broad and sympathetic views are essential to bring this about. An understanding of the problems of our Nation and the problems of our people and of each group is the foundation upon which such advancement must be built.

I believe this very well expressed in an article by Gov. William H. Vanderbilt, and which I ask to include as a part of my remarks. Such article is as follows:

THE WIDE HORIZON—THE REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY

(By William H. Vanderbilt, Governor of Rhode Island)

Occasionally, I run across a Republican—sometimes one high in the party's council—who is still thinking along the lines of 1932 and 1936, a man or woman who still thinks that with slight and grudgingly granted modifications the so-called good old days can be brought back, men and women whose attitude is that all of the Roosevelt administration—its objectives, its actions, and its methods—is wrong and that no matter what the President or any member of his administration may say or do it should be criticized and opposed.

I am a Republican and I believe sincerely that the best thing for the security, success, and happiness of the American people is to elect a Republican administration in Washington, but that if this attitude becomes the attitude of the Republican Party in the coming campaign, then a Republican will not be sitting in the White House in 1941.

Fortunately, this attitude doesn't reflect the feeling of either the rank and file of Republicans throughout the country, or of the vast majority of Republican leaders, but we must not forget that in politics it is the impression that the people get which counts. This impression does not always coincide with the facts in the case. It is, therefore, quite possible for a few persons in prominent positions in the party, themselves reactionary, to give the impression to the public that the entire party is reactionary, and, of course, our friends the Democrats are going to do everything in their power to spread that impression.

Let us, as a party and individually, be realistic about the present situation.

We might just as well realize now that the people of this country cannot be sold the idea that everything that President Roosevelt and his administration have done and all their objectives are bad, because that just isn't true.

Many of the objectives of the New Deal have been good. Many of the reforms were needed. Many of them should and will become a permanent part of our Nation and our Government. Many Republicans, unfortunately, seem to think that it is a sign of weakness to admit that a Democrat has ever done anything good.

Nothing that any one man or any one administration does is all bad or all good. People are not fooled by blanket condemnations of the New Deal and all its acts.

I believe that a majority of the people of this country feel that many New Deal objectives have been good, but they are tired of the methods of administration that have been employed. They are tired of the waste, the extravagance, the inefficiency, and the political browbeating that have been going on. They want a change. They want sound, efficient, economical Government; but at the same time they want to retain the good things which have been accomplished. They believe in the social-security program, unemployment compensation, old-age security, and other forms of public assistance. There are other things, such as the C. C. C. camps, which they want retained.

But the people want these programs carried on honestly, fairly, efficiently, and without political or other prejudice. I believe these programs of public assistance should be put on a permanent basis. They should be treated the same way as any other department of Government.

In 1936 the Republican Party went to the people with a platform consisting largely of destructive criticism of what had been done. In 1940—if we are to be successful—we must offer the people an honest, sincere program. We must point out what we believe to be the mistakes of the present administration and at the same time offer a definite correctiveness. I believe the opportunities and responsibilities of the Republican Party today are very great. We have a chance, if we are sound and constructive in our thoughts and our ideas, to lead this country into better times—times when people are happier, more contented, more prosperous.

I think that the feeling of millions of people in this country is well expressed in what a newspaperman said to me at the Governors' Conference in Albany last summer. He said that he had voted for Mr. Hoover and that when Mr. Roosevelt came along he thought he had something and had voted for him.

He said that in 1940, if the Republicans put up a sound and, as he described it, "middle-of-the-road man," he would vote for him, but that if the Republicans put up someone he considered to be reactionary he would vote for Roosevelt or anyone else who ran on the Democratic ticket.

By a "middle-of-the-road man" he did not mean a "wishy-washy" fence sitter. He meant a man who was sound and could do what has been described as consolidating the gains and liquidating the losses of the past few years.

Are We Heading for War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LYLE H. BOREN, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given over KADA, of Ada, Okla., and KGFF, of Shawnee, Okla., on April 22, 1940, by our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that of the sincere advocates of peace in the House, none is more sincere and regular in his advocacy than the gentleman from Oklahoma, LYLE BOREN. He is always to be found working against those things that threaten to bring war and the insecurity of war and for those things making for peace and security. He pleads eloquently always for peace. In the present address he uses with much force the clear, simple, pithy but strong language characteristic of his addresses. It can be read with interest and with profit.

The address follows:

The nations of the world constitute a small community. Think of yourself as an individual living in a remote wilderness in a community of 92 people. The United States in its relationship to the world community is exactly like one person in that community of 92 people.

This community of 92 nations has all of the attributes of any community. A few are rich. The majority are poor. Some are large and strong; some are weak and small. A few wish to dominate, to rule, and control the affairs of the community, but the vast majority wish to live in peace and harmony. Most all want to live and let live. They want to be secure and they are willing to grant to every other citizen that same peaceful security.

In this community of nations, there are four who are outlaws. One is a braggart; the other is a busybody; another a gangster, and the fourth an insane fiend. There is no organized police system to control the depredations of these four and so each individual must protect and defend himself. What are these four doing to the community of nations? They have murdered five; they have kidnaped one; they have wounded three, and they are engaged in a fight to death against four others at the present time. Every other citizen in this small community of nations who is uncertain that he is strong enough to defend and protect himself against their aggression is in fear and trembling. We have had funerals for Ethiopia, Austria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. We have seen Denmark kidnaped by the gangsters. Finland, China, and Norway are already in the hospital of nations. Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, Belgium, France, England, and many other countries, are within the terrorized area. Each fear what the next 24 hours may bring from the acts of the fiends gone mad with power.

Let us turn the searchlight on Stalin and Hitler.

Stalin is the embodiment of ignorance, tyranny and hypocrisy. This Godless fiend tramples ruthlessly on the liberties of man. Justice, reason, and mercy are all exiles from Russia. Liberty is banished and freedom put to death. Russia has the most detestable government that ever existed on the face of the earth.

It is impossible to estimate the infamy of this fiend. His gloomy insanity has sown the world with seeds of hate. He has put chains upon the thoughts, and manacles on the limbs of man. Think of Finland. Think of the tender and affectionate mothers in Finland; the sad and suffering wives; the trembling and loving children. Think of the hearts filled with weariness and pain, with agony and tears, because of him. I wish I had the genius to pay a fitting tribute to Finland.

Stalin is so cruel and heartless that my blood is chilled and my sense of justice shocked to think of him. Hate is abhorrent to my head and heart, but to think of the millions of innocent people who have been starved, deceived, robbed, and outraged within Russia and the millions more who have been made the prey of bomb and sword and death in Finland is the blackest and darkest page in the annals of time. All of the people of Russia are governed by falsehood, plundered by hypocrisy, the sport of death, and the food of fear. Their own Government is their worst enemy, and death is their only friend.

Hitler gained control of the German people through the promises of a demagogue, made in weakness, to be forgotten in power. I heard at one time where Hitler was greeted by a smile in a Czechoslovakian town, but the smile came only from the lips of scorn drawn back from the teeth of hatred. He has perverted and degraded everything he has touched.

It is impossible to conceive of a more thoroughly despicable, hateful, and arrogant being. He is without one redeeming feature. He has proven himself a false friend, an unjust judge, a braggart, a hypocrite, a tyrant, sincere only in hatred, jealousy, and vanity, false in promise, suspicious, infamous, and hideous.

How can the human intellect get upon its knees to the infinite absurdity of "Heil Hitler"? Thousands of volumes could not contain the crimes of Hitler. They could not contain the names of his victims. With blood and fire, with bombs and ruin, with crime and terror, he seeks to control the world.

If all of the bones of the victims of Hitler could be gathered together, they would rise higher than all the pyramids. He has covered the cheeks of the world with tears. In his warped brain, every possible crime has been plotted, every conceivable outrage has been perpetrated. His bestial heart is savage beyond description, merciless beyond conception. His infamies fill with their stench the nostrils of the world. With the heart of a fiend, he has tortured. With the clutch of avarice he has grasped. Pitiless as famine, merciless as fire, with the conscience of a serpent and the soul of hell, he has spread rapine and murder through the world. His head is filled with everything that is illogical, cruel, and hideous. I hate his insanity. I despise his tyrannical, supercilious, and absurd government.

This Gog and Magog wage an Armageddon against the people of the world. The shadows of these two insane fiends stalk across the world, and in their every footstep resound the echoes of fright, horror, and death. Even at this hour, the battles rage that strew the sad shores with wrecks of ship and the mangled bodies of men. Yet, there are those who believe we should tolerate communism here; that we should deal carefully with the German bund and gently with alien agitators of these perverted doctrines.

To entertain any thought of condolence for communism or nazi-ism, is utterly unsuited to the mind of a free people. These two doctrines fit together like the upper and lower jaws of a wild beast. The one a chopping block, the other an ax; the one a pestilence, the other a famine. They can grow only where education and religion are weak and where economic circumstance is bad. These doctrines have reason on its knees in Germany and Russia and they have trampled all sanity underfoot.

Let us remember that in Russia communism stands erect and is arrogant. In the United States it crawls and is abject. But the purpcse in both countries is the same, and that is the destruction of freedom and liberty. A man who believes in a doctrine that tolerates dictatorship cannot believe in human liberty or intellectual freedom. In Germany and Russia, no one is asked to think, but all are commanded to obey.

We cannot believe that there is anything good about Hitler or Stalin, that there is any truth in their words, or that they will recognize right or justice in any form. We cannot believe something that we know is not true.

Is Denmark better off for having submitted? It makes me think of a dove flying from hawks seeking safety in the nest of a vulture.

We have a war against nazi-ism and communism here at home, and it is imperative that vigilant citizenship stand guard against the invasion of these doctrines. Hitler and Stalin are the world's outstanding examples of demagoguery. We might well remember that the promises of demagogues are almost always forgotten in power. Time was when both Hitler and Stalin were beggars and tramps, armed only with the alms dish and fickle promise. Through every conceivable crime they have become gang chiefs, tyrants. They have persecuted to the exact extent of their power, and they always will.

Every country which has been destroyed by a blitzkrieg has first been attacked by an army of agitators, by a peaceful penetration of saboteurs, by a war of propaganda, and internal turmoil. This country, like the many which have fallen, is at war within our own borders with the forces of "isms" contrary to Americanism. Aliens and propaganda agents are in every possible way using organizations and groups to divide this country from within. The Nazi and Communist trick of internal division in a country has usually been followed by military aggression. Once a people is disunited in its thought and action, then comes blitzkrieg (the lightning strike of military aggression). Even this country carries in its womb the child of revolution begotten by alien agitators.

What does communism and nazi-ism mean to the people who embrace it? It means confiscation, exile, imprisonment, torture, and death. The words are synonymous with rape and murder.

National unity is, in a very real and deep sense, the fundamental safeguard of all democracy. We must, as a united people, keep ablaze on this continent the flames of human liberty and democracy. We are passing through a perilous time in this Nation. Agitators are busily setting group against group, race against race, class against class. The security of democracy in the face of these dangers depends on integrity, calmness, and cooperative wisdom.

Let's take our eyes off of Europe and direct our attentions to the problems at home. With group against group, class against class, we are in an era of strange bitterness. We are torn with class strife, burdened with debt, and bowed down by the weight of unemployment. If Europe is in a life-and-death struggle for freedom, America is also in a struggle for the maintenance of democracy.

The chaotic conditions abroad are, in a magnified sense, similar to the chaotic conditions in America. The social and economic forces which, through their mismanagement in Europe have brought a dictatorship, are the same social and economic forces which we are struggling to adjust peacefully at home. Freedom and liberty are at stake in the economic battles within this Nation, just as they are at stake in the battles of blood and iron on the continent of Europe. The greatest thing we can do to give democracy to the world is to make our Nation a demonstration of the integrity and success of democracy. America must meet this vital challenge at home before she is in position to lend assistance to democracy abroad.

We have enough to do at home. Let's mind our own affairs and let Europe settle hers. We have these same forces to combat at home. They are at work in our own country.

If you believe that America does not face the probability of war, your eyes are closed to the world circumstance in which the map of the world is frequently changed in an overnight maneuver of armed might. Our historical experience is unquestionable proof that America is not immune to contagion from the disease which ravages Europe.

We must not deceive ourselves. There are many inconsistencies between our Nation's actions and the avowed American neutrality.

The United States is already involved morally and economically in the world's war. We have sent, and are sending, everything but men to the war. We have not as yet sent a single soldier. All the other steps we have taken, but that last step we must not take. We cannot ignore the lessons of the last war, which certainly taught us that it was a short step between economic participation in the war and actual military participation. I have fought against entrance into the war in every sense of the word. I believe I am right. I think we should stay out completely.

We have taken every step but one and that one step, sending our sons to die on Europe's battlefields, must not be taken.

I cherish and honor the ideals that motivated our soldiers in the last war. They made the battlegrounds of the last war sacred, for every place that man has died for men is holy ground. Our memory can readily recall all that we lost in the last war, but is there anyone who can name one thing we gained or that the world gained by the war, as for that matter. The losses of the present war are paraded before our eyes and they are terrible to behold. We must not share those losses.

The claim has been made that evidence was found in the Polish state records where American ambassadors had guaranteed aid to the Allies. I have not felt confidence in all of our ambassadors, and I think it is probably through some of them that we are so dangercusly close to being involved in the war. I make no specific charges; I am not certain; but I do know that throughout Europe the question is asked on every hand, "When will America come into the war?" Mark you, the question is not "Will America come into the war?" but "When will America come into the war?"

The United States is already partly participating in the war. Our Federal Reserve system has become the banking agent for the Allies. We are already the supply base of the war. We are full participants in all the material and economic part of the war. What will be our next step? There is no next step, except military participation. Only the American Congress and the American people can keep our Government from taking that step. The American people must remain resolute, vigilant, and determined. I am speaking in the supposition that you would like to know the truth; that you do not want to close your eyes to keep from seeing the facts as they are.

We have the second biggest navy in the world, and yet, we are feverishly increasing its size. We are spending twice as much money this year for military purposes as we are for all agricultural programs. For every dollar that is spent to build a terrace, a drainage ditch, or an irrigation canal, $2 are spent for powder and bullets. For every dollar that is spent for a county agent, an agriculture college, an agricultural experiment station, the Soil Conservation Service, or all of the other needs of agriculture, $2 is spent for soldiers and forts.

We are spending twice as much for armaments as we are for unemployment. We are spending more on guns than we are on jobs. Can the people of America believe, in view of the stark reality of facts, that the experts advocating these expenditures are advocating them in the confidence that they will not be put to use? Do the people of America believe that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are asking Congress to invest all of these millions in guns and battleships that will never be used? Why are they asking for more and more? There is just one reason. That reason is their fear that the United States is headed for war. If you were Secretary of the Navy and you knew that the United States was not going to war, you would not be trying to get the Congress to appropriate money for more boats to enlarge the second biggest navy in the world. Of course, we all want and we must have adequate defense.

I am certain that the majority in the Congress want to stay out of war. I myself have resolved never to vote to send one American boy to European soil. There is no circumstance, other than actual invasion of America, which could cause me to agree to any military action on the part of this country.

A little more than 20 years ago we put our men and material resources into a war to make the world safe for democracy. That was a grand ideal and I do not say that our efforts were a total failure, but I do say we took in too much territory. We did not make the world safe for democracy. It is very doubtful that even in this half of the world democracy is entirely secure. At any rate, it is my opinion that we must be satisfied with making America safe for democracy. We cannot force democracy on Europe. The only hope for a democratic Europe is for Europe to find its own way to democracy through the avenues of experience, understanding, and conviction. Let me say again, that I believe we must be satisfied with keeping America safe for democracy. I believe that America should keep her hands off of this war and her hands off of the peace to follow this war. I am absolutely opposed to meddling in this war and I am not in sympathy with any efforts to meddle in the treaties which will follow the war.

America must keep her sons at home. I am not willing to give one American life to Europe. I would not agree to trade the life of one boy for every battleship in England, every gun in France. Not one soldier, not one father, not one son—we must stay out of this war!

Farm Tenant Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE BIRMINGHAM (ALA.) NEWS AND THE MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will take up for consideration the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. One amendment to be considered is that providing funds for continuing the farm tenant purchase program. When the bill was before the House, these funds were refused. The Senate added a provision for the funds to come from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By all means this amendment should be agreed to by the House in order that this worth-while program may continue.

Two very fine editorials have recently appeared in the Birmingham (Ala.) News and the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser in support of this amendment. They are as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 28, 1940]

SAVE THE FARM-TENANT PLAN

The question of providing funds for continuation of the farm-tenant purchase program is expected to come up for final action in Congress this week.

Unless the House of Representatives accepts the Senate amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill making provision for carrying on this vitally important program, one of the greatest and most hopeful undertakings ever started by the United States Government will be stopped in its tracks, and perhaps permanently ended.

This should not be allowed to happen. The blight of farm tenancy, affecting not only our Nation's agriculture, but all our national economy, is too big and urgent a problem to be ignored, even for 1 year.

Yet, unless the House changes its previous stand, the tenant-purchase system set up by the Bankhead-Jones Act will not be able to operate beyond the present fiscal year. The House failed to provide funds for this program when it passed the agricultural appropriation bill some weeks ago.

This omission was widely regarded as part of the House's "economy" drive. If it was, it was extremely poor economy—the penny-wise-and-pound-foolish sort of economizing. For under this program the Federal Government merely lends money on long-time, low-interest terms to enable qualified tenant farmers and sharecroppers to buy farms of their own. And the money is paid back to the Government by the farmers, so the loans are self-liquidating.

When the agricultural appropriation bill reached the Senate, Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, father of the plan, with the aid of other Senators, amended the measure to provide $50,000,000 for making tenant purchase loans during the fiscal year 1941.

The Senate did not appropriate the money directly. Instead, it authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend that amount to the Farm Security Administration to be used for this purpose. Thus the Senate avoided increasing the total of agricultural appropriations in the pending bill for this purpose—although it did provide for some increases in other items in the measure. No one could say, therefore, that the Senate provision for farm-tenant loans was a blow at economy. The only direct appropriation made by the Senate in this connection was one of 5 percent of the amount involved for administrative expenses, which is only $2,500,000.

Tenancy, particularly in the South, is so widespread that the problem is one of the most serious before the country today. In the South approximately two-thirds of all farmers are tenants or

sharecroppers. It should require no argument to convince anyone that not only the farmers but the country as a whole would be better off if more farmers owned the farms they operate.

The Farm Security Administration, under the Bankhead-Jones Act, is promoting this desirable end by lending money to farmers for as much as 40 years at 3 percent interest to help them buy farms. Only well-qualified farmers are permitted to borrow, the applications for loans being passed on in every case by a committee of local farmers.

This year applications for tenant purchase loans were made by 133,000 farmers. Only 6,971 loans can be made this year. But as the program continues its operations will expand from year to year, and more and more qualified farmers will be aided.

No one need fear that this money is being wasted, or that the program will not be self-liquidating. The fact is that at the end of the first year of its operation $92,544 fell due on tenant-purchase loans, but under the provision for paying the money back faster if the borrower wished to do so, the total paid back to the Government in the first year was $152,779, or 165 percent of maturity.

This program has already proved a success in a few short years. It would be inexcusable not to continue it. The House ought to act without hesitation to save the farm-tenant program.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of April 29, 1940]

SAVE FARM-TENANCY AID

The President recommended a $25,000,000 item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the continuation of the tenant-purchase program during the next fiscal year. This program is authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, under which the Farm Security Administration makes loans to competent tenants and for the purchase of farms. This recommendation constituted a reduction of $15,000,000, or 37½ percent, under the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

In reporting the bill, the House Appropriations Committee eliminated all funds for the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant program; and a vigorous effort to restore this item on the floor proved unsuccessful, primarily because the vote was taken late at night, while many of the Members were absent.

The Senate amended the bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $50,000,000 during the next fiscal year for Bankhead-Jones tenant loans and to provide a direct appropriation of 5 percent of the amount for administration expenses. This amendment was approved by the Senate without a single dissenting vote.

This item of the agricultural appropriation bill probably will be referred back to the House for a vote within a few days.

If the House refuses to accept the Senate amendment, it would wipe out one of the most successful and important parts of the farm program. It would halt the Government's efforts to stabilize the small farmer on the land; at a time when the twin problems of tenancy and migration are growing more serious than ever before in our history.

The Senate amendment would not impose any burden on the Federal Treasury for these tenant loans and would involve only a very small appropriation for administrative expenses. All funds for the loans themselves would be advanced by the R. F. C. This procedure seems sound and highly desirable, since the loans are entirely self-liquidating. In fact, at the end of the first year of operation the borrowers actually had repaid 165 percent of maturities, since many of them were able to make substantial payments in advance. Moreover, every loan is secured by a first mortgage on real estate, which is conservatively valued both by Government appraisers and by committees of local farmers.

The Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant loan program has proved extremely popular with both tenants and landlords and has received wholehearted support from the press and from businessmen in farming areas. If the House refuses to accept the Senate amendment, it would destroy this program after 3 years of successful operation.

Employment Campaigns Sponsored by Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY MILLARD W. RICE

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, May 2, 1940:

Annual employment campaigns, first conducted during March 1938, as sponsored by the major veteran organizations, are designed to arouse more active interest in the employment of older persons, including veterans. Each of the first two campaigns greatly increased the number of veterans actively registered with public employment offices.

A wider range of qualified older men thereby became available to interested employers, thus resulting in many more suitable placements. The Public Employment Service is an ideal clearing house for employers who need qualified employees.

A survey conducted by the National Association of Manufacturers about 2 years ago showed that older workers, generally, are more experienced and dependable, and less likely to lose time because of sickness or accidents than younger workers. Older workers, however, find it more difficult to adapt themselves to new types of jobs.

New machinery has displaced more and more older workers. About 45 percent of all available male employables are over 40 years of age, but only about one-third of all employed males are over 40. This situation needs to be corrected by retraining these older workers for new jobs.

Some 1,200 bills have been introduced during this Congress to provide some form of pensions for unemployed older workers. The only alternative for pensioning unemployed workers is to give them self-supporting employment. Employable veterans would much prefer to have suitable, gainful, permanent employment rather than to have pensions. Jobs or pensions is the answer.

Federal pensions are being urged by the V. F. W. for all unemployable and disabled war veterans, but employable veterans, we insist, should have the chance to earn their living by suitable employment.

To all unemployed veterans, may I say that you will be doing a service to yourselves by becoming actively registered with the nearest public employment offices. To all employers of men, may I say that you will be doing a service to yourselves by extending employment to qualified veterans, whom you will find, generally, to be disciplined, loyal, cooperative, and productive, and therefore profitable. Employable veterans, if given the chance, will prove their worthiness as employees.

Frank Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Station WJSV, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen, needless to say, I appreciate very highly the kindness and courtesy extended to me by the Columbia Broadcasting Co. in allowing me to address you for 15 minutes, or thereabouts, on some matters political which I am confident are important. In fact, they are so important that it is with a considerable degree of trepidation that I attempt to discuss them. Furthermore, I cannot contend that my judgment is infallible. Such as it is, I make bold to express it.

In the midst of a world torn with strife, from which we fortunately are free, the American people are concentrating their attention on the coming presidential campaign. No one will deny that our domestic issues are of primary importance and that their proper solution is vital to our future happiness and security. For more than 7 years we have lived under the New Deal and we are neither happy nor secure in our economic life. The fundamental theory underlying the New Deal has come to be pretty thoroughly understood. It means that if it is to reach its logical conclusion, government, concentrated at Washington, is to be supreme over the individual. The manner in which he shall earn his living, be it in humble or important pursuits, is to be planned for him and imposed upon him by bureaucratic decree. Already a supine Congress has handed over to the Chief Executive, who is the head of the bureaucracy, an extraordinary assortment of powers, the possession of which enabled him to do things which no President in all history has ever been authorized to do. The power over the currency, over the sources of credit, over radio communication, over agriculture, over commerce and industry generally, presents a picture so un-American as to startle the observer. Some of these powers may be exercised directly by the Chief Executive. Others may be and are being exercised through commissions and boards appointed by him and anxious to do his bidding.

Two major attempts at the seizure of power have failed—one when the Supreme Court packing bill was rejected and the other when the President's famous reorganization bill was defeated. Had those two measures gone through, the independence of the judiciary would have disappeared and the power of the Congress to legislate with respect to the structure of our Government would have all but disappeared. Coinciding with these attempts to transform our representative government into an imperial structure, supreme over all the land, we have seen the New Deal spending money with both hands, like a drunken sailor, siphoning it out across the country in fantastic sums, all in the hope that the people, elated by the evidences of right-and-left spending, will forget their birthright and acquiesce finally into becoming the subjects of government.

This has been going on for 7½ years, and, as I said a moment ago, we are no happier nor more secure in our economic life than we were at its beginning. Rather we as a Nation are in a worse condition for as a result we still have our unemployment unsolved, taxes heavily increased, enterprise and initiative cramped, billions of dollars lying idle in our banks, and, most menacing of all, a national debt of $45,000,000,000 staring us in the face. Obviously, we can't go on this way. The present situation and our prospects are terribly serious. And they must be understood thoroughly as we approach the coming Presidential and congressional elections.

The congressional elections of 1938 indicated very clearly that the people are awakening to a realization of the menace. As a result of those elections the Republican strength in the House of Representatives was almost doubled and the Republican Party came back into power in several of the great States. Today we have a closely welded and effective Republican minority in the House which, under the able leadership of Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts, has been able to kill some of the more fantastic proposals of the New Deal. And we know further that the trend against the New Deal and its philosophy is still going on—a fact amply demonstrated in recent special congressional elections. So it is perfectly apparent that the Republican Party nationally is growing in strength, and that the people, awakened to what the New Deal means, expect the Republican Party to be the instrument of its overthrow. Indeed, the citizen has no other political instrument ready to his hand.

To be an effective instrument the party must be both courageous and wise. It must not compromise on fundamentals. It must not pussyfoot, even on small details. It must be forthright in its utterances, vigorous in its performances, and eternally vigilant in the guarding of our free institutions. This means, of course, that its platform must be courageous and sound and that its candidates must be of like timber.

Whenever two or more people gather together today they talk about the coming Republican performance and express the earnest hope that it will be creditable from top to bottom. And quite naturally they are talking about candidates. First, they are wondering if the President is going to run again. Thus far he has not seen fit to take the country into his confidence, despite the uncertainty and confusion which his silence causes. Speaking for myself alone, I hope Roosevelt runs. We would then have the issues clearly defined—the whole New Deal plus the third term. As a matter of fact, the philosophy of the New Deal with its huge concentration of power carries with it the breaking of the third-term tradition. The Executive is to be all powerful, and once in office is to remain there. According to the new dealers' way of thinking, why not?

As a matter of fact, the New Deal and the third term are natural partners, and I'd rather have this whole picture presented vividly to the country so that he who runs may read and understand. And, incidentally, I think the country would reject it, provided, of course, that the Republican performance is creditable.

The names of several men are under discussion in connection with the Republican Presidential nomination. They are good men, all of them—men of honor and understanding—men of good records, entitled to our respect. In giving my adherence to one of them I do not reflect in the slightest degree upon any of the others. If any one of the others were nominated I would support him, and so, I believe, would all the members of our party.

As some of you have learned, my adherence goes to Frank Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., a neighbor with whom I have been well acquainted for many years and in whose character and abilities I have great confidence. And let me say this at this point: Mr. Gannett's candidacy is genuine. Most assuredly it is not put forward as a gesture or an attempt to stop some other candidate. Neither he nor his supporters have entered, directly or indirectly, into any sort of agreement which tends to deprive his candidacy of complete independence. This should be understood clearly. We who are supporting him are doing so because we are convinced that he would be an excellent candidate and an excellent President, competent to face one of the most difficult periods in our history. This is the sole reason for our support.

Without attempting to recite anything like a complete biography, let me tell you something about the man, his background, and his achievements. He was born on a farm situated in the hilly country of south-central New York—a farm literally on a hilltop. It wasn't much of a farm, and the family just managed to scrape along by the hardest kind of work. Hungry for an education, the youngster, on his own initiative, went to Cornell University, and, starting with scarcely a cent in his pocket, worked his way through college. It was a tough undertaking, but he did it. The president of Cornell at that time, Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, took note of young Gannett's enterprise and ability and when the latter graduated took him to the Philippines as his private secretary. It will be remembered that Dr. Schurman was chairman of the American commission sent to the islands just after the insurrection to lay the foundations for its new government under American control. When he finished that job young Gannett returned to the United States and started in as a humble newspaper reporter. As a matter of fact, from his early days his ambition has taken him into and kept him in the newspaper field. He saved every cent he could scrape together and shortly purchased an interest in a small newspaper.

From that point he moved onward with really astonishing success. He worked long hours and upon occasions took big changes, sometimes to the alarm of his friends, but through it all his business judgment proved to be sound and the way he did his business was so constructive and so fair that his early friends and neighbors gave him their complete confidence. It may be said that this very confidence, which he earned in his early days, contributed greatly to his later successes. Advancing steadily and sanely in his chosen field, he is today the owner and publisher of the third largest string of newspapers in the country. His papers, all of them, are clean and decent and their policies are sanely progressive. At present he employs something like 4,000 men in his newspaper establishments. I am not sure that that makes him a big businessman or a small businessman, but big or small, I am sure that he is a good businessman. An important element in his success lies in the highly satisfactory relations which he has maintained with his employees. He has never had a bitter dispute with them. He has always met them half way, or more than half way. He has encouraged the unionization of his plants with the result that they are all organized. His men are genuinely fond of him. They appreciate his problems and he understands theirs. The grand result is that there has never been a strike. Indeed, it can be said of him that he is a model employer. Perhaps this springs in part from his early experiences when he was struggling to get an education and make a living.

It is not strange that a man of such a record of experience and success should take an interest in public affairs. He has done so for years, and far more than the average businessman has studied problems of government. At one time or another he has familiarized himself with the important issues that confront the country. In an effort to gain information he has traveled widely all over the United States and in Europe and South America. Wherever he has gone he has absorbed knowledge and has attempted to apply that knowledge in the solution of our present difficulties. At the same time he has sensed the direction in which this country has been traveling and has not hesitated to speak out about it. Being devoted to the American system he became thoroughly aroused at the menace that confronts it, and unlike many businessmen he did not hesitate to go to the bat.

When President Roosevelt attacked the Supreme Court and demanded legislation which would enable him to pack it, Gannett saw the danger instantly. He hurried to Washington, talked with men in the Congress, got a good picture of the situation, and, supported by the very earnest and sincere request of the late Senator Borah, went back to Rochester determined to get into the fight. And he certainly did so. With astounding energy he put together an organization, Nation-wide, to fight the Supreme Court packing bill. His messages of warning reached every nook and corner in the country. He aroused multitudes of people to a clear understanding of the issue. He marshaled the opposition into a mighty army which soon made its influence felt at Washington. The Supreme Court bill was defeated, and while I hesitate to indulge in comparisons, I do say that of all the men outside of public life, Frank Gannett contributed most to the defeat of that bill. And with that contribution he helped preserve the independence of our judiciary, the foundation stone of our free institutions.

He performed a like service with respect to the President's famous reorganization bill. He sensed in that measure that same intent on the part of the President to break down our system of checks and balances and to transform our Government into an all-powerful bureaucracy headed by a single individual. If Gannett had done nothing else, he is entitled to our gratitude for his achievements in these two instances, and to our admiration of him for having gone into this great battle utterly regardless of the consequences to himself. Not all businessmen can boast of a similar record.

Speaking of businessmen, here is one who knows where a dollar comes from, how it must be earned, and how it should be conserved for wise use. You can't make him believe that pump priming will restore prosperity any more than you can make him believe that a man can lift himself by his own bootstraps. You can't make him believe that debt and ever more debt is a healthy thing for either an individual or a government. You can't make him believe that legitimate enterprise should be choked off by punitive taxation or by dictatorial rulings of a bureaucracy.

He stands for our old system of free enterprise, under which every man is entitled to earn his living at his chosen occupation so long as he does not injure his neighbor. He believes in thrift. He has real respect for a savings account. He stands for the maintenance of these virtues, now so often derided, not merely because he knows they are sound from an economic standpoint, but he knows that a people encouraged to thrift and to enterprise is a free people. The one thing he dreads is that by discouraging these virtues our people shall become dependent upon government and thus ultimately lose their liberty.

Surely here is an example of a businessman who understands the fundamentals of our situation. Here is a businessman clean and straight, well informed, and not afraid to speak out. In all sincerity I submit that he is entitled to the serious consideration of every Republican as the party, acting through its national convention, selects its candidate for President.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me today from the Secretary of Labor:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 2, 1940.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: My attention has been called to the Buck amendment which was adopted yesterday by the House as an amendment to your bill, H. R. 5435. The Buck amendment would redefine the term "agriculture" which is now defined in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

One principal fault of Mr. BUCK's amendment is contained in the latter part of the first sentence in paragraph 4 which carries these words "or in the case of fruits or vegetables, as an incident to the preparation of such fruits or vegetables for market." It should be noted that except in the case of fruits and vegetables all handling, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, and storing, in order to be exempt, is to be performed "as an incident to ordinary farming operations." But in the case of fruits and vegetables there is no such limitation. Therefore, the following operations and numbers of employees will be excluded from the protection of the minimum wage of 30 cents an hour and the maximum-hour limitations.

1. Handling, packing, grading, and storing of fruits and vegetables off the farm when done by either cooperatives, corporations, or individual processors	130,000
2. Drying, processing, and packaging of dried fruit	12,000
3. Processing of dried edible beans	10,000
4. Processing and packaging of nuts, including pecan shellers	15,000
Total	167,000

(Botanically a nut is regarded as fruit by the Department of Agriculture and would therefore come within the fruit and vegetable packing and processing exemption.)

Furthermore, the Buck amendment would also exempt, in the following numbers, employees engaged in cooperative canning and freezing and in the operation of improving and maintaining canals, reservoirs, and waterways used for irrigation:

5. Cooperative canning and freezing	20,000
6. Improvement and maintenance of canals, reservoirs, and waterways used for irrigation	8,000
	28,000
Total	195,000

This figure does not include scores of thousands of employees working in cooperative grain elevators, cooperative creameries, cooperative egg houses, cooperative poultry plants, cooperative livestock associations, and cooperative cotton warehouses, who would also be within the exemption provided by the Buck amendment. The forepart of the first sentence in paragraph 4 extends the exemption to the operations of handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market, or to a carrier for transportation to market, any agricultural or horticultural commodity provided that such service is performed "as an incident to ordinary farming operations." The Bureau of Internal Revenue, following the interpretation of the Committee on Ways and Means in its report on the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act, has ruled that the quoted phrase includes the work of employees of a farmer or farmers' cooperative organization or group (Regulations 106, part 402, title 26, Code of Federal Regulations, 1940 Sup. Relating to the Employees' Tax and the Employers' Tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act).

This redefinition of agriculture should be read in connection with the definition of agriculture now contained in section 3 (f). Senator, now Mr. Justice Black, chairman of the joint congressional committee in charge of the bill which ultimately became the Fair Labor Standards Act, in opening the Senate debate on the bill, stated that it "specifically excludes workers in agriculture of all kinds and of all types. There is contained in the measure, perhaps, the most comprehensive definition of agriculture which has been included in any one legislative proposal.

"We have placed together in the bill definitions of agricultural work which have been fixed from time to time in other legislative enactments and in addition to that we have drawn liberally from Mr. Webster's definition of agriculture." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, original issue, July 27, 1937, p. 9895.)

In other words, section 3 (f), as now drawn, exempts all farm labor including workers engaged on the farm or working off the farm for the farmer and on the latter's crops.

In short, the Buck amendment, by the simple device of calling them agriculturalists, deprives vast numbers of industrial workers of the pittance of 30 cents an hour guaranteed them by the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Buck amendment thus incorporates in the committee amendments to the Norton bill some of the most drastic features of the so-called Barden amendments.

The hours exemptions provided in the Norton bill would grant each of the processing operations added to the agriculture definition by the Buck amendment all the flexibility that is needed from the hour limitations.

Another major fault in the Buck amendment is that it removes the child-labor restrictions contained in the act insofar as the above-listed thousands of employees are concerned. Section 13 (c) of the act provides that the child-labor provisions shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture while not legally required to attend school. Therefore, when the definition of agriculture is enlarged, as is proposed by this amendment, the existing prohibition against child labor in the operations enumerated above is thereby removed. Thus it would be possible to employ child labor in all fruit-packing plants and in many canneries, despite the fact that most of such plants are highly mechanized.

It is well known that migratory labor is used to a large extent in the packing and preparing of agricultural commodities for market, and it is generally recognized that the use of children of such migratory families is one of the most serious of the problems in connection with the migration of family labor. Any amendment which will completely remove the employment of these children from the protection now afforded them by the Fair Labor Standards Act is viewed with great concern by those devoted to the cause of the Nation's children and to the maintaining of the protective standards which Congress has already seen fit to establish.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Job for a Magician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN OF MAY 1, 1940

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 1:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 1, 1940]

JOB FOR A MAGICIAN

Transfer of special funds to the general account in the State treasury to meet relief costs until the end of January, if that method is adopted at the legislature's special session, will merely dodge the question of how the bill is to be paid.

The Governor is definitely pledged not to increase taxes. His committee on State government has considered a shift in the relief load to local governments, though the executive himself has disclaimed such intention.

There is also a pledge to continue relief and a pledge to readjust the tax structure.

It begins to look as though tax readjustment will be a deceptive name for legislation that will boost taxes, but transfer part of the burden from present sources. In any event, somebody must pay more.

The other alternative—shifting part of the relief load—is even more alarming for Philadelphia. If such a shift is contemplated, the city ought to know it well in advance of next January, and Philadelphians ought to be apprised of the intention to load on them a heavier tax than the remainder of the State must bear.

The Governor needs a magician with a lot of white rabbits to extricate him from his predicament. But he brought it on himself by pledges to continue relief and at the same time cut taxes—pledges that obviously cannot be kept except by the device of indefinitely postponing the ultimate day of reckoning.

Control of Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN OF APRIL 23, 1940

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 23, 1940:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 23, 1940]

AN IMPORTANT AMENDMENT

Conservationists are keeping a watchful eye on the conference committee in Washington which is considering the Barkley anti-pollution bill.

With the Mundt amendment, added as the bill passed the House, the legislation is acceptable to them; without it, the measure becomes merely another spending measure, designed to accomplish no more than add to the already voluminous reports.

The amendment would forbid the creation of any new sources of pollution, either by sewage or industrial waste, and would permit suits to be brought in the name of the United States at the request of any State agency or health authority to abate pollution.

There has long been a tendency to talk at length about pollution, but an unwillingness to translate the talk into action. The Mundt amendment, while not meeting in full the aims of the sincere conservationists, is a step in the right direction and a definite gain in the cause of cleaner streams.

The Barkley bill with the amendment might provide the spur needed to get action looking toward the purification of any number of important streams.

Samuel D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of the Honorable SAMUEL D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I was born and reared, to the age of 12, in the third congressional district of Tennessee, represented for many years by the late Honorable SAMUEL D. MCREYNOLDS. The first Congressman I ever heard of was Congressman Moon from that district. My parents moved to the Indian Territory shortly before it blossomed into the State of Oklahoma, and when Oklahoma was divided into congressional districts I found myself in the Third District of Oklahoma. My grandparents, uncles, aunts, and cousins still live in the Third Tennessee District, which I visit often. Naturally, I have kept up with politics in that district, as well as in my own. I was pleased to see Judge MCREYNOLDS first elected to Congress years ago. His name already had been a household word with my relatives, who lived in his judicial district. Everybody had a profound respect for the judge, whether they agreed with him or not.

As I grew older in Oklahoma my ambition grew to be a Member of Congress also, and when I came here as a Member in 1927, Judge MCREYNOLDS was the first person I sought and asked for the advice which a new Congressman needs. The Judge, as he was affectionately known to all, very graciously gave me fatherly advice and a lot of form letters, which were very helpful to me. In 1935 we and our families journeyed to the Philippine Islands together and participated in the inauguration of Emanuel Quezon, the first President of the Philippine Republic. We became very well acquainted on that trip.

He became chairman of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs and an international figure. He was a very able representative, not only of his district, but of the United States. He had the friendship of men, the respect of women, and the tender love of little children.

In saying farewell to my friend and colleague, I do so with the solemn faith of the immortality of the soul and the increasing hope and faith that we shall meet again.

The poet has well said:

There is no death.
The stars go down
To shine upon some fairer shore,
And there in Heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

Santiago Iglesias

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS late a Resident Commissioner from the Territory of Puerto Rico

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, while it is a long way from Alaska to Puerto Rico, perhaps that is an additional reason why I, as Delegate from Alaska, may justly and properly pay a tribute to my late, great friend, Hon. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Perhaps because we both represented constituencies living under local governments not yet attained to the dignity of statehood, and both in a way, in all relations with the Congress of the United States, had, to some extent, the common problems embodied in that unique status, I came to know and to appreciate the sterling character of Mr. IGLESIAS better and more intimately than most other Members of the House of Representatives.

In all of my relations with Mr. IGLESIAS—and we met and talked almost daily during sessions of Congress—I always found him concerned only for the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico, and never for himself. His every thought was, I believe, devoted to the promotion of the interest of the citizens of the United States whom he had been elected to represent in the Congress, and nobody who knew him can truthfully deny that while he was Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the people of that island had an able, high-minded, and devoted advocate in the National Congress.

Not alone in selfless devotion to duty was Mr. IGLESIAS admirable; he also possessed qualities of keen insight and sound judgment so vitally necessary in a member of a legislative body. Never, to my knowledge, did Mr. IGLESIAS follow the easy road that might lead to popular acclaim, when he thought that the true interest of his constituents demanded that another course be taken. All of which means that he had courage, not only the physical courage necessary to face a madman or an assassin, but the greater and the higher courage to furnish inspired leadership to his people, rather than take the easy course which might lead to temporary but unsound popularity.

In the death of SANTIAGO IGLESIAS the people of Puerto Rico have lost a champion of whom every citizen of the island might well be proud, and the United States, as a whole, has been deprived of the services of a man who was an ardent and an intelligent advocate at all time of the principles which underlie our constitutional form of government.

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL E. MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, when CARL E. MAPES died suddenly in New Orleans on December 12, the country and the House of Representatives sustained a great loss. He was a splendid gentleman and a great American.

It was my privilege to have served on the same committee with Mr. MAPES. In his congressional work he was most conscientious and thorough. He was persistent in a gracious way and as a result of his efforts in committee and on the floor of the House much constructive legislation has been added to the statute books.

Representative MAPES was intensely partisan, but he never allowed himself to be influenced along party lines on any question affecting the welfare of his Government. He, a Republican, and I, a Democrat, differed on many questions of the hour but never on the fundamentals of good government.

His type is rare and his presence shall be greatly missed. He was a most devoted husband and father, a fine friend, and a conscientious public servant.

Peace to his ashes;
Honor to his memory.

Thomas S. McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. JOHN L. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sorrow that I endeavor to pay tribute of admiration and respect to the memory of my colleague and personal friend. I first became a great admirer of the late THOMAS S. MCMILLAN when he was speaker of the South Carolina State House of Representatives and while I was a student at the University of South Carolina. I was always interested in civil government and its procedure and always found my friend, THOMAS MCMILLAN, willing to answer any questions regarding legislation which was before the State legislature at that time. Since I have been a Member of Congress I found it necessary to call on Mr. MCMILLAN on numerous occasions for his valuable opinion on different legislation which was before Congress for consideration.

I feel that South Carolina has lost one of its most valuable statesmen and his presence and influence will be missed here in Congress for a number of years. Through his long continuous service and proof of his statesmanlike opinion on different legislation, he had won the respect of every Member of Congress and had been placed in an important post on the Appropriations Committee. I know that his influence on the Appropriations Committee has caused South Carolina to reap a number of benefits from the Federal Government that we people in the South are not accustomed to receive.

I had not been a Member of the House of Representatives very long before I found out that we people of the South had to fight for everything that we got from the Federal Government. We do not get anything because we are justly entitled to receive same, but, on the other hand, we have to fight for all we get for our section of the country. And my friend, THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, could always be depended upon to take the lead in fights which would benefit his district and the State of South Carolina.

Mr. MCMILLAN always had a smile and a cheerful word for everyone he met and no one loved his family and friends more than he, nor was more forgiving of those who differed from him in legislative matters. He was, in fact, a gentleman in every sense of the word—bold, fearless, and courageous, yet always kind, patient, and considerate of others, giving to every person the right to think and act for himself. I had the privilege of counting Mr. MCMILLAN one of my personal friends for approximately 25 years and shall always miss his cheerful smile and important advice on different legislation.

In the death of THOMAS S. MCMILLAN the State of South Carolina has lost one of its most capable servants; the Nation has suffered the loss of one of its most able statesmen.

John A. Martin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN A. MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose the following resolution adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

In the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the United States House of Representatives, on the 30th day of April, 1940.

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives expresses its profound sorrow and the feeling of great loss in the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable JOHN A. MARTIN. During his service as a member of this committee, Congressman MARTIN was conscientious in his attendance and most earnestly devoted to his duties. He was a very hard worker and a most vigorous champion of causes to which he committed himself. He had long been a student of transportation and especially of railroad problems, and his information on the subject was very comprehensive. His practical experience as a railroader during his young manhood enabled him to render the committee great assistance on many occasions. He had a rare sense of humor and a genial disposition which held the affection of even those with whom he differed sharply on questions of principle. He was intensely devoted to his country's welfare and did not spare himself in his public service.

The members of this committee who were associated with him will always remember him because of his pleasing personality and his sincere and intelligent service to his fellow man. Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered in the records of this committee, and that a copy of same be sent to the family of Mr. MARTIN, with assurances of our deep sympathy.

CLARENCE F. LEA, *Chairman.*
ELTON J. LAYTON, *Clerk.*

Clyde H. Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CLYDE H. SMITH, late a Representative from the State of Maine

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected death of CLYDE H. SMITH came as a great shock to his many friends, and especially to his

colleagues in this House, whose esteem and admiration he had won.

I can never forget the friendly welcome with which he greeted me as a newcomer to this floor, or the many little acts of kindliness and courtesy for which I was indebted to him.

His entire life was one of devotion to the service and welfare of his fellowmen, his State, and country. He rose from selectman of his own home town through various offices to that of Representative in Congress, a career which is a clear indication of his honesty, industry, and ability. As a member of important committees, especially that on labor, he never lost sight of the human needs that all legislation is supposed to serve.

This body has lost a devoted and honored Member, and it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I pay this small tribute to his memory.

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL E. MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

In the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the United States House of Representatives, on the 11th day of April, 1940:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives expresses its profound sorrow and the feeling of great loss in the death of our most worthy and beloved committee associate, the Honorable CARL E. MAPES.

Throughout the many years during which he was a member of this committee the work of CARL MAPES was outstanding and an inspiration to the highest quality of public service on the part of all those who had the good fortune to be his fellow members on this committee. Earnest devotion to his highest conception of right was the governing force of his life. He was not only a man of sound judgment and broad understanding, but, more important still, he possessed great moral courage. His thorough study and unusual knowledge of the difficult subjects coming before this committee commanded the unbounded respect of his committee associates and were of incalculable value to the American people.

His genial disposition and his invariably kindly attitude even toward those who had occasion to urge views directly opposed to his own, caused all who knew him to have an abiding affection for him. The influence of the life and work of our beloved late colleague will continue to be felt by his associates who remain: Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered in the records of this committee, and that a copy of same be sent to the family of Mr. MAPES, with assurances of our deep sympathy.

CLARENCE F. LEA, *Chairman.*
ELTON J. LAYTON, *Clerk.*

Samuel D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, my first assignment on coming to Congress was to a place on the Foreign Affairs Committee. There I found a chairman under whom I was to serve with a great deal of pleasure and benefit. Judge MCREYNOLDS, as we called him, was at once a fine southern gentleman and a most able and aggressive statesman. In the conduct of his office he proved to be a strong right arm of the administration in its efforts to uphold the dignity and prestige of the United States in the family of nations.

SAM MCREYNOLDS was a dominating character in the House of Representatives and one of democracy's most rugged fighters. Impatient with delay, intolerant of obstructive tactics, he never quibbled over nonessentials. He never temporized. He drove ahead with dogged determination to his objective. He was a most considerate chairman, and whenever some of his committee disagreed with his views on the legislation under consideration he insisted on granting a fair hearing with opportunity for the views of all to be recorded.

Our committee will miss SAM MCREYNOLDS. The House of Representatives will miss his energetic leadership. But those who lose most are the people of this country now denied the benefit of his ability in the broad field of international relations.

The Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD W. CREAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

TEXT OF THE BILL

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the Hatch bill as passed by the Senate at the present session:

An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for (1) any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) any person employed in any administrative position by any State, by any political subdivision or municipality of any State, or by any agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency), in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, or by any such department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States, to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possession."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of such act of August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law."

SEC. 3. Such act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 12. (a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects. When used in the second sentence of this subsection, the term 'officer or employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or the

Lieutenant Governor of any State or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil-service system; (3) officers holding elective offices.

"(b) If any Federal agency charged with the duty of making any loan or grant of funds of the United States for use in any activity in connection with which any function is exercised by any officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (a) are applicable has reason to believe that any such officer or employee has violated the provisions of such subsection, it shall make a report with respect thereto to the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'). Upon the receipt of any such report, or upon the receipt of any other information which seems to the Commission to warrant an investigation, the Commission shall forthwith by registered mail give notice to any such officer or employee and to the State or local agency employing such officer or employee of the pendency of the charge, in which notice shall be set forth a summary of the alleged violation and of the time and place for a hearing upon said charge, at which hearing (which shall be not earlier than 10 days thereafter) either the officer or employee or the State or local agency, or both, may appear with counsel and be heard, whereupon said Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred. If the Commission determines that any such violation has occurred, and that such violation warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, it shall notify the appropriate State or local agency of such determination, whereupon such officer or employee or the appropriate State, or both, shall have the right to appeal from any such finding to the next term of the United States district court for the district in which such officer or employee shall reside; and the United States district courts shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such appeal, and all proceedings therein shall be had in the same manner as is provided for appeals taken under section 39c, Public Law No. 696, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 22, 1938 (U. S. C., Supp. title 11, sec. 67c). No such officer or employee shall be dismissed as a result of such determination by said Commission, and no loan or grant shall be withheld until said appeal shall be finally determined. Pending final determination of any such appeal, any such officer or employee previously found guilty of a violation of this section shall stand suspended. If in any case the Commission finds that such officer or employee has not been removed from his office or employment within a reasonable time after such notification, or that he has been so removed and has subsequently (within a period of 18 months) been appointed to any office or employment in any State or local agency in such State, the Commission shall certify the fact to the appropriate Federal agency, which shall thereupon withhold from its contributions, loan, or grant to such State or local agency within such State a sum twice the amount of the annual salary of such officer or employee.

"(c) In determining the amount to be withheld under subsection (b) on account of violations of subsection (a), the Commission shall take into account the nature of such violations and the circumstances under which they occurred: *Provided*, That in no event shall loans or grants pledged by a State or local agency as security for its bonds or notes be withheld where such action would jeopardize the payment of principal or interest on such bonds or notes.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section. Any determination made by the Commission under this section shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the United States and all other persons.

"(e) The provisions of the first two sentences of section 12 (a) shall not apply to employees in an activity of a State or of a local agency not financed as to such particular activity in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'State or local agency' means the exeutive branch of any State, or of any municipality or other political subdivision of such State, or any agency or department thereof.

"(2) The term 'Federal agency' includes any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the United States (except a member bank of the Federal Reserve System).

"SEC. 13. (a) Excessive financial aid to any candidate for an elective Federal office is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(b) Excessive financial aid to any political committee or political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the election of any candidate or political party nominees for a Federal office, or any committee engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the success of any national political party is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(c) Presidential Electors and the President of the United States for the purpose of this act are declared to be elective officers.

"(d) Any amount expended, contributed, furnished, or advanced by one person, directly or indirectly, in violation of this section in excess of $5,000 is hereby declared to be excessive financial aid.

"(e) Any person who directly or indirectly contributes more than $5,000 during any calendar year or for use in any one campaign or election, in violation of the provisions of this section, is guilty of pernicious political activity, and on conviction, shall be fined not less than $5,000 and also sentenced to the penitentiary for not exceeding 5 years.

"SEC. 14. No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any officer or employee embraced by this section to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation, or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes.

"SEC. 15. For the purposes of this act, persons employed in the government of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be employed in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, except that for the purposes of the second sentence of section 9 (a) the Commissioners and the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia shall not be deemed to be officers or employees.

"SEC. 16. The provisions of this act which prohibit persons to whom such provisions apply from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns shall be deemed to prohibit the same activities on the part of such persons as the United States Civil Service Commission has heretofore determined are at the time of the passage of this act prohibited on the part of employees in the classified civil service of the United States by the provisions of the civil-service rules prohibiting such employees from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns.

"SEC. 17. Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons.

"SEC. 18. No person or firm entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, or performing any work or services for the United States or any department or agency thereof, or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or part from funds appropriated by the Congress, shall, during the period of negotiation for, or performance or furnishing of, such contract, work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly, make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; nor shall any person knowingly solicit any such contribution from any such person or firm, for any such purpose during any such period. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"SEC. 19. Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent any person employed by the State government, the municipal government, or any agency thereof, from becoming a bona fide candidate for any public office and engaging in any lawful political activity in furtherance of his candidacy in the event he takes a leave of absence without pay from his employment during the campaign.

"Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent any lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign at which there are no candidates on party tickets representing a party which polled votes for President in the last preceding national election; nor lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign respecting any issue not particularly identified with any National or State political party, such as revision of the Constitution of the United States or of a State; referendums; approval or disapproval of city or municipal statutes or ordinances; and other issues of similar character.

"SEC. 20. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, or cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, together with the officers and employees thereof.

"SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall prohibit any official or employee subject to its provisions from becoming a candidate or accepting a nomination for an appointive or elective office or position provided such official or employee shall not use his official authority or influence to secure such nomination or appointment: *And provided further*, That such official or employee shall resign from his office or employment upon receipt of such nomination or appointment.

"SEC. 22. Section 9 (a) of said act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by inserting after the words 'political subjects', in the ninth line of said subdivision (a), the following: 'and candidates.'

"SEC. 23. As used in this act, the term 'State' means any State, Territory, or possession of the United States."

Passed the Senate March 18 (legislative day, March 4), 1940.

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY, *Secretary*.

Expenditures of Selected Federal Agencies, 1933–39

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is conceded that a sound fiscal policy underlies the successful solution of our economic problems, including problem No. 1—unemployment. As a member of the House Conference on Unemployment, seeking a solution of this problem, I have caused to be prepared by the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress a compilation of expenditures of certain selected Federal agencies for the years 1933–39, both inclusive. This statistical information is important in considering these problems. Therefore I am asking permission to include them in an extension of my remarks. I have not been able to secure a detailed breakdown of the expenditures of the War and Navy Departments.

The compilation follows:

Expenditures of selected Federal agencies, 1933–39[1]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total
Department of Agriculture	$250,981,139	$630,674,495	$1,192,920,652	$1,048,966,193	$1,251,247,066	$921,591,840	$1,360,478,595	$6,656,859,980
Agricultural Adjustment Administration		289,055,029	711,819,103	532,201,971	169,861,474	57,807,125	308,654,972	2,069,399,674
Commodity Credit Corporation		2,811,950	136,420	96,852,286	24,348	66,966	108,030	100,000,000
Farm Security Administration		2,372,313	5,423,601	138,015,988	209,695,567	183,200,764	210,257,246	748,965,479
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation							9,256,405	9,256,405
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation[2]				14,590,806	16,097,069	54,202,208	103,696,081	188,586,164
Rural Electrification Administration			16,821	1,402,554	8,911,025	15,192,719	37,767,381	63,290,600
Soil Conservation Service			10,339,590	24,846,927	33,151,321	27,772,748	34,577,152	130,687,738
Farm Credit Administration	103,653,911	369,456,098	154,369,876	[3]121,671,889	9,544,819	[4]4,491,166	[3]2,737,960	607,123,689
Department of Commerce	34,828,642	27,345,215	35,666,545	37,788,857	35,082,504	31,875,538	37,557,789	240,145,090
Department of the Interior	90,764,508	88,570,994	132,171,881	145,073,308	184,970,831	216,780,432	251,238,000	1,109,569,954
Department of Justice	44,125,368	31,735,975	32,810,381	38,624,047	39,623,957	43,249,902	48,668,904	278,838,594
Department of Labor	13,677,842	12,740,415	18,648,151	28,794,489	37,241,891	33,800,650	29,727,470	174,630,908
Navy Department	349,561,925	297,029,291	436,447,860	529,031,636	556,884,449	596,278,300	672,968,993	3,438,202,484
Post Office Department (from general revenues)	117,438,075	64,215,223	63,956,147	85,860,912	39,274,617	47,167,996	39,568,641	457,481,611
State Department	15,604,528	12,160,973	18,678,896	17,865,392	18,452,782	20,656,411	19,172,917	122,591,899
Treasury Department	1,532,920,009	1,774,446,462	1,780,677,240	1,543,285,988	1,644,845,612	1,916,500,090	1,866,959,084	12,059,634,485
War Department	859,638,836	807,841,324	969,301,162	1,188,949,277	1,139,503,087	1,141,050,467	1,126,682,589	7,232,966,742
Military activities	298,417,427	243,329,151	273,485,712	382,654,083	374,260,149	421,985,682	480,900,733	2,475,032,937
Civil functions	120,599,966	155,617,197	206,659,996	187,376,087	136,894,707	74,539,375	50,001,516	931,688,844
Panama Canal	440,621,443	408,894,976	489,155,454	581,482,899	523,072,038	507,886,187	540,704,137	3,491,817,134
General Public Works Program				37,436,208	105,276,193	136,039,223	155,076,208	434,427,827
Veterans' Administration	836,154,885	556,950,488	607,064,725	2,351,383,123	1,137,309,818	581,977,735	557,070,723	6,654,911,498
Tennessee Valley Authority		11,036,795	36,148,537	48,831,424	41,995,141	42,002,238	40,806,801	220,820,936
Railroad Retirement Board				306,881	5,478,724	145,030,561	110,442,242	261,258,409
Federal Security Agency:								
Office of Education	11,785,664	10,927,633	14,146,228	15,345,787	17,694,246	26,809,399	27,730,743	124,439,700
National Youth Administration[4]								
Civilian Conservation Corps	8,773,570	331,940,851	435,508,643	486,281,194	385,807,730	326,382,548	290,385,528	2,265,080,064
Federal Works Agency:								
Work Projects Administration (includes National Youth Administration)[4]				1,263,661,490	1,896,446,658	1,472,499,478	2,239,603,411	6,872,211,037
Public Works Administration		156,243,896	224,979,008	94,083,850	299,430,953	170,922,518	407,937,587	1,353,597,812
Public Roads Administration	168,214,965	227,562,662	285,614,678	233,100,066	348,567,253	232,713,099	196,803,098	1,692,575,821
Public Buildings Administration[5]	127,431,170	87,704,390	65,159,261	64,490,923	53,122,779	30,801,077	21,290,026	450,008,626
Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division of the Treasury[6]	127,431,170	83,340,442	60,367,512	58,074,131	45,756,179	22,430,078	10,910,962	408,310,474
Branch of Building Management of the National Park Service[7]		4,363,948	4,791,749	6,425,792	7,366,600	8,370,999	10,379,064	41,698,152
U. S. Housing Authority						8,629,332	19,653,252	28,282,584

[1] Includes expenditures under the General Public Works program.

[2] Figures given are for obligations incurred in the given period.

[3] Excess credits, deduct.

[4] Allocations to the National Youth Administration as given in the hearings on the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1941, p. 565, are: 1936, $35,517,000; 1937, $65,600,000; 1938, $51,200,000; 1939, $75,100,000.

[5] Public Buildings Administration created by Reorganization Plan No. II, consolidating the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department with the Division of Building Management of the National Park Service.

[6] Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, prior to 1934.

[7] Includes salaries and expenses, public buildings in and outside the District of Columbia.

American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. A. H. HOPKINS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. A. H. Hopkins, of Rocky Mount, Va., on April 17, 1940, at the annual meeting of the Franklin County National Farm Loan Association:

Last week I read a speech delivered by one of the candidates for the nomination for President, in which the speaker said, "To save America you must save the American farmer." Nine years ago I made a speech, in which I used this exact phrase. I believed it to be true then; I believe it to be true now; and this is the subject which I wish to discuss today. I shall not discuss this question from a political or partisan viewpoint for many reasons but principally for the reason that I attribute to the Members of Congress of both political parties a high-mindedness and patriotism too exalted to sacrifice the welfare of their country on the altar of political expediency. Some leaders of both parties seem to understand and appreciate the plight of the farmer; others, no doubt, with equally good motives, seem never to have understood the difficulties confronting the farmer or the ways in which agriculture is interrelated with industry.

I believe that the enactment of equitable farm legislation would be greatly expedited if each Senator and each Congressman knew from experience the price of corn and wheat in terms of sweat and labor.

The present program is violently condemned by some and vigorously praised by others. In my opinion, neither is correct. I think it must be admitted by the informed that the benefit payments, the conservation payments, the parity payments, the commodity loans, the subsidation of exports of surpluses, and purchases of surpluses for relief distribution, low in its rates, has not only saved thousands of farmers from being foreclosed off their farms but has greatly benefited the manufacturer, since every extra dollar the farmer earns finds its way back to the treasury of the manufacturer in exchange for needed clothes and machinery.

Those who contend that the present program is so nearly perfect that it cannot be improved on are, I think, equally in error.

Secretary Wallace, in his published statements, has stated that farm income is $2,000,000,000 under parity. The economists state that the prices of agricultural products are now 26 percent below parity.

There seems to be an ever-widening breach between labor and agriculture. Some pseudo statesmen contend that an increase in the price of agricultural products would accentuate the poverty in the cities, since the principal burden would have to be borne by labor who are already on relief and underpaid. This argument is dangerous for the reason that it can be made to sound so plausible

to those who refuse to take a panoramic view of the picture. It is a conviction of mine, a conviction supported by the almost unanimous opinion of the students of political science in our colleges that both groups should work in harmony; that labor and agriculture should be hitched side by side, and not back to back.

Both groups create our Nation's wealth. The interests of both are identical; their goal is the same; that is, to obtain and preserve for themselves that portion of the Nation's wealth sufficient to provide a living and a security for their family. Labor provides the principal market for agricultural products. The farm provides the principal market for the products of labor. As it is, the markets of both are stunted, and the conditions have produced a vicious cycle—poverty and hunger in the cities, poverty and distress in the country. If a system could be devised whereby there could be a fair and equitable exchange, then there would be no further need of those who labor in the cities being ill-fed and the farmers in the country being ill-clothed.

Some economists have prepared statistics to prove that if farm products could be placed on a parity with industry the farmers could buy and pay for a sufficient quantity of goods to provide work for the 10,000,000 unemployed laborers and that our national income would be increased sufficiently to wipe out our national deficit within 8 years. I do not vouch for these figures and this conclusion, but I am convinced that raising the price of farm products would react greatly to the benefit of both the laborer and the manufacturer.

I am convinced that we will have economic recovery when, and only when, legislation has been enacted which will restore a purchasing power to the farmers.

Time does not permit a detailed discussion of the many theories advanced and bills introduced designed to aid the farmers, and I am not bold enough to pretend that I have found a panacea for the Nation's ills. In 1933, after both the Democrats and Republicans in both the Senate and Congress enacted emergency legislation to save the banks, the insurance companies, and the railroads, they passed what is known as the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which reads as follows: "The goal of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is to restore the same relations between prices of agricultural products and prices of other products as existed in the pre-war period of 1910–14."

This act, it seems, came nearer meeting the universal approval of the leaders of both major political parties than any other subsequent legislation or any proposed legislation which has so far been advanced. The rules and regulations seem not only to have met the approval of the leaders of the farm organizations but it is conceded, I think, that the farmers derived greater benefit from the original act than from any of the subsequent acts. Before the enactment of this legislation our national income was forty-two billions. After the enactment of this legislation, and at the time the farm program was declared to be unconstitutional by a divided Court in the Hoosac Mills case, the national income had increased to seventy billions.

The late Governor Loudon, of Illinois, a great Republican statesman and one of the largest landed proprietors of the West, said that this legislation was not perfect, but that it was more nearly perfect than any proposed legislation which had been suggested; and further said that he thought it advisable for the States to put into operation the same plan and regulations which the Supreme Court had declared to be unconstitutional when administered by the National Government.

Many constitutional lawyers said, in view of the decision in the Hoosac Mills case, that no legislation could be enacted whereby agriculture could be placed on a parity with industry without doing violence to the Constitution, as interpreted by a majority of the Court. As to whether this conclusion is sound or not, I shall express no opinion; but I do say if legislation designed to restore to the farmers equality of opportunity cannot be enacted without violating the provisions of the Constitution, then the Constitution should not become a barrier.

For article V provides how amendments may be made. A study of the debates of the Constitutional Convention impels the conclusion that the founding fathers did not attempt to do more than to set forth certain basic principles, with the hope and expectation that future generations would possess the courage and the genius to adapt these principles as a living force, so as to give expression to the national will with respect to the national need.

The Government has been liberal, indeed, in rendering aid to the 10,000,000 unemployed in the cities and the millions of small farmers on the ragged edge of necessity. But no red-blooded American can be happy on a dole, and every able-bodied man yearns for the privilege of regaining the independence of working for himself in private industry, the dignity of providing for himself and family, and the opportunity for self-expression.

The passage from Matthew xxv: 42, "I was hungry, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink," is touching, indeed. But what touches the soul more deeply is the man who says to his Government, "I was strong; I was ambitious; I stood ready to serve my country in times of war and peace; and you gave me not the opportunity to feed my hungry children."

A totalitarian government may be sufficiently powerful and ruthless to survive, though it trample the rights and liberties of its people under its heel of iron. But if a democracy is to survive, it must not be callous and indifferent to the economic and spiritual needs of her people. If a democracy hopes to retain the loyalty and support of her citizens, it must be equitable; it must insure equal justice to all; it must strive to meet the valid objections of its enemies.

Let us not delude ourselves into a sense of false security; let us not, through a process of rationalization, embrace a false philosophy. Our knowledge of human nature and the soul of man warns us that every man with an empty cupboard and every man denied the right to seek his own little spot in the sun is a potential antagonist to the existing order.

We hear a great deal about regimentation. We read speeches and editorials; and, strange to say, we hear many farmers objecting to the rules and regulations of the farm program for the reason that they encroach on our liberties. This attitude on the part of the farmers, I think, has to some extent hindered recovery.

Now, as I have said before, while the records show that the farm program has proven of great benefit to the farmer, the program is not perfect and will never be fair to the farmer until agriculture is placed on a parity with industry. I am not contending that the rules and regulations promulgated by the Department are either necessary or proper; but I do say that, in my opinion, the argument with reference to regimentation and the surrendering of our rights and liberties has been greatly magnified, exaggerated, and overworked.

Liberty is a relative term. No one has ever had complete liberty. We think of the barbarian and cave man as having enjoyed complete liberty; but even with the cave man, the food he had laid up for winter was in danger of being confiscated by a stronger man or a stronger tribe; and under the regulations established by the most primitive tribes, limits were fixed beyond which one could not go. Under any righteous government, one's liberties must end where the rights of others begin.

All farm organizations were founded upon certain rules and regulations—that is, the giving up of certain rights and privileges in exchange for other rights and privileges—and those organizations have failed, not because the rules were inherently bad, but for the reason that the farmers were so isolated that enforcement of these rules became impractical. Businesses of almost every nature during the past half-century have voluntarily adopted certain rules more drastic than the farm regulations, which they believed to be for their mutual interest.

All through life we are giving up something for something else which we believe to be of greater value. The man who values respect and esteem of his neighbors must give up trickery, licentiousness, and inebriety.

The farmers who gained for us our independence gave up their comfortable cabins beyond the mountains, the association of their families, and joined the Continental Army; but if at Valley Forge they experienced the tortures of hell, when at Yorktown they got a glimpse of heaven. Their courage and their deeds had won for them the grateful reverence of posterity. Who can say but that the consciousness, the joy of having gained for America its independence did not overbalance and outweigh the comforts which they had given up? It seems to me that the Government not only has the right but the duty to define that limit beyond which our actions interfere with the rights and liberties of others.

A law is not to be condemned merely because it affects someone's rights or liberties. People's rights must necessarily be contracted or expanded so as to meet the exigencies of our changing civilization. The truth is most legislative acts affect in some way someone's existing rights. When our forefathers went west to battle with the wild beast and savage Indian, they were permitted to drive their oxen in the middle or on the left side of the road. Now the law has curtailed our rights, and we are required to drive on the right half of the road. But who could contend that this law has not established rights superior to the rights relinquished? Therefore, it seems to be that a law may be avowed as sound as the rights obtained overbalance the rights surrendered.

One of the major obstacles that stand in the way of industrial recovery is the refusal of so many industrial leaders to accept the fact as a fact that there has been a change in our national consciousness; that the cataclysm of 1932 marked the end of an era, the end of what the economists term "laissez faire" and others term "ruthless individualism." For whether this country be controlled by the Democratic Party or the Republican Party; whether some of us believe it wise or unwise, the laws, or the lack of laws, which made the manipulations of Insull and others possible, will never again be tolerated.

The moving finger writes
And, having writ, moves on;
Nor all thy piety and wit
Can lure it back again
To cancel half a line;
Nor all thy tears wash out
A word of it.

We frequently hear speeches and read editorials to the effect that special legislation will in some way destroy our ideals and undermine our Government. It was through special legislation that a tax was levied on agriculture for the benefit of industry that gave to industry its vitality, and this is the meat on which thy Caesar hath fed that he has grown so great. A Government which has levied a tax by way of tariff on agriculture for 100 years will not be desecrated by enveloping within its benevolent folds the farmer in time of adversity.

It seems both trite and hackneyed to say that agriculture has always been the most important industry of the American people, and that our farmers have been since the beginning and are now the bulwark of American democracy.

If you read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or Who's Who in America and tabulate the names of those who were reared on the farm I think you will be persuaded that what Cato said of agriculture is true of America today: "Agriculture produces the bravest men, the most valiant soldiers, and a class of citizens least given of all to evil designs." It is no mere accident that today five of the leading candidates for the Presidency were born and reared on a farm. There is something in the soil, something about living close to nature, that in some mysterious way ennobles the soul which the arts of language cannot describe.

"Nature and Song and God; thrice blessed is he who dwells
Where God in these works out His wondrous miracles."

The courage and loyalty to the farmers of America constitute an asset to this Government which is not surpassed by the material acquisitions of the industrial leaders. They have carried their burdens both in peace and in war; this record—a record seamed with fire and sealed with blood—entitled them not to special favors but to equality of opportunity. They would not deprecate their manhood by asking more; a government should not stultify itself by granting less. If you would save the Government, you must save the people who compose that Government. If the people are to be saved, they not only must be fed, but that vital spark which differentiates man from beast must not be trodden out. We must ever bear in mind that the strength of a nation is not measured by gold or material wealth but by the moral courage that breathes in the spirit of her citizens.

When we consider our material acquisitions, our scientific achievements, our contributions in the field of literature and in the field of statesmanship, our esthetic and spiritual values, and compare these with those of the other nations of the world, it seems to me that, even with all of our trouble, we have more to be loyal to, more to be thankful for, than any other people on this planet. We have traveled a long way since the stormy days of 1932, but we have not passed the crisis. Our democracy is still challenged as it has never been challenged before.

If the ideals and achievements of the past are to be preserved for posterity, if we are to leave the torch of liberty burning to guide the paths of those who are to follow, we who now occupy the stage must, uninfluenced by prejudice or political expediency, exert all of our physical energy and spiritual resources to coordinate and harmonize the divergent interests of this country to the mutual advantage of all.

When I was in college I read of Cato, the Roman statesman, who, believing that the future of Rome depended upon the destruction of Carthage, would end each speech, regardless of place or subject, with the phrase, "Carthago delinda est"—"Carthage must be destroyed." Believing as I do that the welfare of America, that the perpetuation of our liberties and our democracy depends upon the restoration of the purchasing power to the farmer, I would have every speaker proclaim from every platform, until its truth had burned into the consciousness of the American people, "Disparity must be destroyed."

Proposed Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. KING
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to discuss the situation with regard to sugar legislation, soon to be before the House.

When the quota system was first inaugurated by the Jones-Costigan Act as a substitute for the protective tariff to stabilize the American sugar market, Hawaii was allotted a quota that represented a substantial reduction from its established production. Furthermore, the seaboard refiners capitalized the distress of the domestic sugar industry to insert in the Jones-Costigan Act an entirely extraneous provision which limited the processing of sugar in Hawaii to the amount then being refined—about 3 percent of its production.

Had the tariff been continued as sufficient for the protection of the sugar industry, no restrictions on either the production or the refining of sugar would have been required. Domestic sugar producers would have competed among themselves for the American market within the protective wall provided by the tariff as the means of keeping out foreign sugars.

But the industry itself apparently preferred the quota system, with its excise tax and conditional compliance payments. To secure the support of the politically powerful eastern refining interests—historic enemies of the domestic sugar industry—this purely agricultural act carried as a rider an industrial provision denying to Hawaii and Puerto Rico the right to process their own products. The possibility of some decrease of employment in eastern refineries was used as a smoke screen behind which the refiners fought to retain their monopoly.

The Sugar Act of 1937 corrected the method of fixing Hawaii's quota, but further reduced the amount, mainly to give Louisiana and Florida a substantial increase, and retained the refining restrictions of the Jones-Costigan Act. The discussion in Congress over this feature, wherein the refiners again succeeded in having the domestic sugar industry pull their chestnuts out of the fire, is very illuminating. The distinction made between different parts of the United States was so indefensible that it was finally justified only as a necessary temporary expedient—to expire 10 months before the act itself. On that basis Congress accepted the provision, with an implicit assurance that it would not be reenacted.

The following quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are pertinent to this point:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 5, 1937]

Page 8307:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.
Mr. HOPE. Is not the reason the refiners are down here in agreement with the producers of sugar that they want to hitchhike on the producers' bill? They are trying to get a free ride out of a bill which was originally designed to protect the producer.
Mr. CRAWFORD. The answer to the gentleman's question is that you have in this bill a refined-sugar question, not a question that has to do with imported raw sugars.

Page 8315:

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we should not enact any legislation which deals unjustly with any part of our country. If we leave in this bill the provision which prohibits Hawaii and Puerto Rico from refining the sugar they grow, we will have established as a permanent part of our legislative policy the principle that we can by law favor one part of our country at the expense of another.

I know a similar provision was contained in the Jones-Costigan Act. But it was put there largely as the result of the political influence of the eastern refiners. That was emergency legislation. This statute is in the nature of permanent legislation, and we should not commit this grave injustice to our Territories. * * *

These questions should be handled solely on their own merits. Nothing justifies treating any part of the country as a foreign nation and discriminating against it for another part. We know it is cheaper to manufacture cotton in Alabama than it is in New England, but no one would suggest that we prohibit Alabama by law from spinning cotton that she grows, in order that the New England manufacturers could manufacture it. The Secretary of the Interior, who has charge of the Territories, has taken a very clear and firm stand against this discrimination. I support his views heartily and believe it would be unjust and un-American to prevent sugar growers in the Territories from manufacturing in the Territories.

Page 8318:

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MCCORMACK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.
Mr. WADSWORTH. I understood the gentleman to state that Hawaii is a component part of the United States, but nevertheless continental United States must look after itself, or words to that effect.
Mr. MCCORMACK. No; not look after itself. I said there are certain times when we must be practical and apply the rule of practical justice to the circumstances which confront us.
Mr. WADSWORTH. Am I stretching the gentleman's theory a little too far if I suggest that upon his theory the gentleman might be called upon some day to support a measure which would place a quota upon the production of cotton goods in South Carolina?
Mr. MCCORMACK. I do not see the relationship of the gentleman's question to the matter under consideration today. The gentleman is entering the realm of pure speculation, which is a realm the gentleman from New York very, very seldom enters.
Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a very practical question I have posed to the gentleman.
Mr. MCCORMACK. I do not see the relationship. The question is academic and speculative. I respect the fact the gentleman believes the question is practical if he asks it, but on this occasion I disagree with the gentleman.

Page 8320:

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, insofar as tariff protection is concerned, is it not a fact that Hawaii and Puerto Rico share in tariff benefits, if any, to the same extent as the continental producer?

Mr. HOPE. They do. They share in these tariff benefits because they are a part of the United States, and for that reason they are entitled to have the same consideration in this bill to which every other part of the United States is entitled. [Applause.]

Page 8327:

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal this afternoon about the American farmer and the American producer. The truth of the matter is that, according to the Constitution of the United States, the man who produces sugar in Hawaii and Puerto Rico is an American producer, because those islands are each an integral part of the United States of America.

Hawaii and Puerto Rico, my friends—and we all agree to this—are under the Constitution of the United States. Their position is precisely that of the State of Texas. The State of Texas was annexed by the United States of America and became a part of the Nation; so were Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

What does this bill do in reference to section 207 (a) and (b)? It sets up a trade barrier against certain portions of the United States of America—Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Page 8338:

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I have spent the whole afternoon listening to the debate on the bill. I heard bandied about the word "Americanism this" and "Americanism that." I do not think I have to remind the East that the United States Government does not maintain a consular office in the Hawaiian Islands. It is not a foreign country. It is part and parcel of the United States just as much as Oklahoma Territory was before it became a State or just as much as New Mexico was before it became a State.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Chairman, there is an attempt in this bill to treat the Hawaiian Islands as if they were a colony. We operate under a constitution, as is known by all, which is a constricted document. We cannot hope under a constitutional form of government to discriminate against our possessions.

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1937]

Page 8433:

Mr. JONES. * * * Let me say that the position of the administration is this, that it is a matter of principle; that it will not affect much, during the life of this contract, two or two and a half years, the amount of sugar that will be brought in, but they are opposed to the discrimination against any group of American citizens living under the American flag. That is their position, and I want to state that the President has made it clear he is all for the beet growers and the cane growers, and wants them to have legislation. I think that most of you will realize that the great major objectives of this bill will remain the same, insofar as the American producers are concerned, whether these amendments are adopted or not. Then, too, even if my amendment is adopted, industry and labor will have the advantage of the other provision of the bill.

Page 8439:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, let us keep clearly in mind the real issue that is involved in this discussion. The issue is not protection, because the findings of the Tariff Commission under two administrations have been to the effect that there is no difference in the cost of production for refining in the Tropics and in the continental United States. The issue is not labor, because in all these refineries in the United States less than 14,000 people are employed, and they receive an annual wage averaging about $1,005. If all the refined sugar which might be permitted to come into this country under this amendment came in—and it will not nearly all come in, I can assure the members of this Committee of that—it could not possibly displace more than one-third of these workers because it would be less than one-third of what these refineries are refining at this time. This is the extent of the labor issue.

The issue involved is not the issue of protection for the domestic producer of cane and beets, because, as I pointed out yesterday, the refiners who are opposing this amendment have for 40 years done everything they could to destroy the domestic beet-producing industry in this country. [Applause.] I cannot understand why those who are speaking for the domestic beet-sugar industry should allow themselves to be made the tools of the refiners, as is the case today.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Very briefly, for a question.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman asked a question; I wish to answer it. We are supporting it because they have repented and want to come into the fold. They should be allowed to do so.

Mr. HOPE. I am suspicious of deathbed repentances. All these refiners are doing is hitchhiking on a bill for the relief of the domestic producing industry.

Page 8448:

Mr. HARLAN. * * * Some gentleman said a moment ago that this is fair, that we are treating Hawaii and Puerto Rico the same, or better than continental United States. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you when we will be fair. When this Congress says to Ohio, when it says to Georgia, when it says to Texas that the manufactures they have in those States shall stay as they are today now, and henceforth forevermore, that they shall not expand, then such a bill as this will be fair. If in this same bill we should say to New York, or Ohio, or Michigan, where there are refineries, "You cannot expand your refineries, you have to take the same as Hawaii, take what you get," then it will be fair.

Page 8448:

Mr. MAVERICK. * * * the most pernicious lobby we have ever had in the United States is the sugar lobby. It has a long trail of indictments, corruption, and evil practices. The only benefit that this bill as it stands is to the refiners, and I say that if we want to do the thing that is just and fair and constitutional, we ought to adopt the Jones amendment, striking out the restrictions against Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

But suppose Hawaii does refine sugar, how are you going to stop it? It would be the same thing as Texas shipping refined oil or North Carolina shipping textiles, both in their own country. In other words, if we adopt the special restrictions, we are adopting a policy of making colonies out of a part of our own country. Certainly it would be an evil precedent.

Oh, they talk about refineries, and that it means lower wages for 14,000 workers, but let us think about legislating for 127,000,000 Americans instead. So I say to you, for the sake of honestly following our Constitution and doing what is plain right, let us adopt the Jones amendment. [Applause.]

Page 8458:

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely clear to me that President Roosevelt is right in this matter. The parts of the bill sought to be stricken out by the Jones amendment, which I shall support, attempt, by statute, to deny to an American citizen access to the American market. This is a violation of sound constitutional principle. It puts in reverse the historical development of this country for 150 years. It creates a precedent which will be seized upon in later years by those interested in commodities other than sugar. Those supporting the bill in its present form in behalf of sugar today will in the future be the victims of the precedent which they are creating.

It is probable that there was no single influence which had greater weight in 1787 toward causing our fathers to scrap the Articles of Confederation and form the Constitution of the United States than the tariff walls between the Colonies. The Court's opinion in Gibbons against Ogden was written by men who in their own lifetimes had experience with those conditions. In that case one may find this language: "If there was any one object riding over every other in the adoption of the Constitution, it was to keep the commercial intercourse among the States free from all invidious and partial restraints."

* * * It should be recognized that we are introducing a new principle in our commercial life—the principle of industrial quotas; the principle of denying to certain producers access to the American market which is granted to other producers. It is a denial of equal privilege and the equal protection of our laws. It is sectionalism, pure and simple, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Maverick], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harlan], and others have stated.

It may be a debatable question whether Hawaii or Puerto Rico should ever have come under the American flag. Nevertheless, they are here, and they are here by our invitation. We expected to gain certain advantages by reason of bringing them under the American flag and we must take the responsibilities that go with the advantages.

But however true this may be with reference to business with foreign nations, surely we cannot by statute discriminate against some of our own citizens in favor of others.

I am going to support President Roosevelt in this matter. I think he is absolutely right. We will rue the day we start a precedent in this country of denying any part of the American market to any American producer, wherever he lives under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

Page 8463:

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, if our Territories have cheaper labor than the Atlantic coast, that is no reason why they should be deprived of their right to manufacture their agricultural products. The wage and hour law will apply to sugar refining in Hawaii, and, if there is any reason why wages should be raised or hours lessened in Hawaii, the Federal Government will be able to do it. The labor question is a false issue and has no place in the consideration of this legislation.

It is interesting to speculate as to the amount that Japan, for instance, would pay if it could own the Hawaiian Islands. And yet those islands, after a century as an independent sovereignty, voluntarily elected to become part of our country under our solemn assurance that it would become an integral part of our Nation, and as such is entitled to fair and equal treatment.

Under this assurance the Republic of Hawaii turned over to the United States all its properties, the money in its treasury, its forts and public buildings, and more than a million acres of public lands. We not only did not have to pay for the Territory but we got the money in the treasury and all public properties. In addition, Hawaii has paid into the United States Treasury in taxes $150,000,000 more than Congress has expended upon it. We received the islands as a voluntary gift and have made a profit of $150,000,000 out of them.

Mr. Chairman, not only would it be a disastrous national policy for us to discriminate against Hawaii but I earnestly say that it

would be a gross breach of faith with her children—a violation of the trust under which she became part of our Nation. [Applause.]

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 12, 1937]

Page 8766:

Senator HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received last evening from the President of the United States with reference to the proposed sugar legislation. The letter was read to the Finance Committee this morning, and the committee took action after the letter was presented to it. However, I think the views of the President ought to be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 11, 1937.

Hon. PAT HARRISON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR PAT: The amendment to H. R. 7667 adopted yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee has just been brought to my attention.

I am delighted to note that the committee recognizes that our Territories and island possessions are integral parts of the United States and cannot be discriminated against, and that the restrictions on refining in those Territories contained in H. R. 7667 constitute such a discrimination.

I regret that an examination of the committee amendment shows that it not only does not eliminate the discrimination but introduces a new and highly objectionable feature. The discrimination contained in H. R. 7667 is that sugar producers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are prohibited from refining there the sugar which they are permitted to produce under the quota, while there is no similar prohibition on the other areas in the United States. The amendment, which places a refining quota on continental United States at a figure far in excess of the largest quantity of sugar grown there, merely perpetuates this discrimination.

The amendment proposes to limit by law the quantity of sugar that may be refined in various geographical parts of the United States. This introduces a principle of geographical limitations on manufacturing in our country which has no economic or social justification in this instance and would constitute a dangerous precedent.

Agricultural legislation, so desired by our farmers, should not be further delayed by the insertion in an otherwise acceptable agricultural bill of manufacturing restrictions. Their elimination would serve the best interests of our agricultural producers, who desire legislation at this session. If interested parties think there should be manufacturing restrictions on sugar refining, that can be embodied in a separate bill and be considered separately.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 19, 1937]

Page 9340:

Senator HARRISON. * * * The other amendment, and the most important one, was that which dealt with quotas on refined sugar from Puerto Rico and Hawaii. It will be recalled that in section 207 the House bill permitted about 29,000 tons of refined sugar to come in annually from Hawaii and permitted about 126,000 tons to come in annually from Puerto Rico. The Senate committee, as Senators will recall, in order to remove the charge that we were discriminating in favor of the American refiner as against the Puerto Rican or the Hawaiian, struck out all of section 207 of the House bill with reference to the quota or limitation on refined sugar from Puerto Rico and Hawaii and inserted a new section. We did not change the amount of refined sugar that might come in from Puerto Rico or Hawaii in the House bill, but we did say that we would freeze that limitation on the amount that might come in from those two islands, and that was at the height of production of refined sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii. They had never produced more refined sugar in those islands than the amount carried in the House bill and also carried in the Senate bill. We arrived at the figures of what the highest production of refined sugar had been in continental United States, and we placed that amount in the Senate amendment.

So in the conference there was quite a discussion as to limiting the amount of refined sugar coming in from Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Various suggestions were made—1 year, 1½ years, and so on. We finally agreed in the conference that the section permitting refined sugar to come in from Puerto Rico and Hawaii could continue until March 1, 1940. * * *

Page 9464:

Mr. JONES. * * * Most of you, I am sure, are familiar with the situation that arose; that is, the question of whether or not the bill should place any restrictions upon refined sugar coming in from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, in light of the fact that they are both under the American flag. It was contended that there was a matter of principle involved in that question. The conference group agreed to accept the House provision with a limitation. That is, sections (a) and (b) of section 207 limited the amount of refined sugar that might be brought in during the life of the bill in any one year to the highest amount that was brought in from any of those islands in any year prior to the enactment of the original act. The Senate struck out the entire section, including those provisions. The conference group agreed to take the House provisions with this qualification: That these limitations should apply until March 1, 1940, after which all restrictions are taken off of refined sugar from Hawaii and Puerto Rico during the remaining time of the operation of the bill, which is until December 31, 1940. In other words, for the last 10 months of operation of the bill, as agreed in conference, there will be no limitation on the amount of the refined sugar that may be brought in from Hawaii and Puerto Rico within their respective total quotas. We had a very difficult subject to work out, and did the best we could. I believe that is all I care to submit on the conference report, unless there are some questions.

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 20, 1937]

Page 9468:

Mr. HOPE. * * * I am strongly of the opinion that if we do not adopt this conference report we are going to end the session of Congress without any sugar legislation.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. LANZETTA. In view of the President's statement, does not the gentleman think this bill will be vetoed?

Mr. HOPE. I have no opinion as to what may be in the President's mind with regard to this legislation. This bill meets at least in part the objections the President had voiced in connection with sugar legislation.

Mr. LANZETTA. Does not the gentleman think that practically the same discrimination which we complained of in the House bill is now in the present bill that the conferees have agreed to?

Mr. HOPE. No. I think there is recognition in this bill of the principle for which the gentleman has been contending. It is true that it is deferred, but still it is a recognition of the principle. The gentleman knows my position in the matter. He knows that I am in accord with his views on that particular question, and I say to him that I think this is the best possible bill that can be gotten at this time. I further think that this legislation is a matter of such great importance to the sugar industry in Puerto Rico, in Hawaii, and continental United States that all of us should support this conference report.

Despite the strong opposition to this barrier on interstate commerce, to this restraint on the economic development of America's Territories, both in the Congress and the administration, the Sugar Act of 1937 was finally approved by both Houses of Congress with the refining provision retained. Perhaps the implicit assurances referred to, that the provision would be dropped in future sugar legislation, was partly responsible for its passage. At any rate, when this measure came before the President, he signed it on very explicit assurances that the spokesmen for the sugar industry would not again combine with an agricultural bill any provision of this kind. I quote his letter in full herewith as pertinent to the present situation:

STATEMENT ACCOMPANYING H. R. 7667

The problem before me raised by the enactment of H. R. 7667—the so-called sugar bill—is that the bill, intended primarily to benefit the many thousands of farmers who produce beets and sugarcane and those who, at the place of production, refine the raw material into sugar, has been seriously impaired in its value by the inclusion of a provision intended to legalize a virtual monopoly in the hands of a small group of seaboard refiners.

I am primarily concerned with the interests of the domestic beet and cane growers and of the cane growers in the islands which are under the American flag and the cane growers of some of our close neighbors, such as Cuba.

So far as all of these growers, domestic and insular, are concerned, the system of quotas provided in the bill is, on the whole, equitable. From this, the most important objective of the bill, I have no reason to disagree.

The sole difficulty relates to a little group of seaboard refiners who, unfortunately, for many years were able to join forces with domestic producers in the maintenance of a continuing and powerful lobby in the National Capitol and elsewhere. This lobby has cost the stockholders of these refining companies millions of dollars and it has been wholly unnecessary so far as protection of the domestic beet and cane producers has been concerned.

It is with great regret, therefore, that I find that the Congress has accorded a status quo continuation of this seaboard refinery monopoly for 2½ years to come. The bill in this respect gives only one ray of hope—for it provides that this refining monopoly shall terminate on March 1, 1940, whereas the beet and cane producers' quota is extended to December 31, 1940.

Since the passage of the bill I have been given the following assurances by Senators representing the great majority of continental sugar producers:

1. That their primary interest in sugar legislation is to afford protection to the growers of sugar beets and sugarcane in all domestic sugar-producing areas of the United States, and when the Sugar Act of 1937 comes up for renewal they will endeavor to deal with the question of refined-sugar quotas in a separate measure.

2. That they recognize the fact that Hawaii and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are integral parts of the United States and should not be discriminated against.

3. That when the refined-sugar quotas for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are terminated, they will endeavor to enact

legislation providing that minimum labor standards in sugar refineries in these offshore areas shall not be lower than the minimum standards in refineries on the mainland.

4. That in future legislation they will see to it that the American housewife is protected adequately.

I have received similar assurances from responsible leaders of the House of Representatives. In view of these assurances, therefore, I am approving the bill with what amounts to a gentlemen's agreement that the unholy alliance between the cane and beet growers on the one hand and the seaboard refining monopoly on the other has been terminated by the growers. That means that hereafter the refiner's lobby should expect no help from the domestic growers. That is at least a definite step in the right direction.

I hope that the next session of the Congress will consider repealing or shortening the clause which continues the refining monopoly to March 1, 1940; but even if Congress does not then act, the end of the monopoly is definitely in sight, and I sincerely trust that nothing will be done by the domestic growers of beets and cane to perpetuate it. The monopoly costs the American housewife millions of dollars every year, and I am just as concerned for her as I am for the farmers themselves.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1937.*

The restrictions on the processing of sugar in Hawaii and Puerto Rico expired on March 1 last. The Sugar Act of 1937 itself expires at the end of this year. Therefore, with the end of the present session of Congress looming closer every day, there is some urgency for proposing and considering new sugar legislation on the part of those who desire the retention of the quota system as the best means for their protection.

But no bill so far introduced accepts the necessity for adopting a national rather than a sectional attitude toward this complex problem. The measures before the House Committee on Agriculture each treat the problem solely from the point of view of their proponents, without regard to other units of the industry. Those who desire additional quotas for the domestic industry would obtain such an increase in part at the expense of Hawaii, whose industry has already suffered two severe cuts. Others would elicit support for a continuing resolution by reenacting restrictions on refining in Hawaii and Puerto Rico as a sop to the power and influence of the refiners. I cannot hope to express my opposition to these proposals better than in the language used by the President in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which I quote herewith:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 11, 1940.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your recent letters to the Departments of State, Interior, and Agriculture, requesting comments on the various bills with respect to sugar which were introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress and are now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture. In accordance with your request, and since your committee is now holding public hearings on these measures, it is believed that you may wish to have at this time a summary of our views on the basic issues of public policy which are involved in this group of bills.

In reviewing the present sugar situation I have been gratified to note the great improvement in conditions that has taken place since the adoption of the sugar program 6 years ago. Domestic sugar producers are fortunately receiving incomes at approximately the parity level, and they are enjoying a large volume of production. The losses of sugar processors in the years preceding the program have been converted into profits; child labor has been greatly reduced; wages and working conditions for labor have been improved; and there has been brought about an important and greatly needed recovery in the market for our surplus products in the foreign countries from which sugar is imported into the United States. Furthermore, the world price of sugar has increased substantially.

I also find that under the existing provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 domestic sugar producers and processors will receive price protection through the quota system for the full calendar year of 1940 and that domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane growers will receive benefit payments on their 1940 crops even though the marketings of the sugar may extend well over into 1941. The seaboard cane-sugar refiners are protected for an indefinite period against competition of Philippine refiners under terms of the Philippine Independence Act, and they will continue to enjoy quota protection from the competition of Cuban refiners for the full calendar year of 1940. The tax on sugar will remain in effect until July 1, 1941. Consequently, it seems clear that no sugar legislation is necessarily required at this session of Congress, although it might be advisable to extend the life of the Sugar Act of 1937 for an additional period through a joint resolution of the Congress.

In considering the questions raised by these bills, I find myself again confronted with the fact that the basic problem of good government inherent in sugar legislation is to balance, practically and fairly, the directly conflicting interests of the various groups of American citizens concerned; the producers of sugar and the producers of export commodities, the farmers, and the processors, the employers of labor, and the industry as a whole and consumers and taxpayers. These requirements of the general welfare indicate that at least three fundamental aspects of the major bills on sugar now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture should be given special consideration.

In the first place, several of the proposals would unavoidably bring about an impairment of the export market for surplus American agricultural and industrial products, and they would do so at a time when increased export outlets are so greatly needed. It is to be regretted that each increased acre of domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane production inevitably results in a contraction of our export markets in an amount equal to the value of the product of several acres of our principal agricultural crops. A decrease in sugar imports would, therefore, require an unnecessary and painful readjustment and contraction in our production of export commodities. It would also injure the economic status of other American republics to which we must look in increasing degree for enlarged outlets for the products of our own labor, land, and factories. It would strike a serious blow, particularly at the foreign marketing of such important surplus farm commodities of the United States as corn-hog products, rice, wheat, and cotton.

In the second place, some of these bills would discard the established basis of distribution of quotas among the various sugar-producing areas that was carefully developed by the Congress after considerable labor. In its report to the Congress in 1937 your committee stated that the quotas had been arrived at "after careful consideration of the history of production in each area and its present and future capacity to market." I believe that we all appreciate readily the natural desire of each producing area to enlarge its share of the market, but it would be most difficult to justify an abandonment of the existing distribution of quotas in favor of a new and arbitrary basis of allotments. It is also clear that a reshuffling of domestic quotas so as to discriminate against producers in the domestic insular areas would, under the special circumstances, hardly be a conscionable procedure. The people of the Territory of Hawaii and the possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are American citizens who compose some of these minority groups in our population, with local governments that lack the protection of statehood.

If this circumstance were not given adequate consideration, it would be possible to destroy by legislation the livelihood of our citizens in the insular parts of the United States through the enactment of discriminatory prohibitions against their products; and they would possess no legal power to take countermeasures in self-defense. Such a course of action, as I have pointed out on a previous occasion, would be tantamount to an imperialistic classification of citizens and a tyrannical abuse of minority rights that is utterly contrary to the American concept of fairness and democracy. Among the cases in point is the proposal to reinstate the former discrimination against the refining of sugar in the insular parts of the United States.

In the third place, the bills submitted to your committee include a proposal that would sacrifice the protection afforded consumers under existing legislation and substitute a sugar-price standard requiring a reduction in total quota supplies to consumers to a point that would enhance sugar prices beyond the level required to give a majority of producers full parity returns. One of the principal objectives of the sugar program is to assure producers and others fair and reasonable incomes; but after that has been done, further increases in price would place an excessive burden of public protection for the sugar industry as a whole on agriculture, industry, consumers, and taxpayers.

Under the existing circumstances, with sugar producers enjoying approximately a parity level of income and a large volume of production, with labor being benefited by improved wages and working conditions, with sugar processors making substantial profits, and with a gratifying increase in our exports to foreign sugar-producing countries, I am confident that the House Committee on Agriculture will not recommend any bill that would impair the foreign outlets for our surplus products, run counter to the good-neighbor policy, discriminate among various groups of domestic producers and processors, or increase the burden on our consumers and taxpayers.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In view of the above statement, should the domestic sugar industry incur the risk of a veto and consequent lapse of existing legislation with no substitute except a moderate tariff, merely to preserve a restriction which every unprejudiced judge has condemned as unfair and un-American? Or should not the industry accept as its guide the principles of equity and justice so ably championed by the President, while at the same time preserve itself against possible disaster by supporting a simple continuing resolution with no complicating manufacturing restraints?

Hawaii has consistently cooperated with other units of the domestic sugar industry. It asks simply for justice, for equal treatment. I must oppose as well as I can the new un-American policy of making a distinction between "continental" and

"noncontinental United States" in evidence in some of the bills introduced. There is only one United States of America, of which Hawaii as an incorporated Territory is an integral part. Its people are American citizens, just as are the people of the mainland. All the burdens, responsibilities, and obligations of that citizenship rest on them as they do on your constituents.

As a practical matter the argument made in favor of limiting the refining of sugar in Hawaii as a protection to labor in eastern seaboard cities simply has no weight. For many years Hawaii sent no raw sugar to eastern refineries. More recently an annual average of about 300,000 tons of Hawaiian raw sugar has been distributed between several eastern refiners, no one of whom received a very large quantity. The loss of this supply would cause practically no decrease in the labor requirements of these refiners. Within the past 2 years the Hawaiian sugar industry, as a private arrangement, has contracted to supply one group of eastern refiners the amount heretofore distributed among many individual refiners. There can therefore be no justification for the effort to raise the labor issue as an argument to defend restrictions on refining in Hawaii, admittedly not justifiable as a matter of principle.

Legislation that would deny to Hawaii the same rights and privileges enjoyed by other Americans is obviously unfair and probably illegal. It could not possibly be considered if Hawaii were situated on the mainland. Then is its justification based on geography? Is it to be contended that there is an inherent right to preferential treatment enjoyed by American citizens on the mainland not shared with other American citizens?

This is a colonial policy—an imperial policy foreign to our American democracy, indefensible unless might makes right. It makes empty our boast of "equal justice under law." It substitutes two kinds of justice, one for "continentals" and one for "noncontinentals."

I believe too strongly in the sense of fair play of the American people, and in the sense of justice of their elected representatives, to think for a minute that either will relegate any group of American citizens to the status of "colonials" if the circumstances are clearly understood. I urge that sugar legislation, as well as all other legislation, be drafted in accordance with the fundamental principles of our democracy, of extending to all our people equal rights and opportunities.

Great Strides Made in Organizing Southern Workingman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY RAY C. KIRKPATRICK, ASSISTANT ON LABOR RELATIONS, PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ray C. Kirkpatrick, assistant on labor relations, Public Works Administration, Federal Works Agency, before the Louisiana State Federation of Labor convention held at Shreveport, La., April 3, 1940:

I appreciate the opportunity of meeting with labor here in the deep South as the assistant on labor relations for the Public Works Administration. Mr. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and Col. E. W. Clark, Acting Commissioner of the Public Works Administration, extend to you their greetings and best wishes for the success of this convention.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me, a satisfaction I know is shared by you, to see the strides that have been taken in organizing the southern workingman as evidenced by the enthusiasm and progress demonstrated in this splendid convention. It is apparent that many of the obstacles that have presented themselves have been overcome by the hard work and splendid spirit of those engaged in accomplishing this organization.

I congratulate you on these efforts, for such organization, together with its attendant development, is highly desirable. Its benefits extend not only to you who achieved increased wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions; but also, far beyond you, to the community, State, and Nation. This organization of labor indicates that a great class, once lacking in means of presenting appropriately its needs and wants before the public, has now found an instrument through which it can exert its proper influence in society. Such organizing is an indication that our democracy has become more democratic, and that the public voice is now more coherent, as it expresses more comprehensively the aims and wishes of the people. The principle of unionism, in its broad sense, indicates that a great class of our society has banded together for mutual development. In the improving of this social class, a class that has been for too long unfavored, and to some degree oppressed, the social structure as a whole is stimulated and improved.

Labor spent centuries in securing recognition of this principle. Unionism has, until very recently, been automatically associated, in the public mind, with such terms as conspiracy, strikes, abuse, and violence. Few had realized or appreciated the true purpose of the movement. As a result, little recognition has until recently been given the labor cause in our legislative halls. In fact, it was not until 1932 that we obtained national leaders who were fully aware of the service organized labor could, and must, provide the Nation in assisting to adjust the many problems now resulting from our comp'ex society. In consequence of this new and sincere appreciation, however, there has been enacted more legislation favorable to labor since 1932 than in all the previous history of our Government.

You can all recall, I am sure, the national difficulties of this period. We were facing one of our great national crises. The story may be briefly told by reviewing a few statistics presented by the American Federation of Labor. Unemployment had climbed from 1,500,000 in 1929 to 3,216,000 in 1930. From there it rose steadily until, in 1931, the figure was 7,150,000. In 1932 there were 10,197,000 men without work, while in March 1933 a peak was reached when 13,689,000 wage earners were walking the streets seeking work. As a result, serious riots and disorders were widespread. Civil authorities had trouble controlling Americans desperate for bare necessities. Aroused from our smug assumption of superiority in everything, we were shaken by the necessity of facing the problem of feeding hungry millions, either through direct dole or by providing means whereby funds for necessities could be earned.

The situation was complicated by the ironical circumstance that there existed great excesses of all our staple commodities. As stated at that time by the late Will Rogers: "We got more wheat, more corn, more food, more cotton, more money in the banks, more everything in the world than any nation that has lived has had, yet we are starving to death. We are the first nation in the history of the world to go to the poorhouse in an automobile."

Faced with such a situation, the choice of the Government was clear. Some direct relief would be necessary to care for those in extreme need and for the unemployables, but more far-reaching measures had to be undertaken in order to adjust the disorganized economic machinery and to provide those seeking work with a long-range program of employment. Further, this employment must be of a productive nature, returning full value to the society that was providing it. Pauperism must not be encouraged or the national morale bankrupted.

There was adopted, therefore, a plan that long ago had been conceived, whereby such periods of depression were to be met by the initiating of a national program of public construction. The theory of the plan was that, in ordinary circumstances, public construction parallels a course charted by private construction, and there is a resulting competition between the two for labor and materials in good times and a common neglect of these items when difficult periods arrive. According to the plan, this process was to be reversed. In times of prosperity, no public construction not immediately necessary was to be undertaken, but projects were to be designed in such detail as to permit prompt construction. Upon the occurrence of a depression, a large construction program was then to be launched by public bodies throughout the country. By this means new pay rolls would be created at project sites, and old ones lengthened all along the industrial line because of multiplied material orders. There would result not only general relief to the distressed but also a needed impetus to the industrial machine adequate to accomplish the resumption of normal progress.

Applying this idea in 1933, the Government was faced with handicaps resulting from the fact that no planning for appropriate public works had been accomplished, with the exception of a program of Federal projects prepared by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board. As this new program must necessarily extend to non-Federal public bodies as well, the handicap of unpreparedness had to be overcome. This was accomplished by offering to applicants Federal grants in the amount of 30 percent of the cost of labor and materials in the project and long-term loans for the remainder of the money at a reasonable rate of interest. The amount of the grant was increased in subsequent appropriations to 45 percent of the project cost.

The plan worked very well. Thousands of schools, sewers, highways, and similar projects were soon under construction, with preparations being hastily made for many others. In all, 37,271 applications were submitted by public bodies requesting assistance in constructing needed and desirable civic improvements.

As a result, throughout the country, wheels began to turn, goods began to move, and men began lining up for pay envelopes, rather than swelling the lines at the relief agencies. In July 1934 there was a daily average of 657,200 men working directly on projects

financed by P. W. A. As the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has determined that for every man-hour of work created on the site of a P. W. A. project 2½ man-hours are created in providing the necessary materials, we may safely assume that for this period work was generated by P. W. A. sufficient to employ a daily average of 1,643,000 men.

The energy of the program vitalized our entire industrial structure. The power of the movement may be demonstrated by the fact that, in 1934, 74 percent of the total national cement output was used in P. W. A. projects.

A pointed illustration of the functions of this agency may be given by reciting its accomplishments here in Louisiana. Under the non-Federal program 228 projects have been, or are being, constructed, at an estimated cost of $52,156,078. Of this sum $20,493,081 represents grants from the Federal Government. Among these are 138 educational buildings, 40 sewers and waterworks, and 50 other useful public improvements.

In addition to the above expenditure, under the Federal phase of this program there have been constructed in Louisiana 228 projects, at a total cost of $26,770,189. These funds have been entirely provided by the Federal Government. As a result of both the Federal and non-Federal phases of the Public Works Administration program, therefore, 456 projects have been constructed in your State estimated to cost $78,926,267.

There is no one here who is not now enjoying directly the benefits of some of these projects. All of you know that each one was built under careful supervision and is an asset to the State and community; all of you know that these projects were constructed under the normal contract method; and all of you know that the workmen employed on those projects received prevailing rates of pay and worked not in excess of 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week.

The P. W. A. is at the present time being liquidated. In the absence of additional legislation this program will be substantially completed next June 30. Consequently, it has been necessary to return applications for P. W. A. allotments on 117 Louisiana projects, desired and needed by the people of this State, estimated to cost $32,433,684.

There are those that feel that industry has responded sufficiently to carry on without the spark of further public spending. Others, however, see the need of continuing this agency. There can be no doubt as to the tremendous waste, in both experience and ability, that will result from the complete dismemberment of an organization through which 34,508 projects, estimated to cost over $6,000,000,000, have been constructed in a manner so efficient and free from favoritism as to win universal respect.

There are now pending in Congress various legislative measures sponsored by Senator WAGNER, Senator MEADE, Senator ANDREWS, and others, any one of which, if passed, will continue in some form the functions of this agency.

The outcome of these proposals is unknown, but whatever the future holds for P. W. A. those familiar with its record will be proud of its past. It has more than fulfilled expectations in its service to labor, industry, and the Nation.

Mattress-Making Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. SOUTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Grover B. Hill, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
WASHINGTON, *April 27, 1940.*

Hon. CHARLES L. SOUTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHARLES: You are cordially invited to attend a mattress-making demonstration which will be conducted in the patio of the Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, commencing Monday, April 29, and lasting through Tuesday, May 7. This is one feature of the Department's program for increasing the domestic consumption of surplus cotton. The mattresses will actually be made in the same manner that they are being made in the States. A farm family will do the work of making the mattresses.

We would like very much for you to see this work, as it will give you an opportunity to know, at first hand, one of the methods that is being used to stimulate the use of cotton by people who need it. The cotton and ticking are made available under section 32 funds and the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1940. Under the program, any farm family whose cash income is $400 or less may qualify for a mattress, which they make themselves with the assistance of various agencies of the Department. To date the following States are making mattresses: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, and Virginia.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting this display a day or so ago, and I was very much gratified and greatly encouraged by what I saw there, and by the information which was furnished me by the fine farm family, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Jones, and their two children, Dorothy, age 15, and Malcolm, age 11, of Brown County, Tex. The Joneses, who reside in my congressional district, have cooperated with extension-service agents in Brown County for 25 years and are volunteer local leaders in the mattress program.

All of us who have given serious study to the question of surplus farm commodities agree that the problem is one of underconsumption rather than of overproduction. For this reason, in the past few years there have been many campaigns to encourage the use of various articles, such as cotton hose, and so forth, and much has been said about the relatively infinitesimal quantity of cotton used in the manufacture of so-called woolen goods. The amount of cotton used in these ways is small indeed, in comparison to that utilized in the cotton-mattress program which is now being sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. At least 50 pounds of cotton is required for each mattress. Ten mattresses, then, dispose of an entire 500-pound bale of cotton, and at the same time a local want is supplied.

It has been definitely established that the greatest need for these cotton mattresses is in the sections of the country where a large surplus of cotton is produced.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge that each Member of Congress, especially those from cotton-producing areas, visit this splendid display and lend their encouragement and endorsement to the program which is being carried on by the farm families themselves under the supervision and with the full cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department in this constructive effort to reduce our burdensome cotton surplus.

President Justified in Placing Civil Aeronautics Authority in Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER NETWORK OF NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, as chairman of the Select House Committee on Reorganization, I have been asked to comment on Reorganization Plan No. IV, which includes the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce.

Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has been demanded by every outstanding organization of businessmen in the country, and every platform of both of the major political parties for years has contained a paragraph pledging the party to bring about proper reorganization.

By reason of the position that I occupy as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments ever since that committee was established, I have been appointed by the Speaker of the House to membership on every Select Committee on Reorganization in the last 10 years. My first service on such a committee was during the administration of President Hoover. I supported in committee and on the floor of the House a resolution delegating to President Hoover far more power on this subject than was ever delegated to President Roosevelt, or, in fact, any President in the history of the country by any reorganization plan.

When the Democrats secured control of the Congress in the last 2 years of the Hoover administration I became chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. After the defeat of Mr. Hoover in 1932 in the December session of Congress, he submitted a reorganization plan, and among his recommendations was the transfer of the work which had always been performed by the United States Army engineers in connection with rivers and harbors and flood-control projects to the Department of the Interior to be placed in the hands of civil engineers. Republicans and Democrats alike, as well as the great metropolitan newspapers of the country, opposed this plan. Hearings were held by the committee and, in the end, when Colonel Roop, Mr. Hoover's Budget Director, in response to my question, stated that in his opinion it would be for the best interest of the country if the incoming President, Mr. Roosevelt, was permitted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, the committee promptly rejected the Hoover plan. Aside from this, I have supported every recommendation made by a President, Republican or Democrat, since I have been in Congress that had for its purpose the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

While there is a Nation-wide demand for reorganization, still, when efforts are made in this direction, invariably opposition develops from those who have a selfish interest. When the bill now known as the Reorganization Act of 1939 was under consideration, 20 independent agencies of the Government were exempted. In exempting these 20 independent agencies the Congress forbade the President from taking from they any of their activities. This handicapped the President in his efforts to regroup Government agencies. While the bill was under consideration in the House, and also in the Senate, an amendment was offered in the House by Mr. RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and in the Senate by Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to also exempt the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The amendment was defeated in both Houses. Therefore the President was absolutely within his right in making the recommendation that he had. Immediately following this recommendation there was an organized movement started to discredit the President's action. A number of outstanding pilots personally came to Washington and protested the abolishment of the Air Safety Board. They classified themselves as a "lobby to save lives." Probably no family in the United States is a more liberal patron of the air lines than the President's family. There is hardly a day that some member of his family is not traveling by air. Can anyone conceive that the President is not interested in air safety? While the President has submitted four plans providing for reorganization to the Congress, there has been practically no opposition to his recommendations with the exception of the proposal to place the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the Department of Commerce, which is included in plan No. IV.

This proposal has given rise to a great deal of criticism which, unfortunately, is based upon misinformation and faulty assumptions, but which, if permitted to go unchallenged, may carry some weight and tend to defeat the proposal. Therefore, it seems fitting to correctly state a few of the significant facts involved. The Civil Aeronautics Authority was created under the act of 1938. It consists of three agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, an Administrator, and the Air Safety Board, consisting of three members.

Now let us see just exactly what the President proposes to do. In the interest of efficiency and economy, he places the Civil Aeronautics Authority under the Secretary of Commerce. In doing so he abolishes the Air Safety Board. Do not for one moment feel the President abolishes the functions of this Board. He does not, because he has no power under existing law to abolish functions. He transfers the work that has been performed by the Board to the Civil Aeronautics Board. What he does is to abolish two jobs, two members of the Air Safety Board. The law sets up three members for this Board, but there is one vacancy at the present time. The President says the Civil Aeronautics Board will be able to effectively carry forward the important work of accident investigation heretofore performed by the Air Safety Board. The present employees will be retained with the exception of the two Board members; the work of investigation will proceed, the only difference being that it will be under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board, rather than the Air Safety Board.

The President specifically provides in his order—I quote his language—"The five-member Board (speaking of the Civil Aeronautics Board), however, will perform its rule-making, adjudicative, and investigative functions independent of the Department." Thus you see the Board retains its independence, even though placed in the Department of Commerce. The Department will supply in the interest of efficiency and economy budgeting, accounting, procurement, and other office service. The Department has divisions for this purpose already functioning. Is there any harm in making use of them, thus saving money?

The law creating the Civil Aeronautics Authority did not specifically define the duties of the Administrator. In plan No. III the President clarified his duties. Let me read what the President said. I quote:

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

"I propose to clarify the relations of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the five-member Board of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Administrator is made the chief administrative officer of the Authority with respect to all functions other than those relating to economic regulation and certain other activities primarily of a rule-making and adjudicative character which are entrusted to the Board. This will eliminate the confusion of responsibilities existing under the Civil Aeronautics Act and provide a more clear-cut and effective plan of organization for the agency."

Did you hear any objection to that proposal? No. On the contrary, the President was commended because the law did not specifically define the responsibilities of the Authority and the Administrator. The President in plan No. III separated rule-making and adjudicative functions from those of an administrative nature. By so doing he does away with the duplication of work that now exists in some instances.

Let us get back to the Air Safety Board. Every statement I make now I have confirmed. The principal duties of the Board is to make investigations of accidents. When they complete their investigations, they simply make a report to the Authority and, if warranted, make specific recommendations for regulations, and so forth. The Safety Board has absolutely no authority beyond investigation and the submission of recommendations. They have no power to make rules or regulations. Their duties end when they submit their report.

Now what has the Authority been doing? It has a separate investigating division. The inspectors of the Authority in connection with safety have, in the course of their duties, when an accident occurred, made an investigation of their own.

Here you have a situation where there are two sets of investigators, investigating the same accident, cooperating at times, up to a certain point, but when it comes to making the actual report of the investigation they are off on a separate tangent. You now have two reports. It it not clearly apparent that under the present set-up there is a duplication of effort at the expense of the taxpayers? If the President's order is approved, this will be eliminated, but there will be a thorough investigation of every accident as there is today.

I do not say the Air Safety Board has not functioned properly, but from its own statement before the Committee on Appropriations it shows they are in arrears over 1,000 accident dockets which have not been analyzed and acted upon by the Board. The argument that the activities of the Air Safety Board will not be continued under the proposed plan of the President is not based upon facts. The functions, as I stated before, cannot be abolished. The law must be carried out; the President or no public official has the power to refuse to do so. Just as long as the Congress provides funds for the operation of the law these functions will continue unless the law is amended.

In order that the public might fully understand Federal expenditures for civil aviation, let me say that during the present fiscal year the enormous sum of over $108,000,000 will be expended. This money comes from the taxpayers. It should be properly safeguarded. The sum warrants that the President be continually advised of the operations and he is setting up a plan now whereby he will get this information weekly from the Secretary of Commerce at Cabinet meetings. As it is, the organization is one of over a hundred agencies that has no representation at Cabinet meetings. Civil aviation is the fastest-growing industry in the United States today. It will continue to expand for years to come. Last December, according to the chairman of the Authority, America's total investment in civil aviation amounted to over $600,000,000 and this was growing monthly. It will soon be a billion-dollar investment if it has not already reached that figure. Does this not justify representation at the Cabinet meetings? Aside from this, civil aviation is closely related to national defense. At this very moment civilian instructors of the Authority are training Army Air Corps pilots in Army airplanes on commercial fields. It is a complicated problem, according to the officials of the Authority, which requires frequent conferences. This is a proper subject to be discussed at Cabinet meetings when the Secretaries of Commerce, War, and Navy are all present.

If another Government department is ever established—and I think the day will come when it is—it will be the Department of Transportation, with all forms of transportation—railroads, motor carriers, waterways, and air—under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who will be a member of the President's Cabinet.

The question as to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who would probably be directly in contact with civil aeronautics, has been discussed. The charge was made that neither of the Assistant Secretaries is sufficiently informed to assume this place. With this I do not agree, but only yesterday the President sent to the Senate the name of John Monroe Johnson, now an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This creates a vacancy, and, while I have no information as to who will be appointed to this important post, I can certainly visualize the President selecting a man who will be well qualified in aviation. The opportunity is present, and the President will undoubtedly take advantage of it.

To defeat the President's proposal would be a distinct set-back for civil aviation. He realizes the importance of the problem by providing a set-up which advances rather than retards progress. When the public and Members of Congress realize just what he has done, they will condemn the efforts of the group, which has a selfish interest, to impede the advancement of this fast-growing industry. I thank you.

The P. W. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY RAY C. KIRKPATRICK, ASSISTANT ON LABOR RELATIONS, PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ray C. Kirkpatrick, assistant on labor relations, Public Works Administration, Federal Works Agency, at the convention of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 1, 1940:

It is a personal pleasure for me to have this opportunity of meeting the representatives of labor in Pennsylvania and seeing again President McDevitt, George Walters, president of the State Building and Construction Trades Council, and other old friends. I am representing the Public Works Administration as the assistant on labor relations. Mr. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and Col. E. W. Clark, Acting Commissioner of the Public Works Administration, have instructed me to extend their greetings to this great convention.

I desire to preface these few remarks by acknowledging my appreciation of the splendid cooperation that has been extended me and the Public Works Administration by organized labor in this State. We had a big job to do, and, in order to do it well, we had to have your help. The 1,589 projects that this Administration has sponsored in Pennsylvania are outstanding evidences of the extent of this help.

There have been many unusual features about the P. W. A. program, one of which is the method adopted in providing the relief for those unemployed. You can undoubtedly recall the social conditions of the 1933 period when P. W. A. was organized. It was estimated by the American Federation of Labor that between 13 and 15 million men were without work or regular income. As construction had dropped to one-third of its 1929 peak, the building and construction trades were among those labor groups most seriously affected. In approaching this problem, the newly elected administration supplemented the time-honored method of subsidizing industry from the top in the hope that help would trickle down to the needy wage earner. Through a gigantic construction program, a means was afforded of insuring the workingman an income. As wages are soon spent for necessities, the monetary turn-over, coupled with the tremendous necessary material orders, would stimulate industry from the bottom as well as the top, and result in genuine, far-reaching relief. The success of this phase of the program may be shown by the fact that during the 80 months following June 1933, P. W. A. has been responsible for material orders to the Nation's industries amounting to over $3,000,000,000, averaging about $39,000,000 per month. During the same time, over a billion and one-half dollars have been paid out in wages at construction sites.

Many other factors made this program attractive. Although based upon an emergency unemployment situation, it is, nevertheless, economically sound. In addition to the relief of workmen and industry, resulting from the employment provided for many hundred thousand men, there will remain after the program is completed thousands of socially desirable and socially necessary public works. The greater amount of the construction under the non-Federal phase of the program has been in the form of the 6,680 school buildings, 2,411 waterworks systems, 2,056 hospitals, and 1,524 sewer systems. Aid has also been rendered in the construction of those great nationally desirable projects such as the Grand Coulee Dam, Triborough Bridge, and your own $65,000,000 superhighway.

From June 1933 to March 1940 P. W. A. allotted funds for the construction of some 34,469 Federal and non-Federal projects, having a total estimated construction cost of nearly $6,000,000,000. It is worthy of note that these projects have been built under the normal contract method.

Although there is still unemployment and many still in need, there is no question but that this and similar measures have overcome the extreme distress and despair prevalent in the early years of this decade.

In a time when foreign armies are marching forth on missions of death and destruction, it should be a source of great satisfaction that we in America are engaged in constructing instruments to serve mankind. Whereas other armies are creating chaos and misery, our workers are contributing not only to their own well-being but also to national progress and security.

Organized labor has been a great help in administering this program, and every care has been exercised that labor should receive the recognition demanded in consideration of the part it has played in accomplishing the purposes of the program. An example of the attitude assumed by the Public Works Administration toward the labor movement is found in the fact that unions, along with agencies of the United States Employment Service, are the only sources from which employees can be obtained for P. W. A. projects. In addition, there is included in every contract under this program, those provisions with which you are familiar—guaranteeing, among other features, the payment of prevailing rates of pay; the right to organize and bargain collectively through employee-chosen representatives; and prohibiting persons from working more than 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week.

These provisions indicate, in a degree, the development of the labor movement. After centuries of struggle, the workingman is achieving his proper place in our national life. Under this great democracy labor has finally been awarded that recognition and understanding so necessary for the accomplishment of its purpose of emancipating the wage earner. The workingman is being given a greater opportunity to assist in directing the destiny of that America in the construction of which he has been such a dominant factor.

In my position as coordinator between the labor organizations, contractors, and the Public Works Administration, I have learned to appreciate the importance of cooperation of labor in undertakings of such magnitude as the P. W. A. It is, of course, entirely appropriate that we should thus have worked together, for in a general sense we have had common ends. The fundamental aims of the P. W. A. have been to assist those in need and, through this assistance, revitalize the industrial machine. In such a cause we expected organized labor as an ally and in our expectations we have not been disappointed.

Because of this program, $386,156,766 have been expended for construction in this State. Of this sum, an estimated 35.8 percent, or $138,244,122, has been paid to workmen for on-site employment. The United States Department of Labor Statistics, after an extensive study, has estimated that, for every hour of work created on a P. W. A. project, 2½ hours are created in those industries providing the necessary materials. It may be safely said, therefore, that as a result of the P. W. A. program in Pennsylvania approximately $300,000,000 has been paid in wages to labor. In consequence of this employment, you are now enjoying or will soon enjoy the services of some 1,589 projects approved by the people to be served and the P. W. A. as to construction, design, and utility.

There are those who feel that this administration has accomplished its purposes or that a furtherance of its purposes may be better attained by other means. That the people of Pennsylvania do not subscribe to this view is indicated from the fact that 914 Pennsylvania applications for projects estimated to cost over $288,000,000 have been returned to the applicants because of the lack of funds.

The P. W. A. is now in process of liquidation. In the absence of an additional appropriation, this construction program will be brought rapidly to a close. There are, however, now pending in Congress bills designed to perpetuate in one of various forms the purposes of this administration.

Although the future is unknown, we who have been associated with this organization are proud of its past. We are proud of the honest and efficient disbursement of over $6,000,000,000 of public funds. We are proud that a means has been determined whereby the Government may constructively aid the wage earners. We are proud that assurance has been received that organized labor will cooperate in carrying forward such a program.

National Institute of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR., SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau before the National Institute of Government at Washington, D. C., Friday, May 3, 1940:

I am particularly pleased to be able to talk to you today, because I am in such hearty accord with the purpose of this series of meetings, which I understand to be education for democracy. I applaud the initiative and the public spirit of the leaders of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee in making this notable convention possible.

In considering your invitation it seemed to me that I might contribute most to stimulation of your thought on the problems of democratic government by talking to you about the money of the United States, and particularly about gold. I have chosen this subject because I think it is one in which all of you are interested; and it is one about which you may be asked a good many questions as the year proceeds.

One thing you will hardly need to be told about our monetary system; that is, that the American dollar is the soundest unit of currency in the world. Its value is unquestioned here at home and it is not questioned anywhere else in the world. It is a solid rock of strength and stability amid all the monetary confusion created by aggression and war. It is more than a domestic currency; it has become in the last few years more and more an international currency. People throughout the world who are driven by disaster and fear to hoard currency prefer to hoard the currency of the United States when they can get it.

We have tried through many means to facilitate stability in the currencies of the world. An outstanding example is the Tripartite Accord which we initiated in September 1936. In all, six of the leading democracies of the world have subscribed to the principles of that accord. Unfortunately the progress we were making in the field of international finance and trade has been interrupted by the cataclysm in Europe.

One of the most striking developments of these recent years has been the universal confidence in the American dollar as one of the very few certain things in a highly uncertain world.

Some of our citizens who admit the strength of the dollar and the world's confidence in our currency now suggest that confidence in our dollar has resulted in this country receiving too much gold.

During the last 6 years we have acquired about $10,000,000,000 of gold from abroad.

Why has so much gold come to the United States?

In the first place, we have exported many billions of dollars' worth of goods and services in excess of the amounts we have imported. Secondly, large amounts of foreign funds have come to this country to be placed and kept on deposit with our banks. Foreigners have sent their funds here for safekeeping because of the peace, stability, and security which this country enjoys.

Thirdly, foreigners have made large investments in American industries because they regard American business as a safe and profitable investment. Finally, Americans have been withdrawing their funds from abroad and liquidating their foreign investments in large sums because they prefer the dollar to any other currency.

It is for these reasons that we have had so large a favorable balance of payments; it is for these reasons that gold has come and is continuing to come to the United States.

Gold moves from country to country, not as a commodity but as a means of payment—the one final medium through which international settlements are made.

The continued acceptance of the gold that comes here is the only sound course of action open to us. There are, it is true, other courses of action theoretically possible, but they would all have disastrous consequences.

Take, for example, the proposal so frequently made to us that we stop buying gold. It has the charm of simplicity. All that we have to do is to issue an appropriate Treasury order. But let me tell you what I think would happen. Dollars abroad would instantly become very scarce and more costly, and the foreigner would find it much more expensive to buy American goods. For example, the British pound, the Canadian dollar, the French franc, the Dutch guilder would at once sharply depreciate. A chain of forces would be set in motion which would disrupt our trade, seriously discourage what remains of world commerce, and remove from world finance the strongest element of stability.

The cessation of gold purchases would have the following three immediate effects of great importance to us:

Firstly, the sale of American products in foreign markets would be made much more difficult. This would not apply so much to war materials, which foreign countries want so urgently, but it would hit hard our export of hundreds of agricultural and industrial commodities not vital to the conduct of the war. We would lose heavily in the very markets we will badly need when the war is over.

Secondly, there would result an immediate flood of imports of cheapened foreign goods, which would deal an even more serious blow to labor, industry, and agriculture in America. The very items which compete with our domestic products would deluge our home markets. Meat and dairy products, textiles, and hundreds of other articles would at once be subjected to greatly intensified competition from abroad.

Thirdly, Americans who have investments abroad would find that they had suffered substantial dollar losses overnight, just as foreigners with investments here would find that they had windfall gains overnight.

So you see this simple remedy is, in effect, a proposal that would completely disrupt our foreign exchanges and our trade and greatly increase unemployment in this country. And so with the other naive proposals which some well-meaning citizens suggest as a remedy for our accumulating gold stocks.

Shall we follow their advice and cut the price for gold? A moderate cut would be ineffective and a cut in price sufficiently large to have a significant effect on the gold inflow would introduce the same conditions as would follow prohibition of gold imports. This also would cause a serious decrease in our trade and a big increase in unemployment.

Shall we, as some have suggested, discriminate against certain countries in our purchases of gold? Such a policy would not even have the virtue of effectiveness. The active cooperation of practically the entire world would be required to prevent any one country's gold from entering the world's markets and reaching the United States. Obviously this would be impossible even in normal times, let alone at a time such as this. Besides, the value of gold is proportionate to its unqualified use and acceptance as an international medium of exchange. To limit its acceptance would mean to reduce its usefulness.

There is yet another alternative which has always been open to us. Instead of taking gold we could have granted credit. Americans could again have accumulated huge unsettled claims abroad. We have had experience with that system—extensive experience—in the decade that ended with the economic collapse of 1929. It is doubtful that Americans would want to repeat that experience.

For the excess of goods we shipped and for the dollar credits we granted we have taken gold in the last 6 years instead of promissory notes. The phrase "good as gold" still has real meaning in the world. I prefer the gold to pieces of foreign paper. I think most Americans agree with me.

Our gold policy is carefully adjusted to the realities of a complex world situation. There have been many glib suggestions for changing that policy. Examination of each of these suggestions has revealed, as in the examples I have mentioned, that in the effort to remedy fancied evils they would bring on real disaster.

Of course, should basic conditions alter, should we be confronted with new and unforeseen economic and political developments, the Government will necessarily take such action as will best protect American interests. It is to be prepared for such contingencies that the powers with respect to gold operations have been kept flexible. The Treasury is constantly observing, analyzing, and studying the course of events in their relation to monetary problems in which this country is interested. But nothing has yet appeared which would warrant any change in our gold policy.

There is only one sound way in which we can work to reduce the inflow of gold and to promote the return of at least a part of the wealth it represents to useful service in the lands from which it came. That way is to do everything in our power to contribute to the return of peace to the world and to encourage reconstruction and the restoration of normal trade. With the restoration of enduring peace and economic stability abroad, the gold problem will solve itself. Our great export surplus will drop—not because we shall sell less abroad but because we shall buy more. Foreign capital will be gradually repatriated—not because we drive it out but because it is attracted home by the reemergence of security abroad. Our investors will once again invest their funds abroad—not because of the scarcity of opportunity at home but because of greatly enhanced opportunities for sound and profitable investments in other lands. And finally our tourists will spend hundreds of millions more in foreign countries.

These are the developments which will automatically and gradually direct the flow of gold away from the United States. These are the developments upon which we must concentrate. We must concentrate on the promotion of further recovery here and peace and security abroad not in order to correct the gold situation, but because prosperity, peace, and security are in themselves the supreme ends of governmental policy. That their attainment will also solve the world's gold problem is only a byproduct, but an important one.

I should like finally to turn to the question of the continued usefulness of the gold we have and the gold we are going to get. This is a matter that is troubling some people.

Let me reassure you once and for all. As long as there are independent nations, and as long as there is international trade in goods and services, so long will it be necessary to settle international balances. Gold is the international medium of exchange par excellence. Its acceptability is universal; its utility as international money survives changes in economic systems. It is used and needed just as much by the freest democracies as by the most rigid dictatorships, as much by capitalist economies as by socialist economies. It is the refined instrument of international exchange of goods and services, as well as an essential ingredient in the more complex international financial transactions, an instrument that has functioned without challenge for hundreds of years. Every foreign country wishes it had more of it; no foreign country likes to lose any of it; all countries accumulate it as soon as they can afford to do so. And the fact that some countries find it possible to conduct their international trade without gold does not mean that they prefer to do so any more than people reading by candlelight do so, because they prefer candles to electricity.

Gold does not lose its value because some countries are forced to resort to clearing arrangements, barter, import controls, and other substitutes. All these substitutes are admittedly worse alternatives. They are methods of conducting trade and finance which will only be adopted when a country does not possess adequate gold holdings. Governments resort wholly to these substitute methods for keeping a country's balance of payments in equilibrium only during times of great and prolonged stress and instability, and only when for one reason or another they have been unable to prevent the loss of most of their gold holdings. All countries would like to have more gold, and the countries which have the least are, you will find, countries which are striving most to add to their gold holdings. They do so because they know that an adequate supply of gold promotes economic strength and furthers financial stability.

To be sure, if the political picture of the world should undergo a drastic change in the future, so that instead of 50 or 60 independent nations there should exist only one or two groups dominated by ruthless powers, then international trade and finance may

assume the character of domestic trade. There would cease to be independent monetary systems, as there would cease to be independent foreign policies. Balances between countries would be settled as balances between our States are now settled; that is, by transfers of deposits. Under such circumstances it might well be that gold would no longer be needed. But under those circumstances life would be so different that the possible loss in the value of gold would, I am sure, be the least of our troubles.

Certain governments may boast of the day when independent democracies will disappear. I, for one, have no fears that such boasts can be made good. I am as confident that gold will continue to be used as the medium of international payments as I am that the majority of nations will succeed in maintaining their independence. With the return of peace and of normal economic and political relationships, the present barriers to the free flow of goods, capital, and services will be gradually lowered, and gold will inevitably play its indispensable role in making that result possible.

One word more—the exchange we made and are making in return for gold is a good bargain for us. It has enabled us to increase employment and recovery. It has made possible the utilization of labor, capital, machinery, and resources that would otherwise have been idle. We have expanded our exports and encouraged our domestic industry. And, moreover, we have at the same time acquired the safest physical asset in the world.

There are some sincere people who have been disturbed by stories that this country had a monetary policy that threatens to cause loss to the Nation. If you meet such people I hope you will reassure them. You may tell them that the greatest and richest country of the world has the best and soundest monetary system and that there is no reason to fear that it will not remain sound.

We can feel entirely comfortable in the possession of a supply of gold with which we can meet future demands on our monetary system without any shock to our economy. We can be prepared also to play the part we ought to play in the reconstruction of the world that must follow the senseless destruction of war.

Antialien Bills Menace America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said throughout the Nation on pending legislation designed to embarrass aliens within their land. Since I believe any attack upon any minority group is dangerous, I am happy to extend a declaration by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born. This declaration is signed by more than 200 prominent American citizens and as many organizations of the American people. The statement with the list of signers follows:

DECLARATION TO CONGRESS

The war conditions throughout the world today increase the danger of intolerance and prejudice against the foreign-born similar to those which culminated in the Palmer raids of 1920. Noncitizens are being dismissed from their jobs and are being intimidated by threats of discrimination, deportation, concentration camps, fingerprinting, and registration. The noncitizen is being wrongly blamed for unemployment, crime, espionage, and sabotage.

An attempt is being made to disrupt American organizations and to divert the attention of the American people from a thorough consideration of our domestic problems by blaming the noncitizen for our difficulties. America was discovered by immigrants. Our Government, our Constitution, and our customs were molded by immigrants. Our railroads, our factories, our roads, and our industries were built with immigrant labor.

A careful analysis of the antialien bills considered by the Seventy-sixth Congress and several State legislatures discloses that it is these bills that menace America and not the so-called alien. Every one of the antialien proposals would restrict the constitutional rights of all Americans, native and foreign-born, citizen and noncitizen, Negro and white.

The representatives of the American people in Congress and in the State legislatures must not be misled into adopting un-American proposals based upon the false charges and demagogic propaganda leveled against the foreign-born.

As Americans, we pledge to devote ourselves to defending the rights of the noncitizen and the foreign-born, regardless of place of birth, political, economic, social, or religious belief. We invite all those who believe in democracy to join with us in our efforts to preserve the principles of liberty and justice as provided in the Bill of Rights and in the Constitution of the United States.

SIGNERS

The following signed the above declaration: Josephine Truslow Adams, Louis Adamic, Dr. Thomas Addis, Dr. Janet Rankin Aiken, Sherwood Anderson, Brooks Atkinson, Emily G. Balch, Tallulah Bankhead, Margaret Culkin Banning, Harry Elmer Barnes, Dr. Charles A. Beard, Lewis Alan Berne, Mary McLeod Bethune, Rabbi Philip Bernstein, Alice Stone Blackwell, Dr. Franz Boas, Prof. Edwin Borchard, Ohio State Senator William M. Boyd, Dr. Ralph P. Bridgeman, Van Wyck Brooks, Prof. Francis J. Brown, Prof. Edwin Berry Burgum, Prof. Walter B. Cannon, Frank Capra, Prof. Haakon M. Chevalier, Prof. Edward P. Cheyney, Sarah Cleghorn, Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, Dr. Ada L. Comstock, Edward Corsi, Howard Costigan, Dr. George S. Counts, Dr. Leonard Covello, Dr. Herbert Davis, Jerome Davis.

Also: Prof. John Dewey, Carl Van Doren, Prof. Dorothy Douglas, Dr. Harl Douglass, Prof. Leslie C. Dunn, Will Durant, Prof. Horace A. Eaton, Prof. Mildred Fairchild, Dr. Ernest Feise, Edgar J. Fisher, Osmond K. Fraenkel, Waldo Frank, Rabbi Solomon, B. Freehof, Donald S. Friede, Lewis Gannett, Prof. Christian Gauss, Dr. Frank P. Graham, Edward Everett Hale, Dr. Roswell G. Ham, Prof. Frank N. Hankins, Prof. Ralph S. Harlow, Prof. Benjamin Harrow, Ernest Hemingway, Donald Henderson, Prof. Melville J. Herskovits, Dr. Frank Ernest Hill, Sidney Hillman, Prof. Norman Hines.

Also: Charles H. Houston, Leo Huberman, Prof. Ellsworth Huntington, Fannie Hurst, Rev. William Lloyd Imes, Inez Haynes Irwin, Hon. Stanley Isaacs, Rabbi Edward L. Israel, Dr. Charles S. Johnson, Matthew Josephson, Rockwell Kent, Dorothy Kenyon, Prof. William H. Kilpatrick, Carol King, Prof. Otto Klineberg, Alfred Kroymborg, Prof. Oliver W. Larkin, Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, Dr. Emil Lengyel, Prof. Max Lerner, Dr. William Ellery Leonard, Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman, Johanna M. Lindlof, Robert Morss Lovett, Rev. Sidney Lovett, Max Lowenthal, Dr. J. A. MacCallum, Dr. Gerald Machacek, Dr. Henry N. MacCracken, Dr. Malcolm S. MacLean.

Also: Albert Maltz, Paul Manship, Utah State Representative P. S. Marthakis, Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Prof. F. O. Mathiessen, Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Carey McWilliams, Dr. Paul Monroe, Prof. D. H. Mowrer, Prof. Gardner Murphy, Prof. Alonzo F. Myers, Dr. Reinhold Neibuhr, Judge Patrick H. O'Brien, Clifford Odets, Hon. Culbert L. Olson, O. M. Orton, Prof. Bernhard Ostrolenk, Prof. Ernest Minor Patterson, William Pickens, Francis A. Preveden, Prof. Max Radin.

Also: Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, Frederick L. Redefer, Prof. Joseph S. Roucek, Dr. Harold Rugg, Charles Edward Russell, Reid Robinson, Rose Schneiderman, Adelaide Schulkind, Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Prof. Vida D. Scudder, George Seldes, Prof. Harlow Shapley, Irwin Shaw, Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, Prof. George W. Simpson, Upton Sinclair, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Prof. Bernhard J. Stern, Donald Ogden Stewart, Maxwell S. Stewart, Prof. C. Fayette Taylor, Prof. Robert K. Speer, Prof. Hans Otto Storm, Prof. Harold C. Urey, Oswald Garrison Villard, Mary Heaton Vorse, Dr. J. Raymond Walsh, Dr. Harry F. Ward, Prof. Colston E. Warne, Max Weber, Prof. Louis Wesinir, Prof. Philip Wheelwright, Rev. Wayne White, Thornton Wilder, Prof. Carl Wittke, L. Hollingsworth Wood, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, Dr. Max Yergan.

TRADE UNIONS

C. I. O.: United Automobile Workers of America, Packard Local, Detroit, Local 51, Local 174, Local 208; United Shoe Workers of America; Packinghouse Workers' Council of Chicago; New Jersey State Council, Steel Workers' Organizing Committee; New Jersey State C. I. O.; United Construction Workers' Organizing Committee; Farm Equipment Organizing Committee; United Federal Workers; Social Service Employees' Union, Local 19; Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; American Communications Association; Furriers' Joint Council of New York; Cleaners and Laundry Workers' Union, Local 188B; United Cannery Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America; United Office and Professional Workers, Chicago, Local 16; C. I. O. Maritime Committee; Transport Workers' Union, Local 100; C. I. O. Women's Auxiliary; Pecan Workers' Union, Local 172, San Antonio, Tex.

A. F. of L.: Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' League of America, New York Local Joint Board, Local 16; Cafeteria Employees' Union, Local 302, Local 1050, Philadelphia; Cigar Makers' International Union, Local 500, Tampa; Delicatessen and Cafeteria Workers' Union, Local 410, Newark; Chefs, Cooks, and Pastry Cooks, Local 89; Hotel and Club Employees' Union, Local 6; Cleaners, Dyers, Pressers' Union, Local 239; American Federation of Teachers, Philadelphia.

Independent: International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Baltimore Joint Board, Local 48; Workers Alliance of America.

CIVIL-RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Senator Nowak's Club, Detroit; Ladies' New Deal Club, Detroit; Maryland Democrats; Washington Commonwealth Federation; Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; Equality Magazine, New York; Harlem Legislative Conference; Descendants of the American Revolution; American Friends' Service Committee; Professional League for Civil Rights, Detroit; Greater New York Emergency Conference; National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; American Society for Race Tolerance; International Labor Defense; Philadelphia Conference on Alien Legislation; Civil Rights Federation, Detroit; Illinois Conference for Social Legislation; Midwest Civil Liberties Conference, Church League for Industrial Democracy; Council Against Intolerance in America; Women's League to Combat Anti-Semitism, Illinois; Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation; League for Protection of Minority Rights, Pittsburgh; American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; Cleveland Council for American Unity; Chicago Federation

of Settlements; American Civil Liberties Union; Maryland Civil Liberties Committee; Chicago Civil Liberties Committee; Lake County, Ill., Civil Liberties Committee.

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

Academy of Political and Social Sciences; National Lawyers' Guild; League of American Writers.

NEGRO ORGANIZATIONS

National Negro Congress, Caribbean Union, Jamaica Unity Club.

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

Washington Youth Council, American Student Union.

FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

Workmen's Benefit Fund, International Workers Order.

LANGUAGE ORGANIZATIONS

National Council of Jewish Women; American Jewish Congress, Women's Division, Youth Division; Bulgarian Educational Club; Sino-Korean People's League; Filipino-American Citizens' Council; Committee for the Protection of Filipino Rights, California; Association of Lithuanian Workers; Kearney, N. J., Lithuanian Society; Lithuanian Literature Society, Chicago; Federation of Progressive Lithuanian Societies, Cleveland; Lithuanian Societies of Waterbury, Conn.; Lettish Workers Unity; German-American League for Culture; Comite Pro Democracia Cubana; Comite Femeninos Unidos de Ayuda Espana; Comite Pro Democracia Espanola; National Congress of Spanish Speaking Peoples, California; United Ukrainian Toilers; Jewish Peoples Committee; Jugoslav Labors Non-Partisan League, Ohio; Finnish Workers Federation; Czech American National Alliance; American Czechoslovak Foundation; Slovak and Czech United Organizations, Pittsburgh; Pancyprian Brotherhood; Greek Educational Spartacus Club; St. Sophia Greek Church; League for Protection of Greek Immigrants; Armenian Progressive League, New York District; United Hungarian Societies; People's Voice, Detroit; American Friends of the Chinese People; Slavodnahec, Pittsburgh; Serbian National Federation, Branch 166; United Croatian Societies; Radnicki Glasnik, Pittsburgh; Croatian American Womens Society, Union City, N. J.; Croatian Fraternal Union; Croatian Singing Society of New Jersey; United Istrian Societies; Polish National Alliance.

Accident and Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., OF MISSOURI

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made before the Accident and Health Underwriters of St. Louis on April 23:

I am delighted to have the opportunity of discussing with you some of your problems, as they appear from the standpoint of one who is not a member of your profession, and to congratulate you upon the real contributions which you have made, and will continue to make toward the stability and prosperity of this great community in which we live. Your endeavors afford not only an unmistakeable index of business solvency, but of the social well-being and relative happiness of your fellow citizens, both from the standpoint of the welfare of the individual and society as a whole—the protection given by insurance is beyond estimate.

For centuries people have availed themselves of insurance as a mighty and never-failing instrument of cooperative self-help. Fundamentally, insurance is but another form of the cooperation of good neighbors. Today it is an indispensible instrument in the lives of thousands of our people—in the security of women and children and the home. It can be said of insurance what Lincoln said of government, "Its legitimate object is to do for a community of people what they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

In recent years, the American people have been on a mental migration, dissatisfied with old conditions and seeking new conditions of security.

Many a man does not own his own home any more. His possession is an insurance policy.

Scarcely any man can call his neighbors to raise his roof today. He pays a contractor cash and has to have financing to find the money.

Once old age was safe because there was something useful which men and women, no matter how old, might do to earn an honorable maintenance. That time is gone and some kind of organized old-age insurance had to be provided.

In the many perplexities of this modern world the individual turns, as he always has turned since the days of dimmest antiquity, to the collective security of the willingness of his fellows to cooperate through the use of insurance to help him and each other. When you think it through, at the bottom, most of the great protective statutes of today are, in essence, mutual insurance companies, and our recent legislation is not a departure from, but a return to, the healthy practices of mutual self-help of the early settlers of this great Nation of ours.

Every outstanding invention of the past century has contributed its quota to the list of accidents to be insured against—railway, motorcar, and airplane. Changes in social habits, the growing recognition of the importance of good health, the more human relations of employer and employee have all stimulated the movement to provide against the unforeseeable contingency of injury, permanent or temporary. With every invention of science has not only come new benefits but new perils to mankind.

In 1880 the first Employers' Liability Act was passed. The enactment of this legislation was followed by a rush of new companies formed to insure the employer's risks. In 1896 the Locomotives on Highways Act wiped out the law that made it necessary for any motor vehicles on the road to be preceded by a man carrying a red flag. Though this emancipating measure left the speed limit at 14 miles an hour, it at once created a demand for insurance against motorcar risks. This demand was further stimulated when in 1903 the raising of the speed limit to 20 miles an hour encouraged the advent of many more cars on the roads. The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1906 provided compensation in case of accident for every class of manual worker. Employers had to make provision by insurance for new liabilities.

Mr. Thomas A. Buckner, one of the leading insurance executives in the United States, testifying before a Senate committee in February of 1939, said that "the Government of the United States popularized life insurance during the last war as no number of agents could ever have done. There the Government quite properly insured the soldiers and the sailors, but they put a valuation on the life of men—young men without training, either mental training, perhaps, or any business experience. The Government put a valuation of $10,000 on that life, and he was urged to take the $10,000 insurance. That, of course, went all over the United States. The father of the boy, with perhaps a wife and other children to support, said, 'Well, if the boy is going to carry $10,000 for my protection, I am totally uninsured or rather underinsured.' It gave a great impetus to the business," said Mr. Buckner.

I have given this brief résumé of legislation and executive action as it has related to the insurance industry to point out a much-forgotten fact that to a great extent legislation has not been merely content to regulate accident insurance but has actually provided the demand for such insurance. In every instance government, through wise and disinterested enactments keeping pace with the social and technological developments as they have arisen, has been, not a harness and impediment to the development of the insurance industry, but a spur and a stimulus, opening up new worlds for the insurance business to conquer as new risks, brought about by social and economic change, have properly come under legal notice.

There has been much excited discussion in the insurance industry during recent months as to whether the Temporary National Economic Committee intended to recommend to this session of Congress legislation providing for Federal supervision of insurance or for some agency of the Government going into the insurance business. I can tell you unreservedly that the Committee never meant to consider recommendations with respect to insurance, and no member of the Committee ever suggested that either of these policies should be adopted or that any recommendation of that character should be made. I do wish to point out, however, that while the Nation's Business and other like periodicals, which pretend to have an almost clairvoyant knowledge of what is going on in the congressional mind, have alarmed and distressed thousands of people engaged in the insurance business with dire prophesies of a legislative witch hunt, strong arguments have been made by insurance companies themselves favoring Federal jurisdiction over the insurance business. In the instances of Paul against Virginia and the New York Life Insurance Co. against Deer Lodge, Mont., both cases were brought by insurance companies, which entered the courts for the purpose of trying to prove that insurance is a national business and should not be regulated by the State. In the Deer Lodge case, the New York Life Insurance Co. was at great pains to point out that the business of insurance was so national in scope, so interstate in character, that it should be relieved of State taxation and regulation. This is simply another instance where a small minority of a huge business, restive under State taxation and regulation, was perfectly willing to embrace the alternative of Federal jurisdiction, while the great majority of the business was supremely content with the status quo and viewed with the greatest misgivings and disapproval any change so sweeping in character.

Secretary Ickes has never been cuddled to the bosom of orthodox businessmen, but speaking of situations of the kind to which I

have just referred, he recently made a very cogent observation. "It was businessmen," says Mr. Ickes, "who originally persuaded the Congress that regulatory agencies were necessary to preserve the system of private enterprise for the majority of businessmen against the depredation of a minority."

"One set of businessmen, in the name of preserving the system of private enterprise, is always invoking against other businessmen the power of the Government.

"The immediate point is not what set of businessmen is right. The point is that what sets the forces of government, legislative or executive, in motion against one set of businessmen is practically always another set of businessmen invoking protection for free enterprise.

"When, therefore, a businessman is mad because government is "interfering" with his business what he is really angry about is another businessman because government, acting as a referee, has had to come to some decision between the two of them. The businessman who wins the verdict from the Government calls the result 'freedom.' The businessman who loses the verdict calls the result and the whole process 'interference.' You pay your money and you take your choice."

I cannot restrain a sense of admiration for the integrity and the blunt honesty of this statement by Paul Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation of America, which he recently made before the Bond Club of New York, "I propose to give my views on what businessmen must not do. They must cease and desist from asking special privilege of any kind from the Government. If a businessman needs an umbrella to protect himself against the impact of competition he isn't a businessman; he is a political racketeer. When he requires special privilege, he is attacking free enterprise. It is an act of treachery and business suicide as well because special privilege is an invitation to governmental control. If we wish to pass down to our children our heritage of free enterprise under which America has become the greatest nation in the world, let us go to Washington for one purpose, and one purpose only, to insist that free enterprise be kept free in America."

Speaking for myself, I have no hesitation whatever in saying that my deepest conviction is that the solution of the Nation's economic troubles does not lie along the road of the further expansion of Government activity or competition by Government with private industry. My conviction is that the best service we can render to the people of the United States is to stimulate private enterprise to the uttermost. It is my conviction that any proposal for Federal jurisdiction of insurance could not receive an affirmative vote either in the committee or in the Congress. Finally, it is my conviction that the Federal Government is going to continue to be the friend and not the fuehrer of the insurance business in the United States.

The campaign of education which this meeting auspiciously opens is one of great challenge and one from which incalculable good will come. It is no mere happenstance that accident and health insurance has become of major importance in our national economy. One needs but to acquaint himself with the staggering tolls in money and misery—the bitter fruits of avoidable disease and preventable accidents, every year exacted from the people of our country—to understand the full import of what you are attempting to do.

About a century ago, the United States recognized that public safety and public economy, as well as the ideals of a democracy, demanded that an opportunity for an education be open to all. Today we are at the point of recognizing and making effective a greater opportunity for health and life.

Preventable sickness and death among children are still much too common. Tens of thousands die unnecessarily each year. Hundreds of thousands are crippled by disease or accident. Millions are left with scars which handicap them for their future lives. Much of this is a needless waste of young life and a blight on the families of the Nation.

On an average day of the year about 5,000,000 persons are disabled by sickness to such an extent that they cannot go about their usual work or other routine. Of these 5,000,000, about half get well, sooner or later, and resume their ordinary life; about half remain permanently disabled. Among those permanently disabled, nearly 2,000,000 are less than 65 years of age.

During the course of a year sickness and disability cost the American people nearly 2,000,000,000 days' absence from work, school, or household duties.

Not including individuals who are already permanently disabled, workers who are in the labor market lose a billion dollars or more each year in wages unearned because of sickness. Industry and the Nation as a whole suffer additional losses.

The costs of medical services exceed $3,000,000,000 a year.

Including the costs of medical and health services, the loss of wages because of sickness, and the loss of potential future earning power because of premature death, the Nation's bill for sickness and postponable death amounts annually to about $10,000,000,000.

The problems confronting you are large and urgent. Through preventable illness the Nation is being deprived of much of its potential vigor and well-being. Any program of action now contemplated in a war against the grim specter of disease must surpass all previous efforts of this kind and must be backed by public opinion, by civilian volunteers, by civic-minded organizations, by the schools and colleges. An adequate program must be national in its dimensions if it would come to grips with problems which are also national in their breadth and depth.

The promotion of safety is a primary job of the accident-insurance business. Unquestionably, rates have a very strong bearing on the amount of insurance sold. It is axiomatic that when rates are high much less business is written than when they are low. Prosperity is more abundant when superior products are sold at lower prices. Accident rates definitely affect insurance rates. If organized safety work had not been instituted many years ago in our highly complex mechanized Nation of today, the volume of insurance sold would be infinitely less because the rates would be practically prohibitive.

It is an interesting fact that due to the introduction of safety education in the grade schools in 1922, accidents among adults have tripled but fatalities to children of school age have decreased sharply. Safety instruction in the schools can be credited with saving the lives of 70,000 children during the years from 1922 to 1938. It is quite evident that your program of education must reach men and women of mature years who have grown haphazard and indifferent to the fierce consequences of avoidable accidents. Ninety-five thousand American citizens in 1938 died as a result of accidents. On the nonfatal casualty list were 8,900,000 of our fellow citizens. Of that number 330,000 were permanently crippled. The cost was $3,300,000,000. Is there a job to be done or not? It surely cannot be done by making speeches, passing resolutions, or holding conventions. No matter how intensely 130,000,000 people believe in accident prevention, accidents won't be prevented unless we have the common sense and determination to roll up our sleeves and put the machinery in motion to stop them.

It will require work and sweat, the humility to do the unspectacular job that needs to be done to decrease the spectacular aggregate of deaths and human suffering which is seriously sapping the resources of our Nation. For too long we have been living in an age of property economies, and it is high time that we recognize adequately the enormous importance of human life values and extend to them the same scientific treatment that has for so many years been applied to property values. One of your agents has said, "Looking over the insurance I had sold, the thought occurred to me of the estates I had helped to create, the financial burdens I had removed, the continuation of salaries I had guaranteed, and I suddenly realized that my compensation was more than dollars and cents." Here is a man who is doing his work with the social vision which has kept accident and health insurance on a voluntary basis in this country. It is men of his type who push back the possibility of compulsory accident insurance as it is governmentally operated in 26 of the European nations.

The business that lies before you, it seems to an entire outsider, is not simply to write this, that, or the other policy, but to educate the people of your community into the belief that poverty is not a necessary part of the modern state; that much of mankind's wretchedness can and must be eliminated if civilization is to survive.

In Europe today a gigantic struggle is in progress testing whether the democratic way of life can withstand the brutal impact of totalitarian armies and philosophies. All about us rage undeclared wars; all about us are acts of new aggression; all about us grow more deadly armaments. When one considers the appalling state of the world today, may we not rejoice in the peace and progress of America of which this council of citizens in St. Louis is splendidly symbolic. You have gathered here for an interchange of ideas on problems of vital domestic concern. That is in the best democratic tradition. Pitiable people in foreign lands everywhere are looking to America for the assurance that democracy can survive and succeed. The proof that we are the "last best hope of earth" however, does not lie in great armies and mighty battleships and submarines and air bases, vital as are all these. The proof lies in the good result of meetings such as this. It lies in the atmosphere of optimism, of determination, and of new challenge, evident here on every hand. It lies in the assurance of employment for those of our people who are able and willing to work. It lies in the sound minds and bodies of the men, women, and children of America. It lies in the reclamation and nurture of our natural resources. It lies in a never-ending war upon drought and flood. All these are the fortifications of democracy—the greatest bulwarks against the enemies of America, both within and without.

For the last decade we have gone through a great period of transition and of readjustment within our own borders. But whatever needed to be done, we have done without dictatorship, without conscription of labor, without confiscation of capital, without concentration camps, without a scratch on freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, or the rest of the Bill of Rights, without one single abrogation of the orderly processes of democratic government. And never before have the American people been so conscious of their interrelationship and interdependence—the sense of a common destiny and a common need of each other.

There are unquestionably darker days ahead across the sea. We may be the sad witnesses of the end of European civilization. No one may now foretell the outcome. May we not then be humbly grateful "that here on the western horizon, a star, once acclaimed, has not set and the strength of a hope and the shape of a vision, died for, and sung for, and fought for, and worked for, is living yet!"

Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

LETTERS FROM PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION AND SUPERIOR OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION, NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

APRIL 10, 1940.

Hon. FREDERICK A. HARTLEY,
Representative, Tenth District, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Patrolmen's Benevolent Association of the Newark Police Department, at a regular meeting held at the Labor Lyceum on April 9, 1940, unanimously adopted the following resolution, and ordered the same entered on the minutes, with instructions that a copy be forwarded to the United States Senators for the State of New Jersey and to the three Members of the House of Representatives with constituencies in the city of Newark:

"Whereas the press of the United States has recently published statements made in the Congress which attack the law-enforcement methods of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice and the Director of said Bureau, John Edgar Hoover; and

"Whereas it has been the experience of our organization to receive from the Federal Bureau of Investigation the fullest of cooperation in all matters affecting the enforcement of law and the apprehension of criminals: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association of the Police Department of the city of Newark endorse unanimously the policies and practices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director and urge upon the Congress that the Bureau be encouraged and commended in its excellent work in the field of law enforcement."

Copies to Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, United States Senator for New Jersey; Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, United States Senator for New Jersey; Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN, Representative, Eleventh District; Hon. ALBERT L. VREELAND, Representative, Twelfth District.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS E. DURKIN,
President, Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, City of Newark, N. J.

Attest:

EDW. J. SCANLON, *Secretary.*

APRIL 25, 1940.

Hon. FREDERICK A. HARTLEY,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, N. J.,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the regular monthly meeting of the Superior Officers' Association of the Newark (N. J.) Police Department, held on Wednesday, April 25, 1940, at the Newark Labor Lyceum, the following resolution was unanimously adopted and ordered spread upon the minutes with instructions to forward copies to the following members of the Congress of the United States: Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, United States Senator for New Jersey; Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, United States Senator for New Jersey; Hon. FREDERICK A. HARTLEY, Representative, Tenth District; Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN, Representative, Eleventh District; Hon. ALBERT L. VREELAND, Representative, Twelfth District.

"Whereas it has been published in the press of the United States that certain Members of Congress have attacked the methods and integrity of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice and its Director, John Edgar Hoover; and

"Whereas the record of accomplishment of the said Federal Bureau of Investigation in the field of law enforcement, and their unfailing willingness to cooperate with and assist local law-enforcement agencies in matters of mutual interest, and to place at their disposal the entire resources of their organization in the detection and apprehension of criminals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Superior Officers' Association of the Police Department of the city of Newark, N. J., unanimously endorse the policies and practices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, John Edgar Hoover, and express confidence in their ability and policies in the enforcement of law."

Most sincerely yours,

SUPERIOR OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION, CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.
THEODORE S. MCNALLY, *President.*

Attest:

J. J. SWEENY, *Secretary.*

The Detroit Negro Progress Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, an event which seems destined to prove both unique and symbolic is to take place this month in Detroit.

Starting May 10 and continuing for 9 days thereafter, the city is to be the scene of an exposition of a type never before presented to the public. It is to be an exposition conceived, planned, and executed by members of the colored race, and promises to be broad enough in scope to constitute a Negro world's fair.

It is being dedicated to 75 years of the colored man's progress, and will mark, incidentally, an important anniversary in his history on the North American Continent—the seventy-fifth year since the adoption of the thirteenth amendment.

This exposition is to have dignity and breadth as a result of 2 years of careful work and planning. President Roosevelt has been invited to open it by pressing a button here in Washington, and many important public figures are to address its several sessions.

Exhibits will be assembled from every State in the Union in commemoration of the colored man's very considerable contributions to our science and culture, and, in addition, exhibits are to be on view representing Liberia, Cuba, and the Virgin Islands.

There is to be a Hall of Fame, portraying in stone and on canvas the great colored leaders of the past and the present, and white leaders will likewise be memorialized.

The fact that this exposition is being held in Detroit is in itself an interesting coincidence because of the part Detroit played in the old underground railway of the slave days.

To me there is something inspiring and deeply significant in this phenomenon. I am taking the liberty of mentioning it in the House of Representatives because I believe there is also a moral involved that is today particularly meaningful. My moral concerns itself with freedom and the fruits of freedom on this side of the ocean, as contrasted with the fast-widening "black-out" of freedom now eclipsing Europe.

I believe the Detroit event deserves widespread acclaim, because it will offer impressive evidence of the colored man's ability to account for his stewardship. I believe that it should forcefully reaffirm—if such reaffirmance is needed—that the colored man has found his place in the sun and is ready to maintain that place by dint of native genius, ambition, and a capacity for hard and painstaking work.

The Detroit exposition, I am informed, is to be followed later in the summer by a similar one in Chicago. It is clear that the colored man is profoundly aware of the importance of this anniversary and is proceeding to make it memorable by impressive observances.

The colored man can well be proud of the vast progress he has made under our free institutions in the past 75 years. And when I say "free institutions" I am well aware of the irony of that phrase as it applies to the colored man, who has never at all times and in all places been allowed to exercise his full constitutional prerogatives.

Nevertheless, making the best of such rights and opportunities as were available, he has moved ahead with swinging strides. He has proved himself a courageous philosopher and has demonstrated a superlative capacity for patience.

His progress during the past 8 years has been particularly noteworthy. Offered for the first time an honest share of representation in the councils of his Government, the colored man's fitness to sit in offices of high public trust has in scores of instances been proved conclusively by highly meritorious performances.

Throughout the past 75 years the colored man has always, when the opportunity was extended, shown an extraordinary awareness of the responsibility that goes with citizenship. He has proved himself a producer as well as a creator. During the past decade he has displayed admirable ability to adjust himself to the changing social-economic order. Chiefly and preeminently, however, he has proved himself among the worthiest of all the communicants who humbly worship in the temples of higher knowledge.

The Detroit exposition is to be primarily an educational undertaking. Thousands of colored persons will make the pilgrimage to Detroit on their own time and at their own expense for the enlightenment they hope to gain, for the self-betterment they hope will accrue. It will be a sober-minded and ambitious group who will travel, many of them from distant places, to take part in this event.

It is this essentially serious side of the colored race that has escaped many of us for altogether too long a time. They have always thirsted for improvement through education, but it was not until relatively recent times that book knowledge was possible to them except through stealth or through efforts involving superhuman self-sacrifice.

In the beginning few schools were built for the colored man, so he had to set about building his own. It is true that outside help was sometimes offered but mostly when this was the case it was help that the colored man himself had originally actuated or inspired.

In this connection it is with considerable pride that I will allude—parenthetically—to an ill-fated attempt on the part of the great Polish leader, Thaddeus Kosciusko, to bring education to the slaves of the post-Revolutionary period.

Kosciusko, in 1812, after his supreme efforts on behalf of American freedom, sensed prophetically that education was imperative if ever the colored man was to be fitted usefully into our form of society. He had been deeply disturbed by the abject helplessness of the slave class, and, being a man of deeds as well as theories, he decided to do something about the matter.

It was therefore on May 5, 1798—142 years ago this month—that Kosciusko wrote out a will—a copy of which is one of my proudest possessions—stipulating that a great tract of land owned by him in the vicinity of what is now Columbus, Ohio, be sold, and the proceeds be donated to the purchase and education of slaves. His friend, Thomas Jefferson, he named as executor.

The text of this will, which I believe will be of interest to many persons, is brief, so I will take the liberty to append it as follows:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testimentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in the purchase of Negroes from among his own or any others, and give them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trade and otherwise and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husband or wives, and in their duties as citizens; teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, and of the good order of society, and in whatever will make them happy and useful. I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. KOSCIUSKO.

It was through no fault of the great man, however, that this dream was never realized. Litigation was piled on litigation for 50 years, and then the estate was finally assigned to other beneficiaries by the courts here in Washington.

Always has the colored man had to hoe his own row, and, instead of being helped, all too often his arm has been jostled as he bent over his work.

Let us look briefly at his fight for education. Let us consider Booker T. Washington, who opened a road through the tall trees that boys and girls of his race might have access to the light of knowledge. It was only a few weeks ago that the Postmaster General of the United States went down to Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, to inaugurate the first-day sale of the Booker T. Washington stamp and there pay humble homage on the site where a great man had so nobly wrought. Mr. Farley marveled at Tuskegee's 130 buildings and voiced his tribute in a Nation-wide radio address before the 2,000 alert members of the student body.

"The Tuskegee idea itself is a heroic monument," Mr. Farley said, as he contemplated the miracle that a Negro, in the social and emotional turmoil of southern reconstruction, could establish a teaching institution which from the outset has consistently been educating colored youth for self-development and leadership.

Booker T. Washington had an affinity for the soil, and he taught his people their need for it. As an agricultural college, Tuskegee ranks with the highest.

Booker T. Washington will be honored in the Detroit exposition, as will such historically famous Negroes as Frederick Douglas, Sojourner Truth, and Philip Laurence Dunbar.

Honored also at the exposition will be Dr. George W. Carver, and I am not at all sure but that when the pages of later history are recorded his name might lead those of all the rest of his race. This wizard of the new science of chemurgy—this first and greatest of all chemurgists—will be present in person at the exposition, and present also will be a replica of the famous Carver Laboratory from Tuskegee Institute.

Like Booker T. Washington, this modern alchemist has also a strangely close affinity for the soil, and already he has extracted secrets from its flora that one day may revolutionize our whole economic order. The development of modern plastics is in no small measure due to the achievements of this colored Edison.

Here is a genius of the first order. Yet had he not been possessed of an indomitable will, his ravenous desire for higher knowledge might early have perished.

As a boy in his teens he worked his way through high school at Fort Scott, Kans., by taking in white folks' washing. Thus cramped for time, it took him 7 years to complete the course. He wanted to enter a college in Iowa and his application was accepted. He went North only to discover that the college admitted no colored students. But this man of destiny was not to be stopped, and he later completed his college work, first at Simpson College, in Indianola, Iowa, and later at Iowa State College at Ames.

Today many southern whites call Dr. Carver "the savior of the South." He is the first man who extracted paper from southern pine and not only from pine but from cotton stalks and tomato vines, from chinaberry and mulberry, from wisteria vines and the calladium. A full generation ago he was making synthetic marble from wood shavings.

He took the peanut apart, isolating each chemical component, and out of his work in the laboratory there grew a mammoth new southern industry that now puts $45,000,000 a year into the peanut farmers' pockets—$200,000,000 a year into the peanut business.

Not interested in money, he once turned down an offer of $25,000 to join Edison at the Menlo Park laboratory. Yet this man, who has created new industries in the South, and whose discoveries may one day lead the way in solving the unemployment problem, still wears tattered old clothes and shoes, and has not a red cent to his name.

Today the educational opportunities for the colored man have broadened out. Less discrimination is apparent in our universities than a half century ago, when Dr. Carver was sent away because his skin was black from the first Iowa college to which he applied for admission.

Today the colored man, through his intellectual accomplishments, has emphatically flouted the old canard that in the realm of the intellect he was biologically unfitted to compete with his white-skinned brother.

What Carver has done in science, what Cullen, Johnson, and dozens of others have done in the world of literary art, countless other colored men are certain to duplicate in the years to come.

The Detroit exposition marks a happy beginning. Its educational and cultural motives are in high keeping. I trust that it will be the precursor of a long line of periodic dramatizations of the colored man's manifest ability to think and to do.

Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DURHAM (N. C.) HERALD AND QUOTATION FROM EDITORIAL OF RICHMOND (VA.) NEWS-LEADER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Durham (N. C.) Herald of April 27, 1940]

WAGE-HOUR LAW ROW

The thing that stands out about the more-than-a-little confusion in the House over various sets of proposed amendments to the wage-hour law is that nearly everyone agrees the law has many rough spots that need to be smoothed out by amendment, but only a few favor the whole of any of the amendments offered.

No little of the debate is over the effect of particular amendments.

One group, for instance, insists that the so-called Barden amendments contemplate the removing of all workers in factories and plants processing agricultural products from provisions of the wage-hour law. Others answer no, the Barden amendments do no such thing. They simply clarify the law and liberalize it so that certain types of plants handling agricultural products can operate and continue to give jobs to people who otherwise will have no jobs.

There are several side controversies along that same general line, it seems.

We are less than convinced on more than one point, but it does seem to us that if we are going to have a wage-hour law at all it should be one applicable to the almost million workers who work in the various plants or factories commonly called processors of agricultural products. For they, any way we are able to reason, are entitled to protection the same as any other group, and if wages and hours in their field are low and long, there is where the law is needed. If wages are not low and hours not long, then the law doesn't constitute a problem anyhow.

Obviously there are cases and areas or type of operations that call for special treatment, especially as to hours. The folk who operate tobacco stemmeries say their problem requires more liberal treatment than is permitted under the law as it now stands. Other folk in other fields feel the same way, and perhaps with good reason. With them we do not propose to argue.

The central point is, it seems to us, that only where long hours and low wages obtain is there use for a wage-hour law, and if the law is to be amended to exempt industries and workers in that group, then why have a wage-hour law?

[Quotation from editorial appearing in Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, July 20, 1939]

In spite of the personnel troubles of the tobacco firms, particularly the small independents, the Federal wage standards have had a gratifying effect in Richmond. The incomes of more than 2,000 families here have been substantially increased. Scores of slum tenements have been abandoned for better living quarters. If reports are to be credited, the quality of work of the average stemmer has improved to a point that largely has compensated for the boost in wages. Further trial of the act among southern low-wage industries may mean the same happy experience for other communities that Richmond has enjoyed for the past year.

Poll Tax Limits the Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the favorite arguments of the upholders of the poll-tax system is that the mass of people in the South who are too poor to pay poll taxes would have no interest in voting even if there were no poll tax. They say that these underprivileged whites and Negroes are so lazy and shiftless and ignorant that the right to vote has no meaning for them at all. But there are plenty of people in the South who know this is not true and are not afraid to say so. Here is an editorial which appeared in the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel on April 14, reading as follows:

John T. Moutoux, the News-Sentinel's Washington correspondent, today makes what we believe is one of the most powerful arguments ever made against the poll-tax requirement for voting.

Because Congress has faithfully redistricted the country once every 10 years, all congressional districts have pretty well the same population.

Yet, Mr. Moutoux points out the average vote in a congressional election in the districts where there is a poll-tax requirement for voting is 15,000. In districts where there is no poll-tax requirement the vote averages 87,000.

Mr. Moutoux further shows the vote in two congressional races last election. Representative EUGENE COX, of Georgia, comes from a district where there is the poll-tax requirement. Less than 2 percent of the population voted in the election in which he was chosen. Mrs. MARY T. NORTON comes from a district in which there is no poll-tax requirement. In her district more than 39 percent of the population voted.

Mr. Cox received 5,137 votes, enough for his election. Mrs. NORTON, who was also elected, received 89,287 votes.

We believe every News-Sentinel reader in Tennessee will want to read Mr. Moutoux's poll-tax article.

Some significant comparative statistics are given in an article by Fred Hixon in the Chattanooga Times for April 14; these figures prove that the poll tax has a definitely limiting effect on the so-called free vote. Excerpts from this article read as follows:

Tennesseans have only to look to a border sister State—Kentucky—for example as to the difference in the response the voting population gives on election day where there is a poll-tax barrier and where one does not exist. In Kentucky the poll tax is not a prerequisite for voting, while in Tennessee it is. These two States have practically the same total population and their peoples are of practically the same temperament and habits. Yet Kentucky polled over 900,000 votes in the 1936 Presidential election, while poll-tax ridden Tennesseans turned out slightly in excess of 470,000. Based on official census reports, Kentucky polled 68 percent of its population of voting age in the 1928 Presidential election, while Tennessee polled but 26.7 percent. And yet Tennessee's percentage is high compared with some of the other eight poll-tax States. In South Carolina, for instance, the percentage ran as low as 10.6 percent in 1928, but in 1932 it moved up to 18 percent, and up to 33 percent in Tennessee. In view of the economic issues involved in the 1932 election, there is little doubt that both in Tennessee and South Carolina the percentages would have jumped higher than they did had it not been for the poll-tax draw-back. But all of the Southern States reflected increases in their percentages in the 1932 election over the 1928 election. In North Carolina, for instance, 44 percent of its population eligible by age to vote participated in the 1928 Presidential election and 60 percent participated in 1932. North Carolina abolished its poll-tax barrier in 1920.

An editorial in the Birmingham (Ala.) Post on April 4 makes an outspoken comparison between Alabama and Ohio with respect to number of votes cast in the 1936 Presidential election. Excerpts from this editorial read as follows:

Because the poll tax is undemocratic, because it plays into the hands of the politician and political clique, resulting in a minority rule, and because, as a cumulative tax, it is particularly vicious in Alabama, we would like to see it eliminated. * * *

We believe the day will come when Alabama and other States still clinging to the poll tax will open their eyes to the fact that we are only hurting ourselves when we deliberately limit the number of qualified voters within our State borders. * * *

We cannot be very proud of Alabama's record when it is remembered that she cast only 274,347 votes in the last Presidential election.

Compare the above figures with the 3,000,000 votes cast by Ohioans, and it is easy to understand why Ohio eats at the first table in Washington. Or compare the Alabama vote with North Carolina's 840,000 and charge the difference largely to our disfranchisement through the poll tax.

No wonder some of our neighbors regard us as—er, "backward" shall we say?

The European War Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

ARTICLE BY LINN A. E. GALE, SECRETARY, MAKE EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append an article published in the

April number of the magazine Ancient Wisdom, of St. Louis, Mo., by Linn A. E. Gale, secretary of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee. I sincerely believe that if the question of the war debts is constantly kept before the people of the United States it will minimize our chances of becoming involved in the European mess.

A somewhat silent but great American President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, when pressed for his views on the war-debts question stated "They hired the money, didn't they?" We can say with President Coolidge, "Yes, and we demand payment now."

The article follows:

[From Ancient Wisdom for April 1940]

THE EUROPEAN WAR DEBTS

(By Linn A. E. Gale, secretary, Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee)

In an interesting and ably written article in the February Ancient Wisdom Prof. Stanley Rogers raises the question, Can we afford to allow Europe to repay the war debts? He answers his own interrogation in the negative after discussing several methods of payment.

Professor Rogers does not, however, touch upon the two means involved in the proposal of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee, its national chairman, Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, and its vice chairman, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, and Congressman MARTIN L. SWEENEY, of Ohio. These two ways have commended themselves to thinking people throughout the United States and have been endorsed by various other Members of Congress. They are conceded to be methods that are both practical and equitable.

With respect to British and French war debts, it is proposed to have the British and French West Indies, also British Honduras and Berumda, ceded to the United States in part payment. With regard to war debts of Germany, Italy, and other European nations, it is suggested that the deposits of those governments in American banks be attached the same as bank deposits of individuals are attached to satisfy claims. Neither the British and French real estate in the Western Hemisphere nor the bank deposits of the other European countries would equal in value the sums due the United States for the past two decades, but the transfer of both the real estate and the deposits to our Government would constitute a substantial payment on account.

The potential value of the British and French colonies here to the United States is quite obvious. Some of the West Indian islands are distinctly valuable now. Others could become so if intelligently utilized. In a speech on the floor of Congress March 4 Senator REYNOLDS produced detailed tables showing the more important exports of these colonies, including sugar, rice, bananas, cocoa, tobacco, lumber, hemp, tomatoes, sponges, turtles, salt, molasses, cotton, asphalt, nutmegs, coffee, limes, and other products.

The usefulness of the islands as naval bases for the United States has frequently been stressed by authorities. Former Senator William G. McAdoo, who was Secretary of the Treasury under President Wilson, only a few weeks ago advocated locating such bases on West Indian islands. Many outstanding statesmen have taken a similar position.

When the recent incident occurred, of the seizure of American mail by British officials at Bermuda, it was frequently remarked that there would have been no such event if Bermuda had been an American possession. With war of unprecedented cruelty and bitterness raging in the Old World, it is plain enough that the ownership by any belligerent nation of Caribbean islands or other land on or off the coasts of the Americas is fraught with danger. At any time a crisis may arise in the West Indies that would be likely to ensnare the United States in the European strife, no matter how conscientiously we may seek to maintain a policy of neutrality and isolation. The peril of alien ownership of the lands in question is too great.

A sophistical and an unfounded counterargument has been put forward in the American Mercury of March by Tom S. Hyland in an article headed "No More West Indies!" Mr. Hyland rehashes various complaints about alleged mismanagement of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico by American officials, and cites this as proof that the rest of the West Indies would be a liability, not an asset. Some of his statements about poor administrative methods may be true, but they prove nothing whatever about the commercial worth either of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico which we now own, or of the other West Indian isles, Bermuda and British Honduras, which it is proposed that we take over. If the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico have been mismanaged, it is all the more reason for expecting that American officials, profiting by experience, would handle the other colonies of the region successfully.

But to return to Professor Rogers' article: His explanation of the necessity of keeping international trade a mutual rather than a one-sided process is a sound one, and I have no essential difference with him on this subject. But that has no bearing on the logic of the proposition for part settlement of British and French war debts by cession of their lands in the Western Hemisphere to the United States. He has made no mention of this plan. I also agree with him that payment of the war debts in gold, goods, or services would not be altogether workable—except insofar as attachment of bank deposits in this country might be effected. This resolves the problem down to the solution favored by the "make Europe pay war debts" committee—cession of land in part payment of British and French war debts, and attachment of German, Italian, and other bank deposits in the United States in partial settlement of the obligations of those nations. As for the bank deposits, it is well known that they amount to heavy sums.

With Professor Rogers' contention that the European war debts to the American Government should be canceled because some of the money was wrongly used, because some of it stayed in the United States, and because American manufacturers to whom portions of the money were paid, sometimes exacted exorbitant prices and pocketed outrageous profits, I must take issue. Even if these claims were true concerning practically all of the loans, the fact remains that the European debtor nations still owe the American Government these obligations, totaling over $14,000,000,000. Nor can we forget that American citizens were victimized by profiteers, too, but their debts were not canceled.

It is not a question of how the money was spent. Neither is it a question of whether the money was partially spent in this country for goods needed by the borrowing nations. Nor is it a question of whether the borrowing nations got the worth of their money or were frequently "stung" in bad bargaining.

The crux of the whole matter is that the United States loaned over $14,000,000,000 to the empires of Europe; that it has not been repaid a single cent except the periodical payments of Finland on a principal that was sliced in two, and the small interest payments of Greece and Hungary; and that the United States is justly entitled to recover as much as possible of the loans, in real estate or cash, or both, regardless of whether the funds were wisely utilized, wasted, or squandered. After over 20 years of patience and self-restraint we have an undeniable right at this late date to demand the money or its equivalent or whatever may be obtainable of either.

An individual who sought to evade repaying a loan because he had lost the borrowed funds in foolish investments or had been swindled by unscrupulous merchants who charged him too much for his purchases, would meet with scant consideration in ordinary business circles. There is no reason why rich and powerful governments should attempt to wriggle out of repaying loans on similar pretexts. Still less so when it is reflected that the loans were expended for buying the machinery of mass murder, the tools of torture, and the devices for devastation that were employed in what is now conceded to have been the most imperialistic and indefensible war in human history—up to that time.

Finally, if the agitation for liquidation of the long-overdue debts of the first World War fails to recover a single penny in cash or a single penny's worth of acreage, it will have accomplished a most worthy result in the economy of the universe if, by reminding the American people of the financial losses which, on top of moral, mental, and physical losses, they suffered from what Scott Nearing so appropriately branded "The Great Madness," it lashes our citizenry into a stern determination that "It Shall Not Be Again!"

Scouting—American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America I include as a part of the permanent records of this Congress the following articles, which point to the achievements and objectives of the Boy Scout movement in America:

The Boy Scouts of America represent a cross section of American life. Enrolled under the banner of scouting are boys from large cities and from villages and farms, from seaport towns, and from the western plains. It speaks the universal language of boyhood. It rises above sects and creeds and social classes to unite the boys of America on the ground of common interest and common ideals. All of these boys have come into scouting voluntarily; they are Scouts because they want to be. In the melting pot of scouting they are fused, in spite of their different backgrounds, social relationships, and nationalities, into American citizens.

Character and citizenship—these are our goals. But these are not peculiar to scouting. Most organizations for youth aim for the same thing. There are, however, unique features in the Scout program which we feel justify us in the theme we have adopted for our thirtieth anniversary, The American Way.

THE BOY—INDIVIDUAL, PATROL, TROOP—IN UNIFORM

First, we have the boy himself—recognized as an individual and encouraged to develop his own initiative, self-reliance, and confidence, based on knowledge. Boys are organized into patrols—the smallest democracy. The patrol is the boy gang, led by a boy leader, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The Scout wears a uniform so that whether he comes from a rich or a poor family he is just as good as the other fellow in true democratic fashion.

LEADERSHIP—TRAINED VOLUNTEER

The Scoutmaster and other leaders volunteer their services because they are interested in boys and take training to make their leadership more effective.

ACTIVITY—ACHIEVEMENT WITH RECOGNITION

Hiking, camping, outdoor cooking, fire making, signaling, tracking, and trailing—all these offer new worlds to conquer. Recognition is given for achievements, a badge that says, "This I have accomplished." Step by step along the scouting trail the Scout learns to take care of himself and be prepared to help others.

ORGANIZATION

The organization is as democratic as our Nation. Troops are sponsored by institutions which have representation on the local council and on the national council.

SCOUT OATH AND LAW—IDEALS OF SERVICE

Through the Scout oath and law, the ideals of service, scouting seeks to give the boy a wider horizon. There are chances for him to participate in service to the community, an opportunity to become a participating citizen. The twelfth Scout law emphasizes religion.

Over 1,000,000 Scouts each year are dedicated to the principles of reverence, of tolerance, of the Constitution of the United States. (Pp. 5, 10, 11, and 6, extracted from the thirtieth annual report section of Scouting Magazine, May 1940.)

In submitting the 1939 annual report of the Boy Scouts of America, Chief Scout Executive James E. West said:

Our theme for this our thirtieth anniversary, The American Way, takes on a deepened significance in view of events which are happening in the world today. Those who believe in Scouting and who have contributed to the record presented in the following pages can feel that they are making a contribution, not only to the Boy Scouts of America but to those things in American life which are distinctly our country's heritage.

Since the movement was first organized 30 years ago, 8,999,123 boys have had the joy and benefit of the Scout program in its various branches. Yet, as you review the accomplishments of the past year, I ask that you think of the vast army of boys who want to be Scouts and who cannot be because they have not the opportunity.

All these boys are going to have the right of voting and the responsibility of participating citizens. If we believe in America, America the beautiful, it is definitely our obligation to so organize, to develop such financial support, to become so skillful in our leadership that we make the Scout program not only capable of reaching a larger number of boys but more effective in influencing the character of those we do reach.

The record presented on the following pages touches only upon the high points of the past year. A complete report of the Boy Scouts of America, as presented to Congress, as required by Federal charter, may be obtained upon request from any Member of Congress—House Document No. 680. I do hope that all having leadership responsibility in the movement will secure and study a copy.

We are going forward into a great year. Our hearts have been stirred by the events of the past 12 months, and we have been led to a new appreciation of the importance of the training of youth. It is my hope that this report of what has been accomplished will increase the vision of everyone connected with Scouting and his desire to extend the vision of others, to the end that none of us will be content to rest on the record of the past year but will, with the spirit of crusaders, plan and organize so that in the years to come we may more approximately meet our obligations to the boyhood of America.

I have so often thought of the thousands of public-spirited individuals who have given of their time, thought, and energy to the advancement of the Boy Scout movement in America as a great group of unheralded, unsung builders of this Nation's future. To them—the Scout executives, the Scoutmasters, and all other officials of the Boy Scouts of America—I say this Nation owes a debt of gratitude; gratitude for the fact that by their work there has been instilled in the young manhood of this Nation an appreciation of American traditions and values.

And in expressing our gratitude we should not stop here, but also extend a vote of appreciation to the mothers and fathers of this Nation who have encouraged their sons to become a part of the Boy Scout program. These mothers and fathers are doing something great for their sons, who as Boy Scouts will have an opportunity to develop initiative, self-reliance, and confidence based on knowledge. They are also doing something great for this country which in future years will benefit from the kind of citizenship that is developed by these early years of preparation and training.

The Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

LETTER FROM BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

MAY 3, 1940.

Statement urging enactment of transportation bill, S. 2009:

The transportation bill, S. 2009, should be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. It proposes equality of treatment and regulation of the several modes of transportation.

I am opposed to referring the bill back to the conference committee, because this action will endanger enactment of the legislation at this session.

The interests of railroad and express employees, numbering 210,000, for whom I speak, will be improved by the enactment of this bill. Unregulated, subsidized water and motor-carrier transportation is taking a heavy toll of railroad employment and business. It is estimated that 180,000 railroad jobs have been lost because of present unfair, discriminatory transportation policies and lack of Federal regulation of these other modes of transportation.

There is no danger to railroad employment in this proposed legislation, but to the contrary, railroad employment should improve if the legislation is enacted.

GEORGE M. HARRISON,
President, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

The Wholesalers' Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that not a single Member of this House who voted for the Fair Labor Standards Act and who will vote against any emasculating amendments to the Norton bill ever intended by legislative fiat to—first, discriminate in favor of the large integrated manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer over the millions of independent operators in distribution; or, second, discriminate in favor of the serve-self distributors who achieve a low cost of doing business by eliminating jobs wherever possible over the job-giving merchant; or, third, discriminate in favor of a type of concern that will come into business after the 40-hour week has become effective next October on a wage scale based upon the minimum of 30 cents per hour over the long-time-established merchant whose cost of doing business has been automatically inflated and pyramided and his competitive position impaired simply because he was a generous payer of wages before the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In practice, these are exactly the ugly results that are being brought about in distribution as the law now works. In fairness to ourselves and to the millions of small and independent factors in wholesaling and retailing, operating everywhere in this Nation of ours, Congress should right these wrongs and do so immediately before irreparable damage has been done.

I ask for careful consideration of the plight of wholesale service trades under the Fair Labor Standards Act and practical relief that can be secured through a simple amendment to the Norton bill that is not intended to nor will defeat the basic objectives of the wage-hour law.

First, I want to present to you the basic characteristics of the service wholesalers. There are about 175,000 wholesalers, operating in 1,833 cities. They service over a million and a half independent retailers. They employ more than a million people. They have an annual pay roll of over $2,000,000,000. The independent retailer vitally depends upon the efficiency and low-cost operations of independent wholesalers. If the services of these wholesalers are disrupted or their costs inflated unwisely by legislative fiat the independent retailers are stymied and their business is handed over to the large integrated distributors and the self-service type of distributor, both of whom operate in a way designed to require as few employees and as little labor as the consumer and the traffic will bear.

What were the employment conditions among service wholesalers before enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act? (1) Rate of pay: In 1929, the average annual earnings of employees in manufacturing were $1,492; in retailing $1,312; and in wholesaling, $1,875. These figures are quoted from "Wholesale Principles and Practices" by Beckman and Engle and are based upon census compilation. (2) The official workweek of a typical wholesale grocery plant was 48 hours in 1938; the typical office worker was on duty 45 hours; the warehouse workers 48 hours; the truck driver 51 hours; and the median employee for the trade as a whole 48 hours. These are statistics gathered by research in statistical division of Dun and Bradstreet. (3) Working conditions: Dun & Bradstreet report (a) There was unusual stability the year around, (b) there was unusual stability of employee income, (c) lay-offs were negligible, less than one-quarter of 1 percent, (d) vacations with pay were accorded to 80 percent of the workers, (e) sick leaves with pay were accorded 75 percent of the employees, (f) the payment of a premium wage for overtime work was not customary. (4) Customers exempted: Customers of wholesalers are retailers, hospitals, charitable institutions, restaurants, hotels, railroads, steamship lines, governmental institutions, and so forth. All are exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act and in most cases themselves operate 7 days per week. Naturally, they continue to demand full and instant service from wholesale supply houses which makes it most difficult for wholesalers to operate effectively within the 42- or 40-hour workweek. (5) Plight of wholesalers: The 44-hour week caused the typical wholesale grocer to pay time and one-half for 4 hours, the 42-hour week forces him to pay time and one-half for 6 hours and the 40-hour week will force him to pay time and one-half for 8 hours. This, mind you, despite the fact that even before the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the typical wholesaler already paid approximately three times the minimum wage set in the Fair Labor Standards Act. The wholesaler, from a meager 6 percent earnings on invested capital, cannot absorb these new costs from net. Competition will not permit him to add to the prices he charges if his independent retailer customers are to be kept competitive. He must either retire from business or go to a 5-day week while a new concern can come into the business after the 40-hour week is established at a legal but much lower rate of pay per hour. This newcomer can thus work customary hours of 48 hours with a considerably lower cost of doing business. In a trade operating upon incredibly small margins this factor may well be decisive. (6) The remedy proposed: The established wholesaler is not interested in the minimum wages and is not complaining about them. However, the short workweek is drawing his life's blood.

Therefore each of these wholesalers in the various trades has joined a united plea to us that we enact legislation at this session of Congress relieving him of the time and one-half penalty for overtime, with the understanding, of course, that he must and will continue to pay his already high scale of wages for each hour worked so that there will always be a check on him to avoid unnecessarily long hours.

My amendment relieving the wholesalers of the time-and-one-half-for-overtime penalty is so worded that the Administrator will be left with full power to delimit the term "wholesale establishment" so that only bona fide wholesalers may take advantage of the relief granted.

During N. R. A. days, the fresh fruit and vegetable wholesalers were assigned a 48-hour week and the grocers a 44-hour week. Wholesalers of some of the other trades adopted a 40-hour week. But it must be remembered that they accepted the 40-hour week in their codes because they were promised fair-trade-practice rules that they felt would offset the costs and disruptions of the shorter work week. Of course, the wage-hour law offers no opportunities for such an offset and upon all is imposed the flat 40-hour week. The amendment for wholesalers should be adopted. They are the type of individual business enterprises that the Government should keep hands off. Instead of interfering the Government should say "God bless you," for paying decent wages to over a million American citizens, and for treating them with the dignity and respect due them. How can I, Uncle Sam, assist?

Wildlife Resources in Oregon and Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

REPORT OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources, I have been giving consideration to the activities of the several departments of the Federal Government having to do with this important branch of our Federal activities. At a recent meeting of this committee the Forest Service officials gave a factual presentation of the work of that Department. I am particularly interested in region 6, comprising Oregon and Washington, in which my congressional district is situated. I ask leave, in an extension of my remarks, to include therein a portion of this report of the Forest Service, covering this region. It is as follows:

In an effort to improve further the wildlife estimates, this region asked each forest to map the boundaries of natural big-game ranges. These, in some instances, extend off the forest. On each range is shown the winter-concentration area, if any, and also the areas where game problems have developed to the point that some remedial action is necessary. Estimates are then made by ranges for national-forest land only and another figure is made for all land within the natural range. As additional information is obtained these range boundaries may be changed, but it is hoped that the divisions will serve as control units, if and when special control measures are necessary for any individual range. Following are brief comments on individual species:

Antelope are increasing rapidly, both on the forests and on outside lands. Oregon opened a 5-day hunting season and sold 275 permits. Two hundred and thirty-six animals were reported killed. Favorable seasons, protection, and improved watering facilities have aided materially in restoring this animal to its former range. The State of Washington has made a plant of 23 head, secured from the Sheldon Antelope Refuge.

The bear is not classified as a game animal in Oregon and is open to hunting at any time, except in Jackson, Josephine, and Klamath Counties. There is some urge to make them a game animal, but so far the objectionists have succeeded in keeping them off the protected list. Authentic information on grizzly bears is difficult to secure, as they are seldom seen by persons qualified to identify them. In Washington bears are classed as a game animal and their take is controlled by the game commission.

The winter of 1938–39 was very favorable for big-game increases of all species. In this region it is felt that the series of mild and fairly mild winters have been the greatest factor in the phenomenal increases of deer that have occurred on several forests. Some of the largest increases have taken place where the range was carrying a full capacity of domestic stock, which would indicate that livestock on the summer ranges, at least, is not affecting the increase of deer. The total increase shown amounts to 17,260 animals. This represents principally unconsumed increases throughout the region, but is partly influenced by surveys made on the Malheur and Fremont Forests. The increase has been general in every forest of natural mule-deer habitat.

Total figures for this region show a decrease of 1,400 in Columbia black deer. This does not reflect the true situation. The Siuslaw Forest has made a large reduction due to the previous estimate including the protective area of the forest instead of the national-forest land only. The Olympic likewise shows a reduction, due to

the inclusion of additional acreage in the national park. The remaining west-side forests show a slight increase. The general opinion now is that blacktail deer are again increasing.

The only whitetail-deer population of any size in this region is on the Colville Forest. This is a natural range for whitetail and is stocked by the original species. A few recent plants and remnant bands of the original whitetails that inhabited the lower Columbia and Willamette watersheds are still in existence. The Biological Survey has recently established a whitetail-deer refuge in eastern Washington and has placed a man in charge to study this important game animal.

Elk are quite definitely on the increase—not only are the numbers increasing but the animals are invading new territory each year. Only two Oregon forests, the Fremont and Umpqua, and the Chelan, Colville, and Mount Baker forests, in Washington, report no elk. On the Whitman and Umatilla forests, in Oregon, they are becoming a problem. Browse feed has been heavily utilized over the entire range and in some places eliminated. To relieve the situation in eastern Oregon, the game commission issued 500 cow permits and 376 cows were reported killed. This, together with 807 bulls from the same area, did not consume the year's estimated increase. The kill in the rattlesnake area on the Snoqualmie was reported at about 300. Because of light snowfall last winter, only a minimum of damage to agriculture crops was reported in this area. The opening of the season on either sex in this area has succeeded in scattering the elk into small bands and this has relieved the situation to some extent. It is possible, however, that some additional measures will have to be taken to remedy completely the situation.

The Washington Game Commission and the Forest Service have been much concerned about the small increase in mountain goats. Sufficient facts are not available to account for the condition. This season the commission has started a study which will involve constant observation of a large band of these animals for a full year.

There is some question now regarding the existence of the mountain sheep on the Wallowa forest. The Chelan forest reports on authentic information that a small band still exists along the Canadian boundary. They cross to the United States side occasionally in summer, but winter on the Canadian side in the breaks of the Similkameen River. Here they are subject to some winter hunting by Indians, but seem to be holding their own. Such a small band, however, is subject to extermination by an unusually severe winter.

Total fur-bearing animals for the national forests of this region, consisting of 11 miscellaneous species, are estimated at 187,550. Fur bearers have been overtrapped and their habitat has been changed in many places until the present population is only a fraction of the former numbers. Illegal trapping still exists in some places, especially of the more important animals, such as beavers. Law enforcement is difficult and public opinion, especially in certain localities, is not too favorable for protection. A greater consciousness in the public mind of the value of such animals is necessary to restore fully the fur animals to their remaining habitat.

A general increase in beaver is reported throughout this region. In Oregon the game commission made a Pittman-Robertson project of beaver transplanting and took over that phase of the work.

The marten, a valuable fur animal, has been seriously depleted in the past, but is showing some recovery on most forests.

Mink and otter, valuable fur bearers, do not seem to stand the drain of trapping and are decreasing over most of the region. Closure to trapping may be the solution and this action being recommended to the game department of both States. There is an indication that fur taking may have to be put under much closer control if the finer fur animals are to be maintained as a source of revenue in this region.

There is little change in badger population. A reduction in ringtail cats and skunks is indicated in Oregon, due primarily to a reduction in area considered on the Siskiyou and Siuslaw Forests. Skunks showed a sight increase in Washington. The weasel population shows an increase in both States, which is normal.

Estimates of game birds vary somewhat from the 1938 figures. In some cases the difference is accounted for by more reliable information, and in others the natural increase is indicated. As stated in previous reports to the committee, estimates of game birds and fur-bearers represent more or less an initial undertaking in an effort to take stock of these species in their national-forest relations. The figures, to begin with, are necessarily broad estimates, but are considered reasonably conservative.

Blue grouse are showing a general increase over the entire region.

Ruffed grouse frequent the creek bottoms and lower valleys. Because of this habit, they have suffered considerably from the encroachment of civilization. Oregon maintained a closed season, but Washington allowed hunting 4 days. A general increase is reported.

The foolhen is holding its own, with little change in numbers. The Chelan National Forest reports an indicated increase but is reserving statistics until they have more definite information.

The ptarmigan is one of those rare species that lives and dies away from the adverse influences of civilization. Their numbers are kept in check by natural enemies, and there is little change in numbers. An increase in numbers is indicated.

The State of Oregon, through Pittman-Robertson funds, has a project, which was operating this past season, to restore watering and nesting places for sage hens. This work consists of improving springs and watering places by fencing areas of one-half to 2 acres to exclude stock and game. The water, of course, is made available to the larger animals. A few sage hens still exist in eastern Washington, but not on any forest land.

There has been no material change in numbers or conditions affecting sharptailed grouse. It is protected in both States. Outside of the forested areas Washington sportsmen report a slight increase.

California valley quail have shown a marked increase, and on the Chelan Forest have invaded the forested areas much more than ever before. This may be due to the general drought condition. The mountain quail is found mostly in western Oregon and Washington in the lower valleys.

Hungarian partridge has shown a steady increase on most forests in both eastern Oregon and Washington. It is subject to complete changes in range, but the past mild winters and dry spring seasons have no doubt been instrumental in aiding its increase. It appears to be most abundant on the Wallawo and Colville Forests.

The Chinese pheasants seem to be more hardy and productive than the ring-neck in this region. Because of habitat, the national forests do not attract this fine game bird, and their numbers are unimportant on forest lands.

Predatory animals are considered to comprise bobcat, lynx, cougar, coyote, and wolf, which total 59,588. The estimates on other animals are 410 fisher and 20 wolverine. Through contacts with hunters, woodsmen, forest officers' records, and other available sources, it is felt that the estimates are as accurate as any obtainable under existing conditions, though admittedly not as good as desirable.

Some variations from the 1938 report on bobcats are shown. The principal difference is on the Willamette, where the estimate for lynx has been changed to bobcat. Some reports of deer kills made by bobcats are received.

The 1939 estimate for lynx represents a decrease of more than 30 percent over 1938. This is accounted for by correcting lynx estimates to bobcat on one or two forests where some confusion has existed as to the different species.

Due to bounty payments in Oregon there has been more attention directed to the cougar. Increases were reported in many sections of the region and more local hunters were in the field.

Wolves are very infrequent and many of those reported are believed to be coyotes instead of wolves. The estimates given are based on the best information obtainable and records of catches by experienced trappers.

MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Wildlife control is gradually emerging from a period of restorative conservation to one of management, and the big problem of the Administrator is to change public opinion from one of strict conservation to that of controlled management.

Interest in wildlife administration is increasing in the public mind as publicity is given to the work that is being done. The number of hunters has increased only slightly, but the increasing public interest is manifested in magazine articles and newspaper releases, as well as sportsmen's organizations and individual inquiry. Both Washington and Oregon are making rapid progress in scientific investigations and management practices. While much progress in this field has been made there is still much to be accomplished.

Perhaps the most outstanding accomplishment of the year has been the completion of working arrangements between the Forest Service and the State agencies to facilitate and coordinate the accumulation of factual wildlife information and the administration of present functions.

SPECIAL BIG-GAME HUNTS

The State legislature in 1939 passed a law authorizing the hunting of antlerless deer in Grant County, Oreg., which included the problem area on Murderers Creek and large part of the Malheur Forest. Hunters were given special doe permits for $1 each and were required to check in and out of the area. The law provides for hunting antlerless deer in 1939 and 1940. The trial hunt was very successful from the standpoint of reducing numbers, but it is quite evident that the hunting effort in the State is not sufficient to reduce such overpopulation to a point in full proportion to the reduced carrying capacity of the winter range.

The following tabulation shows the results of the hunt:

Estimated population of area, mule deer	40,000
Number of hunters checked in	15,646
Number of deer checked out:	
Bucks	3,563
Does	6,397
Fawns	936
Total deer killed	10,896

The number of deer killed just about equals the estimated increase on that area for the past season. The doe season attracted approximately 6,600 more hunters than previous years, and the success was approximately one deer to $1\frac{1}{10}$ hunters. Considerable criticism was heard from those who do not favor an antlerless deer season, but the game commission is satisfied such a season was necessary. Because the take only equaled the estimated increase, the situation is not much changed from last year.

Much to the surprise of many sportsmen, only two minor accidents occurred in this area.

The issuance of 500 cow permits by the game commission increased the hunters in the elk territory. Approximately 61 per-

cent more elk were checked out than were recorded last year. The cow season was the major influence, although weather conditions were favorable for hunting, and more hunters were in the woods.

Comparison with previous years shows the following:

Year	Number hunters	Number elk killed	Success ratios
1935	2,761	692	1 to 4.
1936	2,945	547	1 to 5.38.
1937	2,970	634	1 to 4.68.
1938	2,717	734	1 to 3.7.
1939	3,022	1,211	1 to 2.49.

The break-down between cows and bulls for the 1939 season was 832 bulls and 379 cows. The success of the larger number of hunters was greater than in former years. This is due, no doubt, to the opening of the season on cows, and also to favorable weather.

The kill of 1,211 elk from an estimated population (1938) of 17,700, which includes the Umatilla, Wallowa, Whitman, Malheur, and Ochoco Forests, hardly scratches the surface as to reduction of the herd. The kill is less than 7 percent of the population and less than one-third of the increase estimated for last year. Elk are difficult to hunt in this area, where lodgepole thickets are numerous, and it is quite plain that the hunting effort is not keeping pace with the annual increase.

Last season the hunting of either sex on the Rattlesnake Game Refuge took out 1,006 elk. This was regarded by sportsmen and State authorities as too heavy a kill for the size of the herd. This year only bulls were legal kill, and the take was approximately 300, or about 10 percent of the estimated population. An increase of 20 percent may be expected during the mild winters experienced the past 3 years.

The total game killed by hunters in 1939 covered black bear; blacktail, mule, and whitetail deer; and elk in the number of 30,710.

The estimated number of game animals killed by predatory animals consisted of 50 antelope, 13,390 blacktail deer, 10,130 mule deer, 230 whitetail deer, 1,290 elk, 880 mountain goats, and 4 mountain sheep—a total of 25,974.

The region reports 83,200 big-game hunters, 13,030 bird hunters, with 9 fatal hunting accidents and 11 nonfatal. Nine hundred and eleven trappers were reported for the year.

Fishermen numbering 429,100 were reported on the national forests of the region for 1939.

In fish planting the Oregon Game Commission operates its own pack string and fish were planted by State men in most cases. The Forest Service has cooperated in the past to a great extent in this work but fire duty often interferes with planting schedules. The present system assures greater efficiency and better planting practices through proper coordination and timing.

The Washington Game Department is now planning on a similar arrangement. This will provide for an orderly, progressive planting plan. Forest Service pack stock will be used when and where they will facilitate the program. Likewise the State pack strings will be available, at times, for emergency fire duty.

Total fish planted in the region by the Forest Service were 2,713,000; the total planted by all agencies including the Forest Service were 23,378,500.

Water surveys were continued on three forests—the Fremont, Whitman, and Mount Hood. These will be turned over to the State as they are completed.

The State of Oregon has arranged for a technician to supervise the release of all fish this coming season and in addition will employ several men to make stream and lake surveys. Our plans are coordinated with those of the State so there will be no overlapping of work.

The Washington Game Department is making a special drive on this data and is securing some very valuable information. The Oregon Game Commission provided for catch records at Paulina Lake on the Deschutes Forest which is a heavy producer of game fish. The records so far show that the creel census method is valuable in determining the returns on plantings.

Stream improvements during the year were constructed, as follows:

Forest	Number of improvements by classes				Purpose
	Dams	Deflectors	Barriers removed	Other	
Deschutes	6	5			Creek opened to permit trout to run up from Lake of the Woods.
Rogue River					
Siskiyou			3		Beaver dams torn out so fish from Lake Ann could use stream for spawning.
Do			1		
Willamette			2		
Do			1	(1)	
Total for region	6	5	7		

[1] Dug 700 feet spawning channel.

Forest	Name	Size or capacity	Remarks
Check dams to raise lake levels: Ochoco.	Delintment Lake	15 acres	Size and type of dam: Earth fill dam 4′ x 10′ x 100′ will raise water level 1 to 2 feet.
Natural rearing ponds: Siskiyou.	Grayback	½ acre	Size and type of dam: 300 x 100 feet earth dam.
Holding ponds: Mount Hood.	Zigzag River	5,000	Concrete dam with spillway.
Fish ladders: Columbia.	Trout Creek	12″ x 18″ x 8′	
Fish screens:			
Deschutes	Cabot Lake		Loose rock filter to prevent loss of fish downstream.
Do	Round Lake		Do.
Do	Three-Creek Lake.		Do.
Do	Suttle Lake		2 roller screens.
Do	Todd Lake		Good rock filter.
Mount Hood	Olallie Lake		Rock and concrete weir. Removable framed screen inserts.

COOPERATION

The Forest Service in this region, through intimate contacts with field conditions and wildlife problems and needs, has naturally sought to take an advanced position in wildlife management practices such as stream and lake surveys, deer and elk studies, and beaver transplanting. The importance of game commissions is duly recognized and cooperation is a major consideration. In Oregon the State game commission was asked to take over the deer- and elk-checking stations with such assistance as the Forest Service could offer. Also it was asked to supervise all fish plants with such assistance as the Forest Service could extend in men and pack stock. Stream and lake surveys to improve fish planting plans were also taken up with the State, the Forest Service offering to continue assistance with the work to the extent of available funds. The State was requested to participate in future big-game surveys on the national forests. All of these suggestions have been accepted by the Commission and are now incorporated in the plans. The checking-station work was taken over by the State last fall, and it has hired a special man to handle fish plantings and water surveys and has now formulated plans to participate with the Forest Service in the elk and deer surveys in the spring of 1940. There is general recognized need for more scientific information and the State is laying plans to acquire such data. There has been set aside in the 1940 Budget approximately $35,000 to be devoted to scientific management and investigation. This will include game-bird and habitat surveys and creel, stream, and lake survey for planting fish and big-game census and control. Past experience has taught the need for having game counts on questionable areas worked out cooperatively with the State commission so that an agreement can be reached on the final results of such counts.

The State of Washington has taken a lead in scientific research, and where a problem is indicated an investigation will be made with such participation by the Forest Service as is needed to further cooperative interests. The Washington Sportsmen Council is a strong organization with considerable influence and represents nearly all of the sportsmen's associations in the State and has a splendid leadership.

Cooperative relations with the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries have been very satisfactory.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Plans and programs: Some of these have been covered in previous discussions. Among others may be mentioned the following:

Big-game studies: The special study on the Malheur was completed by O. T. Edwards and the report has been made available to those interested. Further work on this area is planned in cooperation with the Oregon State Game Commission to check on the results of the doe season opened on that forest.

Mr. A. C. Randle, of the Modoc Forest, region 5, completed a study on that forest which involved the migration of Oregon deer into California to winter. Because of heavily overused winter feed, winter losses are imminent when weather conditions become severe. To utilize a probable loss and to reduce numbers to avoid possible range problems, the Oregon Game Commission issued permits to take 500 does on the area. There were 488 permits sold and 360 does were checked out. This, together with 2,600 bucks killed, is an insignificant reduction from an estimated 20,000 deer that migrate across the State line.

The Washington Game Commission, after detailed investigation, opened the deer season on either sex in problem areas on the Chelan and Wenatchee Forests and two other places within the State. On the Chelan area the following were checked out: 134 does, 76 bucks, 97 fawns. The hunting season opened before fall concentration was noted, and the above kill (considered resident deer) amounted to approximately 20 per square mile. It was estimated the kill was about 95 percent of the resident herd. The object was to relieve the range for a larger herd that migrates to that area for winter feed.

The Washington Game Commission is making a detailed study of mountain goats on the Chelan Forest. Cooperation by the Forest Service is furnished as needed. The results of this study should be available next summer.

Sickle cell disease: Some concern has been felt over the possible results of this disease which has been found in blacktail deer on the west slopes of the Cascade Mountains. To locate and determine the occurrence of this disease each west-side forest has been requested to send in blood smears for examination. Samples from these forests have been submitted and examination was made by Dr. Howarth, of Oregon State College. With the exception of two or three samples, all have shown evidence of the disease. The greatest amount of sickling occurred in deer from the Rogue River and Siskiyou Forests. This office is maintaining a map showing the location from which each sample was taken and the result. Little is known here of how much effect this disease has on the animals, but because of subnormal increases in blacktail deer we are looking for any cause that may be contributing to that condition.

The Snoqualmie reports some disease in blue grouse affecting their toes and beaks. Specimens will be obtained and investigation made to determine the cause, if possible.

John Schwartz completed a survey of the Olympic elk situation and has submitted an excellent report. It is now in the process of being checked and will be available at a later date.

Forest	Name	Remarks
STUDY PLOTS		
Chelan	Deer Point	Deer and stock excluded.
	Gold Ridge	Stock only excluded.
Deschutes	Metolius deer study plot	Split rail enclosure 7 feet high.
Malheur	Canyon Creek Deer plot	Deer and stock excluded.[1]
	do	Stock only excluded.[1]
Wenatchee	Roaring Creek	1938 deer grazing sample.
	Stelico	1939 plots.
Willamette	McKenzie District, fenced enclosure.	Part of material cut. No fence built. Study of elk use on S. and G. summer range.
OTHER IMPROVEMENTS		
Deschutes	Bird Nesting Island	Construction of rock and dirt.
	Pumice Flat, antelope water hole.	To serve antelope in vicinity. Fenced to exclude domestic stock.
Fremont	Campbell Lake, sunken rafts.	Shelter for planted fingerlings.
Mount Hood	Spawning boxes	
Umpqua	Twin Lakes No. 1	Planting vegetation grasses and lily bulbs.

[1] Constructed 1935.

Beaver-trap planting: In 1939, 50 beaver were transplanted in 5 Oregon national forests, 33 of them on 2 forests being planted by the State.

In Washington 74 were planted on 4 national forests, of which 16 were planted by the State independently or by Forest Service cooperation. Some failures have occurred in past plantings due to an inadequate food supply. The Oregon Game Commission is continuing the beaver-planting project and some rehabilitation of stream banks is contemplated. The Washington Game Department has also made much progress in beaver rehabilitation, and especially in law enforcement. Definite information as to stream carrying capacity is needed to keep colonies within the limits of feed. Research, therefore, is much needed in this field.

Amendment of Federal Copyright Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM UPPER PENINSULAR LIQUOR VENDORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MARQUETTE, MICH., *May 2, 1940.*

Congressman FRANK HOOK,
Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan, Washington, D. C.:

Upper Peninsula Liquor Vendors Association, consisting of every licensee selling liquor for consumption on the premises in the Upper Peninsula, and having a branch organization in every county, urges your cooperation in drafting an amendment to Federal copyright laws which at present give unfair rights to American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

The Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers has used the Federal law as a threat in order to collect tribute from every tavern owner in whose places their music is played, regardless of whether their performance was made with the knowledge of the tavern keeper or not. This law as it now exists amounts to a system of shake-down for the society and its lawyers.

We also urge that you encourage action already contemplated by the United States Department of Justice under the antimonopoly laws. Your replies will be awaited with keen interest by our members.

UPPER PENINSULAR LIQUOR
VENDORS ASSOCIATION,
JOHN FEGAN, *Secretary.*

Foreign Relations of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

THE LANSING PAPERS, 1914–20

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a document which has been recently published in the Foreign Relations of the United States, The Lansing Papers, 1914–20, volume I. The subject is so important today and the thoughts of the author parallel the events of the moment so much that I think it worth while to make the entire paper available for a wider public than would ordinarily have access to the formal documents.

The preface of volume I has this to say:

The documents contained in this and the following volume constitute an extensive selection from the large body of correspondence of Robert Lansing, former Secretary of State, which was secured for the files of the Department of State following Mr. Lansing's death in 1928.

These papers were, therefore, not available at the time when the volumes of Foreign Relations for the years 1914 through 1919 and the supplementary volumes on the World War and on Russia were compiled. A large number of the papers, however, seemed to have such great public interest that it was deemed desirable to publish these additional supplemental volumes. Although these volumes consist largely of papers received from the collection of Mr. Lansing, a certain number of closely related documents from other official sources, whose publication seemed desirable, have been included.

It ought to be a controlling and ever-present thought throughout the reading and study of these words of the author that our Government, in all of the solemnity of its official utterance, has enjoined on all of us "a strict and impartial neutrality." The indulgence—yes, luxury—of taking sides are both denied to us by the injunction of the President of the United States acting by and with the consent of the Congress of the United States in public act expressed.

Full well, however, does the President of the United States understand the impossibility of being neutral in thought. He did not make the mistake of President Wilson in seeking to close the mind against the unneutral thoughts of man. He understood that there may be subjective unneutral thoughts even though there are no outward manifested objective unneutral actions.

He understood Shakespeare's analytical delineation of man's temperament when the Bard of Avon asked:

> Who can be wise, amazed, temperate and furious,
> Loyal and neutral, in a moment?

An American can so long as he can cabin, crib, and confine this wisdom, this amazement, this fury, loyalty, and neutrality within his mind's ambit. He can fulfill then the outward duties and obligations of "strict and impartial neutrality."

DECEMBER 1, 1916.

Neutrality is a state which becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the longer it lasts. The government charged with its maintenance has no easy task, for as a foreign war progresses the citizens of the neutral country become more and more partisan in their sympathies and less just in viewing the impartial attitude of their own government. Neutrality—that is, a real neutrality—satisfies no one who supports the one belligerent or the other, so that they constantly criticize the attitude of the government and complain that it is failing to perform its duty.

When so tremendous a struggle is being waged as the present one, which is sapping the energies and eating into the very fiber

of the great empires of Europe, and when all nations the world over are affected, their individuals in neutral countries should become increasingly strong in their sympathies and desire earnestly the success of those powers whose cause they advocate.

And this partisanship is naturally more intense and more irreconcilable to impartiality in a Nation like ours which had drawn its blood from the various nationalities of Europe, which are now arrayed against each other in the most bitter and most desperate strife in the annals of history. It is natural that ties of blood should affect the sentiments and through the sentiments the individual judgment of the American people, and make of them sympathizers with the nation from which their ancestors came. We are still a young Nation in which national characteristics are in the making. We are only gradually absorbing the millions of people who themselves, or whose forbears left the lands of their nativity to find here refuge from oppression or opportunity to win the just reward of their industry. Comparatively few of our citizens have lost touch with the lands across the sea or do not feel the call of kinship and the sympathy which springs from pride of origin.

However intense may be the feeling which would inspire every American if this Republic was in conflict with another nation, it is not strange, when the United States is but a spectator of a war so great that it involves nearly all countries from which we have drawn our people, that every American should become a partisan under the impulse of relationship. Nor is it strange that the people of the United States, thus divided into partisan groups, view the policies of their Government with prejudiced eyes and are bitterly critical of any course of action which bears hardly upon the belligerents with whom they sympathize, complaining that the strict neutrality of the Government is unworthy of the United States in view of the great principles at stake in the war.

Thus this Government, striving to preserve a free and open mind toward both sides and to resist with equal vigor encroachments upon the rights of Americans by either, pleases no one, not even its own citizens, while belligerent public opinion is naturally hostile and contemptuous because the official attitude of this country does not coincide with the viewpoint which forms the basis of that opinion, judging of the merits of the conflict, which denies all justification to the enemy.

For two years and a half this Government has faced this situation and patiently endured the denunciations and invectives of partisanship at home and abroad. It has done this because it believed that its first duty was to the millions who had confided to it their welfare and their interests, and that the welfare and interests of this great people were served by keeping the United States at peace. But another duty has impressed itself more and more as the war increased in magnitude and the combatants became more desperate in their efforts to vanquish one another, and that was the duty to preserve one great nation in the world free from the terrible results of the World War, so that its energies might be devoted to the restoration of wasted resources, to the rebuilding of new enterprises on the ruins caused by the innumerable lives sacrificed and by the destruction of vast treasures.

Determined as this Government was to remain neutral because of its duty to the American people and its duty to the future of mankind, it realized that restrictions which had never been listed in actual war were introduced and put into practical operation. How these various changes increased the efficiency of the military and naval forces of the warring nations and how manifestly inadequate the old codes of warfare were and the accepted rules defining the relative rights of belligerents and neutrals became almost at once apparent. The whole magnificent system of international law applicable to a state of war, which had been constructed with such pains and toil, came tumbling to the ground in a few months. Only the foundation stones of principle were left on which to build temporary structures which would at least give partial shelter from the fury of the tempest which seemed to be sweeping every right from its former place in society.

Relying apparently upon the fact that many of the rules of conduct universally accepted were impossible of application because of changed conditions, the belligerents went further and violated other rules which would have been applied and ought to have been applied. These violations of established rules, some of which were possibly justifiable, but many of which were not, were seized upon by their adversaries as ample excuses for violations on their part. Thus every new breach begat another, which in turn begat another, until the standards of right, sanctioned by treaties and usage, were torn to bits, and the belligerents ignored more and more the former practices of nations at war.

In stating this situation and the positions taken by the warring powers I do not intend to condemn the course pursued by either side so far as they affect their respective rights. It is not the part of a neutral to sit in judgment or to compare the conduct of belligerents in carrying on hostile operations against one another. It is practically impossible for those having the administration of foreign affairs not to make such a comparison and not to form a judgment as to the justifiable character of violations of recognized rights, but it is, nevertheless, their duty to refrain from giving official sanction to such opinions or from in any way departing from the position of an impartial spectator who, while he may deplore the conduct of one combatant more than that of the other, remains silent and strives to keep the official mind of the government free from prejudice, even though the public opinion of the nation may denounce acts as beyond the pale of right or of humanity.

When, however, the acts of belligerent(s) seriously infringe the rights of neutrals, a neutral government cannot permit such acts to be passed over in silence. It is a duty, which a government owes to its citizens and for which it was established, to protest against such violations and to endeavor to prevent their repetition. Without passing upon the question as to whether new conditions have made certain belligerent acts, previously condemned, justifiable, or upon the question as to whether they are warranted by way of retaliation for alleged lawlessness on the part of the enemy, a neutral is bound to decide as to their legal character if they impair recognized neutral rights, and in reaching a decision it can only apply existing rules, even though they seem obsolete and insufficient.

It is obvious that, with the belligerent nations engaged in what they believe to be—and what indeed may be—a death struggle, a struggle in which they are determined to employ every means to weaken their opponents, a neutral government, seeking to preserve rights, has well nigh a hopeless task. What can be done to keep inviolate those rights? Appeal to the established rules governing a belligerent's treatment of neutrals? In the intensity of this extraordinary war the ears of belligerents are deaf or at least dull to neutral appeals, if they are convinced that they are working injury to their enemies. Threaten the offending government with retaliation? Would that have any more effect than an appeal to legality unless the threat was carried out? And if the threatened retaliation did not bear with equal force on both belligerents would it not be held with more or less reason that it was unneutral?

On the other hand, to threaten without putting the threat into operation would seem to be worse than useless. It would be humiliating and result in a loss of esteem in foreign lands and at home.

In this situation what course lies open to a neutral nation physically unable to give effect to a declaration that it will maintain its rights at all hazard? Is it wise to make such declaration with the possibility that it will accomplish nothing and only bring discredit upon the one that makes it? I do not believe the most optimistic opportunist would counsel such action. But if not that, then what? Do you not preceive the great difficulty of the problem and the perplexities which face those who have to solve it?

Viewed from every angle, is not the most sensible course for a neutral government to show patience and treat the warring powers as if the circumstances of the war had made them in a large measure irresponsible for their improper acts? If such a policy is adopted, a belligerent government must be frankly notified that its conduct is in flagrant violation of neutral rights, that its conduct cannot be forgiven or condoned, and that it will be held responsible for any resulting loss or damage. Of course, such a notification amounts merely to a reservation of rights to be determined at some later time, and probably will not have the effect of causing a belligerent to change its policy. But what else can a neutral government do if the nation itself is unwilling or unprepared to have its rights enforced by action? As a reservation of rights on which to found claims to be adjusted when the war is over, a representation of this sort is manifestly desirable, but as a means of improving a difficult or unpleasant state of affairs it will amount to nothing at all. This might just as well be admitted and understood so that hopes may not be built on so weak a foundation.

To guide the course of this Government with intelligence, it is necessary to look at the situation, not only from the point of view of the neutral but also from that of the participants in the struggle, and first let me say that the warring nations and their governments are wrought up to the highest pitch of nervous tension. They are desperate. One supreme purpose controls their conduct. It is to win the war. National independence is to them the prize of victory. To preserve that independence is the supreme motive. Put yourself in their place and then decide what regard you would pay to the rights of other nations, if to do so interfered with efforts to injure your antagonist. You might attempt to pacify a neutral, whose friendship you desired, by certain minor concessions, but would you cease in pursuing a practice which you considered essential in the least degree to gaining an advantage over your enemy unless that practice so seriously affected the rights of a neutral nation that its continuance would force that nation to enter the war as an enemy? I do not say that this attitude is right, but I do say that we ought not to be surprised that it is under present conditions the one taken by belligerents.

I think, too, that we should also accept as a logical consequence that a nation, obscessed with the idea that its life hangs in the balance, that it is engaged in a struggle for life, feels a natural irritation and is not as strongly impressed with the righteousness of its cause as are its government people. A belligerent government, straining every nerve to conquer on land and sea and in the air, putting forth herculean efforts and making tremendous sacrifices of life and treasure, is in no frame of mind to consider calmly and judically a request or demand by a neutral which, if granted, would seem to surrender some gain, be it ever so slight, over the enemy. It would be folly to expect a just and dispassionate discussion of a question in such circumstances.

Continue to put yourself in the frame of mind of a belligerent and then answer these questions: What does a government, whose people are dying by the tens of thousands for the sake of their country, care about a legal right of neutral property? What is the observance of law, however sanctioned by the world, compared to a nation's life? How much do commercial interests weighed against a possibly greater sacrifice of life by prolongation of a war? Answer these questions from the belligerent's standpoint and you will perceive very clearly the attitude of the governments of warring Europe in their dealings with the United States.

Can you in your heart blame them for their indifference to our legal rights or for their attempt to justify their illegal acts? Can

you blame them for making bitter complaints that we, as a people, are mercenary, selfish, and unsympathetic when we insist that our rights shall be respected, when insistence appears to be favorable to their enemies? They would not be human if they felt otherwise. We must accept it as a natural consequence of present conditions and deal with it as best we may.

The conditions are abnormal. Public opinion in the countries at war is abnormal. The state of mind and point of view of belligerent governments are abnormal, and the relations of neutral nations with those which are fighting are consequently abnormal. Manifestly the situations which arise cannot be treated in a normal way. This needs no evidence, the facts are two patent to require proof.

In spite of this temper of the belligerents, which is so essentially human, and in spite of these abnormal conditions which have presented a situation of the greatest delicacy in our international relations, there have been numbers of Americans who seem to have failed to comprehend the conditions or to apprehend the mental attitude of the peoples who are at war. Many of these Americans have been engaged in European trade or have industrial enterprises dependent for their materials on imports from belligerent countries. The personal interests of these people seem to have blinded them to the true state of affairs and to the national interests affected, which are so much greater than their own. They appear to have lost their sense of perspective, and to be unable to understand the reasons which have caused this Government to hesitate in peremptorily demanding that every neutral right previously admitted be strictly observed. They not only call upon the Government to protest and threaten, but numbers have insisted that it should go to extremes in defending their rights. The possible consequences of so radical a policy do not seem to worry them, possibly because they expect that the protests and threats will be heeded, which is further evidence of their failure to realize the situation.

I do not wish to judge too harshly those Americans who have maintained this attitude. Very likely we ought to expect persons, who are suffering financial loss while they see many of their fellow citizens prosperous as a result of the war, to resent bitterly the illegal conduct of the belligerents and to feel that the Government was willfully deaf to their appeals and was failing in its duty as their protector. I can understand their frame of mind. They honestly believe that all this Government has to do is stiffen its back and emphatically demand respect for the rights of its citizens, and the result that the belligerent governments, though they may bluster and fume, will submit rather than have the dispute become actually serious.

Of course, these complainants, however legally right they may be, have entirely misunderstood the temper of the belligerents. The Government, however, with a much wider horizon, and feeling responsibility for the general welfare, takes into consideration all the circumstances. It realizes that the belligerents have but one object and that they will subordinate everything to military exigency. It knows that the course which the complainants demand would aggravate the state of affairs already very difficult. You might as well try to drive with an ox whip a bull which has been maddened with the banderilleros and which stands in the ring with blood dripping from the colored darts, as to force in this way a belligerent to live up to rules which interfere with the necessities of the conflict.

Furthermore, a stern, unbending policy would close the door to all compromise, through which some measure of relief may be found. Of course, this Government cannot compromise a right, but the individual, who is suffering, may, as has been done in very many cases. And then we must look into the future and as a nation save out of this wreckage, with all its passions and hatreds, some friendships on which to build anew the normal trade and commerce between this country and the great European markets.

Why not look at this matter squarely and admit the truth? It is almost a certainty that none of the belligerent governments, which are infringing the neutral rights of Americans, is going to change its policies because of diplomatic pressure, however vigorous it may be, unless it is firmly convinced that this country intends to declare war if its demands are not complied with. Unless the United States is prepared to back up its threats with force, is it wise to make them? Does any American, who comprehends the situation and has the good of his country at heart, advocate such a course? And if it is adopted what would be the result? Would it tend to advance the honor and dignity of the United States, or would it have a contrary effect? Of course, even without the physical power to enforce its demand, a nation may be compelled, because of gross insult or wrong, to sever a friendly intercourse with another nation, and so invite more radical action; but to do so when the issue may be honorably avoided would be condemned by men who take a common-sense view of international affairs and do not permit selfish interests to influence their judgment.

A policy of moderation is never pleasing to those who mistaken, believe threats will be heeded. It is not pleasing to the unthinking element of the population who applaud vigor of language as evidence of national greatness and who consider it is patriotic to bluster and brag and abuse. But, for the matter of that it is not agreeable to the government which adopts it as the wise and sane course to pursue. It is a difficult policy, a policy of patience, a policy of extreme forbearance, which under normal conditions would be humiliating and incompatible with the dignity of a self-respecting nation.

But at the present time, when half the world sees red, when great empires are staggering under the sledge-hammer blows of their adversaries and exerting every effort to resist the onslaught, and when governments and individuals are laboring under intense excitement, common sense, as well as generous sentiment, demands that a neutral should not threaten a belligerent with radical action unless he changes his conduct when the neutral is convinced that no change will take place. Is it reasonable to expect that nations struggling for their lives will be willing to step aside and let a neutral pass when those nations are firmly convinced that their enemies would be benefited if they should do so? Ought not a neutral government to seek to give just proportion to its commercial interests in comparison with the great enterprise of war? Is not that the sensible, practical, and rational way of viewing the present situation and of dealing with the difficult problems which it presents?

A neutral in time of international war must always show forbearance, but never, since neutrality has been recognized as a legal state, have the patience and forbearance of neutrals been put to so severe a test as in the present conflict. The arbitrary and illegal conduct of the belligerents have very naturally aroused intense indignation. To curb the desire to resist this conduct to suppress the indignant feelings aroused, to remain cool and self-possessed under the great provocation—that is the difficult task which a neutral government has been called upon to perform in spite of repeated storms of criticism and abuse.

It seems to me that neutrality is like a slender cable stretched above a seething torrent of war. Along this swaying narrow bridge a neutral nation must walk from shore to shore, from peace to peace. It is no easy matter to keep one's equilibrium. With a long balancing rod weighed at either end with belligerent rights and carrying on his back the rights of the neutral he sets forth on his precarious journey. He bends a little to this side, then a little to that, recovers his poise, and cautiously takes a step forward. He hesitates; the cable trembles and sways; with increased care he again puts his foot out and feels it firmly fixed before he moves; the balancing rod dips dangerously first this way and then that; again he stops; again slowly advances.

This is the task of preserving neutrality as I see it reduced to physical terms.

The neutral must keep his eyes on the swinging cable which stretches away into the mists where lies the firm ground. He must not lean to either side. He must always move with extreme caution and with the certainty that the step taken will not destroy his balance and plunge him into the gulf. The roar of the rushing waters beneath must not affect his calmness; the dashing spray must not dim his vision. He must be prepared to resist the fierce gusts of passion and abuse which beat in his face. He must always look forward, not downward. Above all he must keep his head even though he is wet by the leaping red waves and though the cable grows slippery with bloody foam.

His goal is the distant shore of peace. To reach it without falling into the gorge where the raging flood of relentless war is engulfing millions of men and great nations are sweeping away the standards of life, the very foundations of civilization, is the supreme purpose of the nations which travel the difficult way of neutrality.

I do not think that I have overdrawn the perils and difficulties which beset a government striving to maintain its neutrality; I doubt if the picture can be overdrawn. With a just appreciation of the forces constantly exerted from within as well as from without to compel the abandonment of a policy of impartiality toward the nations at war, no true American will too harshly judge or be too ready to criticize publicly his own Government's conduct of foreign affairs, he will not be eager to believe that the Government is pusillanimous, and he will not be one of those who cannot curb their tongues but one who seek by abuse and ridicule to excite contempt and condemnation of the Government which they are bound to support.

Patriotism, real American patriotism, ought to restrain every loyal citizen from giving free rein to his passions and from open and hostile criticism of his own Government in any dispute with a foreign power, and especially if the dispute is of so serious a nature that it may result in a resort to arms. To impress a foreign government with the idea that the United States is a divided nation is to encourage that government to pursue a policy which may bring disaster on the Republic and force an issue which the American Government is seeking to avoid. To encourage a foreign government to continued aggression or to anger it so that it will not cease from aggression is an unpatriotic and disloyal act on the part of an individual citizen. The responsibility lies with the Government, and to place obstacles in its way is neither wise nor praiseworthy. It is not treason to do so unless a state of war exists, but it comes as near treason as any act can in time of peace.

Thus do I view the state of neutrality; a difficult state, in which a government is tried to the uttermost; a state, the preservation of which wins the favor of decreasing numbers the longer it exists; a state which invites greater and greater resentment from the people of a neutral nation as day by day more individuals are added to those who complain of rights violated and injustices perpetrated by the belligerents.

Even if a government succeeds in passing through the tempest and shielding the nation from the dread consequences of war, it cannot expect the plaudits of a grateful people. In the avoidance of conflict there is nothing to excite hero worship or to stir the emotions with patriotic fervor. There may be a flicker of thankfulness that the nation has been spared, but no outburst of rejoicing like a paean of victory. What praise is given will be given grudgingly, it will be mingled with complaints at the methods employed and possibility with regrets that the might of the nation was not exerted in behalf of one belligerent or the other.

So the restoration of peace will find the neutral government which has won a greater struggle than that waged on the battlefield, a struggle which has required the exercise of those traits of human nature which appeal least to the average man, the traits of patience, self-control, and forbearance.

It is only in the realization of duty performed and in the confident hope that history will some day do tardy justice, that those, upon whom lies the burden, will find a full recompense for having been faithful to the end and attained the gold in spite of every obstacle which has been placed in their way and of every influence which has sought to force them from the path leading to the peace and prosperity, which their countrymen have enjoyed as the result of their efforts.

Antilabor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, those who yell antilabor at all who would require of labor unions the same responsibility that is demanded of all other organizations are facing some rather embarrassing facts. Many have closed their eyes to the racketeering which of late has been flourishing in the labor organizations and which is now being given to the public by the press; actually, millions of dollars have been collected from the workers in the way of membership fees, dues, and special assessments, and much of the money has found its way into the pockets of racketeers—like Scalise, a convicted white-slaver with a salary of $20,000 per year; and Bioff now serving a sentence for pandering—who exist by creating prejudice against employers, levying toll upon the pocketbook of workers and through the failure of labor organizations to clean house.

Fortunately, publishers and editors throughout the country are aware of the situation and no longer hesitate to expose the rascals. In thus exercising their right of free speech, a safeguard which we should ever fight to maintain, these editors are doing a yeoman service to the cause of labor. The editors back in the sticks have not been deceived by the cry of antilabor and are stripping the mask from those whose only interest in the workingman is in the collection of dues. Note the following editorials, one by Harry H. Whiteley, editor, Dowagiac Daily News; another by William H. Shumaker, editor, Three Rivers Commercial; another by Harold S. Pringle, editor, South Haven Daily Tribune; and the fourth by Mark P. Haines, editor, Sturgis Daily Journal. They are but four of the many which have recently come in:

[From the Dowagiac Daily News]

Labor racketeering in the larger cities in which labor is organized by mobsters and gangsters and made to prey upon legitimate business and industry, presents a phase which the regular labor organizations have not shown any great amount of zeal in combating. Chicago and New York are not pretty pictures of this extortion. The leaders live in massive, expensive establishments like kings, while their dupes, either driven under the belief that they are getting some advantages through their forceful bargaining with those who want their services, or through fear of what will happen to them if they refuse to do the bidding of their overlords, put themselves into the ranks and accept the situation. This is done under cover of being regular divisions of organized labor and recognized as such by the central control bodies. So long as this gang management persists in organized labor ranks and the legitimate organizers do nothing to stamp it out, just that much longer will labor organizations be looked upon with a serious degree of suspicion by the public.

[From the Three Rivers Commercial]

LABOR BILLS

The House is giving some attention to widespread pressure for revision of the Labor Relations and Wage and Hour Acts. The administration would prefer to let both acts stand until the next Congress. But both are so faulty in so many respects that it cannot afford to overlook them.

The Labor Relations Act has been badly administered. The Labor Relations Board has consistently acted as grand jury, prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner, in one of the most flagrant attacks upon American system of justice in the history of the country. It is incompetent, biased, and the tool of radicals that would overthrow the Government.

In practice, the truth about the Wage and Hour Act is coming out. It does protect some few people from exploitation, but its principal purpose is to force higher pay rolls on employers. This it does by reducing the time at which overtime pay begins, or compelling the use of more than one shift in industries which got along well enough with one shift working a fair week.

During the last session the act barely escaped repeal. It is creating unemployment and raising the price of goods at a time when conditions call for lower prices. It should be drastically revised, but the features protecting employees from distress pay and long hours should be retained.

The administration strategy is to make a show of revision in the House and then allow the bills to die in the Senate. That is expected to satisfy everyone. As a matter of fact, it will not satisfy the people. The administration may find out that it cannot head off revision. If so, it will be because the people demand that it do what it should do.

[From the South Haven Daily Tribune]

LABOR BILLS IN CONGRESS

The House is giving some attention to widespread pressure for revision of the Labor Relations and Wage and Hour Acts. According to news stories emanating out of Washington, President Roosevelt has hurried back from Georgia to exert administrative pressure to keep both acts intact, to continue them on trial for another year. Certainly he is aware of the enormous damage both acts have done in continuing unemployment and hindering industry from giving employment.

The Labor Relations Act has been badly administered. The Labor Relations Board has consistently acted as grand jury, prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner in one of the most flagrant attacks upon the American system of justice in the history of the country. It is incompetent, biased, and the tool of radicals that would overthrow the Government.

Designed to bring harmony between employer and employee, the Wagner Act saw the inauguration of the bitterest period of industrial strife in the country's history. The public, as well as representatives of all groups in our economy, has registered its desire that the act be amended to reduce this strife to a minimum.

The Wage and Hour Act does protect some few people from exploitation, but in so doing is crippling all industry. No one complains about the elimination of sweatshops, long hours, child labor, and meager wages as paid in some parts of the country, but there is serious objection to forcing legitimate industries to absorb higher pay rolls by reducing the time at which overtime pay begins, or compelling the use of more than one shift in industries which got along well enough with one shift working a fair 48-hour week.

During the last session this act barely escaped repeal. It is creating unemployment and raising the price of goods at a time when conditions call for lower prices.

It behooves the ordinary citizen who wants to see industry and the country firmly back on the road to progress to protest the administration's strategy of making a show of revision in the House and then allowing the bills to die in the Senate. The administration should be informed that it cannot head off revision of these two troublesome acts. You can help by making your desires known to your Senators and Congressmen now.

[From the Sturgis Daily Journal]

MAYBE LEWIS HAS THOUGHT OF IT, TOO

When William Green charges John L. Lewis with planning to make himself dictator of the United States through a political revolution, it may be observed that it's a rival leader of labor who brings the accusation while the two are locked in a struggle to control a large section of the motor industry.

Nevertheless, the shot hits somewhere near home. For the title, "would-be dictator," fits Lewis like a glove. He is more than a ruthless boss of labor, determined to perpetuate his power in his own field.

With his delusions of grandeur would it be strange if Lewis now dreamed of the day when he would be boss of the whole country, seizing supreme authority by the same bulldozing methods that have marked his whole career?

There was at least some background for Green's accusation in Boss Lewis' recent implied threat of a third political party, a personally conducted organization composed of diverse elements in the population that he thought he could force to accept his leadership.

Nobody would put it past Boss Lewis to entertain such a preposterous vision of his own future greatness; to strike a pose before his mirror and see reflected the frowning figure of America's first dictator.

But he would be due for a rude awakening. The American people long ago took his measure. He will have to remain content with his present rank as America's troublemaker No. 1.

The requirement by the National Labor Relation Board, that employers against whom it has rendered adverse decisions must post "cease and desist" promises, has received a blow from the Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond.

This court cannot believe that Congress intends to countenance N. L. R. B. orders prescribing, in effect, that a person who denies having committed an unfair practice must confess that he has been guilty. For "to inflict such a humiliating punishment is out of harmony with the spirit of our laws."

Many acts of the National Labor Relations Board have been out of harmony with the spirit of our laws and common, everyday justice. The Wagner Act gives it enough power, as everybody knows—much more than enough—but not satisfied with this authority it has proceeded to overstep all bounds of fair dealing.

Each day's developments give fresh emphasis to the imperative need for sweeping such a Board out of office and enacting a law which will prevent these gross invasions of ordinary human rights.

These editorials are typical of the feeling throughout the country. There is no doubt but that people generally are sympathetic to labor organizations. They believe in collective bargaining. It is just as true that the public demands that labor organizations free their membership of racketeers and insist upon legislation which will be fair to anyone who will be affected by it.

This can only be brought about by the abolition of the National Labor Relations Board and the amendment of the law.

Samuel D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, SAM MCREYNOLDS guided the destinies of the Committee on Foreign Affairs through its earliest neutrality days. Under his chairmanship the first so-called Neutrality Act of modern times was placed on the statute books. He had, of course, previously given his name to the famous Johnson-McReynolds Act—Public, No. 151, of the Seventy-third Congress. Today, and for some days to come, this Nation will be concerned over the prohibition of financial transaction with any foreign government in default on its obligation to the United States. The guide, however, is still this act.

SAM MCREYNOLDS saw with great clearness the dangers of unwise legislation, and in many ways he anticipated the thought of the President of the United States on the impossibility of foreseeing events to warrant a too straitjacketed neutrality.

SAM MCREYNOLDS loved peace, though no man could give more than he in the call to service, were it his duty. He was a fighter in every sense of the word, but he knew, too, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

In his own valley, in the heart of the district that he loved so well and for which he gave every ounce of his devotion and loyalty, there is a fitting public monument. It will stand forever—ineradicable, permanent, yet so useful and so gigantic it will tower above the countryside—man-made, a Congressman's dream fulfilled.

For us outside that district there will be a spiritual memory of a great American.

John A. Martin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN A. MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, many of us who serve in the House of Representatives pride ourselves on being progressives or liberals or supporters of a government philosophy which teaches that the state was made for man and not man for the state.

The best example of this philosophy in action was the gentleman from Colorado whom we mourn today. JOHN MARTIN was an inspiration and a guide to those of us younger and less-learned Members of the House who have consistently striven to make more secure the lives and the liberties of the American people.

JOHN MARTIN was to me the Bill of Rights itself: If in doubt on a particular legislative issue, I knew I could with confidence follow my friend from Colorado.

In 4 short years it is not always possible to properly evaluate the qualifications and the character of a man, but I am sure of one thing: That JOHN MARTIN by his deep sincerity and his great human sympathy endeared himself to every one of us, his colleagues, and with his passing not only have we lost a friend, but the great cause of service to humanity has lost its foremost champion in the Congress of the United States.

The Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the transportation bill, S. 2009, is to come before the House on next Thursday, May 9.

This bill has been the subject of consideration by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since the 24th of January, 1939. Eleven weeks' hearings were had on the transportation problem. Every interested group in the United States was given an opportunity to present its viewpoint.

The Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate has given a similar consideration to this measure. The bill passed by the Senate was a revision and codification of the Interstate Commerce Act, providing for the unified regulation of our domestic interstate carriers, including water carriers.

The House bill approached the subject from a different angle. It provided for changing the existing law by specific amendments and not by a revision of the whole Interstate Commerce Act.

The conferees agreed upon the House form of bill. There is little, if any, subject matter in the bill as agreed upon in conference that was not in either the House or the Senate bill. In the main the bill agreed on in form and subject matter follows the bill as passed by the House.

Certain subjects in the Senate bill, but not in the House version of the measure, are included in the conference agreement.

No important bill in recent years has had more searching attention than that given this measure by the conferees of the House. Prior to taking the matter up in conference we received many briefs on the two bills as they passed the respective Houses. We received an exhaustive criticism of both bills from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The conferees on the part of the Senate were Senators WHEELER, TRUMAN, DONAHEY, WHITE, and REED.

On the part of the House: Representatives LEA, CROSSER, BULWINKLE, COLE of Maryland, WOLVERTON, HOLMES, and HALLECK.

With the very able, commendable aid of legislative counsel, particularly, of Mr. Perley and Mr. Mullen, digests were made of all briefs presented.

Every letter and communication was also checked before the conference report was agreed upon.

The legislative counsel presented us with a 400-page analysis which covered every section of the Senate bill and the House amendment. The conferees, in joint session, went over every controversial phase of the bill and joined in signing the conference report. The legislation proposed is fair and just to all carriers. It is sound legislation. It does not propose any magic remedies, or provide for subsidies or guaranties. It seeksto stabilize transportation and to provide for impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the act.

NEW SUBJECTS

The principal new subjects taken from the Senate bill include an amendment of the short-haul provision of the Interstate Commerce Act. The principal effect of this amendment is to broaden the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission so that the Commission may require the establishment of joint rates and through routes where it finds that the route proposed is needed in order to provide adequate, and more efficient, or more economic transportation.

RULE OF RATE MAKING FOR RAIL CARRIERS

The rule of the present law which in substance provides that in fixing rates due consideration shall be given to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic is amended by limiting consideration of movement of traffic to the traffic of the carriers for which the rates are prescribed. This rule is made applicable, in separate provisions, to rail, motor, and water transportation.

MOTOR-VEHICLE EXEMPTIONS

The bill contains an amendment to the House bill which extends the exemption granted to motor vehicles controlled and operated by a federation of such associations.

INVESTIGATION OF MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

The Senate bill contained a provision providing for a three-member board of investigation and research to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to investigate the relative economy and fitness of carriers of various types for transportation service with a view of determining the service for which each type of carrier is especially fitted. This provision, modified in its terms, is included in the substitute bill. The authority of the Board is to continue for 2 years. It is directed to report the results of its investigation with its recommendations to the President, and to the Congress.

CHANGES FROM THE HOUSE BILL

Many of the changes made in the legislation since it passed the House were naturally of a clarifying or routine type. Many were of important but not of a controversial type. Certain changes are noteworthy.

FORWARDING CARRIERS

The bill, as it passed the House, by general language placed forwarding carriers within the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The House provision is dropped from the conference agreement.

The House conferees were friendly to this legislation but finally concurred in the action taken under which forwarding-carrier legislation is to be considered by both Houses with a view of working out practical legislation to take care of the transportation problems presented by the operations of such carriers. Regulatory bills for this purpose have been introduced in each House.

CONSOLIDATION PROVISIONS

The Senate and House bills contained provisions intended to facilitate consolidation of carriers. The Senate bill contained no such provision. This subject is hereinafter discussed.

EXPORT RATES

A provision in the House bill relating to export rates as related to agricultural and industrial products was also omitted from the bill and which subject is hereinafter discussed. The omission of the provisions as to the minimum rates permitted to be changed is also hereinafter discussed.

WATER-CARRIER EXEMPTIONS

Little change was made in the provisions of the House bill as affecting the exempted transportation of water carriers. The provision of the House bill granting exemption to the transportation of commodities in bulk by contract carriers by water in a vessel the cargo space of which is used for the carrying of not more than three such commodities was extended to apply equally to contract and common carriers by water.

LAND-GRANT RATES

The bill as it passed the House provided for the elimination of land-grant rates with certain limited exceptions. The conference agreement modifies these provisions by continuing the land-grant rates as to transportation of military or naval property moved for military or naval use, and the transportation of members of the military or naval forces when traveling on official duties. In other words, land-grant rates are confined to these specific purposes.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

The provisions of the House bill in reference to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act are modified by providing that the total amount of loans to railroads and purchase and guarantee of obligation of railroads shall not exceed $500,000,000. This bill does not provide, however, for increase in the aggregate amount of funds available to be loaned by the Corporation. Under the conference agreement, loans are to be based on full and adequate security and must be approved by both the Interstate Commerce Commission and Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS

The provisions of the House bill in reference to bridges over navigable waters are omitted from the conference agreement.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Notice has been given that when the conference report comes up in the House a motion will be made to recommit it with instructions to the conferees to insist on the inclusion in the bill of the Jones amendment, the Wadsworth amendment, and the proposed amendment for dismissal compensation for employees.

Each of these two amendments attempts to inject Congress into rate making by arbitrary rules. Neither of these rules would operate in the public interest or for the benefit of the persons in whose names they are proposed. They are destructive of the rate-making control that must take into consideration all the circumstances involved in each particular case. Each of these rules, if enacted into law, would be burdensome to shippers and an unnecessary interference with our economic conditions that would be detrimental to business.

They are unneeded because their legitimate purposes are properly provided for under existing law and the bill as agreed upon in conference.

THE JONES AMENDMENT

The Jones amendment was offered on the floor of the House, without its previous presentation in the hearing or to

the committee considering the transportation bill. It reads as follows:

(1a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that shippers of wheat, cotton, and all other farm commodities for export should, under like circumstances, have substantially the same advantage of reduced rates as industrial products for export as compared with shipment of industrial products not for export, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to institute such investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to issue orders making such revision of rates as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out such policy.

This amendment attempts to impose a rate-making rule in reference to the relative treatment of agricultural and industrial products when shipped to United States ports for transshipment to foreign destination. It in substance provides that such products, respectively, shall have substantially the same advantage of reduced rates when intended for foreign destinations.

The yardstick to be applied is not whether the rate is reasonable or just, or whether the rate is discriminatory or unduly prejudicial to any section or commodity. It ignores the different competitive or other conditions which may warrant a higher or a lower rate in the one case or the other, and requires export rates to be arbitrarily determined regardless of the different circumstances that may be involved as between the different products.

If a reduced export rate is given to one agricultural or industrial product, does this amendment mean that regardless of the need for a lower rate all such products, whether competitive or not, and whether on the same line or not, are to be placed on a common level of rates? If so, such an arbitrary interference with recognized principles of rate regulation would greatly disturb the economic conditions of the country.

Under the present law the Commission has the same jurisdiction as to rates for export as it has for domestic rates. It has authority to require that the rates shall be reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and nonprejudicial.

The Commission cannot require the carrier to establish a rate that is less than reasonable within the legal meaning of that term. If the carrier establishes a rate that is less than reasonable, he does so voluntarily and not by compulsion; but if he establishes a low rate, one that is legally less than reasonable, it may be protested by any interested party.

Most so-called export rates are established voluntarily by the carriers for the purpose of enabling our traffic to move so that it can meet foreign competition. Wheat or a manufactured product may be able to move and compete in the foreign market under a reduced rate, but not if compelled to move only under a higher domestic rate. The domestic rate may be reasonable and compensatory to the carrier, but it may not, under the law, be unjust, unreasonable, or unduly prejudicial to the shipper.

The reduced rate that is established to help open up the foreign markets to our products, whether industrial or agricultural, is not an injury to either agriculture or industry. In fact, it is a help to both.

The carriers can afford to carry some products on a relatively low rate if they can get reasonably compensatory rates on other products.

A merchant may sell sugar at a profit of 5 percent. On some luxury or semiluxury he may make a 100-percent profit. He does not attempt to do business on the common profit margin. If he conducted his whole business on a low margin alone, he would shortly be in the bankruptcy court.

Rail rates are fixed on the same general plan, and it is a policy followed throughout the civilized world.

The proposal contained in this amendment would serve no constructive purpose. If such a rule were put into effect, it would probably cause all reduced rates established to aid exports to be raised to the domestic level, with a consequent curtailment of the market for American products, which it is the design of the present transportation law to encourage.

Articles shipped to supply the domestic market are not in competition with articles shipped to the foreign market. The carrier would like to have the higher price on the article intended for export as well as on the article for domestic consumption. His motive in offering the reduced rate is to increase consumption of American goods and to get a haul that otherwise it could not get. A low export rate is not a discrimination against the domestic shipper.

If wheat is selling in Baltimore for $1 a bushel and in Liverpool for $1 a bushel, and we have surplus wheat for sale in the Liverpool market, it is no aid to the American wheat grower to bring about a situation which would deny him a reduced rate to the ports and therefore, compel him to pay a rate that might prevent the sale in Liverpool.

If an export rate is discriminatory or prejudicial between carriers or between ports or between competitive articles, the regular provisions of the present act provide a remedy. The proposed legislation in the conference report reinforces existing remedies. The present law permits equalization of rates between different points and gives different producing sections the advantage of the most available routes to market their products abroad. The injection of an arbitrary rule that would disturb existing routes as between points might itself cause an embarrassing situation.

In fact, most export rates have been made lower than domestic rates for the aid of different sections in giving them equality as between different ports.

Export rates are not confined to either agricultural or industrial products. I am advised by the Commission that relatively they apply as frequently to farm products as to industrial products. In most instances they are not rates required by the Commission, but voluntarily established by the carriers.

Many high-valued products are carried on a liberal margin which permits a liberal reduction in rate, if necessary to meet the export demands in order for the American products to compete in a foreign country. Domestic rates on some heavy products are frequently so low that no great margin of reductions can be made even though it were desirable to take our products into the foreign market. To establish an arbitrary standard that would apply the same rule of reduction as to each product under such dissimilar conditions could not be of any constructive value.

Labor costs are frequently less in foreign countries than in the United States. In order to sell, our product must meet that competition. The reduced export rate under which goods are carried at a very low margin helps to employ American labor and give a market for the American producer. Any arbitrary interference with the operation such as proposed would simply, in its primary effects, militate against our labor and our producers.

The bill, as agreed on in conference, reaches further than the existing law in attempting to prevent unjust discriminations. The undue prejudice and undue preference sections have been broadened to include regions, districts, territories in the prohibition against subjecting "any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever."

Agricultural commodities and raw materials are brought within the provision.

The present law directs the Commission to make adjustments in rates necessary to promote the freedom of movement of the products of agriculture, including livestock, "at the lowest possible lawful rates compatible with the maintenance of adequate transportation service." It is probably impossible for Congress to do more for the farmer with respect to freight rates than this bill provides for without injecting Congress in the field of rate making, a course without support of any responsible authority on rate-making problems. Arbitrary provisions that attempt to set up a special legislative rule unduly favorable to any particular group or class add inequality to improvidence in any attempt to legislate on a serious problem of the country.

The National Industrial Traffic League opposes the Jones amendment. It is declared to be an ill-advised attempt at statutory rate making and wholly unworkable. The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission condemns the amendment for similar reasons, including the administrative difficulties that its adoption would involve.

A basic error of the Jones amendment is its attempt to apply a common arbitrary rule to dissimilar situations.

Among the many briefs presented to the conference committee was a joint brief in behalf of the Southern Traffic League and North Carolina Traffic League. After discussing the Jones amendment it declared "It is wholly impossible of intelligent administration because of its unwieldiness."

WADSWORTH AMENDMENT

The House bill contained an amendment added from the floor as follows:

In order that the public at large may enjoy the benefit and economy afforded by each type of transportation, the Commission shall permit each type of carrier or carriers to reduce rates so long as such rates maintain a compensatory return to the carrier or carriers after taking into consideration overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier or carriers for the service rendered: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to affect the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4.

This amendment is the same as a provision that was included in the Senate bill, except the proviso. This amendment by its terms is proposed in order that the public may enjoy the benefit afforded by each type of transportation. The Commission is required to permit each type of carrier to reduce its rates so long as such rates maintain a compensatory return to the carrier, after taking into consideration overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier for the service rendered. It seeks to protect each type of carrier against low price rates of a competitor by compelling such competitor to charge rates which shall not be below the level defined in the amendment.

Manifestly the effect of the provision is to impose high rates to a degree that would prevent the shippers and the public from getting the benefit of lower rates that might otherwise be charged. In order to accomplish the purpose an arbitrary rule is proposed that ignores the different circumstances that should be considered in fixing rates for the various products offered for transportation. The value of the freight to be moved, the effect upon the movement of the traffic, the competitive situation as to the market to be reached, the low cost of the product to be moved, as elements to be considered in rate making, are all to be ignored. This presents the question, Is this a just standard to be applied in every case? Very much of the traffic that moves on our carriers today by rail, highway, and water moves at a lower price than that required by this proposed amendment. The amendment would not only require a rate which would cover overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier for the service rendered, but also a compensatory return which includes carrying charges and profit. If it were possible to put such an improvident rule into effect and enforce it, it would provide every carrier in the country with business on a profit-making basis. Thirty percent of the railroad mileage of the country now under custody of the courts, because of their inability to meet their current expenses, would be suddenly lifted into a state of profit earners. Thirty percent more of the roads, nonprofit making but still able to keep out of the possession of the courts, would find themselves in easy financial condition.

There is probably less than 15 percent of the passenger business done by the main-line rail carriers that pay fares sufficient to make the returns to the railroad that could be required by this amendment.

It is roughly estimated that the rails carry passengers at a loss of $100,000,000 a year more than income from such service. How would it be possible to raise passenger fares, haul the traffic, so as to make up the additional cost of $100,000,000?

As a practical proposition, the amendment, put into effect, would stop the movement of much traffic, further decrease the earnings of the railroads, reduce employment, and unjustifiably interfere with economic conditions that should be left undisturbed by legislation.

A large part of the wheat of the Rocky Mountain and western producers have materially lower rates than this amendment would permit.

Wheat, like many other heavy products, such as coal, sand, and gravel, are, in many instances, carried at a very low margin. How can wheat moving from distant farms and selling for 75 cents to a dollar a bushel afford to pay freight up to the standard permitted by the Wadsworth amendment? The value of the product when delivered permits no transportation except that which can be performed on a narrow margin above the actual cost without bearing its full percentage of the overhead. The carrier is better off to move such freight at a low margin and otherwise build up the community it serves than to refuse the product because it does not provide the income that this amendment requires.

The farmer, who is one of the distinct sufferers under present economic conditions, would be one of the primary victims of this amendment if Congress should be so improvident as to put it into effect.

Under the present method of making rates we have large areas blanketed into common rate levels in originating and destination areas. The area might be 800 miles across, but it is afforded a common rate level. The Wadsworth amendment might make the application in this blanket system of rate making very difficult. Our business and economic system is built up on this group plan of rates to a very substantial extent. The status of business institutions, the stability of our industries, are based upon this grouping of rate areas.

The administrative difficulties of this amendment, if put into effect, would make rate correction slow, expensive, and harassing. In order to get a change of even a minor rate in the face of protest would require the burden of proving the cost of transportation, including all overhead for each particular class and item. As there are many thousand items on the freight list of the country, we would have an involvement that could not make for constructive rate regulation.

After all the experience of this country and the rest of the world in rate regulation it should not be necessary to prove the unsound contention that all freight carriers should pay its full share of the total cost and contribute something to profit. Classification of commodities on that basis would be next to impossible with rates on many classes prohibitive.

A peculiar feature of the amendment is that it is especially directed against permitting the establishment of lower rates. It is the carrier who wants to make a lower rate who is put under the handicap and burden of justifying each rate or classification on the cost basis that this amendment affords.

Generally speaking, lower rates where not involving any unfair or destructive effect should be encouraged instead of handicapped.

Contemplate the difficulty of a railroad charging up the cost of track maintenance and determining relative cost to be charged to passenger trains and that to freight trains, or to a cubic yard of hats and to a cubic yard of beans.

Long delays and expense in adjusting rates to meet the changing necessity of the traffc movement unfairly divert and discourage business.

The Wadsworth amendment is totally unnecessary as a means of dealing with unjust rates, territorial or commodity discriminations. Complete machinery is otherwise provided in the transportation bill and in existing law for that purpose.

The bill provides for the fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation covered by its terms. It places all these types of transportation equally under the protection of the unified regulatory body. It protects each type of common carrier from unfair rate cutting by another carrier having higher costs by protecting inherent value of each type of transportation. The amendment, if adopted, would afford only a needless interference and burden on shippers and business without any practical justification.

Stability, flexibility, and the exercise of discretion are qualities that must be attained by just regulation and which are not possible under rules made in disregard of the practical problems with which they deal.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, after discussing the Wadsworth amendment, has declared that, in its judgment,

the amendment is both "unnecessary and undesirable." The Commission further states:

In our judgment, the provision in question is not necessary in order that the public at large may enjoy the benefit and economy afforded by each type of transportation. The requirement in the rate-making rule that the Commission give due consideration to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic by the carrier or carriers for which the rates are prescribed and also to the need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation by such carrier or carriers at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service, coupled with the admonition in the declaration of policy in section 1 that the provisions of the act be so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation, will afford adequate protection in this respect. If experience should show that further protection is needed, contrary to our expectation, Congress can then amend the act, but such a restriction as is now proposed is, we believe, both unnecessary and undesirable.

HARRINGTON AMENDMENT

The motion to recommit proposes that the conferees be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the conference report of the provisions adopted by the House in reference to consolidations with a substitute for the Harrington amendment to read as follows:

As a prerequisite to its approval of any consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition on control, or any contract, agreement, or combination mentioned in this section, in respect to carriers by railroad subject to the provisions of part I, and as a prerequisite to its approval of the substitution and use of another means of transportation for rail transportation proposed to be abandoned, the Commission shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected. In its order, or certificate, granting approval or authorization of any transaction referred to in this paragraph, the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that such transaction will not result in employees of said carrier or carriers being in a worse position with respect to their employment.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, an agreement pertaining to the protection of the interests of said employees may hereafter be entered into by any carrier or carriers by railroad and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its or their employees.

It will be observed that this provision as a prerequisite to the approval by the Commission of any proposed consolidation of a carrier subject to part I, the requirement that a fair and equitable arrangement be made to protect the interest of the railroad employees affected.

It also requires as a prerequisite to the Commission's approval of the substitute and use of another means of transportation for rail transportation proposed to be abandoned, a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interest of such railroad employees.

In its order approving any such transaction, the Commission shall include conditions providing that such transaction "will not result in employees of said carrier or carriers being in a worse position with respect to their employment."

A consolidation contemplates the general continuance of the service of a carrier but the possible or probable reduction in the number of its employees. The proposal that the Commission be authorized to require as a condition of its approval of a consolidation that fair and equitable arrangements be made to protect the interest of the employees is the same as was embodied in the House bill as reported to the House. It was adopted without any opposition in the House committee reporting the bill. It manifested the desire of the House committee to give fair and reasonable protection to employees dismissed by reason of consolidations.

The provision of the proposed amendment to require the Commission to make similar provisions in the case of the substitution and use of another means of transportation for rail transportation proposed to be abandoned, was not requested of the House committee during the hearings on the bill. An abandonment contemplates the determination of an enterprise and, therefore, the need of further employment.

Any substitute means of transportation for rail transportation that is abandoned requires a different kind of labor employment. The training and experience of the rail employee may not qualify him for the substituted service. A proper regard for faithful employees would suggest their retention in the service of the company for which they were qualified. To compel employment in the service for which they are not particularly qualified, if we can do so by law, involves an extension of Federal authority.

The question of dismissal wages to cover an adjustment period is quite different from providing for the permanent compensation on a regular employment basis for men for which the employer has no work.

If the third provision above referred to would require the Commission in every case of consolidation or abandonment to include terms and conditions providing that such transaction will not result in employees "being in a worse position with respect to their employment," this provision would largely nullify the discretion given the Commission as to the first two proposals. Under this provision the Commission must, without limit of time, require that an employee for whom the employer no longer has any need must be retained at the expense of the employer on a working salary basis or on a compensation basis totally equaling that which the employee received while performing useful service for the carrier.

This is a novel provision probably not heretofore written into any law in the United States. It would, by Federal law, impose on an employer the duty of indefinite if not a lifetime support of employees for whom he no longer has a job. It is entirely separate from retirement systems and unemployment insurance by which employees receive partial compensation based on disability or length of service, or age.

The advisability and practicability of this proposal must be measured in the light of its implications. If it is a correct national policy to apply to railway employees, it must be a correct national policy to apply to all employment.

Labor employment always involves the normal hazards of investment. In times of a great depression the investment hazard of the employer is great. If we add to the employer's hazard a liability of assuming the support of all employees when he ceases to have use for them, regardless of the amount of salary paid or the length of service for the employer, we would thereby create a new and very great deterrent to labor employment.

If we believe that this is a practicable system to adopt we should vote for it and then go home and convert the farmers of the country, the businessmen of the country, and the average laboring man of the country that this is a correct American policy of government. If this is a practicable plan of contributing to prosperity and progress then we have been missing an opportunity to aid Russia to take another step forward.

In the long run, under the American system of government, the welfare of the employee and the employer is linked together and cannot be disregarded. The one cannot succeed on the other's failure. As a long-time policy, labor's interest in employment is in securing a just reward for what it does rather than in a reward for what it does not do. In this generation we have learned to assume and respect many humane provisions to do justice and afford humane treatment to employees, but a policy so destructive to an employer as this proposal would in the end be a greater misfortune to labor than to the employers themselves.

Nearly 50 percent of the railroad's dollar goes to labor. A nonpaying railroad, while it continues to operate, is a good asset to the employee. It is little or no asset to its owners so long as it pays nothing.

A big purpose running through this transportation bill is as much for labor as for the employer. It proposes to unify regulation, stabilize the transportation industry, deal fairly with all types of carriers and shippers alike, and place the industry on a self-supporting basis. The end sought to be accomplished would not only alike serve employers and employees but the Nation as well.

HISTORY OF PROPOSAL

A brief recital of some of the circumstances leading to the proposed substitute is worthy of consideration.

The Committee of Six, appointed by the President to study and report on the transportation system, was composed of three representatives of management and three representatives of employees of the railway industry. They united in

support of the provision contained in the House bill. The bill filed pursuant to the recommendations of this Committee carried out their joint approval.

The representatives of the management and employees appeared before the Committee and urged the adoption of the provision included in the bill as reported to the House.

After the bill passed the House and before it went to conference the Supreme Court in the Rock Island case decided that the Interstate Commerce Commission has authority to prescribe as a condition of its order authorizing a lease of one railroad company to another that the employees of the lessor shall receive partial compensation for the loss which they may suffer by reason of their discharge or transfer as a result of the lease.

In that case the estimated savings by the transfer was estimated to be about $500,000 per year. The Commission made orders which would temporarily give the employees about $300,000 per year of the savings as an equitable arrangement for their protection. This decision in substance establishes the right of the Commission in consolidation cases to require fair and equitable provisions for dismissed employees of rail carriers for some reasonable adjustment period. The Supreme Court decision was, in effect, the establishment of the law in accordance to what the Committee had already included in the House bill.

When the bill came before the House the Harrington amendment was added from the floor preventing approval of any consolidation which would result in unemployment of the carrier's employees or the impairment of their existing employment rights.

This amendment was added to the provisions of the bill in reference to consolidation. These provisions were intended to facilitate consolidations and protect the employees who might lose employment thereby.

The provision of the House bill is within the power of the Commission as already cited by the Supreme Court.

When the matter went to conference the conferees considered the question as to what action should be taken as to the Harrington amendment, whether to modify it, place a time limit on it, or strike it out.

The conferees decided to make suitable provision for the employees within fair and reasonable limits. There was slight disposition to do anything else.

In the meantime a disagreement developed among railway labor as to the desirability and practicability of the Harrington amendment.

Among the interested labor leaders of prominence was Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The conferees were led to believe that Mr. Whitney, and the groups which he leads, would be satisfied if the consolidation provisions of the bill, including the Harrington amendment, were stricken. This proposal seemed to come as near reconciling employees as any course available, and, though undesirable, was not destructive of the main purposes of the legislation. The conferees made a report striking the consolidation provisions from the proposed legislation according to conference agreement. Under date of April 29, 1940, the chairman of this committee received a telegram reading as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Member of Congress, House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please be advised that opposition Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen to Senate bill 2009 was based upon the consolidation section of the bill. Now that conferees have eliminated that section, the source of our opposition is eliminated. However, we shall continue our earnest effort to obtain legal protection for labor in consolidation and abandonment situations.

A. F. WHITNEY.

It will be observed that the telegram confirmed the previous understanding of the conferees—that opposition was based upon the consolidation sections of the bill. The sentence of the telegram, "Now that conferees have eliminated that section, the source of our opposition is eliminated," confirmed our understanding of the situation. The last sentence of the telegram stating, "We shall continue our earnest effort to obtain legal protection for labor in consolidation and abandonment situation," was construed in light of the fact that Mr. Harrington filed a separate bill proposing to deal with that situation.

Thereafter the chairman of our committee received a letter under date of May 1, 1940, signed by the heads of five brotherhoods, including Mr. Whitney and Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. Mr. Robertson was a prominent member of the railway labor organizations who united with management in proposing the bill presented to the House, and which supported and was supposed to be satisfied with the provision for the benefit of employees as contained in the House bill.

The letter of May 1 stated that its authors—

> Are disappointed to learn that the conference committee which considered S. 2009 has stricken out of the bill the consolidation section as amended by the House; * * * in brief, there have been taken out of the bill the only provisions which were of direct benefit to the men actually engaged in operating railroad transportation equipment and facilities.

The letter proceeded to advocate recommitment of the bill and support of the proposal to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. As above indicated, the provisions stricken from the bill, against which complaint is now made, were eliminated with the suggestion and approval of Mr. Whitney.

Now the House is asked to reverse that action at the request of five leaders, one of whom was a member of the Committee of Six and once an active supporter of the House bill with its provisions for the protection of employees. The other was active in securing the elimination of the provisions on account of which complaint is now made.

I submit this situation for the consideration of the membership of the House.

Three main proposals as the ground of recommitment are suggested. The protection that Congress can legally and lawfully give to dismissed employees is confirmed by the authority of the Commission as decided by the Supreme Court.

The proposal to indefinitely place unemployed labor in a position no worse than when its employment ceased regardless of the length of service, the financial condition of the employer, or the need of employment is a fantastic proposal.

The other two alleged reasons for recommittal are so manifestly unsound and unnecessary, and so inept in their design to accomplish any useful purpose, that they have no legitimate place in sound, constructive legislation.

The whole set-up of the motion to recommit is surprisingly devoid of constructive value.

The motion to recommit should be defeated, and this important and useful legislation that represents so much painstaking, loyal, and constructive work on the part of the House made a part of the laws of the country at an early date for the betterment of our transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I offer the statement of George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees.

No man in railroad labor is of higher integrity, more substantial character, or better understands the problems of railway labor than Mr. Harrison.

STATEMENT URGING ENACTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BILL, S. 2009

MAY 3, 1940.

The transportation bill (S. 2009) should be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. It proposes equality of treatment and regulation of the several modes of transportation.

I am opposed to referring the bill back to the conference committee, because this action will endanger enactment of the legislation at this session.

The interests of railroad and express employees numbering 210,000, for whom I speak, will be improved by the enactment of this bill. Unregulated, subsidized water and motor-carrier transportation is taking a heavy toll of railroad employment and business. It is estimated that 180,000 railroad jobs have been lost because of present unfair, discriminatory transportation policies and lack of Federal regulation of these other modes of transportation.

There is no danger to railroad employment in this proposed legislation, but, to the contrary, railroad employment should improve if the legislation is enacted.

GEORGE M. HARRISON,
President, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

Regulation of Public Service Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY GOV. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES BEFORE ELMIRA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MAY 3, 1907

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, then Governor of New York, before the Elmira (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce on May 3, 1907. The address deals with the problem of administrative law and the supervision thereof by the courts. The address will, I think, be a valuable contribution in connection with the pending legislation on that subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I did not come here tonight to join in a debate. It is entirely true that I had purposed to say some things in regard to the very measure about which my friend Mr. Stanchfield has spoken, and I shall not say any less, but perhaps something more. In distinction from my learned friend, I am here under a retainer. I am here retained by the people of the State of New York to see that justice is done, and with no disposition to injure any investment, but with every desire to give the fullest opportunity to enterprise, and with every purpose to shield and protect every just property interest. I stand for the people of the State of New York against extortion, against favoritism, against financial scandal, and against everything that goes to corrupt our politics by interference with the freedom of our legislature and administration. I stand for honest government and effective regulation by the State of public-service corporations.

Now, I am fully conscious, as is everyone who professes to have a modicum of intelligence, of the tremendous advantages which the country and every community in it have derived from the extension of our railroad facilities. Our communities would be lifeless, our trade would collapse, we would all be worse than dead, were it not for these opportunities of communication and these facilities of transportation. We honor every just effort to make these possible. We want every opportunity afforded to enable the people to move their produce and we want fair treatment to those who are engaged in this very necessary activity. Yet it is said that, despite the prosperity of the country and the great benefits that have been derived from the extension of our transportation facilities, there is a state of unrest; that there is a general condition of discontent throughout the country. Why? Is it because of extension of means of communication? Will anyone suggest to an intelligent audience that American citizens are in revolt against their own prosperity? What they revolt against is dishonest finance. What they are in rebellion against is favoritism which gives a chance to one man to move his goods and not to another; which gives to one man one set of terms and another set to his rival; which makes one man rich and drives another man into bankruptcy or into combination with his more successful competitor. It is a revolt against all the influences which have grown out of an unlicensed freedom, and a failure to recognize that these great privileges, so necessary for public welfare, have been created by the public for the public benefit and not primarily for private advantage.

There has been a determined effort through the State to make it appear that the chambers of commerce in New York and the businessmen composing those chambers of commerce are opposed to an effective scheme of State regulation of public-service corporations and opposed to the specific measure now pending in the legislature having that object in view.

I do not believe that the resolutions that have been passed reflect the sentiment of the businessmen of the State of New York. It would be most unfortunate were it so. There are undoubtedly many whose interests are directly affected, and who desire to maintain existing conditions and to enjoy unrestricted freedom in order that they may give rein to their own selfish purposes, who undoubtedly are frankly and consistently against the proposition. There are others who throw a sop to public opinion by saying that they believe in regulation and who then will contest with you any provision that promises effective regulation.

I heard a distinguished railway man the other night speak of the great difficulties under which railroads are now suffering, endeavoring to keep up with the extraordinary demands that are incident to our very rapid improvement and development in commerce. I sympathize with those difficulties. I sympathize with the operating man who lies awake nights trying to devise means by which he can improve traffic facilities. I sympathize with the great army of active railroad men who, under severe conditions, are trying to perform their duty. There is nothing antagonistic to them, or to anybody who desires to deal squarely with the public, within the four corners of that bill. This gentleman said, speaking for the railroads: "We want friendly cooperation; we want protection against aggression and injustice." And I speak for the people by saying: "So do we." That is what we want on both sides—friendly cooperation for just ends and protection against aggression and injustice.

I am amused at times at the phantoms that are conjured up by practical men whose experience should have taught them better. It is said that a commission with such broad powers would take active management of railroad corporations and practically oust their boards of directors. Imagine the situation of any such commission taking into consideration the vast variety of questions relating to the management of any one railroad corporation. Think of the great number of problems and complaints necessarily committed to any such commission, and then tell an intelligent American audience that any such commission could, if it wanted to, manage any railroad.

But what is important and vital to any scheme of regulation is this: That wherever there is an abuse the commission can put its finger on it and hear the evidence and determine whether or not the abuse exists, and if it does exist stop it, no matter in what department of management it may be. Why, you cannot do that unless you give power which in an emergency will reach any department of management, so that wherever an evil exists which the State ought to control and correct, the power delegated by the State to such a body can be exercised for its correction. That does not mean that any commission should displace the operating management of any particular property. It does mean that they should have the power to exercise control sufficient to correct abuses that might exist. Now, when we consider these matters in detail, you will find, and I have found, the railroad men sitting quietly down with you and talking it over. You take up one thing after another and they will say: "Yes; they ought to have power to do so." Suppose so and so? Yes; they ought to have power to do it, assuming that they start with the premise that the business of the public-service corporation is a public business. There are many who lay down that premise very glibly, never to remember it again; and who, having admitted to you that the management of the railroad is public business, forthwith will argue with you that it is their own private concern. But when you deal with a railroad man who fairly and squarely meets you, you will find that he will agree that these powers are needed, supposing that abuses exist which would call them into action. The other night I was talking to such a gentleman, and when we got through, the practical result of all was this: I said to him: "What you really want is a chance to go to the courts?" And he said: "Yes; that is all there is about it." That seemed to be the main point. A chance to go from the commission to the courts.

I have the highest regard for the courts. My whole life has been spent in work conditioned upon respect for the courts. I reckon him one of the worst enemies of the community who will talk lightly of the dignity of the bench. We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is, and the judiciary is the safeguard of our liberty and of our property under the Constitution. I do not want to see any direct assault upon the courts, nor do I want to see any indirect assault upon the courts. And I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, no more insidious assault could be made upon the independence and esteem of the judiciary than to burden it with these questions of administration, questions which lie close to the public impatience, and in regard to which the people are going to insist on having administration by officers directly accountable to them.

Let us keep the courts for the questions they were intended to consider. When questions of property rights are involved—the constitutional right to hold property and not to be deprived of it without due process of law is involved; when, under the guise of regulation or authority to supervise railroad management, there is an assumption of arbitrary power not related to public convenience; when there is a real judicial question—let the courts have it and every good citizen will stand aside and hope to see it decided fairly and with even-handed justice.

When you deal with matters of this sort, you may be sure that there will be a variety of questions, which, whatever the fact may ultimately be proved to be, can, by astute lawyers, be said to involve such judicial matters, and there will be abundant opportunity for review of everything that should be reviewed. But to say that all these matters of detail which will be brought before the commission—matters requiring men to give their entire attention to the subject, to get their information in a variety of ways, to have hearings of those interested, and to deal with questions from a practical standpoint—should, at the option of the corporations, be taken into court, is to make a mockery of your regulation. And, on the other hand, if that policy should succeed, it would swamp your courts with administrative burdens, and expose

them to the fire of public criticism in connection with matters of this description, from which I hope they will be safeguarded.

You must have administration, and you must have administration by administrative officers. You cannot afford to have it otherwise. Under the proper maintenance of your system of government, and in view of the wide extension of regulating schemes which the future is destined to see, you cannot afford to have that administration by your courts. With the courts giving a series of decisions in these administrative matters hostile to what the public believes, and free from that direct accounting to which administrative officers are subject, you will soon find a propaganda advocating a short-term judiciary, and you will turn upon our courts—the final safeguard of our liberties—that hostile and perhaps violent criticism from which they should be shielded, and will be shielded, if left with the jurisdictions which it was intended they should exercise.

Now it seems to be regarded as a very serious thing that my successor might remove the commissioners I appoint. I do not share the fears of my friend, because the experience of the past has taught us that the only safety of democratic government is responsible government. If you put men in a position where they cannot be reached and are not compelled to be accountable, you put a premium upon incompetency, you put a premium upon political interference, and set the people at bay. Do you want these commissioners elected? Some might say "Yes." I say that is not the way to get really responsible government but rather diffused responsibility; to prevent unity of administration, to break up a system of accountability which would be found to answer the purpose. If you apply it in that case, why not through the whole administrative field? Voters would not know the qualifications of the men for whom they were voting, and they would have no opportunity to test their qualifications for this administrative position or that. There is one safety for the voters, and that is to say to the man who is elected Governor, just as the owner of a business would say to a man he puts in control of that business, "You run this business and I will hold you accountable for it." Pick your man and get the right man and hold him directly accountable to the people. Say to him, "You whom we can watch—you with reference to whose selection public sentiment in the first instance has the largest play under our system—you run the business and we will see how you run it."

We have had a recent illustration. Eighteen months ago the whole country, and you might say the whole world, was shocked by the revelation of corruption in those institutions which we deemed strongest and which we supposed to be officered by the most honorable and efficient managers. It was a business that constituted a sacred trust and affected the savings and securities of thousands of homes throughout our State. And when it appeared that those who were trusted were faithless, when it appeared that these funds had been used for extravagant, corrupt purposes, that bookkeeping had been deceptive, that vouchers had been improper, that all the safeguards which go to maintain proper administration had been neglected, a great outcry went up from the people of the State and the people of the United States. They said: "This thing must stop." And that was in a business under governmental control. That was in a business under a control designated by statutes which pried into the very life of every department of activity. It was a State department in the hands of those who could walk into offices, take accounts, examine books, put officers on oath, and make reports. It was a business put under severe regulations because of its high importance—and these things happened. What a farce it all was. And the people of the State knew it.

When I went into office some 8 months or so after the laws had been enacted which resulted from that investigation, there was practically the same conditions of affairs that had existed in the course of the insurance investigation, and the very men through whose negligence and connivance all these things had taken place were there as the trusted and confidential advisers of the superintendent. It was an intolerable situation. No business manager would have stood it. There was no personal question involved. It would have been much more agreeable to me to leave it alone. But it was there, and it was my duty to endeavor to put the department upon the best possible basis of efficiency to protect the interests of the policyholders, and I sought to do it.

Now, that is an illustration of the situation where places are created which are removed from any direct accounting. No removability except by the Senate means incompetent and inefficient administration, and in the long run political administration. I do not care who is Governor, in the long run the one safeguard of the American people is responsible government with power adequate to meet the responsibility and accountability to the people for the exercise of that power.

Now, we want in these measures, as in other measures, to be just; but, we want to be effective. We cannot have any power that is not susceptible to abuse. There is not a single State officer who has power enough to do his duty but could be guilty of a serious abuse if he neglected his duty.

In your mayor and in your Governor, and in others entrusted with administrative powers, you must repose confidence. And, if these men really stand, not in some secluded nook, protected by some statute passed without due regard to the public interest, but directly before the bar of public opinion, in the long run the people will get their due. And my policy in this measure, as in every other measure, is simply to see to the best of my ability during my short term that the people get what they are entitled to receive.

The National Institute of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TO DELEGATES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by President Roosevelt from the south portico of the White House to the delegates attending the National Institue of Government, conducted by the Women's Division of the Democratic National Committee, on May 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two months ago I was told that there would be a meeting of women interested in or affiliated with the Democratic Party, with the objective of studying and discussing the processes of our form of government. It was expected that there would be not more than 100 of them who would come to Washington and I suggested that they come to my Executive Office in order that I might shake their hands individually and have a little informal chat with them.

Three weeks ago my wife told me that the enthusiasm was so great that five or six hundred might come and we shifted the party to the East Room in the White House.

By 10 days ago the gathering had grown into a pilgrimage, with the result that if you tried, the three or four thousand of you could not all get into the White House at the same time, and if I were to start shaking hands with you now you would still be passing in line long after dark.

This amazing and splendid outpouring does my heart good because it proves, first of all, that there is tremendous enthusiasm for a continuation of liberal democratic government in the United States and also because it shows an honest wish to gain further knowledge of government.

May I add, too, that the thought which I have expressed on several previous occasions—that while in the past 7 years your Government has put into practical effect more constructive legislation for the average man, woman, and child of the Nation than in any similar time in our history, the greatest ultimate long-range gain of these years lies in the increased knowledge of what government is all about, the increased discussion of broad problems, and the increased recognition that the people of this country are entitled to a government which constantly thinks in terms of the people's needs.

We are coming to differentiate between fact and fiction. That in itself is a step in advance. We do not fall as easily as in older days for glittering generalities, for specious promises. We say in an election year to candidates for President and Vice President, and to would-be Senators and Representatives, "quit condemning each and every act of this administration and tell us just how you would change the laws if you were in power."

"You say you would balance the Budget—you who oppose present policies—don't tell us that you would appoint some new committee or board to make recommendations. The Budget is an open book. If it is to be balanced you can do it in one of two ways or by a combination of both. You can levy new taxes, or you can cut appropriations. If you choose the former, what kind of taxes do you propose to levy? If you propose to cut expenditures, which ones will you cut and by what amount? Will you, in these critical days, lop off a billion dollars from our national defense? Will you in these critical days lop off a billion dollars for the care of the needy unemployed? Will you curtail expenditures for old-age pensions or unemployment insurance? Will you abolish the Securities and Exchange Commission and turn their functions over to the stock exchange? Will you end the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration? Will you destroy, by withdrawing appropriations, the soil conservation and tree planting program of the Government?"

I recognize the horrid dilemma that questions of this kind are going to put certain types of candidates into in the coming 6 months.

Whoever the nominees of the two major parties are, I firmly believe that the real question, the honest question, the fundamental question on election day is going to be this: "Do you wish to employ for your bus-line chauffeurs who wrecked the previous bus line for driving the old busses into the ditch or going to sleep at the wheel, or are you going to continue the present policy of employing active, wide-awake chauffeurs who are inspired with the thought that their duty is to be polite to the passengers and see to it that they reach their destination in comfort and complete safety?"

I am confident that your common sense, your enthusiasm, and your deep understanding of the problems of the day will go far to keep the American people on the right road in this year of grace, 1940.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the President of the United States with reference to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1940.

Since the transmittal of Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV a flood of misinformation has engulfed those sections dealing with the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Much of this has fallen of its own absurdity and needs no comment. This morning, however, we saw a group of well-intentioned people staking out an exclusive claim to a so-called lobby to save lives.

The implication that we are not interested in saving lives, which is certainly contradicted by the record of our progress in civil aviation during recent years, compels me to restate in simple terms the basic features of the reorganization plans affecting the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

I might say here that everybody is for the abstract idea of reorganization in the interest of increased efficiency and economy. However, there is a rather discouraging collapse of enthusiasm when concrete propcsals are made. In selfish protection of their own special interests we always find particular groups who hitherto favored reorganization arising in protest.

As it now stands there are three agencies—the Civil Aeronautics (five members) Authority, the Administrator, and the Air Safety Board—all autonomous groups, none of them represented at the Cabinet table. The inherent problems confronting them were intensified by friction, particularly within the Air Safety Board. For 5 months the Administrative Management Division of the Budget Bureau made a study, at my request, of the operation of the Authority. It became obvious that a change was imperative if we were to continue to move forward in civil aviation. Here, in simple summary, is the proposal:

1. Despite handicaps, the Federal program for civil aeronautics has now achieved a stature and an importance which justify bringing this program more closely into the Federal family. The proposal will place it within the framework of the Department of Commerce where it will have a closer relationship with the important reporting services of the Weather Bureau and the essential air navigation chart service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. More than that, it will provide representation at the Cabinet table for a program of basic significance to our national transportation and our national defense. Present world conditions make the merit of this phase of the proposal obvious.

2. The present five-member Authority, which has received such widespread praise, remains as an independent Civil Aeronautics Board performing the basic regulatory functions. It will continue to appoint and control its own personnel and submit its own budget.

3. Certain of the Authority's functions are transferred to the Administrator to eliminate a blind spot created by the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to carry out the intenion of Congress to distinguish clearly between the functions of the Administrator and the Authority.

4. The function of investigating accidents is transferred to the Civil Aeronautics Board which, unlike the present Air Safety Board, will not be helpless to take positive steps toward preventing the recurrence of accidents. Unlike the Air Safety Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board will have the power to prescribe air-safety rules, regulations, and standards, and to suspend or revoke certificates after hearing. Not only does this continue the present independence of accident investigation, but it also makes possible prompt translation of findings into corrective action.

5. Not only are we advancing the cause of air safety by these changes but we will also realize appreciable savings. Several highly paid positions on the Air Safety Board will be eliminated and other economies made possible.

Mr. Justice Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY JUDGE SAUL A. YAGER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion of the record of Mr. Justice Hugo Black which should make every Senator proud of his vote to confirm that Justice.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Saul Yager once again bringing you both sides of the news.

In the hope that one of our metropolitan newspapers would sooner or later comment upon the subject of my broadcast, this evening, I have purposely refrained, up until now, from dealing with it.

On February 12 of this year—Lincoln's birthday—the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision which will go down in history as one of the strongest reaffirmations of the democratic system of tolerance and equality. The importance of the decision does not rest alone in the principles which it announced. That Justice Hugo Black wrote the opinion is as newsworthy and epic-making as is the opinion itself.

The facts of the case were quite simple. An elderly white man had been found murdered in a small town in Florida. Using a type of law enforcement not altogether uncommon in some localities, a large number of suspects, white and colored, were arrested and questioned at length by the local authorities. A few of them were held for prolonged questioning; and the four Negroes who were finally convicted of the crime were questioned continually for an entire week—day and night. During this time these Negroes were denied the opportunity to consult with their friends or relatives or to engage legal counsel. There was evidence that they were subjected to physical violence and continual threats. All ordinary civil rights were denied them. Finally, in hopeless desperation and fear of their lives the Negroes agreed to confess; and they were convicted and sentenced to death. The Supreme Court of Florida sustained the conviction and an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, which reversed the case.

Justice Hugo Black, speaking for a unanimous Court, reaffirmed the faith of those who wrote into the Constitution the fourteenth amendment; that is, that no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Justice Black wrote thusly, "To permit human lives to be forfeited upon confessions thus obtained (he is now referring to the third-degree methods used by the local officials) would make the constitutional requirement of due process of law a meaningless symbol." He continued, "Due process of law, preserved for all by our Constitution, commands that no such practice as that disclosed by this record shall send an accused to his death."

Mr. Justice Black saw in the tactics adopted by the local officials a technique of persecution not altogether unknown in certain parts of the world today. He pointed out, "Today, as in ages past, we are not without tragic proof that the exalted power of some governments to punish manufactured crime dictatorially is the handmaiden of tyranny." He went on to say, "The rack, the thumbscrew, the wheel, solitary confinement, protracted questioning and cross-

examining, and other ingenious forms of entrapment of the helpless or unpopular had left their wage of mutilated bodies and shattered minds along the way of the cross, the guillotine, the stake, and the hangman's noose."

And Justice Black recalled the historical setting and wrongs which called into being the uncompromising guaranty of the Bill of Rights. He said: "Tyrannical governments had immemorially utilized dictatorial criminal procedure and punishment to make scapegoats of the weak, or of helpless political, religious, or racial minorities. * * * And a liberty-loving people won the principle that no man's life, liberty, or property be forfeited until there had been a charge fairly made and fairly tried in a public tribunal free of prejudice, passion, excitement, and tyrannical power. Thus," he went on to say, "as assurance against ancient evils, our country, in order to preserve 'the blessings of liberty,' wrote into its basic law the requirement, among others, that the forfeiture of the lives, liberties, or property of people accused of crime can only follow if procedural safeguards of due process have been obeyed.

"No higher duty, no more solemn responsibility, rests upon this Court," said Justice Black, "than that of translating into living law and maintaining this constitutional shield deliberately planned and inscribed for the benefit of every human being subject to our Constitution—of whatever race, creed, or persuasion."

Had this opinion been written by any other member of the Supreme Court it would still be a notable decision; but since its author is Justice Black it is doubly significant.

Two and a half years ago the press of the United States, including our own metropolitan newspapers, condemned, in no uncertain terms, Justice Black's appointment to the Court. His one time affiliation with the Ku Klux Klan became the rallying cry for those who predicted that upon the Court the Justice would be prejudiced against minority rights—that he would be an advocate of bigotry and a defender of tyranny.

The opinion to which I have referred has proven beyond any doubt that such expressions were not only uncalled for, but that in the recent words of President Roosevelt, their authors owe Mr. Justice Black an apology. As a matter of fact, one of the leading newspapers in the East, the Philadelphia Record, which denounced the Justice's appointment, said, editorially, the day after the opinion was written: "A great hue and cry was raised over the fact that Black had once been a Klansman. This paper joined in that denunciation of him." And then the editorial continued, "We have since regretted it. No man in whom race prejudice remained could have written the ringing opinion that Black did, upholding equality before the law."

Besides this public and unqualified apology, the Birmingham (Ala.) News, in appraising the opinion, said: "This is one of the great Supreme Court opinions of our time and it stamps Hugo Black as a liberal Justice of the highest status." The New York Times, whose Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock, led the vanguard in the denunciations of Black's appointment, praised the opinion and Justice Black, editorially. It reminded its readers that when Justice Black spoke of protecting the poor, the ignorant, the numerically weak, the friendless, and powerless he reaffirmed on behalf of the United States Supreme Court a policy of standing on guard "with flaming sword over the rights of everyone of us."

The evidence of Justice Black's defense of civil liberties, as a member of the Supreme Court, is not confined to the Florida case to which I have referred. In February 1939 he wrote an opinion setting aside the conviction of a Negro who had been sentenced to death in Louisiana. In that case Black said: "* * * when a claim is properly asserted * * * that a citizen * * * has been denied the equal protection of his country's laws on account of his race, it becomes our solemn duty to make independent inquiry and determination of * * * [the] facts * * *" because, said the Justice, "* * * equal protection to all is the basic principle upon which justice under law rests."

In the short time that Justice Black has been on the Supreme Court, he has made an outstanding record as a jurist. Only a few months after he had taken his place upon the bench, the Court, by a divided opinion, sustained the right of the United States to tax members of the Port of New York Authority on the ground that the officials of the authority were not performing functions which were essential to the existence of the State. Although agreeing with the result of the majority opinion, Justice Black in a specially concurring opinion criticized the attempt of the majority of his brethren to differentiate between essential and nonessential government services. He contended that there was nothing in the Constitution which would prohibit all State employees paying Federal income tax. It was only a few months later that the Supreme Court, in another case involving the same question, adopted, for all practical purposes, the view of Justice Black.

Again, in May of 1938, the Court held unconstitutional an Indiana gross income tax as applied to sales made in other States and foreign countries by an Indiana corporation. The majority of the Court said that the tax was an impediment to interstate commerce and was, therefore, unconstitutional. Black dissented from the majority ruling. And, on January 29, 1940, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the New York sales tax on the very grounds which Justice Black had urged in his dissenting opinion in the Indiana case.

In February 1938, Justice Black, writing a lone dissent, urged that the Montana law instead of the so-called Federal common law should be followed in a trial of an insurance case in a Federal court. A few months thereafter the Court reversed a 150-year-old precedent, which had permitted the Federal courts to disregard the common law of a State, and adopted the view which Justice Black, standing alone, had had the courage to urge in his prior dissent.

It was again only a few months after Black had taken his seat upon the Court that he and Justice Reed dissented from an opinion in a complicated case involving the liability for fraud of the agent of a surety company. A few weeks ago that Court again, for all practical purposes, adopted Justices Black's and Reed's previous dissenting opinion.

As the Washington Post recently pointed out, "Few members of the Supreme Court have ever seen their dissents become the law of the land within so short a time." It went on to say that if Justice Black "quit the Court tomorrow he would leave a record distinguished enough to make an historian wonder what caused the spasm of hysteria which swept so much of the press and of the Nation in the late summer of 1937."

The St. Louis Post Dispatch, one of the most outspoken critics of the Black appointment, recently characterized him as, and here I quote, "an influential thinker and craftsman."

In an article on the Supreme Court of the United States in a recent issue of Life magazine, the editors commented thusly: "Only a handful of the 80 Justices who have served on it—Marshall, Story, Taney, Holmes, among the dead—could be called great men. But nearly all of them have risen in some measure to the challenge of their great responsibility." The editorial continued, "A current case in point is Justice Hugo Black, President Roosevelt's first and widely damned as his worst appointee, who is winning informed respect for his earnestness and intense awareness of the impact of changing social-economic conditions on the law." And the editorial concluded, "He may take his place with the great Justices of history."

I see that my 14 minutes are up, so until next week at this time, good night.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

SPEECH BY MR. HOMER MAT ADAMS INTRODUCING THE PRESIDENT AT JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ON APRIL 20, 1940

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Homer Mat Adams, president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, introducing the President of the United States at the Jefferson Day dinner in Washington on April 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, distinguished guests, and Young Democrats of America, today is National Young Democratic Day. Throughout the States and Territories young democracy is assembled to honor our country's first young Democrat, Thomas Jefferson. Liberal in thought, progressive in action, and courageous in expression, he fought for the rank and file of the American people.

Before reaching his thirtieth birthday, Thomas Jefferson was chosen Governor of Virginia. At the age of 33 he drafted the Declaration of Independence, and while still a young Democrat he fought for and had enacted into the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights.

Through these dinners honoring his memory, we hope to fire the interest of youth in progressive government. In keeping with this spirit, it is appropriate that this day, in 1940, we enjoy the privilege of hearing from the man who personifies the ideals of Jefferson, who has kept the Bill of Rights as an active force of protection for the American people, whose life embraces a continuous struggle to keep government looking forward and moving forward—it is my extreme pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to present to you the President of the United States.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTERS FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Robert H. Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and a letter from the Attorney General to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, both relating to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT H. HINCKLEY,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Authority,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HINCKLEY: If Congress takes no adverse action on Reorganization Plans III and IV, the effectuation of these plans will require that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, subject to the approval of the President, determine the necessary transfers of funds. In view of the limited time available and because of certain questions arising out of the complexity of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Bureau of the Budget has consulted with the Department of Justice in order to establish a sound basis for the distribution of the available appropriation balances of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Attorney General has agreed to the following interpretive statements concerning the civil aeronautics provisions of the two plans:

1. Plan III centralizes in the Administrator, who is hereafter to be known as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, those functions that are essentially of an administrative character as distinguished from those relating to economic regulation; the prescription of safety standards, rules, and regulations; and the suspension and revocation of certificates after hearing. Thus, in addition to the functions now vested in the Administrator by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, he will be responsible for the administration of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; the issuance and amendment of airman, aircraft, and air-carrier certificates; emergency suspension of certificates; the registration of aircraft including the recordation of conveyances; the enforcement of safety rules, regulations, and standards; and the control of notification as to hazards to air commerce.

2. Plan III divests the Authority of all control it now has over the personnel and expenditures of the Administrator.

3. Plan III leaves the Authority with all the functions described in title 4 (air carrier economic regulation) of the Civil Aeronautics Act; such of those functions described in title 5 (nationality and ownership of aircraft), and title 6 (civil aeronautics safety regulation) as relate to the prescription of safety standards, rules, and regulations, and the suspension and revocation of certificates after hearing; and the functions vested in the Authority by section 205 (a) and title 10. In connection with the suspension and revocation of certificates, it should be noted that a waiver of a hearing would not operate to deprive the Authority of its jurisdiction.

4. In performing air-safety work, the Administrator will be bound by the rules of the Authority and the extent of his administrative discretion will be entirely dependent upon the rules so prescribed.

5. While the Administrator may submit recommendations to the Board as to safety rules, regulations, and standards, it is anticipated that the Board will have adequate technical facilities for arriving at its own independent determination as to the soundness of such recommendations, and for developing such material on its own initiative.

6. In order to eliminate the existing confusion in terminology, plan IV provides that the present 5-member Authority shall hereafter be known as the Civil Aeronautics Board, and employs the term Civil Aeronautics Authority merely as an over-all designation for the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

7. Plan IV transfers to the Civil Aeronautics Board all functions now performed by the Air Safety Board.

8. In performing its functions, including those mentioned above, the Civil Aeronautics Board will be entirely independent of and in no way subject to control by the Department of Commerce or the Secretary thereof. This independence is specifically referred to in two separate paragraphs of plan IV.

9. The requirement in plan IV that the Board report to Congress and the President through the Secretary of Commerce provides for the routing of such documents through the Secretary so that he may have an opportunity to examine them and append such comments as he may wish to make. This provision does not imply that the Secretary may in any way delete or revise the reports and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

10. In providing that the routine management functions of the Board shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce through such facilities as he shall designate or establish, plan IV is designed to prevent the uneconomical duplication of such facilities by the Board, the personnel of which will be relatively small. This provision is not intended to divest the Board of its authority to appoint and control all of its personnel, to authorize expenditures, or to determine and support the Budget estimates that are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. As stated in the President's message, its purpose is to make available to the Board, in the interest of efficiency, departmental services in connection with these functions.

11. The Board is left with full authority to make its contacts with other agencies of the Federal Government and with State and foreign governments. It is reasonable to assume that the Board will make the necessary arrangements with the Secretary of Commerce so as to coordinate such contacts with those made by the Administrator and thereby minimize duplication of effort.

12. Those functions of the secretary of the Authority which relate to the maintenance of dockets and the keeping of minutes cannot be regarded as routine management functions and will, therefore, remain directly under the Board.

13. Plan IV obviously contemplates that the Board will have its own legal and other technical facilities. Any other interpretation would be in direct conflict with the independence which is to surround the Board's determinations.

14. In connection with the investigation of air accidents, the Board, pursuant to the statutory prescription of the duties of the present Air Safety Board, will furnish the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics with copies of any reports or recommendations that relate to the functions vested in the Administrator.

15. The compromise of civil penalties for violations of titles 5 and 6 becomes a function of the Administrator, since it must be regarded as an integral part of the responsibility for the enforcement of these provisions. On the other hand, the Board will have the power to make compromises involving violations of title 7.

16. As contrasted with the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Administrator will be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

I feel certain that this interpretation is in full accord with what was envisaged by the President in submitting the reorganization proposals to Congress. Identical copies of this letter are being sent to the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1940.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I have examined your letter of this date to the Secretary of Commerce in which you set forth your interpretation of the provisions of Reorganization Plans III and IV relating to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and I agree with the conclusions reached by you.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

Government and Business Can Cooperate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESSES BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, MR. HENRY I. HARRIMAN, AND SENATOR MEAD

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD ad-

dresses on the subject Government and Business Can Cooperate, delivered by the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States; Mr. Henry I. Harriman, former president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and myself on the occasion of the Democratic Forum held at the Riverside Stadium, Washington, D. C., on the evening of May 3, 1940. This notable forum was sponsored by the Woman's National Democratic Club as a feature of the National Institute of Government, conducted here last week by the women's division of the Democratic National Committee.

This forum proved to be a successful and enlightening program. The Honorable MARY T. NORTON, chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives, served as moderator; and Mr. Felix Morley, editor of the Washington Post, summarized the discussions from a nonpartisan, independent viewpoint.

Mrs. Curtis Shears, under whose chairmanship the meeting was conducted, pointed out that it was the hope of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee that similar forums might be organized throughout the States as fact-finding groups dedicated first and foremost by its sponsors to the principles of peace, unity, and cooperation.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT H. JACKSON, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

I once knew a smart lawyer who always took his well-to-do clients to court dressed up in their old clothes. He thought that got sympathy from the jury. I recognize the same tactics in some of the smart lawyer candidates who are trying to dress up their political contributors in old clothes to get the sympathy of the voters this fall. It must be annoying that just as they all joined in a calamity chorus picturing their contributors in rags and patches, along comes the news about the profits of leading corporations for 1939.

I hold here the April 1940 business letter of the National City Bank. They cannot say that is New Deal propaganda. It tabulates the profits for 1939 of 2,480 companies representing all major lines and having capital, surplus, and undivided profits of more than $55,000,000,000. The year's profits on this capital were at an average rate of 6.2 percent. That average reflects the worst as well as the best. But the average profit of manufacturing corporations alone was 8.5 percent, of public utilities it was 6.9 percent, and of trade corporations 11.3 percent.

Now, I would like to hear these candidates say what they think these corporations ought to earn if 6 percent to 11 percent represents ruin. What rate of profit do they think our economy can afford to pay these corporations and what is a fair rate of profit with interest rates at their present level and employment and national income down?

If these gentlemen said that, in spite of this general prosperity, there were specific lines of industry that are sick and need attention, I should agree with them. If they said that the concentration of wealth in the United States has proceeded to a point where the prosperity of the big corporations listed on Wall Street does not indicate an equal prosperity throughout the country, again I should agree. And if they were to say that underlying this corporation prosperity are serious economic and social problems, such as unemployment, again I should agree. But to contend that business in the United States is "on dead center" as one of the candidates put it last night, or that the Government is destroying American business, or that there is no prosperity in this land, is little short of ridiculous. The administration's enemies in the past 7 years have predicted in America more ruin to business and to our form of government and to our society, than has actually happened in Europe. The public has again and again found their predictions false. And their claim that American business is in ruins will likewise be found false and those who are making such exaggerated claims are doing business no real service.

It is one of the syndicated fables of the opposition that this administration is hostile to business.

The fact is that the most extensive effort ever made by any administration at cooperation between business and Government was undertaken by this administration when it passed the National Industrial Recovery Act. That authorization of self-government for business was sponsored before congressional committees by my opponent on this platform tonight, Mr. Henry I. Harriman, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, as well as by the administration. Moreover, a similar effort to establish self-government and to overcome the demoralization of the petroleum industry, and another for the same purpose in the bituminous-coal industry were sponsored by this administration. These measures constituted the greatest experiment in self-regulation and self-control ever offered to American business. Every one of these ventures was destroyed by businessmen who instituted lawsuits that were argued by business lawyers and decided by a court that certainly was not a part of the New Deal. Whether these endeavors, on a permanent basis, were wise for the country as a whole is arguable, but they offered to businessmen a chance to get together among themselves and write their own ticket—and American business missed the boat.

I should suppose that the most important need of a successful business would be customers. The great collapse of 1929 was destructive to private business because it destroyed millions of its customers. A laborer out of work, a farmer with his farm under foreclosure, a home owner with his property advertised for taxes, a citizen who has been cheated of his savings by stock salesmen, or who has had his savings wiped out by bank failure, is not a first-class customer. To restore the purchasing power of these people, which would again put them in the market as purchasers of useful commodities, has been one of the most persistent and most costly efforts of this administration. Through emergency work relief, through public buildings programs, through home owners' loans, employment insurance, and old-age benefits this administration has struggled not only to keep their bodies and souls together but also to save these people as customers of business.

After the businessman has customers, his next most important need is enough capital to carry on his trade. No administration in the history of this or any other nation ever made available to private enterprise such an amount of capital to restore the banking and transportation systems, and to provide working capital for manufacturing enterprise. And it has been furnished at a very low rate of interest. This Administration has not only provided business with customers, but also with the capital to meet their demands.

But it is charged that the Administration is hostile to business, because the Government is regulating this or controlling that business. Unfortunately, the nature of the competitive business struggle is such that the Government has to arbitrate between different groups of businessmen. Practically every regulation that has at any time been imposed on American business has been championed by one group of businessmen to protect itself from the exploitation or oppression of another group.

It was the businessman as a shipper who demanded protection from the businessman as a railroad operator and obtained the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate rates and stop rebates and discriminations. It was the businessman who obtained the creation of the Federal Trade Commission to protect him from the unfair trade practices and unfair competition of other businessmen. It was capitalists and investors in American business who demanded a Securities and Exchange Commission to bring truth into the securities business. It was the businessman who bought electric power and the investors who bought electric securities who demanded the regulation of the public utilities holding companies. I am unable to recall a single antitrust prosecution that was not instituted on the complaint of businessmen who sought protection against competitors who threatened them with injury or destruction. Nothing would be more disastrous than for the Government to cease these activities and let business be governed only by the principle of dog-eat-dog.

Some businessmen, admitting all of this, point out the National Labor Relations Act, the wage and hour law, and the policy of high wages and maximum welfare for labor as evidence of hostility to business. We still have stone-age mentalities who think that the way to lift business is to keep labor down.

The fact is that American industry is geared to supply a high standard of living, and if the American people are unable to maintain a high consumption of food products and of manufactured goods, American industry will fail. A Chinese coolie labor system in this country would give our industrial giants cheap labor, but it would destroy the market for their goods. The only customer worth his salt to American business is the one who demands the American standard of living. This administration has been determined to maintain those standards and to arm the laboring forces of the country with such weapons as collective bargaining, so that they may themselves defend their living standards. I know that this is for the good of American labor and I believe it is equally good for American business. A low-wage policy or sweatshop hours may mean temporary profits to a few greedy men, but their general establishment would break down American business just as certainly as it would break the heart of the American workman.

The campaign of 1940 can be a constructive one if those who are complaining of present legislation will state frankly and honestly what they propose to repeal and what they propose to enact. Why not say what changes they propose to make in the law requiring truth in the sale of securities or regulating the stock exchanges? Why not tell us what they propose to do with the Labor Relations Act or the Wage and Hour Act? What their antitrust policy would be? How much profit will they want for the great industries before they will be willing to support old-age pensions or relief for the unemployed?

It will take more than a parade of old clothes to make this country believe that this administration is hostile to business, when we can go into every community of the Nation and point to banks and industries that would not be operating today except for its loan of capital. It will take something besides epithets to convince the long line of customers, who can patronize American business only

because the Government has come to their rescue, that the President is trying to destroy prosperity. But we cannot, and no decent government ever can, accept the proposition that everything is legitimate if only it makes somebody a profit. Every person who believes, as I do believe, in a system of free private enterprise, knows that Government must take steps to keep it free and keep it within the rules of the game. And business itself—legitimate business that wants to thrive on a fair margin of profit and to pay a decent wage and to compete in the market with other businessmen on a decent basis—knows that business and Government not only can cooperate and must cooperate, but that they have cooperated to an unprecedented extent in the last 7 years.

ADDRESS OF HENRY I. HARRIMAN

In these troubled times of wars and depressions it is of infinite importance not only to our own country but to the entire world that the United States maintain a sound and solvent economic system based upon the continuance of free business enterprise, equal and fair economic opportunities for all, and the preservation of the full rights of individual liberty which are guaranteed to the people of the United States in the Bill of Rights.

Totalitarian governments have invariably arisen because of mass misery, and want and hunger have been the impelling motives which induced men to give up their individual liberty for the essential "pot of porridge." It was indeed a wise man who defined democracy as "liberty plus groceries" and an astute person who said "You cannot eat individual initiative," and I am a firm believer that the only way in which the American people can permanently preserve their liberties is to so adjust their economic system that privation and want shall not stalk through a land which has all of the essential raw materials, the labor, the capital, and the technical skill to give an abundance to its entire people. To do that without establishing a totalitarian government, without giving up the economic system under which the United States has grown great and powerful, and without surrendering our individual liberties requires the closest cooperation between American business, American labor, American agriculture, and the Government of the United States.

We are continually asking the question, "What kind of a world will emerge from this period of economic distress and war? Will it be one that people will enjoy living in, a world in which human freedom is respected and the energies of men turned anew to the arts of peace? Or will it be one wherein old and tested ways of economic and social life struggle vainly against the upsurges of new forces?"

No one can, of course, answer these questions categorically and we cannot prophesy whether calm wisdom or blind hate will dominate the era of reconstruction which lies ahead; but these things are certain: (1) That we are living in a world of economic and social interdependence which represents, in many respects, the flowering of centuries of gradual development; (2) That human liberty cannot be preserved if the profound distress, resulting from economic disorganization, continues; and (3) That the wisdom of men must be mobilized to prevent the continuation of this distress. There is indeed no such thing as a final plan for human happiness. The best that we can do is to build wisely from the experience of the past and to recognize, as Dean Pound has said of the law, that our economic life should always be stable but never static.

Thus far I have spoken in generalities. May I now specifically outline my views as to the way in which business and government can cooperate. In the period of our national life when the Nation was growing up, when the rich lands of the West and the South were being settled, and when our railroads, our utilities and our great industries were being constructed, there was work for every man and woman who desired to labor. In this period of growth there was not the degree of mechanization or centralization of industry which exists today and our people were not so interdependent one upon the other. There are still great and unexplored frontiers in science and technology and daily the ability of man to produce more is increasing; but all of this means a greater interdependence of each group and each individual upon other groups and other individuals. This is the first thing that business must recognize in our ever-changing economic world and it must recognize as a corollary that because of this greater interdependence there arises the need for the social insurance of the individual against the three great hazards of life—sickness, unemployment, and old age. It may well be true that the laws which have been passed to give this security are not in all ways wise, and that they may require change and amendment. To this end government and business should quietly and dispassionately cooperate.

Again business must recognize that labor is entitled to the untrammeled right to organize or remain unorganized as it desires and have a ceiling for its hours and a floor for its wages. In the two nations of Europe, England and Sweden, which, until the war enjoyed the greatest degree of prosperity, this right has long been recognized, and many employers in these two countries said to the American commission which studied labor relations abroad, that they could not understand the need of a Labor Relations Act or a Labor Relations Board as the problem which the Board was created to adjust did not exist in their countries. I personally feel that many details of our present labor acts are unwise, and that the administration of them has not been entirely unbiased, but I do say to American business that if it asks Congress to correct these acts it should, at the same time, lessen the need of such laws.

Finally, I think that American business must recognize the right of agriculture to a just reward for its labor. This country cannot be half prosperous and half depressed; and industry cannot hope to prosper when agricultural prices are at or near the levels of the early thirties. We may, indeed, doubt the wisdom of many of the features of the agricultural laws which are now on the statute books, but we cannot deny the need of a prosperous agriculture.

Thus far I have spoken of certain mental attitudes which business must have if it is to seek cooperation with government, to wit, that it must recognize the need of social insurance against unemployment, sickness, and old age; that it must admit the inherent right of labor to organize or remain unorganized as it may desire, and that it must acknowledge that agriculture is entitled to a fair reward for its effort.

Now may I speak briefly of what government must do if there is to be free and full cooperation between business and government. First, it must recognize wholeheartedly the desirability of our present system of free business enterprise, and it must not permit the entry of government into competition with industry. Proper and limited regulation of business to protect the public interest is admitted by business but it does not approve the degree of regulation exercised by many boards and commissions and it does not and cannot grant the desirability of the Government entering large fields of enterprise which would otherwise be carried out privately. Second, government must appreciate that free enterprise can only be carried on if it has the spur of profits, not meager profits but large profits, to compensate for its many and inevitable losses. This means tax adjustments which will encourage the spirit of enterprise, even of adventurous enterprise. Our railroads, our utilities, and our great industries were built by venturesome men who made much and lost much, and I say to you frankly that if you desire to kill private enterprise and prevent it from creating jobs for the unemployed, don't levy losses upon enterprise and then deprive it of compensating profits when they are made. Any effort to limit the profits of industry to 3 percent or even 6 percent in the face of its inevitable losses is to sound the death knell of private enterprise and to herald the advent of state socialism.

In the welter of criticism which business, with some reason, levels at the present administration, I am frequently asked what I have to say in defense of the New Deal and of the Roosevelt regime. The present administration came into power in the midst of the greatest economic crisis which this country has ever gone through. Its banks were closed, at least one-third of its workers were unemployed or on reduced pay, cotton was selling at 5 cents a pound, corn at 10 cents a bushel, and wheat at four bushels to the dollar. Under these circumstances, fully one-third of the local taxes of the country were not being paid and there were many in all ranks of life who wondered whether recovery was possible without a change in our form of government. The first great achievement of the administration was the restoration of confidence to all classes in the land. With a smile and with supreme confidence in the future of America, the President caused the country to take heart. I was in Washington in those days and I heard no voice raised in opposition to the great effort which the President was making to rebuild the confidence of the people.

As a part of this effort came many laws to prevent the continuation of the downward spiral of business. I have but to recount the various banking laws which were passed which enabled the banks of the country to reopen with ample capital and with assurance to depositors that they would not lose their deposits, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which prevented the foreclosure of hundreds of thousands of mortgages on homes and a similar act which preserved the ownership of farms, both acts providing for new mortgages on a sound basis of real value. There was also passed a Securities and Exchange Act, designed to place under proper regulation the exchanges of the country and to prevent a recurrence of the orgy of speculation which flowered in the closing days of the last decade, and the various agricultural acts which provided for the conservation of soil, the removal from cultivation of much submarginal land, the insurance of crops, and the temporary regulation of supply to demand in the basic agricultural crops. In this connection, may I say that I do not believe in the appropriation of huge funds from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of any particular class of our people (although it may be justified as an emergency measure) and I am confident that other ways can be found to assure the farmers fair or parity prices for the portion of their product which enters into domestic consumption. These are only a few of the emergency acts which were passed for the protection of the people of the United States in the early days of the present administration and there are few businessmen who do no approve the basic principles underlying these laws.

The second important achievement of the present administration was the passage of laws permitting the negotiation of Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade treaties. The Secretary will, in my opinion, go into history as one of the really great Americans of this period. He saw clearly that science and technology had wrought the world into one economic whole, that a policy of isolation could not continue, that trade barriers must be reduced, that international trade was a necessity, and that foreign trade meant not merely selling abroad but also buying from other nations. There are few in busi-

ness who do not approve of these treaties. While I am speaking of Secretary Hull's achievements, may I also refer to the President and his earnest efforts to amend our former Neutrality Act which forbade the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents before the outbreak of the war. I was in Berlin in March of 1939 and talked with many prominent Germans and I can say to you without any hesitation that if Congress had amended the Neutrality Act before the outbreak of the war and if it had been generally known that the great industrial resources of America would be at the command of the Allies, to the extent of their ability to pay, there would have been great hesitation on the part of Germany to precipitate a war. Germany knew she was prepared; she knew that in many respects her industrial machine was far superior to that of France and England, and what she really feared was that if war came American industry would supply a large quota of aircraft and ammunition to the democracies. Unfortunately, that assurance was not given by America until after the present great tragedy was under way.

Another real achievement of the administration was the passing of the various social-security laws. There are three great tragedies of life—sickness, unemployment, and old age—and the Security Act was designed to lessen the hardships of these two last calamities. European countries had moved in this direction long before our acts were passed, and, while business may not approve all of their provisions, I do not think there is any thoughtful businessman who would wish to abolish old-age or unemployment insurance. May I add that I hope the problem of sickness insurance, both through public and private effort, will not be too long delayed.

The Federal Housing Administration has done a most excellent task in stimulating the construction and improvement of small dwellings. Its mortgages are sound, its construction is well supervised, it has put much idle capital to work, and it has given employment to many thousands. Business approves the F. H. A.

Finally, may I refer to the courage of the Department of Justice in attempting to enforce our antitrust laws not only to prevent monopoly in business but also to stop rackets in the realm of labor. We should have honest and untrammeled competition in business, and equal freedom for labor. Anything which tends to unduly restrict output or to check the advance of technology, thereby making possible a higher standard of living, is against the real spirit which has made America great.

The administration has not balanced the Budget, it has not limited the growth of the national debt, it has not solved the problem of unemployment, but it has accomplished many excellent reforms, of which I have mentioned a few, and I would prophesy that if a Republican administration follows a Democratic administration in 1941 few of the basic principles of New Deal laws will be changed. Whoever is elected President in 1940 will desire many changes in the details of these laws and many alterations in their methods of administration, but he will not desire the repeal of these acts or a major set-back to the social reforms which have been enacted in the last 8 years. We are living in a period of evolution, and if we evolve wisely our period of evolution will not become an era of revolution.

If business and government will each recognize the few principles which I have outlined, if they will stop calling each other names, and if each will cultivate a spirit of real friendship for the other, then that indefinable something which we call patriotism when it relates to the Nation, and confidence when it relates to business, will be reborn, cooperation will become a reality, our present system of democratic government will not be replaced by the totalitarian state, and private enterprise will continue to bless the Nation in the future as it has in the past. How can I better close than by quoting from Daniel Webster, who said in one of his great addresses:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up and preserve its institutions, promote all of its great interests, maintain its Government, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

I am pleased to participate in this program so appropriately dedicated to an improved understanding of the problems which confront both government and industry. This is an appropriate occasion to discuss the gains that we have made, and to take stock of the responsibility that we must assume.

Under the disturbing circumstances of today, when the civilized world is being torn asunder through the rush of armaments and the disaster of war, we have increased reason for meeting on common ground.

Our unemployment problem is another reason for the practice of the democratic way. Cooperation and harmony between industry, labor, and Government is now a real necessity. Neither political considerations, nor self-seeking aggrandizement must be permitted to thwart and to obscure the requirement for a united national front.

Labor and government have enjoyed a pleasant relationship under our present liberal leadership. Labor has proven a mighty force in the advancement of effective governmental means to insure the economic and social well-being of our people.

Our present government, on the other hand, has dissipated the barriers that kept political agencies in the past functioning for the few.

It has legislated and administrated for social and economic security. It has sought a wider diffusion and distribution of wealth, while adhering to a continuation of the capitalistic system, with its profit motive.

A government that gains its authority from the consent of the people must respond to social demands and economic pressure. These forces, operating in every community, advocated by every unemployed and underpaid worker, by tenant farmer and sharecropper, assert themselves in our legislative forums, and very properly so.

Labor was obliged to look to the Federal Government because this modern age brought problems too complex and too widespread for the independent agencies of labor alone to conquer.

Unemployment became our major problem 10 years ago. The increased efficiency of man-made labor-saving machines; the enlarged productivity resulting from mass production; the unwholesome labor practices on the part of a few industrialists; the continued exploitation of children in industry; and the unfairness which developed with large-scale employment of underpaid women workers presented problems for government to consider. The Fair Labor Standards Act is our answer to sweatshop-employment conditions.

The right to organize into unions and the right to bargain collectively for improved working conditions became an increasingly difficult effort.

This was not completely a struggle between labor and industry, for the great majority of industrial leaders likewise recognized that their security was at stake. They recognized that the few unscrupulous exploiters of labor were polluting the very springs of democracy, and that wise, judicious, governmental supervision was the only answer.

And so, the Federal Government carefully paved a pathway on which labor might travel with safety and assurance; on which industry might find protection and comfort; and where true democracy in the Nation's business enterprises might function.

Democratic cooperation could follow labor organization. That pathway is marked with a series of outstanding legislative achievements. The Social Security Act, the Wage and Hour Act, the Wagner Labor Act, the provision of job opportunities on programs of public works—these and other accomplishments are the milestones that mark that happy highway, that pathway which the New Deal pioneered.

The foundations on which we have built during the past 7 years, and the legislative structure that we have raised, are here to stay.

We recognize that, when experience indicates that defects are marring the smooth application of the actual operation of these laws, and when it is indicated that the rights and privileges of either employers or employees are being unfairly affected, then we must, in mutual cooperation, unite in helpful and wholesome readjustments.

But the alterations that may be made shall not destroy the philosophy which inspired and which now underlies these measures.

Yes, labor and government have enjoyed a mutuality of purpose during these recent enlightened years of liberal Federal administration.

Labor is interested in an economic balance, in a national economy that will give stability to business, in decent employment opportunities for our workers, and in a reasonable prosperity for agriculture.

That, too, is the attitude of liberal, progressive government.

It has been said that labor has achieved its greatest gains under this administration. That is certainly true in spite of implications advanced by some who are either motivated by partisanship or by an unwillingness to accept the modern-day obligation of government and business toward the security and well-being of the masses of our people who must subsist on the fruits of their daily toil.

All of the advances which we have been able to make during these 7 eventful years, and which have served to bring about a kindlier atmosphere in which both government and labor may progress, are affirmative, positive, constructive steps.

We are not looking backward any longer. We are facing the sunshine of a new day. We are on the march to a higher standard of living.

It is not sufficient to say that we are on labor's side or that labor is on our side. Rather, let us say that we are together and that we share common, constructive views. We are on democracy's side.

Labor, since the beginning of the industrial system, has surmounted many obstacles, and it has tasted both the bitterness of defeat and the sweetness of victory.

But down through the years it has clung steadfastly to the banner of progress in government.

For the past 7 years, under the leadership of the outstanding liberal of this day and age, the President of the United States, we have carried that banner. We are not going to lay it down, nor are we going to permit any vitiation of the cooperation and fraternalism that have been developed between government and labor.

We who subscribe to progress in government are not blind to the unsolved problems that remain with us.

We know that there are still unemployed in our Nation, we know that a threat to our peace is in the air, and we know that there are unfriendly subversive influences within our shores.

These are major considerations with which our Government must deal during the next few years while the world crisis of the early forties is at hand.

We know that we are not going to master these problems by turning our backs to them. The solution rather will lie in a continued attack on domestic insecurity and instability, upon the intelligent rearrangement of our domestic affairs, and upon measures designed to insure peace.

We are going to improve on the enlightened formula which we now follow. We are going to banish joblessness and insecurity. In the enactment of social security, the wage and hour law, the Wagner Labor Act, the child-labor law, and the Public Contracts Act we have laid the mudsills for the superstructure in the soil of our country.

We are well along on that program now. With peace as our objective, with domestic tranquillity our most earnest endeavor, and with a continued solicitation of cooperation and harmony between Government, business, and labor we shall, under progressive leadership, accomplish the high resolve that has thus far activated this administration.

America's Duty to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject America's Duty to the Future delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the New York Federation of Women's Clubs, Hotel Astor, New York City, May 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In modern times, the Nation has not witnessed a more significant and important development of civic spirit than is found in such organizations as the Federation of Women's Clubs, which I am proud to address today. When things go wrong in the business, social, and political world, women are among the first to suffer. From them usually comes the first inspiration to improve conditions which might otherwise become chaotic. Thus my message to you today concerns the welfare of that place where womankind rules supreme—the home—and the happiness, the peace, and the security which should surround it.

Our present position of national prominence did not result from accident. As a nation we became great through thoughtful planning for the future and through an invincible determination to translate those plans into action. The time has now come when we must plan anew, otherwise hordes of schemers with fantastic ideas that sprang from unworkable and alien philosophies from abroad will eat away the otherwise firm foundations upon which our Nation is built. Vile and vicious forces are today seeking to tear our America asunder—killing freedom, ravishing justice, and destroying liberty in the name of transplanted totalitarianism. The one achievement above all others which America must preserve is that of good citizenship. By this I mean a preservation of our democratic institutions, freedom, liberty, respect for country, and better government through the efforts and will of all our people.

Without a superior stalwart national citizenship, everything is insecure. The ideas which international propagandists would foist upon us are the very antithesis of American citizenship. Churches have been closed by the mere whim of a dictator; the members of the clergy have been humiliated. As has been the case in other lands, homes can be wrecked, businesses ruined, jobs lost forever, and personal security relegated to fearful outrages of secret police more criminal than even the worst murderers they can accuse.

Some of our dangerous gangsters have come from foreign shores. The worst of these, however, are not the murderers or racketeers. Far more dangerous are those who advocate revolution under the disguise, as the Communist spokesman, Earl Browder, put it, "We are the Americans and communism is the Americanism of the twentieth century." Such masqueraders have not as much respect for constituted authority as does the average robber, highwayman, or murderer; at least the latter admit their crimes and, in many cases, accept their punishment as just and due. Those who would subvert liberty meanwhile shout most loudly for the protection of the Constitution while seeking to destroy its sacred guaranties. There is no such thing as liberty unless it is liberty under law.

A great many false notions of liberty are now quite common, due to plausibly worded propaganda designed by the seducers of our liberties to mislead Americans. This they will never do, because the heart and soul of America, once aroused, is unconquerable.

This has been demonstrated time and again. Until recent years the kidnaper thought that all he need do to enrich his coffers was to snatch the body of some defenseless child or adult and then collect his ransom. In this he was successful until Congress, acting upon urgent appeals, authorized the F. B. I. to function under laws designed by a farseeing Attorney General.

How many kidnapings occurred before that time no one knows. Any figure at best would be an estimate, because victims then were afraid to speak up, facing inevitable gangland vengeance. But we do know that since 1932, 179 cases of kidnaping have been reported to the F. B. I. and 177 of these cases have been completely solved. Thus the kidnaping menace that once was a nightmare in every home in the land has come to be a thing of the past, because an aroused people determined that kidnapers must no longer operate with impunity.

The same applies to the bank robber, whose vicious plunderings have been reduced to a faint echo of past activities. The same is true of the extortioner and organized gangdom in general. These vicious forces are fearfully conscious that they are no longer at liberty to rob, plunder, and steal, because the American people have decreed against their invisible empire.

However, the notion is prevalent in too many communities that liberty means, "Do as you wish as long as you don't get caught." That is why 4,067 serious crimes are committed every 24 hours. That is why a human life is sacrificed on crime's altar ever 44 minutes, and that is why a robbery occurs every 9½ minutes, a larceny every 36 seconds, and a burglary every minute and a half.

Because the misdirected energy and perverted teachings, we have in the F. B. I. today, the fingerprints of some 5,000,000 persons who have been arrested for an offense more serious than a traffic violation. Before this year comes to a close, approximately 1,000,000 persons will have heard the clanging doors close behind them as they enter jails, prisons, and reformatories, and all because they had not been properly schooled in the true meaning of liberty.

Because of misinterpretation of liberty, often deliberately brought about by inciters of violence, the Nation is paying a crime bill which in 3 years would equal our national debt. Hence, every decent citizen should rededicate himself to a furtherance of liberty in its truest sense, defined by our democratic traditions. There is only one way to insure liberty to all peoples. That is by a firm adherence to justice, such as has been provided and established in our American heritage, and in our Constitution which we must preserve for the future at all costs.

America's duty to the future demands that the cherished principles of liberty be preserved for all time. We can do this best by striking at the forces which assail liberty—the lawless, the thoughtless, and the exponents of totalitarian serfdom and slavery.

We must and shall cope with this effort to enslave us through perversions of the truth. The first line of defense is the home, with its all-important atmosphere of expectations and fond hopes for the future and the training so necessary to develop future generations of Americans.

Modern law enforcement has demonstrated its ability to cope with the hardened criminal, but at best that is only first-aid treatment. The only permanent cure lies in killing the infectious and deepseated germs of lawlessness with a thorough prophylactic, which is best administered by proper home training and environment.

Sinister forces of the underworld, with totalitarianism, constantly seek new places to work their evil. Youth, more youth, is sought for this purpose. We must inoculate our young against such treacherous germs. This means proper home training, proper precept, and proper example. We can prevent more crime in the high chair than in the electric chair, whether that crime be against property or against our Nation.

Youth must be told about the slime and dirt that infest the underworld. Dishonesty is one common denominator found in all criminals. It must be met with the daily teachings of the virtues of honesty. In teaching honesty, you are also teaching Americanism. You are piercing smoke screens of falsehood and subterfuge thrown up by enemies of America, one of which insists—to quote a resolution of the Communist Party—"More revolutionary novels and short stories especially based on American life must be issued for the youth."

The corruption of our youth by subversive activities is a violation of our American liberties and is an attempt to lure us into the fear, the injustice, and the slavery of totalitarian barbarism. And this is so regardless of the high-sounding names of hypocritical "front" organizations. Our greatest asset is intellectual freedom. Our worst menace is intellectual debauchery, which is as rotten and untenable as the filth from which it springs. Certainly we have a right to inquire into the character of our children's education. We have the inalienable right to see that they are taught the true principles of Americanism and nothing else. If young Americans are to be educated for the future, parents must accept

the responsibility of seeing that this education is properly given for a better and safer Nation.

What are you doing to make your child recognize his good fortune in being an American? Are you teaching him a respect for his country and its institutions? Does he respect the American flag as a symbol of liberty? Does he respect honorable forces of law and order? Have you compared his plight with that of boys and girls in other lands? Do you take him to the shrines of great Americans and tell him their glorious histories? Does he go to Sunday school and church, and is he taught that he is responsible to God rather than to some spouting dictator whose insane ego denies even the power of the Deity and charges that religion is the opiate of the people?

A flood of vilification has recently been loosed upon all things American by scandal sheets which espouse the cause of foreign "isms." We must counter with a constant program of education, designed to penetrate this thinly veiled and slimy propaganda. We are a peaceful people, and we want no part of the terrible turmoil and sickening strife that is going on across the seas. Let us not be blinded, however, to the necessity of preparedness for any emergency.

We of the F. B. I. have not been spared from the sting of vicious, anti-American propaganda cleverly designed to blind the eyes of otherwise sincere and conscientious citizens. We have been charged with having created an American Ogpu or Gestapo. Let's get at the truth of what is behind a lot of such untrue and utterly malicious statements.

I charge that the most vicious "smear" campaign which is being directed against the F. B. I. is a part of the working program of various anti-American forces, the basis of which is to undermine public confidence in the law-enforcement bodies of America and thus weaken the defenses of our internal security.

And I want to emphatically state that my remarks are not directed at any individual who sincerely criticizes the F. B. I. from a constructive viewpoint. I do say, however, that the Communist charge that there is the slightest desire in the F. B. I. for an Ogpu or a Gestapo is nothing but blustering ballyhoo designed to cover their own Trojan horse activities. The Communists hope that with the F. B. I. shackled, they can proceed without interference as they go their boring, undermining way to overthrow our Government.

You must learn to judge people by what they think. These totalitarian tricksters are the very first ones who would introduce un-American, violent, murderous types of spy systems into our country. They desire to break down true law enforcement in every part of America under the guise of the protection of alleged civil liberties so that they may, in turn, destroy the very things that they pretend to revere. Then, they seek by a type of confidence game to steal away your liberty, your home, and your constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In proof of this, I say to you that under constitutional safeguards as they now stand, it is utterly impossible for such a thing as an Ogpu or a Gestapo to exist in America. Let us look, for instance, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am merely the Director of this Bureau's activities under laws enacted by Congress; I have no right, no desire, and no means of being anything else.

The F. B. I., like all Federal bureaus, must present its report of activities and justify its work, for the purpose of securing appropriations, once each year. To do this, its record must be presented, not only before the public, but first, to the Attorney General of the United States, the Nation's chief law officer, who certainly would not favor the setting up of an Ogpu or a Gestapo.

From the Attorney General, the facts concerning the work of the F. B. I. go each year to the Budget Bureau, where each item is carefully scrutinized. From the Budget Bureau, the reports and estimates covering the F. B. I.'s activities go to the White House, where they are reviewed by the President of the United States. From the White House, the estimates and reports are sent to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, where the Director of the F. B. I. must explain every major item and the reason why it has been entered in the estimate for appropriations. The various items of the appropriation are then considered on the floor of Congress by Members of the House of Representatives before being forwarded to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for review. The estimates then must be considered on the floor of the Senate. It is utterly ridiculous for the foreign ism advocates to charge that with these annual executive and legislative reviews of the work of the F. B. I. it could develop into anything resembling an Ogpu or Gestapo.

When these poisoners of American opinion tell you that an effort is being made to instigate an Ogpu or a Gestapo, they infer that every system of representative government has failed and that it is time for some other kind of government to come along and take over. That kind of governmental procedure is the perverted, subversive, serpentine type of nonrepresentative totalitarianism from lands of viciousness.

These perverted people scream about the denial of civil liberties in this country, although nowhere on earth is there less liberty, civil or of any other nature, than under the foreign governments they so vociferously champion. It has been proven time and again that they have every civil liberty which possibly can exist, that they possess in America more honest safety in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness than in any other nation in the world. And when their rights allegedly are violated, the courts of a free land are open to them. Their rights are as closely guarded here in America as the rights of subjects are defiled in the countries whose views they espouse. Therefore, what these people want is not civil liberty. They already have that. They are demanding, under a pretense of misapprehension, and deliberate falsehood, nothing more nor less than licentiousness—the right to take what they will of our possessions and our traditions and defile them as they please. They want the right to rule when, in many cases, they are not even citizens. These people are seeking to accomplish by propaganda what other aggressors usually do by force of arms, because they know they could not at the present resist the real force of Americanism which is found in this Nation.

It is America's duty to perpetuate a heritage that will continue to be a beacon light of freedom and equality to oppressed peoples the world over. Likewise, there is a present duty to evaluate the "front" organizations that exist by the score, designed to carry on destructive activities.

We should awaken to the fact that as soon as one "front" organization is exposed another springs up to carry on the program of scuttling America.

We must ever be on the alert to protect our democracy from the bacteria of barbarism. We need to stand firmly and fearlessly on democratic principles and upon no other foundation.

Our task requires patience and forbearance. It requires the faith of our fathers and the courage of present-day pioneering. We must know and respect and fight for only one ism—Americanism.

The motivating spirit of America must ever be justice. We need have no fears, so long as justice reigns. May we consecrate ourselves to this sacred cause in order that the stars and stripes may reign supreme and that our Nation may retain its supremacy as the exemplification of true democracy.

Banking System for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY PETER R. NEHEMKIS, JR.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD an address by Mr. Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., special counsel, Investment Banking Section, Securities and Exchange Commission, delivered on the 2d instant before the Kiwanis Club of Newark, N. J.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The small business enterprise is one of the Nation's most important employers, producers, and customers.

We have in this country about 2,400,000 business units. Of this number more than 90 percent are small—that is to say, they have assets of less than $250,000. Big business constitutes only 1 percent of the business population. Almost half of the Nation's gainfully employed have jobs in small business establishments. Despite the inroads of bigness, we are still a nation of small enterprises.

But small business is important to the country for other reasons than that it constitutes the largest body of employers and producers.

Small business also performs a unique service for the American consumer; it is the small-business man who is responsible for much of the versatility of product and service, which, despite standardization, is still highly valued by the consumer.

Nor can we afford to overlook the vital importance of small business to big business. It is frequently stated that the development of a new large business creates many new small businesses; it is less commonly recognized that without the existence of small enterprises it would be difficult for the large units to function. The large enterprise relies heavily upon smaller, independent units for the processing of a wide variety of machinery and products that are indispensable to its output and the distribution and sale of its product.

Perhaps the clearest example of the dependence of big business upon little business is the automobile industry. Without the small pattern and parts concerns the assembly lines of General Motors and Ford could not move, and without the network of dealers and distributors the great automotive factories would be paralyzed.

But there is still a further aspect to the relationship between big and little business. It is from small business that large business grows: Some of our largest and most important enterprises have emerged from "basement" or "backyard" origins. The classic example is, of course, the Ford Motor Co., which started operations with a cash capital of $28,000. It is sometimes useful to recall that Frank Woolworth started business with a stock of goods worth $200.

Nor should we overlook the highly significant fact that small business is the proving ground for large business. The radio was experimented with in homes and lofts long before it was put on the market by R. C. A. The plastic industry—one of our fastest growing new industries—had its origin in numerous small concerns which were later absorbed by the large units. I need scarcely remind this audience that the giant electrical industry was born only a few miles from Newark in the laboratories of Thomas A. Edison.

Moreover, because it is small, little business can adapt itself to changes in the business environment more quickly than can big business. You will all recall, in this connection, the huge expenditure which was required for the overhauling of plant and equipment to bring out the first model A Ford car. Now contrast this situation with that of two partners who own a small feather concern. They are being crowded by competitors. They decide to go into the manufacture of shuttlecocks used in the game of badminton. There are no boards of directors which have to be consulted; no battery of lawyers to advise on the effects of the proposed change; no special consultants to render reports upon the change in sales policy involved; no tax experts to report on how the change in business will affect Federal, State, and local taxes; and so on. Small enterprise may have less hull than the full-rigged corporation, but, like the racing yacht, it carries a greater spread of sail, has a lighter draft, and can change its course more swiftly. The ability of small business to change its plant without undue disruption of operations helps to explain the amazing vitality of the small enterprise in the competitive struggle. Such factors, among others, contribute to the varity of product which enables the small concern to serve a shifting market and profit by changes in style and varieties of demand.

For these and other reasons, it is of the utmost importance that we should have in this country a continuous growth of new and healthy small businesses. Since 1927, in relation to population, the number of business units has been declining. In 1935, there was a thinner "business population" than at any time during this century. During these years, the heaviest mortality has unquestionably occurred among the smaller business units and especially among the individually owned concerns, which are by far the most numerous. It is gratifying to note, however, that the downward trend stopped in 1935 and that the "business population" has been increasing steadily.

II

A major difficulty experienced by small business in recent years has been its inability to obtain adequate funds for its operations.

What kind of financial aid does small business require? What are the obstacles which stand in the way of its obtaining adequate financing?

By far, the most essential financial requirement of the small enterprise is for equity capital. But small business cannot obtain equity capital because it lacks direct contact with the sources of capital supply.

The major source of equity capital for small enterprise has always been the wealthy individual who was familiar with the business, its management, and the locality in which it operated.

Today, angels for small business are scarce. Your moneyed individual feels that the speculative profits are not worth the risk; he prefers to play safe and put his money in tax-exempt Government securities.

Where else can the small-business man turn for equity capital? Certainly, not to the investment banker. The investment banker cannot afford to underwrite the securities of the small concern whose name is not known beyond its own community. And besides, the amount of capital involved is usually too small to yield a profit if, indeed, it can cover flotation costs at any reasonable rate of commission.

There has been a great deal of newspaper discussion and feeling among small-business men that the Securities and Exchange Commission has been responsible for the inability of small businesses to obtain equity capital. In my opinion, this attitude is not based on fact.

The Commission has done everything within its power to reduce the costs of registration to the lowest level compatible with its duties under the Securities Act. It has provided for various exemptions from registration with respect to issues below $100,000. And for issues of intermediate size—for which there is required the filing of a full registration statement—special concessions have been provided. In order to reduce the cost of registration, the Commission has reduced the amount of information required from the small business concern.

Some of you may not be familiar with the fact that the Commission has established a special unit within its Registration Division for the purpose of aiding prospective registrants and advising them and their representatives on problems arising in connection with their registration statements. This unit has been utilized largely by small-business men.

The high cost of flotation of small issues—over and above the cost of registration—has been of major concern to the Commission. Studies prepared by the Commission's staff show that, among registered issues with expected proceeds of less than $1,000,000, the cost of flotation amounts to about 20 percent of the proceeds for common stock, about 16 percent for preferred stock, and about 7 percent for bonds.

An important fact, which is often overlooked in discussions of this problem, is the heavy compensation absorbed by the underwriters and other distributors of securities. For stock issues of less than $1,000,000, between 80 and 90 percent of the total flotation costs has consisted of compensation paid for underwriting and distribution. For bond issues of similar size, 70 percent of the flotation costs have been absorbed in such compensation. Other expenses, also not attributable to registration under the Securities Act, constitute a considerable portion of the remaining costs. While it is difficult to estimate precisely the additional cost of selling small issues resulting from registration under the Securities Act, it appears that such extra cost is not in excess of about 1 percent of the gross proceeds; in fact, there is reason to believe that it is nearer one-half of 1 percent.

It is not the alleged cost and delay of registration which is responsible for the small volume of unseasoned equity issues. A more significant factor—again frequently overlooked—is the inability of the small issues to find purchasers.

An analysis of 700 small-security registrations shows that, 1 year after the effective date of the registration, over one-third had not sold any of the securities registered. This means that over 200 such issues, fully registered and ready for market, could not find a single purchaser in the year following effective registration. This would appear to indicate that, in the words of Chairman Frank, and I quote, "The obstacles standing in the way of the successful flotation of issues of small and particularly unseasoned enterprises are to be found in places other than the requirements of the Securities Act."

In the final analysis, the small business enterprise has never utilized—and in all probability will never utilize—the machinery of investment banking or the security markets. Statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show the average assets of the small corporation to be $47,000. Plainly, the corporation with total assets of less than $250,000 is not the kind of enterprise which can be financed profitably by the investment banker or whose securities are suitable for trading in the public markets.

To say that the registration requirements under the Securities Act are a deterrent to the flow of capital to small business is plainly without any foundation. Issues of less than $100,000 are exempt from registration. In my opinion, it is extremely doubtful whether many of the 253,000 business corporations with average assets of $47,000 or the more than 2,300,000 small business establishments in this country will ever have occasion to raise capital in such amounts as to require registration.

With the wealthy individual disinclined to place his funds in the small enterprise, and the capital markets largely closed to small business as a source of equity capital, what other avenues are open?

The commercial bank? The answer, as you are all aware, is "No."

Now the commercial banker has been subjected to a great deal of criticism for not aiding small business. In general, the attitude of small business toward the commercial bank is summed up in the remark of the businessman who said: "If your business is in shape for a bank loan, it doesn't need one."

At the possible risk of incurring your displeasure, I want to take issue with some of the extreme criticism which is being directed against the commercial banker. In my opinion, such criticism is not only unjustified but is based on a failure to recognize the responsibility of the banker to his depositors, as well as the inherent limitation of commercial banking as a medium for supplying small business credits.

In the first place, not all small-business enterprises have difficulty in obtaining bank credit.

The heart of the problem has always been (and continues to be) that sizable groups of small-business men whose concerns are not so firmly established and whose personal resources are not so great as to be able to satisfy the credit standards of commercial banking. Those businesses which experience difficulty in obtaining bank credit generally fall into one of two groups: (1) That group of older enterprises whose liquid and capital assets have been dissipated through the depression years and whose credit facilities have been cut off through the shut-down of more than 15,000 local banks; or (2) that group of younger enterprises, still in the early stages of development, which have not yet either accumulated sufficient liquid and fixed capital or have been unable to establish permanent credit relations.

While there are in these two groups a considerable number of businessmen who may have a legitimate complaint against the commercial bank, by far the greater number cannot obtain bank credit on the basis of the existing credit standards and lending techniques of the commercial banks. To constitute a good credit risk, an enterprise should be profitable. But, if the enterprise is expanding rapidly, the probabilities are that it will be short of capital and the equity will be thin. The likelihood is also present that the tangible assets will be special-purpose plant and equipment of negligible value on an auction basis.

The position taken by the commercial banker that the funds at his disposal belong not to him but to his depositors and therefore can be loaned only to individuals and enterprises whose assets and future prospects make repayment certain, is fundamental to sound banking practice. Faced with this responsibility, the commercial banker is compelled to find that the assets or business prospects of a considerable proportion of the smaller enterprises in his community are such as not to warrant bank credit.

Furthermore, in discussing this problem, we should be perfectly candid and recognize that under our system of banking, the commercial bank cannot be expected to supply the need for equity capital. In making long- or even intermediate-term loans, a bank must consider not only the nonliquid and unmarketable character of the assets which it will have to hold, but also the additional element of risk which will be involved, such as an adverse turn in the business cycle; or a change in the management; or a new development in technology which may even wipe out the borrower's business.

Moreover, the extension of small business credits requires special skill and facilities which are largely lacking in the existing commercial banking system. The growth in the average size of commercial banks, the spread of branch banking, and the closing down of thousands of small unit banks, has resulted in a situation in which bank officers no longer have the same intimate knowledge of local management and enterprises, which their predecessors possessed. The earlier generation of bankers were largely businessmen; they either owned or managed the local banks. Through their own personal business experience, they were intimately acquainted with business needs and business management. Today, by and large, this group of bank officials has been supplanted by a personnel which has risen from the ranks; they are primarily bankers rather than businessmen. This newer type of bank manager is disposed to pay greater attention to the static elements of assets and liquidity than to the dynamics of growth and expansion. As a result of this gradual shift in banking personnel, the commercial banks have largely lost their intimate contact with the business activity of the community. And most of them have not yet substituted for this loss of personal contact the kind of machinery which can achieve the results which were obtained earlier.

Prior to the recent banking crisis, when the local banks were usually owned and managed by the community's substantial citizens, it was not uncommon for the bank to have among its own stockholders the responsible backers of those local enterprises which enjoyed bank credit. Hence, to a considerable extent the ultimate cushion of risk for the bank as well as the enterprise, rested upon the same individuals. Today, this picture has changed. During the banking crisis, this cushion of risk became impaired. Local bank stockholders and directors were compelled to draw heavily upon their own resources to make good assessments on their stock and to protect the solvency of their banks. Frequently, they had to make good on the double liability which was attached to their stock. To no small extent, the banking crisis served to undermine the financial standing of those individuals upon whose credit loans had formerly been made. Local business enterprises which had formerly constituted good risks were, therefore, seriously affected. And those enterprises which had never enjoyed satisfactory banking relations now found that it was even more difficult to establish them.

While many local banks have returned to their traditional lending practices, or have endeavored to meet the problem through the establishment of personal loan departments, and the Government, through the Federal Reserve banks and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has also attempted to alleviate the situation, the void has not been filled completely.

The successful financing of small business requires that loans be made to a large variety of unrelated enterprises and that there be many different loans in each classification. In the absence of such diversification, solvency is placed at the mercy of business uncertainties in a restricted field. Most commercial banks, as presently operated, lack the special skill and facilities for the supervision required in handling of a large variety of small business credits.

Although this sector of small business is not being favored by the commercial bank, it does obtain credit. Today, the banker for small business is the accounts-finance company, the personal-loan company, the factor, the trade creditor, and other private lenders.

These intermediary lenders have largely supplanted the commercial bank in the financing of small business. The commercial banks, on the whole, do not appear to be concerned with the competition of these "retailers" of credit. By financing the accounts-finance company, the factor, the personal-loan company, and the trade creditor, the commercial bank engages in profitable operations without directly assuming the risk, expense, and responsibility of handling an enormous number of unrelated and widely scattered transactions.

The phenomenal growth of these intermediary financing institutions shows that credit can be extended successfully to small business if an appropriate credit machinery is utilized. Such a machinery has been developed by these intermediate lenders. They, rather than the commercial bank, have developed "mortality tables" expressly designed for the financing of small business. The successful experience of these financing agencies is due largely to their having employed such techniques and methods as (a) pooling of risks; (b) routine procedures for appraisal, accounting, and servicing; and (c) establishment of schedules of charges appropriate to each class of risk as well as individual risks.

These "retailers" of credit, through their ability to organize the multiplicity of small transactions into aggregates, and to graduate financing charges and terms in accordance with the special requirements of each individual industry and client, are able not only to attract equity capital but also to tap the credit of banks and the capital markets—sources of capital supply to which small business individually has no access.

While small business is obtaining its credit to an increasing extent from these intermediary bankers, the cost of such credit is considerably in excess of the cost of bank credit. The small enterprise which utilizes this medium of credit is, therefore, placed at a disadvantage in relation to those of its competitors who are able to obtain bank credit or utilize the capital markets. Moreover, since this field of credit extension is largely unregulated, practices vary widely and abuses are prevalent.

III

The technique developed by these "retailers" of credit offers a solution to the problem of financing small business.

I think the time has come when small business should have available to it a banking system designed to serve its special needs as effectively as the existing financial institutions serve the requirements of big business.

Various proposals in this direction have been advanced by Members of Congress. Certain of the measures which have been proposed for the provision of more adequate long-term and intermediate credits for small business recognize that the commercial banks cannot undertake this type of financing without additional mechanisms for the distribution of risk, for guidance to banks unfamiliar with the handling of small-business credits, and for extensions of credits which local banks are unable to provide.

Senator JAMES MEAD has proposed legislation for the creation of an Industrial Loan Corporation which would utilize the existing machinery of the Federal Reserve System.

The proposed corporation would utilize the 12 Federal Reserve banks and their 24 branches. It would finance small and intermediate businesses through the acquisition of the obligations of such enterprises, or the purchase of preferred stocks, notes, etc. The corporation would also make loans or make loans in cooperation with local banks or guarantee loans made by the banks directly. The basic principle underlying this proposal is that of Title I of the Federal Housing Act, which covers loans made by banks for modernization of residential dwellings. This proposal utilizes the existing banking system, but endeavors to overcome some of its deficiencies in the handling of small-business credits.

To overcome the deficiencies of the commercial bank and to fill up the void in capital and credit facilities for small business, Mr. Justice Douglas, when he was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, proposed the establishment of a capital credit banking system.

Last week, Chairman Frank addressed the Kiwanis Club of Cleveland on this very subject. He there proposed that there be established a system of regional finance companies. In each of the Federal Reserve districts, there would be set up a financial institution, the common stock of which would be owned by private persons in the district. The Government would invest in their preferred stocks, but such preferred stock would have little, if any, voting power. These institutions would purchase the common stocks of local enterprise. The institutions would not make loans—they would supply equity capital. In short, the institution proposed by Chairman Frank "would be a sort of speculative finance company or investment trust."

It is believed by those who have given serious consideration to this problem that the special and varied financial services required by small business and its need for long-term capital, particularly equity capital, can be met only by the creation of a new financial machinery organized on a regional and functional basis.

Capital credit banks, under this machinery, would purchase equities in small business enterprises and would extend credits at costs sharply below present levels. Such a system of banks would be able to harness to it the trade and business experience of those members of the community who are familiar with the enterprises in their localities. A movement in this direction would go far in restoring the personal banking which was characteristic of earlier times. Credit extensions would again be based on the dynamic factor of growth and expansion as it was in the past.

However, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that merely to reduce the cost of credit or to make the supply of capital more abundant, will not solve all of the small-business man's problems.

Obtaining credit and capital facilities are a necessary first step; in addition, small business also requires that its functions and activities be improved. It must be enabled to possess, in its field, the operating and developmental efficiencies which large business enjoys through expert accounting, managerial, operating, and capital techniques. Small business should have available to it a systematic informational and research service comparable to that furnished to the farmer by the Department of Agriculture

or which big business enjoys through its own research facilities and the Department of Commerce.

Just as the credit and marketing problems of the farmer have been dealt with successfully through the establishment of a system of land banks, intermediate credit banks, commodity credit agencies, so, too, the capital and credit problems of small business can be solved successfully if they are broken down into manageable elements and special solutions provided for their distinctive requirements.

Address by President of Norwich University at Unveiling of Painting of Admiral Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY JOHN MARTIN THOMAS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John Martin Thomas, president of Norwich University, on the occasion of the unveiling of a painting of Admiral George Dewey at Manila Bay, by Rufus Fairchild Zogbaum, presented to the State of Vermont by Mr. Bartlett Arkell, at the State House, Montpelier, Vt., May 1, 1940, which was Dewey Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Norwich University is proud to have part in the placing in Vermont's beautiful statehouse the most famous painting reminiscent of the American victory at Manila on May 1, 1898. The figure on the bridge of the *Olympia* is that of our most illustrious graduate. We have not forgotten to do him honor. Every year for 42 years we have celebrated Dewey Day, seeking to imbue our cadets with his courage and his noble-souled devotion to his country and to inspire them with the example of his magnificent achievement. In years to come Norwich cadets, with thousands of students from other schools, will come to this statehouse to receive to their hearts from Zogbaum's art the conviction of America's might and greatness which Dewey's guns at Manila spoke to all the world.

It has been said many times in modern years that textbooks of history should have less to say of wars and battles and soldiers and more about the activities of all the people in the arts and industries of peace. There need be no quarrel with that sentiment if it means that the emphasis in history should be upon advances due to intelligence, man's conquests of nature and achievements of the mind and spirit of man in literature and art, in government, education, and industry. We do not wish to teach our children that war is the only field in which a man may achieve greatness or render patriotic services to his country or, indeed, that war is anything else than the last resort of a nation threatened by loss of its honor or destruction of ideals and principles which it holds dearer than life.

But the history we teach our children should be a true and faithful record of the past. And it is a sure fact of the years of the past that in the maintenance of liberty, in the preservation of values both material and spiritual dearly acquired by the toil and sacrifices of those who have gone before, the soldier has been called upon to do his duty. History which omits or slights brave and glorious deeds of arms is not true history, certainly not of the United States which was born in war and saved through war to be one nation.

In telling the whole truth of American achievement and progress there must be included many deeds of valor in which men fought with weapons of death. To these Vermont has contributed at least two, Ethan Allen's capture of Ticonderoga and George Dewey's victory at Manila Bay. Both are part of the story by which we nourish our love of our country and our pride in her strength and greatness. The former the children of these mountains can never forget, and, if in the lapse of years, the memory of the latter should tend to grow dim, the genius of Zogbaum now placed permanently in this shrine of Vermont liberty will awaken afresh the heart stirrings of that glorious day when a Vermont boy revealed to the world that America was not only permanent master of her own great continent but a power to be reckoned with to the far corners of the earth.

It is true that "peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war." But the victories of peace, for the most part, are not dramatic. They cannot be made eloquent of courage, of death-defying determination, of holy zeal for maintenance of honor and of right, as are the deeds of men when they look death in the face and give their all for victory.

For most of us life is largely repetition of ordinary duties, tending to the commonplace. We have few great moments and face no crises which call for our utmost in courage and the will to win. In the monotony we are inclined to forget the stature of our humanity, the powers latent in our souls waiting for some supreme duty to call them forth.

It needs some great book or drama, or some picture like this of Zogbaum with the reeking guns, the belching funnel, and the fearless figure in the mastery of command on the bridge, to send the red blood of courage and aspiration coursing through our veins. You cannot stir like inspiration with the story of Thomas Davenport inventing the electric motor, nor of Thaddeus Fairbanks constructing a platform scale, nor of Jacob Estey designing a reed organ, though all of these were noble Vermonters and their works were highly useful. It still needs the soldier to call forth the heroic so that even the dullest feel the summons, and such will be the high usefulness of "Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay" in all the coming years.

Norwich University is especially proud to have this picture here because it proclaims in superb art the justification of her principles maintained in utmost fidelity since Alden Partridge first proclaimed them 121 years ago. Captain Partridge invited students to Norwich to receive a sound education, with instruction fundamental to the various professions, including engineering, while at the same time they fitted themselves for service to their country in case of need. He was himself a farsighted man. He introduced physical education into his program long before others recognized its necessity, he abandoned the stereotyped classical curriculum and gave his cadets a choice of subjects 50 years before Charles W. Eliot, and he anticipated the Army's Reserve Officers' Training Corps by a full century. Likewise, he encouraged his students to be farsighted, to anticipate a definite calling in civil life, but not to be unmindful that the Nation might have need of a citizen army with competent trained officers.

His watchword was "be ready." His eyes were turned, not to the educational traditions of the past, but to the needs and possibilities of the future. For more than a score of years he traveled far and wide through the country, assembling "conventions," as he called them, and urging his fellow citizens to look forward, and to shape the education of their schools to the preparation of men to do the work of this mightily expanding Nation and to defend her in case of need.

The Partridge spirit was still strong at Norwich when George Dewey enrolled as a cadet in 1851. During his 3 years in the old South Barracks he not only learned the discipline and the fundamentals of military science but he also acquired the trait of looking forward and being ready for whatever might come.

It was this trait which won the Battle of Manila Bay. Military history has no more striking example of victory through long-continued, careful preparation than Dewey's great triumph. In the first place, he was not in command of the Asiatic squadron by accident. He sought the responsibility and worked for it, gained the approval of Theodore Roosevelt when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and persuaded Senator Redfield Proctor to intercede for him with President McKinley. Having gained the assignment he had every ship in his fleet in perfect condition long before war was declared. He spent days and weeks in gunnery practice under all kinds of weather conditions. As hostilities neared he laid in a sufficient supply of coal and other supplies. He summoned the American consul from Manila that he might have complete information of the Spanish Fleet and coast defenses. When he put out from Mirs Bay on the *Olympia* for the 600-mile voyage to Luzon he was ready—completely ready.

Dewey's information was that the Spanish Fleet would await him at Subig Bay, where batteries had been newly installed. Reconnaissance by the *Boston* and *Concord* failed to find the enemy at Subig. It was learned later that Admiral Montego actually had sailed to Subig Bay, but finding that the batteries sent there a month before had not been installed, he returned to Manila Bay. In projecting the battle on the 3-day voyage from Mirs Bay to Luzon, Dewey must have had the situation at Subig in mind. His actual plan of battle, therefore, when he found the Spaniards under the batteries of Cavité and within range of the guns at the port of Manila must have taken shape while he was steaming into action.

Dewey's report to the Secretary of War is a marvel of conciseness, even for a military man. "The squadron then proceeded to the attack, the flagship *Olympia*, under my personal direction, leading, followed at distance by the *Baltimore*, *Raleigh*, *Petrel*, *Concord*, and *Boston*, in the order named, which formation was maintained throughout the action. The squadron opened fire at 5:41 a. m. While advancing to the attack, two mines were exploded ahead of the flagship, too far to be effective. The squadron maintained a continuous and precise fire, at ranges varying from 5,000 to 2,000 yards, countermarching a line approximately parallel to that of the Spanish Fleet. The enemy's fire was vigorous but generally ineffective.

"At 7:35 I ceased firing and withdrew the squadron for breakfast. At 11:16 a. m. I returned to the attack. By this time the Spanish flagship and almost the entire Spanish fleet were in flames.

At 12:30 p. m. the squadron ceased firing, the batteries being silenced and the ships sunk, burnt, and deserted."

George Dewey obeyed his orders to search out and destroy the Spanish Fleet. You will pardon the boast that he first learned to obey orders at Norwich University. He had not learned at home and that was the reason his father, Dr. Julius Y. Dewey, enrolled him at Norwich. Tradition has it that young George tipped over the family buggy and nearly drowned the horse attempting to ford the Winooski River instead of going around by the bridge. George Dewey further learned obedience at the United States Naval Academy, and still more under Farragut on the Mississippi during the Civil War. His 33 years of conscientious and able service in the Navy were all a further preparation for those few magnificent hours of action in Manila Bay. But it was Norwich which gave him his start. Therefore the school of his youth joins with all citizens of our State in heartfelt thanks to Mr. Arkell for his most gracious deed in presenting to Vermont his canvas which immortalizes the victor of Manila Bay. May it serve the youth of Vermont as the legend of Drake's drum serves to keep alive unconquerable spirit in the sailor lads of England.

"Call him up the deep sea,
Call him up the sound,
Call him when you sail to meet the foe—
"Where the old flag's flying
And the old trade's plying.
They will find him ware and wakin'
As they found him long ago."

James A. Farley and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HAROLD BRAYMAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Harold Brayman entitled "Colorful Jim Farley Looms Large in Demo Presidential Picture," published in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press of April 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press of April 20, 1940]

IF NUMBER OF FRIENDS MEANS ANYTHING, COLORFUL JIM FARLEY LOOMS LARGE IN DEMO PRESIDENTIAL PICTURE

(By Harold Brayman)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Postmaster General James A. Farley has taken it on the chin for other people's mistakes more than any other official in the New Deal administration. In the early Roosevelt years, his uncomplaining willingness to take the blame, whether he deserved it or not, made his name, for a while, the synonym for everything that is wrong in politics, but as the 8 years approach an end he emerges as probably the member of the cabinet who, at least in Washington, is more respected than any other except Cordell Hull.

And as to friends, there is nobody, not even the President, who has so many as Farley. But while the President's friends are offset by many who have an equally fervent hate for him, there are very few people who hate Jim Farley. In spite of 7 years which have brought him a great deal of political grief he is still "Sunny Jim."

Let no one discount the influence of Jim Farley in the Democratic convention, for his friends are where they count—in the political organizations in every city and State in the country. Ninety percent of the delegates are chosen by those political organizations, and when it comes to a hard decision, many years of friendship for and favors from Jim Farley are going to count heavily.

THE MACHINE TYPE

Farley is no pretender. He admits openly that he is the machine type of politician, but he insists that he plays the game squarely, and so far as is known in all his long experience no one has ever caught him playing it any other way. Such a skillful smearer as Huey Long tried hard and continuously to get something on Farley.

Long discovered that Farley had a business in which he was interested, a firm called the General Builders Supply Co., in New York, which sold gypsum and other similar supplies. It was inconceivable to Huey that a politician could have a business and not be using his political influence to get contracts for his company. Huey tried his best to get a congressional investigation of Farley, but the committee which considered his investigating resolution looked into the subject and decided there was nothing to investigate. The five Republicans on the committee were with the Democrats in a vote of confidence in the personal honesty of "Big Jim."

Farley is about the only influence in the last few decades of a political generalissimo who has come through unbesmirched. Much of the respect for Farley is based fundamentally on the fact that he came up through the Tammany route and came clean.

He was born in 1888 at Grassy Point, N. Y., in Rockland County just above New York on the west side of the Hudson. His father kept a saloon and died when Jim was 10. His mother took his father's life insurance and bought a grocery store. Jim worked in the grocery store and went to high school.

After high school Farley went for a year to the Packard Commercial School and got a job as bookeeper. But his interest was in politics. He had an ambition to be State senator, a job which he actually skipped on the way up. His first attempt at public office was when he ran for town clerk in Grassy Point. It was a Republican town, and there were 700 voters. Developing a technique which he has never discarded, young Jim went to see personally, every one of those 700 voters. He was elected.

PICKS RIGHT HORSES

There did not seem to be much future for a Democrat in Rockland County, but Farley tried his best. He never missed a wedding or a funeral. And he went on being town clerk of Grassy Point until he was 30, when he thought he was strong enough in the county to branch out into State politics.

He picked out a New Yorker as a likely comer and started booming him in Rockland County for Governor. The year was 1918. The name of Farley's man was Alfred E. Smith. That fall Smith was nominated and elected. Farley had picked the right horse.

He won for himself a seat in the assembly, the majority of which was Republican, but lost it the next year because he courageously voted for repeal of the State prohibition enforcement act, although he knew that vote would be very unpopular in his district. Repeal was carried by 1 vote. His action was purely one of principle, because Farley in all his life has never taken a drink or smoked.

After this he was given a political job by Smith as port warden of New York. It paid $5,000 and didn't overburden Jim with duties. But eventually Smith found out about its meager duties and abolished it. He found out from Farley.

But Jim's real start in politics came from a job which everybody advised him not to take because it would ruin him. There had been a scandal in the State athletic commission and Smith wanted Farley to go on the commission and clean up the prize-fighting racket. The job paid no salary.

After a short time he decided he would have to become chairman of the commission to get anywhere. He won over Commissioner Muldoon and told Chairman Brower straightforwardly of his plans. One day when Brower was absent from a commission meeting Muldoon and Farley elected Farley chairman.

CLEANED UP BOXING

"It has been decided to rotate the chairmanship," Farley blandly announced. But Farley stayed on until he went to Washington. Whenever the subject of rotation was brought up he would just smile and say, "The rules have been changed. We have decided not to rotate the chairmanship any more."

As chairman of the boxing commission he had an insatiable desire for passes which he showered on his friends and those whom he wished to make his friends until somebody referred to it as a "pasteboard blizzard."

On one occasion when Jim had been notably demanding, Tex Rickard said to him: "Jim, you give me back the 'Annie Oakleys' and I'll give you the fight."

But by 1928 when there was a vacancy in the secretaryship of the Democratic senate committee, Al Smith had Farley appointed, because he not only had cleaned up boxing but knew everybody in the State who was worth knowing. In the meantime he had built up a fairly good building-supply business.

That is the way "Genial Jim" came up eventually to the chairmanship of the State Democratic committee which made him the natural preconvention manager for Roosevelt in 1932.

The technique which Farley worked for F. D. R. was as follows: First, he sent out to a list of 10,000 political leaders all over the country a roster of the New York State Democratic organization, carrying at the top, "James A. Farley, chairman." This was just to identify himself.

PERSUASIVE LETTERS

He followed this a few days later with a tabulation of the vote of New York since 1918, a tabulation showing that Roosevelt carried 42 out of the 57 up-State counties in 1930, whereas Smith had never carried half a dozen of them. These rural, Protestant, Republican areas are not unlike the Middle West in their political leanings. Letter after letter followed this up, each trying a new persuasion. Then along came an Elks' convention, fortunately out in Seattle. Jim went, stopping in 19 States out and back.

On that trip he saw as many as possible of the 10,000 people he had been working on, and many others besides. Each night he

called in a stenographer and dictated the names and nicknames of those he had met, whether they were married, and how many children they had, and their home addresses which he took out of the telephone book.

When he returned to New York he spent a week dictating and signing from 6,000 to 7,000 letters to each of these people and in each one he had some personal reference to convince the recipient that this was no form letter. The only form thing about it was a line in each about "magic in the name of Roosevelt." He called each man by his first name and he signed all the letters, in green ink, "Sincerely, Jim." That was the beginning of a series of 10 or a dozen letters to each of these people, all selling Roosevelt.

Ever since that time he has kept up the letter writing. He receives more mail than a Hollywood movie star, more than any other official except President Roosevelt, and more than the President from people of importance. He writes more letters than anyone else. His average is over 200 a day. He never misses a congratulation, a condolence, an anniversary, or an offer of help to a Democrat who has been elected to office. He does it so extensively that he has been referred to as "Jim, the Penman."

BIG HEART INSIDE

This, coupled with an uncanny ability to remember names and faces, and a big heart inside him, is the secret of all Farley's friends. There is not a city in the United States in which he does not have a friend in politics on whom he can call, and in most the number is from 10 to 100. He is said to know about 10,000 individuals by their first names. If friends in the right places can make a man President, Farley ought to be a strong contender.

Farley's long-distance telephone calls are enormous. There are dozens of them every day. He never misses an opportunity to keep in contact with those he knows. If he takes a trip by automobile he stops at every post office, sometimes to the great discomfiture of a surprised postmaster.

He makes speeches in great profusion, accepts every speaking invitation he possibly can. He does it not because he likes to make speeches but because it pleases somebody to have him accept the invitation and because it affords him the opportunity to meet many new people and shake hands with them. And to every new one whose name he remembers (which is most of them) goes a letter when he gets back to Washington.

He used to feel a little hurt when newspapermen hinted that there was a Charles Michelsonian or Eddie Roddan quality in his speeches, but he doesn't mind any more. Once when he protested that such a story was "hitting below the belt" the correspondent replied: "Jim, your belt is so wide we can't tell where it begins or ends."

One of Farley's fundamental qualities is loyalty. Once he gives his word, he keeps it, at no matter what sacrifice, and once he gives his loyalty it is hard to break, although in recent months it has frequently been placed under heavy strain by President Roosevelt.

TAKES MANY RAPS

All during the early days of the New Deal, Farley took so many raps that he was always a little bruised. It began with patronage. President Roosevelt wanted to hold it up until he got his emergency legislation through Congress. Thousands of people, at the depth of the depression, were clamoring at Farley's door for jobs. For 3 months he had to hold them off against his own will and take the brunt of their inability to understand why he would not move faster.

When the job distribution did begin, then the high-minded new dealers all began pouring out their vitriol on Farley for putting somebody in the Government except Harvard Law School graduates. Farley never winced, but it was the system as much as he which was at fault.

In the 1938 New York mayoralty election, President Roosevelt thought it would be a good idea to run Joe McKee on a Recovery Party ticket against La Guardia, but when it was apparent that McKee would be beaten the White House let it be known that it was taking no part in the election and it was all Jim Farley's doings.

When the air-mail contracts were suddenly canceled in 1934, the White House announced it. How much advance notice Farley had is disputed. A few days later, when it was apparent that public reaction had turned against this because of the loss of life by Army fliers carrying the mail, the White House blandly asserted that President Roosevelt would not interfere with Postmaster General Farley's decision to cancel the contracts. Farley took it without a murmur.

One mistake was his, although others were the beneficiaries. When he saw new commemorative stamps rolling off the presses, the boxing commissioner's love of passes arose in him, and he, knowing that President Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, and several others were ardent stamp collectors, thought it would be nice to autograph a few sheets and send to them. So he purchased the sheets and started to do this. The perforations made it difficult for him to write. So he told the help to get him a few sheets which had not yet been run through the perforator. He sent these around, not being a philatelist himself and not realizing what he was doing until one of the sheets was sold to a stamp house which announced its existence and that it had insured the sheet for $20,000.

LOYALTY NEVER SHAKEN

With the ingenuity that made the Government over a million and a half dollars, Farley destroyed the value of the sheets he had given to high officials and friends by putting similar ones on sale at the philatelic agency at face value. Stamp collectors bought them to the tune of $1,663,717. In spite of his neat extrication from a wholly innocent mistake on his part, Farley took a lot of blame rather than those who accepted the stamps, knowing what valuable prizes they were getting.

Nevertheless, through all this his loyalty was never shaken. It is other things which have placed it under strain. Farley was deeply hurt when he spent nearly an hour with President Roosevelt the morning the Chief Executive sent the name of Hugo L. Black to the Senate for confirmation as Supreme Court Justice, and was never told of the appointment, but had to read it later off a news ticker.

He is fundamentally an organization man and was hurt again when President Roosevelt embarked upon the purge campaign of 1938. He told the President frankly he would have none of it, and when he finally did accompany Mr. Roosevelt, under great pressure, on the trip through Maryland (and then only because he did not think Senator TYDINGS had played fair with him) he was the most unhappy man on the trip.

But perhaps he was most deeply hurt by events in the Presidential campaign. Jim Farley would frankly like to be on the ticket in 1940. He thinks he has earned it. He feels it keenly that the Corcorans and the Jacksons are closer to the President's confidence than he.

CATHOLIC RELIGION

But the greatest distress of all came to him when Ernest Lindley's column, quoting the President as having told a southern Congressman that Farley was disqualified by his Catholic religion, went unrepudiated by the White House for almost 3 weeks. At the end of that time the damage had been done and the denial was not effective.

It was soon after that that Farley, who has never been for a third term, if it could be headed off, embarked on a course of parallel action to that of Vice President Garner.

He announced that his name would be presented to the convention which rather definitely committed him against a third term up to the time of the convention. It did not commit him, if Roosevelt is nevertheless nominated, to withdraw support, which few people think he will do.

Retaliation and reprisal are not in Jim Farley's soul. After the 1936 election returns were in he made his famous "no reprisal" comment. Many keen observers believe that if President Roosevelt had followed the Farley hunch he would have had an easier time through his second term.

If people criticize him, he usually answers softly, if at all. After the first Jackson Day dinner, Norman Thomas assailed the whole procedure.

"It seems incredible," said the outraged Socialist, "that 1,300 people would pay $100 for a $2.50 dinner to listen to Jim Farley and watch him eat."

DEPARTMENT PAYS OFF

"Anyhow," Jim answered, "he didn't say watch Jim Farley and listen to him eat."

Looking back over his 7 years as Postmaster General, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, all of which places he has held tenaciously, Farley takes justifiable pride in his handling of the Post Office Department.

This chronic loser in Government activities has been put in the black, perhaps permanently, and yet the employees regard Farley as a good Postmaster General. It's hard to find a mail carrier who doesn't think well of Jim Farley, or one who doesn't believe the Department is better run now than it used to be.

All in all, Washington likes Jim Farley, too, and respects him for the qualities of character he has shown. He never fails to observe his code.

Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Ernest Lindley, appearing in the Washington Post of May 3, 1940, entitled "The Lesson of New York."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 3, 1940]

THE LESSON OF NEW YORK

(By Ernest Lindley)

ON WALTER-LOGAN BILL

Two years ago there was an interesting sequence of events in New York which may be illuminating to both the advocates and the opponents of the Walter-Logan bill.

The New York Constitutional Convention—controlled by the Republicans—adopted an amendment providing that decisions of State and municipal administrative agencies should be subjected to review in the State courts, not only as to law, but as to facts. The argument for it, like that for the Walter-Logan bill in the House of Representatives, was largely hue and cry about checking rampant bureaucracy and guaranteeing a government of laws, not of men.

The New York amendment was much milder than the Walter-Logan bill. It made, or seemed to make, however, one serious breach in the customary relationship between administrative agencies and the courts. This was in the "substantial evidence" rule. By this practice the reviewing court goes into the facts only far enough to satisfy itself that the administrative agency had "substantial evidence" for its order or decision. It does not attempt to weigh each and every fact and try to reach its own appraisal. It recognizes that the experts in the administrative agencies are better equipped to do this.

The "substantial evidence" rule is supposed to protect the citizen against arbitrary action while enabling the facts to be ascertained in the most efficient way. Whether it always does is another question. The point is that the New York constitutional amendment seemed to breach this rule. The Walter-Logan bill has a somewhat similar provision.

The New York amendment also subjected to judicial review a number of administrative decisions which are not now reviewable. Like the Walter-Logan bill, however, it exempted a number of agencies for no reason except that they were able to bring the political pressure to obtain exemptions.

Unlike the Walter-Logan bill, the New York amendment did not provide for judicial review of mere rules and regulations issued by administrative agencies. Nor did it contain other hamstringing features to be found in the Walter-Logan bill.

Mild as it was, this is what happened to the New York amendment:

Both candidates for Governor opposed it. Thomas E. Dewey said "It would permit a judge to interfere with and delay the effective administration of the laws of the State."

Both candidates for United States Senator opposed it. Edward Corsi, the Republican candidate, called it "vicious."

Frederick Crane, a Republican, at that time chief judge of the New York Court of Appeals—for years the most distinguished judicial body in the United States next to the Supreme Court—opposed it. Other eminent jurists opposed it.

Mayor LaGuardia said: "It is the most outrageous, disgraceful thing ever done. This is a real threat. In Germany they do it with a brown shirt, but here they are doing it with a black robe. It is a vicious threat to orderly administrative government."

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York opposed it. (It has also condemned the Walter-Logan bill.) Among the leaders of the New York bar who opposed the constitutional amendment were John Foster Dulles, of Sullivan & Cromwell; Thomas Thacher, former Federal judge and Solicitor General of the United States; Arthur A. Ballantine, former Under Secretary of the Treasury; and many other Republicans—not to mention Democrats.

The New York Times attacked the amendment on the ground that the courts were in danger of superseding administrative agencies, a role for which they were not fitted.

The State Federation of Labor condemned it as "utterly and completely vicious."

When this amendment was explained to the people of the State, the mild case of hysteria whipped up at the constitutional convention was dissipated. At the polls, in November, the judiciary amendment was defeated more overwhelmingly than any other proposed amendment to the Constitution. The vote was 1,362,424 to 574,299. (There were other parts to this amendment, but the controversy centered on the judicial-review section.)

If the New York amendment was a vicious menace to orderly government, the Walter-Logan bill is several times worse. It was put through the House by hue and cry with very little regard for its practical effects.

There was a sequel to the New York controversy. It focused attention on the need for changes in administrative procedure to assure the citizen protection against arbitrary action. This need was recognized by many opponents of the amendment, just as it is by many critics of the Walter-Logan bill. Governor Lehman appointed a commissioner to investigate the problem. This investigation parallels that now being made for the Federal Government by an Attorney General's committee, under the chairmanship of Dean G. Acheson, a distinguished leader of the bar.

The Acheson committee will submit a full report in the fall. Whether or not it agrees with all the recommendations, Congress will then have the factual basis for legislation.

If the Senate does not fall prey to hysteria, the Walter-Logan bill will be beaten or pigeonholed. Judging from the New York experience, the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress who feel that reforms in this field are necessary should have no difficulty in explaining to their constituents why it is wise to wait until the problem can be dealt with intelligently and carefully.

Silver Purchase Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the silver-purchase program which has a bearing on the bill now under consideration. The article, by Mr. H. B. Elliston, is taken from the Christian Science Monitor of May 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 3, 1940]

THIS CHANGING WORLD—SILVER BUYING—TOWNSEND BILL UP BEFORE THE SENATE; WOULD STOP THE PILING UP OF THE WHITE METAL FROM FOREIGN SOURCES—EFFECTS IN THE FAR EAST

(By H. B. Elliston)

For several years the senior Senator from Delaware has been fighting a battle in behalf of common sense. JOHN TOWNSEND is his name and his "Mein Kampf" is the repeal of silver buying from foreign countries, whereby Uncle Sam has been piling up a huge hoard of the white metal for use unknown. The Senate is now considering his repealer.

What has turned attention to the problem of late is that silver buying confers a gratuitous subsidy on Japan. This has added insult to injury for the Chinese, not to mention the susceptibilities of antiaggression Americans.

The injury to China was caused by the initial effects of America's silver purchase act. The buying became law in 1934. It was authorized after silver Senators from Senator Borah down had contended that American buying of silver would add immensely to the purchasing power of the Chinese. The implication was that this added Oriental purchasing power—"half the purchasing power of the world"—would mean a fill-up in the demand for American goods. This is how the argument was worded: "Silver will go up in price as the result of the American demand, and then the silver stores of China, the only great country left which uses silver as money, will feel a corresponding lift in value." What actually happened, however, was just the reverse. China's purchasing power, instead of being increased, was crippled severely, as was pointed out at the time by the opponents of the Silver Purchase Act.

The explanation of this reversal of silverite prognostications is easily understandable. China's use of silver as money meant that whenever the country had balances due from the rest of the world it accepted them in silver, just as gold-standard countries like the United States accept balances in gold. Now China for scores of years back has had an incoming balance in its international accounts. China, in consequence, was a creditor nation. How much metal the Chinese had absorbed down the years since the New England clipper ships sailed for Canton loaded with Spanish "pieces of eight" I don't know. No one does; but the hoard must have been immense.

The American silver-buying program forced up the price of silver from 45 cents an ounce to 80 cents. Logically, therefore, Chinese silver stocks went up correspondingly in value. But the American buying program at the same time forced up the value in China's silver money of Chinese goods and of course of foreign money. As for the goods, the lift in price made it that much more difficult to sell China's goods abroad. As to foreign money, Chinese immigrants abroad had to offer more money in the countries where they lived with which to buy the same amount of Chinese money. What was the result? Obviously that fewer Chinese goods were sold abroad and less immigrant money was received; so that China changed from being a creditor to being a debtor. And that meant that China no longer received silver in payment for balances but had to send out silver in meeting deficits.

For what happened then we might go to a Chinese authority, K. P. Chen, best-known Shanghai banker, who several years ago described China's monetary plight in World Trade, organ of the International Chamber of Commerce. He said:

"Now on account of this purchasing plan, not only was monetary stabilization denied China, but the nightmare of civilization, the depression, came to fall upon China as its prey. The rise of the silver price brought in its wake, as far as China was concerned, falling prices, shrinkage of currency, destruction of industries and business, a greater deficit in the Government's budget, and increasing chaos in society."

Consequently, the Chinese were persuaded to take remedial action. In Mr. Chen's words, China was "compelled to recognize the fact that in order to stabilize its currency and to avoid national bankruptcy, it must go off the silver standard." The country, in other words, simply stopped using silver as international money and went on a nonmetallic standard in 1935.

This was the injury to China caused by America's Silver Purchase Act. The insult came when Japan invaded China in 1937. Japan then fell heir to most of China's silver stocks. I mean, of course, Japan got the kind of dubious inheritance that comes from mere possession. Even the reserves held by the Chungking Government, according to a recent issue of the London Financial News, have been "largely exhausted." Accordingly the Japanese have been collecting the metal and exporting it to London for sale to the world's great buyer, Uncle Sam. In this way the Japanese have been enabled to obtain the dollars wherewith to buy a lot of their war materials from America.

How much importance the Japanese attach to this silver traffic is attested by the Japanese-British negotiations. The Japanese have demanded that the metal held in the Chinese banks in Britain's Tientsin concession shall be handed over. The dispute has hitherto seemed to be British-Japanese. But there would be no dispute if Uncle Sam weren't standing in the background as the willing buyer.

Since 1934, it has been argued that the Silver Purchase Act is one of the most foolish in American legislation. Such a description now finds fairly general recognition. One may lament that the recognition has been delayed until America has bought itself a white elephant of costly dimensions. But it's better late than never to wake up to a foolish policy. And the fact that, besides adding to the stature of a white elephant, the silver buying is helping to subsidize war-making Japan should help the movement headed by Senator TOWNSEND, of Delaware, to purge the statute books of it.

America and the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE WANDERER AND THE LUTHERAN COMPANION

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excellent editorials, one from the Wanderer of the issue of May 2, and the other from the Lutheran Companion, of the issue of April 25.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Wanderer of May 2, 1940]

CARDINAL O'CONNELL URGES AMERICA TO STAY OUT OF WAR

An unequivocal plea for American neutrality was made by Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, who declared before the diocesan Congress of the League for Catholic Women that "we want no part in this muddle of a row in Europe."

Warning against paid propagandists who are talking to audiences in this country trying to justify "the horrors of the madhouse" on the other side of the ocean, Cardinal O'Connell said:

"We have the greatest sympathy for the people of all lands. We are Catholic, and as Catholics we belong to the children of the whole world. We are sorry for any horror that comes to any race or flag, but we cannot make the same mistake we made in the other war. To go around the world trying to right every wrong, that is too preposterous. Just because we are sorry we don't intend to make the same mistake again—if we can help it.

"We must keep our minds cool. These propagandists resort to falsehoods and lies to raise our emotions, our sympathies. Do not pay any attention. Our Government should see to it that we are kept at peace. It is a terrible situation, but it is not making it better to do something over there and perhaps do the wrong thing."

[From the Lutheran Companion of April 25, 1940]

CHURCH AND PEOPLE LOSERS IN WARFARE

Who will win the war in Europe? That question is being heard today on every side. The whole world is watching with mingled emotions the terrible drama which is daily unfolding across the Atlantic. History is in the making and mankind is becoming conscious of the fact that stupendous issues for the future are hanging in the balance. The course of empires is being determined by the grim struggle which is growing more deadly every day.

Who will win the war? We do not have the gift of prophecy and would not even venture an opinion. But we are sure of one thing—it will not be the people.

Charles Benedict, writing in the Magazine of Wall Street, characterizes the present war as "a struggle for power—political, industrial, and financial—and not for democracy," and a writer whose views are accepted by such a publication ought to know what he is talking about. Moreover, he is quite definite in his conclusions that, whatever happens to anyone else, the great financial barons of Europe are assiduously protecting their own interests. Note, for instance, this significant statement:

"Combined English, German, and French control of industries still exists. Not a few have questioned the failure of the Allies to bombard the Krupp works, within striking distance of the Maginot line—and the amazing situation wherein necessary war materials and other goods were shipped to Germany via Belgium is another instance."

It might be added here that perhaps this is another reason why the belligerents have chosen to make neutral soil their battleground. There is, of course, a distinct advantage in bringing the actual fighting zone as far away from the scene of vital German, British, and French investments as possible, particularly the industries of the "Merchants of Death."

Mr. Benedict then concludes:

"Power and wealth will change hands among the big fellows in Europe. The little men who shed their blood will lose everywhere."

But it is not merely the "little men" who will lose. The church and Christian civilization will also lose. We know already what the church lost in the first World War, and it has been losing ever since.

A continued struggle between the great nations of the world will undoubtedly provide fertile soil for every movement antagonistic to Christianity. Atheistic communism and the spirit of absolute nationalism are threatening to undermine the church everywhere. Because of the widespread poverty and social distress that will inevitably follow in the wake of the present disastrous conflict, anything can happen. One thing is certain—the present situation bodes no good for the Christian church. The enemies of Christianity will be only too ready, as usual, to place the blame at the door of the church. We may expect at any time to hear the hue and cry that was raised at the close of the first World War: "Christianity has failed!"

The recent tragic developments in northern Europe have aroused bitter resentment throughout the world. At the beginning of the conflict in Europe it was not difficult to find much to blame on both sides. Thinking people throughout the world could see much justice in Germany's demands for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles. By the ruthless invasion of Denmark and Norway, however, Chancellor Hitler has forfeited all claim to the sympathy of neutral nations. He has revealed himself as an unscrupulous seeker of power who does not hesitate to trample upon the rights of inoffensive and peace-loving people when such a course serves his purpose.

It is conceivable, therefore, that the rising tide of indignation over Hitler's methods may tempt the Church once more to compromise in its opposition to war. The time may not be far distant when ministers of the gospel in this country will again be urged to "present arms" and to become preachers of hate.

That is why it is so urgent just now that every Christian should proclaim unceasingly to all men that the love of Christ is the only power that can bring peace and unity to this sin-cursed world. War will never solve the world's problems; it can only multiply the woes and miseries of mankind, and especially of the common man who must always bear the burdens and sorrows of war. We would shudder if we could see clearly the financial, industrial, and social conditions in Europe after this conflict. And as for the fate of the Church, only God knows what the future may bring.

Therefore the duty of the Church in this hour of crisis should be clear to all who know the Spirit of Christ. Christianity is a religion of peace. Let the Christian Church be faithful to the message it has received from its divine Head—the Prince of Peace.

Sale of Planes to Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an

article which I clipped recently from the columns of the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "Arnold Defends Sale of Latest Planes to Allies. Says It Will Result in United States Having Best Aircraft of Any Army."

General Arnold very ably defends our recent decision to permit the Allies to buy our planes, for the very plausible reason that it will help the aircraft industry in this country. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ARNOLD DEFENDS SALE OF LATEST PLANES TO ALLIES—SAYS IT WILL RESULT IN UNITED STATES HAVING BEST AIRCRAFT OF ANY ARMY

INDIANAPOLIS, April 28.—Disclaiming any desire on the part of the United States to profit by the misfortunes of the warring empires in Europe, Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps, tonight defended the policy of selling the latest and fastest types of war planes to England and France.

General Arnold spoke at a dinner given by Raymond J. Kelly, of Detroit, national commander of the American Legion, in celebration of the Legion's eighth annual aerial round-up of memberships.

FULL-SCALE LABORATORY

"We would be unwise," said General Arnold, "if we failed to realize that the war in Europe is a full-scale laboratory in which our fighting planes can be service tested under war conditions at no cost to us.

"It is a fair exchange. Our foreign customers get the planes they require when they need them, and our aviation industry is built up with foreign capital to a proper size and our air force is equipped with combat planes incorporating the latest features necessary to make them efficient fighting machines.

"I can say without the slightest reservation or hesitancy that our new release policy on military aircraft has not and will not delay the revitalization of our own air arm.

UNITED STATES TO SURPASS ALL

"It will promote the industry, and at the end of the 2-year augmentation program for the Army Air Corps will provide planes superior to those found in the air forces abroad. Our air force, though not so large as those of the warring nations, will, plane for plane, be superior to any of them.

"Military observers are now generally agreed that air transportation and air operations played an important part and may have been the controlling influence in the conquest of Ethiopia, the overthrow of the Republic of Spain, the conquest of Austria and Czechoslovakia, in the partition of Poland, in the rape of Finland, and, only this month, in the invasion and occupation of Denmark and Norway.

"In all its tests to date, air power has demonstrated completely that warfare has truly moved into the third dimension; that no longer can any army or any navy operate successfully without the cooperation of air forces, nor can sea and land battles be won without the protecting shadow of an effective air force."

THREE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS SPENT

Virtually all of the $300,000,000 appropriated by Congress for expansion of the Air Corps has been spent or obligated, General Arnold said. By June 30, 1941, he added, the Air Corps will have 3,000 airplanes of the latest type, 4,500 officers, and 45,000 men. From 200 to 225 trained pilots are being trained every 6 weeks.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Star under the heading "F. B. I. Exonerated."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 6, 1940]

F. B. I. EXONERATED

Attorney General Jackson's report absolving the Federal Bureau of Investigation of misconduct in the much-publicized arrests of 11 persons indicted in Detroit for Spanish Loyalist recruiting activities is thoroughgoing and convincing. The report, submitted to Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, who had been disturbed by vociferous charges of "third degree" tactics made by self-styled defenders of civil liberty, should dispel all doubts from the mind of the Senator as to the way the F. B. I. handled the disputed cases. As Senator NORRIS had said that he would be content to have the investigation made by the civil liberties unit of the Department of Justice, rather than by a congressional committee, it may be assumed that the findings of Henry A. Schweinhaut, head of the unit, will close this unfortunate matter—from an official standpoint.

But it may be assumed safely, at the same time, that certain communistic groups which have shouted loudest about the alleged brutality of J. Edgar Hoover's G-men will not be quieted by facts. It is too much to expect that these radical agitators will drop their apparently planned campaign to smear an organization which is making it increasingly difficult for foreign agents, including those supported by Moscow, to violate American neutrality, espionage, sabotage, and sedition laws. These elements would seek to make a mockery of civil liberties by using them to cloak subversive and criminal activities of "Trojan horse" character. It is but natural that these agitators should resent the inquisitiveness of Mr. Hoover's G-men. That the effort to undermine public confidence in the F. B. I. will be continued along other fronts is taken for granted.

The general public will not be deceived by this smoke screen of baseless allegations and abuse which Communists and bundsmen alike are endeavoring to throw up between themselves and the F. B. I. The record of the G-men is the best answer to such attacks. As Mr. Jackson pointed out in his letter to Senator NORRIS, not one F. B. I. case has been reversed by an appellate court because of "third degree" or other improper treatment of prisoners. The Attorney General is convinced that the F. B. I. is a stanch protector of civil rights. As such, the Bureau should be given every encouragement in its important work. And, incidentally, it would seem wholly unnecessary to create any superagency, such as the proposed Neutrality Laws Unit, to supervise a job that is being done fairly and fearlessly under the existing set-up.

The Cost of War in General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY CARNEGIE PEACE LIBRARY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, within the past few days the Carnegie Peace Library, of Washington, D. C., has prepared for circulation one of the finest articles I have ever seen on The Cost of War in General. It is so valuable a contribution to the sum total of knowledge upon this subject that I think the people of the country ought to have it so far as it is possible to disseminate this knowledge to them through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am not certain that it may not in a very small degree transgress the rule about the length of articles, though I am not certain of that; but I sincerely hope there will be no objection to it on that account. It is certainly worth presenting to the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST OF WAR IN GENERAL

COSTS HARD TO ESTIMATE

It is difficult to appraise the real cost of war. A recital of the figures of war debts only serves to conceal the truth. On the purely material side, the best we can do is to ascertain the extent of the loss of new capital and the amount of depreciation of the existing industrial equipment of the national resources of a nation. On the human side, we can determine the number of casualties, but it is impossible to measure the different values to the community of those who are killed. A genius lost involves an immeasurable cost viewed in national terms. * * *

THE PEACETIME BURDEN OF WAR

The costs of war are always with us. In peacetime the nations are preparing for future wars and paying for past wars. In order to compare the figures in various countries, the fiscal year 1930 is taken. In that year the net expenditures of the United States

Government totaled $3,976,141,651.26. Of this total, expenditures due to war, past or future, were:

Army and Navy (military functions only)	$719,089,000
United States Veterans' Bureau	597,375,000
Public debt:	
Principal	623,894,100
Interest	656,000,000
Total war expenditure	2,596,358,100

It appears from the above figures that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, 65.2 percent of the total expenditures of the Government of the United States went to pay for war, past or prospective. In the same fiscal year the State Department of the United States received $14,794,945.68 the cost of the normal transaction of our business with other nations was one one-hundred-seventy-fifth of the cost of past and future wars. Preparing for future wars alone cost this country, in 1930, more than 48 times as much as the peaceful, normal conduct of international relations through the State Department. In 1930 the total expenditure of the League of Nations, including the World Court, the International Labor Organization, an installment on the new building, and all of the other agencies and activities of the League, amounted to 25,338,935 gold francs, or $4,890,414.46.

"Estimates of the present total annual world expenditure upon armaments range between 4 and 5 billion dollars * * *." Taking the lowest estimate, $4,000,000,000, a single investment of 5 percent, or one-twentieth of the sum spent each year in preparing for war, would provide an adequate permanent endowment for the League of Nations on a much larger scale than at present. (From The Costs of War, by D. Elton Trueblood, Philadelphia 1934.)

WHAT HAVE OUR WARS COST?

No reliable estimates have been made of the costs of wars prior to the Civil War. There are, however, official estimates of the direct costs of the Civil, Spanish-American, and the World Wars. But to the direct costs of war must be added continuing costs, interest on war debts, and payments to war veterans. Indeed these continuing and indirect costs in the long run are far greater than the costs of the hostilities themselves.

CIVIL WAR

The direct cost of conducting the Civil War was $3,328,000,000. The interest on the Civil War debt, which ran for a period of about 26 years, was $1,572,000,000. But by far the greatest item of cost resulting from the Civil War is the payment of over $8,000,000,000 in pensions to Civil War veterans and their dependents from 1865 to 1939. In other words, the Civil War pensions have cost nearly twice as much as the war itself, plus interest on the Civil War debt.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The Spanish-American War is linked with other military expeditions, and engagements, the Philippine, Moro, and Boxer expeditions. The War Department estimates the cost of these military activities at $592,000,000. The cost was met by about $382,000,000 in additional taxes and by $200,000,000 in borrowed funds. The debt resulting from the Spanish-American War had all been retired by June 30, 1904. The interest on the Spanish-American War debt was about $47,000,000. Up to June 30, 1939, $1,405,000,000 had been paid out in Spanish-American War pensions. Pension payments are already twice the cost of hostilities.

WORLD WAR COSTS

To date our part in the World War has already cost us about $57,000,000,000. * * * The direct costs of the World War to June 30, 1921, were $24,135,000,000. The loans to the Allies have cost us (to June 30, 1939) $6,860,000,000. We loaned the Allies $9,610,000,000 of which only $2,750,000,000 had been repaid to June 30, 1939. * * * The interest on the war debt (to June 30, 1939) is $14,383,000,000. * * * World War veterans and their dependents have received $11,736,000,000 in pensions and other benefits from June 30, 1918, to June 30, 1939. * * *

War costs have gone up considerably since the last World War. In 1916 the most expensive battleship cost about $15,000,000, whereas a modern battleship costs about $75,000,000—five times as much. Airplanes and cargo steamers show a similar increase in cost. Armies are more heavily mechanized than in the last war and this adds greatly to war costs. It is not unlikely that if we were drawn into another war, similar to the last World War, the cost would be doubled. (From Can We Afford Another War? by John C. Gebhart, 1939, pp. 1–2.)

Let us suppose that an intelligent inhabitant of the planet Mars should look across space to see what is happening on this Mother Earth. What would his impressions be? He would see a world in which expenditure for military purposes is now three times as great as it was just previous to the outbreak of the World War in 1914. He would see some 8,500,000 men under arms, and he would see more than $7,000,000,000 being spent in 1937 on armaments, if the old gold basis be accepted, or some $12,000,000,000 if the new devaluated gold basis be used. These colossal figures are to be compared with $5,800,000,000 spent in 1936, with $4,300,000,000 spent in 1932, when the last futile conference on disarmament was held, and $2,500,000,000 spent in 1913. These, we are assured, are minimum figures based on peace-footing expenditures—if that cynical adjective can mean anything—and are but a fraction of what actual war expenditures would involve. This observer from Mars would also be surprised to see that there is a wholly new kind of international war which is most destructive and alarming. Its battles are fought on the field of economics and the social order, and its disasters, while not immediately accompanied by the shedding of blood, are just as fatal to prosperity and to peace as if blood were shed. (From introduction to the annual report of Nicholas Murray Butler, director of the division of intercourse and education, for the year 1938. In Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Yearbook, 1938, p. 43.)

THE EXTENT OF WORLD REARMAMENT

The average annual total expenditure by the seven great powers, Great Britain, Germany, France, United States of America, Italy, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Japan, during 1908–13 was £376,000,000. In 1929 the total expenditure by the same powers was £595,000,000. During 1939 Great Britain will spend nearly £650,000,000. Germany spent in 1929 less than £34,000,000. During the past 6 years Germany's budget has not been made public, but in his speech to the Reichstag on September 1 of this year Hitler said that Germany had spent over ninety milliard reichsmarks during the past 6 years. The expenditures in the year 1933–34 and in 1938–39 were as follows:

	1933–34	1938–39
Great Britain	£93,500,000	£326,600,000.
Germany	671,000,000 reichmarks	Figure not given.
France	12,324,300,000 francs	11,064,300,000 francs.
United States of America	$544,400,000	$1,009,000,000.
Italy	4,823,800,000 lire	6,363,400,000 lire.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.	1,547,300,000 rubles	26,044,000,000 rubles.
Japan	872,600,000 yen	1,246,800,000 yen.

Thus every nation increased its annual expenditure on armaments except France. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics increased eleven times. The total expenditures by all nations in 1913 was approximately £450,000,000. Today it is no less than £3,500,000,000. (From Some Economic and Social Effects of Rearmament, by Col. David Carnegie. In International Affairs (London) November–December 1939, vol. 18, pp. 784–785.)

Once upon a time a war could be fought for comparatively little money. The American Revolutionary War of 1775–83 is estimated to have cost less than $50,000,000; the United States Civil War, a sanguinary 4-year struggle, cost the Federal Government $6,000,000,000. The Franco-German War of 1870 involved an expenditure of $2,000,000,000, including the indemnity that the victorious Germans imposed upon France. But the days of inexpensive war making are gone forever. At the height of the World War, the combatant nations were spending $113,000,000 a day in cash—to make no mention of the destruction of property values and human life. It cost $25,000 to take a life in the World War, and a total of 9,000,000 lives were taken. By the time the nations of the world settle the last bill incurred in the Great War, they will have paid—if they ever do pay—the fantastic and dumbfounding sum of $500,000,000,000. (From The Ledger of Mars by Henry M. Robinson. In The Rotarian (Chicago) November 1936, vol. 49, No. 5, p. 7.)

EDITORIAL NOTE: That a realization of the cost of war acts as a powerful deterrent to those contemplating hostilities cannot well be doubted. The entire question of the cost of war—economic costs, direct and indirect, the human suffering involved, and the general setback to civilization—could, however, hardly be discussed adequately within the confines of a single article. * * * A rather brief examination of the literature revealed more than 300 volumes bearing on this general subject of war costs. (From footnote to The Price of War, by Frank G. Dickinson. In the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1934, p. 166.)

In the annals of the office of The Assistant Secretary of War the fiscal year 1939 stands out as the most active in its peacetime history. Procurement of military supplies made necessary by the argumentation and acceleration of national defense, as urged by the President and as authorized by the Congress, reached a new peak. The War Department spent more money for equipment—approximately $450,000,000—than the total money expended for the prosecution of the War with Spain. That the future may hold prospects of even greater activity in this office may best be illustrated by the fact that funds appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year, 1940, permit expenditures for fighting equipment alone of the sum of $373,267,832. (From Report of the Secretary of War to the President, 1939. Washington, 1939, p. 15.)

THE COST OF THE WORLD WAR, 1914–18

Conclusion: In conclusion, an attempt may be made to bring together the scattered data of this study into one final comprehensive picture which shall show the total cost of the war. The direct costs were estimated at $186,000,000,000. The indirect costs are now seen to have amounted to almost as much more. The com-

bined direct and indirect costs are set forth by the principal items in the following table:

Direct and indirect costs of the Great World War

Total direct costs, net		$186,233,637,097
Indirect costs:		
Capitalized value of human life:		
Soldiers	$33,551,276,280	
Civilians	33,551,276,280	
Property losses:		
On land	29,960,000,000	
Shipping and cargo	6,800,000,000	
Loss of production	45,000,000,000	
War relief	1,000,000,000	
Loss to neutrals	1,750,000,000	
Total indirect costs		151,612,552,560
Grand total		337,846,189,657

The figures presented in this summary are both incomprehensible and appalling, yet even these do not take into account the effect of the war on life, human vitality, economic well-being, ethics, morality, or other phases of human relationships and activities which have been disorganized and injured. It is evident from the present disturbances in Europe that the real costs of the war cannot be measured by the direct money outlays of the belligerents during the 5 years of its duration, but that the very break-down of modern economic society might be the price exacted. (From The Direct and Indirect Cost of the Great World War, by Ernest L. Bogart, New York, 1920, p. 299.)

From our entry into the war to the end of the fiscal year 1921 this country spent, through Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies, very nearly $40,000,000,000 on war demands of one sort or another, of which possibly thirty-five and one-half billions was on account of the World War, and the rest mainly pensions to veterans of former wars and the normal peacetime outlays of military and naval establishments. Of the thirty-five and one-half billions some thirty-two billions represented outlays of goods and services by the national economy as a whole, and not mere fiscal transfers such as payment of interest on the public debt to our own citizens. These wartime dollars may be thought of as roughly equivalent in buying power to post-war dollars of 1922–28. About half of this effort was concentrated in the calendar year 1918, constituting more than one-fourth of our national income in that year. (From The Costs of the World War to the American People, by John M. Clark, New Haven, 1931, pp. 281–282.)

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

1. The war cost the United States considerably more than $1,000,000 an hour for over 2 years.

2. The direct cost was about $22,000,000,000, or nearly enough to pay the entire cost of running the United States Government from 1791 up to the outbreak of the European war.

3. Our expenditures in this war were sufficient to have carried on the Revolutionary War continuously for more than 1,000 years at the rate of expenditure which that war actually involved.

4. In addition to this huge expenditure nearly $10,000,000,000 have been loaned by the United States to the Allies.

5. The Army expenditures have been over $14,000,000,000, or nearly two-thirds of our total war costs.

6. During the first 3 months our war expenditures were at the rate of $2,000,000 per day. During the next year they averaged more than $22,000,000 a day. For the final 10 months of the period, from April 1917 to April 1919, the daily average was over $44,000,000.

7. Although the Army expenditures are less than two-thirds of our total war costs, they are nearly equal to the value of all the gold produced in the whole world from the discovery of America up to the outbreak of the European war.

8. The pay of the Army during the war cost more than the combined salaries of all the public-school principals and teachers in the United States for the 5 years from 1912 to 1916.

9. The total war costs of all nations were about $186,000,000,000, of which the Allies and the United States spent two-thirds and the enemy one-third.

10. The three nations spending the greatest amounts were Germany, Great Britain, and France, in that order. After them come the United States and Austria-Hungary, with substantially equal expenditures.

11. The United States spent about one-eighth of the entire cost of the war, and something less than one-fifth of the expenditures of the allied side. (From The War With Germany, a Statistical Summary, by Leonard P. Ayres, chief of the Statistics Branch of the General Staff. Washington, 1919. pp. 135–136.)

COST OF THE WAR

It is difficult to estimate the cost of the war, even apart from interest on debt, pensions, and other permanent charges which war always leaves in its wake. Exclusive of debt operations and postal disbursements from postal revenues, the total expenditures of the Government, from April 6, 1917, to October 31, 1919, by which time the overseas troops had been returned, was over $35,413,000,000; of this total, $11,280,000,000, or nearly 32 percent, was met by taxes and other minor ordinary receipts. The expenditures, given above, include the amounts loaned to foreign countries. If this be subtracted, the disbursements for the purposes of the American Government, during the war period under consideration, was $26,007,000,000; and on that basis the proportion met out of tax receipts and revenues other than borrowed money was over 43 percent. (From Financial History of the United States, by Davis R. Dewey. 12th ed., New York, 1939. pp. 510–511.)

THE PRICE OF WAR

The World War, which lasted 1,565 days, was the bloodiest and costliest war that had ever been fought. During the conflict about 65,000,000 men were mobilized and forced to participate, for a longer or shorter time, in the economically unproductive activity of organized destruction. Of these men, about 9,000,000—1 in 7—died in action or of wounds. Approximately 22,000,000—1 in 3—were wounded, and of these 7,000,000 were permanently disabled. A number of the wounded died within a few years after the war as a consequence of their disabilities, while many shell-shocked or gassed veterans continued to lead tortured existences. More than 5,000,000 men were reported "missing" after the war. More than twice as many men were killed in battle during the World War as in all the major wars from 1790 to 1913 together, including the Napoleonic wars, the Crimean War, the Danish War of 1864, the Austro-Prussian War, the American War between the States, the Franco-Prussian War, the Boer War, the Russo-Japanese War, and the Balkan wars. Two-thirds of the men mobilized and two-thirds of those killed were on the Allied side. (From The World Since 1914, by Walter C. Langsam. New York, 1936, p. 87.)

PEACETIME COSTS FAR EXCEED ACTUAL WORLD WAR EXPENSES

Sixty billion dollars for one war, and still the total rises. Those dollars represent the cumulative cost to the American people of their fight against Germany and her allies. * * * Actual fighting occupied 1½ years after April 6, 1917. A technical state of war continued for another 2½ years. Sixteen years of peace followed. Yet the cost in dollars goes on. Calvin Coolidge estimate that before the balance finally is struck the World War costs to the United States will reach $100,000,000,000. Scarcely $20,000,000,000 have been used to battle more than 7 years of depression. In none of these war calculations is there a reckoning of the human cost—the most important calculation of all.

THE DIRECT HUMAN COST

* * * Fifty thousand four hundred and seventy-five American soldiers and sailors killed in action or dead of wounds. Another 234,300 were wounded. This was the direct human cost. * * *

THE PEACETIME COST

First, there were the postwar loans to the Allies, amounting to about $12,000,000,000. Second, there was the interest to be paid on the billions of debt. This interest represents the wages on the loans made to the Allies. Its total—unpaid—amounts to about $10,000,000,000. Third, there were the peacetime payments to this country's wartime soldiers and sailors. These payments have amounted to nearly $12,000,000,000 in the past 16 years. Their total will rise to uncertain proportions in the future. * * *

VETERANS' BENEFITS CONTINUE

The third group of peacetime costs goes on regularly month by month. This group of costs shot up sharply when veterans were allowed to take payment on their full bonus in 1936. Now that cost runs along evenly in the form of benefits for disabled veterans, hospitalization for 20,000 veterans, and pensions for widows and orphans. Experience shows that these costs tend to remain large many years after a war ends. * * * Then, in addition, there are indirect costs that are incalculable. (From Twenty Years After, in the United States News, April 5, 1937, p. 1.)

Yet our own outlay had been and was to continue to be a perfectly enormous sum. It is sometimes represented that this country made a profit out of the war. Nothing could be further from the truth. Up to the present time our own net war costs, after allowing for our foreign-debt expectations, are about $36,500,000,000. To retire the balance of our public debt will require about $7,000,000,000 in interest. Our Veterans' Bureau and allied expenses are already running at over $500,000,000 a year in meeting the solemn duty to the disabled and dependent. With what has been paid out and what is already apparent it is probable that our final cost will run well toward $100,000,000,000, or half the entire wealth of the country when we entered the conflict. (From address of President Coolidge at the observance of the tenth anniversary of the armistice, Washington, November 11, 1928.)

THE COSTS OF THE WORLD WAR

We do not know and can never know the full costs of the World War; of any war. The history of post-war Germany sketched in this short study leads to no other conclusion. * * * It is in this sense that we have ventured, in the course of this study, to indicate how much of Germany's post-war burden was a result of the war and how much, comparatively, was due to what it paid on reparation and treaty accounts. The former was about four times as much as the latter. * * * The only comprehensive effort to cover this whole field was that of the Economic and Social History of the World War, published under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, for which I have had the responsibility of direction and editorship. * * * The mas-

ters of Nazi Germany, thinking to liquidate the Treaty of Versailles, have thrown Europe back into the maelstrom of war costs from which it has been struggling to escape ever since 1919. (From What Germany Forgot, by James T. Shotwell, New York, the Macmillan Co., 1940, pp. 121 and 131.)

THE ESTIMATED COST OF THE EUROPEAN WAR, 1939—WAR APPEARS MOST COSTLY IN HISTORY

The cost sheets of Europe's war are convincing bankers and Federal officials that it will be the most expensive conflict in history.

Great Britain already is spending at the rate of $9,600,000,000 a year. That amounts to 40 cents of every dollar its citizens earn. On a population basis it would equal a $27,000,000,000 annual budget for the United States, more than double that of any of the high-spending depression years. * * *

The French costs are a little lower than those of Britain, but still are high enough to wrench the souls of thrifty French taxpayers. France is spending at the rate of $7,400,000,000 a year, which would be equivalent to $23,000,000,000 for the United States. * * *

German costs are largely a matter of conjecture. The best estimates at which experts can arrive, however, produce the rounded conclusion that 60 cents of every dollar earned in Germany is being spent by the state.

Figures from Russia and Finland are hard to get. Nor is any over-all figure available for neutral spending. Belgium and the Netherlands, each with less than one-fourteenth of the population of the United States, are spending $300,000,000 to maintain their armed neutrality.

Sweden, with a population half a million less than that of Ohio, is spending $475,000,000 this year, half of it to keep from being swept into the maelstrom. (From statement by Associated Press. In Washington Post, March 13, 1940, p. 5).

COST OF WAR

The present war costs the nation £6,000,000 per day, but alongside the astronomic figures of modern war costs, the bills for the great wars of the past look like a tip. The American War of Independence cost £120,000,000, the Crimean less than two-thirds of that. The Boers cost £223,000,000. Twenty years of fighting to get rid of Napoleon Bonaparte cost £604,000,000, a terrifying sum then, which William Pitt dealt with by introducing Britons to income tax.

In 1914 the national debt stood at £650,000,000. By 1920 that figure had become £7,527,000,000. Four years of modern war had multiplied by more than ten thousand the accumulated debt of a century and a half.

The cost of war in 1914 has been estimated at £1,000,000 a day. By 1915 it had risen to £3,000,000 a day—a third of the national income, and by 1917 to £7,000,000 a day.—Condensed from the Belfast Telegraph. (From Current History (New York), April 1940, p. 11.)

UNBEARABLE COSTS

In the concluding chapter of Capt. Lowell M. Limpus' recent book, Twentieth Century Warfare, it is stated that in Caesar's time it cost only 75 cents to kill a man. During the Napoleonic wars, as a result of modern methods, the cost had gone up to $3,000 a man. In the American Civil War it had risen still further, to about $5,000. Then came a still more rapid mechanization, and in the World War the cost was at approximately $21,000—dead, 8,538,315; expense, $180,000,000,000.

Now—even if there should be real fighting on the western front—it is estimated that the cost per death will be in the neighborhood of $50,000. So, as Captain Limpus puts it, it will cost as much to kill a single poilu on the Maginot line as it would have cost Pompey or Marius to dispose of 50,000 foemen.

And considering a normal war on a large scale, what do all these figures add up to? What do they total? That should be obvious. They total bankruptcy for mankind. Nothing more, nothing less, exactly that. (From the Sunday Oregonian of March 17, 1940. In the Appendix of the RECORD, p. 1594.)

CASH COST OF WAR SET AT $100,000,000 DAILY

Additional to this are the huge uncomputed losses in the fields of property, arms, and commercial revenue. Available data indicates that Germany, heading the list, may have spent $12,000,000,000 for war by the end of its fiscal year next March; Great Britain, its dominions, and colonies, at least $5,262,000,000; and France, using a calendar-year fiscal period, at least $2,194,758,000 by the end of 1939.

The $100,000,000 figure was computed on the basis that by the end of March Germany and the British Empire supposedly will have spent $17,262,000,000 for a war that began 211 days earlier, on September 2, or $81,800,000 a day. By the end of December, 120 days after the start of hostilities, France will have spent $2,194,758,081, or $18,200,000 a day, which brings the total to $100,000,000 a day. (From the Christian Science Monitor, November 18, 1939, p. 1.)

ANOTHER WAR HELD RUINOUS FOR AMERICA

The cost to the United States of entry into another World War would very likely be double the cost of the last World War and would result in a "lowered standard of living for generations to come," it is estimated in a somber study of modern war costs (Can We Afford Another War? by John C. Gebhart, director of the National Economy League). The league, which is identified with very conservative political opinion here, suggests that the annual expenditure for direct war costs alone probably would amount to $30,000,000,000 as compared with $15,000,000,000 for the war in 1917–18; and that the public debt, now near the legal limit of $45,000,000,000, might well reach $70,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000 in the first year and pass $100,000,000,000 in the second. (From the Christian Science Monitor, November 13, 1939, p. 5.)

THE INFLUENCE AND RESULTS OF WAR

REVERSED SELECTION

The people who will live in the years to come get none of the glory for which rulers wage war; they, at least, are innocent; they are at the mercy of the past, which did not consult them; but they must pay. * * * war not only demands a price in life, even of the victor, but the life which war demands is always the strongest and fittest, and healthiest and best. * * * None of the champions of war, who declare that peace corrodes and ruins nations, have thought about the matter deeply enough to learn that the argument they quote is the most fatal of all to their own horrible creed. For the truth is that war involves what real students of this subject call reversed selection—in which the best are chosen to be killed, and the worst are preserved to become the fathers of the future. (From The Long Cost of War, by Caleb W. Saleeby, in War and the Breed, by David Starr Jordan, Boston, 1915, pp. 223–225.)

THE LOST GENERATION

Fourteen years ago nearly a whole generation perished. In July 1916 most of the men who today would be in the seats of power in business, politics, literature, were wiped out. They were obliterated before the wall of steel. But Great Britain is only now beginning to realize that loss in all its bitterness. For now the time has come when we want those young men who today should be in the fullness of their powers and their maturity to help us out of our difficulties. We are sighing in vain for the men whose lives we recklessly used up in the awful slaughter of those weeks. In the House of Commons the old men remain enthroned. The men who sat on the front benches in 1914 are there still.

In business it is the same; the directors' rooms are occupied by old men. There is not a single railway company where the average age of the directors is not well over 60. Our industries are stagnant, not a little because they lack the lubrication of youth. The country is suffering from Methuselahs in business. Every profession tells the same tale. In literature our prophets are the same as in Edwardian days. There are no rivals to Shaw, Galsworthy, Wells, and Bennett. That splendid generation that would have succeeded them was blotted out as if it had never been. As Cassius said of Rome, "We have lost the breed of noble men." It is discernable even at the bar. Twenty years ago the law courts echoed with great voices.

No great new figures have emerged out of journalism. Everywhere postwar problems are being grappled with by men with the prewar mentality. It is not surprising that we are making so little progress to their solution. (From The Lost Generation, by Maj. H. L. Nathan; in the Nation (London), August 2, 1930, p. 555.)

WAR SHOCKS TO EUROPEAN COMMERCE

The international trade of the world in 1913, adding imports and exports, amounted to thirty-seven thousand nine hundred millions of dollars. In the preceding generation the world's trade had been growing constantly and fairly steadily, at a rate of increase of about 3.3 percent a year. If this rate had been maintained during the period 1913 to 1924 the total trade of the world in the latter year would have amounted (measured by the same standard, the dollar of 1913) to fifty-four thousand millions. Measured by this standard its amount was actually thirty-seven thousand and seventy millions. International commerce had not yet recovered in 1924 its pre-war volume. It fell below the figure which might have been anticipated, had normal growth continued, by some seventeen thousand millions of dollars. (From War Shocks to European Commerce, by Clive Day. In Foreign Affairs, New York, July 1927, vol. 5, p. 633.)

HOW THE MONEY COSTS MIGHT HAVE BEEN SPENT

According to the best statistics obtainable, the World War cost 30,000,000 lives and $400,000,000,000 in property. In order to give some idea of what this means, just let me illustrate it in the following: With that amount we could have built a $2,500 house and furnished this house with $1,000 worth of furniture and placed it on 5 acres of land worth $100 an acre and given all this to each and every family in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland, France, Belgium, Germany, and Russia. After doing this there would be enough money left to give each city of 200,000 inhabitants and over in all the countries named a $5,000,000 library, a $5,000,000 hospital, and a $10,000,000 university. And then out of the balance we could still have sufficient money to set aside a sum of 5-percent interest which would pay for all time to come a $1,000 yearly salary for each of an army of 125,000 teachers and, in addition to this, to pay the same salary to each of an army of 125,000 nurses. And, after having done all this, we could still have enough left out of our $400,000,000,000 to buy up all of France and Belgium and everything of value that France and Belgium possess; that is, every French and Belgian farm, home, factory, church, railroad, streetcar—in fact, everything of value in those two countries in 1914. (From A Leading American Socialist's View of the Peace Problem, by Victor L. Berger. In Current History, January 1928, p. 471. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 13, 1928; and the introduction to the Annual Report of the Director of the Divison of Intercourse and Education,

1934. In Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Yearbook, 1934, p. 43.)

The cost [of war] to the world approximated $250,000,000,000. If we placed this staggering sum into peacetime circulation we would not now have millions of unemployed, plus the direct loss of 50,000 men and approximately 250,000 casualties. Well could we rid ourselves, with this vast sum, of the slums of our great cities, the misery and poverty that go with them. Well could we multiply our opportunities of education and culture, through better and larger institutions of learning. Well could we afford, not one, but several airports in every large city. Well could we rid ourselves of the inadequate highways, narrow streets, and the constant congestion in every city, large or small. Well could we multiply our airways, expediting the transportation of mail, people, and merchandise to and from every hamlet in this country. Well may we remember the forgotten statistics of the World War. Seventy-four million men mobilized, 10,000,000 killed, 3,000,000 maimed, 19,100,000 wounded, 10,000,000 disabled or incapacitated for the balance of their lives, 9,000,000 orphans, and 5,000,000 widows. In view of these startling facts, who could wish for our participation in another world war? (From the Cost of War, by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker. In CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, 1939, vol. 86, pt. 2 (Appendix), p. 116.)

Speech Delivered to Christian Mobilizers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. THORKELSON, OF MONTANA

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered to Christian Mobilizers March 4, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentleman, I am pleased to be here tonight, on the invitation of Mr. McWilliams, whom I recently had the pleasure of meeting in Washington.

Many New Yorkers have called on me in Washington, and I am always glad to converse with them, for they seem to have an entirely different viewpoint from people in other localities. This is no more than should be expected, for New York is indeed a cosmopolitan city.

Mr. McWilliams, from my observation, is one of those stanch Americans who believes in the principles of this Republic, and it is those principles, and the manner in which they are abused, that I shall discuss here tonight.

No doubt many of you have read statements in regard to my position on national and international matters, which I shall discuss this evening, but let me first tell you a little about myself so that we will be better acquainted.

I am not a stranger in the city of New York. I sailed out of this port more than 45 years ago, when there was one bridge across the East River. I have been a sailor, captain of oceangoing ships, and navigator. I am still a doctor of medicine, surgeon, pilot of aircraft, and a plain businessman. In all these occupations, I have learned to give and take, and now, as a Member of Congress, I draw upon this training in the performance of my duty, to serve as I have all my life—the people and the Nation.

As a sailor and officer in the United States merchant marine, Navy, and Naval Reserves, much of my life has been subjected to strict discipline, a training which I have not forgotten today. As a doctor of medicine, I have learned to evaluate and conserve life, and as a surgeon, to estimate risk and proceed on my own responsibility. As a pilot of aircraft, I have learned to fly my ship, each of us interdependent upon the other. As a businessman, when hard pressed for capital, I have found it best to convert deficits to profits by reducing operative costs, and to employ such earned profits for expansion of the business, in order to increase income.

Professors who now run the Government call this a return to the "horse and buggy" days, but it has worked successfully for over 2,000 years. The New Deal educators who have been running the Government successfully into debt for the last 10 years do not believe in all the established principles. To those new teachers everything looks rosy and a big national debt is a mountain of joy. They simply glory in it and others seem to take pride in this Mount Nova of debt. In further recognition of this, Congress has granted permission to the President to issue medals for outstanding civilians in the Government, and I wonder if this mountain of spending is to embellish the medal.

No doubt many of you are familiar with the esteem in which I am held by the communistic press, for I am sure they have been more than attentive. To those who have formed an opinion from these publications, let me say that I am opposed to all who are engaged in subversive destruction of this Government, no matter who they are or where they are.

I grant everyone considerable latitude in expression, but I believe it is generally true that it is of little purpose to hurl invectives, for such action is often a boomerang that strikes back at those who take such liberties.

I am, as I hope to disclose here tonight, a plain American citizen, who asks for no greater privilege than to subscribe to the same fundamental laws that govern the majority. I am what you may call old-fashioned, for I still believe that we, the people, are the supreme power in this Republic, and that Congress, or our Government, is elected to serve and not to rule the people—yes; the people who have unselfishly labored from generation to generation to build this magnificent structure that we call our home—these United States of America.

We have now reached the point where this Nation no longer can be pushed or pulled by factions or organizations, each of them having a different idea of how things should be done. We must begin at some known point, and what could be better than those sound principles which are set forth in the Constitution of the United States?

It is not my intention to bore this audience with a so-called dry discussion of a subject that may appear to some of you more or less academic. But I realize that the Government of this Republic is not understood by a great number of people, and if you do not understand your own Government, it is useless to accuse anyone of destroying it. For that reason I shall now discuss the early formation that led to the drafting of the Constitution of the United States.

Suppose we now assume that all of our people believe in the principles as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. What would be the result? The result would be a united, patriotic Nation, composed of patriotic and loyal American people. It is upon these principles that all Americans must unite, and those who cannot do so must be looked upon as problem groups by their own selection, unassimilable, and therefore anti-American.

Let us now for an illustration compare the people of a nation to a pyramid. The base represents the plain or common people, and the apex the titled or the rich people. We have in such picture not only a contrast of society levels but also a picture of the "haves" and the "have nots."

A nation, of course, is composed of many social groups, which I shall not discuss tonight. For illustration, and to serve my purpose, I shall divide the people into two political groups, the "right" and the "left," each forming a distinct type of government.

The "right" is an imperialistic or autocratic government, composed of the titled and the rich people, ruled by a king who wields the power over the people through the armed and policing forces. The "left" is a democracy composed of the masses, ruled first by an oligarchy, and then by a dictator, who wields absolute power over the people by secret police, the military, and the firing squad.

Both types of government are undesirable, and they will, as they swing to the extreme right or left, become unbearable to the people over whom either type rules.

Russia provides examples of both types. Under the Czar, the Russian Government was an imperialistic despotism. Under past dictators, the Russian Government has been a democratic despotism, or a democracy. Of these two types, neither is desirable but the more pernicious is the present Russian proletarian despotism, for it appears to have forgotten Christian principles in government.

For the past 20 years, the dictators of Russia have paved their road to power with the bodies of innocent men, women, and children. All of them have maintained their positions by liquidating those who have oppcsed them. We, the people of America, object to both types of despotic government. We have suffered from an autocratic despotism, and we dread a proletarian despotism.

The founders of our country had lived under tyrannical masters, and were well acquainted with aristocratic and autocratic despotisms. It was with this knowledge fresh in mind that they set to work to organize the first Government of the United States.

The first attempt was a failure, for the Articles of Confederation did not establish balance or unity, but left each of the Thirteen States independent and free, with little responsibility to the Central Government. The Articles of Confederation, while forming the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, was in reality nothing more than a mutual-defense pact among the Original States. I quote articles 2 and 3:

"ART. 2. Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

"ART. 3. The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatsoever."

It is therefore clearly evident, after reading the Articles of Confederation, that the draftsmen had two definite objects in mind:

First, that each State retain its sovereignty, freedom, and independence; second, that the United States, through their representatives, should control the Federal Government. The manner in which this was to be accomplished is set forth in article 5 of the Articles of Confederation:

"ART. 5. For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed

in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

"Each State shall maintain its own delegates in a meeting of the States and while they act as members of the committee of the States.

"In determining questions in the United States in Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote."

It is quite evident that the gentlemen who wrote these paragraphs into the Articles of Confederation had the same thing in mind when they wrote the Constitution of the United States, for in it provision is also made for State representation in the Senate of the United States and for the withdrawal of such representatives when they violate their obligation by misrepresenting their State.

The States, after operating under the Articles of Confederation for 9 years, found the instrument incomplete, and to correct the error and provide a balanced Government they called the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, May 1787. In regard to the work which had been accomplished, Washington said:

"I conceive, under an energetic General Government, such regulations might be made and such measures taken as would render this country the asylum of pacific and industrious characters from all parts of Europe—a kind of asylum for mankind."

Of the many governments that have ruled nations throughout the ages, our Government as formulated in the Constitution is the best, for it blends the better elements of the two major types. It is not an aristocracy and it is not a democracy, but it is, instead, a democratic Republic in which the people, by electing the government of each State, provide an instrument of their own choice—the State legislature—with power to select two men to represent the State in the Senate of the United States. In this manner the party in power and the State legislators, in a certain sense, sponsored and put their stamp of approval on their United States Senators. This procedure of selecting Senators established State control of the United States Senate. It was through this representation in the Senate that the 48 United States, through their elected Members in the Senate, directed the Federal Government in its international relations and national administration.

After reading the Constitution, it is clearly evident that the entire Federal Government is subservient to the Congress of the United States. Congress, in transferring its power to the executive and other Federal departments, reversed this wise provision of the Constitution by unconstitutional dispensation of its delegated powers. The Executive and all executive departments, through their chiefs, are directly responsible to the Senate. The Senators are responsible to their State governments, and the Senate is responsible to the United States of America. That intent was clearly evident in article 2 of the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitution of the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, I contend that State rights and direct State representation and equal suffrage in the Unied States Senate were abolished when the seventeenth amendment was adopted. I charge that this drastic change removed balance and destroyed our Government, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

To prove my assertion, I quote:

"Art. IV, sec. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." And—"Art. V. * * * No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

It is my desire to call attention to the fact that a republican form of government and equal suffrage in the Senate cannot be abolished except by unanimous consent of all the States, because the 48 States, according to article IV, section 4, guarantee these rights to themselves and to each State in the words:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Since adoption of the seventeenth amendment, there has been no State suffrage in the Senate, and, therefore no legislative balance. It was State influence and control in the Senate that provided balance in the Federal Government, and that was destroyed when this amendment was adopted. There is a technical question involved in the adoption of this amendment because of the wording in the Constitution, as already expressed. If the adoption of this amendment was not ratified unanimously, there is a possibility that it is now null and void.

It should be clear that if we continue operation under the seventeenth amendment the Government will in time swing entirely to the left, and we will then have a true democracy in its real meaning. To this I believe every patriotic American will object, and if we fail to provide correction by restoring States' rights, the final result will be revolution. Americans will never submissively kneel to a dictator.

Looking back, I can only reach the conclusion that the founders of our Republic were fearful of imperialistic domination. They had experienced that in the countries from which they had emigrated, or from which they had been expelled for political or other causes. It was for their own protection that States and State governments were designated to represent the aristocratic element in our Government, and that the State legislators were given power by the people to select two Senators to the Senate of the United States.

With the same foresight, the founders provided, in article I, section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States."

The wisdom of the rule for electing Members to Congress was apparent, for the people themselves controlled the election of all public officials. They controlled the United States Senators indirectly, through their own State governments, and they controlled the Members of the House of Representatives by direct election.

In this manner, the two Houses became a check upon each other, establishing a finer balance in the Government, one for the direct interest of the State and its people, and the other for the direct interest of the people and the State. To provide a still better balance, two special powers were granted to the Senate and two to the House of Representatives. The Constitution provides that the Senate shall approve treaties and Presidential appointments, and shall conduct hearings on impeachments of public officials.

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall appropriate all moneys, and shall prefer charges of impeachment.

The wisdom of this arrangement is apparent, for the powers of controlling the purse strings and removal of public officials by impeachment were left to the House of Representatives, whose Members are elected every 2 years. The people and the State can therefore elect new Representatives every 2 years, who will increase or decrease spending and impeach public officials. This power is entirely within the reach of the people in each State every 2 years.

As I pointed out before, the seventeenth amendment penalized the people and no one else, for the Senators are now, like the Representatives, elected by direct vote, leaving the President with greater powers and the State without representation in the Senate of the United States.

In discussing this subject, I find that many people have forgotten that the States at one time were represented in the Senate of the United States, and that States' rights and representation in the Senate were abolished when the seventeenth amendment was adopted. This lack of interest may be forgiven in the younger generation, but it is certainly inexcusable in older, matured people. It is difficult to account for this indifference toward the Government, for surely no one can be blind to the eventual outcome. Let us not forget the words of Washington, "Despots arise on the ruins of public liberties."

While discussing the loss of State representation and State control of the Senate, I often encounter this observation: "Do you recall the corruption in the United States Senate before the adoption of the seventeenth amendment? Do you remember how many Senators were bribed by the vested interests, and that frequent Senate scandals were largely responsible for this change in our Government?"

My answer, of course, is "Yes." I do remember, and I admit that conditions were, to say the least, disgraceful. But would you, if one or two houses in your town were burning, set fire to the whole town to prevent future conflagrations? Or would you extinguish the fire and remove fire hazards?

Do you believe we were justified in destroying States' rights and State representation in the Senate of the United States, in order to eliminate a few corrupt Senators? Do you not believe it would have been a wiser plan for the State legislatures to recall these traitors, and treat them as common criminals?

Before adoption of the seventeenth amendment, each State through its representatives in the Senate directed the Federal Government in the interest and for the general welfare of the United States. Today the reverse is true. Each State is now seeking aid from the Federal Government in its own interest, with little consideration for the United States.

Our ancestors moved forward and carved the Nation you see. We are sitting and whittling the structure away.

The States, however, cannot escape responsibility, for money borrowed by the Federal Government must be repaid by industries, business, and people within each State. When the Federal debt and our currency are repudiated the people again pay through the losses they will sustain in investments and savings. The point to bear in mind, however, and one that should be of interest to everyone, is that the international bankers, designated on the Treasury balance sheet as "interests outside of the Treasury and the Governors of the Federal Reserve banks," will not sustain any loss, for they own and control over $15,000,000,000 in gold now stored in the Treasury of the United States and, in addition, many of the Nation's larger industries. So it is for us "Heads they win, tails we lose."

This national debt should be of interest to every State in the Union, as their own representatives in Congress propose large appropriations for Federal spending. Agriculture and industry alike should bear in mind that money borrowed by the Federal Government on States' credits, when loaned to foreign governments, becomes a weapon of destruction to agriculture and industries in the United States. The truth of this may be found in restricted and regulated crop production and in the steadily increasing surplus of farm produce.

Unemployment springs from closed food-processing plants, stagnant business, and idle factories, all of which can be charged to unsound administration trade policies. It is this planned destruction of farming and manufacturing that Congress should stop before it destroys our Nation's industries.

Expression on this subject must come from the electors of the Congressmen who voted for this legislation, and in the future it is imperative that each State give the most serious consideration to

the ability and patriotism of those chosen to serve in the Nation's Congress. It is only by the most careful public selection of candidates in primary elections and the united support of them in the general elections that we will remove anti-American influences from our Government.

For the benefit of those who blindly follow the dictates of political parties I shall quote the first President and ask you to pay particular attention to what he said more than 140 years ago:

"I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

"This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

"The common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it."

"It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passion. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another."

These are cold facts, spoken by President George Washington in his Farewell Message, when, after two terms in office, he voluntarily retired as President of the United States.

His words are as true today as they were then, and the wisdom of his advice is evident as we observe the evils rampant in both major political parties.

I want you to understand that I have no greater respect for political parties than the esteem in which they were held by the first President of the United States when he said:

"The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."

May I call attention to the fact that our Government differs from others and is unique in that the Constitution of the United States is an instrument by which the people delegate certain administrative powers to the Federal Government.

The powers delegated are so clear that little or no disagreement should arise in interpretation, yet evasion and misinterpretation of the Constitution are the actual causes for the condition in which we find ourselves today.

In our Republic the people are the supreme power, and the Constitution is the body upon which our Nation depends for life. The people should elect Members to Congress who will "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution" with the same care that a skillful surgeon employs in protecting the life of his patient. For an incompetent Congress will, by ignoring the Constitution, destroy our Nation as effectively as an incompetent surgeon destroys the life of his patient when he ignores the principles of surgery.

I want to call your attention to the preamble and its relation to the Constitution, for observation leads me to believe that little or no consideration is given to this part of the document, either by Congress, the Supreme Court, or by the people themselves:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Suppose we rearrange the preamble in the following manner:

"We, the people of the United States, ordain and establish this Constitution:

"1. In order to form a more perfect union—

"2. Which will establish justice;

"3. Insure domestic tranquillity;

"4. Provide for the common defense;

"5. Promote the general welfare; and

"6. Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

I believe it was this that the founders had in mind when the Constitution was drafted.

This should now be plain, and as questions arise before the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary branches of the Government or before any Government department or employee it is only necessary to ask these questions: Will this act on my part perpetuate a perfect Union? Will it establish justice? Will it insure domestic tranquillity? Will it provide for the common defense? Will it promote the general welfare, and will it secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity? If you are in doubt, or if the answer is "No" to one or more of these six questions, the matter under consideration is unconstitutional and therefore not allowable except by special permission of the people, as set forth in article V.

It would be interesting to know how much of the legislation now written into the law is unconstitutional. There is much of it, I am sure, and for that Congress alone is responsible. Article I, section 1, says:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

This paragraph is plain, and states without quibbling that all legislative powers granted in the Constitution shall be vested in Congress and no one else. This is only just and proper, for there is no provision in the Constitution which gives Congress the right to transfer any part of its own powers to any person or department. In spite of the fact that our Constitution states that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in Congress," transfer of powers to the Executive and other departments is a common occurrence and will, if continued, make Congress obsolete.

In article I, section 8, the people give orders to Congress. These orders are not vague, but are, instead, very explicit. I shall quote the first paragraph:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

After reading this it is evident that the founders were not entirely satisfied that we would understand the importance of the preamble, and to fortify this declaration they repeated in section 8:

"Congress shall have the power to * * * provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States."

The Members of Congress are obligated to carry this out so that our Union may be preserved.

The powers delegated to Congress in article I, section 8, are full or complete powers, first, "to lay and collect taxes." For what purpose? Obviously, "for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States." It follows, therefore, that Congress has the power to lay and collect any tax or taxes that will not disrupt justice or upset domestic tranquillity, but will, instead, secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Under this provision Congress may assess taxes on income, no matter from what source derived, and Congress may also, under this provision, issue tax-exempt securities if it is in the "common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Will anyone say that incomes cannot be taxed under article I, section 8? I do not think so; but should the question arise, let those who dissent state where in the Constitution the power to tax incomes is denied to Congress. It surely is just, and will equalize the operative cost in maintaining the Government.

It appears from this that the sixteenth amendment was not needed, for full power to lay and collect taxes from any source is granted to Congress in the first paragraph of article I, section 8.

In the same manner "Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises," "for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." It is this qualification that must be considered in all acts of Congress, as well as other branches and departments of the Government. However, the Constitution does not give Congress the right to transfer its power to the Executive, or any other department, but actually denies any such transfer of power. This is only proper and right, for the Congress alone is responsible to the owners of the document—the people of the United States. We are paid by the people of the United States to safeguard and protect their interests against usurpation by political parties and the Government itself, which I believe many Members of Congress have forgotten.

Congress has the power to pay debts, and we may assume that Congress also has the power to consider whether debts should be paid, and how they should be paid. But whatever is done, it must be for the common defense, and for the general welfare of the United States.

It occurs to me, however, that it is well for us to remember that while Congress pays the debts, the money is earned by the industry and business of this Nation, and not by employees of the Government.

"Congress shall have the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States," but it is well for Congress to remember that it must be "for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States," and not for anyone else. A national debt of $42,000,000,000, which at the end of the coming fiscal year is liable to be $48,000,000,000 or more, not including the $13,000,000,000 contingent liabilities, is not for the common defense, and certainly not for the general welfare of our people, but is instead a burden heaped upon the back of future generations, a burden for which Congress should feel ashamed.

"Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

What does this mean? It means that Congress may regulate trade with foreign nations, negotiate trade treaties or other pacts concerned with the flow of commerce, such as transportation, warehousing, dock space, and other maritime regulations. Under the same provision Congress may also regulate commerce with the Indian tribes by mutual agreement with the tribal chiefs, but there is no constitutional provision for treating them in any other manner than as foreign tribes.

This provision should be changed, for the Indians are quite as capable of looking after themselves as other tribes we have in the United States, and, being the original Americans, they should be granted this right. I am sure the taxpayers of the United States

would not object to having the various Indian departments, bureaus, and agencies closed, for they benefit neither the Indians nor the taxpayers of the United States.

What interests me most in this paragraph is the use of the wording "among the several States." How anyone can read into these four words the right of Congress to invade the boundaries of the State and the capital structure of business is surely more than I can get out of it.

"Congress shall have the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States."

To establish uniform rules of naturalization does not mean that when immigration quotas from various countries remain unfilled we shall exert ourselves to fill the quota, at least not until our own people are employed. As to bankruptcy, I believe we have sufficient laws for that, and it is possible that the United States may fall under the hammer if Congress does not begin to reduce the national debt.

"Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures."

This paragraph in section 8 has been stretched and misinterpreted both by the Attorney General and the Supreme Court to such an extent that we are now left with a currency that cannot be regulated because all standard value has been removed.

Gold is the internationally accepted medium which establishes money value in all countries. Gold is not only valuable because of its physical qualities but it is valuable and necessary because all nations have agreed to use it as a standard upon which to base the value of money. It follows, therefore, when gold is removed from the dollar, the inherent value is reduced, and when the last fraction of gold is removed all value is removed, and nothing is left for regulation. That is precisely the condition in which the United States finds itself today. We have a dollar devoid of all intrinsic value and have inflated a commodity dollar that depends upon price fixing for purchasing power.

Attorney General Cummings, in arguing this case before the Supreme Court, said:

"Although it may seem trite to do so, I draw attention to what, for want of a better term, may be called 'presumption of constitutionality.'"

The Attorney General should know that the ninth amendment governs presumption of constitutionality.

After reading the Attorney General's argument before the Court, one cannot but come to the conclusion that the onus of responsibility is literally thrown in the lap of Congress; and, of course, that is where it rightfully belongs, because Congress is responsible to the people of this Nation and no one else.

Had the Attorney General put these questions to himself, the answer might have been different:

1. Is it an act of justice to deprive the people of the United States of the right to be secured by gold; and is it an act of justice, after having deprived the people of this protection, to give it to foreigners and international financiers?

2. Is it an act of justice and is it for the common defense of our Nation to allow foreign investors to hold such amount of American securities that, when negotiated, they might seriously deplete the total amount of gold in the United States Treasury?

The remainder of section 8 concerns additional powers which the Constitution grants to Congress, most of them legislative, but at the same time nontransferable. In the next 12 paragraphs of section 8, I cannot refrain from calling attention to these three:

"To declare war.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

It is clearly evident that in these three paragraphs the people make Congress responsible for the declaration of war and for mobilization. Should any governmental branch, department, or officer violate these provisions of the Constitution, dismissal from office is in order and should be enforced by the ruling power in this Government, the Congress of the United States.

In studying article I, section 8, one cannot but come to the conclusion that the Constitution delegates specific nontransferable powers to act and to provide legislation, and this power cannot be transferred but is instead the total responsibility of Congress.

I shall now quote the last paragraph in section 8:

"Congress shall have the power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

This paragraph is clear, for it gives Congress the right to make all laws as set forth in article I, section 8, but all laws must be "for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." The United States means the 48 States, and not the Federal Government, so let us not labor under any delusion as to the power of these 48 States, or as to where all legislative power rests. I quote again article I, paragraph 1:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

It would be interesting to know where, in the Constitution, the majority in Congress found authority to delegate negotiation of trade pacts and treaties to the State Department, and the reorganization of the Government to the executive department. It would be interesting to know where, in the Constitution, the majority in Congress found power delegated to allow Federal corporations to regulate their own affairs without any accounting to Congress. Where did this majority find an excuse for the enactment of the Gold Reserve Act, and the power to place the stabilization fund under the absolute control of the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States?

I believe nearly all of us would like to be informed what is meant by the word "emergency," and the reason for having had this for a period of nearly 8 years. The fact is there is no provision in the Constitution that gives Congress the right to enact this kind of legislation, nor for the Supreme Court to hold it constitutional.

It is well to bear in mind that the constitutionality of all legislation must be based upon the Constitution itself, and not upon some fantastic decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States. Citations of court decisions are in no sense conclusive proof that an act is constitutional, and neither is the enactment of the legislation conclusive evidence that Congress considered the Constitution when the law was enacted. I grant that it is the duty of Congress to consider constitutionality, but that seems to be a lost art. To avoid what we have today, namely, a mass of unconstitutional laws, the Supreme Court must, to honor its obligation, base its decision in each and every case squarely upon the Constitution. It is only so that justice can be done to the people of this Nation.

To make this more clear, let me quote from article VI:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

After reading article VI, there should be no question in the mind of Congress or courts that are called upon to determine constitutionality of legislation, for it is clarified in these words:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

It is clear from this that laws made in pursuance of the Constitution shall be the laws of the land, which, if nothing else, infers that laws that are not made in pursuance of the Constitution are not the laws of the land, and are, therefore, null and void. It is in this classification we must place the present trade pacts, for Congress has no legal right to allow this power to remain at the whim and fancy of someone in the Executive or State Department.

It will be found that article I, section 8, delegates specific powers to Congress in legislation and regulation, which appear to be clear and understandable. Should any question arise in the minds of those who serve in Congress as to interpretation or meaning, the benefit of the doubt must be given to the people, as set forth in article IX:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

When question arises as to the extent of power that has been delegated to Congress and to the Government of the United States, article X should prevail. And this is particularly true when attempts are made to widen or reconstruct the meaning of the Constitution, for the people reserve the unwritten power in the Constitution to the States and to themselves. I quote article X:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Inasmuch as there is no specific declaration of power to Congress to put the Federal Government in competition with private business, one cannot but assume that the Government is now engaged in illegal competition. When the Government allows imports that are destructive to our producers it has exceeded its constitutional authority. Article X is plain and states distinctly that the powers and rights not delegated to the Government are reserved to the States and to the people themselves. This Nation can survive only by adhering to the Constitution. When we depart from it we have destroyed a united America.

In article I, section 8, specific powers are granted to Congress in these words: "Shall have the power to." In section 9, specific powers are denied Congress in the word: "No," or the words: "Shall not." These specific grants of power in section 8, and the specific denials of power in sections 9 and 10 are written into each section to clarify all powers granted or denied by the Constitution to Congress and to the State "for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States." Section 9, of which I shall quote one paragraph, deals entirely with restrictions imposed upon Congress by all the United States, in order to protect the rights of the State.

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement

and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The founders of our country, foreseeing problems which might confront our Nation, wisely provided that: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." Why was this stipulation made? It was made in order to furnish pertinent information to the public as to expenditures and the purpose of such expenditures, not only of money appropriated by Congress, but of all moneys appropriated, earned, or collected by the Federal Government, its departments, bureaus, and of the many new Federal-owned corporations over which Congress unfortunately has no control except in appropriation of money.

This provision of the Constitution has been, and is being, violated by Congress, by the executive department, and by the extra-constitutional Federal corporations which have been created by special acts of Congress, and for which there is no legal authority.

The question should be asked: "Are appropriations for these Federal-owned corporations made according to law?" And the answer is "No," for these corporations are, as I have said, extra-constitutional, and therefore illegal. The Constitution provides that a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time; the purpose of which is to give those who furnish the money, namely, the taxpayers of the United States, an opportunity to be informed what the Government is doing with their money.

It is this unwarrantable procedure of Congress that is in reality responsible for the condition in which we find our country today, and for this you are also responsible, because of the men you have elected to represent you in Congress. To bring this home, let me quote the Gold Reserve Act, section 3699, section 10 B:

"To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of the receipts which are directed to be covered into the Treasury under section 7 hereof, the sum of $2,000,000,000, which sum when available shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a stabilization fund (hereinafter called the fund) under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, whose decisions shall be final and not be subject to review by any other officer of the United States."

Did Congress conform to the Constitution when it set aside $2,000,000,000 in gold and said that this money should be "under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, whose decisions shall be final and not be subject to review by any other officer of the United States?" Certainly not. Congress did not give the Constitution the slightest consideration, and neither did the Supreme Court when it upheld this act.

It is acts of this sort, and do not forget there are many of them, which are now causing disintegration of industries and business. How can this be corrected?

By sending to Congress men who will honor their obligation "to preserve, to protect, and defend the rights of the people," as set forth in your own document, the Constitution of the United States.

In article 1, section 10, the Constitution provides:

"No State shall * * * coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Did Congress adhere to this paragraph in section 10 when the Gold Reserve Act was passed? It did not, for we, the people, were not only deprived of gold and gold-secured investments but it was made a criminal offense for you and me to be secured by gold—our own property, comparable to other properties such as a house and real estate.

What are we using for money today? We are using inflated currency, with less inherent value that the wampum used by the Indians a thousand years ago. It is not my desire to dwell too long on section 10, but bear in mind: In this section, the 48 United States denies certain rights to each State exactly in the same manner and with the same intent as the same States have reserved the right to themselves and to the people of this great Nation to regulate their own affairs.

The present chaotic state is not due to the obsolescence of the Constitution but is, instead, entirely due to the fact that your own Government does not adhere to it.

Who are to blame for this deplorable situation? We, the people, are to blame for it, for we have been too gullible. We have accepted the promise of the politician to give and distribute other people's property among political factions; and while this may seem pleasing to the factions, it can only end in utter destruction. Your greatest security is to compel your candidates for office to conform and adhere strictly to the Constitution, for therein lies your greatest protection. Your avenue of approach is through the ballot, for it gives you the opportunity to remove un-American representatives every 2 years.

STATE RIGHTS

What is State rights? It is the rights as expressed in the Constitution of the United States, and in addition to that the absolute control of the unwritten power in the Constitution which is protected in the Bill of Rights, and particularly in the ninth and tenth amendments, which I now quote:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States respectively or to the people."

It follows, therefore, all rights except those which are specifically delegated to the respective branches of the Government in the Constitution of the United States are reserved to the States or to the people.

What are these rights? They are:

(1) For the State to operate unmolested and free under State government elected by the people;

(2) For the people and the State to be represented by two Senators in the United States Senate;

(3) For the State to be administered by its own laws;

(4) For the State government to regulate business and all affairs within the State which have not been specifically delegated to the Government of the United States;

(5) For the State to provide laws for banking under which its own people may be protected, and to use nothing but gold and silver for payment of debts.

I may say at this point that article I, section 8, provides only that Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, but the unwritten power to provide regulation for banking and practical use of money is a power which the people have reserved to themselves and must therefore remain within the State. It is only in this manner industries and business can be regulated within the State, for when gold-secured currency is permitted to fall into the hands of private exploiters, the State and the United States suffer from such exploitation.

What was the purpose of setting up a sovereign government in each State?

(1) To maintain the very fundamental principles of this Government, which are based upon the coordinated and united effort of the 48 States;

(2) To make each State responsible for the conditions within the State;

(3) To provide training for public officials to fill more important positions in the Government of the United States;

(4) To make each State responsible for its own government which prevents overlapping and reduces cost of administration.

(5) To provide a more efficient and economical Federal administration which, when being relieved of intra-States administration, may apply itself where it should—to international affairs.

WHAT IS THE CONSEQUENCE OF ABDICATION OF STATES' RIGHTS?

The state of government is in reverse, for the State has become subservient to the Federal Government. What does it mean? It means a tremendous increase in the cost of government administration, not only within the State, but multiplied by 48 times in the Federal Government in Washington. No one should fail to see that each State government is costlier than it was before the seventeenth amendment was adopted. No one should fail to see the weakness produced in State governments by Federal usurpation of States rights.

The Federal Government today is a destructive monster which has grown fat upon the poverty of the States and of the people. What will be the end? The end, no doubt, will be national bankruptcy, and I admit such situation may become serious, but to look at this purely from the collapse of the currency structure is not facing the issue squarely, for when it happens we cannot escape internal strife.

Should we become so involved, protection will be furnished not by the State government but by the Government of the United States, and the forces used will be the military and policing forces.

Should these offensive, defensive, and protective forces take charge, the President, being the chief in command, will, of course, become the Nation's commander, and it is in such manner popular governments like ours are converted into a totalitarian state.

Federal Government Gives Needy Farmers and Laborers a Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER WMBS BROADCASTING STATION OF UNIONTOWN, PA., APRIL 2, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

prepared by me and delivered over radio station WMBS by the Honorable Wooda N. Carr, of Uniontown, Pa.

The world today is in great turmoil, and our biggest headlines are about the most distant upheavals because these are the most violent and destructive—war, brutal oppression, and other tragic events most abhorrent to our own ideals of peace, justice, and liberty. Unfortunately, the very excitement of the news from abroad tends to make us less aware that we have a serious, if less dramatic, war of our own to wage against certain basic problems that threaten our democratic way of life—against poverty, unemployment, insecurity, and other evils. Make no mistake that this too is war, even if we are fortunate enough to be fighting things instead of people, and to be fighting not with murderous weapons but with all the intelligence, vigor, and foresight at our command. This is the type of war of which all of us can be proud, and in which none of us can afford to be neutral.

One of our major battles if being conducted on the farm front, and this is what I propose to tell you about in these talks. The farm is one of our first lines of defense against poverty and insecurity, and we have always regarded it as the foundation of our democracy. It is the home and support of nearly one-fourth of our population, more people than are supported by any other single type of employment. When these farm people are prosperous their purchasing power benefits our manufacturers and businessmen and opens up more employment to our city workers, but when farm income is meager the rest of the people suffer from the farmers' weakness as consumers. Farm families are rearing one in every three of our children, the fresh blood our cities need as well as our farms. And yet our farmers are receiving only about one in every ten dollars of our national income. Think of it, one-fourth of our people. One-third of our infants and school children. One-tenth of our national income.

Yes, indeed; when this administration was first called to the bedside of our ailing farmer, it found him in a serious condition. His wasn't a new sickness, caused like others of that period by the depression. That infection could have been thrown off more easily had not the farmer's once sturdy constitution been shattered by many years of suffering from other disorders. Among these were uneconomic one-crop farming, abuse of the land, soil erosion, the break-down of the farm-credit system, bad tenure systems, shrinking foreign markets, increased farm mechanization, and the squeezing out of the little fellow by huge commercialized farms. For years, the great majority of our farmers have been just getting by in good years, and going into the red in bad years. Even in our so-called "prosperous" 1929, nearly one and three-quarter million American farmers, more than 25 percent of the total, reported a gross income of less than $600—and that sum included all their operating expenses and the food raised for their own table.

So you see, these people were in a chronically depressed economic state before the depression came. One farmer's sole complaint against the depression was that it came, as he said, in the midst of hard times. It was just the last infection which sent the patient's temperature shooting up to the danger point. By 1935, nearly 2,000,000 farm families were on relief, and another million were close to being there.

I wonder if the thought of farmers on relief makes you shudder as it does me. The man who feeds the world not being able to feed himself and his family. It has been said that farmers are the world's best grumblers. Knowing the farmer so well, his rugged independence, his willingness to toil from sunup to sundown, it seems to me that nothing could give him more real cause for grumbling than the thought that he might be forced to depend upon the public bounty. No real farmer has ever wanted relief. The most he has ever demanded of the Government is the chance to help himself. That was what millions of destitute farm families asked of this administration when a collection of circumstances beyond their control had driven them to the end of their resources.

What was to be done? Contracting industry, and technological advances had for the time being, at least, closed our industrial frontier. The other remedy which "doctor" Government has prescribed almost since he had first put up his shingle—we all know that remedy of throwing open more free land in the West for cultivation—could no longer be prescribed, because there wasn't any more fertile free land available. Our frontier is already at the Pacific. Pioneering of a very different sort is necessary today, pioneering in solving our problems, not somewhere else, but right at home.

Therefore, this administration devised a way of helping the incapacitated farmer to get moving behind his plow again. The agency set up by the Congress to direct this pioneering is the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Under emergency conditions or in certain areas stricken by such catastrophes as drought or flood, this agency does administer relief for subsistence, medical aid and the like to rural families in distress, but then only as a preliminary step toward restoring these families to a self-supporting basis through subsequent planning and financial assistance. Farm Security's major program has operated to remove many families from the relief rolls and to keep others off the rolls. Farm Security people use the word rehabilitation to describe this program, but it can be explained in words of fewer syllables. The job is simply to help the farmer get back on his own feet. For the first time in the history of our Government credit is being combined with training and sound farming methods to accomplish this.

The Farm Security Administration's files contain records of hundreds of thousands of families participating in this program. About 4,500 of these are Pennsylvania families whose loans, totaling more than $2,500,000, have stimulated several million more dollars of economic activity in the communities where they are getting a new start. Close to 175 of these families are residents of Fayette or Somerset County.

Some of these farmers had been affected by years of low prices, bad management, inadequate resources, or all three; some have had mortgage headaches ever since the speculative twenties. Some got a bad start in farming, while others were leading farmers, well established, who lost everything in the 1936 flood, or through a series of other misfortunes beyond their control. Some had been forced by the closing down of the mines or local industries to expand and obtain their entire living from farming. But all these F. S. A. borrowers had this in common; all were low-income farmers eager to profit from their past mistakes or inadequacies, and not one of them was able to get from any other source reasonable credit for the seed, feed, livestock, or equipment they needed to continue farming.

For example, what agency would lend to the family living not far from here whose only assets were $200 worth of household goods and a 1922 sedan? Their financial statement, when they first came to the farm-security office for a loan also showed old feed, fuel, and doctor's bills on the other side of the ledger, giving this family with six young children a net worth of minus $205. The Browns—let us call them that because it isn't their name—were chronic movers, and had been on town relief several months. Then Mr. Brown moved back to a farm, and began fighting another losing battle, keeping cows on feed but owning no stock of his own. The F. S. A. supervisor studied his set-up and came to the conclusion that the farmer could support his family on that farm if he could obtain a loan for four horses, some hens, a few pigs, and about $200 worth of machinery.

Like every other family in this program, the Browns accepted the proposition that their loan would be supervised; in fact they welcomed these four typical recommendations of their supervisor. One, that they keep careful records of all income and expenditures. Two, that they raise some heifer calves to build up a herd of their own. Three, that they diversify their operations by selling eggs and hogs as well as milk. Four, that they raise a good kitchen garden and can or store sufficient home-grown foods to provide wholesome meals throughout the winter. "Feed thyself" is a slogan embodied in every F. S. A. borrower's home plan, and by producing nearly $375 worth of their food, including their own milk, butter, bacon, poultry, eggs, vegetables, and fruits, the Browns conserved their cash for operating expenses and loan repayments. Mrs. Brown made the children's clothing from remnants with patterns loaned her by the F. S. A. home supervisor. By careful management, the family in 2 years has brought its net worth up from that $230 in the red to plus $601. They have recently moved to a better farm where they are building up their income from poultry, hogs, and crops. Their 5-year loan is being gradually repaid.

One sidelight on this family: After not attending church for two or three seasons, due to lack of money and suitable clothes, the Browns are now at church every Sunday. They even have an item of $25 in their budget this year for church and charitable contributions.

By giving the Browns constant supervision the F. S. A. fulfilled its double obligation—to the taxpayer, that the loan would be repaid, and to the farmer, that this credit would not put him deeper in debt, but would really help him to independence.

This program has been operating less than 5 years, operating to counteract diseases of long standing that cannot be cured overnight. But a promising beginning has been made. Already 114,000 families have "graduated" from this term of supervised credit to "farm security." They have already paid up their loans in full and need no further pointers in farm management.

That means that their local bankers, dealers, or production credit association, which once considered these families "bad risks," will now give them credit if they need it. That means that in the communities where they were once on relief, or close to being liabilities, they are now taxpayers and consumers. They are succeeding through their own efforts—make no mistake about that, but the Farm Security Administration made it possible for them to get a fresh start.

At the present time the F. S. A. is helping 1 in every 10 American farmers to plan and finance his operations. It is estimated that at least 80 percent of the more than $300,000,000 which this agency has loaned to these farmers will be eventually returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. Thus the annual cost of this program, including all administrative costs and losses, is less than $75 per family. Moreover, besides offering a cheap method of keeping rural families off relief, through its educational aspects, this program is pointing the way toward rebuilding our agriculture on a sounder basis. It is helping us wage successfully our major battle on the farm front.

The Farmers of the Nation Are Cooperating With the Federal Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER WMBS BROADCASTING STATION AT UNIONTOWN, PA., APRIL 5, 1940.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, pertaining to farmers and farming procedure in the Nation, I include the second of a series of addresses prepared by me and delivered over station WMBS by the Honorable Wooda N. Carr, of Uniontown, Pa.:

All of us are aware, I believe, that when the American farmer has money, the American manufacturer has a market and the American merchant has a customer. We realize that the farm is one of the basic and ultimate sources of our wealth. Therefore, if our country is to prosper, the farmers must have greater purchasing power. The farmers who are so weighted down with debt that they are about to go under must be given the opportunity to liquidate these debts gradually as they can pay them out of current income.

A constructive program has been developed by this administration to solve such problems. The opportunity we are giving our underprivileged farmers to help themselves toward security is not philanthropy; it is businesslike economy. The farmer who is taking part in the rehabilitation program of the Department of Agriculture's Farm Security Administration is not a public charge. He is a taxpayer.

Experience has demonstrated the form this self-help opportunity should take. Plentiful credit alone is no panacea; the twenties taught us that. Neither is technical guidance alone, because good farming costs money. But small loans, backed up by technical guidance in farm and home management, are a totally different matter.

These loans are sometimes compared to the character loans which our country bankers used to make in the days before the protection of depositors required full security for every loan. Like the old-fashioned character loan, the F. S. A. loan, although secured by a chattel mortgage on equipment and crops, has human equity as its most important security. But whereas the character loan was completed with the borrower's promise to pay, the F. S. A. loan has the plus feature necessary in our far more complicated age. This plus is the supervision which guarantees to the lender—the American taxpayer—that the loan will be used to put the farmer on his feet and will eventually be repaid.

Many borrowers owe their progress more to the technical guidance they receive than to the money. This supervision has undoubtedly contributed to the F. S. A. participants' fine record of repayments. As I mentioned in my talk last week, 80 percent of the 800,000 farmers who have received these loans—the worst possible risks by ordinary banking standards—are getting on a self-supporting basis and actually repaying their loans.

A recent survey of some 232,000 families in this program showed that since they obtained their loans they have tripled their subsistence and increased their net worth an average of $265, or 37 percent. This increase is, of course, over and above all their debts, including their obligations to the Government. This figures up to an increased total purchasing power for these families of $62,000,000.

There is another F. S. A. service for farmers which is proving of direct benefit to the taxpayer and businessman as well.

The need for this service is suggested by the rhyme:

"Oh, little debt, don't you cry:
You'll be a crisis by and by."

Those lines may make us smile, but millions of hard-working and highly respected farmers found themselves in just such a crisis several years ago and they found nothing funny about it. After years of inflated land values and high prices they were close to bankruptcy. The debt millstones around their necks threatened to choke their creditors as well and to drag down their entire communities in an economic landslide. Yet the great majority of these farmers had never welched on their debts in the past, and they could in the future be expected to pay out promptly on a debt load in line with their ability to pay under current conditions. A system of adjusting these debts outside of the law courts, and in such a way as to protect both the farm families' means of livelihood and the financial investment of their creditors, was necessary. This service was started in 1933, and when the Farm Security Administration was set up it became an integral part of its program.

Although working without legal authority to adjust debts, the F. S. A. personnel in charge of this work are not finding it difficult to convince farm debtors and their creditors that it is to the interest of both to work out plans for the gradual liquidation of these debts. To date, close to 112,000 farmers and their debtors have adjusted debts totaling $369,000,000. Some 53,000 of these farmers—less than half—needed Farm Security loans after their top-heavy debt structure had been revised. The others were then able to continue farming either without further credit, or they were able to get loans from banks or other commercial credit agencies.

These adjustments have reduced the total debt by about 23 percent throughout the United States. In Pennsylvania, the 1,800 farmers who have had adjustments paid somewhat more than the national average—84 cents on the dollar. However, many of these settlements are simply new arrangements whereby the farmers can repay in full. These may entail an extension of time on notes, or they may protect the principal while reducing the interest rate. Let me emphasize again that creditors are under no obligation to accept the settlement suggested. They do so voluntarily because they realize that, permitting the farmer to go on farming and make payments as his income allows would bring them more in the long run than foreclosure. Some of these adjustments are undertaken at the creditor's own request.

The debt adjustments serve the taxpayer by keeping families on the land and off relief. They have even more directly benefited the taxpayer because, by unsnarling huge amounts of debts and getting money moving again, they have released nearly $5,000,000 for the payment of local taxes which were long in arrears.

I want to tell you about one of our Pennsylvania farmers who was helped by this debt-adjustment service. We shall call him Robert White although that is not his name. He has always farmed in Somerset County. Robert's difficulties remind me of that Biblical allusion to the "Sins of the fathers" because the family's difficulties began about 20 years ago when Robert White's father borrowed a considerable sum of money from his bank for a coal-mining venture on his land. The coal boom collapsed. The farm, heavily mortgaged, was eventually turned over to Robert White, who assumed his father's obligations. Since every other milk check went to pay interest on the note he had signed jointly with his father, things began to go from bad to worse. At Robert White's request about a year ago, the Farm Security Administration entered the picture to help him get straightened out. A meeting of the creditors was called by the supervisor.

The family could not get credit elsewhere. But they would be able to get a decent living from the farm once their debt difficulties were ironed out. Therefore, the Farm Security Administration had also agreed to make them a 5-year loan based on a farm-and-home management plan. This was explained to the assembled creditors. One was a feed dealer who agreed to carry White's bill indefinitely. Unsecured hospital and doctor bills also were extended without difficulty. The creditors agreed to accept a total of $7,100 in full payment for claims amounting to $9,400. And new agreements were signed accordingly.

The F. S. A. loan included a sum sufficient to purchase outright from a local bank the family's mortgaged livestock and equipment so that they could continue their farming. The adjustment also made it possible for this farmer to pay $500 in taxes that were long overdue.

I understand that as a result of debt adjustments in our State, $130,000 in back taxes have gone into our tax coffers. That is one measurable benefit of the many that have been derived through this debt-adjustment service. Most of the other returns cannot be figured in black and white on a ledger sheet, but it is obvious that when a once-insolvent farmer succeeds in making a financial comeback, every fellow taxpayer, every business and professional man in his community is bound to gain thereby in actual dollars and cents.

Many merchants and other businessmen have informed us that they would have been forced to close their doors had it not been for the help which the various Farm Security service had afforded their farmer customers. They report that old debts are being paid up, new purchases are being made, and in general the business and social tone of the entire community has improved from the reestablished morale of those taking part in the program.

Among the borrowers themselves there is a new spirit. They meet in groups with the Farm Security supervisors to talk over their common problems and experiences, and to plan for the new crop year. In Pennsylvania they are organizing garden clubs for the cooperative buying of vegetable seeds. They are banding together in herd-improvement associations and other ventures of mutual benefit. Their children are joining F. S. A. calf clubs, and also taking an increased interest in the activities of the 4-H Clubs. Beginning this winter several youths selected by the supervisors from the families of F. S. A. borrowers are attending special courses arranged at State College in cooperation with the National Youth Administration.

The opportunities this program is giving to farmers without substance, farmers who were once on the relief rolls or so close to it no banker or merchant would give them credit, are the kind which we like to associate with American democracy. And the use which is being made of this credit and guidance in farming proves that the low-income farmers are true sons of their pioneer forefathers, deserving of this chance to help themselves.

We Must Hand to the Next Generation of Farmers and Laborers Greater Opportunities to Make a Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER WMBS BROADCASTING STATION OF UNIONTOWN, PA., APRIL 12, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third of a series of addresses prepared by me and delivered over the above-mentioned radio station by the Hon. Wooda N. Carr, of Uniontown, Pa.

Those of us who live in Pennsylvania, generally referred to as an industrial State, but where agriculture is an important industry representing a larger capital investment than mining or the manufactory of primary metals, are vitally interested both in a prosperous agriculture and in a prosperous industry.

There are those who, with great fanfare and bravado, declare: "The American farmer doesn't need help."

The facts cause us to wonder whether such statements are not made through a complete lack of information and understanding; with a mistaken and false appeal to the traditional independence of the American farmer. * * * Generally, too, the facts show, we find these same individuals, on the other hand, busy planning help for other more favored and more prosperous industries.

Let's see whether the farmer needs help.

Since 1932, when a group of farm leaders from every part of the country called on Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace, and asked him to assist them in obtaining Federal legislation to help solve their farm problems, the Government has been spending many millions of dollars to assist the American farmers in solving their problems.

We are interested in knowing why and how the money is being spent. I am particularly interested since I have constantly voted in Congress to support those measures designed to aid in solving the problems of agriculture.

Now, before we supply the answers, as to why money is spent to help agriculture, we must know the questions and the problems.

First, how important is agriculture?

Farmers and their families represent one-fourth of the entire population of the Nation. Consider then, the importance of this purchasing power, especially if the farm income can be raised to its proper position in relation to the income enjoyed by other industry.

Its importance as an industry in Pennsylvania is shown by the fact that the capital invested in agriculture in our State is only second to that invested in any other industry. The value of farm propery and equipment in Pennsylvania amounts to more than $1,460,000,000. This value is surpassed only by the value of the investment in steam railways and equipment, which represents an investment of more than $2,155,000,000. The money invested in farm property and equipment exceeds that invested in all the mines and quarries and all the capital invested in producing steel and other primary metals.

Surely, then, when we are concerned about the problems of agriculture, we are concerned about the problems of a vital and important industry within our borders.

There has been considerable discussion and controversy over the farm question since the fall of farm prices and farm income immediately after the first World War. It is generally agreed that the very acute farm problem of surpluses and falling prices was the result of a condition in agriculture brought on by the war. Therefore, that would seem a logical point to start to examine in order to determine the cause and then attempt a solution of the problem.

Before the World War, agricultural emphasis was on production, in most cases with little or no heed being given to possible soil exhaustion. Patriotism and profits blinded us to the need for caution and conservation. And during the World War, the need for excessive amounts of farm products rose. "Food will win the war" was the cry and America was called upon to supply the food. As a result the farmers of this country plowed up 40,000,000 extra acres of grassland in order to supply food and fiber for Europe.

Then the war ended. Europeans went back to farming. As a result many European nations gradually worked toward a self-sustaining basis and the demand for American agricultural products naturally dropped off; but not so with our additional 40,000,000 acres. They stayed in cultivation.

In the early twenties our farm exports required the production from over 80,000,000 acres. In recent years the foreign market has taken products from only 20,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres. The demand in the domestic market, likewise, has fallen off because of the let down in domestic production and the lowering of income of city workers through lack of employment. As a result of all this immense surpluses of all farm products continued to pile up until we had the inevitable price collapse of 1932.

Now, what was the picture of agriculture as a result of this price collapse?

The cash farm income for 1932 had fallen to $4,328,000,000—less than half of what it had been in 1929.

Not only that, but the purchasing power of this small cash income that the farmer received in 1932 was pitifully low, for, while farm prices fell, the price of industrial goods—the things the farmer had to buy—stayed up.

As a practical example of this disparity between farm and industrial prices:

In 1929, it required 101 bushels of potatoes to buy an average double wagon.

In 1932, it required 183 bushels of potatoes to buy the same wagon.

The purchasing power of other farm commodities—wheat, corn, and milk—were likewise, as low.

To continue the picture of agriculture in 1932: Great surpluses of all farm commodities had piled up, and were continuing to pile up. Cheap prices did not help to move them. Cheap farm prices meant low income to farmers; they meant a loss of farm-purchasing power that resulted in industry in the cities falling off. The farmers had no money to buy manufactured goods, and industrial workmen had no money with which to buy farm products, no matter how cheap they were. Farmers continued to grow immense surpluses in order to bring in some cash, using up their soil fertility, and getting practically nothing in return.

The farmers knew the growing of these immense surpluses hurt them and the rest of the country, but they were not organized as was the rest of industry. They had no guide as to their plantings to meet needs, and thus insure them a fair price.

At this point many farm leaders throughout this Nation realized that we were living in a world of changed agriculture, that the demands for agricultural products had changed since 1914. To meet this change from 1914, these leaders realized that it was necessary to change agricultural methods and planning.

Therefore, the group of farm leaders, to whom I referred previously, asked Secretary of Agriculture Wallace to help them obtain Federal legislation to aid in solving their problems.

The Secretary, well aware of this change in agriculture and in sympathy with the ideas and ideals of these farm leaders, worked with them to bring about the present farm program, which has as its objectives the cooperation of farmers in planning their agriculture to fit it to present-day needs.

The agricultural conservation program is a voluntary program designed by the farmers for the farmers and operated by the farmers themselves. It set out to conserve our land resources by stopping the unnecessary depletion of soil fertility through mining of the soil by growing cash crops far beyond the need of consumers. In addition it aims to conserve our soil through the prevention of erosion that has already destroyed 50,000,000 acres of land in America.

The program set out to assure the farmer of a fair income by planning with him to grow commodities in line with needs and the program further aims, with the welfare of the consumer in mind, to assure the consumer an adequate supply of food and fiber at fair prices year in and year out. This it aims to accomplish through the stabilizing influence of the ever-normal granary.

As a result of the agricultural conservation program the farm picture is changing. Six million farmers throughout the Nation and more than 70,000 farmers in Pennsylvania are cooperating to create a new and better agriculture—a planned agriculture, an agriculture that includes in its planning common sense business principles, such as have been used successfully in other industries for many years.

For the expenditure of the millions of dollars that the taxpayers, through a vote of Congress have been devoting to the upbuilding of agriculture during this period, millions of acres of fertile topsoil have been reclaimed and renewed through the planting of more than 5,000 acres of forest trees; through the seeding of more than 15,000 acres of new pasture mixtures; through the establishment of more than 365,000 acres of new seedings of alfalfa—and the story of the development of this

conserving crop in Pennsylvania under the farm program will, I believe, take its place among the most important things in the agricultural history of the State. More than 1,750,000 acres of new seedings of clover and timothy were established and more than 185,000 acres of green manure crops were grown to put fertility and humus into the soil.

In addition to all this, another important chapter has been written in Pennsylvania agriculture with the application of more than 2,000,000 tons of lime and 175,000 tons of superphosphate. At the present time under the agricultural conservation program more than three times as many tons of lime are used by the farmers in the program as were used by all farmers in the State before the program. Several million acres of neglected soil have been brought to a better state of fertility.

Farmers have now learned to plan their agriculture more in line with their needs, and as a result the immense price-depressing surpluses are gradually being eliminated. The ever-normal granary is working to assure the consumer of an adequate supply of food and fiber each year at fair prices.

At the present time, in the case of wheat, we have, according to Administrator Evans, of the Triple A, about what we ought to have in the ever-normal granary—a supply of about 300,000,000 bushels over and above domestic demand. This reserve is the consumers' guaranty that the United States is going to have ample wheat under all conditions. Right now drought is seriously threatening the winter crop, but we know that even if drought comes up to the worst expectations the people of the United States are going to have plenty of wheat next year.

The ever-normal granary is out of the theory stage. It is working. A similar situation exists with corn. The granary is carrying over a half billion bushels of corn, more than half of which is safely stored right out in the granary, where it can be used in event of a short crop such as we had in 1934 and 1936.

On the other hand, in addition to all its value in the way of soil conservation, restored fertility, stabilizing production, and assurance of abundance and fair prices to consumers, the assistance that has been given to farmers through the various farm programs has almost doubled that pitifully low income of 1932 and farm income is making headway to its rightful goal. This goal is in turn reflected in purchasing power and prosperity to industry.

In fact, the money diverted to agriculture inures to the welfare of the entire Nation, and I believe the facts show it to be actually an investment to guard agriculture so that agriculture can in turn guard the Nation.

Pennsylvania Farmers Enthusiastically Support and Cooperate With the Federal Agricultural Program When Given an Opportunity Through State Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER WMBS BROADCASTING STATION OF UNIONTOWN, PA., APRIL 9, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fourth of a series of addresses prepared by me and delivered over the above-mentioned radio station by the Honorable Wooda N. Carr, of Uniontown, Pa.:

We pointed out to you previously that the World War made a drastic change in agriculture. The demands of that war had speeded production until we had 40,000,000 acres of new land under cultivation, and then the war ended. And with the end of the war came an end to our export markets, which cut down the demand for these tremendous crops that we had been producing. We no longer owed money abroad, payments of which we could make with agricultural commodities. Instead, foreign nations owed us. Likewise, foreign nations became more self-sustaining, further cutting down our export market.

In addition to this, tractors and automobiles replaced horses and mules. Thus the market for products from about one-tenth of our harvested acres was lost.

Likewise, efficiency in farming became the watchword—new machinery came into use, higher-yielding crops were developed, and scientific management speeded production. Agriculture was becoming streamlined.

Then the depression set in soon after the World War. Lack of income forced many farmers to use all available land to grow cash crops in order to make both ends meet.

Then it was realized that it was no longer possible to continue producing agricultural products in a haphazard manner. There were no more new lands to exploit, and practically a hundred million acres of cropland had been ruined, with damage to millions of additional acres. A farmer's market was no longer a local market. His market was now a world market. His price was now conditioned on world and national supply.

It was realized that it was necessary to introduce commonsense business principles into agriculture—business principles similar to what had been used by industry for years. This was necessary if the American farm was to be maintained, if the farmer was to receive an adequate income, and if consumers were to be protected.

At stake was the welfare of 7,000,000 farm families, constituting 25 percent of the population of the United States. This 25 percent of the population is educating 31 percent of the children of school age. At the same time this 25 percent of the population has been receiving only 11 percent of the national income. This is somewhat higher than the 7 percent which they had been receiving in 1932, but farmers are still at a severe handicap in comparison with nonfarm groups.

The decision of the farmers to introduce these sound business principles into farming resulted in the present farm program. It meant the goal of conserving our land resources and fertility, stabilizing income and production, and assuring an abundance of food and fiber to all the Nation.

How well has it worked? Certainly the restoring of millions of acres of soil fertility through the sound farming practices as outlined in my recent talk is evidence that we have made at least a start toward recapturing our depleted cropland.

The 6,000,000 farmers who are cooperating in the agricultural conservation program throughout the Nation have come to realize that it was poor business to continue to grow food and fiber far in excess of the actual needs. They decided to do what industry has done for years. For years industry has applied sound business principles to production. When industry determines that a certain number of units of a product are necessary to supply a given market, industry manufactures that amount. Industry does not intentionally produce great surpluses; it produces in accord with its need, thus maintaining a more stable income and a fair price.

Farmers began to question: "If this is a necessary and sound thing in one business, why not in another—in agriculture?" So the farmers began to plant their production in line with needs. This is the part of the farm program in which the farmers voluntarily produce within allotments for the various crops. They are advised as to what acreage is needed to produce sufficiently for all purposes and then each farmer is allotted his fair share of that total.

Now, how has this worked?

I give the word of Administrator Evans, who has declared that "the farm program in full operation in 1939 has been a decided success. The gains that farmers have made with it have demonstrated that this is the greatest farm program ever offered farmers anywhere."

Have the farmers cooperated?

Here are the facts:

Under the 1939 program, in order to produce an abundance, but not burdensome surpluses, farmers were advised to plant within their allotments and grow from ninety-one to ninety-three million acres of corn. They actually harvested ninety-one million.

For cotton they were advised to grow from twenty-five to twenty-seven million acres. They actually harvested 25,000,000.

For potatoes they were advised to grow 3,100,000 acres. That identical number of acres of potatoes was harvested.

For wheat they were advised to grow from fifty-five to sixty million acres. There were actually harvested 55,000,000 acres of wheat.

This demonstrates to you in a practical way, I believe, the sincere cooperation of the 6,000,000 farmers of the Nation.

Under the 1939 farm program, conservation payments, plus parity payments, have given the cooperating wheat farmer about 28 cents a bushel on his normal yield on his allotted acres. This in addition to his warehouse price has assured the cooperating farmers a fair price for their wheat. As a matter of fact, all the parts of the farm program, in full operation, have held a relatively fair price for wheat in spite of the accumulated surplus, which it has been the aim of the program to reduce.

This adjusting of production to demand through acreage allotments or quotas is in direct line with the responsibility that the farmers participating in the Triple A program have assumed. This is the responsibility to supply an adequate supply of food and fiber for the consumer.

This responsibility has been discharged by the carrying of reserve supplies in the ever-normal granary—another sound business principle—a bank account of grain against a rainy day. The ever-normal granary affects both Pennsylvania farmers and consumers.

As I reported previously—in the case of wheat, we have in the ever-normal granary about 300,000,000 bushels over and above domestic requirements. This reserve is the consumers' guarantee that the United States is going to have ample wheat under all conditions; this in the face of drought which is seriously threatening the winter-wheat crop.

The half billion bushels of corn now carried as a reserve under the ever-normal granary is insurance against a short crop, such as we had in 1934 and 1936.

These reserves in the ever-normal granary prevent ruinously low prices to producers in years of plenty, because the surplus can be

taken from the market and stored in the granary. On the other hand, it protects consumers against excessively high prices in years of short crops, for in that case a reserve supply can be drawn from the granary and placed in trade channels.

Pennsylvania farmers have an interest in both sides of the question; they do not wish to see fellow farmers ruined by low prices and themselves eventually sharing in any such ruin. Again Pennsylvania farmers are interested because when it comes to feed grains for dairy and poultry feeds, the Pennsylvania farmer is really a consumer.

As Administrator Evans declares: "The ever-normal granary is out of the theory stage. It is working."

One of the greatest tributes to the soundness of this program that the farmers have adopted to stabilize production is the fact that only recently our own Pennsylvania State government has applied this same Triple A theory of stabilizing production to the anthracite-mining industry.

The Governor of our Keystone State has set up a committee similar to your farmers' committees to determine how much anthracite coal is needed to supply the demand, and then equitably, just as you farmers do in the case of grain, this committee will assign production allotments to the various coal producers.

And again a tribute to the sound theory of your farm program, this new emergency mining committee, which makes coal allotments, operates under no statute making mandatory on the part of the coal producers to mine within these allotments. Instead, it is planned to have it operate on the same theory followed by your farm program—on voluntary compliance on the part of the producers in an effort to stabilize their industry, its production, and prices.

The fact that you farmers have taken your allotment program and your ever-normal granary and made it operate in a practical way for the benefit of the general welfare of the entire country, and the fact that your plan is being adopted by the great multibillion-dollar anthracite-mining industry is additional justification for the expenditure of great sums of money to rehabilitate the great industry of agriculture.

President's Reorganization Plan Will Not Disturb Independent Status of Civil Aeronautics Authority

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and printed concerning the plan No. IV submitted by the President, especially that part which transfers the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. The claim has been made that the independent status of the Authority has been destroyed. Anyone who took the trouble to carefully analyze the plan could not come to this conclusion. This statement is verified by the Director of the Budget, Hon. Harold D. Smith. His views are concurred in by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the letter written by the Director of the Budget. The letter follows, as does the letter of the Attorney General:

MAY 2, 1940.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: If Congress takes no adverse action on Reorganization Plans III and IV, the effectuation of these plans will require that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, subject to the approval of the President, determine the necessary transfers of funds. In view of the limited time available and because of certain questions arising out of the complexity of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Bureau of the Budget has consulted with the Department of Justice in order to establish a sound basis for the distribution of the available appropriation balances of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Attorney General has agreed to the following interpretive statements concerning the civil-aeronautics provisions of the two plans:

1. Plan III centralizes in the Administrator, who is hereafter to be known as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, those functions that are essentially of an administrative character as distinguished from those relating to economic regulation; the prescription of safety standards, rules, and regulations; and the suspension and revocation of certificates after hearing. Thus, in addition to the functions now vested in the Administrator by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, he will be responsible for the administration of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; the issuance and amendment of airman, aircraft, and air-carrier certificates; emergency suspension of certificates; the registration of aircraft, including the recordation of conveyances; the enforcement of safety rules, regulations, and standards; and the control of notification as to hazards to air commerce.

2. Plan III divests the Authority of all control it now has over the personnel and expenditures of the Administrator.

3. Plan III leaves the Authority with all the functions described in title 4 (air carrier economic regulations) of the Civil Aeronautics Act; such of those functions described in title 5 (nationality and ownership of aircraft) and title 6 (civil aeronautics safety regulation) as relate to the prescription of safety standards, rules, and regulations, and the suspension and revocation of certificates after hearings; and the functions vested in the Authority by section 205 (a) and title 10. In connection with the suspension and revocation of certificates, it should be noted that a waiver of a hearing would not operate to deprive the Authority of its jurisdiction.

4. In performing air-safety work, the Administrator will be bound by the rules of the Authority and the extent of his administrative discretion will be entirely dependent upon the rules so prescribed.

5. While the Administrator may submit recommendations to the Board as to safety rules, regulations, and standards, it is anticipated that the Board will have adequate technical facilities for arriving at its own independent determinations as to the soundness of such recommendations, and for developing such material on its own initiative.

6. In order to eliminate the existing confusion in terminology, plan IV provides that the present five-member Authority shall hereafter be known as the Civil Aeronautics Board, and employs the term Civil Aeronautics Authority merely as an over-all designation for the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

7. Plan IV transfers to the Civil Aeronautics Board all functions now performed by the Air Safety Board.

8. In performing its functions, including those mentioned above, the Civil Aeronautics Board will be entirely independent of and in no way subject to control by the Department of Commerce or the Secretary thereof. This independence is specifically referred to in two separate paragraphs of plan IV.

9. The requirement in plan IV that the Board report to Congress and the President through the Secretary of Commerce provides for the routing of such documents through the Secretary so that he may have an opportunity to examine them and append such comments as he may wish to make. This provision does not imply that the Secretary may in any way delete or revise the reports and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

10. In providing that the routine management functions of the Board shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce through such facilities as he shall designate or establish, plan IV is designed to prevent the uneconomical duplication of such facilities by the Board, the personnel of which will be relatively small. This provision is not intended to divest the Board of its authority to appoint and control all of its personnel, to authorize expenditures, or to determine and support the Budget estimates that are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. As stated in the President's message, its purpose is to make available to the Board, in the interest of efficiency, departmental services in connection with these functions.

11. The Board is left with full authority to make its contacts with other agencies of the Federal Government and with State and foreign governments. It is reasonable to assume that the Board will make the necessary arrangements with the Secretary of Commerce so as to coordinate such contacts with those made by the Administrator and thereby minimize duplication of effort.

12. Those functions of the secretary of the Authority which relate to the maintenance of dockets and the keeping of minutes cannot be regarded as routine management functions and will, therefore, remain directly under the Board.

13. Plan IV obviously contemplates that the Board will have its own legal and other technical facilities. Any other interpretation would be in direct conflict with the independence which is to surround the Board's determinations.

14. In connection with the investigation of air accidents, the Board, pursuant to the statutory prescription of the duties of the present Air Safety Board, will furnish the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics with copies of any reports or recommendations that relate to the functions vested in the Administrator.

15. The compromise of civil penalties for violations of titles 5 and 6 becomes a function of the Administrator since it must be regarded as an integral part of the responsibility for the enforcement of these provisions. On the other hand, the Board will have the power to make compromises involving violations of title 7.

16. As contrasted with the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Administrator will be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

I feel certain that this interpretation is in full accord with what was envisaged by the President in submitting the reorganization proposals to Congress. Identical copies of this letter are being sent to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Administrator.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

MAY 2, 1940.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I have examined your letter of this date to the Secretary of Commerce in which you set forth your interpretation of the provisions of Reorganization Plans III and IV relating to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and I agree with the conclusions reached by you.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, the division of administrative management of the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the President made an exhaustive study of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Below will be found the report of the study.

SUMMARY OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS STUDY

This memorandum summarizes the major findings of the study made by the division of administrative management relative to the Civil Aeronautics Authority. This study, which began on December 4, 1939, was undertaken at the request of the President, who was anxious to ascertain the basic causes of certain administrative problems that had manifested themselves in connection with the operations of the Authority. As the study progressed, it became evident that there were several structural inadequacies in the framework established by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which could be remedied only by legislative action or through the exercise of the authority conferred by the Reorganization Act of 1939. The following discussion is arranged according to the three major changes recommended for inclusion in reorganization plans.

REDEFINITION OF RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTRATOR

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 established an Authority consisting of three agencies that are basically autonomous: A five-member board known as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, an Administrator, and the Air Safety Board consisting of three members. In defining the relative jurisdiction of the Authority and the Administrator, the act very definitely attempted to draw a sharp line of demarcation between administrative functions and those of a quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial character. However, certain inconsistencies and ambiguities were inadvertently included within the act.

More specifically, the following are some of the statutory flaws that have tended to impede the administration of the functions vested in the Administrator and the Authority. In the first place, the act is confusing because of the fact that the term "Civil Aeronautics Authority" is employed in two conflicting senses. (In order to avoid confusion, this memorandum uses the term "Authority" to designate the five-member Board, unless otherwise specifically indicated.) In certain paragraphs it means the five-member Board, while in others it denotes the over-all agency, consisting of this Board, the Administrator, and the Air Safety Board. Of much more significance is the fact that the act falls far short of delineating functions according to the theory upon which this legislation is predicated. Furthermore, the law creates an overlapping of administrative responsibilities that cannot be reconciled with any sound separation of rule-making and adjudicative functions from those of an administrative nature.

Thus, the Authority is made responsible, not only for the prescription of safety rules, regulations, and standards but also for their actual enforcement. It could hardly be contended that inspectional and related enforcement activities properly come within the purview of an agency designed to function solely in a quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial capacity. The confusion is accentuated by provisions requiring that the Authority approve purchases and expenditures of the Administrator, that the Administrator consult with the Authority as to plans regarding air-navigation facilities, and that the Administrator report to Congress through the Authority. In view of this confusion, it is not surprising that the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 completely disregards the attempted segregation of administrative functions and designates the Authority as the agency for carrying out this extensive training program. This activity manifestly has no aspects that even remotely impinge on the rule-making and adjudicative processes.

Fortunately the Authority has recognized the administrative weaknesses inherent in these statutory provisions and has taken full advantage of the authority vested in it to assign certain of its functions to the Administrator. In fact, it has found it necessary to circumvent the prohibition against the delegation of any safety work to the Administrator and has accomplished this by setting up the separate position of supervisor and having the Administrator also serve in that capacity. While such an arrangement may be satisfactory as a temporary palliative, it is entirely too tenuous to be continued for any extended period of time. Indicative of the absence of any substantial foundation for a truly sound organization is the fact that during its existence of less than 2 years the Authority has adopted at least five different organization plans.

It is essential to reallocate the functions of the Administrator and Authority so as to carry out the original intent of Congress, eliminate organizational defects which have tremendous potentialities for friction and inefficiency, and afford a more stable basis for organizational planning than the existing understanding between the Authority and the Administrator. It is recommended that plan III transfer to the Administrator the following functions now vested in the Civil Aeronautics Authority:

(a) Administration of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939.

(b) Aircraft registration and safety regulation as described in titles V and VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act, except the functions of prescribing safety standards, rules and regulations, and of suspending and revoking certificates after hearing.

(c) The authority to require notices as to hazards to air commerce; and

(d) The appointment of officers and employees and the authorization of such expenditures and travel as may be necessary for the performance of all functions vested in the Administrator.

Such a redefinition of functions would eliminate jurisdictional questions, would make the Authority and Administrator truly independent of each other, and would establish the Authority as a real rule-making and adjudicative agency entirely free of functions extraneous to and in conflict with these two responsibilities.

REORGANIZATION OF AIR SAFETY FUNCTIONS

In establishing the Air Safety Board, the Civil Aeronautics Act recognized the desirability of providing for the independent investigation of air accidents so that findings would not be colored by attempts to cover up administrative shortcomings. As established by the act, the Air Safety Board merely investigates accidents and formulates recommendations, but can take no positive remedial steps.

This arrangement is not conducive to the ready translation of accident investigation findings into real action. On the contrary, such an agency over a period of years might well become extremely captious in its attitude and be much more interested in developing an extensive paper record of recommendations than in actual promotion of safety. It has already been demonstrated that such a device has definite potentialities for friction and leaves the investigative agency without an adequate incentive for the speedy investigation of accidents and the development of recommendations. Such an agency would have a much more challenging task if it were required to go beyond the mere investigation and take positive steps toward preventing the recurrence of such accidents. The investigative agency could make a much more substantial contribution to the advancement of air safety if it were implemented with authority to prescribe and revise safety rules and with the power to suspend and rescind certificates issued to carriers and aircraft personnel. Armed with these additional prerogatives, the agency could constantly improve the air-safety rules on the basis of its investigations and could take necessary disciplinary action, thus making its recommendations much more than mere expressions as to what should be done.

If the Civil Aeronautics Authority is established as a purely rule-making and adjudicative agency, and if its independent status is maintained, it seems entirely logical and highly desirable that the Authority and the Air Safety Board be combined. This would place real power at the disposal of the investigative agency and at the same time keep the investigations completely separate from the Administrator, who would be responsible for the enforcement of air-safety regulations. As it is pointed out in the next section, such a rule-making, adjudicative, and investigative agency can be placed within the framework of one of the executive departments simply to make available the usual departmental service facilities without in any way impairing the independent exercise of the agency's substantive functions. It is recommended that plan IV embody a provision consolidating the functions of the Air Safety Board with those of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and changing the title of the latter to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Such a change should facilitate still further progress in the advancement of air safety, which is the basic factor in the development of air transportation.

TRANSFER TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The existing arrangement which places promotion and regulation of aviation entirely outside of the regular executive establishment can be looked upon only as a temporary device to be used during a transitional period. The defense and commercial implications of civil aviation make it imperative that the President be currently apprised of any significant developments and that he at all times be in a position to integrate this function with related governmental activities. The need for establishing and maintaining such a relationship may be better appreciated if it is realized that the estimated Federal expenditures which will be incurred during the current fiscal year for civil aviation total more than $108,000,000, which total is made up of the following items:

1940 estimated expenditures

Civil Aeronautics Authority	[1] $25,518,000
W. P. A. and P. W. A. funds for airport construction; and for C. A. A. emergency relief administrative expenses	43,901,992
Total C. A. A., W. P. A., and P. W. A.	69,419,922
Domestic air-mail deficiency	8,260,000
Foreign air-mail deficiency	6,293,000

[1] Includes $4,000,000, civilian pilot training program.

1940 estimated expenditures—Continued	
Weather Bureau: airway weather service and research	$3,469,000
Total net expenditures[2]	87,441,992
Air-mail expenditures offset by revenues	20,600,000
Total gross expenditures	108,041,992

[2] Excludes National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and Army, Navy, and Coast Guard.

This vast sum definitely negates the thought that in dealing with civil aviation the Federal Government is concerned with a purely private endeavor. On the contrary, air commerce is vitally dependent upon the tremendous financial assistance given by the Federal Government. If the Federal Government's financial participation is to reflect a proper balance between the public and private interests in air commerce facilities, it is essential that the program be continually reviewed on behalf of the President by a Cabinet officer, who would have a broader perspective than can be expected of officers who are focusing their entire attention on the one industry. Such an official could also serve as the instrumentality for expediting the flow of aviation data to the President, whose contacts with the Authority are now necessarily of an intermittent character.

The survey findings point to the desirability of transferring the aviation function to the Department of Commerce, while at the same time keeping the rule-making, adjudicative, and investigative work of the Civil Aeronautics Board entirely free of any control by the Secretary of Commerce. In fact, the Board would be placed within the Department merely so that the Secretary of Commerce might serve as a contact point between the Board and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and in order that the Department can act as a service agency in handling the accounting, budgeting, personnel, and other routine management functions of the Board. It would be distinctly advantageous for the Department to function in this capacity for the Board since the latter will be a relatively small establishment in terms of personnel and could not economically afford to maintain its own facilities for handling those administrative details that in no way involve policy or other determinations.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, whose functions are entirely administrative in character, should be subject to direction and supervision by the Secretary of Commerce. The latter will thus be in a position to inform and advise the President as to the establishment and maintenance of airway facilities and the enforcement of safety regulations. Furthermore, the transfer of the Weather Bureau to the Department of Commerce, which has been recommended as the result of a separate study, will facilitate the integration of the work of that Bureau with the airway facility activity. It need hardly be pointed out that the services rendered by the Weather Bureau are indispensable to airway operations. It is to be further noted that the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce makes a vital contribution to the field of aeronautics through the preparation of aeronautical charts.

On the other hand, the Secretary of Commerce will have no jurisdiction over air-carrier economic regulation, the prescription of air safety rules, regulations, and standards, the investigation of air accidents, and the suspension or revocation of certificates after hearing. This division of responsibilities will surround the civil aviation program with adequate checks and balances and at the same time eliminate certain features which serve no purpose other than to inject confusion into the administration of this highly important function of the Government.

In order to effectuate these recommendations, Reorganization Plan IV should place the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce and should provide that the Administrator and the Civil Aeronautics Board shall constitute the Civil Aeronautics Authority within the Department of Commerce. This change in terminology would obviate the existing confusion as to the meaning of the term "Authority," since hereafter that would refer solely to the over-all function. It is further proposed that the plan maintain the complete independence of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the performance of its substantive functions and that, insofar as the Board is concerned, the Department of Commerce be restricted to furnishing routine management services. Finally, it is contemplated that the Civil Aeronautics Board report to Congress and the President through the Secretary of Commerce.

DESIRABILITY OF EFFECTING CHANGE AT THIS TIME

In view of the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority was established as recently as 1938, the question might be raised as to the desirability of effecting a change at this time, particularly since such a fine safety record has been achieved by the air lines. These facts lead one to the exclusion of theoretical considerations in formulating a plan of action. However, even after this is done, one is faced with the very realistic finding that the present organization structure of the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been productive of confusion and friction which have manifested themselves in problems presented to the President. This condition, although not readily discernible to an outsider, threatens to become increasingly serious.

The suggestions submitted herein do not represent a reversal of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 but, on the contrary, are designed to correct certain deficiencies revealed by actual experience, and thus carry out more adequately the basic administrative concept upon which the act is premised. In other words, this will provide a much more efficient organization for the administration of all existing functions. The danger of deferring any revision of the Civil Aeronautics Authority reorganization is well demonstrated by the experience with the Civilian Pilot Training Act to which reference has already been made. This bears out the conclusion that the effects of these statutory inconsistencies and ambiguities will definitely cumulate rather than abate. Finally, the existing international situation makes it of all the more moment that everything be done to facilitate Presidential leadership in the administrative aspects of the civil-aviation program. To regard civil aviation as something entirely apart from the aviation facilities of the Army and Navy would completely overlook the realities of the situation.

The South's True Interest in Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the present time Congress is deciding what the sugar policy of the United States is to be after December 31, 1940, when the present Sugar Act of 1937 expires. The Southern States have a big stake in this decision. In the first place, any legislation which cripples the South's sugar-refining industry should be defeated. Secondly, any sugar legislation should be opposed which would decrease the export markets for the products of Southern farms and factories. Thirdly, the Southern consumer does not want to pay higher prices for sugar. The Cummings bill, H. R. 8746, proposed by the beet-sugar industry, would do all three of these things. It should be defeated.

THE SOUTH'S CANE SUGAR REFINING INDUSTRY—WHERE IT IS AND WHAT IT DOES

Many southerners know that the production of sugarcane and its milling is an old agricultural pursuit in southwest Louisiana, but the importance of refining, which exceeds sugarcane growing in value, has long been neglected in discussions of the economic life of the South. It is to be stressed that the southern farmers producing sugarcane for sirup have no interest as producers in the sugar problem. The Sugar Act of 1937 and the discussion herein have no reference to sugarcane for sirup. The South is a leader in refining. It does about one-third of all the cane-sugar refining of the United States although it does only one-sixth of all manufacturing.

The 10 plants which refine raw cane sugar are located on or near the leading southern seaports; for example, on the Chesapeake Bay at Baltimore, Md.; on the Savannah River at Port Wentworth, Savannah, Ga.; on the Mississippi at or near New Orleans and at Sugar Land, Tex., a few miles from 4 ports of Texas.

The South's refining industry is not to be confused with the production of raw cane sugar on the plantations of Louisiana and Florida. Refining is the industrial aspect of the sugar business, not the agricultural. Court decisions and Federal legislation, such as the Wage and Hour Act have designated refining as an industrial process, whereas the manufacture of raw sugar is a plantation process. And finally, raw cane-sugar producers receive generous cash subsidies from the Federal Treasury, whereas the Southern refining industry is not subsidized in any manner.

The finished product of the southern cane sugar refining industry, valued at $125,000,000 per year, is sold mostly in the South and in the Midwest. The raw material which is used in this southern industry is crude, brownish cane sugar, produced largely on the plantations of the tropical islands such as Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. About 1,100,000 tons of this tropical sugar is unloaded at southern refining ports each year from some 450 vessels. The yearly

value of this imported raw sugar runs around $50,000,000, and, measured either by worth or by tonnage, is one of the leading products entering southern ports. About 400,000 tons of raw sugar used in southern refining, approximately one-third of the total, is purchased from the cane plantations in Louisiana and Florida, which ship their raw sugar to the refineries by truck and rail. Raw sugar costs the southern refineries about $100,000,000 a year, including duties and excise taxes.

WHAT REFINING MEANS TO THE SOUTH

The refining of raw cane sugar in the South represents an investment in docks, warehouses, refining-plant and housing facilities of around $60,000,000. One of the characteristics of this industry, unlike the work on the raw-sugar plantations, is that it gives all-year-round employment. In the process of refining the raw sugar a pay roll of about $6,000,000 is created at wage rates higher than those commonly paid in the South. Another $8,000,000 a year is expended for fuel, packages, chemicals, and other supplies mostly produced in the South. It is estimated, based upon 1937 data of the United States Bureau of the Census, that the purchasing power created by the operation of the southern refining industry is about $25,000,000 annually exclusive of raw sugar.

It is not only the labor and industry directly connected with the refining plants which share in this purchasing power. Southern cotton farmers find an outlet for about $1,000,000 of their farm products in the cotton bags used as refining containers. Shipowners, seamen, stevedores, warehousemen, and other persons connected with the maritime life of the South receive the benefits of the shipping and unloading of some 450 vessels of raw sugar per year. The railroads, barges, and trucking concerns of the South benefit from the freight bill which arises from the movement of some 2,000,000 tons of products in and out of the refineries each year.

SOUTHERN REFINING MORE IMPORTANT THAN FARM PRODUCTION OF SUGARCANE

Southern refining, an all-year-round industrial activity, adds about $25,000,000 a year to southern purchasing power. This is in substantial excess of the farm value of the sugarcane produced in the South, which in 1938 was reported by the United States Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Statistics, 1939, page 134—to be $18,100,000. The yearly value of southern refining is about the same as the market value of southern raw sugar—approximately $25,000,000.

Taken from the point of view of the small man, southern refining is more important than cane production. At least $5,000,000 a year goes to the ordinary southern refinery worker. On the other hand, the total farm income of all the cane produced on the family-sized southern farm was only about $3,000,000 in 1938. According to the United States Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Statistics, 1939, page 134—the farm value of the Louisiana cane crop in 1938 was a little over $15,000,000, and of this income, the family-sized farmer—planting up to 100 acres—got only about 20 percent, or $3,000,000—an analysis of sugarcane farms participating in 1934 and 1935 sugarcane program, January 1937.

Certainly any sugar policy supported by the South in 1940 should give as much consideration to the position of southern refining as to the position of southern cane growing. This is true not only because of relative size but because refining, unlike cane production, receives no subsidies from southern consumers, nor does it prejudice the position of the sale of southern products in her export markets.

THE IMPORTS OF RAW SUGAR BY SOUTHERN REFINERS HELP SUPPORT THE EXPORT TRADE OF THE SOUTH

Southern refiners pay about $50,000,000 a year for the raw sugar which they purchase from Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and other sugar islands. This enormous sum creates a purchasing power from which these tropical islands, in turn, can buy southern farm and factory products. The list of southern exports, amounting in 1937 to almost $800,000,000 is well known—cotton, cotton textiles, cottonseed oil, gasoline, tobacco, cigarettes, lumber, naval stores, wheat flour, and rice. With the decline that has taken place in foreign trade since 1929, the market for these southern commodities has seriously shrunk. Prices have been depressed, even though the volume of output has been severely curtailed by Government action, especially in cotton, rice, naval stores, and petroleum, and, for a time, tobacco.

There are 2,287,000 farms in the South, most of which are dependent upon export markets; there are approximately 9,200 sugarcane growers.

It is a commonplace that there is little chance for a permanent improvement of the southern cotton, tobacco, or rice farmer unless he has some opportunity to regain his lost export markets. Southern exports will grow with the growth of imports, and in no other way. Now, the southern refiner of raw cane sugar is the channel through which an important tropical product flows into this country. Shipowners, seamen, stevedores, and warehousemen in every port of the South will feel the blow, as well as the farm and factory hands, in every State below Delaware. Certainly it is in the interest of the South to maintain a reasonable flow of overseas raw sugar into the United States. Southern refining, therefore, creates southern exports.

The Secretary of State lists this as one of the main tenets in his trade policy to recover lost export markets.

SOUTHERN CONSUMERS HAVE AN INTEREST IN MAINTAINING REASONABLE SUGAR PRICES

In the 15 Southern States, including the District of Columbia, there are some 41,000,000 consumers of sugar. These persons consume on the average about 64 pounds of refined sugar a year which, at current retail price levels, amounts to about $145,000,000. This enormous expense shows that refined sugar is an important item in the food budget of the South. Now, it is obvious that any Federal sugar legislation which tends to boost the prices of sugar above current levels is directly detrimental to the interests of southern consumers. Indirectly, it is detrimental to southern industry and agriculture because it raises the cost of living, and hence the cost of factory and farm production.

With the exception of two counties in Florida, and several parishes in southwestern Louisiana, there is no production of sugar beets or sugarcane in the South; only one farm in about 230 produces sugarcane for sugar. But of the $145,000,000 a year that the southern consumers pay for their sugar, at least $60,000,000 goes to maintain the volume of the producers of sugar beets and sugarcane through an elaborate subsidy system established under the Sugar Acts of 1934 and 1937. At this figure, the cost to the South of this sugar protectionism is over twice the value of all the raw sugar produced in the South, and 20 times as great as the farm income of the sugarcane producers of ordinary size.

On the basis of these facts, it is certain that Congress, in 1940, should not adopt any sugar legislation which would further increase the burden of sugar protectionism now carried by the southern people.

WHAT SUGAR POLICY CAN THE SOUTHERN STATES FAIRLY DEMAND IN 1940?

Before discussing what sugar policy might well be demanded by the South, it is necessary to review briefly the South's stake in sugar. In the first place, nearly one-third of the refining of raw cane sugar done in the United States is done in the South. This industry is a growing one and under no circumstances should its volume of business be reduced by any sugar-quota legislation in 1940 or thereafter. In this regard, the quotas on tropical refined sugar from overseas plantations should be restricted to the figure set by Congress in September 1937. In the second place, the importation of raw cane sugar from overseas islands by the southern refiners helps to bolster up an export trade which is absolutely essential for the preservation of the farms and factories in the South. Certainly, no Federal legislation should be passed which would further reduce the present quotas of the overseas imports of raw sugar.

Thirdly, southern consumers pay some $60,000,000 a year for direct and indirect subsidies to sugar-beet and sugarcane growers. This burden should not be increased by further raising prices. And lastly, although it is of little importance to southern agriculture generally, the fact must be recognized that the producers of sugarcane and raw sugar

in Louisiana need some kind of Federal subsidy in order to maintain their output.

The South's interests would at least be protected if the Barry bill (H. R. 9044) were enacted in 1940. This bill would not raise the price of sugar; it would not increase the production of subsidized beet and sugarcane farmers; it would not kill the South's overseas trade and it would not be harmful to the South's cane-sugar refining industry. It would merely continue the present Sugar Act in the form in which it was originally written in September 1937. This means that it would continue to give a generous protection, through cash subsidies and a guaranteed market, to the sugarcane producers of Louisiana and Florida.

Under any circumstances the southern people should study the sugar problem in 1940 because it is bound to come before Congress in future years. The East and West for many years have had preferences over the South in many commodities; in sugar, the South should fight for an equitable and fair deal. Such a fair deal involves:

First. No objection to a preferential duty to Cuba, which the State Department obviously desires.

Second. No objection to benefit payments to growers of beets in the western area of the United States, and growers of cane in Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, even though it seems illogical both to impose a high duty on foreign sugar and to provide benefit payments to domestic growers.

Third. No objection to the quota system, which, however, should be fixed and not left to the discretion of any department.

Fourth. But our entire country should contend, in all fairness, and based upon any sound system of economy, that, having accorded all these advantages to the cane-growing areas and beet-growing areas—which in themselves restrict the operation of cane refineries—the same legislation that gives the grants and immunities to offshore areas should not accord these offshore areas the additional privilege of refining sugar when it thereby jeopardizes the employment in continental United States of over 16,000 well-paid laborers and trained employees, endangers the investment of capital made in good faith, and uneconomically substitutes similar new investment in tropical areas, transferring to the relief rolls thousands now gainfully employed.

SUBSIDIZED TROPICAL PLANTATIONS SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED IN 1940 TO EXPAND THEIR SUGAR REFINING AT THE EXPENSE OF HOME INDUSTRY

The home refining of cane sugar may be wiped out by adverse sugar legislation pending before Congress. To prevent this, a 200-year-old industry, and its thousands of well-paid American workmen, solicit your support.

The Sugar Act of 1937 expires at the end of this year, and Congress is now drafting sugar legislation. Congress since 1934 has put limits on the expansion of tropical refining; it should continue those limits in 1940.

There are three good reasons why this should be done:

First. The Puerto Rican refiners, as cane growers, are heavily subsidized by the Federal Treasury, having received some $2,000,000 in cash since 1934.

Second. The Puerto Rican refiners employ plantation labor which is paid a little over a dollar a day. Puerto Rico has even made attempts to be exempted from the Wage and Hour Act. Unionization, as found in the home refineries, is not found on the tropical plantations.

Third. The United States has adequate facilities to refine all the cane sugar, at fair prices demanded by American consumers. It is not necessary to duplicate refining facilities in Puerto Rico when there are idle men and idle plants here at home.

No sugar legislation should be passed in 1940 unless it puts a limit on the amount of tropical refining.

The National Association of Retail Grocers, the American Federation of Labor, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and chambers of commerce in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Georgia, and Texas, as well as hundreds of other national and local organizations, representing all walks of American life, have gone on record as favoring the maintenance in 1940 of the home cane sugar refining industry.

The Walter-Logan Administrative Law Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on April 18:

The United States House of Representatives today passed by a vote of 282 to 97 and sent to the Senate a bill that has received the attention of lawyers, educators, laboring, farm, and business groups for many years. This is the so-called Walter-Logan administrative law bill. The Senate, I am reliably informed, will take up this important legislation in the near future, and if the vote in the House of Representatives is any indication of the sentiment of the people I predict that the bill will be passed by that august body by a correspondingly large majority. While this bill has been described as a new "bill of rights" for the American people, it is neither New Deal nor anti New Deal. It is pro-American, and its passage by a nearly 3-to-1 majority should put on notice another branch of our Government that the representatives of the people will no longer tolerate the maladministration of laws that mean so much to America. With almost the entire world in flames tonight, it is indeed gratifying to me to know that our people are determined to keep separate the three branches of our Government.

This bill is intended to regulate the regulators and govern the governors—in short, to compel officers and employees of the United States to comply with and observe the law as enacted by the elected representatives of the people in Congress. Let no one tell you that the Walter-Logan bill either expands or restricts the rights which the American people have under the Constitution, or the terms of any valid existing statute. It does not. This bill neither expands nor restricts the obligations imposed on the American people under any existing statute. This bill neither expands nor restricts the benefits which may be conferred on any class of American people under existing law. In sober fact this bill neither expands nor restricts the powers or duties of the officers and employees, approximately a million strong, in the executive branch of the United States Government—officers and employees charged, under their oath, with the administration of a vast number of statutes and an even greater number of Executive orders and regulations.

However, and here is the rub so far as the opponents of the bill are concerned, this Walter-Logan bill clearly intends, first, that the Government officers and employees shall not exercise any jurisdiction or authority which is not conferred upon them by statutes enacted by the Congress; second, that these same officers and employees must exercise in a fair and just manner such jurisdiction and authority as is conferred upon them by law; and third, that these same officers and employees must decide in accordance with the terms of the applicable statutes and in accordance with the facts all controversies concerning the rights, obligations, benefits, or privileges of the American people which may be conferred or imposed by law. If this Walter-Logan bill is passed by the Senate and becomes law, it no longer will be possible for the bureaucrats to refuse to give a full and fair hearing to an individual seeking such rights as may be conferred upon him by law or to an individual who claims some privilege or benefit under some law. All of the evidence presented at the hearing must go into the written record and a written decision must be made and filed. Both the record and the decision will be available for review by the board or commission and by the head of the department or other agency concerned. But one record will be made and that record can be used through all further stages of the matter in the agency itself or in the reviewing courts. Thus expense and time will be saved to the individual and to the American taxpayers in the handling and adjudication of claims and controversies with the officers and employees of the United States Government. Let no one suggest to you that this bill will either delay the operations of the Government agencies or that it will add to the present tremendous expense

of such operations. On the contrary, as I have stated, the bill will expedite very greatly the hearing and final determination of controversies with the United States and the bill will greatly decrease the expense of doing so. Also, let no one tell you that this bill attempts to apply the rules of court procedure—either in civil or criminal cases—to the hearing and determination of controversies with the United States. The bill does not even mention such rules of court procedure.

A few simple and obviously fair rules are stated in the bill which both officers and employees of the United States and individuals must observe, but these are rules as old as the Government itself and absolutely essential to any fair and just determination of disputes between individuals or between individuals and officers and employees of the United States. After the record has been made, as I have stated, and after the administrative agency has determined the controversy, the bill provides that the aggrieved individual may secure a judicial review in the United States circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which he resides or maintains his principal place of business. There are 11 such courts. Thus it will be unnecessary for the individual to incur the expense and delay of coming to the District of Columbia to have his controversy judicially determined. In addition, the reviewing court is given the same jurisdiction over both the law and the facts of administrative decisions as such courts now have over judgments of trial courts which hear cases without a jury. We believe that the decision of an administrative officer should have no greater sanctity than does a decision of a trial judge. Under the terms of the Walter-Logan bill, it no longer will be possible for administrative officers to issue rules and regulations without public notice and public hearing if such hearings should be requested. Also, instead of waiting for years to judicially test any rule or regulation—as is now the situation—the bill provides that any such rule may be tested in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on a petition filed in that court within 30 days from the date the rule is published for a declaratory judgment. In broad outline, my friends, this is the substance of the Walter-Logan bill to regulate the regulators; to insure fair and just decisions by administrative officers; to improve the caliber of such administrative officers; to expedite and decrease the expenses of settling disputes with such officers; and to insure a rule of law instead of men. It would seem that no one could possibly disagree with these objectives of the bill.

But, my friends, a small minority has disagreed. True it is that this minority does not publicly state that the members thereof are in disagreement with the objectives. They profess to disagree with the details of the bill to accomplish such objectives. Read the debates in the House of Representatives for the past 4 days and see for yourselves what this minority has stated as the reasons for the disagreement. Do not take my word for it or the word of any other man. Study the matter for yourselves. After all, this is your Government—not the Government of the politicians of any political party—and you have obligations as American citizens to see to it that fair and just laws are placed on the statute books. Possibly it is too much to expect that everyone would agree with either the basic principles or with the detailed provisions contained in the Walter-Logan bill for the attainment of these principles. It will be remembered that after 3 long months of hard work in Philadelphia in 1787, there were some members of the Constitutional Convention so dissatisfied with the principles and procedures provided in the Constitution that these members absolutely refused to sign the Constitution. Yet that Constitution was adopted after prolonged debate in the several States ratifying conventions and for 150 years it has provided the most just and fair government that has ever appeared on the face of this globe. Truly has it been said of the Constitution that it is the most wonderful work that has ever been struck off by the brains and purposes of men. Today self-proclaimed liberals are opposing the Walter-Logan bill. They want more power in the hands of Government officers and employees. They want more governmental power concentrated in Washington. They are opposed to public notices and public hearings before rules and regulations are issued. They are opposed to judicial review of rules and regulations until months or years later, when by some chance that rule or regulation may be brought before some court in the merits of some case and after there has been a long course of practice under such rules and regulations. They are opposed to having the rules and regulations judicially determined in an early and expeditious manner before all of the harm has been done by an invalid and illegal regulation.

They are really opposed to a full and fair hearing before the administrative agencies, and they are opposed to a really effective judicial review of the decisions of such agencies. In fact, my friends, many of those opposed to the Walter-Logan bill are the bureaucrats who would subordinate both the Congress and the courts to their purposes. The man or woman who is truly liberal knows that there can be no liberty, no protection of religion, no freedom of the press, no protection of life, and no protection of property without a rule of law which can be, and is enforced by a group of men outside of the political control of the ruling powers, and which group of men have the support of an enlightened and militant public opinion. Laws which an uncontrolled bureaucracy, which is but another term for a dictator, may liberally administer today may be illiberally administered tomorrow. Harsh, unfair, illegal, and biased administration of any law will sooner or later lead to the repeal of that law. I claim to be a liberal. I believe with all my heart that many needed and just laws have been placed on the statute books during the administration of President Roosevelt—laws which I assisted in my humble capacity in placing on the statute books—which I want to see continued in operation for the benefit of our common country. As sure as the sun rises in the East and sets in the West, these laws will not be continued unless we can secure a just, fair, and legal administration of such laws. Without such an administration of the laws, the people will rise up in their might and destroy the laws just as they destroyed the prohibition law and just as they destroyed the laws under which slavery existed. Yea, just as they destroyed the star chamber many hundreds of years ago in Stuart, England, and just as they swept the forces of King George and Lord North from the American soil for reasons so nobly stated in the Declaration of Independence. No bill could have been endorsed and approved by the American Federation of Labor, the American Bar Association, the National Association of Women Lawyers, the Master Plumbers of America, and the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Farmers National Grange, and by numerous other business, legal, and patriotic organizations which is contrary to the rights of all Americans—rich and poor, strong and weak.

The Wage-Hour Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH OF MAY 2, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a brief editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 2, 1940, calling attention to the necessity for proper and restrained amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 2, 1940]

THE WAGE-HOUR BATTLE

Is $12.60 a week too much for a family?

A lot of other questions are being asked in the debate in and out of Congress on the wage-hour law amendments, but this is the one which stands above all the rest.

Is $12.60—30 cents an hour for a workweek of 42 hours—is that more than a family should have to live on, to educate its children, to function as a useful, self-respecting unit in America?

The answer, of course, is that $12.60 a week—$655.20 a year if 52 full weeks are worked—is not too much. The answer is that this guaranty of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 provides no more than a subsistence level of living; that something is seriously wrong with the business or industry which cannot meet so modest a wage scale.

Yet we have just been treated to the spectacle of a hard fight in the House to exempt a million or more workers now under the jurisdiction of the law. These chiefly are the canners and other processors of agricultural products whom Congressman BARDEN of North Carolina sought to deprive of the act's protection.

The attempt has failed temporarily at least, but the battle in the House is not over. Supporters of the emasculatory amendments may now try to load up desirable amendments with changes so unacceptable that administration supporters will have to oppose them, just as the administration group stacked Mr. BARDEN'S own amendments against him.

The plea that the canner of peas is an agricultural worker and so should be exempt from the law is specious. The canner may work with an agricultural product, but he works with it under industrial conditions. He does for peas in a cannery what the textile worker does in a mill for cotton—prepares a raw product for the market. He is no less in industry because he is handling a vegetable from the fields instead of a mineral from beneath the ground.

The truth of the matter is that the processors, including the canners of seafood products from the Gulf and Southern Coastal States, constitute one of the groups of workers most in need of the protection of the Wage and Hour Act. The scandalously low pay and long hours which have been their lot were an important factor in the passage of the law. If there has been any mistake, it is not

that the law was drawn to include them, it is that the administration of the law has been slow actually to extend to many of them the protection which they legally enjoy.

This does not mean that adjustments in the Wage and Hour Act are not needed. Some alterations are now an obvious need. The law levies an unfair penalty when it requires employers who pay their employees well over the minimum scale, perhaps as much as several times the minimum, to compensate at overtime rates for all hours worked in excess of the legal maximum. This is not only unfair to employers who pay well, but places many employees in an unfortunate position. They must either turn in memorandums for extra pay which they would prefer not to ask for or blink the time beyond the maximum which they may work in a week.

The need for correction at this point is generally recognized. One of the Barden amendments would have exempted from the maximum-hours provisions all so-called "white collar" workers earning more than $150 a month. Chairman NORTON'S own amendments, which may be described as the administration changes, would exempt all workers earning more than $200 a month from the hours limit. In any case, persons earning approximately $2,000 a year are not those for whom Federal wage-hour legislation was intended. They may not be in the upper brackets, but they are not the bottom-rung workers in whose behalf the law was passed.

The Wage and Hour Act more than any other single piece of legislation embodies the humanitarian philosophy of the New Deal. It needs to be improved and strengthened, not weakened or emasculated. Experience charts the course for its friends in Congress. If they amend it in the light of reason, its enemies will not be able to wreck it.

Organizing for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CAROLINE O'DAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of the Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, to the National Institute of Government, Thursday, May 2, at Riverside Stadium, Washington, D. C.:

This meeting is unique in party annals and I trust its significance will not be lost upon those who like to peer into the future for political signs and portents.

When Mrs. McAllister and her associates first planned this gathering, they expressed the hope that perhaps 500 party workers might find it possible to lay aside their daily cares long enough to visit Washington for a preview of the approaching campaign. Now, you are assembled here, more than 4,000 strong, a loyal and enthusiastic army of crusaders, eager and anxious to carry on the good fight for the principles and policies to which we all adhere.

Naturally we welcome you here and we welcome this sign of your enthusiasm and devotion to the Democratic cause. You have responded in a way that far exceeds our expectations. There is no more effective force in politics than a united and determined body of women, and again I say, that those who are curious about the election should find here a reliable omen of what the women of this Nation propose to do on the 5th of next November.

In a sense this meeting is an experiment. I doubt if any party has ever attempted a gathering of this size in advance of the national convention. The reason for it is founded in the Democratic principle that in organization lies the key to political success. A commanding officer, no matter how clever or brilliant, is unable to rise above the merit of his army. A campaign that extends over 48 States must have something more than a small general staff at headquarters to be effective. The outcome in the long run will depend upon the workers in the field, those volunteer soldiers who give without stint of their time and efforts because conviction has rallied them to the party standard.

We are glad of this opportunity to become acquainted with you personally and to thank you for your past contributions to party success. The facilities of the national committee are at your disposal. You have an excellent chance to see for yourselves what Government is doing to advance the general welfare and to correct the false impressions about Federal activities which have been scattered about by those who are careless of facts or who dislike to face the truth. I am sure that you will leave here with a new outlook on Uncle Sam's activities and a new arsenal of facts with which to confound the political enemy.

The historian who tries to interpret this period in national life without mentioning the political influence of women will have a vital lapse in his story. The old-fashioned notion that your sex merely reflects the views of the stalwart male members of the family has been smashed beyond repair by the political developments of the past decade. I am not referring to the fact that women are using the ballot box in such healthy numbers. I am stating the honest conviction that the emphasis on the improvement of social conditions has resulted largely from your insistence and your wise use of the franchise. We are debating issues today that only a few short years ago aroused nothing but indifference and prejudiced opposition. It is no longer considered political folly to bring unwholesome social and economic conditions into the sunlight and to insist that something be done to remedy them.

The Roosevelt administration has devoted a good part of its energies to the solution of those problems in which women are primarily interested. These include the elimination of city slums, the construction of good schools, the adoption of minimum-wage standards, an attack on the causes of crime, and a measure of financial security for those who spend the best years of their lives toiling in industry or agriculture.

Great reforms are not won in a hurry. They are the fruit of years of patient and persistent effort by hardy pioneers who keep at the task until they awaken the social conscience of the public. There has been a notable series of gains under the present administration, in the winning of which women have played an outstanding part. I feel certain that you are determined to retain the good results of these victories and that you will not tolerate any backward step. Your presence here in such large numbers is proof enough of that fact.

The Republican Party has just paid us a great compliment. For a decade the party has lagged behind the procession in considering these vital economic and social questions. Showing an appalling lack of vision and foresight, the G. O. P. leaders in Congress had little or nothing to contribute to the splendid program which was enacted under the wise leadership of President Roosevelt. Now, being unable to work out a program of their own, they propose to appropriate what they like to call "the best features" of the Democratic program. We propose to keep that program for ourselves. To borrow a phrase from the current war dispatches, we are deeply suspicious of Trojan horses and, I may add, the American public is likewise suspicious. The Republican effort to slip into power by donning the cloak of liberalism, a garment which has always been ill-fitting for the G. O. P., is too apparent to fool anyone.

The Democratic Party has won a remarkable series of victories in recent elections as a result of which it is now the majority party of the country. In winning these victories, we had most of the feminine votes on our side and, frankly, we want the same vote again this year. The great task of holding the lines rests squarely upon your shoulders. The fate of the election may depend upon your efforts, and I feel confident that you will not shirk or falter. The primary purpose of these meetings, the one objective that overshadows all others, is to organize for victory in next fall's election. The Nation will be better under a continuance of Democratic rule and the outcome is up to us.

The Democratic Party is proud of the fact that it was the first to give equal representation to women in its political councils as a matter of right and justice and also as a matter of hard, common sense. From the time the suffrage amendment was adopted the party has been sensible enough to realize the arrival of a new force in politics and to make its plans accordingly. It has not been a one-way or a one-sided arrangement. The party is grateful for your support and in return a sincere effort has been made by those in authority to give the members of your sex the kind of recognition which they deserve. It is not by accident that the Roosevelt administration has appointed more women to outstanding positions in public life than any of its predecessors and that these have been something more than routine appointments of secondary importance.

I always hesitate to mention names because it is so easy to overlook individuals who are entitled to mention. You are all familiar with the fact that Miss Perkins is the first woman ever to serve as a member of a President's Cabinet, and you know the splendid record she has made in office. You know about the appointment of Mrs. Owen and Mrs. Harriman to the diplomatic corps. You know about the work of Mrs. Ross as Director of the Mint, and of Mrs. Roche as an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Far more important than the fact that these individuals were appointed to high places is the part they have played in doing away with old prejudices and mistaken notions about women in public office. In the old days it was a common saying that women were poor executives and administrators, that they allowed emotion to sway their judgment. It was said that a woman could never become a first-ranking diplomat because international politics was too complex of feminine understanding. It was said

that a woman could be given authority only over members of her own sex. The list of old-time prejudices could be extended indefinitely but they are too familiar to need repetition. The interesting thing is that they have all been exploded through the inspiring records of the women whom President Roosevelt has appointed. In the future, when a Federal position of trust and responsibility is to be filled, the appointment may be made on merit alone without regard to the wrong-headed views of past generations.

I have talked only about women in executive or diplomatic positions. The field of legislation requires talents of a different nature, yet the story is just the same. As Members of Congress, Senator CARAWAY, and the three Democratic Members of the House, Mrs. NORTON, Mrs. O'DAY, and Mrs. MCMILLAN, have demonstrated a quick and sure grasp of legislative problems and parliamentary procedure. They have advanced steadily to positions of eminence, not because of male chivalry but because of their own talent and worth.

A review of this nature, however brief, would be incomplete without a reference to the individual who has done so much to fix the new status of women in the realm of social and political thought. I refer, of course, to our distinguished and gracious first lady, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I have talked only about those splendid representatives of your sex who have attained to places of high public trust. Please do not take the mistaken view that the Democratic Party has rewarded its feminine adherents with a few positions that attract public attention, as a kind of window-dressing, and then ignored them in the broader field of Government activity. They have been given deserved recognition all along the line.

A mass of statistics is always boring, and for that reason I have not attempted to gather figures for the entire Government service. Yet I should like to point out that in the Post Office Department in the last 7 years the percentage of women appointed as postmasters has been more than 27 percent of the total number of appointments. These are not confined to the smaller offices. On the contrary, the list includes such large offices as Los Angeles, Little Rock, Fall River, Portland, Maine; Oakland, Calif.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Minot, N. Dak.; Galveston, Tex.; Camden, N. J.; and Long Beach N. Y. Experience has taught me that comparisons between groups are highly dangerous, so I shall content myself by saying that these appointees have lived up to the highest traditions of the service in every way.

In approaching the coming election we must be sure to remember that the advantage lies with the Democratic Party. Mental attitude is always an important factor in a contest of any type, and our attitude should be one of honest pride in a job well done and not one of apology or misgiving. Given the facts, the American public will arrive at the right decision in the vast majority of cases, and this should be the main source of our strength.

The Democratic Party, in the past 7 years, has faced the responsibility of restoring a badly shattered economy system, while at the same time keeping the peace in one of the most crucial and dangerous periods in world history. The highest order of statesmanship has been necessary to preserve and promote the national welfare, and the Roosevelt administration has met the test in magnificent fashion. While popular government has suffered tragic defeats in other sections of the globe, it has been given new meaning and fresh validity here in the United States. The energies of the Nation have been devoted to the preservation and betterment of human life and not to its destruction.

Within the short time allotted to me there is no opportunity to review at length the campaign issues. That task will be done in adequate fashion before the votes are cast next November. But I wish to emphasize one point. The course of events has done more than demonstrate that the domestic and foreign policies of the administration are sound and essentially right; it has demonstrated that any other program of policies would have menaced the national well-being. To the wise foresight of this administration we owe the fact that not a single American life has been lost in belligerent waters. To the wise foresight of this administration we owe the fact that the United States has emerged from the deepest industrial depression in history with its human resources and natural resources in better shape than when the depression set in. This is the record on which we propose to wage the Presidential campaign.

The advantage always lies with the opposition in the period of uncertainty which precedes the national conventions and the selection of standard bearers. Criticism and faultfinding come easy to those who have no record to defend and no policy to advocate. The atmosphere will undergo a wholesome change when the critics face the responsibility of telling the electorate how they propose to conduct the Nation's Government. The opposition learned that painful fact in 1936.

During your visit the directors of the women's division will acquaint you with the six-point program and other practical measures which they have worked out for campaign activity. I know that you will give them your fullest cooperation and, with your loyal support, I look forward confidently to another party victory in November.

Farmers Have Not Been Discriminated Against in Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the current methods used in trying to arouse farm opposition to trade agreements is the suggestion that the principal concessions made in these agreements have been those made on agricultural products. This is another effort to set off the interests of one group against another. In the trade agreements there is no pitting of the interests of agriculture against industry as is suggested. Both economic groups receive equal treatment in the negotiation of agreements.

It has long been recognized that farmers generally are in a disadvantageous position as far as protective tariffs are concerned. The tariffs on many agricultural products have not been effective in increasing or maintaining prices as they have done for many manufactured products. People with low incomes, the average worker or farmer, spend nearly all of the income on the immediate necessities of life and a small difference in the prices of those necessities, made possible by tariffs, may be a matter of considerable importance to farmers.

No proper formula for calculating the total cost of tariff to any particular group has ever been worked out. We do know, however, that consumers generally are the forgotten men when United States tariffs are being made. Farmers are becoming better organized and thus placing themselves in a more effective position as far as tariff legislation is concerned. But in the past, when they have bargained with industry in tariff matters, they have usually lost out in the horse trading. That cannot be said with respect to the trade-agreements program. As a matter of record, we have granted many more reductions in duty on nonagricultural products than on agricultural items. Reductions have been made in about 850 nonagricultural items in comparison with about 170 agricultural products. The imports of the 850 nonagricultural items were valued at $334,698,000 and the imports of the 170 agricultural items at $231,510,000 in 1937, when many of the nonagricultural concessions, particularly those in the British agreement, were not in effect. Also included in the imports of agricultural items is Cuban sugar valued at more than $100,000,000. The great majority of American farmers are interested in an enlarged supply of sugar so that they may obtain it at prices more nearly in keeping with those of the farm products which American farmers sell.

Included in the 170 reductions in duty on so-called agricultural products are orchid plants, cut flowers, coconuts in the shell, rutabaga seed, venison, limes, orange marmalades, celery, curry and curry powder, and other items of equally small importance to American farmers as general producers. It is true that the reductions in a number of the nonagricultural items have been small, and as in the case of the reductions in duty on practically every agricultural product of this country, have had no effect whatever on domestic producers. On the other hand many reductions in both groups were lowered by the full 50 percent permitted by the Trade Agreement Act.

An example of an ineffective reduction in duty on a manufactured product was that made on high-priced sewing machines. It is generally recognized that on products of which

we are large exporters tariffs are not effective and so consumers can derive no benefits when tariffs on such products are lowered. The effect in such instances is the same as lowering our duties on distinctly export agricultural products such as apples, on which the rate of duty is not effective. That is, the tariff has no influence in increasing the price of apples.

I have prepared some illustrations of reductions in duty on manufactured products made through trade agreements for the benefit of farmers as consumers. Now, it is realized that the farmer in Iowa, or some other State, may not buy the exact imported product represented in this tabulation, but if, as is frequently the case, he purchases the less-expensive domestic item, more than likely the tariff nevertheless takes toll from his pocketbook. The extent to which the tariff is effective in these illustrations varies from commodity to commodity. Making these reductions in trade agreements is as far as the trade-agreements program can assist American farmers. These illustrations, taken largely from the British agreement, are, however, a complete refutation of the contention of those who have sought to turn the farmers against the trade-agreements program by suggesting that nothing has been done to the industrial-tariff structure. Furthermore, the recent hearings on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act indicate that manufacturing organizations were fully represented in opposition to trade agreements. The American Tariff League and the National Association of Manufacturers acted as the spearhead of this opposition. In the attached illustrations I want to call particular attention to the items from schedule 3 of the Tariff Act of 1930, "Metals and manufactures."

Illustrations of reductions in duties on manufactured products, for benefit of farmers

Article	Hawley-Smoot tariff rate	Trade-agreement rate	Percent reduction
1. Salt, bulk	7 cents per 100 pounds.	4 cents per 100 pounds.	43
2. Flavoring extract, not containing alcohol.	25 percent	15 percent	40
3. Toilet soap	30 percent	20 percent	[1] 33
4. Chinaware, etc., not decorated, cups and saucers.	60 percent plus 10 cents (per dozen pieces).	40 percent	[1] 35
5. Rockingham earthenware	25 percent	12½ percent	50
6. Furniture wood (other than chairs).	40 percent	25 percent	38
7. Tooth brushes	1 cent each plus 50 percent.	1 cent each plus 25 percent.	43–49
8. Tobacco pipes and pipe bowls	45 percent	22½ percent	50
9. Horn buttons	do	35 percent	22
10. Blackings, cleaners, etc	25 percent	12½ percent	50
11. Varnishes, containing 5 percent or more methyl alcohol.	do	15 percent	40
12. Enamel paints	do	do	40
13. Bricks: Not glazed, enameled (including common building bricks).	$1.25 per M	$1 per M	20
14. Leather straps and strops	35 percent	25 percent	29
15. Gloves of leather	25 cents per pair	15 cents per pair	40
16. Leather footwear, boots and shoes.	20 percent	50 cents per pair—minimum 10 percent.	[1] 50
17. Wool wearing apparel, valued at not more than $4 per pound.	33 cents per pound plus 44 percent.	33 cents per pound plus 30 percent.	25
18. Hose and half hose of wool valued at not more than $3.50 per dozen.	90 percent	65 percent	28
19. Oilcloth	30 percent	15 percent	50
20. Cotton wearing apparel	37.5 percent	20 percent	47
21. Sheets and pillow cases, flax, etc.	40 percent	25 percent	38
22. Crosscut saws, etc	20 percent	15 percent	25
23. Agricultural hand tools: Hoes, forks, rakes.	15 percent	7½ percent	50
24. Shovels, spades, and scoops	30 percent	15 percent	50
25. Sashes and frames of iron and steel.	25 percent	do	40
26. Wire rope	35 percent	2½ cents per pound.	[1] 50
27. Harness hardware, not plated with gold or silver.	do	20 percent	43
28. Saddlery or riding bridle hardware, not plated with gold or silver.	50 percent	25 percent	50
29. Shotguns over $10, not over $25 each.	$6 each plus 45 percent.	$3 each plus 22½ percent.	50
30. Metal buttons	¾ cent line per gross plus 15 percent.	½ cent line per gross plus 10 percent.	33

[1] Estimated.

Illustrations of reductions in duties on manufactured products, for benefit of farmers—Continued

Article	Hawley-Smoot tariff rate	Trade-agreement rate	Percent reduction
31. Pruning and sheep shears and blades.	20 cents plus 45 percent.	10 cents plus 22½ percent.	50
32. Safety razors, handles and frames.	10 cents each plus 30 percent.	5 cents each plus 15 percent.	50
33. Hay forks, and 4-tined manure forks, etc.	4 cents each plus 22½ percent.	2 cents each plus 12 percent.	49
34. Table knives, forks, steels and cleavers with blades less than 6 inches.	2 cents each plus 45 percent.	2 cents each plus 25 percent.	35

The Bonneville Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville power administration has agreed to deliver a second block of 32,500 kilowatts of power to the Aluminum Co. of America, which now is building its first western reduction plant, to use Bonneville power.

Attracted to the Pacific coast by the large quantities of low-cost energy becoming available on the Columbia River as the result of a Federal construction program at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, the company signed a 20-year contract last December for an initial 32,500 kilowatts of power.

The new contract runs for 5 years and increases the company's total demand for Bonneville power to 65,000 kilowatts. It permits the firm to double capacity of the Vancouver plant, where aluminum will be produced from alumina processed at East St. Louis, Ill., and Mobile, Ala.

The company advised Paul J. Raver, Bonneville power administrator, that it would immediately begin construction of the additional unit made possible by the augumented power supply.

In requesting the additional power, Aluminum Co. officials told Administrator Raver that in view of the unusual demand for aluminum resulting from the situation in Europe and the preparedness program of the United States, they felt the company should proceed immediately with expansion of the Vancouver plant.

Date for delivery of power under the second contract is dependent upon completion of generating units 3 and 4, now being installed at the Bonneville powerhouse by the United States Corps of Army Engineers. These two generators, each having a capacity of 54,000 kilowatts, are expected to be ready early in 1941. The first contract calls for delivery of power upon completion of the company's first Vancouver unit, expected scmetime next fall. The present installed capacity of the Bonneville powerhouse is 86,400 kilowatts—two generators; the ultimate—10 generators with total capacity of 518,400 kilowatts.

The power is being sold to the Aluminum Co. on the basis of $17.50 a year for each kilowatt, the standard wholesale power rate at all points on the Bonneville system outside of a 15-mile zone around the dam, where the rate is $14.50.

The new contract brought the total contractual obligations of the Bonneville Power Administration for all types of agencies—public and private utilities and industries—to 97,610 kilowatts and placed the administration in the position of selling power ahead of the actual installation of generating capacity.

In other words—

Raver said—

the actual demand for power is preceding our ability to supply it, and it is necessaray to schedule deliveries to correspond with the completion of our generating facilities.

Execution of the contract in no way affects the priorities given public bodies and cooperatives by the Bonneville Act.

In negotiating all contracts—

He explained—

due consideration is given to the protection of the interests of public agencies, which, under the law, have a preference to Bonneville power.

Units 1 and 2 of the Bonneville project, completed and in operation, produce 86,000 kilowatts. Units 3 and 4, which are under construction, and for which appropriations have been made, will be completed on or about April 1941 and will produce 108,000 kilowatts. Units 5 and 6 are also under construction, and, with the $800,000 provided by the House, require no additional appropriation, and will be completed early in the summer or late spring of 1942. They will produce 108,000 kilowatts. The additional units, 7, 8, 9, and 10, have not been started, and are not authorized. The additional expenditures provided by the action of the Senate, as set forth in Senate report No. 1397, are strictly limited to speeding up the construction of units 3 and 4, and to building the foundations for units 7, 8, 9, and 10.

The Portland Oregon Journal, commenting editorially on the demand for Bonneville power, says:

BONNEVILLE PREDICAMENT GOOD NEWS

For the time being, the Bonneville administration is in the happy predicament of having more power sold than it can deliver. The second Aluminum Co. contract brings total contract commitments to industries, cities, public utilities departments, and private companies to 97,610 kilowatts. Capacity of the two generators now in service is 86,400.

That doesn't mean that there is a shortage of Bonneville power today, or that there will be one in 1941 when over 300,000 kilowatts will be available. The Aluminum Co., Sierra Iron, and several P. U. D. contracts are not yet effective.

But it does mean that Bonneville power sales are keeping pace with installation of additional generators by the army engineers. And it makes welcome the news that the Senate has approved an additional appropriation of $2,600,000 for powerhouse construction.

The new appropriation, added to the $800,000 allowed by the House, will provide $3,400,000 for powerhouse work. That will permit speed-up of work on four additional generators so they will be ready about next January 1, when the first 32,500-kilowatt Aluminum Co. contract becomes effective.

Bonneville has passed out of the dream stage and has become a going concern. It is selling power in increasing quantities for domestic, commercial, and industrial use. It seems not only possible, but certain, that Bonneville power will find a market as rapidly as generators and lines are completed, until its entire 10-unit 518,400-kilowatt capacity is put to beneficial use.

Senate Report No. 1397 on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1941, shows an increase of $2,600,000 over the House Bonneville item. This $2,600,000 represents two additional expenditures, namely, $100,000 for accelerating the completion date of units 3 and 4 and $2,500,000 for starting the foundations for units 7, 8, 9, and 10. The justifications for these amounts were placed in the record of the hearings before the Senate subcommittee on appropriations by Senators McNARY and HOLMAN, and are found on pages 169 and 213 of the Senate hearings on H. R. 8668.

Unfortunately, the status and necessity for the work was not included in the hearings before the House subcommittee. The brief testimony before the House subcommittee shown on page 125 of the House hearings was based on a misconception, which was partly corrected during the House debate on the bill, and is shown on page 2178 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 29, 1940.

In January 1940, the Secretary of the Interior wrote to the Secretary of War indicating the necessity for this work. This letter appears in the House appropriation hearings on the Interior bill, page 223, but was not placed before the Budget or the House war committee. In this letter the Secretary of the Interior pointed out that by 1942 there would be a demand for primary power amounting to 231,920 kilowatts, which is 37,520 kilowatts in excess of the dependable power which will be available at Bonneville at that time.

The details making up this estimate appear on page 173 of the Senate hearings.

On page 174 of the Senate Hearings the prime power sales progress schedule is given, and this exhibit may be summarized as follows:

Item	Number of applications	Kilowatts
Applications received	121	657,614
Applications ready for connection	40	92,971
Feasibility reports completed	25	128,621
Contracts submitted and executed	23	82,210
Contracts executed	15	65,110

Since the preparation of the exhibit, Administrator Raver testified on pages 213, and the following of the Senate hearings that the Aluminum Co. was negotiating for an additional contract of 32,500 kilowatts, which has now been consummated, and that another large industrial organization has asked for a reservation of 50,000 kilowatts.

Under the present schedule of construction, units 3 and 4 will not be completed until April 1941. To take care of contract commitments, contracts in sight, as well as a definite power shortage in the Portland area, there will not be sufficient capacity in operation the late winter of this year to handle the load. The additional revenue accruing to the Government from accelerating completion date of units 3 and 4 will be approximately $500,000 and the cost, $100,000, leaving a net advantage to the Government of about $400,000.

Units 3, 4, 5, and 6 are now under construction and funds appropriated and available do not make any provision for any work on the remaining units. The construction schedule of the Army Engineers was designed to effect the most economical plan. Discontinuing the schedule at this time will result in a construction loss to the Federal Government, for this reason alone, of $200,000 to $500,000.

In addition to the loss occasioned by interrupting the schedule there will be a very substantial loss from inability to contract the capacity of units 5 and 6. If the foundations for units 7 to 10, inclusive, are put in at a later date, it will be necessary to construct a foundation cofferdam which will block off the water from units 5 and 6. These two units will have a capacity of 108,000 kilowatts, which if sold on a firm basis under existing rates will mean $1,890,000 in revenue per year. The total amount of loss to the Government cannot be estimated exactly, as the same will depend on the length of time units 5 and 6 will be tied up, and this in turn will depend on the appropriation schedule. Industry is moving into the Bonneville area. This is not industry transplanted from other sections, but is either new projects or curtailment in Canadian development. This movement should not be stopped by the impression that Congress is curtailing the program. If this movement is slowed down, the loss to the Federal Government could amount to at least $10,000,000.

The object of the $2,500,000 appropriation is to cover so much of the foundation work for units 7 to 10 as will obviate the necessity for cofferdams blocking the output of units 5 and 6.

The report of the Chief of Engineers for 1939 shows that $7,089,200 could be profitably expended during the fiscal year 1941 at Bonneville, and of this amount $4,000,000 would be necessary to bring the substructure of the last four units to a point where there will be no impairment in the output of units 5 and 6. The $2,500,000 is that minimum part of the full amount that the War Department advises can be profitably expended in the fiscal year 1941. This item will avoid tying the hands of the Bonneville administrator on power sales. No industry seeking a location in the Bonneville area would make an investment unless there is a guaranty of capacity delivery. The $2,500,000 appropriation is designed to remove this handicap applying to 103,000 kilowatts of capacity.

BONNEVILLE AND MINING WAGE EARNERS

The gainful direct employment in mining is relatively small compared with processing and indirect employment. In the United States as a whole there is only 1 wage earner in mining to 10 wage earners in industry.

The following table from the United States Department of Commerce statistics shows mining wage earners in the principal Western States and the number of industrial workers per mine worker.

State	Number mining wage earners	Industrial worker per miner
Arizona	6,258	0.8
California	33,895	7.2
Colorado	14,202	1.6
Idaho	4,152	2.5
Montana	9,461	1.0
Oregon	1,841	28.0
Utah	7,556	1.5
Washington	3,958	20.6

This table shows that mining activity in Oregon and Washington has lagged behind other States, and that Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, and Montana have largely exported their minerals in an unfabricated state, and imported their mining supplies and materials.

The Northwest has the following strategic minerals which are now nationally imported. This classification was taken from War Department official lists:

STRATEGIC MINERALS VITAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST

Antimony: Essential military shells and auto batteries.
Chromium: Stainless steel.
Magnesium: Metal of future—airplanes.
Manganese: Vital to steel industry.
Mercury: Explosives.
Mica: Electrical industry—automobiles.
Nickel: Steel industry and munitions.
Tin: Containers.
Tungsten: Automobile and steel.
Critical list, Northwest minerals, War Department official list: Lead, graphite, zinc.
Essential list, Northwest minerals: Copper, gold.
Commercial list, Northwest minerals: Bismuth, China clay, diatomite, feldspar, gypsum, iron, limestone, phosphate, silica, silver, talc.

Mining furnishes a substantial indirect pay roll for supplies and materials used in mining, for transportation, clerical help, and trade. In the Western States cited, 20 to 33 percent of the value of the mined product goes into mining supplies and materials. Conservatively, the indirect pay roll is nearly double the direct pay roll.

Direct mining employment is not the measure of value of the mining industry. Its chief value lies in the national or regional wealth it produces and the indirect and industrial pay roll it creates. To secure national industrial independence, we must produce rather than import our strategic and critical minerals.

There is no direct means of measurement available for the possible additional direct mining pay roll in the Northwest. The extent of the cited minerals in the region has not been fully explored, neither has full information been secured on the quality. However, it is known that the quality approaches the lower grade. The large extent of the magnesium and mercury deposits is fairly definitely established. The United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines are now exploring the chrome and manganese occurrences. Electrochemical and electrometallurgical technology is the avenue to be used to overcome the commercial handicap of low-grade ores. This has been worked out for chrome, manganese, and magnesium by the United States Bureau of Mines and Washington State College at Pullman. To release the remaining listed minerals for commercial use, further exploration and research are necessary. As an example of the fact that the direct mining pay roll is not the real measure of intrinsic worth of the mining industry, it can be cited that all the iron mines in the United States had only 14,873 direct wage earners. The steel furnaces and rolling mills in the same period employed on the average 359,630 wage earners, or 24.1 industrial workers per mine worker.

With the present state of our knowledge as to the occurrences, quality, and transportation requirements of the Northwest's mineral resources, the best that we can do is to roughly estimate from statistical analysis and comparisons with other States the probable additional direct mining employment under existing known conditions.

Such an estimate of additional mining wage earners of all classes, metallic and nonmetallic, is as follows:

Low direct-employment estimate would be about 70 percent of present mine employment in Oregon and Washington or additional wage earners, 4,000; conservative upper estimate, 22 percent of existing California employment, 7,400; or the indirect ratio can be conservatively taken as 60 percent of the national average, or 1.6 indirect employees in all classifications per 1 mining wage earner.

The industrial ratio also, to be conservative, can be taken as 25 percent of the national average or 35 percent of the California ratio.

Summarizing these rough estimates, we secure the following on mining and allied wage earners:

	Lower range	Upper conservative range
Direct mining employment	4,000	7,400
Indirect employment	6,400	11,800
Industrial employment fabricating all classes of mineral products	10,000	18,500
Total	20,400	37,700

In making these estimates the intent was to base the same on known facts and to be conservative.

The direct mining and industrial employment based on mining alone, cited above, represents a 10- and 18.5-percent increase over the last reported existing total mining and industrial employment in Oregon and Washington.

The complete Bonneville plant will have sufficient available capacity to make such employment possible. The time that this employment can be reached will depend on the program of exploration, research, construction, and marketing.

This industrial employment applies only to minerals and does not include industrial activity represented by steel, forest products, agricultural, and general manufacture. These would be in addition to the mining activities.

The total over-all industrial direct employment from Bonneville can fall into four possible classifications, depending on the type of industry contracted. These are:

(1) Basic industries with a small ratio of undistributed satellite industries, represented by 28.2 wage earners per 1,000 horsepower. This is the situation at Niagara Falls, N. Y. ---- 12,400
(2) Basic industries with larger number of smaller industries. Conditions similar to Niagara County, N. Y., or 42 direct wage earners per 1,000 horsepower ---- 18,300
(3) 33 percent of present industrial employment in Oregon and Washington, or 100 wage earners per 1,000 horsepower. Fair distribution of smaller industries induced by the basic industries ---- 44,000
(4) National average of ratio of basic to distributed industries, or 153 wages earners per 1,000 horsepower ---- 67,500

These over-all industrial employment figures are based on total Bonneville installed and available horsepower. Indirect employment of 1 to 2 per industrial worker is in addition to the above.

Address to Nebraska State Democratic Convention at Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by me as chairman of the Democratic State Convention at Omaha, Nebr., on May 2, 1940:

Fellow Democrats, democracy in Nebraska continues its forward march and the spirit of this meeting demonstrates that we are marching with enthusiasm. I am glad to be here to join forces with all loyal members of our party in the work of the convention. I welcome the opportunity of taking an active part in the proceedings by serving as your chairman and am highly honored to be afforded the opportunity of speaking to you at the outset of your deliberations.

I am told this is to be a keynote speech. Frankly, I don't just know the exact definition of keynote, but if it means the note which sounds in the heart of every mother and father, every man, woman, and child in America today and which spells the difference between opportunity for happiness and black despair, between construction and destruction, which points the very way to life or death, then I say the keynote in America at this solemn moment is peace. The United States of America is determined to keep out of war.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a democratic speech. When I have finished I hope it will have sufficiently spoken for itself on that score. It will point with pride and view with alarm. It will praise and condemn. But before I enter upon it, let me say this: Political parties are a means to an end—a very good end; the means by which Americans adopt their policies, select their public officials; in short, the means by which we Americans govern ourselves. Let us not forget that whether we are Democrats or Republicans or Independents, we are all Americans. We argue and debate but is there one among us who does not know that every honest, fair-minded man and woman in our land in his heart desires justice and opportunity for happiness for his neighbor as well as for himself, harmonious relationships between citizens of differing backgrounds and viewpoints, helpful cooperation between Government, business, and labor and general healthy concord rather than destructive discord? Differences exist as to policies, as to means of accomplishing desired ends. In a republic the airing of these differences, however violently, is a salutary thing, a sign of intense interest on the part of the citizen in the welfare of his Nation. I hope the day will never come in our land when our party will cease to attack the policies and leadership of our opponents when we consider such attack to be justified. And I am sure we all are determined that we will continue in America to unite with all patriotic Americans as Americans, though we may not agree with them politically as individual citizens. In that lies the greatness of our country.

The Democratic Party has been in power for 7 years. We will shortly be summoned before the bar of public opinion to give an account of our stewardship. We willingly answer the summons. We gladly accept the challenge. We stand upon our party's history of performance, past and present. And now, ladies and gentlemen, in the words of a great American, "Let's look at the record."

The Democratic Party has the honor and distinction of being the largest voluntary political party in the history of the world. It has been in continuous existence longer than any political group in a democratic country. Our chief source of pride, however, is not that we are as old as the Republic. It is not that we have the support and confidence of a large majority of our voters. It is rather that throughout our long and honorable history we have been consistently loyal to the high principles of service to the basic needs of the great rank and file of our citizens, and that we have produced an unbroken chain of leaders who have kept the liberal spirit of progressive free government vital in each succeeding generation. We have a right to feel a very real pride in our historic background, but at this particular time we have an exceptionally strong basis for our loyalty to our party. It is that in the critical period through which we have been passing the Democratic Party has been the means by which our Government has been made once again the powerful bulwark of human rights and the effective agent of the common people. This agency has functioned in this crisis under the administration of our party chief, our national leader, our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As a matter of historic accuracy, the principles of the Democratic Party were not conceived in the mighty brain of Thomas Jefferson. What Jefferson did was to crystalize and adapt to American conditions the age-old truth that a government exists to serve the needs of its people, and not to enforce upon them the will of self-appointed rulers. He made a cold philosophy a living political creed. More than that, he furnished a leadership which prevented those who were the spiritual ancestors of the present Republican Party from making the new Republic a shoddy imitation of the kingdom which had been lately repudiated. Once the all embracing figure of George Washington had passed from the political scene, the self-satisfied aristocracy of the Northeast had attempted to remold the life of the United States into the old patterns, but Jefferson and his democratic disciples gave a rallying point to the liberal hopes of the day and for the succeeding 24 years under Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe the Democratic Party dominated.

Then came a 4-year lapse and the periodic reaction which seems to characterize human action. Once again the need became great and once again the people turned to the Democratic Party and, as had become the custom, we furnished the new surge of life. Under the leadership of that great son of Tennessee, Andrew Jackson, we restored the Nation to the people. The West and South responded and America became a democracy. Control of government passed forever, except for temporary ebbings of the tide, from the domination of the limited groups whose claims to power rested solely upon control of wealth and social position. When Jackson broke the power of the eastern seaboard bankers, he made the common man the first citizen of the Republic. As long as we remain upon the record of human endeavor, "Old Hickory" will stand as the rugged bulwark of democracy. He was and is our "Andy" Jackson.

We have no cause to be ashamed of the record left by Van Buren, Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan during the ensuing 30 years. Probably no human minds could have changed the course of events which preceded the tragic War between the States. At least no other party, no other leaders, had the genius to stem the growing tide of hate.

Then came the single great figure of the nineteenth century, to whom the Republican Party points with justifiable pride. His record and his inspiration belong to the whole Nation. Once Abraham Lincoln passed from the scene, the Republican Party, born with such lofty aims, descended into the hands of a group of unscrupulous, power-mad political tyrants. The carpetbag era blackened the pages of our history, while the vilest political scandals rocked our very foundations. The election of 1876 is, even by the narrowest partisans, conceded to have been won by that true hater of corruption, Samuel J. Tilden. Great as he was as a Governor and as a reformer, he was never greater than when he renounced his just claim to the Presidency rather than plunge the Nation into another bloody internal war.

However, the Nation soon turned to our party and we presented to it the rugged honesty of Grover Cleveland, who triumphed over the hatred and personal abuse of his day and wrote indelibly into our political life the principle that "a public office is a public trust."

Once again a temporary reaction triumphed in 1888. Those who would make government the tool of big business succeeded, and to make their triumph effective they wrote the Tariff Act of 1890. Panic swept the country and continued on through the second Cleveland administration. A combination of reactionary influences prevented effective counter measures until 1896, when the rank and file of the Democratic party took command at the national convention in Chicago and, reaffirming and reestablishing the liberal principles of the party, charted a forward course to bring it into line with the changing conditions of the day.

Under the influence of the silver tongued "boy orator of the Platte," William Jennings Bryan, that convention adopted a platform and conducted a campaign based upon principles many of which were a generation in advance of their time. On the face of the returns the election was lost, but the seed of liberalism was sown and the harvest has been reaped in the subsequent enactment of much humane and liberal legislation which has been accepted generally by fair-minded and forward-looking citizens, regardless of party, as an advance step in human progress. The militancy of that campaign roused the Nation's conscience, revived the pioneer spirit of the West, and set America upon the road toward progressive leadership of the world.

While the rest of the Nation was preparing itself for the acceptance of this twentieth-century liberal movement, the Republican Party controlled the Government. Even in its own ranks the progressive revolt mounted. Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa—all the prairies flamed until it swept the party out of control.

Our opponents charge that they lost control in 1912 because of a party split. Let us consider that. Is it not more reasonable to suppose that if it had not been for the dynamic personality of Theodore Roosevelt, the Bull Moose movement would have found expression in a mass migration to the Democratic Party rather than a temporary sojourn in the third-party territory? When the Republicans claim Teddy Roosevelt as their shining contribution in the twentieth century, we need but remind them that it was only by leaving their party and indignantly repudiating their leaders that he felt he could maintain his own political self-respect.

Fortunately, out of a wide field of trained progressive leaders we could present a great liberal philosopher and statesman in the person of the Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson. If you would be truly proud of our party and its record, reread the story of the first Wilson administration. Nowhere in previous history had such a comparable series of forward-looking legislation been adopted.

Our archaic banking and currency system, prolific of panic and disaster under Republican administration, was supplemented by the Federal Reserve System, which, if it had been administered as the law provided, would have been a bulwark against the disaster which overtook us in 1929.

We created the Federal Trade Commission for the protection of honest business. We forged an adjustment of the tariff for the benefit of the consumer, while protecting legitimate American production. We, by law, raised labor from classification as a commodity and we laid the foundation of all succeeding legislation for the protection of the rights of labor.

Then came the World War. Whatever may have been the causes of that war historians may discover, but under Woodrow Wilson America was roused to the highest level of idealism in all history. We may sneer at "making the world safe for democracy," but if Woodrow Wilson had prevailed at Versailles, and later in his gallant fight, in which he was so ably assisted by our distinguished native son, United States Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock, the world might

well have been spared the horrors which again confront civilization. Much as we hate war, we still remember that under Democratic administration the Army and Navy successfully accomplished their tasks without a major scandal or a charge of corruption.

Woodrow Wilson passed on, a martyr to the cause of human liberty, and the Nation, reacting from the tension of war and weary of welldoing, sank to the lowest level of corruption and inefficiency in our entire national life. From Teapot Dome, and the Ohio gang under the genial but careless Harding, through the drunken financial orgy, under the cautious and unsmiling Coolidge, to the inept fumbling under Hoover, the Nation plunged into the downward spiral of disaster, culminating in the devastating panic of 1929. Through 12 long years the Republican Party retained control and wrote a record which they now beg us to forget. They set new records. Most bank failures, most bankruptcies, most home and mortgage foreclosures, most men out of work. Farm and home were united at last under the black blanket of hopelessness, while the sole major contribution of the Republican Party to save the day was the Grundy-Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which guaranteed the destruction of our vital international trade.

True to the best of our traditions, our Democratic minority Congress tried to rouse the blind Republican leadership to assume responsibility and to act. Nothing resulted. National collapse seemed imminent. The Republican Party could offer nothing except "more of the same."

As at previous crises, the Democratic Party was confronted with the task first of saving and then of rebuilding the national life.

The climax seemed to be reached in 1932 with stagnant industry, new low prices for agricultural products, new high records for idle men, and new standards for governmental helplessness. Rugged individualism was paying dividends in permits to peddle apples on the street corners.

The Democratic Convention of that year saw a rebirth of liberal idealism coupled with a courageous, realistic attack upon the still mounting economic hurricane. The American people responded and in November rendered an almost unanimous verdict of "guilty" against the incompetent reactionary forces which dominated the Republican leadership.

By March 4, 1933, the whole financial and social structure was collapsing. No party ever took over the reigns of government under more distressing circumstances. The first inaugural address of Franklin Roosevelt electrified the Nation. Hope reappeared. Our citizens found that the Government at Washington was their Government and that its full power had been marshalled in their behalf.

To review the history of the party's 7 years—even to touch upon the high spots—would require days rather than these brief minutes, but no one can ever forget the black despair as the banks crashed on March 1, 2, and 3 of 1933, nor fail to remember the high hopes of March 4 as financial stability again began to reassert itself under the magic of our leader's voice.

Congress was called into special session, and at once the Democratic Party began to justify the faith which our citizens had reposed in it. Throughout history governments had leaped to the side of the rich and powerful, but now every resource of the United States was strained in behalf of plain men and women. Our banking holiday was terminated almost at once, but when the banks reopened it was in a new era. On March 3, 1933, every one of the thousands of bank failures meant distress or ruin to hundreds, even thousands, of depositors. Two weeks later, and to this date, bank failures, which rarely occur, merely mean the liquidation or the readjustment of banking enterprises. Why? Because the United States of America guaranteed to every citizen the safety of his bank deposit up to the amount of $5,000. In other words, the Democratic Party made government the servant and the protector of our people rather than the complaisant agent of corporate wealth.

Under the Republican leadership of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover the Government carried the load and assumed the risks for the big banks, the major railroads, and the powerful insurance companies. Under the democratic administration the Government does not withdraw its aid from these great institutions which retained their governmental support, but the farmer, the home owner, the laborer, and the helpless received the same needed assistance which previously had been reserved for those who were most able to help themselves.

We have legally secured labor's right to collective bargaining and have laid a foundation so broad that only labor's internal quarrels, or a selfish imitation of the crimes previously charged to capitalists, can prevent the development of a happier era in industrial relations.

We have been mindful of the obligation which we owe to the men who answered their country's call to arms in war. To the disabled, in mind and body, no adequate compensation can be made, but to these men we have offered the care and attention of a grateful country.

We have put into action, effectively, the forces of the Department of Justice, in the administration's campaign to end monopoly in business; to put a stop to unfair competition, and to abolish dishonorable trade practices.

We liberalized the farm-loan agencies, and we set up the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. We made it possible for millions of our best citizens to save their farms and homes, which seemed hopelessly lost. We enacted the basic legislation which enables the States to pay real old-age pensions. We established unemployment compensation. We provided the Civilian Conservation Corps, and gave unemployed youth a refuge from the city slums. We supplied the necessary support to the criminal investigation bureau to stop the wave of kidnaping and organized banditry, but better yet, we provided the funds to bring education to our young men and women who otherwise might be thrown into the swollen ranks of the unemployed.

We provided the world's largest public works program with employment for millions of men, both on the job and in the heavy industries, to say nothing of arranging outlets for the accumulated supplies of raw materials.

We encouraged home ownership by setting up the housing authorities with their long-term loans at low rates of interest. We brought every resource to the aid of agriculture in the Agricultural Adjustment and Surplus Commodity Acts. We put Government credit at work to enable the producing farmer to hold his crops from a glutted market. We made rural electrification a reality.

We made vast loans to villages, towns, cities, school districts, counties, and States to enable them to furnish work to their own unemployed and, at the same time, to construct needed public improvements, which otherwise would have been enjoyed only in the distant future, if at all. If mistakes were made in this field, remember that these Federal funds were granted only when the local authorities certified, first, that they had needy employable workers who were unemployed; second, that the relief load was beyond the local carrying capacity; and, third, that the plans submitted were for needed useful public improvements. We added to the funds for highway construction; we eliminated dangerous grade crossings.

This but touches some of the more important items of our scheme of national restoration. We will freely concede that some errors have been committed and that some of the methods used were not ideal, but we declare that every mistake was made on the side of the rights of humanity.

We have not completed the task of domestic recovery, but we have seen the number of employed in nonagricultural fields rise, under our leadership, from 27,245,000 in 1932, under Republican administration, to 34,940,000 in 1939. We find that the cash farm income of $4,682,000,000 in 1932 is $8,519,000,000 for 1939, while the national income of $40,000,000,000 in 1932 has become $68,000,000,000 in 1939. National wealth has mounted by many, many billions, regardless of the method of calculation or of the statistical sources used.

While we have been fighting this epochal battle to restore our internal affairs the world has gone insane. Dictator powers and greedy nations have all but destroyed the last hope of world peace. International trade has been almost completely disorganized. Foreign "isms" have been, and are, attempting to upset our internal lives. In the midst of this chaos our President and our State Department untiringly have been working to maintain our peace with the world and to build good relations with all peoples who would be good neighbors with us.

Thanks to this administration, our relations with each of the South and Central Americas have been more firmly and more satisfactorily established than at any time in our previous history. If trouble should spread to the Americas, the benefits of our foreign policies will become increasingly apparent to us all.

While we have been engrossed in our troubles at home, and while we were seeking harmony with all peoples, we could not overlook our responsibility for national safety. We are determined to keep out of other people's wars, but we are also still more determined that we shall not become the spoils of war to any aggressors. We are building a land, sea, and air defense which will be so strong that no power or combination of powers will dare to turn their covetous eyes upon this continent.

We are doing our part to make this country internally secure by building a strong, intelligent, and loyal citizenry. We have dedicated ourselves and the Democratic Party to the task of doing all that is in Government's power to make every agency of Government an effective servant to the public good. The task is not complete, but we have made a magnificent start and we will finish the job. The Democratic Party will remain the liberal, progressive, fighting party of the people.

We are assembled in convention today from the length and breadth of our State to renew our allegiance to the fundamental principles and historic traditions of our party and to plan for the future. Adhering to its basic tenets we shall promulgate a pronouncement of our party's aims and purposes and shall set forth in the form of a platform our attitude on those particularly pressing questions which confront us at this solemn hour. Opportunity has been afforded every Democratic man and woman in the State to present for consideration his or her suggestions. The platform which will be submitted to this convention and adopted in accordance with the will of the majority will reflect the composite convictions of the Democrats of Nebraska.

The Democratic Party is made up of independent individuals. This characteristic of independence is peculiarly applicable in the State of Nebraska. No attempt has ever been made to stifle independent thought on the part of the members of the Democratic Party in our State. Such an attempt would fail at the outset, for the pioneer spirit which characterized the settlers of our Commonwealth still typifies the membership of our party in Nebraska. We need never fear the result of honest differences of opinion. It is only by free and open discussion that sound decisions can be reached and worth-while policies formulated and followed. But, like the members of the family who may disagree within the walls of their home, we as Democrats should settle disputes within our party, and having settled them, present a united front. It is through such harmonious concert that best results can be achieved.

We may not agree absolutely with some of our brethren. If all Democrats thought alike it would be proof that they did not think at all. If harmony exists within a political party it exists because its members emphasize their points of agreement rather than their points of difference and, as in this Nation, those things which the whole people have in common are more numerous and more important than the things on which they differ, so in political parties men act in unison when the points on which they agree are more numerous and more important than the points on which they differ.

Present at this convention today are veterans in the ranks of Nebraska democracy who have worked unceasingly and untiringly to keep alight the flame of liberalism which often flickered dimly in the winds of fierce and powerful opposition. We salute these men and women who, in season and out, have always fought the good fight and have kept the faith and who are fighting as hard as ever today.

We extend the hand of welcome to those young Democrats, many of whom are first voters, who already have entered militantly into the fight for liberal principles and whose activities constitute such a vital and forceful contribution to the success of our party's program.

We recognize particularly the splendid work done by the women of our party. The inspiration they have offered in the battle for humane legislation and for measures for social welfare has contributed immeasurably to the success of our cause.

If there are disagreements within the party, let those in disagreement ask themselves whether they are nearer in point of agreement in their political philosophy than with the political philosophy of those in the opposing ranks. The best way to keep our party useful is to keep it in power. The best way to keep it in power is to keep it strong. The best way to keep it strong is to keep it united. Above all, our party must be kept clean and to keep it clean is to be vigilant in our scrutiny of its standard bearers and its aims and purposes. The people have the right to expect and the right to demand honesty of purpose and capacity for accomplishment in public office. We present to the people of Nebraska our candidates for office from the highest to the lowest and we urge the electorate to apply to them these tests of honesty of purpose and capacity for accomplishment in public office. At the same time we urge the application of the same tests to the candidates presented by the opposing party. We will await with confidence the outcome of these tests and these comparisons of candidates by the voters of our State at the polls next November.

Well-meaning people have viewed with alarm the use of new methods in dealing with new problems. With post-war collapse, brought about by world conditions and a selfish and unwise domestic policy, drastic action was demanded to meet an unprecedented national situation. Some of these same well-meaning people who have been tremendously benefited by many of the extraordinary steps taken by our party continue to avow that no good thing can come out of this administration, and indeed, in some instances, to proclaim that nothing but evil can result from any Democratic administration. We all recall, I am sure, the illustration of this frame of mind used in a certain fireside chat, of the old gentleman who, when rescued from what might soon have been a watery grave, after he had gone under for the third time, roundly criticized and condemned his rescuers because he had lost his silk hat.

Economic disaster demanded emergency treatment just as fires or floods or other disasters of nature call for emergency handling. By heroic action the stability of the Nation was preserved and, despite criticism and complaints directed against our efforts, the Constitution remains intact and our representative form of government continues, and will continue for the protection and benefit of the individual citizen. The convention in which we are now taking part is a concrete evidence of the vitality and force of our governmental system. Ours is one of the few remaining nations on the face of the earth in which the citizen has an effective part in his own Government. It is our solemn duty to live up to our responsibilities to the end that our plan of government of the people, by the people, for the people may continue for our own welfare and as an example and a symbol of hope for oppressed peoples throughout the world.

Criticisms of a broad general character are aimed at our recovery program by our opponents. But when specific measures are discussed it is a different story. Leading Republican Presidential candidates assure the people that, if elected, they will continue our farm program, our work-relief program, our social-security program, and the other measures set up by our party to cope with present-day conditions and to bring about recovery. Republican congressional and State candidates likewise heartily endorse the continuance of these measures. These Republican candidates say they favor these laws but that their party will administer them more effectively than ours. What then is the issue? It is, my friends, just this: Which party, the Democratic or Republican, will best administer laws, conceived, initiated, sponsored, and passed by the Democratic Party? We are content to let the voters decide that at the polls next November.

The United States is a Nation of immigrants. Our whole history is the story of pioneers. We the people of the United States in the year of our Lord 1940 are now, as we always have been, a composite of the races of the world. What progress we have made, what success we have had is due to the best efforts, in thought and in deed of this Nation of people who are the descendants of nearly all nations and races. Interdependence is the keynote of our structure as a Nation. We need two basic qualities—foresight and spunk—the former carefully developed, the latter rationally controlled. In 1932 America was a Nation lacking strength, courage, hope. Since 1932 that hope has been restored, that courage revived and today we stand before the world as a Nation with renewed strength and vigor.

Fellow citizens, the Democratic Party has pointed the way. Definite objectives can be reached through determination and through firm, patient, and persistent effort. We call upon all liberal forces to join us. Our direction is not backward. It is forward—definitely, dauntlessly forward.

The Jefferson Memorial "Will Undoubtedly Be the High Light of Most Visits by American Tourists to the National Capital"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

ARTICLE BY R. P. HARRISS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the memorial to Thomas Jefferson, heretofore authorized by Congress, is now taking substantial form on the Tidal Basin. This memorial which was born of much clamor and controversy furnishes a fitting though distinct architectural balance to the Lincoln Memorial which is now beyond the realm of controversy.

The memorial was designed by John Russell Pope, now deceased. In the field of classic structure the late Mr. Pope was without a peer, not only in America but in the entire world.

Thomas Jefferson was not only the first American architect but was one of the greatest of our architects. Mr. Pope, under the instructions of the Commission, embodied in the memorial the outstanding and unique features of the Jefferson school of architecture. The result will be a structure of extreme beauty.

The setting is a superb one. The House already knows that the memorial is located on the last major monumental site in the Capital under the L'Enfant plan of the city of Washington.

My attention has been called to an article in the Baltimore Evening Sun of date of April 13, written by Mr. R. P. Harriss.

Mr. Harriss has caught the spirit of the memorial so effectively that I have asked the permission of the House to include his article in the RECORD. It follows:

WHITE COLUMNS AND CHERRY BLOSSOMS

(By R. P. Harriss)

WASHINGTON.—It was a blowy, nippy spring afternoon, but the sun was almost hot and the cherry blossoms along the rim of the Tidal Basin made a brave pink imitation of an impressionist landscape. They did it rather tentatively, though, as if anticipating the weather's current treachery. Hardy tourists, foreign functionaries, Government clerks strolled and cycled along the paths, admiring (and sometimes trampling) the flower beds, stopping to take photographs, eating popsicles. Whenever they gazed out across the water their eyes roved 'round the shore, with its pink fog of bloom, and came to rest upon the marble pile that will be the Jefferson Memorial.

Hitherto the cherry blossoms have been enough of a show for the thousands of April visitors who walk or drive there. But the cherry blossoms, the whole of the Basin area, are destined to become merely so much appropriate landscaping for the white pillars and white dome designed by the dead hand of James Russell Pope. Even now, in its incomplete state, the structure is inescapable, rising, as it appears to do, right out of the water which becomes its reflecting pool. Once the scaffolding is cleared away, the thing will be dazzling.

It was scarcely less dazzling when the construction foreman (a Mr. Yopps) conducted a two-man tour. In the center of the pantheon, where a statue of Jefferson will stand, one looks north directly at the Washington Monument shaft, with the flagpole of the White House visible to the left. The east portal looks toward the Capitol dome. The western view is the Lincoln Memorial. Only to the south is the view disappointing: No. 1 Highway and, a little beyond it and partly screened by trees, the railroad tracks. We did a good deal of climbing up and down iron ladders

and eventually got in a jerky little lift and were hauled up to the top of the columns, where the low dome soon will fit down like a cup. Mr. Yopps pointed to where a famous declamation of Jefferson's had been cut into the inside of the circular wall, high up under the dome, inviting me to take a good look, since very few, if any, visitors would ever be privileged to read it at such close range again. The enormous lettering spelled: "I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

I thought how this memorial henceforth will exercise its glistening white tyranny over the eyes of all who stroll 'round the Tidal Basin.

The structure will house a monument to Jefferson, and the Memorial Commission has just announced the name of the probable sculptor. He is Lee Lawrie, a New York sculptor who was brought to this country in his infancy from Germany and who received some part of his education in a parochial school in Baltimore. He has specialized largely in architectural sculpture.

The procedure for selecting a sculptor was as follows: The Memorial Commission, which includes three Senators, three Representatives, three members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, and three "Presidential commissioners," and of which Stuart G. Gibboney is chairman, named as a jury. The jury consisted of Henri Marceau, James Earle Fraser, and Heinz Warneke. From more than a hundred applicants, six sculptors were invited to compete: Rudulph Evans, Raoul Josset, Lee Lawrie, Sidney Waugh, A. A. Weinman, and William Zorach. Models were submitted anonymously. Mr. Lawrie's model was picked by the jury, but it was rejected by the commission. Nevertheless, the commission invited the sculptor to submit a revised model, "after which, if approved, it will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and duly made public." In picking Lawrie's model, the jury made these observations:

"To aid in choosing a model which will best typify the man, we started with the fact that Jefferson was not an orator, neither was he a man of great physical action. On the contrary, he was a thinker and a philosopher.

"Therefore, in the first step of the work, these characteristics should be indicated more definitely than the likeness of head and body; whereas, in the next stage, and on a larger scale, the latter points can be more easily achieved. The first rough impulse of the sketch model must give the Jefferson mental characteristic by pose, action, and design, or there is little chance that they will ever be achieved."

It was added that while the winning sketch was not photographic, it distinctly carries throughout the movement of the philosopher and thinker and reflects the atmosphere of Jefferson.

The total cost of the statue, include the payment to the winning sculptor, compensation for the other sculptors who were invited to submit models, and the expense of execution will fall within the $60,000 which Congress authorized. It is hoped that the work will be completed in 3 years, in time for its dedication on April 13, 1943.

The pantheon itself is proceeding on a building schedule which should see it entirely completed by July 1941. There is a possibility that it may be ready for dedication by next January.

There has been a vast amount of controversy over the Jefferson Memorial—over its cost, $3,000,000; over its design, an adaptation of the style of Jefferson's own Monticello and of the Jefferson-designed rotunda of the University of Virginia.

Critics of the memorial (and of the classical tradition in general as applied to Washington) have called it "an unimaginative rehashing of dead architecture," "another Lincoln Memorial," "a pseudo-classical horror," and have derided the use of "empty forms" which, they hold, lack meaning to the present-day American or present-day anybody else. It is a question, however, just how empty these forms really are. Probably they have more meaning to the generality of citizens than the architectural purists and antitraditionalists would be willing to admit. It is not a meaning which the common or garden variety of citizen can readily express, but I do not believe it likely that many people will be able honestly to say that the finished memorial is not impressive and meaningful.

The cold classical forms which make so much of the late Mr. Pope's work seem tomblike are exactly suited to the Tidal Basin job. A John Russell Pope structure inevitably looks like a mausoleum and in this case a supermausoleum is what the design called for and it is what the public is going to get. And it will undoubtedly be the high light of most visits by American tourists to the National Capital.

What would Jefferson himself have thought of this thing? Would the great man of simple tastes have abhorred a grandiose and impractical memorial?

There is considerable evidence to indicate that a design such as this would have pleased him. It is true that he said he wished to be remembered chiefly as the author of the Declaration of Independence, or a religious freedom statue and as the founder of a university. On the other hand, it is hardly conceivable that he would not have been intrigued, enchanted even, with a structure inspired by his own architectural ideas and principles and occupying the finest natural site in the Capital. In France he visited Nimes and gazed worshipfully for hours at the Maison Carrée—"like a lover at his mistress," as he confessed. Moreover, he was a man of great ingenuity. He fitted all sorts of gadgets into Monticello, some of them no less tricky than the disappearing ironing board which today's contractors use as bait for selling semidetached, suburban dwellings. He saw nothing incongruous in adapting classical forms to contemporary needs, or of making them as livable as possible inside. The way in which all the interior details are to be handled, the clever concealment of the public toilets under terraces, the heating arrangements—all these more or less routine features of the design would have appealed to a man of his inventiveness. But I think those marble columns would have fetched him most of all.

Jefferson, the philosopher, swore eternal hostility to tyranny over the mind of man; yet, for good or ill, Jefferson, the architect, imposed his own taste upon his countrymen, some of whom find it tyrannical.

Loans and Repayments of Selected Federal Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

REPORT BY LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, showing loans and repayments of selected Federal agencies. The table is as follows:

Loans and repayments, selected Federal agencies

	Loans	Repayments	Outstanding
Reconstruction Finance Corporation [1] (Sept. 30, 1939)	$7,292,933,361	$5,509,529,617	$1,783,403,744
Federal home loan banks [2] (June 30, 1939) (advances to member institutions)	523,023,390	354,061,827	168,961,563
Home Owners' Loan Corporation [3] (June 30, 1939)	3,093,450,641	601,002,640	2,492,448,001
Federal Housing Administration [4] (Dec. 31, 1939)	23,967,882	8,519,536	

NOTE.—During the fiscal years 1936-39, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has acquired 141,742 properties of a capital value of $737,285,128. Of these 55,303 have been sold at an aggregate price of $193,175,844 (capital value $237,636,622), leaving 86,439 properties of a capital value of $499,648,506 on hand.

[1] Total loan and other authorizations from Feb. 2, 1932, to Sept. 30, 1939, inclusive. Excludes allocations to other Government agencies; purchases of securities from Public Works Administration; and commitments outstanding. (Source: Quarterly Report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Sept. 30, 1939, p. 44.)

[2] Seventh Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, June 30, 1939, p. 172.

[3] Same, pp. 125, 128. Includes original loans only. Properties, same, p. 137.

[4] As of Dec. 31, 1939, the Federal Housing Administration had insured 2,346,276 loans under title I of the National Housing Act at a face value of $966,417,896; 103,426 claims have been paid to the amount of $23,967,882. Of this amount $4,739,788 in cash and $3,779,748 in repossession credits have been recovered. (By telephone from the Federal Housing Administration.)

Our Farm Credit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Fred Branckman, Washington representative, the National Grange, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange hour, from Washington, D. C., April 20, 1940:

As those who are conversant with the agricultural situation are aware, a shake-up of considerable proportions has been underway in the Farm Credit Administration for some time, and further drastic changes are contemplated.

The somewhat chaotic condition that prevails today had its inception a year ago when President Roosevelt, under the authority conferred upon him by the Government Reorganization Act, transferred the Farm Credit Administration to the Department of

Agriculture. The major farm organizations of the country were vigorously opposed to this transfer, for good and sufficient reasons.

In an effort to reassure the farmers and to quiet their uneasiness, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, on May 22 last, issued a statement with the concurrence of the President to the effect that the Farm Credit Administration, including the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, would not become an integral part of the Department of Agriculture. It was explained that the principal purpose in transferring the F. C. A. to the Department was to reduce the number of agencies reporting direct to the President, and that in the future the Governor of the F. C. A. would report to the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than to the President himself. As Secretary Wallace well said at the time:

AS WALLACE SAW IT ORIGINALLY

"Not all the functions of the institutions and corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration are exclusively governmental in character. The Farm Credit Administration exercises a type of Federal supervision over these agencies quite unlike the usual Federal supervision, where the organizations and controls are wholly governmental. Supervising as it does many different types of organizations, involving among other things more than 8,000 corporations, the Farm Credit Administration does not seem to be adapted to complete identification with the Department. The relationship involved can be best handled by a continuation of its present method of operation, with the Secretary of Agriculture exercising a coordinating supervision in only the broadest and most general way."

That was what Secretary Wallace said in May; but by the time November rolled around, he took the position that if he was to be held responsible for the conduct of the Farm Credit Administration, he wanted to have full control of it. The first indications that a storm was brewing came shortly before Christmas, when, after much undercover work, with rumors flying thick and fast, Forrest F. Hill was compelled, under administration pressure, to hand in his resignation as Governor. Dr. A. G. Black, who had been Chief of Marketing Research in the Department of Agriculture, was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Hill's resignation.

Others who have been ousted in connection with the shakeup include Deputy Governor Gerald E. Lyons, of Iowa; Payton R. Evans, general counsel, of Virginia, together with Albert S. Goss, who during the past 7 years served as Commissioner of the Federal land banks.

GOSS EXPLAINS HIS RESIGNATION

Mr. Goss was not in sympathy with the move merging the Farm Credit Administration with the Department of Agriculture, destroying the independent status of the farmers' lending agencies. Neither was he in sympathy with the policies that Secretary Wallace announced would henceforth be pursued by the F. C. A. These were the reasons why he was asked to resign.

In tendering his resignation to the President, Mr. Goss issued a public statement showing that there was a fundamental difference of opinion between him and the leaders of the administration with reference to farm-credit matters. He declared there was a tendency toward a type of so-called credit in which personal responsibility is denied, loans made to everybody, with no adequate margin of safety provided, and that under this scheme the Government would be expected to pay the losses whenever borrowers took the notion to quit paying.

Mr. Goss likewise called attention to the fact that pursuant to the act creating the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal land banks had been lending money on the basis of normal values, when under conditions prevailing during recent years, farmers had not received a normal income. That is the nub of the whole matter, and we must not allow all the confusion and uproar that is in progress now with reference to the Farm Credit Administration to obscure this important point.

No system of farm credit that could possibly be devised could be expected to function satisfactorily and remain self-supporting under the conditions that have prevailed during the past several years, when farm income has been several billion dollars a year less than during the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929. Compensatory farm prices, and not "soft" credit, that will sink the farmer deeper and deeper into the mire of debt, is the only real answer to the situation with which agriculture is today confronted.

The leading farm organizations of the country, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the American National Live Stock Association, and the National Wool Growers Association are all heartily in favor of the enactment of the Gillette-Kleberg bills, S. 3480 and H. R. 8825. This measure would restore independent status to the Farm Credit Administration under a bipartisan board of five members, with the Secretary of Agriculture serving in an ex officio capacity.

THE JONES-BANKHEAD BILL

On March 4, the same day that the Gillette-Kleberg bill was introduced on the Senate side, another measure, known as the Jones-Bankhead bill, which undoubtedly was drafted by the Department of Agriculture, made its appearance in both Houses of Congress. Hearings on this latter bill were started before the Agricultural Committee of the House 2 days after its introduction, and before anyone connected with the land banks or the farm borrowers had ever heard of it. Dr. Black, the new Governor of the F. C. A., was called as the first witness before the committee. When he was asked to explain the bill and the purposes behind it, he testified that he could not say what the new policies were going to be until he knew what the Department of Agriculture intended to do. Assuming that the farmers of the country, who have invested $130,000,000 of their own money in this cooperative enterprise, still think they should have a voice in its affairs, Dr. Black's statement was not very reassuring, to say the least.

Secretary Wallace, representatives of the farm organizations, Mr. Goss, and many other witnesses have appeared before the Agricultural Committee in connection with these hearings, which have now been completed so far as the House is concerned. Short hearings have also been held on the Gillette-Kleberg bill before a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate.

It is true that some attractive bait is contained in the Jones-Bankhead bill, which, among other things, would reduce to 3 percent the interest on mortgages held by the Federal land banks. But it is not necessary to swallow this whole bill, with its many objectionable features, in order to give farm borrowers a lower interest rate. A bill has already passed the House and is now in the hands of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate that would continue the present emergency rate of 3½ percent for a period of years. If this rate is not low enough, the bill could easily be amended so as to make it still lower.

The Grange has always favored the lowest interest rate on farm mortgages consistent with a sound loaning policy. Three years ago we strongly urged Congress to override President Roosevelt's veto of the 3½-percent interest bill. If Congress had sustained the veto, it would have had the effect of restoring the contract rates at which the money was originally loaned to the farmers, varying between 4½ and 6½ percent. The following year the President again vetoed a bill extending the 3½-percent rate until June 30, 1940, and when Congress overrode this second veto, it met with our full approval.

At a time when our Government is able to borrow money on its long-time bonds at a rate as low as 2¾ percent, why should the debt-burdened farmers of the country be asked to pay rates ranging from 4½ to 6½ percent? My purpose in referring to this matter is to make it perfectly clear that we are not finding fault with the 3-percent interest rate contained in the Jones-Bankhead bill.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS OUTLINED

Among the principal objections to the Jones-Bankhead bill, which is supposed to have been drafted by the Department of Agriculture, are that it would substitute bureaucratic Government lending and control for farmer-controlled cooperative credit; that it would entail the danger of mixing sound credit with relief and social problems, and that partisan politics, from which the work of the Farm Credit Administration has heretofore been free, would in due time permeate the whole set-up.

In my opinion, it is also possible that the granting of loans to farmers might be made contingent upon compliance with the triple A program or various other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. With all due respect to Secretary Wallace, who undoubtedly means well, he already has far greater powers than were ever before granted to any administrative officer of the Government, and if, in addition to all his other powers, he should be given a strangle hold on the farmers' credit facilities, a situation would be created that is without parallel in any free country.

It is well to remember in this connection that even if Secretary Wallace should not be tempted to abuse the vast powers reposed in him, nobody knows who the next Secretary of Agriculture may be, nor have we any knowledge as to what policies he might pursue. If we want our democracy to endure, why not let the people themselves have some say in the conduct of their own affairs? Instead of destroying everything that has been accomplished in the field of cooperative farm credit during the past 23 years, would it not be far better for us to build on the experience we have had and improve the system, giving the farmers a larger measure of responsibility and control than they have heretofore exercised?

We are admonished to hold fast to that which is good, and in spite of all that the detractors of our cooperative farm credit system may say, it has on the whole been very successful. It has weathered the greatest inflation of land values ever witnessed in this country, together with the greatest deflation. Its record with reference to farm-mortgage foreclosures is about twice as good as the record of private lending agencies. Most assuredly, it would be a great mistake to destroy the element of personal and joint responsibility in the making of farm loans, because this factor is vital to the continued success of the whole system.

More Spinach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President has appointed Mr. J. Monroe Johnson to the I. C. C. Mr.

Johnson is now Assistant Secretary of Commerce, where he was formerly in charge of aviation. The record made under his administration in the Department was notoriously bad.

Next, the President announces he will probably appoint Mr. Robert Hinckley, present Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, to the post to be vacated by Mr. Johnson. In this way Mr. Hinckley can have charge of aviation if the C. A. A. is moved back into the Department of Commerce.

This maneuvering proves that the independence of the C. A. A. is destroyed if the reorganization goes through.

Forever afterward the development of civil aviation will depend on who is the Secretary of Commerce and who is the Assistant Secretary.

Who Am I?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1940

AN ESSAY BY LAWRENCE C. MURPHY, POSTMASTER, SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following essay on one of the foundation stones of our civilization speaks for itself. It is the work of one of the postmasters in the Twelfth Congressional District of California, Mr. Lawrence C. Murphy. I am proud to include it with my remarks.

WHO AM I?

(By Lawrence C. Murphy, postmaster, San Gabriel, Calif.)

I am the smallest commodity in the world. I am, likewise, the cheapest commodity on earth. I am, of all man-made things, the most important. I weigh less than a dram; my price a trifle. I am the reason for the world's largest enterprise. My recognized value is world-wide. From the birth to the death of each existence I am an important factor—every day. In truth and in essence, I am—

The messenger of sympathy and love.
The servant of parted friends.
The consoler of the lonely.
The bond of the scattered family.
The enlarger of the common life.
The carrier of news and knowledge.
The instrument of trade and industry.
The promoter of mutual acquaintance of peace and good will among men and nations.

Every joy, each vicissitude; every romance, each fact, every success, each failure, every birth, each death—all are known to me. Without me, life would lose much of it's charm. Without me, the heart would never know the fullness of love or the depth of sorrow. Were I nonexistent wealth might well discount its power. I am in everything, always meeting you. In your every motivation—social, commercial, intellectual, romantic, idealistic—you always come to me.

In human democracy I am a mighty implement. I prompt and encourage the spirit and the service of what makes for freedom and the happiness of man. I am a binding tie in all affairs.

I travel the world. I know all roads, all paths, all climates. Land and sea and air are my highways and byways. I never weary of my journeys. I am the most familiar wayfarer. My comings and goings are always important. I am a constant visitor. In the sanctums of the mighty or the hovels of the poor I have equal welcome. Though I travel far, none may bar my journeys. The mightiest of armament—vast armies—unlimited resources of nations, all protect my wanderings. Whither I go, law and order supersede violence and the crude customs of savage life.

As a plutocrat I journey. I use only the best and most modern of transportation—motors, streamline Diesels, aircraft, mighty vessels—all are familiar to me. I am their constant passenger. En route I am attended by a trained entourage who guard me jealously, willing to give their lives to uphold the traditions behind me.

Neither storm nor flood, neither heat nor cold, neither pestilence nor catastrophe can stay me. And all because I am in your service—the one reason for my existence. When I part with you, you are certain of a fulfilled mission. Though you send me to the frigid zones or to burning desert wastes, to prince or pauper, saint or sinner, I perform your task.

I know the birth of every day through whose sunlit hours I toil. When night rests on a weary world—I still go on. For me there is no rest. With your every heartbeat I start a journey anew. For I am in your service.

Yes—I am small—the smallest commodity in the world—and cheap, my cost a trifle, and though I weigh less than a dram, who travels farther, works harder, or is more consistent than I? And who, with all the selfishness and clamor of the ages—who—with all the weaknesses of man—can equal my claim—"I know no enemy?"

Who am I?

I am a postage stamp.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

"Citizenship" is an old word—as old as democracy. "Citizenship" is a proud word that holds all the pride of a free man in his freedom.

"Citizen" is a simple title. It is the boast of America that no American may hold any other. It is our pride that no American is less and that no American can pretend to be more than a citizen of this country.

Not long ago I saw an English passport. An English friend showed it to me, and it was a very elaborate affair. Inside it there is a great show of state seals and a long, flowery statement beginning, "We, Viscount Halifax, His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs * * *." Then there is a whole paragraph listing the Viscount's titles. It ends by requiring, in the name of His Majesty, that all concerned allow the subject to whom the passport is issued to pass freely.

Compare that with an American passport. Our passports are not elaborate. There is only this simple statement:

"I, the undersigned Secretary of the United States, hereby request all whom it may concern to permit freely and safely to pass, and in case of need to give all lawful aid and protection to ——— ———, a citizen of the United States."

I take a deep pride in those words, "a citizen of the United States." A free American, one with millions of free Americans—a citizen of the United States.

That is what I want to talk about—what citizenship means in liberty, what it means in the duties necessary to preserve liberty.

There is little need, when speaking to Americans, young or old, to make a catalog of the rights preserved to them in the Constitution, and traditions of the United States. I do not mean to make such a catalog.

Equality in the courts, freedom of speech and of worship, and the universal right to vote in elections which afford a real choice—these are commonplaces to us in America.

There is danger, though, in the very fact that we are likely to think of our most precious liberties as commonplace.

One hundred years ago, Daniel Webster said, "God grants liberty only to those who live it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." This is just as true in 1940. It is even more true, because in 1940 democracy has enemies more dangerous than the Royalists and Tories of Revolutionary days. Fascism lies just beyond this growing thirst for a leader, for one man who can take the heavy job of governing off our hands.

There is no easy way to democracy, there is no easy way to preserve it. I cannot state too emphatically my belief that there is no royal road to freedom and individual liberty.

A free people learn self-government and preserve it as any gift or talent is fostered and preserved, by practice. Only by governing ourselves, by exercising the right to vote and to participate in our own government, can we hope to retain our democracy and our freedom.

Nation after nation around us has learned too late this simple truth that was crystal clear to Daniel Webster 100 years ago. But in learning that the right of citizenship is preserved by use, they lost it.

Citizenship is not automatic. That is something we must not forget in days like these. When the people hold the governing power too loosely in any country, there are strong men waiting to seize it, working to seize it. And America is not so free as to be free of such men. Make no mistake about that.

Once strong men who feed on the power to govern have seized it, they fight to hold on. The weapons they use are not pretty—spies, concentration camps, and soldiers in the streets. We want none of that here.

I paint this dark picture because I see a real danger in taking liberty for granted, and in taking citizenship lightly.

Citizenship is a duty as well as a right, and neglecting that duty means losing the right. That is why I urge the young citizens who are this year assuming their citizenship to take it seriously. It needs exercise as much as their minds and their muscles. That is why I urge those young people who will soon come into their citizenship to look forward to it and to prepare for the business of being citizens.

Citizenship does not mean only voting in this coming national election. It does not mean only voting, even if you are careful to cast a ballot in every election—town, county, and State. Citizenship means more than that.

To my mind a citizen should be familiar with the organization of the governments of which he is a part. He should be familiar with the problems of his community, of his State, and of the Nation. He should know how the officers he elects are handling those problems. This is necessary to his dignity as a citizen. It is fulfilling these obligations that makes him a citizen in the fullest sense. These are obligations to himself, as well as to his country.

Again I cannot stress too much the importance of being a part of local government. It is there that it is possible for the greatest number of American citizens to touch government closely. We can see the problems at first-hand and feel the individual responsibility for decisions. We can see the results of policies we have helped to make close at home.

Community government is doubly important. It is close to us, and what it does is vitally important to every part of our lives. But, in addition, community government is important as a school of government. It is there that we can see problems close enough and on a scale small enough for us to completely understand it.

Without a knowledge of how government works in your own community, you are pretty much at a loss to understand the more complex workings of State and National Government.

Just like a correspondence school, I urge you to learn at home. Study the public affairs of your town, and make yourself as much a part of them as you can. There is nothing more true than that a community gets just the sort of government it deserves. I do not mean morally, but rather in proportion to the intelligent effort the citizens are willing to put into the business of governing themselves.

The young people of America hear the word "politician" used scornfully too often. Politician is only a word of reproach, if the citizens think it is, and hold themselves aloof as too good for the dirty business of politics. That attitude is the only one which can make politics a dirty business.

The citizens can make of politics whatever they want. Their neglect makes it a dirty business, but their active and enthusiastic participation makes of politics enlightened self-government worthy of free men in a democracy.

When I urge you to take your place as citizens to the fullest possible extent, I feel obliged to add a word of caution. And again I quote to you the words of Daniel Webster:

"Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint."

Into those words is written another of the cardinal principles of democracy. It is another simple truth which other nations have ignored to their sorrow, and whose essential value they have learned too late.

It is impossible to forget that democracy is cooperative and universal, impossible to forget this and retain democracy.

The rights guaranteed to us in the Constitution are guaranteed to all of us. Those rights must be preserved to all of us. If they are not, if we deny the fundamental liberties to some of our citizens, the result is the loss of freedom by us all.

The constant effort to insure the blessings of liberty to every citizen of the United States is no more than selfish—if anyone needs the assurance of personal gain to fight for liberty.

No case of the denial of constitutional rights to a citizen is unimportant. Fascism and dictatorship starts slowly and finds its roots in the neglect, and in the failure to constantly defend the rights of every individual. Eternal vigilance is certainly the price of freedom.

In this year, as in no other in the recent history of our country, has there been such a need for alert and sincere citizenship on the part of every American. The flags of freedom are being struck, in nation after nation. It is our first and most sacred duty to keep that of American democracy flying.

The way to do this is not romantic. No bands will be playing. The way to preserve democracy is quiet and industrious. It is to use democracy without misuse. It is to govern ourselves, and to defend the rights of Americans, for every citizen, in every case.

The editorial to which I have referred, follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1940]

"'I AM AN AMERICAN'

"We have a day, or a week, for virtually everything. The President has designated Sunday, May 19, as 'I Am an American Day,' to be observed as a 'public occasion in recognition of our citizens who have attained their majority or who have been naturalized within the last year.' This group, officially coming into new responsibilities and gaining the right to vote, doubtless will listen to a great deal of advice, some of an excellent nature, and to various definitions of 'Americanism'—that much-abused word which is such a godsend to the orator. And yet, these new voters could do worse than devote a little thought to their place in the scheme of things. They might ponder the fact that, when one comes right down to it, this is not a bad country.

"Our civil liberties appear to be in an excellent state of repair, for the most part. A vote still means something and is usually counted. Freedom of worship has not been impaired. It is still possible to do a great many things without getting permission from a bureaucrat. Nearly everybody has a chance to get some sort of education. A lot of generosity abounds. Some people—not enough, to be sure, but some—have managed to get and hold on to jobs. The country is not directly menaced by any foreign power. Diseases are waning. We have some odd people who are always annoying, but in the words of Alfred E. Smith, 'This country has to put up with a certain number of crackpots, but we get along.'

"A good country, but at the same time it would be a disservice to oversell the idea to these new voters. They are, it is to be hoped, not entirely blind. Certainly this is not a time for smugness, gloating, or self-righteous chauvinism. Between now and November they will all have a chance to listen to tunes ranging all the way from the most exuberant optimism to the blackest despair—and all from good Americans. Those for whom May 19 has been set apart can say in all pride, 'I am an American' but they might at the same time refrain from thinking that they are sitting on top of the world. For they are not."

Minority Attempt To Usurp Majority Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call particular attention to three bills that have been introduced into Congress, and which bill, if enacted into law, prevent anyone from denouncing those who are now engaged in subversion and destruction of our own Government.

It is high time for Congress to realize that when special protective legislation is granted to any minority, the majority digs its own grave. I imagine Members of Congress would be shocked if a society of thieves should ask for special legislation to protect its rights. Yet it is that very thing that happens when a minority asks for special legislation to grant it extra protection.

It is by minority legislation all free and popular governments are converted into despotisms, and it is that which is happening in the United States. It should, of course, be plain to all that, as each group of our people is restricted by law, all of us will, when the last law is enacted, be deprived of all liberties and rights we had before the first restrictive law was passed.

Two of these bills, H. R. 7603 and 7604, introduced by Mr. CELLER, of New York, are in the Judiciary Committee of the House. The third, which I shall discuss, is S. 3876, introduced by Senator BARBOUR, of New Jersey, and is now in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

These bills are most vicious and would, if any of them is enacted into law, penalize Members of Congress as well as everyone else who has the moral courage to denounce those of the various minorities who are now engaged in sabotage and destruction of our Government. I quote S. 3876:

A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 211 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The term 'indecent,' within the intendment of this section, shall include matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination or riot and also forgeries or matter of a character fraudulent and scurrilous, tending to incite hate against any religious sect or creed or race."

This bill differs from the others in that it is "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States." It is this I fear, for as an amendment it appears innocent and may therefore, at the end of the session, be reported out and passed with a mass of other legislation, only to work a great injustice upon our people. This bill should never have been introduced because it is not only unconstitutional but would, if enacted, actually repeal or nullify the first amendment in the Bill of Rights.

The Senator should understand that Congress has no right to pass any legislation that restricts the rights of the people as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Neither has Congress the right to enact legislation which gives minorities extra legal rights, for it is such legislation that paves the road for minority conquest of the United States.

It is astonishing how minorities within the United States are able to hoodwink a tolerant majority, and, in addition to that, wield sufficient influence over Congress to provide legislation which penalizes the majority of the American people. I cannot understand whether this tolerant attitude on the part of the people is because they do not understand the danger or do not have the proper information. I cannot understand whether the submissiveness of the majority in Congress is due to ignorance of facts or because of some unseen or pernicious power wielded by the minority.

Should this amendment pass, this much is certain: No Members of Congress would be able to discuss or mail information in regard to subversive activities of the minority party that controls the Justice Department and the courts in the United States without inviting legal action as the amendment provides. Surely no Member of Congress will consider legislation justified which deprives his own people of their constitutional rights. Surely no Member of Congress will support legislation which places our own people in a subservient position to those who now wield the power of gold. Let us not forget, when courts fall under the control of the minority and under the power of those who control the gold and money, the majority rights are jeopardized, for the courts can, by law, incarcerate each and every one who insists on his constitutional rights.

Let us put the microscope on this amendment. We now have laws against arson, murder, assassination, and kidnaping, so this amendment cannot be to protect us against such crimes.

As a matter of fact, the law against kidnaping is very severe and could, I believe, be invoked against those who, a few days past, set a price of one or two million dollars to promote kidnaping. Such offers are dangerous to the safety of even our own citizens, for they may induce some weak-minded person to engage in a foolish attempt. It might, as a matter of fact, end in murder, so the question may be asked: Why should the press give publicity to such dangerous provocation of crime? This stunt might reach much further than we expect. Let us suppose that some American cititzen is in Germany when such attempt is made. Is not it possible that such person may meet with reprisal, even though he is absolutely innocent? Is not it possible that blame for such crime may be placed not only upon Americans in Germany, but upon Americans in other countries as well?

Let us now put the shoe on the other foot. Suppose any foreign nation offered a reward of two or more million dollars for the kidnaping of one of our officials. Would we take it with indifference? I do not know how others would feel, but I am sure that I would resent such offer made by anyone, and particularly a foreign nation.

The Justice Department should, in order to clean this up, investigate and expose those who made this offer. It is quite possible that the same group may be willing to pay for the kidnaping of some of our own officials. People with criminal tendencies do not always confine their offers to foreigners, but may, to gratify such abnormality, offer a reward for murder in the United States.

The real crux of S. 3876 may be found in the last four words: "Sect, creed, or race," and make no mistake about that. The bill is to give the minority the legal right, through the control of the justice departments and courts, to prosecute and persecute patriotic American citizens who believe in the fundamental principles of this Government, and who are opposed to the termites who are boring from within.

It is indeed unfortunate that legislation of this kind is introduced in Congress, for it can only engender greater and greater hatred toward this rapacious internationalistic group. However, should this legislation bring about animosities and hatreds, which, of course, it will when the people understand what is happening, the proponents are alone responsible.

It is time that we run these traitors out, for they are becoming more and more obnoxious to us who believe in the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Who is more indecent, if we must speak of it, than those who have cast morals on the city dump in pictures, in exhibitions, and in the press? Little should they complain or worry about defamation or decency, for they themselves are the greatest offenders. I say let those who introduce these bills explain the sect to which they refer and explain the creed as well. I am sure it would be interesting to know just who they are. Identification of them by the proponents of these bills would be interesting to us who are perfectly satisfied to obey our own laws as set forth in the Constitution.

Furthermore, let the proponents of this bill designate the race to which they refer, and let them state whether this race is composed of Americans or hyphenates. The question, in reality, answers itself, for no one but hyphenates would ask for greater rights than those enjoyed by the majority of the American people. What a farce it is, and what fools we are, we Members of Congress, who are elected to preserve, protect, and defend the rights and liberties of our own people, what fools we are to sit in the Halls of Congress and allow ourselves to be dominated by this obnoxious tribe, whose sole purpose is to entrench itself and to control our courts and our departments of justice for the protection of its own people.

The gentlemen who introduced these bills appear to be unfamiliar with the Constitution of the United States, for it protects all American people without fear or favor; and the Constitution even protects those who are not Americans in any manner except in lip service.

Let no one be mistaken. These bills are vindictive, unconstitutional, and an insult to those who are perfectly willing to conform to our own laws. I sincerely hope, for the sake of decency, that not one of these bills or any similar legislation will ever be reported out from any committee in this Congress of the United States.

In conclusion, may I ask those who propose such legislation to read the Bill of Rights, and should they be dissatisfied with these 10 amendments in their present form, let them in decency propose amendments to the Constitution according to article IV, so that the people may at least be informed as to the identity of our destroyers.

Civil Aeronautics Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CLARKSVILLE (TENN.) LEAF CHRONICLE

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days there has been a great deal of propaganda to the effect that the Civil Aeronautics Authority will not lose its powers to appoint and control personnel and to determine budgetary matters under the proposed reorganization.

If the reorganization is supposed to save money, how can it do so except by amalgamating C. A. A. functions with the functions of the Department of Commerce? And if the C. A. A. has to depend on the Department of Commerce facilities for its personnel and budgetary work, what does it

mean to say that the C. A. A. will be able to reach its own determinations?

What is the purpose of putting the C. A. A. into the Department of Commerce? Things like that are not done just because it looks nice. They are done to give the Department of Commerce control.

Of all agencies of the Government, the C. A. A., regulating the safety of pilots and passengers and of the boys and girls in the civilian pilot-training program, ought to be most independent and most free of the departmental pressures and jealousies. Keep it as it is.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I have included herewith an editorial from the Clarksville Leaf Chronicle, Clarksville, Tenn., entitled "Keep It As It Is."

[From the Clarksville (Tenn.) Leaf-Chronicle]

KEEP IT AS IT IS

President Roosevelt has issued an order which, if carried out, will have the effect of destroying the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Presidential order would pull the teeth of the C. A. A. and turn its authority over to the Commerce Department. This Department is headed by Harry L. Hopkins, who should have enough to do without taking over aviation.

Former Congressman Samuel B. Pettingill, "the gentleman from Indiana," in a copyright article issues a timely warning against such a move, which he describes as A New Death Sentence. He cites the tragic mistake of February 1934, when air-mail contracts were canceled. Aviation was under control of the Commerce Department and "during that period * * * 473 persons lost their lives in air crashes of whom 146 were air-line pilots. The ranks of the air-line pilots were being thinned at the startling rate of one every 28 days. Their passengers were meeting death averaging 1 every 15 days. The crash-scared public was afraid to ride which resulted in inestimably large losses of revenue to the industry and progress was stymied."

As a result of these tragedies, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was enacted. The Authority was made independent from political pressure and the act created an independent Air Safety Board which investigated all crashes. Yet, under the new plan, this Board is to be abolished and Mr. Hopkins is to be made responsible.

Considering the remarkable advancement aviation has made under the C. A. A., and the amazing record of a year without a single fatality that commercial air lines have made, it seems to us well enough should be let alone. Commercial air-line pilots have flown more than 87,000,000 miles, or have flown a distance that would girdle the globe 3,600 times without a single death among its more than 2,000,000 passengers.

The C. A. A. is a Government commission that has done a remarkable job. As long as such a record is maintained, or even approached, the Authority should be continued. We are an air-minded Nation because of the relative safety of aviation. The Authority deserves much of the credit and, if anything, its life should be made more secure—certainly not snuffed out.

Dairy Farmers' Union Support Debt-Adjustment Bill (S. 3509)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

STATEMENT BY HARRY A. CARNAL, SECRETARY OF THE DAIRY FARMERS' UNION OF NEW YORK

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the storm over the debt-adjustment bill, Farm Credit Act of 1940 (S. 3509), continues to rage both in the press and legislative committees. I am in receipt of a communication from Harry A. Carnal, secretary of the Dairy Farmers' Union of New York, favoring this legislation. Mr. Carnal knows the situation of the dairymen at first hand and is of the opinion that no procedure bound about by red tape will rescue them from their present actual or impending bankruptcy. It is my own judgment that so long as the Government permits the northeast dairymen to be exploited by the Milk Trust that some relief, not homeopathic in character, must be given them.

Pursuant to the permission of the House, I append hereto Mr. Carnal's statement:

DAIRY FARMERS' UNION,
Ogdensburg, N. Y.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE DEBT-ADJUSTMENT BILL—FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1940, S. 3509

It is obvious that agriculture in New York and New England stands to benefit decidedly from the debt-adjustment bill. Unlike farmers in other sections, those in the East have not been vocal nor pressing in their demands, nor have they always utilized Government agencies to the full extent, frequently to their own detriment. But in the debt-adjustment bill, which so ably complements the more humane policies of the revamped Farm Credit Administration, they see very real and welcome assistance.

For one thing, the debt-adjustment bill opens the way for reducing the number of farm-mortgage foreclosures. It goes a step further in helping to restore to the land farmers who have already lost their farms through foreclosures. To return these farmers to the land is the best possible solution from the standpoint of human welfare, efficiency, and the national economy. But at present, a farmer once foreclosed, is not eligible for another farm loan.

That provision of the debt-adjustment bill which eliminates the purchase of land-bank stock as a prerequisite to obtaining a loan will be especially commended by eastern farmers. This especially onerous provision has long been regarded as a legalized racket, an unfair toll levied upon those who can least afford it. A pun on the words "stock" and "stuck" has already gone the rounds of the milkshed in this connection.

The stock-purchase plan is so unpopular, not only because of the added burden it imposes, but because it is an obvious injustice to make one farmer jointly liable for the loan of another. A farmer who is a borrower is not impressed with a neatly engraved stock certificate. His major interest is in getting a loan and getting it paid off most expeditiously, and anything which interferes with this is bound to be vexatious, especially when it appears to be unnecessary and unjust.

Those who defend the stock-purchase plan in the New York milkshed claim that it imparts an element of "cooperation" to the system. They are the "professional cooperators" of the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and kindred organizations who are largely responsible for the indifference or hostility of eastern farmers toward the cooperative movement. In fact, agricultural cooperation in these areas has not received the support to which it is entitled largely because of the numerous infringements which have been perpetuated upon the cooperative movement.

From the economic and human standpoint, the debt-adjustment bill is a desirable piece of legislation, and as such it is recognized by farmers of the East, especially by those who are already indebted to Federal Farm Credit.

As representatives of 21,000 dairy farmers in the States of New York, Vermont, and Pennsylvania we give our unqualified support to, and urge the passage of this bill.

HARRY A. CARNAL, *Secretary.*

Dies Committee Against Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

DECISION AND OPINION BY HON. GEORGE A. WELSH, JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the decision and opinion of the Hon. George A. Welsh, judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, with regard to the illegal activities of the Dies committee:

[In the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. *Carl Reeve* v. *Chester Howe, George F. Hurley, Albert A. Granitz, Jacob Dogole,* civil action No. 840; and *Frank Hellman, individually and as district organizer of the International Workers Order and the International Workers Order, Philadelphia District Committee,* v. *Chester Howe, George F. Hurley, Albert A. Granitz, and Jacob Dogole,* civil action No. 841. May 3, 1940.]

SUR MOTIONS TO DISMISS

Welsh, J.:

"* * * The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue,

but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized * * *."

ARTICLE IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The only question before us for decision is whether or not the above constitutional safeguards and guaranties have been violated. Partisanship and political philosophies have no place or bearing in the discussion. Those matters can very well be left to their proper avenues of expression and control.

The questions thus having been placed squarely before a Federal court for decision requires a full, accurate, and complete statement of the facts and the law involved. The court cannot be otherwise than exceedingly mindful of the fundamental principles of the case thus submitted to it for its decision. The comments of men high in public life, the discussion of the subject in the public press and magazines, and the hundreds of letters on the subject coming to the chambers of the court indicate the tremendous feeling that the case has aroused, the state of the public mind due to existing world conditions, and the confused thought as to what the real underlying principles of the case are. We could scarcely discharge our duty in the circumstances without taking due notice of all these factors, and without exercising a wider latitude in our treatment of the problem than in the usual or ordinary case. Hence, we consider it advisable to state as clearly as possible the actual fundamental facts as we believe them to be. Also, the principles of law that govern and which we believe have governed from the time our country was founded, its Constitution adopted, and as this Constitution has been defined and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States for over 150 years.

The courts are concerned only with maintaining the sanctity of the safeguards of the Constitution of the United States. We feel that we should call attention to the exceedingly grave consequences of breaking down the applicable provisions of the Bill of Rights. It just so happens that the aggrieved parties in this case are apparently very much in the minority in our country. But their rights which they claim were invaded are rights that are sacred to all of us. All of our people have the right to form themselves into political parties and to have the free and untrammeled right to the press to promulgate their ideas. The collateral evidence shows that the offices of the political party and the newspaper known as the American Free Press were both raided and much property confiscated and taken away.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Thornhill* v. *State of Alabama*, decided April 22, 1940, called the attention of our people to the fact that the Continental Congress itself, as long ago as October 26, 1774, recognized the utmost importance of this fundamental doctrine in these words:

"The last words we shall mention regards the freedom of the press. The importance of this consists, besides the advancement of truth, science, morality, and arts in general, in its diffusion of liberal sentiments on the administration of government, its ready communication of thoughts between subjects."

On April 2, 1940, the defendant George F. Hurley, a special investigator for a United States congressional committee known as the Dies committee, made affidavit before Jacob Dogole, a magistrate of the city and county of Philadelphia, that, upon information and belief, matter of a seditious nature, banned by the Pennsylvania Act No. 275 of June 26, 1919, as amended by the act of May 10, 1921, No. 211, was to be found at the headquarters of the Communist Party at No. 250 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, and at the headquarters of the International Workers' Order, 810 Locust Street, Philadelphia, and praying, under the authority of said act of assembly, for the issuance of warrants authorizing the search and seizure of said seditious matter.

The search-and-seizure warrants were issued by Magistrate Dogole, and though by him directed for execution to "any police officer of the city and county of Philadelphia," were, nevertheless, delivered by the magistrate to the defendant Hurley. Pursuant thereto, the defendants Hurley and Howe, accompanied by Lieutenant Granitz and a squad of some 30 Philadelphia police officers, proceeded to the said headquarters of the Communist Party aforesaid at 250 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, and to the headquarters of the International Workers' Order at 810 Locust Street, Philadelphia, and searched and seized and carried away various property which, however, has since been returned and is now in the custody of the polic authorities of the city of Philadelphia.

It transpired that the headquarters of the Communist Party at 250 South Broad Street were in the apparent occupancy or charge of one Carl Reeve, educational director of the Communist Party in Philadelphia.

On April 3, 1940, the said Carl Reeve, in his representative capacity as educational director of the Communist Party, filed in this court his complaint, as above captioned, praying for an order (a) quashing the search-and-seizure warrant issued by Magistrate Dogole; (b) enjoining and restraining the above-named defendants, and each of them, from using, copying, or otherwise interfering with the seized property, or making public any of its contents, and (c) directing the return of the seized property. (The prayer for an order restraining the use or publication of the seized property, was subsequently formally withdrawn before us by counsel for Carl Reeve, complainant.)

On April 12, 1940, motions to dismiss the complaint for want of jurisdiction in this court, and for failure to state a claim entitling the complainant to the relief prayed for, were filed by counsel for the defendant Albert A. Granitz, and by counsel for Jacob Dogole. Briefs for and against the motions to dismiss have since been submitted, and are now before us. As the warrants for the search and seizure both at 250 South Broad Street and at 810 Locust Street, were identical in content, what we shall say of the one directed at 250 South Broad Street, may be regarded as equally applicable to the other addressed to 810 Locust Street.

Upon the question of our jurisdiction, we note, first, that although the warrant was issued by a magistrate of the city of Philadelphia, nevertheless the application for the warrant was solicited from the magistrate alike by defendants Hurley and Howe (admittedly the agents of the Dies committee, which is admittedly a Federal investigating committee), and that the application was actually signed and sworn to by Hurley.

We note further that although the warrant was directed for execution to "any police officer of the city and county of Philadelphia," nevertheless it was delivered by the magistrate to Hurley, who, with Howe and Lieutenant Granitz and a squad of 30 city police, proceeded to 250 South Broad Street and executed the warrant at that place.

We note further that though under the terms of the warrant, return of the warrant and of the seized property was to be made to the magistrate forthwith, or at any rate no later than within 10 days, nevertheless Hurley and Howe took immediate possession of the seized property, and transported it to Washington, and there delivered it to the Dies committee, who, having first made such use of the seized property as it saw fit to make, returned it into the custody of Magistrate Dogele.

Under the narrated facts, we are of the opinion that the search and seizure was in reality a Federal undertaking, taken under the chance that possibly something would be disclosed of official Federal interest. The fact that the undertaking was the joint undertaking of the local and Federal officers is material. The effect is the same as though the Federal agents had engaged in the undertaking as one exclusively their own. (*Byars* v. *United States*, 273 U. S. 28, 32.)

"Where a search has been participated in or instigated by Federal officers, under such circumstances as to stamp it as a joint enterprise * * * the validity of the search and seizure must be tested by the Federal law." (Cornelius on Search and Seizure, sec. 17, p. 62.)

Was the search and seizure invalid? That is to say, was the supporting warrant itself supported by sworn facts competent to be submitted to a jury, as reasonably affording probable cause for believing that seditious or subversive matter was to be found at the headquarters of the Communist Party at 250 South Broad Street? This is the standard by which the validity of the search and seizure is to be tested (*Grau* v. *United States*, 287 U. S. 124–128).

Tested by this standard, we note, first, that the affidavit of defendant Hurley, upon which the warrant issued, sets forth only Hurley's belief "upon information received," that certain persons, among them Carl Reeve, were in possession of and were concealing seditious records and literature, in violation of the Pennsylvania act of assembly, upon the premises 250 South Broad Street. Nothing more. Nevertheless Magistrate Dogele issued the warrant which, as we have said, though directed to "any police officer of the city and county of Philadelphia," the magistrate delivered over to Mr. Hurley. Magistrate Dogele admits he made no inquiry at all as to the source of Mr. Hurley's information. Lieutenant Granitz was not present at the time of the delivery, and the magistrate testified that he did not know how Lieutenant Granitz got possession of the warrant, if indeed he got possession of it at all. It is, however, admitted that Hurley and Howe, accompanied by Lieutenant Granitz and a squad of police, approximately 30 in number, proceeded to 250 South Broad Street, and ransacked and cleaned out practically the entire contents of the headquarters of the Communist Party, not even omitting matters relating to housing construction, the personal property of Reeve, the complainant here, who is a member of the advisory committee of the Philadelphia Housing Authority under appointment of the president of that authority, the Honorable Frank Smith, nor omitting even the Communist Party's nomination papers for election to the State legislature—nomination papers the last day for filing which at Harrisburg was the next day following their seizure and transportation to Washington, with the result that unless some other means might be found it would be too late to do so—nor omitting even a letter file containing the names and addresses of furniture dealers, the property of one Esther Segal who, it is our understanding, was not an employee of the Communist Party.

We are not, however, greatly concerned with the actual property seized and transported to Washington. Whether it was seditious or not seditious has no bearing on the legality of the search and seizure. An unlawful search and seizure would not be made lawful no matter what evidence of an incriminating nature was found among the archives. The authenticity and genesis of any alleged seditious literature may now be difficult to legally prove in view of the circumstances surrounding their seizure and transport, and handling by so many persons involved. However, should this matter be material and relevant it may be legally inquired into later. We go to the affidavit of Mr. Hurley upon which the warrant issued, and find (as we have said) that it stated only that the affiant "upon information received" believed that "books, records, writings, publications, printing, cartoons, or utterances, documents, or writings," of a seditious or subversive nature were on the premises to be searched. Such an affidavit was plainly inadequate. The belief that the statements in an affidavit to a warrant are true,

is insufficient, *Byars* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 28). The fourth amendment of the United States Constitution, provides that:

"* * * and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

It was also inadequate as tested by the act of Congress of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, title 18, U. S. C. A., sec. 613), which provides that:

"A search warrant cannot be issued but upon probable cause supported by affidavit naming or describing the person, and particularly describing the property and the place to be searched."

The affidavit being defective, it is unnecessary to consider the alleged defect in the warrant, for if the affidavit was defective the warrant itself was without lawful foundation (*Grau* v. *United States*, 287 U. S. 124, 127). Being so, it is unnecessary to consider whether the warrant was good under the State law, since in no event could such warrant constitute the basis for the search and seizure here, which was so palpably a Federal search and seizure (*Byars* v. *United States*, 273 U. S. 28, 29). It thus appears that the search and seizure was made without probable cause and without any personal knowledge of the searching officers. As has been said by a high authority, no good reason exists why the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure should not stand upon a parity today with freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of assembly, as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, inasmuch as all of these rights are of equal importance to the individual (*Hague* v. *Committee, etc.*, 101 Fed. (2d) 774, 787, C. C. A. 3, per Biggs, C. J.). Protected from abridgment by the Federal Government by the first and fourth amendment, they are protected from abridgment by the States by the fourteenth amendment (id. p. 788, citing *Colgate* v. *Harvey*, 296 U. S. 404, 428). The suit in question was brought by the complainant to secure the protection and enforcement of civil rights guaranteed to him by our fundamental laws. The district court has jurisdiction of the suit under section 24 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. A. sec. 41 (14)).

Defendant claims that the complainant has no redress because he was acting as the officer of a corporation, and that a corporation is not within the protection of the Constitution. In the early days of our national life, when business was largely individual in character or conducted by small groups of associates, the artificial entity of the corporation was looked upon as being outside the guaranties of the Constitution. But as we progressed to great corporate activities this view changed, and many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States declared that corporations were persons within the meaning of certain provisions of the Constitution. This interpretation was but a recognition by the highest tribunal of the fact that man's rights, possessed as an individual, were not lost by reason of his associating himself with others in a corporate activity. It requires only casual reflection to appreciate how important this interpretation has been to our national life. Men have been encouraged to combine their fortunes, their brains, and their energies, knowing full well that they forfeited no rights possessed by them in their individual capacity. Corporations have been declared persons within the meaning of the Constitution in certain respects. The mere fact that Mr. Reeve, the complainant, happened to be a member of an unincorporated society, and its duly accredited officer in the lawful possession, custody, and control of its property and paraphernalia, does not remove him from the protecting fold of the Constitution. If he became the victim of a raid or of process prohibited by the Constitution, relief should be given by a Federal court.

Counsel for defendants further allege that the complainant, as an individual, has no legal personal title to the papers and records seized due to the fact that he was also the officer of the corporation. Is this claim warranted within the real meaning of the applicable constitutional provision? Are the effects merely physical objects or do they include something more intangible and possibly far more real and substantial? Is the individual secure in his person, if he is deprived of or denied the right to function according to the rational activities of the office or station which he lawfully occupies? Man's life and his very being consists in his activities; he functions as man in the realm of thought; in this he differs from the brute creation. Surely a civilization as wonderful as ours cannot limit or circumscribe the constitutional guaranties of personal security within the limits claimed by the defendants. Furthermore, dispassionate reasoning must concede that the duly constituted corporate officer, having books, papers, records, money, and other property committed to his care, for the proper use of which, within the scope of corporate powers, he is personally responsible, has a right therein and thereto. We therefore cannot accept the claim of the defendants that they are free from the constitutional command not to violate those rights. Let the seal of judicial approval be placed upon such constitutional violations and liberty of the person, and liberty of religious and political thought and action will have vanished from our land.

Humanity can be no freer than its liberty to think. The search for good and the search for truth must be free for the mind of man to explore in all realms, spiritual and physical, each man according to his light. Man's relation to his God, to his fellow man, and to the State must ever be the subject of search and investigation. This is the liberty that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to its people. Any limitations of that liberty must be placed by the sovereign will of the people, lawfully expressed and self-imposed, and not by the fiat of any branch of the Government, whether it be executive, legislative, or judicial.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Our Government, through its proper agencies, has the power, the responsibility, and the duty of exercising such vigilance. When such vigilance is exercised within the limitations of the constitutional safeguards, all of our people will be found in sympathy.

The motions to dismiss the complaint in the above-entitled proceedings are denied.

Proposed Amendment of the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted to recommit the legislation amending the wage-hour law. The effect of this vote is to send the Norton bill (H. R. 5435), the Ramspeck bill (H. R. 7349), and the Barden bill (H. R. 7133) back to the Committee on Labor. This means that there will be no action on the part of the House looking toward perfecting the wage and hour law at this session of Congress.

By voting to recommit this bill, the House has nullified everything done during the last 7 long days. Now that it is all over, it is will to take an inventory and see just where we started and where we finished.

At the beginning of the debate on the rule making these three bills in order, I called attention to the objections inherent in a rule of this kind. The prophecy made then has surely come true. If this 7 days' wasted time has not done anything else, it should at least convince the House of the fallacy of a rule of this type.

The debate has shown clearly the genesis of these three bills.

The Labor Committee report on the Norton bill, among other things, says:

Section 4 (d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 requires that the Administrator submit annually in January a report to Congress covering his activities for the preceding year and including such recommendations for further legislation in connection with minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation as, in his opinion, are desirable. Acting in accordance with this requirement the Administrator did, in January of this year, submit his report to Congress together with suggestions for amendments to the act which, in his opinion, were necessary to relieve hardships found to exist and to make the administration of the act more effective. These suggestions were incorporated in the bill (H. R. 5435) introduced by the chairman of the committee and have been fully considered by the committee. All of them are carried in the committee amendment but not all in the form recommended by the Administrator. A number of other matters, not contained in the recommendations of the Administrator, were brought to the attention of the committee, and it was the committee's considered judgment that these matters also should be dealt with in any amendments to the act.

It will therefore be observed that the Norton bill not only had the support of the Committtee on Labor, but was in response to the request of the Administrator of the wage-hour law for legislation in order that some of the hardships and inequalities under the existing law might be removed. The Norton bill to which the report refers is the bill as introduced, and that part of the bill reported through which the lines were drawn by the printer and which the House has just recommitted. The Norton bill was introduced March 29, 1939.

The Barden bill was introduced July 11, 1939, and represented the views of organized agriculture as to amendments that were necessary in order that certain branches of agriculture might not be destroyed.

The National Grange, with its over 800,000 paid membership, advised each Member of Congress in reference to the Barden bill as follows:

We regard it as urgently necessary that Congress should pass the Barden bill, H. R. 7173, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, commonly known as the Wage and Hour Act.

Under the act, those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, together with those employed in handling or processing agricultural commodities in the area of production are exempted. However, this exemption has been largely nullified by the wholly illogical and unwarranted interpretation or ruling made by the former administrator of the act, Mr. Andrews. While his successor has been in office for about 6 months, this ruling still stands.

The purpose of the Barden bill is to amend and clarify the original act so as to give agriculture and the processors of farm commodities in the area of production the exemptions to which they are justly entitled.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act it is the declared purpose of Congress to give agriculture price parity with the other groups in our national life. But during the past 2 years the exchange value of farm commodities as compared with commodities that farmers must buy has stood at only about 75 percent of the pre-war level, 1909–14. No industry could be expected to function very long under such a tremendous handicap and remain solvent.

The Wage and Hour Act, as it has been misinterpreted, simply operates to make the old disparity greater than ever. As we see it, Congress has a responsibility in this matter that it cannot afford to evade. We trust that the Barden bill may be enacted.

Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and an outstanding new dealer, sent a telegram to Members of Congress which reads as follows:

Urgently request you support Barden bill amendments to Wage and Hour Act. Unreasonable construction of area of production by wage-hour Administrator makes amendment of act imperative. Farmers producing perishable and seasonal commodities already receiving less than parity prices and income. Cannot stand increased costs in marketing of such commodities.

Mr. C. L. Brody, executive secretary of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, advised the Michigan Members of Congress as follows:

We understand that the Barden bill to amend the wage and hour law will come before the House Thursday or Friday of this week. We are convinced that the enactment of this legislation will give agriculture relief from certain interpretations of the act as follows:

(a) Modify the hour restrictions in certain agricultural trades and industries;

(b) Clarify the area-of-production problem that has arisen from the restricted definition promulgated by the wage and hour Administrator;

(c) Put a statute of limitations period of 6 months upon the time in which action to recover time and a half overtime can be maintained. This is designed to prevent the unwarranted accumulation of overtime with the resultant possibility of complete ruination of business for any technical violation of the act;

(d) Exempt under certain conditions employees working under higher salary brackets.

We are glad to give you our position on the Barden amendments at this time, and hope that it will be helpful to you in your consideration of the bill.

The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association had this to say about the Barden bill:

In the interest of all agriculture, our organization, which represents approximately 350,000 dairy-farm families, urgently requests the passage of the Barden bill (H. R. 7133) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Barden bill not only clarifies the wage and hour exemption provisions of the law but reiterates and carries out the original intention of Congress to exempt operations of employees engaged in the preparation of farm products for market. While specific exemption of such operations was provided for in the wage-hour law, the unwarranted and unreasonable definitions given "area of production" and other terms contained in that act by the Wage and Hour Administration have, for the most part, nullified these exemptions and have deprived farmers of their benefit.

Denial of these exemptions results in saddling increased production costs on the farmers. This tends to widen the existing disparity between prices farmers receive and pay at a time when farm prices and income are still below the parity level which Congress, in the general farm program, has provided as the goal to be reached.

It is vital to American agriculture that the Barden bill be passed. The passage of the bill gives needed relief to agriculture and insures preservation of the specific exemptions which Congress provided in the original wage-hour law with respect to employees engaged in preparing farm products for market.

The bill has the support of the major farm organizations of the country which are sincere in their belief that the wage-hour law has not been administered consistent with the express intention of Congress when it passed the law.

We accordingly respectfully urge that you support the Barden bill—H. R. 7133.

In short, organized agriculture favored the Barden bill because the interpretation placed upon the wage and hour law by the previous Administrator works a direct injustice to agriculture. We, who were Members of the Congress when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, all know that it was never intended that the Administrator should interpret the law as he has interpreted it, and which interpretation makes at least a part of the Barden bill essential if the farmer is to have a square deal.

The Ramspeck bill was introduced on July 24, 1939. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is one of the outstanding members of the Labor Committee and no Member of that committee knows more about Federal labor legislation than does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. I am advised that after some consideration had been given to the Norton bill and the Barden bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] took from those two bills such amendments as to him seemed less controversial and matters on which there seemed to be general agreement within the committee, and embodied those proposals in the Ramspeck bill. This was sort of a compromise, and the purpose was to get needed legislation even though it were impossible to get what the Administrator wanted in toto or what the Barden proponents wanted in its entirety.

The House first gave consideration to the Barden bill and when it had finished, the bill was hardly recognizable so numerous and potent were the amendments.

The Ramspeck bill was only given formal consideration by the House and was withdrawn.

The committee amendment to the Norton bill was given full consideration by the House and likewise was amended all out of shape. Under the rule no opportunity was given to amend the Norton bill as originally introduced, and which contained the provisions asked for by the Wage and Hour Administrator.

When the vote was taken as to whether or not the Barden bill, as amended, would be substituted for the amendment to the Norton bill, as amended, the Barden bill was defeated. Then, in turn, the committee amendment to the Norton bill was defeated, so that in the final analysis the House was required to vote on the Norton bill as introduced and as advocated by the Administrator.

I voted for the Barden bill as a substitute. I then voted for the committee amendments to the Norton bill. Both of these propositions were defeated. Then a motion was made to recommit the bill; that is, to send it back to a quiet pigeonhole in the office of the chairman of the Committee on Labor, there to repose quietly until the end of this Congress, when it would be officially dead. My reasons for voting as I did are as follows:

First. It is generally agreed that the wage and hour law, in order to be equitable and effective, should be amended.

Second. The legislative processes provided to bring this about are:

(a) The introduction of a bill into Congress which is referred to the Committee on Labor.

(b) Consideration by that committee and a report to the Congress.

(c) Consideration and passage by the House with or without amendments.

(d) Consideration by the Senate of the House bill as amended.

(e) If the Senate passes the House bill with any changes whatever, the bill so changed comes back to the House and goes to conference between the House and the Senate. The House is then permitted to vote on the bill as agreed to by the conferees.

In short, by voting against the motion to recommit, I voted to send the bill, such as it was, on its way to the Senate where it might be made better. We all know that the Senate would not accept the Norton bill without some changes. I wanted some changes. Therefore, as a practical matter, when the bill came back from the Senate, the House would have an opportunity to vote on its final passage in the adoption of the conference report.

Those who voted to recommit the bill, in effect voted against any amendments to the wage and hour law at this

session of Congress. Those who voted against the motion to recommit, as I did, voted for further consideration of this whole matter in the Senate with the possibility of making the changes in the law advocated by the Administrator, as well as needed additional changes in order to make the law workable and helpful rather than unworkable and destructive to some of our agricultural industry.

The wage and hour law is on the statute books and will not be repealed. It matters not what our views were before this policy was adopted by the Congress. The fact is that the Congress has determined upon this policy and it seems to me that the duty of the Congress is to honestly, sincerely, and courageously amend the law wherever amendments are needed, to the end that the objective of eliminating child labor, sweat shops, and unreasonably low wages be accomplished. It seems to me that the House has made a mistake in recommitting this bill, and thereby affirmatively killing all chance of wage hour law amendments at this session. Helpful and necessary amendments can and should be made without destroying the commendable features of the act. Had the bill been sent to the Senate amendments would still be possible.

Protest Transfer of Control of State Schoolships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1940

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOLSHIP CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOLSHIP CLUB,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1940.

The Massachusetts Schoolship Club of Washington, D. C., composed of graduates from the schoolship maintained by the State of Massachusetts, unanimously adopted the following resolution at its April meeting:

Whereas under section 10 of the President's fourth reorganization plan, it is proposed to transfer the control of State schoolships from the jurisdiction of the Navy Department to that of the United States Maritime Commission; and

Whereas such a transfer in these times of uncertainty in the field of maritime labor, when officers, trained under naval discipline and inculcated with a spirit of loyalty, are urgently needed, is most ill-advised; and

Whereas the needs of national defense have been most splendidly served by Navy-trained schoolship men during the past 50 years, as the records of the schoolships show; and

Whereas the present plans of the Navy Department contemplate an ever closer cooperation with the various schoolships; and

Whereas the functioning of schoolships under joint State and Navy jurisdiction affords a permanence which unfortunately may not be the case should the control of the schoolships be vested in the Maritime Commission, a bureau whose permanency is not assured with changes of administration; and

Whereas such a transfer of functions will, in the opinion of many, eventually lead to the abolition of schoolships by the various States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Schoolship Club of Washington, D. C., protest against such a transfer, and respectfully petition the Congress to disapprove section 10 of the fourth reorganization plan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to:

Chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee; chairman, House Naval Affairs Committee; chairman, Marine and Fisheries Committee of the Senate (Commerce); and chairman, Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House.

CHARLES B. SCULLY,
Secretary, Washington, D. C.

United Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. FRANCIS SMITH

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of extending and revising my remarks and including therein a speech delivered by the Democratic State chairman of Connecticut, J. Francis Smith, on April 20, 1940, before the members of the Young Democratic Clubs of Connecticut and their friends.

Mr. Chairman, National Committeeman FitzGerald, Governor Cross, Senator Maloney, honored guests, members of the Young Democratic Clubs of Connecticut, and their friends, this gathering, marked by enthusiasm of the true harmony of a common and sincere purpose, augurs well for the success of our party in the crucial elections which make the year 1940 a critical one in the history of our State and Nation as well as of the Democratic Party.

A united Democratic Party cannot fail to command the support of a great majority of our citizens. And I am convinced that we are united. United in a determination that this country shall not return to the cynical reaction of the Harding administration, to the cool indifference of the administration of Calvin Coolidge, nor to the wishful futility of Herbert Hoover. We have had 7 years of progress and of vigorous action under a national democratic administration. No one should claim perfection for this administration. No one should or does claim that no changes are needed nor that all of our problems are solved. That we have made real progress is enough, and that claim cannot be denied by our opponents. In fact, we need no more than their own words to prove our claim. In fact, Governor Baldwin was quoted on February 14 in a Bridgeport newspaper as stating that he considered it "astounding that with employment at the level that it is today there are still people looking for work." But, astounding or not, it is a fact that these people do exist, and it is a fact that progressive action cannot give way to pleasant but meaningless gestures and phrases.

As a further evidence that the progress of the past years has been real and substantial, we need only consider that the Republican Party does not dare to recommend the abandonment of a single major part of the Roosevelt program. Which of the Republican candidates for the Presidential nomination recommends the abandonment of Federal aid to the unemployed, of aid to home owners, of recognition of the rights of labor, of assistance to agriculture, of protection of depositors and investors, of the social-security program? Even conceded that this criticism may occasionally be justified in some detail, what of that, compared to the overwhelming fact that the Republican Party does not and will not dare go before the American people on any other platform than a continuation of the major policies of the Roosevelt administration?

Lacking the courage and the justification for making a direct and forthright attack upon the fundamentals of the Democratic program, the Republican leadership has been reduced to a campaign of devious indirection. We do not need to go outside the boundaries of our own State to observe the nature of this campaign. We have observed the efforts of our own amiable Republican Governor to create the impression that prosperity and employment can be obtained by friendly words and a cheering philosophy. Let me remark that I most heartily endorse the proposition of Governor Baldwin that we should have a government "friendly to business." I most emphatically agree that over a period of years the prosperity and welfare of our citizens will be materially affected by the attitude of our State government toward all legitimate business. The Governor deserves praise rather than criticism for his insistence upon proclaiming Connecticut's welcome to industry and commerce. The fault, and it is a serious one, lies in attempting to make a political issue of a policy approved and supported by all parties and all citizens in this State.

There are two major fallacies in the campaign which has been carried on by the Governor. One fallacy is the idea that a government friendly to business is something new. When have we had a Democratic administration unfriendly to business? Were the administrations of Governor Cross unfriendly to business merely because they promoted the cause of the wage earner or because they recognized the needs of some of our less-fortunate fellow citizens? And if it is not intended to criticize the administrations of Governor Cross, would it be said that the administration of Gov. Simeon Baldwin was unfriendly to business?

State Finance Commissioner Saxon recently issued a statement in which he gave the two principal reasons for the improvement in State finances. One was the reorganization of the financial structure of the State. This reorganization, ladies and gentlemen, was the policy and performance of the Democratic administration of Gov. Wilbur L. Cross.

The second reason given by Governor Baldwin's own official was general business improvement. This brings up the second fallacy. That fallacy is that the actions of the State government can materially or immediately affect industrial prosperity and employment in the State of Connecticut. I dislike even to discuss this contention. It can be described only as downright silly. The following editorial from the Bridgeport Times-Star is common sense:

[Excerpt from editorial, Bridgeport Times-Star]

"Followers of Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin who became too enthusiastic in assigning to him personally all credit for such reemployment as Connecticut knew during 1939 did him no favor and are now engaged in the embarrassing business of confronting some unpleasant statistics. The statistics show a sensational drop in Connecticut employment in the past 6 weeks, turning a foolish claim on the part of Republican leaders into an opportunity for a claim equally foolish on the part of the Democrats.

"As a matter of fact, all such claims and counterclaims are out of place."

Let me say that I know of no responsible Democrat who has taken advantage of the opportunity offered in that editorial to be "equally foolish." We know that Governor Baldwin had no more to do with the recent increase in unemployment than he had to do in 1939 with the increase in employment. I have here a few statistics. They cover seven industrial States: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. These States now have both Democratic and Republican adminstrations among them. Over the period covered from 1933 to 1939, each State has had both Republican and Democratic administrations. Every State went up (in industrial employment) from 1933 to 1937. Every State went off in 1938. Every State gained in 1939. Every State was higher in 1937 than in 1939, including Connecticut, which shows that such things can happen under Democratic State administrations. These statistics are from the United States Census of Manufactures and the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The lowest gain from 1938 to 1939 was in New Jersey, with 7.9 percent; the highest was Michigan with 17.5 percent. The gain in Connecticut was 9 percent, which was exactly in the middle of the seven States. I suppose that Governor Dickinson, of Michigan, could claim that his antivice campaign had led to the favorable position of the State of Michigan, but I think that we may assume that the purchases of automobiles throughout the Nation because of generally improved business conditions had something to do with these results.

I feel apologetic when I present such facts as these to an intelligent audience. I will not aggravate my offense by discussing further matters so obvious as to require no discussion.

I am satisfied in my own mind that the appreciation of the American people for the real accomplishments achieved under Democratic leadership cannot be upset by such ill-founded Republican attacks as we have witnessed. Let us all look for and work for victory in November.

Employee Retirement Rights Under Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication and resolution from the Jewish Federation for Social Service. From time to time I have had inquiries from various nonprofit organizations now kept from participation in retirement responsibilities and benefits under the Social Security Act. The communication which I introduce is another example of a most worthy organization seeking extension of the act so that its employees can secure retirement rights thereunder.

I know that these requests are being given attention and hope that legislatively we will soon have an opportunity to permit the inclusion of such worthy organizations, at least on a permissive basis. The communication follows:

At a meeting of the board of governors of the Jewish Federation for Social Service of Buffalo, N. Y., held in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., on April 24, 1940, the following preamble and resolution was unanimously adopted.

"Organizations not covered in the Federal old-age retirement plan feel the disadvantages of their position and resulting injustice to their noncovered employees. Employees naturally prefer employment in those positions covered by social security.

"Social-service organizations must of necessity feel embarrassed in that their employees do not possess that same security which employees in business and manufacturing establishments now have; most of the social-service organizations have no plan for retirement of superannuated employees with provision for the future, and the Jewish Federation for Social Service and its constituent organizations are none of them exceptions to this general situation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Jewish Federation for Social Service of Buffalo, N. Y., endorses wholeheartedly the work of the committee of national nonprofit organizations in its attempt to have social-welfare organizations included in the Federal old-age retirement plan; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the expression of favorable opinion for the proposed legislation now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives be endorsed and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Robert L. Doughton, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, as well as to Representatives upon such committees from the State of New York and Representatives in the House of Representatives of the Fortieth, Forty-first, and Forty-second Districts."

The Jewish Federation for Social Service employs upwards of 30 individuals, and includes within the scope of its activities practically all of the Jewish social-welfare organizations in the city.

The main constituent societies are: The Jewish Welfare Society, Inc., the Bureau of Jewish Education, the Jewish Community Center, Inc., the Jewish Fresh Air Camp, Inc. It also grants a specified amount to the Y. M. H. A. of Buffalo.

We trust that when this amendment comes before the House it will receive your favorable consideration and active support.

Very truly yours,

JEWISH FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE,
EUGENE WARNER, *President*.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, commercial aviation in the United States towers head and shoulders above air transportation anywhere else in the world, whether judged by completed schedules or passenger miles flown or safety records. This magnificent attainment has been brought to its highest degree of success under an independent C. A. A. and an independent Air Safety Board. After struggling for years against political administration of air commerce regulations, Congress finally provided a set-up that had long been advocated by the companies and the pilots. It is working splendidly, and the results speak for themselves. It would be a distinct and disheartening step backward to return to political management this fine organization for the administration and regulation of airways by transferring the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board to the Department of Commerce, from which the system was so recently rescued.

The very essence of the Air Safety Board is its complete independence and divorcement from the regulation-making bodies. There has been no complaint from anyone, within or without the industry, about the fine administration of our commercial air transportation system. Then why should this fine administration be returned to a political cabinet department? There was constant criticism while commercial aviation was under the administration of the Department of Commerce, all of which disappeared when the independent agencies were created. What purpose can be served by a return to political control? What need for such a return when the present system is working in such a highly satisfactory manner?

It is significant that the pilots and the air-line companies worked for years for the establishment of an independent agency to make and to administer the regulations of the industry. It is also significant that an immediate protest came from the organization of air-line pilots and from pilots individually when the proposal to return the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce was announced. The pilots were joined in their protest by all of the air lines. This too is significant.

Certainly, as a subordinate division of a politically controlled executive department, the prestige of the Civil Aeronautics Authority will be greatly diminished, and its influence materially lessened. Former control by the Department of Commerce did not prevent a black chapter of increasing accidents and fatalities in commercial aviation. The great evil against which the pilots fought—that of competitive flying—was never brought under control. Political influence was always able to block the efforts of the air-line pilots to abolish the conditions of competitive flying. One of the first accomplishments of the independent agency created for the regulation and control of commercial air transportation was the elimination of this disastrous and disgraceful condition. Immediately the accidents began to diminish, and in a short time they disappeared entirely; whereas they were increasing under the old Department of Commerce control. And yet, it is now proposed, for no good reason, to return control of the commercial air system to the very department that made such a conspicuous failure of it for years.

Why is this plan being presented now? No one in the aviation industry advocates it. The air-line pilots never requested it. The officials of the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board never proposed it. Private pilots and owners of private planes do not want such a backward step. Who, then, is interested in returning the control of our great air-transportation system to a politically controlled executive department of the administration, and why? The air lines are subsidized to carry the mails. They were always looked upon as fair prey for solicitation for heavy campaign contributions. Being dependent upon governmental subsidies, they were amenable to "suggestions" about liberal campaign donations. When their regulation was vested in a politically controlled department they were easily got at for such "voluntary" contributions. However, when their control was transferred to an independent agency, free from political interference, they were no longer subject to such pressure. Now an election campaign is coming on; campaign funds are urgently needed. Can it be that there is a desire to put the lucrative aviation industry again in a position where it will be forced to contribute heavily to the campaign funds or else be faced with possible cancelation of air-mail contracts, and so forth? No other reason is apparent for such a transfer of the regulatory authority over the air-transport system.

The reasons advanced by the few proponents of the transfer fall of their own weight. One is that regulation of commercial aviation will be given Cabinet representation. Actually what will happen is that the direct contact now existing between the Authority and the White House will be removed, and instead the contact will be filtered through the intermediary agency of a Cabinet department. That system was tried and failed. It existed from the beginning of the regulation of aviation until the independent C. A. A. was established in 1938; and under it all the evils complained of existed, and Cabinet representation at the White House did not result in correcting any of them.

The whole concept of subjecting a regulatory body to the control of an executive agency is contrary to the fundamentals of our philospohy of government. Under our American system, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of the Government must be wholly independent of and free from each other. The Civil Aeronautics Authority is a regulation-making body, and as such partakes of the legislative. It derives its life from the legislature. It is, in fact, a delegation of the powers of the legislature. It should be responsible therefore to the Congress and not to the President. Such is the very heart and nature of an independent agency created by Congress and designed to act for the Congress. To transfer such an agent of Congress to the control of an executive department is to defeat a fundamental purpose of our intended system of separation of the legislative and the executive branches of government, and to destroy our greatest safeguard, checks and balances.

The Air Safety Board's value exists only in its complete independence from the regulatory body and freedom from political domination. It would be as logical to place the courts in an executive department as to transfer the Air Safety Board to a Cabinet department.

An inevitable ill-effect of the proposed return of these independent agencies to the Department of Commerce would be a lamentable lowering of the quality of their leadership. Surely we cannot expect to be able to procure as subordinate officials of a minor division of a vast executive department men of such outstanding caliber and qualities of leadership as may be procured as executive heads of such important independent agencies as the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board now are.

If, on the other hand, as has been stated in support of the order transferring these agencies to the Department of Commerce, there is to be no change in functioning and no loss of independence, then why make the change at all? Either significant and undesirable changes will result, or there is no purpose in making the change.

Had the control of civilian aviation worked out satisfactorily under the Department of Commerce, there would never have been the movement to take it out of the Department and set up an independent agency. Why then is there any reason to believe that the old system will be any more successful now than it was before? We know the old system didn't work well; we know the present system does work well. Then why return to the old method? It just does not make sense.

For years, when all these matters were under the control of the Department of Commerce, we talked about mass training of civilian pilots under a Government program. We talked about a square deal for the private flyer. We talked about aiding the small-airplane manufacturer. We talked about assistance to the privately owned airports. Talked about these matters, yes, but that was all. In less than 2 years under the independent C. A. A. every one of these talked-of objectives has been attained. The air-minded young men and boys, and girls, too, are getting a chance in aviation now. Is there any reason to believe that the same old Department of Commerce will be any more sympathetic or progressive in these matters now than it was before? Shall we risk losing the advances we have made? Will not a return of the control of aviation to the Department of Commerce mean a return to the old conditions? Will it not mean at least freezing progress of commercial air transportation at its present point? Private aviation has advanced more in its little more than a year under the C. A. A. than in any 5-year previous period under the Department of Commerce domination.

The argument is advanced that the control of civil aviation must be brought under the Department of Commerce in order to better integrate it with the related activities of the Weather Bureau and the air navigation-chart service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Our civil aviation is intimately related also to our Army and Navy aviation. Must the latter services also be brought into the Department of Commerce to better integrate them? They, too, depend upon the services of the Weather Bureau, and they use air-navigation charts. The latter proposal is no more ridiculous than the former.

Under Department of Commerce control pilots were being killed in scandalous numbers, there was an alarming increase in passenger fatalities, and the companies were losing money. Under the administration of the C. A. A. the number of accidents has been so reduced that there have been no pilot or passenger fatalities during the past year. Also air lines are now making money, expanding their services, speeding up their schedules, and vastly increasing the number of their passengers.

Again I say, let the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board alone. Let us defeat Reorganization Order No. IV and continue the progress of American aviation.

Emmett Marshall Owens

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EMMETT MARSHALL OWENS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague, EMMETT MARSHALL OWENS, who was a member of the great Agricultural Committee of the House and a personal friend of mine, the State of Georgia has not only lost a distinguished citizen and lawmaker, but his valuable service to his people and his country on the Agricultural Committee and in the House of Representatives will be missed.

Emmett was a rather quiet man, but he was conscientious in the performance of his duties to his people and to his country. He was ever mindful and thoughtful of the best interests of his friends and colleagues, and, apparently, he took a personal interest in me. Very often, either in the office or some other place we would sit and talk about matters of interest to both of us and concerning the problems of the country. He, apparently, had a great deal of confidence in me, and his very splendid and gracious attitude of friendship for me, naturally caused me to be very fond of him.

Our colleague held many positions of trust and honor during the years he spent in this life. His services, as stated, were rendered on a very high and efficient plane, all of which brought about that type of attitude on the part of his people toward him which enabled him during all of these years to receive their favorable consideration for the many positions accorded him in the way of their suffrage.

I am sure that his loving and friendly disposition and his readiness to be of service to his colleagues and to his people will be missed.

I join with the members of the Agricultural Committee and his many friends in the House in extending to his bereaved family my deepest sympathy in the untimely passing of this distinguished citizen of Georgia and their beloved one.

'Tis easy enough to be pleasant
When life flows by like a song;
But the man worth while is the one who will smile
When everything goes dead wrong;
For the test of the heart is trouble,
And it always comes with the years,
But the smile that is worth the praise of the earth
Is the smile that comes through tears.

Carl E. Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL E. MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, during all of the years that I have had the privilege of representing my State—South Carolina—in the Congress of the United States I have had the privilege of observing the outstanding character and ability of our colleague, CARL E. MAPES, who passed away on December 12, 1939.

During these years, while not closely connected with him, in that he served as a Republican, and for a number of years on the Rules Committee of the House, however, as stated, I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting and speaking with him on many occasions, and the opportunity of observing his statesmanlike attitude on all matters, and I agree with many of my colleagues on both sides of the House that in the passing of this distinguished lawmaker Michigan and the Congress of the United States has lost a most capable and worthy citizen.

Mr. MAPES, in every instance, regardless of the temper of the House, performed his duties calmly and efficiently, as well as impartially. To know him and to observe his wonderful and outstanding personality always in his work or in speaking with his colleagues individually, we were impressed with the fact that he was conscientious, God-fearing, and desirous of impressing those around him with that type of life which is not only worth while here but which would mean everything to them when called upon to enter the life beyond.

You had only to observe his personality and his character to understand that there is a life beyond this tenure of work, strife, sickness, pain, and death. Therefore, we should be happy in the thought that, although the Great Speaker of the heavens called, "Come quickly," he answered the call, his place is vacant, and many are sad; we all have the consoling memory of a life lived bravely, of tasks done nobly, and of a personality that pleased, that helped, that inspired his associates among whom he lived, loved, and was loved.

I am glad to have had the opportunity of serving with him, he coming from one of the North Lakes States and I from the deep South, in that I have had the privilege of observing in him, as well as in many of our colleagues from the various sections of this country, that, regardless of the section from whence we might come or what might be our race or creed, the same God whom I adore is the Father of us all.

Along with my colleagues who mourn the passing of this distinguished lawmaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones, and may I leave with you this gracious thought: Today he is basking in the sunshine of a beautiful heavenly home prepared from the foundation of the earth for those who love the Lord, and that in the years to come those of us who have been spared will have the privilege of seeing and being with him again.

'Tis easy enough to be pleasant,
When life flows by like a song;
But the man worth while is the one who will smile
When everything goes dead wrong;
For the test of the heart is trouble,
And it always comes with the years,
But the smile that is worth the praise of the earth
Is the smile that comes through tears.

The Spirit of the Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON, AT OLD POINT COMFORT, VA.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] before the Jeffersonian Democratic Club, at Old Point Comfort, Va., on Saturday, May 4, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was delighted to be able to accept the invitation to speak to the Jeffersonian Democratic Club at this banquet. For one from the far West, the privilege of meeting with a group of Old Dominion Democrats is a distinct honor. I know there is no need for me to discuss the question of democracy with you. You in this State have a background of cherished traditions of which we in the West are, by the very force of circumstances, deprived. However, I do feel that it may be possible, since I come from so far away, for me to add something to this meeting by outlining the philosophy of the democracy of the far West. It may be that even you good folks in Virginia can find some profit in understanding our political background on the Pacific coast and why, in that area, there exists such substantial and enthusiastic support for the New Deal administration of President Roosevelt.

To us the spirit of the New Deal is the spirit of the pioneer. It is the spirit of the American pioneer. It is the spirit which refuses to accept those conditions which are wrong, just because they always have been wrong. Like the pioneer of old, the New Deal pushes on. It has the will and the determination to make conditions right.

It means courage; love of adventure; understanding of the needs of, and ambition for, the future of all our people; peace and amity with the nations of the world. The New Deal is the expression of the hopes and aspirations of the pioneer spirit in American life. May we not, then, with propriety characterize it with the name "pioneerism"?

We in the West are closer to our pioneers than are you of the East. When you want to know what your pioneers did, you look it up in a history book. We just go and ask ours. Our pioneerism is just a bit more realistic to us than it is to the people of sections of the country older than ours. The result is that we are not so easily frightened by new ideas as are some other people. You can't be touching shoulders daily with people who themselves or whose fathers and mothers carved out from the forests the great cities in my State and be much alarmed about the country being wrecked by the New Deal.

Those people were unafraid. They were determined that they would have economic security. They were not satisfied with a condition in which their children would be undernourished or ill-clad. They demanded proper housing facilities. They were not to be deterred in their program.

Those people were not without their critics. Some said they were restless. By some they were called shiftless. Others said they were foolhardy and irresponsible. For myself, I think they were upright, courageous Americans. Regardless of what may have been said at that time, we now know that they "had what it took" to build a great nation on a great continent.

The problems of this day are not dissimilar to those which confronted our pioneer forefathers. They take courage. They take determination. The goal of economic security is the same one the pioneers sought. Our task is to see to it that the New Deal has "what it takes" to save that Nation which they built.

I know that right here the doubters and the scoffers will rise up and say that these pioneers had no governmental assistance. They did not get P. W. A. grants. They had not C. C. C. boys to build their trails. There were not any W. P. A. jobs. They could not collect wheat checks or old-age pensions. That is absolutely true. But don't let anyone tell you that Government bounties were not being given in those days. The difference was that the real pioneers who grubbed and slaved and really developed the country got none of them. The railroads got their sections of land in each township to encourage their efforts. Vast tracts of timber lands were made available for spoilation by the timber operators. The mineral and oil resources were quickly acquired by a greedy few. A protective tariff system was maintained by which hidden taxes were removed from the pockets of everyone who labored in industry or agriculture. A system of financial control was fostered and protected which resulted in increased cost on everything which was purchased or sold. Government did not bother business in those days. It couldn't. Why? For the simple reason that business wouldn't let it. In those days, business ran the Government. There were bounties galore. But the people who worked, and who bought and consumed our products never got in on them. It is that very fact which has brought on the problems of the last 9 years.

I now hear you ask, Why has it taken so long? Why has this condition not come upon us before? Why did it happen in 1929 instead of 25 or 50 years before?

You have heard about the last frontier. You have read about it. You have seen pictures of it. I live there. In my State our west is the Pacific Ocean. When you get that far, you can't get any farther. So long as we had an undeveloped West—new lands, new resources, new opportunities—we had no cause to worry. We could permit concentration of wealth. We could permit speculation of our heritage. We could permit waste and erosion by wind and water, but we caught up with ourselves. We reached our last frontier. We on the Pacific coast know this just a little better than do others. It is more graphically before us day by day. We know that the time for rebuilding and repairing and replacing has come. That's another reason why we understand the New Deal.

As we look back today we realize that we were most prodigal, both of our resources and of our opportunities. We denuded our forests, we permitted wind and water to erode our fertile topsoil. We exploited our mineral and oil resources; we planted millions of acres to which the till should never have been laid. Then, almost 26 years ago, an event occurred which upset all the plans of which we or any other people had previously dreamed. A Europe-wide war was declared. Even then it seemed to us to be something separate and apart. Three thousand miles of ocean on one side and five thousand on the other created for us an isolation which would not permit us to be touched by the events of either Europe or Asia. It is true we enjoyed the profits which came to us from the sale of our agricultural and manufactured products to the belligerents.

Two and one-half years after that time, we found ourselves in the midst of the struggle. Even then we did not appreciate the extent to which we were involved. Except to those families to whom the war was brought in direct contact, our participation was largely a glorious adventure. Even with the termination of the war, we did not realize the extent to which we were a part of the world. The American people were tired of high idealism, we wanted to get back to normalcy and we proceeded to draw ourselves back into the shell of isolation.

Our leaders told us that prices in this country were too high, what we needed to do was to contract the currency. That was done, and in September 1921 we plunged abruptly into a minor depression. Millions of acres of land which we placed under cultivation in order to supply food for the belligerents were still kept under cultivation. Yet no one could understand why farm surpluses thus created resulted in depression of prices for farm products and lowered agricultural land values. Despite the fact that we had changed from a debtor nation to the extent of $2,000,000,000 on July 1, 1914, to a creditor nation to the extent of $22,000,000,000 on January 1, 1921, we still clung to our old tariff policy and raised the rates in the Tariff Act of that year. This resulted in twenty-nine nations raising their tariff walls against us. We had plenty of money, so we climbed over these raised tariff barriers by the simple procedure of loaning the people of those countries money with which to buy our goods. Most of the money has not been repaid. We kept our money circulating by the simple expedient of private P. W. A. projects in not only this country but in South American countries and other parts of the world.

We launched into a period of breathless prosperity by the creation of fictitious values at home through the medium of speculation in the security markets. Even with the collapse of 1929 there was no understanding upon the part of our people of the fact that the condition with which we were confronted was of a fundamental nature. Had we not pulled ourselves out of previous depressions? We completely forgot the fact that the method used in previous depressions was the extension of the frontier, and that we had not only reached our last frontier but that we had exploited and despoiled the resources within our boundaries. In my opinion, by and large, the American people did not appreciate the fundamental nature of our problems even with the advent of this administration and the New Deal. They were terrifically angry with those who had mismanaged affairs of business and government during the 12 preceding years. By and large, they felt that the President could wave a magic wand here and there, do a little tinkering with this and that, and we would all slip back into the comfortable days which preceded the war and live happily ever after. It is only since the depression of 2 years ago that there has come a realization that if democracy is to be maintained in this country, government must recognize its responsibility to afford some reasonable assurance of economic stability to the American people.

Today, for the first time, the ever-lengthening shadow of totalitarian states appears over the shoulder of the average American and has become to him a serious threat to the maintenance of the liberties which he enjoys. First, it was the dictatorship of proletariat in Communist Russia. Then came the advent of Fascist Italy. More recently came the dominance of national socialism in Germany and Austria. The methods of these forms of dictatorships have become known to us. We have come to recognize the subtle processes of the Communists and the more direct onslaught of the Fascists and the Nazis.

I said a few minutes ago that we came to take our liberties for granted. We have done more than that, we have completely misconstrued their purposes and objectives. Very largely we have looked upon such rights as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion as ends in themselves. We have thought that the right to make a speech or the right to print a paper, or the right to go to any church we may choose should satisfy our people. I do not believe that down through the ages men and women have fought and suffered to establish and maintain these rights simply as empty gestures in themselves. Mankind has always sought two goals—one of them, political liberty; the other, economic security. To my mind, the goals are correlated. Political liberty is revered for the reason that it makes possible economic security. Reasonable economic security must be maintained if political liberty is to be protected.

There are many people today who preach the doctrine that the democratic processes have been destroyed through the medium of gradual encroachment. History disproves this contention. No one will deny, however, that it was economic insecurity which resulted

in three outstanding dictatorships which today threaten democracies in the world. Futility has ever been the nemesis of democracy. Democratic processes are necessarily slow. It is only when they fail to function and fail to provide that economic security to which a people feel that they are entitled that the people of a country are willing to abandon the liberties guaranteed to them under democracy and turn to dictatorships. This was the condition in Russia, this was the condition in Italy, this was the condition in Germany. It was also the condition in Austria.

From the throats of these dictators come rumbling threats to democracy. We are told that democracy can't work. We are told the democracies must go. The institution democracy is sneered upon and spat upon.

What these other nations do is their own business. The people of these nations have the right to live under governments of their own choosing. We need not interfere with them. Our task is here at home.

Of all forms of government yet conceived, democracy furnishes the most useful agencies for fighting arbitrary and artificial mismanagement. What we must do is to protect and preserve democratic methods in America. No doubt we will be importuned again to spend our resources in a futile effort to correct conditions in Europe. What we must do is to preserve American democratic processes, to care for our own.

History shows that democracies have disappeared when they failed to care for their own. Never in the world's history has it been more necessary for democracy to work than it is for democracy to work here now. If we are to preserve that democracy we must first be sure that we have a lasting peace. May I, at this point, explain what I mean by a lasting peace?

Let me put it in this way. We all remember what England's Prime Minister, Chamberlain, said when he returned to England after sacrificing Czechoslovakia at Munich. These were his words, "We have preserved peace in our time." In England he was applauded for that statement. His phrase "in our time" turned out to be just about 11 months.

I will not be content with a "peace in our time" for the United States. I fully recognize my responsibility to maintain that sort of a peace for our people. I know that each of us in Government is responsible to the mothers and fathers of the young men of military age to see that their boys are not dragged off into war. I know how you mothers and fathers of such boys feel. It happened that in the last war I was right in that military age. I know how my own mother felt. But I am not content to assure that group of parents alone. I think we in Government have an equally serious responsibility to the parents of boys 10 to 15 years of age. I even venture to think of the mother and father listening to this speech who may before this night is over tiptoe in for a goodnight glance at an infant boy in his crib. I think we in Government have a responsibility to try to so conduct our Government that even they need not fear that that child will become the fodder for cannon when he comes to military age. I don't think we in Government can be content with any lesser responsibility. If we are, we are not faithful to our trust.

We will have no great task in attaining a Chamberlain's peace in our time. We can stay out of this war for the next 11 months, or even the next few years, without much difficulty. We can do that by simply sticking our heads in the sand and refusing to see or hear what is going on in the world around us. We can rely upon the protection of our two oceans. We can trust to the fact that the other nations are too busy in their own wars to bother with us. It will take no great statesmanship to preserve that sort of a peace in our time. But I am not content with that. America is entitled to peace during this whole next generation. Those of us in Government owe it to our people to strive to maintain it.

We hear so much today of the lesson we should learn from what happened between 1914 and 1917. I fully agree that that lesson should not be forgotten. The mistakes we made then must not be repeated. They took us into the last war. We must not let similar mistakes take us into this one.

What we must not forget, however, is that avoiding these mistakes will not suffice. By avoiding these mistakes we can preserve a Chamberlain peace in our time. The avoiding of these mistakes we owe to the parents of the boys who are now of military age. If you agree that we also owe a responsibility to the parents of the younger boys, then you must agree that we must go further than avoid the 1914–17 mistakes.

That responsibility requires that we avoid the mistakes made since November 11, 1918. People often wonder why the peace which followed the last World War was of such short duration. Statesmanship requires an analysis of the reasons behind the short tenure of that peace. Such analysis is essential to the lasting continuation of our own peace.

First, it must be conceded that the bases of that peace were unfair. The bases of that peace were punitive. You can't long maintain a peace that has as its purpose either the punishment or intimidation of a great race of people. That's why it is so important that our Government keep the record straight. That's why it is essential that our Government should protest every effort by any government to impose its will through either force or fear upon a weaker government. That is why it is important that we should preserve our economic stability in order that our voice might be heard when the belligerent nations sit around a peace conference at the termination of the present hostilities. If our peace is to last, the peace to which the belligerents agree must have as its basis the principles of fundamental fairness.

The second mistake that the nations made was the abandonment by most of them of the principles of simple, common honesty. The best standard by which to judge the honesty of nations as well as men is whether they keep their word. Broken promises, broken pledges, broken treaties, have contributed more to the present world disaster than has any other single factor. These breaches of faith have not been limited to any single nation or group of nations. I do not deprecate the importance of economic needs in the present situation. However, if the nations of the world had kept their word during the last quarter century many of these economic factors would not today exist. Had Germany and Russia believed that England and France would keep their promises to the smaller nations, they would never have dared to plunge the world into its present condition.

Our people hope when the present wars end to play some part in establishing a lasting peace. To my mind that hope will be barren unless we can enter into such a peace conference with a record clear of the taint of treaty breaking on our own part. The only leadership we want to give the world is moral leadership. We must have our own hands clean if we try it.

That is why I am so insistent that we should discontinue our present policy of violating our obligations under the Nine Power Pact by supplying war materials used by Japan to destroy the administrative and territorial integrity of China.

The third mistake has been the failure of peace-loving nations to prepare to protect themselves against the aggressions of nations which they should have known were bent upon a policy of aggression. Not only China, Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, and Norway have been the victims of their own unpreparedness. Even England and France today are suffering from that mistake. That is why I insist that we shall not permit ourselves to be similarly victimized.

It must not be forgotten that our responsibility for defense is not limited to the 48 States in the continental United States. Almost 120 years ago we assumed the responsibility of defense of the entire Western Hemisphere. That policy of over a century cannot be and will not be abandoned by our people.

America's international policy today must have as its foundation the recognition of these three policies:

First, the maintenance of fairness in our dealings with the other nations of the world.

Second, the eternal insistence that we at least will respect our international promises and obligations.

Third, that we will be as vigilant in our degree of preparedness as will allow us to protect ourselves from attacks from any source.

No one can lay down a guaranteed formula for lasting peace. The best that may be asked of anyone is that he does not repeat the mistakes which should already be evident to him. Certainly it should be apparent that we cannot ignore the world around us. While we may not like what is going on in the rest of the world, the fact is that we live in it. We could commit no greater blunder than to ignore it. There is nothing shorter lived than a fool's paradise. It will take more than a cool head to keep us at peace. We must keep our heads up and alert to maintain a lasting peace for our people. May I conclude by repeating that when I speak of peace, I mean peace even for that little boy child who is lying in his crib. Even he is relying on us.

Eleven-Point Program for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] at Columbus, Ohio, on May 4, 1940, and a summary of the address.

There being no objection, the address and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak to such a fine audience of Republicans in Ohio—a State to which we in Massachusetts are linked by so many historic ties. In fact, the first covered wagon to go into the Northwest Territory and settle at Marietta started a few miles from my home. My personal sense of pleasure in being here is also enhanced by my friendship with the men whom you have sent to represent you in Congress. I have had the pleasure of close association with your junior Senator, and am happy to be here to testify to his intelligence,

patriotism, and character. Since I have been interested in affairs in Washington I have never seen a man grasp the business of the Senate as quickly as he, or forge ahead as fast. May I also say that your Governor has many friends outside of Ohio, and that we all have great expectation for him in the future, as well as respect for what he is today.

As Republicans, we are, of course, interested first of all in our forthcoming national convention, to be held at Philadelphia next month, with the duty of choosing candidates and adopting principles which will gain the support of the American people and bring back honest and unselfish government to America. I shall not tonight go into personalities or attempt to make a choice from among the many excellent men who are candidates. I have thought it appropriate, however, to submit some recommendations for the Republican platform. I cannot, of course, expect all Republicans will agree with me. In a party as large as ours, differences of opinion are inevitable. I hope you will all agree, however, that it is useful to have principles submitted so that we may discuss them and eventually find broad foundations of agreement.

Point 1. I submit that our platform should contain a pledge for a balanced Budget, balanced with sound money, with control of the currency vested in Congress as provided in the Constitution. Of course, there is no thought of balancing it immediately, but it is perfectly possible to move in the direction of a balanced Budget instead of moving rapidly toward a financial precipice. There definitely are items which could be eliminated or reduced. Only the other day Congress in one of its rare moments of economy adopted a motion of mine to strike out an appropriation of $162,000 which was to be devoted to paying a group of so-called business experts who were to find out what caused the depression and who, in actual fact, were duplicating the work of others and were a real fifth wheel. You may say that $162,000 is not much; but it is something. If you do it often enough, you will really make some savings.

This leads me to the second point, that the Republican Party should stand for economy in governmental expenses without sacrificing any real needs of the people. This last cannot be overemphasized. Our opponents keep circulating the rumor that if the Republicans win, those who are now receiving relief will be cut off without a penny. Such rumors are entirely untrue and should deceive no one. There is not a single responsible Republican who does not state that if the Republicans obtain control of the Government that they would, of course, continue Federal financing of relief activities. Let that be understood once and for all. And let no party seek to obtain votes by frightening the underprivileged into believing that their welfare will be adversely affected by Republican victory.

We would, of course—and this brings me to my third point—change the system. We would make it work better. We would get a larger proportion of public funds into the hands of the man on relief. We would see to it that the taxpayer received more for his tax dollar. We would treat unemployment relief as a relief proposition and not as a political proposition. We would put an end to the present outrageous system whereby relief funds are allotted to the States and their subdivisions on the basis of the individual discretion—or let us say whim—of officials in Washington. We would see to it that these funds were allotted on the basis of a formula, scientific and humane, whereby each State received the amount of money to which its unemployment entitled it. Year after year now I have moved such an amendment to our relief bills so that the amount of money going into Ohio, we will say, would bear the same relation to the total amount of money appropriated as the unemployed in Ohio bore to the total number of unemployed in the Nation. No worth-while argument has ever been made against such a proposal. It has, however, always been defeated. To adopt such an amendment would unthrone the king-makers who now apportion funds and withhold funds in accordance with their personal preferences. I say we should have no king-makers in this country anyway, but certainly no king-makers who draw their power from the miserable pittance which is allotted to the needy.

In fact, this partiality in the allocation of relief funds is but one symptom of a disease which seems to be rampant at the present time. I refer to the mania for attempting to milk certain sections for the benefit of others. Only last year a strong effort was made by the party in power to allocate funds for old-age assistance, aid to dependent mothers, aid to the blind, and to handicapped individuals generally, on a basis which would have given larger amounts to those States where the "per capita income" was below the national average. I hope you will get that phrase "Per capita income." It is natural that in certain States where the climate is warm that the per capita income should be lower. Had this scheme gone into effect it would have constituted probably the greatest device for siphoning money from one group of States into another that has been devised in years. Of course, if a formula like that is permissible—if you can give money to States where the per capita income is low—then you should also give money to States where the cost of living is high. That was my final conclusion, and I offered an amendment to that effect. The result is that this proposition is now asleep, but it may wake up at any time.

Point 4. The Republican Party should certainly favor the awarding of Government jobs on the basis of merit and not through political influence. And when I say merit system I do not refer to a bill which would cover in for life a lot of political appointees. I mean a true merit system which means all that the word implies.

Point 5. As a great national party which is proud of the fact that men of many different races and creeds have molded its destiny, we should say further that we will never permit any consideration of race, creed, or color to prejudice any man or woman in our public service. The diversity of our racial stocks is our richness and our strength. Let us never forget that fact.

Point 6. It is well said that the welfare of us who work for a living is dependent, insofar as government is concerned, on two things: One, that we be protected against exploitation, and, two, that government allow an atmosphere to exist in which risk takers can have confidence in the future and thereby create new jobs, new wealth, and higher wages. The first involves a positive act on the part of government, either through child-labor laws, wage and hour laws, old-age-pension laws, etc., a field, by the way, in which Republicans have been leaders and in which States which have always been under Democratic rule have had the worst record. The second function is negative. It means that the Government should not do those things which discourage new enterprise.

For my sixth suggestion, therefore, I suggest that we express our opposition to Government competing in business with its own citizens; that we proclaim our faith in private enterprise and inventive genius and do everything possible to promote them; that, in short, we should at all times have policies which will create real work and real wages.

We must make it clear, as the seventh point, that this does not mean any laxity on our part in the prevention of exploitation. The two are not contradictory. We can favor a liberal old-age-pension policy within the limits of our financial capacity at the same time as we submit that a civilization in which people can save money to take care of themselves in their old age is a very desirable kind of civilization. We recognize the value, for example, of having young men enroll in the C. C. C. and our Army and Navy, but at the same time, my friends, if you have my experience, you know hundreds of boys and girls just coming out of school who want a real chance and a real job with a future which will enable them to lead happy and useful lives, and I tell you with all urgency that a wise answer to this question of opportunity for youth must be found if we are to avoid an answer which is destructive and unwise.

As an eighth suggestion I would submit the thought that all of these things can be accomplished within our constitutional framework of government—that these things do not require a superman or a superstate or a lot of personality boys or the activities of royalists—be they political or economic. Let us make a plea, therefore, for constitutional government—for democratic and not bureaucratic government—to the end that we may have government for the many and not for the few.

Point 9. My suggestions so far have been internal—looking inward into the problems which confront us at home. To be complete we also must look abroad. The moment we do so, the word "isolationist" raises its head, and to clear the air I ask: "What is an isolationist?" If an isolationist is someone who believes that it would be desirable to isolate the United States from the dangers of the outside world, then I suppose most of us would be isolationists. If, however, the word means someone who thinks that it is easy to isolate the United States from the outside world, and that we can do so simply by wanting to do so, then, of course, no one but a fool would be an isolationist. My efforts will be devoted to keeping the United States at peace and to save America first.

I submit that the party in power do not think that it would be desirable to isolate the United States from the dangers of the outside world. In fact, they seem to think that there is a positive advantage in developing foreign trade just because it is foreign. I asked witnesses for the administration when they came before the Finance Committee in support of the Reciprocal Trade Act why it was not better to sell a car to a man in Ohio than it was to sell a car to a man in Europe. The man in Ohio would be a customer for oil and gas and tires and parts, and would pay taxes in support of the roads. He would eat in American wayside lunch rooms. It seemed to me that it was not only just as good to sell automobiles in America—yes; it was even better.

I also pointed out that we have a wage and hour law in this country which aims to prevent the payment of sweatshop wages, and the working of people under slave conditions, and that no other country had laws like that. If we are to maintain our standards we simply cannot allow goods to come into this country which are made below those standards. The choice is perfectly clear. We can either compete, and reduce our wages and increase our hours to that of foreign workmen—and to this I am unalterably opposed—or else we can strive to maintain the high-wage rate which has been one of the most prideful things in our history, and retain our own American market for ourselves. And this proposition I hope the Republicans endorse.

The statement is made, of course, that these reciprocal-trade agreements promote peace. I suppose if you say anything often enough—no matter how absurd it may be—there will always be someone to believe you. Certainly the situation in Europe today is not a very striking endorsement of the peace-producing quality of our trade-agreement policy. Certainly there is nothing in history which shows that foreign trade promotes peace. In fact, almost all of the major wars in the history of the world were caused in greater or less degree by the friction arising out of foreign trade

and the bitter competition which it engenders. I asked Secretary Hull, for whom I have the highest personal respect and regard: "If it is true that free trade promotes peace, how is it that England, the greatest free-trade nation on earth, is always the first to get involved in every major war?" I have yet to receive an answer to this question. And so I say to you, as a ninth point, we may well stand for a tariff policy which will protect American labor and American industry, which turns its back resolutely on all of the old logrolling methods of the Smoot-Hawley Act (which the Democrats have never repealed), and which favors a scientific tariff-making procedure based on a protective philosophy.

Point 10. It is clear that we could isolate ourselves from the world, but that we have not done so. We could be almost self-sufficient and completely so if we were to confine our foreign trade simply to the countries north of the Amazon. But we have not done so. Our normal foreign trade is an important item in our economic life, and war-supported foreign trade is growing by leaps and bounds, with the active encouragement of the party in power. Even if we were self-sufficient, we should have to maintain an army and navy. At this stage in the world's history when every nation which refused to arm is being defeated, it is essential—and I suggest this as the tenth point—that we maintain an army and navy sufficiently large to be an effective aid in preserving peace for the United States. Our naval construction is well in hand. Our Army, however, has a shortage of equipment which is alarming. In spite of our tremendous resources in manpower our Regular Army of over 223,000 and our National Guard of over 250,000, we only have enough tanks, planes, machine guns, and field artillery for an army of 75,000 men—not enough to repel an invasion on our own shores at the present time. At this moment we do not possess a single military plane which embodies the lessons which have been learned from this current European war. These are matters which call for immediate correction.

Point 11. Let it be understood that we favor such an army and navy, as I said, as an effective aid in preserving peace for the United States and not with a view to using it in the near future to help some foreign country. We hear constantly the words of administration leaders that there is no thought of sending American soldiers to Europe. I wish they would add in the words "sailors, marines, and aviators." They never seem to mention them. I submit that we maintain an army and navy to fight for the United States, and that we should never draw the sword except in an American cause. This struggle, deeply as it engages our sympathies, and intimately as it involves all of us who have relatives in Europe, is not a struggle which threatens the safety of the average American. Of course, it offends our ideas of right and wrong. Of course, it runs counter to our ideas of government. It may be true that a spread of totalitarianism in Europe would cause an economic depression in this country, which, in its turn, it is alleged, might lead to totalitarianism over here. But if we relax our credit restrictions, repeal the Johnson Act, and give supplies to the Allies, are we not scuttling private enteprise in our own land? And if our democracy cannot withstand economic privation, is it not weak indeed? The Pilgrims who landed in Plymouth; the first settlers who left Ipswich, Mass., in 1787, and came to Ohio to found the Northwest Territory, established a democracy in the midst of privation. I do not believe that American democracy hangs on a slender thread of war-supported dividends.

Let us say in conclusion that it is American democracy in which I am interested, for which I would fight, and for which I would be willing to see my countrymen struggle. A struggle for any foreign cause, no matter how noble it may appear or how convincingly it may seem to affect our selfish interests, can only be destructive of American democracy in the end. I close on this note because it is the fundamental one at this time. Without peace, all of our internal reforms will melt like snow in the summer sun. With peace, all things are possible.

SUMMARY OF 11-POINT REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

1. A balanced Budget—balanced with sound money, with control of the currency vested in Congress as provided in the Constitution.
2. Economy in governmental expenditures without sacrificing the needs of the people.
3. Local control of unemployment relief, with Federal grants on the basis of greatest need, thus placing a larger proportion of public funds into the hands of the man on relief and giving the taxpayer more for his tax dollar.
4. Government jobs to be given on the basis of merit and not through political influence.
5. No consideration of race, creed, or color to prejudice anyone in public service.
6. No Government competition in business with its own citizens; renewed faith in private enterprise and inventive genius so that we may create real work and real wages.
7. Security for the aged and a real chance and a real job for those in early life who have been forgotten.
8. Constitutional government to the end that we may have government for the many and not for the few.
9. A tariff policy, scientifically devised, which will protect American labor and American industry. No return of the old logrolling methods.
10. An Army and Navy sufficiently large to be an effective aid in preserving peace for the United States.
11. No armed American intervention in Europe by American soldiers, sailors, aviators, or marines. No extension of credit. Keep out of war.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, OF DELAWARE, BEFORE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] before the American Forum of the Air on May 4, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since March 1933, I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate. I have there listened repeatedly to arguments urging that Government spending is the panacea for our economic ills. I have seen billions spent in an attempt to prove it, and I have seen that attempt fail. I have also seen our national debt tremendously increased by unnecessary expenditures.

My firm conviction from my experience as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee is that you cannot appropriate yourself out of a depression—you cannot spend your way, on Government borrowed money, into prosperity. I am also convinced that we can drastically cut governmental expenditures, and in time effect a balanced Budget.

In 1933, upon the plea that plenary powers were needed to resurrect the Nation from the depths of the depression, Congress granted to the President the greatest powers that this Nation has ever given to any one man.

Immediately, an unprecedented number of agencies was created, unprecedentedly large appropriations were demanded, and the spending spree was on.

From March 1933 to June 30, 1939, the programs which passed as "must" legislation caused an increase in the national debt from twenty-two billions to forty-two and one-half billions despite unusually high taxes.

Have you ever stopped to think how fast we have been spending in excess of our income?

Just think—in 8 New Deal years the excess of Government spending over revenues will exceed by five billions the excess for the 144½ fiscal years from 1789 to 1932. And the national debt of twenty-two and one-half billions after 144½ years, in 8 New Deal years will be nearly forty-five billions.

This debt equals $346 for every person in the United States.

In terms of tangible wealth the New Deal deficit is enough to buy the estimated tangible wealth of Maryland, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maine, Vermont, Washington, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, and my State of Delaware.

If all of the property in all of the States west of the Mississippi River could be sold today for its assessed value, the total amount realized would not pay off the national debt.

Bear in mind that while these deficits were mounting the New Deal advocated, obtained, and collected taxes equal to or in excess of the amounts produced during our most prosperous years, when the taxpayer was far more able to pay.

What has been accomplished by all this Government spending?

Throughout the 7 New Deal years there has been an average of ten and one-half million unemployed workers. Today there are still ten and one-third million.

Agricultural surpluses and low farm prices are still with us.

While the Government has expended large sums in connection with housing programs, private residential building has declined 60 percent. Private industries have expended $4,000,000,000 per year less on the construction of homes, factories, and other buildings than in the years prior to 1933.

Over 83,000 firms which survived the depression year of 1932 have failed for a total of nearly $2,000,000,000.

New capital investment has dropped from nearly four billions a year to less than half a billion.

Such are the results of the New Deal spending program.

We all will frankly admit that the Government must spend money. My plea is that too much money has been spent in nonproductive uses, unnecessarily, and that no recovery ever will result until governmental expenditures have been cut to the bone and limited to necessities.

In 1932, when the President was campaigning, he made a solemn promise to reduce the costs of Federal Government operations by 25 percent. At that time there were 570,000 Government employees

Instead of adhering to that promise the President has almost doubled the number of people on the Federal pay roll, for on January 1, 1940, there was an all-time high of over 987,000 employees.

When the reorganization bill of 1939 was being discussed it was said that the consolidation of various departments and agencies which would follow would be in the interests of economy. The bill became a law on July 1, 1939. The economy effected to January 1 of this year, after three such reorganizations, was the addition of more than 61,000 employees in a period of 6 months.

Not all of these new employees have by any means gone into the new agencies. Old-line departments have been so crowded with political job holders that they literally fall all over each other. They have titles, often so long and complex, particularly in the high-salaried brackets, that the officials can hardly pronounce their own titles.

Take, for example, the Department of Commerce. The Budget for the current fiscal year asks appropriations, in the office of the Secretary of Commerce alone, for the Secretary, an Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, Administrative Assistants to the Secretary, Assistants to the Administrative Assistants to the Secretary, confidential clerks, confidential assistants, and secretaries to them all—without end—all at very attractive salaries

The White House itself has not been at all neglected.

In 1933, when President Roosevelt took office, White House costs were $369,000. For the fiscal year 1941, the President has requested $3,500,000 for the White House—an increase of nearly 1,000 percent.

Here we have an excellent example of what happens, when the spenders run rampant and disregard the condition of the Federal Budget, recklessly spending money without regard to whether we have the money to spend.

Since 1934, we have squandered over $1,000,000,000 on foreign silver, at more than its value—silver which no other government wants. At the same time we have wasted hundreds of millions of the wealth produced by American farms, factories, and labor in paying $35 an ounce for gold.

Congress appropriates millions to increase agricultural production and then appropriates more millions for the purchase of surplus commodities. Then Congress appropriates again to take acres out of production. Finally, the tariff is lowered so that billions of dollars' worth of competitive farm products may be imported. Then another twist is given to this merry-go-round.

I am definitely not against giving assistance to farmers, that is, to family-sized farms. In 1937, about one-half of the 7,000,000 farmers participated in the soil-conservation program and received an average check of $75. However, to reach this average, 11 companies received payments of more than $100,000, 8 of which were insurance companies, one of which received nearly $260,000. Twelve other "farmers" received from $50,000 to $100,000; 272 farmers received more than $10,000.

In connection with the 1937 sugar program to benefit the farmer, there were 140 payments of over $10,000, 36 of which were way in excess of $100,000.

I repeat that, while I would help the farmer, I cannot condone the spending of borrowed money to make this sort of payment in the name of the "farmer."

There are only three ways to raise money to meet governmental expenditures. They are (1) by increasing the borrowing power, (2) by increasing taxes, or (3) by printing money.

Interest on the Federal debt this year will reach in excess of $1,000,000,000. We certainly need no debt increase. Inflation through the printing press is unthinkable. That leaves only taxation. But—there is a limit to the portion of private income which can be taken through taxation for Government purposes without causing a loss of jobs and a general lowering of living standards.

The road which we must travel is clear.

The problems which we have are not solved by the imposition of taxes which restrict and discourage private industry—by transferring their functions to the Government, and by giving to that Government a blank check on the resources of the Nation.

We must reduce Government spending.

We must reduce taxation.

We must encourage, through sound public policies, a resumption of private spending. We must stop giving our wealth to foreigners for things we do not need.

We know from experience that such a program will bring business expansion, increased pay rolls, and reemployment, as well as revenue to the Government.

Education for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY MORGENTHAU BEFORE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and instructive address delivered by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, before the National Institute of Government, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am particularly pleased to be able to talk to you today because I am in such hearty accord with the purpose of this series of meetings, which I understand to be education for democracy. I applaud the initiative and the public spirit of the leaders of the Woman's Division of the Democratic National Committee in making this notable convention possible.

In considering your invitation it seemed to me that I might contribute most to stimulation of your thought on the problems of democratic government by talking to you about the money of the United States, and particularly about gold. I have chosen this subject because I think it is one in which all of you are interested; and it is one about which you may be asked a good many questions as the year proceeds.

One thing you will hardly need to be told about our monetary system; that is, that the American dollar is the soundest unit of currency in the world. Its value is unquestioned here at home and it is not questioned anywhere else in the world. It is a solid rock of strength and stability amid all the monetary confusion created by aggression and war. It is more than a domestic currency; it has become in the last few years more and more an international currency. People throughout the world who are driven by disaster and fear to hoard currency prefer to hoard the currency of the United States, when they can get it.

We have tried through many means to facilitate stability in the currencies of the world. An outstanding example is the tripartite accord which we initiated in September 1936. In all, six of the leading democracies of the world have subscribed to the principles of that accord. Unfortunately, the progress we were making in the field of international finance and trade has been interrupted by the cataclysm in Europe.

One of the most striking developments of these recent years has been the universal confidence in the American dollar as one of the very few certain things in a highly uncertain world.

Some of our citizens who admit the strength of the dollar and the world's confidence in our currency now suggest that confidence in our dollar has resulted in this country receiving too much gold.

During the last 6 years we have acquired about $10,000,000,000 of gold from abroad.

Why has so much gold come to the United States?

In the first place, we have exported many billions of dollars' worth of goods and services in excess of the amounts we have imported. Secondly, large amounts of foreign funds have come to this country to be placed and kept on deposit with our banks. Foreigners have sent their funds here for safekeeping because of the peace, stability, and security which this country enjoys.

Thirdly, foreigners have made large investments in American industries because they regard American business as a safe and profitable investment. Finally, Americans have been withdrawing their funds from abroad and liquidating their foreign investments in large sums because they prefer the dollar to any other currency.

It is for these reasons that we have had so large a favorable balance of payments; it is for these reasons that gold has come and is continuing to come to the United States.

Gold moves from country to country not as a commodity but as a means of payment and the one final medium through which international settlements are made.

The continued acceptance of the gold that comes here is the only sound course of action open to us. There are, it is true, other courses of action theoretically possible, but they would all have disastrous consequences.

Take, for example, the proposal so frequently made to us that we stop buying gold. It has the charm of simplicity. All that we have to do is to issue an appropriate Treasury order. But let me tell you what I think would happen. Dollars abroad would instantly become very scarce and more costly, and the foreigner would find it much more expensive to buy American goods. For example, the British pound, the Canadian dollar, the French franc, the Dutch guilder would at once sharply depreciate. A chain of forces would be set in motion which would disrupt our trade, seriously discourage what remains of world commerce, and remove from world finance the strongest element of stability.

The cessation of gold purchases would have the following three immediate effects of great importance to us:

First, the sale of American products in foreign markets would be made much more difficult. This would not apply so much to war materials, which foreign countries want so urgently, but it would hit hard our export of hundreds of agricultural and industrial commodities not vital to the conduct of the war. We would lose heavily in the very markets we will badly need when the war is over.

Secondly, there would result an immediate flood of imports of cheapened foreign goods, which would deal an even more serious blow to labor, industry, and agriculture in America. The very items which compete with our domestic products would deluge our home markets. Meat and dairy products, textiles, and hundreds of other articles would at once be subjected to greatly intensified competition from abroad.

Thirdly, Americans who have investments abroad would find that they had suffered substantial dollar losses overnight just as foreigners with investments here would find that they had windfall gains overnight.

So you see this simple remedy is, in effect, a proposal that would completely disrupt our foreign exchanges and our trade, and greatly increase unemployment in this country. And so with the other naive proposals which some well-meaning citizens suggest as a remedy for our accumulating gold stocks.

Shall we follow their advice and cut the price for gold? A moderate cut would be ineffective, and a cut in price sufficiently large to have a significant effect on the gold inflow would introduce the same conditions as would follow prohibition of gold imports. This also would cause a serious decrease in our trade and a big increase in unemployment.

Shall we, as some have suggested, discriminate against certain countries in our purchases of gold? Such a policy would not even have the virtue of effectiveness. The active cooperation of practically the entire world would be required to prevent any one country's gold from entering the world's markets and reaching the United States. Obviously this would be impossible, even in normal times, let alone at a time such as this. Besides, the value of gold is proportionate to its unqualified use and acceptance as an international medium of exchange. To limit its acceptance would mean to reduce its usefulness.

There is yet another alternative which has always been open to us. Instead of taking gold we could have granted credit. Americans could again have accumulated huge unsettled claims abroad. We have had experience with that system—extensive experience—in the decade that ended with the economic collapse of 1929. It is doubtful that Americans would want to repeat that experience.

For the excess of goods we shipped and for the dollar credits we granted, we have taken gold in the last 6 years instead of promissory notes. The phrase "good as gold" still has real meaning in the world. I prefer the gold to pieces of foreign paper. I think most Americans agree with me.

Our gold policy is carefully adjusted to the realities of a complex world situation. There have been many glib suggestions for changing that policy. Examination of each of these suggestions has revealed, as in the examples I have mentioned, that in the effort to remedy fancied evils they would bring on real disaster.

Of course, should basic conditions alter, should we be confronted with new and unforeseen economic and political developments, the Government will necessarily take such action as will best protect American interests. It is to be prepared for such contingencies that the powers with respect to gold operations have been kept flexible. The Treasury is constantly observing, analyzing, and studying the course of events in their relation to monetary problems in which this country is interested. But nothing has yet appeared which would warrant any change in our gold policy.

There is only one sound way in which we can work to reduce the inflow of gold and to promote the return of at least a part of the wealth it represents to useful service in the lands from which it came. That way is to do everything in our power to contribute to the return of peace to the world and to encourage reconstruction and the restoration of normal trade. With the restoration of enduring peace and economic stability abroad the gold problem will solve itself. Our great export surplus will drop—not because we shall sell less abroad but because we shall buy more. Foreign capital will be gradually repatriated—not because we drive it out but because it is attracted home by the reemergence of security abroad. Our investors will once again invest their funds abroad—not because of the scarcity of opportunity at home but because of greatly enhanced opportunities for sound and profitable investments in other lands. And finally our tourists will spend hundreds of millions more in foreign countries.

These are the developments which will automatically and gradually direct the flow of gold away from the United States. These are the developments upon which we must concentrate. We must concentrate on the promotion of further recovery here and peace and security abroad not in order to correct the gold situation, but because prosperity, peace, and security are in themselves the supreme ends of governmental policy. That their attainment will also solve the world's gold problem is only a byproduct, but an important one.

I should like finally to turn to the question of the continued usefulness of the gold we have and the gold we are going to get. This is a matter that is troubling some people.

Let me reassure you once and for all. As long as there are independent nations, and as long as there is international trade in goods and services, so long will it be necessary to settle international balances. Gold is the international medium of exchange par excellence. Its acceptability is universal; its utility as international money survives changes in economic systems. It is used and needed just as much by the freest democracies as by the most rigid dictatorships—as much by capitalist economies as by socialist economies. It is the refined instrument of international exchange of goods and services, as well as an essential ingredient in the more complex international financial transactions—an instrument that has functioned without challenge for hundreds of years. Every foreign country wishes it had more of it; no foreign country likes to lose any of it; all countries accumulate it as soon as they can afford to do so. And the fact that some countries find it possible to conduct their international trade without gold does not mean that they prefer to do so any more than people reading by candlelight do so because they prefer candles to electricity.

Gold does not lose its value because some countries are forced to resort to clearing arrangements, barter, import controls, and other substitutes. All these substitutes are admittedly worse alternatives. They are methods of conducting trade and finance which will only be adopted when a country does not possess adequate gold holdings. Governments resort wholly to these substitute methods for keeping a country's balance of payments in equilibrium only during times of great and prolonged stress and instability, and only when for one reason or another they have been unable to prevent the loss of most of their gold holdings. All countries would like to have more gold, and the countries which have the least are, you will find, countries which are striving most to add to their gold holdings. They do so because they know that an adequate supply of gold promotes economic strength and furthers financial stability.

To be sure, if the political picture of the world should undergo a drastic change in the future, so that instead of 50 or 60 independent nations there should exist only 1 or 2 groups dominated by ruthless powers, then international trade and finance may assume the character of domestic trade. There would cease to be independent monetary systems, as there would cease to be independent foreign policies. Balances between countries would be settled as balances between our States are now settled—that is, by transfers of deposits. Under such circumstances it might well be that gold would no longer be needed. But under those circumstances life would be so different that the possible loss in the value of gold would, I am sure, be the least of our troubles.

Certain governments may boast of the day when independent democracies will disappear. I, for one, have no fears that such boasts can be made good. I am as confident that gold will continue to be used as the medium of international payments as I am that the majority of nations will succeed in maintaining their independence. With the return of peace and of normal economic and political relationships, the present barriers to the free flow of goods, capital, and services will be gradually lowered, and gold will inevitably play its indispensable role in making that result possible.

One word more—the exchange we made and are making in return for gold is a good bargain for us. It has enabled us to increase employment and recovery. It has made possible the utilization of labor, capital, machinery, and resources that would otherwise have been idle. We have expanded our exports and encouraged our domestic industry. And, moreover, we have at the same time acquired the safest physical asset in the world.

There are some sincere people who have been disturbed by stories that this country had a monetary policy that threatens to cause loss to the Nation. If you meet such people I hope you will reassure them. You may tell them that the greatest and richest country of the world has the best and soundest monetary system and that there is no reason to fear that it will not remain sound.

We can feel entirely comfortable in the possession of a supply of gold with which we can meet future demands on our monetary system without any shock to our economy. We can be prepared also to play the part we ought to play in the reconstruction of the world that must follow the senseless destruction of war.

Stephen Collins Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY AT BARDSTOWN, KY.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on Friday last, at My Old Kentucky Home, at Bardstown, Ky., the first Stephen Collins Foster stamp was issued. Upon that occasion a very brilliant address was delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is appropriate that the first sale of the Stephen Foster commemorative stamp be made in the great State of Kentucky, where love of home and home life, the two abiding themes of this composer, have meant so much in the lives of your citizens, many of whom have played a prominent part in the history of our country. Few places are more cherished than this Old Kentucky Home. And I am happy, indeed, that the appointments of my office bring me to Bardstown today.

Of all the poets and minstrels, none has done more than Stephen Foster to make us more simply, more universally aware of our deeper national emotions. His voice was the voice of the people.

His spirit was of the stars—to which we look for light. The name of Stephen Collins Foster is eminently suited to inaugurate and endow with approval this musicians' group in the series of stamps for famous Americans.

When a portion of mankind obviously hates and lies, it is well that we think more than ever of those who have loved and sought truth. Our musicians, perhaps more than any other class of men, have made us inwardly happy. "Let me make the songs of a people," said an eminent philosopher, "I care not who makes the laws." On the wings of song we range through the lexicon of life—birth, love, sorrow, happiness, hunger, death.

May I congratulate your city with its distinguished Federal Hill of Judge Rowan and its many memories devoted to Stephen Foster. May I extend my congratulations also to the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital, with its distinguished Federal Hill of another sort—which is today commemorating in a similar manner the distinguished composer and director, known to all the world, John Philip Sousa.

Words and testimonials sometimes fail us where one verse of a song will definitely carry the message. Perhaps that is what's needed to give us the picture today of the tragedy of Foster's altogether too-brief existence. I speak as one with a sense of reality of the magic which this "beautiful dreamer" wrought.

Stephen Foster is commemorated and loved, generations after his death, because he wrote of the elemental values of life: Of "folks," of good will to men, of home—which makes a brotherhood of all men. Everywhere he roamed, the "homesickness of living" affected him. And he translated it into music. For all of us, his thoughts, his hopes. his dreams about the Old Folks at Home, My Old Kentucky Home, Jeanie With the Light Brown Hair have become our thoughts, our hopes, and our dreams.

But—philosopher and poet—Stephen Foster was eminently a composer of music, a melody maker. At a time when Philadelphia was 26 days by stage from the Ohio Valley, he devised a melody that fell with welcome delight on the ears of both the westerner and the easterner. In a world of onrushing factories and a retreating frontier, he preserved the touch of the good earth, of the fields and rivers, and of man laboring with his hands. While music was still considered only a fit occupation for women and foreigners, Foster gave the forty-niners their theme song. Oh, Suzanna, will be forever associated with that dramatic westward migration, which came from Alabama as well as from every other State of the Union.

Foster's talent came from within. When he was 7 years old, Stevy once picked up a flute in a music shop. In a few minutes he was playing Hail, Columbia. From then on, music was his passion, his lifeblood. Fifteen minutes of improvisingat a piano, or spent strolling in the park whistling, meant the beginning of a great new song. In less than 20 years as an active composer, Foster wrote almost 200 heart-gripping melodies.

His subjects were similar. His music was primitive, plain. But his power lay in a few carefully chosen words, in a sentiment born of the melody itself. His tunes are charming. The best of them, the ones we whistle and hum and hear played, are endowed with an expression that is incomparable. They are the folklore of American music.

What Stephen Foster might have been in Robert Burns' bonnie hills! Or in Franz Schubert's graceful halls! But he was of the busy Ohio, of plaintive darkey voices in the moonlight, and of the joyous minstrel frolic. He was the son of a Pittsburgh merchant, born in a pleasant white cottage on July 4, 1826, the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Stephen carried the hereditary marks of that eventful date; he was impatient under the discipline of school. Although his teacher called him "the most perfect gentleman," the boy preferred the solitude of the forests and streams to the study of books and multiplication tables. He would rather whistle a few new bars, or warble his newest song to his companions. "Idle dreaming ways," his family concluded.

But the young dreamer, at least, was not idle. Even while still at school, his many songs pleased his audiences—if not the judges. He discovered his total inability to do bookkeeping. He got married. Fairly suddenly. The young lady of his choice, Jane McDowell, one evening accidentally invited both Stephen and another admirer to her home. When Stephen saw his rival, Richard Cowan, he turned his back upon the two and proceeded—strangely enough—to read a book. After Richard finally left, Jane didn't know with which of her young men she sympathized most. But Stephen, stern and pale, settled the issue. "And now, Miss Jane," he said, "I want your answer. Is it 'Yes'? Or is it 'No'?" Nineteen-year-old Jeanie, then and there, made up her mind.

Sensitive, dreamy, young Stephen Foster reveled in the southern river atmosphere. He delighted in the sketches of the E. P. Christy's widely known minstrels. And he decided to write "Ethiopian melodies" for these shows himself, freeing the minstrels from their crudities and lack of novelty. Louisiana Belle, Massa's in de Cold, Cold Ground, De Camptown Races, were among song after song which led him to fame.

The story of his discovery of the immortal Swanee River is well-known but bears repetition. For Old Folks at Home, Foster needed a two-syllable name of a southern river. Yazoo had been used before. Pedee didn't sound right. But there was a little river down in Florida that might do: The Swanee. That's how Way Down Upon de Swanee River was born.

That song sold hundreds of thousands of copies and made his publishers rich. Others—Old Dog Tray, and Old Black Joe—were almost as popular. But Stephen Foster was naturally not a good businessman; his song writing was not financially profitable. For Oh, Suzanna, he was glad to take two $50 bills. Later, the successes became further and further apart. From July 1860, when he went to New York, the composer wrote without resting. But, somehow, the old spark was almost extinguished. The years seemed to be invading his talent, leaving him only a remnant that grew smaller and more barren.

Much has been said about those last years of Foster's life. Perhaps too much has been said. We do not know, even now, all of the facts. Certainly his life had never been a contented one. He was too much the brooding artist to be a happy individual. Stephen Foster paid a high price for his emotional temperament. But the whole world is enriched because of that same temperament.

Let us rather remember the earlier Foster, the remarkable genius known and loved the world over. Kind, polished, with a sympathetic low baritone voice, he was a popular figure in his wide circle of friends. And his large, dark eyes and pensive countenance—which this stamp shows so well—his graceful features and well-proportioned slenderness made up for his lack of height.

Nor was he wanting in courage. He was always ready to give a hand to another. Out walking once with his niece, he overheard two hangers-on make an insulting remark. Leaving her in a nearby drug store, Stephen proceeded to beat up the two men. Then he walked to the nearest police station, paid his fine for disorderly conduct, returned for his niece, and, perhaps, a strong lemonade.

Foster's tastes and wants were simple. He loved nature, liking nothing better than to go picking wild strawberries in the fields. He loved his fellow beings, especially the company of cultured people. Above all, he loved the universe of music, listening to as much of it as he could, and composing anywhere and everywhere. The legend of his writing many songs on a piece of brown wrapping paper, if not true, is symbolic.

We have not forgotten the man who brings the happiness of a child to so many of us. His native city of Pittsburgh honors him with numerous monuments. Fargo, Ga., the source of the S(u)wanee River, also commemorates him. Along the picturesque banks of the famed Swanee, near Lake City, Fla., there is an interesting shrine to Foster. And the beautiful, unique, and nearly complete collection of Foster's songs, letters, manuscripts, and other data in Foster Hall, Indianapolis, was recently presented to the University of Pittsburgh by its founder, Josiah Kirby Lilly. Here, in Bardstown, old Judge Rowan's mansion is a museum known far and wide.

All the world over, the songs of Stephen Foster—more eloquent testimony even than these memorials—are on the lips of millions. A graphic motion picture and, recently, a national radio program were devoted to the story of his life. From neighboring Tennessee, a group of Lincoln Memorial University players has been touring the South over a period of years with a play called "O Stephy Foster." I am sure that this commemorative stamp issue will contribute its part to the universal admiration in which he is held.

Stephen Foster touched life, and it burst into song. He sang what he felt in his heart, and it has become immortal. He felt the inner humor, the charm, the tragedy of human life as have few others. To the last, his fellow men were "Dear friends and gentle hearts."

Perhaps his was not a great life—as we measure great lives—but his accomplishment was distinctively harmonious and great. No thought of ours can efface the memory, the beauty of a man:

"Whose heart sang the simple joys of a world and broke in sorrow upon his last note."

In closing, I have the honor to dedicate this stamp to the refreshing memory of that unexcelled and distinguished composer of folk melodies, one of America's greatest—the troubadour of the Ohio Valley—Stephen Collins Foster.

What Is the Matter With America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK GANNETT AT LAWRENCE, KANS.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, last Thursday, May 2, Mr. Frank Gannett delivered at Lawrence, Kans., a very fine address on the farm problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recovery was the first—and soonest forgotten—promise of the New Deal. The President asked for such power as endangers constitutional government, and more money than any ruler in the world has ever had to spend in peacetime.

But instead of substantial and sustained recovery we have had low income for agriculture, unemployment for industry, deflation and liquidation, staggering taxes, huge Government debt, discouragement, and lowered living standards for everybody. The ground has been plowed and harrowed and a perfect seedbed prepared for destructive inflation. Seeds of the Russian thistle of communism have been planted there, too.

Whether the result has been reached by ignorance or by design, the responsibility is the same. The new dealers sidetracked recovery when it was most needed. Some of them were, from the outset, frankly in favor of a "planned economy." That is the polite parlor name for national socialism. It is a system where the politicians in control of the state decide and the people do what they are told.

Agriculture, the new dealers said, couldn't be regimented if prices went to profitable levels. Industry couldn't be subjected to N. R. A. codes and price fixing if business became profitable. So the brakes were put on recovery after the first hundred days of the New Deal.

And every time the engine of private enterprise picked up, the brakes were put on again. In the spring of 1937, when farm prices were just getting into line with industrial prices, the President said commodities were too high. The country knew he was in control of the machinery of banking and credit and that he had the power to inaugurate a policy of severe deflation. His threatening announcement drove markets into a tailspin and the country into the second phase of a needlessly prolonged depression.

Measured in dollars, what has the failure of New Deal policies cost Kansas? Every year the farmers of Kansas receive $180,000,000 a year less for their crops. During the 6 years before the depression farm income in Kansas averaged $450,000,000; now only $270,000,000 after the benefit payments have been added to the prices received.

What does it mean to the farmers of Kansas and to the businessmen from whom they buy to have $180,000,000 a year, one-half million dollars every day, subtracted from the farmers' income? Since 1933 this loss adds up to one and one-fourth billion dollars for the State of Kansas alone. This means that every one of the 175,000 farms in this State has suffered an average total loss in gross income of $7,200 under the New Deal compared with its normal income before the depression.

Farmers everywhere suffered from depressed prices. The total loss of income and buying power by farmers during the last 10 years has amounted to $38,000,000,000. Think of it. A loss by one group of almost as much as our total national debt. And that tells only part of the story. You in Kansas know that your producers of petroleum, coal, lead, zinc, and other basic raw materials also have suffered just as farmers have from low prices. All raw-material producers in the Nation have had a heavy toll taken from them. The total deficit from depressed prices of all American farmers and producers of basic commodities has amounted to $54,000,000,000 in the last decade.

Fifty-four billion dollars of destroyed purchasing power. That figure should be repeated again and again. When farmers' and basic producers' prices melted, they could not buy from city industries, and Nation-wide unemployment is the result.

Farmers and producers of other raw materials comprise 55,000,000 of our population. The price tag on their products as they move to market is the base of the Nation's entire income. During the twenties this averaged $17,000,000,000, and the national income was about $85,000,000,000. When basic producers' income fell to $8,000,000,000, national income dropped to forty billions.

If we want recovery that will cure the ills of our private-enterprise system, we must restore farmers' and basic producers' income to normal. Only then can we have the national income of $90,000,000,000 or more that our productive system should yield.

When these facts are seen in true perspective, city people as well as farm people will understand what's wrong. They will understand that the way to recovery is to retrace the road that led into depression. And recovery must come soon if we want to cure the ills of our private-enterprise system and not kill the system.

"But," says the man in the city, "I, too, am suffering from lowered income. The depression hit me just as hard. Why should I be taxed to help out the other fellow?"

The city person with that point of view needs enlightenment. He needs, in his own self-interest, to look in the right end of the telescope.

The depression and unemployment problems of our cities started on the farms, in the mines, and forests, back where the food came from for the city man's table, the fiber for his clothing, the fuel for his heat and power, the lumber and metals for his house and workshop. Our depression started among the raw-material producers. The price tag on all these products melted, not only in the United States but all over the world. And there will be no understanding of the cause of depression and no intelligent approach to recovery until this sequence of events is taken into account.

The cycle of deflation and bankruptcy was set in motion by a world-wide collapse in commodity prices. Buying power dried up in the rural communities where people depend for their living on farming, mining, quarrying, oil production, lumbering. When commodity prices fell below the cost of production, country buying slowed down. Then the cities began to suffer, and not before. Wage reductions and industrial unemployment followed and resulted from the commodity-price collapse.

Let us look at the typical United States farm. It represents an investment of $10,000, has one and two-thirds gainfully employed workers besides the unpaid labor of women and children. After deducting unavoidable expenses such as taxes, fertilizers, interest, machinery, and counting nothing as a return on the capital, nothing for management, the average farmer and his hired man have had $1.40 per day in cash and 46 cents in food produced and consumed on the farm.

How can the farmer be a good market for city products with a cash income of only $1.40 a day? How can businessmen and stockholders in the city fairly ask him to be their voting ally to preserve our system of free enterprise if it gives him so little for his labor, even when no return is allowed for his capital investment?

The farm problem is the city's problem. The sooner that is understood the sooner unintelligent attacks on farm relief will cease. And the sooner we shall have intelligent cooperation of industry, finance, and labor, together with agriculture, to find the way out of depression for all groups. For not one of them can prosper permanently unless all are permitted to exchange their goods and services at a fair level of prices.

Under our constitutional system of free enterprise, everyone should strive to give the most for the least in free markets. There is no purchasing power but goods and services produced by one group in exchange for desired goods and services produced by others. The price tag on commodities, manufactured goods, wages, salaries must be in balance so that every producer can buy his fair share of the other's goods. If any one group charges too much, competition must bring it down. What the Nation has been suffering from during the past 10 years is an uncorrected price disease that is holding down the price tag on the products of farmers and other producers of raw materials. Until we correct this, they cannot buy in full volume, nor can they dispense with relief from the Federal Treasury.

City labor should see this, for it is a fact that pay rolls go up or down in step with farm income. When farm income, before the depression, averaged $12,000,000,000 a year, industrial pay rolls were around twelve billions. When farm income dropped to five billions, pay rolls fell to five billions. Industry should see this, because the volume of industrial production goes up and down with agricultural income.

Restoration of fair prices for farm products and other basic commodities will bring recovery to the cities. Our farms and rural communities will again be able to buy in normal volume from industry. There will be a tremendous farm market for radios and bathtubs, telephones and vacuum cleaners, books and magazines and machinery and building materials. Make the commodity-producing half of our population prosperous, and all will be prosperous—all who are willing and able to work.

The can't-works will be generously cared for. That was always the American way. And the won't-works? Their number would diminish if we had a Government that wasn't interested in their votes.

Now, the problem of recovery has other aspects. One is security and freedom for private enterprise, free from the stifling control of government. Private enterprise with all its blessings is the child of liberty. Only when our Constitution was set up did private enterprise get its charter of liberty. Never before were men starting business or making inventions protected as they were under our written Constitution and our Bill of Rights. Our forefathers substituted the security of law for the caprice of personal government. They set up barriers—which we thought permanent—against government by men. And our private-enterprise system, giving free rein to initiative and reward to thrift, created in 150 years more well-being than any people had ever known. The men who set up this system were the greatest liberals of history. We, who fight to preserve what they created, are the liberals of today. The reactionaries of our time are those who are trying to destroy it.

But, the exchange of goods and services in high volume under free enterprise depends upon a properly functioning price system. The most that government should do is to establish stable standards and fair rules. The Government set up by our forefathers was never to act as a player—no; not as quarterback—in the competitive game of producing and exchanging goods and services. Government's job was to be a fair umpire.

Something happened during and after the World War that upset price relationships everywhere between the basic producers and the industrial populations. It was not overproduction. It was underconsumption due to faulty distribution. I call it a price disease. Another name for it is depression. It started to sweep like a plague through all capitalistic countries.

Many nations set up a quarantine to keep the price disease from getting within their borders. In each case they acted under economic advice from London to adjust the local price tags on commodities, not by governmental price fixing, but by adjustment of their foreign exchanges.

Germany let the price disease run its course. Result, national socialism under a dictator.

France struggled with the same price disease, and communism nearly got the upper hand.

The United States believed it was immune.

Great Britain based its program for recovery on studies of the Macmillan Commission, appointed by the British Treasury in the autumn of 1930.

The British Government was the only one that made any investigation of the cause of the depression. In its report to Parliament in June 1931, the Macmillan Commission said:

"The problems thus raised transcend in importance any others of our time and generation, and we have regarded it as our main task to expound their significance and bring forward suggestions for their solution."

The policies recommended by the Macmillan Commission were carried into effect by the British Empire Economic Conference in Ottawa in the summer of 1932 and were extended to the so-called "sterling bloc" of 22 nations. The Ottawa Conference was under the leadership of Neville Chamberlain, then Chancelor of the Exchequer, now Prime Minister.

England, the wisest banking nation in the world, recognized that the price depression had its origin in monetary forces and not in overproduction. It made restoration of farm prices its primary objective. Let me quote from the official reports:

"A rise throughout the world in the general level of wholesale prices is in the highest degree desirable." * * * "The governments of the British Commonwealth should persist by all means in their power, whether monetary or economic, within the limits of scund finance in the policy of furthering the rise in wholesale prices." * * * "A rise in the general level of commodity prices in various countries to a height more in keeping with the level of costs * * * with a view to avoiding, so far as may be found practicable, wide fluctuations in the purchasing power of standards of value."

Instead of recognizing the realities of the problem, as the British did, the New Deal brain trust grappled with the problem on the false basis that has destroyed the export power of American agriculture, that has killed production with scarcity policies, reduced freight for our railroads, and generally made the Nation poorer. You can't give people abundance by producing less.

Every effort of the British and associated governments, on the other hand, was directed toward raising the price level of basic commodity producers toward parity with the prices of industry and the wage rates of labor. The British Government knew that industrial prices and wages could not be scaled down to the level of commodity prices. The voice of inexperience still suggests trying it.

The United States needs a similar open-minded approach to economic realities. It needs to face the commodity price problem of its depressed farmers and its oil and coal and metal and lumber producers. It must face this problem with knowledge of the protective measures that have worked in other countries.

This is what the Roosevelt administration has refused to do. It ran away from the facts. When a committee of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce made a semi-official investigation in 1935 and 1936, President Roosevelt suppressed its report. He didn't want public discussion of the methods which the 22 sterling nations, following Britain's leadership, had used successfully to turn depression into recovery.

That suppressed report recommended a permanent monetary policy for the United States along lines endorsed unanimously by the great national farm organizations—the Grange, the American Farm Bureau, and the National Cooperative Council. It advised returning to Congress the constitutional function of regulating the value of money and of foreign exchange. It recommended the creation by Congress of a monetary authority with powers such as Britain was using successfully to restore economic balance between commodity producers and other groups. It pointed to the partnership of prosperity, with balanced budgets and little unemployment, which the sterling nations enjoyed while the United States was floundering in deficits, unemployment, and depression.

Why did President Roosevelt prefer not to follow the tested and successful road that brought recovery and balanced budgets to 22 nations with 600,000,000 people? Was it because he wanted to gather still more powers and to keep in his own hands the monetary powers Congress abdicated to him in 1933?

New dangers have arisen now. Another world war has again upset price relationships. True, there is a greater demand for commodities and some prices are rising. But that is only temporary. Meanwhile, Britain and France are adjusting their foreign-exchange rates to their own advantage. I am not criticizing them for doing so. But I do insist that the United States should have a monetary policy of its own, and it should be fitted to the needs of our own people.

Why should we hold our farmers in a strait jacket of price disadvantage against a $3.50 pound or Canadian dollars at 80 or 85 cents? Selling wheat, lard, wool, and cotton at the world price, our farmers receive 80 cents, where the Canadian farmer, in his currency, receives a dollar, and the eight principal sterling nations the equivalent, in their own respective currencies, of $1.23 for the same products. We are under no obligation to allow our farmers to remain with depressed prices so that they must depend upon war exports and lopsided recovery built on armament and war.

Our problem is to cure the price disease in our distributive system to keep Americans consuming to the fullest possible extent the goods and services that Americans can produce. We have the factories, the technical equipment, the willing workers, the productive power of farmers and miners to produce $105,000,000,000 of annual national income. This would mean $1 a day more for every gainfully employed worker; $666 more per year for every farm; $9,000,000,000 more for interest, dividends, and taxes; and still leave $10,000,000,000, or $1,000 a year of wealth production for each of the 10,000,000 now unemployed.

After this world war there will be economic readjustments as far reaching as those which followed the last war. Unless we are prepared to adjust ourselves to those changes, a worse depression will be in store. And a worse depression would end in inflation and the death of private enterprise.

Great Britain and associated nations are adjusting their exchanges to keep their farmers and basic producers solvent. We remain disadvantaged because we have no mechanism for automatic adjustment. We leave it, under the New Deal, to the whim or judgment of one man, the President, to do with our money and our price level whatever he pleases.

The constitutional power of Congress to regulate the value of money and of foreign exchange doesn't belong to the Presidency and should never be lodged there. It should be recovered by Congress and administered through a monetary authority under a strict mandate to provide a stable and honest dollar. This has been all during the New Deal the unanimous request of the farm organizations. The administration has persisted in ignoring their petitions while dealing out part-way relief to agriculture.

Speaking from agricultural America, I wish I could make all city people understand that the farmer doesn't want a "hand-out." He has accepted relief from the New Deal because it was the only approach offered to economic justice. One billion dollars for farm relief is a poor substitute for an annual loss of four billions. The problem of farm parity can't be solved by the new dealers' formula. The price disease must be attacked with a knowledge of its economic cause and a readiness at least to investigate the cure which other nations have applied successfully.

The monetary and economic measures adopted by Britain and 21 other nations of the "sterling bloc" were so successful that reemployment, high building activity, and generally balanced budgets resulted.

What is most important to farmers is a fair price for what they grow—a restoration of their missing $4,000,000,000 of annual income and buying power.

If New Deal policies continue to keep the American private-enterprise system on a dead center, with the income of the commodity-producing half of our people so low that they cannot buy the goods and services of industry, you will see national socialism as complete in America as it is in Germany and Russia. We must save agriculture to save America.

The New Deal, unless it is stopped, will finish breaking down State lines and State sovereignty. You know it in the West because Washington has seized control of your water resources. You know it in Kansas because your able Republican Governor Ratner is resisting the Federal Government's attempt to seize all of the petroleum industry.

Unless the New Deal is stopped, it will wrest supervision of life insurance from the States and eventually make insurance a Federal Government monopoly. It will make medicine a Government monopoly. It will extend price-fixing from coal to everything you buy. Private enterprise, initiative, self-reliance, thrift, independence, will all go by the Board, as they have gone in Europe when economic distress is not relieved.

The record is plain. Behind the New Deal are influences working to change our social order and our form of government. We have let them experiment and conspire too long for our comfort. But not too long for action.

We still have the ballot box. We still have a means of redress—if we will use it before it is too late. It is already too late in Germany and Russia and in a large part of the world.

We can lift up our spirits. We can throw out the whole New Deal crowd—if we bestir ourselves.

We can substitute business experience for experimental philosophy.

We can stop raising taxes. We can lower them, and stop crazy spending.

We can reverse the process of executive dictation of tariffs, and protect our home market. Whatever else may be said about the trade treaties, they are greatly harming agriculture, already our most distressed economic group.

We can continue all desirable aids to agriculture while taking the steps which other nations have used successfully to give basic producers profitable prices.

We can adopt a helpful, friendly attitude toward all honest business. We can stop promoting hate.

We can give kindly care to the unfortunate and stop coddling those who won't work. We can revive the virtues of thrift and self-reliance.

We can bring about the one reform that America most needs; that is recovery, with reemployment, and prosperity, and opportunity for youth.

If you believe in private enterprise and want constitutional government for yourself and your children, this is the year to do your whole duty as a citizen.

Go to the delegates and to the national committee men and women of the Republican Party. Tell them that agricultural recovery has been too long delayed; that this year they must work with representatives of agriculture and raw material producing States to formulate a platform that will restore agriculture to its rightful place and make farmers our voting allies for victory in November.

My call to farmers is—Use your political power to put through the program of restoring farm prices upon which the great national farm organizations, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the National Cooperative Council, have united. Tell your local political leaders and the delegate who speaks for you in the Republican convention that you will work and vote only for candidates and a platform that will give agriculture restored prices and its just income. Use your political power. Save agriculture to save America!

Report of Republican Program Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM A. H. PACKARD

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, Mr. A. H. Packard, president of the Vermont State Farm Bureau, addressed to Mr. Glenn Frank, chairman of the National Republican Program Committee, a letter which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT STATE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Burlington, Vt.

GLENN FRANK,
Chairman, National Republican Program Committee,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. FRANK: I have been studying the report of the Republican program committee on money and banking which was submitted to the Republican National Committee on February 16, 1940, and I notice that this committee recommends a return to a fixed gold standard, and yet I understand in other sections of the Republican committee's report they urge that normal purchasing power be restored to agriculture.

It is very hard for many of us up here in the Northeast to understand how you plan to have both agricultural prosperity and a fixed gold standard. We have had a fixed gold standard most of the time for the past 100 years, and during this time we have had two major depressions. We are in the midst of the second great depression today. It is taking away from the farmers of America the ownership of their farms much faster than many realize.

Today, out of the 6,000,000 farms of America, there are two and one-half million tenant farmers, and on the three and one-half million farms, to which the farmers still hold title, there is a mortgage debt of over seven billion. When you take away from the farmers of this Nation the ownership of their land, you have taken away the initiative, the courage, and the industry that made America great.

While we were still on the gold standard, farm income dropped from the 1924-29 average of $12 billions to $9.5 billions in 1930; to $7 billions in 1931; to $5.3 billions in 1932.

The most effective thing that has been done since 1930, as I see it, to help a mortgaged farmer to hold on was the revaluation of gold in 1933. The President, by authority of the Thomas amendment, raised the price of gold 69 percent, and this in turn raised the basic commodity level about 67 percent. While the cost of living increased only 3 percent. In 1933, after we had abandoned the fixed weight of gold in our dollar, for 100 days we had such recovery as had never taken place in a like period of time in the Nation's history. Three and one-half million men and women went back to work. Ten million stockholders saw their investments increase almost $20,000,000,000 in value. Business activity increased 53 percent.

This would have proved a God-send to agriculture and America, had not several bills passed like the N. R. A. which widened the price disparity between agricultural prices and sticky prices, including debts.

Your committee appears to be worried over the "threat of inflation," but they do not appear to be worried over the rigidity of salaries and other fixed costs that have been with us for 20 years. This group must, in some way, learn that World War No. 1 is over and we, in agriculture, want to meet them on an exchange basis that will permit the free exchange of goods and services.

Today we are trying to carry on with United States farm prices at an index of 99, while in 1915 they were 98. The index of our cost of living today is 141—in 1915 it was 102—and the cost of distribution of food is 168 while in 1915 it was 106. I wish to respectfully say to you that this Nation cannot go forward while this price disparity exists.

I wish further to say that since our civilization is too complex for barter, that our unit of value—our dollar—has to be the common denominator for price relation as between goods and services. There are millions of men and women who are receiving the same salary or a larger salary than they received 10 years ago or 20 years ago. At the same time the farmers of the United States, instead of receiving the same number of dollars, or more than they got 10 or 20 years ago for their commodities, are receiving about two-thirds as many dollars.

Now, if the salaried or sticky-price group wishes to continue on their present price level and we wish our dollar to function as a common denominator so that agriculture, industry, and labor can freely exchange goods and services, we will have to change the gold content of our dollar from time to time according to supply-and-demand conditions for gold. At the present time we need smaller dollars to restore purchasing power to our primary producers. With price equilibrium, surpluses would disappear.

Those who have saved money for declining years should not expect years of bargains at the expense of young men and women who are trying today to find jobs. If their dollar would buy two pounds of butter when they stored their money, they must not expect that when they draw it out it must buy three.

Up here in Vermont many people in and out of farm organization believe our monetary program is most important. We feel that if the men who shape the platform for the major parties had faced a farm mortgage for the past 10 years, that they would not be asking for a return to a fixed gold standard, and I assure you, that many of these debtors are our finest citizens. In closing, please read the joint resolution passed by the Vermont Legislature last session and signed by Governor Aiken March 2, 1939, as follows:

"Mr. Walker, for the committee on agriculture, offered the following joint resolution:

"J. R. H. 26. Joint resolution relating to investigation of monetary system of the United States:

"Whereas it is very apparent to the residents of the State of Vermont, and particularly to the producers of primary products, that there is a grave disparity between prices received by primary producers for their products produced in Vermont and the fixed charges which are attendant upon the producers; and

"Whereas our natural instinct tells us that something is wrong with the present monetary situation in this country; and

"Whereas article 1, section 8, clause 5 of the United States Constitution gives exclusive power to the Federal Government to provide a currency for all the States, to coin money and regulate the value thereof: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives,* That it is the opinion of this legislature that there should be an immediate and thorough study by the Congress of the United States, through a special committee, of the reason for the grave disparity that now exists in all parts of the country between prices to primary producers and the fixed charges that are attendant upon them; to investigate carefully the monetary system of this country with the view of correcting evils that are now apparent and with a view of bringing to this country a better monetary system and to report their findings at an early date to the Congress of the United States for proper action."

The major national farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Council—have united in asking of Congress the establishment of a managed currency system to replace the gold standard, which has brought disaster to American agriculture.

Other nations—Argentina, Australia, and Brazil—took defensive measures in 1929 and 1930 in time to save their farmers from the worst of the depression. Eight of these countries of the sterling bloc, large agricultural producers with which our farmers must compete in world markets, receive today, on the average, when selling their identical products in world markets for identical quantities of gold, 54 percent more in their respective currencies than American farmers receive in dollars.

Many farmers are asking themselves whether the program committee's recommendation for return to a fixed gold standard foreshadows a refusal on the part of the Republican Party to cooperate in restoring farm prices by revaluation or managed currency, the only methods that have proved effective in our own experience or that of other nations.

Very truly yours,

VERMONT STATE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
A. H. PACKARD, *President.*

A Foundation for a Political Platform for Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES BY WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, within the next 2 months or so the national party platforms will be adopted. It would be a great blessing for America if every citizen who

will be represented in those conventions could read the declaration of principles set forth by Wendell Willkie, and insist upon its consideration. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Willkie's petition be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Fortune for April 1940]

Before the political platforms are written, we, the people, have a declaration and a petition to make.

In the decade beginning 1930 you have told us that our day is finished, that we can grow no more, and that the future cannot be the equal of the past. But we, the people, do not believe this, and we say to you: Give up this vested interest that you have in depression, open your eyes to the future, help us to build a New World.

In this decade you have separated "business" and "industry" from the ordinary lives of the people and have applied against them a philosophy of hate and mistrust, but we, the people, say: Business and industry are part of our daily lives; in hurting them you hurt us. Therefore abandon this attitude of hate and set our enterprises free.

In this decade you have undertaken vast new obligations, which we support. But because you have not applied to these obligations the ordinary standards of business judgment, you have lost our money by the billions and we, the people, say: Give us a business-like administration that will act as the steward of our prosperity; that will insure the social progress that is now threatened; and that will manage our affairs at least as intelligently as we manage our own enterprises.

In this decade, under the banners of reform, you have usurped our sovereign power by curtailing the Bill of Rights, by short-circuiting the States, and by placing in the hands of a few men in executive commissions all the powers requisite to tyranny; and we, the people, say to you: We do not want monopolistic government, any more than we want monopolistic industry. Give us back the powers that our forefathers declared to be ours; liberate us to govern ourselves by law.

Because you have concealed from us the amount of our real taxes, and because you have hidden from us the real nature of our expenditures, you have specifically usurped our power over the public moneys, and we, the people, say: Give us as much information concerning our Government as we expect to get concerning our own enterprises, so that we may control the vast sums that it has become necessary to spend.

You—the politicians of both parties—have muddled our foreign affairs with politics, with vague threats and furtive approvals, with wild fears and inconsistent acts; and we, the people, say: Give us a foreign policy that we can trust and upon which we can build toward the future. We are against aggressors, we are for foreign trade, and we recognize that our own standard of living can be improved only by raising the standard of the other countries of the world.

This declaration will not interest those who regard the United States as a laboratory for social experiments.

It will not interest those who regard the United States as a free-lunch counter.

It will certainly not interest those who regard the United States as a somewhat impoverished gold mine out of which they can still scrape a nugget or two for themselves.

It will interest only those who think of the United States as their land—a land that they know and love—a land that became rich through the industry, thrift, and enterprise of its people, and will never regain its prosperity in any other way.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY LUDWELL DENNY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Weakness," written by Mr. Ludwell Denny and published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

DEFENSE WEAKNESS

(By Ludwell Denny)

Loud talk but little action is expected from congressional re-examination of American defense in the light of German victory over the Allies in Norway.

After Congress has appropriated $8,500,000,000 in the last 9 years to modernize our defense system, why are our forces now considered grossly inadequate? Specifically—

Why is our air strength so puny compared with the land and sea forces?

Why is such a small portion of our Army mechanized?

Why is there so little coordination and so much costly rivalry between the land, sea, and air forces?

Confessions of our weakness have come from the highest officials. Secretary of the Navy Edison, as a result of the recent United States Fleet maneuvers in the Pacific and of German successes in Norway, admits that aircraft have a "temporary superiority" over battleships. Major General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, admits—according to Senators—that our warplanes are inferior to Europe's best, not only in numbers but in quality.

Today Senate committees are to begin the requestioning of Secretary Edison and other War and Navy chiefs about the apparent superiority of German weapons and methods as compared with our own expensive "horse and buggy" ineffectiveness.

There are many reasons why the outcome of this "investigation" is apt to be more alibis and more money for the same set-up, rather than real reform. Here are some of them:

1. The "investigators"—that is, the congressional Military and Naval Committees and appropriation subcommittees—are jointly responsible with the executive authorities for the present system; they cannot be expected to indict themselves.

2. President Roosevelt is an amateur admiral, who has operated as his own Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, and who has personally supervised preparedness Budgets and policies. He has covered up blunders, when news about them has leaked out, and has opposed investigation.

3. The admirals and the generals, especially the admirals, have a vested interest in the self-perpetuating system of old weapons and methods at the expense of new. In their control of the air forces and in their congressional lobbies, the sincere but prejudiced Army and Navy commands naturally put aviation last instead of equal—much less first.

4. The naval shipbuilding lobby is one of the richest, strongest, and best organized in Congress; and it can wangle billions for battleships, at $70,000,000 to $100,000,000 each, until there is little left for $25,000 planes.

5. Now that the administration has turned over virtually the entire American aircraft production industry, plus expansions, to the Allies, there is no chance of getting sizeable warplane deliveries for the United States Army and Navy, even if Congress makes an even Budget trade of 1 new battleship for 4,000 pursuit planes.

6. The basic issue of establishing a single command over three coordinate defense services, with a united air corps ranking equally with Army and Navy, probably will not even be faced in Washington unless and until the backward British model is belatedly revamped to meet German victories.

Of course nobody expects a final decision by admirals in this generation on the endless debate of battleship versus bomber—no matter how many Norways fell. It must be assumed both are essential.

The immediate question in the United States is whether defense can be balanced better between sea and air fleets, between manpower and mechanized power in the Army; and whether aviation can have equality under coordinated command.

Unless Congress sets up a powerful independent investigating committee—without fear of vested interest lobbies, admirals, generals, commanders in chief, and Presidents—there seems no hope whatever of getting a streamlined defense system for our borrowed billions.

Seventy-five Percent of All Railroad Employees Urge Passage of Wheeler-Lea Bill (S. 2009)

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are in the United States today approximately 1,103,600 railroad employees.

For the information of the Members of the House, I am inserting the following table showing the various classes of employees:

	Number	Percentage
Employees not in train service:		
Clerks, station and express employees	225,000	20.4
Maintenance of way	249,000	22.6
Shop crafts [1]	290,000	26.3
Dispatchers	3,100	.3
Signalmen	12,000	1.1
Telegraphers	48,000	4.3
Yardmasters	4,500	.4
Marine workers [2]	7,000	.6
Total	838,600	76.0
Train-service employees:		
Engineers	47,000	4.3
Firemen	60,000	5.4
Conductors	26,000	2.4
Trainmen	122,000	11.0
Switchmen	10,000	.9
Total	265,000	24.0
Grand total	1,103,600	100.0

[1] Represented by 7 organizations: Machinists, boilermakers, blacksmiths, electrical workers, sheet-metal workers, carmen, firemen and oilers, and roundhouse shop laborers.
[2] Represented by 3 organizations: Masters, mates and pilots, marine engineers, longshoremen.

More than 75 percent of the railroad employees of the country are in favor of the passage of S. 2009, the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill. Their approval of this legislation is expressed through 15 of the great railroad labor organizations in the following letter over the signature of the president of each labor organization:

[American Train Dispatchers' Association; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Order of Sleeping Car Conductors; Railway Employes' Department, American Federation of Labor]

REPRESENTING 850,000, OR MORE THAN 75 PERCENT OF ALL RAILROAD EMPLOYEES URGING ENACTMENT OF CONFERENCE REPORT TRANSPORTATION BILL S. 2009

The conference report transportation bill S. 2009 should be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. It proposes equality of treatment, regulation, and preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation.

We are opposed to referring the bill back to the conference committee. We urge enactment of the conference report at this session of Congress.

We speak for approximately 850,000 railroad express and Pullman employees, more than 75 percent of all railroad employees. Their interest will be improved by the enactment of the conference report. Unregulated, subsidized water and motor-carrier transportation is taking a heavy toll of railroad employment and railroad business. It is estimated that 180,000 railroad jobs have been lost because of present unfair, discriminatory transportation policies and lack of Federal regulation of these other modes of transportation.

The legislation proposed by the conference report does not in any manner change the law regarding consolidation of railroads.

Railroad employees already have the decision of the Supreme Court in the Rock Island consolidation case and the Washington job-protection agreement of May 1936 to protect railroad jobs in consolidations.

Railroad employment should be increased, not reduced, by enactment of this legislation.

C. L. Darling, president, American Train Dispatchers' Association; H. W. Brown, president, International Association of Machinists; J. A. Franklin, international president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America; Roy Horn, general president, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; L. M. Wicklein, vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; J. J. Duffy, vice president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; F. H. Knight, general president, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; George Wright, vice president, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; F. H. Fljozdal, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; A. E. Lyon, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; M. S. Warfield, president, Order of Sleeping Car Conductors; B. M. Jewell, president, Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor.

MAY 6, 1940.

Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM MILWAUKEE SENTINEL AND LETTER FROM AMERICANIZATION LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 4, 1940, entitled "Citizenship Day," and, following the editorial, a letter from the Americanization League of America, together with a resolution enclosed in the letter.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 4, 1940]

CITIZENSHIP DAY—WISCONSIN HAS SET PATRIOTIC EXAMPLE

The Hearst newspapers have noted with much interest and pleasure the extent to which Citizenship Day has become an occasion for annual and national observance.

When the county of Manitowoc in Wisconsin publicly honored a class of 350 young citizens a year ago, these newspapers thought the patriotic example thus set was worthy of wider emulation, and said so.

A large number of other American communities agreed, with the result that thousands of young Americans who had achieved the age of citizenship were appropriately welcomed to their new and high estate.

First, as always, to recognize an opportunity to expand its Americanization program through this medium was the American Legion.

At its national convention in Chicago in 1939, the Legion adopted a resolution calling for an annual and national observance of Citizenship Day, the purpose being to give recognition to all American young people when they gain and accept the privileges and responsibilities of voters.

In accordance with that program, May 19 of this year was designated officially as Citizenship Day by the National Education Association, and special committees have worked out plans for observance in many States, including Wisconsin, Alabama, West Virginia, Montana, Iowa, Minnesota, California, and South Carolina.

California, incidentally, varied and broadened the program in part by devoting an entire week to instructive and inspiring citizenship projects, from April 29 to May 5.

In view of the impetus which was given to this splendid movement by the patriotic people of Wisconsin, it is interesting to know why and how it was conceived.

Hugh S. Bonar, superintendent of schools of Manitowoc, thus explained the origin of citizenship day in the Wisconsin Journal of Education:

"Citizenship day, as conceived and carried out in Manitowoc County, was an effort to make significant an important event in the life of every young man and woman.

"That event was arriving at age 21.

"This foundation of government in our country, universal suffrage, has been threatened because of the indifference toward it and the absence of any recognition of the major qualification for beginning voters—becoming 21 years of age.

"Both to arouse in young and old voters an appreciation for this vital right and to better prepare to exercise it, citizenship day was inaugurated."

It is hardly necessary to say such a movement is important in the United States.

And it is a matter of clear and proud record that it has already accomplished worth-while results.

The thousands of young American men and women who have been made to feel that a thing so important to them is vitally important to the country are the personification of its results.

For whatever reason some States still do not designate a Citizenship Day, either of their own selection or in conjunction with the date set by the American Legion and the National Education Association, none should any longer refrain from participation.

The opportunities for encouraging and creating higher standards of intelligently informed and patriotically loyal American citizenship are too abundant in this project to be neglected.

Why should any young American reach the age of active American citizenship without being made to realize he has gained something of priceless value?

Why should he not be instructed in the privileges and responsibilities of what he has gained?

Why should he not be honored and acclaimed upon attainment of the right of full participation in the vital affairs of his beloved country?

Not just those States which have first recognized the great possibilities for better Americanism in the observance of Citizenship Day should pay this tribute to youth, but all American communities and States should do so.

AMERICANIZATION LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 1, 1940.

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have been furnished with a printed transcript of the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 233 and House Joint Resolution 437, discussing citizenship-day rallies, and noticed that on page 9 it was stated that the first rally was held in Manitowoc, Wis.

For your information, we wish to advise that the Americanization League of America held the first rally of citizens in this country on November 7, 1931.

We are enclosing a copy of the resolution of the common council in Milwaukee, Wis., and wish you would request that a correction be made so that the matter will be taken care of in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICANIZATION LEAGUE
OF AMERICA.
Mrs. A. B. VAJDA.

[Enclosure]

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, ss:

I, Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk of the city of Milwaukee, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the common council on May 18, 1931, viz:

"File No. 47031.

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the proper city officers be, and hereby are, authorized and directed to issue a city order in the sum of $250, payable to the Milwaukee Auditorium Board, in payment of the rental of the concert division of the Milwaukee auditorium for the celebration of the Americanization League of America, which rental shall be used for the purpose of maintaining and operating the Milwaukee auditorium; said amount to be charged to the fund set up in the budget under the heading 'Common council; special; special funds; auditorium patriotic-purpose rental fund.'

"STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
"City Clerk."

Wheeler-Lea Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

LETTER FROM AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter addressed to President Roosevelt, signed by American farm leaders from every section of the country. I also include a letter from the Iowa State Cooperative Legislative Council of the Transportation Organization, signed by four legislative representatives representing 80 percent of all railroad labor in the State of Iowa.

This is clear evidence of not only universal opposition by all thinking and progressive farm leaders in the United States, but by the most successful and experienced of all railroad brotherhoods.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1940.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are opposed to the adoption of the conference report on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill for the following reasons:

1. It ignores the public interest and lays the basis for a transportation monopoly.

2. It will increase the cost of distributing agricultural products, which cost the farmer has to bear, thereby reducing his income.

3. It will increase the cost of things that the farmer has to buy, thereby further reducing his income.

4. The destructive effects of this legislation upon agriculture will retard the economic recovery of the Nation, and this in turn cannot fail to adversely affect the railroads themselves, who are the advocates of this bill.

5. Those who drafted this legislation appear to have lost sight of the fundamental purpose for which Government regulation was established, namely, to protect the public interest. Instead of adhering to this sound principle, under the bill regulation would be employed to stifle competition and to bring water and motor rates up to the level of rail rates, regardless of the cost of rendering the service.

The cost of transportation is the heaviest service charge that the farmer has to pay. Approximately 20 percent of all the freight revenues accruing to the railroads are derived from carrying agricultural products to market. In 1929 the farmer's freight bill amounted to $1,000,000,000. In 1937, when the farmer's income was greatly reduced, the figure was $838,000,000. These items do not include the freight charges paid on commodities purchased by the farmer, which he must likewise pay.

Last year the farmer received only 39 cents out of every dollar paid by the consumer for food. At the depth of the depression the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar dropped to 33 cents. While transportation and distribution must be regarded as legitimate and indispensable functions in the affairs of civilization, the fact remains that when those who merely transport and distribute the products of our farms receive vastly more than the share that goes to the producer, it amounts to the same thing as the perpetration of an economic crime. Instead of ameliorating the conditions that have so long handicapped agriculture in matters relating to transportation, the pending bill would most certainly aggravate the situation.

We are sensible of the fact that railroads are a necessity, and we want every properly managed railroad to be solvent and prosperous, but we must not lose sight of the fact that agriculture is also a necessity, even more fundamental to the well-being and the very existence of man than the railroads or any other agency of transportation can possibly be. Common sense should teach those who are charged with the management of our railroads that they cannot expect to benefit by reducing to bankruptcy the fundamental industry upon which their prosperity rests.

There is justification for condemning the report of the conference committee on the transportation bill by virtue of the fact that the Miller-Wadsworth amendment, which passed both House and Senate, was entirely eliminated from the bill. The gist of this amendment was to the effect that no form of transportation could be compelled to charge higher rates than would be compensatory. The full wording of the amendment was as follows:

"In order that the public at large may enjoy the benefit and economy afforded by each type of transportation, the Commission shall permit each type of carrier or carriers to reduce rates so long as such rates maintain a compensatory return to the carrier or carriers after taking into consideration overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier or carriers for the service rendered: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to affect the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4."

It is manifest that with the Miller-Wadsworth amendment stricken out the declaration of policy contained in section 1 constitutes nothing but empty words because nothing contained in the bill gives the public any assurance that it will receive the benefit of transportation at the lowest possible cost. In our opinion, the Miller-Wadsworth amendment was so fair and reasonable that it would be nothing short of tragic to pass the bill without this provision.

Those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits find an additional reason for dissatisfaction in the report of the conference committee because an amendment adopted by the House which provided for reduced rates on farm products for export, comparable to the lower rates granted to industry in this connection, was eliminated.

We maintain that there are only two legitimate grounds upon which the Government could justify itself in attempting to regulate transportation on our inland waterways and in the coastwise trade. One of these grounds would be in the interest of public safety, and the other to protect the public against monopolistic practices. So far as safety is concerned, the Department of

Commerce already looks after that; and when it comes to protecting the public against monopoly, the truth is that no monopoly whatsoever exists among the carriers on our inland waterways, nor in the coastwise trade. The rivers, the lakes, and the seas are open to all. So far from breaking up any monopoly among the water carriers, which in reality is nonexistent, the pending legislation takes a long step toward creating a monopoly.

The carriers now operating would be permitted to continue, subject to rules and regulations laid down by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but before it would be possible to establish a new service, it would be necessary to secure from the Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If this bill should be enacted it is very doubtful if there would be any new water carriers, because the legislation is so worded as to virtually instruct the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny any person a certificate of convenience and necessity if the Commission comes to the conclusion that the present transportation facilities are adequate to take care of existing commerce. The fate that befell many of the common and contract carriers under the grandfather clause of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 furnishes an example of what may happen to many of our water carriers if the present bill is passed.

As the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission well said in a joint letter addressed to Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY on February 18, 1940, in opposition to this legislation:

"Certificates of public convenience and necessity should not be used to create a monopoly in the branch of transportation industry where monopoly is presently nonexistent and where the public interest requires that competition, although it should be regulated to prevent abuses, should not be limited or discouraged. The great advantage of water transportation to shippers is the flexibility and variety of service it can offer. Certificates of public convenience and permits would destroy this advantage and stifle competition. The same effect of stifling competition is discernible in the provisions of the bills, that except with the permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission no carrier can operate both as a common carrier and as a contract carrier."

We think the writers of the joint letter already mentioned are on the right track when they said:

"All the provisions of the bills seem designed to free the railroads from restraints and obligations, while imposing restrictions on their water competitors and making it more expensive for the public to move freight. Under these provisions inland-water carriers can easily be regulated out of existence without the recapture of enough tonnage to affect railroad earnings appreciably."

We also endorse the further statement of the writers of the joint letter when they declare:

"Farmers and other shippers should not be required to pay rates based on transportation costs of properties improvidently built, wastefully operated, or partially obsolete. The advocacy of thorough regulation of the minimum rates of motor and water carriers by a centralized agency appears to represent an attempt to use Government power to bring competing transportation agencies into a cartel, and in this manner to share traffic and adjust rates in such a way as to earn a return upon all transportation capital of these agencies. The present high rail-rate level would be protected from the impact of vigorous competition. Undoubtedly such a policy would also result in more rigid rates in times of depression, since the motor carrier and the boat line would no longer play their role as an effective competitive force in bringing down rail rates on commodities susceptible to rail or truck, and rail or water movement."

We are impressed by the fact that the general public has had no opportunity whatever to become acquainted with the conference report on the transportation bill; the Members of Congress as a whole have not had time to familiarize themselves with its details; there is no public demand for this legislation; it is filled with numerous objectionable features and ambiguities, and for the good of all we are strongly of the opinion that it should be defeated.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Elmer Brock, president, American National Live Stock Association; Frederick Brenckman, National Grange; J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, National Wool Growers Association; Irvin S. King, master, Washington State Grange; T. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Oscar Heline, president, Farmer Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Marcus, Iowa; Frank Rutherford, secretary, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Omaha, Nebr.; Karl Peterson, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *May 6, 1940.*

VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: The cooperative legislative council of the transportation organization, in session at Des Moines today, urge you to work for the recommitment of the measure generally referred to as the omnibus transportation bill, with instructions to reinsert the consolidation provisions, with full protection for labor. We will appreciate your advocacy and support of motion to recommit S. 2009.

Very truly yours,

W. H. JEFFRIES,
Iowa Legislative Representative, O. R. C., West Des Moines, Iowa.

C. G. BRANDON,
Iowa Legislative Representative, B. of R. T., Sioux City, Iowa.

J. W. SNYDER,
Iowa Chairman, State Legislative Board, B. of L. E., Waterloo, Iowa.

T. L. TOLLEFSON,
Iowa Chairman, State Legislative Board, B. of L. F. and E., Waterloo, Iowa.

Poll Tax Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK EVENING POST

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Evening Post, which is self-explanatory:

[From the New York Evening Post of May 2, 1940]

POLL-TAX STATESMANSHIP

Score one for democracy. Under the insistent pressures of a Presidential year, the Barden wage-hour amendments have, so far, been blocked in the House. This result is good, though the manner in which it was achieved is not edifying and represents a frivolous way of doing the public's business.

Here are the ways in which the public's trust was abused:

1. Mr. BARDEN'S amendments, which would have denied the benefit of the Wage and Hour Act to more than 1,000,000 of the 3,000,000 persons affected, were forced to the floor by the Rules Committee though they had been rejected by the Labor Committee. Not for many decades has it happened that legislation turned down by a regular standing committee has been given way to the floor in rules.

2. When the legislation reached the floor it became obvious that the Senate had no intention, in a Presidential year, of weakening the wage-hour law. Any bill passed by the House would therefore die in the Senate. Thus it became safe to load up the Barden amendments with other amendments most liberal on their surface. The Republicans seized this chance to make good labor records for themselves, secure in the knowledge their proposals would never become law.

They joined with the new dealers to put through a blanket 30-cents-per-hour minimum for everyone. At this point Representative BARDEN took the floor against his own bill, altered beyond recognition.

3. After the bill had been liberalized, it was voted down, 156 to 66. Almost the same majority that had amended it, killed it. But nowhere was there a test vote on the Barden proposals themselves; the final vote was on a hodge podge bill, thrown together to provide material for the summer's stump speeches.

One point rises clear to the surface. That is the fact that Mr. Cox of Georgia, who dominates the Rules Committee, and who forced the Barden proposals to the floor, is much less sensitive to Democratic pressures than is the House as a whole. Why was he not afraid to take this stand? Why does Mr. Cox not fear retribution at the polls in a State in which wages are notoriously low?

The answer in large measure is that a vicious poll tax in Georgia, as in seven other Southern States, keeps the majority of the people from voting, allows an election turn-out of only 20 percent of the eligible voters, effectively denies the remedies of democratic process to the people affected by antilabor legislation.

That group of Southern Democrats which has fought the New Deal even more vigorously than the Republicans, a group represented by Cox and SMITH of Georgia, STARNES of Alabama, and GARNER of Texas, does not fear the people because the people do not have the vote in their States.

It is a group of misrepresentatives whose power can be broken only by passage of the Geyer bill, H. R. 7534, which bars the poll-tax requirement in elections for Members of Congress.

There is the root of the problem and the point around which supporters of the liberal ideal must rally. If they win this fight, they will never see repeated such a spectacle as has just taken place on the House floor.

The Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

LETTER FROM ABRAM FLAXER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1940.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALTER: On behalf of the organized Government employees of this country, I want to congratulate the members of the House Judiciary Committee for their farsightedness in tabling the Hatch bill.

The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America takes pride in its slogan, "Make the Government service a career service." We stand for good government, for the defeat of the spoils system, for the extension and protection of the merit system, and it is on these grounds that our organization opposes the extension of the Hatch law to cover State employees.

This union maintains that the only way to outlaw political manipulation of Government employees is to give them the protection of an ironclad civil-service merit system. Such legislation as the Hatch law, rather than removing the rank and file Government employee from the influence of pernicious political practices, lays him wide open, for the Hatch bill specifically exempts the very officials who can use their office for such pernicious practices. The only way to remove politics in Government administration is to remove the jobs of the Government employees from the hands of political manipulators through ironclad civil service.

I sincerely hope, Mr. WALTER, that if a motion to reconsider the tabling resolution is introduced, you will vote against it.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAM FLAXER, *President.*

Secretary Edison Revamps Naval Program—Real National Defense—Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this country is to be congratulated on having as its Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Charles Edison, a worthy son of a most illustrious sire. If he did not inherit the genius of his distinguished father, Thomas A. Edison, he at least inherited a large measure of his practical common sense, which enables him to face realities without illusions.

I am glad to note that he recognizes the fact that spending billions of dollars on alleged national defense will not protect this country in times of stress, unless those funds are properly applied. He knows that we cannot protect ourselves in case of war by following the example of the Chinese soldiers—wasting their resources on useless expenditures and then turning somersaults in the air in the face of the enemy.

His determination to reexamine and revise the plans for building the battleships which Congress has authorized should be commended by every patriotic American. We need men of the same courage, vision, patriotism, and sound judgment in every other branch of the service, including the Senate and the House of Representatives.

What a pity we could not have had an Edison in control of our air force for the last 20 years. What a pity we couldn't have men of such vision to pass legislation for the development of our inland waterways.

Eighteen years ago Gen. "Billy" Mitchell told us that naval vessels could be destroyed by bombing from the air, and proved it by sinking the *Ostfreiland* off Hampton Roads. The *Ostfreiland* was the largest German war vessel we captured during the World War, and yet it was sent to the bottom with an expedition that should have warned the world of the part an air force would play in future conflicts.

But, for that valuable demonstration, General Mitchell was rewarded by being demoted and "sent to the cactus." Today everything he said is being borne out by demonstrations abroad.

Recently Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, the outstanding aviator of all time, gave England and America some first-hand information on air preparations abroad. For that great service he has been maligned and abused unmercifully both in England and in America. His statements have been borne out by subsequent events.

Congress recently provided for battleships costing as much as $80,000,000 apiece, which, if constructed according to the old plans, would probably have been helpless under a bombardment from the air, accompanied by submarine attacks from below.

What we need to defend our country is an air force and a submarine force second to none. Then we should do one thing that continental Europe has done, and that is develop our inland waterways so as to make them available for inland transportation at all times.

Today the nations of Europe are at war over the routes of ingress and egress to an iron mine in northern Europe. Today every inland water route in Europe is developed and in operation. They are moving safely along interior lines protected from bombardment from the sea. They will probably decide the fate of Europe.

While in this country, the Congress of the United States strains at the gnat and swallows the camel.

On last Wednesday the Senate of the United States, under the pressure of a barrage of telegrams, struck from the river and harbor bill the provision for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterways—one of the greatest contributions that could possibly be made today to a permanent and effective program of national defense—and cut the great Columbia River in two by striking the provision for the Umatilla Dam from the bill.

Just how this action can be reconciled with the appropriation of something like a billion dollars to build battleships that would have been obsolete before the keels were laid, if Secretary Edison had not intervened, I am unable to understand.

This Tombigbee inland waterway would penetrate an area richer in natural resources than all the iron mines of Sweden and Norway, and would shorten the distance from that area to the Atlantic Ocean by more than 1,000 miles.

I fear that august body was misled by the railroad lobby. A veritable barrage of telegrams was sent in, signed by men who claimed to be members of the railroad brotherhoods, who had also been misled into believing that the development of this great inland waterway would hurt them; when, as a matter of fact, it would have stimulated railroad transportation in that area for the next 10 years and forced the railroads to have readjusted their rate structures and ceased their discriminations. That would have stimulated rail traffic in that area, and increased the number of railroad men employed.

No project of this magnitude that was ever thoroughly surveyed and approved by the Army Engineers, as this one has been, was ever finally defeated. This development is bound to come, and the sooner the better.

What a farce! What a mockery! to be spending billions of dollars on alleged national defense, and then refusing to develop our inland waterways, which every well-informed man knows is the greatest contribution any nation can make to its national defense.

An international writer tells us that the European war is being fought primarily for the control of the Danube River. Here we have a project leading right to our source of nitrate supplies from which we would derive our explosives in times of war, and penetrating the very heart of an area upon which we must depend for our raw materials of all kinds, entirely protected from attack from the sea, furnishing an additional outlet for agricultural and industrial commodities, and shortening the distance to the Atlantic ocean by 1,000 miles.

Yet the Congress of the United States becomes stampeded by a barrage of inspired propaganda and strikes this project from the bill, and almost at the same time votes to build battleships at a cost of $80,000,000 apiece, every one of which would probably be obsolete before the keels were laid and any one of which could be sunk by one well-directed torpedo from a submarine or put out of commission by a barrage from the air.

The elimination of this project was a great blow to the people of Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and all the other States of that area. It was a great blow to our program of internal development as well as to that of real national defense and one that must be corrected, no matter how long it takes.

Mr. John L. Bogert, associate editor of the Marine Journal, in a letter to me, says:

How strongly I feel about the Tombigbee-Tennessee River Canal you can appreciate if you have carefully read what I have written. I do not hesitate to say that it is one of the most necessary canals for the enhancing of our national prosperity. It means everything to Tennessee and that entire section of the United States that has been on the sidetrack far too long. More power to your tongue and pen in this worthy campaign.

The article to which he refers reads as follows:

The Mississippi River is the normal outlet for the products of our farms and mines situated adjacent to its banks and the banks of its tributaries. But the very current which helps to bear our exports to the sea hinders our imports which must move "upstream." With the same power expended by the propulsive machinery of the towboat, which would be adequate for a flotilla speed downstream of 9 miles per hour, only a speed of 3 miles per hour can be maintained bucking the current. Which means that, assuming the accuracy of the foregoing, it would cost three times as much to transport cargo upstream as down. A mill a ton-mile is considered an economic performance for any tow, but transportation which costs 3 mills per ton-mile is not especially attractive, though even that would be highly creditable bucking the Mississippi current in the spring when the river is running "full."

It is only in the lower Mississippi that such currents as 4 miles, 6 miles, and even occasionally 8 miles per hour will be encountered, for the upper Mississippi from St. Louis to Minneapolis, 673 miles, has by means of 26 locks and dams been canalized, or transformed into a succession of lakes, practically currentless. And what is true of the upper Mississippi is also true of the Ohio, which has 47 locks and dams.

Thus, leaving out of consideration the Mississippi River below Cairo, there will be over 3,000 miles of canalized waterways in 1940 with a minimum depth of 9 feet and no heavy current to buck anywhere. Wherever possible, instead of a normal river sloping 5 or 6 inches per mile, a series of pools about 25 miles long has been developed, constituting a succession of steps each one about 10 feet high. In such water it should be perfectly feasible to transport cargo at rates approximating 1 mill per ton-mile either upstream or downstream. The 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River cost the Government $147,000,000. The 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi have cost $150,000,000. Examples of public money well expended. It would be practically impossible to canalize the lower Mississippi, owing to the great depth of the alluvial trough through which the river winds its tortuous way. So, of necessity, downstream costs will be but one-third upstream costs, which works to the advantage of exports but not of imports. However, Nature has provided a remedy which involves no huge expenditure of time, labor, and money in utilization. We are referring to the possibility of joining the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers by a canal of but 27 miles in length, which will connect the Yellow Creek of the Tennessee River with the Mackeys Creek of the East Fork of the Tombigbee River.

Yellow Creek branches off from the Tennessee River at mile 215, and it is just about there that the Tennessee River changes its direction from roughly east and west to nearly due north and south. Accordingly, as the Tombigbee runs nearly north and south, Nature has offered a simple solution of an extremely difficult problem. Here in the joined Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers is a waterway that can be cheaply canalized for its whole length, and can supplement the Mississippi River's lower 1,000 miles by what might be well called double tracking. With large flotillas always going down the Mississippi and up the Tombigbee and Tennessee, there would be small chance for collisions. What an ideal arrangement—a double-track combination of waterways.

At present the only outlet for commerce on the Tennessee River, which is 652 miles long from Knoxville to Paducah, is by way of the Ohio River to Cairo, 46 miles, and from Cairo down the Mississippi to New Orleans, 980 miles. The total distance by that route would be 1,678 miles from Knoxville to New Orleans. But by way of the canal connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee, the distance would be materially shortened. Thus: Knoxville to Yellow Creek, 437 miles; Yellow Creek to Mobile, 491 miles; Mobile to New Orleans, 153 miles. Total distance via Tombigbee from Knoxville to New Orleans, 1,081 miles—a saving of 600 miles. If the object sought was simply a tidewater shipping point, Mobile is one of the most active ports on the Gulf, and the saving in reaching tidewater for Knoxville shipments would be 750 miles. When this canal is dug and opened for business we can imagine the citizens of Knoxville and Chattanooga holding a joyous celebration; and, of course, what is true of those two cities is equally true of all communities up and down the whole Tennessee Valley.

All cities and towns on the Ohio River will share in the benefits that flow from this connection between the Tombigbee and the Tennessee. All points on the Ohio River above Paducah will be 320 miles nearer tidewater at the Gulf. For the distance by river from Mobile to Demopolis, where the Warrior River branches off on its way to the Birmingham coal and iron district, is 231 miles; and the distance from Demopolis to the Tennessee River at mile 215 is 260 miles. So the distance from Mobile to the Ohio River at Paducah is 231 miles plus 260 miles plus 215 miles, or 706 miles. But the distance by the Mississippi from New Orleans to Cairo is 980 miles, and the distance on the Ohio of Paducah from Cairo is 46 miles. So the distance of Paducah from New Orleans by the Mississippi is 980 miles plus 46 miles on the Ohio, or 1,026 miles. Thus the saving in distance for all points on the Ohio River above Paducah from tidewater at the Gulf is 1,026—706 or 320 miles. But best of all is the saving in current bucking.

What is true of the Ohio cities and towns is likewise true of all points on the upper Mississippi and on the Missouri and the Illinois, though the saving in distance from tidewater is less by 92 miles, which translates into 320—98, or 228 miles.

By short cut along the shore of the Gulf of Mexico, New Orleans is but 153 miles distant from Mobile. So imports for the entire interior of the United States can transfer to river barges at either New Orleans or Mobile and still go upstream by way of the Tombigbee-Tennessee route; and even if the transfer to barges is made at New Orleans, the route by way of the Tombigbee-Tennessee Rivers will be the shorter for all points above Cairo, Ill., by not less than 75 miles. So little is generally known of the towns and cities along the Tombigbee that it might be well to give some short account of the Tombigbee and the region through which it flows.

Starting with Mobile, few seem to realize that this city is one of the only two free-zone ports in the United States, where dutiable imports may be received and stored without having to pay duty until removed from the free zone for actual entry into the country. Because of this free-zone facility, it shouldn't require a high degree of prophetic instinct to predict that Mobile, as a port of entry, is bound to grow in popularity with importers all over the land, especially since Mobile is wide awake when it comes to loading and unloading facilities. Of course, Mobile is not yet the Rotterdam of the Gulf and Atlantic seaboard; and the Tombigbee, or rather the Mobile River, as the Tombigbee is called below its confluence with the Alabama River, 45 miles above Mobile, is not yet the Rhine of the United States. But don't make any mistake about it, Mobile, Deo volente, has, in virtue of its location and the intelligent vision of its citizens, one of the most brilliant futures of any port in the entire Nation. Remember, it was the vision of one man in New York and his Erie Canal, which a majority of the metropolitan newspapers and practically all the city's assemblymen and senators fought bitterly, that raised the rank of the port of New York from fourth in importance to preeminence. And the writer would like to here record a prediction to the effect that if and when the Tombigbee-Tennessee Rivers and their connecting canal become a reality, comparable in efficiency with the canalized Ohio and upper Mississippi Rivers, the cities, towns, and villages along these waterways will grow and thrive just as did Schenectady, Utica, Rome, Syracuse, and Rochester along the New York State Barge Canal.

Alabama's future seems bright indeed. It is at Demopolis, 231 miles upstream from Mobile, that the Warrior River (usually called the Black Warrior) branches off toward Birmingham, the Pittsburgh of the South and the most rapidly growing city in Alabama, the center of the coal and iron deposits, 430 miles from Mobile and connected with that city by a channel maintained at 8-feet depth.

What coal, iron ore, and limestone can do to make a city grow is well demonstrated by Birmingham. In 1930 the population of Birmingham was 260,000, in 1931, 270,000, an annual rate of growth of 4 percent; next in size to Birmingham is Mobile with 69,000 in 1931. All of the other cities in Alabama are smaller than Mobile, and when the Tombigbee-Tennessee canal is an actuality, just watch Mobile grow; nothing can stop it except foolishly listening to the siren song of the railroads, which are moving heaven and earth to block any and every new waterway no matter how meritorious.

Though one-third of our railroads are bankrupt, and another one-third can just about "hold their heads above water," there is always plenty of money forthcoming to spread propaganda against every form of water transportation.

The railroads were given presents of land totaling 275,000 square miles—not marginal or submarginal land, but choice acreage. As there are 640 acres to a square mile, they received 176,000,000 acres. What do you suppose that land is worth today? At $100 per acre, which is not a high figure for choice farm land, it would be $17,600,000,000. In contrast with that sum does the few hundred millions spent on our waterways look like anything but "chicken feed"? And don't forget that any and every last railroad stockholder and bondholder is free to use these very same waterways on the same terms as everybody else. He hasn't been injured to the tune of one cent personally. He can scrap his railroad tomorrow, and ask permisison of the court to abandon unprofitable service, like the Old Colony Line, down the length of Cape Cod. There are no inhibitions to his changing his investments; the building of waterways does him individually no injustice. But he sins against light and progress, and becomes a public liability, when he throws millions of money, that rightfully belong to the stock and bond holders of his railroad away in a mistaken effort to hamper progress and fetter transportation with methods and means that have been abandoned in Europe for many years.

Read carefully the foreign news in the papers and see how every nation in Europe is exploiting its waterways to the utmost. The Russian Soviets, the German Nazis, the Belgian Monarchists are all building new waterways. Are they all dumb, and are the only wise ones those who spend millions in trying to preserve the "all the traffic will bear" railroad freight structure? The writer doesn't think so.

Books and Articles on Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

LIST COMPILED BY ALBERT M. TEWKSBURY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, public opinion all over America is becoming more and more aware of the pressing need for a solution to our No. 1 public problem, the unemployment of 10,000,000 people. As an aid to those searching for a way out of this dangerous situation, I append a brief bibliography of recent, selected writings on unemployment which was compiled by Albert M. Tewksbury, research counsel in the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress.

A SELECTED LIST OF RECENT REFERENCES ON UNEMPLOYMENT

(Compiled by Albert M. Tewksbury, research counsel in the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

Alexander, Dr. W. W. A Program for the South. Address before the Southern Conference on Interstate Problems, Nashville, Tenn., January 25, 1940. 17 pp., mimeo.

Ballantine, A. A. Employment and Federal Finance Vital Speeches, VI, pp. 150–152 (December 15, 1939).

Bassett, Lucy A. Bibliography of Transient and Homeless. Jacksonville, Florida, Florida Emergency Relief Administration, 1934. 87 pp.

Bell, Howard. Youth Tell Their Story. Washington, D. C., American Youth Commission, 1938.

Chase, Stuart. Capital Not Wanted, American Business Rolls Its Own. Harpers Magazine, CLXXX (February 1940), 225–234.

Colcord, Joanna C. Stamps to Move the Surplus. Survey Midmonthly, LXXV (October 1939), 305–307.

Colean, Miles L. Can America Build Houses? Public Affairs Pamphlets No. 19 (Revised). 1940.

Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless. Current Bibliograhy on Transiency, No. 1. New York, July 1936 (and later revisions).

Consumers' Cooperatives in 1938. Monthly Labor Review, September 1939, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. 16 pp.

Cooke, Morris L., and Murray, Philip. Organized Labor and Production. New York, Harper and Bros.

Coyle, David Cushman. Back to the Land. Survey Graphic, February 1940, pp. 115–118.

Coyle, David Cushman. Depression Pioneers. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1939. (Works Progress Administration, Social Problems No. 1, 1939.)

Coyle, David Cushman. Rural Youth. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939. (National Youth Administration, Social Problems No. 2, 1938.) 35 pp. Selected bibliography.

Dennison, Henry S.; Filene, Lincoln; Flanders, Ralph E., and Leeds, Morris E. Toward Full Employment. New York and London, Whittlesey House, 1938. 297 pp.

Dispossessed; for Nearly One-Fourth of the Population There Is No Economic System and from the Rest There Is No Answer. Fortune, XXI (February 1940), pp. 94–96.

Downey, Sheridan. Pensions or Penury? New York and London, Harper and Bros., 1939.

Edwards, Newton. Equal Educational Opportunity for Youth, a National Responsibility. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1939.

Ezekiel, Mordecai. Jobs for All Through Industrial Expansion. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1939.

Fine, Ruth. Profit-Sharing: Selected References, 1923–1939. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Labor, 1939.

Florea, J. H. Stamp Plan Boosts Egg Use, Poultry Tribune, March 1940, pp. 9, 24–25.

Food-Stamp Plan Makes a Hit, Business Week, August 19, 1939, pp. 19–20.

Fortune Survey: Government vs. Business as Employer, Fortune, XXI (February 1940), pp. 133.

Fuller, Grace H., comp. A Selected List of Recent Books and Pamphlets on Cooperation in the United States and Foreign Countries. Washington, D. C., Library of Congress, 1937. Supplement 1939. Mimeo.

Gill, Corrington. Technological Change and Unemployment, Dynamic America, November 1939, pp. 14–16.

Gill, Corrington. Wasted Manpower: the Challenge of Unemployment. New York, Norton.

Green, William. Labor and Democracy. Princeton University Press, 1939.

Hinrichs, A. F., and others. Estimated Number of Workers in April 1939, Subject to Provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act Effective October 24, 1939. Washington, D C., U. S. Department of Labor, 1939.

Hinrichs, A. F. Trends of Employment Opportunity. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Labor, 1940. 30 p. Mimeo.

Holland, Kenneth. Youth in European Labor Camps. Washington, D. C., American Youth Commission.

Homes, Front Line of Defense for American Life. Survey Graphic, February, 1940.

The Fourth Fortune Round Table: How Can the U. S. Achieve Full Employment? Fortune, XXI (October, 1939), 40–43 ff.

Huzar, Elias. The New WPA What it is; How it Works, Survey Midmonthly, October, 1939, pp. 300–301.

Jobs After Forty, The Nation, September 23, 1939, p. 308.

Keller, Kent. Prosperity Through Employment, a Job for Every Man and Woman Who Wants to Work. New York and London, Harper and Bros., 1936.

King, Wilford I. The Causes of Economic Fluctuations, New York, Ronald Press, 1938.

Lindley, Betty, and Ernest K. A New Deal for Youth. New York, Viking Press, 1939.

Macklin, Justin W., and Hasell, Duncan I. Labor Saving Machines Make More Jobs. Nation's Business, XXVIII (January, 1940), 18–21 ff.

Maris, Paul V. Farm Tenancy. Washington, D. C., U. S. Farm Security Administration, 1939. 19 p. Mimeo.

Melvin, Bruce L. Rural Youth on Relief. Washington, D. C., Works Progress Administration, 1937. (Division of Social Research, Research Monograph XI.)

Melvin, Bruce L., and Smith, Elna N. Rural Youth: Their Situation and Prospects. Washington, D. C., Works Progress Administration, 1938. (Division of Social Research, Research Monograph XV.)

Menefee, Louise A., and Chambers, M. M. American Youth, an Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1938.

Murray, Philip. Unemployment, the Root of America's Economic Ills, Vital Speeches, VI (February 15, 1940), 263–265.

National Industrial Conference Board. Conference Board Studies in Enterprise and Social Progress. New York, 1939.

Perkins, Milo. The Challenge of Underconsumption. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1940. 37 p. mimeo.

American Youth Commission. A Program of Action for American Youth. Washington, D. C.

Rainey, Homer P., and others. How Fare American Youth? New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937.

Reemployment Measures in Belgium, Monthly Labor Review, January 1940, pp. 68–69.

Social Science Research Council. Pacific coast regional committee. Subcommittee on seasonal agricultural labor in the west.

Agricultural Labor in the Pacific Coast States, a Bibliography and Suggestions for Research, August 1938.

Springer, Gertrude. * * * And What It Has Left Behind, Survey Midmonthly, October 1939, pp. 302–304.

Taylor, F. J. Busy Unemployed, Unemployed Citizens' League, Santa Monica, California, New Republic, January 15, 1940, pp. 77–79.

Taylor, Paul S. Migratory Farm Labor in the U. S., Monthly Labor Review, March 1937, pp. 537–549.

Terry, J. William. American Labor and the Trade Agreements. Des Moines, Iowa, Economic Policy Committee.

Thompson, Dorothy. Problem of Youth, Ladies Home Journal, March 1940, pp. 4, 111.

Thompson, Laura A. Unemployment Insurance and Reserves in the United States, a Selected List of Recent References. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Labor, 1935.

U. S. Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations: 1937. Final report on total and partial unemployment. United States summary with data for geographic divisions, cities, and States. Washington, D. C., 1938.

U. S. Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations: 1937. Final report on total and partial unemployment for geographic divisions, including data for registrants in each industry group by occupational group. This report is a supplement to the United States summary. Washington, D. C., 1938.

U. S. Congress. Senate, Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief. Unemployment and Relief. Hearings before a Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief, U. S. Senate, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, pursuant to S. Res. 36. Vol. 1, January 4 to 22, 1938. Vol. 2, February 28 to April 8, 1938. Washington, D. C., 1938.

U. S. Congress. Senate, Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief. Unemployment and Relief. Report (pursuant to S. Res. 36, 75th Congress) of Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief. Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, Senate Report 2, parts 1–3.

U. S. Congress. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. American Youth Act. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, 75th Cong. 3rd sess., on S. 1463. March 7–11, 1938. Washington, D. C., 1938.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. An Estimate of the Number of Persons Engaged in the Production, Distribution, and Servicing of Goods for Export (preliminary summary). Washington, D. C., January 10, 1939. 7 p. Mimeo.

U. S. Department of Labor. Employment Service. Division of Standards and Research. Survey of Employment Service Information. Washington, D. C., May 1939.

U. S. Executive Office of the President. Office of Government Reports. Report of the President of the United States to the Congress showing the status of funds and operations under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 as of December 31, 1939. Washington, D. C., 1940.

U. S. Federal Works Agency. Work Projects Administration. Report on progress of the W. P. A. program, June 30, 1939. Washington, D. C., 1939.

U. S. Federal Works Agency. Work Projects Administration. National Research Project. Industrial Change and Employment Opportunity—a selected bibliography. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 1939.

U. S. Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration. National Research Project. The Work and Publications of the W. P. A. National Research Project on Reemployment Opportunities and Recent Changes in Industrial Techniques. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 1939.

U. S. Inquiry on Cooperative Enterprise. Report of the inquiry on cooperative enterprise in Europe, 1937. Washington, D. C., 1937.

U. S. National Resources Committee. The Structure of the American Economy, Part I. Basic characteristics. Washington, D. C., 1939.

U. S. National Resources Committee. Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of New Inventions, June 1937. Washington, D. C., 1937.

U. S. President's Committee on Farm Tenancy. Farm Tenancy, Report of the President's Committee. Prepared under the auspices of the National Resources Committee. Washington, D. C., 1937.

U. S. Social Security Board. Bureau of Business Management. Library. Selected list of references on unemployment compensation and related subjects. Washington, D. C., April 1938. 75 pp. Mimeo.

U. S. Social Security Board. Social Security in America. Washington, D. C., 1937.

U. S. Temporary National Economic Committee. Investigation of concentration of economic power. Hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee pursuant to Public Resolution No. 113 (75th Cong.). Washington, D. C.

Webb, John N. The Transient Unemployed. Washington, D. C., Works Progress Administration, 1935. (Division of Social Research, Research Monograph III.)

Weintraub, David, and Kaplan, Irving. Summary of findings to date, March 1938. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Works Progress Administration, National Research Project, 1938.

Winslow, W. Thacher. Youth, a World Problem. Washington, D. C., National Youth Administration, 1937.

Wood, Edith Elmer. Introduction to Housing Facts and Principles. Washington, D. C., Federal Works Agency, U. S. Housing Authority, 1939.

Where Are We Heading Under Reorganization Plan IV?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the greatest struggle in the world today is that concerning a philosophy of government which would subject public right and private interest to the determination of personal decree instead of the rule of law. This struggle has gone on through the centuries. To guard against the dominance of that philosophy we must ever be alert against well-intentioned and seemingly minor steps to extend the power of personal rule.

In our own system of economy, when the regulation of great industries was undertaken, Congress saw the danger involved if regulation were to be entrusted to the Executive. It saw that in regulation of this nature, public and private rights and interests of so extensive a character were bound to be affected; that if power were to be vested freely in the Executive, the stability of our institutions would inevitably be undermined.

Consequently, when the regulation of a great industry first occurred, that of railroad regulation, Congress evolved a new instrument of government, the independent regulatory agency, free of Executive domination, and operating under legislative standards to carry out the will of Congress.

In 1938 Congress followed the pattern set forth in the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, when it determined the regulation which should control the new and growing civil aeronautics industry, an industry which in a few years promises to be of transcendent importance to our civil life. Congress created an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority to exercise jurisdiction.

Now, it is proposed to reorganize that Authority and place it in the Department of Commerce. Since that proposal was made, opposition to it has been voiced from every side, on the ground that the independence of the Authority must at all costs be preserved.

Recently there have been hasty moves to marshal support for the measure, coupled with protestations that the independence of the Authority is not threatened.

But the best evidence that the reorganization will subject Civil Aeronautics to the personal rule of the Executive is disclosed in the very moves made to gain support for the proposal. An Assistant Secretary of Commerce, whose record in dealing with civil aviation before 1938 had been unfortunate, has been appointed to another post, and the President has announced that to succeed him he will appoint the present Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. There could be no clearer demonstration that if this reorganization is adopted, the office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce will be of first importance in the regulation and development of the industry. That office, and the exercise of its power, are directly under the Executive. Its incumbents come and go, depending upon Executive decision and policy.

It is this very effort to enthrone personal rule against which our traditions have stood fast. The good intentions of one Executive, the likelihood that one Assistant Secretary of Commerce will be able and above reproach, should not beguile us into an abandonment of fundamental principle.

In preservation of an American principle, vital to our institutions, we should reject the proposed reorganization.

Warning to Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHREVEPORT (LA.) JOURNAL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present an editorial from the Shreveport Journal, of Louisiana, published April 23, 1940, entitled "Warning to Neutrals," which I think is of universal interest.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of April 23, 1940]

WARNING TO NEUTRALS

Tragic happenings in Norway, resulting from the invasion by German troops upon the thin pretext of "protecting" that country from allied aggressions, will serve as a solemn warning to other small neutral states of continental Europe. These should immediately take stock of themselves, to discover whether or not their governmental and defense forces are being undermined by Nazi intrigue, such as has been shown to have occurred in the Scandinavian country, in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, in Poland, and in Memel. The fuehrer, it is already known, never undertakes an expansion enterprise until his agents have first had opportunity to bore from within the government to be attacked.

In Norway, at peace with the world and observing the strictest kind of neutrality as between Germany and the Allies, the German army was permitted to enter and to take over the capital and principal ports without resistance because of orders issued by traitors in high place. These had been reached by Germans, masquerading as business emissaries, and they evidently sold their country's honor. Norway is paying the price, and, though in the end her independence may be preserved, that price is going to be the sacrifice of many lives and the shattering of many of her population centers. Norway believed Hitler's promises, and all the bitter consequences of such gullibility are now being suffered. The Norwegians failed to weed out the traitors within their own armies and in high governmental place.

That the Balkan states are next in line for crushing by the German juggernaut is believed by most diplomats now in Europe, with Rumania almost certain to feel the first blow unless she accedes to every demand for economic and other concessions, and with Russia awaiting only a favorable opportunity to regain the rich territory of Bessarabia taken from her after the World War. Already it is plain that Nazi plotters are at work within Rumania, and when the time comes Hitler will make use of his usual strategy—that of claiming necessity for the protection of German nationals or the prevention of Allied aggressions. Apparently the Rumanians will be prepared to offer more resistance than was met in Denmark and Norway when the Hitler surprise was sprung, but, if there are in King Carol's land the same kind of traitors, this will be useless.

That Nazi propagandists are engaged in all South American countries, and even in the United States, is also generally accepted as true. For this reason, let the Dies committee of the House of Representatives keep up its good work. Let it ferret out every individual engaged in subversive activities of any kind, and especially those who may be suspected of trying to inculcate into American youth the philosophies of the German maniac. The time may come when it will be found this task was supremely important. Though far from the scene of conflict, even America should heed the warning that is made plain by what is now taking place on Norwegian battlefields.

Public Ownership, Unemployment, and Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN M. COFFEE, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a copy of an address made by me recently and broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co. system.

The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I value highly this opportunity of speaking for the People's Lobby on the subject The Public Ownership of Natural Resources.

Some Americans are puzzled that citizens are starving while crops are left to rot in the fields, that raw materials are unused while men and women have no work. Poverty in the midst of plenty—that is the problem! But today some Americans with a degree of foresight are beginning to see that one of the main causes of our distress is that many of our most valuable natural resources are being both exploited and controlled by gigantic monopolies and semimonopolies. Price agreements, rebates, sales agreements, among these corporations have left the public almost helpless. Observe the American Aluminum Corporation, which now owns 100 percent of the bauxite deposits in America. Today the deposits of diatomite, magnesite, magnesium, and molybdenum in America are each controlled by a single corporation. Do you know that four leading copper companies mine 78 percent of the total production, four companies control 60 percent of the lead, and three business concerns mine 71 percent of the anthracite coal? Are you aware of the fact that the mammoth United States Steel Corporation owns and controls over half of the known iron deposits in our country? Few persons realize that four corporations have 100 percent of the potash and another four business concerns own 84 percent of the known marble deposits. Both sulfur and beryllium deposits are owned by huge trusts. The Standard Oil companies, whose past black record of price fixing, manipulation, and intimidation has seldom been paralleled, control four-fifths of the oil production in the United States. As a vast holder of our natural resources the Bethlehem Steel Corporation recently reported its greatest profits since 1929, and the Anaconda Copper Co. reported that its net income for the first 3 months of this year is $1.20 per share, compared with 42 cents in the same quarter last year. As controllers of many natural resources, some "fat cats" are certainly making fat profits at a time when 10,000,000 are unemployed.

With 200 of the largest corporations having three-fifths of the corporate wealth in America, the silk-hatted pundits, who control our many natural resources given to them in sumptuous land grants by our benevolent Government, are robbing three groups chiefly: First, the workingmen who are employed in the production of raw materials; second, the manufacturers who are dependent upon these raw materials; and third, you and me as common consumers. Workingmen are often thrown out of employment in the production of raw materials owned and controlled by monopolies. To assure their maximum profits, monopolies and semimonopolies drop their production rather than cut their prices when there is a drop in demand. This monopolistic practice causes men to lose their jobs, and instability in employment results. For an example, observe the cement industry, where five major corporations perform 40 percent of the production and have indirect control over the rest of the market. Here prices in 1926 and 1932 did not drop, but in 1932 production was only 48 percent of that in 1926, and as a result only about half as many men were employed. Similar examples are numerous.

The manufacturer who is dependent upon receiving certain raw materials is the next to suffer. Knowing that the manufacturer has to have these raw materials, the producer controlling the natural resource can easily charge a high price for his product. As a result of this hold-up, the manufacturer cannot cut his production costs, and consequently he cannot increase his output, which would increase employment. An example of such hold-up methods is found in the case of the American Aluminum Corporation, as I have mentioned, which has a strangle hold over all the bauxite deposits in the United States.

But the most serious effect of the monopolistic control of natural resources is upon the common, everyday consumer—you and me. Often we are charged high prices, because a manufacturer by will or by necessity passes along his increased cost of production, caused by the monopolistic prices of some trust. Our dollars are taken from us because some corporations not only control the raw materials but make the finished goods. We are skinned by corporations who both produce and distribute, as by some of the companies in the oil industry where price agreements, trade association tactics, and illegal restraints of trade are the order of the day. In the end you and I pay; we pay through the nose. Meantime, our standard of living is lowered. The absence of lower prices keeps our demand low, and as a result our unemployed friends cannot find jobs in industry. With monopolies controlling many of our most necessary natural resources, is it surprising that 10,000,000 American citizens are jobless and discouraged?

To alleviate the evils of private monopolies of our natural resources such as oil, water power, coal, copper, and the like, some citizens have advocated Federal and State regulation. We have followed their recommendations by setting up the Federal Power Commission, the Bituminous Coal Commission, the Antitrust Division, and a hundred and one other Federal and State agencies. But, in the main, these agencies have failed, they have failed miserably. They have been unable to prevent monopolies of natural resources or to regulate them adequately. For how is it possible, my friends, for the small $800,000 Federal Trade Commission to prevent unfair trade practices of many billion-dollar corporations which have a strangle hold upon our natural resources? How can

the small Antitrust Division stamp out the ever-increasing restraints of trade, when corporation lawyers are thinking up new ways to avoid the law each day? And what can the Division do, anyway, to put an end to huge monopolies when the Supreme Court since 1912 has taken upon itself the task of deciding what are reasonable restraints of trade? This agency of the Government seems helpless, after the Supreme Court ruled in 1920 that the United States Steel Corporation was not restraining trade, in spite of the fact that the concern produced over half of the steel in America. Since, in the words of the court, "bigness is not an overt act in itself," it seems virtually impossible to loosen the holds of this huge octopus—the monopolies of natural resources.

Yes; regulation has failed. Today, under the hypnotic guise of the magic word "conservation," the largest oil producers, with the aid of the Federal Government, have been able to strengthen their semimonopolistic control by the passage of the Connally Act. This act has almost put the small oil producer out of business. Other monopolies are forwarding this pseudo-conservation argument to gain similar control. Today the monopolies of natural resources have a death grip on American industry.

But shall we remain complacent and accept servility enforced upon the American public by these huge trusts? The answer is "No." Since our attempts at regulation have seemingly failed, we must go further. We must nationalize our natural resources, we must remove them from the exploitation of the monopolists and place them under public ownership. Such a program can be constitutionally upheld, as was the T. V. A. a few years ago, because the Federal Government has the power of eminent domain. Let us remember that "basically ownership resides in the State (either in the Commonwealth or Nation); for under the police power the State may constrain the private use of land within bounds set by the public interest."

Let us keep in mind the fact that originally the Federal Government gave the present monopolists the right to exploit our country's natural resources. Federal land grants to the trusts have been very plentiful. Thus the oil, the acres of virgin timber, the iron ore, the bauxite, and the many bountiful resources of America really belong to the Federal Government—they belong to the people of America. With the establishment of the public ownership of natural resources, a far-reaching conservation program would commence, a program which would preserve our fast-diminishing natural resources now being exploited and wasted by grasping monopolies. Efficiency and economy in production would result. Our dollars would be used to better advantage, for prices would be lower. No longer would there be poverty in the midst of plenty—hunger, unemployment, and depression in this the richest land in the world.

The Logan-Walter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BLOCK NEWSPAPERS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the highly important measures which has been passed by the House at the present session is the Logan-Walter bill. This legislation is now in the Senate and the same should have the unqualified support of every Member of the Senate. The people are entitled to some relief from the arbitrary rules and regulations which have been adopted by the various governmental agencies and which rules and regulations have the force and effect of law; in many instances there is no redress for the people under the adopted rules; this legislation will give the people the right of appeal in certain instances from the vicious force of unjust rules—a right which is not now extended to them. This proposed legislation is both just and sound.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a very interesting and illuminating editorial which appeared in the Block newspapers of recent date, which editorial follows:

[From the Block Newspapers]

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS WALTER-LOGAN BILL TO CURB TYRANNY OF GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS

There has been for some years a persistent running fight over the charge made by critics of the New Deal, and denied by its supporters, that many of the independent, quasi-judicial agencies exercise such wide and arbitrary powers, without appeal from their rulings, as to deprive the citizens affected of their constitutional rights.

Many of the bodies created by the New Deal have been cited for overbearing action of this sort. The National Labor Relations Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are but a few of the Commissions which have exercised their power in a despotic manner. But perhaps never has there been a clearer case of arrogant interference than that of which the Federal Communications Commission has been guilty in its recent rulings on television.

The Commission originally authorized commercial television beginning September 1 this year. As a result of this the Radio Corporation of America was able to plan for sales of television receivers and for regular sponsored programs, which would have begun at long last to net a return on 10 years of research costing $10,000,000 and might have given additional employment to many people.

Now, however, the Commission has revoked its permission to proceed. The reason given is that television should not be marketed "prematurely"; that is, that it is not now perfect, and that competitors should be allowed to catch up with the pioneer company in order to prevent monopoly.

The value of the Commission's judgment on the technical aspect of the question is well illustrated by the fact that the only member of the Board who knows anything about television disagreed with his colleagues and voted to let the sales proceed. And just where, we may ask, would this country be if we had waited for every invention to be perfected and had prevented distribution on the basis of some foolish fear of monopoly?

The action of the F. C. C. would be reprehensible enough even in good times. But under present conditions, when new industrial fields providing an outlet for capital and a stimulus to employment are just what are so badly needed, it is doubly to be condemned.

The whole incident emphasized the vital necessity for a curb on the brazen bureaucracy which has grown up in Washington, a bureaucracy which is doing everything to hold back business recovery and reemployment. It is time that the citizen who has been hindered in his rights by the rulings of these commissions should have the privilege of seeking redress in the courts.

A bill to provide such a course, the Walter-Logan bill, is now before Congress. It deserves the support of all who wish to preserve their own rights and those of their fellows from the intolerable and tyrannical interference of the New Deal agencies which have sought to take the law into their own hands.

PAUL BLOCK, *Publisher.*

The Iniquitous Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, after several weeks of earnest consideration, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House voted to table the bill extending the Hatch law. This action was taken after thorough investigation and mature study of the purposes of the bill, the result that would ensue if enacted, and the philosophy of governmental control involved.

In view of the public interest that has been expressed, as one of the members of the committee who voted to table the bill, I wish to set forth my reasons.

The bill has been widely heralded as an effort to purify politics. It is popularly misunderstood, and I do not believe the extent of the application or the catastrophic confusion that would have resulted had the bill been passed are fully realized. The philosophy of the bill and the result that would have ensued upon its application are so dangerous and undemocratic that I am sure many of its proponents, upon a fuller analysis, will agree that the committee has acted wisely.

Stripped of bric-a-brac, the philosophy of the bill is to extend the control of the Federal Government over officers and employees of States, counties, municipalities, and other local political districts, where (1) any part of their salary is paid directly or indirectly from Federal funds, or (2) where they do any work or perform any function in connection with any project or agency financed in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants.

Section 2 of the bill extends the provision of the law to "any person employed in any administrative position by any State, by any political subdivision, or municipality of

any State in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States."

Section 12 (a) of the bill provides "no officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States," shall use his authority to influence elections or take active part in political campaigns, and so forth.

This is the first effort and step toward regulation of employees of State and local political subdivisions by the Federal Government. Heretofore conditions have been imposed by the Federal Government as to the type of projects and services which the State and local subdivisions may perform with grants or loans from the Federal Government, but the Hatch Act extension is the first effort to regiment the activities, dictate the extent or expression, and restrict the political right of employees of States and local political subdivisions.

Let us see what would be the result of the enactment of the law. The Federal Government secures its funds from States. In giving it back to the States and political subdivisions in the form of loans and grants, it has heretofore attached conditions as to the type of road to be built, the curriculum of schools to be established, and so forth, but under this bill it would say to the States and political subdivisions, "We will give you back your money, but with it follows power and control; the people you employ must be regulated as to their political activities by the Federal Government. If you wish to preserve your State and local political rights and control over the people you employ, you cannot secure Federal funds—we will not return your money."

We are extremely critical of any attempt on the part of the Federal Government to regiment people, to deprive them of their political prerogatives, or rights of expression. Legislation regulating the personal conduct or freedom of the individual is a blow to our safeguards of liberty, and hence impossible of enforcement and dangerous if enforcement is undertaken.

If Federal power can be used to prohibit activities on the part of employees of States and local subdivisions, it can by the same token be used at another time to promote activity. And this power in the hands of a person with dictatorial inclinations could literally be used to produce a political dictatorship over the entire Nation from Washington. In my opinion, the American people would not stand for a measure that sets out to subject the grants of the Federal Government to control the democratic processes in the States, cities, counties, and other political subdivisions throughout the United States.

Under the bill the enforcement agent is the Civil Service Commission which, being an administrative agency, is to some extent dependent upon the continuation in power of the party under which it serves for its own fortune, and would therefore be tempted to enforce the provisions of the bill in such a manner as to perpetuate the continuation of the party to which it was responsible in power. It could and might prosecute its enemies and wink at the pernicious political activities of its friends. If the power is given an administrative agency to penalize a State and prosecute an individual for a vague and indefinite offense called pernicious political activity, the next step might be to prosecute for lack of activity agreeable to that agency. It is evident that in capricious or dictatorial hands the authority given could be used to stultify and even usurp the rights guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. An unscrupulous administration could use the power given in the bill to exert a tremendous influence over, if not to control, local elections by subjecting its enemies to the embarrassment of political prosecutions under the guise of having engaged in pernicious political activities.

In my opinion the law would be absolutely impossible of enforcement, and a law in this category can only lead to ridicule and a deterioration of general law enforcement. It would be impossible even with a veritable army of investigators to determine when employees of State and political subdivisions were doing any work in connection with any activity, or who were exercising any function in connection with any activity. Under the law an employee might work one week in connection with such a project, and with immunity engage in political activities the following week when he is on his leave of absence, or is working on some other project. Furthermore, pernicious political activity, or taking any active part in political management or political campaigns, or using his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result, are such vague, indefinite, and uncertain terms as to make enforcement impossible. We all know that the inflection of the voice, the gesture of the hand, or the blink of an eye may be as effective in political persuasion as the words spoken, and yet the proponents of this law would have the employees of an administrative agency decide the financial destiny of the States and local political subdivisions, and also determine whether political prosecution should be commenced. The American people would not tolerate this type of undemocratic and dictatorial violation of their right of freedom and expression which has been guaranteed to them by our Constitution.

In these days of distress, it is imperative that movements and laws aimed at destruction of our safeguards of liberty be nipped in the bud.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the real significance of the President's reorganization order scuttling the independent and well-working Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board does not lie in the feeble explanations the President has given the country. Nor have the spokesmen for the New Deal who have been thrown into the breach in a desperate effort to allay the Nation's growing resentment against this proposition given the real clue to the motive.

When one cuts into this reorganization order, the real reason behind it becomes clearer. And from a New Deal viewpoint, it is a logical reason and one that conforms thoroughly to its history.

The answer is simply that the President could not "handle" the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board as now constituted. He does not like its independence; it does not conform to his pattern of government, predicated on Executive control. Hence his recommendation that the Civil Aeronautics Authority must be transferred to the Commerce Department and the Air Safety Board must be abolished.

His fight on the Air Safety Board and on the Authority is the Supreme Court fight all over again. It is the history, repeated, of the President's fight on the nonconforming Mr. Humphreys, of the Federal Trade Commission. It is the history of his fight, again, on the nonconforming Mr. Morgan, of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The challenge, the threat, of the New Deal has always been: Conform or be annihilated.

And now the intended victims are to be the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board.

The air pilots tell us that the President's recommendation threw consternation into their ranks. This same reaction has been had among both Members of the House and the Senate, and especially among those who know the history of civil air regulation while in the hands of the Commerce Department or who come from districts with aviation industries, and who appreciate the terrible set-back to civil aviation while control was vested in the Commerce Department. And I think it is fair to say that the people of the

country generally were equally amazed and flabbergasted—and just as resentful.

Here we have the spectacle of a clean, wholesome, beneficial, and independent confidence-creating agency of the Government laid open to the surgical knife of the New Deal. To do what? To cut away a vital and healthly adjunct of civil-aviation control, independent, nonpolitical control, and to replace it with a political crutch to be furnished by the Commerce Department. When everything is said and done, that is what this attempted surgery would do. But that political crutch would furnish the control the President wants. With it the Civil Aeronautics Authority would become dependent on the administration.

The issue is clear enough.

Let us keep this independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and our Air Safety Board. The people have confidence in its administration. And so has the industry.

That the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board have done their job well is attested by the fact that it has not been in the public eye. Since its inception our newspapers have been free from headlines screaming their notices of air crashes and the toll of human lives in airplane accidents. Everything has been going smoothly.

And yet, despite this background, and without even a murmur of demand for any change, we are asked to reorganize this agency. What we are being asked, in fact, is to disorganize it, to destroy its independent status, to put it again under the same spoils-ridden Commerce Department where years ago the administration of civil aviation nauseated every instinct of decency and conscience, and where its only accomplishment was a tragic toll of lives and a disorganized industry.

I hope that the House will vote down this reorganization order. To carry it out will be indeed to tempt fate. Let history teach us something.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following short, vital resolution:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall provide for the national defense; and

Whereas in present world conditions with the break-down of international law and the failure of all treaties to protect the sovereignty of nations, no nation can feel secure; and

Whereas the Congress should accept the responsibility of providing for the national defense of the United States of America and to protect the sovereignty of the countries of North and South America and the West Indies as announced under the Monroe Doctrine: Therefore be it

Resolved, That on the passage of this resolution the Speaker at such time as he may designate at this session of Congress shall call the House of Representatives into executive session and the Speaker shall invite the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and those charged with the responsibilities under them to inform the House of Representatives on the actual condition of the national defenses of this Nation and to answer questions that may be propounded by the Members of the House of Representatives as to the conditions relative to the national defenses of this Nation.

The Speaker is further authorized to call such additional executive sessions of the House of Representatives until the House of Representatives shall have been satisfied of the information necessary to guide them in providing legislation and funds that may be required in providing adequate national defenses.

Mr. Speaker, the people of these United States can well be compared to a bunch of corn-fed rats basking in the sun waiting to be pounced on by the wildcat nations prowling the world today. Congress has voted billions for defense, yet no informed person feels secure.

Before this session ends Congress must adopt an adequate defense program. Balanced budgets and a $45,000,000,000 debt limit pale into insignificance if our national security is at stake. The hungry wildcat nations of the world covet the fat resources of North and South America. We are pledged to defend the sovereignty of this Nation. What with? A powerful Navy, the most powerful in the world perhaps. England had the most powerful navy in the world. Yet she could not protect Norway. Our present air force could not protect one shore line of the United States. How will we protect the shore line of North and South America and the West Indies? Our limited number of trained, equipped men would not make a formidable expeditionary force to dislodge enemies from the West Indies if they were firmly established. We can avoid the terror of invasion in the continent only if we are prepared. Three years of intelligent, defensive preparation would find us equipped for any eventuality. Bravery and patriotism are sterling American qualities but barehanded and untrained American forces would be smashed by a warring nation in this continent just as the brave and patriotic Poles, Finns, and Norwegians were smashed.

We should know how late it is. Congress should know how late it is by adopting my resolution. The House of Representatives may act as a committee to find what the actual needs of this Nation are and provide adequately for those needs. Our President has made bold and far-reaching steps to provide a Navy, an Army, and an air force. But the time has come when our President needs the united support of an informed House of Representatives to provide this Nation with an adequate defense program.

Puerto Rico and the Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and having in mind certain statements inserted in today's RECORD, I want to make the following remarks about the refining of sugar in relation with Puerto Rico and the sugar legislation which is now under consideration by Congress.

THE SITUATION AS REGARDS THE REFINING OF SUGAR IN PUERTO RICO

The nearly 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico request that no discrimination be laid against our industry. Puerto Rico is under the American flag and is an integral part of the United States, politically and economically. Sugar legislation that seeks to place on Puerto Rico any restrictions pertaining to the marketing of sugar that do not apply equally to sugar producers in other parts of the United States is unjust discrimination and un-American.

According to newspaper stories, the eastern seaboard refiners are seeking to restrict production of refined sugar in Puerto Rico on the basis that an increase in the refining of Puerto Rican sugar would result in the displacement of labor on the mainland.

The facts are that the maximum amount of sugar that Puerto Rico could refine is the amount that is produced on the island. The island is completely out of the lanes of traffic in which raw sugar flows from other countries to the continent, and from a practical business point of view it is impossible to ship sugar from the continent or any other area serving the continent to Puerto Rico for refining and then reship it to the continent. Accordingly, the maximum amount of sugar that Puerto Rico can refine and sell in the United States is the amount that it is allowed to produce under the quota system. In 1939 this amount was 800,000 tons, in round numbers.

The 1937 Census of Manufactures shows that there were 14,024 people engaged in refining sugar on the continent,

and these 14,024 people refined 4,516,000 tons of sugar, or 322 tons per person employed. If Puerto Rico refined its entire output of 800,000 tons of sugar on the basis of the amount of sugar refined per person by the eastern-seaboard refiners in 1937, only 2,485 people would be required to refine Puerto Rico's entire quota. Of course, not all of these people are engaged in actual refining operations. Many of them are engaged in moving sugar to and from the refinery or into the channels of trade. No matter whether the sugar is refined in Puerto Rico or in the continental United States, those engaged in moving the sugar into the channels of trade would still be employed. Thus, the number that would be displaced, assuming that Puerto Rico refined its entire continental quota, would be something less than 2,452.

This is, indeed, a small number, considering the vast amount of propaganda and the many statements put out about the reduction in employment that would occur if Puerto Rico was allowed to refine all of its sugar.

In actual practice, however, the island never would refine more than a fraction of its total quota. The reason is because the island on the average grinds its entire crop of sugarcane in about 4½ months. Thus, each individual raw sugar mill would have to refine all of its own sugar or other refiners independent of the raw mills would have to purchase sugar for refining from the raw mills and carry it over during the other 7½ months when there was no raw sugar available.

Anyone at all familiar with the situation on the island knows that by no means all or any large portion of the 41 independently owned companies would ever attempt to refine even their own sugar, and furthermore, it is sheer ignorance to assume that any refining unit is going to purchase sugar and hold it in Puerto Rico for 7½ months in order to refine the sugar. The market risk is too great.

The larger mills which for 40 years have been able to finance refining operations have shown no inclination to refine sugar. The main reasons why the larger mills have refrained from going into the refining business are, first, they would be able to operate their refineries only about half the year; and, second, they would have to establish selling agencies on the mainland. Experience indicates that the cost of maintaining selling agencies for so small an amount of refined sugar would amount to as much or more than the refineries would realize out of their refining operations.

The four large mills of the island grind approximately 50 percent of the sugar produced on the island. If they have not found it advisable to go into refining in the 40 years that they have been in operation, during most of which period there were no restrictions, it is not likely that they would find it advisable to do so under present conditions.

A few of the smaller mills can refine their sugar and sell it in bulk direct to chain stores or other large users of sugar. Then the question comes as to what chance there is that other smaller mills would be likely to set up and attach refining units to their raw mills for refining their own individual output. That is difficult to say. It is known, however, that not all of them are so situated or are in financial position to go into the refining of sugar, and the experience of the small mills that have gone into the refining of sugar does not lend too much encouragement to those not now refining.

The result is that, when you review the refined situation in Puerto Rico from a practical standpoint, it is not likely that the island will ever refine more than a fraction of its total production. Thus, the argument advanced that permitting Puerto Rico to refine its own sugar would displace a large number of employees engaged in refining on the mainland is largely pure unadulterated nonsense, designed to be misleading.

If the island refined half of its quota, which seems to be the maximum under present and prospective future conditions, it would not displace at the outside more than 1,200 workers engaged in the refining of sugar, based on the record of the number of employees required to refine sugar on the mainland. This, of course, makes no allowance for the number who would still be employed on the mainland in moving the sugar into the channels of trade.

Not only has discrimination against Puerto Rico been proposed in this connection, and not only has the effect and extent of Puerto Rican refining been exaggerated, but other erroneous statements have been made regarding the island's refineries. It has been printed publicly that Puerto Rican refineries pay laborers only a little more than $1 a day. I can state that refinery workers in the island are under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which means that minimum wages cannot be less than $2.40 for an 8-hour day.

In addition, a recent charge stated that refinery workers in Puerto Rico are not represented by labor unions as are mainland refinery employees. To the contrary, workers in Puerto Rican refineries are organized. Wage rates are determined each year by collective bargaining between the unions and the representatives of the refineries.

The further charge has been made that Puerto Rico's refineries are subsidized by the Federal Government, that they have received $2,000,000 in cash in benefit payments since 1934. But the facts are that no refinery on the island has received any benefit payments for the refining of sugar. The only payments have been to growers of sugarcane, exactly the same as in all other domestic sugar-producing areas.

Faced with record-breaking unemployment, entitled to its full rights as a part of the United States, Puerto Rico asks for and insists upon fair and equal treatment in all matters pertaining to sugar.

In this matter, as in all matters, we simply appeal for simple justice to the American Territory of Puerto Rico.

Bureaucracy Runs Wild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, every week you work 3 days' pay goes for taxes. Those taxes today support the greatest number of Federal bureaucrats in the history of organized government.

Bureaucracy is as old as society. No man can enforce the rules of any community without assistance. In even the most primitive tribes the native chief probably called in his favorite nephews to help run the business. He would have been a good deal less than human if he had not heeded the demand of his wife or wives to distribute a few of the softer jobs to the long list of relatives on his waiting list. And those who succeeded by this ancient process in gaining comfortable berths on the tribal roster undoubtedly joined in the game by employing still other pals and relatives to assist them. From such small beginnings rise great institutions.

We all know the famous lines:

> The big fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,
> The little fleas have lesser fleas, and so ad infinitum.

No better description can be offered of the New Deal in action. No one denies for a moment that any system of organization requires the development of bureaus. Someone must be found at the top, and down the line there must be an army of subordinates, each contributing his share to the effective functioning of the system.

Even the simplest forms of human organization acquire constantly expanding duties. Families assume new responsibilities as they grow. Governments create them in the process of growth.

Even the most embittered critic of our present National Government recognizes the imperative necessity for a bureaucracy in the guidance of our people. Republicans, no less than Democrats, concede the truth that our gigantic business of government requires a vast army of public officials to carry out the detailed operations of the Nation. We know full well

that there are tremendous forces at work compelling our representatives to establish new agencies to meet unforeseen and sometimes unpredictable problems.

In the colonial era of American history bureaucracy was already an old acquaintance. Committees drew up rules for the organization of the Continental Congress, for its Army, for the safety of the Colonies, for executive business. A 13-man Naval Committee launched the American Fleet, to be succeeded by a Board of Admiralty. The modern problems which rise from the endless red tape of bureaucratic government were well known to John Paul Jones, who found the naval officials of the Revolutionary Government impossible to handle. In disgust he threw up his hands and obtained from the French those famous ships with which he harassed British vessels up and down the Atlantic coast. Treasury problems were no less irksome. To start the flow of checks, the Continental Congress named two Treasurers, as an assurance of honesty. A few weeks later a congressional committee was added to check accounts.

Within 6 months they set up a new standing committee to check on the checkers. Committees of commerce, foreign affairs, superintendents of finance, marine, and war introduced the founding fathers to bureaucracy at close range before the Republic was born.

By the dawn of the nineteenth century Federal departments were no longer a novelty. But the tremendous expansion in their personnel, expenditures, and functions has been a creature of the twentieth century. Just over 100 years ago, in 1839, the United States Department of Agriculture began its existence with an appropriation of $1,000. Today, a century later, its bureaus have mushroomed to a position which would have amazed the citizens who founded it. More than a billion dollars have been spent by the Agricultural Department alone in that century. The number of its subdivisions defies accounting. No less than 70 separate programs are carried on by its employees, ranging from "dourine treatments to horses" to "phony peach control." Young men by the hundreds stand along the Nation's highways, casually asking motorists to confess the transportation of Japanese beetles, gypsy moths, and pink bollworms. Pamphlets teaching the proper technique of handling three-cornered pants are sent in the mails.

The process of bureaucratic growth has been instructive. It demonstrates the inevitable conflict between the desire for economy in government and the tendency to gain voting strength through the pleasant device of padding the pay roll.

But in the last 7 years we have seen bureaucracy run wild in the United States. It is a new kind of bureaucracy, far removed from the harmless variety which blossomed with the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1882. The New Deal's bureaucrats represent a new species, all afflicted with "bureaucratis perniciosis." They fancy themselves as more than administrators. Many of them look upon their role in American life as that of legislators, policymakers, appointment dictators.

More than 50 new agencies have been established to house this new army of Federal superservants. So-called "brain-trusters" have used such bureaus as the sounding boards for their pet ideas. Masquerading as legal counsel to the R. F. C., S. E. C., P. W. A. are men who look upon themselves as missionaries, dedicated to the spread of New Deal gospel to a recalcitrant, reactionary Congress. With oratorical fanfare and newspaper trumpets, they have made such alphabetical concoctions as C. W. A., W. P. A., C. C. C., P. W. A., F. E. R. A., and F. H. A. part of the everyday language of millions of Americans. Even those whose business it is to know these things find it almost impossible to find their way through the labyrinth of Government bureaucracy. Only the manufacturers of "red tape" find cause for rejoicing in the brain children of the New Deal's agencies.

Some of these establishments have unquestionable merit. A few may even be completely indispensable. Yet, valuable, necessary, or wise, the growth of this new kind of bureaucracy must raise many questions.

How can we reconcile the rise of a new generation of domineering bureaucrats, responsible only to their appointers, with the traditions of a government based upon direct accountability to the people? What does the new centralization of government in the hands of Washington's floating population portend for the future of our Nation?

The Republican Party is convinced that the New Deal's vast new army of civil employees engaged in the task of administering legislation marks a sharp departure from the basic pattern of our governmental system. Republican administrations, too, have established bureaus. But for 150 years it has been the boast of America that ours is a "government of laws and not of men." We in America are determined that our lives shall not be regulated by arbitrary individual action. We know that regulation rushes quickly into regimentation—that regimentation is a synonym for tyranny.

To the men and women of the United States the growth of the New Deal's new kind of bureaucracy represents the direct antithesis of democratic theory. We believe that those who make our policies must be removable at the will of the voters back home. In a republic this is axiomatic. But the New Deal has created a new kind of irresponsible bureaucracy. The establishment of administrative agencies is not in itself a denial of American principles. But the New Deal's bureaucracy declares: "Those whom you elect may sketch outlines of policy. In the daily operations of the Government's business we, the administrators, shall take over the affairs of state. We shall determine the actual effect of each policy upon you. We shall interpret the law. Upon our regulations will rest the success or failure of legislation."

We have seen the results of this new departure in American life. Like a swarm of locusts, investigators, armed with pencils, paper, and authority to compel the production of books, records, pay rolls, and correspondence have descended upon the unsuspecting businessmen of the Nation. Wherever they have gone, they have harrassed them, spreading suspicion of their integrity throughout the land. Farmers have been besieged by earnest young agents of the Agricultural Department, requesting them now to curtail production, now to expand production, sometimes to cease production entirely.

From all that has occurred, one conclusion seems unchallengeable. No matter how well-meaning may be the motives of the New Deal's bureaucrats, their results endanger the American principle of governmental responsibility. This New Deal bureaucracy means a constant diversion of attention from the business at hand. It means the creation of hundreds of new sources of friction in the intricate industrial, agricultural, and commercial life of America. It means the constant employment of men and women whose livelihoods depend upon the analysis of other people's business. It means the creation of a group regarded by the remainder of the Nation as parasitic.

America's founding fathers were well aware of irresponsible bureaucracy. They had seen it in the course of their own relations with the British crown. Dozens of intermediaries stood in the path of any direct appeal to the mother country. They had witnessed misunderstandings fostered by the representatives of a distant government. In the French revolution, too, they had observed its effects. They were not willing to impose any such monstrosity on the newly founded republic.

There are those who argue strenuously that more and more agencies must be created in a never-ending process, because of the growing complexity of modern life; that the recognized need of regulation invariably requires the presence of a multitude of new officials. To them the answer must be straightforward. Our Nation grew from an insignificant group of sea-coast colonies to a mighty power in less than a century and a half. We established Federal bureaus, but they did not usurp the powers of their creators. We developed the East from an agricultural into an industrial center without changing our system of government policy making. We built a railroad network covering 3,000,000 square miles with only one administrative tribunal to handle complicated affairs.

What has happened in the period since 1932 to justify the almost incredible multiplication of these agencies? To be sure, we have suddenly found ourselves faced with a seemingly endless relief problem. To meet it perhaps the Federal Government was justified in establishing a group of organizations within its framework to assure efficiency in feeding the hungry and sheltering the homeless. But this in no way accounts for the establishment of E. C. W., E. H. F. A., F. B. V. E. F. C. of T., F. I. C. B., F. S. L. D., and the dozens of other fantastic growths which have mushroomed overnight since the New Deal took office.

The dangers which arise from the establishment of these many Federal bureaus are no creations of an overactive imagination. In Europe the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist dictatorships of the Russian, German, and Italian Governments did not seize power with ammunition and bayonets. They started on the path to tyranny through constitutional methods. They promised every group within the population precisely what it lacked. Their spokesmen won elections. They added converts to their causes. To hungry men and women they brought the promise of food, the hope of gain. And once in power they perpetuated their authority by the simple device of centralized bureaucracy-dominated government. All power was vested in the leaders. In Communist Russia it went to Lenin and then to his successor, Stalin. Italy gave absolute authority to Il Duce. Germany revered its Fuehrer. But behind each of these men was the army of government employees whose livelihoods were determined by the maintenance of an authority which was being ruthlessly exercised. In Europe the procedure was simple. To carry out its needs the dictatorship developed a pattern for the life of the entire country. Business became part of the government. Laborers and farmers were conscripted into the army of the state. Huge governmental expenditures became normal. Mass-work systems requiring the services of every available man were instituted. Over the air waves and in the press a constant stream of propaganda directed at convincing the nation of its prosperity was propagated. Everyone became part of the bureaucracy. It was the ultimate in bureaucratic government, with the entire nation on the pay roll.

These are steps astonishingly similar to those employed in our own Nation in the last 8 years. With the exception of the freedom of the press, they reflect an almost identical adoption of European practices by an American government. We, too, have heard the talk of a planned economy. From every administrative official high up in the councils of the New Deal has come a discussion of the advantages, the Utopian splendor, of a system completely organized from one coast to another. Rex Tugwell, Henry Wallace, Harry Hopkins, are all disciples of this delusion. They recognize in it nothing antagonistic to the American tradition of free enterprise. They are ready to scrap the whole system for the sake of their plan.

Centralization of government is more an abstract idea. In practice it means that the entire business of government must radiate from Washington. The States become subordinate. Their well-being depends entirely upon an ability to satisfy the dictates of Washington's rulers. And the price of rebellion is all too expensive. Cooperate with the Federal Government and your reward is certain. W. P. A. projects, P. W. A. construction, speedy distribution of Federal old-age pension contributions—these are the reward for good behavior. Refuse to join the chorus of "yes men" and your State is penalized. Ohio finds itself pleading in vain for $1,300,000, withheld by the Social Security Administration because of an internal Democratic Party feud. W. P. A. appropriations become snarled in endless complications. Governors find themselves "persona non grata" before administrative overlords. It is all a very pleasant era for the powers that be. They find it possible to wield the "big stick" with impunity, for their decisions are final. Woe unto those who cross them. This is centralization in practice.

No wonder business finds itself constantly concerned over the development of our "wonderland of bureaucracy." To penetrate it requires the services of accountants, lawyers, bookkeepers in untold numbers. Every new piece of legislation furnishes the source for dozens of regulations issued by agencies of whose existence we are scarcely aware.

In America our farm population numbers 32,000,000. Their lives are intimately affected by the growth of centralized government. It has reached out to make them part of official Washington. What they may plant and what they may harvest are determined by the dictum of the Agricultural Department. Agents scattered over the 3,070 counties of America run our farms. Thirty million workers engaged in industry recognize the growing importance of administrative agencies. They determine the rights to organize and in increasing measure the opportunity to work. Salesmen, bankers, exporters, importers, investors see their daily lives governed almost completely by Federal regulation. The era of voluntary self-regulation which was inaugurated in the twenties has given way to a new day, a New Deal, with Government taking over the role of private policeman.

Bureaucracy is here in full force. Little by little we are pushing on toward centralization. It is not in the interest of America to succumb to this device. We who value individual freedom cannot reconcile it with the dictates of our daily lives by Government agents. It is a short step from free "advice," reinforced by governmental mandate, to coercion, reinforced by the concentration camp. We must determine now never to take this step.

W. P. A. Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, experience of the W. P. A. in the operation of the provision we heretofore adopted requiring 30-day lay-offs for W. P. A. workers who had been employed continuously for 18 months has proven its adoption a serious mistake. Many workers who have dependents and no other means of support have been made to suffer, particularly those of past middle age. With some 10,000,000 of our people on the unemployed list, it is evident to all of us that these older workers who are discharged have scant opportunity to find reemployment.

Industry is taking up the slack with younger workers to some extent, and those 50 years of age or over are cast aside. I urge that before we adjourn we modify this provision which has been so harmful.

I am just in receipt of a letter from a constituent whom I have known for many years and who is familiar with the operation of this provision of the law in my district. I ask leave to include this letter in the extension of my remarks. Obviously I will not disclose the name of the writer. I also ask leave to include the news item referred to in the letter.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 4, 1940.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: The enclosed article appeared in the Oregonian of May 3 on the subject of the 18 months' continuous employment of the W. P. A. workers and the proposed amendment to the same. I feel sure that you are interested in this matter and I therefore hasten to address you regarding the havoc this rule has worked on the employees as well as retarding work on the projects. It is a drastic rule considering the dismissed are compelled to remain idle for 6 weeks, it requiring the relief worker assigned to the case 2 weeks in which to reassign the person. You can see that, even if the amendment holds, the worker will be out a month—possibly more, if not assigned to another project immediately.

I understand that this removal rule has been and is but an experiment. It certainly is a nerve-racking experiment for the young, but more so for the older workers, for they cannot expect to obtain private employment, preference being given to the young "fry," as you know. The salaries given by W. P. A., especially to

the intermediate and unskilled workers, many of whom have dependents, do not allow saving for dismissal time, hence when it comes worry and debt ensue until one is on the verge of distraction. The skilled office workers do not fare much better, as they have been compelled to incur past indebtedness because of the varying maneuvers from time to time of the W. P. A. moguls. If the W. P. A. administrative department would dismiss many of the workers young enough to get private work, but who are preferably making W. P. A. a "career," experiments in all probability would be unnecessary. I know positively from experience with these youngsters that they do not try for private work in the majority of cases.

It is my opinion that the ones doing the skilled work (the older ones generally), such as timekeeping, pay rolls, editing, proofreading, etc., should not be removed, as it retards the progress of the work to a big extent. The ones already on the projects should remain until the conclusion of the projects in order to assure accuracy.

I am employed on the most important nonconstruction project in Oregon (it is in effect throughout the States, I understand), that of land classification, such as public domain, Oregon-California holdings, bird refuges, reservations, etc., doing timekeeping, pay rolls, editing, as well as typing land descriptions, which work is hard and particular and requires corrections because of inaccurate clerks. If the 18-month rule is in operation November 1, I will be in line for dismissal, and then the trials and tribulations and indebtedness will begin. Being an efficient office worker for many years, I have been able to handle the work no doubt much better than the average run of W. P. A. workers could do.

I am appealing to you, a member of the Relief Subcommittee, to put forth your best efforts to have this drastic and seemingly foolish experiment put totally out of commission, as it is a detriment to both projects and workers. I am not appealing from a purely selfish standpoint, but for the interest of all who are in line for dismissal, with its consequent trials and tribulations.

[From the Portland Oregonian of May 3, 1940]

RELIEF BARRIER LIFTING URGED—HEAD ASKS END TO RESTRICTIONS

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The administration moved Thursday to persuade Congress to abandon severe restrictions placed upon the Work Projects Administration in this year's relief bill and grant wide discretion in expenditure of $985,000,000 in the 8 months following July 1.

Col. Francis P. Harrington, W. P. A. Commissioner, proposed to the House relief subcommittee it abandon most of the restrictions voted last year after a W. P. A. investigation.

He approved, with modification, one of the most controversial restrictions. This is the provision for a 30-day lay-off of W. P. A. workers after they have been on the rolls for 18 months. He suggested the lay-off be cut to 15 days.

California's Migrant Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the fact that eastern editorial writers are taking more and more interest in California's migrant problem, and advising the reading public of our State's sincere efforts to care for the migrants. Facts compiled by the Department of Agriculture indicate that migration to California is due to that State's high labor standards. Secretary Wallace's report was printed in the Chicago Tribune of May 2, 1940, and reprinted editorially in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial of the Times-Herald, and that I be permitted to extend my remarks.

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 2, 1940]

WHY THE JOADS WENT TO CALIFORNIA

By this time several million Americans have either read Grapes of Wrath or seen the movie. A great many of them are no doubt persuaded that farm labor in California is poorly paid.

It may be well, then, to adduce the facts as compiled by the United States Department of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, Secretary. They were presented graphically on the financial page of the Tribune a few days ago.

Farm wages in California are not low; they are the highest in the United States. Mr. Wallace reports that the average monthly farm wage rate, with board, in California is $45.50. This compares with $33.75 in Iowa, $32.50 in Illinois, $34.75 in New York. In Georgia the corresponding figure is $12.50. In Oklahoma, the home of the Joads, it is $20, and in Texas only a little higher.

Farm wages in California are about 35 percent higher than in the Middle West, 300 percent higher than in the Southeastern States, and rather more than 100 percent higher than in Oklahoma and Texas. It is scarcely remarkable, then, that considerable numbers of Texans and Oklahomans hit the road for the Golden West. They migrated, as men have from the earliest times, to better their economic condition. They did not have to be lured by false promises of employment. They went in the certainty that employment on the land in California could not be more difficult to find than in Oklahoma and was far better paid.

The reason the farm hand in California gets the highest wages is not at all obscure. The capital investment per acre there is relatively high. That, in turn, means that the productivity of land and labor is relatively high. That means that the wage rate can be high, for wages cannot rise above the value of the product.

Mr. Steinbeck did not do justice to his Okies. He pictured them as pitiful dupes who set out on a perilous pilgrimage without any real prospect of improving their condition at the end of it. In fact, they were behaving as intelligent people are supposed to behave; they were leaving a low-wage area for a high-wage area. Thousands of the migrants have benefited materially from the exodus.

Idealism and Transportation—Being Advice "North Northwest" to Idealists in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the transportation bill forthcoming for consideration by the House has set my mind to work upon how much of our political enterprise can be regarded as transportation of something or other from somewhere or somebody to somebody or somewhere else. I submit here for the consideration of idealists, who specialize in transportation wholesale, an address I delivered some time ago in the city of Chicago before a group of earnest citizens devoted to the improvement of that great city:

GREETINGS TO FELLOW IDEALISTS

We are gathered here, as I understand, to celebrate and to facilitate the cause of city betterment through means political. It is a worthy cause in general and an opportune one in particular. Great as Chicago is, she is not yet perfect; her will to do requires support from our joint will to do well. Whatever happens in Europe, whoever is President of the United States, whoever becomes Governor of Illinois, whoever is mayor of Chicago—the City Council of Chicago needs honest, efficient, and intelligent aldermen. That is the cause, as I understand it, to which you mean to address your efforts in the days ahead. It is a cause that is good regardless; for whatever does or does not happen elsewhere, here and now we in Chicago need the best aldermen we can get. We have some good aldermen. We need more. We shall not get too many good ones. If other things go well, this present effort is also well; if other things go ill, this is well—and all the more important. The mayor of Chicago, whoever he may be, can always profit from having a few independent men in the council, and the citizens of Chicago stand to profit even more greatly by having public matters publicly debated before they are acted upon.

I am personally happy to be here with you and to raise my voice in behalf of this will of yours to improve Chicago. It was this group or the nucleus of such a group as this which prodded me into politics, though I acknowledge that it did not require heavy prodding. They call you idealists; you may accept unequivocally the ambiguously intended appellation. The cause you represent will be alive and flourishing long after the lesser causes are forgotten of those who are less idealistic than you. The will to improve one's city: to make its personnel more intelligent, its services more humane, its performance more efficient—this desire is as deep as the human will to power and in height towers above the will to power and all its hungry kin.

ADVICE TO IDEALISTS

As idealists we have nothing to apologize for—nothing save our impotence. We have a good cause, a permanent cause. What we

need is that our good cause should cause something, that it should make a difference in our city. I am not one to belittle high ideals even when they are useless; for what is useless may be far from worthless, and I hold ideals to be that which is finally worthful. But when worth can be turned to use it is doubly worth while. I know that some good people are good for nothing; but a lot of good people are both good and good for something. By venturing into politics we idealists advertise our desire to convert worthiness into utility, to turn our ideals into the humble channels of action. In doing so, we also subject ourselves to the discipline of action. Thereby hangs the larger tale of the impotence of idealists in politics.

For the first lesson to be learned from the discipline of action is this: That many more noble things can be thought than can be done. One lifetime is enough to think all noble thoughts, but it is not enough to effect more than one or a few noble changes in human society. The price of doing anything in politics is not trying to do too much. What we idealists almost never learn is how to specialize our ideals into action. The logic upon which we mostly operate I have observed to be something like this:

Major premise: Whatever is wrong and remediable should be remedied.

Minor premise: Here is something wrong and remediable.

Conclusion: Therefore I should remedy it.

Now, that's a beguiling argument, in logical form almost impeccable, though not quite impeccable for man. It is an argument good only for God. For a man to conclude that he ought to begin to right all the wrongs he sees about him is for him to right none of them. Frustration is the normal outcome for such aspiration. What each idealist needs to learn is simply this: That he is not God. Whatever idealist has learned this is on the humble road of achievement. Thus humbled, he may leave some modest monument ere his brief day be done. The lesson is harder than you might think; for it is our friends who become our enemies here. It is easy for us idealists to tell our enemies where to go; but to resist our friends who request of us only the simple thing that we be God—that we sponsor all the good things, introduce all the reform bills, speak against all the wrongs of the world—to resist such friends is a matter so difficult that I have found thus far only one idealist who is mean enough to do it.

But this, I believe, is the price—the painful price—of our being more than dreamers of things very dear, but also very, very dead. We must specialize, we idealists—must specialize in our idealism. This you have begun by foregoing official responsibility for the mayoralty fight. Keep up what you have begun. Disavow, not interest in, but responsibility for, a few thousand other things, and we shall be on our slow way to sure betterment of Chicago. Beyond this advice to specialize—one man, one cause—I can help you, if help I can, by sharing with you some notions as to what causes to choose for the specialized concentration of your efforts.

Most that any one person, or any one group, can do in one lifetime flows as an unearned increment from something else wisely chosen and well done. It was this thought that led me to resist for 4 years the temptations offered by friends to sponsor only one bill during my entire term in the State Senate of Illinois. I saw, or thought I saw, one thing to do, which, being done, would itself do a thousand other needed things. And that was to provide a research staff for the legislature itself under the direction of legislative leaders, to furnish lawmakers with the facts they need when they need them. I thought that if we could thus unite the practical sagacity of political leaders with the scientific intelligence of the trained technicians, we should strike a body blow for improvement. I still think so. Indeed, I know so.

In some such abstemious and foresighted spirit, let us pass by the easy temptations to specialize against the visible evils of drinking, gambling, and excessive good timing in general—pass them by in order to make our efforts themselves carry on for our ideals. I see four lines on one of which I'd specialize were I privileged to sit in the city council. The other three I'd try to get somebody else to master and represent. 1. The fiscal system. 2. The traffic system. 3. The personnel system. 4. The educational system. In saying a word upon these four problems in turn, I mean not so much to offer a political program as to illustrate a method for moral ideals to improve in political effectiveness. And I certainly do not mean what I have to say as a broadside against the best efforts in these directions of sitting members of the city council. Not criticism of the past but hope of betterment for the future—let that be here our theme.

1. THE FISCAL SYSTEM

As regards the city's money, citizens are entitled to know that it comes from fair sources, that it goes to useful and necessary ends, and that it really comes rather than stays and really goes rather than sticks. It is abuses here that, next to drinking and gambling, usually attract the easiest attention of us reformers. When some fiscal agent of the city fixes or permits to be fixed tax bills, so that the money does not come in save from the weak and the gullible, or when some venal official takes a few thousand or a few hundred thousand dollars to enrich himself or more often to save or help his friends, the city gasps and reformers get busy to reform. And, faith, there's every reason the city should gasp and every reason that idealists should resolve to reform such putrid excesses against common decency and honesty.

But to get a tax system which levies most taxes on those most able to pay and least taxes upon those least able to pay, this, while undramatic, is infinitely more important to good government than the stopping of occasional stealing; for lopsided taxation is the graft of great grafters, the acceptance of the benefits of the city without acceptance of the responsibilities of the city's cooperative life. You can bond against theft, but not for integrity. Taxation touches our deepest integrity for fair play in the rules of the game. Chicago's idealism requires a man who's head is as hard as his heart is tender to give all his time on the city council to this task, which is a thousand tasks rolled functionally into one. One such hard-headed specialist, not also hard-hearted, could do much to save the city for and from business, from and for genuine humanitarianism.

2. THE TRAFFIC SYSTEM

If those who have the political power had to put up with transportation normal for the majority, there would not long be such transportation as Chicago now has for the bulk of its population. Even most of us articulate idealists ride most of the time on fast, comfortable North Shore or Illinois Central trains rather than upon the jerky, noisy, smelly, slow streetcars. Or we drive our own cars that are not draughty, with money enough in our pockets to pay for convenient parking. To tire workers out in getting them to work is not economy, and to wear them out on the way home is not decency. And to do both for the sake of private enrichment is not democracy. The problem of getting men and women to and from work and pleasure, from and to the spot called home, requires honesty and brains, requires skill in city planning and construction engineering, requires knowledge of finance and accounting.

This is a problem upon which I do not purport to know more than that it has often been left to city fathers that know no more than I. The fact that the subway is coming at last makes not less necessary, but more necessary, the election of men to the city council that mean well and that know as much as possible about the problem. We need wise idealists to discourage stealing the comfort and the pennies of the people, to further both economy and efficiency, and to keep abreast of city planning and population shifts. We need tender-hearted, hard-headed specialists as aldermen from a few wards to represent all wards on this central and crucial matter. One such idealist who'd keep his mouth mostly shut about other matters and his brain always active on this matter would enrich the city from highly paying dirt.

3. THE PERSONNEL SYSTEM

An aspect of politics that lies very close to my own heart is the personnel system of our public service—urban and national. A metropolis like ours requires a veritable army of skilled men and women, and unskilled, too, to carry on the daily work. The unskilled do not constitute a crucial problem—given any moderate desire to serve the city rather than some party leader. But the skilled servants of the city require great care in training, in selection, in promotion, in retirement. This is no task for a politician with personal interests to be served thereby. To know what sort of jobs need doing, to get the kind of men who can do them best, and to keep conditions continuously favorable for the right man in the right job—this would be to effect economy through efficiency and to get efficiency through economy. Here is the real and only great chance to save money without impairing civilized services.

To get the right people in the right places is what the term civil service ought to mean. It is not what the term means in Chicago. So far from this meaning has been the fact in Chicago during my time here, regardless of the party in power, that the very name has come to suggest partisanship, nepotism, and occasionally scandalous graft. Temporary appointments by the thousands, delay in examinations, probable favoritism in the lists—all these, and more, have brought the city's personnel work into such disrepute that it is simply better to call it the uncivil service and be done with it. There is a frankness about all this that, were it not ignorant, would be cynical.

While all this is going on, the necessity of scientific personnel work has grown apace. The functions of government are expanding, the social services are increasing, the necessity for continuous skill is ever more and more apparent. Great strides have been made by technicians in making skilled administration possible, but not largely for Chicago. Our city goes on its ancient way, inefficiently, wastefully, stridently. Political partisanship is made to appear more important than perfect performance in the work of the city.

What a field is here for an idealist who will become a specialist and stay a specialist on civil service. There is available a whole moral philosophy to back him up—cities, model compared with Chicago, would uphold his hand, and the citizenry, once informed, would welcome the chance for their most skilled sons and daughters to find a career in the service of this fair city. A civic cesspool here awaits transformation by hard-headed idealists.

4. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Totalizing all opportunities at improvement is that offered by the educational system. Through the schools, public and parochial, pass now each decade the total population in its quest for richer life. Schools are justly the center of all major efforts to make Chicago better, and the public schools are the crucial center. The public schools alone prevent parochial schools from sacrificing citizenship to sectarianism, and private schools from training cads rather than men. Both private and church schools perform a useful role in our city, but permanently useful only if the public schools confront them constantly with a high standard and a democratic will.

There are those who would keep the public schools out of politics. I would not. I would, the rather, keep politics out of the schools. There's little chance to keep schools out of politics; for politics concern the most important things of our common life, and the schools are the most important things. But to keep

politics out of the schools is the first essential of democratic statemanship. There is every doubt whether this is being done in Chicago today. Citizens are entitled to know what is being done with the schools, to the schools, for the schools. As a democratic idealist, I should welcome the chance to devote myself exclusively to this problem in our city council. There would not be much competition, I believe. How many debates on this matter in the council have we heard or heard of for a half-dozen years?

If the schools are to be kept properly at the center of politics and politics is properly to be kept out of the schools themselves, then political authorities must insist upon a board of education itself educated, impeccable, impartial, and unapproachable. It must be a board that enjoys informing citizens about the schools while educating the children in the schools: Frankly explaining its budget, eagerly exposing its curriculum, ardently soliciting the interest of parents and jealously protecting the integrity of teachers. But I find that I'm off my subject; I'm not talking about the Chicago schools. Let me return to Chicago.

Some years ago I was walking to school thinking of what I'd been reading in the morning paper when I overtook a friendly policeman. I asked him if he noticed several new appointments to our city school board. He had, and thought well of them. I commented wonderingly upon the number of coal merchants in the list. And what had I against coal merchants, he wanted to know. Nothing, I replied, in the coal business; but what fits them peculiarly to run our schools? Well, they are businessmen, he said, and businessmen ought to be able to run anything. "Come, come," said I. "I am myself a school teacher, as you know. I admit that I'm a plumb good one. But what would you think if you had read in the morning paper that I had been appointed chief of police?" "Why," said he sputtering, "I'd think it was a hell of an appointment." And so it would be, my friends. So it would be.

We need some idealist, who is much more patriot than partisan, to go to the city council and specialize in educational matters. The city fathers are responsible in the last analysis for the city children. The city council ought to ask of the official custodians of education an accounting for their high stewardship. Weakness, cowardice, indirection, arrogance, ignorance, avarice—these have no place in the management of schools. Nor has partisan politics or partisan religion either. We need somebody in the city council high-minded enough to free the school from partisanship, intelligent enough to expose failure of function, and courageous enough to put public education in Chicago where it belongs—put it right in the forefront for the sake of all the children whether all the children go to public schools or not.

And while upon the educational problem, I would as an alderman give some of my specialized idealism to adult and even to official education. I'd like to see some idealist who believes in the efficacy of light arrange for an adequate system of reporting upon the city's business, with a proper and independent audit of all funds, including those of the board of education. This ought not to be a matter of muckraking; it ought to be done as a matter of course, for the sake of popular education and decent citizenship. Aboveboard enterprises have nothing to fear from the light and everything to hope from popular interest in public business.

The radio makes possible in large cities for the first time since Pericles a proper educational approach from officials to citizens. As an adult educational measure I would like, as a city father of Chicago, to further the use of the radio for correction, improvement, and enjoyment of the city services. The city council ought to provide for itself or the mayor or for both, a station or regular hours on the air in which scandals could be exploded, problems explained, plans broached, and achievements celebrated. To neglect this new and magnificent avenue to enhanced morale is to forego the mightiest opportunity yet offered to make knowledge effective out of campaigns as well as in campaigns. While the schools are educating the oncoming generation, we can now, by the radio, educate ourselves to common problems, projected solutions, eventual compromises. But there is little hope of adequacy in this larger field of enlightenment until idealism can make itself effective in saving the integrity of the common public schools from predatory interests and cultural provincialisms.

Chicago is, in all truth, too fine a place to have education mean less than all the light all of us can shed all the time upon common concerns. In the schools it is light shed by one generation from all the generations for the sake of the next generation. Out of the schools it is the light of honesty shed on civil affairs. In and out, it is the creation of finer human hungers so that as surely as slowly we shall from our many racial cultures, religious complexes, and economic conflicts create one community, the community of Chicago the civilized. It is the task of idealism to create such a community on this very site of this very city.

No idealist can do it all, nor all idealists do all of it at once. But give Chicago four idealists each specializing in one of these four regions and cooperating for the good of the city, and we should make Chicago better more rapidly than any materialists believe possible. One intelligent, specialized idealist is a company, two's a crowd, three's a regiment, and four's an epoch. These problems are not so many that we idealists must break up in dissention over them, as we have done in the past.

These problems are really all one, as the city itself is one. They are really all problems in transportation. Our fiscal system is transportation through taxation of money from private plethora to public need. Our traffic system is transportation of persons from home to work or pleasure and back again. Our personnel system is transportation of skill from private to public business through wise recruitment and proper placement. And, finally, our educational system is transportation of ideas and sentiments from man to man and from generation to generation. So much one enterprise are these several problems seen to be that one idealist could do them all, were it not for the meagerness of human energy and the shortness of human life. Capable men in the several fields of interest should be able through cooperation to relieve each other of having to play at being God and yet enable all together to be more than mere man.

To regard our city politicians as idealistic experts in transportation is to require of them one outstanding characteristic, integrity. He who moves all things else must not himself be easily moved. He must himself stay put so that all else may move in order and to a purpose. He must not be in politics for money, for there's too much money moving about him for safety. Only idealists meet this elemental demand—services for a moderate salary. He must not be in it for power, for there are always too many people about him who are powerless to protect themselves against him. Only idealists meet this indispensable demand.

He must not be in it to get even with life for wrongs fancied into his very personality, for he will poison with suspicion the sources of human friendliness and succor. Only idealists meet this inexorable demand. Our city politician, he must be in all truth what you are; he must be a devotee of the ideal but willing to disclaim responsibility for all but a little of that. To do what can be done well and to do it with a will—that's the vocation of an idealist.

The United States Housing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

ADDRESS BY HARRY C. BATES

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very able and informative address of Mr. Harry C. Bates, president of the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union and chairman of the A. F. of L. housing committee, before a recent labor conference in his home city of Dallas and appearing in the El Paso Labor Advocate.

The housing program is one of the most constructive accomplishments of this administration. It has had my vote and active support from the beginning. I joined with officials of El Paso and many citizens in recommending and urging that El Paso be included among the cities awarded projects. I am happy in the thought that one of these projects is now nearing completion, and construction on another about to begin. This will mean much for the health, happiness, and prosperity of many underprivileged citizens in my home city. It will also bring lasting indirect benefit to our entire citizenship. I congratulate the El Paso Housing Authority on the fine work it has done.

The speech is as follows:

I am proud to have this opportunity today to address the Southwestern Labor Conference of the representatives of a great labor movement that has raised high the banner of the American Federation of Labor. I am honored because I have been asked to come and speak to you about housing—a problem of vital importance to every single member of our great labor movement; a problem with which the American Federation of Labor has succeeded in dealing effectively where many had failed. But, above all, I am proud to be here to discuss this vitally important subject with you as one who comes from Dallas, who is a son of Texas, and who, no matter where he is or in what representative capacity, will always remain at heart a delegate from the great Southwest.

The American Federation of Labor, which has grown over a period of nearly 60 years, is four and a quarter million members strong today. During these many years the American Federation of Labor has seen many changes take place, has faced many obstacles, and has weathered many storms.

Among such changes were the growth of our whole Nation; development of new means of production; new products; new, better, and faster means of communication. Among these changes also was the great, almost incredible, transformation of the South-

west from sparsely populated and neglected open spaces into a region rich in resources, expanding in production and trade, where we have built large cities, have reared tall buildings up into the sky challenging others to catch up with our pace and our ability to succeed in a difficult job.

When I say that in the past 60 years the American Federation of Labor has overcome many obstacles and has weathered many storms, I say that knowing that some of these obstacles had seemed insuperable, and yet they were overcome, and that some of these storms had seemed fierce and menacing, and yet labor emerged from them unscathed, only strengthened by the experience.

For more than a decade now the ship of labor has been lashed by the worst storm it has encountered, the storm of unemployment. Uncertainty, privation, insecurity, and outright suffering—all these things have been faced by workers, and all these things have strengthened their belief that they must be together and act together if the way out is to be found. Those four and a quarter million wage earners who today make up the membership of the American Federation give our movement the strength it has never had before, and give us the assurance that we shall pass through the storm of unemployment and emerge upon the true course which leads to better wages, better working conditions, and a better standard of living.

There are over 10,000,000 workers today whom we count as unemployed and who should find employment in private industry. A part of this number are new workers coming into the ranks of our working population every year and seeking jobs. A large portion of this number, however, are the workers previously employed in their trades and occupations, those whose skill and experience are not being put to use because of the lagging industrial business and construction activity.

Since 1929 our population has grown and our needs have become greater, but the construction industry as a whole employed nearly a million workers less in 1939 than it did in 1929. Workers in other industries have also carried a heavy burden of unemployment, but it was the construction industry, together with the industries related to construction, that was most severely affected by the depression and has failed to make up for its share of unemployment losses.

Organized labor realized earlier than it is generally supposed the importance of a long-range construction program as a force which would lessen the severe fluctuations in business activity and in employment in all industry and trade. As far back as 1923 the American Federation of Labor made its proposal for a permanent public-works program. It was this proposal of ours that served as a foundation for the Employment Stabilization Act of 1932 and whose basic principles were finally given realization in 1933 by the public-works program.

But the 1933 P. W. A. program was admittedly an emergency program and not, as we proposed, a program of permanent public works through which useful projects could be expanded in the periods of severe unemployment and the activity contracted when private construction was revived. Today the P. W. A. program is rapidly tapering off. Large numbers of workers employed on P. W. A. projects and on the production of materials for these projects are being constantly laid off. As each one of these men loses his job more and more importance attaches to the question, Why has not our proposal been accepted in full? Why has not Congress provided for a permanent public-works program?

Because no such provision has been made, even more insistent, more pressing, and more immediate is the question, What other work is there for these workers?

Eight years ago, at the very bottom of the depression, the volume of our home building shrank to practically nothing.

Residential construction, which is not only an important part of our major industry but also the most vital part, one which affects most directly our standard of living, came to an almost complete halt in 1932. Realizing the importance of this to our economy and the danger of the already developing shortage of decent housing to the workers, the American Federation of Labor gave particular attention to the problem of housing, sought the advice of experts, and studied the facts. In the meantime the shortage of low-rent housing had become more acute. While more workers were driven by unemployment into slums, with two and more families often huddling together in crowded quarters, lack of new building kept vacancies down and rents continued high.

Local housing committees were formed in several communities to study these conditions and to formulate plans to remedy them.

While the Federal Government undertook the construction of several demonstration projects with P. W. A. funds, no provision was made for a comprehensive long-range plan that would be flexible, rest upon local initiative, and reflect local needs and yet provide for the necessary measure of Federal assistance in the form of repayable loans for the construction of low-rent projects.

Our local housing committees were then organized nationally in the labor housing conference of the American Federation of Labor, which in collaboration with the Building Trades Department formulated a housing program in 1934. In February 1935 this program was discussed in detail by the representatives of the building and construction trades with Senator WAGNER who prepared and introduced a bill which carried our labor's principles for a national housing program. This legislation provided for a permanent agency of the United States Government, and was designed to make possible a Nation-wide low-rent housing and slum clearance program. No action on the bill was taken by Congress in 1935. The 1935 bill was shelved by Congress because our labor movement had not yet fully grasped the importance of this program nor had it mustered its full strength in its support. The program was new and the public opinion had not yet crystallized on the issues it presented. The supporters of better housing seemed divided and the administration, busy with various temporary housing experiments paid but little attention to the permanent and fundamental program contained in this bill.

In 1936 the American Federation of Labor unions voiced a Nation-wide demand for the enactment of the Wagner housing bill. As the result the bill passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority. In the House it was caught in the last-minute legislative log jam. The future of hundreds of thousands of ill-housed families depended on a few parliamentary technicalities. There was still strong opposition and the administration was still indifferent as to the outcome.

By 1937 it became clear that half-hearted experiments and stop-gap expedients could not solve the problem. Private enterprise, with or without the F. H. A. insurance, was clearly unable to meet the mounting need for decent low-rent homes. This time labor was thoroughly aroused and from the entire ranks of the American Federation of Labor unions resounded the insistent call for the enactment of this permanent housing program by Congress. This call did not go unheeded. The United States Housing Act of 1937 became law in August 1937, and the United States Housing Authority was organized on November 1 of that year.

The United States Housing Act of 1937 is your act. It contains the basic program formulated by the American Federation of Labor, a program whose outlines labor had studied, analyzed, discussed, and debated long before it was put into the form of legislation. It is an act whose passage was due chiefly to the forthright demand for low-rent housing on the part of the American Federation of Labor unions. To thousands of our building trades councils, central labor unions, and locals of national, international, and directly affiliated unions and countless individual members who supported this act, goes the credit more than to anyone else for making this program a reality. Let me quote from an official publication of the United States Housing Authority a statement of the Government view of what the American Federation of Labor has done to put the housing program through:

"From the very first, important State organizations and international unions in the United States helped to bring housing before the public eye. The low-rent housing bill was discussed at union meetings from coast to coast. Representatives of labor appeared before congressional committees and presented dramatic evidence of the need for public housing. They told grim stories of crime and disease and deterioration in America's slums."

At the first the United States Housing Authority was authorized by Congress to lend a total of $500,000,000 in repayable loans for construction of low-rent housing projects. In response to the demand for labor, Congress passed an amendment in 1938 increasing this authorization for construction loans to $800,000,000. This is the amount authorized by Congress for construction loans to date. These loans are made to local housing authorities constituted by each community. The local housing authority is a public agency of the community; it initiates each project and is responsible for its development. The act also authorized the U. S. H. A. to make grants of $28,000,000 a year in the form of annual contributions, which, together with contributions made by the communities themselves, assure low rents in U. S. H. A. assisted housing projects.

We have seen that organized labor has made this program possible and that organized labor has also led in the first step toward the expansion of the program. But our job has just begun. Today we know that the program we have designed is sound not only in theory but also in fact. It has passed all tests. The most grueling and time-consuming task of starting from scratch and planning, organizing, and developing a Nation-wide program of truly low-rent housing was completed by the U. S. H. A. in the past 2 years. A lot of preliminary work had to be done in that time; a lot of underbrush had to be cleared.

The enactment of enabling State legislation and the formation of local housing authorities do not in themselves build projects, but without them projects cannot be built. Ways had to be figured to make the program economical, with the result that the cost to the Federal Government of assisting families to live in decent housing has been cut. As the result of all this work the U. S. H. A. and the local housing authorities cooperating with it are now ready to turn to their main job with their attention undivided, and that job is to build projects. There are 176 projects now under construction in 107 communities. By the first week in April, 22 projects were completed and occupied, and several projects have been opened during the last 2 weeks. While progress is being made, it is being made within the very narrow limits imposed upon the program by Congress. Some 160,000 families can be rehoused under the program we have today. But this number of low-income families seems insignificant when we know that about one-third of all our families are now living in substandard housing, and the majority of these ill-housed families are in need of such housing as the U. S. H. A. can provide.

Aware of this, conscious of the need for expansion of the U. S. H. A. program, the 1938 and 1939 conventions of the American Federation of Labor unanimously voted to urge amendments which would double the amount of U. S. H. A. construction loans and increase the amount for annual contributions to $45,000,000 a year. This proposal was embodied in the bill known as S. 591, introduced by Senator WAGNER, and passed by a large majority of the Senate

last year. This bill is still pending action of the House of Representatives. But the congressional session is drawing to a close and time is getting short.

Why is the enactment of S. 591 so important to labor? Just what does the housing program mean to the workers throughout the Nation, and more particularly what does it mean to the workers whom you represent, workers of the Southwest?

The expansion of the U. S. H. A. program means good, healthful, decent housing for working men and women and their children who have been the worst victims of badly built, insanitary, substandard housing in our cities and towns. For the first time workers' families are given an opportunity not only to live in clean, comfortable homes built by local housing authorities with U. S. H. A. aid, but also to live in these homes at rents which they can afford to pay.

As I just told you, the present program authorized by Congress provides for $800,000,000 in loans for construction of these projects. These loans are repayable over a period of years out of the rents charged on these projects. The money does not come from the Treasury, but is obtained by borrowing. This means that the U. S. H. A. program places no additional burden upon the Federal Budget, that its operation in no way increases the public debt, and that the cost of the projects is not supported by the taxpayer.

The only item of cost to the Federal Government has nothing to do with the construction of the projects, and although this cost is relatively small, every dollar of it stretches far to make this program a low-rent program. I am referring to the annual contributions made to these projects to insure their own low-rent character and to take these projects out of any possible competition with private enterprise. Annual payments are necessary to bring rents on these projects within reach of low-income families. It costs the Government about $6 a family per month to keep rents low and to keep these good homes within the reach of the workers.

S. 591 authorizes the increase in these annual contributions by only $17,000,000, while it doubles the construction-loan authorization of $800,000,000.

We have seen that under the program authorized to date, 160,000 low-rent homes will be constructed on more than 436 projects in some 200 communities. We have seen also that in proportion to our housing need, while this is a good beginning, it is a very small beginning. The increase in authorization for construction loans of $800,000,000, and the increase in annual contributions by $17,000,000 will more than double the present program. Profiting by initial experience the United States Housing Administration and the local authorities will be able to make every dollar go even farther. Thus it will be possible to build more than twice the number of low-rent homes that can be built under the present program and more families will be benefited. All this can be done if S. 591 is approved by the House in the same form as it passed the Senate. But this is only one of the things the passage of this legislation will accomplish.

The most important question to us today is what will this measure do to provide work for the unemployed? It does a lot. The United States Housing Administration is a double-barreled employment program. But it also shoots straight at the heart of the unemployment problem.

Building-trades mechanics and laborers profit most directly from the United States Housing Administration projects for they are needed to do the construction work at the site.

The present program will provide a total of approximately 512,000 building-trades jobs on the sites of projects in 200 cities and towns. For this work they will receive in wages a total of around $225,000,000. These are important items to the building workers. They mean jobs and they mean wages in the pay envelopes, wages paid by the contractor at not less than the prevailing rate.

But you must remember that the U. S. H. A. will hit its full stride next June, and to the building worker that means gradual tapering off in employment unless additional provision is made by Congress to keep up the pace of the U. S. H. A. activity. And this cannot be done unless S. 591 is approved by Congress.

The amount of indirect employment and wages which the U. S. H. A. program yields is even greater.

For every 100 men put to work at the project site 150 men are given employment and are kept busy supplying building materials, in cement plants, brickyards, sawmills, and all the related building materials industries.

This means employment and buying power to labor at the crucial time when the burden of unemployment has become unbearable to those millions of American workers who are entitled to their opportunity of earning a decent living through their own efforts.

In the world in which we live today we are surrounded with conflict and strife on every side. Under these conditions, more than ever before, we must act and act vigorously to achieve our purpose. We must make our wishes known and back them up by our strength. Our course is not an easy one. But I know we shall succeed because the strength of the American Federation of Labor as a labor movement is in the very simplicity of its objectives. As an American movement, as a democratic movement, and, above all, as a labor movement, for nearly 60 years our goal has been kept clear and distinct as it remains today: To provide shorter hours, to secure higher wages, to improve working conditions, and to insure stability of employment for American workers.

The U. S. H. A. program is one of the means to achieve these objectives. It is not a partisan program. It bears no political imprint. It is in a real sense labor's own program.

Having done as much as it has to launch the U. S. H. A. housing program, labor must not permit it to be scuttled at the time when the real worth of this program has been demonstrated and proved to the world beyond challenge. That is why I ask every delegate to this meeting to act without delay and to appeal to their Congressmen, urging them to give their full and unqualified support to S. 591 in order to insure the enactment of this important labor legislation. On your action now depend the future jobs of thousands of workers. On your action now depends the future of low-rent housing.

The Benefits of Being an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

ORATION BY MISS MARY CALEMINE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to me to have this body act in agreement with the Senate in the matter of establishing I Am an American Day. The conference report was agreed to April 26, and the President signed the bill May 3.

Increasingly we are realizing the privileges we possess in being citizens of the United States of America. We must not take our rights too lightly, for there is a very real responsibility connected with our being citizens of this land.

Recently, while visiting in my congressional district, I was a guest of the Rotary Club at Keyser, W. Va. On the program that day there appeared Miss Mary Calemine, high-school girl of that city, who had recently won a contest with an oration, The Benefits of Being an American Citizen. She delivered the speech with eloquence and feeling. I was impressed with her splendid preparation of the subject and asked her to send me a copy, which follows:

Many people in America are not mindful of the benefits they enjoy. Benefits enjoyed become so matter-of-fact and commonplace we sometimes forget that they are the components of our hard-earned freedom. On occasion down through our national life we have experienced internal disturbances which have threatened our pattern of freedom. On such occasions we have stopped to evaluate and reappraise our benefits as American citizens. At this very hour when wars and oppressions abroad shock our sense of humanity we count our blessings and become deeply conscious of the benefits of being an American citizen.

In times past, doubting Americans left our shores in search of pleasures, benefits, or safety, which they thought could not be found under our American system. We now find these expatriots returning thoughtful of privileges once unappreciated, horrified at the Old World's dictatorships and their accompanying disregard of personal rights. These self-motivated exiles have seen human hopes blighted by threats of war. They have seen personal liberties and benefits of freedom yield to the cause of war and national survival. They have seen slavery in so-called civilization, bondage under so-called freedom, and even hell in a supposed Christian world.

HUMAN RIGHTS PRESERVED

In America, we are protected by a Government which will not allow our human rights to be so twisted or altered.

Our forefathers fought for the rights and privileges that are found in the famous documents which are the foundations of our Government.

A famous clause in the Declaration of Independence states that "All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." How hollow these words would sound in an Old World dictatorship. In America, Mr. Smith is a common factory worker, but that is no reason why his children will not acquire a good education. The Government has provided schools where all may attend. The rich and poor alike are educated under the same standards. Here, any high-school graduate has an opportunity, through his efforts, to win a scholarship or work his way through college. Work is honorable. Opportunity is not issued out like rations or uniforms. The world may have hidden scientists, teachers, and doctors who have not become known because their government has not insured opportunities for them to acquire an education.

The preamble to our Constitution states that our purpose is "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Today we are virtually the only people fully preserving such blessings as freedom of press, speech, and assembly. Americans are entitled to read in uncensored newspapers facts concerning world news, not news our ruler wants us to read. Congressman

MARTIN DIES said: "Our unfettered press is free from the paralyzing fear of deadening control that characterizes newspapers and magazines in those lands where the dictators tell the people what they may or may not read."

NO PERSECUTION HERE

We may listen to foreign broadcasts without the fear of being persecuted. It is not that we care so much about what goes on in certain foreign countries, but there are countries where the people know nothing of what takes place in other lands more than what the government allows them to know.

One of the greatest benefits we have is the right to vote. However, too many people do not take advantage of voting. If many of our countrymen were in lands where this privilege is denied they would readily see how fortunate they are in free America.

In some foreign countries the one and only political party elects the man they want as ruler, and by controlled political methods keep him there. In America on election day, every American citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color, has the privilege to go on to the polls and vote for the man he wants in power. Thus, the ruler of our country is the choice of the people.

I am a first-generation American. My parents and other immediate relatives came from abroad. But the family to which I belong is truly American. I am not boastful of my parents' patriotism or civic mindedness. I am proud of a country where intelligent immigrants can find a life which compensates for family ties and traditions left in the Old World. I can speak of the benefits of being an American citizen because my country held out to immigrants freedom of religion, freedom of thought and action, freedom of initiative and enterprise, freedom of property and contract.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

In America we are privileged to adhere to any religion or faith. We are not persecuted. We are not sent into exile for our convictions. Our churches and synogogues are not robbed; our church officialdom is not punished or put to death. Our Bible is not rewritten and flavored with paganism and nationalism. It is difficult even for us to imagine such atrocities in a so-called Christian world.

I am glad I live in a country with our kind of educational and welfare institutions. Schools and colleges are not hotbeds of nationalist propaganda but champions of freedom of thought and action. Sympathetic institutions for the handicapped and unfortunate exist out of the great heart of a helpful people. Our philosophy is that of rehabilitating and instilling hope. While Europe and Asia fight to kill, America fights to save.

My uncle is a shoe cobbler on one of the busy streets of our town. He came to America 35 years ago and opened a shop. No Government decree altered his plans of enterprise. No governmental agency set the price on the products of his labor. He is successful in a free, competitive system and lives on quality of workmanship and customer satisfaction. His right to use his talents and develop economic security for himself and his dependents rests upon our American freedom of contract and the right of private property. In other parts of the earth we may observe, along with the march of dictatorship and totalitarianism, the fall of private property and the mutilation of the right of contract. Contracts are not observed even by the governments themselves.

THE PRIVILEGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a benefit to live in a country where problems of government and social life are the concern of all the people. I readily admit to the Fascist or Socialist that under American democracy we make many mistakes in seeking to solve our problems. We blunder and resort to trial and error methods in our attempt to advance in a young and growing country. But in the end we reach our goal with freedom preserved. By such methods we have achieved a high standard of living. The common man remains above the state and not a servant to it. What a glorious privilege it is to live in a country where achievement, both in private and public life, is a challenge to the common citizen. The future of America is my dream. It is yours too. It is not the aspiration of some empire builder or power-mad egotist. To accept this challenge to advance individually and collectively, I consider, is the greatest benefit of being an American citizen.

The Wisdom of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., of May 7, 1940:

Speaking Sunday in honor of Italy's new patron saints (St. Catherine of Siena and St. Francis of Assisi), Pope Pius XII mentioned "the whirlwind of war, unleashed from the depths of human passions and egoism," and addressed this plea to the Almighty:

"Triumph in the world, O God of Hosts, and may that peace return in the midst of peoples and nations whom rancor poisons and vengeance inflames, separated by forgetfulness of Your life. O Jesus, disperse the whirlwind of death which crushes humanity, redeemed by You."

By his unceasing struggle for an early peace, Pope Pius XII shows himself the wisest statesman in Europe today, even as his World War predecessor, Benedict XV, by his 1915 and 1917 appeals for a peace without victory, showed himself Europe's wisest statesman of those times.

Had the Allies and the Central Powers listened to Benedict XV, many of Europe's present-day miseries would most likely have been avoided. By listening now to Pius XII, Hitler and the Allies could avert a catastrophe which threatens to hurl Europe into some species of Twentieth Century Dark Ages.

It is doubtful that Hitler would talk peace on a basis of giving up all of the territory he has conquered. Peace is almost always signed on the basis of the fait accompli, the accomplished fact. But the details of the workable peace could be hammered out if only the peace conference could be got under way. If Pius XII's peace pleas are to fail we fear that the executioner Stalin waits for all of Europe.

Iowa Businessmen Are Opposed to the Conference Committee Report on S. 2009

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

MESSAGES FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two telegrams signed by the Iowa manufacturers of carbonated beverages and the Iowa legislative representative of the Order of Railroad Conductors. This is clear evidence of the opposition of all railroad labor as well as businessmen throughout the Middle West to the enactment of the transportation bill:

WEST DES MOINES, IOWA, *May 4, 1940.*

VINCENT HARRINGTON,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Iowa members Order of Railway Conductors urge you to work for the recommitment of the measure generally referred to as the omnibus transportation bill, with instructions to reinsert the consolidation provisions with full protection for labor. We will appreciate your advocacy and support of motion to recommit.

W. H. JEFFRIES,
Iowa Legislative Representative Order of Railway Conductors.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *May 3, 1940.*

Hon. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill 2009, being considered in House today, places private truck operators hauling their own products under burdensome requirements of Interstate Commerce Commission. One hundred twenty-five manufacturers of carbonated beverages in Iowa urge your opposition to this bill.

IOWA MANUFACTURERS CARBONATED BEVERAGES,
EDWARD A. KIMBALL, *Secretary.*

Carl Edgar Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL EDGAR MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great emotion I pay my humble tribute to my warm friend

of many years, CARL E. MAPES, of Michigan. Fate brought us together as members of the Rules Committee. There I learned to appreciate his many splendid qualities.

CARL MAPES was a gentle man. He would never knowingly do any harm or any injustice to anyone. He was one of the most sincere legislators I ever knew. He was a man of wide experience, a profound student of national affairs. He was an expert parliamentarian.

Together with his knowledge he possessed a judicial mind. He was thinking always of doing the right thing, the fair thing. No abler or fairer man ever sat in the American Congress than this distinguished son of Michigan.

When my Republican associates were good enough to choose me as minority leader, it was natural I would lean heavily upon my old friend, who served as assistant leader. I highly valued his good advice and his sterling loyalty.

The loss of CARL MAPES would be severely felt at any time. But his death is a great loss particularly at a time when we are facing many critical days in our national life. Men like CARL MAPES, with the rugged courage of their convictions, are too few in this country. And so are men like him, who in great moments could arise above partisanship for the service of our country.

We who remain pause to pay fitting honor to a great American who has passed on to enjoy the rich reward of a life nobly lived.

Third Term for President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSH LEE, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting, able, and eloquent address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] over station KOMA, at Oklahoma City, and carried over several other Oklahoma stations, on Monday, April 29, 1940, on the subject Third Term for President Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Home folks and neighbors, I am grateful for this opportunity to talk to you about the nomination of a Democratic candidate for President.

There is a great deal of discussion as to who will control the Oklahoma delegation which we send to Chicago.

I do not believe that any individual, whether he is a private citizen or a high public official, should control that delegation. Neither do I believe that any group of politicians should be allowed, through the use of political pressure, to dominate our State convention and deny the people their constitutional right to vote for whomever they wish.

I believe that the rank and file of the members of the Democratic Party is the authority which should control our delegation.

When you deny the people the right to select the nominee of their choice you are thwarting democracy itself, because the rule of the people is the very essence of democracy. Any effort to prevent the rank and file Democrats of Oklahoma from nominating the man they want for President is a dictatorial usurpation of power entirely out of harmony with democracy.

The Presidential primaries which have been held in other States have shown without exception that the people want Roosevelt again. While we have had no Presidential primary here in Oklahoma, yet every single poll has indicated that the Democrats of Oklahoma want President Roosevelt to lead them again. In fact, every method by which public sentiment can be determined shows an overwhelming preference in Oklahoma for Roosevelt.

If we had a Presidential primary, as some States have, where the Democrats could show by their ballots whom they want, there is no doubt but that it would be Roosevelt.

But under the precinct system it is much easier for a small minority, by the use of political pressure, to select a delegation which does not represent the wishes of the majority.

Fellow Democrats, we may just as well face the facts—under our precinct system a well-organized political machine representing, say, only 10 percent of the people can thwart the wishes of the other 90 percent unless the other 90 percent do something about it. Those who constitute a political machine are motivated by patronage and political favors, but the other 90 percent have no other incentive than their desire for good government.

I want the people to have the right to decide for themselves whom they want to lead them in 1940. But, Mr. Democrat and Mrs. Democrat, of Oklahoma, unless you go to the precinct meetings and express your preference in those precinct meetings, you will have no more voice in the selection of a Democratic nominee for President than if you were not a citizen of the United States.

I repeat to the rank-and-file Democrats of Oklahoma: No matter how much you may want Roosevelt, the only way in which you can have a voice in selecting him as the Democratic nominee for President is to attend your precinct meetings and there vote for Roosevelt delegates to the county convention. You can also express your preference by passing resolutions demanding a Roosevelt-instructed delegation to the national convention.

Those who are against Roosevelt are now making a seemingly plausible argument. They are saying, Let us send an uninstructed delegation but one which is friendly to Roosevelt.

Make no mistake, fellow Democrats. An uninstructed delegation would more than likely be an anti-Roosevelt delegation. The plea for an uninstructed delegation is simply the strategy which the anti-Roosevelt forces are using to deprive the rank-and-file Democrats of a delegation that reflects their sentiment.

If the majority of the Democrats in Oklahoma want Roosevelt, then they have a right to a delegation instructed for Roosevelt.

THIRD-TERM ARGUMENT

Then again, the argument is being used that we should not break the precedent against a third term, but that also is merely an effort to deny the people the right to their choice for President of the United States. In a democracy the power to make or change a precedent rests with the people. Therefore, if the people themselves want to change this third-term custom, it is their undisputed right to do so.

The decision whether or not to break this third-term precedent does not lie with Mr. Roosevelt, but it lies rather with the people. He, himself, cannot break this precedent. The people alone have the power to do that. All that President Roosevelt can do is to accept or reject their decision.

There is not a word in the Constitution against a third term. While the founding fathers debated the limitation of the Presidential term, it is significant that they refuse to adopt a resolution prohibiting a third term.

George Washington declined a third term because he was old and wanted to retire, not because he hoped to set a precedent.

Gouverneur Morris, whose hand drafted the Constitution, wrote a letter to George Washington appealing to him to stand ready to serve a third term if circumstances demanded it.

"But you may say that you stand indirectly pledged to private life. Surely, sir, you never gave, nor meant to give, such a pledge to the extent of possible contingencies."

President Grant said of a third term:

"It may happen in the future history of the country that to change an Executive because he has been 8 years in office will prove unfortunate, if not disastrous."

Thomas Jefferson told a close friend in a letter that he stood ready to serve a third term in order to prevent the election of a monarchist:

"There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election—to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist."

Furthermore, George Washington himself made an exception. He told Lafayette in a letter that he saw no propriety in the people depriving themselves of the leadership of their strongest man during a great emergency:

"I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who, on some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

To compare George Washington's refusal of a third term to the present situation is like comparing a peaceful summer day to a roaring storm on a winter's night.

At the end of George Washington's second term there were many of his able lieutenants, known to be in full sympathy with his political philosophy, who were ready to carry on his work. There were no great economic problems or clouds of war darkening the horizon. Therefore Gen. George Washington, who was an old man, felt that he could allow the mantle of leadership to fall upon younger shoulders.

But the present situation certainly presents a different picture. The economic maladjustments which have been accumulating for years are now all crowding for immediate solution. While at the same time half of the entire world is literally blazing with war. Couple this with the fact that we have available one of the greatest leaders of all times who is just now in the prime of his life, and in robust health, and you have a very different situation.

Today Franklin D. Roosevelt has the best knowledge and grasp of the entire situation, both foreign and domestic, of any man in the United States.

Then ask yourself the question, Does it seem rational that we should deny ourselves his leadership simply because he has had 8 years' experience at the job already?

The situation in which we find ourselves today is, in every sense of the word, an exceptional one. Although President Roosevelt

has accomplished more in less time than possibly any other President of the United States, yet there is so much to be done that his work is not yet finished.

In that regard this has been no ordinary administration, but this administration will mark an epoch in history. It has been necessary to crowd into a few years the greatest number of social and economic reforms ever attempted in the same period of time by the American Government. Therefore this administration, by its very nature, constitutes an exception to the no-third-term rule.

During President Roosevelt's administration we have launched an entirely new program for social and economic betterment, and unless these measures are strengthened by friendly hands many of the gains for humanity may be lost.

The important thing today is that these gains for humanity not be lost. I ask you to consider: Is not this of greater importance than the question of a third term or no third term? The question of 4 years more or 4 years less is of little importance when compared to the economic security of 130,000,000 people. Does not the question of a third term dwindle into insignificance when compared with the importance of extending the great humanitarian program of Roosevelt?

I know that it is argued that others would carry on Roosevelt's program, but we cannot be sure that they would. We are sure that no President before Roosevelt ever inaugurated these reforms which were so long overdue. But Roosevelt did, and we are certain that he would continue his vigorous efforts in behalf of the underprivileged. Therefore, why should we in these critical times exchange a certainty for an uncertainty?

There are many candidates for President in both parties, but none of these candidates have advocated outright repeal of a single one of Roosevelt's important measures. Yet we know that most of these candidates are not in sympathy with this program, and we know that if elected they would sabotage indirectly what they dare not repeal outright.

Furthermore, we know that many of these candidates are giving Roosevelt's program lip service only. We know this because they are promising the people they will keep all of Roosevelt's program going and yet at the same time they are promising the same people that they would stop spending the money which is necessary to keep it going. But the people of this country are not fooled by these empty promises. They know that you cannot have your cake and eat it, too.

Many of these candidates say to the needy old people: We will guarantee you security. But can the old people be sure that those pension payments, which mean life itself, would keep coming to their trembling hands under some other President?

Many candidates tell the farmers that they will carry out the farm program better than Roosevelt and that they will do it without any cost to the Government, but can the farmers depend on that?

We have a tariff system which is very unfair to the farmer. It forces him to sell his commodities on an unprotected market and buy what he uses on a protected market.

Would some other President equalize this disadvantage to the farmer by sending him parity payments to offset that discrimination? Or would we slide back to the old system, which allowed the farmer to sink deeper and deeper into debt without any help from his Government?

Would some other President consider soil conservation a national problem and help the farmer in his efforts to conserve this natural resource? Or would we slide back into the old system of mining the soil and wasting its fertility?

Would the millions of unemployed workers throughout the Nation be able to go home at night to their families with arms full of groceries, or would they be compelled to go home empty-handed and watch their children slowly starve while waiting for some mysterious increase in business to open up employment?

Would thousands of young people who are now able to go to school because of the N. Y. A. program continue their education under some other President?

Would the C. C. C. camps be continued, or would the boys be forced to go back to the highways, the boxcars, and the back alleys?

Would the surplus food continue to be distributed to the poor and the needy throughout the country, or would these surpluses again accumulate in warehouses and elevators while starvation stalked the land?

Would people once more lose their savings in failed banks without Government protection?

Would people's homes be foreclosed again, without Government aid?

Would some other President fight the people's battles for them against the big Power Trust? Would some other President build great power projects, like Red River Dam and Grand River Dam, in order that the people might enjoy the benefits of cheap electricity?

We do not know what the other candidates for President would do, but we know what Roosevelt would do, because we know what he has already done.

One of the necessary requirements for a candidate is that he can be elected. Today Franklin D. Roosevelt is the only man the big Wall Street bankers fear. They fear him because they know they can neither defeat him nor control him. Their opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt should be proof enough to the people that he is the right man to lead them in 1940.

NO DANGER OF DICTATORSHIP

Then, again, it has been argued that we should not reelect Roosevelt because he might become a dictator, but let us consider that argument.

When the people elect a man for the first time, they are taking a chance that he might abuse the power of his office. But when they elect a man for the second time, they know how he will use his power. Then if they should elect him for a third term, they would be taking much less chance than when they elected him for his first term, because they would have 8 years' experience and knowledge of how he used the powers of his office on which to base their judgment.

The people of the United States know that Roosevelt has used the power of his office for the benefit of humanity. They know that he is the greatest friend of the plain, common people since Andrew Jackson. They know that he is the greatest champion of the downtrodden since Abraham Lincoln; and if they have the chance, they will express that confidence at the ballot box in the next election.

No, my friends, it is not that Roosevelt's enemies fear that he would become a dictator; it is that they know he would be elected.

If Roosevelt had planned to use patronage in order to perpetuate himself in office, then why has he sponsored the greatest extension of civil service of any administration in the history of the United States?

If he had planned to use patronage to extend his power, then why did he sign the Hatch bill and publicly encourage its extension?

No, my friends, it is not because President Roosevelt has abused his power but because he has used his power for the benefit of the many underprivileged people in the United States at the expense of a few overprivileged people.

It may be that many sincere people have a conviction that in normal times we should not elect a President for a third term. But I dare say that most of those people will make an exception as George Washington did, for a critical period.

Not only is this a critical period from the standpoint of social and economic conditions within our borders, but it is also a critical period because of the wars in Europe and Asia. Scarcely before in the history of the world have we seen more turbulent times abroad than we are witnessing today.

Yet in spite of the danger of international involvement, President Roosevelt has for 7 years steered a straight course toward peace. He has at the same time increased the prestige of the United States throughout the world. His foreign policy is based upon justice and is guided by a dogged determination to keep America out of war.

What another President would do we cannot be sure, but the people of the United States have a deep-seated conviction that on account of the critical conditions at home and abroad, they should not be deprived of the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Out of every crisis of history, God has raised up a leader to lead the people out of their distress. Such leaders are scattered sparingly through the pages of history.

In the early struggle for freedom, it looked as though the attempt of the American people to found a new nation was doomed to failure. But out of the crisis there came George Washington.

Years passed and another great crisis threatened the destruction of the Nation, but out of that crisis arose Abraham Lincoln.

Years passed again; then came the depression. It was a crisis more dangerous than outside foe and more sinister than civil war. The threat of class revolution raised its ugly head. Utter poverty, stark misery, nakedness, and starvation stalked the land, while warehouses and granaries burst with surpluses. The horrors of the French Revolution, like flitting shadows, lurked in the background.

Adolf Hitler had already predicted the collapse of democratic government in America. Josef Stalin was already planning the extension of communism upon the wreckage of the American Government.

But in this dark hour an airplane roared up from the flying field in New York, and Franklin D. Roosevelt flashed across the sky to Chicago to accept the nomination of his party.

Then in rapid succession there came the greatest list of reforms ever crowded into a new administration. Foreclosures were stopped. The youth of America were gathered up from off the highways. The farmers were saved from bankruptcy. The unemployed were given employment. The hungry were fed, the naked were clothed, and the homeless were sheltered.

Whose clear vision chartered the course of that recovery? Roosevelt's.

Whose strong hand forced it into action? Roosevelt's.

Whose stout heart for 7 years has borne up our courage through drought and flood, wars, and economic disasters? Roosevelt's.

But his work is not yet finished. As the people turned to George Washington in their distress, as the citizens of New Orleans turned to Andrew Jackson in their danger, so are the people of the United States today turning to Franklin D. Roosevelt to lead them again in their battle for human rights and to guide the old ship of state safety through the dangerous waters of international strife.

The drums of public opinion have already sounded the long roll. Every Gallup poll has shown that the people want Roosevelt. Every State primary election has shouted "Roosevelt."

I want the people of Oklahoma to have a voice in this nomination. Away with this talk about certain high officials dominating our State convention and controlling our delegation. The democratic way is to let the people themselves decide this question.

Let the rank-and-file Democrats of Oklahoma attend the precinct meetings Tuesday, May 7, and there decide this important question for themselves.

Liberty, Law, and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH E. DAVIES, AT MADISON, WIS.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on May 5, 1940, by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, at the banquet of the University of Wisconsin, at Madison, Wis., in connection with ceremonies dedicating the University's new law library. The occasion of this address is of particular interest to me, as I was born in Wisconsin, and I commend the address to the attention of the Senate. Mr. Davies spoke on the topic of Liberty, Law, and the War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to be here for the dedication of the law library at my old alma mater, the University of Wisconsin, and to speak to you tonight on Liberty, Law, and the War.

Civilization, in its development from the cave man to the present day, has contributed to mankind no more priceless benefits than liberty under law—the only kind of freedom that remains secure rather than destroys itself through its own excesses. Law under our system is ordered liberty. It is liberty under law which assures us freedom to worship God as conscience dictates, security in our lives and in our homes, freedom to think, speak, write, or act in a conscious effort to mold conditions of life under which we and our children wish to live. Blest is that government or people which has this citadel of freedom, for tyranny begins where law ends.

During my stay in Europe I saw the stark tragedy of men and women who have been denied these protections. Liberty under law takes on a very vital significance when you see men tried and condemned to die because of the lack of these privileges. Concentration camps, secret police, forced emigration of peoples, mass starvation, economic, industrial, financial, and journalistic slavery, where the state is master of men and men exist only for the state, and those small groups that control the state—these among other things are conditions which make the liberties which we enjoy the envy of millions of people in the world.

WORLD FORCES AND THEIR EFFECT ON US

All peoples have the right to determine their own political and national ideology and policy. That is their own business, respectively, and none of our affair. But it is our vital duty to see, know, and understand the forces which are at work in the world and to guard jealously our own beliefs and our own institutions that the kind of life which we think is worth living shall be preserved.

The fact is that the world has reached a most critical stage in the crisis which confronts a threatened civilization. It is a fact that in many parts of this earth absolutist political creeds, ready to crush all opposition without pity or remorse, are doing battle against our concepts of law and liberty. Our constitutional system under which individual rights are guaranteed is the mother of our economic, social, and political life. We citizens of the United States cannot conceive of living in a society in which rights of the individual, which are the essence of our ideas of religion and life itself, can be systematically denied in the name of a state or a party or a race. It shocks our sense of justice and right that the moral unity of international society should be shattered by wars—declared and undeclared—in which both primitive and progressive peaceful nations, who desire only to be left alone, should be subjected to force, intrigue, sabotage, and invasion.

We, here, are innocent bystanders in what may be the greatest war ever waged. All about us there exist now and are developing further, tremendous upheavals in religious, social, and political concepts. It is intelligent and wise that we should assess these facts and the impact which these forces might have upon our life—upon the well-being of our farmers, businessmen, manufacturers, wage earners, our churches, and possibly even upon the form of government which we cherish.

EFFECT OF WAR CONDITIONS

It would be manifestly improper for me to discuss political or military aspects of, or to take sides in, this military conflict. Our Government is maintaining a strict neutrality. It is entirely proper, however, that we should study and discuss some of the possible effects which are threatening or may threaten our country. Due to Providence, we are secure from any possibility of armed invasion. We can and will protect ourselves and will maintain the security and freedom of this hemisphere against outside intervention. Under the leadership of the President, the Government of the United States is taking far-reaching naval and military precautions to guarantee that security. Protection from the indirect consequences of this war on world economy and upon our own life, however, is more difficult.

FISCAL REPERCUSSIONS

Even though the war were to be settled tomorrow, forces already exist which will have far-reaching effects upon us. I need not recall that the artificial skyrocketing of farm prices and farm values in 1914 and thereafter left disastrous results here, from which we still suffer today. The business boom which may be created here by this war will have its accompanying disastrous reaction unless we exercise the highest quality of wisdom.

A prolongation of the war, on the other hand, will inevitably create even more devastating forces in the world. Each year, entirely apart from the human life and values being destroyed, the belligerent nations are spending for nonproductive purposes—for destructive purposes—an amount of goods and effort costing more than the total gold supply of the world. Whether this war, therefore, results in an "all-out victory" for either side, with a peace imposed by the will of the conqueror, or whether it results in a stalemate, the effect upon the daily lives of our people will be enormous. It will be a new world in which we will live and elements that may be beyond our control will influence the life and the political thought of our children and their children.

No man can foretell now what the outcome of this war will be. An accident might determine the result. But for the rain that fell on the fields of Waterloo the night before the battle, the history of Europe might have been different.

Even though no foreign military plane, warship, or soldier ever touches our shores, the forces which this struggle has unleashed seem sure to affect us vitally. Some of these are the new economic alinements now being forged across the seas.

The outlet for our agricultural, mineral, and industrial products in foreign trade already has been clogged, and the regular channels of peaceful intercourse between nations have been disrupted.

Hundreds of years of experience has taught mankind that the largest volume of trade is induced by having as a basis of their monetary systems a medium of exchange which is convenient, small in compass, reasonably stable in supply, and universally acceptable. The best medium which civilization has found through this experience has been gold. It is the use of this system and this metal which has facilitated the growth of trade and increased its velocity manyfold over the primitive methods of barter. This system brought attendant greater prosperity, higher standards of living, and better conditions of living to the peoples of the earth. That system has now been challenged as obsolete over a large part of the world by a so-called new and scientific system of barter and exchange where the medium is not gold or a currency based upon gold, but which involved the highly controlled and restricted barter of commodities induced by necessity, force, or fear.

POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND INDUSTRIAL EFFECTS

Our greatest foreign market and the greatest foreign market of all the Americas is Europe. Nearly 40 percent of Brazil's coffee crop alone is sold in Europe; about four-fifths of Argentina's meat and hides are sold in Europe; nearly half of our agricultural products and more than half of our nonagricultural products are sold in Europe. With Europe denuded of gold, this great market might possibly be temporarily excluded from American goods except on the terms which the buyers would impose; to wit, on a basis of exchange of commodities in such quantities and of such character as the buyer would desire. Such a situation might involve serious dependence of the Americas upon European control, or the alternative of finding other markets, which do not exist, in order to keep the standard of living of their peoples consistent with national well-being.

European markets for our manufactured goods may be lost; South American and other markets now friendly to us might be closed by preferential barter; and it is entirely possible that we might be faced with a financial and industrial crisis compared with which the 1930 depression would rank as a period of prosperity.

The liberal thought of the world cleaves to the hope that following this terrible military destruction in Europe, America will still have the strength and power to help recreate our civilization and heal a stricken world. That hope, we believe, will be fulfilled. To safeguard its fulfillment, however, we should think the matter through and envisage potentialities of the situation. We should not overlook the possibility that these high hopes might be thwarted by the fact that we might be relegated to the position of a minority stockholder in a going world concern in which we would have little to say.

EFFECT ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS

These are some of the conditions which confront us and which might bring us face to face with far-reaching and serious effects upon our agriculture, our manufacture, and the standard of workers' wages; with an unemployment situation on such a scale and social insecurity of such intensity that the foundation of our social and political order might be shaken. Despair knows no law.

The continued existence of our individualistic system might possibly be threatened.

These things I do not say will happen. It is, nevertheless, prudent and wise, is it not, that we should appreciate and foresee the forces now existing in the world which affect us, the consequences of which we and our children might have to confront.

There is, of course, another side to the picture. We should not look through a glass too darkly. There are great strengths in our people which are inherent in democracy. James Bryce said 20 years ago:

"No government demands so much from the citizen as democracy, and none gives so much back."

These conditions which I have suggested to you are now being met by American business and by the American Government. It is innate in the genius of our country to meet emergencies and find their solution sanely and practically, and, as our President recently said, with our feet on the ground. It is essential, however, that the facts should be seen and their possible significance understood.

Thus, in conclusion, I would stress again liberty and law as the foundation of our life. Our pioneer forbears left to us precious values as a heritage which we must guard jealously. Whatever the result of the world conflict, our form of government must never be translated from a government of, by, and for the people to a government of, by, and for a dictatorship. Our civil liberties must never be abridged to deny us the equal protection of the law, liberty to worship God freely as conscience dictates, the right to fair trial, against which no writ can ever run, and that form of life in which men are not slaves to a state but where the state is the servant of mankind, where the dignity of the human spirit shall be preserved as the most priceless attribute with which God has invested mankind. To deserve these blessings, we must be vigilant in their protection.

So, my fellow citizens, I recommend that you give these few thoughts and suggestions your consideration. This is our America.

Addresses at Dedication of Tablet Commemorating Cooperation of Railroads With the Government in 1917

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR, AND REMARKS BY JOHN J. PELLEY AND DANIEL WILLARD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, together with introductory remarks of John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, and Mr. Daniel Williard, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The addresses were delivered in connection with the dedication at the Union Station in this city on April 26, 1940, of a bronze tablet commemorating the patriotic cooperation of American railroads with the Government and the services of the Railroad War Board in 1917.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF J. J. PELLEY, PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Our gathering here today is to do honor to the men who were responsible for a significant achievement in industrial coordination, undertaken in patriotic support of the war effort of the United States in 1917.

The lessons of the experience of that time are alive with meaning for us today. No American wants to see this country at war, but every American knows that the Nation must be prepared to defend itself, come what may—and in that defense transportation arteries of the Nation are an essential element. So today, in commemorating events which took place 23 years ago, we are not simply talking about the past. We are looking at the past with an eye to its lessons for the future.

It is particularly fitting therefore that we should have in this gathering some of those who were responsible for what was done in 1917 and 1918—two members of the War Industries Board of that period, for example, and surviving members of the committee of railroad executives, which came to be called, informally, the Railroad War Board. We have with us, too, a number of the members of the staff of that board—railroad men who gave devoted service under great difficulties; also, the only present member of the Interstate Commerce Commission who was a member of that body during the World War period.

Leaders in Congress who have a peculiar interest in transportation or in the national defense, or both, are with us today, as well as those in the executive departments and other agencies of the Government which have special responsibilities in connection with transportation or the national defense. We have, too, officers in key positions in the Nation's armed services. By the presence of so many of those to whom the Nation looks for the plans and organization necessary to meet any future national emergency, we are especially honored.

The first step toward organized cooperation with the Government taken by any industry after the declaration of war in 1917 was taken by the railroads. For that Daniel Willard was responsible more than any other one man. Sixty years he has been a railroad man, starting as a fireman in Vermont. For more than 30 of these years he has been president of the historic Baltimore & Ohio. His career is familiar to you. His position of leadership, not only in transportation affairs but in national affairs, came to him unsought by reason of his ability, his courage, his unselfish devotion, his fairness, and his friendliness. The railroad industry does honor to itself when it presents to this audience, and to the national audience made possible through the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, the dean of railroad presidents—Daniel Willard.

ADDRESS OF DANIEL WILLARD, PRESIDENT OF THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD

On the 6th of April 1917, the Congress of the United States declared that a state of war existed between this country and Imperial Germany. Just 5 days later, on April 11, more than 50 railroad presidents, representing practically all class I railroads in the United States, assembled in Washington in response to an invitation from the Council of National Defense, extended myself as chairman of the advisory commission of the Council. They met at the Willard Hotel. Mr. Hale Holden was requested to take the chair, and presided until the conference had accomplished its purpose.

In explaining the call for the meeting, I stated that a few days previously the Secretary of War, who was also Chairman of the Council of National Defense, had told me that President Wilson felt concerned about the transportation situation, our country having entered the war, and feared that it might be necessary for the Government to take over the control and operation of the railroads, as had been done in England. Feeling that this action was neither necessary nor desirable at that time, I suggested that if the Council of National Defense would request me as chairman of its advisory commission to take the matter up with the railroad executives, I believed they would take such immediate steps as might be thought necessary to meet the situation.

Having explained the call for the meeting with reasons which made prompt action seem imperative, I recommended that those present select an executive committee and give it the necessary power to act for all the railroads during the war emergency. This recommendation was unanimously adopted. A committee was then appointed, of which Mr. Howard Elliott was chairman, to draft a suitable resolution, and a brief recess was taken during which time Mr. Fairfax Harrison prepared the following:

"*Resolved*, That the railroads of the United States, acting through their chief executive officers here and now assembled, and stirred by a high sense of their opportunity to be of the greatest service to their country in the present national crisis, do hereby pledge themselves, with the Government of the United States, with the governments of the several States, and one with another, that during the present war they will coordinate their operations in a continental railway system, merging during such period all their merely individual and competitive activities in the effort to produce a maximum of national transportation efficiency. To this end they hereby agree to create an organization which shall have general authority to formulate in detail and from time to time a policy of operation of all or any of the railways, which policy, when and as announced by such temporary organization, shall be accepted and earnestly made effective by the several managements of the individual railroad companies here represented."

The conference unanimously adopted this resolution and immediately selected an executive committee to carry out its provisions. This committee consisted of Mr. Fairfax Harrison, president, Southern Railway, chairman; Mr. Samuel Rea, president, Pennsylvania Railroad; Mr. Howard Elliott, president, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; Mr. Hale Holden, president, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad; Mr. Julius Kruttschnitt, chairman, Southern Pacific Lines.

Two others were designated to serve as ex officio members of the committee—Hon. Edgar E. Clark, member, Interstate Commerce Commission, and myself, chairman, advisory commission, Council of National Defense.

The committee became known as the Railroad War Board. It established headquarters in Washington, and its members gave substantially all their time to the matters entrusted to their direction until the railroads were taken over by the President on December 28, 1917.

This action by the railroad industry as a whole in pledging its united support to the Government during the period of the war and subordinating during that period all of its individual and competitive interests in an effort to create a truly continental and coordinated system was the first action of its kind taken by any industry after the United States entered the World War. The example thus set by the railroads was, as I had ample opportunity to know, of great value later on in pointing a way in which other industries equally loyal and anxious to be of service to the country might correlate their activities in the most effective manner.

The results accomplished through the activities of the War Board are a matter of record, and I shall not dwell upon them save to refer briefly to a report which was prepared by one of its members, Mr. Julius Kruttschnitt, for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. In this report Mr. Kruttschnitt pointed out that the increase in ton-miles alone handled by the railroads in 1917 over 1915 was greater than the total ton-miles handled in the last previous year of record by all the railroads of Canada, Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, and Austria combined. No greater tribute could be paid to the loyalty of the individual railroad companies and their employees and to the effectiveness of the War Board than was expressed in this report.

However, it became apparent near the end of the year that it would be desirable, if not necessary, for the Government to take over the control and operation of the railroads. There were several reasons why such action seemed necessary. The coordinated operation of the railroads required the rerouting of much tonnage in order best to serve the country's needs. This resulted in the excessive concentration of freight on certain lines. On others it caused a relative reduction in traffic, with consequent serious financial disturbance which was beyond the power of either the railroads or any then existing Government agency to remedy. Equally, if not more serious, was the fact that no agency existed at that time with power to determine which shipping orders for Government account should be given preference when preference was necessary, as frequently happened, and the railroads themselves had no legal right to do so. As a result railroad tracks, particularly at eastern industrial centers and seaports, became congested with cars which could not be unloaded because of lack of ships to receive the tonnage, or because of inability of consignees to accept it. The railroads moved the freight promptly enough, but large numbers of their cars were used by shippers for storage, instead of transport, under the emergency conditions.

I do not hesitate to say that with the railroads as now organized, and with the War and Navy Departments also organized as they now are to deal promptly and understandingly with the difficulties certain to arise in time of war, there need be no feeling of concern about the ability of the railroads under private ownership and management, with the cooperation of the Government, to handle promptly and effectively in the future any transportation situation with which they may be confronted.

I can think of no better way of bringing my remarks to a close than to quote from a public statement made by the late Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War. In referring to the achievement of the Railroad War Board, Mr. Baker said:

"It strikingly illustrates the patriotic cooperation of American railroads with the Government, and also their tremendous capacity."

It seems to me highly appropriate, having in mind the event to which I have briefly referred, that a memorial should be placed in this Union Station under the very shadow of the Nation's Capitol—a memorial designed not only to commemorate the work of the five able and distinguished railroad officers who gave the best of their thought and effort to the successful performance of the important task which had been confided them, but in a larger sense to mark a great and patriotic accomplishment by the railroad industry as a whole.

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Willard has told you what was done in 1917, and how it was done. Now for the future. By act of Congress, responsibility for making plans for use of the Nation's economic power in any future national emergency is placed upon the Army and Navy Munitions Board, a continuing body which reports directly to the President of the United States. The responsible members of that Board are the Assistant Secretary of War, Col. Louis Johnson, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Lewis Compton, both of whom are here today. It is to be our privilege to hear from Colonel Johnson, of West Virginia, lawyer, soldier, former commander of the American Legion, and now Assistant Secretary of War. Colonel Johnson.

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Railroad Executives of America, I thoroughly agree with Mr. Willard. We in the War Department have full confidence in the innate capacity, in the cooperative spirit, in the ability, and in the patriotism of our railroads to cope successfully with the transportation problems that any grave military emergency would involve. Our faith is well founded.

We believe in the capacity of the railroads because we are impressed with the leadership of its management, which is so appropriately represented here today in the person of Daniel Willard.

"Uncle Dan," as we in West Virginia know him best, epitomizes the "master railroader"—a man who has risen from the ranks of labor to the presidency of a great corporation, but who has never forgotten the hopes and the aspirations of the common worker; a student whose education was cut short by economic adversity, but whose passion for the acquisition of knowledge has never abated; an executive who formulates broad principles of policy, but who by experience knows and understands to the minutest detail the operations of a vital industry; a courageous, self-reliant, independent soul, who, in peace or in war, gives of himself unstintingly to his community, to his people, and to his Government; in brief, the highest type of American.

I congratulate you upon his selection as your representative on this occasion when the railroads and the Government join hands to memorialize in bronze your patriotic cooperation during the crisis of 1917–18.

The cooperative spirit which you displayed during the World War, I am confident, will always be present to tide us over any serious military crisis that may arise in the future. Every day you manifest your helpfulness.

The quartermaster general of the Army, our traffic manager, relies upon your invaluable counsel to meet his transportation problems, and you never disappoint him. The five railroad employees whom you have assigned to his office have a complete understanding not only of the Army's needs but even of the War Department's own regulations, and they never hesitate to give us the full advantage of their experience.

In the recent concentration of troops for maneuvers, we transported by rail approximately 25,000 men with their arms and equipment, hundreds of motor vehicles with their spare parts, and tons of food and supplies; yet there were no delays, no break-downs, no injuries to men, and no damage to property. To be sure, we moved only by thousands, and a major mobilization might call for the transportation of millions, but the teamwork that we have developed between the Army and the railroads in meeting our peacetime needs should serve both of us well if a call for greater effort should ever be sounded.

Our confidence in the ability of the railroads to meet a transportation crisis more effectively than in 1917–18 is based principally upon the improvements which the industry itself has initiated. You railroad men have increased the efficiency of your plants with heavier rails, stronger ties, and more dependable signals. You have made tremendous strides in developing safety, in reducing time, in decreasing the drudgery for labor, and in improving service to the public. You have added shop capacity to maintain your equipment. You are making a serious effort to keep your rolling stock up to the high standard that you have established.

You have created and perfected an organization to meet the demands of war under private individual management. Your Association of American Railroads, with its far-flung regional offices, is performing a most useful function. It is helping you to meet jointly your common problems of peace and war without giving up the individuality of each one of your separate systems.

No; you are not in perfect shape. No industry is or can hope to be in a dynamic world. You are better prepared to meet a military emergency than you were in 1917–18. Of that no one is in doubt. You have your problems but none that cannot be met by mutual understanding, patience, courage, and cooperation.

The successful operation of our railroad system to meet the exigencies of war depends, however, not only upon the industry itself but upon the armed forces in whose interest it must operate. If the Army and Navy program for the mobilization, the training, the equipping, and the moving of our fighting men from home to cantonment and from maneuver area to theater of operations is not developed along sound lines, then no transportation system in the world, no matter how efficient it may be, will be able to function effectively. If the Army and Navy plans for the procurement, the transportation, and the storage of munitions are not well worked out and coordinated, then all the best efforts of the industry can be nullified.

Mr. Willard already has pointed out our shortcomings of 1917–18. We admit them, and we are determined that they shall not be repeated. In 1917–18 we waited until war was declared before we selected our cantonment sites. Today we already have established many training areas. During the World War we permitted five Army purchasing agencies and the Navy to bid against each other for supplies, loading and unloading facilities, and for transportation. Today we have plans for the coordination of procurement activities which do away with interdepartmental competition.

In the last military emergency we concentrated the production of munitions into a narrow geographical area in the eastern part of the United States. Today we have more than 10,000 private plants scattered throughout the entire country, which are prepared to meet a war load. In selecting each of these plants, we carefully examined its available transportation facilities and assured ourselves of their adequacy.

Our Army and our Navy should be better prepared than they were in 1917–18 to handle and to distribute expeditiously the munitions which industry would turn over to them. They have avowed that never again will they permit the congestion of terminals and miles of railroad sidings with thousands of cars awaiting unloading.

Our transportation plans are not rigid. They do not contemplate the regimenting of the railroads. They merely seek to establish a broader spirit of cooperation and a practical method of meeting a grave situation, if it should ever arise—and may God grant that it shall not. There is no place in our plan either for Government operation or for Government ownership.

Government operation of railroads is especially distasteful to us. We have predicated our whole industrial mobilization program on the maintenance of the established American way of getting things done. Our railroads now have proven their ability and their capacity. Those who operate them know more about transportation than any substitutes who could be mobilized in the midst of a grave crisis. The Army is not organized to run the railroads. It is honest enough to admit its own lack of training and capacity. It does not want the job. Moreover, it is satisfied that the railroads under private management are always in a state of national defense and are admirably suited to transport men and munitions in time of war. With the job of running a war on our hands, we would have all we could do without embarking on an experiment in Government operation or ownership.

Personally and officially, I am opposed to government ownership. I doubt whether it would offer the opportunity for development of such men as Dan Willard. I do not want to put on the public pay rolls the thousands upon thousands of wage earners, now privately employed by the American railroads. I am against revolutionizing our whole system of private investment, and perhaps jeopardizing the value of railroad stocks and bonds held by banks, insurance companies, educational institutions, and others. I dislike the idea of an absolute state monopoly in the field of transportation; and I assure you, gentlemen, that the plans of the Army and Navy Munitions Board in no way encourage Government ownership or operation of railroads.

The railroads play a tremendous role in the development of our country. They serve every one of our 48 States. They bring our people more closely together and knit them into a cohesive national unit. Other transportation agencies, such as water, air, bus, and truck have their place in the economic life of America, but the railroad still predominates. These may supplement the railroad but they can never replace it. From three-fifths to two-thirds of all of our transportation needs the railroads can and do meet. We must therefore keep them financially sound and physically strong. They are the blood stream of American life in peace and in war.

While I have talked about war, let my words be not misconstrued or my intentions misunderstood. In America we ask only that we shall be permitted to live and work and build to greater things in peace; in short, to carry on our normal functions as a Nation, at home and abroad, not at the point of a bayonet but according to sound governmental and business methods. Our whole philosophy as a people is opposed to war.

Thus we are organized for peace. The railroads and all industry are geared to the productive and progressive ways of peace. That this progress may not be halted by the mailed fist of war is our fervent prayer. But it will take more than prayers to protect it. We would be rash, indeed; yes, even criminally negligent, if in a world where armed men are on the march, and reckless leaders reach with greedy hands for conquest by force, we failed to do the things that are necessary to defend our American heritage.

In preparedness we shall find our greatest assurance of peace. So we are preparing to hold that which is ours by peaceful means if possible but by force if force is brought against us in spite of everything we shall do to discourage it. In this spirit, let the program of the War Department be understood by all people. We shall carry it to fulfillment not in secret conclave but in the light of constructive publicity to the end that our people shall be informed and being informed will understand.

We are making definite progress in our preparedness program—progress toward which not only the railroads but all elements of American society are contributing. We still have much to do, but, with the President's alert attention to our needs and the cooperation of Congress, we have every confidence that we shall reach our objective.

We want an army of the best-led, the best-trained, the best-armed, and the best-equipped fighting men in the world—an army that can be transported, supplied, and replenished by an efficient transportation system—an army that will not threaten the weak and the oppressed—an army that will stand majestically on guard over the peace we all cherish.

Mr. PELLEY. Thank you, Colonel Johnson, for such an analysis of our transportation situation, and so heartening an outline of the future, insofar as the national defense is concerned. It is good to know that the lessons of 1917 and 1918 have been taken to heart, both by the railroads and by the Government, and that through mutual conference and advance understanding we have set up the framework of cooperation between the Government and the railroads in any future national emergency.

Nazi Infiltration in the Balkans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article by Dorothy Thompson on the subject of Nazi infiltration in the Balkans, published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 8, 1940]

FIFTH COLUMN ON THE MARCH

(By Dorothy Thompson)

NAZI INFILTRATION IN THE BALKANS

ZURICH.—If and when the war actually comes to southeastern Europe, it will have been preceded long before by the "fifth column" of those agents, secret and open, those conspirators, spies, commercial agents, provocateurs, revolutionists, and propagandists, who search out the Henleins and the Tisos and the Quislings, the malcontents and the traitors, the idealists and the rascals, who prepare the way and open the gates for the soldiers.

This is a strange war. It is not only a war; it is a revolution. There is little chivalry in it, unless it be perhaps among common soldiers who do their tasks, among airmen who form a transcendental society of their own, and among seamen who fight in actual conflict with their equals according to the old tradition. Waters and roads are mined by soldiers. That is war. But nations are mined and undermined in other ways. The Nazis have gone to school with the Russians and have been good students. The Italian Fascists know the technique also. Russia, Italy, and Germany are all led by revolutionists, who have made subversive movements into instruments of conquest. In this field the Allies are absolutely no match for them.

The Nazis, especially, proceed with a scientific thoroughness. There is not a disgruntled individual, not an overambitious statesman or politician, not a resentive social class, not a discontented national minority, not an avaricious businessman whom they overlook. Like strategists surveying the terrain upon which the campaign is to be conducted, mountains and streams that must be crossed, swamps that must be circumvented, the estates and farms upon which troops can be quartered; who study the climate and the seasons, who know when the roads will be muddy or under snows, estimating every advantage and every handicap, these twentieth-century revolutionary leaders sap the very structure of the society against which they are campaigning, and know all the weak points, which can be made weaker.

I write this on the train between Trieste and Zurich, on the way back from a tour which has taken me to Italy and Turkey, to Rumania, Hungary, and the two Provinces of Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Croatia—from the east of Germany to the Dardanelles, from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, and back again. In no country is the aspect of things quite the same as it is across the border in the neighboring country. But one aspect is everywhere typical: The technique of subversion as a weapon of conflict.

Because the Nazis have perfected the weapon with the most meticulous thoroughness, while, at the same time, their methods are the most crude and the most obvious, it is easiest to study the German side of the picture. The Russians are more devious, and the Italians more inhibited, subtle, and Machiavellian.

In contrast to the Allies, who pursue their own political aims along the more trodden and traditional paths, working through governments, established commercial connections, and espionage organizations euphemistically called intelligence services, the Germans, who use these mediums also, vastly expand them in an effort to reach, tap, and influence the broad masses. I have counted 10 ways in which they work; I have doubtless overlooked numerous others.

1. The German minorities. In all the southeastern countries there are large colonies of German-speaking people, settled there for generations, but never completely divorced from the influence of the mother country. These people have been worked upon for years. They have their own Nazi organizations, their own Gestapo, and they receive instructions from headquarters. In Yugoslavia,

German settlers began purchasing land along the Danube a short time ago. To counteract this, the Yugoslav Government published a decree forbidding the sale or transfer of land immediately proximate to this most important stream, or within 50 kilometers of its shore.

2. Through other dissatisfied national minorities. Thus the Magyar as well as the German minority in Rumania, has been promised reunion with Hungary when the time comes to "break the Rumanian yoke." In Croatia, the northwestern Province of Yugoslavia which has always been rebellious under the highly centralized government concentrating its power in Belgrade, the movement for Croatian independence is encouraged. Its leader is a man named Budak, with a scavenger named Buc. The powerful Croatian peasant party, led by Dr. Matchek, is against this group because they know that an independent Croatia, divorced from the rest of Yugoslavia and surrounded by Germany and Italy, would very soon forfeit its Adriatic coastline to Italy, and in any case be about as independent as Slovakia is today.

But there are idealists and scoundrels ready to join any movement that can call itself patriotic. Despite the fact that the Independence Party (the Frankists) are responsible for having produced the camarilla that, organized, drilled, and nourished on Hungarian and Italian soil, committed one of the most wretched crimes of the decade—the assassination of King Alexander and French Foreign Minister Barthou at Marseilles—they are not yet finished. The local leader, Budak, was recently imprisoned by the authorities. Only a few days ago his wife was found dead, head-downward in a well. The Frankists raised the cry of murder, although the verdict was suicide, and laid the crime at the door of the Peasant Party. Budak was released and his wife's funeral became the occasion for a great demonstration in the Croatian capital of Zagreb, where the Frankists appeared for the first time in a distinguishing dress—a sort of pill-box cap.

In the next few days, leaflets were distributed in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, another Yugoslav province that wishes for home rule. These leaflets, supposed to have been distributed by students, demanded Trieste, Fiume, and the littoral—parts of Italy—for Yugoslavia. Immediately there were counter demonstrations in Italy. No responsible element in Croatia or Slovenia could possibly have been guilty of such nonsense. Yugoslavia wants nothing less than an incident with Italy at this time, and even the Frankists, supported by Italy, could not sincerely wish an incident.

Such incidents are not uncommon. Within the last 3 weeks the former prime minister of Servia has been arrested, together with the chief of police. The arrests were minimized in the press and Yugoslavia. Immediately there were counterdemonstrations in foreign diplomatic circles that both men were pro-German with Fuehrer complexes, nor are those facts alone sufficient to cause the arrest of two such prominent figures.

The point is that constant interference in internal political affairs is a cardinal policy of the undermining process.

3 and 4. Commercial agents and commercial offices exercise a constant pressure both upon individuals and upon the press. Germany is and always has been the most important seller and buyer in all the southeastern countries. The acquisition of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, along with industries and markets of those countries, has increased her position. In Budapest, Belgrade, Zagreb, and Bucharest shops are full of German wares of all kinds. The great German companies, such as A. E. G. (electrical products) and the sellers of machinery, cutlery, cosmetics, and similar products, luggage, cameras, and novelty articles are heavy advertisers in the newspapers, and their pressure greatly reduces the impartiality of the press. The newspapers almost invariably give front-page prominence to the official German communiques regarding the war and bury the Allies' news in condensed form in the back pages.

Every commercial office in this part of the world is a propaganda display. In Zagreb, for instance, the German travel bureau was displaying a few days ago photographs of the finding of the Polish documents, facsimiles of some of the correspondence, together with many photographs from the Norwegian front. A long queue of Zagreb citizens were staring at the display. The English Cunard Line office, farther down the street, contented itself with a long account and a boring picture of the British Fleet, which had probably been in the window since before the start of the war.

The "sensational" Ribbentrop revelations attempting to prove that it was the British and not the Germans who violated the independence of Norway were not taken seriously by a single Government official anywhere with whom I was able to talk, but the Germans believe that the broad public is greatly influenced by this sort of sensationalism. They hammer on it inside and out, while the Allies do nothing to counteract the impression upon the nationals.

5. Contacts between German and local businessmen are used constantly to emphasize the rationalization, efficiency, and progress which would ensue from German economic organization of the entire Danubian basin, and the advantages to executives who, when the change came, would already have become recognized as sympathetic and willing to cooperate.

6. Widespread anticapitalistic propaganda, spread among the masses mostly in the form of pamphlets, accusing Great Britain and France of trying to quench the social revolutions of the Nazis and the Russians. This propaganda makes full use of quotations from British left wingers themselves, depicting the worst aspects of social life in Great Britain and France, and is supported by Russian propaganda as well.

7. Appeals to soldiers and the population at large depicting the enormous strength of the German Army and the complete hopelessness of resistance, with terrifying references to the fate of Poland and Norway and the blissful happiness prevailing in wise and reasonable Denmark. This propaganda is distributed by leaflets and supported by the German press, which has wide distribution all through this part of the world, reaches it earlier than British, French, or Swiss newspapers, and is published in a language more widely spoken here than any other foreign tongue. Especially effective are the German illustrated papers, which tell their story in a language that even the illiterate can understand. The Allies have no press whatsoever that can tend to offset this.

8. Anticommunism. The Nazis do not hesitate to talk almost the exact language of the Communists in addressing factory workers and miners and to present themselves as the bulwark against communism to the conservative peasants. At the same time, in the Slav countries and to peasants and workers alike they undermine the malevolence to their cause of Russia, who in the Slavic peasant mind is still Mother Russia, whether imperial or Soviet.

9. Actual corruption of officials. It is very difficult to trace this, but it exists on a grand scale, according to the evidence of all who know these countries well from long residence in them.

10. Terror. The candid revelation of what happens to individuals and officials who take an outspoken stand against the Nazi plans: "If we succeed and you are known to be our enemy, exile, concentration camp, or death will be your lot."

Many who sincerely believe that the Germans will lose the war nevertheless contemplate the possibility of a temporary German occupation and have no desire to be its victims.

The Henleins, the Seyss-Inquarts, and the Quislings are the German advance guard who are all over southeastern Europe. The allied counterespionage, counterpropaganda, and counterorganization does not even touch the peoples whom the Nazis reach. For when the Nazis fail to reach the responsible they go after the irresponsible, and they have learned from experience how valuable both can be to them.

United States Aid to Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY LUDWELL DENNY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD words penned by Mr. Ludwell Denny on the subject of United States aid to the Allies, recently published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

UNITED STATES AID TO ALLIES

(By Ludwell Denny)

Many informed persons here assume that the United States will be financing the Allies' war within a year. Whether that will lead to direct American military involvement is a matter of dispute.

Some military men think we will go into the war next year. Others think that, even if we went in, our participation would be limited to naval and air aid. Another school maintains that the Allies will be satisfied to let our Navy guard the Pacific, while our war industries supply Allied troops in Europe.

But few doubt that the United States will be furnishing the Allies aircraft and other war materials, metals, and food on loans—which probably never will be paid.

This may seem somewhat surprising in view of the fact that it is impossible under existing laws. The Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act prevent such loans and credits. Of course the theory is that those laws will be modified, just as the other neutrality law was amended when the pressure came last autumn. Under that revision the arms embargo was thrown out in favor of a cash-and-carry provision.

The Allies can meet the cash requirements of the law for several months yet. But by next winter they will be scraping bottom. Then we will be given the choice of losing their war business or financing it.

The arguments for loans will be potent. They will be the same as those used in the last war, brought up to date. Here they are:

1. To shut off the war business would increase our unemployment and disrupt industry dangerously.

2. It also would undermine our own military preparedness by depriving the United States Army and Navy of a going war industry, capable of turning out adequate equipment quickly, if and when needed for Western Hemisphere or Pacific defense.

3. The American farmer has been the victim of the cash-and-carry Neutrality Act provision. Because the Allies have been forced to use their resources for war planes here, they had to shift their purchases of agricultural products elsewhere. Only by loans to the Allies can the American farmer now regain and increase his foreign market, without which he is doomed.

4. Since the Allies are fighting our battle for democracy, standing between us and the aggression of dictators, it is our moral and patriotic duty at least to give them our products on credit.

Although one hears these arguments frequently today in off-the-record conversation, there is little public discussion. The reason, obviously, is that politicians are very much aware that public opinion is now isolationist. They fear that even preparatory propaganda for revision of the Johnson and neutrality laws might easily backfire. This being a campaign year, few are willing to take that chance.

But after the November election the attempt to legalize allied loans certainly will be made.

There is rather surprising evidence that the voters themselves, especially in the isolationist Middle West, are aware that this is the play. For instance, when Candidate Tom Dewey stopped at Oklahoma City last week, he was asked whether he would favor repeal or modification of the Johnson law, which prevents loans to nations which have not paid their last war and post-war debts to us.

Mr. Dewey said he was opposed to any modification of that law.

The isolationists will try to commit both parties on this issue in the campaign platforms, as well as the Presidential and congressional candidates.

But, regardless of commitments, many think the next Congress and administration will lift the loan ban—whoever is elected. That may or may not be the outcome. But, anyway, there will be a bitter fight on this war issue.

Administrative Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. NATHAN L. MILLER

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. Nathan L. Miller, former Governor of New York, and a great judge, at the meeting of the New York State Bar Association, held at Saranac, N. Y., July 2, 1938. Those who are interested in the basic principles will find in this address strong support for the passage of the so-called Logan-Walter bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall speak of what has come to be known as administrative law, which now requires the businessman to have a lawyer constantly at his elbow. Lawyers certainly can have no selfish reason to complain of that or to favor the administration of the law by regularly constituted courts of justice, though some may attribute selfish motives to the lawyers' support even of the Ten Commandments. The record of the bar for its unselfish and patriotic contribution to the establishment, development and preservation of our institutions and to the cause of liberty and human progress must constitute the answer to such critics.

By the slow process of attrition institutions may be destroyed that could not be overthrown by direct assault. I have witnessed that process at work for half a century. The founding fathers intended the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land. The people adopted it to be the supreme law of the land. No one doubted that its exposition was for the courts. No one supposed that the courts would determine rights of litigants according to a statute in conflict with the supreme law. That the supreme law should be controlling in the decision of causes was implicit in the definition of judicial power and in the declaration that the Constitution was the supreme law of the land binding even on State judges. The contemporary evidence is conclusive that those provisions were drafted with that intent. However, the question was mooted at an early date and was set at rest for a hundred years by John Marshall.

When I came to the bar the question was again being mooted, mostly in academic halls. Men out of sympathy with the spirit of our institutions began attacks upon the courts for usurping, as they said, legislative power. In truth they were against any limitations on the power of the popular branch of government, not understanding that the Constitution was designed to set limitations even on the popular will, to safeguard individual liberty. In truth they were against having any written Constitution at all. They preferred the parliamentary system of England.

But we had a written Constitution. It had been evolved from the experience of the ages to make our hardly won liberties secure. It had established a system and structure of government based upon principles which all human experience had proved to be necessary to preserve liberty from despotic and arbitrary power. It had been reconsecrated in the precious blood shed in a titanic civil war.

But all that meant nothing to doctrinaires. Their ranks were swelled from time to time by those who wanted to substitute an alien system for the one whose blessings they or their fathers had been allowed to enter this country to enjoy. Impressionable youth susceptible to false teaching and false idealism swelled those ranks in ever-increasing numbers.

Thus considerable body of opinion was developed that we had outgrown the Constitution, that it had become unsuited to modern conditions and social needs, though under it an acute social consciousness had been developed whose demands could be met within its provisions, and certainly by amendments adopted in the orde `y way provided without destroying the system based on the accumulated wisdom of the ages and established and preserved at such cost. Social need was the excuse put forward to deceive the people. The destruction of that system was the objective.

Finally, men bent on the accomplishment of that objective found themselves in positions of influence under conditions favorable to its accomplishment. They began their attack cautiously. But it gathered boldness as it developed, and today the only thing that stands in the way of its complete success is the abiding faith of the American people in the system under which they have enjoyed the greatest progress with the widest distribution of its blessings ever enjoyed by any other people anywhere.

By the process of trial and error administrative law has been hit upon as the most effective weapon to destroy our institutions. Through its channels those who have been well called termites can safely attack the foundations of our American system, for it has been discovered that administrative law screens them from judicial scrutiny. Oh, I know that when one swelled with arrogance oversteps the forms of due process he may not escape the judicial eye, but most of them are clever enough scrupulously to observe all the forms, while disregarding the substance, of due process, and they can do it in such a way as to thwart judicial review, as we all know.

Let no one misunderstand me. The exercise of legislative and judicial power by specially constituted tribunals has become a necessity in our complex civilization. There are problems constantly arising which neither the courts nor the legislatures are constituted to deal with and which can only be handled efficiently by specially equipped agencies or tribunals in whom under adequate safeguards some legislative and some judicial power must be vested.

We have heard at our meetings for many years concern expressed and warnings uttered by men of wisdom and experience because of the growth of such agencies and tribunals and the extension of their powers, though at first they were created with carefully defined powers to be exercised in accordance with plainly prescribed standards and though care was taken to assure their impartiality and their freedom from political influence. Thus the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Public Service Commissions of the States were created.

But in the effort to subject the varied activities of the people to Government regulation and control, all safeguards have been disregarded. New agencies have been created, existing ones have been clothed with legislative and judicial power, without a single thought of safeguarding the manner of its exercise. And I make the assertion that already there are enough governmental agencies combining in the same individual or individuals executive, legislative, and judicial powers without a single restraint upon their exercise to make this a government of men and not of law, though the forms of law may be preserved.

Already we have heard the head of an executive department, even a member of the Cabinet, charging the Supreme Court with usurping his functions, because, forsooth, the Court had held that in exercising judicial power he must comply at least with the forms of due process. We have heard members of these tribunals on the air defending their fairness and impartiality and charging that any interference with them is judicial usurpation. Such outbursts are symptomatic of what is going on. They show the effort to substitute executive authority for fair and impartial judicial determination. They show the confusion of thought already created by the extent to which administrative agencies have been clothed with judicial power. They show a growing impatience with the judicial process which requires notice, a fair hearing, and an impartial determination. That has become too slow and cumbersome. That is an unwelcome check on executive authority which must not be hampered in its worthy efforts to advance the public good. So has autocratic power always been justified. So may the people be made subjects and their servants become their masters. So may our free institutions be overturned by a process so gradual that it escapes

notice until it has all but succeeded. The truth is that the people have been drugged into a state of unconsciousness. By slow stages the safeguards of liberty are being destroyed one after another. The anesthesia is so complete that the patient is likely to awake to the discovery that he has lost his most precious possession when it is too late to regain it.

No one can say how many more of these agencies may be created or how many of the existing ones may survive in one form or another, and I am far from suggesting that there are not useful and even necessary functions for some of them to perform. The practical question, then, is how to remedy existing evils.

And the first great evil is the centering of executive, legislative, and judicial power in the same hands. That is the very essence of arbitrary power. Because of that the principle of the division of powers between three separate, independent, and coordinate branches of the Government was firmly established in the Constitution, some say, because of the teachings of Montesquieu. But history had taught and still teaches that that is necessary to prevent despotic power. Why then is not the delegation of judicial and legislative power to administrative agencies a violation of the provisions of the Constitution vesting all legislative powers in the Congress, the executive power in the President, and the judicial power in the courts? The reason is that the courts have construed our great charter as a flexible and practical document, as it was intended to be, not as a rigid and unworkable instrument, as many have charged. The definitions of the respective powers of the three departments of government have been given a practical construction. As complex problems arose requiring tribunals specially equipped to investigate and determine particular facts, the courts sustained the vesting of legislative and judicial power in tribunals so equipped subject only to the requirement that the power conferred be properly defined and that a sufficiently definite rule or standard of decision be prescribed. Under the construction so adopted it probably does not violate the Constitution to combine so-called quasi-legislative and judicial powers with strictly Executive power. But that does lead to the very evil that the separation of powers was designed to prevent, the exercise of arbitrary and despotic power. It does violate a fundamental principle proven by all human experience to be necessary to prevent abuse of power.

If you examine the services that the practicing lawyer now has to have, nearly a score, you will find many agencies of government making rules, not merely of procedure which every quasi-legislative or judicial tribunal needs to make but rules of conduct, rules of construction of statutes even sometimes contrary to their plain terms which, though not law, have the force of law, because it is either too bothersome or the necessary delay is too costly to test them in the courts. You will find rules and regulations obviously designed for ulterior purposes to secure a power of control and regulation not conferred. When such agencies have the coercive power to enforce their will, they are not likely to be meticulous to keep within the limits of the powers conferred. Naturally they lose sight of the distinction between executive, legislative, and judicial powers. Naturally they are irked and shout usurpation when the courts on rare occasions require them to observe at least the forms of due process in the exercise of judicial power.

Now these agencies are certain to be governed by some policy which their rules and regulations, and their decisions as well, are made to further. Everybody who has had any contact with them knows that. In truth that is inevitable when any administrative agency has the power to make, enforce, and judge of the compliance with its own rules.

The obvious way to remedy that is to separate rule making and fact finding from executive or administrative authority.

That no man shall be a judge in his own cause has been a maxim as long as law has been administered. Yet we find agencies combining the role of complainant, prosecutor, and judge. It is not in human nature for the complainant or the prosecutor to be an impartial judge. Observance of the forms of due process will not cure that. The only way to cure it is to separate those functions.

The rule was long ago established by the courts to accept determinations of matters of fact by the other departments of government acting within their own spheres, unless destitute of any basis. In the creation of these agencies the statutes have provided that their decisions on matters of fact are final, if supported by any evidence. That works all right with tribunals like the Interstate Commerce Commission. It does not work all right with tribunals whose decisions are bound to be predetermined by some matter of policy. For it is a rare case in which some evidence cannot be adduced to support a decision already made. The decisive question involved is usually a question of fact. The members of these tribunals can observe the forms of due process and still get some evidence into the record to support what they have decided to do. Under the present practice they ought to score a hundred percent of affirmances. If they do not, it can only be because of their contempt even for the forms of law. In fact, the present limited review is as a rule a vain and idle effort and gives their proceedings a purely fictitious appearance of fairness.

When there was a limited number of tribunals specially constituted with carefully defined powers to deal with specific problems, it was not necessary to burden the courts with a review of determinations made by experts especially qualified to make them. But that is no longer the case. If you were to take the trouble to compute it, I venture to assert that you will find that more of your time is taken in the study of the latest rule or regulation or decision of some administrative agency than in the examination of the reports of judicial decisions. And what law is so administered? Not the law prescribed by legislative authority, not the law determined by usage and custom, but rules and regulations of a departmental agency adopted to serve some policy, perchance to fit the particular case. That is not the rule of law. It is the rule of men.

Under the present limited review, the courts are helpless to prevent injustice. However much the courts may insist on compliance with the forms of due process, they cannot compel observance of the substance of due process, and law is being administered more and more by so-called quasi-judicial tribunals which are anything but judicial.

If we are to preserve the rule of law, and escape the rule of men, tribunals exercising judicial power, quasi-judicial tribunals, as we call them, must be completely divorced from administrative, executive, or political policy. They must be assimilated as far as may be to courts of justice. Our judges have no axes to grind, no political or administrative policy to further. Theirs is the sole duty to determine the rights of litigants according to the facts and the governing law. They have administered justice in this country for 150 years without losing the respect and confidence of the people, solely because, despite all that may be said to the contrary, they have scrupulously kept to the exercise of judicial power. They may have made mistakes. Who does not? But they have maintained the public confidence because they have kept within their sphere and have not had to go on the air to prove their impartiality.

There are three simple ways to improve the chances of the substantial observance of due process by quasi-judicial agencies, first, by creating them with specifically defined powers and a definitely prescribed rule of action, second, by divorcing them from executive authority, as the Interstate Commerce Commission has up to now been divorced from executive authority, and, third, by removing them as far as may be from political influence by their prescribed tenure and method of appointment.

If we are to have as many of such agencies as we now have, and we are threatened with more, there should be a broad power of court review. Decisions of such tribunals in the exercise of judicial power should not have greater weight than the decisions of our courts of first instance. The reason for giving their decisions on questions of fact finality disappears when the judicial function becomes predominant. I know that the bureaucrats regard any court review as a usurpation of their powers, but the very fact that they so regard it is proof conclusive of its necessity.

Already we hear the charge that the courts are usurping the functions of these quasi-judicial agencies as we have heard for years the charge that the courts usurped legislative power in deciding that the supreme law of the land is controlling in the decision of lawsuits. That shows how far we have traveled from the true conception of judicial, legislative, and executive power. What does the prefix quasi mean? In truth, it is used to save the exercise of judicial power by administrative agencies from condemnation for being in conflict with the division of powers prescribed by the Constitution. But the power exercised is nonetheless judicial for being exercised by a particular tribunal, though the notion seems to prevail in some quarters that the person exercising the power, not the nature of the power exercised, is the test.

I am not speaking of those determinations which every administrative agency has to make as a mere incident to the exercise of executive authority, and which do not require notice and a hearing. Those decisions are administrative, and since they partake of that character they should not be reviewed. I am speaking only of determinations that can only be made upon evidence after a hearing. The making of such determinations is a judicial function, the exercise of judicial power, and its nature as such is not changed by the prefix quasi. It certainly derives no added authority from being made by one unsuited to make it.

One review of the decisions of impartial judges on matters of fact is the rule in this and most jurisdictions. Should the exercise of judicial power by administrative agencies have greater force and authority?

You will observe that my proposition for a broad court review of such decisions was conditioned on the continuance of as many such agencies as we now have. Far better that there should be less. Far better that there should not be so many as to give rise to the suggestion, which we have already heard, of a special court of appeals to review their decisions, which would remove the last check to prevent these agencies from becoming a law unto themselves and would establish two separate and independent systems of administering law. One would establish the rule of men, no different in any essential particular from the rule now prevailing in the totalitarian states of Europe. The rule of law under the other system would continue only so long as our impartial courts of justice should survive the encroachments of Executive power.

Final determinations requiring special knowledge and experience may well be made by tribunals specially constituted in the way I have endeavored to indicate but beyond that, determinations both of fact and law are for the courts, and when the law ceases to be administered by the regularly constituted courts of justice, liberty will have perished.

A great effort has been made to discredit lawyers for being actuated only by selfish interest. Though, strange to say, the process which I have only imperfectly described is being directed by a cabal

of clever young lawyers indoctrinated with the belief that our American institutions have become archaic and that Russia is leading the way to the new freedom.

My appeal is to lawyers who reject the alien doctrine that the spiritual or material welfare of the mass of people can be promoted by reducing the individuals composing the mass to a common level. My appeal is to lawyers who believe that our free American institutions are the best so far devised by men to safeguard those freedoms, opportunities, and liberties of the individual essential to human progress. My appeal on this subject is especially to lawyers because in their daily work they are able to perceive the gradual encroachment of executive authority upon the judicial process and because they know that the impartial exercise of judicial power, no matter by whom, is essential to freedom. By no means the least of the charges on which our forefathers justified rebellion was the charge that King George had obstructed the administration of justice by refusing assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers and by making judges dependent on his will. The modern way of substituting executive for judicial decisions differs only in method. I appeal to lawyers to make their voices heard in their communities on this subject. That will require them to put patriotism above self-interest, because we have already reached the stage in this country where it has become imprudent, to say the least, to give free expression to one's views But the lawyer has been trained to put the justice of the cause he pleads above all else. Neither the hope of reward nor the fear of reprisals will deter any lawyer who is true to the ideals of his profession from pleading the cause of America. That cause stands in sore need of patriotic defenders.

Easy-Money Policy of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the most fundamental, alarming, and penetrating analysis of the New Deal administration's easy-money policy has just come to light in the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Beginning on page 77 is a recommendation by the Federal Advisory Council which should be read and studied by every citizen of the United States who wants to help preserve constitutional government and our present economic system.

At a meeting of the Federal Advisory Council with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Council submitted a resolution expressing the conviction that many of the fundamental effects of the continuing cheap-money policy have not been fully appreciated. The council advised that the Federal Reserve Board conduct a study of the long-range consequences of this cheap-money policy upon the accumulation and investment of the peoples' savings, and upon the financial structure of the country, with especial reference to its effect upon the maintenance of a sound banking system.

In view of the now well-established fact that the New Deal administration has been driving steadily toward acquiring political control of the banking and credit machinery of the country, these recommendations by the Federal Advisory Council are both timely and alarming.

There is no indication that the Federal Reserve Board will make the study recommended by the Advisory Council; in fact, it is understood it will not do so. The Federal Advisory Council in plain language says the country is moving toward a dangerous condition as a result of the easy-money policy. The administration theory is that this easy-money policy would act as a stimulant to business and would cause business to borrow and would impel banks to lend. It has not had that effect. But, in the words of the Advisory Council:

> It has done and is doing undeniable economic injury to the whole savings class of the American people.

The Advisory Council points out that this easy-money policy is, encouraging an unhealthy position of bond portfolios of the banking system through inducement toward lengthened maturities at progressively lower rates.

By lessening the current cost of Government financing, the policy has made the people, and even Congress itself, indifferent to the steadily mounting debt; thus it tends to create illusions as to the eventual burden of carrying this constantly increasing debt.

The cumulative effect of the policy is profoundly and adversely affecting the large group of industrious and thrifty persons who by reason of character and habit form the backbone of the country's social and economic structure.

Returns on accumulated savings have steadily decreased because savings institutions, facing diminished earnings, have been forced, step by step, to decrease interest rates on savings deposits.

Discouragement of savings investments in life insurance because the cost of insurance is slowly mounting and dividends payable on policies are steadily diminishing.

Schools, colleges, churches, hospitals, educational and charitable institutions of all kinds are receiving diminished returns on their accumulated endowments. With these returns being constantly lessened, salaries of staff members have been reduced, promotions have been delayed, services to students, patients, and dependents have been curtailed, with the result that more and more of the functions which are normally and most efficiently performed by these private or semiprivate agencies are having to be taken over by public boards at the expense of the taxpayers.

After listing these highly dangerous and cumulative effects of the administration's easy-money policy, the Advisory Council states that it believes the time has come to face squarely the fact that the entire banking system of the United States is thus confronted by a distinct menace to the soundness of its capital structure. The Council says it realizes that the long-continued easy-money policy has created a condition which can be corrected only gradually. It insists, however, that the problem portends critical consequences unless it is modified at once and changed as rapidly as possible.

Pilots or Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. McLEOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY AND THE AIR SAFETY BOARD MUST BE RETAINED

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, for several years prior to 1938, American aviation seemed to have reached an impasse. Most of the air lines were experiencing considerable financial difficulty and the future for them was far from bright. Aircraft manufacturers, likewise, were in the doldrums and the outlook for pilots was that of a group who had pursued a dead-end occupation. The public had lost confidence and all interest in air transportation.

In August 1938, Congress stepped into the picture by passing an act establishing the Civil Aeronautics Authority and taking from the Department of Commerce all regulatory powers over air travel. This action has proven to be one of the most important events in the progress of air transportation. The Civil Aeronautics Authority was to become, in fact, the Interstate Commerce Commission for the air.

From its very beginning the C. A. A. demonstrated, by action, that the Congress had been wise in establishing such a regulatory body. The C. A. A., in cooperation with all air lines, has established a most impressive record for the past year. Last year air lines carried more than 2,000,000 passengers and flew over 88,000,000 miles without a single fatality. Major credit for this feat goes to the operators and

pilots for their efficiency, sound training, and judgment. The aviation industry also must share in the glory in having perfected the equipment. However, the C. A. A., with its broad powers over air transportation, must be credited in no small measure for this accomplishment.

Compare the safety record of the air lines under the C. A. A. with the record of the Department of Commerce Bureau. During the last 20 months of operation of the Department of Commerce Air Bureau there were 9 accidents, in which 83 persons were killed. All of us remember the long list of accidents which occurred in Army flying when they carried the mail under Executive direction.

It would seem, in view of such a magnificent showing, that the Executive would for once forego his desire to be all-powerful and allow the C. A. A. to continue to function. However, with typical New Deal disregard for proven facts, the President recommends that the Air Safety Board be abolished, its functions merged with the C. A. A., then that the C. A. A. be transferred back to the Department of Commerce.

Nearly everyone who knows anything at all about aviation opposes the change. To those who are unfamiliar with the technical aspects of air-line operation their common sense tells them that with the amazing achievements under the present system it is foolhardy to throw this agency into the political boiling pot of the Department of Commerce—now in a state of confusion under the tutelage of Mr. Hopkins.

This backward step is being fought by the Republican Members of Congress, and everyone sincerely interested in the welfare of aviation in America. The men who actually carry the mail are against the transfer, pointing out the devastating effect the change will have on them. I am inclined to believe that they are not nearly so ignorant as the President would have people believe, and that they may know considerably more about the operation of aircraft than he does.

The House should, by all means, reject this reorganization proposal. I feel confident that a majority of the Members of this House will so completely repudiate this ill-conceived plan, that the Administration will realize that the people want pilots in the planes, not politicians.

Senator Wheeler and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. WORTH CLARK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ITEM FROM THE MILLEDGEVILLE (GA.) NEWS

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD the comments of Mr. C. B. McCullar, editor of the Milledgeville News, of Milledgeville, Ga. Mr. McCullar discusses the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in a column which he writes.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milledgeville (Ga.) News of April 12, 1940]

In Current History, in its issue of March 1940, page 25, Robert S. Allen tries to decry and minimize the chances of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, to be the nominee for President. Senator WHEELER is one of the most outstanding Democrats in the United States, and is from a section of the country that can win. When these big Republican magazines and newspapers commence knocking him it is an indication that he is a serious contender for the nomination. If President Roosevelt should not be renominated, the odds are greatly in favor of Senator WHEELER being the next nominee regardless of what the ring-tailed corporation crowds want. Better watch his smoke.

A Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK ON MAY 2, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert my radio address of May 2, 1940:

Recently I heard an argument in the congressional cloak room as to whether or not the turkey is more symbolic of life in America than the eagle, and whether or not the turkey—not the eagle—should be deemed our national bird. I am inclined to the belief that the turkey, being a bird of peace and not, like the eagle, a bird of prey, and being more closely associated with our American history—dating back to the days of our Pilgrim Fathers—might well supplant the eagle as the bird symbolic of our American life. The eagle is not a pleasant bird. It is the robber and plunderer among birds. Benjamin Franklin, who championed the cause of the stately, native turkey, branded the eagle as follows: "He is a rank coward; the little kingbird, no bigger than a sparrow, attacks him boldly and drives him out of the district." Our patriotism apparently causes us to condone these faults in the eagle. These faults, to my mind, far outweigh his superb strength in flight and his so-called noble bearing. The turkey contributes to the support of the farmer and those dependent upon him. The eagle contributes to no one's support.

It would be hard, however, to dislodge the eagle, which is so deeply ingrained in the minds of the American people as the American bird. It appears on most of our coins and currency. Many of our posters and public buildings bear the picture or the replica of the eagle. Nevertheless, the "gobbler" would to a far greater extent typify our American ways and habits. I am for the turkey as against the eagle. Unfortunately, the bald eagle was adopted as our national emblem by act of Congress June 20, 1782.

THE DUTCH EAST INDIES

My hat goes off to Cordell Hull. When Japan's Foreign Minister Hachiro Arita made a "verbal pass" at the Netherlands or the Dutch East Indies, Cordell did not lose any time in putting Japan, politely, yet forcibly, in its place. The Dutch East Indies are assuredly a matter of genuine and major concern to the United States. It is one of the main sources of our rubber and tin. These islands supply our country with $100,000,000 worth of rubber each year. The neighboring federated British Malay States supply us with $50,000,000 worth. That area also supplies us with $50,000,000 worth of tin annually. It is well to remember that we are paying upwards of $1,000,000,000 a year for our Navy in the Pacific to maintain and protect a Pacific life line for rubber, tin, manganese, and other essential articles.

It was, therefore, with real concern—if not genuine alarm—that Cordell heard the Japanese Foreign Minister say "Should the hostilities in Europe be extended to the Netherlands and produce repercussions in the Dutch East Indies * * * it would give rise to an undesirable situation from a standpoint of peace and stability in east Asia." He added, "The Japanese Government takes the deepest interest in the Netherlands East Indies as part of the Empire's life line in the south." It would have been awkward and negligent for Cordell Hull to have received these words in silence. Bluntly and plainly, our Secretary of State said, "Intervention in domestic affairs of the Netherlands Indies or any alteration of their status by other than peaceful processes would be prejudicial to the cause of peace and stability not only in the region of the Netherlands Indies, but in the entire Pacific area."

President Roosevelt, soon after Cordell's utterance, went to the unusual extreme of confirming what our Secretary of State had pronounced. This is the time for plain speaking. It clears the air. Japan, with her hands full with China, will think twice before moving south in the event of Nazi invasion of Holland.

If our Secretary of State and our President would remain silent, in the face of Japan's pronouncement after a German blitzkrieg in Holland, that silence would have been a cue for Japan to walk in and seize the Dutch East Indies. All the more power to Roosevelt and Hull. They know that we must take a firm stand in the Far East. We can give no ground in asserting America's rights. We must be equally determined to enforce a so-called status quo as it may affect British, Dutch, and French rights in that same area. Japan knows we mean business. She knows that our hints are not academic, that our threats are not idle.

ICELAND AND GREENLAND

The average American little realizes the grave problems constantly facing the White House and the State Department. Isolation is not as simple or as easy as it seems. It might be well for the man in the street to know that the Monroe Doctrine, the Declaration of Panama, and various treaties have bound the United States and caused us to assume obligations that extend one-third of the way around the world. We have, e. g., a commitment to defend this entire hemisphere. Be it remembered that a vast part of this hemisphere is nearer Europe and Africa than it is to the United States. We have a further commitment to protect and defend the Philippines. They are 7,000 miles removed from us. We have other commitments in a war-torn world. Much might be in store for us as a result of the disappearance of Denmark as an independent nation. What about the problem of sovereignty in Greenland and Iceland? Both of these are strategically important to our safety.

The Monroe Doctrine affects Iceland and Greenland. It might be premature to make the statement that the Monroe Doctrine applies to Greenland, but the State Department can very easily point to a precedent upon which to base the invocation of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1916, during the World War, the United States purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark, and at the time the Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, privately advised the Danish Minister that the United States might have been forced to take possession of said Virgin Islands. He apparently meant that Germany was at that time threatening Denmark and her possessions. The implication was that the United States would have defended the Virgin Islands as a possession of a neutral. There has been no official statement, but Greenland provides a parallel to the Virgin Islands in the last war. Nevertheless, President Roosevelt has stated that because of the war, America's responsibility toward Greenland has increased. Iceland lies just athwart the hemisphere line, and, I am sure, will be deemed within the protection of the Monroe Doctrine, just as Greenland.

BLEEDING THE CZECHS

We hear little from unfortunate Czechoslovakia. However, word seeped through the barbed-wire censorship to the effect that the Nazi policy is bleeding the Czech people of their economic and financial resources. The Nazis continue, e. g., ruthlessly to ship Czech silver coins to Germany in large quantities, to be replaced by Nazi paper money. In other words, the Czechs are getting worthless German paper money for valuable metal. At the present moment, there is more paper money in Czechoslovakia than there was formerly in Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Poland. For example, Nazi soldiers are allowed to reckon 1 mark as equal to 10 crowns in the shops, whereas the official rate of exchange is only 7 crowns. In Bratislava hairdressers post notices in their shop windows that Germans will be shaved free. Reason for this is as follows: The regular price of a shave is 2 crowns. The hairdressers are obliged to give their Nazi clients 8 crowns change from a mark. They would thus lose 1 crown on each shave.

NAZI TREACHERY IN NORWAY SEEMS INCREDIBLE

There is an amazing story that comes from Oslo. When the first Nazi troops reached Oslo, an attaché of the German legation donned his uniform and assumed active command over one of the naval detachments that had landed. He thus abused his diplomatic privilege by taking command of part of the forces invading "a country to which he had been attributed and assigned as a diplomatic agent."

The Lord only knows how many German spies, in and out of the diplomatic service, that are located in our own country, and who are reporting constantly to their home Government and authorities what our officers and what our private citizens may or may not be doing. Assuredly, considering the harrowing tales concerning Nazi diplomats, we should be on our guard. We should take nothing for granted.

NAZI TREACHERY IN HOLLAND

The other evening at a private dinner, at which a high dignatary of the Dutch Government was present, I heard the following amazing story which is probably part of the Hitler blitzkrieg.

It would appear that Holland has a population of about 8,000,000 and about 400,000 thereof are Germans, mostly Nazis. Hundreds of these Nazis in Holland are used as spies and espionage agents. Most of the domestics in the homes of the well-to-do in Holland are Germans, and these domestics have been known to keep diaries, or intimate records, of conversations of their mistresses and masters, particularly where the latter utter anti-Nazi sentiments. In that way, the entire records of thousands of families are known to the Germans. These records are often coupled with photographs which these domestics have stolen from the albums in the homes which they serve. In all likelihood these families will feel the scourge of the blitzkrieg if the Germans ever dominate Holland.

Furthermore, to the amazement of the Dutch Army officers, it was discovered that the records of the Dutch Army and Navy and uniforms of soldiers and sailors were stolen by the Nazi spies. There are today thousands of Nazis parading through Holland in Dutch uniforms. In this way, they spy into the innermost recesses of the Dutch Army and Navy records.

Punishments have been meted out to these culprits when caught, but the espionage is more rampant than ever. In one Army camp one evening an attempt was made to trap these false German soldiers, and the order was given not to salute. Of course, the Nazis knew nothing of the order and saluted. They were immediately apprehended. But there are any number of these false Dutch soldiers roaming the streets and entering the homes of the Dutch, and in that way have been enabled to increase to an amazing extent the Nazi knowledge of Dutch defensive and offensive practices.

SOUTH AMERICA

There appeared in the press about 10 days ago a rather important news item, indicating that the Rockefellers are looking toward Venezuela for additional investments. Nelson Rockefeller and his brother, Lawrence, are now en route to Venezuela, where the family plans an extensive real-estate development, including the building of a hotel at Caracas. There is a trek of powerful American companies in the direction of Venezuela. The Government of the latter has encouraged large entities to make considerable investments in the rich oil fields of that Republic. In addition, the Bethlehem Steel Co. plans to expend about $25,000,000 in developing its concessions. I believe such business campaigns in South America most constructive and worthy.

TOM DEWEY

Primaries have been conducted in Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and are planned in other States, but, be it remembered, elections may be determined in Scandinavia. It becomes increasingly evident that the effects of the present European war are growing catastrophic. It, therefore, will become increasingly difficult for a Dewey to persuade the Nation that a mere local district-attorney background is sufficient Presidential equipment with which to deal with the present European chaos.

Concomitantly, a Roosevelt ian third term possibility increases and the possibility becomes more certain as each message from abroad tells of increased chaos. Of course, every current world event makes Roosevelt a stronger third-term candidate. Each crisis has the effect of belittling his opposition, Republican as well as Democratic. Frankly, the President is wise in keeping silent as to the third term. Yet I am one of those who believe that he will not accept a third term. The tradition against it is too strong for even one as great as he to resist.

And, by the way, who are the men who surround Dewey? Who are his managers and financiers and, therefore, the ones who will share his power if he gets it? First, there is Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick Simms, daughter of the late Mark Hanna, of Ohio, an inheritor of great wealth, and a politician in her own right. At Dewey headquarters, Ruth is boss. Then, there is John Foster Dulles, one of the senior partners in the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell. This is a very wealthy, conservative, and powerful outfit. Dulles can be found on the board of directors of numerous blue-chip organizations. Another Dewey man is Artemus Gates, president of the New York Trust Co. Gates married the daughter of the late Henry P. Davison, one of the most powerful of the J. P. Morgan outfit. In addition, there are S. Sloan Colt and Roger W. Straus. The former is president of the Bankers Trust Co. The latter is a heavy holder and executive in the American Smelting & Refining Co. Need I say more as to the tremendous power and wealth supporting Dewey?

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

An importnt decision has just been announced by the United States circuit court of appeals in Philadelphia. It is a precedent-shattering decision and provides that public-school children need not salute the American flag, if that patriotic ceremony violates their religious scruples. The Supreme Courts of New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Georgia had decided differently. The United States circuit court of appeals said that in some instances compulsory flag saluting would be violative of religious liberty; that no school director is empowered to censor another's religious convictions. It would appear that there is a sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses, and several children belonging to that religious group were wont to stand in respectful silence while their classmates and teacher daily saluted the flag. The children were expelled from the school by the school board for their refusal to salute the flag. The teachings of the sect of Jehovah's Witnesses, said the court, taught them that to salute the flag was to "bow down to a graven image." And "to do this was a sin against God." I, personally, of course, do not believe that the American flag is a "graven image" and it is highly unfair to say that to salute the flag is to sin against God. However, if that is their religion, I am willing to protect all true believers. The right to worship their God as their conscience dictates is sacred. All shall be protected in the enjoyment of religious convictions. The conscience of the individual is even supreme over the exercise of governmental authority. In my humble opinion, Jehovah's Witnesses are wrong, but nevertheless the Constitution gives them the right even to be wrong.

THE WAR

I have been canvassing the war situation in the cloakrooms and offices of departmental heads and have come to the conclusion that (1) the chances that the United States will get involved in the present European war on a military basis are small indeed, and (2) that the chances that the United States may get involved by becoming a base of supplies to the Allies will become greatly increased, and

particularly so if the present Allied reverses continue. To be specific, I have already noticed among some of the Members of the House and Senate a change, or rather a softening, of sentiment. It is a sort of recurring "benevolent neutrality." There is talk of an issue of French and/or British securities to be floated in this country for the purchase primarily of nonmilitary materials. I cannot put my finger on anything specific, but there is a definite feeling in that direction. I say this despite some very improvident statements made by some of the European leaders and, unfortunately, an unusually illuminating comment made by Premier Reynaud, of France, to a New York Times correspondent, as follows: "I think the tendency in the United States has been to underestimate the German strength and the scale of the effort the Allies must make to overcome it. Otherwise you would not proceed so comfortably on the assumption that we are sure to win. You would be more alarmed at the prospect of your own danger if we fell and the British and French fleets disappeared from the high seas. If that happened, the world would not be very safe or happy for you." Frankly, I do not believe statements of that character are very helpful to the Allied cause. To the contrary, such statements are very harmful. It is also an example of the so-called heat that will be turned on or directed at the American public opinion from France and/or England, particularly in the event of Allied defeats.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CROWTHER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John T. Flynn from the Washington News of today.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 8, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, May 8.—The Republican convention is less than 7 weeks distant—the Democratic a little further away. Everybody is talking about candidates. Those who talk about issues wonder what the war will do to the coming battle. No one seems very much concerned about what the domestic economic situation may do to it.

As 1932 dawned and the conventions of that year approached, the curve of business activity was moving down. It was 77 in January; it was 67 in June when the conventions met.

This year since January the curve of business activity has actually descended lower and faster than it did in 1932. There is a difference, of course, in this—that then it went from 77 to 67, while now it has gone from 107 to 93. It is a 14-point drop now against a 10-point one then, but, on the other hand, the rate from which it dropped this year was much higher.

But what if it continues to go down? It has never continued down so long or so far in any other year. It may taper off now a bit, but even if it does the drop will be a record one for the first half of the year.

Now, if you take these two periods—the first half of 1932 and the first half of 1940, and either add to the 1932 picture $300,000,000 a month of Federal spending or take this Federal spending away from the situation now, you have no other important difference.

Then, the business cycle was going down without any Government spending; now, in the face of huge Government spending, it is going down faster and further.

If the decline continues until the conventions meet it is difficult to see how the consideration of this important fact can be kept out of our reckoning. And if it continues after the conventions meet, nothing can prevent it from overshadowing the war.

This fact will make it quite plain why the Government is so anxious to keep the war issue to the front; to keep the war on people's minds. The President, himself, is, of course, fascinated by the war. He told a caller not so long ago that it was difficult for him to think about domestic issues. What is more, it must be unpleasant to think about domestic issues in the presence of this serious decline in business.

It becomes imperative, therefore, to keep other people from thinking of domestic issues. So, all the propaganda and publicity power of the Federal Government is turned loose on the war subject.

Would it not be an excellent thing if the President and his Cabinet and his opponents would stir themselves to thinking about a domestic issue which may be stated thus: After 7 years of spending of borrowed funds amounting to over $25,000,000,000, we still have 10,000,000 unemployed and the business index of the first 4 months of the year has gone down further and faster than in any year in the last 15. What can we do to change this?

Staying out of war is not so difficult. The people do not want to get in. The only way they can get in is by being led in. All we need for that is a leader who will not lead us in by "meddlin' in." But this other problem is more difficult. What are we going to do about it?

W. P. A. and Private Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HERBERT C. LEGG

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the work-projects administrator in my district, Mr. Herbert C. Legg:

To you gentlemen who are familiar with the hard labor as well as the engineering and construction problems of public work I can speak with some measure of experience.

Thirty-seven years ago I started in the construction business, carrying water in a railroad construction camp in southern Colorado. For 15 years I lived in a tent on such work. I have turned out yardage behind four mules on a fresno with the best of them, and I have been pitched as high from the beam of a rooter-plow behind eight mules as any of them.

I have ridden miles on the back end of a buckboard over location, trying to guess what was 10 or 20 feet below the surface—dirt, loose rock, or solid rock. Sometimes my guess was good and sometimes not. I have worked side by side with station men where our output was 15 and sometimes perhaps only 5 cubic yards per day per man of solid rock at 80 or 90 cents a yard.

I question whether anyone in this room has a better knowledge of the contractors' problems than myself, or, may I add, one who has a more wholesome respect for the construction industry as a whole. By and large, the industry is truly representative of all that we admire in ingenuity, resourcefulness, and decency in American industry. Perhaps if I were a contractor today, I would be over in the trenches with the rest of you, fighting W. P. A. If I were in the clothing or textile business I might be fighting the W. P. A. sewing projects. If I were a school teacher I would be apprehensive of the thousands of teachers who are on W. P. A., conducting education classes for millions of adults in the United States. If I were a shoe manufacturer I would regard with some concern the W. P. A. shoe-repair shops where hundreds of thousands of pairs of shoes are prepared each year for the relief clients, whose cash budgets do not permit the amounts necessary for new shoes.

But, knowing the relief problems as I do, knowing how intimately it concerns every businessman and every taxpayer, how it has drained the tax dollars from all local governmental agencies, I would, as a contractor, hesitate to recommend the abolition of W. P. A. Even if I were assured of customary profit on the additional volume of work, I would realize that the relief problem still remains. Probably, as a contractor, I might feel elated that I had won a fight, and temporarily perhaps I might have a little more profit, but the basic problem would still be there to engulf me, as it does all other businessmen and their prospects and commitments.

The Federal Government, through W. P. A., is not engaged primarily in carrying on a huge construction program to create buildings, highways, sewers, storm drains, and the like for the communities we are serving. It is engaged solely in creating jobs for the millions who are on the relief rolls unable to secure private employment. It is the only method the States find available in securing Federal assistance to care for their own relief problem. W. P. A. never puts anyone on the relief rolls. We employ only those whom the State relief administration has determined are a problem of the State and entitled to relief under the constitutional amendment of 1933, which the people of this State adopted by an overwhelming vote.

W. P. A. in California has never carried more than one-half of those registered on the State relief rolls as available for assignment to us. Today W. P. A. is employing 38,000 from the State relief rolls in southern California, but there are still 45,000 others on the same State rolls who would like to have a job with us and who are a financial responsibility of State taxpayers. W. P. A. in California has employed on an average of 100,000 from the State relief rolls during the past year. If there had been no W. P. A., the State

would have needed $40,000,000 more for relief the past 12 months than the legislature appropriated. I wonder if the members of the chamber of commerce would feel justified in recommending that W. P. A. be done away with and that the State take on that additional burden. If so, what would you recommend as a substitute?

Perhaps you say the projects should be turned over to the Public Works Administration. Relief work by contract methods have been tried out with billions of dollars appropriated and expended through P. W. A. Certainly, no one will say that any other purpose was in the minds of Congress in setting up P. W. A. But the record is clear and easily understood. If you want a real spending program, recommended to Congress that 2,000,000 unemployed be kept at work under P. W. A. methods. It will require nearly $3 for each man against $1 under W. P. A. methods. Furthermore—and this is the important question—P. W. A. will offer work opportunity to only a small percentage of the workers we employ on W. P. A. P. W. A. methods require a high percentage of skilled labor, W. P. A. the exact reverse. Certainly our work costs more, but the total cost in the end to the taxpayer is much less. Employing machinery and leaving the unemployed men and women on the relief rolls will never solve the basic problem we are facing. Actually, idle equipment and contractors' volume of work do not create the economic or social problems represented in 4,000,000 people on the relief rolls of the States.

The Third Street paving job we are doing for the State highway is about as well mechanized as any we have ever had on W. P. A., but it is being done with 75.5 percent of unskilled and intermediate labor. Our average construction project percentage of unskilled is nearer 85 percent. We agree you could do it faster and perhaps cheaper with machines and skilled laborers, but we don't have those on our relief rolls.

When we have the opportunity of referring W. P. A. workers to contractors on Federal construction work they hire less than 50 percent of those referred because our workers are not on the average up to the rigid requirements of the contractors.

The claim is often made also that, under private contract methods, greater employment is made necessary in contributing or cooperative agencies—factories, material plants, etc. That is true to so small a degree that it constitutes not much of an argument. W. P. A. also keeps many such plants going. Every day truck loads of materials are on the highways of southern California, delivering their goods to our projects. The purchases of our sponsors and ourselves for materials reach astonishing totals. Millions of dollars for rock, cement, lumber products, bituminous materials, brick, tile, and steel, textiles, etc. Many a material firm in southern California exists today only because of the millions of dollars we have expended with them. Our sponsors alone have paid out for equipment rental during the life of W. P. A. more than $1,500,000.

You may say that this business would have been available, too, had the work been done by contract methods. I agree with you, but the work would not have been done. Our sponsors, in a recent questionnaire, stated they would have done only 11 percent of the work W. P. A. has done for them had they been dependent upon local revenues available for such work.

You may contend that we have been trying to sell the W. P. A. methods of doing public work as against private contract methods, but I assure you such is not the case. I have never talked to any of the higher-ups in Washington, especially in the W. P. A., who would not like to see private contractors doing this job of taking people off the dole, if they offered a way of doing it. No one likes it. If private contractors in southern California were doing the volume of work we are now doing, I would be out getting my share, making more money than I am today, and working fewer hours per day in doing it.

But we are simply an adjunct to your relief agencies—your local ones if you please. If the taxpayers can stand the added cost, we would like to give you the load. If you feel the people on the relief rolls should not be working, but kept on the dole, you won't find many to agree with you.

And then if all our construction work were stopped, W. P. A. would still have about 30 percent of its activities left. They constitute what is known as the white-collar load. They fulfill, provide, and direct myriad functions in public service—service that is as essential as air, food, and water. They prepare, for instance, lunches for the children in our schools whose parents cannot afford adequate or nutritious food. More than 26,000 such lunches are being served to the children in schools in Los Angeles County each school day. Remember these are not children to whom we think lunches should be given. It is your own school and health authorities who decide the beneficiaries, who select the lists of the undernourished or improperly nourished from the school rolls.

Hundreds of our workers are employed with your courts in juvenile delinquency pevention work, and through their efforts have made white many black spots of delinquency in southern California's nine counties. Several thousands of our workers are employed on sewing projects, making hundreds of thousands of garments which are distributed to your local relief agencies each month for the use of our underprivileged, and with a consequent saving in their cash budget. Garments, not for those we think should have them, but in response to individual requisition from your local agencies.

Housekeeping aids, school libraries, the distribution of surplus commodities, historical records, music and art projects, visual aids to our schools, help for the blind, and countless other similar activities are today employing nearly 12,000 of our load of workers in southern California, rendering a service that can better be known and felt in your community when we have to close some of them through quota reductions.

Ask your civic clubs, your parent-teacher associations, your service clubs; yes, ask your many other chambers of commerce and scores of other fine community groups now making immediate demands upon us that the service be reinstated, what they think of W. P. A.'s contribution to public welfare in California and, indeed, all over the United States.

Remember I don't contend that we can compete with any highly specialized organization in doing many of the things we do, insofar as it relates to cost. The reason is immediately apparent: We are not free to select our personnel as you do. You pick your own workers—we have to take those who are given us. Our average monthly wage rate on construction projects, for example, is less than $62. Your's is more than twice that. While we try to keep all of our people working within their work-experience classification, it is not possible at all times, and if we have men who were former real-estate agents, shoe salesmen, or bankers, it usually means they have to go down in the bottom of a sewer ditch, and we know they won't dig as many feet per day as you get out of your trained and seasoned pick-and-shovel men. They may, and often do, try as hard. They get more blistered hands, more tired backs, and aching feet, but they are fighting to keep off the dole, to do their bit for what they get to keep soul and body together, and constantly they are looking for the private job that doesn't exist.

Despite the inevitable percentages of trial and error with raw recruits and hastily assembled organizations, we are proud of what we are doing and how we are doing it. Less than 3 percent of our employees are nonrelief. Over 94 percent of our labor moneys go to relief workers. Our administrative costs may be compared favorably with those of any highly organized private industry. This is the appraisal of Fortune magazine, and I know it to be true.

Every worker on W. P. A. has to be an American citizen before he can be employed. Each has to sign an oath of fidelity to our Government before he may be employed. Our executives on construction projects are men who have worked in responsible positions with private industry; some of them worked for you in the past. No better are to be found anywhere. They can and are doing as good work as you could do. All our workers, including those on relief, are your neighbors. They have an average of three and one-half dependents. More than 50 percent have been taxpayers in the past. Their average residence in the State is over 7 years. If they were offered private jobs they would eagerly take them, but even in W. P. A. work they contribute to the purchasing power of southern California. Their monthly expenditures keep over 200 grocery stores open. They purchase 30,000 gallons of gasoline each day going to and from their work. The big merchants, as well as the little places of business, know what their earnings mean, but whether they know it or not the fact is that no place of mercantile or kindred business activity gathers up its cash for the day without including money expended by W. P. A. workers. Their nickels and dimes and quarters may not seem like large contributions individually, but they trickle in, eventually to make a mighty river, measured in millions of dollars every month in the year.

Let me add in closing, W. P. A. is not in California because it wanted to be. It is here because you could not stand the drain on your pocketbooks for maintaining hundreds of thousands of your citizens on the relief rolls. It is here because you hammered on the door of Congress demanding that we come and help. We don't determine who should be on relief, and we don't do anything your own public officials don't ask for.

The problem is far deeper than that of interference with private industry. It is a problem for your taxpayers to be interested in also. Certainly it is a problem that should be commanding the serious attention of every business, commercial and industrial, in California. There is no point in picking at it with your eyes closed. Go into it thoroughly in all its phases. Help improve it if you decide you have to have it. But, above all, be able to offer an answer to all the questions that call for an answer if you feel it should be done away with.

Thousands of the Rank and File of Railroad Labor Support Wheeler-Lea Railroad Bill

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 8782, authentic information can be found showing 850,000 out of 1,103,600 railroad employees are strongly in favor of S. 2009, the Wheeler-Lea railroad

bill. In other words, 75 percent of all the railroad employees in the United States urge passage of this important legislation.

This morning I am in receipt of a telegram from Mr. T. H. Davis, president of the Brotherhood of Shop Crafts of America, representing some 30,000 shopmen on the Pennsylvania system, vigorously protesting any effort to recommit S. 2009.

The vast majority of these 30,000 shopmen are personally known to me, since it was my privilege during 24 years' service on the Pennsylvania Railroad, to come in daily contact with them. They truly represent the views of the rank and file of railroad labor.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 7, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Member of Congress, State of Pennsylvania:

The Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America, Pennsylvania Railroad system, representing some 30,000 shopmen on the Pennsylvania Railroad system, desire to vigorously protest against longer withholding the Wheeler-Lea bill cited as the Interstate Commerce Act national transportation policy, which bill we understand is scheduled for final consideration May 9. We as railroad workers believe the time has come when all competitive transportation should be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. We believe that this bill will be of value to railroad workers, and therefore we are opposed to the bill being returned to committee, where we believe it will die. Your support is solicited in our behalf, and we will appreciate any effort you will put forth to assure the passage of the bill.

T. H. DAVIS, *President.*

Federal Aid For Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1940

STATEMENT BY COL. SIDNEY D. WALDON, OF DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting statement by Col. Sidney D. Waldon, of Detroit, Mich., chairman of the highway and legislative committee of the American Automobile Association, in connection with Federal Aid for Highways.

Colonel Waldon actively participated in the launching of the first National Good Roads Convention, held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1909. Through the years he has maintained interest in the continuing efforts to provide adequate public roads for the Nation. His views, as a member of the advisory board for the Michigan State Highway Department, and as spokesman for the American Automobile Association, an organization of a million private passengar-car owners, deserve serious consideration.

The statement referred to is as follows:

It seems highly significant that of all legislation brought before Congress from year to year, perhaps none receives such wholehearted and widespread support as authorizations for Federal participation in highway construction. Over a period of years hearings of roads committees in both the Senate and the House have developed consistent support of the Federal-aid policy. It has come from a great cross-section of groups concerned with the development of highway transportation, with the welfare of the farmer, with the national defense, and with the general economic progress of our country. In fact, the degree of support given to the Federal-aid principle is probably without parallel in the history of congressional legislation.

The American Automobile Association is, of course, one of the sponsors and a steadfast supporter of this program. We virtually launched the original national good-roads movement of 30 years ago. This Nation-wide campaign to get America out of the mud led to Federal aid for highway construction. We have always been extremely gratified that during the pioneer effort to secure Federal assistance in building a national network of highways connecting at State borders into an interstate system, Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, then a member of the House of Representatives, said on the floor:

SENATOR HAYDEN'S COMMENT

"The American Automobile Association, in its advocacy of national highways, has also rendered a great service. There was no real good-roads movement in America until this association and others interested in the construction of improved ways of travel put their shoulders to the wheel * * *."

During the twenty-odd years of experience with Federal aid for highways, the American Automobile Association has never wavered in its advocacy of continuation and extension of this program as greater road use made such extension both desirable and essential.

We again urge the Congress to continue the time-tested Federal-aid policy. We do so in behalf of our 750 affiliated A. A. A. motor clubs and branches in all parts of the United States and also in behalf of our membership of 1,000,000 owners of private passenger automobiles—the largest in A. A. A. records. This membership represents a great cross-section of car owners. It offers evidence that motorists generally subscribe to A. A. A. programs and activities.

BILLS NOW PENDING

Before discussing the bill (H. R. 7891) now before the House Committee on Roads, it seems fitting to discuss some general phases of the Federal-aid policy. These have to do with the trends in highway development and the influence of Federal aid administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, more recently the Public Roads Administration, on all road building.

When the initial Federal Aid Highway Act was approved in 1916, States were just beginning to shape highway programs. There was little or no real effort to connect roads at State lines. Comparatively few had State highway departments. There was also a vital need for research and utilization of the experience gained in planning for the future. At the time there were only 3,500,000 motor vehicles in the country, and there was considerable speculation as to the number that might eventually be in use. Many people still accepted the automobile as a passing fad and luxury.

By 1921 the number of vehicles had increased to more than 10,000,000. In that year the Congress enacted broader legislation, which continued many of the features of the 1916 act and also provided for the first time a designated Federal-aid system of roads connecting at State lines. All Federal funds for main roads, plus matching funds advanced by the States, have since been concentrated on building and rebuilding this system. This broad policy has been responsible for the rapid growth of highway transportation and the manifold benefits which have accrued to the whole country.

FEDERAL COOPERATION

In this connection it might be well to point out that through the years the Federal road-building agency has stood as a fine example of Federal cooperation with the States. While exercising a vital influence on the construction of roads composing the interstate system and road building generally, the objectives have been attained without Federal domination of projects. Actual construction is done by the States, within limitations and requirements set forth by the Congress. It is a tribute to the now Public Roads Administration that its important and tremendous job has been accomplished on a cooperative basis and in keeping with the letter and spirit of congressional authority.

As the Federal Air Highway Acts of 1916 and 1921 were important from the standpoint of the foundation for our present interstate system of roads, the pending legislation is equally as important from the standpoint of the future. We have now reached the point where development of our interstate highway system must not only be continued, but sections of it must be modernized to meet current traffic needs. The number of vehicles in use has increased 200 percent since 1921 and there has been an even greater increase in use of the highways on a mileage basis.

HIGHWAY SURVEYS

Fortunately, the preliminary but comprehensive findings from highway surveys underway in 47 States offer a body of facts to be utilized in highway planning. Highway needs are becoming clearly evident for the first time. Engineers now have a true picture of the good and bad features of our highway system. It offers an accurate guide for modernization. For example, they now know where funds should be concentrated to meet the heaviest traffic conditions and where funds should be expended to assure the maximum service of secondary or farm-to-market roads. However, as these findings have been transmitted to the Congress by the Public Roads Administration, they need not be again reviewed here.

Two other factors in connection with orderly highway development deserve particular mention as a preliminary to discussion of proposed legislation. First, the effort to link Federal-aid highway appropriations with special Federal excise taxes currently collected from motorists, and second, the ineffectiveness of that section of existing Federal-aid highway legislation which provides penalties in the form of reduced Federal-aid on States diverting special motor taxes to other than highway purposes.

FEDERAL MOTOR TAXES

From time to time the argument has been advanced that the Federal Government spends a great deal of money to help the States in the construction of roads. For this reason it has been suggested by some that the Federal levy on motor vehicles is proper. This is a hollow argument.

When the Federal Government launched its policy of Federal-aid for highways, it was with two definite purposes in mind. First, it was for national defense and justified on the basis of the vital

need for a strategically located system of trunk-line interstate highways. The War Department scrupulously maintains a military priority map of these highways, and no bridge on this system is constructed without its having been approved by the War Department. Certainly no part of Federal aid for this purpose could be a proper charge on the motor vehicle.

Federal aid to highways for national defense purposes is similar to appropriations for rivers and harbors and the structure of coastal forts to protect harbors and naval anchorages. Shipping derives benefit from these national expenditures, but is not subject to special excise taxes to pay for the improvements because they benefit the country as a whole. Likewise, the Federal Government spends large sums in services to aviation which, while beneficial to air commerce, are extremely helpful to the country and particularly advantageous in the event of war. Such services are a charge against the general fund and are not in any way offset by excise taxes on plane manufacturers, or the passengers, mail, and commodities transported by plane. Similarly, Federal expenditures on highways for military purposes are properly chargeable to the people as a unit rather than to one selected class of taxpayers.

DEVELOPMENT OF POST ROADS

In the second place, Federal road expenditures are intended to help in the distribution of mails as indicated by the term "post roads." In order to advance the accomplishment of both purposes, financial aid to the several States was considered a sound capital investment. In 1916 practically all of the rural mail routes of this country were served by horse and buggy and consequently this part of Federal aid could not have been considered by the Congress a proper charge against the owners of motor vehicles.

You will look in vain in the original debates on Federal aid to find one hint to the effect that such a contribution by the Federal Government should ever be predicated on a special levy on motor-vehicle users, as distinct from all other beneficiaries of the highways. In fact, it was definitely recognized that since distribution of the mails and the provision of adequate national defense benefited the Nation as a whole, the cost should be met by general taxation contributed by all taxpayers.

As a matter of historical accuracy, we make the point that this theory of Federal taxes on the motor vehicle, in return for Federal aid for highways, is of very recent origin.

In this connection, Representative Cartwright, in a recent address, very appropriately said:

"I have always believed that the participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in cooperation with the States, using general Treasury funds therefor, is amply justified on the grounds of general welfare, national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

"I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time in a few years when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements."

FEDERAL FISCAL PROBLEMS

We all recognize the serious fiscal problems confronting the Federal Government but, by the same token, we must not lose sight of the fact that the State governments have equally serious problems. The States have the responsibility of maintaining adequate road systems. For this purpose the State governments have to depend on revenues from special motor vehicle taxation. If you look at the record you will find that a great number of State legislatures have, year after year, adopted resolutions—resolutions duly presented to the Congress of the United States—urging the Federal Government to get out of the gasoline tax field and to leave this source of revenue to the States.

Despite the increasing highway needs, there is a strong disposition on the part of legislative bodies to divert the proceeds of special motor taxes to purposes other than highways. In the 10-year period through 1938 the States and their subdivisions diverted more than $900,000,000 of road revenue to other than road purposes. Congress took cognizance of this fact by declaring in section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934, that it is "unfair and unjust" to impose special motor taxes unless the proceeds from such taxes are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways. The act provides, of course, that any State that applies to highway purposes a lesser amount of motor taxes than was provided by law on June 18, 1934, shall be penalized as much as one-third of the Federal-aid apportionments to which it would otherwise be entitled.

PENALTIES FOR DIVERSION

Since the Federal provision designed to discourage diversion became effective, penalties in the nature of reduced Federal aid have been imposed on only 2 States and in comparatively small amounts. On August 7, 1937, $250,000 was withheld from the apportionment to New Jersey for the fiscal year 1937, and on June 2, 1938, $472,862 was withheld from the apportionment to Massachusetts for the fiscal year 1938. This in the face of the fact that in the latter year some 36 States and the District of Columbia were diverting revenue from gasoline taxes and registration fees. In the 3 years following enactment of the Hayden-Cartwright amendment, $488,273,000 of motor-vehicle revenue was diverted, while the total amount of Federal-aid withheld from States amounted to only $722,862. New York State alone, the worst offender, has diverted $251,427,563.

In fairness to the Public Roads Administration, it should be stated that it is powerless to even partially correct existing conditions, unless Congress is willing to provide legislative authority by putting teeth in the Federal antidiversion statute.

POLICIES OF A. A. A.

Over a period of several years the American Automobile Association, through policy resolutions, has urged strengthening of the Federal antidiversion amendment so that it can be vigorously and effectively enforced. Typical of such resolutions is that adopted by our thirty-fifth annual convention, in November 1937, as follows:

"In 1934 the Congress adopted the so-called Hayden-Cartwright amendment to the Federal Aid Act, the purpose which was to penalize those States diverting their motor-vehicle taxes by withholding from them a portion of their Federal-aid allotment. The Hayden-Cartwright amendment, as now framed, is vague and not wholly effective. This convention urges the immediate revision of the Hayden-Cartwright amendment in order that the intent of it may be carried out as an additional safeguard for the road funds of the country."

We respectfully submit that the antidiversion-penalty clause should embody the following principles:

1. The penalty should apply in respect to all diversion and not merely provide for freezing of expenditures of motor taxes for highway purposes to the level prevailing at the time the antidiversion clause was enacted.

2. The amount of Federal funds withheld should be sufficient to act as a deterrent to diversion and a formula to this end should be developed.

3. The States should be given ample opportunity to restore diverted money in order to escape the penalty, but such period of grace should not be so long as to interfere with effective enforcement of the statute.

FEDERAL-AID AUTHORIZATIONS

Now as regards the pending measures. Title I, of course, provides for authorizations for Federal participation in highway construction during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943. Thus it is a continuation of a long-established Federal policy and in line with the practice of making such authorizations 2 years in advance. Such a policy enables the State highway departments to plan highway developments in advance and thereby assures adequate planning. It also enables these departments to know what amounts they can anticipate from Federal aid when they submit road programs to State legislatures.

In leaving blank the actual amounts to be authorized for Federal aid and related projects for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, it seems evident that this was done for several reasons. It was perhaps the desire of the committee to ascertain the viewpoint of all concerned with road building. It may be that the committee also wanted to study authorizations in the light of national defense and other demands on the Congress.

However, the American Automobile Association believes that current highway needs are such that authorizations for each of the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 should at least be at the level of authorizations made for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939, as follows: $125,000,000 for improvement of the Federal-aid system and its extension through cities; $25,000,000 for secondary or farm-to-market roads; $50,000,000 for the elimination of grade crossings; $14,000,000 for forest highways, roads, and trails; $10,000,000 for national parkways; $7,500,000 for national-park roads and trails; $4,000,000 for Indian-reservation roads; and $2,500,000 for nontaxable public-land highways.

Such a recommendation is in accord with the policies of the American Automobile Association as adopted in the form of resolutions passed at our annual conventions. For example, at our last annual meeting in November 1939, the following resolution was adopted:

"Because of the interest of the Federal Government in national defense and in post roads, the support of the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs is reaffirmed in the Federal-aid principle as a constructive and coordinating influence in the entire road-building activity of the Nation."

RECENT HIGHWAY TRENDS

In this connection, it seems proper to call the attention of the committee to recent trends which serve to emphasize the need for major attention to the Federal-aid system. Subdivisions and municipalities are more and more putting pressure on State legislatures for a greater share of special motor-tax revenues.

In some States motor-tax refunds are becoming a "grab bag" for diversion and loans to avoid new tax levies. The comparative ease in collecting motor taxes and penny outlays for gasoline taxes are, of course, factors in this whole situation. Add to this the heavy maintenance cost of existing highways, and it is readily seen that many States are finding it difficult to sponsor new construction and

to modernize existing main roads to meet current and future traffic needs.

As a result, Federal aid for main interstate highways is becoming more important than ever before and should receive first consideration of Congress, with due regard for the need for secondary roads and related projects. It is now evident that main interstate highways are not receiving the attention they deserve. For instance, as pointed out by the United States Commissioner of Public Roads, Thomas H. MacDonald, main rural highways and their transcity connections, comprising some 352,000 miles, or 11 percent of all highways, carried 153,000,000,000 vehicle-miles of traffic, or 57 percent of all traffic in 1938. Yet in the same year only $834,000,000, or 33 percent, of the $2,520,000,000 expended for highways and city streets was spent on main rural highways and transcity connections. Obviously, these figures and their implication deserve the careful attention of all concerned with meeting modern traffic needs.

PROBLEM OF CONGESTION

The most serious phase of the highway problem today is in connection with traffic needs in heavily congested areas. This includes the problem of getting through large cities and serving the large volume of traffic moving to and from the centers of these cities. For example, Commissioner MacDonald, in his last annual report to Congress, said:

"A system of direct interregional highways, with necessary connections through and around cities, is needed to meet the growing peacetime traffic of longer range and the requirements of national defense in time of war.

"Studies of the present flow of traffic on main highways indicate that such an interregional system should comprise not more than 30,000 miles. No attempt has been made as yet to fix the exact location of the proposed system. Existing highways could be modernized to form a large part of the system, but some new highways would be needed to provide directness of travel. A system of the scope suggested would represent less than 1 percent of the total mileage of rural roads, but the Bureau estimates that it would serve at least 12.5 percent of the travel outside of cities.

"The more complete information on the character of traffic in and near cities that has become available shows that existing facilities are seriously inadequate. The situation is becoming more aggravated by increases in traffic, and only the provision of major improvements at a large cost will provide a solution. Such improvements would be a necessary part of an interregional system.

"It is found that as much as 90 percent of the traffic on main highways near the entrances to large cities is bound to or from points in cities themselves and cannot be bypassed around them. The studies reveal also that a large part of the traffic is destined to or bound from points in the very heart of the city or points most conveniently reached by going through the center of the city.

NEED FOR EXPRESS HIGHWAYS

"There is need for express highways cut directly into and through the center of the big cities. These are needed not only for service of the through traffic delivered by the main rural highways but also for the daily in-and-out movement of local traffic between the downtown section and suburbs centering about the main highways at the periphery of the city.

"By preference such express highways should be constructed as attractively landscaped depressed thoroughfares passing under all cross streets."

Fortunately, through the highway-planning surveys there have been developed traffic-flow maps which show very definitely the areas of heaviest traffic volume and, in turn, the areas of greatest traffic congestion. In general, they are along the Atlantic seaboard between Washington and Boston; in the northeastern section of the country, particularly between Detroit and Chicago; and in a lesser degree at points on the Pacific coast in the vicinity of San Francisco and Los Angeles.

These sections mentioned and others are faced with a tremendous shuttlelike movement of strictly local traffic and vehicles moving to and from adjacent areas. In addition, they are focal points for passenger-car owners, commercial traffic, and mobilized national-defense units from all sections of the country. Thus the problem of efficient and safe movement of traffic in geographical sections with unusual traffic density is a matter of local, regional, and national concern.

PROBLEM IN LARGE CITIES

This is particularly true of large industrial cities. For many years industrial plants and large business houses were located in compact fashion in the heart of industrial centers. The movement of traffic, limited as compared with that of recent years, was into these centers in the morning and outward in the evening. However, in recent years there has been a trend toward the location of large industrial plants in outlying areas. Thus between these outskirt sections and main business sections have developed blighted areas occupied by low-income groups and with low tax values. Through these areas daily flow opposing streams of traffic in the morning and evening hours—workers living in cities enroute to and from outlying plants and suburban residents to and from city centers. In addition, there is heavy nonresident passenger and commercial traffic to and through the centers of industrial cities.

Express highways, preferably landscaped depressed thoroughfares, will not only expedite traffic with greater efficiency and safety but will bring light and air into the new blighted sections of cities and increase the usefulness and taxable values of these areas. Any programs for slum clearance, now being undertaken on a large scale with the aid of Federal funds, should go hand in hand with improvement in means of handling traffic. Joining these authorized traffic facilities through cities should be limited-access highways leading to and from city lines of other industrial cities.

MODERN TRAFFIC FACILITIES

It should be borne in mind that delay in providing modern traffic facilities increases the difficulty and cost of eventually creating them. Under existing conditions, State highway departments are, on the whole, hard pressed to keep abreast with traffic needs on major rural roads. They are financially unable to give necessary attention to real modernization of these rural roads, much less undertake the tremendous task of providing limited-access highways adjacent to, and depressed routes through, cities. Municipalities are, of course, facing great difficulties in maintaining current street maintenance and other municipal functions. In most instances cities are already taxed to the limit.

At the root of the whole problem of efficiently handling traffic in heavily congested areas and industrial centers is the tremendous costs for rights-of-way. It is these costs which are delaying needed improvements, despite the fact that modern traffic facilities create new uses which help defray their cost.

SECURING RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Recognizing the vital need for broadening the means of securing rights-of-way for highway purposes, the thirty-seventh annual convention of the American Automobile Association, held last November, adopted the following resolution:

"The American Automobile Association urges that the Federal Government and the State governments develop as quickly as possible a comprehensive land program for acquisition of adequate rights-of-way for future highway programs and for full protection of the rights-of-way when they have been acquired. To that end it recommends:

"(a) That the Congress of the United States authorize the Public Roads Administration, or other suitable agency, to aid the States, through loan, grant, or otherwise, to acquire needed rights-of-way, especially for limited-access highways.

"(b) That State highway departments be authorized to acquire land in advance of, and in certain cases in excess of, actual highway needs and to amortize the cost thereof over a term of years through rental or resale of the excess land, or by other appropriate means.

"(c) That every State adopt laws permitting the construction of free ways or parkways through limiting right of access by abutting property owners.

"(d) That every State simplify its condemnation proceedings, if necessary, to permit acquisition of land for highways and related purposes without undue litigatory delays.

"(e) That motor clubs in each State cooperate fully with the State highway departments in bringing about necessary changes in the law to permit the carrying out of these right-of-way policies."

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

That congressional leaders are alert to the new conditions confronting road builders is evidenced by title II of the pending Hayden-Cartwright bills. It proposes one of the most important advances in highway construction since the drafting of the original Federal Aid Act. It seeks to provide a means of solving one of the most difficult problems in the highway field—the problem of providing money and legal authority for meeting traffic needs in areas of heavy traffic density and where the cost of acquiring needed rights-of-way is tremendous; in many instances too great for States or municipalities, or both, to undertake without Federal assistance.

Quite naturally there are conflicting viewpoints as to the proper procedure. But the fact remains that unless the Federal Government steps in to help solve one of the most perplexing of all highway problems, it will be postponed for many years to come, and we cannot attain the full benefits of highway transportation.

The basis of title II of pending bills is, of course, financial aid by the Federal Government to States and municipalities for large-scale traffic facilities through long-time loans for rights-of-way. There are many ways in which such loans can be used. They can be used in securing land to provide efficient and safe movement across industrial cities, thus serving commercial vehicles and passenger vehicles used by workers en route to and from their jobs, as well as foreign traffic destined to and through these cities. These loans can also be used for rights-of-way for limited-access highways between industrial cities. This latter is highly important from the standpoint of the flow of finished and raw materials and, in turn, plans for national defense.

ALL BENEFICIARIES PAY

If surrounded by safeguards to assure returns from all beneficiaries of such modern transportation facilities, there is no question that Federal loans would be repaid. And certainly there is no more advantageous way for the Federal funds to be expended in the interest of bettering economic conditions and providing employment than in helping to relieve the pressure of traffic conditions in heavily congested areas.

Federal-aid policies have through the years been liberalized to meet new highway conditions created by greater highway use. Federal assistance to States and municipalities for acquiring needed land for rights-of-way for highway purposes is now essential to an early solution of complex traffic problems. This can be accomplished within the scope of the present Federal-aid policies. The

Federal Government would continue to deal directly with State highway departments. Obviously, if provision is made for acquiring land in excess of actual traffic needs, these land values will automatically increase with the building of new traffic facilities. In turn, all beneficiaries would bear a fair share of the cost.

In our policy recommendation as regards rights-of-way, already quoted, the American Automobile Association urged that "State highway departments be authorized to acquire land in advance of, and in certain cases in excess of, actual highway needs and to amortize the cost thereof over a term of years through rental or resale of the excess land or by other appropriate means." This could well provide amortization of the cost through returns from all beneficiaries of proposed highway development.

Such a policy has long been advocated. In our Bill of Rights for Motorists, adopted in November 1936, article 2 reads as follows:

"* * * road programs should be definitely related to a road budget, which in turn is based upon a fair charge to all the beneficiaries of the highway—the community in general, real estate, commercial transport, the Federal Government, as well as the private passenger-car owners."

It Is Time To Be on Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the peaceful, home-loving, Christian peoples of Norway and Sweden are enduring the horrors of a war for which they are in no way responsible. The people of Denmark have seen their Government taken over by a powerful and warlike nation which could find no fault with them, but desired to use their land and their resources to aid in its fight against the English and French.

Whatever may be the merits of the controversy between Germany and her enemies she has not even the shadow of an excuse for invading Denmark, Norway, or Sweden. She did it because she needed their resources and had the power to take them. Nor have you forgotten how the Russians came down like a pack of wolves on helpless Finland.

TREACHERY ABROAD

Doubtless, in last week's press you read the story—including the editorial in the Benton Harbor News-Palladium of April 18—of how, having bored from within, through the treachery of Norwegian officials, Germany's path for the occupation of Norwegian territory was made easy.

In other places in Europe, it is reported that similar undermining against neutral governments has been going on and, across the seas, no one knows from day to day whether his established government is secure or in the hands of those who, at the bidding of an outsider, will openly turn traitor.

HERE AT HOME

We have a Communist Party. It has openly proclaimed its purpose to be the overthrow of this Government by force. Its Presidential candidate brazenly made the statement:

> We industrial unionists are going to take over the factories some day for three very good reasons: (1) Because we need them; (2) because we want them; (3) because we have the power to get them.

Lewis, aided by the Labor Board, is trying to do it now.

Has that a familiar ring? Is it in line with what Hitler has just done to Sweden and Norway?

WILFULLY BLIND AND FOOLISH

For months—yes, for years—we, in the pride of our strength, in the fullness of our generosity, through an excess of tolerance, have permitted Communists, who would destroy our independence, our schools and our churches, to talk and to preach and to write against our Government.

REWARD TREASON

Not only have we permitted the Communists and others who would destroy a free America, who would establish the doctrines of a Hitler and a Stalin, to speak openly, advocate the adoption of their program, but, as in the sit-down strikes where they violated the laws, flouted the orders of the courts, beat peaceful citizens and destroyed property, State and Federal Government, by failure to protect our citizens, gave them aid and comfort.

Yes; and the Federal Government has many of them on its pay roll where, carrying on their treasonable schemes, living on the bounty of the country which enables them to purchase food, clothing, and shelter, they occupy positions, which, in time of war, would enable them to betray us into the hands of the enemy.

SOUTH OF THE BORDER

Down to Mexico last year went John L. Lewis, speaking to the Mexican Communists, to the representatives of the Mexican Government which have by force stolen the property of Americans; and our Government, up to the present time, has taken no effective steps to force the Mexican Communists or their allies from abroad to respect American property or American rights. It has been openly charged that those now in charge of the Mexican Government are but waiting an opportunity to extend their activities across the border into our land.

BLITZKRIEG PLOT READY

Charging that his committee had possession of a written Communist plan, obtained from Communist sources, to "'blitzkrieg' the United States at the proper hour," the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, this week told newspaper reporters that the plan contemplated paralyzing vital industries, such as utilities, communications, transport, steel, the navy yards, including factories making airplanes.

Have you forgotten that a short time ago I brought to your attention, to the attention of Congress, written proof from the Acting Secretary of the Navy that a union in Detroit defied the United States Navy and refused to give up plans and parts that were needed to operate the navy yard at Philadelphia?

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES, said that the Communists and the Nazis, when the time is right, plan to do here what they have done in so many European countries. Do you doubt that statement? With the knowledge that the C. I. O. has been organized and aided by Communists; that they now claim the right, and, on occasion, have exercised the power, to stop production in essential industries; that that organization has been aided by the National Labor Relations Board and the operation of the National Labor Relations Act, do you doubt that, if war comes, not only our airplanes, our motor transportation, but many of our vital manufacturing industries, upon which this Nation would depend for its very existence, would be in the hands of those who claim the right to say when and where a man shall work and what and how much shall be produced in a factory?

WE SHOULD BE ON GUARD

The members of the National Labor Relations Board should be fired from their positions of public trust and be replaced by men of patriotism, who have the welfare of the country at heart; who believe in, and who will abide by, the Constitution.

OUR MERCHANT MARINE

Do you recall that very recently Representative Keefe, of Wisconsin, produced documentary proof that a seamen's union, honeycombed with communistic ideas, now sailing the ships of our merchant marine, has the power in time of war to turn them over to Russia or Germany? If it appears that Russia and Germany are about to win, what do you think these Communists, these agents of Moscow, in control of our ships, will do? Will they sail them across the seas, with the valuable cargoes with which they are loaded, and deliver them to the enemies of the Allies?

PUT OUR HOUSE IN ORDER

The passage last week of the Logan-Walter bill, by a vote of 282 to 97, shows that the House, regardless of what the Senate may do, is aware of the necessity for curbing

Federal agencies, which are usurping the power of both Congress and the courts. Let us finish the job by legislation which will convince the Communists, the administrative agencies and boards, the bureaucrats and those new dealers who believe in a dictatorship, that our people intend to have constitutional government, a Congress which will do our legislating, courts which will interpret our laws, executives who will abide by the law and keep faith with the people.

Civic Duty and National Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War:

Young leaders of West Virginia, today you are the junior executives of Clarksburg and other cities throughout West Virginia. Tomorrow their whole destiny may be in your hands. By affiliating yourselves with the junior chamber of commerce, you voluntarily have assumed a responsibility to serve your community. By devoting yourselves wholeheartedly to its program, you are preparing yourselves for the duties that may lie ahead. I commend your loyal civic spirit.

Civic consciousness is the first step toward national consciousness. When you participate in local problems and solve them, you grow into an awareness of State and National problems and become fitted to cope with them. As you help to plan and to execute projects which benefit your town, you have benefited your State; as you benefit your State, you have benefited your Nation. There is no purely local problem. There is no purely local benefit. All merge and become a part of our varied national life. The happiness and prosperity of your city are predicated on a sound and healthy West Virginia. The well-being of our beloved State, in turn, depends upon a strong and patriotic America. The interests of our city, our State, and our Nation are interwoven inextricably into the same pattern.

In grappling, therefore, with what are termed "local problems," you junior executives face issues that confront all of us everywhere in America. For the role that you play in civic affairs, you may indeed be regarded as the junior leaders of America.

As you face your problems from day to day, you must keep your vision clear. You must see beyond the limits of your city, beyond the boundaries of our State—yes; even beyond the far-flung shores that outline the Americas. Your clear eyes should be focused on the ever-changing horizon of world events. You must be alert to the fact that we are a part of a world whose boundaries are converging.

On the world's horizon we behold force rampant. Everywhere we note that weakness invites aggression. Need I but mention China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Poland, Finland, Denmark? It was weakness that invited aggression in each of these areas. It was our apparent weakness that got us into trouble in 1917. If you entertain any doubt on that score, examine with me the German records that have been made public in the last 20 years. Let me quote a few pertinent statements from reliable authorities:

"I consider the intervention of America to be worth nothing at all," said the German Secretary of State for the Navy before April 6, 1917.

"The intervention of America would not be of much importance" was the sum and substance of the pre-1917 views of both Hindenburg and Ludendorf.

"I give my word as an officer that not one American will land on the Continent," promised the Chief of the German Naval Staff to justify his proposal to intensify submarine warfare.

To be sure, the Germans erred. They miscalculated our ability to recruit, organize, train, and transport an expeditionary force that would turn the tide of battle against them. But let us not forget that to teach them the error of their ways we had to pay, and pay dearly with thousands of American lives. On April 6, 1917, it was too late to do anything but fight. I repeat, we had to fight, and let no scoffing sophist of today try to tell you otherwise.

We went to war not to protect the interests of munitions makers, nor to pull British or French chestnuts out of a boiling international caldron. We broke with Germany because her unrestricted submarine warfare had taken the lives of American seamen engaged in occupations which they had a legal and a moral right to follow. We struck back at the German Imperial Government because we refused to submit our lives, our liberty, and our property to the arbitrary disposition of a war lord bent on aggression. That battle we won and won decisively; and you and I in America today live in relative security because in 1918 we defeated the German Imperial Army.

Today, as always, we are trying to build an Army and a Navy that will insure us against aggression. In the present world the most certain means of discouraging those who would trespass against us is to let them know in advance that we have adequate means to resist their thrusts. Let us, therefore, inspect the present state of our Army and determine whether it is adequate for our defensive needs.

At the outset, let me state unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly with all the strength and the energy at my disposal that an Army adequate for the safety of America does not contemplate an expeditionary force for use in Europe. On that score I am confident we are unanimous. We need an Army for these purposes:

First, to provide garrisons in our overseas possessions to protect our naval installations—in the Panama Canal Zone, in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and in similar localities. For this purpose our General Staff has estimated a need for 70,000 soldiers. Today, we have approximately 65,000 in our overseas garrisons, but we are working toward the 70,000 goal.

Second, to protect America against raids. This means a force available on short notice sufficient to thwart any threat that may develop against the Panama Canal or the continental limits of the United States.

Third, to provide a basic force which can be expanded to meet the full needs of any grave emergency. This means, in turn, organizations reasonably manned and fully trained and equipped; and officers fully qualified and experienced.

In 1920, at a time of relative peace in the world, the Congress, after extensive hearings, enacted the National Defense Act. This basic law authorized 280,000 men in the Regular Army and 435,000 men in the National Guard. That force we do not have.

What do we have?

Our present strength for the Regular Army is 227,000 enlisted men and 13,000 officers. For the National Guard it is 235,000 enlisted men and 15,880 officers. In other words, our present force consists of a total of approximately 490,000 officers and enlisted men. Let us say a force of approximately one-half million. With the funds made available in the 1940 Appropriation Act we will be in a position to provide adequate supplies for an Army of only 400,000 men. That means only four out of five of our fighting men will be fully equipped for battle. That situation we hope Congress will remedy in the current appropriations.

In justice to the Congress, may I add that when it was dealing with the 1940 appropriations world conditions were not as grave as they appear at present. The increase to the 227,000 figure for the Regular Army and to the 235,000 for the National Guard was authorized by the President in his emergency proclamation after hostilities in Europe had broken out and after Congress had adjourned.

Questions naturally arise in your minds—what is our ultimate goal? What size Army do we finally want?

In the first place, it is very difficult to establish in advance an objective that will fit all possible future contingencies. Our need depends on conditions in the rest of the world. We want an army no bigger than is actually necessary. No one of any responsibility in the military service is in favor of a large standing army such as existed among European nations prior to the outbreak of war. Given the world as we find it today, we have adopted an objective which we believe is reasonable, conservative, and in keeping with the law as laid down by Congress.

In manpower we are content to go along with a force of approximately 500,000, to include both the Regular Army and the National Guard. If and when circumstances require, it should be increased. Based on previous records, it is the largest peacetime force that we have ever had. Based on present international standards, it is one of the smallest armies in the world. Despite recent augmentations and increased appropriations, we do not rank as well now as we did in 1938.

At the time of the so-called Munich appeasement, our land forces, including all trained Reserves, gave us a standing of thirteenth among the nations of the world. Among those that preceded us were both Czechoslovakia and Poland. Today, despite the fact that these last two nations have been eliminated as military powers, we rank twentieth. Certainly, no one can say that the War Department in asking for a force of less than 500,000 at this time is using the world situation as an opportunity to aggrandize itself.

In the current Budget estimates, the War Department is putting all of its emphasis on an increase in supply strength. We feel that our Army of 500,000 should have available at all times all the items necessary for its complete equipment. At this time we have asked merely for enough money to take care of minimum needs. Our War Department budget was carefully scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget, approved by the President, and recommended by him to Congress.

It is a modest program, and even if fully enacted it would still leave us far short of the amount needed to meet our full supply requirements. We would still be deficient in Reserves to equip the full strength Regular Army and National Guard and the replacements necessary to maintain an efficient Army in the field. Without such a standing reserve of equipment, effective mobilization in time of a grave emergency would be impossible to attain. There would be no use in mobilizing men if we could not furnish them arms and equipment.

Reserves of munitions cost money and so does every other element in a well-balanced Army. Yes; our Army is expensive, but it is a necessity and not a luxury. Nor is the reason for the cost difficult to ascertain. Man for man, item for item, the cost to America is greater than in any other country. Our soldiers are better paid, better fed, better clothed, and should be better equipped than those of any other army in the world. Who of you would have it otherwise?

Totalitarian governments pay their bills by fiat. They conscript their labor. They confiscate capital. Our Government pays in good American dollars for value received. Our labor is free to move about, and it has the right to bargain. Our capitalist system encourages private industry and individual enterprise. Of course, we pay more for these American rights and privileges. Who of you would have it otherwise?

Here and there a hue and cry sometimes is raised about profiteering in our armament program. These insinuations have no basis in fact. As director of munitions, it is my job, within the appropriations made by Congress, to arm and equip America's land forces for combat. Let me assure you that in my dealings with industry I have seen no evidence of this so-called profiteering. On the contrary, I have found industrial leaders who, of their own accord, put their own business to great expense to make production studies of potential value to industrial mobilization. I see evidence daily of sincere efforts to cooperate and even to reduce costs to the Government.

Industry is willing to assume any production job in the field of munitions in time of war but willingness may not be enough. It must be accompanied by readiness. Industry must know how to make implements of war. After an emergency is upon us is a poor time to start to learn the intricacies of production. By our educational-order system we are taking steps this fiscal year to educate 115 civilian industrial plants to manufacture 73 separate noncommercial items. Next year, we hope that we will get the funds to train a similar number of factories on another group of strictly military articles of approximately the same quantity. On our lists we still have 600 munitions items that may give us difficulty and 2,000 plants that may be called upon to produce them. Preparedness on the industrial front will not be complete until we are ready to meet battle-front needs for every one of our military items.

Industrial mobilization will be achieved by the cooperation of the armed services and industry, backed and supported by the President and the Congress. The success of our civic plans, our State projects, and our national programs is predicated upon the cooperative spirit of our citizens. Cooperation is the keynote of American effort. We may disagree in politics but when our city, our State, or our country calls, we must rise above our differences and think and act as one. Under the American system of cooperation, we shall plan, create, and perpetuate a better city, a healthier State, and a stronger Nation.

All Chambers of Commerce Are Not in Favor of the Wheeler-Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM LEO C. DAILEY

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a telegram from Mr. Leo C. Dailey, Secretary of the Sioux City (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce expressing the sentiment of the United States Chamber of Commerce in regard to the conference committee report on S. 2009.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA, *May 7, 1940.*

Hon. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Following wire sent to all Iowa Congressmen; hope it will help: "Today received stereotyped broadcast of United States Chamber of Commerce. Assume addressed to all local chambers, urging us wire you supporting Wheeler-Lea bill. This is to inform you position United States Chamber exactly contrary to position of vast minority membership of that organization taken recently at national annual meeting, Washington. On behalf our organization and speaking what we know to be sentiment of agriculture, this section, and what our people believe best interests of labor, we urge recommitment of bill. Please do not let great Nation-wide railroad and United States Chamber campaign now being directed and under way, inspired from small central steering committee, stampede Congress into passing this important measure. Interests of agriculture and Nation as a whole will be best served by recommitment with oportunity for further study."

LEO C. DAILEY,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

Historic Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

SPEECHES AND LETTERS BY HON. HENRY F. ASHURST, OF ARIZONA, AND OTHER DATA

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several letters written by me, certain speeches I have delivered, and several bills introduced by me which became laws.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATTER-DAY SAINTS

[Remarks of Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, of Arizona, Tuesday, November 11, 1919]

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Utah, Mr. Smoot, has spoken as he has. It was time for such a speech. A matchless maker of epigrams said that when "once a lie or a counterfeit statement gets into circulation it is well-nigh impossible to overtake it"; and therefore I believe the Senator from Utah has done a service to his country in exposing this infamous slander, which has been published broadcast against so many worthy people.

When I read the article I felt offended, because there are in Arizona a large number of Mormon people, or people who belong to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and I would be false to that principle of fair play for which I have always pretended that I stood if I failed at this time to say a word on the subject.

It may be that I do not understand fully the theology of the Mormon Church; but, Mr. President, the first church I ever attended was a Mormon Church. When there was no other church within 100 miles of the lonely frontier cabin where my parents lived, we found solace and comfort in attending the Mormon Church situated 9 miles distant. Our nearest—in fact, our only—neighbors for years were the Mormon people. Better neighbors no pioneer ever had. I am proud of the Mormon people. I am proud of the friendship that I have for them and that I believe they have for me; and I am able to say here in the Senate of the United States that their church has elevated many intellects and purified many hearts in my State.

As pioneers in a new country the Mormons are unrivaled. They are sober, industrious, frugal, honest. They are preeminently State builders; and today, if called upon to name a people who could most expeditiously transform a desert into splendid fields and farms, I would unhesitantingly choose the Mormon people. In many places where once the cacti lifted thorn arms into the brazen and heated air Mormon industry has reared temples, hospitals, homes, factories, and schools.

Moreover, I never saw a Mormon I. W. W.; but I have at some county courthouses in my State heard disgruntled, lazy, and indolent men who did not belong to the Mormon Church sit on the steps of the courthouse and curse the Government while Mormon citizens were going into the same county courthouse to pay taxes without complaint.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield for a question.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a tenet of the Mormons to teach and preach industry and thrift?

Mr. ASHURST. I am able to state that industry and thrift are amongst the foundation stones of the Mormon Church. Absolute and unquestioned obedience to law is a tenet of the Mormon Church. Respect for authority is one of the tenets of the Mormon

Church. We need more of such people in these perilous times of the Republic; and, again, I would be false to every principle of justice and to every sentiment of gratitude if I failed to state at this time that when savage Indians galloped along by our pioneer homes, burning and murdering, plundering and scalping as they went, it was to the Mormon people that my defenseless but heroic parents went for refuge and defense.

Mr. President, I say the Senator from Utah has done well in "scotching" this falsehood, which has been given such wide circulation. I believe the American people are coming at last fully to understand the Mormon people. Their temples, schools, fields, homes, industry, frugality, their morality, and their patriotism testify for them in more eloquent terms than the Senator or I could speak. Then, again, observe their Representatives in the House and in the Senate. Look at the high class of public servants they send here. I ask that the Mormons be judged as a people, judged as a religion, by their fruits; and if they be judged by their fruits the verdict of the world will be in their favor.

It seems to me that the time should be welcomed in America when men shall not further be assailed because of their religion or lack of religion. Men ought not further be assailed or discriminated against because of their particular view of how to follow the Master. America was built up, and one of the reasons for the migrations from the old countries to these shores was that our ancestors desired to find a place to build free and strong States where such ignoble sentiments as bigotry could not survive.

I do not forget that the splendid domain of Arizona, one of the imperial States of this Union, came into being largely through the brave exploits of the Mormon people. When Gen. Stephen Kearney was beleaguered near San Diego during the Mexican War, and it seemed as though the Mexicans were going to capture and annihilate him and his entire command, it was the Mormon battalion that marched all the long way from Iowa into Tucson, Ariz., and occupied in then Mexican territory a domain we now know as the Gadsden Purchase, which was purchased by our Government in 1854. When the commanding officer of the Mormon battalion, Lt. Col. St. George Cooke, entered the then Mexican town of Tucson and raised the American flag, he issued a pronunciamento, as follows:

"We do not war upon civilians. We make war against men in uniform only. The property of individuals will be held sacred. All civil rights will be upheld. Those who obey the law and conform to order will be protected."

The command remained there some days to refresh itself and then marched on to the relief of General Kearney who, as I said, was beleaguered and surrounded near San Diego.

So, Mr. President, the Mormon people, as pioneers, as State builders, as statesmen, as people of industry and patriotism in every department of life, compare well and favorably with the general mass of their fellow citizens. This much I should have said; more than this I need not say.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1940.*

Mr. FREDERIC E. FOX,
Flagstaff, Ariz.

DEAR MR. FOX: Your letter of January 15 received, advising that you are compiling a history of the five Babbitt brothers.

It is now more than 53 years since I first met the Babbitt brothers, David, George, Charles, William, and Edward. Within a short time after they settled in northern Arizona they, severally, established character as forward-looking, courageous, reliable citizens and down through the years they contributed toward the upbuilding and the dramatic progress of Arizona.

When I was trying to earn $20 per month as a cowboy (I was overpaid) I rode scores of days and many hundreds of miles under the summer sun and winter stars with Bill Babbitt. Bill was a clean-spoken, chivalrous cowhand.

The thundering herd would sometimes stampede and this caused some cowhands to let out profanity as they rode furiously and hard, but Bill was serene, and silent as he rode, and let out no profanity, even of the low, sweet, soft kind.

When the chuck wagon would break down or get lost, or the camp cook would turn cranky and there was nothing for supper but "wind pudding," Bill was patient and pleasant and endured all hardships with an almost royal humor.

Some years ago Bill went to that vast realm where kings and queens are probably counted as deuces and the American cowboys are probably counted as aces.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY F. ASHURST.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1940.*

Mr. T. E. STEVENS,
National Representative, Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: Your letter of May 2 received.

Please convey to the delegates my cordial salutations and best wishes for a successful convention. Assure Dr. Townsend, founder and president, of my confidence and esteem.

Dr. Townsend's proposed plan of "Pay as we go," by means of an income tax, is one of the happiest hits of statesmanship of our day.

Many, if not most of the economists and financiers believe that Dr. Townsend's plan may be the method by which we may care for the aged, avoid inflation, and at the same time begin to reduce our national debt.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY F. ASHURST.

WOODROW WILSON

[Remarks of Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, of Arizona, in the Senate of the United States Tuesday, October 24, 1939]

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the subject of the pending joint resolution has very deeply stirred the feelings of some excellent persons.

Not a few citizens, although thoroughly schooled and well trained in self-control, have, in discussing the joint resolution, been unable to keep their emotions within bounds.

During the past month some calumnies have been inflicted posthumously upon the memory of some characters who during their lifetime deserved well of our country and were highly esteemed by their countrymen.

It is, however, some consolation and comfort to know that such calumnies as were inflicted posthumously were not uttered in the Senate or by any Senator. They were uttered elsewhere.

Caustic words and whizzing javelins of accusation hurled in the hot blood of excitement and in the rough-and-tumble of debate against a living person are easily endured and quickly forgotten.

Unfair imputations uttered against a man while he is in existence will, if he declines to notice them, fall soon enough into the abyss of oblivion, as silence is the noblest weapon and most devastating rebuke with which to meet calumny; but when misconduct is charged to one whose voice is forever silenced, the dead must be allowed to reply in the only way they may reply; that is, through the record of their deeds done.

When, in his last hours, Woodrow Wilson said, "I am ready," he spoke as few men may speak. He was, indeed, ready. He had enlightened thousands of our young men and had sent them forth from our colleges with minds and characters trained for the truth; he had enriched our literature; he had been Governor of a proud State; he had, as President, ennobled labor and had shown a nation how to be valiantly honest. Such a man is always ready.

The Wilson administration was an epoch crowded with complex governmental problems; grave international involvements creating desperate emergencies, the surmounting of which ran to the foundations of our national existence; training, victualing, and transporting vast armies; providing and deploying an immense navy; raising revenue aggregating billions of dollars. In all of these stupendous duties Woodrow Wilson was moved by a zeal as warm as ever inspired the breast or nerved the arm of patriot warrior.

Rarely has there been a character like Woodrow Wilson. Even under the pressure of catastrophic events he insisted that all problems, at whatsoever pain to himself, should be solved only by the rule of justice.

The alluring temptation, always before public men, to obtain for immediate constituents some trifling benefit today, although at the sacrifice of a nation's vitality and efficiency for the future, has been the Circean spell that has since the days of antiquity deflected the purpose and weakened the fiber of many statesmen; but such temptation never influenced Woodrow Wilson.

He could not negotiate compromises; hence he did not consider what was or was not expedient. He reckoned not the cost to his health or to his fame, but pressed forward to his duty as he saw it, and as the horologe of time ticks on and on the waves of malice and hatred that once rolled so furiously about him will spend their force and his fame will be far shining, for he strove for superlatively great ideals.

Woodrow Wilson believed that human liberty is like unto a coral island—built from the deeps and by the dying of the builders until at last it greets the surface and the sunlight—and high above the range of doubt or fear, with the charm of a poet, Woodrow Wilson sacrificed himself in an effort to banish from the earth the incarnate Moloch of War. Such a man is always ready.

THE F. B. I.

[Remarks of Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, of Arizona, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, April 25, 1940]

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the speeches just delivered in the Senate regarding the F. B. I. are timely and pertinent.

Charging the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] with attempting to smear somebody is about like charging Abe Lincoln with engaging in a similar endeavor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. When Abraham Lincoln lived he was charged with that and everything else imaginable in the category of crime and ridicule.

Mr. ASHURST. No one believed it.

Mr. NORRIS. They do not now; they know better now; but many believed it then.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me, no one believed it then.

Mr. President, it is not my function, certainly not my duty, to make any elaborate defense of the F. B. I. or of the Department

of Justice. Some 1,600 men make up the personnel of the F. B. I. It would be impossible to imagine that out of 1,600 men there could be no weak member, no rotten bough. The greatest Wisdom, the greatest Mind, the greatest Good on earth, in choosing a cabinet found that He had a denying Peter, a doubting Thomas, and a bribe-taking Judas. Finite man will labor in vain to select men in large numbers without finding some weak one. Therefore, I do not doubt that out of 1,600 men there may be, and doubtless is, some unworthy man.

I speak now as a whole regarding the work of the F. B. I. I shall not even refer to the Detroit cases, because it is my habit never to discuss a matter pending in the courts. It was wise on the part of the speakers who preceded me not to descend into the details of those cases. It is proper in such circumstances to stand in awe of justice and let justice speak.

The members of the F. B. I.—that is, the Federal Bureau of Investigation—are trained men. In my service as a Senator I have made but one recommendation to the F. B. I. I did recommend that a young gentleman be appointed. He was given an examination and could not pass. I requested a reexamination. Still he did not pass. So far from feeling any resentment against Mr. Hoover, I admire him rather for the strong and sterling way in which he disregarded what might be called a political endorsement.

The F. B. I. requires men of unusual types, sagacious, prudent; they must know when to speak and when to withhold speech. They must know what a criminal would do in certain circumstances. They must even know who would be likely to commit a crime of a particular nature. They must be trained to know what a suspected person will do in certain circumstances. In order to be a successful member of the force of the F. B. I. one must understand physics—that is, natural philosophy; one must understand psychology—that is, the science of human emotions—to an almost perfect degree.

The persons against whom the F. B. I. agents are operating constitute some of the boldest, most desperate, most cruel, and inveterate criminals ever known. Such criminally disposed or antisocial persons desire sensations, wines, high-powered cars, bright lights, ease, comfort, luxury, but lack the ability to earn these things. Therefore they seek to take them by indirection and in violation of the law.

As to communism, I suppose one has a right, under our Constitution, to preach communism. Communism cannot prevail, because it is contrary to the inborn, ineradicable sentiments of the human heart. Deep in the human instincts and enshrined in the hearts of all humans are three things that may not be repealed by any government or any law:

Something to possess. That desire cannot be repealed. Therefore communism will fail because it cannot wipe out the desire to possess something tangible; some property.

Something in which to believe.

Someone for whom to care.

These three things are invincible and communism will attempt in vain to repeal them. They are part of human life and human destiny.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] opened the debate. I listened to him with care, as I listened, of course, with care to what was said by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I agree with them that a man charged with murder or any other crime should be tried strictly according to law. The only hope we have of maintaining this Government is to assure the accused person, no matter how lowly, how poor, how despised such person may be, that he will be tried by the same system of government, the same law, the same rule of evidence, and possibly by the same judge and the same system of jury selection under which the wealthiest, most eminent, most learned citizen would be tried.

Mr. President, more than a hundred years ago—yes; longer ago than that—an eminent orator—I leave it to some surer scholar to discover whom it was—said:

"If all the men who have fallen under American justice and have suffered the death penalty in America could be resurrected at the foot of the gallows and, after their resurrection, were to form a government, they would form a government of the same kind as the one under whose justice they fell."

There is no doubt about that, because it is the fairest system ever devised by man. Therefore, of course, it behooves us all to see to it that the civil liberty of citizens shall not be swept away, and that the lowliest and poorest citizen, the most meager in funds, shall be tried by the same law as the most opulent citizen.

It is a singular circumstance which, if it were not so poignant in its tragedy, would be ironical to the point of humor that when a cold-blooded, desperate, cruel, and inveterate gangster is arrested after spending a lifetime inveighing against the Constitution of the United States, after spending much of his ill-gotten gains in an attempt to subvert our system of government, the first thing that gangster does when brought into court is to appeal to this very Constitution for the preservation of his own liberty and for a fair trials. Sirs, the document he tried to destroy, the system against which he inveighed, and against which he bored from within, is the system to which in his day of trial and trouble he appeals for his freedom and his acquittal, if he is to have such. That statement shows the strength, the power, the beneficence, and the justice of the American system of government under our Constitution.

As to Mr. Hoover, let me say that he is a young man. So far as I know, he is a good man. He is not a great man, for no man is ever great until he has had much sorrow, humiliation, and disappointment. No man will be great, or can expect to be great, until he has had full measure of those chastening and refining influences. But measuring Mr. Hoover by his accomplishments—of course, he is not without error—measuring him by what has been done, the record seems good.

When Mr. Cummings was appointed Attorney General in 1933, I happen to know that tremendous pressure was brought to bear upon him to try to induce him not to retain Mr. Hoover as the Chief of the F. B. I. Mr. Cummings made an investigation, which lasted nearly a year, and at the conclusion of the investigation made by Mr. Cummings he determined—and I think wisely determined—to retain Mr. Hoover.

When Mr. Murphy succeeded Mr. Cummings, the same pressure was not brought to bear on Attorney General Murphy to release and discharge Mr. Hoover, but there was some opinion that it should be done. Attorney General Murphy retained Mr. Hoover as Chief of the F. B. I.

When Mr. Jackson succeeded Mr. Murphy as Attorney General—I do not now speak with authenticity or with any real degree of accuracy—he considered the question, and after his investigation he also retained Mr. Hoover as the Director of the F. B. I.

It would be childlike in simplicity to pretend that in such a wide field, a field so pregnant with possibilities for mistakes, no mistake has been made. Whenever you find a public man who has made no mistakes, you will find one who has been asleep. I say to my fellow Senators, when they go out into the field to begin their campaigns for reelection, they will be charged with having made mistakes. Admit it, certainly, for it shows that you are active; you are trying to do something. Those in the graveyard and those who are asleep probably make no mistakes. I have no doubt, Mr. Hoover has made mistakes. I hope he has not made as many as I have made; but it should not frighten one to be accused of having made a mistake.

Mr. President, again referring to the men required in the F. B. I., some Senators may have a phonographic brain. I congratulate them if they have. It is not, however, conclusive evidence of mental strength to have a phonographic brain, one which can reproduce like a phonograph. While it happens to be no sure evidence of mental strength, the F. B. I. man must have it.

How many Senators have a photographic eye? I congratulate such as have. With the photographic eye, what you see in a flash is engraved on your mind forever. If you have such an eye, you are a remarkable man. The F. B. I. man must have both a photographic eye and a phonographic brain.

The F. B. I. man must be cool. He must be so deliberate and so cool that he even appears to be like a gangster in temperament. Gangsters are the coolest of all men. There is no excitement about them. The first thing they learn about gangster warfare is to keep cool. A false move and the game is over.

Mr. President, these men in the F. B. I., moreover, must be above reproach. They must have no social ambition; they must have no political ambition; and, above all, they must have no financial ambition. It is not easy to find men, certainly regiments of men, who can meet such a test, and that is the test they must meet, otherwise the inexorable law of efficiency soon will exclude them from their positions in the F. B. I.

As for Mr. Hoover, I have never had sip or sup with him. We are not social, fraternal, political companions, or comrades, and when I speak of him, as I have done before, I do it because I believe I would exhibit a sort of cowardice, I would certainly exhibit a sort of timidity, if I did not lay before the Senate and the country these observations concerning impressions of the F. B. I. which have come to me down through the years.

I could tire the Senate by a long and detailed account of hundreds of cases which have been solved by the F. B. I., cases so startling in their nature, so remarkable, that one might imagine that the F. B. I. men themselves were endowed with some sort of telepathic sense, so remarkable and so startling have been their achievements.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR ASHURST THAT BECAME LAWS

IN THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

A bill authorizing the survey and sale of certain lands in Coconino County, Ariz., to the occupants thereof.

IN THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

A bill for the relief of Warren E. Day.

A bill authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on a part of the Navajo Indian Reservation in the State of Arizona.

A bill to provide for the storing and cleansing of commonly called garbanzo.

A bill to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona.

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease, for production of oil and gas, ceded lands of the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation in the State of Wyoming.

A bill providing that Indian schools may be maintained without restriction as to annual rate of expenditure per pupil.

IN THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

A bill to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

A bill to establish the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona.

A joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents.

IN THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

A bill for the relief of Walter Runke.

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the survey and sale of certain lands in Coconino County, Ariz., to the occupants thereof."

A bill to provide for the completion of the bridge across the Little Colorado River, near Leupp, Ariz.

IN THE SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the board of regents of the University of Arizona, for a certain described tract of land.

A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right-of-way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz.

IN THE SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS

A bill for the relief of Eustacio B. Davison.

A bill (authorizing the withdrawal of certain public lands in Arizona for use as a municipal aviation field by the city of Tucson, Ariz.) to authorize the use by the city of Tucson, Ariz., of certain public land for a municipal aviation field.

A bill for the relief of Edgar K. Miller.

A bill for completion of the road from Tucson to Ajo via Indian Oasis, Ariz.

IN THE SEVENTIETH CONGRESS

A bill to authorize (appropriations for the survey, construction, and maintenance of highways on or adjacent to untaxed Indian lands) an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations.

A bill to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field.

A bill granting a pension to Lois I. Marshall, widow of Vice President Marshall.

A bill for the relief of William A. Light.

A bill authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.

A bill for the relief of William E. Thackrey.

A bill for the relief of C. R. Olberg.

A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to donate certain buildings in the city of Tucson, Ariz.

A bill authorizing the construction of a fence along the east boundary of the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz.

A bill authorizing the Federal Power Commission to issue permits and licenses on Fort Apache and White Mountain Indian Reservations, Ariz.

A bill to authorize the construction of a telephone line from Flagstaff to Kayenta on the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.

A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of two bridges on the San Carlos Indian Reservation in Arizona.

IN THE SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS

A bill for the relief of Hamilton Grounds.

A bill to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the city of Prescott municipal watershed in the Prescott National Forest within the State of Arizona.

A resolution authorizing an investigation of the subject of the utilization of the water resources of the San Pedro River in Arizona.

IN THE SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS

A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915, relative to desert-land entry.

A bill for the relief of A. E. Sholley.

A bill to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of Arizona for the use of the University of Arizona.

A bill providing that no indictment shall be insufficient because of formal defects or because of presence of clerks or stenographers.

A bill to provide punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers.

A bill to limit the operation of the statutes of limitations in certain criminal cases.

A bill to amend the act giving the Supreme Court authority to prescribe rules with respect to proceedings in criminal cases.

A bill to punish smuggling contraband articles into penal institutions, inciting riots therein, etc.

A bill to punish certain offenses committed against banks operating under laws of the United States or any member of the Federal Reserve System.

A bill to extend the provisions of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act to other stolen property.

A bill giving Supreme Court authority to make and publish rules in civil actions at law.

A bill permitting employment of certain counsel in case of United States against Weirton Steel Co.

A bill permitting employment of certain counsel in cases of United States against Electro Metallurgical Co., New-Kanawha Power Co., and Union Carbide & Carbon Co.

A bill vesting courts with discretion relative to the forfeiture of vessels and aircraft seized for violations of law.

IN THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the manner in which property shall be sold under orders and decrees of any United States courts."

A bill to prohibit the interstate transportation of prison-made products in certain cases.

A bill to authorize the acquisition of land on McNeil Island.

A resolution providing for the celebration on September 17, 1937, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention.

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

A bill limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act forbidding the transportation of any person in interstate or foreign commerce kidnaped or otherwise unlawfully detained, and making such act a felony."

A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain moneys to "Funds of Federal prisoners."

A bill to provide an official seal for the United States Veterans' Administration.

A bill to authorize the Attorney General to determine and pay certain claims against the Government for damage to person or property in sum not exceeding $500 in any one case.

A bill to amend section 103 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the Canal Zone and section 542 of the Code of Civil Procedure for the Canal Zone.

A resolution to print additional copies of the revised annotated Constitution, and further to revise the same.

A bill to supplement the act of June 25, 1929, which authorized and directed the Attorney General to institute suit against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and others.

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

A bill for the relief of Lt. Robert A. J. English, United States Navy.

A bill to reenact and amend certain provisions of the various national liquor laws.

IN THE SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

A bill for the relief of Stanley A. Jerman, receiver for A. J. Peters Co., Inc.

A bill limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Fort Reno Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, Okla.

A bill to amend the Criminal Code by providing punishment for impersonation of officers and employees of Government-owned and Government-controlled corporations.

A bill to amend the act authorizing the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance.

A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of Federal penal and correctional institutions to administer oaths.

A bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges in certain United States courts. (Introduced by Senator ASHURST and Senator HATCH.)

A bill to authorize membership on behalf of the United States in the International Criminal Police Commission.

A bill to provide for the care and treatment of juvenile delinquents.

IN THE SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

A bill to amend section 224 of the Criminal Code so as to penalize the making of false claims for the loss of insured mail matter.

A bill to provide for the administration of the United States courts, and for other purposes.

A bill to provide for the confiscation of firearms in possession of persons convicted of felony and disposition thereof.

A bill to authorize the temporary appointment of a special judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

A bill to provide that records certified by the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court, in response to writs of certiorari, may include material portions of the evidence.

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service," so as to extend commissary privileges to civilian officers and employees of the United States at naval stations beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

A bill to prohibit reproductions of official badges, identification cards, and other insignia.

A bill to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior.

A bill to provide that no statute of limitations shall apply to offenses punishable by death.

A bill to amend the Criminal Code in regard to obtaining money by false pretenses on the high seas.

A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

A bill relating to certain lands of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

STATEMENT OF JAMES H. MORRISON

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. James H. Morrison, representing the Louisiana Farmers Protective Association, Inc., before the Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, before I start I would like to correct one misapprehension. I am not really a Senator. I am a Senator merely by courtesy. I have adopted the title.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What is a Senator by courtesy?

Mr. MORRISON. They just call me that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will you give your address?

Mr. MORRISON. Hammond, La.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What is your business, Mr. Morrison.

Mr. MORRISON. I am an attorney. I came up here at my own expense; I represent the Louisiana Farmers Protective Association, Inc., which is an association of over 9,000 strawberry farmers in the Louisiana Strawberry Belt, which incidentally is the largest strawberry belt in America.

Mr. MCCORMACK. We are glad to hear you.

Mr. MORRISON. I come here as their representative, and I might say that the problems of that strawberry deal of Louisiana are perhaps similar to the problems of every fruit grower in America. They raise a perishable crop, like most of the fruit crops grown in America, and this association is for the protection of those strawberry farmers.

This association came into existence in 1937, after a very disastrous season, where the farmers of that deal received the lowest price for their commodity, on the average, that they had ever received in the history of the deal, so to speak.

In the year 1938, the following season, which happened in the early part of March, the association controlled the selling of all the strawberries that left Louisiana at that time. We had made a great deal of inquiry as to why the decline in price and the cause of the flop, so to speak, in 1937, and we were led to believe that the chain-store selling of strawberries as loss leaders was one of the main reasons for the failure of the grower to receive more money for his strawberries. So at the outset of the season of 1938 the representative buyers of the three major chains, A. & P., Kroger, and Safeway were on the ground, and we called them in for a meeting and asked them what would be the possibilities of assuring the strawberry growers in this association that they would sell their strawberries at least not as loss leaders, but at a profit.

They all agreed that 2 cents profit per pint, which is 48 cents per crate, was reasonable. So the association, inclined also to be reasonable, agreed that if the chain representatives agreed that 2 cents a pint was reasonable, that even 1½ cents would be more reasonable, so that association put a restriction on the sale of all strawberries, that they were to be sold at a minimum profit of 1½ cents or more by the chains, or else they could not buy.

The chains said they would take it up with their various organizations, and none of them agreed to do it. All three chains purchased strawberries on that auction down there, which, as I say, was under the control and direction of this association.

When this association found that one of these chain stores had violated that rule of selling at 1½ cents minimum profit per pint, they were not allowed to purchase any more strawberries. The first one to do so was Kroger, which had a buying subsidiary, the Wesco Food Co.; the next one was the buying subsidiary of the Safeway; and later on during the season Wesco agreed to sell at a cent and a half minimum profit, so they were allowed to come back on the auction and purchase strawberries.

When the regulations went in A. & P.'s buying subsidiary, the Atlantic Commission Co., went out and did not buy any more strawberries in Louisiana, and the understanding was that they purchased all their strawberries for their stores from terminal markets.

That is, in a way, a brief history and summary of the operations of this organization for the first year. Every time action was taken against these chain stores or their buying subsidiaries, there was a favorable reaction in the market, and I believe I am safe in saying that that is one of the main troubles of your strawberry farmer, and which I think is also applicable to every fresh-fruit farmer in America; that is, the selling of their products as loss leaders, together with the combined buying power which the chain-store subsidiaries have.

For instance, the Atlantic Commission Co. not only buys for the A. & P. stores from the farmers or on the markets, but they also purchase for independent jobbers whom they control by giving them business in other commodities, and in that way the buying power is lessened in the strawberry belt, which means that the farmer has a harder time securing a market, and especially where strawberries are sold at auction as they are down there, because where the buying power is all given to one man you haven't much demand on the auction.

This past season, 1939, the chain stores, regardless of the Robinson-Patman Act, sold strawberries as loss leaders in various cities and localities in the United States. I have seen various telegrams and letters come back from jobbers to the selling agency there in Louisiana, where they said they couldn't handle any more strawberries at that particular time, due to the fact that the chain stores had advertised strawberries at cost, and in some instances below cost, and for that reason they could not meet the competition and they could not handle the strawberries profitably.

So, as a result of the great buying power, and as a result of selling strawberries as loss leaders, the strawberry farmer has received less money than he would have received ordinarily had they not sold the strawberries as loss leaders and had that large buying power in this combination.

I might say, I believe I am safe in saying, that the chains handle approximately from 15 to 20 percent of the strawberries. If they took all the strawberries and paid a reasonable price for them the farmers would have no kick; but that 15 or 20 percent, where they use the strawberries as loss leaders, puts the farmer in a position where his market on the other 80 percent is ruined, and for that reason he is not able to get what he ordinarily would if they did not use the strawberries as loss leaders.

Mr. DINGELL. As I understand it thus far, your expressions here are centered largely against the vicious practice of selling certain products below cost.

Mr. MORRISON. At cost or below.

Mr. DINGELL. In this instance it is applicable to strawberries, and a certain group of buyers, large buyers, banded together, buy about 20 percent of the crop.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. At the lowest possible price, and then they sell them at the lowest possible price, even below cost, as loss leaders, and through that action force the other independent buyers to either buy strawberries at an excessively low cost in order that they can also sell as a loss leader, and through this combined practice the producer of this product, strawberries, in this instance, is made the victim of this vicious practice?

Mr. MORRISON. I would say that they buy from 15 to 20 percent of the strawberries for their own use, but their buying power for independent jobbers gives them a greater buying power than 20 percent.

Mr. DINGELL. They buy even for others?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. But your main complaint is the sale at or below actual cost and the practice which is known as loss leaders?

Mr. MORRISON. Correct.

Mr. DINGELL. You don't have any laws in Louisiana to curb that?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to say to you that I have on more than one occasion attacked this practice of loss leaders, away back when we considered N. R. A. I had several tiffs with witnesses on that particular practice. That practice ought to be thoroughly considered, because whatever one merchant can do another must do, whether he wants to or not, and invariably will do. If you can sell a pint of strawberries for cost, the grocer on the other corner can do so and must do so, and then if you undersell him, he does the same thing, and there is no way of knowing how far they will go in cutting each other's throats. That is particularly harmful to the small merchant.

Mr. MORRISON. That use of the strawberries as loss leaders is a great weapon to the chain stores in inducing customers to come into their stores and trade. In other words, they have many stores in a community, and with the combined advertising power of 50 stores, say, they will bring a page ad out in the newspaper in that particular locality, and at the time the Louisiana strawberry crop comes in, there are no other strawberries on the market to amount to anything—Florida is the first, and they are practically through; Louisiana comes in when spring is just starting in the North and East; they come out with a page ad and in one corner there will be a conspicuous place, "Louisiana strawberries, two pints for 19 cents," or "two pints for 25 cents," or whatever they can get the price down to.

In other words, they have no motive to sell these strawberries at a reasonable profit and give the farmer who produces them a reasonable profit. Their main motive is to cut that price as low as possible so as to induce every possible customer they can to come into their stores with the price held before them of those strawberries.

Your independent merchant across the street has not that advertising power and he cannot buy in those large quantities; he will have to go to his jobber to buy. Even though he may chisel on his jobber and get those strawberries as low as possible he is only going to handle as many of those strawberries as is possible for him to get by on, because he is not making a profit on them. For that reason your independent does not push the strawberries or that particular commodity, and in that respect the chain

stores have a tendency to bring down the market. In other words, there isn't a possible chance for a bull market as long as your chain stores are in.

The chain stores retaliated when we refused to let them buy strawberries on the auction down there and said that they were not going to handle strawberries but after a careful check-up we found that they were handling strawberries, but they were buying them at the terminal markets. In other words, their business is so competitive that they had to handle strawberries if the independents and other stores were handling them, because that was a delicacy and a much-sought-after commodity which the housewife wanted, and if she couldn't get it in a chain store she would go to the independent store.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I suggest right there, I don't think this legislation covers the situation you are describing.

Mr. MORRISON. I haven't quite come to that particular part of it. I am going to bring that out later on. What I am primarily trying to do before this committee is to give you the grower's angle on chain stores and their operation. In other words, I am representing and talking for the grower, not for the retail merchant, not for the jobber, or not for any other agency except the particular grower. What I am trying to bring out—and I will bring out your problem later on in my discussion—is to show exactly how the farmer would like to have the chain stores regulated, or this practice stopped.

To go on with your chain stores, the farmer of America is completely unorganized. If these 9,000 farmers down there had not had any organization they would have been completely at a loss to do anything about chain stores selling their product as loss leaders.

When the A. & P. store, which is controlled by two gentlemen—I understand, two brothers—and the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co. and the Safeway Stores are really empires, rather than businesses, because of their great number of stores and the bigness of their business, if they want to they can control that situation.

It wasn't so long ago that the A. & P. employed a gentleman by the name of Mr. Carl Byoir, so I am told, as public relations counsel, and he advertised in every paper in America, or practically every daily in America, either through a page or half-page ad, the policy of the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. in the operation of their stores. Many people charged that that was done to get favorable cooperation for the chain stores by the newspapers.

I bring that out as an example of their organization and of their power and of their money as compared to the completely disorganized group of farmers.

There are many farmers in the United States of America that would like to come before this committee and testify, but wouldn't dare do so because the chain stores handle a certain percentage of their crop; and if they did, naturally they would suffer retaliation from the chain stores. In other words, they would not be able to sell their proportion of their crop to the chain stores.

I have talked to some shippers who say that dealing with the chain store is a slow death, but they are going to hang on as long as they can. If they stop doing business with the chain stores and oppose the chain stores, they go out of business, because they started off with them, and they have no other contacts in the produce game. But they realize if they stay with them in the future they are going to be out of the produce business, or at least they are going to be out of the shipping business so far as that particular commodity is concerned.

I realize that perhaps the chain stores will sponsor, very much under cover, and I wouldn't be surprised at all to hear of many farmers coming up and testifying before this committee on behalf of the chain stores, because to a certain extent they control a great many shippers and farmers here in America, and a great many of which know the evils of the chain store, but due to their particular circumstances and conditions they cannot dare to go against the present chain-store system.

I remember one particular instance down in Louisiana, where all the buyers of strawberries had a meeting, and they were asked to vote whether they would vote in favor of the chain-store policy of—I mean the association's policy of forcing the chain stores to sell at a minimum profit of a cent and a half, and one man in particular voted "yes," that he was for that policy, which was against the chain-store policy, because they wanted to sell the strawberries as loss leaders. An hour later that man came back and said he wanted to change his vote for the simple reason, he stated when I asked him, that he grew grapes in another State and the chain stores bought a certain amount of his grapes, and if he went against the chain stores in the Louisiana strawberry field, they wouldn't buy the amount of grapes they had been buying from him.

So, it is so interwoven, and the chains on the one side are so highly organized, and they have a great deal of buying power which their own stores give them, and which independent jobbers who are depending upon these chain stores give them, that they can make or break any perishable commodity here in America, so far as the grower is concerned.

There is an old saying, "There is some good in the worst of us and some bad in the best of us." The chain stores have put on several programs throughout the United States where they come in and say, "We have been the fairy godfather of the shippers; we have taken great quantities of their products which they were unable to sell or merchandise, and we have put on drives to try and help the farmers get rid of the surplus crop here and the surplus crop there."

In all instances where they do that, if you will carefully check and study that, in many instances they caused that situation to exist, for this reason, that they hammered down the price, and they cut the price so low that the farmer was helpless, and for that reason he had to call on the chain stores, if they were going to help him, and they took what they could of his commodity and sold it at a very low price, under the guise of doing a great deal to help that particular group of growers or farmers.

In other words, it is exactly like pulling a man out of the water after he has already drowned.

The chain stores of America, and these three in particular, who are the major ones, have fixed it so that their loss leader practices on every commodity that has a good market and that the housewife wants, have fixed it so that the farmer cannot get the price that he would get because of the loss-leader use of that particular commodity. In other words, they hammered down, down, and down on the price. They have even gone so far in some instances in the Louisiana strawberry deal, to fix their advertisements, so their own representatives have told me, 3 days in advance of when the strawberries would be sold, believing that they could control the market to the extent that they were safe in fixing the price at which they could advertise their strawberries and take a chance at not losing a great deal of money.

They are not in business to lose money, and they only sell those strawberries at cost, and in some instances below cost, so as to get the customer into their store, where the independent across the street, who has to charge a reasonable profit, cannot compete with them, and their idea of strawberries, or any other commodity of that nature, is not to sell it at a reasonable profit and have a reasonable market and reasonable market conditions, but to lower that market, because the lower they make that price, the more inducement it is for the housewife to come in and to buy that particular commodity, and in doing that with these other independent stores, the jobbers do not like to handle strawberries or any other commodity of that nature. They handle as few as possible, and the same way with the independent stores. So, all in all, it is a very serious situation.

Now, you say, what is the remedy, and perhaps, is this Patman bill the remedy?

As I see it, being a lawyer, there are two remedies, one by regulation and the other by taxation. With the regulation you have a bill to place on the statute books. Then you have to make your complaint to the Department of Justice or the Attorney General's office. That complaint is investigated and studied; time, delay, and a great deal of patience is required. Then there may be a trial in a lower court, and then it has to go through several courts. In other words, maybe before that particular case is tried there may be a delay and a change in administration. You may have the same people that started off with that particular complaint in private practice, and having nothing more to do with it, and in some instances it may be possible they would even represent the defendant.

And assuming that you did go to trial, then you would go from one court to the next court, and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States, and you would have maybe a lapse of several years, possibly 5 or 6, and there are your farmers, your strawberry farmers, grape farmers, plum farmers, and all your fruit farmers in America being damaged all the time.

Whereas, on the other hand, if you attempt to cure it by taxation, when you consider their ability to buy, their ability to advertise and sell as loss leaders, which is a distinct advantage, and that is an advantage that no small independent retailer or group of retailers enjoys, and for that privilege I think it is certainly logical that they should pay something to help support this great country which gives them that privilege, if we consider it a privilege. In other words, by taxation they have their choice, either to stay big or to get a little smaller, and when they become smaller they cannot use the loss-leader angle, and they cannot affect the strawberry grower and the other fruit growers of America.

There are chain-store taxes today in many States. In the State where I come from, Louisiana, there is a chain-store tax, and it goes up as regards the number of stores a chain has, so if a chain store like the A. & P., who, I understand, has something like 12,000, were in Louisiana, with that number of stores in Louisiana, they pay the highest tax. If they split it and have fewer stores, they pay a smaller tax, and with this bill that is now before you gentlemen for your consideration, taxation is the quickest and best way to remedy the chain-store situation in regard to its bigness and monopoly viewpoint, because so far as regulation is concerned, as I have just stated, it takes years and years and years to start at the bottom and get your measure into effect.

In other words, it may take so many years that the man that made the original complaint will be put out of business, stopped farming, or whatever he was doing, and engaged in some other business, or even moved away.

And there is a serious situation also in this: If you gentlemen will check the produce markets and the produce conditions and the fresh-fruit and vegetable industry in America, you will find, as I have been told by some of the leading produce men in America, that the produce, fresh-fruit and vegetable industry in America is today at a very low ebb, due to your chain-store practices, their buying power, and their loss-leader practices, and for that reason the farmer is suffering, the jobber is suffering, and the independent retailer is suffering, and, in particular, my main stress that I am trying to give you gentlemen is the fact that the grower who produces those strawberries and other commodities in America, who has no organization at all, comparatively speaking, can do nothing about your chain store. In other words, he is completely at the mercy of your chain-store buying power. If

your chain-store buying power gets larger, he will be more completely at their mercy instead of partially at their mercy, as he is today, and I say that the practice of loss leaders as used by your chain stores, and particularly your three major chain stores, has to a certain extent pauperized groups of farmers in America, and definitely has helped to pauperize farmers all over the country, and there is no better example of what the chain store can do to any farmer than right there in that Strawberry Belt of Louisiana.

Naturally, the chain stores want to create this fairy-godmother feeling that they want to help the farmer. They have gone so far as to come down into that Strawberry Belt in Louisiana and ask the various agents of the farmer to come out and endorse the various activities of the chain stores in buying strawberries, saying that they are a benefit to the farmer, and not, as we contend, a severe detriment.

With your Patman Act, with your taxes on your chain stores, that would give the chain stores a chance to either divide up and become smaller groups, which would take away that buying power and keep them from using loss leaders, or it would make them pay to enjoy that privilege which they do.

Mr. DINGELL. If you would indulge me there, I think you are altogether too sanguine in believing that loss leaders will be eliminated with the elimination of chains, because I believe there is a certain assumption that has crept into our business life in America here, which has been accepted, that we are always going to have a certain number of chiselers who, by using a method of this kind, can destroy their competitors, and in turn the competitors will apply the same sort of practice that has grown up in this country, but I don't know what it is going to take to wipe it out. But it ought to go, because it is vicious, it is not conducive to good business; I don't think the public benefits by it; I don't think anybody benefits by it. Certainly it is bad for the merchant, it is also bad for his employees, it is very bad for the producer; but I don't think the elimination of the chain is going to eliminate that practice. Something else, more fundamental, going directly to the root of the evil, is going to have to take place. We cannot extirpate this practice, I don't believe, by this means. We couldn't do it even through N. R. A. We had chiselers who tried to get around it and who did continue loss leaders in one guise or another.

Mr. MORRISON. I agree with what you say so far as the competitors of your chain stores having to, and, in some instances, selling to counteract business methods, loss leaders; that is true. But on the other hand, your independent grocers and your independent businessmen cannot use the loss-leader method as it is done, unless they were as powerful and big as these chain stores are. In other words, an independent grocery store in Chicago has not got the size to take a full-page ad in the Chicago papers, nor can they have a man down there in Louisiana to represent them, or several men, in buying their strawberries. That independent grocery store has to go to the terminal market and buy his strawberries there, and he cannot advertise, with a page advertisement, a loss leader.

Mr. DINGELL. But the small chains and the combinations of independent groceries can, and would do that. We have a number of grocery chains in Detroit, in Michigan, that run large chains. They are purely local, intrastate, not interstate, chains, and they get together and they advertise. I take it that probably this association would do that against the independents. I am not condoning or condemning. I am merely citing an observation that I know to be a fact, and they will use that to their independent chain, or of the local chain, which is strictly speaking a chain-store organization belonging to one corporation, under the control and ownership of one person. They will use that loss-leader practice. It wouldn't make any difference whether they can buy for less than the big chains are paying for a product to the producer or not. I don't think that enters into it, because the fact of the matter is the loss-leader practice, unless it is rooted out, will continue and be applied below the prices they are able to buy at. They may not be able to buy at a low price from the producer as the big chains now are buying strawberries, but whatever the cost to these combinations, or even to the individual merchant, my contention is that loss-leader sales will continue unless we find some way to kill the custom.

Mr. MORRISON. I think if you check into the matter you will find that the reason these local chains or independents are doing that is because they were forced to do that by these big chains.

Mr. DINGELL. I will grant you that, but my contention is we are going to have to go above and beyond anything that has been said here to kill off this practice of loss leaders, because I know we tried to abolish that, and tried to aid the merchants to do that very thing under N. R. A., and still they chiseled. They went around it and did everything possible to continue the practice of loss leaders.

Mr. MORRISON. So far as the strawberry growers are concerned, they feel if these three big chains are prevented, through taxation or otherwise, from using strawberries as loss leaders, that the loss-leader activity of the few independent chains or the few smaller chains will be relatively nil, and that they will have no effect so far as the strawberry growers themselves are concerned. For this reason, because one little independent chain of stores in Illinois cannot have a representative in Louisiana to buy their strawberries; they cannot have that buying power, and they cannot have that effect on the market, to force a lower market. They have to buy their strawberries, we will say, at a terminal market in Chicago, or their nearest city, and in that way they do not have a direct effect on the market in Louisiana.

Mr. DINGELL. I will grant that it might benefit your strawberry producer in Louisiana, but my contention is—and they may all be forced to buy Louisiana strawberries at a higher price—but I still contend that it will not prevent misguided merchants from selling those strawberries at whatever price they wish, at cost or below, as loss leaders to attract business, and that the merchants will foolishly do that and take their loss, regardless of whether this legislation passes or not.

That may be extraneous, I grant you, but what I am trying to point out and stress is that vicious practice is deeply rooted, and it ought to be destroyed, discouraged. But how to do it is a question. I am convinced that this legislation will not stop that regardless of whether every chain store in the country were wiped out. It may raise your strawberry prices to the producer in Louisiana, but it will not stop that reprehensible practice of loss leaders which ought to be stopped, I agree with you, by law or any other method.

Mr. MORRISON. I might add to your statement there, that before these big chain stores came into the picture, that they did not use strawberries or any other farming commodity in America to any great extent or appreciable extent as loss leaders. In other words, the loss-leader practice has grown with your three major food chain stores, the A. & P., Kroger, and the Safeway. Before they became so large and so powerful the strawberry farmer in Louisiana did not know what loss leaders were, and he received a much better price and had a better market for his strawberries down there at that time than he does today.

Mr. DINGELL. I wouldn't argue that with you, because that you know better than I, but all I know is it is a reprehensible practice and it is going to be very difficult to get rid of it.

Mr. MORRISON. We all know that.

Mr. DINGELL. Tell me this, you are from Louisiana; what do you people in Louisiana do about this practice of loss leaders? Have you prevented it under your chain-store regulation down there? You have chain-store laws that are enforced. Have you been able to destroy the practice of loss leaders?

Mr. MORRISON. That Chain Store Act came into the picture before this strawberry organization came into the picture, and from my understanding of the act it does not have anything to do with the selling of strawberries or other farm products as loss leaders, but it does tax the big chain stores—the bigger the chain, the bigger the tax.

Mr. DINGELL. Over a progressive scale?

Mr. MORRISON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Now, then, under those circumstances, if you are going to repress, if you are going to hold them in check, if you are going to limit their buying power, if you are going to limit their advantages in the open market, shouldn't that have some bearing in Louisiana, since you say the enactment of this act will have a tendency at least to repress this practice of loss leaders in a national way? The principle of loss leaders, the one we are here discussing now, and what you have in Louisiana, are in principle identical. You admit it has not eliminated the loss-leader sales in your State, and you also admit that the law was enacted before this strawberry situation was brought up.

Mr. MORRISON. For this reason: That the chain-store representatives themselves admit that if other States in the United States had the same taxes that Louisiana has they would be forced to dissolve and form smaller chains, and they could not operate as the large chain that they do. If strawberries were only sold in Louisiana, that Chain Store Act would be a lot of help to those growers. But the fact remains that strawberries are sold in 36 States and Louisiana, and if all those States had a similar chain-store tax to Louisiana, you wouldn't have the A. & P., Kroger, and Safeway with the number of stores they have today. In other words, they would disintegrate and they would form a group of chains here and a group of chains there, and make them a whole lot smaller than they are today.

Mr. DINGELL. But still we are going to have chains. If this Patman proposal becomes a law, we will still have chains, and comparatively large chains, in the various States, and they will still have bigger buying power than the individual. Now, this thing of loss leaders, isn't that something the State ought to take cognizance of?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, Louisiana has not taken cognizance of it. The strawberry farmers feel if the chain stores were taxed, that is the only way you are going to force them to become smaller, and if they become smaller, we will say down to a reasonable group, as you term a small chain, then so far as the strawberry farmer is concerned, which is applicable to all fruit growers in America, the grower is not worried. It is the powerful chain stores; in other words, it is the power of these large chain stores that ruins the strawberry growers, and that makes the loss leader possible. You couldn't have the advertising, you couldn't have the loss-leader usage as it is today, if you didn't have your big chain stores. In other words, if the small chain stores were worrying us as much as these larger chain stores, we would be hollering about the smaller chain stores, but they are not. It is the big chain stores with their advertising advantage, with their buying power, and selling the strawberries as loss leaders.

Mr. DINGELL. I am conceding all that. But I am afraid your mind and mine will never get together on this one point that I am trying to bring out; that this problem will be next to impossible to root out, and I don't think this legislation will stop it as long as we have any chains at all, because the chain—take in my State, Michigan. Let us get away from Louisiana. If we have a

chain-store system in the State of Michigan, or if we have an association of chains, as we have—and we have some large ones; I think probably three, four, and five hundred stores in one association, an independent chain, they advertise together, they buy together, they have a warehouse of their own, they handle their own distribution, they eliminate the middleman, they do everything possible. Those people are going to use to their advantage the loss leaders if they can, in order to cripple independent competitors, aren't they? They are doing it now and they will continue to do it regardless of whether we enact this legislation or not, in my estimation, and no one can tell me different.

What I am trying to bring out in this dialog here is the question of loss leaders, which you brought out, has to be handled by another method than this legislation, that this legislation will not handle the loss-leader nuisance.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, to this extent: If you take the purchasing power away, or if you make the three big chains smaller, just as you have mentioned, with relation to your independent chain, then they have not the power to make any product in America a loss leader. They do not have the power over the shipper then.

Mr. DINGELL. I disagree with you entirely. The local chain will still have more power—if there are 200 stores in a small chain in the State of Michigan, for instance—than the little fellow, they will have 200 times the buying power of the little fellow.

Mr. MORRISON. Of the independent?

Mr. DINGELL. Of the little fellow who is not organized or who does not belong to any voluntary or compulsory chain or to any other type of chain. If he tries to waddle along with his own business, this association or group, buying as a unit, if there are 200 stores in it, will have 200 times the buying power of this fellow who is not a member of that chain. And this chain will use this reprehensible method to put him out of business.

Mr. MORRISON. But suppose you consider the power of the chain that is 60 times as large as that chain down there?

Mr. DINGELL. I am granting that.

Mr. MORRISON. Such as the A. & P.

Mr. DINGELL. What I am trying to convey to you is this. I do not think the chain-store bill, which we have here before us, will eliminate that practice. It may do everything else that you claim; I am not debating any other phase of it. But I do say that I do not think it will reach this curse of selling below cost.

Mr. MORRISON. Let us bring down the big boys and then we can work on the little fellows.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why don't you both agree to disagree, then?

Mr. MORRISON. I think my time is up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; your time is not up.

Mr. MORRISON. I understand there is another witness to come on.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Are there any other questions?

Mr. CROWTHER. I would like to ask one or two questions. Senator, have you given any consideration or any study to the constitutionality of this bill, or of such a procedure?

Mr. MORRISON. I will answer that by saying that personally I have not given it a great deal, but I have talked to some lawyers whom I consider outstanding lawyers, and they are of the opinion that it would be constitutional.

Mr. CROWTHER. I quote from a short report that was made to us by the staff of our committee on internal-revenue taxation. They quote from a court decision, *Heiner* v. *Donman* (285 U. S. 312):

"It is now considered well settled that a Federal statute passed under the taxing power may be so arbitrary and capricious as to cause it to fail before the due-process clause of the fifth amendment."

I do not have to read the due-process clause to you, you being an attorney, but article I, section 8, says:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * *; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

You say you have not given such consideration to this question of constitutionality?

Mr. MORRISON. No; except to talk to some lawyers who I think are outstanding in their qualifications as constitutional lawyers. I certainly think, knowing this Patman Act, and knowing of the Louisiana State Chain Store Act, which passed the test of constitutionality in the United States Supreme Court, that this has a chance of being constitutional. So far as I am concerned, no matter what I think, no matter what all of these gentlemen think, no matter what anybody else in America may think, it is those nine men on the Supreme Court who are going to be the judges of that.

Mr. CROWTHER. I agree with you. We have no way of getting a preliminary judgment or opinion on such things as that.

Now, one of the witnesses testified yesterday that the independent organizations as such did exactly the same thing as the corporate chain stores do; that is, they adopt the loss-leader plan on a certain percentage of their merchandise and then raise the ante to their customers in the store on other commodities. They are all alike. They use the same method. Are you aware of that fact? There was testimony here to that effect yesterday.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, I can readily understand how that is possible. If I were in a business where I was an independent, and the big chains were pressing me, I would follow the old saying, "If you are in Rome, you have to do as the Romans do." If you are in business, you have to do as the big chains do or else go out of business.

Mr. CROWTHER. It is just tit for tat.

Mr. MORRISON. I will say this, that your three big chains have so much more power with strawberries and other commodities as loss leaders that the little chain cannot compare.

Mr. CROWTHER. Let us forget strawberries for a minute.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, any other commodity.

Mr. CROWTHER. That leads up to another question that I think is pertinent at this time. Are there any other large groups or independents that employ this price-destroying buying-pressure power, if that describes it, as these chains do, that you have spoken of?

Mr. MORRISON. No, sir.

Mr. CROWTHER. There are none of them?

Mr. MORRISON. None of them have 12,000 stores with a central buying agent.

Mr. CROWTHER. So that you think that the evidence as regards this price destruction and buying pressure all points to what you denominate as the three large corporate chains?

Mr. MORRISON. That is right.

Mr. CROWTHER. You do not think there is anything like that that parallels it among the independents?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. CROWTHER. But will you agree that to some extent the same methods are used, in the matter of the loss leader, and that they attempt by pressure buying, buying in great quantities, to destroy prices?

Mr. MORRISON. I understand that they have had to do that in order to meet the competition from these three chains.

Mr. CROWTHER. How much money do you get out of your chain-store tax in Louisiana?

Mr. MORRISON. Offhand, I do not know. It runs anywhere from $10 up to $500 per store.

Mr. CROWTHER. Have you any way of knowing what the total is in your State?

Mr. MORRISON. No; I have not.

Mr. CROWTHER. It is $406,000. Now, if this proposal is put forth on the basis of taxation for revenue purposes, that is not a very considerable sum of money; is it?

Mr. MORRISON. That is because there are not many chain stores there.

Mr. CROWTHER. You do not have many chain stores there?

Mr. MORRISON. No, sir.

Mr. CROWTHER. Do you think that is because the tax has stopped the development of the chain stores to any degree?

Mr. MORRISON. Definitely; they have less chain stores now than they did before the tax.

Mr. CROWTHER. Is that the result of building superstores and doing away with two or three small ones, where the aggregate of the business is just as large as it was before? After all, total of the business is what counts; it is how much money they take out of your community.

Mr. MORRISON. I believe the chains themselves, in the public papers, said that they were leaving the State because of the excessive tax.

Mr. CROWTHER. They were leaving the State?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. May I add this fact for the record; it may be of interest to some of the members of the committee: It seems that one State that gets something that looks like real revenue from this chain-store tax is Florida, where in 1939 they collected $2,369,000. That appears to be the high point among the States that have this sort of tax.

Other States collect as follows:

Texas, $785,000.

Michigan, $597,000.

Indiana, the State of our distinguished colleague, $544,000.

Those are the outstanding amounts.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. If there are no further questions, thank you, Mr. Morrison.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you.

America's Duty to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau

of Investigation, before the New York Federation of Women's Clubs, Hotel Astor, New York City, May 3, 1940:

In modern times, the Nation has not witnessed a more significant and important development of civic spirit than is found in such organizations as the Federation of Women's Clubs, which I am proud to address today. When things go wrong in the business, social, and political world, women are among the first to suffer. From them usually comes the first inspiration to improve conditions which might otherwise become chaotic. Thus, my message to you today concerns the welfare of that place where womankind rules supreme—the home, and the happiness, the peace, and the security which should surround it.

Our present position of national prominence did not result from accident. As a Nation we became great through thoughtful planning for the future and through an invincible determination to translate those plans into action. The time has now come when we must plan anew, otherwise hordes of schemers with fantastic ideas that sprang from unworkable and alien philosophies from abroad will eat away the otherwise firm foundations upon which our Nation is built. Vile and vicious forces are today seeking to tear our America asunder—killing freedom, ravishing justice, and destroying liberty in the name of transplanted totalitarianism. The one achievement above all others which America must preserve is that of good citizenship. By this I mean a preservation of our democratic institutions, freedom, liberty, respect for country, and better Government through the efforts and will of all our people.

Without a superior stalwart national citizenship, everything is insecure. The ideas which international propagandists would foist upon us are the very antithesis of American citizenship. Churches have been closed by the mere whim of a dictator; the members of the clergy have been humiliated. As has been the case in other lands, homes can be wrecked, businesses ruined, jobs lost forever, and personal security relegated to fearful outrages of secret police more criminal than even the worst murderers they can accuse.

Some of our dangerous gangsters have come from foreign shores. The worst of these, however, are not the murderers or racketeers. Far more dangerous are those who advocate revolution under the disguise, as the Communist spokesman, Earl Browder, put it, "We are the Americans and communism is the Americanism of the twentieth century." Such masqueraders have not as much respect for constituted authority as does the average robber, highwayman, or murderer; at least the latter admit their crimes and, in many cases, accept their punishment as just and due. Those who would subvert liberty meanwhile shout most loudly for the protection of the Constitution while seeking to destroy its sacred guaranties. There is no such thing as liberty unless it is liberty under law.

A great many false notions of liberty are now quite common, due to plausibly worded propaganda designed by the seducers of our liberties to mislead Americans. This they will never do, because the heart and soul of America, once aroused, is unconquerable.

This has been demonstrated time and again. Until recent years the kidnaper thought that all he need do to enrich his coffers was to snatch the body of some defenseless child or adult and then collect his ransom. In this he was successful until Congress, acting upon urgent appeals, authorized the F. B. I. to function under laws designed by a far-seeing Attorney General.

How many kidnapings occurred before that time no one knows. Any figure at best would be an estimate, because victims then were afraid to speak up, facing inevitable gangland vengeance. But we do know that since 1932, 179 cases of kidnaping have been reported to the F. B. I. and 177 of these cases have been completely solved. Thus, the kidnaping menace that once was a nightmare in every home in the land has come to be a thing of the past, because an aroused people determined that kidnapers must no longer operate with impunity.

The same applies to the bank robber, whose vicious plunderings have been reduced to a faint echo of past activities. The same is true of the extortioner and organized gangdom in general. These vicious forces are fearfully conscious that they are no longer at liberty to rob, plunder, and steal, because the American people have decreed against their invisible empire.

However, the notion is prevalent in too many communities that liberty means, "Do as you wish, as long as you don't get caught." That is why 4,067 serious crimes are committed every 24 hours. That is why a human life is sacrificed on crime's altar every 44 minutes, and that is why a robbery occurs every 9½ minutes, a larceny every 36 seconds, and a burglary every minute and a half.

Because of misdirected energy and perverted teachings, we have in the F. B. I. today the fingerprints of some 5,000,000 persons who have been arrested for an offense more serious than a traffic violation. Before this year comes to a close, approximately 1,000,000 persons will have heard the clanging doors close behind them as they enter jails, prisons, and reformatories, and all because they had not been properly schooled in the true meaning of liberty.

Because of misinterpretation of liberty, often deliberately brought about by inciters of violence, the Nation is paying a crime bill which in 3 years would equal our national debt. Hence, every decent citizen should rededicate himself to a furtherance of liberty in its truest sense, defined by our democratic traditions. There is only one way to insure liberty to all peoples. That is by a firm adherence to justice, such as has been provided and established in our American heritage, and in our Constitution which we must preserve for the future at all costs.

America's duty to the future demands that the cherished principles of liberty be preserved for all time. We can do this best by striking at the forces which assail liberty—the lawless, the thoughtless, and the exponents of totalitarian serfdom and slavery.

We must and shall cope with this effort to enslave us through perversions of the truth. The first line of defense is the home, with its all-important atmosphere of expectations and fond hopes for the future and the training so necessary to develop future generations of Americans.

Modern law enforcement has demonstrated its ability to cope with the hardened criminal, but at best that is only first-aid treatment. The only permanent cure lies in killing the infectious and deep-seated germs of lawlessness with a thorough prophylactic, which is best administered by proper home training and environment.

Sinister forces of the underworld, with totalitarianism, constantly seek new places to work their evil. Youth, more youth, is sought for this purpose. We must inoculate our young against such treacherous germs. This means proper home training, proper precept, and proper example. We can prevent more crime in the high chair than in the electric chair, whether that crime be against property or against our Nation.

Youth must be told about the slime and dirt that infest the underworld. Dishonesty is one common denominator found in all criminals. It must be met with the daily teachings of the virtues of honesty. In teaching honesty, you are also teaching Americanism. You are piercing smoke screens of falsehood and subterfuge thrown up by enemies of America, one of which insists—to quote a resolution of the Communist Party—"More revolutionary novels and short stories especially based on American life must be issued for the youth."

The corruption of our youth by subversive activities is a violation of our American liberties and is an attempt to lure us into the fear, the injustice, and the slavery of totalitarian barbarism. And this is so regardless of the high-sounding names of hypocritical "front" organizations. Our greatest asset is intellectual freedom. Our worst menace is intellectual debauchery, which is as rotten and untenable as the filth from which it springs. Certainly we have a right to inquire into the character of our children's education. We have the inalienable right to see that they are taught the true principles of Americanism and nothing else. If young Americans are to be educated for the future, parents must accept the responsibility of seeing that this education is properly given for a better and safer nation.

What are you doing to make your child recognize his good fortune in being an American? Are you teaching him a respect for his country and its institutions? Does he respect the American flag as a symbol of liberty? Does he respect honorable forces of law and order? Have you compared his plight with that of boys and girls in other lands? Do you take him to the shrines of great Americans and tell him their glorious histories? Does he go to Sunday school and church, and is he taught that he is responsible to God rather than to some spouting dictator whose insane ego denies even the power of the Deity and charges that religion is the opiate of the people?

A flood of vilification has recently been loosed upon all things American by scandal sheets which espouse the cause of foreign isms. We must counter with a constant program of education, designed to penetrate this thinly veiled and slimy propaganda. We are a peaceful people and we want no part of the terrible turmoil and sickening strife that is going on across the seas. Let us not be blinded, however, to the necessity of preparedness for any emergency.

We of the F. B. I. have not been spared from the sting of vicious, anti-American propaganda cleverly designed to blind the eyes of otherwise sincere and conscientious citizens. We have been charged with having created an American Ogpu or Gestapo. Let's get at the truth of what is behind a lot of such untrue and utterly malicious statements.

I charge that the most vicious "smear" campaign which is being directed against the F. B. I. is a part of the working program of various anti-American forces, the basis of which is to undermine public confidence in the law-enforcement bodies of America, and thus weaken the defenses of our internal security.

And I want to state emphatically that my remarks are not directed at any individual who sincerely criticizes the F. B. I. from a constructive viewpoint. I do say, however, that the Communist charge that there is the slightest desire in the F. B. I. for an Ogpu or a Gestapo is nothing but blustering ballyhoo designed to cover their own Trojan-horse activities. The Communists hope that with the F. B. I. shackled, they can proceed without interference as they go their boring, undermining way to overthrow our Government.

You must learn to judge people by what they think. These totalitarian tricksters are the very first ones who would introduce un-American, violent, murderous types of spy systems into our country. They desire to break down true law enforcement in every part of America under the guise of the protection of alleged civil liberties so that they may, in turn, destroy the very things that they pretend to revere. Then they seek by a type of confidence game to steal away your liberty, your home, and your constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In proof of this, I say to you that under constitutional safeguards as they now stand, it is utterly impossible for such a thing as an Ogpu or a Gestapo to exist in America. Let us look, for instance, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am merely the

Director of this Bureau's activities under laws enacted by Congress; I have no right, no desire, and no means of being anything else.

The F. B. I., like all Federal bureaus, must present its report of activities and justify its work, for the purpose of securing appropriations, once each year. To do this, its record must be presented, not only before the public, but first, to the Attorney General of the United States, the Nation's chief law officer, who certainly would not favor the setting up of an Ogpu or a Gestapo.

From the Attorney General the facts concerning the work of the F. B. I. go each year to the Budget Bureau where each item is carefully scrutinized. From the Budget Bureau the reports and estimates covering the F. B. I.'s activities go to the White House, where they are reviewed by the President of the United States. From the White House the estimates and reports are sent to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, where the Director of the F. B. I. must explain every major item and the reason why it has been entered in the estimate for appropriations. The various items of the appropriation are then considered on the floor of Congress by Members of the House of Representatives before being forwarded to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for review. The estimates then must be considered on the floor of the Senate. It is utterly ridiculous for the foreign-ism advocates to charge that with these annual executive and legislative reviews of the work of the F. B. I. it could develop into anything resembling an Ogpu or Gestapo.

When these poisoners of American opinion tell you that an effort is being made to instigate an Ogpu or a Gestapo they infer that every system of representative government has failed and that it is time for some other kind of government to come along and take over. That kind of governmental procedure is the perverted, subversive, serpentine type of nonrepresentative totalitarianism from lands of viciousness.

These perverted people scream about the denial of civil liberties in this country, although nowhere on earth is there less liberty, civil or of any other nature, than under the foreign governments they so vociferously champion. It has been proven time and again that they have every civil liberty which possibly can exist, that they possess in America more honest safety in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness than in any other nation in the world. And when their rights allegedly are violated, the courts of a free land are open to them. Their rights are as closely guarded here in America as the rights of subjects are defiled in the countries whose views they espouse. Therefore, what these people want is not civil liberty. They already have that. They are demanding, under a pretense of misapprehension, and deliberate falsehood, nothing more nor less than licentiousness—the right to take what they will of our possessions and our traditions and defile them as they please. They want the right to rule when, in many cases, they are not even citizens. These people are seeking to accomplish by propaganda what other aggressors usually do by force of arms, because they know they could not at the present resist the real force of Americanism which is found in this Nation.

It is America's duty to perpetuate a heritage that will continue to be a beacon light of freedom and equality to oppressed peoples the world over. Likewise, there is a present duty to evaluate the "front" organizations that exist by the score, designed to carry on destructive activities.

We should awaken to the fact that as soon as one "front" organization is exposed, another springs up to carry on the program of scuttling America.

We must ever be on the alert to protect our democracy from the bacteria of barbarism. We need to stand firmly and fearlessly on democratic principles and upon no other foundation.

Our task requires patience and forbearance. It requires the faith of our fathers, and the courage of present-day pioneering. We must know and respect and fight for only one ism—Americanism.

The motivating spirit of America must ever be justice. We need have no fears, so long as justice reigns. May we consecrate ourselves to this sacred cause in order that the Stars and Stripes may reign supreme and that our Nation may retain its supremacy as the exemplification of true democracy.

Discharge of Employees of American Potash & Chemical Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a Los Angeles, Calif., citizen and the clipping from the Washington Merry-Go-Round, referred to in that letter.

It seems to me that an investigation should be in order.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 4, 1940.*

Hon. LEE GEYER,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a clipping from the Merry-Go-Round, which is self-explanatory. I hope that you will be able to start some sort of an investigation of this business, and if possible, arrange to have the Smith committee and Mr. Toland disciplined in some way.

I am one of the workers discharged by the American Potash & Chemical Corporation in 1936 for union activity. There were a good many of us, though only 19 appear in the case itself, and we have all had a tough time in finding jobs. Several times as soon as a job had been obtained, the American Potash would see that the new employer discharged us.

However, the worst thing about it is this: Over 750 employees of the American Potash in Trona, Calif., have been denied the law of the land, and have been hindered in self-organization. The case has been taken to the Supreme Court, and at present the N. L. R. B. is attempting to have the American Potash cited for contempt in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. It is very possible that these confidential files, referred to in the clipping, are being used in the contempt action presently pending.

I hope that the Smith committee and Mr. Toland will be asked to explain this matter before the Congress of the United States, and that if guilty of misconduct they will be punished accordingly. This seems a heinous thing to us here. Goodness knows, workers have a tough enough time organizing themselves, finding a job, fighting the organized employers, etc., without underhanded activity such as this, using the Congress to beat down the law of the land.

Thanking you for your attention in the matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

ELBERT M. BALL.

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

One of the most important cases pending before the National Labor Relations Board is that of the American Potash & Chemical Corporation, which is charged by the A. F. L. Borax and Potash Workers' Union with coercion to block collective bargaining. The Labor Board ruled against the company, and the decision was sustained by a circuit court and even by the United States Supreme Court.

Contempt-of-court proceedings are now pending against the firm to compel it to obey the verdict. But the confidential Labor Board files on the case very mysteriously have vanished—somewhere between the N. L. R. B. and the House committee investigating it.

Adding a note of peculiarity to the mystery is the fact that Edmund Toland, now general counsel of the House investigating committee, once represented American Potash & Chemical. Furthermore, he represented the company in this very same case.

Toland hotly denies knowing anything about the missing records. So does Russell Whitesell, committee secretary, who insists they have never been in his possession. Both admit that the files of the Wheeling Steel Corporation case, in which Toland also participated as private counsel, were obtained from the N. L. R. B. by a member of his staff while he was in Florida.

But Whitesell says that as soon as he heard about it he ordered the records returned, and Toland asserts that his assistant "did not even examine the entire file. He was merely looking for a letter in connection with our 'blacklisting' record."

Meanwhile the big mystery remains: Where are the missing confidential records?

United States Plans for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTREAL GAZETTE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from the Montreal Gazette, Montreal, Canada, Tuesday, May 7, 1940.

Mr. Speaker, the letter which enclosed this clipping had this to say:

Kindly note the Gazette's leading editorial today indicates exactly at what stage the State Department, F. B. I., et al., will find it necessary for the United States of America to go to the aid of civilization—the Versailles Treaty brand, I guess.

This writer evidently is not in favor of war, and neither are we, for there is nothing to be gained by it. A point I wish to bring out is that there seems to be some prearranged plan whereby the United States is to render aid to Great Britain, of which I believe the people should be informed.

It occurs to me that Mr. Welles is another Mr. House, and I have little regard for meddling diplomats who are sent from the Executive or State Department to pave a road for us to enter a conflict which no doubt will end in the killing of millions of American young men.

It is now time for the people themselves to speak through their representatives in Congress. They should speak before it is too late and inform their own representatives as to their attitude toward a war that could have been averted had England been willing to restore some of the colonies she grabbed as a prize in the last war.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Montreal Gazette of May 7, 1940]

UNITED STATES PLANS FOR PEACE

The Department of State in Washington is reported to be making intensive preparations for the peace that must come sooner or later in Europe. Mr. Cordell Hull, in January last, set up a special advisory committee to study post-war problems and this committee has since organized three groups, one under Sumner Welles, which deals with matters of general policy, another under R. Walton Moore, counselor to the Department, which deals with limitation of armaments, and one under Leo Pasvolsky dealing with economic and financial matters. Pasvolsky is special assistant to the Secretary of State. The three groups will have Hugh R. Wilson, former Ambassador to Germany, as liaison officer. The studies which are being undertaken, which indeed are in progress, are designed to enable the United States to protect itself against post-war effects and to play a constructive part in the post-war era, and with these two ends in view the conditions of the last 20 years are being examined, including international economic relations and what has been done in the field of disarmament. One of the matters under consideration is consultation with other neutrals with a view to post-war disarmament and a freer movement of trade.

That publicity has been given to this official enterprise at Washington at this time is interesting and perhaps significant. At the outset the question arises as to whether the special committee and the three groups are giving any consideration to the kind of peace that will be established in Europe in the event of a German victory. Presumably that eventuality is being ruled out, because the State Department must be fully aware that a German peace would nullify all these efforts and all the plans which may result from them. In a post-war era in a Europe dominated by Germany the United States would be in no position to do anything. There would be no question of disarmament except the disarmament imposed by the conquerors upon the conquered. There would be no neutrals with which to carry on trade and other discussions because German domination would be complete. Mr. Pierre de Lanux, in his address to the Canadian Club yesterday, made it abundantly clear that in the event of a German victory no nation will have anything to say about future European conditions except Germany. This means that what are described in Washington as the primary interests of the United States in a post-war settlement and in post-war developments in Europe, would be nonexistent except insofar as a triumphant Nazi-ism might be disposed to recognize and tolerate them for purposes of its own. Mr. Cordell Hull, Mr. Sumner Welles, and Mr Hugh Wilson must know all this, the former Ambassador especially.

It seems to follow that the United States Government is contemplating a peace sequent to an Allied victory, and this being so, the investigations that are in progress in Washington assumed the significance above mentioned. The United States Government's certainty of an Allied victory must be based upon something more dependable than what has come to be called wishful thinking. It must be based upon a determination to ensure that victory by whatever form or degree of participation may be necessary. It is a common statement south of the border that while the United States will cling to its isolationist policy as long as possible it will abandon that policy if the belligerent democracies are facing defeat. It cannot be doubted that were a formal declaration to be made along these lines the effect upon wavering European nations would be decisive and an Allied victory would be hastened. It is possible that what the general public do not know in regard to the ultimate reach of United States policy, some European governments do know. The recent conference between Mr. William Phillips and Count Ciano, following a shorter talk between the American Ambassador and Premier Mussolini, is said to have been marked by a definite statement as to the course which the United States would pursue in the event of Italian military action on the side of Germany.

Whether Mr. Phillips did or did not present some sort of ultimatum to the Italian Foreign Minister, it is unreasonable to suppose that the United States Government has reached no decision as to the extent of its responsibility or as to the manner in which that responsibility will be discharged in the event of the war's extension to the Mediterranean. It is illogical to suppose that Washington is busying itself seriously with peace problems at this early stage unless it is prepared to ensure, if necessary, an Allied victory through which alone an opportunity for constructive participation in the rebuilding of Europe will be afforded. Mr. Hull and his associates would be wasting their time in a discussion of peace problems if the possibility of a German victory had any place at all in their minds.

Farmers' Interest in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a great effort is being made at this time to convince Members of Congress that the farmers of this country are opposed to the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill. There are possibly 32,000,000 people living on farms in this country. Thirty-one million nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand of them know nothing whatever of the provisions of this bill. I doubt if there are very many of the remaining 1,000 who know very much about it, and probably there is not a single one who is acquainted with all provisions of the legislation. Therefore anyone who assumes to state the position of farmers on this measure is taking a great deal upon himself.

This lack of familiarity with the bill is not because farmers are not interested in transportation. They are very much interested in it. It is one of their big problems. They have obviously not had any chance to familiarize themselves with the pending legislation as embodied in the conference report which will be before the House tomorrow. Therefore it is ridiculous and silly for anyone to get up on the floor of this House and say that farmers, or any considerable portion of them as a group, are opposed to the adoption of the conference report.

Farmers are interested in transportation; but as a whole they are not interested in water transportation, because its facilities are available to so few of them. They are smart enough to know that all the ballyhoo which has been put out in Congress and elsewhere to the effect that the farmer has been benefited by the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spend on the inland waterway systems of this country is pure bunk.

The fact is that an almost infinitesimal quantity of farm produce moves on our inland waterways. In the first place, a large proportion of farm produce is perishable. Perishable products are not transported on inland waterways. In the second place, most nonperishable products require more speed in their transportation than can be furnished by waterways. In the third place, only a small proportion of the commodities that might be transported by water are produced where waterway transportation is available.

I submit herewith figures compiled from the reports of the Army engineers for the calendar years 1937 and 1938, showing the tonnage handled on important inland waterways in the United States during each of those years, broken down as to types of commodities. Figures for 1939 are not yet available. It will be noted particularly that farm products constitute a very negligible proportion of this transportation.

PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES CARRIED IN COMMERCE ON IMPORTANT INLAND WATERWAYS OF THE UNITED STATES

Coverage: The data below includes tonnage (2,000 pounds) on the following waterways for the calendar year 1937: Ohio River; Allegheny River; Monongahela River; Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks; Cumberland River, above and below Nashville; Kanawha River; Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth; Mississippi River, Minneapolis to mouth of the Missouri; Mississippi River, mouth of

Missouri to mouth of the Ohio; Illinois and Mississippi Canal; Illinois Waterway; Chesapeake and Delaware Canal; and New York State Barge Canal.

Total tonnage.—All of above waterways, 1937, 70,721,931 tons.

Principal commodities

Commodity	Number of tons	Percent of total tonnage
Coal and coke	39,935,353	56.5
Petroleum and its products	7,812,019	11.0
Sand, gravel, and stone	11,618,410	16.4
Lumber, logs, etc	325,045	.5
Iron and steel products	3,225,008	4.6
Vegetable food products	2,012,115	2.8
Cement	370,909	.6
Pyrites (cinders)	243,496	.3
All other commodities	5,179,481	7.3
Total	70,721,931	100.0

Source: Annual Report, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, 1938, pt. 2.

Principal commodities carried in commerce on important inland waterways of the United States[1]

Calendar year 1938

Principal commodities	Number of 2,000-pound tons	Percent of total tonnage
Coal and coke	29,754,928	49.7
Petroleum and its products	8,270,730	13.8
Sand, gravel, and stone	10,683,255	17.8
Lumber, logs, etc	398,535	.7
Iron and steel and their products	2,433,606	4.1
Vegetable food products	4,235,299	7.1
Cement	291,454	.5
Pyrites (cinders)	252,860	.4
All other commodities	3,585,744	5.9
Total tonnage	59,906,471	100.0

[1] Ohio River and tributaries: Ohio River, Allegheny River, Monongahela River, Big Sandy River (Tug and Levisa Forks), Cumberland River (above Nashville), Cumberland River (below Nashville), Kanawha River. Mississippi River and tributaries: Missouri River (lower), Mississippi River (middle), Mississippi River (upper), Illinois and Mississippi Canal. Illinois Waterway, Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, New York State Barge Canal.

All of the information has been compiled from the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, except certain data for the New York State Barge Canal which was secured from the annual reports of the superintendent of public works, State of New York.

I deplore, and I think most farmers deplore, the lobbying activities of organizations like the Mississippi Valley Association in their efforts to make it appear that farmers are vitally interested in vast Federal expenditures for waterways—a large part of which will eventually have to be paid by the farmers of this country. Farmers know that waterway transportation is not cheap transportation, but that in many cases it is the highest-cost transportation we have, the only difference being that most of the cost is paid by the Federal Government. Farmers know that they are not getting the benefits of this Federal subsidy and resent the fact that most of the benefits, as indicated in the tables set out before, go to big coal companies and oil companies which maintain their own fleets of barges.

During recent months, lobbyists and field men for the Mississippi Valley Association have been particularly active in their efforts to stir up farmer opposition to the pending transportation bill. Just as an illustration of this lobbying activity, I include herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. W. G. Jamison to the Mississippi Valley Association, reporting upon his lobbying activities among farm organizations for the week of February 11 to 17:

[Mississippi Valley Association. General offices, Chamber of Commerce Building, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis. Copy of letter from W. G. Jamison supplementing report of field work to February 17, 1940]

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 19, 1940.*

The following is report of work done during week February 11–17, inclusive:

The National Cooperative Elevator Association, Frank Rutherford, secretary, 314 Barker Building, Omaha, Nebr., will write to each of the State secretaries of the State members—Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma—of this organization, asking that each one of them write to their respective Senators and Congressmen supporting the waterways resolution passed by the organization at its annual meeting, Hutchinson, Kans., November 20, 1939. Each of the State secretaries will be asked by Mr. Rutherford to also have each member of their respective boards of directors, five in each State, to write to the two Senators of each State, and to the Congressman from the respective district in which each director lives in support of inland waterways and in opposition to river rates being made by any Government rate-regulatory body.

Mr. Rutherford is also the secretary of the Nebraska Farmers Elevator Association, which is the Nebraska member of the National Cooperative Elevator Association. Mr. Rutherford will carry out the program outlined above with his organization in Nebraska. In addition to this, Mr. Rutherford will ask for similar letters from about 20 strategically located members of his association in Nebraska, in addition to the letters from the 5 directors and the official letters from his office. Mr. Rutherford has already been in correspondence with the 2 Senators and 5 Congressmen from Nebraska on the subject of the Wheeler-Lea bills and his organization's opposition to the river rates being made by the Interstate Commerce Commission. He has also been in correspondence with all the members of the Wheeler-Lea conference committee on this same subject. He has replies from most of them and most of the replies are noncommittal.

The annual meeting of the Nebraska State Farmers Union, H. G. Keeney, president, Omaha, Nebr., was in session while I was in Omaha. Mr. Keeney, president, and Mr. Elwood, chairman, legislative committee, asked me to appear before the legislative committee, which handles the national legislative proposals and resolutions of this organization. The enclosed resolution was discussed and approved by the legislative committee and later was presented to the delegate body of this organization and was approved. This resolution stands as part of the program and policy of the Nebraska Farmers Union. This resolution, with appropriate letters, will be sent immediately to the two Senators and all the Congressmen from Nebraska.

Contact with Mr. Charles Stewart, chairman, legislative and transportation department, Nebraska State Farm Bureau Federation, Lincoln, Nebr., developed the fact that this organization had anticipated taking action in defense of the inland waterways and opposition to those parts of the Wheeler-Lea bills that put waterways rate making under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Official action, in the form of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of this organization and an affirmative vote by the board of directors, authorized Mr. Stewart to take whatever action necessary to officially inform the two Senators and all the Congressmen from Nebraska on the position of the Nebraska Farm Bureau relative to the Wheeler-Lea bills and the rivers rate-making provisions of this legislation. The enclosed copy of letter to each of the Senators and Congressmen from Nebraska is Mr. Stewart's official communication to each of them. It speaks for itself. These letters left Lincoln, Nebr., February 16. Mr. Stewart advised that it was not necessary for me to see or communicate further with any other officers or directors of this organization.

This completes work done with farm organizations in Nebraska.

The Kansas State Farm Bureau passed a resolution relative to transportation at their annual meeting in November 1939. Dr. O. O. Wolf, president, Kansas Farm Bureau, Manhattan, Kans., tells me that he will write official letters to both Senators and all the Congressmen from Kansas in support of this organization's transportation resolution. He will also ask that the rate making for inland waterways be not placed under any Government rate regulatory body. These letters will leave Manhattan, Kans., on February 19 or 20. Dr. Wolf will also address letters to each of the nine directors of this organization, living throughout the State and giving good regional coverage, asking each of them to write to both Senators and their respective Congressmen. Dr. Wolf will ask the directors to express themselves to the Senators and Congressmen in support of the transportation resolution and in opposition to the Wheeler-Lea provisions for waterways rate making by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A copy of Dr. Wolf's letter to the Senators and Congressmen from Kansas will come to me later.

This completes the field work done for this week.

W. G. JAMISON.

Farmers are interested in transportation, but for practically all of them there are only two forms of transportation available—by railway and highway. Anything which improves the service which they can get from these two types of transportation is beneficial. I sincerely believe that the passage of the Wheeler-Lea bill will be helpful to all types of transportation, and particularly those in which farmers are interested and which they are in a position to use. Therefore, it would seem to me to be a great mistake, if we want to look at this problem from the standpoint of agriculture, to take any steps which are likely to result in the defeat, directly or indirectly, of transportation legislation for this session.

Your Government in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by myself at the Principia College, St. Louis, Mo., on April 26, 1940, entitled "Your Government in Action":

Some fine day you will likely journey to Washington when the Congress is in session, the President is at the White House, the Supreme Court is at work, and all of the departments of the Government are buzzing with action. You will visit the House of Representatives and the Senate, perhaps the Supreme Court, the huge buildings housing the executive departments, will see some of the White House apartments, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, some other objects of tourist interest, and will feel that you have seen your Government at work.

As a matter of fact, you will have simply seen the high spots of the governmental machine—a few of the symptoms of government. The details of how laws are made, interpreted, and executed, comprise so complex and detailed a system, that the time we have will only permit of some of the more cursory observations on the governmental machine.

Let us suppose that on your imaginary trip to Washington you go with a guide through the Capitol Building and have explained to you the physical and historical elements of that symbol of our Government, including the statues of statesman in the Hall of Fame, the old Supreme Court chamber where the Webster-Clay-Calhoun debates were held, and other objects of interest in that famous building, each one of them alive with most intense human interest, seen by most of our people in their hurried trips through.

You are taken into the Chamber of the House of Representatives, which, with its present Chamber, is new, as compared to the older part of the building, having been added in 1857. You may see nearly all of the 435 Members in the House, but the chances are that only a comparative handful will be present, maybe a third or a fourth, or even less of the membership, and you will wonder: "Is this the House of Representatives—the people who make our laws? Where are the rest of the Members?"

The answer is manifold. The absent Members are not at a ball game or on the golf course. They may be snatching a hasty lunch. The likelihood is that some of them are out of the Chamber attending committee hearings in various of the 47 House standing committees; others are at their offices attempting to answer the multitude of letters they have received about legislation or jobs; still others are preparing speeches or studying pending legislation.

When you are looking in, maybe the House will be in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of some bill that has been previously considered by some certain committee. If so, the Speaker of the House will not be presiding. Under tradition coming down from English Parliament, he is not permitted to preside over the Committee of the Whole, but must select some other Member. The Speaker presides only over the House itself in session.

You may see Members offering amendments to the pending bill or moving to "strike out the last word." In either event, they will have a chance to talk only 5 minutes, under the House rules. You may see a demand for a teller vote, enforced by one-fifth of the membership present standing for the demand, after which the Members present file through the center aisle and are counted by an opponent and the proponent of the amendment. You may hear a demand for a quorum, a call of the House, upon which the outside doors are closed, the bells in the Capitol and the Members' offices are rung to notify absent Members, the Members file in, and answer to their names as they are called by the Clerk.

During this period of time you may see a Member stroll down to the little black box near the Speaker's desk and drop a bill in the "hopper." If so, you have seen a proposed law of the United States of America introduced in the House. No formality is involved. It is simply placed in the little receiving box.

Now, we are down to action in the process of legislation. Our bill (which we will call H. R. 12000) is turned over to the Parliamentarian, who on the next day, at the so-called first reading of the bill, refers it to the proper committee. Technically, the Speaker never sees them. The Parliamentarian simply marks the name of the appropriate committee on the bill, the bill clerk refers this bill to the committee designated, and the document is sent to the chairman of that committee, for, as a matter of practice, it is filed with the clerk of that committee for action if and when it is called up by the bill's author, by the chairman of the committee, by a member of the committee, or by some Member interested in it.

It depends on the subject matter of the bill as to what committee it shall be referred. If it deals with legalistic matters, it goes to the Judiciary Committee; with Indian affairs, to the Committee on Indian Affairs; with rates, to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; with appropriations, to the Appropriations Committee; with census, to that committee; with patents, to that committee; with farm legislation, to the Committee on Agriculture; and so on through the list of 47 standing committees.

During the present session of Congress over 10,000 bills have been introduced. Only a few hundred at most will ever reach the President to be signed.

Let us suppose that our bill, H. R. 12000, is a revenue bill. Under the Constitution, revenue and tariff bills originate in the House and, under the rules of the House, must be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, which, up to the Civil War, was the revenue-raising committee as well as the money-spending committee. After the Civil War the Appropriations Committee was created, which, since then, has looked after matters of appropriations. The Ways and Means Committee devotes its attention to revenue raising. This committee is known as the policy committee of the House, and in Democratic administrations selects the membership of the majority party on other committees.

H. R. 12000 having been referred to the Ways and Means Committee, it is filed by the clerk of that committee with several hundred other bills involving tariffs or revenue. If the author of the bill is alert he will promptly request the chairman of the committee to demand a report from the executive department of the Government having the most information on the subject matter of the bill, which is usually the Treasury Department (although, since social-security legislation, involving taxes, liquor legislation, originally came from this committee, it may be referred to the Social Security Administration or the Liquor Control Administration rather than the Treasury Department). In due time a report from the Department is made and comes back to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and is filed by the clerk. The author of the bill interviews the chairman and requests a hearing. The chairman, in turn, usually calls together the members of the majority party for discussion and determination by the majority, whether or not a hearing will be granted. Hearings are not allowed as a matter of course, because the importance of legislation, its partisan nature, or troublesome aspects may be conditions in deciding whether or not a hearing will be allowed. These same conditions are usually involved in other committees, although the regular appropriation bills follow through as a matter of course, because it is necessary for the public moneys to be appropriated in order that the departments of Government may carry on. Public interest in a bill has great bearing as to whether or not a hearing will be granted. For instance, the Townsend old-age pension legislation became the subject of so much pressure on the Congress last year that a hearing was granted although when the subject was actually voted on it lost by a vote of 302 to 97. At the present time a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee is holding an extended hearing on the chain-store tax bill—not because the majority of the members may necessarily be in favor of the bill but because various types of public pressure were put on the Congress and the committee to hold hearings.

If the majority of the committee decides to hold a hearing, the chairman fixes a date, makes public announcement of the beginning of the hearing to the effect that all who care to be witnesses may be heard in the great committee room in the New House Office Building. The chairman, or someone designated by him, presides; and the witnesses are called both for and against the legislation, in rather an informal order arranged by the clerk of the committee and the chairman. Witnesses usually are limited to time, because vast numbers of people usually want to be heard on bills of public interest and importance. If it is a minor bill, the author of the bill usually produces the witnesses, and usually the department of government affected has representatives of its department as witnesses. Twenty-five members of the Ways and Means Committee were probably attending a hearing when you visited the House and saw so few Members on the floor, because committees can sit and hold hearings, with special permission, while the House is in session. Probably other big committees were also in session.

If the committee refuses to grant a hearing after 30 or more days, the author or other parties interested may apply for a discharge rule to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. This is done by filing with the Clerk, on the proper blanks, such a demand that the committee be discharged. Members may sign this document in open session, as it is kept by the Clerk at the Speaker's desk. If 218 Members sign the document, the committee is automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and under certain detailed rules it may be called up for consideration by the House on the second or fourth Monday of each month, with special privilege over other bills being considered when it comes to the House floor.

After a hearing is had on our bill, H. R. 12000, and the witnesses have presented their testimony, the whole committee goes into executive session, which means that only committee members and experts are present, to consider the bill for amendment. It is read in most meticulous detail, paragraph by paragraph, section by section, word for word, and after amendments are agreed to, it is ready to go to the floor of the House. The consideration of the bill in hearings and in executive session may last for weeks, or even months. Thirteen weeks were consumed by the Ways and Means Committee on the original social-security bill, and—4 years later—15 weeks on amendments to the same law. The members of the committee carried on their usual work, attending sessions of the House and looking after their constituents, during the same period of time, trying their best to get to their meals on time, too.

H. R. 12000 being a revenue bill, it is privileged (meaning it has the right-of-way over other bills), and any member of the Ways and Means Committee may call it up ahead of any other bill. This does not produce an awkward situation, because these matters are worked out amicably. If it were not a revenue bill or an appropriation bill, or for some other reason were not privileged, it could not be called up by any member or committee member of the House, but would have to go through the all-powerful Rules Committee, which decides whether or not bills shall be permitted to go to the floor for consideration. You can readily see the necessity for the Rules Committee, because the untold thousands of bills introduced cannot possibly be handled separately by the House, and this policy committee determines which bills are of sufficient importance for the House to use its time on. If the Rules Committee does not grant a rule giving the bill special privilege, the bill is dead—unless 218 Members sign a petition to discharge the Rules Committee.

But since our bill, H. R. 12000, is a privileged bill, the chairman of the committee calls it up on a convenient day for passage, simply by getting recognition from the Speaker, which is usually prearranged, and an agreement is usually entered into between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority (Republican) Member, on the floor of the House, as to the amount of time of debate to be devoted to the bill and the time is divided equally between them, say 2 hours on either side. This gives the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Member command of the time for debate, with members of the committee having the first right to the time, whereupon the chairman and ranking minority Member allot to those desiring to speak on the bill a reasonable amount of time, considering the number who want to speak, and the amount of time agreed upon. Usually, in general debate, as it is commonly called, the individual does not speak more than 10 to 20 minutes.

The chairman of the committee makes a motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of H. R. 12000. Whereupon, the Speaker appoints some other Member to preside and the debate ensues. At the conclusion of the agreed time for general debate, the bill is read, word for word, by the clerk, and section by section, for amendment. At the conclusion of each paragraph any Member of the House may offer an amendment, and is entitled to speak for 5 minutes in favor of his amendment. Any Member who obtains recognition by the chairman is entitled to speak in favor or in opposition to it. This is usually done by motion to "strike out the last word." When debate on the amendment has been concluded, a vote is called for and may be taken by voice vote and the chairman declares the result. A division may be called for. Those voting aye arise and remain standing until counted, then the noes are counted.

If dissatisfied with the results, any Member may call for tellers and 20 Members may arise to second his demand. This orders tellers. The Chairman designates the author of the amendment and its main opponent to take the vote. This is done by their standing opposite each other in the center aisle and the Members pass between them to be counted, first those voting in the affirmative and then those voting in the negative; concluding the vote the tellers address the Chair, announce the votes on either side, and the Chairman reannounces the vote and declares the result. Then a vote is taken by the Committee of the Whole House, on the whole bill as amended, whereupon the Speaker resumes the chair and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House announces to the Speaker the result of deliberations of the Committee. Whereupon, the Speaker reannounces the result, calls for the third reading of the bill by title, and inquires if separate votes are demanded on the amendments attached to the bill in the Committee of the Whole. This may be by voice vote, rising vote, or roll call. After the amendments are disposed of, a motion to recommit the bill to its original committee is in order, and can only be made by a Member opposed to the bill, with members of the committee, from which the bill (in this case the Ways and Means Committee) came, having prior right. A roll call, demanded by one-fifth of those present, may ensue on the motion to recommit the bill, usually taking about 40 minutes for each roll call, after which the Speaker declares the bill passed—if it did.

H. R. 12000 is then engrossed and enrolled, usually on the next day, is signed by the Speaker, in the presence of the House, and goes on its way to the Senate where it is delivered by the Clerk to the Senate, read for the first time by title and, on the next day, is referred to the Senate committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter. Hearings in the Senate, as in the House, may continue for days, even weeks, maybe months. When the bill gets back to the Senate, it is subject to unlimited debate, because in that body, being smaller, the rules are not complex, and any Senator may talk as long as he is physically able, either in favor of or in opposition to, the bill. If it finally passes in the Senate without change, either by voice vote or roll call, the House is notified; it is signed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, and goes on its way to the President.

If the Senate shall have amended the bill, it must be returned to the House and the House is notified of the Senate amendments. If the House agrees to the Senate amendments it goes on its way to the President. If the House disagrees with the Senate amendments the bill is dead, unless the House calls for a conference, and a maze of procedure ensues, resulting in the appointment of a conference committee, consisting of Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker from the majority and minority sides of the committee which reported the bill to the House, and Senators appointed by the President of the Senate. Conference committees are not large in number, usually consisting of about three or five House Members and an approximately equal number of Senators. Often, the conferees from either House vote en bloc, rather than as individuals. If the conference committee cannot agree on the legislation, the respective conferees report to their respective Houses, and unless further action is taken the bill is dead.

If the conference committee does agree upon a report, both Houses must act upon the report affirmatively before the bill can go to the President. No matter can be considered by the conference committee that was not put in the bill either originally, or by amendment, by the Senate or the House. Complex rules involving conference reports must be followed in the procedure on presentation, debate, etc., in either House. Roll calls and rising votes are to the same purpose and procedure as on the original bill as presented to either House. After the conference report is adopted, the whole bill as amended and agreed upon by the Houses at the conference must be enrolled and engrossed, signed by the Speaker and the Vice President, and then sent to the President.

The President may sign the bill, after which it becomes public law and is printed in the United States Statutes at Large. He may hold it for 10 days, let it become law without his signature, or he may subject it to a pocket veto by holding it without signing it (after adjournment) until 10 days after its receipt by him; again, he may veto it, in which event he returns the vetoed bill to the House in which it originated, with a veto message, which has precedence over other matters. If both Houses by a two-thirds vote override his veto, it becomes a law. The presiding officers present the issue after debate to the respective Houses in this language: "Shall H. R. 12000 become a law, notwithstanding the President's veto?"

Now, you may logically ask, since we have gotten the bill passed through the Congress and signed by the President, what of it?

If our particular bill, H. R. 12000, makes a substantive change in the revenue law, the Treasury Department has jurisdiction to write what it termed "regulations" for the executive department's handling of the new statute. This amounts to the Treasury Department's interpretation of the law in order to apply it to the incidents whereby citizens will be affected by it. If it is a further raising of taxes, the Treasury Department's regulations go into detail as to how the average citizen must deport himself with reference to the application of the law in his dealings with the Treasury. If it should amend the Social Security Act, or the liquor law, the same procedure is had—regulations are issued and put into bound form by the Treasury Department, and may be had by the citizenship upon request. All agents of the Department are furnished copies of these regulations so that the tax collectors, liquor-license inspectors, and division heads in the Social Security Department, may be apprised of the final treatment of the law by their department.

When a bill is passed which creates a new governmental activity, it usually provides for a board or commission with general authority to set up its organization, hire stenographers, clerks, and do the necessary things for the organization of a new department. Regulations are also issued by the new department concerning the department's administration of the law. These regulations, theoretically at least, are not an addition to the law or in opposition to it. If a new department is set up, the appropriating machinery of the Congress has to pass a separate bill to provide the money for the new department. Or if an amendment to existing legislation is passed by the Congress which requires the addition of new governmental machinery, and hence the employment of new people, or other expenses, a separate appropriation bill for the payment of these expenses must be passed by the Congress.

I should refer to what is called the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar. These calendars usually consist of bills of minor importance that are permitted under the rules to be called by the Clerk for the Consent Calendar on the second and fourth Mondays of the month and the first and third Tuesdays for its Private Calendar. If opposition is heard, the bill is marked off the Private and Consent Calendars and goes back to the Union Calendar and can only be brought to the floor again by the Rules Committee. Certain special rules relate to these calendars and procedure thereunder.

Calendar Wednesday is so called because on each Wednesday committees, in their order, have the right to the time of the House for that day. For instance, on next Wednesday the Committee on Indian Affairs may have the first call. If it has no bills to present, or concludes its work, the chairman of the next committee in order may call up such bills as his committee may direct him to present to the House, and so on.

On the following Wednesday the next committee in turn (the list having been fixed by precedent) "has the call," as it is stated in parliamentary procedure.

A great majority of bills, of the thousands introduced, die without any action whatever having been taken and are not killed, as is usually thought. Actual action by the committee or the House is taken on comparatively few of the bills introduced. Most of them do not get consideration even by the committee. The death of a bill may be by this process: The committee may never have considered it; it may have considered it and rejected it; it may have been rejected by the House after the committee favorably reported it. It may be emasculated by amendments so that the House defeats it. It may smolder in a Senate committee or be killed by a Senate committee or by the Senate, or die in a conference, or by a conference report being rejected, or by veto by the President. Thus the ordinary bill has slight chance of becoming law.

You may have heard mysterious references to cloakroom conferences, and it may be interesting to you to know what the cloakroom is. The cloakrooms are small rooms opening on the House floor under the galleries. They are simply comfortable rooms for Members who do not care to be physically present on the floor at all times. A large number of telephones are in these rooms, where Members may be called off the floor by pages to answer calls. A small lunch room is provided, where light lunch may be purchased by the Members. Additional equipment includes a number of comfortable chairs. Members gossip, smoke, tell stories, and discuss legislation in the cloakrooms. But no great affairs of state or business of government is carried on in the so-called cloakroom conferences. They are simply a clearing house for all types of conversation amongst the membership of the House.

Party caucuses are seldom held. They are cumbersome, unwieldy, and usually result in more disagreement than harmony. Under the system in recent years, party fealty is not an important element in the consideration of legislation, and a Member may vote according to his knowledge and information, his personal feelings, his bias or partisanship, or whatever other motives which might influence him. It may generally be said that a Member may vote as he pleases, the first consideration being in the interest of his State and district. He likes to be regular and go along with his party, but there is nothing legally or morally binding upon him that requires him to do so.

The length of time a Member has served in either House is important. The longer he has been a Member, the more experience he has had, the higher up he is on his committee. A man goes up on a committee by some man above him dying, resigning, or being defeated. No man can be taken off a committee, once he has been assigned to it. His leaving the committee is purely voluntary, except for the processes I have indicated.

The Speaker of the House is usually considered the head of the party in control of the House, and the floor leader of the party in power is a kind of general manager of legislation on the floor. Together with the party whip, whose function it is to keep the Members advised as to what legislation is about to appear in the near future and its importance to the administration and to the party, these two Members usually confer closely with the members of the outstanding committees on party matters.

If they desire to have a reflection of public opinion in the House on a given matter, a meeting of the steering committee is called. The steering committee is a group consisting of Members from all over the Nation, about 15 or 20 in number. A matter on which information is sought is presented to the steering committee, and the Members get in touch with the Representatives from their States, and at a given time report back to the full steering committee their judgment as to the opinions on the given question.

Reorganization Plan No. IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my opposition is based on the fact that I have more confidence in the judgment of President Roosevelt than I have in either the distinguished gentleman from California or the lobby that has for days infested the halls of Congress.

It occurs to me that when distinguished gentlemen arise and take the floor of the House for the purpose of asserting that the President is asking the Congress to do something under a misapprehension of just what that something is, they are to say the least, just a bit presumptious.

In the debate on the Lea resolution great stress was laid on the fact that there had been no accidents on main-line transport systems in the year of 1939.

What seems to me to be the weak spot in that argument is this: The Safety Board's activities are confined entirely to investigating accidents—get that—investigating accidents. No accidents on main-line transport service, no investigations. Plenty of accidents outside this field. But—will my distinguished friends tell me how, and to what degree the occult operations of the Safety Board affected the volume or character of these accidents?

I am just wondering if there are other factors in this safety record. Could it be barely possible that the agreement between competing lines not to take the air when weather conditions were bad, may not have been a factor. I am also wondering, not being a technician, nor an experienced pilot, if the advances in aircraft production, in pilot experience, in better landing fields, in a better beacon system, in improved methods of receiving weather reports might not be a factor?

In this connection I want to ask my friends who are in favor of this resolution, this question, Do you honestly believe that our great President, whose immediate family are most consistent users of the air service, would jeopardize the lives of his loved ones by proposing a measure that would endanger the lives of those who travel by air?

I do not believe he would do such a thing. Therefore, I am opposed to the Lea resolution, which, by the way, has the solid support of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, plus the support of those Democrats who are openly or covertly opposed to Roosevelt.

Employees of World's Largest Railroad Shops at Altoona, Pa., Support Wheeler-Lea Railroad Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, back in July 1916, as a mere youngster of 16 summers, I entered the employ of the Pennsylvania Railroad as an apprentice boy in the world's largest railroad shops located in my own home town of Altoona, Pa.

From 1916 to 1939 I had the opportunity of completing 24 years of active service, the greatest portion of which was spent among my fellow railroaders in my own home town. As many of you know, I came from the rank and file of railroad labor to the Congress of the United States.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that in this morning's mail I received a resolution speaking for 11,461 of my fellow railroaders urging me to support S. 2009—the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill—and to vigorously oppose any effort to destroy this legislation by recommitting it.

The resolution is as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD SHOP CRAFTS OF AMERICA,
ALTOONA WORKS LOCAL, NO. 42,
Altoona, Pa., May 6, 1940.

Mr. JAMES E VAN ZANDT,
Congressman, Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Altoona Works Local, No. 42, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America, have on this date, May 6, 1940, voted to recommend the following resolution and a copy of the same be sent to Senators JAMES J. DAVIS and JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, and to JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman, Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania:

Whereas that the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill, commonly known as the transportation bill (S. 2009), be enacted into law; and

Whereas it proposes equal treatment and fair regulation to the several modes of transportation; and

Whereas the interests of the railroad shopmen will be improved by the enactment of this bill, as there have been thousands of shopmen who have lost their jobs on account of unfair transportation policies and lack of Federal regulation of other modes of transportation other than railroads: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That you use your vote and influence to effect the passage of the Wheeler-Lea bill, commonly known as the transportation bill (S. 2009), which provides for all subsidized water and motor carriers to be placed under the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Very truly yours,

W. S. GARDNER,
President, Altoona Works Local, No. 42.

The Wheeler-Lea Transportation Bill, S. 2009

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the people in the Northwest are greatly interested in the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill, S. 2009. I have had many communications urging that this bill be recommitted for further study. I have had other communications in favor of its adoption. The farm organizations, under date of May 7, 1940, wrote me, as they have other Congressmen, urging that this bill be recommitted and enclosing a copy of a letter they had sent to President Roosevelt. I also have received a telegram from the five railroad brotherhoods, and a copy of a letter from the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, written to my colleague, the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, urging that the bill be recommitted. I ask that these documents be included in an extension of my remarks. They follow:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1940*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: The undersigned, representing agricultural organizations throughout the United States, on May 2, 1940, addressed to the President of the United States, and delivered at the White House, the following protest against enactment of the Wheeler-Lea omnibus transportation bill. At the same time they presented for the consideration of the President a bound copy of resolutions adopted by 25 national and regional agricultural groups protesting against the enactment of the Wheeler-Lea omnibus transportation bill, and the principle of restrictive control embodied in the legislation.

Among the resolutions delivered were the following:

American Farm Bureau Federation; American National Livestock Association; National Grange. National Farmers Union; National Cooperative Elevator Association; National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors; National Wool Growers Association; Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association; United States Livestock Association; Vermont State Grange; Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.; Kansas Farm Bureau; Kansas Farmers Union; Louisiana State-Wide Conference, Baton Rouge, La.; Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation; and Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

Respectfully yours,

Frederick Brenckman, National Grange; Irvin B. King, master, Washington State Grange; Oscar Heline, president, Farmer Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Marcus, Iowa; Frank Rutherford, secretary, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Omaha, Nebr.; J. Elmer Brock, president, American National Livestock Association; J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, executive committee, National Wool Growers Association; T. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Earl Peterson, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.; Herschel D. Newsom, master, Indiana State Grange.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1940.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are opposed to the adoption of the conference report on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill for the following reasons:

1. It ignores the public interest and lays the basis for a transportation monopoly.

2. It will increase the cost of distributing agricultural products, which cost the farmer has to bear, thereby reducing his income.

3. It will increase the cost of things that the farmer has to buy, thereby further reducing his income.

4. The destructive effects of this legislation upon agriculture will retard the economic recovery of the Nation, and this, in turn, cannot fail to adversely affect the railroads themselves, who are the advocates of this bill.

5. Those who drafted this legislation appear to have lost sight of the fundamental purpose for which Government regulation was established, namely, to protect the public interest. Instead of adhering to this sound principle, under the bill regulation would be employed to stifle competition and to bring water and motor rates up to the level of rail rates, regardless of the cost of rendering the service.

The cost of transportation is the heaviest service charge that the farmer has to pay. Approximately 20 percent of all the freight revenues accruing to the railroads are derived from carrying agricultural products to market. In 1929 the farmer's freight bill amounted to $1,000,000,000. In 1937, when the farmer's income was greatly reduced, the figure was $638,000,000. These items do not include the freight charges paid on commodities purchased by the farmer, which he must likewise pay.

Last year the farmer received only 39 cents out of every dollar paid by the consumer for food. At the depth of the depression the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar dropped to 33 cents. While transportation and distribution must be regarded as legitimate and indispensable functions in the affairs of civilization, the fact remains that when those who merely transport and distribute the products of our farms receive vastly more than the share that goes to the producer, it amounts to the same thing as the perpetration of an economic crime. Instead of ameliorating the conditions that have so long handicapped agriculture in matters relating to transportation, the pending bill would most certainly aggravate the situation.

We are sensible of the fact that railroads are a necessity, and we want every properly managed railroad to be solvent and prosperous, but we must not lose sight of the fact that agriculture is also a necessity, even more fundamental to the well-being and the very existence of man than the railroads or any other agency of transportation can possibly be. Common sense should teach those who are charged with the management of our railroads that they cannot expect to benefit by reducing to bankruptcy the fundamental industry upon which their prosperity rests.

There is justification for condemning the report of the conference committee on the transportation bill by virtue of the fact that the Miller-Wadsworth amendment, which passed both House and Senate, was entirely eliminated from the bill. The gist of this amendment was to the effect that no form of transportation could be compelled to charge higher rates than would be compensatory. The full wording of the amendment was as follows:

"In order that the public at large may enjoy the benefit and economy afforded by each type of transportation, the Commission shall permit each type of carrier or carriers to reduce rates so long as such rates maintain a compensatory return to the carrier or carriers after taking into consideration overhead and all other elements entering into the cost to the carrier or carriers for the service rendered: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to affect the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4."

It is manifest that with the Miller-Wadsworth amendment stricken out the declaration of policy contained in section 1 constitutes nothing but empty words because nothing contained in the bill gives the public any assurance that it will receive the benefit of transportation at the lowest possible cost. In our opinion, the Miller-Wadsworth amendment was so fair and reasonable that it would be nothing short of tragic to pass the bill without this provision.

Those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits find an additional reason for dissatisfaction in the report of the conference committee because an amendment adopted by the House which provided for reduced rates on farm products for export, comparable to the lower rates granted to industry in this connection, was eliminated.

We maintain that there are only two legitimate grounds upon which the Government could justify itself in attempting to regulate transportation on our inland waterways and in the coastwise trade. One of these grounds would be in the interest of public safety, and the other to protect the public against monopolistic practices. So far as safety is concerned, the Department of Commerce already looks after that; and when it comes to protecting the public against monopoly, the truth is that no monopoly whatsoever exists among the carriers on our inland waterways, nor in the coastwise trade. The rivers, the lakes, and the seas are open to all. So, far from breaking up any monopoly among the water carriers, which in reality is nonexistent, the pending legislation takes a long step toward creating a monopoly.

The carriers now operating would be permitted to continue, subject to rules and regulations laid down by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but before it would be possible to establish a new service, it would be necessary to secure from the Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If this bill should be enacted it is very doubtful if there would be any new water carriers, because the legislation is so worded as to virtually instruct the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny any person a certificate of convenience and necessity if the Commission comes to the conclusion that the present transportation facilities are adequate to take care of existing commerce. The fate that befell

many of the common and contract carriers under the grandfather clause of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 furnishes an example of what may happen to many of our water carriers if the present bill is passed.

As the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission well said in a joint letter addressed to Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY on February 16, 1940, in opposition to this legislation:

"Certificates of public convenience and necessity should not be used to create a monopoly in the branch of transportation industry where monopoly is presently nonexistent and where the public interest requires that competition, although it should be regulated to prevent abuses, should not be limited or discouraged. The great advantage of water transportation to shippers is the flexibility and variety of service it can offer. Certificates of public convenience and permits would destroy this advantage and stifle competition. The same effect of stifling competition is discernible in the provisions of the bills, that except with the permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission, no carrier can operate both as a common carrier and as a contract carrier."

We think the writers of the joint letter already mentioned are on the right track when they said:

"All the provisions of the bills seem designed to free the railroads from restraints and obligations, while imposing restrictions on their water competitors and making it more expensive for the public to move freight. Under these provisions inland water carriers can easily be regulated out of existence without the recapture of enough tonnage to affect railroad earnings appreciably."

We also endorse the further statement of the writers of the joint letter when they declare:

"Farmers and other shippers should not be required to pay rates based on transportation costs of properties improvidently built, wastefully operated, or partially obsolete. The advocacy of thorough regulation of the minimum rates of motor and water carriers by a centralized agency appears to represent an attempt to use Government power to bring competing transportation agencies into a cartel, and in this manner to share traffic and adjust rates in such a way as to earn a return upon all transportation capital of these agencies. The present high rail-rate level would be protected from the impact of vigorous competition. Undoubtedly such a policy would also result in more rigid rates in times of depression, since the motor carrier and the boat line would no longer play their role as an effective competitive force in bringing down rail rates on commodities susceptible to rail or truck, and rail or water movement."

We are impressed by the fact that the general public has had no opportunity whatever to become acquainted with the conference report on the transportation bill; the Members of Congress as a whole have not had time to familiarize themselves with its details; there is no public demand for this legislation; it is filled with numerous objectionable features and ambiguities; and for the good of all we are strongly of the opinion that it should be defeated.

Respectfully submitted.

J. Elmer Brock, president, American National Live Stock Association; Frederick Brenckman, National Grange; J. B. Wilson, Secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, National Wool Growers Association; Irvin B. King, master, Washington State Grange; T. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Oscar Heline, president, Farmer Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Marcus, Iowa; Frank Rutherford, secretary, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Omaha, Nebr.; Earl Peterson, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1940.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives:

Approximately 1,000 general chairmen representing employees in the transportation service of the railroads of the United States now in session at Chicago are deeply concerned in railroad bill, S. 2009, and they have authorized us to urge you to support the motion to recommit the conference report on this bill, which will be considered by the House on Thursday, May 9, and provide protections against unemployment resulting from consolidations, etc. We appeal to your sense of justice and fairness to save railway employees from the menace of further unemployment.

A. Johnston, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; D. B. Robertson, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; J. A. Phillips, president, Order of Railway Conductors; A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; T. C. Cashen, president, Switchmen's Union of North America; V. O. Gardner, president, Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

Sent from Chicago.

GRAND LODGE, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 6, 1940.

The Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: I take pleasure in replying to your courteous inquiry by letter of May 2.

As you have previously been informed, the source of our opposition to the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill, S. 2009, was the fact that, as you have many times stated, the consolidation section of that bill proposed to facilitate railroad consolidations. The House conferees correctly stated in their report, which report was signed by yourself, at page 61:

"Employees had a fear of unemployment and to some extent communities feared the loss of transportation due to the possible consolidations under present circumstances where a revival of the transportation industry might show that such consolidations were unwarranted."

We have felt all along, as have 275 Members of Congress who signed a petition on behalf of adequate labor protection, that this Congress should deal courageously with this justified fear of unemployment and deflation of communities. As stated in the joint letter to Congress from the five transportation brotherhoods, the joint conferees struck from the proposed bill the consolidation section, as amended by the House, which was the only provision in the entire bill that proposed direct benefits to railroad labor. To be sure, when this provision was stricken from the bill, the provisions designed to facilitate consolidations also were stricken, and accordingly, as I advised you in my telegram of April 29, that removed the source of our opposition to S. 2009. But also, as I advised you in that telegram, "We shall continue our earnest effort to obtain legal protection for labor in consolidation and abandonment situations." We naturally urge recommitment of the conference report as affording the only present opportunity of achieveing legal protection to the railroad workers we represent, the workers most seriously affected by railroad consolidations.

In your address, as reported in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page 2685, you suppose that our efforts along these lines would be confined to the separate bill which Congressman HARRINGTON, of Iowa, introduced after the joint conferees failed to provide for adequate labor protection.

Do I understand that your committee will give this bill speedy consideration and do all possible to obtain action on it at this session of Congress? I am sure you understand that, unless the committee of which you are chairman would give wholehearted cooperation and support, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain action at this session of Congress; hence, we have no practical alternative but to seek recommitment, with the hope that the conferees will respond to this great demand for adequate labor protection against the desire of railroad bankers to economize at the expense of railroad workers.

In your letter of May 2, you suggest that in favoring recommitment we have made ourselves "a party with a group fighting to destroy the bill." The only possible interpretation that can be placed upon that conclusion is that you are convinced, in advance, that the conferees will not carry out the wishes of the House of Representatives and write into their report the adequate labor protective provisions so clearly favored by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House. In such a contingency, it would be the conferees, rather than we, who favor recommitment, that would destroy the bill. We have no intentions or aspirations to destroy the bill; we ask only that the voice of democracy be harkened to and the wishes of the majority be responded to. If that is done, S. 2009 will yet become law this session of Congress.

Your address, as reported in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD suggests that your conception of the labor-protection provision is entirely erroneous. You state that such a legal provision would have the effect of imposing "on the employer the duty of indefinite if not a lifetime support of employees for whom he no longer has a job." As a practical matter you must know that is not so. Average railroad consolidations eliminate from 20 to 25 percent of the employees. Without the labor-protective provision, those employees youngest in point of service would be spared that fate, and the eliminations would come from the other end of the seniority list, as deaths, resignations, and retirements occurred. Such attrition from deaths, resignations, and retirements, for all railroad employees, now averages upwards of 5 percent per year; but for train service employees who are most severely affected by consolidations, the attrition rate is between 2.5 and 3.5 percent. Thus, on the whole, employee eliminations from consolidations would be gradually and humanely absorbed within a short period of time, especially with an increase in railroad business, which is claimed if S. 2009 is enacted into law. The only way in which you could be correct in your reference to lifetime support is to assume that the lifetime of railroad workers will be short, indeed. Although we railroad employees feel somewhat hardier than that, it may be true that if you force tens of thousands of us into the bread lines you will so shorten our span of life.

I must again remind you that railroad financial interests have expressed the hope that they could save $500,000,000 annually from consolidations if they succeed in obtaining enactment of S. 2009 without the labor-protective feature. Eighty percent, or $400,000,000 of that sum would come from pay rolls. The so-called Washington jobs agreement, executed 4 years before this ambitious banker program was revealed, constitutes only what the railroad financial interests would agree to—it is not a standard of equity or social desirability.

You erroneously refer to the proposed labor protective provision as a "dismissal wage" proposition. The dismissal wage is only another attempt to achieve national prosperity by providing meager compensation for nonproduction. Before concluding that such an arrangement is equitable, ask yourself if you would be willing to forego pursuit of your life's calling for a mere 60 percent of your

present salary for a few months. Railroad employees want honest pay for honest work; that is what the labor protective proposal offers. A dismissal wage proposition proposes to buy up, at bankrupt prices, the jobs of needy workers. I regard the Washington dismissal wage agreement of 1936 now, as I did when it was executed, on which occasion I said:

"I want to emphasize that so far as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is concerned, the agreement with the carriers relative to consolidation and coordination can in no sense be interpreted to mean that the way is clear for railroad consolidation and coordination. This brotherhood will continue to fight as vigorously as it always has such efforts to economize at the expense of humanity. We have now entered into an agreement with the carriers, designed not to improve the standards of living or working conditions of railroad workers, but to share with them a small portion of the booty that would come to the coupon clippers if Wall Street's demand for 'economy' at the expense of humanity is carried out."

I am sure that when you ponder these considerations in the light of the fact that unemployment and business deflation constitute the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, you will understand why we are anxious that S. 2009 be recommitted, so that you and your colleagues among the House conferees may yet be given an opportunity to recommend a bill that will be of great benefit to the country.

I hope I have made our position entirely clear to you, but if questions still arise in your mind, please submit them to me. In order that my position may be clearly understood by all Members of Congress, I am mailing to each of them a copy of your letter of inquiry, together with a copy of this reply.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

A. F. WHITNEY, *President.*

Appropriations for Parity Payments and Purchase of Farms for Tenant Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is going to vote on whether the farmers of this Nation are to receive parity payments for their crops. I hope the Republicans, you on the left side of the aisle, have changed your attitude since a year ago. Last year 140 Republicans, almost your entire Republican group, voted against parity payments. You voted against sending the bill to conference and again the 140 Republicans refused to agree to parity payments when it came back from conference as it is coming back today. I want to plead with you, the Republicans who represent yourselves as being for a farm program, as well as my Democratic brothers, to receive and concur in the Senate amendments.

First, I want to plead with you to vote for the $212,000,000 that is provided for parity payments. It has been definitely proven that every dollar that goes into the hands of the American farmer increases the income of this Nation by $7. The Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor of being a member, authorized this appropriation. In these times of world stress, when nations are crumbling for lack of national defense, when the future of this Nation may be in jeopardy because of inadequate defense, and I am a supporter of an adequate defense, there is one industry, one section of our national life on which we can depend, come what may, the farmer has in the past and will in the future feed and clothe this Nation. All that the Committee on Agriculture asks is that the farmer receive a fair price for his product in comparison with the products he has to buy. This $212,000,000 provides the farmer the difference between the price he gets for his products and the price he is entitled to receive. No friend of the farmer will vote against this amendment.

I, also, at this time want to plead for the $500,000 appropriation that provides for water facilities. This program will make many farmers in semiarid areas self-sufficient.

And last but not least I want to appeal to you to support the provision providing $50,000,000 for the purchase of farms for tenant farmers. I wish you could read the many letters I have received from tenant farmers who have their own equipment and their own livestock, a thorough knowledge of farming, that desire to obligate themselves to pay Uncle Sam every cent of the purchase price of a farm they can call their own. These letters are from farmers who have applied to purchase a farm under the Bankhead-Jones Act and have been turned down. They throw into the discard the arguments of the opponents of the Bankhead-Jones Act that because it provides for the purchase of only a few farms that it should be abandoned entirely. Every one of these tenant farmers look forward to the day they can be financed to purchase a farm that they can call their own. Why this desire of farm ownership? All through these letters runs this story: "I have to put my rented place all to wheat because my landlord demands a cash crop," or "I had to sell my milk cows, or my sheep, or my hogs before I moved on the place I rent now, because my landlord wanted a cash crop and would not allow me to keep livestock." Most of these applicants have the necessary machinery to successfully farm a place. Most of these applicants point out with a 40-year purchase agreement they could buy a farm for the same amount they are now paying in cash or grain rent.

The future of this Nation depends on the family-sized, owner-operated farms of this Nation. We cannot continue our policy of allowing the productive farm land of this Nation to drift into the hands of bankers, lawyers, and insurance companies. Our best line of defense, our Maginot line, the people who will actually defend this country against all "isms" and foreign invasion by providing adequate food and clothing for the Nation and, if necessary, defending with their lives the farms they own, is the farm population of this Nation. Let us give the American farmer a chance to own his own plot of land.

Support of Jones-Wheeler-La Follette Farm-Credit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

LETTER FROM FIRST NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows speaks for itself. It is from the chairman of the First National Farm Loan Association, of Los Angeles, which, I am told, is the largest such association in the Nation. Mr. Reese sets forth why the practical experience of his board of directors leads them to be earnestly in favor of the passage of H. R. 8748.

If this bill is passed, this Congress will go down in history as a really great Congress. Mr. Reese's letter is as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, May 1, 1940.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
138 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge your support of bill H. R. 8748, introduced by Mr. JONES of Texas. The members of our board of directors are unanimously in favor of this bill and we believe that most of the borrowers through this association are likewise in favor of it. We believe the opponents of the bill are greatly exaggerating disastrous results if the bill becomes a law.

We are very much in sympathy with the provisions of the bill that will enable the farmers to obtain cheaper interest permanently, to obtain a refund of stock, and will provide for increasing the functions and responsibilities of the National Farm Loan Associations.

We understand that objectors to the Jones bill are advancing the argument that the Federal land banks are already providing the benefits that are available in the new bill as far as forbearance and reamortization of loans is concerned.

However, it is my opinion that most of the benefits now available to borrowers who are in distress have been brought about since about November 1, 1939, when policies changed.

I am submitting below certain statistical information which may be of interest to you and which may prove my argument in this regard:

	Number	Amount
Federal land-bank loans as of Jan. 1, 1940	781	$6,397,200
Land Bank Commissioner loans as of Jan. 1, 1940	576	1,991,600
Total number of loans	1,357	8,388,800

Reamortizations completed during 1938 and up to February 28, 1939—Federal land-bank loans, 129; Commissioner loans, 23.

Reamortizations rejected—Federal land-bank loans, 18; Commissioner, 7.

Of these rejected loans all except one have been reamortized since November 1, 1939.

From March 1, 1939, to November 1, 1939, only 8 applications were submitted for reamortization.

Since November 10, 1939, including April 5, 1940, 231 land-bank and 128 Commissioner applications were submitted, none of which were rejected.

The present policy of the Federal land bank as regards reamortization is about the same policy as was proposed by this association in a resolution passed about February 1, 1938, but in order to conform with the strict collection policy of the Federal land bank it was necessary for us to practically discontinue reamortization and enforce collections through recommendations for foreclosure where payments could not be made. Several foreclosures were completed during that period and a number were started which have since been reinstated.

Under a change in policy since November 1939 we are now being urged to grant the aid to borrowers which we had previously recommended, and for which we were criticized by the examining board of the Federal land bank.

We believe the board of directors of this farm loan association is better qualified to know the credit needs of the community than the credit department of the Federal land bank.

We believe the present policy being followed by the Federal land bank will be insured continuance by the passage of the Jones bill, and we urge your full-hearted support of it.

Respectfully yours,

EVERETT M. REESE,
President.

Reorganization Plan IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is too important a matter not to have been entitled to a full and fair hearing.

I recognize the right of, as well as the necessity for, the members of the committee to have and to take such time as they may care to use. It is, nevertheless, barely possible that some of the rest of us might have contributed something to the discussion if we had been afforded an opportunity so to do.

It seemed useless to take a minute and "to extend and revise." The occasion neither excused nor justified such procedure on my part.

So, under the permission granted me, in order to keep the record straight and to keep faith with those who asked me to speak, I am appending some of the reasons, only a few of many, which justify my vote against Reorganization Plan IV.

As one who has flown many thousand miles since 1933, I am convinced that we should leave well enough alone. What a record of accomplishment. It cannot be excelled.

It is not a partisan matter with me. You will believe me when I say this.

I am, however, opposed to any change in the present set-up. My life has been at stake. It will be at stake if I continue in my present committee assignments. I am opposed to taking any chance to lose it to satisfy some "reorganization theory" as against the demonstrated capacity and ability, based on experience, of the existing establishment.

I cannot escape the fact, and I assert, that somebody was personally responsible and chargeable for the death of 10 or more Army pilots, politically and impetuously ordered to fly the mail, due to a created alleged emergency some years ago. There should be no repetition of this catastrophe caused by injudicious political emotionalism. Why open the door by favoring this proposition?

I adjure you to resent any interference with demonstrated efficiency based on experience. No lives lost! You cannot beat that. Why experiment? Experience not only suggests but compels you to hold fast to that which you have.

Too many lives and too much money is involved in such an experiment as is proposed to justify any change. I hope you agree, as a rational human being, whatever your partisan political alinement.

The suggested reorganization should not obtain. I am opposed to Reorganization Plan IV.

May Day and the Eight and Forty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF MRS. ELLEN LOUISE WARREN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the American Legion and of the American Legion Auxiliary, a most impressive patriotic ceremonial was held in the Nation's Capital on May Day last. Among the speakers who addressed this gathering was Mrs. Ellen Louise Warren, Chapeau National des Huit Chapeaux et Quarante Femmes.

Because of the unusual nature of Mrs. Warren's patriotic expressions, her outline of the mission of the great organization which is her honor this year to lead, I believe that she is entitled to and should have a much wider audience than those who composed the group which crowded about the District of Columbia World War Memorial Monument to hear that which she then had to say.

In order that Mrs. Warren's speech may have the widest possible circulation, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership that the text of her address may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings.

Unanimous consent having been indicated, Mrs. Warren's address follows:

We of Des Huit Chapeaux et Quarante Femmes, affectionately known as the Eight and Forty, the honor organization for members of the American Legion Auxiliary, are here at the District of Columbia World War Memorial as participants in the commemorative observance on this 1940 May Day.

As the national president of our organization, I find myself concerned with conflicting emotions. In the early celebrations of May Day we recall that the ancient Romans pompously paraded to the Grotto of Egeria. In medieval and Tudor England, May Day was a great public holiday; all classes of people were up with the dawn and went a-Maying; branches of trees and flowers carried back in triumph to the village center to the Maypole, gloriously decked with ribbons and wreaths, the focal point of festivity. Within our own generation we can recall a similar fever of activity throughout our country, when we felt that with the approach of May we could look forward to the pleasures of a full springtime season, the advent of beautiful flowers, and the anticipated pleasures that came with warm weather. This is the May Day we like to remember.

It is tragic that this day, with its significance of beauty, happiness, and contentment, should be selected by certain groups of people as a day of demonstration and agitation against the God-fearing principles under which our people endeavor to live. European countries are deeply enmeshed with communistic activities. France has banned the Communist Party since the start of the war, and now the British Government is seriously considering steps to suppress the British Communist Party. Surely it behooves our United States Government to stand solidly with the Dies committee and aid them in all ways possible to protect our citizens from any and all subversive groups within our lands. We don't want our

Government, our homes, or our safety undermined by grapevine "isms"; we do want to keep America for Americans.

Perhaps in our activities on this day we can in some measure maintain the old-time happy spirit of May Day. I quote from a message of the President wherein Mr. Roosevelt said: "There is need in this country for a genuine concern for our freedom which will parallel and transcend the fanaticism being aroused among young people in behalf of tyranny. No greater service could be rendered by our schools in these times than to make vivid to our children of America the plight and suffering of children of many races and religions in various parts of the world where the principles of fair play set forth in our Bill of Rights are ruthlessly disregarded."

In 1924 our 8 and 40 organization proclaimed May 1 as its national day to emphasize the importance of play for children and adult interest in them. Child welfare is the serious objective of our organization, organized as a national body at New Orleans in 1922. We have been assigned by the American Legion a special field of service, that of childhood tuberculosis prevention. In our State and local organizations the work includes Mantoux tests, care of underprivileged children, establishment of TB clinics, usually working through and with the county and city health departments and nurses. Nationally we have given to the American Legion child welfare division more than $20,000 over the past 17 years; nine beds at $1,000 each have been endowed in the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, Colo., a hospital nonsectarian and whose slogan is, "None may enter who can pay—none may pay who enter"; $1,500 contributed for equipment at the American Legion's Hospital for crippled children in St. Petersburg, Fla.; $1,000 for five geographical area scholarships of $200 each for rehabilitated tubercular children of deceased veterans, 16 years of age or over; $1,000 for a solarium in the Children's Hosp'tal in San Francisco, and annual contributions to the research division of the National Tuberculosis Association. This year we will establish an 8 and 40 health center at Tucson, Ariz., with an initial contribution of $1,000, and in specifically concrete methods we bring May sunshine, with its symbolical reference, to many children who otherwise might be neglected.

Simultaneously with Eight and Forty's May Day plans a movement started in 1923 when the American Child Health Association suggested that May Day be set aside as a day on which to stress child health. President Coolidge in 1924 expressed approval, and expressions of approval were published from persons, both in public and private life; Governors of States issued proclamations from then and on until May 1928 a joint resolution of Congress empowered the President of the United States to annually proclaim May 1 as National Child Health Day, and to ask for its observance in all parts of the United States. President Roosevelt in his proclamation this year called upon all citizens "to take steps needed to strengthen and extend health protection and medical care for mothers and children in every community."

The month of May is one of national significance in many directions: May 1, National Health Day; May 5 to 11, National Music Week; May 1 to 8, National Employment Week, sponsored by the American Legion and strengthened by the President through his proclamation to the Nation's citizenry; May 12, Mother's Day, so dear and sacred to every man, woman, and child; also, May 12, National Hospital Day, when friendly interest is centered upon every veteran in every hospital in our country; May 25, Poppy Day; and May 30, Memorial Day, established in 1868.

May Day was chosen deliberately for the District commemorative observance at its World War Memorial to combat subversive demonstrations, so with a month of human emphasis by our grateful people we again take cognizance of the President's message "that no greater service could be rendered by all sources dispensing information than to bring to the people of the United States of America the realization that the suffering and pain of most of the peoples of our larger nations today are now, and will continue to be, spared to our people so long as we appreciated the Constitution of the United States and our own Bill of Rights"; so at the District World War Memorial's hallowed shrine we rededicate ourselves to a service of considerate helpfulness to those less fortunate than ourselves, and to the principles and doctrines of this great Nation of which we are a part.

The United States Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. CULLEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Postmaster General, Hon. James A. Farley, at the luncheon of the Sales Executives Club at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, Tuesday, April 23, 1940:

There is something very gratifying to me in this large and representative gathering of businessmen, taxpayers, patrons, and cash customers of the United States Post Office. It proves to me that this great human and commercial agency of the people is not merely taken for granted.

It proves something more. It proves that you as American citizens are proud of the tradition and accomplishments of the United States Postal Service down through the years, and that you are eager not only to see it continued and improved but also extended to new heights of achievement in a swiftly moving, progressive civilization.

I am glad to be here on this occasion for a special reason. Every official and every employee of the Postal Service throughout the Nation, from the highest to the lowest, is a servant of the public. We never lose sight of that fact in the Post Office Department. We are highly grateful and truly appreciative of the opportunity you have given to us to be of personal service to the fine and generous American public. For this reason, I make it my business as Postmaster General to meet with citizens and businessmen as often as I can to exchange ideas with them, to get their views in matters of administrative policy, and to obtain their suggestions for the improvement of the Service.

I think this is a good thing to do for another reason. I think the people of this country should have the chance to size up their public officials at close range and determine for themselves what kind of job he is doing. It has been my experience over a long period of years that sooner or later our people get the true measure of every man in public life. They have a way of finding out for themselves whether a man is a sound and able administrator or a disappointment, and whether he really has something under his hat or is just talking through it.

The United States Postal Service is the greatest business organization in the world. It is difficult to realize, but it is a fact reported by the Comptroller General of the United States, that the United States Postal Service is an $8,000,000,000 business. By that I mean that the actual money transactions in the post offices throughout the country result annually in a total cash turn-over of that huge amount; an amount which exceeds the total of all the money in circulation.

Today, the United States Post Office serves 130,000,000 people out of more than 44,000 post offices and branch offices in all parts of the country; it has approximately 250,000 loyal and efficient employees working all hours of the day and night and in all kinds of weather; it took in more than $745,000,000 in cash during the past fiscal year, and, eliminating the subsidies and nonpostal items fixed by law, it is being operated for the benefit and convenience of every man, woman, and child in this Nation, without cost, other than for his postage, to the ever-faithful, heroic American taxpayer.

The United States Postal Service operates as a monopoly in that part of its affairs relating to the handling of letters. There are many special reasons why this monopoly should exist. The first and principal reason is the need for secrecy; that is, the requirement that the contents of your letters be safeguarded and handled as confidential communications. Ordinarily we do not think much about this, but when because of war conditions the mails are subjected to censorship it becomes extremely embarrassing when this privilege of secrecy is withdrawn.

The educational and social aspects of the public management of the post office are also quite obvious. It enables the public generally to have the cheap delivery of letters, newspapers, magazines, and books. The extension of the service into the rural districts, where no private operator could afford to carry it, is indeed important from a social and educational viewpoint. In many ways it is set apart from the usual industrial enterprise, indicating that it is obviously a field for public management.

The post office is a business which the Government should be able to operate most efficiently and economically. The management of the Postal Service is not beset with the ordinary risks encountered in the operation of a private industry, and there is little or no speculative element in its affairs. The business is one of orderly routine and clocklike precision. Therefore it needs but a small number of high-salaried executives. As evidence of this fact I call your attention to the present organization of the Post Office Department, which is managed by an executive staff of five men—the Postmaster General and four assistants to the Postmaster General—appointed by the President.

This executive staff is assisted by a group of trained and seasoned administrative officials numbering about 30 in the Department headquarters at Washington. The entire departmental staff at Washington, including assistants to the administrative officials, clerks, and all other employees, is less than fifteen hundred. It is probably the smallest organization in Washington of any of the executive departments, and yet it manages the largest and most effective agency of Government.

The entire Department is separated into four great administrative bureaus, each of them under an Assistant Postmaster General; an accounting bureau under the Comptroller; a law bureau under the Solicitor; an investigating bureau under the chief inspector; and a procurement bureau under the purchasing agent. The duties and authorities of each of these bureaus are well

defined; duplication is eliminated to the fullest extent possible, and where the interests of several bureaus overlap their efforts are coordinated to an amazing degree.

Our organization of the Department is along the same general lines as those followed in the organization of our large industrial and public-service concerns that are operated privately. Briefly speaking, the First Assistant Postmaster General has to do with matters relating to the selection and supervision of postmasters and personnel in the post offices throughout the country. The second assistant is charged with the transportation of the mail; that is, he must see that the mails go through. The third assistant has jurisdiction over our financial transactions, and the fourth assistant operates the real-estate bureau of the Department, the motor-vehicle service, and the division of post-office supplies.

We have somewhat rigid disciplinary policies in the Post Office. If it were otherwise such a large organization could not be so well timed and so serviceable to the people. We avoid, however, any harsh or unfriendly attitude toward our own people or to the public. We have a friendly organization that is eager to serve. One great thing about the Post Office that pleases the public, especially businessmen and businesswomen, is that the huge revenue and the great amount of money which we take in is almost immediately put back into circulation through the payment of salaries, the purchase of supplies, and in disbursements for service.

Our pay roll last year amounted to more than $595,000,000, and this money went into every city and hamlet throughout the Nation on a twice-a-month basis. We bought in the open market, as we needed supplies, $12,000,000 worth of merchandise. We paid $18,000,000 to individuals and companies for contract service, such as star-route transportation of the mail. We paid the railroads of the Nation more than $98,000,000 for carrying the mail, and we paid $25,000,000 to the aviation companies engaged in the transportation of our foreign and domestic air mail. We paid another $18,000,000 to our American citizens and American business concerns for the rent, heat, and lighting of our post-office buildings. So you can see that the Post Office Department is doing its part in promoting the economic condition of the country.

I feel assured that this audience will appreciate a brief reference to contributions made by the post office in the fascinating development of our great national and international systems of airplane service.

It was the post office, with the cooperation of the Army, which established the first regularly scheduled air line, carrying the mails between New York and Washington. It was the post office which established in its own name, under its own management, the first transcontinental air line, carrying the mails from New York to San Francisco; and it was under the management of this Department that the first fields were lighted and the first beacons set up for night flying. When the Department's success had reached the stage where private interests were attracted with the idea of developing these lines as passenger routes, as well as mail routes, the Post Office Department went out of the business of operating the air lines and became the best-paying customer of the privately operated services.

You people here well know the progress that has been made in the establishment of air lines, the setting up of more frequent schedules, the improvement in equipment, and the increased efficiency of the operating personnel that has occurred since 1933. The Post Office Department has fostered and encouraged this new transportation agency. The Department has helped at every stage of its development by dispatching mail on every available line where the mail could be expedited, and paying to the operators millions of dollars in cash annually for this service.

During the fiscal year ending June 30 last, the Department paid to the domestic air-line operators more than $16,000,000. More than 15,800,000 pounds of mail were transported by these air lines in the fiscal year 1939. In other words, there is more than a ton of mail over our heads every hour of the day, every day in the year.

An important event of the last fiscal year was the inauguration of the trans-Atlantic air-mail service. It operates twice a week on the southern route between New York and Lisbon, Portugal, and on the northern route it operates between New York and Foynes, Ireland. The United States foreign air mail system now serves directly 93 cities in Alaska, Canada, Europe, Cuba, Mexico, Central and South America, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, and Asia. During the past fiscal year the Department paid to the carriers in this foreign air-mail service alone more than $9,200,000. The poundage in the foreign air-mail service is steadily increasing, and since the interruption to ordinary means of transportation for the mails to Europe on account of the wars, this service across the Atlantic has provided a means of sure transportation for important correspondence to and from the European countries. Neither the trans-Atlantic nor the trans-Pacific service could be maintained by the operators but for the payments made to them regularly through the Post Office Department for mail transportation. Therefore, we are again pioneering in the development of modern travel facilities.

There is one more aspect of the Postal Service of which I am proud. I am proud of the postal surpluses in every year of my administration save one; not because those annual surpluses are a credit to my record as a businessman, but because I firmly believe that it is the duty of a Postmaster General "to serve the public more and more and tax them less and less."

If I ran a deficit as Postmaster General, it would have to come out of your pockets in taxes. That is why I have tried to live within our income in the Post Office Department and do my part toward balancing the National Budget.

When we came into office on March 4, 1933, we adopted policies calculated to safeguard this great public business, to improve its efficiency, to assume our full responsibility to the workers, and to save money for the taxpayers. As we have gone along with the work we have stood by those fixed policies. And the record shows that we have been successful. Let me illustrate:

For the fiscal year 1932, the last full year of operation under the previous administration, there was a staggering gross deficit of more than $205,000,000. Deducting $52,000,000 for nonpostal items, the net deficit for that year amounted to more than one hundred and fifty-three millions.

There was a net deficit in the fiscal year 1933 of more than $50,000,000, notwithstanding that in the beginning of that year the postage rate on all first-class matter was raised from 2 to 3 cents.

The fiscal year 1934 was the first full year of this administration. As the result of my recommendation at the beginning of that year, the local rate on first-class matter was reduced from 3 to 2 cents. In spite of the loss in revenue from that reduction in the rate of postage, a net surplus was shown from our operations in 1934.

In 1935 another net surplus was shown.

In the fiscal year 1936, due to the adoption of the shorter workweek, which cost millions of dollars and put thousands of men to work, and because also in 1936 the post office took over for the first time the custody of Government office buildings from the Treasury, costing us approximately $20,000,000, we suffered a net deficit of less than $17,000,000.

Increased efficiency on the part of the postmasters and employees, coupled with increased revenues, enabled us to again show a net operating surplus in the fiscal year 1937.

The same is true of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939.

Therefore, by adopting the same methods of bookkeeping as my predecessors, and by taking credit for nonpostal items in the same manner as previous administrations claimed this same credit, in five of the six full years of operation under my administration we have shown a net surplus from that part of our services which we have rendered to the public for hire.

I am proud to be at the head of this magnificent and universal system of communication. I am proud to be associated with the fine men and women who make up its field forces, and I am pleased to express publicly here and now my appreciation to them. I make claim to no special amount of personal credit for the present high efficiency of the postal system. I do assert, however, that under this administration we have made decided progress.

America—A Trust and a Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS JOHNSON AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in order that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my instant remarks the text of an address delivered on May 1 last by the Assistant Secretary of War, the Honorable Louis Johnson, an address which was delivered in Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall at Pittsburgh, Pa., at a patriotic gathering held under the auspices of the American Legion, an organization which Mr. Johnson has served in the days gone by as one of its most illustrious national commanders.

The unanimous consent of the membership having been indicated, Mr. Johnson's address follows:

Fellow citizens, we have gathered under the auspices of the American Legion to welcome into our American family our newest citizens. They have come to us from nations across the seas in search of the American way of life. They have become so impressed with our institutions that they voluntarily have forsaken their loyalties to foreign governments, rulers, and potentates and have cast their lot permanently with us. We accept them without reservation.

America is a nation of immigrants. Only the Indians have been truly native to the soil of this continent. The rest of us either came here ourselves or are the descendants of those who migrated to these shores. Recognizing the roots of our origin, and holding

true to the principles of our democracy, we make no distinctions among our citizens between the native and the foreign born.

Regardless of place of birth, each one of us in this country has the opportunity to carve out for himself a useful and perhaps a conspicuous niche in the political, social, scientific, and economic life of our country. With the sole exception of the Presidency of the United States, our newest citizens may aspire equally with those of us who have been privileged to enjoy the blessings of America for a longer time to practically any public office within the gift of the American people. On the Supreme Court Bench, on the floor of Congress, under the domes of our State capitols, and within the walls of our city halls we find useful and influential Government officials who first saw the light of day under foreign skies.

It is only right that we should expect more of our native-born citizens. If there is anything to heredity, then the sons of our pioneering ancestors who came to these shores in search of liberty should be imbued with the same ideals. If there is anything to environment, then those who from the cradle have been exposed to liberal American influences should be among the most ardent champions of our democratic principles. Yet, regrettably, we do find men and women born in America who break our laws and scoff at our institutions.

On the other hand, among our naturalized citizens, who have had less experience with democratic traditions, we find thousands upon thousands who are ardent disciples of Americanism; who live every day in observance of our American code; and who are ready in every crisis to die if need be for an American cause. It is hardly necessary for me to tell you, my comrades, of the bravery and of the loyalty of our fellow soldiers of foreign birth, who marched by our side, shared our privations, and sacrificed their lives in our common fight for a more decent world.

The records of the Eightieth Division, in which I served with many of you, fellow Legionnaires of Pittsburgh and vicinity, are replete with heroic examples among men of foreign birth. Let us look at the compilation of the coveted and highly prized Distinguished Service Crosses that were won by men of our Blue Ridge Division. There we find Pvt. Clemente R. Pullono, who was born in Italy, and Corps. Jiozef Adamski and John Pamaranski, both of whom came to this country from Poland. The citations for their valor speak for themselves:

"Seeing the enemy mounting a gun which when operated would sweep his platoon at close range, Private Pullono shot the gunner just as he was about to open fire. He also shot another German who attempted to fire the gun, after which he charged the position and captured the remainder of the crew."

"Rushing ahead of his advancing lines, Corporal Adamski discovered a trail which was not being covered by enemy fire and through which men could pass in safety. He returned with this valuable information to his company commander, his action permitting his company to safely pass through the zone.

"When Corporal Pamaranski's platoon was held up by an enemy machine gun, which had caused many casualties in the platoon, he advanced to within bombing distance of the gun, killed one, and captured two of the enemy, together with the machine gun."

Not only in the Eightieth, but in practically every one of our fighting divisions, names and records of foreign-born soldiers stand out boldly. In addition to those I have already mentioned, the Distinguished Service Cross winners of Pittsburgh and vicinity include Maj. Frederick W. Patterson, of the Seventy-ninth Division, who was born in England; Capt. Robert S. Cain, of Pennsylvania's own Twenty-eighth, the Keystone Division, who came from Scotland; First Sgt. Thomas J. Cavanaugh, of the same outfit, who spent his childhood in Ireland; Private Harry Mates, of the Second Division, who left Russia; and Private Nick Monula, of the Third Division, who migrated from Serbia. Of the 60 Distinguished Service Crosses distributed among the men of Pittsburgh, 8 were awarded to foreign-born heroes.

Even the most casual perusal of the list leaves a definite impression of the mixed origin of our valorous soldiers. Yes; there are Atwood and Botsford and Newcomer and Potter, that show Anglo-Saxon origins or influences; but there are also Finnigan and Flaherty, Cohen and Levenson, Monula and Pullono, Reiter and Shenkel, Patterson and Pedersen, Kaperzynski and Pamaranski. What a testimonial to the rich mixed blood that flows in our American veins.

The American Legion is a cross section of this, our America. It is a group of World War veterans who have proved their right to be considered Americans by their loyalty and by their example in war and in peace. They hold before us the ideals of America toward which every citizen, native- and foreign-born, should reach—justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty. These principles are a sacred trust handed down to us by our American forefathers. Take them to your heart, fellow citizens. Maintain them. Perpetuate them. Live for them. If necessary, prepare to die for them. They are the cornerstone of America. They are the foundation of all civilization.

What a privilege it is to be an American in the world of today. Compare the blessings we are enjoying this very minute right here in this hall with what other countries have to offer. While we assemble without fear in a large body, there are few places across the seas where men may meet even in small groups without arousing suspicion. While we speak freely, others must padlock their lips or whisper in guarded undertones. While lights brighten these walls, others live in black-out darkness. While we breathe God's own pure air, others are adjusting gas masks. While we live peacefully among ourselves, others stand in terror of their nearest neighbors. In Europe there may be a stigma attached to one's origin which may taint the life and business of a whole family, even a whole people. Here men are measured by their own conduct. Each is free to live his own life in his own way so long as it does not encroach upon the similar rights of others. While we may dial our radio to any program anywhere in the world, others must deafen their ears to the outside and listen only to the voice of self-anointed masters. While we may think, write, and say what we please, the lives of others are circumscribed to the minutest detail.

The American way of life confers many rights and privileges, but we must not forget that it also includes serious duties and heavy responsibilities; and it is toward the latter that I would today direct the attention of our newly made citizens. You who most recently felt the hand of oppression and the force of suppression across the seas must realize more keenly than any one of us who have had the good fortune always to live as American citizens the full import of the meaning of America. You should be ever ready to uphold it as the promised land for yourselves and for your children.

Your first obligation as an American citizen is to maintain a good character, or "a good name," as most of you would have it. "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor rather than silver and gold." Temptations may arise to plague you in your relations with your neighbors or with your competitors, but remember the Golden Rule and try to apply it to your life. America is a moral and a religious country. We may worship as Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, but the fundamentals of morality and of good conduct we all have in common. A good American citizen is loyal to his family, to his church, and to his community. To win and to hold the respect of the America that you love so dearly you must conduct yourself as a man—"Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God." Remember, that back of the universe in space, back of Nature's processes, back of the life of man, back of all we do and are, as the source and ground of all that exists, stands the Divine Providence. In these hours of grave concern, we do well to recall the words of James Russell Lowell, "Behind the dim unknown, standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

Good citizenship also calls for prompt, loyal, efficient, and cheerful service. It means participation in your Government, which is a privilege nowhere else so universally accorded. It means attending the primaries and voting at elections. It means studying the platforms of the political parties and the character of their candidates. It means preparing to meet the obligations of a soldier in defense of our beloved America in time of emergency. It means accepting jury service and participating in the process of justice when your name is drawn. It means paying the taxes which are necessary to maintain the Government and the free institutions we so dearly cherish. It means giving your time and your energy toward making the American way of life representative of your most honest, painstaking, and intelligent effort. When all American citizens so regard their obligations of service, our Government will become truly representative—in complete harmony with the ideals of freedom and liberty.

An equally important obligation of the good citizen is to obey the law—not merely its letter, but also its spirit. Every organized society must have laws and rules to control the action of its individuals. If every man were a law unto himself, there could be no orderly community life; there would be anarchy. To be sure, we are entitled to freedom, but not to a license which interferes with the equal rights of other members of our society. We may not always be in sympathy with a law. It then becomes our right and our duty to seek its change in an orderly and constitutional way; but so long as it is on our statute books we must obey it. Violation of one law encourages the break-down of all law. We must, therefore, in our own defense, protect our orderly legal processes.

It should be a point of honor with us all to obey the law. We, ourselves, have made it in the American way—and that means in the spirit of good sportsmanship.

If an election does not turn out to our liking, we should accept the result in good grace so long as it was obtained in the established legal manner. We must accept the umpire's decision, regardless of its immediate import. Otherwise, there can be no game.

In some countries, elections are but a mockery. The party in power cannot lose. If party success demands it, the whole government structure may be overturned to fit the plan of an autocrat. The spirit of fairness in life, as well as in sports, however, is a cardinal principle of the American way. We must take our victories and our defeats as gentlemen. We must cultivate the ideals of good sportsmanship in our personal and official relations with our fellow Americans.

The final obligation of the good citizen is to strive to raise life in America ever and ever toward a higher ideal. We have reached a high standard of civilization in America, higher perhaps than in any other country of the world in this or in any previous generation, but we are still far from perfect. Greed and intolerance often raise their ugly heads. Vice and squalor occasionally show their filthy hands. Graft and corruption from time to time break out on our political face. The good citizen not only does not succumb to these dire influences but devotes his time and his energy toward driving them out of American life. By trying to lead an exemplary life,

himself, and by recognizing his obligation to be his brother's keeper, he contributes his part toward raising the standards of living in our country.

"We must live with the idea that we have a solemn duty to this Republic, that we are its large debtors, and that the only limit to our obligation is our capacity to help in lifting its life to a higher and nobler plane."

In conclusion, I ask that you keep constantly before you the spirit of the American Legion:

"The emblem of the American Legion is the emblem of Americanism. Americanism is unity of love, singleness of allegiance, practicality of purpose, care of the distressed, the education of children, all directed to the promotion of a common good. It is that spirit of patriotism which shall ever preserve our land from the stagnation which is the death of peoples. As members of the American Legion, we must preach and teach the religion of patriotism throughout the Republic. We must not forget our obligations as citizens, and ever must we strive to redeem those obligations. In the emblem of the American Legion there is a great prophecy. It is the promise of the defenders of the Republic bespeaking the fullest good for each in the betterment of all."

Civil Aeronautics Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

TELEGRAMS FROM CAPTS. EARL HALE AND FRANK C. JUDD

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams from pilots of Billings, Mont.:

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 25, 1940.*

Representative JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Arguments of penurious economy do not justify present effort to abolish effectiveness of Civil Aeronautics Authority. The real price paid in lives of passengers and pilots must not be lost by such tampering. Depending on you to prevent it.

CAPT. EARL HALE,
Northwest Airlines.

BILLINGS, MONT., *April 25, 1940.*

Representative JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Worth of present Civil Aeronautics and Safety Boards has been definitely proven. Contrasted with old Commerce Department supervision with its many catastrophes is outstanding. Please do your best to retain present set-up.

CAPT. FRANK C. JUDD,
Northwest Airlines.

Wheeler-Lea Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM RAILROAD ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1940.*

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives:

Approximately 1,000 general chairmen representing employees in the transportation service of the railroads of the United States, now in session at Chicago, are deeply concerned in railroad bill, S. 2009, and they have authorized us to urge you to support the motion to recommit the conference report on this bill, which will be considered by the House on Thursday, May 9, and provide protection against unemployment resulting from consolidations, etc. We appeal to your sense of justice and fairness to save railway employees from the menace of further unemployment.

A. JOHNSTON,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

J. A. PHILLIPS,
President, Order of Railway Conductors.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

T. C. CASHEN,
President, Switchmen's Union of North America.

V. O. GARDNER,
President, Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

Sent from Chicago.

The Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix two persuasive and carefully reasoned articles appearing in the Washington Star of May 6 and May 8 by the noted columnist Mr. Charles G. Ross, in opposition to the Walter-Logan bill.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 6, 1940]

DEAN LANDIS DISSECTS LOGAN BILL—ANALYSIS URGED AS REQUIRED READING FOR SUPPORTERS

(By Charles G. Ross)

Required reading for all those editorial writers, columnists, bar associations, et al., that are clamoring for enactment of the Logan-Walter bill, which has passed the House and is now awaiting action in the Senate, should include the analysis of this measure in the May issue of the Harvard Law Review, by Dean James M. Landis, of the Harvard School of Law. The article is reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning at page 2571.

The devastating findings of Dean Landis with respect to the Logan-Walter bill—glibly described by its proponents as needed to "protect the citizen" against usurpation of power by the executive agencies of the Government—cannot be dismissed as the views of a mere theorist in the law. Before he went back to teaching he was the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. There will be very little dissent from the opinion expressed by Representative RAYBURN in the House debate on the bill that Mr. Landis was a "great Chairman." Certainly he brought to the work of the S. E. C. a fair-mindedness that won for the Commission under his regime the applause of both liberals and conservatives. His qualifications as a student of the law, and especially of administrative law, are equally impressive.

Dean Landis tears the Logan-Walter bill to shreds. More accurately, he cuts it to pieces with a surgeon's knife. He traces the history of the bill from A to Z, shows the absurd fallacy in the titular description of it as a measure "to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States," exposes numerous of the misrepresentations that were used to get votes for it in the House, reaches the conclusion that "to apply the procrustean formula suggested by the association's (the American Bar Association's) pending proposals is to cut off here a foot and there a head, leaving broken and bleeding the processes of administrative law."

COMPARES BILL TO N. I. R. A.

With damning effect he compares the Logan-Walter bill to another ill-considered piece of legislation—the National Industrial Recovery Act. This was another bill put together with "war cries and shouts," another bill "superimposed upon an existing administration scheme with only fleeting concern given to the problem of its joints." This bill also, like the Logan-Walter proposal, was shot through with exceptions "dictated by the happy thought of the moment." When the Supreme Court killed the N. I. R. A., it "expunged from the statute book an act that was bound to fail of its

high purpose because behind it was none of that understanding essential to the effectiveness of reform."

Dean Landis cites various of the misstatements made on the floor of the House in support of the Logan-Walter measure. There was, for astonishing example, the linking of Justice Frankfurter's name with the proposed legislation in such a way as clearly to imply that he favored it. This was done on two occasions in the House debate by Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, one of the nominal authors of the bill. Justice Frankfurter was described "one of the distinguished gentlemen who contributed in the drafting of the original recommendation" of the American Bar Association respecting administrative law.

The facts are entirely different. Justice Frankfurter, then of the Harvard law faculty, was a member of the original committee named by the American Bar Association in May 1933 to report on the subject of administrative law, but owing to absence in Europe he took little part in the work of the committee, and did not examine or sign its report.

The fact is, moreover, that the Logan-Walter bill, in anything like its present form, did not see the light of day until 1937, though the statement was made in the House that "this bill was proposed in 1932, before there was anything known as the New Deal." No one who has read the opinions of Justice Frankfurter touching administrative law can imagine for a minute that he favors or ever did favor the Logan-Walter bill or anything comparable to it.

OPPOSED BY CALDWELL

Again the House was given to understand by Mr. WALTER, "whose irresponsibility of statement in this debate is almost beyond belief," that among those supporting the bill was Louis G. Caldwell, a practicing lawyer of Washington, D. C., and Chicago and the former chairman of the American Bar Association's special committee on administrative law.

Mr. Caldwell, in fact, is on record against the bill with a scathing memorandum pointing to its "obvious defects" and declaring that bar associations have endorsed it apparently on the basis of the "astounding claims" made for it, rather than its actual contents. "With minor exceptions," says Mr. Caldwell, "it is difficult to know just what agencies and what quasi-judicial functions are reached by the bill that are not already equipped with at least equal and usually superior machinery." Refuting the claim that the bill carries forward the early work of the American Bar Association on administrative law, he says that in fact it represents a reversal of the position taken by the association in 1934 and 1936.

Mr. Caldwell's analysis appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 18. It, too, should be required home work for all bar and other associations before they do any more resolving on the Logan-Walter bill.

[From the Washington Star of May 8, 1940]

THE REVERSE OF COURT "PACKING"—LOGAN-WALTER BILL SEEN AS APPLYING JUDICIAL CENSORSHIP

(By Charles G. Ross)

The Logan-Walter bill to heighten the control of the courts over the work of the administrative agencies of the Government—which is a very mild way of describing it—might be called a court-packing scheme in reverse.

The scheme advanced by the President in February 1937 would have tended to bring the courts under the thumb of the Executive. Wisely and patriotically, the Senate sent it to the scrap heap. Though within the letter of the Constitution, the President's proposal would have violated the fundamental constitutional principle of keeping in balance the three independent branches of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

The Logan-Walter bill, except in the case of those agencies which have been exempted, would subject the administrative branch to a court censorship as disruptive of the proper distribution of governmental powers as would have been the court-packing proposal.

DOUBLY HARMFUL

Where the court bill sought to aggrandize the executive arm at the expense of the courts, the Logan-Walter bill seeks to reverse the process and give the courts an unprecedented and wholly unwarranted power over the day-to-day functioning of the affected agencies. The result would harm not only the executive branch but the courts themselves.

Hear the independent testimony of the Brookings Institution:

"The ultimate consequence would be not only to swamp the (appellate) courts with a flood of minor administrative matters that have never been regarded as justifiable cases or controversies, but to retard and hamper the work of the executive branch of the Government to an intolerable degree. The control of the executive branch would be transferred to the courts, and the performance of all executive duties would be subjected to the supervision and control of the judiciary.

"Theoretically, this is contrary to the basic ideas of our form of government, which makes a clear demarcation between executive and judicial duties. Practically, it will destroy the efficient and expeditious operation of the executive departments and throw them into confusion. The cost of government would be multiplied tremendously.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE SENSED

"It is a significant fact that certain administrative agencies are expressly excepted from the operations of the law. While there is no objection to freeing any agency from the shackles of the proposed legislation, the very fact that some agencies (such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission) are to be exempted would seem to be an indication of a lack of confidence in the basic theories on which the legislation is predicated."

Properly jealous of its own place in the constitutional system, the Supreme Court has yet shown its full awareness of the rights of the administrative agencies. This from Mr. Justice Stone, in one of his opinions, is pertinent to the discussion of the Logan-Walter bill:

"When the courts are faced with interpretation of the particular, administration breaks down and the manifest purpose of the legislature is defeated unless it is recognized that, surrounding granted powers, there must be a penumbra which will give scope for practical operation. * * * In carrying such schemes (for regulation by administrative bodies) into operation, the function of courts is constructive, not destructive, to make them, wherever reasonably possible, effective agencies for law enforcement and not to destroy them."

A. A. A. DISSENT PERTINENT

And again Mr. Justice Stone said, in his famous dissent in the A. A. A. case: "Courts are not the only agency of government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern."

When the present Chief Justice, Mr. Hughes, was Governor of New York, he made a memorable speech at Elmira in 1907 in defense of pending State legislation for the regulation of public-service corporations. This was the speech in which he said: "We are under a constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is, and the judiciary is the safeguard of our liberty and of our property under the Constitution." But Mr. Hughes, pleading for the creation of a regulatory commission with broad powers, gave the other side of the picture as well. He might have been speaking against the hamstringing provisions of the Logan-Walter bill when he said:

"No more insidious assault could be made upon the independence and esteem of the judiciary than to burden it with these questions of administration. * * * Let us keep the courts for the questions they were intended to consider. * * * To say that all these matters of detail which will be brought before the commission * * * should, at the option of the corporations, be taken into court is to make a mockery of your regulation. * * * You must have administration, and you must have it by administrative officers. You cannot have it otherwise. Under the proper maintenance of your system of government, and in view of the wide extension of regulating schemes which the future is destined to see, you cannot afford to have that administration by your courts."

COX STATES ITS PURPOSES

In an illuminating colloquy in the House, Representative COX, of Georgia, a leading proponent of the Logan-Walter bill, said it was framed primarily to "get" the National Labor Relations Board and the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department.

The obvious answer is that if Congress wants to "get," or curb the powers of, any specific agency it ought to pass a law addressed to the specific requirements of the case, and not, in the language of Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School, apply the formula of the procrustean bed. The Logan-Walter bill would do precisely that.

Insurance and the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK GANNETT AT HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Frank Gannett at Hartford, Conn., on April 30 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What the new dealers in Washington have done to insurance, as well as what they plan to do, will affect every man, woman, and child in America.

Life insurance has built in the short span of one century the greatest social-security system that any people have ever known. Life insurance is the very embodiment of democratic ideals of individual responsibility. It flourishes in the democracies, not in the totalitarian countries. Ninety percent of life insurance is in force in 15 democracies, and 70 percent of it is in the United States, although we are only 7 percent of the world's population.

In 5 years of depression, life insurance has distributed to its American beneficiaries $3,000,000,000 more than the Federal Government has distributed for relief. Yet only 6 cents out of every dollar of the people's income as a whole goes into life insurance. That little rivulet of thrift has filled a giant reservoir of security. Life-insurance assets amount to $30,000,000,000. As you in the insurance world know, 100,000,000 policyholders and beneficiaries are affected by life insurance. The total amount now in force in the United States is approximately $114,000,000,000.

No wonder the Washington bureaucrats, having exhausted their genius for inventing new taxes, are itching to get their fingers on this $30,000,000,000 prize. They have taxed and taxed, spent and spent to their wits' end. Now necessity can easily account for their turning their sharpshooting to insurance. The sniping is in its second year, and the end isn't in sight. But the plain inference is that the new dealers, unless they are stopped, will take over and attempt to run this gigantic business.

The first question the New Deal inquisitors level at insurance is an old one. It has been answered many times. But it serves the purpose of raising a doubt in the minds of the uninformed. So the new dealers ask it again. It is directed against the vast army of men and women who, with missionary zeal, spread the gospel of thrift and individual responsibility—the life-insurance agents.

"Turn the job over to us," say the Washington bureaucrats, "and we'll make everybody buy life insurance; we'll force it down people's throats." The superb educational job that insurance men and women carry on, inspiring people to work and save and provide security for their dependents, is all waste effort, according to the bureaucrats. They would accomplish the result as Stalin and Hitler do, by compulsion, and do away with the insurance agencies.

Experience has answered the new dealers' question many times. Massachusetts provided a system of life insurance to be sold over the counter. In 31 years it did 3 percent of the insurance business in that State.

Wisconsin established State insurance 27 years ago. In that time it has sold, without agents, $1 of insurance for every $1,000 sold by the private companies in Wisconsin.

Another point of attack by the new dealers is on the bigness of insurance companies. Of course, insurance is big. A few individuals in Boston, attempting to help one another, launched the idea, and public support has made it big—not by monopoly but by legitimate growth.

On the other hand, the new dealers say that big government is all right—the bigger the better, so long as they are the government. Concentration of political and economic power in their own hands is desirable. In other people's hands, the President blandly told Congress, "instruments of public power" forged by the new dealers would provide "shackles for the liberties of the people." So they start their insidious, underhanded attack on private enterprise by pointing their suspicious finger at the size of all business.

Can anyone believe that the purpose is not to take over the insurance industry and operate it as a Government monopoly? If that is not the purpose of the New Deal, why Senator WAGNER's proposal to put the Government into competition with the insurance companies in the sale of annuities at less than cost?

In support of his proposed bill, Senator WAGNER stated that the Government could sell annuities 30 percent lower than the insurance companies.

This is just plain bunk. The Government cannot sell annuities 30 percent cheaper without soaking the taxpayers for its loss. The actual cost of getting annuity business is between 7 and 10 percent. If Government could administer insurance as efficiently as private enterprise and save all the cost of the new business, it could not save the purchaser of annuities more than 10, instead of 30 percent.

A further fact should be considered: If the Government sold annuities and was required to invest the proceeds in its own bonds, which always yield 20 to 30 percent less than private investments, the annuity would cost more than an insurance company's annuity. Of course, the New Deal way would be to take the difference out of the Treasury and sell the annuities below cost.

Senator WAGNER has a radical "brain trust" that prepares Constitution-breaching bills. His National Labor Relations Board strips Congress of power by the identical provisions used in the bill that the advisers of Secretary Ickes prepared to place Government in control of the petroleum industry.

When the history of this period is written, Senator WAGNER will stand out as one of the men who most persistently worked with legislation he proposed to break down our Government. He is an expert at camouflage. He professes one objective and accomplishes another. His so-called Wagner national health bill was in reality an attempt to put politicians in control of the medical profession and make the State the dispenser of medical service.

The new dealers have designs on the institution of insurance. They start with a proposal for destructive competition by government. The next step openly discussed is Federal supervision. The ultimate end is the taking over of insurance assets. Every one of the hundred million holders and beneficiaries of life-insurance policies has reason to be concerned. Look squarely in the face what the New Deal has already done to insurance.

The earnings of all insurance companies and savings banks have been pulled down by the New Deal policy to starve capital. Idle money makes idle men. Therefore the deliberate intent of the New Deal to reduce interest rates to the vanishing point is a crime against all thrifty people. Insurance companies, earning less, must charge more for insurance.

Take, for example, a woman who recently called on her lawyer. She and her husband, through a lifetime of thrift, had paid for a $5,000 home and had saved $12,000 before his death. Through 20 years, as they accumulated, they had received 4-percent interest. The widow received $480 a year interest, or $40 a month, until the New Deal. Meanwhile, taxes on the home have risen from $80 to $200. Insurance costs more.

This widow said to her lawyer: "What am I to do? Last year the bank gave me 1½ percent, which is $15 a month, and now they are going to give me 1 percent, which is $10. I can't live on that.

Her lawyer couldn't help her, because the policy of driving down interest rates to the vanishing point is made by the President and the Treasury in Washington. Every college and university, every trust fund, every hospital or endowed private charity is suffering from this same cause.

The thrifty self-reliant people who pay their own way, who have saved for their own future and for their children, and who are being taxed by government to pay all that government spends for necessary services and for political purposes to buy votes, are now being liquidated and their possessions destroyed.

All this to the end that a profligate Government may continue to borrow at low interest three to four billion dollars a year more than it can collect in taxes.

The great promiser of the White House, in a speech in Pittsburgh on October 1, 1936, said: "This (public) debt is not going to be paid by taking away the hard-won savings of the present generation."

Why, two-thirds to three-quarters of the interest earned by their "hard-won" savings has already been taken away from them. And the New Deal's liquidation of thrift goes on relentlessly.

It should be plain to the most trusting citizen that the New Deal must find some new sources of revenue. It has raised taxes to the height of diminishing returns. It can't squeeze out any more golden eggs nor pluck any more feathers to line its bureaucratic nest.

New Deal taxing and taxing, spending and spending, have strangled new enterprise. Venture capital, which would create new enterprise and new jobs, is afraid to venture. Why should it rush in where its only reward is a death sentence?

Social-security taxation was so devised as to permit the money collected now to be spent for other Government purposes. The wage earner is given a promise that he, in his old age, or his beneficiaries, will be paid. But what is back of the promise to pay? Nothing but the good faith of some future politicians, who must levy and collect new taxes from another generation of taxpayers. What will happen to your social security if the next generation of politicians are some members of the present Communist-dominated Youth Congresses who boast that they will repudiate the debt?

How different from this social security is the guaranteed security which life insurance has built through private enterprise. The insurance companies have first of all educated people in ways of thrift. Then they have collected premiums, year by year, and invested mainly in wealth already created—not in promises of Government to collect from wealth to be created and taxed in the future. Thirty billion dollars of life-insurance assets, which really comprise already-created wealth, have been accumulated.

What ten-strike for the new dealers, with their backs to the wall, if they could only bring life insurance under Federal supervision, then weaken it by Government competition, and finally take over its assets. What a step toward national socialism.

Why have we got into such a mess? Why are the people of the greatest, richest country on earth being swept down the mad stream of reaction, back toward the discarded system of one-man government? In order to understand the origin of these reactionary New Deal policies it is necessary to go back to the origin of the great depression.

During the first hundred days of the New Deal we had recovery. Confidence and courage were at work. The normal processes of private enterprise were functioning.

Then the President shifted his program. It is now known that he was all the time shuffling the deck of New Deal cards. He was allowing industry and agriculture to recover and at the same time was preparing hobbles and halters and strait jackets.

During those first hundred days Mr. Roosevelt was following the policies which had brought substantial recovery to Great Britain and the sterling group of nations. They had diagnosed the depression as a price disease affecting all the producers of primary commodities. Three-fourths of mankind are engaged in producing primary commodities. Only a minority of the world's population is engaged in the industrial processes. In the United States we are about evenly divided—half of us living on farms and in rural communities directly dependent on production of food, fibers, and minerals which the other half transport, convert into finished products, and distribute. When the prices for primary products collapsed all over the world, buying power of farmers, miners, and all people in rural communities disappeared.

Economic statesmanship of the British Empire was directed toward remedying this condition. The New Deal started to follow on that road. President Roosevelt at the very same time was listening to the planned-economy boys—the Tugwells, the Hendersons,

the Corcorans, and Cohens, and the other little "fix-its" who planned the Triple A and the N. R. A. to regiment agriculture and industry. An architect working at the same time on two sets of blueprints—one, a plan to liberate private enterprise and build a house where freedom could live; the other, a plan to restrict and regiment private enterprise—a blueprint for a house of bondage. In that house, don't forget, the execution chamber, for the "death sentences," was the most important room.

Meanwhile, what was the rest of the world doing? The British were rejecting the very philosophy and the very same philosopher whose plan Mr. Roosevelt adopted. That philosopher and theorist is John Maynard Keynes, English economist, father of the borrow-and-spend idiocy. After Keynes' failure to convince his own Government that it should spend itself into bankruptcy, he came to the United States. He was invited to the White House, where he recommended an annual deficit of $4,800,000,000 as the "cure" for Uncle Sam's ills.

Keynes said the United States had become the outstanding economic laboratory of the world and that he envied the young administrators for their opportunity to experiment. Apparently a half million Americans either envied him or did they need to get on a pay roll? At any rate, the New Deal has added half a million of them to the number of jobholders directly in the Federal Government's service. How many of them are there to experiment on the rest of us—on you and me?

I don't envy any of them—whether their purpose was to experiment or to get a job. I believe the public service should attract men and women who don't need the jobs; for whom office holding will be a sacrifice. I want to see that kind of ability brought into elective offices—the ability which private enterprise develops and rewards; ability which also knows the highest obligations of citizenship.

Until we throw the pink and red economic planners out of Washington and substitute business sense and experience, our country will go from bad to worse. Four or five more years of New Deal borrowing and spending would pile up a debt which could not be paid. Repudiation or printing-press inflation would be the way out.

The road to revolution everywhere has been paved that way. Underneath is a layer of the rough stones of economic distress. Bitter deflation, the destruction of values, the wiping out of life's savings—that is the next layer.

Rising taxes for public relief comes next, with mounting public debt. The crushed stone in this layer of the pavement seems less cruel. More people have to tread on it, for the thrifty middle class is being liquidated and shoved onto relief. But the transition is gradual. The sufferers are doped with hand-outs while the insidious germs of inflation are taking effect.

The pavement is now ready for the top dressing—the poured-on promises of the demagogues who tell us that this slick, slippery highway to national socialism leads straight to Utopia and the abundant life.

Then what happens? Just what has happened everywhere, time and again in history. An inefficient, time-serving bureaucracy, goose-stepping at the command of some ruthless man who is drunk with power, puts an end to liberty.

Neither labor nor capital any longer has a voice. The private enterpriser has no voice, because private enterprise has been liquidated. The self-reliant, thrifty middle class is liquidated. Instead of depending on his own initiative and providing his own social security through voluntary insurance, the citizen looks to the state and serves only the state. That is the ultimate and inevitable end of the road of New Dealism—it ends in national socialism, which the Germans call nazi-ism and the Russians call communism and the Italians call fascism.

The New England spirit rebels against all this backward marching under the New Deal. For New England is the home of the virtue of thrift. It knows what thrift and self-reliance mean. It knows how to live within one's income and what it means for an individual or a government to go headlong into debt. We can no more spend ourselves into prosperity than a fat man can grow thin by eating more fattening food.

New England knows why dollars go into hiding and what it will take to coax them back to work. Dollars, like men, want security and reward.

New England would enjoy a fireside chat about the men and women forgotten by the New Deal—the thrifty people who can no longer eke out a living from their work and the reduced income from their savings. These are among the really forgotten men and women, the 42,000,000 with savings-bank accounts which now can pay them only a fraction of the interest they earned before the New Deal. Mr. Roosevelt doesn't make speeches about them, unless he includes them among the economic royalists.

After all, he may have planned it that way, for he has been as ruthless in liquidating thrift as in persecuting business.

Now, he talks about Europe, about the Far East, and about our obligation to save the world for democracy. I say, and shall keep on saying, that we can do most to save democracy for the world by saving it for ourselves. We can do more by practicing representative self-government than we can by preaching it to the world.

And we can accomplish most by putting business experience and common sense back into government.

Here, in the insurance capital, the trustees of the people's thrift can wield tremendous influence. The army of insurance men and women, all over our country, are a vital factor in the processes of economic education. They are in contact with everyone of the hundred million life-insurance policyholders and beneficiaries. They can carry the truth into every home. If they rise to their responsibility, the New Deal threat to thrift can be ended.

Every life-insurance agent, every employee of an insurance company, every officer and employee of a savings bank, everyone who draws his or her living from an endowed institution, has a personal stake in saving private enterprise in America.

I charge that the underlying intent of the New Deal is to destroy private enterprise, little by little; to reform it not for the good purpose of eliminating its abuses and correcting its errors, but for the ultimate purpose of bringing about national socialism.

We Republicans must make this clear. If these facts were generally understood by lawyers, doctors, clergymen, the leaders of labor, agricultural and women's organizations, by the great middle class of the country, we should have an overwhelming majority against the New Deal's national socialism in the fall election. Once the state is supreme, labor unions go, and the skilled worker who has an investment in his skill, who has insurance funds in his union, will stand with us in that fight.

The great, thrifty middle class, the honest, hard-working, self-reliant Americans, aroused, mobilized, and united in a common purpose, can and will end the chaos that is the New Deal. They will save the Nation which they have built.

I have enlisted in their fight. I am in it, for whatever I may have to give, and so long as I have strength to carry on.

If you are one of the more than 64,000,000 policyholders, the value of whose insurance is being imperiled, or if you are a savings-bank depositor whose interest has been cut down by these destructive New Deal policies; if you are a shareholder in a company that has working money in the bank that will be endangered by paper money inflation that will result from the spending-lending program, now is the time to act.

Discuss these dangers with your friends. Go to the chairman of your party. Write to the delegate who will represent you in convention and tell him that this year you will work and vote only for a platform and a candidate who will abolish these policies, who will pledge himself to restore free enterprise and protect constitutional government. Now is the time to make your vote count.

American Forum Poll on a Big Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY UNITED FEATURES SYNDICATE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a press dispatch which appeared this week in a number of newspapers. This dispatch, from the United Features Syndicate, furnishes the results of a poll conducted following a newspaper presentation by the American Forum on the question of a big Navy. Mr. Theodore Granik directs the American Forum and the results of his question on whether the United States should maintain a large navy are most interesting. The tabulation of reader response throughout the country shows sentiment 2-to-1 in favor of Secretary Edison's position.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FORUM READERS 2 TO 1 FOR BIG NAVY

Readers of the American Forum's debate between Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison and Senator GERALD P. NYE are overwhelmingly in favor of the United States building the world's biggest navy.

Debating the question, Shall we build a navy second to none? Secretary Edison, who answered "Yes," received 68.9 percent of the votes received, while Senator NYE, who said "No," received 31.6 percent.

This sentiment was found in all the regions polled, with the exception of Ohio, which voted for Secretary Edison by the much narrower margin of 56.5 percent against 43.5 percent. Heaviest big Navy sentiment was found in Texas, where Edison received 86.8 percent.

Additional returns from the Farley-Hamilton debate on the benefits of the New Deal have reduced Mr. Hamilton's slight lead. Final tabulation gives Mr. Farley, arguing in favor of the New

Deal, 49.6 percent of the vote, and Mr. Hamilton, arguing against it, 50.4 percent.

Following is the vote by States on the Edison-Nye debate:

SHALL WE BUILD A NAVY SECOND TO NONE?

	Edison ("Yes") (Percent)	Nye ("No") (Percent)
Texas	86.8	13.2
Kentucky	73.7	26.3
Washington, D. C	67.3	32.7
Rhode Island	67.1	32.9
Pennsylvania	64.9	35.1
Ohio	56.5	43.5
Scattered	77.4	22.6
Total	68.9	31.6

The Territory South of the River Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. PRENTICE COOPER, OF TENNESSEE; HISTORICAL SKETCH BY ROBERT H. WHITE; AND STATEMENTS BY B. O. DUGGAN AND HARRY LEE UPPERMAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a proclamation by Gov. Prentice Cooper, of my State, concerning the establishment of the Territory South of the River Ohio; also a historical sketch of the establishment of said territory, written by Mr. Robert H. White, a distinguished historian of my State; also, a statement by Messrs. B. O. Duggan and Harry Lee Upperman, members of the Southwest Territory Commission. The article is most interesting and instructive.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas by the act of Congress approved May 26, 1790, there was established the Territory South of the River Ohio, marking the beginning of the Territorial government which, within 6 years, developed into the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas this act of Congress brought vast new pioneering areas into the United States of America, settled and developed by a hardy, resourceful citizenship; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee in joint resolution approved February 27, 1939, provided for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Territory South of the River Ohio, and for this purpose established the Southwest Territory Commission, with the duty of preparing a program for the sesquicentennial:

Now, therefore, I, Prentice Cooper, Governor of Tennessee, having appointed said commission, do hereby call upon all citizens of the State to cooperate in the proper observance and celebration of the founding of the Southwest Territory, and do especially request schools, colleges, civic and patriotic societies to join with the Southwest Territory Commission in the general program culminating May 26, 1940.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed this the 23d day of April 1940.

PRENTICE COOPER, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

A. B. BROADBENT,
Secretary of State.

TENNESSEE'S AGED ANCESTOR TO BE HONORED BY TENNESSEANS

At the last session of the Tennessee Legislature a resolution was adopted to provide for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Southwest Territory, out of which the State of Tennessee was created. The First Congress of the United States accepted as a gift from North Carolina what is today Tennessee, and on May 26, 1790, George Washington, as President of the United States, approved the action of Congress. For about 6 years, 1790–96, this territory belonged to the Federal Government, which set up rules and regulations for its government.

In order that the present generation of Tennesseans may know something as to how their ancestors were governed during the 6-year period, Gov. Prentice Cooper has requested State Commissioner of Education B. O. Duggan to urge the schools and the general citizenry as well to study and discuss a brief outline of the territorial times of our forefathers.

For more than 4 years, June 6, 1790, to August 25, 1794, the inhabitants of the "Territory of the United States of America South of the River Ohio" had no voice whatsoever in their own government. All powers of government were lodged in a governor, a secretary, and three judges, all of whom were appointed by the President of the United States. President Washington named William Blount as governor; Daniel Smith as Territorial secretary; and Joseph Anderson, David Campbell, and John McNairy as judges. Governor Blount was the Territory's military and civil executive officer. He was given the power to appoint county officers. He even could carve up old counties and from the fragments create new counties. If Congress did not forbid, the Governor and the judges could adopt for the Territory any of the laws in effect in any of the Original States. The territorial secretary was required to keep a proper record of the transactions of the Territorial government and was eligible to serve as governor in case of the latter's death, removal from office, or temporary absence from the territory. The judges acted as a court with common-law jurisdiction.

What might properly be termed the second stage of the Territorial government was reached when there were as many as 5,000 free male inhabitants of legal age in the territory. Such of these inhabitants as owned as much as 50 acres of land in the Territory were allowed to elect their representatives to a territorial house of representatives, in the proportion of one representative for every 500 free male inhabitants. Incidentally it was a requirement that the representative must own not less than 200 acres of land in the Territory.

The Federal regulations further provided that when these representatives met they were to nominate 10 men, each the owner of 500 acres of land, from whom the President of the United States was to select 5 to compose the territorial council. The general assembly, then, consisted of the governor, the council, and the house. No law could be enacted without the approval of the governor and a majority of both the council and the house. At this point it might be interesting to note that the Territorial Governor had the power of the veto, a privilege denied to the Governor of Tennessee until the adoption of the third constitution in 1870. The council and the house were empowered to elect a delegate to Congress who was allowed to discuss questions in that body but who was denied the privilege of voting on any measure before Congress. The first delegate was Dr. James White, of Davidson County (not Gen. James White, of Knox County, with whom he is often confused), who was elected over William Cocke by a vote of 11 to 7. This type of government in the Territory held forth from August 1794 to March 28, 1796, when the temporary government ceased to exist.

William Blount, Tennessee's only Territorial Governor, was only 41 years of age when he received the appointment from President Washington. Although he received his commission on July 6, 1790, Blount did not arrive in the Southwest Territory, as it became known, until October. In the following July Blount decided to locate where the present city of Knoxville is located. Town lots were sold to interested purchasers, but each lot was awarded by a lottery scheme perfectly legal at that time. Buildings were started and by the spring of 1792 Governor Blount moved his family into the territorial capital, where he was kept more than busy trying to quiet the disquieted Indians. In the summer of the same year (1792) Governor Blount, by an ordinance, created two new counties—Jefferson and Knox. Emigrants continued to pour into the new country, and by the latter part of 1793 it was evident that enough free males of full age were there to justify the setting up of a territorial government.

On February 24, 1794, the first Territorial legislature assembled in Knoxville, among whose membership were such men as Dr. James White, of Davidson County; John Tipton, who had been a thorn in Sevier's side during the days of the State of Franklin; William Cocke, who later was to be one of the State's first United States Senators; and Joseph McMinn, who later served the State as Governor. The principal work done during the 6-day session was the nomination of 10 men from whom President Washington selected the following 5 as the Territorial council: Griffith Rutherford, John Sevier, James Winchester, Stockley Donelson, and Parmonas Taylor.

It was not, however, until August 25, 1794, that the first Territorial general assembly, made up of both house and council, met in Knoxville. Without the council, no Territorial laws could be passed. For 36 days the law-making body worked industriously at passing laws for the benefit of the pioneers who had pushed their way into the western country. Colleges were chartered, counties created, and a tax law was enacted that levied 25 cents on each 100 acres of land.

In June 1795, the Territorial legislature met for a second and last time. The chief object of the meeting, so Governor Blount stated, was to find out whether a majority of the people wanted "The Territory to become a State," provided a proposed census showed a population of 60,000 free inhabitants in the Territory. The Federal act under which the Territory was organized stated that when the population reached the above number steps were in order to apply for admission into the Union.

Governor Blount had reached the conclusion that the Territory should take steps toward meeting the requirements for statehood.

Upon his recommendation an act was passed in July 1795 for taking a census of the inhabitants and for finding out whether it was the will of a majority of the voters that a State should be established or not. The census was to be taken within the period from the middle of September to the middle of November of that year under the direction of the sheriff and his deputies in each county. The census revealed that there were 77,262 people in the Territory, of whom 10,613 were slaves and 973 were free Negroes. The distribution of the population showed that 65,338 lived in the eight eastern counties, Jefferson, Hawkins, Greene, Knox, Washington, Sullivan, Sevier, and Blount. The three western counties, Davidson, Sumner, and Tennessee contained 11,924 people. Every eastern county voted for statehood. Davidson and Tennessee counties opposed statehood, while Sumner County was not enough interested to vote on the question at all. On the whole, 6,504 votes were for statehood and 2,562 were opposed.

Since there were more than 60,000 free inhabitants in the Territory, and since a large majority favored statehood, Governor Blount called an election in December for electing 5 delegates from each of the 11 counties for holding a constitutional convention.

On January 11, 1796, the Constitutional Convention met in Knoxville. On the following day, the convention appointed two members from each county as a committee to draft a constitution. Within less than 4 weeks, the constitution had been drafted and approved. The pay was voluntarily reduced by the members from two and one-half dollars per day to one and one-half dollars for the session of the convention.

Without waiting for the approval of Congress, steps were taken to put the State government into effect. John Sevier was elected Governor; members of the legislature were selected. On March 28, 1796, the legislature convened in Knoxville, and 2 days later Sevier was inaugurated as Governor. His inaugural address consisted of two brief paragraphs containing a total of 130 words. William Blount and William Cocke were elected as United States Senators.

In the preceding month (February) Joseph McMinn had been sent to Philadelphia to carry a copy of the State constitution to President George Washington.

On April 8, Washington submitted to Congress the constitution of the new State, calling attention to the fact that the law establishing the Southwest Territory conferred upon its inhabitants "the right of forming a permanent constitution and State government, and of admission, as a State, by its delegates, in the Congress of the United States * * * when it should have therein 60,000 free inhabitants; provided the constitution and government so to be formed should be republican * * *." Washington made no recommendations as to what action Congress should take.

The question of the admission of Tennessee into the Union came at a bad time. A Presidential election was "just around the corner." The Federalists and Republicans were in a hot contest. It was expected that Tennessee would cast her votes for the Republican candidates. The Federalists sought to delay her admission into the Union, thereby eliminating her electoral votes for the political opponents.

In the House of Representatives Washington's message was referred to a committee that reported favorably upon the matter; this committee recommended that the new State be admitted. Opposition to this report developed at once, being based upon these grounds in general:

1. Congress, not the people of a Territory, should first authorize the formation of a new State.
2. The census should be taken under the direction and authority of Congress.
3. The census had not been "fairly" taken.
4. The constitution was hastily and poorly drafted.
5. To admit Tennessee under the circumstances would be a bad precedent.

COMMENTS UPON SPEECHES CONCERNING ADMISSION OF TENNESSEE TO THE UNION

William Smith, Congressman from South Carolina.

Smith was elected four times to Congress as a Federalist. This fact largely explains his opposition to the admission of Tennessee to the Union. In the main, his arguments fell along the following lines:

1. The inhabitants could not claim the right of admission as a State until the Territory was formed into one or more States. Congress alone was competent to form the Territory into one or more States.

2. Under whose authority was a census to be taken? The taking of a census was an act that fell wholly under the jurisdiction of Congress. Since the inhabitants of the Territory had been enumerated under an act passed by the Territorial Legislature, such an enumeration was not valid, and should, therefore, be discarded.

3. Had the census been fairly taken? Mr. Smith asserted that it had not been fairly taken. Smith said the Federal act governing the Territory "spoke of the inhabitants within" the Territorial region, whereas the Territorial law "spoke of the people within the respective counties." Smith then argued at some length as to the differences between "inhabitants" and "people."

4. Smith objected to the duration of the time in which the census was taken, September 15 to November 15, 2 months. Since the sheriff of each county was allowed $2 for each 200 names enrolled, Mr. Smith thought that the census rolls may have, in effect, been "padded." He further alleged that "the law being so framed as to authorize the enumeration not only of all transient persons and strangers but also of the inhabitants and travelers, several times over; it was not an uncharitable conclusion that the enumeration was not so correct as to be admitted by Congress on so solemn an occasion."

5. Mr. Smith did not like the proposed Constitution of Tennessee. He said: "It carried with it the same marks of haste and inaccuracy as the rest of the proceedings. In several parts it was repugnant to the Constitution of the United States." This statement of Smith's is in striking contrast to that of Thomas Jefferson, who pronounced the Tennessee Constitution "as the least imperfect and the most republican in form." Smith concluded his harangue by saying that "the whole business was premature, and that the United States had not been on this occasion treated with that consideration and respect to which they were entitled."

JAMES MADISON ANSWERS SMITH

Mr. Madison, a strong advocate for the admission of Tennessee, replied in a direct manner to Mr. Smith's objections. If the Territory must first be acknowledged as a State by Congress and then have its inhabitants numbered under the authority of Congress, such a method "would be spinning a finer thread than was necessary and would give the people reason to suppose that the General Government was disposed to keep them in their present condition as long as possible." In referring to the census, Mr. Madison said that "the fact of population was the only necessary one, and would no evidence satisfy gentlemen but such as they themselves shall direct?" The Territorial Governor, who had directed the taking of the census, was a direct official of the Federal Government and that fact "gave the measure the authority of the United States." To Madison, "There appeared no just ground for supposing the census had not been fairly taken."

But Madison saw a great principle of government at stake. On this point he made the following observation: "The inhabitants of that district of the country were at present in a degraded situation; they were deprived of a right essential to free men—the right of being represented in Congress. Laws were made without their consent. An exterior authority appointed their Executive, which was not analogous to the other parts of the United States, and not justified by anything but an obvious and imperious necessity. Congress ought to lean to a decision which would give equal rights to every part of the American people. If there should be any inaccuracy in admitting them into the Union before they possessed the full number of inhabitants, it was only a fugitive consideration; the great emigrations which take place to that country will soon correct the error. I do not believe there is any doubt on that subject; the evidence is sufficient and satisfactory."

John Nicholas, Congressman from Virginia, supported the views of his fellow Congressman, James Madison. Nicholas said in part: "If, for instance, the determination as to there being one or more States might be at any time made, it is competent for Congress to postpone such determination, and when they do determine, they may divide the country in such a manner as to preclude their inhabitants forever from self-government or representation in Congress. If it depends alone on Congress to make the enumeration, they may delay this also at their own will, and defeat the rights of the other party."

Thomas Blount, a brother of William Blount, and a Congressman from North Carolina, rallied to the cause of Tennessee. He jumped on Congressman Smith, of South Carolina. He called attention to the fact that the Territorial Governor, William Blount, had all along kept the President of the United States informed as to the state of affairs in the Southwest Territory. In July 1795 a copy of the law governing the taking of the census had been sent to President Washington. When the census had been taken in November a copy of the returns had been sent to Washington. He had also sent the President a copy of the proclamation requiring the people to elect members of a constitutional convention, and on February 19, 1796, a copy of the constitution had been sent also. Governor Blount had also informed President Washington that the General Assembly of Tennessee would meet on February 28, at which time the temporary government would cease. This last information, Congressman Blount declared, "was to my own knowledge received by the President on February 28, 40 days before it was communicated by the President to Congress, and 11 days after it must have been known to the Secretary of State, if not to the President, that the State government had gone into operation."

Congressman Blount said that if the census was not a just one, or if there had been any fraud used in taking it, "an impeachment would lie against the Territorial Governor, who, upon his responsibility as an officer of the United States, sanctioned the law for taking it and acted under it after it was taken." The census could not have been taken in 1 day, Congressman Blount asserted. "People daily come to the Territory in great numbers; if the census had been required to be taken in 1 day, they could by no means have been numbered." He concluded his remarks by referring to Congressman Smith, of South Carolina, in the following words: "The gentleman from South Carolina had said that his arguments of yesterday had been today admitted. If the gentleman had supposed that he (Blount) had admitted them, he was mistaken. That he might not continue under the mistake, he would inform him that what he had called arguments were mere quibbles, such as could have only been expected from a county-court lawyer at the bar of a county court."

Another strong Tennessee supporter was Congressman Rutherford, of Virginia. "I do not wish to cavil with this brave and generous people. I would take them out of leading strings, as they are now able to stand alone. I would take them by the hand and

say that we are glad to see you stand on your own feet." Rutherford concluded his speech by saying, "We should not be too nice about their turning out their toes, or other trifles; they will soon march lustily along."

Congressman Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, hit the nail on the head when he said that most of the arguments had revolved about a topic that was not really before the Congress, namely, the number of Representatives to which the new State would be entitled. The question before Congress was on admitting the Territory to the Union as a State. To Macon, it appeared that the admission of the Territory as a State of the Union "was a matter of course, and that it seemed that the Executive, President Washington, was of that opinion." "President Washington," Macon pointed out, "has been duly informed with the proceedings of the Territory toward being admitted into the Union, and if he had thought they had been doing wrong he would have set them right." To Congressman Macon, "everything has been done fairly, and they have a right to claim admission as a member of the Union."

Albert Gallatin, Congressman from Pennsylvania, was of the opinion that the people of the Southwest Territory became ipso facto a State the moment they amounted to 60,000 free inhabitants. It was the duty of Congress, as a part of the compact, "to recognize them as such and to admit them into the Union whenever they had satisfactory proof of the fact." As to the census, Gallatin maintained that "the census bears on its face every appearance of fairness, and the number of inhabitants therein so far exceeded 60,000 as fully to compensate for any possible error or abuse."

Congressman William B. Giles, of Virginia, presented the report of the committee on May 28 as to the admission of Tennessee into the Union. Mr. Giles contended that the "proceedings of these people has been regular and authorizes the admission of them as a State into the Union." He called attention to the fact that the Senate bill "proposed to lay out the Territory into a State and order a census to be taken before they could be admitted." This committee report of the House was supported by Congressmen Giles, Nicholas, Madison, Gallatin, Venable, Lyman, and Holland. It was opposed by Smith, of South Carolina; Sitgreaves, of Pennsylvania; Thatcher, of Massachusetts; Coit, of Connecticut; and Harper, of South Carolina. The lower House of Congress passed the bill admitting Tennessee without delaying for another census to be taken. As may be seen, the Senate bill called for a census before admitting Tennessee to the Union.

All along the lower House of Congress was favorable to the admission of Tennessee. The spearhead of the opposition in the House was William Smith, the South Carolina Federalist. Smith was unable, however, to get a majority to support his views. While the lower House was the scene of the oratorical fireworks, it was in the Senate that the legislative "hand of Esau" was at work. Rufus King, of New York, an ardent Federalist, was able to obtain a postponement of Tennessee's admission from time to time. Undoubtedly Senator King was merely playing for time. If Tennessee's admission could be delayed until the adjournment of Congress, then the Federalists would have that much less opposition to overcome in the next Presidential race. The Senate never acted favorably upon the admission of Tennessee until May 31, at which time it voted to recede from its disagreement with the House bill admitting Tennessee. This action permitted the House bill to become a law, thereby admitting the Territory into the Union upon the status of a State.

A reading of the Annals of Congress for the year 1796 shows that the Senate throttled every effort favorable to the admission of Tennessee except that of May 31. There is a strong probability that Tennessee would not have been admitted to statehood at that session of Congress had not Rufus King resigned his seat in the Senate 8 days before adjournment of Congress. William Blount and William Cocke, Senators-elect from the new State of Tennessee, were never able to get their credentials approved whereby they would have been seated as Senators from Tennessee. On May 23 the Senate, by a vote of 12 to 11, permitted Messrs. Blount and Cocke to "be received as spectators and chairs provided for that purpose." At the 5 o'clock session on June 1 (the last day of Congress) Senator Martin, of North Carolina, moved that "the Honorable William Blount and William Cocke, Esqs., who have produced credentials of being duly elected Senators for the State of Tennessee, be admitted to take the oath necessary for their qualification, and their seats accordingly." The following action was then taken by the Senate:

"*Ordered*, That a paper purporting to be the credentials of Mr. Blount and Mr. Cocke be read.

"And, on the question to agree to the resolution, it passed in the negative—yeas 10, nays 11, as follows:

"Yeas: Bloodworth, Brown, Burr, Butler, Gunn, Langdon, Martin, Robinson, Tattnall, and Tazewell.

"Nays: Bingham, Bradford, Foster, Latimer, Livermore, Marshall, Potts, Read, Ross, Rutherford, and Trumbull."

The above action was the last taken by the Senate except attending to a few routine duties concerned with confirmation of Executive appointments. But Tennessee had barely been able to get its application for admission into the Union acted upon before the adjournment of Congress. If any doubt existed as to the part partisan politics played in the matter, that doubt would be dispelled by reading the jointly signed letter of William Blount and William Cocke to John Sevier, Governor of Tennessee. The letter was written on June 2, 1796, the day after Tennessee's admission into the Union. One statement in the letter hits the "bull's-eye":

"It is generally believed that the State of Tennessee would have experienced no difficulty in the admission of her Senators if it had not been understood that George Washington would not again accept the Presidency and that that State would throw its weight into the southern scale against Mr. Adams, whom it seems the northern people mean to run at the approaching election."

Tennessee was the first State to be created out of a Federal Territory. The population was at the time small and isolated but determined. Pioneer conditions prevailed, and her voice was unheard. In the two succeeding generations her position in commerce, military operations, and politics was of extremely high rank. Within this period she ranked at one time as the greatest corn-producing State in the Union. For more than a quarter of a century Tennessee was a leader in national political life, three of her citizens becoming Presidents of the United States.

The citizens of such a commonwealth, with such a glorious history and heritage, should be proud of their State's notable achievements. That pride will be highly justifiable when others view the long and difficult trek made by our forefathers. We of the present generation will love our State all the more when we come to know the story of her struggles, her hardships, and her success nevertheless. From that story of achievement must not be blotted that day on which her first definite step to honors and awards was taken. On May 26, 1790, President George Washington signed the document that subsequently paved the way for the sixteenth star to be added to our National Emblem. We honor ourselves by honoring this day.

Selected references: Annals of Congress, Fourth Congress, session I, 1796; Philip M. Hamer, Tennessee, A History; White, Robert H., Tennessee: Its Growth and Progress.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Nashville, Tenn., April 25, 1940.

To Civic, Historical, and Educational Organizations:

Governor Prentice Cooper recently announced the appointment of a State committee to be known as the Southwest Territory Commission to make plans for celebrating on May 26 the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the territory southwest of the Ohio River. Appointment of this commission is authorized in a joint resolution passed at the last session of the State legislature.

The commission met in the Governor's office on April 18 to make plans for the observance of this one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. In order to obtain as nearly as possible State-wide participation in this celebration, it was decided to request all civic, historical, and educational organizations in the State to observe this anniversary in their scheduled meetings.

On May 26, 1940, at 3 p. m., the main celebration will be held in Nashville, Tenn. For this particular occasion the commission is inviting a prominent Tennesseean to deliver an address. A suitable musical program will also be a feature of the program. Arrangements are being made for this program to be broadcast for the benefit of those who cannot attend.

The members of the commission feel that your organization will be interested in cooperating in the proper observance of the founding of the southwest territory. The commission is leaving the type observance entirely in the hands of local groups. Whether it be study of this period or appropriate addresses does not matter, but we do feel it important that all citizens join in this observance.

Material prepared by Dr. Robert H. White, member of the commission, dealing with the period in which the territory southwest of the Ohio River was formed is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

B. O. DUGGAN,
Chairman, Southwest Territory Commission.
HARRY LEE UPPERMAN,
Secretary, Southwest Territory Commission.

Life Insurance and the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on May 4, 1940, on the subject of Life Insurance and the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, tonight I wish to talk to you as a life-insurance policyholder as well as a United States Senator. For it so happens that aside from my home and a small New England farm, my insurance represents all of my life's savings. It has been my belief that this insurance of mine will bring my three boys to manhood in the event that I should die or become disabled. It is my way of assuring them an education, clothes, a home, and the other necessities of life regardless of what happens to me. This protection which I have afforded them gives me comfort day by day as I go through the hazards of life. I am fortified by the realization that regardless of what tomorrow may bring, I have done the best I could to safeguard the future of my three children. I dare say this is the story of the overwhelming majority of those who are listening in tonight. You know there are 64,000,000 other Americans today who have taken this same course to protect their loved ones.

The appreciation of the meaning of life insurance came to me at an early age. My father died when I was 9 years old without making any adequate provision for my mother or the three children. Realizing the struggle which my mother made to provide for herself and her children, I determined to acquire insurance just as fast as I could. It so happened that I got my first policy at the age of 16. It was a small one, of course. I have constantly sought to add to my insurance ever since.

Life insurance concerns everyone in the United States. It affects the life, the home, and the pocketbook of all of us. The 64,000,000 foresighted Americans I have referred to own 125,000,000 policies. If we include the beneficiaries of these policies it can truthfully be said that life insurance directly affects the economic lives of approximately 100,000,000 of us, or nearly all the adult part of our population. The laborer and the banker, the city dweller and the farmer, men and women in every station in life are building security for themselves and their loved ones through life insurance. It has been estimated that the estates of 8 out of every 10 persons who die in this country today are in the form of life insurance policies.

These 64,000,000 policyholders are planning for the future delivery of the amazing sum of $113,000,000,000 to themselves and to those for whom they are thus making provision. These dollars will do many things. Group insurance, amounting to $13,000,000,000, is a great security fund for American workers to provide a continuance of salary to their families. Insurance purchased by individuals amounts to some ninety-eight billions to provide funds for burial and the expense of last illnesses, but more important to make it possible for families to be kept together until children grow up and can support themselves; to provide funds for education and, in many cases, to make the mother financially independent for the rest of her life.

Life-insurance assets are invested in many ways, including Government, State, and municipal bonds, which means relief, schools, waterworks, roads, irrigation projects, and other public works. Life-insurance money helped build the railroads in the West, opening up the Nation for development and expansion; today it finances streamliners and improves railroad operation; purchase of public-utility bonds has meant more electricity, more telephones. Farm and city mortgages promote agriculture and housing.

Life insurance has been the only industry to withstand the disaster of depression and national calamity. Throughout the recent great depression and in other critical times for business, industry, and financial institutions, the life-insurance companies were in a solid position. Not more than three-quarters of 1 percent of the assets of the insurance companies were impaired by the failure of not more than a handful of companies during the depression.

The insurance companies, whose solvencies have meant the safeguard of the savings of a thrifty people, have been handling depressions before most of the New Dealers were born.

In the present depression the Federal Government, from January 1, 1933, to December 31, 1938, paid out for assistance to persons in need a total of $12,871,327,000. The insurance companies during the same period paid to policyholders and their beneficiaries a total of $15,700,000,000. There is no doubt either that our private insurance system prevented a much greater disaster than did occur to us in 1929. It has indeed been the bulwark of our capitalistic system.

Since the New Deal administration has been in power it has entered into practically every phase of the public and private lives of all of us. It has regulated our industries, controlled our banks, told our farmers what, when, and where to plant. It has gone into the public power business; it has gone into the rum business. It has taxed and spent and regulated our lives to such an extent that there can be only one conclusion arrived at and that is this administration wants complete control—and even greater power than it has today—over the fundamental forces of our national economy.

The real purpose of my talk tonight is to bring to the attention of the American people and particularly to those who are holders of life-insurance policies, that the forces of the administration in Washington have leveled their big guns on life insurance. Not for the purpose of regulating the type of insurance investments, not for the purpose of regulating the rates. But for the purpose of discrediting the insurance companies first, and later putting the Federal Government itself into the life-insurance business.

Life insurance, a magnificent structure, built by the American people to provide security and protection, maintained through strict State laws, thorough supervision and able management, has finally become the target of the economic "Tinker Toms" in Washington who propose that the Federal Government take over entire regulation of the business.

There is no necessity for this uncalled-for interference. Insurance companies are not gambling institutions; insurance companies are not stock exchanges; insurance companies are not interstate carriers. Insurance companies are the safe-deposit boxes to which your children and my children and our dependents will go for their livelihood after our deaths. Every advance made by life insurance is today protected and regulated and guided under the watchful eyes of State insurance commissioners. If a mistake is made in one State it is a warning to 47 others. If an improvement is made in one State it is a guiding beacon to 47 others. Under a system of centralized control this would not be possible, and life insurance would be frozen in its present state with no further advances.

Today there are 4,400 pages of insurance laws on the statute books of the 48 States. The courts have examined, tested, and interpreted these laws and their provisions, and they are now incorporated in the policies now in force. Should the Federal Government take over control there would be confusion and doubt as to the proper interpretation of policy contracts, with possible loss to beneficiaries until the mass of law could be weighed in Federal courts, which would take many, many years.

Federal control would mean a never-ending congressional discussion and debate on the subject of life insurance. I do not believe that the American people want politics played with their savings, their insurance policies, or their children's future.

The billions of assets of the insurance companies would be an ever-present irresistible temptation to an administration devoted to spending, lending, squandering, and other forms of deficit financing. Even if these economic "Tinker Toms" were not entirely successful in their attempt to gain direct control of the insurance-company assets, there might be attempts to force the companies through decrees and regulations into unwise fields of investments; not based upon profit or safety, but upon social experimentation. The best argument for the continuance of our tested and proven system, which has resulted in the growth and strength of life insurance is its efficiency, solvency, and desirability, in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

What is this specific danger to which I have been referring? It is the Senate Monopoly Committee, technically called the Temporary National Economic Committee, which was set up in June of 1938 in order to make a study of our American industry in order to answer the question, Why do we have idle men and idle machines in a land of plenty? Although this Committee has congressional representation, it has, through force of circumstances, been controlled by representation made up of left-wing New Dealers from the various Federal administrative boards; men of the same school that attempted to cure the evils of the American farmer by shooting his pigs and plowing under his crops; men of the same school that attempted to cure the evils of American justice by attacking and attempting to pack the Supreme Court; men of the same school that attempted to cure unemployment by using W. P. A. funds to buy elections in many of our States 2 years ago.

These New Deal economic wizards have an objective. They want to make a case against all industry and the system of private insurance in particular. And to this end they have directed the testimony of witnesses to prove only what they wanted to prove. They have attempted to create hostilities against the insurance companies. They have sought to build up feeling against insurance salesmen by suggesting that insurance would be cheaper if handled by the Post Office Department.

In addition to this Senate Monopoly Committee we have the example before us of one of the most outstanding New Deal Senators, namely, WAGNER, of New York, announcing in November of last year that he planned to seek legislation to put the Federal Government in the insurance business to the extent of selling annuities up to $100 a month. These annuities, he said, would be 30 percent cheaper than those of the private companies. Senator WAGNER made this claim despite the fact that the taxes which the private insurance companies pay, plus their overhead, does not exceed 12 percent. That being the case, I fail to understand how the Government policies would be 30 percent cheaper.

Regulating private industry out of business is a well-known custom and practice of the New Deal. If regulation fails, then the administration puts the Government into competition with private industry. The taxpayers' money is used to such an extent that the continued operation of the private company is impossible. Sensible and sane regulation of an industry as closely interwoven into the private lives of our people as life insurance is wise. But there are two kinds of regulations. One is for protection; the other is for control and political power. It is this latter type for which the American life-insurance companies are now earmarked.

If the insurance companies become the victims of this grasp for control of power, and if the economic panaceas which would then be invoked for the conduct of insurance business along New Deal lines should fail, a national calamity would result. Then, for the first time in history, there would be no backlog insurance assets for you or for me or for the 125,000,000 Americans who are directly dependent on life insurance to fall back on.

The lives of American people today are regulated from birth to death by their Federal Government. Licenses, taxes, permits, registrations, and rules of conduct are laid down for them. After his death the estate of an American citizen must pay taxes before one cent can be turned over to his beneficiaries. Those things we have now. If this attempt to give the Federal Government the regulation of life insurance and to put the Federal Government in the life-insurance business is successful, then the trustee of everything that a citizen has, of everything that he wishes to leave to his loved ones, will be at the mercy of the social experimenters.

And that is why I come to you tonight. It is up to the 64,000,000 life-insurance-policy holders in this country to say in firm and strong language to the New Deal, "Hands off." It is up to all of us to arise and speak in protest before it is too late.

Reward Offered by Samuel Harding Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, interesting and informative, by the pen of General Johnson, newspaper columnist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

Nut adventurers are beginning to plan to win the nutty offer of $1,000,000 by Samuel Harden Church, president of the Carnegie Institute, for the capture and delivery of Adolf Hitler unharmed to the League of Nations for trial for "his crimes against the peace and dignity of the world."

The offer and the efforts to win the reward are too trivial for comment. But as an index of war hysteria it is not trivial—especially when a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee says that the offer expressed "feelings that probably are shared by 99 percent of the American people."

Most of us are convinced that Hitler is a heel, but how many believe in an American subsidy of international kidnaping? What is proposed here across national boundaries is exactly what, in the so-called Lindbergh law, we made punishable by death if conducted across State lines.

It is attempted to be vindicated by moral indignation. That is the sentiment advanced to justify lynchings. It is a violation of international law. We also have American laws which prohibit recruiting or filibustering against any power with which we are at peace. Filibustering and soldiering-of-fortune are at least aboveboard and in some sense heroic. This ridiculous attempt at subornation of kidnaping reaches down into the Dillinger underworld to adopt tactics of gangsterism condemned by Federal statutes and those of every State. That is the lawless American proposal being broadcast across the world without a word of rebuke from any official source.

"Hang the Kaiser and make Germany pay for the war." That was the slogan either tacitly adopted or permitted to go unchallenged in England and France as a statement of war objectives sufficiently simple for popular digestion. Every statesman knew that neither was possible, but it was good war diet. It returned to haunt them at the Versailles Peace Conference. Riding roughshod over American objections, they made an impossible war-breeding peace. It was forced by one reason among several, that they were politicians and did not dare wholly to repudiate what they had permitted the public to believe. Without infamy they could no more have hung the Kaiser than Abraham Lincoln could have hung Jeff Davis. Yet their action in suffering such a sentiment in the war years is partly responsible for the curse that has come upon all countries today.

Also because of that sentiment—seeking the kind of notoriety that is promised to be fabulously rewarded in this Church-Hitler fantasy—ex-Senator (now ex-convict) Luke Lea, of Tennessee, actually attempted to kidnap the Kaiser and came close to doing it. It gave the head of every Allied and associated power goose pimples. As Mr. Lincoln hinted about Jefferson Davis, Lea's attempted delivery of the Kaiser to "democracy" would have proved to be a pineapple.

Unlike Jeff Davis, who could have been charged with treason, there was no law of God or man under which the Kaiser could have been tried—much less executed. Terrible, inhuman, and destructive as have been the acts of Adolf, the discredited and almost nonexistent League of Nations has no jurisdiction, sanction, equity, or law under which to bring him to trial—much less to sentence him. Certainly no American has an excuse to kidnap him or to procure his snatching.

Flushed with his increasing success and power, Napoleon Bonaparte, who was not particularly bloodthirsty except in battle, did exactly what is suggested here but with more justification in law. He crossed the borders of France, kidnaped the French Duke of Enghien, tried him as a traitor, and had him executed. At St. Helena he seemed to agree with the verdict of many of his critics, that it was a principal blunder of his career. It shocked the conscience of the world. Mr. Church's absurdity is trivial, but any sucker American approval of it is dangerous.

Reward Offered by Samuel Harden Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with close attention to the very long debate, first on the Barden amendments, other amendments thereto, and again to the Norton amendments and the amendments thereto, and at the conclusion I am clearly convinced that there are two schools of economic thought in this House. The one school believes in high wages that will give to the worker the necessities and some of the comforts of life; the other school of thought considers labor as a chattel to be purchased in the open market at the lowest available price. The first school would put a floor under wages, so that whether or not the labor market was glutted the worker would still receive a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour, for labor that is employed in the flow of interstate commerce; the second school would rip the bottom from the wage scale and let the wages of these various types of labor, for which exemptions are sought, sink to the low level of 5, 10, and 20 cents an hour.

I personally cannot subscribe to the philosophy of the second school of thought. I am firmly of the opinion that every worker is entitled to a living wage and that industry, whether it be manufacture, agriculture, or whatever is under the duty and obligation to pay a living wage. There is no more justification for the exemption from the benefits of this law of the workers in canneries and processing plants than there is for the exemption of the workers in cotton mills and shoe factories. After long hours of debate the only justification for exempting the labor in canneries and processing plants is (1) because of their location in agricultural districts and (2) the increased cost to the farmers. With respect to the first reason for exemption—namely, because of their location in agricultural districts, let me ask are workers in agricultural districts not to be looked upon as humans? Are they not to be given a decent wage as well as their city neighbors? Does their nearness to the soil deprive them of their natural right to receive a wage sufficient to buy for them and their families the necessities and some of the comforts of life? Let me say that cheap labor never brought prosperity. Cheap labor has not brought prosperity to China, Japan, or those other foreign countries with substandards of living. It will never bring prosperity to the American farmer and the sooner that fact is recognized the better off both farmer and laborer will be.

The farmer is in business; he is a producer of raw materials for which he must find a market. Even in a country as large as this, and as wealthy, if you take a million and a half or two million people from among the potential purchasers of automobiles, by reducing their earning capacity, you could seriously affect the automobile industry, and similarly, if you affect the earning capacity of the same number of people, in agricultural districts, you not only affect the

farmer's market, but you affect business in those districts generally.

With respect to the second reason given to justify the scuttling of the wage-hour law in agricultural districts, it is claimed that the present law increases the cost to the farmer. This debate has been suspiciously free from any facts to warrant such a conclusion. The only specific instance that I heard was the case cited by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who stated that it used to cost the farmer in his district 5 cents per bushel to clean beans and now it costs 7 cents per bushel. The inference that the wage and hour law is the cause of the increased cost is clear, but the fact has not been proven. The gentleman failed to state whether these plants were paying substandard wages when they were charging 5 cents per bushel. Although no facts have been given to support the contention, assuming that the Wage and Hour Act did cause this 40-percent increased cost to the farmer for cleaning beans, then the conclusion is irresistible that this increased cost either reflects a 40-percent increase in wages to the workers, bringing them from a substandard wage up to 30 cents an hour, or it is reflected in overtime. If the reflection is in the former, I am glad of the result; if it is in the latter, the remedy is to spread employment. But the chances are, it is neither of the two but just the old case of a chiseling canner making use of the Wage and Hour Act to increase his own profits at the expense of the farmer.

In conclusion let me state that the advocates of these amendments certainly have not satisfied me that the wage and hour law, as it now stands, works any hardship on the farmer, as a class; they have given no evidence that any increased cost is passed to the farmer, and not to the ultimate consumer; they have cited no loss of profits to the canners and processors, and last of all, there seems to be just as many canners and processors in business now as there were before this act, and all are apparently doing very well.

German Consul—Fifth Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES SECCOMBE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

LETTER FROM HARRY FREASE

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by one of my constituents to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State:

CANTON, OHIO, *May 7, 1940.*

GERMAN CONSUL—FIFTH COLUMNS

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am wondering if the advice given by the German consul, Karl Kapp, to "more than 1,000 persons at a cultural program organized by the consulate at German central farm" in Cleveland on Sunday, May 5, as reported in the first page of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Monday morning, May 6, 1940, a copy of which is enclosed herewith, does not place the German consul in a similar position to that occupied by Baron Sackville West, the British Minister to the United States in October 1888, when, as I well remember, his recall was asked for, and, in default of a prompt compliance with the request, the Department of State sent him his passport.

The German consul may not be as important an officer as a Minister, but as the actual and active representative of a foreign government in commercial affairs he would seem to come under the same rule of restraint when he voluntarily advises his people that "the plutocratic nations must follow" the Nazis' lead.

It is true that the advice is not given as a matter of party politics but is given as a matter of international interference which may be more pernicious than a party matter, especially in view of the address of Rabbi A. H. Silver at Cleveland on "Trojan Horses" and "Fifth Columns" on the same day, as reported in the first page of the second section of the same newspaper, a copy of which is also enclosed herewith.

If this matter should not be primarily for the attention of the State Department, Dr. Silver's reference to "Trojan horses" and "fifth columns" would seem to be a matter for the Department of Justice; and if so, I would be glad to have you refer the enclosures to that Department and oblige,

Yours very sincerely,

HARRY FREASE.

Are We Going To Amend the Wage-Hour Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, almost from the beginning of this Nation Congress has come in for no small amount of criticism whether just or unjust. The entire membership of the Congress is held accountable by public opinion for the actions of the majority of its Members. There have been times when the criticism levied against Congress has been wantonly unjust; but there have been times when it was merited in fullest measure. The latter occasion is amply demonstrated by the action of this body last week in regard to amending the wage and hour law. It will take a long time to live down our conduct in throwing up our hands and admitting that we were unable to legislate intelligently upon this highly important subject. Stampeded by political and sectional interests the people of this Nation beheld the House of Representatives in utter chaos, finally admitting defeat and pursuing a course that can only be interpreted as a refusal to amend a law that everyone including the men we expect to administer it know to be odiously unjust in certain instances. The people of this Nation are not deceived by the futility of our performance last week. What confidence can you expect the people to place in us when we admit our inability to legislate with calmness and deliberation?

We make much over what ought to be done to preserve and rekindle the spirit of democracy in this country but what the House has just done with the wage and hour amendments is exactly the sort of thing that destroys public confidence in our capacity to do the job expected of us. It is action of this character that has caused too many people in this country to look beyond the Congress and to one or two individuals for leadership. It is such action that gives rise to belief in a false doctrine that leads people to forget that this Government is built on principles and not on men.

I am unwilling to believe that any man or woman in this House contends that the present wage and hour law is perfect or that it even approximates perfection. The men whom we have asked to administer this creature of ours have admitted its many imperfections and have besought our help in providing the solution, by adopting mild, reasonable, curative, and clarifying amendments to this law, so that it can be carried out to achieve the great goal it was designed to accomplish in a fair and just manner. It was our duty, our solemn obligation to do this and we failed.

Unquestionably there are people here and elsewhere who do not believe in this type of legislation. Some are conscientious in that belief and I have long suspected that others have a different reason. But the majority of us here, irrespective of party, believe in the wage and hour law, and we intend to see that all attempts to wreck it are repelled and defeated. No legitimate reason can be advanced for scuttling this law by providing exemptions for millions of factory and mill workers and by rescinding the prohibition against child labor. The wage and hour law stands as a monument to progressive legislation.

However, that certainly does not mean that our eyes should be closed and our ears deaf to the demand for intelligent and restrained amendment of this law which, in operation, has brought forth injustices that we did not perceive when it was first passed.

We make speeches here and elsewhere—and we will probably make a few more than the average this year—expressing our deep concern and our benign affection for the small-business men and the farmers of this Nation. We refer to them as the "backbone of democracy" and the hope of the future, and that sort of thing. Yet by our failure to grasp the possible effect of our actions in passing the wage and hour law, and now by our refusal to correct the mistakes we made, we have tapped the very lifeblood of the farmers and small-business men of this country.

The unavoidable, the inevitable, effect of this law as it now stands, and, standing, must be administered, is to drive the small-business man and farmer out of business and make the big fellow bigger and more powerful than ever.

It was very ably and amply pointed out here by distinguished Members of this body that the enforcement of the present law is wrecking farmers in certain sections of this country and farmers who produce certain types of crops. It was clearly and unmistakably shown that certain farm products must be processed—not for sale to the general public—but before the farmer himself can sell them on the market. There are little plants all over the country in farming communities employing a mere handful of people engaged in rendering this service, which is absolutely essential to the farmer before he can market his products. Here we have a law which, among other things, contains such phrases as "area of production," which the Administrator admits he is unable to understand, and which no Member of this House ventured to explain. By enforcing this law against these little processors who render a service that is indispensable to the farmer we are taking away all the profit that the farmer expected to get for his toil and his crops. These processors have been forced to charge more for their services under this law, and thus the farmer's margin of profit is wiped out. In other instances these little processors have gone out of business and the farmer is left to the mercy of the big processors and milling companies in the large cities. In either case his profit is wiped out.

When the plight of the farmer is thus rendered precarious we have painted before us here in eloquent words his terrible predicament. Thereupon we raid the Federal Treasury and award such things as parity payments and other cash payments for which there is little, if any, sound basis. The farmers of this Nation do not want charity; all they want is a chance to make their own way. The present wage and hour law as it affects these people is perpetrating a rank injustice upon the farmers and the small-business men in these communities.

There is another situation that gives rise to the same disastrous consequences to a different type of farmer—the man who produces cattle.

The present wage and hour law as it is enforced against packing houses and stockyards is causing no end of grief for the cattle farmers. Anybody who has ever lived on a farm, or who, not living on a farm, has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the farmer's problems before ramming a law down his neck, knows that cattle shipped in to a packer may range in number from a dozen to 10,000 on any 1 day. The packer and the farmer have no way of knowing just how many cattle will be on hand on any single day. But under the present law only a certain number of hours can be worked in this branch of the packing industry. After that if too many cattle arrived that day, they must be held over and fed at the farmer's expense. Anybody who will take the trouble to find out knows that the price of feed for these cattle at the market is many times higher than on the farm. That all comes out of the farmer's pocket, and, in addition, the shrinkage in weight of the cattle thus held is likewise the farmer's loss. Anyone of ordinary intelligence can see that the operation of this law in cases of this kind is working hardship and inviting utter ruin for the farmer.

When we sought to amend the law by eliminating this calamitous requirement of the present act, false cries were raised here to the effect that we sought to eliminate all the workers in the packing industry from the provisions of the wage and hour law; that we were trying to break down the Wagner Act; that we were reestablishing child labor, and so on. Yet these able statesmen attempted to justify their opposition to this highly necessary amendment by taking the floor to advise us that they voted for every farm parity payment and supported every farm appropriation bill. That is no answer at all. All you are doing in such instances is taking money from all of the people and giving it to the farmers who are only some of the people, to make up for an injustice that would never have existed if we had the proper knowledge of the effect of this law which we now refuse to correct.

After a week of wrangling, or debate, if that word appeals more, so many amendments were attached to this law that had the bill been adopted the wage and hour law would have been but an empty shell and a hollow mockery. We did what common sense demanded—we recommitted everything. It was the only thing to do at that point if we were to have any wage and hour law left. But while there is time, I ask you, why cannot the Labor Committee profit by the spectacle it beheld here, and taking into consideration the urgent necessity for restrained, reasonable amendment of this law, report out a bill that will be acceptable and one that can be acted upon before adjournment, so that this law can operate with justice and fairness? Let us get this law into a shape that will enable it to help people get jobs, and not go along as we do now inflicting irreparable injury upon thousands of farmers and small-business men.

Trojan Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY RABBI SILVER

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rabbi Silver, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer for May 6, 1940:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 6, 1940]

SILVER WARNS UNITED STATES OF NAZI "HORSES"—URGES COUNTER-ESPIONAGE, WAR ON "FIFTH COLUMNS"

The wholesale treason which betrayed Norway into the hands of a ruthless invader should be a warning to the people of America that Trojan horses are possible here as well as in Norway, said Rabbi A. H. Silver in an address entitled "Trojan Horses" at the temple yesterday morning.

"It is therefore needful for us and for democracy everywhere to begin to anticipate and attack these 'fifth columns,' to develop counterespionage, to become more worldly wise and more cunning in dealing with Nazi and Fascist groups," said Dr. Silver.

"The story of how a free and unsuspecting people and its Government and King were helplessly handed over to the invader shocked the peoples of the world, and yet there should have been no occasion for surprise. It was common knowledge that Nazi agents were at work, sending 'fifth columns' into every country, and the negligence of governments in dealing with these movements can only be explained as a left-over from the policy of appeasement.

SEEK WORLD HEGEMONY

"The Nazis have never attempted to cover up their real intention to subjugate Europe. They are out to give the German race, which

they conceive to be the superior race and therefore most fit to rule, the hegemony over the whole world. They plan to gear the whole life of Germany, with its population of 80,000,000, for the one supreme effort, the exclusive pursuit of power.

"They bore from within, these Nazis, and they have a new technique which has been tremendously successful. Espionage is not new. What is new is the setting up of political parties and factions to stir up trouble, to disrupt the spiritual unity of a country, and to undermine its morale.

"The anti-Communist propaganda of the Nazis was a Trojan horse by which they got themselves into power in Germany. They posed as the saviors of the country from the Bolsheviki. Actually the followers of Hitler were not concerned with communism, but with the political control of the state.

SALVED GERMANY'S FEELINGS

"Anti-Semitism was another Trojan horse. It was welcome salve for the hurt feelings of Germany. It gave the people a welcome compensatory myth, exploited by the Nazis to overthrow the German Republic and gain control of the country.

"In this country anti-Semitism is chiefly a political weapon, used by organizations receiving instructions from abroad as a means of keeping aid to the Allies at a minimum. So also is the kind of propaganda which speaks for social justice, but which really has the motive of introducing the Fascist corporate state.

"The saying, 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty,' was never truer than it is today. Norway, Poland, Austria have been successive victims of neglect of vigilance. Let us not repeat their fatal mistake at this time in the greatest democracy of the earth."

Transportation Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

LETTER FROM W. E. MALONEY

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter I have received from Mr. W. E. Maloney, secretary, the Corn Exchange, Buffalo, N. Y., outlining in detail the detrimental effects that title II of the proposed Transportation Act of 1940 will have on the United States wheat growers, the United States manufacturers of flour, and the United States transportation agencies:

THE CORN EXCHANGE,
BUFFALO, N. Y., *May 8, 1940.*

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940—TITLE 2—REGULATION OF WATER CARRIERS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PART III

Hon. PIUS L. SCHWERT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to direct your attention to the effect of the proposed Regulatory Act when applied to transportation of grain and grain products moving by water on the Great Lakes, the New York State Barge Canal, and the St. Lawrence route.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ROUTE

There are no provisions in the act regulating the transportation of any commodity from a United States or Canadian port on the Great Lakes to a place outside the United States when routed and handled direct to the foreign port via the St. Lawrence River route (sec. 302 (i) (3), p. 31).

To illustrate, grain in bulk, also flour in packages, may be forwarded from such ports as Buffalo, Toledo, Chicago, Duluth, Fort William, and Port Arthur, Ontario, via direct all-water route through the St. Lawrence River to Montreal, the transportation of which would not be subject to this act.

GREAT LAKES-NEW YORK STATE BARGE CANAL ROUTE

Interstate commerce, including grain in bulk, flour in packages, and other grain products in packages from United States ports on the Great Lakes by water through the New York State Barge Canal to New York for export, would be subject to regulations as provided in the act (sec. 302 (i) (1), p. 20).

Grain in bulk, flour in packages, and other grain products in packages from Canadian ports on the Great Lakes such as Fort William, Port Arthur, Port Colborne, Ontario, via water, Great Lakes and New York Barge Canal handled direct to the port of New York would be exempt from any regulatory provisions of the act (sec. 302 (i) 3B, p. 31).

EXEMPTIONS

It is provided in section 303, page 31, that under certain conditions carriers handling commodities in bulk may be exempt from the provisions of part 3.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing, it will be readily seen that United States grown wheat may be transported in bulk freighters on the Great Lakes from Chicago or Duluth to a Canadian port such as Port Colborne, Ontario, and at that point manufactured into flour and forwarded direct through the New York State Barge Canal to New York or through the St. Lawrence River route to Montreal, and no part of the entire transportation would be subject to regulation.

United States grown wheat brought down the Lakes from Chicago or Duluth to Buffalo and manufactured into flour, the flour would be subject to the act when exported via the New York State Barge Canal, Buffalo to the port of New York. The flour, however, would be free of regulation if it should move from Buffalo to Montreal via the St. Lawrence River route.

Canadian grown wheat from Fort William and Port Arthur, Ontario, to Port Colborne, Ontario, or to Buffalo, N. Y., manufactured into flour for export; the flour from the Canadian mill at Port Colborne can move down the New York State Barge Canal free of any regulation whereas the flour manufactured at Buffalo moving down the New York State Barge Canal would be subject to regulation.

The above brief outline clearly indicates that the proposed legislation will be detrimental to the United States wheat grower and to the United States manufacturer of flour. It will leave the Canadian wheat grower and the Canadian manufacturer of flour entirely free of regulation whether he uses Canadian ports for exportation or United States ports for exportation. In our opinion, the proposed regulation would be detrimental to not only the United States farmer, flour manufacturer, and labor, but likewise to the United States transportation agencies for the reason that our products in moving to the foreign markets would obviously move over the unregulated transportation agencies of the Canadian routes.

Very respectfully yours,

W. E. MALONEY, *Secretary.*

The Relief Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS, OF OHIO

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore given, I hereby extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the remarks made by me on May 8 over the radio and dealing with the question of relief, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the air, every fair-minded person will admit that our country is confronted with many serious problems. Problems of war and peace transcend all others. The questions of the relative powers of Congress, the courts, and the Chief Executive are also important. Especially when executives everywhere are taking the ascendency and the courts are relegated to positions of subservience, and the legislative branches are molded to suit the dictator. The colossal national debt is also a serious matter and strongly portends disaster. Unemployment by reason of its persistency demands consideration. Heretofore depressions have not persisted against the inherent economic strength of our country for more than a year or two, but 11,000,000 men out of work over a period of 8 years is a serious situation. The fact that there are probably 4,000,000 young men in our country between the ages of 18 and 25 who have never had a steady job of any kind may be the nucleus of a serious problem. With the return of confidence and consequent prosperity which the country expects after a change of administration, following the fall elections, it is reasonable to expect that some of these serious questions will be solved.

There is one problem that has grown to serious proportions in the last few years that promises to continue regardless of the return of prosperity. It is the problem of public relief. So long as Nature in her wisdom has created all men different, mentally and physically, we are bound to have the fortunate and unfortunate with us always and also the capable and incapable. So long as the complexities of life and business continue there is bound at all times to be a percentage of unemployed that will need attention.

It is to this subject of public relief that I hope to devote the remainder of my time.

The American people are more charitable now than they have ever been and they are perfectly willing to take care of those who are unfortunate, whether because of economic conditions or physical incompetence. I think that my audience will also agree that out of the complexities of modern life, with its hazards and dangers, the American people are developing a greater dependence on governmental agencies. In March 1933 there were five and one-half million cases on relief. In March 1939 there were more than 8,000,000 on relief. In this same period the cost of relief increased more than 232 percent. There is danger in this tendency of our people to seek Government aid. Public agencies must therefore organize themselves to render public relief in a scientific manner. We should not, in this great country, return to the system when some unfortunates lived almost from garbage cans. And never should we continue a system saturated with politics and dishonest favoritism. We must take the relief directly to those entitled to it with a minimum of expense and without duress or humiliation to the recipient.

It will call for the most sympathetic consideration on the part of the eleemosynary institutions and for the most serious consideration of those in authority in the States and in the Nation.

Already the subject is claiming attention in legislative halls. Fiscal authorities of the States and Nation are worried about it.

The major question at this time is: Shall the Federal Government be the prime factor in public relief or shall the States and local authorities be given that responsibility? The people are demanding a decision and they expect a proper decision.

It would be very interesting to know how the majority of the recipients of relief feel about this proposed change. It is safe to say that their Americanism will cause them to resent political pressure. It is safe to say that they do not like the regimentation to which they are subjected. No doubt, they rebel in their hearts at the prospect of never being able to extricate themselves from the relief army. Let us hope that the administration of relief may never be carried on under military appearances. Rather should it be under circumstances in which the recipient will be made to feel that his personal welfare is the uppermost purpose of those administering the relief.

This matter is bound to come to an issue and the people may have to decide it by their ballots. Already both the great political parties are taking their positions. The new dealers will stand by the present policy. The Republicans will likely demand that relief be placed in the hands of the State and local authorities.

The New Deal party has been very appropriately named. They have found the principles of the Democratic Party to be too old. Strikingly is this true when we consider the New Deal's insistence upon concentrating the administration of relief at the National Capital. The New Dealers are demanding that the most intimate interests of the people—food and shelter—shall be controlled by the Federal Government with little regard for local authorities. On the other hand, the old Republican Party, commonly referred to as the party of a strong central government, will be found advocating taking this very personal matter of making one's living out of the hands of the Federal Government and placing it in the hands of the State and local authorities.

It is interesting to follow the course of the development of this Nation-wide activity that we now call relief. Successively, we have had the F. E. R. A. (Federal Emergency Relief Administration); C. W. A. (Civil Works Administration); P. W. A. (Public Works Administration); and W. P. A. (Works Progress Administration). These alphabetical changes indicate repeated failure of methods.

Before the days of the depression, the Federal Government did not participate in any regular relief activities. It was considered that Congress under the Constitution could not appropriate for public relief public funds collected through taxation. The Government did, on rare occasions, appropriate money in cases of great public calamities. But formerly disasters were handled by the Red Cross which operated entirely from money raised by private donations. But when the depression descended it became evident that the problems would demand the cooperative actions of all State and local agencies. President Hoover, adhering to the traditions of our country that the physical need of the people is a matter for the attention of the State and local authorities, proceeded to coordinate the State and local agencies. He established the President's Emergency Council Organization and did an excellent job in coordinating local resources. He maintained that the people should be encouraged to take cooperative action and to appreciate that it was their duty to meet the problems of the depression. He also insisted that the State and local governments should dedicate themselves to utilizing their full resources in the battle against unemployment and similar problems.

President Hoover did not close the door against direct aid from the Federal Government, but maintained that the Government should do nothing to break down the sense of responsibility of individual generosity and mutual self-help. He maintained that if the time should come that the voluntary agencies of the country, together with the local and State governments, were unable to find resources with which to prevent hunger and suffering in the country, he would ask that the aid of every resource of the Federal Government be thrown into the battle to protect the people from want.

The Republican administration did not extend any free direct financial relief. Neither has the New Deal done much of that, if any. Direct relief has been averted by a system of loans known as grants-in-aid to the States. Without regard to party affiliations, it has been quite generally and tenaciously held that we should adhere to our traditional policy of refraining from direct financial aid by the Federal Government. In 1931 it was proposed in Congress that the Government appropriate money to the Red Cross to be used for direct relief, but this agency refused to accept direct public donation because of its policy to receive donations only from private individuals. Even had the Red Cross agreed to accept direct public donation it is not likely that the Congress would have voted it. Then it was that Congress took the first steps toward extending Government aid in the fight against the depression. An act was passed giving to the Red Cross 40,000,000 bushels of wheat. This wheat was to be ground into flour for those in need. I think that the first bill introduced for the distribution of this wheat was a bill introduced by me on December 8, 1931.

It must not be forgotten that by the election of 1930 the control of the House passed to the Democrats, and the Senate, while nominally Republican, was effectively Democratic. In spite of this fact, Mr. Hoover was able to mobilize all the resources of the States and local agencies. He succeeded in having Congress enact legislation setting up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank. The New Deal has been glad to lean on both of these great Republican institutions. The R. F. C. early in its existence loaned $300,000,000 to the States by way of grants-in-aid.

Thus, it will be seen that when the New Deal administration came into power a relief program had been set up and was functioning well.

But the New Deal, with characteristic profligacy, proceeded to put much "ballyhoo" into the administration of relief. Uncle Sam soon became Santa Claus. Even the shallowest New Dealer has more depth of character than to deny the presence of pernicious politics in almost every phase of the present relief program.

The important question, though, is, What are we going to do about it? This is not an easy question to answer. If we turn relief over to the State and local communities, we cannot expect them to assume the total burden. These local agencies will have to be impressed with the importance of the task, but must be supported in any honest effort that they make. I have been thinking that a system of grants-in-aid, with some restrictions similar to the restrictions provided in old-age pension and dependent-children programs and some of the restrictions in the financial program for aid to the States for road construction, might be effective. For instance, suppose grants were made on a matching basis of 60 or 65 percent from the Federal Government and 35 or 40 percent from the State. Then suppose we provided that large municipalities, say, of a population of 500,000 or more should be considered as separate units but in conjunction with the State. Then suppose, by way of illustration, we considered three definite factors that would control the amounts to be paid by the Federal Government to the States and municipalities:

(1) Population would be a 50-percent factor.

(2) The unemployment load would be a 25-percent factor.

(3) And the difference in the cost of living would be a 25-percent factor.

If we believe that this intimate personal matter of assisting the people to secure their daily bread can be better done by the agency nearer the people than by the big, ponderous, far-away Federal Government, there is no reason why we cannot find a way by which these close-up agencies can do it. A sensible, well-administered program would encourage those who can make their own way to attempt to do it. When the people understand that relief is for those who cannot work and cannot get work and is not for loafers and racketeers they will loyally support such a program because it will appeal to their sense of justice.

The appropriation bill for next year's relief is now being considered in Congress. From all indications a strenuous battle is to be waged. There is a strong sentiment among the Democrats that the administration of relief should be decentralized from Washington and more power given to the States. This is the nearly unanimous position of the Republicans. That the President is plainly worried about the whole situation is evidenced by his recent message to Congress in which he abandons his dominating "must" attitude and assumes an attitude of supplication. He appreciates that his extravagant wastefulness has caught up with him. He appreciates that he has driven the country past the legal debt limit of $45,000,000,000. He has made an almost unheard-of request of Congress. Usually appropriations are made by the year and not by the month. He is asking for $975,000,000 for relief and is begging permission to spend it in the first 8 months of the fiscal year, beginning July 1. He evidently is not expecting to be Chief Executive after January 20, 1941, but he wants to be well supplied with relief money between the 1st of July and the November election. This unusual action of the President is practically an admission that the New Deal system of handling relief is a failure and that his principal concern now is to be provided with ample money to carry through while he yet holds the position of Chief Executive.

Purchase of Surplus Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a proposal to appropriate $85,000,000 to purchase surplus farm commodities. I assume that the alleged purpose of this appropriation is to sustain, if not to raise, the domestic price of farm products; but, in the light of experience, will it do so?

The farmers are the victims of two conflicting administration policies. What are these senseless policies? The administration takes $30,479,112 and purchases surplus farm commodities. So far so good. Then what?

The same administration at the same time imports $92,298,000 of the same competitive products. Now, then, I ask in all candor does such a program make sense? Does it in reality help our farmers, or does the benefit, if there is any, accrue to the foreign producer? My tomato growers know that when the Government buys 20,741,815 pounds of fresh tomatoes for $465,259 and at the same time imports 120,692,000 pounds, valued at $2,633,000, they come out at the little end of the horn.

The conflicting policies to which I have referred do not furnish a cure for low prices, but, instead, tend to drive the domestic price down to the foreign low-cost production level. If the price were to be forced up, the foreign importer would still be the chief beneficiary.

I insert as a part of my remarks official figures taken from the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 in support of my statement. It must be remembered, too, that the American farmer does not receive from the Government the full market price for his surplus commodities. The foreigner, however, sells his products in our markets at full price. The foreign producer has had the best of it under every piece of legislation enacted by the New Deal. Mr. Speaker, I insert a table for the information of those who may be interested in the subject under discussion:

Purchase of selected agricultural commodities by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, and imports of those commodities, fiscal years 1938–39

Commodity	Quantity purchased	Amount spent	Imports	
			Quantity	Value
Apples, fresh.....bushels	6,180,847	$4,978,816	52,000	$90,000
Beets.....pounds	17,858,256	149,383	1,000	[1]
Cabbage.....do	152,706,155	1,562,503	339,000	8,000
Carrots.....do	7,612,950	72,379	270,000	3,000
Cauliflower.....do	793,576	17,968	39,000	1,000
Celery.....do	20,391,300	381,384	96,000	3,000
Cheese.....do	3,445,530	478,211	110,167,000	23,584,000
Eggs.....dozen	11,319,300	2,255,659	551,000	106,000
Fish.....pounds	3,677,398	262,966	658,345,000	60,259,000
Grapefruit.....do	188,441,360	2,524,313	12,753,000	155,000
Grapes.....do	15,830,826	[2] 319,489	711,000	1,050,000
Milk, fluid.....gallons	18,440,847	4,229,949	22,000	5,000
Peas:				
Canned.....cases	864,192	[3] 1,427,780	1,610,000	165,000
Dried.....pounds	6,000,000	122,813	4,616,000	183,000
Fresh.....do	77,940	2,808	4,582,000	223,000
Potatoes, white.....bushels	6,579,548	[4] 4,286,457	1,697,100	1,444,000
Raisins.....pounds	50,199,000	2,137,251	825,000	92,000
Rice, milled.....do	85,948,000	[5] 2,861,207	137,024,000	2,294,000
Tomatoes, fresh.....do	20,741,815	465,259	120,692,000	2,633,000
Wheat cereal.....do	106,550,500	1,942,517	[1]	[1]
Total		30,479,112		92,298,000

[1] Not available.
[2] Cubic feet.
[3] Pounds.
[4] Includes seed potatoes.
[5] Broken rice.

Source: Annual reports of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. Fiscal years 1938-39; Foreign Crops and Markets, Nov. 17, 1939.

Proposed Amendments to H. R. 6971

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following statement explaining two amendments which I propose to introduce to H. R. 6971, a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, when the bill is considered by the House.

So many inquiries have come to me about two short amendments which I expect to propose to H. R. 6971, affecting building and loan associations, that for convenience I insert the proposed amendments in the RECORD.

The first proposed amendment would require the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to determine whether or not State examination of insured State associations is an adequate examination and, if so, to accept it without the expense of a duplicate Federal examination. The Federal Board would have full power to determine that any State examinations are inadequate and to conduct its own examination where necessary. This amendment will be proposed to provide further protection to our State associations against unnecessary and duplicate trouble and expense. The amendment is as follows:

To section 5, subsection (b), page 5, line 25, add the following additional language:

"The Board is authorized to accept, in whole or in part, reports of examinations and audits made by public accountants or public supervisory authorities to the extent that such reports will serve the purposes of the Board. Reports of audits and examinations made by public accountants and public supervisory authorities and made available to the Board by the associations examined shall be considered, and if determined by the Board to be adequate and reliable, such associations shall not be charged for duplicate auditing or examination for the same period."

The second and more important of these amendments simply assures State building and loan associations and their members the same tax treatment we accord to Federal associations. The statute already prohibits the State from taxing the Federals more than State associations. Our local State associations are more interested in this question than in any other phase of this proposed legislation. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has approved this amendment in a letter to the committee and states that it has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and the Board is informed that there is no objection.

The tax equalization amendment is as follows:

Amend H. R. 6971 by the insertion of a new section between original sections 8 and 9, page 15, line 17, to be numbered 9, and renumber sections 9 to 17, inclusive, seriatim as 10 to 18, inclusive, the new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Subsection (h) of section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Any exemption from taxation by the United States now or hereafter provided applicable to Federal savings and loan associations or the shares thereof or the income therefrom shall likewise apply to any building and loan, savings and loan, homestead association, and cooperative bank organized under the laws of any State, Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and to the shares, deposits, and certificates of indebtedness issued by such associations and to the income derived therefrom.'"

To further indicate the necessity to equalize taxes on these savings, I include an extract from the record of the hearings on this measure before the House Banking and Currency Committee May 10, 1939, pages 196–197, as follows:

The taxation of savers in Federal savings and loan associations by the Federal Government and the permission to State, county, municipal, or local taxing authorities to impose taxes not greater

than that imposed on other similar local mutual or cooperative thrift and home-financing institutions is found in section 5 (h) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

The investors in Federal savings and loan associations and the investors in State-chartered savings, building and loan associations, and cooperative banks are treated identically as far as taxation by the Federal Government is concerned, with one exception: The earnings to savings members in Federal savings and loan associations are not subject to normal income taxes, as is the case with State-chartered building and loan associations.

The question is raised as to what other or similar investments controlled or created by Federal statutes are accorded similar treatment as regards normal taxes as that accorded to investors in Federal savings and loan associations.

The income from the following is not subject to normal income tax:

United States savings bonds, 2.9 percent.
Postal Savings deposits, 2 percent.
Postal Savings bonds, 2 and 2½ percent.
Credit Union shares, 3 to 6 percent.
Federal Savings and Loan Association shares, 3 to 3½ percent.
Federal Housing Administration debentures, 2¾ and 3 percent.
National Mortgage Association obligations, 1⅝ percent.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds, 1¼ to 3¼ percent.
United States Housing Authority obligations.
Treasury notes, Treasury bonds, 2 to 4 percent.
R. F. C. notes, seven-eighths and 1½ percent.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Treasury notes, 2 percent.
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation obligations.
Federal Home Loan Bank bonds and debentures, 1 to 2 percent.
Commodity Credit Corporation notes, three-fourths percent.
Federal Intermediate Credit Bank bonds and stock.
National Farm Loan Association bonds and stock.

Life-insurance payments on death and annuities, up to 3 percent of aggregate premiums or consideration; also, dividends on unmatured and paid-up policies.

Obligations of State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof.

The basic reason for the treatment accorded savings members in local cooperative thrift and home-financing institutions has been the social service which they render in facilitating and encouraging home ownership. The Government has for many years given special encouragement to cooperatives of all types and has put them in a somewhat different category as regards Federal taxes from other business and industrial enterprises. The position has been taken, and rightly so, that local organizations of a cooperative character, which have as their further purpose the encouragement of thrift, should be assisted to a greater degree than private enterprises whose profits are not widely distributed as in the mutual organizations. It is generally true that governments abroad have traditionally given tax preferences to cooperative organizations in the fields of banking, agricultural credit, consumer purchases, and thrift and home financing. This type of support has been justified because of the mutual and democratic character of these associations and their primary purpose of providing an accumulation of local funds which could be loaned at reasonable rates in the development of sound community enterprises.

The financing of small-home ownership has always been considered a particularly worth-while social activity. Limited tax exemption, such as is requested in this amendment, serves the purpose of encouraging the flow of savings into useful community activity at little expense to the Government. The exemption from normal income tax of dividends on building and loan shares appears especially justified in view of the fact that all of the savings funds in these institutions are employed in the financing of small urban homes, which homes bear a heavy burden of taxation.

The internal-revenue authorities have ruled that where State-chartered building and loan associations are reorganized to form Federal savings and loan associations, the earnings of the associations credited to the shareholders before such reorganization are subject to normal tax and surtax, but the earnings credited subsequent to the reorganization are subject only to surtax. (See I. T. 3050, 1937–1 CB 57.) The same situation prevails when a State-chartered institution converts to a Federal savings and loan association.

The present law, which is section 5 (h) of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, with proposed amendment added:

"(h) Such associations, including their franchises, capital, reserves, and surplus, and their loans and income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States (except the taxes imposed by sections 1410 and 1600 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1939, for employment after such date), and all shares of such associations shall be exempt both as to their value and the income therefrom from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States; and no State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxing authority shall impose any tax on such associations or their franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, loans, or income greater than that imposed by such authority on other similar local mutual or cooperative thrift and home financing institutions. Any exemption from taxation by the United States now or hereafter provided applicable to Federal savings and loan associations or the shares thereof or the income therefrom shall likewise apply to any building and loan, savings and loan, homestead association, and cooperative bank organized under the laws of any State, Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States or the District of Columbia, and to the shares, deposits, and certificates of indebtedness issued by such associations and to the income derived therefrom."

F. H. A. Insuring Operations in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

REPORT BY THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table:

Volume of Federal Housing Authority insuring operations, by counties, in the State of Louisiana

[Net cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1939]

County	Title I. Property improvement loans insured		Title II. Small-home mortgages accepted for insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Acadia	194	$72,459.84	58	$201,380	252	$273,839.84
Allen	101	46,437.97	2	6,200	103	52,637.97
Ascension	80	34,965.21	12	41,060	92	76,025.21
Assumption	50	21,454.94	11	26,300	61	47,754.94
Avoyelles	176	83,809.40	113	311,775	289	395,584.40
Beauregard	179	65,058.02	9	26,100	188	91,158.02
Bienville	63	24,579.78	24	70,900	87	95,479.78
Bossier	164	44,930.39	108	326,000	272	370,930.39
Caddo	1,853	675,897.74	878	3,793,900	2,731	4,469,797.74
Calcasieu	1,463	581,052.91	340	1,078,360	1,803	1,659,412.91
Caldwell	18	4,512.27	11	31,000	29	35,512.27
Cameron	17	7,967.95			17	7,967.95
Catahoula	48	28,995.71	1	2,600	49	31,595.71
Claiborne	83	33,432.59	16	62,400	99	95,832.59
Concordia	40	26,248.81	9	32,300	49	58,548.81
De Soto	124	48,926.18	17	57,900	141	106,826.18
East Baton Rouge	901	367,511.09	444	1,779,530	1,345	2,147,041.09
East Carroll	42	18,014.21	19	71,700	61	89,714.21
East Feliciana	30	10,413.82	1	4,000	31	14,413.82
Evangeline	98	64,488.36	11	39,300	109	103,788.36
Franklin	73	27,447.09	41	128,000	114	155,447.09
Grant	58	21,970.03			58	21,970.03
Iberia	161	65,742.72	20	87,400	181	153,142.72
Iberville	180	57,153.63	11	40,400	191	97,553.63
Jackson	82	25,951.50	14	42,100	96	68,051.50
Jefferson	611	187,974.28	240	1,041,445	851	1,229,419.28
Jefferson Davis	227	90,827.98	73	260,200	300	351,027.98
Lafayette	161	80,723.82	112	403,460	273	484,183.82
Lafourche	75	51,452.56	17	50,100	92	101,552.56
LaSalle	30	13,871.70	5	8,000	35	21,871.70
Lincoln	80	33,412.95	30	130,300	110	163,712.95
Livingston	63	24,315.88	6	14,600	69	38,915.88
Madison	57	28,501.31	81	234,800	138	263,301.31
Morehouse	267	101,264.01	52	158,700	319	259,964.01
Natchitoches	83	29,806.46	7	26,700	90	56,506.46
Orleans	8,980	2,296,357.57	775	$3,622,520	9,755	5,918,877.57
Ouachita	894	286,993.50	451	1,603,150	1,345	1,890,143.50
Plaquemines	92	41,787.74	1	5,400	93	47,187.74
Pointe Coupee	96	32,054.26	2	8,000	98	40,054.26
Rapides	710	215,111.73	139	513,300	849	728,411.73
Red River	25	9,723.17	13	29,300	38	39,023.17
Richland	86	35,181.54	23	69,100	109	104,281.54
Sabine	95	50,332.22			95	50,332.22
St. Bernard	52	11,933.29	5	15,300	57	27,233.39
St. Charles	52	18,873.57	16	41,400	68	60,273.57
St. Helena	10	3,379.35			10	3,379.35
St. James	36	15,037.96			36	15,037.96
St. John the Baptist	37	16,160.69	7	18,800	44	34,960.69
St. Landry	219	116,600.89	54	153,750	273	270,350.89
St. Martin	38	13,727.41	4	17,800	42	31,527.41
St. Mary	113	52,204.19	21	49,900	134	102,104.19
St. Tammany	215	85,841.91	24	64,200	239	150,041.91
Tangipahoa	413	168,492.04	28	78,200	441	246,692.04
Tensas	39	15,337.20	16	45,460	55	60,797.20
Terrebonne	102	31,436.19	91	249,900	193	281,336.19
Union	38	21,557.12	29	84,000	67	105,557.12
Vermilion	97	49,669.28	22	65,600	119	115,269.28
Vernon	57	17,790.84			57	17,790.84
Washington	1,480	822,296.15	84	257,750	1,564	1,080,046.15
Webster	73	21,507.18	140	421,200	213	442,707.18
West Baton Rouge	56	14,568.92	5	17,800	61	32,368.92

Volume of Federal Housing Authority insuring operations, by counties, in the State of Louisiana—Continued

County	Title I. Property improvement loans insured		Title II. Small-home mortgages accepted for insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
West Carroll	104	$47,786.63	21	$63,200	125	$110,986.63
West Feliciana	16	7,556.25			16	7,556.25
Winn	44	27,393.74	3	10,000	47	37,393.74
State total	22,201	7,618,265.74	4,767	18,093,940	26,968	25,712,205.74

A Farmer's Wife Speaks Her Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1940

LETTER FROM VERNA ALLAN VALLEAU

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are in Congress, as well as elsewhere, some who believe that prosperity can be brought about by the passage of a law. There is a continuous drive for an ever increase in hourly wages. Accompanying that drive is a demand for shorter hours. No one can criticize the desire of everyone to improve his condition, either by increasing the amount which he can earn or lessening the hours of employment; but it is quite evident that, if wages increase and hours of labor are shortened, production will be less and the cost of manufactured products must go higher. There is little, if any, justice in demanding that the factory worker be paid as the Secretary of Labor has now fixed the price in the steel industry 62½ cents an hour for common labor on Government contracts, while the farmer, the worker in smaller industries, so far has been forced to be content with a fraction of that amount.

If the cost of the farmer's plow, or his binder, because of high wages paid in the steel industry and the manufacturing plants, is forced ever higher, how can he with his income fixed by low prices received for the things he grows and must sell if he would purchase, buy the products of the factory?

If industrial wages go up, so too must the price of farm products. With the unions' demand for ever higher wages, do they intend to force the farmer, farm laborer, into servitude—a form of slavery?

If the law of supply and demand is not to regulate wages, but is to regulate the price of farm products, how long will it be before the wages of the industrial laborer, fixed by the law at a level which is artificially higher when compared with the price received by the farmer for his labor, create a condition where the farmer, and he is industry's best customer, can no longer buy?

A farmer's wife who lives in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan has an idea, which it would be well for some of us to read and understand. I present her letter, received April 28:

APRIL 25, 1940.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I just heard over the radio that Congress is considering wage and hour legislation. I live on a dairy farm at State Roads crossing between Saugatuck and East Saugatuck. Before becoming a farmer's wife I graduated from college and was a high-school principal, so I've seen life from several viewpoints. Through my home, for the past 15 years, has passed a stream of economic derelicts. From them I've gleaned some facts about industrial conditions.

High hourly wages are of no benefit to a workingman if they last only a few weeks or for a few years of his life. In order to pay high hourly wages companies pick only the best men for the best years of their lives and then, although they might be glad to get work at lower wages, they are denied employment if conditions like the laying up of the Graham & Mortine boats throw them out of work.

What really counts is the total family income. A family with the father getting $100 a month, and two adolescents making $25 each is in a much better economic condition than a family where the father gets $50 a week, and child-labor laws keep the children begging for change and speeding in the family car. To deprive young people of the chance to learn the value of money by earning their own allowance is a great educational crime. Where three people earn, sickness, shutting down the factory, seasonal lay-offs are not such a family catastrophe. In any attempt to improve the conditions of the workers, a man's whole life must be considered, and not a few short years when he might be able to earn $8 to $12 a day.

Yours truly,

VERNA ALLAN VALLEAU.

Minnesota Indians in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. T. BUCKLER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

LETTER FROM BEMIDJI, MINN., ATTORNEY

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter I have received from Mr. Arnold C. Forbes, an attorney of Bemidji, Minn., in my Congressional District, the Ninth, of Minnesota, concerning the distressed conditions of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians on the Red Lake Indian Reservation of Minnesota.

On Monday when my bill, H. R. 8369, the Red Lake per capita payment bill, came up for consideration on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative WOLCOTT, objected to its passage. After reading the letter from Mr. Forbes, I do not think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will want to take the responsibility of holding up the small payments of $12.50, out of their own tribal funds, to these distressed, starving, and hard-pressed Indians.

The letter from Mr. Forbes follows:

BEMIDJI, MINN., *May 1, 1940.*

Hon. R. T. BUCKLER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCKLER: The Indians from Ponemah claim that they are in dire circumstances. They claim that they have had no Indian payment this year; that there is no road work for them to do until July 1; that commercial fishing does not start until June 20; that the wood and cedar cutting has been stopped on the reservation; and that cordwood can only be sold at the Indian agency for $1 per cord, which makes it unprofitable. They claim that there are only 40 men out of some 300 on the Ponemah side of the reservation that are employed in C. C. C. camps and W. P. A. projects. They claim that white men are working on these projects, and that the Indian trucks are unemployed. They further say that the prices of groceries on the reservation are exorbitant and that they are unable to get to Bemidji to purchase supplies. They claim that a can of sardines which costs 14 cents in the Bemidji stores costs 36 cents on the reservation, and that other articles are about in proportion.

They tell me that the Indian families are in very dire need and are living upon fish and recently have been shooting a few ducks as the flight north commences. I have no reason to disbelieve these stories, as I am well and personally acquainted with a great many Indians on the reservation. They are indeed worthy of your sympathy and interest. They complain mostly because they are not given opportunities to work. W. P. A. projects have been closed down until none of them are able to support their families. I realize that all of these problems have difficult solutions, but I do not believe that it is necessary that they actually go in want. Even surplus commodities seem to be distributed to them grudgingly.

All of this they have asked me to communicate with you in hopes that something might be done. I am sending a copy of this letter to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I am sure that there is a real basis for these complaints.

I think that a personal investigation should be made by you which would have no connection with the Indian offices and agencies on the reservation. The complaints come so often that one is forced to believe there is considerable suffering among the Indians.

If you will designate someone to be your personal investigator I will be very glad to take him onto the reservation and to interview families with him. I am convinced that conditions are not very good.

Respectfully,

ARNOLD C. FORBES.

Middle Western Farmers, Beware of Promises From Eastern Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that a politician from a big eastern city, while in the Middle West recently making off-the-record public addresses, promised a complete halt on the imports of all agricultural products, should he be elected President. That sort of a promise might be expected from a city politician during a campaign year, but very few intelligent middle western farmers will be taken in by such easy political-campaign promises. Such promises have apparently been made on the assumption that all agricultural imports are injuring American farmers. This Presidential aspirant evidently did not know that the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture classify as agricultural such imports as tea, bananas, silk, coffee, rubber, cocoa, and other tropical products. These products make up the largest share of the imports of agricultural items, and American farmers consume but do not produce them.

Apparently politicians have found some fertile ground in Iowa and other Midwestern States, because the prices of hogs are lower than they were a year ago. It is as easy as it is untruthful to lay any and all adverse agricultural conditions on so-called agricultural imports.

That has long been an old Republican custom. Of course, the insignificant imports of pork products, amounting in 1939 to less than one-tenth of our pork exports, and to less than one one-hundredth of United States hog slaughter under Federal inspection, has had nothing whatever to do with the current hog prices. A recent bulletin (Foreign Crops and Markets, April 27, 1940) from the Department of Agriculture states:

> United States imports of hams, shoulders, and bacon came largely (73 percent) from Poland during 1933–39. Hence, it is not surprising to find imports of this group of products cut 81 percent during the first 6 months of the war as compared with a year earlier. The effect on the United States market has been negligible, however, since these imports were never, even at their highest, more than a drop in the bucket of domestic pork consumption.

The current situation with respect to hog prices arises from two far-reaching but unrelated causes. First, and by far the most important (as shown by the attached table), was the increased slaughter during the last year; the Department of Agriculture has been forecasting the inevitable results of increased numbers of hogs and large corn crops. Second, due to the necessity of importing war materials, European purchases of pork products from the United States have not been maintained during the first 6 months of the European war. In this connection I may say that the very situation which I was afraid would arise as a result of the repeal of the arms embargo has taken place and affected the price of hogs. Back in October 1939, shortly after I returned from Europe and when I was opposing the repeal of the arms embargo, I took occasion to say:

> Here is a strictly selfish thought: England and France have about $7,000,000,000 in gold to spend on the war. They can't get credit over here, so most of the cash will come to the United States. Under present law we can't sell them arms and munitions and airplanes so their American purchases are limited to raw materials and food—wheat, corn, and hogs. Lift the embargo and this money will be diverted to munitions. We in the Middle West have no munitions to sell. But we do have wheat, corn, and hogs. Do we want a market for munitions or pork?

Well, we are selling those countries plenty of munitions and airplanes but not enough pork products to suit me. This lack of export markets has a very important bearing upon the price of hogs at the present time. Pork products are, as is well known, on an export basis and the slackening up of foreign markets is far more influential on the price situation than are a few pounds of pork which come largely from Canada. Methods of enlarging export markets are the things which the eastern politicians ought to promise Iowa farmers. Thes off-the-record promises to embargo agricultural imports go beyond the traditional G. O. P. theory of equalizing the cost of production at home and abroad. They even "out-Smoot" Mr. Smoot. It is easy, and more effective politically, to promise absolute embargoes on everything; to make good on those promises, of course, would be another matter.

The eventual pay-off of those promises would result in retaliations by foreign countries and possibly make the conditions in Iowa worse than they were under the Hawley-Smoot Act.

I want to remind the hog raisers of Iowa that their income increased during 1936 to 1938, under trade agreements, over the Hawley-Smoot days of 1931 to 1933, by more than $200,000,000. The disastrous experience of the Hawley-Smoot Act is being gradually corrected by trade agreements through which many concessions on pork products have been obtained. Despite the adverse effect of wartime controls, these concessions are helping to support and maintain foreign markets for the products of Iowa hogs.

The attached table, in addition to the above-quoted excerpt from the Department of Agriculture, indicates how ill-founded are the suggested threats of injury caused by imports of pork, and shows the importance of pork exports.

Imports, exports, and production of pork (excluding lard) and percent imports are of production, 1937–39 and January-February 1940

	(1) Total imports of pork and pork products [1]	(2) Pork production under United States inspection (excluding lard)	Percent imports are of production	(3) Total exports of pork and pork products
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Pounds*
1937	75,078,504	4,215,634,000	1.80	210,028,889
1938	52,283,748	4,828,140,000	1.08	312,566,743
1939	40,877,808	5,491,587,000	.74	421,105,312
January 1940	677,682	690,254,480	.10	57,968,962
February 1940	524,566	548,105,526	.09	54,420,206

[1] Imports for consumption: Includes lard, fresh pork, pork, pickled or salted, and hams, shoulders, and bacon, but largely high priced canned hams.

Sources: Columns 1 and 3, 1937 and 1938 from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce; 1939 and January and February 1940 from Monthly Summaries of Foreign Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce. Column 2, 1937 and 1938 from U. S. Department of Agriculture publication, Livestock, Meats, and Wool Market Statistics and Related Data, 1938; 1939 and January and February 1940 from unpublished data of U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Rev. Floyd J. Seaman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

TRIBUTE BY FLORA J. SEAMAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real honor to be able to include with my remarks the following memorial on Rev. Floyd J. Seaman, of Los Angeles, written by his wife. Reverend Seaman was one of those rare people

whose very presence was always an inspiration to all who knew or came in contact with him.

IN MEMORIAM

"I never looked into his face but that I wanted to be a better man." Thus spoke a youth in a former parish, when told of the transition of Floyd Seaman.

These words possibly express the influence of this nobleman of God as no other words could do. He was indeed a "Stephen with the shining face."

Day by day, among men, his face radiated joy and hearty good will; he met men with a hearty greeting and a warm fellowship in his voice and manner; there was something tonic and heartening in his very presence. In the pulpit on Sundays, when under the inspiration of his passionate ideals, his face became luminous, and the very radiance of God rested on his brow.

His manner toward men was never familiar nor condescending; he was straightforward, direct, but always, no matter what condition or faith, he met men as God's children; he saw the best in them; believed the best of them. Men instinctively heightened in self-respect in their association with him.

Floyd Seaman was born in a farmhouse that still stands in northern Kansas, the son of Isaac and Nancy Owen Seaman, pioneers from New York. He loved the wide open spaces and the glory of nature about him. He early had a sense of being a child of God; and in his early boyhood, his mind was cast in the spirit of devotion through his mother's influence. The traditions of a Methodist minister grandfather, and the Revolutionary heroes of his ancestry, tended to set afire ideals and longings for a distinctive service to his country and his God.

He went in youth to Baker University for his academic training as well as his college work. He earned his own way courageously and industriously, and earnestly pursued the studies that were offered in language and literature and oratory. He had a passion for books and knowledge, and thrilled to the inspirational teaching of these teachers with rare ability and insight into the meaning of life and literature. Great moral issues and ethical standards were a tonic part of the training at this Kansas college.

He was well trained in the use of the marvellously beautiful voice that he had been gifted with; and he won outstanding oratorical contests.

With the passionate eagerness for knowledge came the ability to transmit in logical and acceptable form—even to translate new ideas into terms of everyday thought and language.

He went with a group of brilliant Baker students to Drew University for the sake of the highest training for the ministry. The influence of those years under master minds and hearts was ever an inspiration. A Browning Club was a special delight—and significance.

His first pastorate then was as assistant to Dr. Charles McFarland, whose gentleness and courage, and fine abilities won his undying admiration. It was while with him that a great civic reform was undertaken in the city of Topeka, and he watched the leadership of Dr. McFarland, who stood steadfast for principle even when his life was threatened.

He was married to his college sweetheart in 1900 and in 1903 his only son, Harvard Lake Seaman, was born. In 1905 he came to California for the sake of his wife's health, and was assigned to Glendora in the fall of 1906.

He lost his wife in 1912 and in 1914 was married to Flora Jones, of Glendora, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Jones.

Like Lincoln, he seems early to have had a sympathy for the oppressed and the working groups. Rauschenbush was of great inspiration to him and Washington Gladden, and during the interim in his ministry, in a period devoted to his wife's health, he studied widely on the problems of social justice and then formulated definite and passionate principles of what he thought Christianity implied in relation to our present problems. This he believed meant a new social order founded on justice and the welfare of the lowliest and the neediest and this he believed was included in the ideals of the coming of God's kingdom on earth.

He whose heart was eminently a heart of love believed that Christ came to reveal God as our Father, a Father of infinite love and goodness, whose will was good will for His children; and he preached constantly the theme of the goodness of God and His love to men, and the utter need for a disciple of Jesus to love his fellow men. "The greatest thing in the world," he once said in his pulpit, "is to bring the love of God into human hearts."

By the same token he felt that we should reverence all men, even the lowliest; indeed, he held that "true religion begets a reverence toward all of life."

He believed fervently in humanity, in justice, and right for every man; above all, he believed in men—that if only they could know the truth they would live the truth.

He felt that Christ's teachings were the answer to our problems, spiritual and temporal, and utter responsibility lay on the minister to proclaim the truth.

It was probably not only his hearty good spirits and his illimitable good will, but his understanding heart that made him tolerant and free of condemnation of his fellow men. His own heart was pure and his motives and thoughts were invariably and completely above the littlenesses of thought; but he never preached at men, he did not condemn; and yet, in the presence of those who had admittedly done wrong, while never condoning, he lifted them to a higher perspective by the very idealism of his own attitudes and thought.

It was his habit to fling himself ardently into whatever field he had been assigned, and to preach with all the power in him to help folks and give them the best he had.

He was especially happy in his work in the Crescent Heights Church, in West Hollywood. He was minister there at the time when Hollywood with all its vibrant enthusiasm was getting well under way as a center of the great motion-picture industry. The Bowl project was just being launched, and the Pilgrimage play, and the community sings. He shared in the civic interest and joined with the civic leaders to the extent of his opportunities. He planned for and built the church that was to be a spiritual center for that lovely residence district. His plans called for features that meant progress and service for the community and the church.

From there he was sent to Tucson, where the magnificence of the desert and the almost Old World border town gave fresh interest and inspiration. He shared actively in the university interests, was active in the Kiwanis and the Hiram Clubs and with a choir that gave a background of distinctive music, he did some of his greatest preaching and came to be known as the greatest orator of the Southwest. Yet here his ministry was a ministry of compassion and constant devotion to the health seekers of that city. From thence he went to Mission Hills in San Diego.

In the spring of 1930, while pastor at Garden Grove, his beloved alma mater conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of divinity. He gave the baccalaureate address on that occasion.

In June 1932 he was appointed to Grace Church, Los Angeles.

The great east side, with all its cosmopolitan life, its evidences of former prominence in the history of the city, its new relationships because of its present foreign population, were at once a challenge to him. Always he had adapted himself and his ministry to the character of his environment. He deliberately set about to know and to understand the people with whom he was associated.

The great depression was on, and suffering and need such as he had never seen were all about him. He went through a special crisis in his own soul and decided, come what may and cost what might be, he would speak the truth to the people and teach the social gospel—the way of the Kingdom of God. He would throw open the doors of the church to the people.

This led to the establishment of the fellowship forum, which brought speakers of distinction, men of knowledge and authority, to the people of the community; it gave opportunity for utterance and expression to people who were downcast and troubled or even resentful over the tragic conditions that beset them.

He established adult classes which were carried on on popular subjects for some winters and which finally developed into a people's institute, with special courses for workers. This had the sponsorship of noted educators from the various colleges and universities about the city; men gave their names because they believed in Floyd Seaman and his principles.

He loved the youth who gathered in the social center—rejoiced in their joyous activities. They were all a part of the Grace Church family—and they returned his love in fine enthusiasm.

He published this paper, the Messenger, with its announcements of the events about the church and with its brief editorials that constantly pleaded the cause of a better world or gave assurance to those troubled and in doubt.

Great civic causes enlisted his support, and constantly he was called on to contribute his gifts of speech to meetings in behalf of some cause, or to plead the cause of some minority group before the city agencies.

He was appointed to the post of health commissioner by the mayor, but declined because of personal reasons. Part of his greatest ministry was the personal conferences. These brought an enrichment through close personal experiences, though all to often his sympathies were deeply stirred by the suffering of these visitors.

He shared his resources without stint and lived the simplest sort of an existence, and because of the steady need and pressure and the urgency of things, failed to take proper rest or recreation. Like St. Paul, he literally "poured himself out" for his fellow man. He gloried in doing so, for he was in his own medium when he was consciously doing for others and helping to make this old world a better place to live.

When the persecutions of the Jews in Germany began to cast horror across the waters, he espoused their cause with especial sympathy; for he had come to understand and admire the idealism, the energy, the intellect, and the warmth of personality he found among his fellow citizens of Hebrew birth; and one of the most satisfying experiences of his life was at that moment when, after the horrible pogroms of the post-Munich crisis, in the great East Side demonstration, he spoke in the Breed Street Synagogue and in the vast outdoor meeting in their behalf. He was "the suffering servant"—identified with those who suffered, and he poured his heart out in love and pity.

His own health was affected, not only by the steady pressure of work without proper vacation, but by an auto accident en route to Sacramento, where he was to have spoken for the newly formed People's Legislative Conference, a movement of the people to influence legislation in behalf of popular welfare.

That his work at Grace Church should have come to an end was a deep grief to him; he met it bravely and uncomplainingly, but he seemed to sense that his lifework was accomplished.

Nevertheless he accepted the assignment to Echo Park; he entered the work joyously and with enthusiasm; he loved the people, and their response was enthusiastic and encouraging. All seemed well until the shock of his heart attack. From this he seemed to be recovering and was about the home for the month of February, when complications set in and he became seriously ill. He passed on to the Life Triumphant April 15 at the Queen of the Angels Hospital.

He was so vibrant, so hearty, so full of joyousness, that it cannot seem that he is gone; certainly we know that his spirit still lives with fresh joy and blessedness.

He had an eager desire for knowledge and truth; a progressive and open mind; he devotedly loved his books and great music and the beauty of nature; he loved his fellow men, and his dear ones were most blessed in his devotion. Patient, kindly, generous, hopeful, with malice and resentments toward none, he took the teachings of his Master literally, and especially in the last eventful dedication to the Kingdom lived up to what he thought Jesus would do. Each day was committed to God; each day he asked for guidance and direction. His last weeks were especially beautiful, for he blessed all who ministered to him and poured out love on his dear ones.

If he were to leave behind a message for those who knew and loved him, I think it would be something like this: "Have faith in God, and in the triumph of righteousness, no matter how dark the clouds become. God is your Father, and He loves you and all men—trust Him. Do not fail to be true to your highest—and carry on. Love your fellow men and work for a better world and keep the peace."

As his wife, who had the precious privilege of life together with him for 26 years, I am deeply grateful to a gracious God who let me live so close to his inmost heart. We joyously shared together books, music, friends, the out of doors; our tastes in literature and recreation, our ideals, and our perspectives were correspondent and complete. His life was a benediction for which I can humbly thank my God. I only ask for grace to carry on in His spirit and love.

"'Tis human fortune's happiest height to be
A spirit melodious, lucid, poised, and whole:
Second in order of felicity,
I hold it, to have walked with such a soul."

FLORA J. SEAMAN.

The Domestic Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. MOUTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

LETTER FROM JOHN M. CAFFERY, JR.

Mr. MOUTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from a constituent and prominent young attorney of Franklin, La.—Mr. John M. Caffery, Jr.—giving his views with reference to the situation confronting our domestic sugar-producing industry, as follows:

FRANKLIN, LA., *March 3, 1940.*

Hon. ROBERT L. MOUTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOUTON: Before Congress there is now pending a bill affecting one of the oldest industries in the country. The domestic-sugar industry dates back over 200 years. This rather small and little known industry is also one of the most important, and one of the reasons is that, as demonstrated by the last war, it is now recognized that the United States cannot engage in any international conflict without finding herself confronted with a shortage of sugar. One example of this was the difficulty during the last war in securing enough ocean-going bottoms to transport sugar the 6,000 miles from one of our principal sources of supply, the Philippine Islands.

Our sugar policy is therefore bound up to a greater or lesser extent with our military policy. President Coolidge, in June 1925, after a United States tariff report on sugar, stated:

"* * * It is important that as a Nation we should be independent as far as we may of overseas imports of food. * * * The interest of the consumer will be in the long run served only by the ample supply of the product. * * *

"The farmer is entitled to share along with the manufacturer direct benefits of our national policy of protecting domestic industry."

Recently there has been increasing criticism of the sugar industry, particularly on the part of persons high in administration circles. Typical of these are statements by the Secretary of State that the tariff on sugar was costing the consumers millions of dollars. And again by the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that there never should have been a stalk of sugarcane planted in this country. Aside from other equities the Secretary perhaps does not realize the citizens of this country are supposed to be able to pursue the enjoyment of property freely and without restraint and protected by their Government, so long as they operate fairly and squarely. Possibly the Secretary does not feel that it is the duty of his office to promote and protect the domestic interest, regardless of how he feels personally.

From 1900 to 1930 the price of raw sugar ranged from a low of 4 cents to a high of approximately 12 cents per pound, with an average price during those years of almost 6 cents. From 1930 to 1936 the price ranged from 2.9 cents to a high of 3.5 cents per pound.

It is therefore apparent that since 1900 the price has declined about 50 percent, and for the years 1920 to 1925, where the average price was 7½ cents per pound, the decline in price is more striking. Now, with the exception of the war period, the margin of profit and loss to the domestic planter was approximately 10 percent profit to 75 percent loss. This is illustrated by the fact that in the parish of St. Mary in Louisiana there were 16 operators in the business 25 years ago; today there are only 4 of them left. Some of these places went under, some changed hands, and others were just abandoned. Today there are 69 sugar houses in Louisiana, and in addition there are some twenty-odd lying idle in various stages of disrepair. The machinery used in making sugar is expensive and highly specialized, and cannot be converted to any other use but the making of sugar.

The domestic industry faces three hazards. The first is the terrific foreign competition, mainly from Cuba; the second is the almost total lack of knowledge about the sugar industry on the part of the consumer or the general public; and the third, and most disheartening to the industry, is the antagonism displayed toward it by the present administration.

The domestic industry has been termed a high-cost business, and it is pointed out and urged by some that the United States should allow this industry to die out or even force it out and secure its sugar supply from the cheaper source.

The sugar industry points out, however, that there are not many industries that would not be susceptible to supplanting in this manner by cheap foreign competition. In addition, what would the thousands do who are dependent on the industry for a living and whose lands are good for nothing else? Then there is the reason why sugar is made cheaper in Cuba.

Labor costs represent over 50 percent of the cost of production, and in this country and in Puerto Rico employees' wages and hours are regulated by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Wage and Hour Administration. These are administrated strictly, and the penalty for violations is great. The writer knows of one instance where a Louisiana planter is about to lose the total of his benefit payment because he hired a young boy who misrepresented his age.

The minimum wage to daily employees is $1.50 per day. In addition those who desire can secure housing free, and these plantation units generally maintain livestock and gardens whose produce is doled out free at intervals. There is a devotion shown by the workers for their employers in this industry that probably has few parallels in this country.

In Cuba the average wage is as low as 25 cents per day and under conditions akin to the peon situation in Mexico. The domestic industry cannot help but feel that it is unjustly treated when it is forced to pay a high wage to make its product and then forced to compete with foreign sweatshops for its own home market. As ordinary American citizens, members of the industry believe that a knowledge of the situation need only be shown to the consumer.

The lack of knowledge on the part of the consumer has played into the hands of the refiners, both American and foreign. The American refiners are located mainly along the eastern seaboard in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and in San Francisco. It is their business to buy raw sugar from the grower-processor, refine it, and place it on the market for sale to the consumer. The cheaper it can be bought from the grower the larger the profit. The methods these refiners used in playing the domestic industry against the foreign industry are best illustrated by the fact that they have been brought into court more than once and have sustained unfavorable decisions, one resulting in a refund of millions of dollars to the domestic raw-sugar makers.

It is these refiners, small in number and possessing almost unlimited financial resources, who are responsible more than anyone else for causing the distaste generally found among consumers for the domestic-sugar planter.

By the use of leaflets and handbills placed in the packaged sugar for retail stores, the housewife was for a number of years propagandized to the effect that this sugar was costing her several times too much and that she should demand some action from her Congressmen. These tactics could not fail to have some effect, but imagine the feelings of an industry that was on its back, suffering from diseased cane, a fluctuating and uncertain price, and struggling to continue in the face of a ruinous foreign competition. The consumer, then, was alined with the foreign sweatshop employer.

In 1933 came a ray of hope. The Roosevelt administration flashed across the sky like a comet in a blaze of light, and with great fire and fanfare began condemning these practices of child labor and sweatshop conditions. Some of these reforms were passed, and a number of industries were freed of these conditions. The sugar industry waited patiently. It is still waiting but less hopeful.

The Secretary of State, a free trader, seems determined that all foreigners who desire shall profit at the expense of the American businessman. To that end he proceeded to conclude, on his own volition, trade treaty after trade treaty. In addition he has actively opposed, both behind the scenes and before committees and meetings, any legislation that would favor the American sugar planter over foreign interests. It seemed to the domestic people as if being American was a detriment when it came to making a living in America.

The Secretary of Agriculture, as stated at the outset, is on record as opposed to the domestic industry. There is a unit in the Department called the Sugar Section and in it there is not a man who has had any practical connection with the industry.

When the present war broke out and the price of sugar edged forward (not the retail price but the price of raws) one-fourth of a cent per pound, the President made a great noise about war profiteering and suspended the quota on sugar, thus flooding the market. The writer cannot recall any other commodity that was interfered with. He, in addition, threatened to lift the tariff if it went forward any more. Cuba, incidentally, pays only a part of the tariff; and no one else who would be subject to it ships in any appreciable amount of sugar.

At the outset of the present administration the public was exhorted in the name of patriotism and fairness not to buy products or those services that were made possible by the use of such oppressing conditions. Yet this same administration has seen fit to favor, and suggest that the domestic industry be supplanted by an industry built on those very evils.

The domestic industry is an old one. It is old in years, old in land, and old in machinery. It has never shown the financial vitality that marked the growth of its competitors. The fact that as an industry it has never been able to employ the more up-to-date and more efficient machinery and materials employed by its foreign competitors, who in reality are backed by certain New York banks, is one of the elements that make its cost of production higher. There is little doubt that had it had that backing, together with the protection of its own Government, which should be its due, particularly during periods of difficulty in the past with an unadapted cane, the industry would now have been able to compete without any protection of any sort, even in the face of the great wage differential. The industry believes it is entitled to the support of its Government and the good will of its own people.

Very truly yours,

JOHN M. CAFFERY, Jr.

The Fantastic Story of How the American People Have Given Billions of Dollars as Gifts to Foreign Gold Producers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, if I may have your attention for a few moments, I will relate one of the most astounding and fantastic true stories ever written on the pages of history. The legendary fable of King Midas and his golden touch will always be a fairy tale. But when you get the true significance of the expensive legerdemain practiced upon the American people by New Deal monetary wizards in the handling of your money, you will begin to wonder how and why it was all planned that way.

I mentioned King Midas, and, therefore, my story will be about gold—the New Deal's gold and monetary policy. The last chapter of this fallacious and expensive experiment is still to be written.

BRAIN TRUSTERS PLAY WITH MONETARY SYSTEM

Seven long years ago, when the New Deal began its "brain trust" program to remake the United States and its people, two distinguished professors, Drs. Warren and Sprague, conceived a new theory on money. They urged that if their ideas could be put into operation as an experiment with our monetary system, the practical working of the plan would revive our export market, raise farm prices, restore agricultural prosperity, and put millions of unemployed back to work. In other words, we would be out of the depression. President Roosevelt took over the idea, and the program went into operation—authority having been granted by Congress in early 1934, with little or no consideration, and surely without much of any understanding.

At the beginning of the monetary experiment it was stated that only five or six persons in this country and England understood the workings of money. This may be correct, but I doubt very much if even they knew anything about money, excepting the having and spending of it. All of these monetary experts have long since been erased from the picture. But the program still goes on, as it now appears that we have a wild bear by the tail. If we let go, the bear will bite, and so we hang on to a policy which may be real expensive and disastrous before the experiment is finished.

MONETARY EXPERIMENT UNROLLS

In January of 1934, we had around $4,000,000,000 in gold in this country. The historic value of gold throughout the world and in the United States was $20.67 per ounce. Our supply of gold was about 30 percent of the world's stock of this metal. Before June 1 of 1940, the Treasury will have over $19,000,000,000 in gold, which represents approximately 70 percent of the entire world supply. The law states that the Government has title to this gold, but Treasury records show that the Federal Reserve System has a mortgage on it for more than $17,000,000,000.

The authority demanded and secured by President Roosevelt in 1934, from a rubber-stamp Congress, to carry out the new monetary program, gave the President the power to fix the value of our American dollar, which power under the Constitution is solely vested in Congress, and the further authority to buy foreign gold and silver at a price set by him. He fixed the value of the dollar at 59 cents, and raised the price of all foreign gold, and newly mined gold produced in this country, from $20.67 to $35 an ounce. This action resulted in the payment by the United States Treasury of a premium on foreign gold of $14.33 an ounce, which represents an increase in value of 69 percent. A further result of the President's act definitely fixed the world price of gold at $35 an ounce, as it could always be sold at that price to the United States Treasury.

AMERICANS PENALIZED

In order to prevent any American citizen from receiving the benefit of the increase in the price of gold, the law contained a criminal section requiring every American citizen to turn in his gold to the Treasury at the old price of $20.67 instead of $35 an ounce, or else there would be prosecution with a penitentiary sentence and a heavy fine.

Should you possess a $20 gold piece, which contains about 1 ounce of gold, ask your local banker how much it is worth in legal tender. He will tell you $20. This same $20 gold piece when possessed by a resident of any foreign country will bring $34.33 when sold to the United States Treasury.

GOLD PROGRAM FIXES WORLD PRICE

I realize that there may be some confusion in the minds of many as to the practical working of our foreign-gold policy. Therefore I will give an illustration, using wheat, which is grown in nearly every country in the world, as the commodity instead of gold. We will say that the world price of wheat is $1 per bushel. What do you think would happen if the United States Treasury fixed the price on all foreign wheat at $1.69 per bushel and offered to take delivery?

Of course, the answer is simple. The world price on wheat would go to $1.69 a bushel, less cost of transportation, to the United States.

Every foreign farmer would double and treble his production of wheat, and the price would remain fixed at $1.69 as long as our Government continued to buy at the fixed price. If the Treasury dropped the price—the world price on wheat would go down, and, if the Treasury stopped buying, there would be chaos in the world. The price would go down to meet the law of supply and demand, and we would possess billions of bushels of wheat at little or no value.

This is just what has happened with gold prices and gold production, and as long as we offer to buy the world's supply of gold, the price will remain at the figure set by the President.

When Mr. Roosevelt boosted the price to be paid for foreign gold from $20.67 to $35 an ounce, the world price went to $35, less cost of transportation to the United States, and it has remained at that figure for more than 6 years. Production of gold has doubled and trebled in most gold-producing countries. Mine owners are working their properties day and night—7 days a week—in order to get the gold out of the ground for sale to Uncle Sam, or should we say Uncle Santa Claus, at a premium of $14.33 an average. We buy it, pay the $35 per ounce, and then bury it in the ground down in Kentucky. From earth to earth, can properly apply here because the gold is not used.

For more than 6 years foreign gold has been poured into our Treasury, coming by boat, train, and plane. We purchased billions—to be exact, $11,300,000,000 worth—from

Russia, Japan, Italy, England, France, and every other country in the world. Just about enough to pay the debt of $14,000,000,000 still due our country from the days of the World War, 22 years ago.

AMERICAN GENEROSITY

Now we come to the astounding and fantastic part of the gold program. American citizens were forced to take $20.67 an ounce for their old gold, which included gold coins and gold certificates, while the Treasury insisted upon paying foreign gold producers $35 an ounce, or a premium of $14.33. Thus far we have paid foreign gold producers premiums totaling nearly $4,500,000,000. In my opinion, this represents an outright gift from the American people to foreign individuals and governments, who are not entitled to our generosity.

If we stop buying gold or reduce the price, a world-wide economic collapse will occur, and our large gold holdings may be of little or no value as a medium of international exchange or for any other purpose. In view of the disastrous possibilities, the Secretary of the Treasury definitely states that we must continue buying foreign gold at $35 an ounce.

RUSSIA, JAPAN, AND HITLER ARE BENEFICIARIES OF NEW DEAL POLICIES

Communistic Russia has produced over a billion dollars in gold during the past 6 years by the use of convict and exile labor at a cost of approximately $10 an ounce. The American policy of fixing the world price of gold at $35 an ounce made it possible for the Russian Government to make hundreds of millions of dollars on their gold production. Large quantities of Russian gold were sold directly and indirectly to the United States Treasury.

During the same 6-year period Japan has sold us directly $580,000,000 in gold, and we paid them a profit of approximately $230,000,000 on the transaction. The Japanese Government used the money they received from the Treasury largely for the purchase of war supplies and raw materials to carry on the aggression against friendly China and in the building of a large navy, which some American admirals claim will some day be used against our country.

In his mad lust for conquest, Hitler stole hundreds of millions of dollars in gold from the small democracies of Europe. The New Deal's offer to buy all foreign gold at $35 per ounce made it possible for Hitler to secure the full benefit of the inflated price fixed by the President.

CONGRESS MUST RECAPTURE MONETARY POWERS

A few days ago Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, delivered a speech on the subject of gold. In speaking about the American dollar, he said that the United States has the soundest money in the world. I thoroughly agree with him, as I am convinced that no country in the world possesses as sound money as the United States. The people of our country have faith in the soundness of our American dollar, but why should they be called upon to give away their dollars to foreign mine owners and governments, who have no interest whatsoever in their domestic welfare?

I feel that you will agree with me that the foreign-gold policy of the New Deal has utterly failed in purpose. It did not restore our export market, except for materials of war. It did not raise farm prices or create work for millions of unemployed American citizens. Official records disclose that farm exports have diminished to the lowest point in history. Foreign beneficiaries of our gold policy piled up over $9,000,000,000 in bank deposits and security investments in this country instead of buying surpluses which we desired to sell for export.

The scheme failed because we did not insist that foreign sellers of gold spend the money we gave them for American farm and manufactured products. New Deal leaders in Congress defeated my attempt to write such a provision into the law. If gold buying is to continue, we should require foreign beneficiaries to buy our products from farm and factory—otherwise no premium should be paid on foreign gold.

To continue our present policy of giving billions of dollars as gifts to foreign owners of gold mines is beyond all rhyme or reason as a part of our good-neighbor policy.

Our job should be to first take care of American citizens—adequately prepare our national defense, solve our domestic problems, and remain firm in our conviction to keep out of the horrible war in Europe.

Some New Deal leaders propose that we use our gold to rebuild Europe after the war. We tried that once. Others propose that we buy cheaply produced farm and manufactured products from foreign countries and pay for them with gold. Such a policy would stagnate American agriculture and industry. Either suggestion would leave our country "holding the bag."

We no doubt have a wild bear by the tail. The New Deal monetary wizards who got us into this desperate situation cannot solve the problem.

Congress should immediately stop this fantastic and expensive experiment—recapture its constitutional authority to fix the value of money and begin legislating for the future welfare of America.

Seven long years in the role of a world-wide Santa Claus is enough. Let us stop now before it is too late.

Foreign gold purchased by U. S. Treasury Jan. 1, 1934, to Jan. 1, 1940

[The first column shows amount paid (at $35 per ounce) by Treasury to foreign sellers of gold. The second column shows the gift or premium from our Treasury to foreign gold dealers, being the difference between $20.67 per ounce and $35 per ounce]

Foreign gold sold to U. S. came from these countries	Total amount paid by U. S. Treasury	Amount of gift from U. S. Treasury to foreign gold dealers
United Kingdom	$4,916,352,000	$1,966,540,000
France	1,839,360,000	735,744,000
Belgium	283,775,000	113,510,000
Netherlands	903,667,000	361,466,000
Sweden	88,869,000	35,547,000
Switzerland	163,683,000	65,473,000
Canada	1,065,392,000	426,156,000
Mexico	192,467,000	76,986,000
Colombia	91,947,000	36,778,000
Philippine Islands	137,829,000	55,131,000
Australia	175,932,000	70,372,000
South Africa	23,529,000	9,411,000
Japan	580,813,000	232,325,000
British India	347,857,000	139,142,000
All other countries	319,405,000	127,762,000
Total	11,120,820,000	4,448,328,000

WHEN THE WAR ENDS—THEN WHAT?

When the war in Europe comes to an end, and millions of men now engaged in war return to productive employment in foreign agriculture and industry, our troubles in the United States will be magnified beyond present comprehension. Depreciated foreign currencies and the fact that our country will possess nearly all of the world's gold will make the United States the dumping ground for cheaply produced farm and manufactured products from all corners of the earth. Our export market, which now consists largely of war materials, will diminish to the vanishing point, and cheap foreign competition in all lines will bring serious distress to our country.

We can, in part, protect our future domestic economy by legislation, but not before the Chief Executive and Congress learn that our first duty is to protect the welfare of our fellow Americans.

The following United States Treasury statement discloses that foreign governments still owe the American people the sum of $14,605,031,504.70 from loans made by President Wilson during the Democratic administration of 20 years ago.

Debtor countries

[Total indebtedness (payments on principal deducted)]

Armenia	$23,901,391.74
Belgium	457,552,820.78
Czechoslovakia	165,788,588.45
Estonia	21,321,017.05
Finland	8,142,890.21
France	4,200,332,646.54
Germany (Austrian indebtedness)	26,016,720,15
Great Britain	5,574,430,793.82
Greece	34,525,547.43
Hungary	2,412,700.53
Italy	2,025,525,996.77
Latvia	8,790,192.69
Lithuania	7,870,378.50
Poland	266,815,451.34
Rumania	64,914,114.78
Russia	395,002,244.52
Yugoslavia	61,817,578.15
Germany	1,259,870,431.25
Total	14,605,031,504.70

Philippine National Volunteers for Complete Independence in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the unrest in Europe and in the Far East, and occasional statements that there should be a restudy of the Philippine independence question, I wish the membership of this House to know that, so far as the 100,000 members of the Philippine National Volunteers are concerned, they are opposed to any restudy of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, and are ready to assume their responsibility as free people on and after July 4, 1946.

For your information, I would like you to know that the Philippine National Volunteers are composed of men up to 45 years of age who take an oath of allegiance to the Philippine Islands and the United States and swear to uphold the Constitution of our country. In their membership we find men in all walks of life, located in every section of the Philippine Islands, who are highly appreciative of the benefits they have received at the hands of the United States of America.

I know that my colleagues will be interested to know that the chief of staff of the National Volunteers of the Philippines is Maj. Gen. Francisco Delgado, who was recently one of our colleagues, and served ably among us as the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands. The sentiment of this organization is ably stated in the recent annual message of President Panfilo Laconico, who was elected for the eighth consecutive term, to carry on the work of these patriots in the Philippine Islands. By leave given me, I quote from part of Lieutenant General Laconico's annual message, delivered before a large attendance of delegates at the tenth annual convention of the National Volunteers, held on February 25, at the general headquarters of the organization at Manila, P. I.:

Before I proceed to acquaint you with the various details of our activities during the fiscal year which had just closed, I wish to call your attention to the need of revitalizing ourselves and renewing our fervor in order to meet a new challenge which it is our misfortune to confront. I wish to make reference, gentlemen, to the acceptation by certain elements of our people who are willing to forfeit our right to ultimate freedom in favor of uncertainty. Such willingness is, in part, based upon certain flimsy, unreal, and groundless hope inspired, allegedly, by the uncertainty of world conditions and by the inability of our forces to repel foreign aggressions if and when such an aggression comes.

On this point, gentlemen, I cannot but be emphatic with respect to our stand.

The Philippine National Volunteers was conceived and founded 9 years ago upon the assumption and on the firm determination of our people of attaining the independence of our country. Our determination has not abated even for a single iota. We have modified and adjusted our requirements and personal efforts toward the attainment of the goal which our leaders and our people have so reverently set for our country. We have, since the inauguration of the new regime, laid down our own program based on independence in 1946 and have geared ourselves to the preparation of those tasks incident to the inauguration of independent nationhood. Thus far, there has been no reason for us to change or alter our plans. We should be ready for independence and should cherish that day when we may call ourselves ultimately free. Freedom is the richest heritage which America has given us; freedom is the richest prize which liberty-loving Americans have awarded us. Let us sanctify, revere, and cherish this heritage because nothing else in the world can be more valuable or more lasting.

* * * * * * *

ON THE INDEPENDENCE QUESTION

On more than one occasion in the past, I have made full reiteration of the stand of the National Volunteers of the Philippines on the question of Philippine independence. As independence is already an accomplished fact, and as the Tydings-McDuffie law has been ratified by the Filipinos, it is the sense of the Philippine National Volunteers to pursue that course leading to the eventual grant of independence upon the termination of the current transition period.

It is an exaggeration to say that as Volunteers we are looked upon as leaders of thought and citizenship in our respective communities. For this reason, our stand on the subject of ultimate freedom should be unreserved and outspoken. Our stand on the subject serves to bear no little amount of influence to those who look upon us for guidance and inspiration. I have said this before and I am saying it again: Let us help create here a people conscious of their obligations as citizens of a free country. * * * Confronted as we are with a new dispensation in our national life, it is saddening to note that we have not as yet been prompted to a full realization of our situation. * * * As Volunteers I call upon you to help in making our people realize that we are citizens of a country about to be free, that by virtue of certain covenants and enactments between our country and that of America, we are entrusted with new responsibilities. Four hundred years of association with foreign powers has poisoned our minds and has given us the feeling of subservience which all peoples of a subjected country feel.

As leaders along the lines of citizenship, or at least as belonging to a group striving to be model citizens, we should keep faith with our respective trusts and should meet our obligations accordingly. Let us assume our new responsibilities with faith and courage. The country exacts of us the fulfillment of certain duties and obligations. Let us meet them. Let us pay our taxes; let us cooperate with the administration in the orderly process of preparing our country for national security. Let us dedicate ourselves to the rigorous compliance of those activities and labors which the constitution and bylaws of the Philippine National Volunteers had set for us to follow.

We have sworn ourselves to a duty which exacts of us the ultimate in sacrifices and discipline. I beseech you, gentlemen, to remain true to your respective oaths. Ours is a military organization, and in such a body discipline is the watchword, and discipline is our primary requirement. Let us learn to follow the leaders, to obey commands from them, and to follow instructions accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, General Laconico, in this statement, tells us how the mass of people in these islands feels about independence. I hope when complete freedom comes to those people the powerful governments of the world will join together and make those islands neutral and guarantee to them freedom and liberty forever.

Can the Wagner Act Be Made To Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of my colleague from Virginia, Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH:

I don't know but that the answer I am supposed to give might better come from some other source, the question being, Can the Wagner Act be made to work? I think the Wagner Act can be made to work, and I am going to tell you how and why as briefly as I can. I want to say that I recognize that all of you are hard-headed, common-sense businessmen, and I am not here to give you any display of oratory, because that is not along my line, but I am going to seek to tell you what I know. If you are then convinced that the things that should be done are what I believe should be done, those of us who are fighting this battle here in Washington might have your assistance and cooperation.

I think that the businessmen of this country as a first step must make up their minds that collective bargaining—which is the thing that the Wagner Act protects—is a thing that is here to stay. Whether you like it or not, it is one of those conditions in a rapidly changing business world that you must make up your minds to get along with.

PURPOSES OF WAGNER ACT

The Wagner Act as it was originally enacted—and, I submit, as it was intended by Congress—had a twofold purpose. One was to declare by law the right of employees to bargain with their employers collectively through representatives of their own choosing. The second object of that law was to fairly, honestly, and impartially furnish the machinery for the protection and enforcement of that right of collective bargaining. Now that is all the Wagner Act was ever intended to do, according to its sponsors at the time it was enacted. The things that you and I quarrel about are the things that I submit Congress never intended and the sponsors of the bill never intended.

NEED FOR IMPARTIAL ADMINISTRATION

To make the Wagner Act work there are two things that must be accomplished. To make any law work in this country satisfactorily, there has to be a fair, honest, and impartial administration of that law. That is No. 1. As a corollary to that, you have to make the American people very confident of the fact that it is working in a fair, honest, and impartial way.

Whatever might be the facts, if the country is sold on the idea that one of our laws, whether it is the Wagner Act or some other act, is not working fairly and honestly with all the people with whom it deals, then you have destroyed public confidence in that act and before it can be made to work satisfactorily, whatever the facts may be, that public confidence must be restored. To restore that public confidence there must be an impartial administration of the law and then on top of that there must be amendments to the law to correct the evils which are almost unanimously conceded.

We must not only have a fair and impartial administration of the act, but we must have those needed amendments to the act that will reassure the public that the things that have happened in the past cannot, under any administration, happen in the future. So we have proposed certain amendments that those who think the Labor Act is some sort of sacred cow that must not be touched, proclaimed as intended to destroy and emasculate the Wagner Act. Such is not the case; and my few remarks this afternoon are going to be devoted to telling you what those important amendments are and why we offered them and why they should be adopted. In some instances, I am going to tell you the sources from which they came, and I am going to start out with the so-called free-speech amendment.

PRESERVATION OF FREE SPEECH

The so-called free-speech amendment is that amendment which would reaffirm the right of free speech in this country. As it is now, as you know, if a man should happen to remark to one of his employees that if he had a son he would not advise him to join a union, that is an unfair labor practice; it has been so held by the Board. The American Federation of Labor became the victim of that ruling just as the employers did, and so the American Federation of Labor proposed an amendment to lift that ban and permit the employer to discuss with his employees any subject that might be of mutual interest.

What did our committee do in destroying this act through such an amendment? We took word for word the amendment adopted and proposed and introduced by the American Federation of Labor, and offered it to the Congress as the solution of that difficulty. If we are to be indicted on that ground for attempting to destroy the Wagner Act, then we must be indicted jointly with the American Federation of Labor. I think the American Federation of Labor has been here many, many years protecting the rights of the American working man when some of these folks who now declare themselves to be its champions were walking around in swaddling clothes.

There is just one thing we didn't adopt, though, in the American Federation of Labor amendment to free speech. We thought the American Federation of Labor perhaps went further than Congress ought to go, and so we actually modified Mr. William Green's amendment and wouldn't go as far in our committee report as Mr. William Green and the American Federation of Labor proposed to go and have advocated going before three committees of the Congress of the United States. That is how we sought to destroy the act with the free speech amendment. Now I will pass on to another.

UNITS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The unit of representation. I am not sure that all of you folks are familiar with that subject, but under the act this Board has the arbitrary and complete power to determine what shall be the collective bargaining unit in which the employees shall vote in any election. In other words, they may say that one factory shall be the whole unit and the employees shall elect representatives from that factory. But the Board can also say that we will take this factory in Indiana, this one in Virginia, and this one in Minnesota, and we will throw them all in together and make one unit and the employees in all these plants will all have to vote in the same election. Now that has caused untold trouble. It is probably one of the most disputed questions about the whole act.

What did we do about that? A gentleman, Dean Lloyd Garrison, a very fine man and the chairman of the old Labor Board under the N. R. A., and he knows his stuff, came before our committee and said that that situation was bad and that it needed a remedy. He sat there before our committee and stated the amendment which he, probably the best friend of the Labor Board, undoubtedly one of the best friends of organized labor, and one of the best friends of the Wagner Act, thought was the thing to accomplish it. That amendment was this: Whenever a dispute arose as to what should constitute the appropriate bargaining unit, instead of the Labor Board getting into the middle of it and being partial to one side or the other, that subject should be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Board until those labor unions had settled that quarrel among themselves and put the settlement in writing. That was the suggestion offered by Dean Lloyd Garrison, the chairman of the old Labor Board.

Our committee in its frantic efforts, as the other folks say, to destroy the National Labor Relations Act, adopted Dean Lloyd Garrison's amendment. If we are to be indicted for seeking to destroy the Labor Act, then we must be jointly indicted with Dean Lloyd Garrison, the best friend that the Labor Board ever had.

OTHER POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS

I mention these things to you, gentlemen because of the fact that this propaganda started as soon as our amendments were offered that we were seeking to destroy the rights of organized labor. Well, the fact is that it wouldn't have made any difference what amendments we had offered, the same cry would have gone up. We could have offered some amendments that would have had equally good authority that we did not offer. For instance, take the Railway Labor Act, that the labor folks say works fine. We could have offered an amendment that the Wagner Act do away with the closed shop. If we had done that, we would have followed the National Railway Labor Act, which prohibits the closed shop.

We could have put in an amendment which would have prevented mass picketing and such. If we had done that, we would have been following the English law that some of our men on Capitol Hill tell us works so satisfactorily and so fine. But we didn't do those things. What we sought to do was to reach the worst part of this act as quickly as possible and offer those amendments which we thought a fair Congress would put through.

EXCLUSION FOR WILLFUL VIOLENCE

I will mention another one. We put in an amendment which would prohibit the Board from arbitrarily requiring an employer to reinstate an employee who, in the course of a labor dispute, has engaged in willful violence. There is the biggest row about that you ever heard. Some of these fellows think that is a terrible thing to do; they think that the Board should be permitted to reinstate a man who had been guilty of willful violence, such as a sit-down strike. Let's see what was our authority for that.

The Labor Board in the Fansteel case ordered the employer to reinstate a number of people who had been discharged because they had actually with violence seized and taken possession of the plant of that company by means of a sit-down strike. They ordered those men reinstated. That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the Board and said that the Board had no power and no right and no authority to reinstate men who had engaged in violence and had unlawfully seized their employer's property.

So we put in an amendment to cover that, and the reason we did it was that immediately after that decision of the Supreme Court the Labor Board, in another case then pending in the circuit court, in the face of that decision, sought to get that circuit court to order the reinstatement of men who had been fired for indulging in a sit-down strike.

If we sought in our amendments to destroy the National Labor Relations Act and if we must be indicted for doing so, then we must be jointly indicted with the Supreme Court of the United States whose opinion suggested to us the amendment which we offered.

BOARD'S POWERS OVER BARGAINING UNIT

This perhaps does not interest you so much as it does the laboring man, but do you know that under this unit of representation that I was talking about a while ago, if the Labor Board decides, as it did decide in the Longshoremen's case on the Pacific coast, that instead of having one factory in a unit the whole west coast should be the unit of representation, that there was no appeal from that decision to any court?

I will illustrate what happened in the Longshoremen's case. There were A. F. of L. unions up and down the west coast, unions of longshoremen that had been there from time immemorial, almost; they had operated for years, they had built up their reserves, they had members as devoted to their own A. F. of L. union as you are to your lodge, and the Board decided that all of the west coast must be thrown into one unit of representation and everybody on the west coast who was a longshoreman should vote on what union should be selected.

Well, the result was that there were more C. I. O.'s than there were A. F. of L.'s, and so the C. I. O. was certified as the bargaining agent for the whole west coast. A gentleman who is probably known by reputation to all of you, one Mr. Harry Bridges, operates that C. I. O. union on the west coast.

That decision destroyed the right of bargaining of the American Federation of Labor unions all up and down the west coast. That case was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court said that, although that decision had struck at the very heart of those unions and that although that decision had destroyed valuable property rights and personal rights, there was no appeal under this act to the courts. So we sought to remedy that obvious defect by putting in an amendment providing that they should have an appeal to the courts.

I don't care to argue with anybody who will maintain the position that any American citizen who has been aggrieved should not have the right to appeal to the courts of this land.

ELIMINATION OF ECONOMIC DIVISION

We offered another amendment that stirred up a great deal of strife, and that was to abolish what is known as the economic division of the Board, headed by Dr. David J. Saposs. I won't undertake to go into the details of that this afternoon, but will merely say to you that the act itself originally provided that there should be no economists employed by this Board where the data could be obtained from the Department of Labor, and we were informed by the Department of Labor that, if given proper time, they could furnish any statistics that they were asked for. Notwithstanding that, this Board built up an economic division that cost the Government about $73,000 a year. We recommended

its abolition, and as authority for that I will say that in the last few weeks the House of Representatives by a vote of something over 2 to 1 sustained this committee on that by entirely obliterating the appropriation for next year for that division of the National Labor Relations Board.

SEGREGATION OF POWERS

We offered another amendment, and I think the best authority for that is the good, sound common sense of the American people, and that was an amendment which would separate the prosecuting functions of this Board from its judicial functions. You gentlemen know just in the nature of things, from good, sound, common horse sense, that the same man who investigates a case and who goes into court and prosecutes the case can't then impartially try the case and decide it. That just isn't human nature. But under this act as it is now constituted, the same agency which investigate in the first instance, which prosecutes in the second instance, and which finds guilty in the final analysis is all one and the same. I am willing to leave that just to the plain, common sense of anybody that there never ought to be any such law as would permit that, and that the defense is made to that: "Why pick out this agency and do it?" The answer is that my function was dealing with this agency, not the other Government agencies. If I had my way, I wouldn't let any agency confuse the three constitutional functions of legislative, executive, and judicial authority.

PROPOSALS FOR REORGANIZATION OF LABOR BOARD

I am coming back to this question of a fair and impartial tribunal. There are two suggestions before the House of Representatives. One is to take the present Board and keep it where it is and to add two new members. Now that subject hasn't been debated on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I am a little curious to know what is going to be the excuse and the reason and the justification for such an amendment on the part of those gentlemen and ladies who claim that there oughtn't to be any amendments to the Labor Act and that everything is just hunky-dory like it is. If that is true, they ought not to add any to the present members of the Board. All they ought to do is go down and pin a medal on the present members of the Board.

I have been living with this subject for nearly a year now, and I expect I know pretty nearly as much about it as most folks up there on the Hill, and I just don't think that Board can ever be restored to public confidence in the United States so that there may be cooperation between employer and employee in making the Wagner Act work. Until you do restore public confidence, it never will work as it should. So our amendment, as opposed to the amendment offered by the lady from New Jersey, I believe, provides for a new Board. All we do is to say that a new Board is created, and what that means in practical effect is that the President may, if he sees fit, appoint these same three members to the Board, and if they can run the Senate gantlet of confirmation, then I say more power to them, let them go ahead. We don't cut them out entirely; they have still got their chance to be reappointed and to be confirmed.

RESTRICTION ON RIGHT TO HIRE

I am just going to mention one incident in closing, as to why I think there ought to be a new Board. Understand me, ladies and gentlemen, that I have no personal feelings in this matter at all. I never knew anybody connected with that Board until I began this investigation, and all I hope to do is to lend some small contribution toward making this thing operate so that it will not be a continual blackjack over the head of the business of this country.

I want to mention one incident which, to my mind, makes imperative at least the opportunity for the selection of a new Board. Some of you have probably heard of the Waumbec Mills case. It is now pending in the circuit court of appeals for enforcement by the Board. Two men applied for employment with the Waumbec Mills. They were in need of a number of men, and there were a large number who applied for employment. It so happened that two of these men said that they belonged to a union, and there was some conversation about it concerning which there was a good deal of conflict of evidence, but the fact remains that they did not get a job. They were never for one moment on the pay roll of that corporation.

Two years later this Board enters an order which, strange as it may seem, ordered that corporation to reinstate these two men who had never been instated in their employment for a minute in their lives. And they didn't stop there. They further said that they had been engaged in an unfair labor practice because they hadn't hired these two men when they first applied for appointment, and so they ordered this company—believe it or not—not only to reinstate the two men who had never been instated but to pay them back wages ever since the day they applied for a job. And that, ladies and gentlemen, was a unanimous opinion of that Board.

I don't think that business in this country will ever have the confidence in a board that rendered such a decision. Not only that, but in the last 2 weeks there has been rendered a decision of similar character where a company had been formed after an old company went out of business. Remember, this is a new company, with entirely new personnel and new interests and new capital, and many of the old employees applied for reinstatement. Among them were 42 members of the C. I. O. It seems there were about two hundred and some members who were not reemployed for some reason or another.

The other day the Board entered a decision stating that the company had discriminated against these men who had never been on its pay roll because it did not hire them, somebody else got the job. And so in that case it was ordered by the Board that 42 men who had never been instated should be reinstated. It was further ordered that they be paid their wages during the time that they were idle, from the time that they first made application for employment and didn't get it.

IMPORTANCE OF AMENDMENT PROGRAM

Now, gentlemen, all you have to do if you want to know what is going to happen to this country is just look down that road as far as you can see in the light of those two decisions and see what can happen to business in this country and see what can happen to the institution of private capital in this country if this Board can order you to pay from 1 to 10 years' back wages for people that you had never fired because you didn't hire them. I should like you businessmen to think about that case, because when you go back home I want you, if you agree with me, as far as you can to help me put through some honest and fair amendments to this law.

Federal Housing Operations in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks by including therein a report by the Federal Housing Administration, showing the volume of F. H. A. insuring operations, by counties, in the State of Oregon, through December 1, 1939. The report is as follows:

Value of Federal Housing Administration insuring operations, by counties, in the State of Oregon (net cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1939)

County	Title I. Property Improvement Loans Insured		Title II. Small Home Mortgages Accepted for Insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Baker	323	$117,758.60	24	$68,800	347	$186,558.60
Benton	487	144,906.30	75	289,000	562	433,906.30
Clackamas	1,541	515,608.37	187	634,500	1,728	1,150,108.37
Clatsop	1,027	565,829.25	63	180,950	1,090	746,779.25
Columbia	416	142,343.98	13	36,200	429	178,543.98
Coos	441	319,418.13	24	53,025	465	372,443.13
Crook	81	47,074.53	1	1,900	82	48,974.53
Curry	116	103,441.18			116	103,441.18
Deschutes	293	167,119.66	38	86,700	331	253,819.66
Douglas	295	123,631.76	7	21,000	302	144,631.76
Gilliam	27	16,279.70	3	6,500	30	22,779.70
Grant	134	42,425.21	2	5,400	136	47,825.21
Harney	47	26,623.29			47	26,623.29
Hood River	349	224,248.48	57	135,700	406	359,948.48
Jackson	1,382	518,102.69	97	313,000	1,479	831,102.69
Jefferson	21	11,180.64			21	11,180.64
Josephine	533	248,076.18	39	96,800	572	344,876.18
Klamath	1,288	588,972.26	142	486,200	1,430	1,075,172.26
Lake	115	44,535.87	22	64,100	137	108,635.87
Lane	1,959	775,707.09	215	708,650	2,174	1,484,357.09
Lincoln	305	190,056.90	19	38,100	324	228,156.90
Linn	619	204,860.61	48	111,700	667	316,560.61
Malheur	567	226,882.17	61	188,300	628	415,182.17
Marion	2,007	708,913.09	402	1,237,100	2,409	1,946,013.09
Morrow	65	36,963.71	4	8,300	69	45,263.71
Multnomah	16,102	4,968,968.51	2,295	7,638,525	18,397	12,607,493.51
Polk	454	193,580.36	47	121,900	501	315,480.36
Sherman	51	25,166.16	1	2,500	52	27,666.16
Tillamook	264	145,434.31	19	52,150	283	197,584.31
Umatilla	472	312,288.43	43	132,700	515	444,988.43
Union	584	212,701.45	19	56,700	603	269,401.45
Wallowa	73	33,761.23	16	27,600	89	61,361.23
Wasco	329	145,622.56	38	107,300	367	252,922.56
Washington	987	382,240.58	111	365,400	1,098	747,640.58
Wheeler	34	13,083.58	1	1,600	35	14,683.58
Yamhill	378	177,007.75	65	181,700	443	358,707.75
State total	34,166	12,720,814.57	4,198	13,460,000	38,364	26,180,814.57

Capt. Louis Cukela—Marine—A Man's Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK H. RENTFROW

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 28, 1940. Having had 2 years of service with the United States Marine Corps during the World War, and as a captain in the Marine Reserve Corps, it gives me much pleasure to insert in the RECORD this tribute to Capt. Louis Cukela:

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1940]

MARINES TO LOSE LOUIS CUKELA, MOST DECORATED OFFICER, THROUGH HIS RETIREMENT

(By Frank H. Rentfrow)

The United States Marine Corps is losing a great warrior. A man whose fighting heart carried him from the enlisted ranks to the bars of a captain. One who wears on his breast the Medaille Militaire, the Legion of Honor, the French Croix de Guerre with three palms, the Italian Croix de Guerre, five battle clasps on his Victory Medal, and many lesser recognitions. But above these decorations, at his throat, he is privileged to wear this country's highest award—not one but two Congressional Medals of Honor; and Capt. Louis Cukela, United States Marine Corps, has, since the retirement of Gen. Smedley Butler, remained the only person in active service entitled to wear two such medals. In the entire history of our country only 17 men have won two Medals of Honor. Louis Cukela nearly broke all records when he was recommended for still another, but the award was disapproved.

Captain Cukela is not unknown to Washingtonians. He served with the marine guard at the navy yard for 2 years; his glittering medals, his 6 feet of military figure commanding favorable attention on the frequent occasions when the marines paraded down Pennsylvania Avenue. Now he will be seen no more, for the romantic, fictionlike warrior sheaths his sword in retirement—the sword that has carried him into many distant lands on great adventures.

Louis Cukela was born in Split, Serbia, on May 1, 1888, and early in his youth took up the profession of arms in his own country. In 1916 we find him serving as a corporal with the Thirteenth United States Infantry in the Philippine Islands.

Those were grim days of horror for the Allies. Tiny Serbia, ever the butt of warring nations, was being smashed to pieces. The Austrians had struck time and again, only to be flung back across the frontier. Then the combined forces of the Central Powers ripped their way in, tore the Serbian defenses up by the roots and trampled them under foot. The tiny, resolute army was scattered, and Louis Cukela's father was held prisoner in the fort of Maribor.

In his far-away Philippine station Corporal Cukela read a pathetic appeal from home. "We are fighting," it said briefly. "Where are you?" The young corporal didn't hesitate. He bought his way out of the Army and was soon aboard the steamship *Thomas*, bound for the States.

CONSIDERED CANADA

His first intention was to enlist in the Canadian service, but by now it was apparent to everyone that the United States would soon be in the conflict. "The first to fight!" slogan of a Marine Corps recruiting poster caught his eye, and shortly thereafter Louis Cukela, erstwhile corporal in the Thirteenth Infantry, was trying to explain to an officious first sergeant of marines that the "N. C. U. S. A." on his service record signified "naturalized citizen" instead of "not citizen of the United States," as was interpreted by the recruiter.

On June 26, 1917, one Louis Cukela, with the globe and anchor emblem of the Marine Corps transfixed in his campaign hat, debarked with the other leathernecks at St. Nazaire, France.

The days rolled by in a rapid cycle of training periods. On March 18 the outfit moved into a quiet sector just south of Verdun. Before a month had passed, Sergeant Cukela was cited and awarded a Croix de Guerre by the French; and cited in divisional orders by the commanding general of the Second Division, A. E. F.

On May 27 some 40 divisions of German soldiery torrented down from the north and rolled like a tidal wave toward the Marne. The French defenses were swept aside, as a rotten breakwater goes with the flood. Frenzied poilus scurried back, leaving a small and persecuted rear guard to die at the bridgeheads.

The Second Division of the American Army was hurriedly assembled at what was supposed to have been a rest area. In camions and on foot they raced toward the front. There was no time to be lost. The enemy was coming fast. Thirty-five kilometers in three days.

The Marines were flung into a tangled forest known as Belleau Wood. Nearly a month later, when they came out again, those who did, the woods were theirs; eternally theirs, for the grateful French had renamed the field Bois de la Brigade de Marine.

Louis Cukela led his platoon through those woods, their bayonets flashing. His individual fearlessness was recognized, and Sergeant Cukela was recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor; but it was not forthcoming—this time.

ON THE MARCH AGAIN

On July 9, their mission accomplished, the marines were withdrawn, a well-mauled outfit. A week later they were on the march again, Soissons. Long after the bloody horrors of Belleau Wood are forgotten, the survivors of Soissons will remember that fight.

The marines moved out of their billets on the evening of July 16, converged at the rendezvous, and presently the entire brigade, battalion by battalion, was marching down the broad, white highway.

Sgt. Louis Cukela was close to the head of the column. His dark eyes, protected by the ramparts of high, weather-beaten cheeks, glinted like cold gun metal. He knew they were marching to battle, for he had interpreted all the little, intricate signs that indicated another engagement.

Cukela's hobnails drummed out the cadence on the hard-surfaced road. Presently the column came to a line of waiting camions. The pack-ladened marines climbed into the vehicles. Soon they were lurching along like some hideous, disjointed reptile. Cukela sat beside a wizened Annamite driver, silent and thoughtful as they snaked their way through lonely, shattered villages and passed French columns moving wearily in the same direction. Darkness fell. Under the red face of the moon the cavalcade rolled onward.

Dawn came, and still they rumbled forward. The sun was directly overhead when at last they halted. The dust-powdered leathernecks debarked and marched off, hungry and thirsty.

Once more Cukela felt the road under his feet. It was a good road, rolling like a white ribbon toward heavy woods in the distance. Clouds pressed down suddenly and it began to rain, a fetid, sultry shower. Then the marines reached the woods. It was shiveringly damp. Cukela's trained mind realized something gigantic was happening, for the woods concealed a network of roads, crowded with horses, guns, infantry, and even sullen, clanging tanks.

At 6 o'clock they pulled to the side of the road and rested until darkness changed definable figures into shapeless distortions of jumbled silhouettes. Then they were on the march again. It grew miserably dark. Cukela breasted the rain and watched the lightning play against the black sky.

Finally the rain stopped. Dawn came and the sky looked like greasy, fat bacon with a few red streaks of lean running though it. The marines had the road to themselves now, for the artillery had gone into position some distance back, and the other units had disappeared to transact their own grim business.

They halted in the woods and Sergeant Cukela transmitted the order to his platoon. The men stripped to combat packs and then went on again in the face of the reddening dawn.

HALTED BY BARBED WIRE

Barbed wire halted the advance and they cut their way through it. The woods were beginning to thin out before the company commander made the signal everyone was waiting for. Cukela circled his arms, and then extended them out from his sides. His platoon obediently deployed as skirmishers, as taught on the fields of Parris Island and Quantico. They were part of the Sixty-sixth Company, holding the extreme right of the line.

With an abrupt roar the batteries in the rear opened up, drenching the German lines in a torrent of shell fire. Cukela and his marines leaned close up against the barrage. You lose men that way from friendly fire, but not so many as when you hang back and give the enemy a chance to recover before you are on them. The American gunners stopped firing and the German artillery began. But most of the big stuff passed over the marines, ripping into the cannoneers in retaliation.

As the friendly barrage lifted the marines suddenly realized they were confronted by the cold stuttering of Maxim guns. Then rifle fire began whipping into the advancing skirmishers. Cukela shouted a warning and pointed to a saffron mist of mustard gas curling up. Here and there men were falling. The rest continued, slowly, casually.

Step by step they advanced, engulfing the German outposts like some leisurely, incomprehensibly large monster. The hostile lines dinned furiously.

Then abruptly the thread of sanity snapped. One of the leathernecks whose granddad had charged with Pickett, shrieked the rebel yell—the battle cry that half a century before had resounded through the Virginian hills. Other marines echoed the cry and swept forward in a mad assault. All the training of Parris Island and Quantico vanished with that scream. It was each man for himself now. They clawed forward, stabbing their way to the Boche rifle pits. Their only thought was to close in, hand-to-hand. Machine guns and rifles splattered death among them.

The Sixty-sixth Company panted forward. With them went Louis Cukela biting savagely into the leather strap of his helmet, his eyes narrowed to brilliant points. Suddenly his platoon halted, the foremost melting away under a spray of machine-gun fire. The rest wavered.

Louis Cukela, flat on the ground, peered intently ahead. His keen eyes searched for faint, tell-tale wisps of steam. He got to his knees.

"I know where they are. Come on, some of you birds, let's get 'em!"

ONE CHANCE IN THOUSAND

It seemed impossible to move in that enfiladed area. It was suicide. There was only one chance in a thousand! But that was all the fighting sergeant asked.

Stealthily he slid forward. Two of his men started with him, but they died within the first few feet. Cukela went on alone.

He couldn't see the hostile guns now, but he could hear them and he crawled toward the sound, with bullets clattering about him. He struggled forward an inch at a time, restraining a desire to leap to his feet and surge ahead in one wild dash.

Then abruptly he saw them: Three nests, the center one well forward, the flanking two echeloned back for mutual protection. The flaming muzzles of eight machine guns snarled from the emplacements.

Carefully the big marine worked closer. Time and again the hostile guns disappeared, only to show up once more in some rift in the underbrush. Pulling his body along by his elbows, Cukela circled around, coming up on the flank of the first gun. Now a new and deadly menace presented itself. Bullets from his own platoon snarled about his ears. Off in the distance German snipers observed his movements and tried desperately to kill him. Closer and closer he wormed his way toward the unsuspecting gunners. Only a few feet separated them now. Any further movement must surely be detected.

For a moment Cukela lay studying the situation. Then he pulled the pin on a grenade and tossed it, not into the pit, but well to one side. As he expected them to do, the Germans swiveled their guns away from him to point toward the explosion. He leaped to his feet and sprang toward the pit. They saw him.

Before they could move he was upon them, his bayonet licking in and out like a serpent's tongue. A gunner fired his pistol full in the marine's face—and missed. The steel-shod rifle swept forward. Such fury could not be withstood. The survivors fled to the other emplacements and opened fire with insane rage. Cukela wiped the sweat from his eyes. There was still much work to be done.

He gathered a couple of German grenades from the pit and hopped out to complete his job. A stream of bullets blazed forth, and Cukela moved straight forward into the face of fire. Now he was close enough. In quick succession he threw the bombs, and before the gunners recovered from the blasts, Cukela's bayonet was at their throats. Those who lived flung up their hands in eager surrender. Then Cukela's platoon came up and stamped out the other nest.

The sergeant and his platoon, a much leaner, smaller platoon, toiled on through the woods to the day's objective. The brigade suffered some 3,000 casualties that day, and Cukela's men furnished their share.

OBTAINED RELIEF

The night of the 19th saw the relief of what was left of the marines. They tottered out across the fields they had bought with their blood. And with them went Louis Cukela, content with the knowledge that he had performed his task well. How well, he was to learn later at Coblenz, when generals, colonels, majors, and marine were being decorated for various deeds of valor. Louis Cukela was at the right of the line, second to none in position of honor. He stood at rigid attention while they hung about his neck not one, but two, Congressional Medals of Honor. One was awarded by the Army, the other by the Navy. Only five men have ever received this decoration from both services, and only three of those men ever lived to wear them.

There was still plenty of fighting to be done. There was bloody work in the Marbache sector in August; the St. Mihiel offensive a month later; then Blanc Mont in the Champagne, and the Meuse Argonne affair which ended hostilities. Throughout these engagements went Cukela, piling up traditions of reckless courage, distinguishing himself about the rest in an outfit where courage was a collective quality. The marines dwindled, were hacked to pieces, until only a corporal's guard of the original regiments was left. Most of Cukela's pals were gone; but he remained. They took his sergeant's chevrons and gave him the bars of a lieutenant to replace them.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since Sgt. Louis Cukela got into that nest of German machine gunners and cleaned them out with bombs and bayonet. But what adventures those intervening years have brought him; Nicaragua, Haiti, San Domingo, and China. Turbulent years of jungle warfares—and more medals.

Well and faithfully has he served his adopted country. Now he stands on the threshold of retirement, the most highly decorated marine of his day. In generations to come many a young leatherneck will preface his story with "Once there was a marine named Louis Cukela * * *."

Eggs—A Surplus Commodity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in a spirit of abundance, rather than in the spirit of economy, and common sense, with which we started this session, and with which we originally passed the agricultural appropriation bill, we considered and voted on a few more parts of the conference report. In that same spirit of abundance we agreed to the Senate's increase of a mere eighty-five millions to the fund for disposal of surplus commodities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being a new Member, I was unable to secure time from the conferees in charge of the debate to discuss this expenditure on the floor. However, I would be remiss if I did not again call all Members' attention to at least one flagrant misuse of these funds which we again, in a sprit of wastefulness, voted this afternoon.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is already an unexpended balance for surplus commodities of over $101,000,000. That is why this House, in a more sensible spirit, in the original consideration of this appropriation, refused the Budget request for an additional $72,000,000 for surplus. The ever-generous Senate went the Budget thirteen millions more, and today, with economy flown out of the window, we turned down an effort to at least grant what the Budget requested and save the taxpayers a few millions.

Mr. Speaker, if the House or Senate cannot use some discretion in curtailing some of our expenditures, let us at least hope that the officials in the Surplus Commodities Corporation will exhibit a bit more common sense than now seems to be the case in at least part of my own district.

A few days ago I received a letter from one of my constituents enclosing an article from the Escanaba Daily Press of last Friday, May 3, 1940, both of which I include in my remarks at this point:

[From the Escanaba Press of May 3, 1940]

EGG SURPLUS IS REPORTED—DELTA COUNTY FARMERS GET ONLY 13 CENTS PER DOZEN

An oversupply of eggs in Delta County and vicinity is being reported by rural storekeepers and farmers, who express the belief that the recent shipment of a carload of eggs here by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is mainly responsible.

Farmers are able to get only 13 cents per dozen for their eggs now, a figure which is considered to be less than the cost of production. Incidentally, the Chicago market price is 17 cents.

Virtually every country store has from 10 to 50 cases of surplus eggs in the back room one wholesale grocery salesman reported. Sales of eggs to consumers, the stores report, have taken a sharp drop of late.

Some relief clients have received more eggs than they could use on their tables and have sold the surplus at reduced prices to neighbors. The chief complaint is directed against the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation's policy of buying storage eggs elsewhere instead of buying them from farmers in the locality where they are being distributed. Under the food-stamp plan, this situation would be corrected for relief clients would be getting eggs produced by poultry farms in the district, it was pointed out.

RAPID RIVER, MICH., *May 4, 1940.*

FRED BRADLEY,

Member of Congress, Eleventh District of Michigan, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I enclose a clipping from yesterdays issue of a local newspaper.

I wrote you about a year ago that W. P. A. and relief clients had run me out of the hog business. For years I had sold baby pigs in this territory, until this class of people began selling pigs from flocks fed on surplus commodities at prices I could not match, because I had to buy shipped-in grain for my hogs.

So I quit the hog business with only a little holler (the one I sent you), and relied more on poultry as a means of keeping my head just above water. With egg mash at $2.65 per hundred, and scratch feed at $2 per hundred, and eggs at 20 cents a dozen, I wasn't getting much of anywhere, but I tried to paddle along. I sold nearly 50 percent of the eggs to residents around here and took the rest to the farmers' store at Trenary.

Somewhere near a month ago I noticed that no one was calling for eggs. I thought nothing much of it at the time and it ran on and on and I began to wonder. Then one day a little boy came for eggs whose mother had been a steady customer. I gave him the eggs and counted out his change and was surprised when he said, "Ruth sells eggs cheaper than you do."

Ruth happens to be my first cousin, and I pondered this statement for some time. I knew Ruth had a few chickens, but not many more than enough to supply their own needs, and I knew that her husband worked on W. P. A., and that they received quantities of surplus commodities, but still I couldn't understand. Then one day another one of my W. P. A. neighbors, whose family receives huge quantities of the surplus stuff and who also has a few hens, told me how well she's doing with the egg business. They'd paid up a bill with eggs. Still I didn't see the light. Lately in every store I go I see quantities of brown eggs. Brown

eggs are and have always been rather rare up here as most everyone raised white leghorns. (I wish I knew if it is brown eggs that the Surplus Commodities Corporation is bombarding this locality with.)

Then this piece came out in the paper, and you can draw your own conclusions as I've drawn mine.

How we can be expected to buy grain from the Grain Belt to feed our hens and compete with prices of eggs that have been given free, or eggs that have been produced by feeding surplus food (the women tell me they do that 'cause "the stuff isn't good") is more than I can figure out.

Surplus Commodities also killed our potato market, and I now realize that my economic condition is nearing the hopeless stage, and this letter is being written something after the manner of a person who realizes he is soon to drown and places a note in a bottle, which, if found, may serve to tell why and where the body went down. I know very little about the food-stamp plan, but hardly think it will be anything that will help those of us who are Uncle Sam's stepchildren. I don't think we have to go to Denmark to find something rotten.

I am,

Very truly,

JACOB A. RITTER.

Mr. Speaker, I admire the obvious sincerity of that letter. Do you not think it is about time that we give heed to where we are heading in this great Nation? At least it is time, as Mr. Ritter ably puts it, that we let the world know "why, when, and where his body went down" in this perfectly asinine, inexcusable, unforgivable "sea of absurd wastefulness."

Mr. Speaker, is it not about time that we give some thought and at least spend some time looking toward the relief of another "forgotten man"—he who is sincerely trying, by all the ideals and spirit that made us great, to make for himself and his family an honest living? Oh, you tried to hold us on the floor until late tonight—for what, so that we could in short debate, in a further spirit of "pressure, wastefulness, and demagoguery," agree to throw away another hundred or more millions. Not to debate it on its merit, but just crush it through by sheer force. And what had we on the docket for tomorrow—two juicy bills to throw away more millions in subsidies for two world's fairs, in order that our friends the public might come and marvel at the wonders of the New Deal.

No, Mr. Speaker, when we had stayed on the floor for 8 hours, had previously spent 4 hours more in our office, and the chief purpose after the 8 hours is to forget the "forgotten man"—the worker, the man who has to pay the bill—that we can gather a few more votes in the coming election from those we can further subsidize by shipping surplus eggs from the South to Delta County, Mich., in order that Mr. Ritter and others living there may have a surplus which I suppose you will then want to ship South to create a further surplus there, then it is no wonder that the House rebels. Let us use some more sense before we throw more millions, yes a few more hundreds of millions. Where are we heading?

Let us at least give Mr. Ritter, and millions more like him, at least a fair chance, at least an even break. Let his kind drown and America drowns with him.

A Revitalized Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, as the Seventy-sixth Congress draws to a close I believe it to be proper to review some of its actions. As it convened we knew that it would be remembered in the history of the United States because it marked the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the existence of the American Congress. After it had been in session for a time word began to spread through the country that it would be memorable for other reasons. To my way of thinking, our forefathers found the ideal system of Government when they settled upon the division of the powers of government into three coordinate branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. It was their plan that each of these branches should function and be active within its own sphere. For almost 150 years this Nation proceeded upon that theory and in the exact observance of it. In this manner this Nation grew big, strong, rich, and powerful.

SURRENDER OF LEGISLATIVE POWER TO THE EXECUTIVE

Unfortunately, in the two Congresses preceding the Seventy-sixth Congress, an idea gained headway, based upon a mistaken idea of party loyalty or loyalty to the Executive as head of the party in power, that Members of Congress should vote in accordance with the desires of the executive branch of the Government. Such a system was contrary to the very fundamental principles upon which our Government of division of powers was founded, and in the observance of which we became great. It eliminated any necessity for a legislative branch of Government. It reduced the Congress to nothing more than a rubber stamp to carry forward the idea of the Executive.

REASSERTION OF POWER BY CONGRESS

Shortly after our sessions as the Seventy-sixth Congress began the Nation knew that the false idea of government had disappeared; that Congress was no longer a matter of form, a rubber stamp or a useless arm of government. The Congress had recaptured for itself and for the people of the Nation, now living and to come in the generations yet to be, the dignity and power intended by the founding fathers and necessary to the greatness of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, no matter what pathway fate may have in store for me, let me here, in the Congress of my Nation, state that my proudest boast will be that I was a Member of the Congress which reasserted and recaptured the powers belonging to Congress and swung once and for all from the path followed by European nations, where the destruction of a free and uncontrolled legislative body was the first step in establishing dictatorship, back to the clear road and the high road of traditional Americanism. I am truly glad that our Democratic Party was responsible for this awakening.

WE WILL KEEP OUT OF WAR

Within every American heart today is the hope that this Nation will not become involved in the holocaust of war which envelops Europe. Every father and mother in this land prays daily that the bitter cup of war will not be drunk by their sons. American youth is still the patriotic lifeblood of America, ready to die in her defense if such should be necessary. It is the duty of each of us seated here to give our every thought to the preservation of the peace of our land and to the protection of our youth. Let all occasions of war be avoided; let every waking hour on our part be devoted to foreseeing and to avoiding incidents which might prove irritating. We must, we can, and we will keep this Nation out of war.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We have no desire to enter upon a war of aggression. The American people will never permit their Nation to engage in a war of aggression. Indeed, this Congress possesses under the Constitution only the power "to provide for the common defense." That this defense should be adequate, all but those who have no interest in our American plan of government agree. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, it has been my privilege to have an active part in the formulation of the legislation looking to the expansion of our defense. This expansion was the proper and prudent thing to do because of changed conditions in Europe. It provided for the modernizing of our fighting force in accordance with modern implements and modern weapons produced by armies elsewhere. This Nation has no need for a large standing army. Its men are fully capable of springing to arms and becoming soldiers with a minimum of instruction from professional soldiers. Therefore we must have the arms to which they are to spring and enough professional soldiers to train such a citizen army. The patriotism of the manhood of this country is such, Mr. Speaker, that a call for volunteers issued by any President of the United States to protect our Nation will immediately produce just as many men as he may call. When the American reports for duty,

he possesses a qualification of a soldier which Europeans can never acquire—he is a rifleman and a deadly rifleman. He has been familiar with rifles from the day his proud father bought him an air rifle, and he has progressed through the stages of the .22 target rifle on.

MUNITIONS AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR FOR DEFENSE

While the American man will come quickly in the event of need and come impelled by patriotism, the inanimate implements which he must possess to make him an effective soldier do not come through patriotic impulse. Rifles, cannon, airplanes, field equipment, tanks, ammunition, and all other matériel must be available for him—available because such items are not manufactured in quantities in time of peace and the factories of the Nation are not tooled and died to start immediate production in quantities in time of war. Therefore sufficient must be on hand to equip our Army until such time as they can be produced. This is the most important phase of our present national-defense program. Another phase is sufficient established Army posts and flying training fields and trained soldiers to train the citizen. Our program provides for these elements.

FLYING TRAINING

Our Air Corps was long neglected. Aviators cannot be made overnight. Fighting aviators, trained to fly day or night with good visibility or none at all, must be especially trained. Our program of expansion of the Air Corps will give us an adequate force of trained flyers for emergency and trained personnel for instruction. In my district we now have permanent improvements under construction at air fields for which the following sums have been appropriated by Congress: Kelly Field, $4,008,800; Duncan Field, $2,003,415; and Brooks Field, $709,000; a total of $6,721,215—money appropriated to secure American peace, through preparedness, in a world at war. Present plans call for the expenditure of an additional $5,387,375 at Kelly Field. This program continues San Antonio as the Nation's No. 1 military center.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

In the event of war and an abnormal consumption of many materials, together with interruption of ocean transportation, this Nation will find itself in vital need of many materials necessary in the manufacture of munitions and for the needs of the population of the country, as well as the needs of the Army. We produce in this country practically no manganese, without which steel cannot be manufactured. The same is true of tungsten, chromium, tin, rubber, and even such daily needs as quinine and coffee, to mention only a few. Profiting by our experiences in the World War, we have provided for a stock pile of these materials at a total cost of $100,000,000 over a period of 4 years. These materials will be retained on hand against the necessity for their use, which we all pray will never arrive.

VETERANS

And speaking of the day that we hope never comes, we must remember that we have with us those who answered the call when sorely needed the last time. The least a nation can be expected to do is to provide for the wounded, the shattered, the sick, the disabled who have come to her defense in time of need. This Seventy-sixth Congress, struggling to economize on expenditures, has not been guilty of doing so at the expense of the veterans. We have:

Restored benefits to bedridden veterans previously classified as misconduct cases.

Granted pensions to the widows and orphans of veterans who die from non-service-connected causes, who were suffering from 10-percent service-connected disabilities, provided the income of the widow was less than a certain amount.

Increased the pensions of widows and orphans of veterans previously entitled thereto.

Provided transportation and subsistence of all persons going to veterans' facilities.

H. R. 9000, giving pensions to all widows and orphans, is now pending and a petition to discharge the Rules Committee has been signed.

In addition, the Veterans' Administration, because of the activity of Congress, has revised its regulations so as to grant compensation to non-service-connected cases of less than 100 percent disability.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no more pleasant duty than to handle promptly the requests for assistance which come to me from the veterans of my district. No matter what may be the press of business in my office, the request for information or assistance from the veterans receives immediate and personal attention. Ample compensation for prompt and personal service comes to me when I am able to secure justice for them or to hurry action upon their claims.

RETIRED PERSONNEL OF THE REGULAR SERVICE

Not all of the Members of this body have the pleasure which is mine in having within my district a large number of men who have served their Nation in times of peace and war, have served the allotted time on regular duty and then retired from active duty to retired status as members of the Regular Army and Navy. This is an excellent body of men, the kind of men who are men and who are tried and true. In the far-flung spaces of continental United States, in the Arctic wastes of Alaska to Puerto Rico, in Hawaii, Panama, and the Philippines has their service extended. In times of peace to the civilian population war has raged for these old soldiers. In the dark of night on the Mexican border have they fought border raiders; in the tropical jungles of the Philippines they have bushwacked with the Bolos; the Boxer Rebellion in China saw their courage. There was no peace for them ofttimes when others enjoyed its blessings. Not many are interested in their welfare, for politically they are not sufficient in number to make themselves heard and felt. It is my privilege to know them, and to know them is to respect them. I claim the privilege of making their cause mine.

CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Speaker, many render lip service to the civil-service system of the United States. Rarely, indeed, will any candidate for public office state anything other than his absolute love and admiration for the merit system over the spoils system. Whether the office be national, State, or municipal, let me tell you that the indelible mark of the demagog and insincere politician is the one who seeks to wreck established civil service or disregard its provisions. I am proud to state, and I have never missed an opportunity to make known the fact, that I was once a civil-service employee of the Government of the United States. All that I have and all that I am is due to the fact that I was once a civil-service employee. I know their problems and their woes. That I may be of service to them is my constant desire. This Nation committed itself to the principle of civil service 57 years ago. Naturally we would expect all of its employees to be now under civil service. As a matter of fact, fully one-third are not included within the provisions of civil-service law. The entire service should be classified and for the same duty to the Government, the same pay should be given, no matter where that service is rendered. This House adopted H. R. 960 which will extend civil service to all of our civil employees and extend the Classification Act of 1923 to the field service. It is a source of pride to me to know that I had a part in passing that legislation. Still more remains to be done, proper recognition of the poorest paid in the Postal Service, recognition of long and faithful service, courts of appeal to which employees may take their cases for proper action and impartial decision. I look forward to a part in these undertakings.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

There should be adequate old-age pensions in this country. On the other hand, there is no need to promise to any deserving old person in this country any amount of pension which can remain only a promise and can never be paid. When the Seventy-sixth Congress opened, the maximum pension which could be paid under the Social Security Act was $30, one-half by the State and the other in aid from the Federal Government. This Congress has liberalized that provision by providing that the Federal Government will match any amount provided by the State to the extent of $40 per month. This provision of Federal law is automatic.

Payment of the maximum amount depends entirely upon the action of the State.

LABOR LEGISLATION

That labor has the right to organize and collectively bargain is well established in this country. This Congress will support and protect that right. It is most unfortunate that the Labor Act has been prevented from operating satisfactorily because of unfair, partisan, and biased members of the National Labor Relations Board who have represented one branch of organized labor only—the C. I. O. Judicially administered and properly organized, it would have had a chance to really establish labor in its rights under the laws of this country by fair and honest treatment of employer and employee alike. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, condemn labor because an unfortunate labor board membership, in seeking to establish a John L. Lewis dictatorship of American labor, has brought condemnation upon itself from all right-thinking people, including legitimate organized labor. Let us so amend the law as to create a board fair, impartial, and judicial in its treatment of employer, employee and all factions of labor. To fail to do so is to create a two-edged sword that may cut the head from employer and employee alike and destroy all of the achievements for labor that have been gained by every true labor leader from Samuel Gompers to William Green.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTS

Under the American plan of government the final resort for redress of grievances is always the courts. The Government of our Nation has become so complex that many administrative agencies have been created to carry out the functions of government. There are nearly 1,000,000 civil employees of the executive branch of the Government and only 1 of them is elected by the people—the President. He alone must return to the electorate to give account of his stewardship. In this maze of organizations we lost sight of our fundamental principle of resort to courts, thereby bringing down upon these agencies much abuse and distrust. Likewise we turned the agencies aloose with not even the restraint of review of their actions, a tremendous temptation to abuse power. Is it strange that agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in whose laws the right to appeal to the courts is included, are the most efficient and highly respected agencies in our Government? It is not strange, it is but natural. True also, the right to appeal has never been exercised by a person having business before the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and seldom has it ever been exercised in any other agency where it exists. Smoke screens to the contrary notwithstanding, the Walter-Logan bill is but the protection and continuance of the American system and is not designed to, and will not, cripple any agency of government. Judicial review must be reestablished as the only restraint and safeguard against the spawning and fostering of the insolent tyranny of the bureaucrat—a tyranny that comes only when power is unbridled and unchecked.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

No American can view the happenings in Europe and still pretend that there is no need for alarm in this country. One constitutional government after another has fallen and the power of government has been seized by dictators. Mr. Speaker, I cannot too strongly condemn those half-hearted Americans who have condemned one foreign ideology and either praised the other or failed to condemn it. In most cases these are the individuals who have openly associated with known Communists and have worked with them in the accomplishment of so-called liberal objectives. They seek to beg the question by contending that it is not against the law to associate with Communists or that they will not be contaminated by such association. Let us not forget that this association with known advocates of a system of government which destroys the family, all religion, moral standards, and everything which you and I hold dear, gives to such nefarious scoundrels a prestige and position which enables them to carry on their undertaking to destroy America. The civil liberties guaranteed by our Constitution must not be used as a shield to protect or defend those who advocate a form of government which would destroy every vestige of civil liberties. If the Government of the United States was so weak and obnoxious as to be unable to defend herself and the liberties which she guarantees to her people from such vultures, you and I would not love her as we do. All right-thinking men hail the accomplishments of the Dies committee for investigation of un-American activities. Proof of the characters of the attackers of this committee was produced when they turned upon J. Edgar Hoover immediately upon his assumption of the investigation of espionage. How similar are the attacks upon Mr. Hoover to those made upon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. Mr. Hoover has investigated only espionage cases and has been condemned. The conclusion is inevitable that such is exactly what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has done. We must listen no longer to the "parlor pinks" who will justify, countenance, and condone, in the name of civil liberty, the activities of public enemies who should supplant every human liberty with the terrorism of the Ogpu or the barbarism of the Gestapo.

TAXES

The only source of employment for the people of America is private industry. To the extent that industry is prosperous will labor be prosperous. I have long contended that we have heaped restrictions upon the free expansion and operation of industry and burdened it down with taxes until it has been unable to provide work for our unemployed. This Congress has taken a forward step in removing from the shoulders of business some of this burden. We have prevented the increase of old-age-insurance tax to 1½ percent, freezing it at 1 percent, saving employer and employee $275,000,000 in 1940 and other social-security tax benefits totaling $580,000,000 in 1940, and for the 3-year period a total of $1,710,000,000. Likewise we have removed the undistributed-profits tax and other business-irritant taxes. This is but a step in the right direction—much more remains to be done.

HOUSING

Slum elimination goes hand in hand with the eradication of crime, the reduction of disease, and the promotion of public health. In my district alone one project is nearing completion which will provide 932 units and costing $3,588,000. Three more are now in the midst of preparation and soon the land will be bought and construction begun to provide an additional 2,554 units with a Federal allocation of $9,125,000.

AGRICULTURE

The basic occupation of this Nation, or any other nation, is the tilling of the soil. Agriculture has faced one of the most difficult situations in the Nation. While a majority of my constituents live in the city, I realize that the Nation can never be prosperous until the farmers are prosperous. Therefore I have given close and intimate study to all of the problems of the farmer. I am one of the few Members representing city districts who has supported all measures having for their purpose the solution of the farm problem. It is a source of pride to me that leading farm organizations and livestock associations have formally endorsed my position on matters affecting these great industries.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as we now contemplate the closing of this third and last session of this Congress, I am glad to have had this opportunity to review what we have done here. Contemplating this brief synopsis of our activities, I am left with the thought that much has been accomplished. Particularly am I proud to say that this Congress has gone a long way toward restoring the Government of this Nation to the people to whom it belongs. In this respect it is a vast improvement over the two which immediately preceded it. We look forward to still greater accomplishments in Congresses yet to come. This revitalized Congress will prevent the undertaking of new projects involving the expenditure of large sums and the accumulation of vast public debt. Expenses of government must and will be curtailed and business must and will be reassured, with resulting employment for our people.

The Seventy-seventh Congress will convene at a time that will try the souls of men. It will meet surrounded by circumstances and events, so momentous, so tremendous, so perilous, that the destiny of democratic civilization may well be hanging in the balance. The unchained forces of brute barbarism, thundering behind the fiery-mouthed dogs of war,

will still be raging across continents over the sea. Among the waves, and the winds, and the storm of hate, we must keep stable, we must keep calm, we must love peace. We must keep our powder dry. The poverty, the need, the suffering of our aged or unemployed must be ministered unto. But, emergency programs and projects must not be expanded into gigantic, permanent government machines that stifle the recovery and expansion of private business and private industry, and permanently remove the citizen from reabsorption into private employment and individual enterprise. Government work projects must be restricted, not expanded. We must spend less, not more. Taxes must be lowered, not raised. Business must be stimulated and encouraged, not restricted and punished.

The brutish, pagan foreign "isms" will still be striking their fangs at our veins—seeking to inject the venom that destroys the sanctity of the home, the Church of God, and the liberties of men in the poison of hell-born hate. We must be ever on guard to unmask the agents of dictators, however fair and disarming the veil in which they may be disguised, for eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. We must be jealous of power that is unchecked and unrestrained. We must be fearful of added restrictions or encroachments upon the liberties of the individual, for ours is the task in a crumbling world of maintaining an island of sanity where right and reason rule, and men are free. We can only approach that task as Americans have always approached crisis and testing time before—in reverence for God and with love of country.

Private Utilities Pay Tremendous Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, we often hear the cry of leading exponents of Government ownership of utilities, that private utilities are overcharging and gouging the public. In support of their statements they cite the lower service charges of Government-owned enterprises as compared with private industry. But often they fail to mention the fact that no taxes are paid by the Government projects while the private utilities are subject to a tremendous tax burden.

Those who advocate Government ownership are loud in proclaiming that water power is one of the natural resources of our country, and therefore it should belong to the Government. But similar arguments with as little logic might apply to other natural resources, such as the forests, mountains, minerals, and air. Yet you do not hear these advocates urging that the Government seize the atmosphere around this country, or tax the air we breathe.

The following news article appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of March 14, 1940, and it presents a good picture of the taxes paid by utilities.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 14, 1940]

TAXES TAKE A HUGE SLICE OF MONTHLY ELECTRIC BILL—SAME IS TRUE OF CONSUMERS' PAYMENT FOR GAS, PHONE, TRANSPORT UTILITIES, AND ALWAYS GOING UP

Now is the time when taxpayers are digging down deep to pay their income taxes. What most of them don't realize is the amount they pay in hidden utility taxes year in and year out. It works like this:

Every time a patron of the electric company pays a monthly bill for light or power, 20.23 percent of that bill goes for taxes and public expense.

The taxes on the average bill of the Wisconsin Telephone Co. represent 55 cents a month, 12 times a year, an increase of 20 cents within the last 12 years.

The 1939 tax cost per customer of the Milwaukee Gas Co. was $4.25, or about 35 cents a month.

Buried in every public-service bill is a maze of taxes and public expenses, much of which have been put on in recent years.

CONSUMER PAYS ALL

In every instance the patron pays in full.

The tax bill paid by 25 electric, gas, and affiliated transportation companies in Wisconsin reached $12,906,000 in 1939, an increase of $1,587,000 compared to 1938, and with many companies this represented from 19 to 22 percent of gross revenues. In contrast to this tax bill of almost thirteen million, the total annual pay roll for 12,131 people aggregated $21,574,000.

These taxes represent only those that can be dug out of the books and not the hidden assessments that are involved all the way from the coal mines in taxes on transportation and appliances. All of these also are paid by the consumer. It is pay or go without the service.

WHERE ELECTRIC BILL GOES

Look at the taxes in an electric bill.

In the last year total operating revenues of the company in the greater Milwaukee district were $20,851,951.57.

On the other side of the ledger stands $4,219,049 as taxes and money paid to the growing list of public agencies and bureaus—State and Federal. In other words, from every dollar taken in from consumers, 20.23 cents goes for taxes and other governmental expenses.

Have a look at how this tax bill measures up to other expenses. The total pay roll for 2,254 employees, including executive salaries, is $4,709,000. Taxes are 90 percent of the wages and salaries.

There are 217,262 residential users of electric power, representing more than half of the total number of patrons. They pay $6,860,000, or only $2,641,000 more than the taxes.

The taxes come within $120,000 of the total bill of $4,339,000 paid by 28,407 consumers in the classification of small commercial companies, such as stores and moderate industrial users of power.

Based on 1939 operations, here is how taxes and public agency costs show up in an electric bill, the first column being the kilowatt-hour consumption:

Consumption	Net bill	Taxes in bill
25	$1.41	$0.29
50	2.23	.45
75	2.79	.56
100	3.35	.68
150	4.35	.88
200	5.35	1.08
250	6.23	1.26

The distribution of taxes and regulatory expense charged to operating costs and all included in the bills of the utility follows:

Federal taxes:	
Capital-stock taxes (United States)	$55,500.00
Electrical-energy tax	348,455.41
Unemployment insurance	10,172.25
Old-age retirement benefits	31,480.82
Federal income tax	830,900.00
State taxes (Wisconsin):	
Unemployment compensation	32,238.19
Ad valorem tax	2,720,132.27
State income tax	75,000.00
Automobile and truck license and fees	8,723.18
State taxes (New York): Unemployment compensation	337.48
Local taxes: Real estate	3,615.00
Subtotal	4,116,554.60
Regulatory Commission expenses:	
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin	96,013.45
Federal Power Commission	740.85
Securities and Exchange Commission	3,857.50
Federal Trade Commission	574.10
United States Bureau of Labor	3.09
United States War Department	95.91
Bureau of Internal Revenue: United States social-security tax	885.82
Industrial Commission	323.68
Subtotal	102,494.40
Grand total	4,219,049.00

Of this total Uncle Sam took $1,276,508, the State of Wisconsin $479,376, and Milwaukee governmental units, with considerable of the payment to the State returning to the city, county, and townships, took $2,360,332.

To furnish reports and figures for the different commissions now takes the full time of about 10 auditors and at times more than 20.

"It is getting so every time you turn around some bureau or agency wants another report that takes a week to a month to dig out," say the accountants.

TAXES IN GAS BILLS

In 1939 there were 184,861 people paying gas bills in the Milwaukee district.

The total of taxes carried in gas bills was $778,784.90, or 37.6 percent of the net operating income of the Milwaukee Gas Co. before public cost deductions. The average tax cost per customer was $4.25, which the consumers paid.

In the early days of State regulation, before the advent of numerous surtaxes and assessments, the taxes on utilities and railroads just about matched State expenses.

"But that was fully $40,000,000,000 ago," remarked one company executive, referring to the growing public debt and the disposition to heap on assessments.

The gas company, for instance, pays seven different direct taxes. Taxes in 1939 which were not in existence in 1928 include the Wisconsin unemployment-fund contribution; Federal excise tax on employers, and Federal old-age-benefit tax, with the total cost amounting to $32,923. Other taxes charged to prescribed expense accounts are those on gasoline, oils, automobile licenses, and regulatory commission costs, adding up to $22,220 more.

Figured down to the average revenue per 1,000 cubic feet of gas revenue, which in 1939 was 84.8 cents, taxes took 11 cents.

TAXES SURPASS NET INCOME

In this company holders of both preferred and common stock received $455,000, as compared to the taxes of $778,784. The annual statement shows taxes and public costs were $213,000 higher than the net income before preferred dividends.

In the last 10 years the relations of taxes to operating revenue follow:

Year	Operating revenue	Taxes	Percent taxes are of revenue
1929	$7,233,802.49	$900,154.35	12.44
1930	7,284,567.64	918,138.43	12.60
1931	6,934,445.38	980,667.96	14.14
1932	6,667,016.82	1,005,962.28	15.09
1933	6,538,190.86	945,006.14	14.45
1934	6,454,940.08	886,249.53	13.73
1935	6,459,214.11	947,222.34	14.66
1936	6,554,466.97	822,558.91	12.55
1937	6,522,949.89	856,233.37	13.13
1938	6,294,021.33	815,820.29	12.96
1939	[1] 6,000,257.40	778,784.90	12.98

[1] Total operating revenue on a consolidated company basis for entire year 1939: Milwaukee Gas Light Co., Wauwatosa Gas Co., West Allis Gas Co., Lakeshore Gas Co., Wisconsin Eastern Gas Co.

Now the telephone bill.

Taxes of the Wisconsin Telephone Co. in 1938 were $2,175,555, as compared to $1,350,842 in 1928. The taxes of 1928, that represented approximately 26 percent of the net operating income in 10 years, had increased to 44.5 percent of the net income.

For 1939 the total taxes will amount to about 14.5 percent of the total operating expenses.

Executives of public-service companies poring over tax reports say that the end is not in sight.

"As a matter of fact many electrical companies pay as high as 25 percent of their total revenues as taxes and public-agency costs," said one electric-company official. "Realizing that most governmental units are far from a cash basis, but piling up public debt that must eventually be paid, there may come a time when 30 percent or more of a bill will be taxes if the disposition to pile on additional loads keeps up. Rates have been reduced but the taxes still go higher."

The most hopeful news to the utility executives is a ruling from the New York Public Service Commission:

"Practically every investigation by this commission into the accounts and practices of various operating utilities in New York during recent years discloses that the predominant cause of increased costs of service is the enormous growth of taxes which these utilities must pay. Since these increased taxes are reflected in rates charged to consumers, the public must bear the increased costs."

Merchant Marine as Part of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed, on May 6, under suspension of the rules, House Joint Resolution 519, suspending section 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, during the present European war, unusual authority was delegated to the Maritime Commission to dispose of more than 100 ships. According to Chairman E. S. Land, "these vessels have been classified as being of sufficient military or commercial value to warrant their preservation for possible use in case of a commercial or national emergency."

This authorized disposal may appear to be advisable in view of the abnormal wartime demand for bottoms, but I desire to direct the attention of the House to recent developments of a crucial nature involving our merchant marine and undermining our national defense.

The declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 declares "it is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels."

Huge sums have been appropriated by Congress for construction-differential subsidies, as well as operating-differential subsidies to make possible the employment of American crews. In times of national stress or emergency it is essential that our merchant marine be maintained at a high rate of efficiency to justify these vast peacetime public expenditures in cooperation with private groups.

At the special session of the Seventy-sixth Congress the neutrality legislation enacted provided that when the President shall have issued a proclamation he shall define combat areas, and "thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area."

Within 4 days after adjournment of the special session developments took place reflecting the desire of American shipping interests to circumvent the provisions of the act designed to minimize travel of their vessels in combat areas. On November 7, 1939, the United States Lines made a proposal to transfer nine ships to Panamanian registry in order to continue European trade through danger zones. However, Secretary of State Hull immediately announced his opposition to this plan, informing the Maritime Commission that this proposal would impair the integrity of the Neutrality Act just enacted. The Secretary explained that he was extremely desirous of preserving the absolute integrity of the act so there would not be any appearance of the Government taking any course that might undermine the policies therein formulated. If this transfer of registry were approved, the ships would fly the Panama flag and not be subject to the Neutrality Act's restrictions.

It is interesting to observe subsequent developments, obviously despite the previously expressed disapproval of Secretary Hull and his efforts to preserve the neutrality of this country. A report from the Maritime Commission for the period of October 26, 1938, to October 25, 1939, shows that 88 vessels, tugs, barges, yachts, and tankers, with a total gross tonnage of 229,026, were approved by it for transfer to alien ownership or registry. This included 15 oil tankers transferred to Panamanian registry by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey during September 1939.

A similar report from the Maritime Commission for the period of October 26, 1939, to April 30, 1940, approximately 6 months, indicates that 160 vessels with a gross tonnage of 586,758 were approved for transfer. In other words, almost twice as many sales and transfers were made to foreign registry in 6 months as in the preceding year.

It is significant that 82 of the 160 vessels approved by the Commission for transfer in this 6-month period went to Great Britain, Canada, and France. Thus, although Secretary Hull opposed transferring American ships to neutral countries, 82 have been transferred to belligerent countries. Of the total 160, there are included 40 vessels which have been subsidized at some time by the United States Government.

In December 1939 the United States Lines, of New York, is listed as having sold eight vessels to the North Atlantic Transport Co., of Oslo, Norway, for Norwegian registry, while 2 months later the United States Lines, as owner, is listed as

having sold the same eight ships to the Societe Maritime Anversoise, a Belgian corporation, for Belgian registry. What does Secretary Hull now think about such manipulation?

Members of Congress who delegated extreme emergent powers to the Maritime Commission, as well as American taxpayers who have subsidized the construction of our merchant marine as an auxiliary to national defense, should have access to such information. Therefore, I am having inserted here the report of the Maritime Commission for the period of October 26, 1939, to April 30, 1940:

Statement of U. S. Maritime Commission showing vessels approved for transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry Oct. 26, 1939, to Apr. 30, 1940, inclusive

Date	Name of vessel	Type	Gross tonnage	Year built	Owner	Purchaser	Registry	Restrictions
1939								
Oct. 26	Lucky Lady III	Yacht (gas sc.)	18	1923	Harry McKinney, Los Angeles, Calif.	Jack Stahl, a citizen of Latvia, residing at Torrance, Calif.	No change	D
	Scanmail [1 2]	Combination cargo and passenger (st. sc.).	5,152.85	1919	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.	Lloyd Brasileiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.	Brazilian	D
	Scanyork [1 2]	do	5,163.92	1919	do	do	do	D
	Scanstates [1 2]	do	5,163.92	1919	do	do	do	D
	Scanpenn [1 2]	do	5,152.52	1919	do	do	do	D
	Mormacstar [1 2]	Cargo (st. sc.)	4,941.02	1919	do	do	do	D
	Mormacsea [1 2]	do	4,955.41	1919	do	do	do	D
	Mormacport [1 2]	do	4,942.32	1919	do	do	do	D
	Mormactide [1 2]	do	4,951.58	1919	do	do	do	D
	Southfolk [1 2]	do	4,925.04	1919	do	do	do	D
	Southland [2]	do	5,052.63	1919	do	do	do	D
	Southerner [2]	do	5,083.09	1919	do	do	do	D
	Southlure [1 2]	do	4,986.74	1920	do	do	do	D
	Mormacsun [1 2]	do	4,996.15	1920	do	do	do	D
	Commercial Bostonian.[2]	do	2,730.10	1919	do	do	do	D
	Total		68,215.29					
November	Lina B	Fishing (oil cs.)	136	1936	Joseph F. Gisler and Frances A. Wandtko, San Francisco, Calif.	J. H. Gorvin, Commissioner of Natural Resources, Newfoundland Government.	Newfoundland.	D
	Yosemite	Ferry (st. sc.)	1,782	1923	Southern Pacific Golden Gate Ferries Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	Compania Argentina-Uruguay de Navegacion y Turismo, S. A. Montevideo, Uruguay.	Uruguayan	D
	President Madison	Combination cargo and passenger (st. sc.).	14,187	1921	Harry E. Warner, trustee, American Mail Line, Seattle, Wash.	Jose Cojuangco, Manila, P. I.	Philippine	F
	Gotham	Tug (st. sc.)	412	1913	Gotham Marine Corporation, New York, N. Y.	Lakehead Transportation Co., Ltd., Port William, Ontario.	Canadian	D
	Brant	Fishing (st. sc.)	414	1919	Portland Trawling Co., New York, N. Y.	The French Line, Paris, France.	French	D
	Plover	do	411	1920	do	do	do	D
	Coot	do	409	1919	do	do	do	D
	Loon	do	409	1919	do	do	do	D
	Penguin	do	377	1919	do	do	do	D
	Bellflower	Cargo (st. sc.)	6,085	1919	Hyman-Michaels Co., Chicago, Ill.	A. G. Pappadakis, a citizen of Greece.	Panamanian	D
	Kennebec	Commercial (st. sc.).	400	1919	Boston Dry Dock Co., Chelsea, Mass.	The French Line, Paris, France.	French	D
	Barrenfork	Tug (st. sc.)	418	1919	S. A. Guilds, Charleston, S. C.	do	do	D
	Frango	Whaling (st. sc.)	6,400	1917	The American Whaling Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.	Frango Corporation, Panama City, Panama.	Panamanian	G
	DeBardeleben	Tug (st. sc.)	429	1919	DeBardeleben Coal Corporation, Birmingham, Ala.	The French Line, Paris, France.	French	D
	Total		32,269					
December	Peter Koenig	Commercial (st. sc.).	688	1912	Koenig Coal & Supply Co., Detroit, Mich.	J. Earl McQueen, Amherstburg, Ontario.	Canadian	D
	Queen of Scots [3]	Yacht (st. sc.)	658	1904 [4]	Anthony Joseph Drexel, Philadelphia, Pa.	M. Grahame White, Southampton, England.	British	D
	Cheerio Too	Yacht (gas sc.)	23	1925	John P. Phelps, American citizen residing at Caracas, Venezuela.	Transfer only	Venezuelan	D
	Santa Isabel	Cargo (st. sc.)	2,647	1920	Santa Steamship Corporation, New York, N. Y.	Krogstad Dampskibsrederi A/S., Oslo, Norway.	Norwegian	AD
	Walter D. Munson	do	3,703	1917	Munson Line, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Nicholas B. Rethymnis London, England (Greek citizen).	Greek	AD
	Mundixie	do	3,285	1921	do	do	do	A B (2) D
	Iclanda	Yacht (st. sc.)	1,647	1908 [4]	Edith Bishop Nicholson, Newport, R. I.	Edgar A. Millett, London, England.	British	D
	Whitney Olson	Schooner	1,558	1917	Oliver J. Olson & Co. and C. J. Hendry Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Canadian Transport Co. of Vancouver, British Columbia.	Canadian	D
	Geo. L. Olson	do	1,428	1917	do	do	do	D
	San Diego	do	1,487	1918	Wood & Hart, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	do	do	D
	Comerio	Cargo (st. sc.)	3,349	1910 [4]	Agwilines, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Giuseppe Bozzo, Genoa, Italy	Italian	AD
	Sankaty	Ferry (st. sc.)	463	1911	Washington Trust Co., Westerly, R. I.	Northumberland Ferries, Ltd., Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada.	Canadian	D
	American Merchant [1 2 4]	Combination cargo and passenger (st. sc.)	7,430	1921	United States Lines Co., New York, N. Y.	North Atlantic Transport Co., A/S, Oslo, Norway.	Norwegian	D
	American Trader [1 2 4]	do	7,461	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Shipper [1 2 4]	do	7,430	1921	do	do	do	D
	American Farmer [1 2 4]	do	7,430	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Banker [1 2 4]	do	7,462	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Traveler [1 2 4]	do	7,555	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Importer [1 2 4]	do	7,590	1920	do	do	do	D
	President Harding [1 2 4]	do	13,869	1921	do	do	do	D
	Total		87,163					

[1] Subsidized at some time.

[2] Proceeds of sale to be used for new construction.

[3] Sale canceled.

[4] Foreign built.

Statement of U. S. Maritime Commission showing vessels approved for transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry Oct. 26, 1939, to Apr. 30, 1940, inclusive—Continued

Date	Name of vessel	Type	Gross tonnage	Year built	Owner	Purchaser	Registry	Restrictions
1940								
January	Capt. A. F. Lucas	Tanker (st. sc.)	4,188	1904	Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif.	Balboa Transport Corporation, Colon, Panama.	Panamanian	D
	San Lucas	Cargo (st. sc.)	6,517	1919 [4]	Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Co., Portland, Oreg.	Canadian International Paper Co.	Canadian	D
	Canadian	do	5,802	1920	American Hawaiian Steamship Co., New York, N. Y.	Compania Transatlantica Centro-Americana S. A. Panama City, Panama.	Panamanian	D
	Jackson	Ferry (elec. sc.)	224	1927	Florida Ferry Co., Jacksonville, Fla.	Pedro Barboza, Maracaibo, Venezuela.	Venezuelan	D
	Elmer E. Gray	Fishing (oil sc.)	121	1903	Gorton-Pew Fisheries Co., Ltd., Gloucester, Mass.	Louis Sheaves, Port-aux-Basque, Newfoundland.	British	D
	West Nilus [1 3]	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,495	1920	Pacific Argentine Brazil Line, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	Compania de Vapores Cardina S. A., Panama City.	Panamanian	D
	West Portal [1 3]	do	5,333	1920	do	do	do	D
	Delawarean	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,705	1920	American Hawaiian Steamship Co., New York, N. Y.	Runciman (London), Ltd., London, England.	British	D
	Louisianan	do	5,484	1919	do	do	do	D
	Tennesseean	do	6,379	1919	do	do	do	D
	Indianan	do	5,582	1919	do	do	do	D
	Waban [1 3]	do	6,038	1919	Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	Runciman (London) Ltd., London, England.	do	D
	Oakwood [1 3]	do	6,071	1920	do	do	do	D
	Total		62,939					
February	Star of Finland	Sailing vessel (sch.).	1,699	1899	D. H. Bates, Portland, Oreg.	South Pacific Trading Co., Inc. (C. F. Sharp & Co., Inc., Manila, P. I., agents).	Philippine	D
	Sir Thomas J. Lipton	do	1,358	1918	do	do	do	D
	Z. R. 3	Commercial (oil sc.).	2,375	1920	H. J. Emard, Seattle, Wash.	Vancouver Steamships, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia.	British	D
	President Fillmore [2]	Cargo and passenger (st. sc.).	15,575	1903	American President Lines, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	Compania Transatlantica Centro-Americana S. A., Panama City, Panama.	Panamanian	D
	Texas Banker	Cargo (st. sc.)	2,606	1919	Newtex Steamship Corporation, New York, N. Y.	Sir Wm. Reardon Smith & Sons, Ltd., Cardiff, Wales.	British	D
	Texas Trader	do	2,674	1919	do	do	do	D
	Texas Ranger	do	2,689	1919	do	do	do	D
	Vigilant	Sailing vessel (sch.).	1,603	1920	City Mill Co., Ltd., Honolulu, A. H. Kuhn, Soule Tug & Barge Co., Cora E. King, J. O. Stearns, Frances B. Stearns, all of Hoquiam, Wash., and Emily S. Dalton, Aberdeen, Wash.	Canadian Transport Co., Ltd. Vancouver, British Columbia.	do	D
	Content	Yacht (oil sc.)	180	1929	Howard E. Spaulding, Shelburne, Vt.	R. W. Sawyer, of Nassau, N. P. Bahama Islands.	do	D
	Transfer	Ferry	1,511	1887	Morris Passman, Detroit, Mich.	J. Kovinsky & Sons., Ltd., Windsor, Ontario.	Canadian	D
	Point Clear	Cargo (st. sc.)	4,839	1920	Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	A. G. Pappadakis, Galatz, Rumania.	Greek	D
	Point Bonita	do	4,782	1918	do	do	do	D
	Point Arena	do	4,673	1917	do	do	do	D
	Point Ancha	do	4,727	1919	Gulf Pacific Mail Line	do	do	D
	Point Lobos	do	4,802	1919	do	do	do	D
	Point Judith	do	4,810	1919	do	do	do	D
	San Gabriel	Cargo (st. sc.)	4,943	1919	Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Co., Portland, Oreg.	Theseus Steamship Co., Piraeus, Greece.	do	D
	Jomar	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,104	1920	Tampa Interocean Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (French Line), Paris, France.	French	D
	Lafcomo	do	5,028	1919	do	do	do	D
	Santa Inez	Barge	1,764	1908	Santa Inez Fisheries, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	William C. T. Hwang, China Trading Corporation of Shanghai, China.	Chinese	D
	Tripp [1 3]	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,703	1919	Lykes Bros Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (French Line), Paris, France.	French	D
	West Hobomac [1 3]	do	5,527	1919	do	do	do	D
	West Tacook [1 3]	do	6,176	1919	do	do	do	D
	West Chatala [1 3]	do	6,187	1918	do	do	do	D
	Eglantine [1 3]	do	6,312	1919	do	The Lyle Shipping Co., Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland.	British	D
	Endicott [1 3]	do	6,318	1919	do	do	do	D
	Ethan Allen [1 2]	do	7,777	1920	do	do	do	D
	Patrick Henry [1 2]	do	7,743	1920	do	do	do	D
	Santa Maria	Tanker	8,482	1922 [4]	Union Oil Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.	No sale	Panamanian	
	Norman Bridge [2]	do	4,323	1913 [4]	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	Compania de Petroleo Lago, Caracas, Venezuela.	Venezuelan	D
	Sapinero	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,106	1919	Tampa Interocean Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	Compania Scotia de Vapores S. A., a Panamanian corporation.	Panamanian	D
	American Merchant [1 2]	Combination cargo and passenger (st. sc.).	7,430	1921	United States Lines Co., New York, N. Y.	Societe Maritime Anversoise, a Belgian Corporation.	Belgian	D
	American Trader [1 3]	do	7,461	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Shipper [1 3]	do	7,430	1921	do	do	do	D
	American Farmer [1 3]	do	7,430	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Banker [1 3]	do	7,462	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Traveler [1 3]	do	7,555	1920	do	do	do	D
	American Importer [1 3]	do	7,590	1920	do	do	do	D
	President Harding [1 2]	do	13,869	1921	do	do	do	D
	MV Munmotor	Cargo (oil sc.)	2,450	1919	Munson Lnie, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Henri Vervliet, Antwerp, Belgium.	do	D
	Freeport Sulphur No. 5.	Collier (st. sc.)	4,127	1920	Freeport Sulphur Co., New York, N. Y.	Sir William Reardon Smith & Sons, Ltd., Cardiff, Wales.	British	D
	Total		220,200					

[1] Subsidized at some time.
[2] Proceeds of sale to be used for new construction.
[3] Sale canceled.
[4] Foreign built.

Statement of U. S. Maritime Commission showing vessels approved for transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry Oct. 26, 1939, to April 30, 1940—Continued

Date	Name of vessel	Type	Gross tonnage	Year built	Owner	Purchaser	Registry	Restrictions
1940								
March	Transportation	Collier (st. sc.)	4,015	1910	Coastwise Transportation Corporation, Boston.	Frano Petrinovic, Split, Yugoslavia.	Panamanian	D
	Almeria Lykes [1] [2]	Cargo (st. sc.)	2,637	1920	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., New Orleans, La.	Mario Maestro, on behalf of Italian Associates, Trieste, Italy.	Italian	D
	Muncove	Cargo (oil. sc.)	2,437	1919	Union Shipbuilding Co., Baltimore, Md.	Torsen Caribom & J. Inkapoel, Tallinn, Estonia.	Estonian	D
	Coppename	Cargo (st. sc.)	3,289	1908 [4]	Boston Iron & Metal Co., Baltimore, Md.	Scoeita Anonima Industria Pesca, Rome, Italy.	Italian	D
	Defacto	do	4,800	1919	American Sugar Transit Corporation, N. Y.	Sir William Reardon Smith & Sons, Ltd., Cardiff, Wales.	British	D
	Sea Foam	Barge	564	1914	O'Brien Bros., New York, N. Y.	Jose Arechabala, S. A., Cardenas, Cuba.	Cuban	D
	Sea Dog	do	564	1910	do	do	do	D
	Ruth Kellogg	Tanker	5,037	1920	Kellogg Steamship Corporation, Edgewater, N. J.	Gow, Harrison & Co., Glasgow, Scotland.	British	D
	Capac [3]	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,586	1919	Grace Line, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Compania de Vapores Cardina S. A., Panama City, Panama.	Panamanian	D
	Charcas [3]	do	5,555	1919	do	do	do	D
	Cuzco [3]	do	5,496	1919	do	do	do	D
	Coya [3]	Cargo (st. sc.)	4,954	1919	Grace Line, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Compania de Vapores, Cardina, S. A., Panama City, Panama.	do	D
	O'Brien Bros	Dredge (st. sc.)	5,902	1920	O'Brien Bros., New York	Compania Diana de Vapores, S. A.	do	D H
	Maria Dolores	Yacht (oil sc.)	218	1929	LeRoy M. Edwards, Los Angeles, Calif.	J. H. Marsman, Manila, P. I.	Philippine	D
	Machigonne	do	195	1909	L. C. Carsten, Long Beach, Calif.	E. W. Irvine Keenleyside, Vancouver, B. C.	Canadian	D
	Ramona	Yacht (oil sc.)	495	1922	John W. Hubbard, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas K. Wade, Toronto, Canada.	do	D
	Heron	Trawler (st. sc.)	411	1919	Marine Products Co., Wilmington, Del.	Hellyer Brothers, Ltd., Hull, England.	British	D
	Kingfisher	do	414	1919	do	do	do	D
	Teal	do	408	1919	do	do	do	D
	Curlew	do	408	1919	do	do	do	D
	Manatawny	Commercial (st. sc.).	5,030	1920	Deep Sea Fisheries, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	Vincente Madrigal, Manila, P. I.	Philippine	D
	San Angelo	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,606	1918	Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Co., Portland, Oreg.	W. A. Souter & Co., Ltd., Newcastle, England.	British	D
	San Felipe	do	5,918	1919	do	do	do	D
	San Marcos	do	5,750	1919	do	do	do	D
	San Simeon	do	5,561	1919	do	Wallem & Co., Shanghai, China.	Panamanian	D
	San Bernardino	do	5,751	1920	do	Compania de Navegacion "La Interoceanica" S. A., Panama City.	do	D
	Tropical Trader	Commercial (gas sc.).	53	1932 [4]	Eloise B. Knox, Nicholas Michels, N. R. Field, Miami, Fla.	No sale alien	do	D
	Breezin' Thru	Yacht (gas sc.)	204	1916	Lelia Y. Post Montgomery, Battle Creek, Mich.	Clarence Wallace, Vancouver, British Columbia.	Canadian	D
	Eastern Glade	Cargo (st. sc.)	5,057	1920 [4]	Postal Steamship Corporation, New York, N. Y.	Sir William Reardon Smith & Sons, Ltd., Cardiff, Wales.	British	D
	Howard L. Shaw	do	4,241	1900	Pittsburgh Steamship Co., Duluth, Minn.	Upper Lakes and St. Lawrence Transportation Co., Ltd., Ontario, Canada.	Canadian	D
	Bryn Mawr	Schooner barge	3,854	1900	do	do	do	D
	Elfreda	Yacht (oil sc.)	295	1928	H. B. H. Ripley, New York, N. Y.	David R. Turnbull, Halifax, Nova Scotia.	do	D
	Avalon	do	422	1931	Delta Transportation Co., Inc.	Frederick H. M. Jones, Halifax, Nova Scotia.	do	D
	Conseco	do	419	1921	John W. Hubbard, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Philip S. Ross, Montreal, Canada.	do	D
	Cleopatra	do	263	1930	Anthony O. R. Baldridge, New York.	Ralph P. Bell, Halifax, Nova Scotia.	do	D
	Wild Duck	do	360	1930	Charles B. Levey and Margaret B. Levey, Irvington, Va.	G. H. Duggan, Montreal, Canada.	do	D
	Total		102,169					
April	Queen of Scots	Yacht (st. sc.)	658	1904 [4]	Anthony Joseph Drexel, Philadelphia, Pa.	Corporation of Trinity House, London, England.	British	D
	Victor	Launch (gas sc.)	37	1920	Tela R. R. Co., Boston, Mass.	Government of the Republic of Honduras.	Honduran	D
	Latouche	Cargo (st. sc.)	2,156	1910	Alaska Steamship Co., Seattle, Wash.	Vincente Madrigal, Manila, P. I.	Philippine	D
	Victory	Cargo (st. sc.)	4,527	1895	Interlake Steamship Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	A. G. Campbell, Toronto, Ontario.	Canadian	D
	Winchester	Yacht (st. sc.)	411	1916	Cornelius Vanderbilt, New York.	B. Pearson McCurdy, Halifax, Nova Scotia.	do	D
	Zizania	Cargo (st. sc.)	447	1888	Pan American Shippers, Inc., Miami, Fla.	Santa Maria Timber Co., Panama City.	Panamanian	D
	S. C. 260	do	82	1917	H. C. Farrington, New York, N. Y.	S. Plaza M. LaGuaira, Venezuela.	Venezuelan	D
	Sea Giant	Tug (st. sc.)	508	1920	Shipowners & Merchants Tugboat Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Overseas Towage & Salvage Co., Ltd., London, England.	British	D
	Arcadia	Yacht (oil sc.)	578	1926	Mrs. Margaret S. Hardwick, Brookline, Mass.	Stuart B. Playfair, Toronto, Canada.	Canadian	D
	President Wilson [3]	Cargo and passenger (st. sc.).	12,597	1921	American President Lines, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	Berge Y Compania, Bilboa, Spain.	Spanish	D
	President Lincoln [3]	do	12,594	1921	do	do	do	D
	West Cape	Cargo	5,660	1918	McCormick Steamship Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Sir R. Ropner & Co., Ltd., West Hartlepool, England.	British	D
	Forbes Hauptman	do	5,674	1919	do	do	do	D
	Halonia	Yacht (oil sc.)	372	1931	Ray Alan Van Clief Nydrie, Esmond, Va.	A. Montye Macrae, Toronto, Canada.	Canadian	D
	Memnon	Cargo (st. sc.)	3,453	1921	Columbia River Packers Assn., Inc., Astoria, Oreg.	Sir R. Ropner & Co., Ltd., West Hartlepool, England.	British	D
	Harpoon	do	1,548	1920	Shepard Steamship Co., Boston, Mass.	Douglas & Ramsey, Glasgow, Scotland.	do	D
	Sabine	Tug (st. sc.)	488	1917	Sabine Transportation Co., Inc., Port Arthur, Tex.	Overseas Towage & Salvage Co., Ltd., London, England.	do	D

[1] Subsidized at some time. [2] Proceeds of sale to be used for new construction. [3] Sale canceled. [4] Foreign built.

Statement of U. S. Maritime Commission showing vessels approved for transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry Oct. 26, 1939, to April 30, 1940—Continued

Date	Name of vessel	Type	Gross tonnage	Year built	Owner	Purchaser	Registry	Restrictions
1940								
April	Aztec	Yacht (st. sc.)	808	1902	Mrs. Alice H. Burrage, Boston, Mass.	Thomas H. P. Molson, Montreal, Canada.	Canadian	D
	Mascotte	do	337	1926	C. R. Anthony and Anderson Prichard Oil Corporation of Delaware, Oklahoma City, Okla.	Sidney C. Oland, Halifax, Nova Scotia.	do	D
	Curacao	Cargo (st. sc.)	1,548	1895	Alaska Steamship Co., Seattle, Wash.	Emmanuel Yannoulatos, a Greek citizen, Shanghai, China.	Greek	D
	Munami	Cagro (st. sc.)	2,594	1919	McCormick Steamship Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Paris, France.	French	D
	Brookings	do	2,327	1919	do	do	do	D
	West Planter	do	2,609	1919	Wallingford Steamship Co., Silverado Steamship Co. (joint owners), San Francisco, Calif.	do	do	D
	Wallingford	do	2,256	1919	Wallingford Steamship Co., San Francisco, Calif.	do	do	D
	Vamar	do	598	1919 [4]	Vamar Steamship Co., Inc., Jersey City, N. J.	Sociedad Navigacion Dos Oceanos, S. A.	Panamanian	D
	Nabesna	do	2,451	1919	Portland Steamship Co., Portland, Oreg.	Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Paris, France.	French	D
	W. M. Tupper	do	1,756	1917	Santa Ana Steamship Co., Seattle, Wash.	Compania Escandinava De Vapores, S. A. Panama City, Panama.	Panamanian	D
	Wilhelmina [3]	Cargo and passenger (st. sc.)	6,725	1909	Matson Navigation Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Lochinver, Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland.	British	D
	Eldorado	Cargo (st. sc.)	2,180	1918	Western Transport Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Wm. C. T. Hwang, Shanghai, China.	Panamanian	D
	Eureka	do	2,246	1919	Hammond Shipping Co. Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	Transpacific Steamship Co., S. A., Panama City, Panama.	do	D
	West Cawthon [2 3]	do	5,611	1919	American South African Line, New York.	Sir R. Ropner & Co., Ltd., West Hartlepool, England.	British	D
	West Isleta [2 3]	do	5,680	1919	do	do	do	D
	Total		91,516					
	Grand total 171		664,471.29					
	Sales canceled [4] 11		77,713					
	Total 160		586,758.29					

LEGEND

[Conditions under which approval of transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry was granted by United States Maritime Commission]

A—Commodities on first outward voyage from a United States port restricted.
B—Trade restrictions—Trade with United States ports restricted for given number of years.
C—To be scrapped.
D—That there shall not be any liens or encumbrances on record against said vessel in the customhouse at its last United States home port when the outstanding marine document is surrendered.
E—Redocumentation of vessel under United States registry upon request.
F—Vendee will agree not to sell vessel without prior approval of U. S. Maritime Commission; vendee will agree to conform to conference rates and practices when operating vessel in competition with United States services; vendee will agree to sell or charter vessel to United States on same terms and conditions upon which any American-flag vessel could be requisitioned for purchase.
G—Whaling equipment to be removed and vessel converted into a tanker.
H—Repairs to be performed in United States shipyards.

NOTE.—Bond required of vendor and/or vendee under all of the above conditions with the exception of "D" to secure performance of any conditions imposed by Commission.

*Transfer only—Ownership retained in American company, therefore subject to provisions of sec. 902, Merchant Marine Act 1936, as amended.
[2] Proceeds of sale to be used for new construction.
[3] Sale canceled.
[4] Foreign built.

NOTE.—In the case of most of the cargo vessels approved recently for sale by the Commission to belligerent governments, assurances have been received that such vessels will not be employed for belligerent purposes and also that such vessels will be used principally in trade between United States ports and foreign ports. The latter assurance was for the benefit of American shippers.

STATEMENT SHOWING TYPE, NUMBER, GROSS TONNAGE, AVERAGE AGE OF VESSELS APPROVED BY U. S. MARITIME COMMISSION FOR TRANSFER TO ALIEN OWNERSHIP AND/OR REGISTRY UNDER SEC. 9 OF THE SHIPPING ACT, 1916, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PERIOD OCT. 26, 1939, THROUGH APR. 30, 1940

	Number	Total gross tonnage	Average age
1. Sailing vessels	6	9,133	25
2. Tugs and barges	9	9,001	26.5
3. Pleasure vessels (yachts, etc.)	19	7,903	18.4
4. Tankers	4	22,030	25
5. Commercial vessels under 1,000 gross tons (fishing vessels, motorboats, etc.)	20	6,910	22.29
6. Commercial vessels over 1,000 gross tons (cargo, combination cargo-passenger)	102	531,781.29	22.71
	160	586,758.29	22.5

STATEMENT SHOWING NATIONALITY, NUMBER, AND TONNAGE OF VESSELS APPROVED BY U. S. MARITIME COMMISSION FOR TRANSFER TO ALIEN OWNERSHIP AND/OR REGISTRY UNDER SEC. 9 OF THE SHIPPING ACT, 1916, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PERIOD OCT. 26, 1939, THROUGH APR. 30, 1940

Nationality	Number of vessels	Gross tonnage
Belgian	9	68,677.00
Brazilian	14	68,197.29

STATEMENT SHOWING NATIONALITY, NUMBER, AND TONNAGE OF VESSELS APPROVED BY U. S. MARITIME COMMISSION FOR TRANSFER TO ALIEN OWNERSHIP AND/OR REGISTRY UNDER SEC. 9 OF THE SHIPPING ACT, 1916, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PERIOD OCT. 26, 1939, THROUGH APR. 30, 1940—continued

Nationality	Number of vessels	Gross tonnage
British	39	151,245.00
Canadian	24	31,845.00
Chinese	1	1,764.00
Cuban	2	1,128.00
Estonian	1	2,437.00
French	19	49,229.00
Greek	10	42,112.00
Honduran	1	37.00
Italian	3	9,275.00
Newfoundland	1	136.00
Norwegian	1	2,647.00
Panamanian	21	101,738.00
Philippine	6	24,648.00
Spanish	2	25,191.00
Uruguayan	1	1,782.00
Venezuelan	4	4,652.00
Total	159	586,740.29
Sale alien only	1	18.00
Grand total	160	586,758.29

Discussion at the Forum of the Judge's Gavel, Yale School of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT E. AUSTIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT E. AUSTIN, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on May 5, 1940, as follows:

Were it understood that this discussion had to do with the possible aspirations of our present administrative head for a third term, I could not give the reasons against such a procedure in my allotted 12 minutes—it would take 12 hours.

There is here involved no question of law, for there is no legal authority against third terms for any President. Our consideration, therefore, must be along the lines of pure theory and clear reasoning. The problem before us this evening is whether this country shall change its procedure of a century and a half and decide that after the completion of the usual 8 years in office an incumbent may seek and be granted another 4-year term, and perhaps more than that.

What conditions would justify such a procedure? The only condition on a solid basis would be that in this country of 130,000,000 people there was such a dearth of material for statesmanship that the man then holding the Presidential office would be the only one mentally equipped, sufficiently experienced, and, may I say, providentially inspired, to hold this exalted office. This is nothing more or less than a confession of failure of government by the people. It is a confession that democracy fails to produce more than one man in a generation endowed with the ability to carry on the office of the Chief Executive. It is an insult to our cherished tradition that any child born here has his opportunity by personal effort and personal ambition to become the President of the United States. Again, failure of this country to proceed along ordinary processes of law and government might be offered as a justification for more than two terms. This could occur were there revolutionary tendencies that had to be curbed. It might be justified if there were a chaotic condition here in this country with factional elements prepared even by force of arms to overthrow and gain control. Then, by compromise, disturbed and disturbing elements might agree upon one man who could unify all elements and all factions. This, however, would be a transient condition and would in no way formulate a basis for continued or unending procedure by which one man would then remain in power. The history of this country shows no such occasion. The Civil War might be cited as an illustration, but that period showed no spirit of compromise. In spite of lugubrious and pessimistic opinions, there will be no crisis of such character in this country. Another justification for a third term would be a popular decision to change our form of government entirely, making of it what would then be nothing less than a one-man government. I doubt very much if opponents either here or elsewhere are yet ready to confess wholeheartedly and with good conscience that our democracy or Republic is a failure—that a century and a half of popular rule, rule by the people, has produced nothing that is worth continuing or is following out a divine destiny. Such carries with it all that we have won in the past, all that we may hope for in the future, summed up so splendidly in "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It might be wondered if the increased average of Republican sentiment since 1936 in 38 States of our Union, as shown by a recent poll, is not a popular decision, because this question is a paramount issue and the Republican stand on it is known to everyone. Can anyone say that this increase is not due in some degree to the third-term potential menace? Did the third-term issue come to ultimate appeal to a citizenry of 130,000,000 people with the exception of those guided only by selfish and personal interests, none would oppose it. The answer would not be determined by political control, caucus, convention, and primaries—it would be by referendum.

Who at this present time could demand such a change and the following out of such a procedure? Certainly no one influenced by conditions just mentioned demands it. It must be said—and I defy well-founded contradiction—that such a demand must come now and would come in the future as a result of the then existing administrative policy. Why is there talk now about a third term? What conditions are there now existent which would lead a considerable portion of our voting public even to consider a third term? The answer to this is conclusive. Let us assume that all of our present governmental policies are good policies. Mark you, I say "assume." The question then resolves itself into this—who are they who are now interested in Mr. Roosevelt's continuing in office, and who are they who in all probability would be interested 20 years from now in continuing Mr. Blank for a third term? The broad answer is this—the proponents look for personal gain or personal advantage with no time limit set. What is the situation today? So great and so excessive has been the increase in numbers of those who are supported by, dependent upon, or subsidized through, the present Administration that selfish interests are put before patriotic interests. Bring to your minds the almost innumerable bureaus, administrations, agencies, boards created in the last 7 years. They all contain voters. Bear in mind that at the present time there are nearly a million employees of the United States Government in the executive department. They all are voters. Do not lose sight of that which is so well known that many of these creations have assumed to themselves powers which belong only to the Congress to such an extent that their rulings are declared to be and to have the force of statutory law. In this must be included even certain Members of the President's Cabinet today.

Do you think it probable that the recipients of Federal grants and of Federal patronage, or those who know that their support possibly can be bought by largess, as it has been bought at times within the last 7 years—do you think that they will be overjoyed to know that the source of their power and their support would be gone if another President came to the highest office in the land? Don't you think most of them now favor a third term and would vote for it? Even certain States may be found in the column of those desiring a third term for the reason that due to Executive plans and Executive processes they have found that they are being supported in large or small part by other States in the Union more affluent. Is it not certain that a majority of the voters in such subsidized States will back the bounteous hand that supplies them from Federal funds making unnecessary an increase in their own State tax burden? In classifying those who have a personal or group interest in a third term it must not be forgotten that there is unfortunately within our midst a certain portion of our citizens who, either through direction by a foreign power or by a desire to overthrow, want a change in our system of government. They are known as subversive influences, and like it or not they are with us, and like it or not they are working and plotting day and night for this very end. They, perhaps smarter than promoters of the third-term idea, realize that therein can be found their proper method of approach to accomplish their object. Let our splendid tradition once be broken down, then those influences are on their way to victory. Just as soon as the people of this country are willing to surrender their rights and prerogatives, just at that moment these subversive influences have won what would be to date their greatest victory. It is but a few steps from that to the triumphant entry of communism or kindred ills to the White House. Mr. Roosevelt has not declared himself for a third term, so who can be accused of urging it? Those whom I have just classified are urging him to announce it and restraining him from denouncing it. Who are they thus performing? I have just named and classified them for you.

Let us suppose that a sufficient number in our country should declare by their votes a third term for any President. Are there or are there not dangerous and menacing results to such? What could happen? First, there is an important departure from our philosophy of government, our constitutional government, which has carried us in a short space of time, as time is measured, from a handful of pilgrims who landed on the Massachusetts shore to the most powerful nation on earth and, incidentally, a nation belonging to the people and not to a dictator and ruled by peace and not by force. Second, our established theory of States' rights and State sovereignty will remain only as a hallowed memory of happier days. There will be the establishment in perpetuity of a bureaucratic form of government where the laws will be made, interpreted, and executed by a group of men who have arrogated to themselves a power once belonging to you and me. It is not difficult to think the then situation out to a conclusion. If three terms are desirable, and if three terms can be effected, then why not four or five, the length of time determined only by the age and vigor of the incumbent? As the years went by this incumbent would have so fortified himself, so entrenched himself because of his subsidization that, call it by any name, a dictator is in authority. How far is it from that to the position of Louis XIV of France who so haughtily remarked, "I am the State." There was a reigning house then in France. Facetious, perhaps; but what would prevent a reigning house here in the United States of America, the oldest democracy on earth? I mentioned a while ago life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have illustrated here in this country the results of supreme power in local application. Is it necessary to mention Tammany, Pendergast, Long of Louisiana, "I am the Law" Hague? Political debauchery, the flaying of liberty, the sabotage of a people—do you or do you not want even the possibility of all this?

In the beginning I remarked that this would be a general discussion. I cannot refrain from a concrete and specific example. The conditions aforementioned may be possible but not entirely probable in this free land. A moment ago in our discussion I removed policies. Now I restore policies to the argument. Do our present Administration policies justify a third term? A continuance of such policies could be expected for the reason that in the case of those policies which have been proven by use to be damaging and dangerous there has been a continued refusal to change them. We do not object to the continuance of policies which have proved to be sound, and there have been such. The voters of the United States must bear in mind certain facts before deciding on a third term now. The political policies with which we have become famil-

far during the last 7 years, suggest the State to be supreme, suggest that a centralized government is the goal of action, that the citizens exist for the State. Every trend has been away from our long-established constitutional form of government. The economic policies are for centralization—in one instance a centralized control of business, industry, and labor. It has revealed as civic philosophy government competition with private capital and private corporate initiative to say nothing of final Government ownership of utilities. Financial policies have been built on theories, found even through centuries to be unsound and false, obstinately refusing the voice of experience. We now face financial instability to be followed inevitably by inflation or repudiation. Tax sources are becoming beautifully less each day, tax sources which are being destroyed in order to continue our debauchery of waste. Social policies have completely revolutionized our social structure. Due to them many of our citizens now believe that they must not work for themselves that the Government owes each a living. In our social environment today has intruded the question of war. Your common sense must penetrate to the real situation. War is an effective smoke screen for domestic difficulties. Tell those who argue against changing horses in the middle of the stream that they would be changing horses in the middle of a dream.

I have not discussed at length the burying of a precedent and noble tradition of our existence as a republic so well known to all. During our national life attempts have been made to secure third terms, and these attempts have been successfully defended by the electorate. Direct refusals to consider such have been made by others, and it did not take them up to within 2 months of the nominating convention to make their declaration. The statements made by a multitude who through the years have been statesmen and have thought only of our welfare that such a plan is not to be thought of, hostile and contrary to the interests of all, must be given full weight.

Summarizing in a word, the questions, and the only questions, are: Shall we throw aside our philosophy of government? Shall we destroy its structure and its strength? Shall we even endanger it by thought or deed? Shall we cease to be a sovereign people, each one free and independent? Shall there no longer be 48 States existing all for one and one for all? Shall we tolerate the insult to the intelligence and ability of our people by declaring that even in an emergency there is only 1 man in 130,000,000 able to carry on? Shall we stand back of any man who today or tomorrow may, through pomp of circumstance or pride of rank, declare "I am the State"?

Townsend Plan Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. T. BUCKLER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. P. G. PETERS, OF MOORHEAD, MINN.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include herewith a letter which I have received from an elderly woman in my district. This fine old lady appeals to me to support the Townsend plan in this session of Congress. I have assured her, as I have hundreds who have written me, that I am strongly supporting the Townsend-plan bill, H. R. 8264, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative JOE HENDRICKS. I voted for the Townsend plan last session of Congress and certainly will do so again in this session if we can get the bill up for consideration. I have signed the petition to discharge the committee, and if we get a sufficient number of names, 218 being required, we will get a vote on the Townsend bill before the session closes. The communication which follows is one of the best arguments I know of for the Townsend plan. Her situation is repeated many times over throughout my own district and over the United States. Her letter follows:

MOORHEAD, MINN., *April 27, 1940.*

Hon. R. T. BUCKLER,
United States Representative in Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCKLER: Please do what you can to help the only real cause along, meaning the Townsend plan. My man is 64 years old and must earn our living, since it is all we have. After losing two homes during depression, high taxes for paved streets, and big interest on the money, we had to sell out our grocery business and live on our savings until we spend every cent. No relief at that time and no work to get. We had to burden some of my relatives to keep alive. I would to God the last few years we have left of our hard slavery life could be spent in rest. We both need medical care, but can't afford it on his wages. How nice it would be if he could have one of these young, husky street loafers to have his job. Will close.

Sincerely,

MRS. P. G. PETERS.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM A. C. JEWELL, SECRETARY, CALIFORNIA STATE SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION, AND A RESOLUTION FROM THE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Capt. A. C. Jewell, secretary of the California State Sheriffs' Association, and also resolution adopted by the California State Sheriffs' Association at its forty-sixth annual convention held April 27, 1940, commending the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

CALIFORNIA STATE SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION,
May 3, 1940.

Hon. LELAND M. FORD,
Congressman, Sixteenth California Congressional District, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the California State Sheriffs Association I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution passed by the California State Sheriffs Association at its annual convention in the city of Santa Barbara on the 27th day of April 1940.

Your support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be greatly appreciated by every member of the California State Sheriffs Association.

Thanking you for your interest and support, I am,

Very truly yours,

A. C. JEWELL, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation was brought into being largely through the activities of the local law-enforcement officers of the country for the purpose of national suppression of kidnaping, gangsterism, and other forms of law violations beyond the jurisdiction and finances of local communities; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has more than justified its creation by stamping out kidnaping, extortion, and other terrorist crimes that once threatened every American home; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation is now engaged in the important duty of suppressing espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities throughout the country; and

Whereas these laudable activities have earned the undying hatred of both the underworld and the subversive influences of the Nation with the result that a campaign of villification is now being conducted by them against the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the obvious purpose of destroying its efficiency; and

Whereas the success of any such campaign of villification would eventually destroy all law enforcement in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Sheriffs Association, in annual convention assembled, does hereby reaffirm its unqualified faith in the integrity, efficiency, and devotion to duty of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That this expression of our faith in the Federal Bureau of Investigation be communicated to the California Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, and that they be urged to use their best efforts in Congress to protect the present status and the well-deserved good name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Dated at Santa Barbara, Calif., the 27th day of April 1940, at the forty-sixth annual convention, and unanimously adopted by the California State Sheriffs Association in convention assembled.

CALIFORNIA STATE SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION,
By GRAT M. HOGIN, *President.*
By A. C. JEWELL, *Secretary.*

Enriching the Youghiogheny Watershed for Future Generations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. BUELL SNYDER AT CONFLUENCE, PA.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the address I made at the ground-breaking exercises for the Youghiogheny Multi-Purpose Dam at Confluence, Pa., April 13, 1940, as follows:

THE HILLS OF HOME

It affords me a great deal of pleasure to be here today to greet you on this occasion. As we older grow, the scenes and activities of our early childhood are more vividly portrayed when we travel the same roads, fish in the same streams, gaze upon the same hills, and reminisce with our childhood friends of those days in recalling the country school and country church activities.

It was my privilege as a boy to see the hills around my home, from Confluence up the Casselman River, up the Laurel Hill Creek, and on parts of the Youghiogheny River, largely covered with a splendid growth of timberland, much of it virgin timber.

Then as I grew into young manhood I saw millions of the trees being cut from these hillsides, and none of them replaced. As a result, we find the hills covered to a large extent with mere shrubbery, the ground hardened by the elements to the extent that now, when we have a dashing rain and the melting of snow, it rushes down the hillside, thus eroding away the rich top soil and causing floods and destruction in the regions farther down the river.

Yes, my friends, as a boy I caught fine bass and trout in the Casselman River up by Markleton, Rockwood, but that was before the streams were polluted with factory and mine water.

It is my contention, and always has been, that we get out of life exactly what we put into it. The same holds true with reference to nature. Nature gives back to man exactly what man gives to nature. If man robs nature, nature in turn will rob man.

In the case of the Youghiogheny watershed, man took from the hills timberland to get dollars, and did not put any dollars back on the hills. Man took from the bowels of the earth minerals, coal, and other metal. Of course, he could not put these minerals back, but at the same time he took the minerals he allowed sulphur and other elements to reach our streams and thus pollute the water in all the streams making up the Youghiogheny River, with one or two exceptions.

You have heard me say on other occasions that a nation is prosperous in proportion as the tillers of the soil are prosperous. You cannot conserve the soil of a nation unless you conserve the waters of a nation. It is human nature to strive to do something worth while for our community and Nation.

I am happy in the thought that the people of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District selected me to represent them in the Halls of Congress for the last 8 years.

I appreciate very much the fact that my colleagues in Congress saw fit to place me as chairman of the committee that makes appropriations for river, harbor, and flood-control projects throughout the Nation.

It goes without saying that when my colleagues cooperated with me in getting an appropriation to build the Youghiogheny watershed dam I was grateful indeed. I was grateful because I want to see the boys and girls of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District in generations to come have facilities and opportunities to make a living, if possible in a little better way than we have today.

We cannot serve our fellow men or country in a full-orbed way unless we ever keep in mind that we must conserve our soil, conserve our forests, and conserve our streams for the men and women of the future.

It is no use to blame our forefathers for depleting our forests, polluting our streams, and partially destroying our soil. We must let bygones be bygones and has-beens be has-beens.

It is our duty in our generation to adjust our social and economic fabric so year after year we will find our community and Nation a better place in which to live.

The building of such a reservoir of water that will not only control floods but will distribute water down the Youghiogheny as far as McKeesport, enrich farm and forest in the Youghiogheny watershed, provide fishing and hunting facilities, prevent stream pollution, bring benefits to the people living in the Youghiogheny watershed estimated by the Army engineers at $500,000 each year, is one big way in which we must prepare for the future not only here in this great Youghiogheny watershed but throughout the Nation.

There would be no dust bowl in the Central West if they had not plowed down those hundreds of thousands of acres of buffalo grass in order to get a few crops of wheat and corn. While man took possibly $100,000,000 worth of crops off that acreage, it is now costing the Government 10 or 20 times that amount to stave off further destruction that is caused by dust storms.

Yes, my friends, you cannot rob Nature without Nature turning around and making you pay for it tenfold.

Being a resident of this great Youghiogheny watershed, you will be interested to know that the flood program for the Nation as prepared by the Flood Control Committee in Congress provides ample protection for the Youghiogheny watershed. My able and distinguished friend and colleague, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri, is a member of that committee, and I want to say that his forceful and persistent efforts in shaping the program and getting congressional authorization for such projects as the Youghiogheny Dam were big factors in such a well-planned flood-control program.

I want to also commend Mr. W. B. Rodgers, president of the Tri-State Authority, for his assistance in bringing data and information to my committee in Washington.

Perhaps many of you do not know that since July 1, 1938, the Army engineers have been working with one, two, and three crews right here between confluence and the upper reaches of the Youghiogheny River preparing the groundwork and fundamentals for the superstructure of this dam.

In community life, if you have a splendid, energetic, well-informed, courteous, hard-working superintendent of schools and keep him on the job for a number of years, you have good schools. The same is true with your churches. The same is true with your enterprises, whether it be mill, factory, or mine. The same is true in public life. The same is true with your public officials.

From the time I was a barefoot boy in Turkeyfoot Township, I heard my elders talk about conserving the streams, and especially the Youghiogheny River.

When I went to Congress 8 years ago I aimed to do what Shakespeare said was necessary in order to accomplish a big thing. That is, "Screw your courage to the sticking place."

Well, I did that with a determination that if possible I would see to it that the Yough watershed was enriched and protected by my Government.

Thus, we are breaking ground for the second unit of this conservation—the first being the Laurel Hill Federal Park conservation.

We expect to build two and perhaps three more conservation water-controlled dams on the Youghiogheny, Casselman, or Laurel Hill Creek. We must build them within the next space of years if those who live here 50 or 100 years from now expect to have facilities to make a living.

I want to say that Col. William E. R. Covell, chief of the Pittsburgh office of the Army engineers, which takes in parts of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, has had sole charge of this construction work. He is not only capable and efficient but is a splendid fellow to work with. I feel honored that he stayed in his present position 1 month longer than he had intended in order that he might participate in the initial exterior construction work of the Youghiogheny Dam project.

In conclusion I wish to thank the Lions Club of Confluence and all other individuals and groups for their splendid cooperation in making this occasion a success, and I hope this fine cooperation continues.

I express the same appreciation of the cooperation and help from Somerfield, the "Cornish Arms," the Addison Band, and to Mr. Everett Will and the boys in the community bands, for their contribution to this program.

We will be inviting you back in 3 or 4 years when we dedicate this structure.

Widows' and Orphans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in discussing the merits of H. R. 9000, a bill providing pensions for widows, orphans, and dependent parents of World War veterans, which will be considered by the House next Monday, the question has been asked as to just what benefits a widow with two minor children would be entitled under the provisions of the existing Social Security Act. I submitted a hypothetical case to the Social Security Board,

using, for example, a man of 45 years of age, who died in January of this year, leaving a widow and two minor children, and who had been paid $35 for each week of service from the time the program went into effect until the quarter in which his death occurred. I quote herewith from a letter received from the Social Security Board in reply to my inquiry:

A surviving qualified child is entitled to a monthly benefit equal to one-half of the worker's primary benefit; a qualified widow receives an amount equal to three-fourths of her husband's benefit. You mention, as an example, the case of an individual who died in January of this year and who is survived by a widow and two minor children. If this person was paid wages of $35 for each week from the time the program went into effect until the quarter in which his death occurred, or an average monthly wage of $151.67, his primary insurance benefit would be $31.07, entitling each of his children to a monthly payment of $15.53 and his widow to a monthly payment of $23.30. A child may continue to receive monthly payments until it reaches age 16, or 18 if unmarried and still attending school. The widow's benefits stop when the youngest child reaches age 16 or 18; but since the worker in this case was fully insured at the time of his death, the widow may, upon reaching age 65, again receive widow's benefits, provided she has not remarried and is otherwise qualified.

Southern Vindication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

AN ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I include herewith an editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post:

SOUTHERN VINDICATION

Encouraging news is reported by the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching. For the first time since records began to be kept, in 1882, 12 consecutive months have now passed without a single lynching in any Southern State.

The ability of States and groups of States to cope with the lynching problem, without help or interference by the Federal Government, is thus emphasized. And particular credit for this constructive development belongs to the association which makes the report, and which has rendered yeoman service in making every section of the South conscious of the imperative necessity of eradicating this form of mob murder.

The announcement also reveals the highly efficient technique being used by local governments to combat mob violence. Education, radio-alarm systems, and mobile State police units have alike proved their worth in eliminating the ugliest stain on the escutcheon of southern civilization.

If the record of the last 12 months is maintained, the last vestige of excuse for the present antilynching bill will be wiped out. That measure, with its proposals for Federal penalties on State and county officials who fail to do their duty, and on the counties themselves, would provide a very dangerous invasion of local rights even if the apparent need for it were greater than is the case.

At the first appearance of the bill its partly political character was obvious; lynchings were already rapidly diminishing. In 1939 there were but three in the Nation. Yet the measure has twice passed the House, and now is on the Senate calendar. Now that lynching can at last be called nonexistent, it is difficult to see how arguments for the measure can be effectively sustained.

The significance of this editorial is that it emphasizes the demonstrated ability of the States and their communities to govern in those matters which are within their governmental capacity.

I take advantage of this opportunity to direct attention to the fact, using this antilynching thing to illustrate, that in proportion as we develop a condition of public opinion and of State and community success, which would make Federal intervention less necessary from anybody's viewpoint, there is increased the probability of the enactment of a Federal law dealing with the matter. A Federal law cannot be enacted until there shall have developed by community achievement a public opinion which, if given a little more time, would crystallize into an effective State and community policy.

When there were 231 lynchings in 1 year in this country there was not nearly the pressure for a Federal law as obtained in this country last session when a Federal antilynching law passed this House, under public pressure, by a vote of 2 to 1. This happened, although the States and their communities by their own efforts had reduced lynchings to only 3 during the preceding 12 months, 1 lynching for each 40,000,000 people. It is by this way of not thinking things through, this emotional back-seat driving, this unwillingness to await the somewhat slower but surer and more effective processes of popular government, that we are destroying the States as the responsible agencies of popular government and erecting upon their ruin a great Federal bureaucracy.

Sugar-Situation Facts as to Effects on Louisiana Sugarcane Growers, Refineries, and Consumers if Continuing Resolution, Now Pending Before the House of Representatives, Is Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in order that the people of my congressional district and Louisiana may understand all facts in connection with the present consideration of sugar legislation, I deem it my duty to take the time of the House of Representatives to offer these pertinent remarks.

POSITION OF LOUISIANA CANE GROWERS WITH REFERENCE TO CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Their position with reference to the continuing resolution is best expressed by Mr. Charles Farwell, of New Orleans, La., as follows:

We'd rather have no quota at all, and no sugar benefit payments from the Federal Government, and take our chances, than continue to try to grow sugar under a system of regulations by which we plant sugarcane in good faith and then get orders to plow it up. After paying the cost of planting and cultivating. Louisiana sugar planters were ordered by Washington to plow up 30,000 acres of growing cane, and in 1940 we were ordered to plow up 50,000 acres. We don't want to have to do that again. No quotas, no Federal benefits, and take our chances is infinitely preferable to that.

So much for the Louisiana sugarcane growers.

CONGRESSMAN FERNANDEZ'S STATEMENT BEFORE THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE—FROM A REFINING STANDPOINT

In the hearing conducted by the House Agricultural Committee I filed the following statement:

Wholly aside from other questions involved in sugar bills pending before your committee, continental sugar interests should be united on one thing—that limitations on tropical refined sugar must be embodied in any legislation that may be enacted. My State is both a cane-refining and a cane-producing State. In protesting against further expansion of the tropical refining industry, I speak particularly for the refining industry in my State—one of the most important from a refining standpoint. As an incidental question, I have no doubt that the refining industry realizes that any increase in quota granted the producing interests in Louisiana will, for the most part, ultimately come to the refineries in the form of raw sugar for manufacturing into refined sugar.

In sugar legislation heretofore enacted Congress has imposed limitations on the quantities of tropical refined sugar that could come here. Although it is my own judgment that Congress was overgenerous with tropical areas, and particularly Cuba, who should be required to send here in raw form all sugar permitted her in this market, the important thing now is that further expansion of the tropical-refined sugar industry will be disastrous to the cane-sugar refineries operating in Louisiana and other States. With the expiration of the present quota law at the end of this year, Cuba will have no limitation on the amount of refined sugar she can send here. Puerto Rican and Hawaiian refined-sugar limitations expired under

the Sugar Act of 1937, on February 29, 1940, and those areas can now ship their entire quota in refined form. New legislation should limit Cuba's share in this market to raw sugar, upon which her economic structure has been built up; and should at least limit Puerto Rican and Hawaiian refined sugar to the amounts allowed them under the Sugar Act of 1937, which, incidentally, was the highest shipments in any previous year.

So much for the refining industry. I have one of the largest refineries in the country in my congressional district, employing approximately 1,000 men.

THE BENEFITS NOW ENJOYED BY THE SUGARCANE REFINERIES UNDER EXISTING LEGISLATION AND WHAT THEY STAND TO LOSE WITHOUT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(a) Limitation on imports of Cuban refined (direct consumption) sugar to 375,000 tons.

(b) Limitations on admission of sugar from all other foreign countries of the world, that is, Peru, Santo Domingo, Java, and so forth, which automatically limits the refined-sugar importations from these countries to small amounts:

Under the present act the total amount of raw and refined sugar which may come in from foreign countries other than Cuba in 1940 is about 26,000 tons spread out among 27 countries. Without quota limitations there is danger of large shipments of refined sugar from Latin and South American countries and other producing areas of the world which are having and may continue to have difficulties under war conditions in finding consuming markets.

(c) The embargo on imports of liquid sugar from all countries in the world except Cuba and Santo Domingo and restrictive quotas on these countries:

In the present act it is provided that only Santo Domingo and Cuba may bring in liquid sugar—7,970,558 gallons for Cuba and 830,894 gallons for Santo Domingo per annum—equivalent to approximately 40,000 tons of sugar. There is an outright embargo on importations of such sugars from all the rest of the world. Quotas were first put on Cuban liquid-sugar importations by the Secretary under a discretionary power held by him in 1936 when nearly 16,000,000 gallons came in. All the efforts of the refiners and others in the past to limit competition in the form of these liquid sugars would be largely lost if the sugar legislation lapsed.

(d) Limitations on the marketings of refined sugar processed from sugar beets:

The 1940 marketings of beet sugar are now restricted to 1,549,898 short tons, raw value, and every sugar-beet processor has a restrictive allotment. In the absence of legislation 1941 marketings would be limited only by the inventory stock of sugar-beet processors.

I have not mentioned in the above summary the limitations on importations of the Philippine refined sugar, because that is covered by other legislation, which would continue in any event. It is true that on March 1 the limitations on receipts of direct-consumption sugar from Puerto Rico and Hawaii terminated, but official spokesmen from both Puerto Rico and Hawaii have recently explained publicly that there is no likelihood of enlarged capacity for sugar refining in these areas during the next year, and the quantity of such sugar which will come in before the Congress meets again and undertakes new, permanent sugar legislation is not reported to be a significant amount.

EFFECT ON LOUISIANA SUGARCANE PRODUCERS

Since the sugar-quota system has been in effect, sugar production in Louisiana has more than doubled, increasing from an average of 187,000 tons in the period 1928–33, which preceded quota legislation, to 362,000 tons in the period 1934–39, during which such legislation was effective. In fact, the last three crops produced in my State—Louisiana—have been the largest the State has ever produced. The total income of Louisiana growers has also more than doubled, going from an average of $8,594,000 in the earlier period to about $18,000,000 in the quota period.

If a continuing resolution is not approved and no new sugar legislation is enacted, sugar quotas will expire on December 31 of this year, the excise tax on sugar will cease to be effective on May 31, 1941, and conditional payments to growers will not be made after the 1940 crop. Under a system in which domestic sugar production would be protected only by tariff, the position of independent growers would not be as favorable at any given price of sugar as their position has been under the sugar legislation which has been in effect since 1934. Although the sugar excise tax levied under existing legislation reduces the value of raw sugar in an amount equal to the tax, the lower price received by growers from processors is more than made up by the conditional payments growers receive under the act. The actual effect of the tax and payment phases of the program is to give sugarcane producers a larger share of the total income than they would otherwise receive. For example, assuming the price of raw sugar to be $3.25 per hundredweight, a grower would receive $3.15 per ton of standard of par sugarcane under the established purchase agreements in use in the territory. The imposition of an excise tax of 50 cents per hundredweight of sugar, other things being constant, would lead to a reduction in the value of raw sugar to approximately $2.75 per hundredweight, in which case the processor payment for standard sugarcane would amount to $2.50 per ton. In addition to the processor payment, however, the grower receives a conditional payment of approximately 95 cents per ton, making his total income $3.45 per ton, as contrasted with $3.15 per ton in the absence of a tax and conditional payment program. On an acre of cane yielding 22 tons the increased income to the grower would be $6.60 per acre.

Under the existing sugar program cane growers are protected through the crop-insurance feature of the program, which provides abandonment and deficiency payments for producers when a substantial portion of their crop is damaged by freeze, drought, flood, insects, or other crop hazards. In the case of a deficiency in harvested acreage below the yield which would normally be expected, growers are assured conditional payments on at least 80 percent of their normal yield. In cases where acreage is abandoned prior to harvest, the insurance payment is made on one-third of the normal yield per acre. In 1937, in Louisiana, approximately 21,000 acres of sugarcane were abandoned because of freeze damage, and the yield of sugar from the acreage harvested was in many cases deficient. Abandonment and deficiency payments in Louisiana that year under the sugar program amounted to approximately $200,000. Since freezing weather is one of the major hazards facing Louisiana sugarcane producers, the crop-insurance feature of existing sugar legislation is a very important consideration.

There are approximately 12,000 farms in my State—Louisiana—on which sugarcane is grown for sugar. On over 60 percent of these farms the acreage of sugarcane harvested for sugar does not exceed 10 acres. Under the present sugar programs these small growers have not been required to make any acreage adjustments to qualify for payments. Adjustments have been required on the part of larger growers because production of sugar has exceeded quota and reserve requirements. It is conceivable that if no sugar legislation is enacted to replace that now in effect there will be an immediate expansion of sugarcane plantings not only in Louisiana but also in Florida, where the production of sugarcane enjoys several natural advantages over the sugarcane production in Louisiana. It is impossible to measure the consequences of such an expansion of sugar production in the mainland cane-sugar area. If, as in 1934, when the protective tariff on sugar was at its highest point in almost 50 years, sugar prices should fall to extremely low levels, it is probable that the industry would again be forced to consider the adoption of protective measures more effective than the tariff. Each producing area would undoubtedly be forced to make sacrifices, as has been the case since 1934, and any further expansion of acreage in the mainland cane area would aggravate the resulting problem of adjustment.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that for certain classes of producers in Louisiana it would be to their advantage at the moment to have no legislation so that they might increase their acreages or, in the case of new large growers, enter the field of cane growing. Undoubtedly there are owners of land who would like to be able to derive an income from

cane growing on such land, and even old growers in many cases may have additional land they would like to turn to sugarcane.

EFFECT ON CONSUMERS

If there is no sugar legislation at the present session of the Congress, consumers would, of course, benefit by the increased competition by the sellers of sugar that would result from the removal of all quotas and marketing allotments, including quota restrictions on importations of foreign sugar. However, in view of the change in tariff rates which would ensue and the developments which may arise in the world markets, it is impossible to judge the trend of prices in the absence of the existing sugar program.

I again repeat, Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in taking the time of the House of Representatives on this question at this time is to inform my people of all facts I have secured on this most important industry in my State.

F. D. R. Postpones St. Lawrence Seaway Negotiations With Canada on Account of Presidential Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ARTICLE FROM BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Buffalo Evening News of May 9, 1940. This news item emanates from Ottawa, Canada, and presumably would not have been printed, had the information not come from someone of high authority in the Canadian Government. For obvious reasons, the item does not carry the name of the informant, but this interesting story reads as follows:

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of May 9, 1940]

SEAWAY NEGOTIATIONS HELD UP UNTIL ELECTION—OTTAWA HEARS ROOSEVELT ASKED FOR A SUSPENSION

OTTAWA, May 9.—President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King have agreed to postpone further negotiations on the St. Lawrence seaway project until the Presidential elections are over in November, it was learned today in most authoritative sources.

High quarters say that suspension of the discussions was at the request of President Roosevelt. The heads of the two Governments, it was learned, conferred on the proposal during Mr. King's visit to Warm Springs and Washington 10 days ago.

The feeling here is that Mr. Roosevelt decided, because of the opposition to the plan in several parts of the United States, it would be inadvisable to open the door for the subject during the coming American election campaign.

Spokesmen say the Canadian Government was ready to pursue negotiations along the lines of the draft agreement submitted by United States Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, but the suspension request was agreed to with the understanding discussions would be resumed late this year.

It is interesting to note that Prime Minister King is reported to have made the agreement with President Roosevelt while the Prime Minister was paying his "social call" at the Little White House in Georgia. The Canadian authority stated that the Canadian Government is ready to pursue negotiations, but an understanding was reached that "discussions would be resumed late this year." I confess that optimism had run away with me; I thought the President might have seen the error of his ways not only from an economic angle, which is inimical to the interests of the people of our country, but even more important from the point of view of maintaining our neutrality. I know the time is short before Congress will adjourn, but I again call to the attention of my colleague the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that House Concurrent Resolution 48, which I introduced on February 20, 1940, is still reposing peacefully in the pigeonholes of his committee. Day-to-day events indicate just how necessary it is for Uncle Sam to guard his neutrality. After we go home and, above all, after election day, if our executive department is planning on pushing this international problem child, the international seaway and power project, as Members of Congress you should know of the possibilities lying ahead. These possibilities can best be given an airing if the Committee on Foreign Affairs will favorably report the above-mentioned resolution, so that all of us will know just how far down the road toward involvement the President wants us to go. Surely he cannot wish to have the United States Government make a treaty with a belligerent and jointly build canals, transportation systems, and power developments with that belligerent and at the same time shout to the world that he and the State Department are doing everything possible to keep the United States neutral. No one is gullible enough to feel that we can use our funds in helping any belligerent the better to carry on the war without violating the spirit of our neutrality.

Surely no one will believe for a minute that war would not affect the maintenance of such an international project and would not mitigate against free flow of neutral trade through waterways lying wholly within belligerent territory. If the news item can be believed—and I repeat, it is probably on good authority—the probability is that these important considerations are uppermost in the President's mind when he makes an agreement to hold up international discussions for the treaty until after the American people have named their President who will occupy the White House starting January 1, 1941.

With this in mind, I am convinced those same American people want no part of a treaty and project so outstandingly dangerous to Uncle Sam's desired neutral position.

Virginia Military Institute—A Builder of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the alumni of the Virginia Military Institute, frequently referred to as the West Point of the South, are launching a campaign to raise an endowment fund of $1,000,000. While the V. M. I. is a State institution, supported exclusively by State funds, it draws its cadets from every State in the Union and numerous foreign countries. The needs of the public-school system in Virginia have become so pressing the State legislature has been unable to make adequate provision to enable the Virginia Military Institute to expand its training program.

The news of the attacks upon the democracies of Europe by totalitarian governments must shock and alarm every lover of a democratic form of government in this country, as well as indicating the absolute necessity on our part of being able to successfully defend representative democracy in America.

On November 11, 1938, which was the ninety-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Virginia Military Institute, I paid the following tribute to the part played through the years by V. M. I. men in upholding representative democracy:

The 99 years of V. M. I. history have been marked by the outstanding character and ability of its superintendents. Fully measuring to that high standard is one whose irrefragable courage on the battlefield and whose innate tenderness and humility mark him as truly great. That man is our present superintendent, Gen. Charles E. Kilbourne. I was flattered to receive from that distinguished soldier, scholar, and gentleman an invitation to address you today.

The memory of my college days is still too fresh to permit me to believe that any college man would choose to listen to a speech

on a holiday, but orders are orders, and "You're in the Army now." As a concession, however, to that psychology I will emulate the example of that brilliant cavalry leader, Gen. Nathan B. Forest, who, when facing a superior force, said to his men: "Boys, we'll give 'em hell for 10 minutes and if they don't run we will." So hold your ground for 10 minutes and then your bugler may sound "cease firing" and I will fall back.

It is pleasing to me to have the privilege of bringing a brief message to the cadet corps of a school with which I have had many contacts. My first contact with V. M. I. was on a Richmond football field, 32 years ago, and the V. M. I. left tackle against whom I played gave me a personal introduction to the V. M. I. spirit. Between 1908 and 1917 I officiated in most of your home games. I served with V. M. I. men in the Army, and one of your old football stars, Max Patterson, took me under his wing in the Third Infantry Company of the Fort Myer Officers Training School and helped me to get a commission. For the past 30 years I have watched you at work and have watched you at play. On numerous occasions I have stood with you at attention on your parade ground when the sunset gun was fired and the emblem of our national life and unity reverently lowered from its masthead. And that sight has never failed to thrill me, as I have thought of the part played by V. M. I. men in giving meaning and significance to the symbolism of the flag. In the flag I would see 48 stars, symbolic of great and sovereign States stretching from ocean to ocean, and in your ranks I would see the engineers who helped to construct transportation and communication systems that made the unity of that vast area possible; chemical and other research men who, under the inspiration of a Maury or a Brooke, helped to discover unto us the secrets of natural laws; still others who in the professions have made of the peacetime activities of V. M. I. a balanced program of constructive service. I saw reflected in your ranks from that white stripe of purity in the flag, character training in the fundamental distinction between meum and tuum; between yes and no; between what is ethically right and what is ethically wrong. And mirrored in the gleaming bayonets held at attention was the red stripe of courage that had never wavered in loyalty to representative democracy nor faltered in the face of an enemy.

In the first decade of your history V. M. I. men carried that national emblem under Scott in the Mexican War to the heights of Montezuma. May the recording angel blot out with a tear the tragic 4 years when our land was torn with civil strife and drenched with fraternal blood. But should that page of history be opened, recorded at its top will be the immortal deeds of heroism on the bloody field of New Market. You carried that flag to victory in 1898. And in 1917, when the call came again to take up arms in defense of an ideal of government, 2,000 V. M. I. men answered that call—a larger percentage of the living alumni than was furnished by any other school in the Nation except West Point—48 percent of the graduates of the class of 1903, the percentage raising for each succeeding year to 100 percent of the class of 1918.

The V. M. I. boys of the North and the V. M. I. boys of the South donned the Doughboy khaki—a composite of the Union blue and the Confederate gray, and as they marched to the great adventure our Nation exclaimed:

"Here's to the boys of the windswept North!
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Grant be with them all
As the sons of the North advance.

"Here's to the boys of the sunny South!
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Lee be with them all
As the sons of the South advance.

"Here's to the Blue and the Gray as one!
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of God be with them all
As the sons of the flag advance."

The flag they had learned in school to love was taken by 2,000 V. M. I. men for the first time upon a European battlefield, where it received, as its baptism of fire, a salute from the arsenals of hell. And in that hell, 57 lost their lives, and 120 more were severely wounded.

One hundred and seventy-seven sons of V. M. I. fell "in order that we might live in peace"—so reads the tablet erected to their memory. They thought they were battling to make the world safe for democracy and waging a war to end wars. Ten million men laid down their lives in that struggle; 30,000,000 more were wounded. The financial cost and property destruction are beyond computation. Oh, the irony of the fact that on this twentieth anniversary of Armistice Day the world was never less safe for democracy nor the peace of the world more insecure. Europe is an armed camp, with open hostilities resting upon the ipse dixit of any one of three dictators.

For more than a year dictatorial Japan has been slaughtering the Chinese without mercy, and the days of the white man in the Orient are numbered. At the so-called peace of Munich, the democracies of France and Great Britain trembled in unpreparedness before the iron heel of war and made concessions to force.

Where does that leave you and me? It leaves us, as Secretary Hull recently said, at the cross roads between rule by armed force and rule by law. We, of course, prefer rule by law, but some day may be called upon to defend our democracy by force. Your stay within these barracks has been in vain if you have not already learned it is worth defending.

With only 7 percent of the population of the world, we have 45 percent of the world's wealth, and yet there are those who insidiously seek to change the form of government under which that became possible. Consider our welfare, if you please, on a coinage basis. There is only one nation in the world that does not use coins smaller than our cent. It takes 2½ German pennies to equal 1 of our cents, 20 Italian pennies, and 25 Japanese pennies—just to mention three dictator nations. When you say to a cavalier the flying squadron is $10 better than your outfit, you are backing your enthusiasm with a few weeks' pin money, but the equivalent of a year's wages in China.

An hour's wage for an American laborer buys of the necessities of life four times as much as the wages of the laborer in Italy, three times as much as in Germany. Mussolini requires corn meal to be added to wheat flour, and Hitler rations the German consumption of meat and butterfat. And yet a near riot was started in this county in readjuster days when Jim Frazier said Maj. William A. Anderson said: "No poor man is good enough to eat fried chicken." And the "lame lion of the confederacy" replied: "Where is Frazier; I'll kill him on sight."

A recent report on taxes in Germany discloses the startling fact that 30 percent of the produced income of the country is being consumed in war preparations alone, against a total tax burden in this country for all Government purposes of less than 20 percent. And as for freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and even freedom of conscience, they just don't exist in any dictator nation. Yet subversive agitators suggest we gamble these known blessings of democracy on the tables of chance and change. They are not satisfied with our laws, with the type of government that has made possible what Americans enjoy. Preferring some foreign "ism," they want to change our Constitution. As to such a contingency, Daniel Webster warned us on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington: "Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

But you and I are going to resist their demands. Ninety-nine years of glorious V. M. I. history buttress my conviction that should the call come again to defend American constitutional liberty, from foes within or without, the word will again be passed down the line: "The V. M. I. will be heard from today." What a heritage; what a tradition; what a reputation to live up to.

But God grant that you may never be called upon to demonstrate your loyalty to V. M. I. traditions on the battlefield. Rather do I hope that the world will come to its senses, prefer law to force, and as to the economic causes of discontent act on the advice of Woodrow Wilson, who said, "The sum of the whole matter is this—our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead." And when that happy day comes, V. M. I., excelling in giving meaning and significance to the symbolism of purity, unity, and loyalty, as well as that of courage, can then propose as an international motto the dying words of its immortal Jackson, who, as he approached that judgment throne where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one, whispered, "Let us cross over the river and rest in the shade of the trees."

Widows and Orphans Bill—H. R. 9000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has conducted hearings relative to presenting a bill to Congress to secure benefits for the widows and dependents of deceased World War veterans. This committee gave ample opportunity for everyone to be heard before framing a bill for

our consideration. The members of this committee are familiar with all issues involved and have worked tirelessly to secure benefits for these widows and dependents.

The favorable report of H. R. 9000 by the committee brought forth criticism from many persons, both in Congress and the general public. This criticism is based generally on the cost of providing the payments proposed. The cost of any veterans' legislation cannot be considered solely on the basis of dollars and cents involved. We recall that during the World War no expense was spared to bring this conflict to a quick and satisfactory conclusion. A large part of our national debt is composed of expenses incident to our participation in that war. Billions were expended, without question, to provide war materials and supplies. Not one provision was made for a satisfactory adjustment of the veterans and their dependents to the changed condition of living which followed the return home of the participants. Every provision enacted for the care of the disabled, their dependents, widows, and orphans has been accomplished since war days. We may look with pride to the work of the Veterans' Administration in caring for the wounded, the sick, the lame, and the blind. However, none of these expenses have been considered a part of the cost of the war. Reams and reams of paper have been used to show what the veterans have been costing the Government. Has anyone ever considered that this cost is a just charge against the cost of the war?

To separate the cost of materials and the cost of destruction of life and health of the personnel is manifestly unfair. Should we approach this question of veterans' costs with an open mind, we would discover that many of the items of cost which are charged to this account could very well be placed in other columns.

The provisions of H. R. 9000 grant a small pension to the real sufferers of war and its horrors—dependent mothers, widows, and orphaned children. When this law is passed and adjudicated as written, we will discover a drastic reduction in payments made from the local welfare boards in old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the needy blind, and general public assistance. The majority of widows and dependents who will be put on the Veterans' Administration pay roll are already receiving benefits under the provisions of aid through the local welfare boards. We believe that the dependents of war veterans are distinctly in a separate class and should be cared for by the Federal Government and should not be considered with all the relief cases in the communities.

It has been the policy of our Government since the days of the Revolutionary War to provide for the widows and dependents of its war veterans under our pension plan. We can see no reason for discriminating against this same class of unfortunates of the World War.

I believe if we will view this problem in the light of past experience we will give H. R. 9000 favorable consideration at this session. I believe in economy in government, but I do not want to see this economy effected at the expense of the disabled, the dependents, and orphans of the men who volunteered their services during the last national crisis.

To Harness Our Rivers Is To Store up Prosperity for All Times To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. BUELL SNYDER BEFORE THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the address I made before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at their annual luncheon, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, March 14, 1940, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow colleagues, and friends, I lived on the headwaters of one of the streams that had to do with furnishing the water that caused the most damaging flood in the history of the Nation—the Johnstown flood of May 31, 1889.

As a barefoot boy at the country Sunday-school the morning after the flood, I can still see and hear the grown-up folks talking about the flood down at the city of Johnstown, where those thousands burned and drowned. I, as a little boy, thought it was awful.

Of course, I did not realize at that time that some day my fellow countrymen would place me in a key position where I would have an opportunity to do something toward building a flood-control program for our Nation.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the many committees throughout the States that constantly work for flood-control projects and programs. Here in Congress I find it a pleasure to work with my colleague WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House, and his committee; the distinguished chairman of the Senate Flood Control Appropriations Committee, Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, and his committee; Judge DRIVER; and many others.

In these few minutes I have, may I cite you to what Congress has appropriated for flood control during the past 7 years. The amounts are as follows:

1935	$29,395,487
1936	38,811,730
1937	27,924,487
1938	86,123,330
1939	120,110,008
1940	172,800,000
1941	110,000,000

I always take pleasure in doing whatever is possible within the money limits available to advance the flood-control program, and I trust that our financial set-up will be such each year from now on that we can complete a flood-control program for this Nation by the year 1950.

When that is completed, I believe that the Nation as a whole in 10 years' time will save the entire amount that it cost to build every flood-control project in the United States.

I thank you.

Rights of Arid States in Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

STATEMENT OF CLIFFORD H. STONE, DIRECTOR OF THE COLORADO WATER CONSERVATION BOARD

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement made by Clifford H. Stone, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, on April 13, 1940.

It is a splendid statement of the constitutional rights of the arid States of the West to the exclusive use and control of the waters within their borders. It is a forceful presentation of the constitutional provisions of each State and the decisions of the Federal and State courts in relation thereto. He also discusses the possible conflicts between the Federal Government and the States in the conservation and utilization of water resources. The national interest and the doctrine of equitable apportionment of the water of interstate streams among the States are considered.

The United States Supreme Court has established the validity of interstate compacts and recognized the exclusive rights in States to apportion and distribute the use of water among its citizens. Those provisions are discussed at some length. The nature of the governmental structure, with reserve powers in the States, the necessity for protecting the economic development of these States, and the provisions of different State constitutions and laws, and decisions of the courts are fully considered.

Judge Stone clearly points out that conservation of water resources must be accomplished consistently with the foundation principles of our dual system of government and must

not be construed to destroy the constitutional rights reserved to the States. I may add that there is nothing as important to the entire arid Western States as the preservation of their respective constitutional rights to the exclusive apportionment, use, and control of the waters within their borders. Those rights must always be jealously guarded. Water is the vital and sacred birthright of every arid State. That reservation was the most important provision in the enabling act and the constitution which each of those States adopted and which Uncle Sam acquiesced in when those States came into the Union, and the West can never tolerate any "chiseling" on that birthright from any source.

Because of the disposition constantly to infringe upon, ignore, or destroy those rights, I feel that the statement is important to the West and should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is a helpful supplement to the very learned decision of the United States Supreme Court. Justice Brandeis delivered the opinion of the Court in the case of M. C. Hinderlider, State engineer, et al., appellant, against the La Plata River & Cherry Creek Ditch Co., on appeal from the Supreme Court of Colorado, April 25, 1938, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at pages 8075–8078, of May 2, 1938. That decision very strongly sustained the validity of interstate compacts regarding water rights. The statement of Judge Stone is as follows:

This statement is largely devoted to a consideration of the rights of States in the arid region where irrigation is practiced, to control the appropriation, distribution, and use of water among its citizens. It concerns possible conflicts with Federal control arising from conservation and reclamation practices and developments in which Government agencies participate. No attempt is made to do more than suggest the problems and major considerations.

The development of the water resources is fraught with such wide national significance, but at the same time is so intimately associated with the welfare of local interests, that it is at once a national and a State problem. In the arid States it is a component part of land use, and, as has been stated, "water problems merge into land problems, and both water problems and land problems merge into human problems." Under our form of government, human and land problems are the concern of both the Federal and State Governments. It is patent, therefore, that the States have a very definite part as well as an obligation in the program for conservation and utilization of water resources.

The public good and a sound national policy demand planning for utilization of the water resources over large basin areas involving in many cases the interests of several States. This is true because the supply of water for essential purposes is limited and the residue must be so used that it will accrue to the maximum economic advancement of the people in the national interest, as well as for the advancement of industrial welfare of the several States. This means that all uses to which water may be put, as well as the necessities for flood control, must be recognized. Domestic, irrigation, industrial, and recreational values must be preserved to the greatest extent possible. Realizing fully the national phase of the problem, the interest and the part of the States in this development should not be disregarded in the planning and construction of projects. The very nature of the governmental structure, the federation of 48 sovereign States, and the preservation of the principle of democracy make this necessary. Economic development is the concern of each of the States. The plans of local interests within a State and the policy of development of natural resources throughout a State must be coordinated with a sound national policy for the development of large areas involving many States.

The States must, as far as possible and on an equitable basis, protect and preserve the rights of their citizens in the water resources. These rights are founded in the constitutions of many of the States subject to the doctrine, announced by the United States Supreme Court, of equtable apportionment of waters of an interstate stream among the States through which it flows. Wiel, in his work, Water Rights in the Western States (3d ed., pp. 752–755), states:

"Because of its fugitive nature, the only property rights which exist in water in its natural state, under either the riparian rights or the appropriation doctrine, are rights of use, the corpus being susceptible of ownership only while in possession."

Vested rights in water recognized by the laws of the States are founded on the principle of beneficial use and represent large property interests, denial of which would be disastrous to present and continued industrial development. These rights must be reckoned with by the Federal Government and other States.

Provisions are embodied in the constitutions of most of the irrigated-land States dedicating the water of unnavigable streams to the use of the people of the State, subject to appropriation. These constitutions, in one form or another, have been approved by the Congress. The provision of the Constitution of the State of Colorado is typical. It provides:

"SEC. 5. Water, public property: The water of every natural stream, not heretofore appropriated, within the State of Colorado, is hereby declared to be the property of the public, and the same is dedicated to the use of the people of the State, subject to appropriation as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 6. Diverting unappropriated water—Priority: The right to divert the unappropriated waters of any natural stream to beneficial uses shall never be denied. Priority of appropriation shall give the better right as between those using the water for the same purpose; but when the waters of any natural stream are not sufficient for the service of all those desiring the use of the same, those using the water for domestic purposes shall have the preference over those claiming for any other purpose, and those using the water for agricultural purposes shall have preference over those using the same for manufacturing purposes."

Briefly the doctrine of prior appropriation, which is recognized under the local laws in most of the arid States, is "first in time, first in right." The riparian water law of the humid East has been abrogated in these States except in California, where both riparian and appropriation rights are recognized. Under the doctrine of prior appropriation, he who first applies water to a beneficial use either upon riparian or nonriparian land, acquires a vested right to such use superior to the claim of all subsequent users. Such rights are recognized in the order of initiation until all of the water of the stream, if unnavigable, is utilized, and may be enforced without reference to State lines. Where interstate compact or United States Supreme Court decisions establishes an equitable apportionment between States, the portion allotted to each State is distributed under the State law and in that case it cannot be said that the priorities are always recognized irrespective of State lines. A review of the decisions of the Supreme Court adjudicating controversies over the waters of interstate unnavigable rivers indicate that the factors used in establishing equitable apportionment among States are not limited to a determination of priorities of use, irrespective of State lines, even where all the States involved have adopted the doctrine of appropriation.

In 1901 Colorado, where the doctrine of appropriation had been adopted by its constitution, claimed the right to the exclusive use of all waters arising within its boundaries, on the basis of its sovereign right of ownership in such waters. This claim was urged in the famous case of *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46). The decision in this case, and others which followed, established the principle that there must be an equitable apportionment of the benefits of an interstate stream between the States affected. The latest development of the law on this phase of the subject was noted in 1938 in the case of *Hinderlider et al.* v. *La Plata River and Cherry Creek Ditch Co.* (58 S. Ct. Rept. 803), where the doctrine was announced that States by compact may divide the waters of an interstate stream, even though individual rights, under appropriations recognized by the State law, are thereby denied.

The Court said:

"As Colorado possessed the right only to an equitable share of the water in the stream, the decree of January 12, 1898, in the Colorado water proceeding did not award to the ditch company any right greater than the equitable share. Hence the apportionment made by the compact cannot have taken from the ditch company any vested right unless there was in the proceedings leading up to the compact or in its application some vitiating infirmity. No such infirmity or illegality has been shown."

The challenge has been made against the right of the State to control the use and distribution of waters of an interstate stream among its citizens, subject to the principle of equitable apportionment among the affected States and the power of Congress to control such rivers for the purposes of national defense, navigation, and flood control. This challenge appeared in the petition of the Government, in the case of Nebraska against Wyoming and Colorado, now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining a decree to equitably apportion the waters of the North Platte River among the three States.

After the commencement of the suit the United States filed a petition of intervention and was allowed by the Court to intervene, on the principle that the Government should be permitted to protect its claim to water necessary for the operation of federally financed structures; but the claim made by the United States that it is the owner of all unappropriated waters in the North Platte has not been passed upon by the Court, and remains a question for adjudication. It is logical to assume that the Court recognized the interest of the Government as appropriator for the actual uses of water and as an investor on the river, and, by such permission to intervene, made provision for the Government being adequately represented in the proceedings. There is no indication that such intervention was permitted on the basis that the Government is recognized as owning and in control of all unappropriated waters to the exclusion of what we believe to be the well-recognized rights in the States; but pending this litigation and before the final decree is entered in the case, it is necessary that the States defend their rights to control the use and appropriation of water within their borders.

The broad principle on which the Government relies is stated in the appendix to motion on behalf of the United States for leave to intervene as follows:

"It is the contention of the United States that existing rights to appropriate and use the waters of the nonnavigable streams of the public-domain country are derived from the United States either under the acts of 1866, 1870, and 1887, or by tacit grants in the area preceding those statutes; that these rights were granted by the United States, using local customs and State and Territorial laws as

subordinate instrumentalities only. It is the further contention of the United States that title to all the water of the nonnavigable streams of the public-domain country which has not been granted away by the United States remains in the United States."

In general the position of the States is that the following propositions have been established by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States:

"1. By the act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), if not before, all unappropriated waters of nonnavigable streams in the arid portions of the public domain became property of the public subject to the plenary control of the States.

"2. There is no Federal statute authorizing the United States, or any of its agencies, to make an appropriation of water except the Reclamation Act of 1902, and under that act an appropriation of water may be made by the Secretary of the Interior only in conformity with the laws of the State or Territory wherein the appropriation is made. The Secretary of the Interior, as an appropriator of water, is in the same position as any other appropriator.

"3. The United States is not the owner of unappropriated water or of water rights under appropriations made by the Secretary of the Interior, but such rights belong to the owners of the land upon which the water is applied.

"4. The Congress, in accepting, ratifying, and confirming the constitution of the States, agreed that the natural waters within its boundaries are the property of the State."

The United States Supreme Court has heretofore ruled on the motion of Wyoming to dismiss the complaint of Nebraska in the instant case on the ground that the Secretary of the Interior was an indispensable party.

The Court said (295 U. S. 40, 43):

"The motion asserts that the Secretary of the Interior is an indispensable party. The bill alleges, and we know as a matter of law, that the Secretary and his agents, acting by authority of the Reclamation Act and supplementary legislation, must obtain permits and priorities for the use of water from the State of Wyoming in the same manner as a private appropriator or an irrigation district formed under the State law. His rights can rise no higher than those of Wyoming, and an adjudication of the defendant's rights will necessarily bind him. Wyoming will stand in judgment for him as for any other appropriator in that State. He is not a necessary party."

There would seem to be no reasonable distinction between the Secretary of the Interior, representing one of the Government departments, and the United States, appearing directly through the Attorney General. It follows, then, in view of this decision of the Court, that where one of the litigant States moved to dismiss because the Secretary of the Interior was not a party, the Court established the principle that the Secretary must obtain permits and priorities for the use of water from the State of Wyoming in the same manner as a private appropriator or an irrigation district formed under the State law, and that his rights can rise no higher than those of Wyoming.

That the State represents all appropriators of water is sustained in other Supreme Court cases. In *Kansas* v. *Colorado, supra,* it was held:

"While several of the defendant corporations have answered it is unnecessary to specially consider their defenses, for, if the case against Colorado fails, it fails also as against them."

Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (ch. 1093, 32 Stat. 388), provides as follows:

"SEC. 8. That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, * * *."

Reference is made in the Government brief to the acts of 1866 (14 Stat. 253), 1870 (16 Stat. 218), 1877 (19 Stat. 377). In the last cited statute, after providing that a claimant's right to the use of water depends upon bona fide prior appropriation, it is expressly provided that—

"All surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes subject to existing rights."

The proper interpretation of the Reclamation Act, and other Federal legislative provisions respecting this subject, would seem to be that the Congress, in passing them, did not make a mere revocable grant of water rights to the States nor merely acquiesce in the State laws, but on the contrary recognized the rights of the States to control the appropriation and use of water for irrigation and other purposes. In other words, there has been a deliberate congressional intent to recognize these States' rights. Such recognition has ample foundation in the constitutions of the several States, and constitutional interpretations by decisions of the Federal courts.

In *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (299 U. S. 142), the Court holds that the effect of the Desert Land Act was to sever the water from the land, and that a grantee in a patent would only take (295 U. S. 162)—

"The legal title to the land conveyed, and such title and only such title, to the flowing waters thereon as shall be fixed or acknowledged by the customs, laws, and judicial decisions of the State of their location."

The Court further held in this case that the nonnavigable waters on the public domain became "publici juris, subject to the plenary control" of the States, in language as follows:

"What we hold is that following the act of 1877, if not before, all nonnavigable waters then a part of the public domain became publici juris, subject to the plenary control of the designated States * * * with the right in each to determine for itself to what extent the rule of appropriation or the common-law rule in respect of riparian rights should obtain."

In *Ickes* v. *Fox* (300 U. S. 82), the Court held:

"Although the Government diverted, stored, and distributed the water, the contention of petitioner that thereby ownership of the water or water rights became vested in the United States is not well founded. Appropriation was made not for the use of the Government, but, under the Reclamation Act, for the use of the landowners; and by the terms of the law and of the contract already referred to the water rights became the property of the landowners, wholly distinct from the property right of the Government in the irrigation works. * * * The Government was and remained simply a carrier and distributor of the water * * * with the right to receive the sums stipulated in the contracts as reimbursement for the cost of construction and annual charges for operation and maintenance of the works. As security therefor it was provided that the Government should have a lien upon the lands and the water rights appurtenant thereto—a provision which in itself imparts that the water rights belong to another than the lienor—that is to say, to the landowner."

Referring to the Desert Land Act in this same decision, the following language was used:

"Acquisition of the Government title to a parcel of land was not to carry with it a water right; but all nonnavigable waters were reserved for the use of the public under the laws of the various arid-land States."

The Colorado River compact, which involves seven Western States, and which was ratified by six of the States and approved by Congress, provides:

"ART. VIII. Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unimpaired by this contract."

The Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), passed by the Congress on December 21, 1928, contains the following:

"SEC. 12. (b) The rights of the United States in or to waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries, however claimed or acquired, as well as the rights of those claiming under the United States, shall be subject to and controlled by said Colorado River compact."

"SEC. 18. Nothing herein shall be construed as interfering with such rights as the States now have either to the waters within their borders or to adopt such policies or enact such laws as they may deem necessary with respect to the appropriation, control, and use of the waters within their borders, except as modified by the Colorado River compact or other interstate agreement."

One of the considerations which, in the opinion of the writer, protects the rights of the States to control the waters of their rivers for all beneficial purposes goes to the very foundation of our dual form of government. This principle is reflected in the following language from *Kansas* v. *Colorado,* supra:

"Appreciating the force of this, counsel for the Government relies upon 'the doctrine of sovereign and inhert power'; adding, 'I am aware that in advancing this doctrine I seem to challenge great decisions of the court, and I speak with deference.' His argument runs substantially along this line: All legislative power must be vested in either the State or the National Government; no legislative powers belong to a State government other than those which affect solely the internal affairs of that State; consequently, all powers which are national in their scope must be found vested in the Congress of the United States. But the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in the grant of powers, is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a government of enumerated powers. That this is such a government clearly appears from the Constitution, independently of the amendments, for otherwise there would be an instrument granting certain specified things made operative to grant other and distinct things. This natural construction of the original body of the Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment. This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted. With equal determination the framers intended that no such assumption should ever find justification in the organic act, and that if, in the future, further powers seemed necessary, they should be granted by the people in the manner they had provided for amending that act. It reads: 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.' The argument of counsel ignores the principal factor in this article, to wit, 'the people.' Its principal purpose was not the distribution of power between the United States and the States, but a reservation to the people of all powers not granted. The preamble of the Constitution declares who framed it, 'We, the people of the United States,' not the people of one State but the people of all the States; and article X reserves to the people of all the States the powers not delegated to the United States. The powers affecting the internal affairs of the States not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, and all powers of a national character which

are not delegated to the National Government by the Constitution are reserved to the people of the United States. The people who adopted the Constitution knew that in the nature of things they could not foresee all the questions which might arise in the future, all the circumstances which might call for the exercise of further national powers than those granted to the United States, and, after making provision for an amendment to the Constitution by which any needed additional powers would be granted, they reserved to themselves all powers not so delegated. This article X is not to be shorn of its meaning by any narrow or technical construction, but is to be considered fairly and liberally so as to give effect to its scope and meaning. As we said construing an express limitation on the powers of Congress, in *Fairbank* v. *United States* (181 U. S. 283, 288; 45 L. ed. 862, 865; 21 Sup. Ct. Rept. 648, 650)."

After extensive discussion in the principle, the Court announced:

"It is useless to pursue the inquiry further in this direction. It is enough for the purposes of this case that each State has full jurisdiction over the lands within its borders, including the beds of streams and other waters."

It has been noted that water being of a fugitive nature, the only property rights which exist in water in its natural state, under either the riparian or appropriation doctrine, are "rights of use, the corpus being susceptible of ownership only while in possession." The right of use and regulation is exercised under the police power of the States; and there is nothing in the law which expressly or by implication shows that this power has been delegated to the Federal Government.

Other constitutional provisions, statutes, and court decisions may be noted:

The Federal Water Power Act (act of June 10, 1920, 41 Stat. L. 1077, ch. 185, sec. 27; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 16, ch. 12, sec. 821) provides:

SEC. 821. State laws and water rights unaffected: Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein.

In *Gutierres* v. *Albuquerque Land Co.* (1902, 188 U. S. 545) Mr. Justice White said in delivering the opinion of the Court (pp. 552–553):

"We think, in view of the legislation of Congress on the subject of the appropriation of water on the public domain, particularly referred to in the opinion of this Court in *United States* v. *Rio Grande Irrigation Co.* (174 U. S. 690, 704–706), the objection is devoid of merit. As stated in the opinion just referred to, by the act of July 26, 1866 (ch. 262, sec. 9, 14 Stat. 253; Rev. Stat., sec. 2339), Congress recognized, as respects the public domain, 'so far as the United States are concerned, the validity of the local customs, law, and decisions of courts in respect to the appropriation of water.'"

In *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.*, supra, the United States elaborately outlines the history of the development of the law in relation to waters in the irrigated-land States of the West, refers to and discusses the several acts of the Congress and the uniform line of decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

An important footnote appended to this case in the official reports (p. 164 of 295 U. S.) is as follows:

"In this connection it is not without significance that Congress, since the passage of the Desert Land Act, has repeatedly recognized the supremacy of State law in respect of the acquisition of water for the reclamation of public lands of the United States and lands of its Indian wards. Two examples may be cited:

"The Reclamation Act of 1902 (c. 1093, 32 Stat. 388) directed the Secretary of the Interior (S. 8) to proceed in conformity to the State laws in carrying out the provisions of the act and provided that nothing in the act should be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory 'relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation.'

"The act of June 21, 1906 (c. 3504, 34 Stat. 325, 375), made an appropriation for constructing irrigation systems to irrigate lands of the Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes in Utah, with the proviso that 'such irrigation systems shall be constructed and completed and held and operated, and water therefor appropriated under the laws of the State of Utah,' etc. This was amended by the Indian Appropriation Act of March 3, 1909 (c. 263, 35 Stat. 781, 812), which again recognized the supremacy of the laws of Utah in respect of appropriation, and provided that the appropriation should 'be used only in the event of failure to procure from the State of Utah or its officers an extension of time in which to make final proof for waters appropriated for the benefit of the Indians.'"

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Before Wyoming was admitted to the Union July 10, 1890, its constitution was submitted to and approved by the Federal Government. Section 31 of article I, being part of the "declaration of rights" in this constitution, was and still is as follows:

"Water being essential to industrial prosperity, of limited amount, and easy of diversion from its natural channels, its control must be in the State, which, in providing for its use, shall equally guard all the various interests involved."

Article VIII was and still is as follows:

"IRRIGATION AND WATER RIGHTS

"Water is State property; section 1. The water of all natural streams, springs, lakes, or other collections of still water, within the boundaries of the State, are hereby declared to be the property of the State.

"Board of control; section 2. There shall be constituted a board of control to be composed of the State engineer and superintendents of the water divisions, which shall, under such regulations as may be prescribed by law, have the supervision of the waters of the State and of their appropriation, distribution, and diversion, and of the various officers connected therewith. Its decisions to be subject to review by the courts of the State.

"Priority of appropriation; section 3. Priority of appropriation for beneficial uses shall give the better right. No appropriation shall be denied except when such denial is demanded by the public interests.

"Water divisions; section 4. The legislature shall by law divide the State into four water divisions, and provide for the appointment of superintendents thereof.

"State engineer; section 5. There shall be a State engineer who shall be appointed by the Governor of the State and confirmed by the senate; he shall hold his office for the term of 6 years, or until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified. He shall be president of the board of control, and shall have general supervision of the waters of the State and of the officers connected with its distribution. No person shall be appointed to this position who has not such theoretical knowledge and such practical experience and skill as shall fit him for the position."

Similar provisions were embodied in the constitutions of other irrigated land States, which constitutions were submitted prior to their admission to the Union and were approved by the Federal Government. Such provisions still remain in these constitutions. For example:

"Section 15 of article III, constitution of Montana, admitted to the Union November 8, 1889.

"Article XV of the constitution of Idaho, which State was admitted to the Union by act of Congress July 3, 1890.

"Article XVII, constitution of Utah, which State was admitted to the Union January 4, 1896.

"Sections 1, 2, and 3 of article XVI, constitution of New Mexico, which State was admitted to the Union January 6, 1912.

"Sections 1 and 2 of article XVII, constitution of Arizona, which State was admitted to the Union February 14, 1912.

It should be noted that these rights in the State are not only subject to the principle of equitable apportionment among States on an interstate stream but also to the power of Congress over interstate navigation.

Gibbons v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1), in a controversy involving States' rights, sustained the exclusive control of the National Government over navigation.

In 1898 the Supreme Court through its holding in *Green Bay Canal Co.* v. *Patten Paper Co.* (172 U. S. 58, 80), rejected the efforts of States to realize water-power resources developed by navigation structures. Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for the Court in the case of *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288), in 1936, sustained the Government's contention—

"That the Wilson Dam was constructed, and the power plant connected with it was installed, in the exercise by the Congress of its war and commerce powers—that is, for the purpose of national defense and the improvement of navigation."

This case also upheld the constitutional authority, under section 3 of article IV, to dispose of electrical energy at this dam. It is interesting to note that in this decision the Court said, citing the case of *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46), that in disposing of this energy the method used—

"Must be consistent with the foundation principles of our dual system of government and must not be contrived to govern the concerns reserved to the States."

Flood control was at first largely considered as a local responsibility, but soon was regarded, in its major phases at least, as a national obligation. Its relation to navigation was recognized in *Jackson* v. *United States* (230 U. S. 1). Time does not permit a discussion here of present controversies involving alleged conflicts with States' rights resulting from the operation of proposed flood-control projects.

Existing Federal statutes and interpretation of the courts as to what constitutes reasonable requirements in the national interest for navigation and other purposes afford further possible invasion of the States' right of control of their waters. Within the limits of this statement, a review of these statutes and decisions cannot be attempted. It should be noted that the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1063) is designed to subject private developments to the Commission control in order to secure more complete utilization of water resources for navigation, hydroelectric power, or other beneficial uses. This act has been under the scrutiny of the Federal courts in the recent case of *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co.* (23 Fed. Supp. 83), commonly known as the New River case, decided in 1938. The New River rises in North Carolina and flows across Virginia and West Virginia, where it joins the Kanawha. The Federal district court rejected the position of the United States and refused to enjoin the proposed electric-power development. The Government contended that because of the possible but very improbable effect the damming of the New River might have on navigation on another stream, of which the New River is a tributary, the Government should control the river from its mouth to the headwaters. It was alleged that the defendant obtained a license from the State of Virginia and was proceeding to construct without consent of Congress or authority of the Secretary of War and without a license from the Federal Power Commission. The Court held that the right of a State to provide for development of its water power must be exer-

cised in submission to paramount interests of the United States to protect its navigable waters; but, to deprive a State of its rights in this respect, there should exist facts which create reasonable belief that the interests of the Federal Government will be interfered with, and a mere averment of such interference or a nebulous and remote possibility is not sufficient.

The Court also held that the Federal Water Power Act does not confer authority on the Federal Power Commission to require a license for a dam or similar project on a nonnavigable stream, and that the findings of the Federal Power Commission are not final. It was also shown that the proposed improvement was not on public lands, and for this further reason the Government could not prevent the construction. This case was affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit, on November 6, 1939, with a dissenting opinion.

We must recognize the interrelation of development for various uses inherent in the rivers of the Nation. All values must be preserved if possible. Proper conservation and development cannot be attained without comprehensive planning and development. The national interest should not be disregarded. But these considerations and the forces behind them need not, and must not, be permitted to destroy the citadel which protects the rights and interests of the States in the waters of our rivers.

Although great decisions of the Supreme Court were necessary to establish fundamental principles with respect to the apportionment of water to States on interstate rivers, it is the opinion of the writer that the time has come when controversies over these rivers should be settled by the compact method. Often, if not always, court decrees "breed" further litigation. Compact negotiations should in all cases be preceded by investigations supervised by impartial agencies in which the interested States should participate in the cost. The value of such a procedure is evidenced by the Rio Grande joint investigation under the National Resources Committee, which was followed by a compact. An interstate suit between Texas and New Mexico, in which the United States and Colorado undoubtedly would have become parties, was settled by this compact.

It seems obvious that Federal agencies should be required in initiating projects to observe State laws governing the filing and perfecting of water rights for federally financed developments. Only in this way can present vested rights be protected and a coordinated plan within a basin preserved. Much complaint has been made and difficulties of a serious nature evidenced in cases where the official of a State charged with the administration of water rights is ignored. As has been noted, some Federal statutes require observance of these State regulations, and nearly all responsible heads of Federal agencies engaged in water-project development claim such observance, and yet evidence of nonobservance is often encountered.

Because of the interest of the States, their representatives should participate in planning. This can be accomplished through appropriate agencies such as planning commissions and conservation boards, which exist in nearly all of the States. These boards should cooperate in not only promoting feasible projects but in effectuating an orderly plan of development. For effective procedure and in order that the States assume their full measure of responsibility, Federal agencies should be expected to recognize and work with these State agencies. Such agencies should maintain the proper contact with local interest; and Federal agencies, in the interest of orderly development and coordination of State and Federal activity, should avoid a short cut directly to strictly local interests.

If States are to maintain their interests in conservation and their rights in the control of water, it is recognized that they must assume their full measure of responsibility. They must also demonstrate their ability to cope with inevitable controversies over waters. Lawsuits as far as possible should be avoided. The conference method in recent years is being recognized as the most effective method. Note the efforts of the Committee of Fourteen in the Colorado River Basin, which is working with Federal agencies and drainage-basin committees of the National Resources Planning Board to develop a comprehensive plan of development. This, after all, represents the democratic way and in the end will better preserve all interests than a recognition of the principle of strong centralized control.

Salvage of Hurricane Timber in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM J. F. CAMPBELL, ACTING DIRECTOR, FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION,
NORTHEASTERN TIMBER SALVAGE ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1940.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: We are very desirous of keeping you informed as to the progress being made in the salvage of hurricane timber in New England, so that you may, in turn, pass on whatever portion of the information you wish to any of your constituents.

As you know, the program got under way in December 1938. Records show the following log receipts, the majority of which are white pine, for Massachusetts:

Receipts from beginning of project to Mar. 30, 1940

White pine	126,257,742
Other softwood	2,359,141
Hardwood	2,208,401
Total	130,825,284

We feel that we have accomplished the first two points in our salvage-program objective, namely:

1. To bring to the owner of down timber the maximum amount in conformity with good business practices.

2. To offer to purchase any and all logs which meet our specifications and establish the price of logs and prevent speculation.

It is now evident that the majority of logs the project expected to receive has been delivered, and the average delivery and the merchantability have fallen off to the point where it is not economical to maintain receiving stations with scalers in attendance. Private industries are purchasing an increasing amount and should easily consume the major portion remaining after our stations close down.

With this in mind, all active vendors have been advised by letter that the receipt of logs will cease on April 30. However, in a few cases, because of poor hauling conditions near the end of this month, some logs and pulpwood which have been prepared to our specifications will still remain in the woods. To take care of such scattered cases the following procedure has been adopted:

1. All timber-purchase agreements were executed to be completed by April 30, 1940, and no new agreements will be written.

2. Extensions beyond that time may be granted upon written request of the vendor and will not be issued until an authorized agent of the Administration has made an on-the-ground inspection to determine the approximate volume of material which will be accepted under the extension and the date of final delivery. This provision is made so that vendors who really have logs of pulpwood cut but were unable to complete delivery because of hauling conditions will not be put to expense without an opportunity to realize on the expenditure. It also gives us an opportunity to check on deliveries and determine how soon a receiving station can be closed.

3. Under no conditions will deliveries be accepted after May 29, 1940. This sets a definite dead-line date on all deliveries and again gives us an opportunity to control our costs of scaling, etc. Logs will start to stain shortly after this date.

4. In allowing any extensions the Administration further reserves the right to indicate the receiving station to which delivery is to be made. There may be cases where only one vendor who has been delivering to a particular station has logs to be delivered after April 30. This provision will give us an opportunity to concentrate deliveries.

A field check indicates that there will be very few vendors who will ask for an extension of time beyond April 30.

We trust that the above information may be of assistance to you in answering any inquiries you may receive. We shall be glad to answer any questions that may occur to you.

Very sincerely yours,

J. F. CAMPBELL,
Acting Director.

Zero Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's edition of the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1940]

ZERO HOUR

The zero hour has struck on Europe's western front. Hitler's most feared blitzkrieg has come with all the ruthlessness and

violence of modern, mechanized barbarism. The neutral soil of inoffensive Belgium once more is being defiled by the grinding heel of German aggression—and a similarly shocking fate has befallen peace-loving Holland and tiny Luxembourg. Their only sin is that they stand in the path of a carefully planned drive by the Reich's formidable war machine against her democratic adversaries, France and England. The move came with dramatic suddenness—significantly at the height of the British Cabinet crisis. Britain no sooner had bared the weaknesses in her armor than Germany decided to thrust a well-timed dagger at allied vital spots—inferior air forces. Goering's vaunted air power is being given its supreme test—with savage and cminous initial results in the lowlands and in France.

The crime speaks for itself. But this much is clear in all its stark reality: On the outcome of the long-awaited German smash in the west well may hinge the entire fate of the allied cause and of European democracy. The nearness of a decision on whether Germany is to hold and use the channel ports should impress Americans with the critical stage at which the war now has arrived.

France and England face squarely the necessity of retaliating with a hard and devastating blow at Germany. There can be no minimizing the immediate peril in which the German invasion of the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg places the allied cause. Unlike Norway, where an allied failure had only a secondary influence on the course of the war, the low countries are so strategically located that their fate is bound up inextricably with that of Britain and France. If the allied cause is to be saved from disaster, German military might must be met with a fiery and masterful counteroffensive which will wrest the low countries from the hands of the invader.

Excuse for German violence—that the Allies were plotting a blow at Germany through Holland and Belgium, that the little kingdoms were conniving in a plan to overthrow the German Government, and that they failed to take military precautions in the direction of the Allies equal to those taken on the German border—is sophistry of the usual Nazi brand. Who among unbiased, sensible peoples can be so naive as to swallow such utter nonsense? The charge that the Allies were contemplating invasion of Holland and Belgium obviously is as brazen and false a contention as the mendacious Nazi regime ever has had the effrontery to make. The absurdity of it is so patent that the German case will receive not the slightest credence from intelligent persons.

Obviously the allegation is part of a formula which Fuehrer Hitler has evolved from a long study of the most ruthless precedents. It was the excuse Germany used in Norway, and it is the excuse she will use again if she decides to loose her thunderbolts over southeastern Europe. Ingredients of the Nazi formula are, first of all, a false charge of conspiracy against the Reich, followed immediately, and without opportunity for negotiation, by a violent "blitzkrieg," of which the attack on Holland and Belgium is as perfect an example as has yet been offered.

Reported misuse of the Dutch uniform, which is a particularly cowardly piece of work, clears up some of the mystery about the discovery of truckloads of Dutch Army clothing on the German border at various times in recent months. It is a variation, of course, of the Nazis' Trojan horse technique used so effectively in Norway.

The Allies have pledged immediate aid to Holland and Belgium in response to appeals from Brussels and The Hague. The big test of the Allies is at hand. They deserve every blessing in that test that farseeing Americans can give them.

The Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Thursday evening, May 9, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the Hatch Act, which passed last year, combines a new "emancipation proclamation and bill of rights" for those Federal employees who are not protected by the civil-service laws.

The controversy raging at this time is whether or not State employees paid in full or in part by Federal funds should likewise receive this protection.

Let me briefly sketch the present Hatch law to you:

First. It is a criminal offense for any person to intimidate, threaten, or coerce another in connection with the election of any Federal official. This is all-inclusive—it applies equally to every person in the United States.

Second. No official or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government can use his official authority in any way to influence the nomination or election of Federal officials. No official or employee in the executive branch of the Government, with the exception of the President, Vice President, heads of administrative branches and their assistants, and appointive officials who determine foreign and Nation-wide policies can take an active part in political campaigns or campaign management. The penalty for violation is loss of position and a ban against future employment in Government service.

Third. This legislation provides no person can exact or solicit political assessments or contributions from public employees who are paid from relief funds.

Fourth. The law provides that all employees and officials are free to vote as they choose and to express their opinions on any political subject, but are not permitted to manage or be active in a political campaign.

There are other prohibitions, such as securing lists of Federal employees to be used for political purposes, or promise of political rewards or benefits in exchange for political support.

Those are the principal provisions of the present law simply stated.

The pending amendments would extend this same protection to employees in the States paid in full or in part by Federal funds. While the pending amendments permit a voluntary contribution by Government employees other than those paid from relief funds, solicitation of such funds by other Federal officials and employees for political purposes is prohibited.

Cognizant of the growth of the spoils system over a period of many years under administrations by both Republicans and Democrats, the senior Senator from New Mexico, the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, sought in 1938 to pass this legislation, but failed by the margin of a single vote in the United States Senate. His effort was not in vain, for it resulted in the formation of a special Senate committee to make an investigation of charges of intimidation, coercion, and enforced assessments by political bosses in the elections of that year. The report of that committee, which was made up of Senators SHEPPARD, AUSTIN, and HATCH, was a startling revelation to the Congress and the people of the Nation, for it stripped bare the sordid facts of virtual political enslavement of tens of thousands of men and women, including even those on the relief pay rolls receiving a meager wage from the W. P. A.

This report left no room for doubt of the need for legislation that would stop unscrupulous and power-greedy political bosses from perpetuating themselves as dictators and building up their machines at public expense, with funds mulcted and extorted from those who were paid with money from the Federal Treasury appropriated by the Congress.

It was apparent that the time had come to protect the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees from political piracy and no longer to permit appropriations from the Federal Treasury to be used in part for campaign funds. It was high time, the advocates of the Hatch law argued, to return to the sound and honest premise that employees on the Federal pay roll are employees of the people, not the subservient slaves of politicians; that the funds in the United States Treasury belong to the people of the Nation and are not to be diverted to the selfish purposes of any individual political boss or machine.

We faced opposition—strong and subtle opposition—but the courageous and determined battle waged by Senator HATCH, backed by public demand for this legislation, carried this measure through to victory.

I deemed it my duty and a privilege, indeed, to sponsor the bill in the House of Representatives, where a great majority of the Members stood squarely behind legislation that had for its prime purpose the reestablishment of integrity and decency in American politics.

In signing the original Hatch bill, thus making it the law of the land, the President of the United States, pointed out in his message to the Congress which accompanied the bill the need for this further legislation, which would grant to employees of State and other political subdivisions the same protection given employees of the Federal Government by the Hatch Act. It is not within the power of Congress, of course, to enact laws affecting State employees, except those who are paid in full or in part from the Federal Treasury, but the thousands who come within that latter category are included in the provisions of the pending amendments. It is gratifying to know that some of the States already have adopted or are proposing to adopt laws which will safeguard their own public workers by legislation intended to supplement the Hatch law and these proposed amendments. It is my confident belief that nearly every State in the Union will, within a comparatively short time, have such a law on its statute books. I venture that prediction because I know that the vast majority of the citizens of every State are in full accord with the purposes of this legislation and, in the final analysis, public opinion writes the laws of our land.

In view of that preponderance of public favor for this legislation, you undoubtedly find it difficult to understand why there has been such bitter opposition to the passage of both the original law and the proposed amendments. I believe it is most significant that the greatest opposition comes from the very places which were shown by the report of the Sheppard committee to have the worst conditions in regard to intimidation and regimentation of voters who were on the public pay roll; States where arbitrary assessments were levied by political bosses, where workers were threatened with loss of their jobs if they didn't vote as they were told. The black spots in the Sheppard committee's report are, in most cases, the strongholds of the opponents to the legislation that would remove them as blots on our political picture. Clean politics is unafraid.

Undoubtedly you wonder, too, what arguments are advanced by the opposition. Let us consider them for a moment. The principal

argument offered against the Hatch law is that it is an infringement on the rights of the Federal employee or official; that it restricts his freedom of action and the exercise of his right of franchise.

The Hatch law is not restrictive; it is protective. No employee can be forced to pay political tribute; no employee can be forced to become a ward heeler; no employee can be coerced or intimidated. Is that restrictive? Every employee may vote as he chooses; every employee, except a relief worker, may contribute to a campaign fund if he wishes; every employee may express his opinion freely. Has he sacrificed any rights there?

Civil-service employees have been under those regulations for years. Have any of them ever complained because they are beyond the greedy reach of the political boss? Have any of them ever sought to be placed outside the protective civil-service regulations? If so, I never have heard of it.

Another opposition argument advanced against the pending amendments is that they are an invasion of State's rights; that the Federal Government has no right to say what State employees may or may not do. The amendments to the Hatch law provide only that the State employee who is paid in full or in part from the Federal Treasury with money appropriated by the Congress, shall have the same protection as any other Federal employee; that he shall not have to barter his birthright of citizenship for a mess of political pottage in the form of a job, from which he can be fired unless he becomes a cog in the machine of a political boss.

If that is an invasion of State's rights, I am sure you will agree with me that it is time the invasion started. I cannot agree with the argument that the Federal Government should send money appropriated by Congress into a State so that a part of it can be used to build up and maintain political dominance for any politician or group of politicians. I do not believe that the people of this country will agree with a political theory that will permit public officials to perpetuate themselves by voting big appropriations to pay inefficient and subservient people who are appointed only because of the tribute they will pay in money and service to those politicians.

When that sort of practice is outlawed, as it will be by the amendments to the Hatch law, another of the real purposes of the law will be evident. Employees in public work will be selected on a basis of efficiency and capability. The public, not the political bosses, will get the service paid for by public funds.

Efficient employees, devoting their full time to their work, not to politics, mean fewer employees to accomplish the same job. Fewer employees mean smaller pay rolls and smaller pay rolls mean the saving of public funds.

When political bosses can no longer profit by the appointment of a large number of employees on the public pay roll, those pay rolls will shrink and the taxpayers will benefit. And that, my friends, is one purpose of this legislation.

It is not difficult to understand, then, why there is opposition and the principal source of that opposition.

Another argument advanced against the legislation is that it cannot be enforced; that it cannot be made effective. Any law which has the force of public approval and sanction back of it, such as has this legislation, is never difficult of enforcement. But the best evidence in regard to the ultimate effect of the Hatch Act on the political morale of this Nation, I believe, can be found in the record of the W. P. A. Prior to the passage of the Hatch Act last year, it is shown by the report of the Sheppard committee, W. P. A. workers in many parts of the Nation were the prey of political racketeers. How much criticism of the W. P. A. have you heard in the last year on that score? Isn't that proof that conditions can be bettered when a sincere attempt is made, backed up by a law with teeth in it?

The President of the United States has urged the passage of these amendments; the people of the Nation are almost unanimous in favor of them; the Senate has passed them by a 2-to-1 vote.

I feel confident that the House of Representatives will accord the amendments even a greater majority than it did the original law; that is, of course, if the opportunity is accorded the membership. This opportunity is dependent on whether the Members of Congress represent their constituents as, in my opinion, those constituents desire to be represented in this matter. The Members of the House of Representatives can very readily accomplish this by signing the petition which will bring the legislation to the floor of the House from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I appreciate your graciousness in listening, and the courtesy of the Mutual network for affording me this opportunity to talk with you.

Cherry Harvest Festival, Beaumont, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM GUY BOGART

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BEAUMONT, CALIF., *May 5, 1940.*

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Member of Congress, Nineteenth California District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: Beaumont's Chamber of Commerce, cherry growers, city council, and civic groups unite in extending through you an invitation to our President, to the members of the Cabinet, and of the Congress and Senate to attend the annual Cherry Harvest Festival, in Beaumont, June 14, 15, and 16. Your home community of Yucaipa, through its cherry growers, is cooperating in this midharvest festivity as the only southern California cherry acreage is transformed from its white blossoms to the red fruit to take the farmer out of the red.

Cherry pies with the vitamin D Beaumont fruit await the Washington folks.

Cherry-ly yours,

GUY BOGART, *For Cherryland.*

Let Us Be Fair to Employees, Employers, and the Public—Some Examples of Inequity in the Operations of the Wages and Hours Act—Adopt the Casey Amendments; the Gwynne Amendment; the Country-Bank Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-fifth Congress much attention was given by the House and the Senate to labor legislation. I am one of those who believed in the principle of minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation, and so supported the Fair Labor Standards Act. I signed the discharge petition to bring that measure before the House and voted for the bill. I am proud of that vote and the fact that a Democratic Congress established the principle as a matter of law. There is certainly no quarrel with the basic philosophy nor with the underlying motives of the Wage and Hour Act. It was right when it passed and is still right, but, unfortunately, it has been made so unfair in so many instances by the ill-considered and impractical decisions and rulings of the Wage and Hour Division that no fair-minded Member can countenance continuation of the arbitrary and sometimes stupid administration of the act.

When Congress writes legislation it is as well considered and specific as it can possibly be made. Each Member in his own mind has a positive conception of the intent and purpose of that legislation. After the Wage and Hour Act was passed we felt that a great forward step had been taken in the field of social legislation, but imagine our amazement when during the past year and one-half we all woke up to the fact that the law is not what the Congress said it was at all. It is something entirely different, and our only recourse is to come back to Congress and rectify the mistakes which are so apparent in the law or, at least, in the interpretation of it.

I have been much interested particularly in the bill proposed by the distinguished and progressive-thinking gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] and in two or three other amendments which would clarify and assist not only employers and employees generally in certain specific industries, but would enable the present Administrator, who is trying to solve many vexing problems, to do the things many of us thought we were doing when the act was originally passed.

The other amendments beside the Casey amendments in which I am interested are, first, those applying to country newspapers, and, second, the amendment to enable country banks to continue to give reasonable and fair service to their customers, who, throughout the Middle West at least, are largely farmers and small-business men in rural communities.

I have introduced a bill seeking to exempt country weekly and biweekly newspapers from the provisions of the act where the circulation of those newspapers is 5,000 or below.

I understand my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], will offer that amendment, or a similar one, at the proper time. I trust the committee will

see fit to adopt such amendment and thus bring relief to the many hundreds of distressed country editors and their relatively few employees who now feel the burden.

I expect to offer an amendment at the proper time which has to do with the exempting from the wage and hour provision those banks and trust companies the major share of whose business is in intrastate commerce. I shall discuss this amendment separately when it is offered, but right now I want to address myself to the Casey amendment and point out many reasons why I think the Wage and Hour Act must be amended at this session. I expect to point out by example and show the urgency and need for changes such as those suggested by the gentlemen from Massachusetts. Every case cited is an actual one taken from the experiences of businessmen, particularly wholesalers in the State of Iowa. I know many of the people involved personally and can assure this House that many of the cases brought to my attention were brought by the employees rather than the employer.

The experience of the past 18 months that the wage-hour law has been in effect and operation clearly indicates that many businessmen, whose businesses are vitally affected by this law, do not yet understand it. Each day new interpretations and regulations are being issued. These interpretations, rulings, and regulations are extending the law far beyond anything that it was believed was contemplated by Congress when the law was enacted.

Every reasonable and fair-minded person will heartily approve any legislation that properly safeguards the underprivileged and that will eliminate sweatshop conditions in business and industry. This was declared to be the purpose of the wage-hour law. The extent to which it has gone beyond this declared purpose, the complex problems and uncertainties it has created for employers and employees, and the extent to which it is disrupting normal and long-established business practices, is illustrated in the typical cases hereinafter set forth.

CONTROLS WAGES AND STANDARDS FAR ABOVE MINIMUM STANDARDS ESTABLISHED BY LAW

Case 1

A firm operating branches in other cities employs a man on a salary basis of more than $5,000 per year. He is a certified public accountant and is the duly elected secretary of the corporation, although not a member of its board of directors. He has charge of the audits and accounts for the company's branches as well as its main office. Periodic auditing of branch offices and occasional contract accounts frequently requires his absence from his home city. On such trips out of the city he may prefer to work extended hours per day, or per week as the case may be, and in excess of 42 hours per week as prescribed by law, in order that he may complete his assignment and return to his home. The company furnishes such clerical assistance as he deems necessary and has at no time regulated or been concerned with the number of hours that he has put in on his work, either in the main office or on outside duties.

Inquiry to the Wage and Hour Division for a ruling as to whether or not this employee is exempt from the provisions of the wage and hour law does not give the company assurance that he can be exempt under the classification of executive or professional, or by any other provision of the law. It seems, therefore, that in this and similar cases the only authoritative determination as to whether the wage and hour law applies must come through appeal to and decision by the courts. In the meantime the employer must curtail the hours per week and arrange for accurate time records of service or else accept the liability of possible overtime payments and penalties.

Case 2

The manager of a wholesale establishment employs a private secretary at the rate of $140 per month. This young woman, as is the case with other office employees of the company, is never docked for sickness or for time taken off for other purposes. For example, she has been given time off for trips out of the city, besides being given 3 weeks' vacation with pay each year. At a certain time of the year, usually in the month of July, when inventory is being taken, this young woman puts in a few hours overtime.

Recently the records of the company, whose manager she works for, were inspected by the Wage and Hour Division, and they ruled that the company owed her about $43 for overtime she had put in, notwithstanding the fact that the records show that she actually worked 190 hours less during the year than she would have had she actually worked straight 44 hours and 42 hours per week, as required by the law.

Case 3

Another case in point is that of a young woman working in the accounting department of an employer at a salary of $105 per month. During the year 1939 this young woman was unable to work for 4 weeks because she was stricken with pneumonia. At the end of 4 weeks she returned to her job and worked between 30 and 36 hours each week for about 5 weeks and until she was able again to resume her regular work hours. During all this time she received her regular monthly salary. In addition to this she received 2 weeks' vacation with pay during the year and had also been given time off for a trip out of the city, without being docked, and received pay for all holidays not worked. Two months after returning to work after her illness, when the company was distributing bonuses to its employees, she too received a bonus of $75.

Following her period of illness and after her return to work, when her condition permitted her to do so, she worked some overtime in order to catch up in her department. An investigator from the Wage and Hour Division, who investigated the company's records, claimed the company had violated the wage and hour law and that this young woman was entitled to overtime in the amount of $5.92. In this case the employment records of the company showed that the young woman had worked 327 hours less during the year than she would if she had worked a straight 44- and 42-hour week, as provided by the law.

OPPRESSIVE CHILD LABOR

A certain employer employed a charwoman to do cleaning up around the office each night after work hours, for which she was paid a monthly wage. Because of the isolated location of the company's factory, and not wanting to be alone in the building, it had been the custom of this woman to bring with her her two children under 16 years of age. They helped her clean up the office by picking up scraps of paper, emptying wastebaskets, and so forth. The employer, in doubt as to whether this practice on the part of the charwoman might make him guilty of a violation of the wage and hour law, called for information. The Wage and Hour Division held that an employer, in permitting a woman to use her children to help her in her work, might be violating the oppressive child labor provision of the wage and hour law. It was ruled that a woman could take her children with her for company while she was working, but that they must refrain from helping her in any way.

Accordingly the employer, to protect himself, was compelled to direct the charwoman to refrain from permitting her children to help her clean the office.

LIMITS EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUNG WORKERS

Subsection (b) of section 12—child-labor provisions—empowers the Chief of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor to determine what occupations are hazardous for the employment of minors between 16 and 18 years of age and oppressive child labor practices under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Order No. 2 of the Chief of the Children's Bureau declares the occupation of motor-vehicle driver or helper to be extremely hazardous for the employment of such minors, and accordingly the employment of such minors is declared to be oppressive child labor. Consider the effect of this ruling:

A manufacturer of light products gave employment to a husky boy, 17 years of age, delivering some of his products after school and on Saturday mornings. He used the employer's private automobile for such purpose and, on some occasions, a light delivery truck.

Under order No. 2, issued by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, this employment became oppressive child labor, and the employer, accordingly, could not continue to give this young man employment in the above capacity.

Section 9 of Interpretative Bulletin No. 5, issued by Wage and Hour Division, office of general counsel, in November 1939, says, among other things:

> The entire legislative history of the act leads to the conclusion that Congress intended to exclude from the channels of interstate commerce all goods produced under labor conditions detrimental to the health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers.

By what possible stretch of imagination can it be found that it is "detrimental to the health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers" to work more than 42 hours without the payment of overtime when it is not held to be "detrimental" if they work over 42 hours and are paid overtime? Moreover, as in the case cited above, it is apparently not construed to be detrimental under the wage and hour law for an employee to work any number of hours per week over 42 that he may wish, at straight time, provided he works for different employers. Can it be possible that Congress intended any such inconsistent interpretations and situations to be developed when it passed the Fair Labor Standards Act?

OBSTRUCTS AMBITIOUS AND FAITHFUL, INTERESTED WORKERS

Case 1

A food wholesaler employs a buyer who has been with the company nearly 35 years. He is paid at a rate in excess of $300 per month. Recently he suffered a serious automobile accident which confined him to the hospital for a number of months. Upon his return to work it was necessary for him to rest at some time during the day. He engaged a room in a downtown hotel near his place of employment and spent several hours therein during the day, usually immediately after lunch. His need was for physical rest; so he would lie on the bed while in the room. The hotel in which he stayed was the one most convenient to his place of employment so that it was not necessary for him to travel far, but it was also a hotel which is patronized by many salesmen who have called on this buyer for many years. Frequently salesmen would go to the buyer's room for a friendly visit, and on occasion would talk business. Under a strict interpretation of the act the employer is fearful that he will be required to count as hours worked the time spent by the buyer while he is resting in his room.

It appears probable that this buyer could be regarded as an executive and, therefore, exempt under the definition issued by the Wage and Hour Division. However, one phase of the definition provides that an executive must direct work of other employees of the employer. This buyer directs the work only of his own stenographer who is an employee, but because he does not direct the work of employees—note that the plural is used in the definition—there is some doubt about his exemption as an executive, unless this definition can be interpreted to mean one or more employees.

Case 2

The application of the wage and hour law to a wholesale firm resulted in shortening the maximum workweek for its drivers from 48 to 42 hours. This firm, in collective bargaining with the union, had agreed to give its drivers enough hours at overtime so that the weekly pay check would be equivalent of the pay received formerly under a 48-hour week.

A certain truck driver of this particular company usually completed his week's work on Thursday evening. Being an ambitious individual anxious to learn all phases of the business so that he could get ahead, and having noted that most of the men occupying higher-salaried jobs in this firm had advanced from truck driver and warehouse positions, requested that he be permitted to do some work on Fridays and Saturdays in retail stores in order to acquaint himself with that most important part of the business.

After a careful analysis of the wage and hour law, it appeared to the management that if the driver were permitted to do this the company would be required to pay time and one-half for such hours as this employee might spend in such extra work, which in this case would mean $1.05 per hour. Inasmuch as this was prohibitive, the management found it necessary to forbid the driver doing this extra work.

Net result: The company lost a good truck driver because he could see no future in the business.

Under the wage and hour law this same condition confronts many thousands of young men who are perfectly willing and anxious to devote part of their leisure time to studying the job ahead of them and to preparing themselves for advancement.

Case 3

The effect of this law upon ambitious workers is illustrated in the following case:

The Chicago regional attorney for the Wage and Hour Division reports the following case: A company engaged in the customs brokerage and freight business was asked by a young man in its employ to have work assigned to him by the foreign-traffic department of the company in order that he might gain experience and become familiar with American business methods. This experience, it appeared, would be of real value to him and his father's Swedish concern when the young man returned to his native country. This young man was to devote a certain number of hours each day to such work, with the understanding that he was to receive no compensation for his services. According to the Chicago regional attorney's statement, the answer to this inquiry was as follows:

> The act contains no exemption of services performed for the purpose of gaining experience without compensation paid therefor.

While this particular situation is unusual, there are many cases of employees anxious to gain experience and develop responsibility who may not now be permitted to do so because of prohibitive cost to the employer. It is difficult—almost impossible, in fact—to develop executives under the present situation.

CLOSES THE DOOR OF OPPORTUNITY

The Wage and Hour Act was intended, in part, to protect children from employment in sweatshops. Every decent person in the country believes in the elimination of child labor in sweatshops. But here is how it works out in practice:

A wholesale establishment had an employee whose young brother quit school and asked the manager to be allowed to learn to operate a tabulating machine in the company's office without pay, because in this way he could get a practical education without costing money. The boy was ambitious to fit himself for a good job and the tabulating machine was not available in schools.

The branch manager gave his consent and the boy went to work. At the end of 3 months a representative of the company discovered the young man was working for nothing and at once suggested that he be paid something so he would be covered in case of accident. So they gave the boy $20 per month, which they figured would pay for his lunches and carfare, and which made him eligible for compensation in case of accident. After working another 3 months the company gave him $65 a month, which was later raised to $75 a month.

Investigators for the Wage and Hour Division discovered the case, ruled that this company had violated the law, and forced the company to pay the young man an additional $123. The wage and hour investigator informed the company that it would have owed the boy nothing if it had paid him no wages at all while learning, but because they paid him something they were liable. It would, indeed, be strange if this company again gave a youth an opportunity to improve himself.

DESTROYS JOBS

Case 1

A company has a salesman who travels by truck in several States. He has worked up his own route. He transports parts and accessories for automobiles from one State into the other States and then makes a certain route in selling these products. He travels from town to town and from garage to garage. He solicits the customers, makes the sale, delivers the product and collects for the article sold, and whatever is left in the truck after his trip is hauled back to his home.

This is a young man who has encouraged his employer to establish this routing, and has worked the business up on a commission basis until he receives approximately $4,500 to $5,000 a year.

Under the present interpretation of regulation 541, wage and hour law, Outside Salesmen, this man is not considered exempt under the act. His employer has notified him that he will have to limit his work to 42 hours. The salesman claims that he cannot work his route in that time; that most of his time and the best part of his time is evenings, when he can stand around the garage and see his customers when they are not as busy as during the day.

If this man is not exempt, the employer will very likely discontinue the route entirely and this young man, who is now enjoying an income of from $4,500 to $5,000 a year, will be without employment.

A CHINESE PUZZLE FOR THE BUILDING INDUSTRY

According to the interpretations of the Wage and Hour Division, the employees of a contractor engaged in building a new building, even if it is going to be used for the production of goods that will move in interstate commerce, are not subject to the provisions of the wage and hour law. This includes employees actually working on the construction project as well as office employees whose work is in connection with this particular project.

However, if a contractor is engaged in remodeling, repairing, or building an addition to an old building which is used for the production of goods that move in interstate commerce, his employees, during the time they work on that job, as well as office employees any part of whose work may be in connection with this particular job, are subject to the provisions of the law.

Apparently, if a new building is being built by a contractor for a firm who is engaged in the production of goods for commerce, and it is an entirely separate unit and not attached in any way to the old building, the employees in the office as well are not subject to the provisions of the law of the contractor working on this particular unit and his employees.

If a contractor is building a new building in another State, such of his key employees who, because of their experience and skill, are not available to him in the locality in which the building is to be erected, and who are taken from his home office across State lines to work on this project, are subject to the provisions of the law, but the employees hired in the local community where the job is located, if it is not a remodeling or repairing operation, are not subject to the provisions of the law. If it is a remodeling or repairing job, all his employees come under the provisions of the law, including those in his home office any part of whose work is in connection with the job.

DISRUPTS MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS

A certain firm employed three truck drivers. Because the work fluctuated a good deal, the drivers some weeks drew small checks and other weeks drew large checks. The drivers requested the employer that some method be worked out so they would be sure of a certain amount each week. They figured at 70 cents an hour, and the employer agreed to pay them $35 per week whether they worked 10 hours or 50 hours. The Wage and Hour Division ruled that during weeks the men worked up to 50 hours the employer must pay them $1.05 for all hours worked in excess of 42 per week. The result was that a system which had proved highly satisfactory to both drivers and employer had to be abolished.

AN ODDITY IN FIGURING OVERTIME

A company has a union contract under which the watchmen work 56 hours a week and receive $25 a week. This would establish an hourly rate of $0.446. However, the employer found that he did not need the watchmen on duty the full 56 hours they are permitted to work under the union contract, and has permitted them to work on 51 hours per week, but has continued to pay them $25 per week. This 42 hours at $0.446 plus 9 hours' overtime at $0.669 would equal just a little less than $25 per week.

The wage-hour inspector takes 51 hours, the hours actually worked, as the divisor, and 51 into $25 makes an hourly rate of $0.49 per hour.

Computing the straight time for 42 hours and overtime to 51 hours, the employer is assessed overtime at the rate of $2.19½ per week.

Accordingly, the employer by not requiring the employee to work the full time permitted under the union contract will be penalized and required to pay overtime.

ENCOURAGES SHARP PRACTICE BY CERTAIN EMPLOYERS

A certain wholesaler opens his establishment at 7 a. m. each weekday. One employee has made a practice of coming to the establishment considerably before the opening hour. He checks in on the time clock at various times, ranging from 6:25 to 6:35. He comes early from his own choice, not because of any request or requirement by his employer, and is not expected to perform any work before 7 a. m.

When an inspection was made of this establishment the time that this employee checked in was noted by the inspector. The employee and the employer were questioned concerning the facts. The employee was asked whether or not he ever performed any work before 7 a. m. He replied that he sometimes did perform work before 7 a. m. When asked what he did, he stated that he helped salesmen get their samples and material ready and occasionally helped to wait on a customer who called before the establishment was open. His response to questions was that he did these things "sometimes." The employer then asked him how many salesmen he helped to prepare samples and other material; he then stated "only one." He was then asked whether he did this regularly and frequently and finally admitted that he had helped this salesman a few times over a period of a number of months. Concerning his waiting on customers, it developed that this occurred most infrequently—in fact, the most definite statement that was made was a "few times."

Notwithstanding the information which was developed, the employer was required to pay for the time prior to 7 a. m. that this employee had been present after checking in, and, of course, at the time-and-a-half rate because the regular hours were 42 per week or more.

From the foregoing it is apparent that there is need for amendment of the wage and hour law for clarification and relation of the regulations thereunder in fairness to employers and employees alike.

The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, commonly referred to as the Wage and Hour Act, has now been in effect for about 18 months. Ambiguities in the law itself and the varied interpretations of the act by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor have created great confusion in industry and have disrupted normal business practices to an unusual degree.

The experience of business and industry under this law illustrates clearly what happens when Congress enacts a law, general in provisions, which delegates to some Federal bureau broad power of discretion in its administration. Under such conditions business and industry find themselves governed by administrative rules and regulational rules and regulations that may be changed at the will or fancy of the Administrator.

It is clearly stated by the Wage and Hour Division's general counsel that interpretations, regulations, and definitions issued by him "except in certain specific instances where the statute directs the Administrator to make various regulations and definitions serve only to indicate the construction of the law which will guide the Administrator in the performance of his administrative duties, unless he is directed otherwise by the authoritative ruling of the courts or unless he shall subsequently decide that his prior interpretation is incorrect." Obviously the result of such an indefinite type of interpretative ruling places the average businessman in the position that he may follow these interpretations and still later find himself in violation of the law and subject to its penalties.

Business management, to properly apply the provisions of any statute by which it is to be regulated, must know defi-

nitely what the law really is and what its various provisions mean, not only today but for the future as well.

When the Fair Labor Standards Act was under consideration, and finally enacted, it was contended, and certainly assumed by everyone, that the law was for the express purpose of protecting the underprivileged and putting a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours, so that sweatshop conditions might be eliminated—an objective that should be heartily favored and approved. However, the law as it is administered goes beyond such declared purpose, and certainly it appears beyond anything that was intended by Congress.

In closing I call attention to the following colloquy which occurred in the House when the bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole:

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment I have just offered is to exempt the many country banks throughout the Nation which are now subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In most country communities the bank operates as a service establishment. Hardly ever are there more than three or four employees, and in most cases only one or two in the smaller communities.

The amendment does not exempt or exclude all banks as a group. It exempts only those banking institutions from the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the greater part of whose selling or servicing is intrastate in character. Banking institutions in the large metropolitan centers are far better equipped to enable them to comply with the wage-hour law. The noncity banks of this country are far less able to employ additional help and to meet the requirements of the Wage and Hour Act with respect to the number of hours of employment of their staff members and at the same time give their local customers and farmers and other townspeople the banking service to which those individuals have become accustomed. It is those banks that will get relief from this proposal.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman believe that the banks have solved this situation pretty well by moving up their closing hours, etc.?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I do not agree with the gentleman. I know that many banks in the State of Iowa in the small country communities have to strike a balance every afternoon. They have to have at least one employee stay to do the work.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. But may I say to the gentleman we have heard of no bank closing in the United States in recent times, have we?

Mr. HARRINGTON. No; and I want to help them along a little further. I would like to see those banks prosper.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman feel it would be better not to bring that amendment into this picture?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I think they would get along a lot better if my amendment were adopted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Has the gentleman any figures showing the amount of compensation received by the employees of these small banks throughout the country—whether or not it is larger than the wage-hour scale anyway?

Mr. HARRINGTON. In most sections—at least in the small communities of my State—I think the ordinary bank teller or clerk gets between $75 and $110 a month. I imagine it is very much the same throughout the Middle West.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. One of the things that has got to be guarded against, in the gentleman's amendment, is that the long hours required of the country banker are required not in order to discharge the business of banking but to accommodate the merchants beyond the actual need for accommodation. In shortening hours to get under the Wage and Hour Act the country bank in most every instance has been able to attend to its business. But the country banks as a whole are not rendering the type of service, the very long hours of service desired by the merchants, and I doubt very seriously if those long hours are justified. That is where most complaints come from—not from the bank people themselves on the ground that they cannot attend to their work, but from the merchants on the ground that the banks do not stay open long enough to make change and render other incidental service to the merchants in the small communities.

Mr. HARRINGTON. But the bank itself, of course, after the close of business, must take a balance every day. This requires overtime employment of the same people, and that is what I am trying to correct to enable them to do that without the burden of paying overtime.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. So far as the bank work is concerned, they can get all of their work done within the regular hours. Does not the gentleman think that is right?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes; I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As a matter of fact, a number of small banks, the banks in these rather small communities, are closing on Saturday afternoons because they want to comply with the Wage and Hour Act. Is not that correct?

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is true in the State of Iowa, and I assume it is true also in the State of Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And in a great many of the States, but there is a demand that the banks stay open longer.

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's amendment is limited in its operation.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I limit it to those banks the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce. This excludes the large banks that do an interstate business. It applies simply to the small country banks, whose business is done, in the case of 99 percent of them, within a radius of 25 miles.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true. The amendment would not apply to those banks engaged in interstate business where drafts go to New York and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRINGTON. This is intended to relieve those small country banks whose business is intrastate in character.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. One of the reasons for the banks remaining open for only a few hours a day is because they have to close in order to keep their books and take their balances.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. They would like to remain open longer for the service they are rendering in these small communities.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is quite correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. I think the gentleman has pointed out one of the places in the wage-hour law that should be amended. The banks close on Saturday afternoons in the rural communities and this is a real inconvenience to the farmers and merchants of these sections. The banks are rendering a real service and I think the gentleman's amendment should be adopted. Let us take advantage of an opportunity and correct this situation.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. I would like to point out that these little-bank clerks get $75 a month. Now the gentleman is going to exempt them and he is going to work those people from daylight to dark.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Oh, no.

Mr. GEYER of California. Let us adopt it and maybe we will kill the whole thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Civil Service and Veterans' Preference—H. R. 7313

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the question of veterans' preference in civil service is one which has been debated for years. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I am interested in the passage of H. R. 7313 at this session of Congress.

We are voting an unprecedented amount for building and maintaining the Military Establishment, and I believe it is only fair to the ones whom we are calling into service to provide some reasonable protection for their employment after their services are no longer required in military service.

Since the establishment of the United States, all of our wars have been fought, in the main, by volunteer soldiers. This is as much of an American institution as the Bill of Rights and the Monroe Doctrine. It is fitting and proper to prepare for war in times of peace; also it is just as fitting and proper to provide for the welfare of our war veterans when we can consider their welfare in calm and peaceful times. During a war or immediately upon its termination the incentive for caring for these volunteers is lacking.

Veterans' preference as now provided by law is defective in its operation, and I believe H. R. 7313 will correct many of the ills existing. The problem of our war veterans is becoming critical. These remaining from the Spanish-American War have reached the age where they are being provided for by pension and other means. The World War veteran now averages 46 years of age, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to replace him in employment, especially in view of the

unemployment situation and new methods being developed in industry.

We are coming face to face with a problem for which we should attempt to provide an economical solution. The enactment of H. R. 7313 would insure many of our unemployed veterans being taken into Government service without any additional cost to the Government. The work coming under the supervision of civil service is necessary to maintain effective and efficient Federal administration.

My comrades of the American Legion have made a careful study of this problem, and the provisions of the proposed legislation cover many resolutions enacted by the national conventions of that organization. The members of the Legion who have made the recommendations for veterans' preference in civil service are requesting that we enact this legislation immediately. Certainly we do not want to see those who volunteered their services in times of national crisis be dependent on private or public charity. The majority of World War veterans are not interested in pensions for able-bodied men. They ask us now to give them an opportunity to put their unemployed comrades to work.

I believe by enacting this legislation we can provide a partial solution to the unemployment problem of our World War veterans and postpone indefinitely a more expensive solution. I recommend the immediate passage of H. R. 7313 as an economy measure.

It Is Not Our War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present invasion of Holland and Belgium, we may expect an ever-increasing effort by the internationalistic press to involve the United States in the present European war. This involvement may not be directed toward Europe, but may shift toward the Orient. Should this come about, let us remember that we have no interest in the Occident or the Orient, and should, for that reason, remain strictly neutral, no matter who becomes involved in war.

We have nothing to gain, but everything to lose in the present conflict. There is nothing we can save except our own country, and that cannot be saved by casting our lot with the war powers of Europe.

Let us not kid ourselves. This war is unnecessary, for had England restored part of the colonies to Germany, peace would have prevailed in Europe today. Is it logical, realizing this, that we should, in order to please English greed, engage upon destruction of lives and property? I say, if we do, God have mercy on us.

The question involved in this war is whether or not the international financiers are going to rule the world by the power of gold. England and France are fighting to maintain this power. Shall we help them to enslave ourselves to the same international exploiters? This is not a war to establish freedom, nor to save civilization. This war is fought to establish a centralized international government which is to own and control all the gold and rule the world by such power. We will not establish a better civilization. We will instead destroy the civilization we now have, for it is only in such manner that any minority can maintain its power.

I shall now quote an episode that happened on April 18, 1793, and I hope that we will use the same good sense that Washington, Jefferson, and others, used at that time:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 18, 1793.*

Memorandum of questions submitted by George Washington to his Cabinet, as to whether a proclamation of neutrality should be issued in respect to the war between France and England; how to receive the minister from France and other problems:

The posture of affairs in Europe, particularly between France and Great Britain places the United States in a delicate situation, and requires much consideration of the measures which will be proper for them to observe in the war between those powers. With a view to forming a general plan of conduct for the Executive, I have stated and enclosed sundry questions to be considered preparatory to a meeting at my house tomorrow, where I shall expect to see you at 9 o'clock to receive the result of your reflections.

Question I. Shall a proclamation issue for the purpose of preventing interference of the citizens of the United States in the war between France and Great Britain? Shall it contain a declaration of neutrality or not? What shall it contain?

(He then enumerates several other questions.)

Answer of the Cabinet:

Question I. Agreed by all that a proclamation shall issue forbidding our citizens to take part in any hostilities on the seas, with or against any of the belligerent powers and warning them against carrying to any such powers any of those articles deemed contraband according to the modern usage of nations, and enjoining them from all acts and proceedings inconsistent with the duties of a friendly nation toward those at war.

Let us observe these same principles, and peace will prevail in the United States. It is the will of the people, and it is time for Congress to pay attention to the peace of this Nation. If we Members fail to do that, we may expect internal strife or revolution, for the people of the United States are not going to jeopardize the life of this Republic.

Cassius C. Dowell

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CASSIUS C. DOWELL, late a Representative from the State of Iowa

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my knowledge of the late Mr. DOWELL amounted to little more than what I saw of him in the public service, but that was enough, and of such character, as to reveal the real gentleman, for it went beyond what occurred on the floor of this Chamber, and embraced years of fairly close intercourse in the work of committees.

The records of the Congress bear witness that our late friend and colleague was an indefatigable and intelligent worker, who discussed elaborately every major question of the day. To those who only heard him it was a constant question how he could find time and command the strength necessary for the exhaustive work he did, for it showed the widest observation, the closest study, and the most thorough investigation.

Our friend practiced none of the arts of oratory and he made no effort at display of any kind, but his speeches were models of logic and conservatism. To those not interested in the subject he was discussing, his speeches sometimes appeared dry, formal, uninteresting, and hard to follow. For this reason they frequently attracted less attention than they deserved; but in the committee room, where there was less formality, as a rule, no previous preparation of what was to be said, his discussions were of the most entertaining and instructive character.

I served more than 21 years in this House with our late colleague; and although we were of different political faiths, I never heard him say a mean, unkind, or contemptuous word against a personal or political opponent. He was tolerant and in every way respected the rights of others.

I well remember this good man's interest in the subject of public highways. At the close of Republican control of the House in 1930 Mr. DOWELL had risen to the chairmanship of the Committee on Roads, which committee's records bear his enduring imprint. If I remember correctly, Mr. DOWELL became a member of that committee when it was created by the House. The great system of highways in this country is largely a monument to the sagacity and assiduity of our late friend.

Mr. DOWELL was well equipped by temperament, education, and experience for outstanding service in this body. He graduated from Drake University in 1887. He was a member

of the Iowa Legislature 14 years; elected to the Congress in 1915; and served continuously from that time, excluding 2 years, until his unfortunate passing.

It will stand forever to the credit of Iowa that she has contributed many able sons, including this honorable deceased, to help make the Congress of the United States, for they have left a record of which their families, their friends, their State, and the Nation may always be justifiably proud.

Born of Freedom—To Die of Taxation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. ERVIN T. BROWN

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ervin T. Brown, treasurer of Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., delivered before the Association of University and College Business Officers, at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., April 9, 1940, and Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, at the Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee, Fla., April 12, 1940:

Mr. President, without attempting to pose either as a prophet or a historian, I can assert without fear of contradiction that the past decade has been a most trying one for private colleges and universities. You, the treasurers and business managers, know that every institution in the land, from the richest to the most obscure, has been confronted with decreasing income from endowment funds, shrinkage in gifts from philanthropists, increased demands for scholarship aid for deserving students. You know all too well the expedients which have been adopted to meet these conditions. You know that some institutions have raised their rates only to find that they had less money in the end because of reduced enrollment; that faculty salaries have been reduced, in some cases below the level of decent subsistence; that buildings have been allowed to decay without proper rehabilitation; that faculty promotions have been postponed or forgotten; that hundreds of the most brilliant students have been forced to leave college and embark upon careers in the W. P. A. or the C. C. C.

Everywhere there is a hue and cry for money for buildings, for endowment, for scholarships. The rich and powerful institutions, who once selected only those students they wished to accept from a long waiting list, now have field agents scurrying about the country visiting every nook and hamlet. No longer are there merely athletic coaches scouting for football material, but dignified deans and even presidents are venturing forth on "lecture tours" to centers where prospective students are alleged to be lurking. Any student having special ability can virtually put himself on the bargain counter and await the best scholarship offer from dozens of institutions.

The standard criterion of stability of a private institution has traditionally been the size of its endowment fund. But this has been of little help during the past decade, for, largely due to political manipulation, yields have dropped from 25 percent to 50 percent or more. One of our largest and richest universities reports a drop in average yield on its various funds from 5.76 percent in 1929–30 to an estimated 3.73 percent in 1938–39, a decrease of over 35 percent. Applying this to a moderate-sized institution, having an endowment fund of $10,000,000, it means an annual loss of income of $203,000—and this sum of money will pay a large corps of professors at current salaries to teach a small army of students.

Another factor which makes the position of the private colleges and universities more complex is the competition from the State-supported institutions. True, most of these have had serious financial problems during the past decade. But, on the other hand, in times of stress, more students, relatively speaking, attend State institutions where tuition is free. Also, the State-supported institutions have been the beneficiaries of a benevolent Federal Government and now have their campuses liberally dotted with monuments to the prestige of their Senators and Congressmen. In contrast with the private institutions, this has given the public institutions a semblance of prosperity—even if their professors were meagerly paid or subject to the whims of political opinion.

In a study[1] recently made by the John Price Jones Corporation, of New York City, covering the period 1920 to 1938, it was found that in the 9 years of depression four great universities—Harvard, Yale, Chicago, and Columbia—received 21.13 percent more money through gifts and bequests than they did during the "golden twenties."

On the other hand, 45 smaller institutions received 23.86 percent less during the depression years. Here are the comparative statistics:

Received from gifts and bequests	9 years of prosperity	9 years of depression
Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Columbia	$196,498,644	$238,016,531
45 smaller institutions	213,658,830	162,684,656

Is this but an illustration of the biblical proverb, "To him that hath it shall be given"—and does it mean that the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer? If it means that, why is Chicago University, for example, planning an intensive campaign for many millions more in endowment? Why is President Hutchins writing propaganda articles in the Saturday Evening Post to pave the way for this effort, as well as pointing out much more clearly than is done in the above paragraphs the unfortunate dilemma of the privately endowed institutions? Have the American people ceased to believe in the desirability of privately endowed institutions and is this the beginning of the end of them? Quoting again from Trends in Educational Finance, 1920–38, we learn:

"Since 1929 many an institution has been physically starving. In 1934 it was authoritatively estimated that there was a piled-up demand of $900,000,000 of building needs in the colleges and universities of America. The potential demand for rehabilitation of out-worn buildings, for new educational equipment, and for new dormitories, student unions, auditoriums, and class-room buildings is conservatively estimated today at $1,000,000,000."

But these are astronomical figures. Before trying to arrive at any conclusions, let us consider something more concrete and understandable. Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., of which I have the honor to be treasurer, 15 years ago had net assets, including land, buildings, equipment, and endowment, of only $802,000 and has been attempting to expand into a first-class, small, liberal arts college. To do this, considerable sums of money had to be raised to operate the college, to build adequate and modern buildings and supply suitable equipment, and to build up an endowment fund as well. We have been "on the firing line" during this whole period, and are consequently much more closely attuned to the economic cycle of prosperity and depression than many other more wealthy institutions. Following is a record, in round numbers, of all gifts and bequests to Rollins College, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929:

Year ending June 30:	
1929	$250,000
1930	816,000
1931	171,000
1932	220,000
1933	267,000
1934	85,000
1935	94,000
1936	69,000
1937	84,000
1938	67,000

Roughly speaking, something over 60 percent of the above funds have gone into permanent equipment, buildings, and endowment, while the remainder has been used to keep the college in operation, pay professors' salaries, grant scholarships to worthy students, et cetera.

But at the present moment Rollins College vitally needs $3,000,000, $1,500,000 to replace obsolete buildings, purchase essential equipment, and meet its obligations at present and in the near future; $1,500,000 more for endowment, which would largely eliminate the need of annually "passing the hat" to avoid a deficit.

Unlike some of the older institutions, Rollins does not have a rich and powerful alumni body to supply its needs, consequently it has to depend upon the generosity of philanthropic-minded people who have no formal or sentimental ties with the college. Thus, anything affecting the economic status of this group is immediately reflected in gifts—or rather the lack of them—to Rollins. In the 6-year period beginning July 1, 1932, and ending June 30, 1938, Rollins College did not receive a single major gift to erect a building. We were, however, fortunate enough to receive a substantial bequest in 1933 which had been written in a will almost 30 years before.

Why, then, does a generous public not respond and meet the needs of Rollins College? From constant study of this problem, I am convinced that the will to help is much stronger now than it was 10 years ago—that then the program of Rollins College was an experiment, and now it is an experiment that has proved itself and deserves support.

Scores of reasons could be given as to why Rollins and other similar colleges and universities are facing this predicament, but the basic, fundamental reason was succinctly expressed by the celebrated jurist, John Marshall, over 100 years ago, when he said:

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

True, private colleges and universities are exempt from direct taxes, but a far more insidious form of taxation is gnawing at their very vitals. Those who would be generous, those who have formerly been more than generous, are being taxed so that their incomes do not permit major gifts, especially if they wish to retain their estates

[1] Trends in Educational Finance, 1920–38.

intact, retain control of their business enterprises, or provide for those dependent upon them. Thus, the source of income is being stifled and threatened with permanent extinction over the coming years. A glance at the total Federal income taxes, both regular and surtaxes, on large incomes in 1931 and in 1939 will show this is no idle assumption:

Net income	Approximate total of Federal income taxes, including surtaxes	
	1931	1939
$100,000	$15,660	$34,000
$200,000	39,660	97,000
$300,000	63,660	164,000
$500,000	111,660	306,000
$1,000,000	231,660	681,000
$2,000,000	471,660	1,451,000

The proponents of the soak-the-rich theory will at once say that notwithstanding the high rates now in effect anyone who has so large an income as anyone in the classes tabulated above still has as much money left as any person should need. But it is not quite as simple as that. In addition to Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes (which have been known to result in virtual confiscation of some estates) nearly all of the States also levy an income tax. Gov. Herbert Lehman, of New York State, summed up the situation succinctly in writing to Senator PAT HARRISON, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, under date of March 18, 1938, when he said:

"But when I tell you that in two States the combined Federal and State rate is 94 percent of all income above a certain amount and in another 90 percent above $12,000 you will see the situation is extremely serious."

At first it may be difficult to reconcile this situation with the fact that gifts to the four large institutions mentioned above—Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Chicago—have been larger during the past 9 depression years than in the preceding 9 years of prosperity. But the thinkers who have analyzed the situation—as President Hutchins, of Chicago, has done—know that the giving of the past few years has not been sound. Wealthy individuals have faced the dilemma of seeing their estates as well as their incomes confiscated by the tax gatherers and are breaking up their estates, and many of them have already made their last gift. Hence there is the rush of institutions to "get on the band wagon" and promote financial campaigns while there are still private fortunes to be distributed. The high tax rates and tendencies have been used as "ammunition" by harassed college and university officials to induce wealthy individuals to make gifts.

In 1936, Hon. T. W. Phillips, Jr., of Butler, Pa., received such a suggestion from the president of a university. Mr. Phillips has had a distinguished career as a public-spirited citizen, successful businessman, and public official. He has the faculty of being too far advanced in thought for most of his contemporaries, but has lived to see some of the sound ideas he has advanced and which were at first ridiculed, later applauded by the masses. I am violating no confidence in quoting from the letter Mr. Phillips received, and his reply, since it was inserted as an advertisement by Mr. Phillips in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, December 28, 1936, and later published in pamphlet form.

BUTLER, PA., *December 22, 1936.*

———— ————,

President, ——— *University.*

DEAR DOCTOR: A short time ago I received a letter from you soliciting a contribution, in which you stated:

"I call your attention to a law, passed by Congress last year, concerning the paying of income taxes. Condensed, it is as follows:

"Income-tax regulations make it possible for a person to give up 15 percent of his income to educational and charitable organizations, tax-free, and 5 percent of a corporation's income, if given to such enterprises, is tax-exempt. For example, if a married man whose net income is $70,000 makes a contribution of $10,000 to a college on or before December 31, 1936, the gift will cost him but $6,135. Uncle Sam gives up his claim on this man for $3,865. To put it another way, Uncle Sam offers to give $1 for each $2 the donor gives. This rule applies to gifts of $150 on a $1,000 net income, and above.

"Under this law, men, without added cost, can designate a part of the tax they are compelled to pay, to ——— University. Such a gift does not rob the Government * * *."

I am especially interested in the educational institution which you represent and am solicitous of the welfare of all institutions, organizations, and associations created to improve social conditions. Therefore, it is a matter of extreme regret and keen disappointment to me that in your eagerness to make unjust and discriminatory tax laws serve temporarily as a vicious instrument in securing funds for a worthy cause, you completely overlook the opportunity to perform a service far greater than securing contributions, and which in the long run would redound to the benefit of all institutions dependent upon individual contributors. All responsible heads of institutions, writing letters similar to that which you address to me, should as a matter of duty to the institution represented, as well as decorum to the person solicited, express their abhorrence of a system of taxation that destroys initiative, invites governmental extravagance, involves ever-increasing taxation, lays the groundwork for a totalitarian state, and sounds the death knell of the very work in which they are engaged.

You may be interested to know why letters like yours often do and always should fall on stone-deaf or near-deaf ears. In large and heretofore increasing numbers the makers and possessors of fortunes were generous public benefactors, evidenced by numerous churches, cathedrals, colleges, and charities, built, endowed, and in a large measure supported by them. During the last 20 years the masses, led by the radical press and by swarms of vociferous politicians, pulpiteers, and professors, have been more than advocating the crippling—they are demanding the destruction—of that element whose ingenuity, initiative, progressiveness, and aggressiveness made us a great Nation.

This destruction can be accomplished by any one of three methods: By wholesale murder, by confiscation of capital, or by high and discriminatory taxes. The latter method has been chosen in our country, although it may take two generations to accomplish that which could be done in a day by either of the other methods. Already inheritance taxes are sufficiently high to prevent the owner of a large business from passing it on to his heirs, unless he keeps his affairs too liquid for efficient operation.

The primary purpose of excessively high taxes is not the securing of sufficient funds to administer the legitimate affairs of government economically. On the contrary, the very taxes which you in your letter condone, or rather tacitly commend, are punitive. The Government levies destructive taxes and then holds out the 15-percent exemption from taxable income, if given to educational and charitable institutions, as a kind of bait in order to induce the individual to voluntarily still further reduce his capital, deplete his assets, and rob his heirs. What does this mean? Where does it lead? The class of people who have built colleges, orphanages, and hospitals throughout the length and breadth of the land, and to whom millions now living owe, and many more millions yet unborn will owe, a debt of gratitude, face destruction. Yes, we will continue to have with us many big fortunes of the new rich, made by gambling, racketeering, and grafting. But the conservative class, the promoters of the fine arts, the custodians of culture, the stabilizers of civilization are rapidly being set apart for annihilation.

All this would be true if we had only the Federal taxes which you mention, but it might be said that it is doubly true when we take into consideration local and State taxes. There have been cases in the past—and at the rate we are going, there will be many more in the future—where after State and Federal inheritance taxes have been paid little or nothing remains for the heirs.

"But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

Evidently there is a question under present conditions as to how far you have the moral right to go in soliciting funds from those having heirs, just as it is a question as to how far, if at all, they have the moral right to accede to your request. Confiscatory taxes completely relieve the heretofore generous donor from responsibility of all but nominal support of college, church, and charity, but unfortunately they deny him the pleasure of participating in a large way in benevolent work.

When the goose is killed it stops laying golden eggs. When the seed corn is destroyed there can be no crop. Therefore, unless men like you, who head educational institutions, in conjunction with those interested in hospitals, the Y. M. C. A., and the Red Cross, sponsor a movement and make it a successful movement to prevent a continuation of the improper use of the power of taxation, and substitute reasonable taxation, equitable taxation, general taxation in place of punitive taxation, then let me tell you that you are on your last round-up. The future solicitor will be compelled to make his appeal for dollar and dime contributions.

If you know of any way, other than by withholding of financial support, that would induce men and women in your position to assume leadership in advocating tax revision and economical government, I wish you would tell me.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

T. W. PHILLIPS, Jr.

The logic and reason in Mr. Phillips' letter cannot be dismissed with a mere wave of the hand. It is a challenge to every man, woman, and child who believes in private schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, orphanages—and the myriad number of similar agencies which hitherto have been the product of the noblest impulses felt by successful men and women—the desire to share their success with the less fortunate.

Another and more vital point of indirect Federal taxation of charitable and educational institutions is the taxing of all gifts from income, except the 15 percent specific exemption. Consider the logic of the situation. Suppose that Blank Orphanage has been founded and is being maintained by private charity. In recognition of its humanitarian service, the State has granted it a charter exempting it from all forms of State taxation. Let us suppose Mr. Phillips or any other successful businessman wishes to make a large contribution to Blank Orphanage. The Federal Government says, in effect:

"If you give only 15 percent of your income, we shall exempt the gift from taxation. If you give more, you will be taxed on that portion in excess of 15 percent."

I do not profess to pose as an economist, tax expert, or lawyer. Yet if this is not taxing charity at its very source—taking bread

from the mouths of orphans—I do not know night from day. It is an invasion of the rights of a soverign State more flagrant than others recorded in history over which destructive wars have been fought.

Consider a moment. A charitable or educational institution, chartered by a sovereign State and exempted from taxation because of its service to the State, is the highest expression of altruism—the nearest approach to the Golden Rule in action—that modern civilization affords. Not a penny from its budget can go into the pockets of any stockholder. On the contrary, the trustees who manage its affairs serve without a cent of salary. It exists for one purpose, and for one purpose alone, and that is to help the unfortunate or the ambitious, and thus promote the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. And yet the Federal tax gatherers, in their predatory search for funds, will not permit individuals to give their incomes to such an institution—beyond a certain limited amount—without taxing the donor for the privilege.

In his inaugural address, over 139 years ago, Thomas Jefferson summed up the function of good government in the following statement, which has become a classic quotation, especially in political candidates' speeches, but not in their practices:

"A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned—this is the sum of good government."

Seven years ago this philosophy was boldly thrown out of the window. We learned to our dismay that our troubles were caused by not spending enough money; that thrift and not extravagance was the root of all our worries; that we could spend our way to prosperity. Well, we have tried it. In the 144½ years before the beginning of the present administration the Federal Government spent $112,203,367,065. In the 8 years of the present administration (taking Budget estimates presented to Congress by the President for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1941) we shall have spent $65,628,526,692—or 58 percent as much as it has cost to operate the Federal Government for the preceding 144½ years, including the cost of the Civil War and the World War.

Although business is taxed to the point where, in 1938, according to authentic statistics prepared by the American Federation of Investors, covering the operations of 163 of the biggest corporations in American industry, 61.6 percent of the net income of these corporations went for taxes and only 38.4 percent went to the stockholders. These same corporations paid taxes amounting to $576 per employee. How does that square with Thomas Jefferson's statement that "a wise and frugal government * * * shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned * * *"?

And even these confiscatory taxes, plus the soak-the-rich taxes on large incomes, was far from enough. By the most conservative calculation, in the 8 years ending June 30, 1941, we shall have piled up an additional national debt of at least twenty-five billions of dollars for our children to pay—or more likely repudiate by some sleight-of-hand performance.

This issue transcends all political parties. This is no time to indulge in tirades against any individual or group. I hold no brief for those buccaneers of business who have built their fortunes by exploiting the helpless. This small minority should be dealt with as racketeers. We must not allow these minor details to warp our vision; but, the moment any government oversteps the bounds of a regulating agency "which shall restrain free men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement," that government has taken the first step toward socialism, which ultimately means absolute dictatorship.

I have no quarrel with those who honestly believe we would be better off under such a system. I would only suggest they spend a year or so in one of the countries which has made such wonderful strides in this direction—Germany or Russia—and then give us the benefit of their advice. You may say: "It can't happen here." Don't be too sure. In the past few years, millions have come to look upon the powers that be in Washington as Santa Claus, the giver of all good things, the inexhaustible fountain of special gifts and favors. If the day should arrive that the majority of the citizens of these United States should look upon the Government as their master and not as their servant—our representative republican form of government will have become a thing of the past, and though Congress and the Supreme Court may exist as "rubber stamps," we shall have an absolute dictatorship in fact if not in name. And, as every thinking man knows, dictators can only perpetuate themselves in power so long as they give bread and circuses to the multitudes, which means until the national wealth has been dissipated, and then chaos.

Please do not think me an alarmist. This change will not come overnight. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation history has ever produced, and, in the parlance of the prize ring "can take a lot of punishment." As Mr. Phillips pointed out in his letter to the university president, high and discriminatory taxation may be very slow, but it is just as sure a method of bringing about a new social order as wholesale murder and the confiscation of capital, which has brought such swift results in Germany and Russia, and where the citizens have become serfs and not free men.

But what is to be done about this situation? Specifically, what can the treasurers and business officers of the private colleges and universities do about it?

If our private institutions of higher education have any right to exist at all, they should be looked to for leadership in such a crisis. Regardless of party, sect, creed, or color, they should, in general, stand for:

"A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement."

Under such a philosophy of individual liberty all such institutions were born, and when it passes all such institutions will die—some swiftly, some slowly, but nonetheless surely.

But it is not enough to stand for a general principle. The time has come for action. I believe that every treasurer and business manager of our private institutions of higher learning, every college and university president, every trustee, every donor, every alumnus, every person interested in or benefiting from the work of any private educational or charitable organization; every one who believes in a free church—that all of these millions should unite under the leadership of the executive heads of our private colleges and universities and sponsor an immediate movement, and make it a successful movement to do two things:

1. Replace punitive and confiscatory taxation with reasonable taxation, equitable taxation, more general taxation.

2. Repeal the present 15-percent tax-exempt provision for charitable gifts in the Federal income-tax law and make all such gifts exempt from Federal income taxes.

It is high time we came out of our cloistered walls and dealt with causes instead of effects; that we cease to use unjust and discriminatory tax laws to pry contributions from those who would be most generous if given the opportunity.

If the treasurers and business offices of the private colleges and universities will accept the responsibility for leading this movement—and it is a grave responsibility—it can and will be successful. But inert millions of voters must become dynamic—yes, even militant—before their voices will be heard in legislative and congressional halls. But once aroused they can win, for no "ism" or schism, no political machine, or combination of selfish interests, can ignore them, let alone fight them.

Mr. President, there is nothing more to add. We must tackle this colossal task as a unit and win. To do less would prove that we are unworthy of our heritage. We dare not sit supinely by and expect our descendants on some distant day to point with pride to a granite shaft erected as a memorial to our once splendid private institutions, on which is engraved "Born of freedom—died of taxation!"

My Mother—A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

PRAYER BY TOM DILLON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[Extract from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1914]

MY MOTHER—A PRAYER

(By Tom Dillon)

For the body you gave me, the bone and the sinew, the heart, and the brain that are yours, my mother, I thank you. I thank you for the light in my eyes, the blood in my veins, for my speech, for my life, for my being. All that I am is from you who bore me.

For all the love that you gave me, unmeasured from the beginning, my mother, I thank you. I thank you for the hand that led me, the voice that directed me, the breast that nestled me, the arm that shielded me, the lap that rested me. All that I am is by you, who nursed me.

For your smile in the morning and your kiss at night, my mother, I thank you. I thank you for the tears you shed over me, the songs that you sung to me, the prayers you said for me, for your vigils and ministerings. All that I am is by you, who reared me.

For the faith you had in me, the hope you had for me, for your trust and your pride, my mother, I thank you. I thank you for your praise and your chiding, for the justice you bred into me, and the honor you made mine. All that I am you taught me.

For the sore travail that I caused you, for the visions and despairs, my mother, forgive me. Forgive me the peril I brought you to, the sobs and the moans I wrung from you, and for the strength I took from you, mother, forgive me.

For the fears I gave you, for the alarms and the dreads, my mother, forgive me. Forgive me the joys I deprived you, the toils I made for you, for the hours, the days, and the years I claimed from you, mother, forgive me.

For the times that I hurt you, the times I had no smile for you, the caresses I did not give you, my mother, forgive me. Forgive me for my angers and revolts, for my deceits and evasions, for all the pangs and sorrows I brought to you, mother, forgive me.

For your lessons I did not learn, for your wishes I did not heed, for the counsels I did not obey, my mother, forgive me. Forgive me my pride in my youth and my glory in my strength that forgot the holiness of your years and the veneration of your weakness, for my neglect, for my selfishness, for all the great debts of your love that I have not paid, mother, sweet mother, forgive me.

And may the peace and the joy that passeth all understanding be yours, my mother, forever and ever. Amen.

Emmett Marshall Owen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EMMETT MARSHALL OWEN, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is not a platitude or trite eulogy to say that the subject of our encomiums was a remarkable man.

Mr. OWEN was an affable, courtly gentleman of the old school; tolerant, understanding; ever exhibiting a thorough respect for the rights of others.

I am sure that nobody who served with our honorable dead in this Hall failed to admire his inordinate modesty and self-effaciveness, especially when it was so well known that he was well equipped educationally and temperamentally to engage in either rough-and-tumble or placid debate in any forum.

Mr. OWEN's life, character, and public service have been so thoroughly covered by others who knew him better than I that I could not do much more than repeat in different form that which has been so truthfully and beautifully expressed.

Mr. OWEN served 4 years in the Georgia Legislature, 24 years as a solicitor for various Georgia judicial districts, and almost 6 years as a Member of the Congress. Such long service in elective offices is indeed a fitting testimonial for any man.

Let us believe, in spite of repeated utterances of irresponsible critics of the membership of the Congress and others in public life, that continuous public service, with a persistent and relentless calcium light of publicity beating down upon public servants, is unmistakable evidence of good character and true merit.

This good man leaves a memory to be cherished and honored among all who knew him, and especially among us who had the privilege of serving with him in high position in a mercurial, difficult era that exacts much strength of mind and body.

Science and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of the President of the United States to the Eighth American Scientific Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow servants of the Americas, all of the men and women of this Pan American Scientific Congress have come here tonight with heavy hearts. During the past few years we have seen event follow event, each and every one of them a shock to our hopes for the peaceful development of modern civilization. This very day three more independent nations have been cruelly invaded by force of arms.

In some human affairs the mind of man grows accustomed to unusual actions if they are oft repeated. This is not so in the world happenings of today—and I am proud that it is not so. I am glad that we are shocked and angered by the tragic news from Belgium and The Netherlands and Luxemburg.

The overwhelmingly greater part of the population of the world abhors conquest and war and bloodshed—prays that the hand of neighbor shall not be lifted against neighbor. The whole world has seen attack follow threat on so many occasions and in so many places during these later years. We have come, therefore, to the reluctant conclusion that a continuance of these processes of arms presents a definite challenge to the continuation of the type of civilization to which all of us in the three Americas have been accustomed.

OLD WORLD AT WAR

I use this Pan American Scientific Congress as one of many similar illustrations. It is no accident that this meeting takes place in the New World. In fact, this hemisphere is now almost the only part of the earth in which such a gathering can take place. Elsewhere war or politics has compelled teachers and scholars to leave their great calling and to become agents of destruction.

We and most people in the world believe in a civilization of construction and not of destruction. We and most people in the world believe that men and women have an inherent right to hew out the patterns of their own individual lives, just so long as they as individuals do not harm their fellow beings. We call this by many synonymous terms—individual liberty, civil liberty, democracy.

Until now we permit ourselves by common consent to search for truth, to teach the truth as we see it—and by learning a little here and a little there, and teaching a little here and a little there, to allow the normal processes of truth to keep growing for the well-being of our fellow men. In our search and in our teaching we are a part of a great adventure—an exciting adventure—which gives to us a larger satisfaction even than did the adventure of settling the Americas give to our founding fathers. We feel that we are building human progress by conquering disease and poverty and discomfort, and by improving science and culture, removing one by one the cruelty, the crudity, and the barbarism of less civilized eras.

MINDS REGIMENTED

In contrast, in other parts of the world, teachers and scholars are not permitted to search for truth lest the truth, when made known, might not suit the designs of their masters. Too often they are not allowed to teach the truth as they see it, for truth might make men free. They become objects of suspicion if they speak openly, if they show an interest in new truth, for their very tongues and minds are supposed to be mobilized for other ends.

This has not happened in the New World. God willing, it shall not happen in the New World.

At the Pan American Conference at Buenos Aires, and again at Lima, we discussed a dim and unpleasant possibility. We feared that other continents might become so involved in wars brought on by the school of destruction that the Americas might have to become the guardian of western culture, the protector of Christian civilization.

In these days it was merely a fear. Today the fear has become a fact.

A LEGACY TO GUARD

The inheritance which we had hoped to share with every nation in the world is, for the moment, left largely in our keeping; and it is our compelling duty to guard and enrich that legacy, to preserve it for a world which must be reborn from the ashes of the present disaster.

Today we know that until recent weeks too many citizens of the American republics believed themselves wholly safe—physically, and economically, and socially—from the impact of the attacks on civilization which are in progress elsewhere. Perhaps this mistaken idea was based on the false teaching of geography—the thought that a distance of several thousand miles from a war-torn Europe gave to us some form of mystic immunity which could never be violated.

Yet, speaking in terms of timetables, in terms of the moving of men and guns and planes and bombs, every acre—every hectare—of the Americas from the Arctic to the Antarctic is closer to the homes of modern conquerors and the scenes of attacks in Europe than was the case in historic efforts to dominate the world in bygone centuries. From the point of view of conquests, it is a shorter distance from the center of Europe to Santiago de Chile than it was for the chariots of Alexander to roll from Macedonia to Persia. In modern terms it is a shorter distance from Europe to San Francisco than it was for the ships and legions of Caesar to move from Rome to Spain or Britain. Today it is 4 or 5 hours from the continent of Africa to the continent of South America, where it was 4 or 5 weeks for the armies of Napoleon to move from Paris to Rome or Paris to Poland.

INVENTIONS MISUSED

You who are scientists may be told that you are responsible because of the processes of invention for the annihilation of time

and space, but I assure you that it is not the scientists of the world who are responsible, because the objectives which you have had have looked toward closer and more peaceful relations between all nations through the spirit of cooperation and the interchange of knowledge. What has come about has been caused solely by those who would use, and are using, your inventions of peace in a wholly different cause—those who seek to dominate hundreds of millions of people in vast continental areas—those who, if successful in that aim will, we must now admit, enlarge their wild dream to encompass every human being and every mile of the earth's surface.

The great achievements of science and even of art can be used to destroy as well as create; they are only instruments by which men try to do the things they most want to do. If death is desired, science can do that. If a full life is sought, science can do that also. Happily for us that question is solved—for in the New World we live for each other and in the service of a Christian faith.

ISSUE FOR AMERICAS

Is this solution—our solution—permanent or safe if it is solved for us alone? That, it seems to me, is the most immediate issue that the Americas face. Can we continue our peaceful construction if all the other continents embrace by preference or by compulsion a wholly different principle of life?

Surely it is time for our republics to spread that problem before us in the cold light of day, to analyze it, to ask questions, to demand answers, to use every knowledge, every science we possess, to apply common sense, and especially to act with unanimity and singleness of purpose.

I am a pacifist. You, my fellow citizens of 21 American republics, are pacifists.

But I believe that by overwhelming majorities you and I, in the long run and if it be necessary, will act together to protect and defend by every means our science, our culture, our freedom, and our civilization.

A Party To Be Trusted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WALLACE BEFORE IOWA DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, before the Iowa Democratic State Convention at Des Moines, Iowa, on May 11, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This convention—this Iowa Democratic convention—is a challenge and an inspiration.

A challenge because it gives the Democratic Party the opportunity to show the American people the safe and sane road to travel for the years to come.

An inspiration because it personifies 7 years of national accomplishment under the New Deal.

Time blurs many things, but it cannot wipe out recollection of the misery which Republican mismanagement, indecision, and defeatism brought to the American people in the early thirties.

Neither can it blur the memories of the multitudes who were hungry in the cities, of the farmers who were forced off their farms, of the bank depositors who lost their money, of the businessmen who went bankrupt. For millions of men and women it cannot blur the memory of the paralyzing fear that gripped their hearts.

The American people remember how in that hour of need there appeared a man of vision, wisdom, and courage; a man who knew the road and could steer a straightforward course; a man who loved the humble and weak as well as the thrifty and capable; a man of strength who could face and conquer difficulties which to most men seem unconquerable.

The country cannot forget the tragic need of 8 years ago. Nor can it forget the return of hope and then the determination and confidence that were the gift and are the continuing achievement of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Calm of voice and clear of eye, this man gave new heart to a faltering people. Fearless and tireless, he took the lead in restoring our sacred rights, in rebuilding our well-loved American institutions, in spreading comfort and happiness where there had been hunger and want.

The American people got over their panic. They rejected the "defeatism" of the Republican regime. They joined forces with a Democratic administration, which put through a far-reaching program of reconstruction and reform.

Placing the guarantee of the Government itself behind the safety of the banks, we have reassured millions of depositors. The crash of failing banks is no longer heard.

Setting up machinery to enforce new standards of financial honesty, we have given back to investors a confidence they had lost.

Establishing a long-needed system of social security, we have brought protection to the worker against unemployment and old age.

We have taken action to conserve our natural resources, which were fast disappearing through exploitation and neglect. Thus we have saved the fundamental basis of our wealth.

We have established a system of economic democracy on the farm, and have given our farmers at last a chance to work together to achieve equality.

Acting to assure fair standards for labor, we have outlawed the sweatshop and have begun to curb the labor spy.

We have reduced the interest burden on the farm and on the home. The old deal stands for high interest rates. The New Deal stands for low interest rates.

By spreading purchasing power to the roots of our economic life we have reopened markets and brought thousands of business concerns out of the red. Better business brought more jobs and higher wages to millions.

We have shown all the world that as a nation we know how to be a friend. Our good-neighbor policy was beginning to thaw out the frozen channels of international trade when this tragic war came on.

We have worked actively for peace. We have forbidden our ships to enter the troubled waters of Europe. We have kept our Nation out of war.

But friendly as we are, we know we must be watchful. We have made a start toward fortifying this Western Hemisphere as an impregnable citadel of democracy.

More important than all these accomplishments, the New Deal has restored the American spirit to the American people.

All this has been done in the last 7 years. For farmers, for labor, for business—for the whole American people—the New Deal has been an honest deal.

But the old deal, which wants to come back to power, is a double deal. There are two decks of cards, and you have to look close to see which deck is being dealt.

Here are some examples of what I mean. When the Republican bosses want to lure the Midwest vote, they deal a card out of one pack. They select a youthful Governor from Minnesota to be their keynote speaker. That will help them to put up a front. But the card that really counts isn't dealt from that pack at all. The card that really counts is the selection of Mr. Ernest T. Weir, one of the potentates of the Republican Old Guard, of Pennsylvania, to raise the money. Mr. Weir will get the money from his Old Guard friends. And all of us know that the men who put up the money are the men who will call the tune.

Here is another example. One of the candidates for the Republican nomination is Mr. Frank Gannett, who among other things publishes a farm paper that circulates in the Northeast. Mr. Gannett's farm paper on March 30 attacked the farm program on the ground that it favored the farmers of the Middle West. His paper said that feed prices were too high for the eastern farmers to pay. But what did Mr. Gannett himself tell the farmers of the Middle West 6 days later? In a speech in Nebraska he reached for a card in the other pack. Farm prices, he declared, were much too low and should immediately be raised.

Mr. Gannett's tactics are typical Republican tactics, always telling the farmers of one section that the farmers of some other section are getting the best of them, always trying to set group against group. By dividing the country against itself, the Old Guard hopes to conquer.

But the Republican who has more ability than anyone else in dealing from two decks of marked cards at the same time is Thomas E. Dewey, of New York. He showed his ability as a sleight-of-hand expert in taking two directly opposite stands on foreign policy. He made a speech in New York City on January 20 which seemed to place him squarely behind a policy of participation in world affairs. That was a card out of one pack. But when he came out to the Middle West, he didn't deal that card. When he spoke in Milwaukee on March 29, he dealt an isolationist card. So you can take your choice as to which card you think he really means to play.

Then, just a week ago today, Mr. Dewey came out to Marshalltown, Iowa, and used his two decks of cards to play both sides of the farm issue. He said he was for parity prices for farmers, reasonable crop loans, soil conservation, submarginal land purchase, encouragement of cooperatives, use of agricultural products in industry, and the American market for the American farmer. This sounds fine. It sounds as if Mr. Dewey is for absolutely everything we have been doing during the past 7 years. But does Mr. Dewey really mean it?

Take parity prices, for example. If Mr. Dewey stands for the parity which has already been established by Congress, how does he propose to bring it to pass? He says he wants to balance the budget, so he evidently wants to cut down on farm appropriations. He must have some other plan in mind. But what is it? Does he support processing taxes? Is he for the certificate plan? Is he for price fixing?

He says crop loans should not be used as "a device for fixing prices or achieving parity." He wants them at "reasonable levels." But what does that mean? The men in the grain trade who will be enthusiastically supporting Mr. Dewey if he is the nominee will be sure his statement means 25 cents a bushel or less.

"More purchase of submarginal land," says Dewey. We have already bought 25,000,000 acres of land at a total cost of $100,000,000. Would Dewey spend more than this?

"The American market for the American farmer," cries Dewey. Does he realize that between 1929 and 1932 the Smoot-Hawley tariff increased the American farmers' share in the home market from 90 to 93 percent, while at the same time the farmers' income was cut down by $7,000,000,000? Does Dewey want to do this again?

Dewey claims to be an expert on corn and hogs and says that the cotton program has increased the corn acreage of the South. Dewey must have gotten his figures from the Chicago Tribune. The truth is that in the 12 Southern States the corn acreage in 1939 was one and one-third million acres less than in 1932. He calls this "complete failure." He fails to mention that the cottonseed oil produced by the average acre of cotton is equivalent to the lard in a 200-pound hog, and if there has been as many acres planted in cotton in 1939 as there were in 1932, we should have had on the fat market of the United States increased competition amounting to the lard of 15,000,000 head of hogs.

Dewey speaks of the lard exports last year being only half of what they were in 1932 and calls this "New Deal bungling." The truth is that Germany, ordinarily our second largest lard market, was completely out of the export picture in 1939. Is there anything Mr. Dewey could have done about this? It is also true that in 1939 the value of our lard exports to Cuba—our third largest lard market—was more than three times as great as in 1932. That was directly a result of our Cuban trade agreement.

From all that Mr. Dewey has said so far, I am convinced that his farm program, if it had been in effect during the past 2 or 3 years, would have given hog prices at the present time at least a dollar or two a hundred lower than they actually are. Twenty-five-cent corn inevitably means $3 hogs a year or two later.

Dewey and the other Republican leaders have been making claims about the 7 Republican years that preceded the 7 Democratic years. Here are the facts: During the 7 Democratic years, farm families had an income that would buy 5 percent more, on the average, than in those 7 Republican years. Even on the basis of their own comparison, the Republicans come out behind. But remember that during the last 4 of those 7 Republican years, farmers and the Nation were sliding downhill. The fact is that in 1939 the farmers could buy 72 percent more than they could in the last year of Republican reign, and were within 1 percent of being as well off as in 1929.

Under the New Deal farm program farmers are cooperating with each other and with their Government to save their soil, stabilize their production, protect their prices, insure their crops, store their surpluses against a time of need, eliminate marketing waste, build up cooperative credit, put their abundance to use, check farm tenancy, and preserve the family-size farm. For the farmers, the New Deal has been like a burst of sunny spring after a long, dark winter.

It is amusing to note the way in which Republican candidates for President have felt it necessary during the past 5 years to stop off in Iowa to say uncomplimentary things about the farm program. Landon stopped in Iowa several different times in his 1936 campaign. In the current campaign Taft, Dewey, and Gannett have already shown how deep is their interest in winning the Iowa farmer and how great is their ignorance concerning him. Candidates catering to the big interests believe that the power of the farm program is derived in considerable measure from the steadfastness of the Iowa farmer. Unfortunately for these candidates, farmers understand the farm program better than they do.

Dewey's Marshalltown speech showed that while he seems to favor the different parts of the farmers' program, he is really making their program the object of a most vicious attack.

He is following the example of most of his Republican rivals for the Presidential nomination.

Senator TAFT says the farmers' program is based on a suicide theory.

Senator VANDENBERG calls it a "menace not only to the farmer's individual liberty but also to the preservation of free political institutions."

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN has called it a "demonstrated failure."

Frank Gannett says it is leading to a "totalitarian state."

Every one of these Old Guard Republicans loves to attack the farm program when he's dealing out of his Old Guard deck. Out of that deck they deal to their rich campaign contributors and promise them a reduction in taxes. Just how they can run the farm program without cost remains a double-deal secret. And no matter how many cards they may show from their fake New Deal deck, you can always be sure it is the Old Guard deck they will play.

Not one Republican speaker is specific about anything. Every one of them views with alarm everything the New Deal has done. Not one of them advocates eliminating any specific New Deal achievement. All of them would cut expenditures. Not one of them mentions specifically what items he would eliminate.

But next fall the voters will have a chance to choose. And if they really understand the issues there is no doubt what their decision will be. They will again reject the double deal of the Republicans and choose the honest deal of the Democrats.

There is one reason especially why next fall's election will be vital. That reason is the tremendous importance to American agriculture, American business, and American labor, of what happens abroad within the next few years and what we in this country do about our relation to the rest of the world.

When the present war comes to an end, our farmers are almost certain to have a problem more difficult than anything they have faced yet. England and France are now using up their dollar exchange for munitions and airplanes. After the war, they will find it impossible to lay hands on enough dollars to buy the quantities of American farm products they were accustomed to buy before this war began.

Unless the American people indicate a very great interest in working together with other nations of the world in reducing trade barriers and reestablishing freely moving international currencies, it is obvious that American agriculture will have before it an even greater need of readjustment to a reduced world demand than it had following the first World War.

England and France are going to be buying farm products, first from within their own empires, and second, from countries like Argentina, which are willing to accept industrial products in exchange for farm products. The United States, because it is a creditor nation, will inevitably be last on the list.

The problem of the war and of the peace is extremely serious. We shall face the need of making further adjustments, either in the foreign field or in the agricultural field at home. This job will require a President who understands both the foreign field and the agricultural field.

When we look at the existing set-up in the Republican Party, we find neither vision nor intelligent grasp of underlying problems.

The Republican leaders say they are in favor of increased exports of American farm and industrial products. They know, or they ought to know, that our exports can be paid for by our foreign customers only in American dollars. But where are those foreign customers going to get the American dollars to buy our wheat, our lard, our cotton, our automobiles? Can they get dollars by selling us their own goods? The Republicans are dead against letting in any imports. Can our customers get dollars by arranging for American credits? The Republicans, after their disastrous foreign-loan policy of the twenties, are against foreign loans now. Can our customers get dollars by selling us their gold? The Republicans don't like our gold-buying policy and have tried their best to kill it. They want to close every door that would make it possible for us to stay in the export market.

What is the answer? No prospective Republican candidate seems to know. But we Democrats do know. We know that the world, including the United States, can never return to sane trade relations and a maximum of free enterprise unless there is an intelligent world settlement. This intelligent world settlement will have to deal with trade barriers, with currencies, with access to raw materials, with stabilization of markets, with credits, and with gold. Then, and then only, can the "free enterprise" which the Republicans cherish so devoutly with their lips and ravish so destructively with their deeds, be made a reality.

Our Democratic Party, in contrast with the muddled thinking and double dealing of the Republicans, has a straightforward appeal to make to the voters. We don't have to say one thing in the East and another in the West, one thing in the North and another in the South, because our programs and our policies are honestly conceived, zealously executed, and written in action for all to see. Our programs and our policies do not split region from region and group from group. They are based on the general welfare, which is the sum of the welfare of every region and every group.

The Republicans lack real leaders, but our Democratic Party has been exceedingly fortunate in its leadership during the last 8 years.

No man has available for the service of the Nation such a unique combination of qualities as Franklin D. Roosevelt. No man so completely understands the twists and turns and tricks of European politics. No man is so familiar with the needs and methods of national defense. No man is more anxious to keep this country out of war.

After having seen my father wrestle with Presidents unfriendly to agriculture, I can testify that Franklin D. Roosevelt is more friendly to agriculture than any other man who ever sat in the White House. He has always backed me up when I really needed help. More than any other President, Roosevelt has had personal experience in the production of a great variety of farm commodities—cotton, dairy products, fruit, timber, corn, wheat, and so on.

He has proved himself to be a real friend of agriculture, labor, and business.

With the emergency as it is today, we should hate to face the thought of giving up the services of such an outstanding leader who we know can lead us to victory. I do not say others cannot lead us to victory. I do say that if the President should make himself unavailable, the man who makes the race must stand for the Roosevelt New Deal.

During the past 7 years the Democratic Party has developed and trained a dozen or more men, any one of whom is more competent than any Republican leader who has a chance of nomination for the Presidency.

But whatever the future holds we know the Democratic Party must be united to win in November of 1940. It must and will have the enthusiastic support of Roosevelt and the thousands of leaders and workers who have made the New Deal Democratic Party the instrument of statesmanlike progress. On this enthusiastic unity depends the welfare not only of the United States but of the whole world.

Our Democratic Party has proved it is a party which in a crisis can be trusted. Not once has our Democratic administration sought to solve a difficult problem by calling out the troops and setting the torch to the dwellings of the unfortunate. Not once in nearly 8

years of national responsibility has our Democratic administration sacrificed the ways of democracy, even though they sometimes are slow and cumbersome. We have made democracy work in all our programs.

With leadership that is intelligent, that is devoted to the public good, our Nation can face with confidence whatever the future holds. That kind of leadership can be trusted. It is the leadership of an honest deal instead of a double deal. And that is the kind of leadership the Democratic Party offers to the Nation in the history-making years that lie ahead. That is the reason the Democratic Party will win in 1940.

Seventy-Five Years of Negro Progress Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Seventy-Five Years of Negro Progress Exposition at Detroit, Mich., on May 12, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I need not tell you how happy I am to be with you today and to be privileged to see this splendid exposition celebrating 75 years of Negro achievement. As James A. Farley, a representative of our National Government, and as Jim Farley, a citizen, I congratulate you most sincerely.

At Tukegee Institute, Alabama, on April 7, I had the pleasure of dedicating a commemorative stamp in the famous American series of postage stamps bearing the likeness of the distinguished educator and leader of his people, Booker T. Washington, the first Negro in the history of America to be paid that well-deserved tribute. His great contribution to humanity is recognized by all the world. Last week I also dedicated a stamp in honor of Stephen C. Foster in the Old Kentucky Home. Probably no American has done more than this famous composer to bring to our people the realization of the home-loving, loyal, and spiritual nature of the Negro.

Stephen Foster is commemorated and loved generations after his death because he wrote of the elemental values of life; of the Swanee River, the Old Folks at Home; of good will to men, which makes a brotherhood of all men. It took a Stephen C. Foster to give all America those immortal melodies, and it took the Negro race to give all America the immortal characters about which he wrote.

I believe that this exposition, with its many impressive exhibits, showing the development of Negro culture over the past three-quarters of a century, fills a great need in America. On the one hand, it enables the Negro people to take stock of their genuine advancement in the face of obvious difficulty. On the other hand, it reveals to all Americans the nature and magnitude of the contributions of our Negro citizens. It shows, furthermore, that the dreams and the aspirations of the Negro people, their striving toward higher goals, are something that we all share in common.

The history of the Negro race in America, while not entirely an epic of unmitigated suffering, is largely the history of a people's brave and heroic struggle. Against their will, and without knowledge of the place they were to occupy in America, their ancestors were forcibly brought to what was practically a barren wilderness. It was their job to clear the land for the future cities, the factories, the homes, and the farms of America. We are fortunate in recent years that the historian, especially Carter G. Woodson, has brought the many achievements of the American Negro to the attention of the public.

We Americans are very proud of our Revolutionary War—and justly so. It was the beginning of our evolution as a democracy. If we go back to the eve of the Revolution we find that a Negro, Crispus Attucks, was the first American citizen to fall in the Boston massacre. A statue to his memory has been erected on Boston Common commemorating his patriotism.

During the Revolution many Negro slaves volunteered as infantrymen and were highly respected for their bravery and unfaltering loyalty. From Haiti came other Negroes—men who had themselves revolted against earlier tyranny and oppression—to help the Colonies win their independence. It is noteworthy that one of the most gracious tributes ever paid to George Washington, the Father of his Country, came from the pen of a Negro woman, Phillis Wheatley, a woman who came to America as a slave and lived to become one of the outstanding literary figures of her day.

Many Negroes served with distinction in the War of 1812, including several Detroit Negro slaves who fought side by side with their masters. The same is true of the Mexican War. During the Civil War we find Negroes—both men and women—entering the conflict which was to resolve not only the question of their freedom but, in a sense, that of all the workers of America.

I have just seen a statue of Frederick Douglass in the Negro Hall of Fame. I wish I had the time to tell you of the spiritual stature of this man, his penetrating and daring mind, and his amazing resourcefulness. From a slave, Frederick Douglass rose to the eminent leadership of his people and was recognized by frequent appointment to high public office.

Another heroic personality of this period was Sojourner Truth, a legendary figure who traveled the country over preaching the iniquity of slavery. She also served in the Civil War, and during the days of reconstruction worked among the freedmen. Michigan can be proud of the fact that she spent the last 20 years of her life in nearby Battle Creek. She was a great and good woman.

During the reconstruction educated Negroes led the movement to rehabilitate their people. Foremost among them were, again, Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth; also Blanche Kelso Bruce, who became a United States Senator, and whose knowledge and insight into the burning issues of his day enabled him to render a definite service to his country.

In the Spanish-American War and in the World War our Negro soldiers distinguished themselves by their loyalty, their endurance, and their ability as fighting men. And let me say right here that if this Nation is ever called upon again to protect our rights and defend our liberty against a foreign invader the American Negro will be among the very first to respond.

In promoting his advancement some people may say, "But the Negro did not do all these things by himself; he had plenty of help." Of course, it is true that the Negro did not make all his progress through his own efforts. None of us do. But it is also true that, given even a degree of help and guidance, the American Negro has been able to forge ahead. You cannot help anyone who refuses to meet you halfway. But it must be said to his definite credit that the American Negro has eagerly proceeded more than halfway in every movement designed to promote the advancement of his race.

During and after the troubled days of the reconstruction, the lot of the American Negro was like that of an orphan. Society provided no place for him. No particular attention was paid to his problem. No attempt on a national scale was made to alleviate his condition. Today, this American citizen, brought here against his will and turned loose from slavery without resources, without a place to call his own, is often the victim of all the evils in American society. Too frequently, he has been pushed to the outer rim of our economy.

He has migrated in large numbers from the sharecropper districts of the South to the industrial centers of the North, only to face the same economic forces from which he fled. Here he is often given the worst houses in which to live and charged the highest rentals. There is a growing sentiment in some quarters that the Negro is the last to be hired for employment and the first to be fired. Yet the Negro has contributed a full measure of devotion to his country. He has fought valiantly in the American wars. He has never been a traitor to his country or committed any act bringing dishonor to his flag, and he never will.

It is most significant that the favorable changes in Negro life have been wrought under the leadership of liberals in the broadest meaning of that term. Only in times of this kind of leadership has the chart of his progress shown a consistently upward curve. Thomas Jefferson, the father of American liberal government, freed his own slaves. Jefferson's precedent was later followed on a magnificent scale by Abraham Lincoln, whose Emancipation Proclamation was the salvation for millions. But after the glorious, humanitarian work of Lincoln, the liberal, little or nothing was done for the Negro until a new era of liberalism for all Americans came into existence under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Negro himself played a strategic role in this political revival. Though for many years traditionally a Republican, the Negro shook off his yoke of blind partisanship. It was with his important help that this Nation put into the White House a new leader of liberalism. That man and his wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, a great American in her own right, have indeed often proven themselves the friend of the Negro. I take personal satisfaction in thanking the American Negro for his indispensable aid in restoring liberal government once more to the American people.

What it means to have a liberal government is demonstrated by a recent decision written by Justice Hugo Black of the Supreme Court of the United States in a notorious Florida case. I think it fitting on this occasion to read a passage from the opinion in this historic case.

"Under our constitutional system, courts stand against any winds that blow as havens of refuge for those who might otherwise suffer because they are helpless, weak, outnumbered, or because they are nonconforming victims of prejudice and public excitement.

"Due process of law, preserved for all by our Constitution, commands that no such practice as that disclosed by this record shall send any accused to his death.

"No higher duty, no more solemn responsibility, rests upon this Court than that of translating into living law and maintaining this constitutional shield deliberately planned and inscribed for the benefit of every human being subject to our Constitution—of whatever race, creed, or persuasion."

Only under a truly democratic government aware of the needs and rights of all the people could such a decision have been made. Furthermore, my friends, the decision of Justice Black offers conclusive proof that the true southerner does not subscribe to the rule of intolerance, prejudice, and injustice. My own record in my home State, New York, and my record in Washington as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and as Postmaster General will bear out the fact that I give no quarter to religious or racial intolerance. I am looking forward to the day—and that day is coming, if it is not already here—when we can expunge such evils from the record of our national life.

The Negro people themselves are doing their part in bringing about better race relations. This 75 Years of Negro Progress Exposition is one way of accomplishing the task. No one can look at these products of Negro genius, culture, and enterprise displayed in this hall without realizing how thoroughly this group of Americans has interwoven itself into our national life and how valuable have been its many gifts to America.

The distinguished contributions of Marian Anderson, Paul Robeson, Bill Robinson, Dr. George Washington Carver, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Dr. Frederick Patterson, and many other outstanding figures of the Negro race are a moving force for improving race relations and stimulating closer interracial harmony and cooperation. The Negro citizen himself, by his patriotism, his industry, his patience, and his progress, is also making his contribution.

All America has accepted the Negro as an essential factor in the success of our democracy. There can be no true democracy unless all the people are considered and protected alike by the Government. A house divided against itself cannot stand. We are either going to have a democracy, where all men have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or we are going to have a restricted social order. I do not believe that the latter will ever gain a foothold in this Nation.

Together, black and white, Americans all, we are going to justify the blood that was shed for the preservation of our country on Boston Common and Bunker Hill, at Fort Wagner, and at Gettysburg. This is the American way. For us there can be no other. For all Americans there can be no blackout of the rights of any American.

Condemnation by Pope Pius XII of Attack on Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAMES M. MINIFIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Pope Condemns Nazi Attack on Low Countries."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940]

POPE CONDEMNS NAZI ATTACK ON LOW COUNTRIES—PUTS CHURCH BEHIND THEIR FIGHT IN NOTES TO RULERS; ITALY WON'T PRINT NEWS

(By James M. Minifie)

ROME, May 11.—Pope Pius XII intervened today to throw the weight of the Catholic Church into the scales on behalf of Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg, the latest victims of German aggression. In messages to the rulers of those three states the Pope declared that he was profoundly moved and that he prayed God their liberty and independence would be reestablished by the successful result of the struggle forced on their peoples "against their will and their right."

The Pope thus alined himself and the moral and spiritual power of the Catholic Church in Italy and throughout the world against Germany and by implication against the Berlin-Rome axis and the Fascist policy of supporting the Reich in its aggression.

It is a decisive step, recognized universally here to be of the greatest significance, and it proves that the concordat between the Vatican and Italy has not bound the Vatican to the wheels of the Fascist chariot.

ITALIAN PAPERS OMIT NEWS

Italian newspapers found the Pope's action so little to their taste that they did not print a word of the messages or even mention the fact that they had been sent. Nor were they mentioned on the Italian radio. The Vatican paper L'Osservatore Romano published them on the front page and in bold-face type.

The Pope's message to King Leopold III of the Belgians crossed an appeal by the King for the Pope's moral support which arrived by telegram at the Vatican this morning. The Pope's messages were sent out last night and made public about noon today.

King Leopold's appeal said: "In violation of formal and repeated pledges to respect Belgian neutrality, and despite our attitude of absolute loyalty, Germany has brutally attacked Belgium, without warning. My country, respecting its honor and true to its word, is defending itself with all its strength. I take the liberty of asking Your Holiness, head of the Catholic Church, to support with your high moral authority the cause for which we are fighting with invincible determination."

The Pope's message to King Leopold, which had left the Vatican at least 12 hours before the King's appeal was received, was a moving and heartening blessing upon the Belgian Nation. "When," it said, "for the second time, against its will and its right, the Belgian Nation sees its territory exposed to the cruelties of war, deeply moved we send to Your Majesty and to all of that beloved nation the assurance of our paternal affection. Praying Almighty God that His heavy trial be concluded by the reestablishment of full liberty and independence of Belgium, we grant with all our hearts to Your Majesty and to your people our apostolic benediction."

WARM MESSAGE TO DUTCH

Even more striking of its kind was the Pope's message to Queen Wilhelmina, of the Netherlands, since it was directed to a Protestant sovereign. On this account the formal apostolic benediction was not given, as it cannot be given to a non-Catholic, but there was no mistaking the warmth of the Pope's message. It was: "We learn with great emotion that Your Majesty's efforts for peace have not been able to preserve your noble people from becoming, contrary to their will and their right, the theater of a war. We pray God, arbiter of the destinies of nations, to hasten with His Almighty help the reestablishment of justice and liberty."

Similarly, to the Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxemburg, the Pope wrote: "In this sad moment in which the people of Luxemburg, despite their love of peace, are involved in the whirlpool of war, we feel our heart nearer to them. We implore Heaven for aid and protection, so that they may live in freedom and independence, and we grant to Your Royal Highness and to your faithful subjects our apostolic benediction."

Inequality Between Farm and Nonfarm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE PARSONS (KANS.) SUN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement printed in my own newspaper, the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, setting out the importance to the country of the inequality that has developed in the last 30 years between the farm and nonfarm income. I regard this as the most important economic problem before the Congress, and I think it contributes more than any other single thing to the great volume of unemployment. It is my belief that unemployment will not be taken care of until the farmer has been restored to a reasonable parity of income with his town and city neighbors.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of May 10, 1940]

FARM AND NONFARM INCOMES

The United States Chamber of Commerce meets in Washington annually. On May 1 the Kansas group of the United States Chamber of Commerce invited the Kansas Members of Congress to meet with them at dinner. That was done, and a good time was had by all.

The principal speaker for the Kansas group was an able, energetic, successful businessman. He knows his own business very well indeed and has the viewpoint of most men of his type. He started

a lot of discussion when he rather disparagingly referred to the attention which the Members of Congress from Kansas (and with whom could be included Members of other farm States) gave to the farm problem. His solution for Kansas difficulties was to industrialize the State.

The strong inference was that the farmer was a chronic grouch whose ills were more imaginary than real.

The Parsons Sun, on Tuesday, August 3, 1937, printed an editorial which is reproduced here:

"The farm problem is the disparity between the return to the farmer for his labor and the non-farm person's average income. That disparity is too great, and the extent of the disparity measures the importance of the problem which the country will have to solve.

"We know that there is a school of thought that assumes that the farmer is just a natural-born grouch and that his wails have no substantial foundation. That is why this is being written.

"Let us start with a quotation from Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, which is one of the half-dozen most accurate and conservative economic-research agencies of the Nation. Dr. Moulton wrote recently:

" 'It must also be recalled that farmers, as a class, have the lowest incomes of any important group. If we are to find adequate markets for the products of our industrial establishments the 54,000,000 people who live on the farms or in adjoining small towns obviously cannot be ignored.' "

The statement of Dr. Moulton may be taken as a starting point. The next question is the extent of the income deficiency for the farmer—as compared with his urban fellow citizen. This isn't so easy a question. There are statistics on the total national income, and the division of it, to some extent. Only recently have the figures showing farm and non-farm income, reducible to a per capita basis, become available."

The table which is printed at the bottom of this column is furnished by Dr. L. H. Bean, one of the foremost economists and statisticians of the country. He gives the result of his studies, based upon all available data, including that collected by various research institutions. Dr. Bean has been working on this subject for some recent years in addition to his regular duties with the department. In explaining the figures given in the several columns he says:

"It represents what farmers have available, after deducting production costs, for the purchase of food, clothing, rent, household goods, transportation, education, miscellaneous living costs, and savings. Comparable data for the non-farm population is also given."

In other words the gross farm income is taken as a basis and the production costs deducted. The nonfarm income is similarly treated. The result is to show the number of people in each broad classification and their income available for the purpose of meeting the cost of living and savings. The average reader will be startled by the disparity between what the farmer receives for his labor and management and the similar sum for the town worker and businessman. No thoughtful citizen can ignore the deep significance of these figures. They constitute the most important problem facing the Nation. In virtually every other land than ours the land is tilled by serfs or peasants. It will come to be so in this Nation, unless some remedy is found for the condition illustrated herein.

No informed writer, careful of his statements, would say that these figures are exactly correct. But that they set forth an approximation of the truth is not to be doubted and is not doubted by any student of this and allied questions. In all fairness it should be further said that some economists hold the opinion that these divisions do not entirely reflect a comparable basis as between living conditions and expenditures of the farm and the non-farm populations. Dr. Bean himself is inclined to concede that possibly the city-bought commodities are some 15 percent higher than the price paid by farmers and their families. But even if this allowance be made, the farmer and farm workers are tremendously underpaid as compared with their town and city brethren.

In the 5-year period before the World War, usually taken as a basis from which to start, the average farm income per capita available for living expenses was $141. Similar income for nonfarm population was $401. By 1932, the darkest year for American agriculture, the farm income had fallen to $60 per person, but the nonfarm income had risen to $479, nearly eight times as great for the city worker as for the farmer. Making all allowance for some error in calculations, this cannot be justified on any theory of governmental fairness. The farm problem is a problem which can only be solved by some degree of governmental policy action. It constitutes a problem preeminently important to the farm States, of which Kansas is one. No one man or group of men have all the answers to this problem. Maybe they haven't any of the answers. But that it constitutes a problem of the first magnitude no thinking citizen, who is informed, will dispute.

This problem will be with us, after even so good a year for agriculture as 1937 promises to be. This year will help the farmer a lot—but it will not solve the farm problem.

The only difference between what was said in these columns nearly 3 years ago and is being said now is that the figures up to and including 1939 are available and are given herewith. They show no relative improvement for agriculture in its relation to organized industry.

Farm and non-farm income available for living expenses

Year	Farm			Non-farm		
	Population	Income	Per capita	Population	Income	Per capita
1910–14 [1]	32,105,000	$4,518,000,000	$141	62,268,000	$25,690,000,000	$413
1925	30,830,000	7,426,000,000	241	83,205,000	65,852,000,000	791
1929	30,220,000	6,830,000,000	226	90,474,000	73,542,000,000	813
1930	30,169,000	5,115,000,000	170	92,328,000	68,456,000,000	741
1931	30,497,000	3,081,000,000	101	93,190,000	59,303,000,000	636
1932	30,971,000	1,804,000,000	58	93,608,000	46,551,000,000	497
1933	31,693,000	2,597,000,000	82	93,694,000	43,174,000,000	461
1934	31,770,000	3,376,000,000	106	94,464,000	49,164,000,000	520
1935	31,801,000	4,237,000,000	133	95,351,000	52,770,000,000	553
1936	31,809,000	5,123,000,000	161	96,215,000	61,599,000,000	640
1937	31,729,000	5,471,000,000	172	97,148,000	65,282,000,000	672
1938	31,819,000	4,451,000,000	140	97,999,000	60,236,000,000	615
1939	32,059,000	4,458,000,000	139	98,870,000	63,150,000,000	639

[1] Average.

Authority: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

In the nearly 30 years since the base period 1910–14 hourly wages of men engaged in industrial employment, mining, manufacturing, and transportation have increased from 100 to 200 percent. In other words, their present hourly wage is 200 to 300 percent of what it was 30 years ago. Whether their annual income has increased as much depends upon the number of hours worked per year. In most cases there has been a reduction in hours. For the last 10 years there has also been a great unemployment, greater than ever before in the history of our country.

The Sun has done, is doing, and will continue to do its part in helping additional industries to locate in Kansas with the hope they may be successful and add to the population and wealth of the State. But all that may be done in that direction is insignificant as to the general prosperity of Kansas in comparison with what a removal of the inequality between the farm and the non-farm income that has come about in the last 30 years would do for Kansas.

What the Sun said nearly 3 years ago (and which its editor has been saying for 20 years) is still good.

CLYDE M. REED.

President's Message to King Leopold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Roosevelt Tells King Leopold United States Hopes for Belgian Victory."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940]

ROOSEVELT TELLS KING LEOPOLD UNITED STATES HOPES FOR BELGIAN VICTORY

WASHINGTON, May 11.—President Roosevelt, answering an appeal from Leopold III, of Belgium, for moral support in Belgium's fight against the Nazi invasion, cabled the King today that the American people and their President hoped that policies of aggression would be arrested and that the Belgian people and their Government might preserve their integrity and freedom.

At the same time Mr. Roosevelt, acting under provisions of the Neutrality Act, proclaimed that a state of war existed between Germany on the one side and Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg on the other. In a series of accompanying proclamations and orders he moved to establish and enforce American neutrality in the situation.

King Leopold, in making his appeal for American sympathy, recalled the previous interest of the United States in Belgium and asked that it be continued. His message follows:

"Brutally attacked by Germany, which had entered into the most solemn engagements with her, Belgium will defend herself with all her strength against the invader. In these tragic hours which my country is undergoing, I am addressing myself to Your Excellency, who so often has demonstrated toward Belgium an affectionate interest, in the certainty that you will support with all of your moral authority the efforts which we are now firmly decided to make in order to preserve our independence.

"LEOPOLD."

President Roosevelt made the following answer:

His Majesty LEOPOLD III,

King of the Belgians, Brussels (Belgium):

I have received Your Majesty's telegram. As I stated in an address which I delivered last night to representatives of the 21 American republics, the cruel invasion by force of arms of the independent nations of Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg has shocked and angered the people of the United States and, I feel sure, their neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. The people of the United States hope, as do I, that policies which seek to dominate peaceful and independent peoples through force and military aggression may be arrested, and that the Government and people of Belgium may preserve their integrity and their freedom. As an old personal friend, I send you my warm personal regards.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

A World in Flames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A World in Flames."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1940]

A WORLD IN FLAMES

The wanton, simultaneous assault upon Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg, the unrestrained bombardment of open towns and civilians wherever it seems at the moment expedient, have now at length made it plain to the most reluctant mind that Hitler, and the German Army behind him, will literally stop at nothing. No matter what Hitler and his followers have done in the past, they have always been influential groups in the democracies to believe or hope that he would shrink before the last barbarities; that, if nothing else, opinion in his own or neutral countries would stop him from letting loose a war on all civilization that would spare neither the monuments of the past, historic cities or the homes and lives of peaceful civilians. Many have found it impossible hitherto to believe the testimony regarding the complete recklessness and irresponsibility, the moral insanity of the Nazi leaders, that have come to us from Rauschning and other observers. But now we know that they are true; and because of the awful instruments of power and destruction in the hands of these madmen, all the values of European civilization now hang in the balance.

The spectacular successes of the German arms until now also demonstrate how efficient a totalitarian regime can be for the purpose of conducting a war. The very end for which such a regime seizes power, in fact, is to turn a nation into an armed camp; to fasten military discipline and barrack-room mentality upon a whole people. Such a regime, because it does not take its own people into its confidence, or consult their wishes at all, can spring lightning surprises upon other nations. Against such an enemy the very virtues of the democracies appear as weaknesses. Their refusal to invade a helpless neutral even though they may know that the totalitarian enemy is planning a foothold there to be used against them; their need to consult all parties and elements in the population regarding the next step in any broad policy; their need to explain their failures or to admit their weaknesses to their own people, and hence, incidentally, to the enemy—all these put them at times under heavy handicaps in a war against nations fighting without rules or scruples.

Some of these weaknesses of democracy are inherent; it is merely necessary to remind ourselves, in considering them, that the processes of democracy are designed primarily for peace, not war. But the totalitarian countries have exposed other weaknesses in the democratic nations that are in no real sense inherent but abandonments of the very ideals for which democracies, as such, ought to stand. The democracies have been shockingly uninformed. They have been almost fatally complacent in the face of the growing menace of totalitarian armament. Men who were their titular leaders, instead of dealing candidly with their people, instead of impressing their people with the facts that they themselves had learned or were in a position to learn, have been in fact followers; they have expressed before the voters merely the opinions and sentiments that they believed the voters already to hold. "Supposing," as former Prime Minister Baldwin once put the matter with unintended candor—"that I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm, does anybody think that this pacific democracy would have rallied to that cry at that moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain."

Among the delusions destroyed in the last few days have been the last props under the arguments of the isolationists everywhere. Nothing has been shown to be more horribly false than the belief that a nation can remain at peace with security merely by an ostrichlike policy of minding its own business. Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg have all found themselves invaded despite the strictest neutrality and iron policies of noninvolvement. The first lesson in all this for ourselves is to reconsider immediately our own defenses. It will be a sad day for this Republic if the political candidates, simply because they think that that is the only thing our people want to hear, continue to tell us that what is happening in Europe is no concern of ours.

Administrative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM O. R. McGUIRE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from O. R. McGuire, chairman of the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association, published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 12, 1940, regarding the so-called Logan-Walter bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 12, 1940]

ATTORNEY TAKES ISSUE WITH COLUMNIST ON LOGAN-WALTER BILL—PURPOSE IS TO PREVENT THWARTING JUDICIAL REVIEW, HE WRITES

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The Logan-Walter administrative-law bill, which passed the House of Representatives recently with 282 Members in favor of it, as compared with 97 against it, is termed by Columnist Charles G. Ross in the Evening Star of May 8, 1940, as a "Court-packing scheme in reverse" and a device which would "subject the administrative branch to a court censorship as disruptive of the proper distribution of governmental powers as would have been the Court-packing proposal." He further says that this Logan-Walter bill would "give the courts an unprecedented and wholly unwarranted power over the day-to-day functioning of the affected agencies." These statements are such that issue must be taken with Mr. Ross.

The ill-fated Court-packing scheme, which I am glad to see that Mr. Ross apparently condemns, originated in the Federal bureaucracy. That bureaucracy is fighting the Logan-Walter bill. The Court-packing scheme was an attempt to enlarge the Supreme Court of the United States so as to provide places on the bench for sufficient additional judges in favor of certain administrative policies that there would be a pro-Government majority on that great Court large enough to reverse some decisions with which the bureaucracy did not agree. The time-honored and constitutional method of changing the Constitution and the statutes was not attempted, because it was claimed that the constitutional method was too slow, but the real fact of the matter was and is that the constitutional majorities could not be secured to support such a change, as was proven when the Court-packing scheme was condemned from one end of the country to the other and was defeated in the Congress.

ATTEMPTED TO SUBSTITUTE RULE

Instead of a rule of law, the Court-packing scheme attempted to substitute a rule of men, apparently upon the pattern of Nazi Germany, where the Court of Appeals at Breslau has stated in an opinion that:

"Today's constitution is dominated by the principle of political leadership. The courts have, therefore, no right to decide upon the legal validity of political acts of the administration. Any such decision would be incompatible with the order of the national socialist state."

This same political and administrative domination of the courts in Nazi Germany was expressed by the Reich law leader, Dr. Hans Frank, in an address of 1936 to the conference of German judges, as follows:

"The party program * * * is the guiding line for decision. * * * Say to yourself at every decision which you make: How would the leader (Adolf Hitler) decide in your place? In every decision to which you are obliged to ask yourselves: Is this decision compatible with the national socialist conscience of the German people?"

The American Bar Association and many State and local bar associations fought the Court-packing scheme to defeat. That same association and a large number of State and city bar associations, as well as national business, patriotic, and labor organizations, are supporting the Logan-Walter bill as vigorously as they fought the Court-packing scheme.

The Logan-Walter bill leaves the Federal administrative agencies just as free as they now are to execute, prosecute, and decide, provided always that they function within the terms of the Constitution and the statutes. Unless they travel outside the statutes, the judicial review provisions of the Logan-Walter bill will not touch them. Instead of attempting to substitute a rule of men, as might have been the effect of the Court-packing scheme, the Logan-Walter bill would insure a rule of law by compelling the army of administrative officers and employees to remain within the terms of the Constitution and the statutes. These men, servants of the people, have no reservoir of undefined power. They have no power except that conferred by statutes, and what the statutes have given they may take away or circumscribe, as the Congress may see fit. The Logan-Walter bill is indeed in this respect a Court-packing scheme in reverse.

QUOTATIONS DO NOT APPLY

Mr. Ross has quoted from a 1907 address by Chief Justice Hughes when he was Governor of New York, but the statements so quoted from the distinguished lawyer, judge, and administrator have not the slightest application to the issue involved in the Logan-Walter bill. Governor Hughes appears to have said:

"You must have administration, and you must have it by administrative officers. You cannot have it otherwise."

This statement is, of course, too true for argument, but as I have above stated the Logan-Walter bill does not attempt to have administration by the courts. Mr. Ross confuses administration or execution of the statutes with the exercise of wholly different powers—the power to legislate, through the issuance of rules and the power to judge, through the decision of particular controversies. The legislative power and the judicial power have been conferred by the Constitution on the Congress and the courts, respectively. It is merely a matter of convenience that the administrative agencies are permitted to exercise some legislative power as to the details of statutes and that they are permitted to judge in the first instance controversies which normally would be for decision by courts. Even the lone dissenting member from the Senate and House Judiciary Committee's reports in support of the Logan-Walter bill declared in his dissenting report that one administrative agency, which he named, "has overridden the plain intent of the basic statute creating it" and "has sought to legislate and replace Congress." He was equally critical of other named agencies.

PUTS US TO NEW TEST

Chief Justice Hughes stated in 1931 before the Federal Bar Association with respect to the judging power of administrative agencies that:

"The power of administrative bodies to make findings of facts which may be treated as conclusive, if there is evidence both ways, is a power of enormous consequence. An unscrupulous administrator might be tempted to say: "Let me find the facts for the people of my country, and I care little who lays down the general principles * * *." But these new methods put us to new tests, and the serious question of the future is whether we have enough of the old spirit which gave us our institutions to save them from being overwhelmed."

Former Judge and later Governor, Nathan L. Miller, of New York, stated in an address of July 2, 1938, before the New York Bar Association, that in proceedings before Federal administrative agencies:

"The decisive question involved is usually a question of fact. The members of these tribunals can observe the forms of due process and still get some evidence into the record to support what they have decided to do. Under the present practice they ought to score a hundred percent of affirmances. If they do not it can only be because of their contempt even for the forms of law. In fact, the present limited review is, as a rule, a vain and idle effort and gives their proceedings a purely fictitious appearance of fairness."

In exercising judicial power the administrative agencies should be required to observe a few basic principles of procedure as stated in the Logan-Walter bill, and the reviewing courts should have sufficient jurisdiction to prevent the administrative agencies from doing what Chief Justice Hughes and Governor Miller have stated that they could do—and which we lawyers with long experiences within and without the Federal service know that these administrative agencies do in some cases and may do in almost all of them.

There is no sound argument to support the conclusion that these agencies should be free to follow any general procedure they may see fit in reaching quasi-judicial determinations and that when they reach such determinations, they should not be reviewed by the courts to the extent that they have reviewed trial courts in equity, admiralty and law where the trial judge hears the case without a jury.

The crux of the opposition to this bill is in this provision which would widen the scope of judicial review to the extent that the trial courts are reviewed, but not to the extent that orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission are reviewed in reparation cases.

I commend to all the statement made by Governor Miller in the above-referred-to address that there are men in this country who think that we have outgrown the Constitution and that:

"By the process of trial and error administrative law has been hit upon as the most effective weapon to destroy our institutions. Through its channels those who have been well called termites, can safely attack the foundation of our American system, for it has been discovered that administrative law screens them from judicial scrutiny. Oh, I know that when one is swelled with arrogance, oversteps the forms of due process, he may escape the judicial eye, but most of them are clever enough scrupulously to observe all the forms of due process, while disregarding the substance, of due process, and they can do it in such a way as to thwart judicial review, as we all know."

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the Logan-Walter bill is to prevent the administrative agencies from thwarting judicial review in their exercise of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial power. That is all there is to the bill. Would Mr. Ross have less? Evidently he would or he does not understand the bill.

Mr. Ross might well read the opinion of May 7, 1940, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at San Francisco as to one of these administrative agencies where the court declared that it was "grasping for power" which was "to be expected" in a philosophy of "administrative absolutism" and that it was the duty of the court "to curtail this inevitable overreaching" as "one of the first necessities of a democratic government."

Yes; the judges who wrote that opinion were appointed by President Roosevelt.

O. R. McGUIRE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Administrative Law, American Bar Association.

Defense Preparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. BURKE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wake Up, America!" published in the Omaha (morning) World-Herald of May 11, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald of May 11, 1940]

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

"It may seem alarmist to talk in such strong terms of the need for strengthened national defense. It would be alarmist if this country could still depend on the British Navy and the French Army to maintain a friendly world dominance. But while it is hysterical at this early date to expect an Allied defeat, it is also incredibly short-sighted not to begin at once preparing for the worst."

"For 3 or 4 years everything that has been, has been half-hearted and ineffective, without drive or intelligence."

The first quotation is the closing paragraph of the Alsop-Kintner report in Friday's World-Herald revealing that "the present state of our national defense is downright shocking."

The second quotation is not from a speech delivered in the American Congress by an alert Senator or Representative, but from David Lloyd George's indignant attack on the British Government in the House of Commons.

But the stinging though futile criticisms heaped on the Chamberlain ministry in the Commons this week may yet—unless Heaven and the British and the French defend us—lie at the door of our own Government.

Far better it would be that the Cassandra-like warning of "too little and too late!" be sounded before rather than after the event, and that it be heeded.

There is license for no American to join in criticisms of the Government of Great Britain because it loafed away the happy hours of peace; because, knowing, as all the world knew, how Herr Hitler was converting the whole of Germany into an arsenal and an army of air and land; knowing, as all the world knew, his grandiose plans, outlined frankly and in detail in Mein Kampf—still the British Government did not prepare for the inevitable.

For our own Government has been no less culpably short-sighted. It, too, has wasted the years of opportunity. While pouring out its billions, while adding twenty-five billions to the national debt, it has neglected the supreme duty of national defense in a world crumbling into chaos and dark night.

Not only has it slighted defense. It has failed utterly to strengthen our internal resources, to build our productive capacity, to buttress our financial power, to encourage industry, restore agriculture, cure our running sore of unemployment. And now should our first line of defense on the Rhine and in the British Navy fail us, we could face the catastrophe of war shamefully unprepared in both civic and military might.

The most powerful and richest nation on this earth, with the most resourceful and intelligent population, may some day lie supine before the thundering legions of the plunderer, weakened and drained of its strength, because its talents were buried in the ground as its head was buried in the sand.

"If the situation of the Navy is difficult to credit," comment Alsop-Kintner, "that of the Army is simply hair raising." There are hardly enough antiaircraft guns to defend the single city of New York. And they are obsolete and inefficient. Machine guns, artillery, tanks, are lacking. Hardly more than 1,500 military air pilots are trained in a year. And there is no reserve material, no adequate industrial machine to support and supply the fighting forces, though their numbers are ridiculously inadequate.

It is neither hysterical nor alarmist to mention these things. The facts need to be brought out in the open. They need to be considered and discussed. While there is no present likelihood of an attempted invasion of our shores, time is flying on the wings of light and no man can guess what a not very distant tomorrow may bring.

The lesson now being learned as a harvest of barren regret by Britain stares us in the face.

In self-defense the United States could be, and should be, impregnable. But today it is not. No more will it be next year, or the next, or the next, if the policy of neglect and the rule of inefficiency are continued.

Yet another menace calls for attention. It exists within our walls, as it has existed within every land Hitler has invaded—the loathesome and traitorous Fifth Column. We cannot doubt its existence. We cannot doubt its burrowing and infiltration into strategic works and positions, industrial and civic, even military. It is time to stop sneering at and discrediting the Dies committee. It is time for Senator NORRIS to discontinue his attacks on Director Hoover and his Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The time is at hand, in a word, to "Wake Up, America!"

A Choice Between Safety and Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY DR. C. L. NELSON AT ROCHESTER, MINN.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by Dr. C. L. Nelson, democratic chairman of the First Congressional District of Minnesota, delivered over the radio at Rochester, Minn., on April 29, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the coming campaign the voters of the country are going to be confronted with the duty of making a choice of the kind of government they wish to have in Washington. In Presidential election years they always have to make such a decision, but it was never more important than it will be this year. There have been times when our national affairs were undisturbed by economic or social questions of vital importance, when there was no sharp cleavage to distinguish one of the major political parties from the other, so that it did not make a great deal of difference to the average citizen which one was in power.

During the present decade, however, no such situation has existed. The difference between the policies of the two major parties has been so wide and sharp that the importance to the mass of the people of which one was to be entrusted with the administration of national affairs has been critical. It was a choice between safety and disaster. The Republican Party, after 12 years of unmolested and lucky, haphazard driving, at last had the inevitable crash and the Democratic Party was called upon to reassemble the wreckage and get the machine going again. It performed the task so speedily and so satisfactorily that it received the overwhelming endorsement of the people in 1936. The people had not forgotten the ruin wrought by the Republican regime, they appreciated the solid benefits brought to them by the Roosevelt administration and they were content.

No matter who the candidates may be this year, the same situation exists today that the voters had to meet in 1936. The policies of the two leading parties are as distinct and different, and their courses of action as divergent, as they were in the two preceding campaigns. The Democratic Party stands for progress, for planning for the future, for the widest possible distribution of national prosperity and for giving security to the greatest number. The Republican Party has adopted for its slogan, "Let Us Go Back," it turns its face toward the dead past, and both by precept and action declares itself in favor of restricting prosperity and privileges to enjoyment by the favored few. Despite the tribulations incident to its long and weary wanderings in exile it has learned nothing. It clings to outmoded doctrines and remains true to its masters who sold it down the river.

For a time after the bursting of the iridescent soap bubbles blown by the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, the party was so completely disintegrated that it gave evidence of life only through occasional spasmodic convulsions like those of a chicken after its head has been cut off. Its frightened so-called leaders disappeared into cyclone cellars and those who had to remain on the scene moped around in helpless bewilderment. They witnessed the bold and energetic manner with which the Roosevelt administration took hold of the desperate situation and brought order out of chaos. They saw the confidence of the country return under this inspired leadership, they saw the machinery of Government transformed from an instrument helpless in the face of destruction into a positive means of restoration and healing. Their benumbed wits even sensed the sigh of relief and joy that went up from the whole country over being saved from the abyss toward which 12 years of frenzied, irresponsible Republican rule had hurried them.

In that condition of fright and stupor many members of the G. O. P. went along with the Democrats for a while in their work of building up the country and correcting the evils which had brought it to the brink. Without resources of their own, they were glad to be led. But when they felt themselves to be entirely out of danger they began singly and in groups to revert to type. Instinct and habit were too strong to be overcome by a short course in true democracy and the leopard spots began to reappear in all their former clear visibility.

And so as soon as they were able to pull themselves together a little what do we find them doing? Proposing some new, definite method of dealing with the problems which had been thrust upon the country? Advocating improvement and extension of the benefits brought to the people by the measures of the Roosevelt administration? Far from it. They were not for any improvements; they were for restoring the past, for going back to the good old American way.

American way, old or new, sounds good, but when you come to examine what they mean by it you find it means the good old high tariff of the steel and textile trusts, of Joe Grundys, the Mellons, the Weirs, and the Girdlers—the good old tariff through which the Republican Party enabled the manufacturers for scores of years to fatten off the American farmer and the general consumer.

This showed itself in the concerted way in which the Republicans in Congress set about it to defeat the trade-agreements program, the only rational, civilized way for making tariff rates to protect the public and expand foreign commerce that has ever been put into effect in this country. The Republicans in Congress might differ among themselves about other things, they might be disorganized, but when it came to protecting their source of supplies, the foundation of their existence, the interests of the farmer, the consumer, and the country as a whole could go hang—they stood for the pap. All their disagreements disappeared under the cohesive influence of public plunder. They were united for the good old tariff, fashioned in the good old way by logrolling, trading, and the lobbies of special interests.

What the Republicans wanted to go back to and why was well described by Representative DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in telling about the framing of the Hawley-Smoot Act. "No group or interest not ably represented at the grabfest," he said, "was given more than secondary or passing consideration, and, judged by their actions, nothing could have been further from the minds of the bill's sponsors than the general welfare of the American people. Some of the most favored of the benefit grabbers actually attended the executive sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means, so I am reliably informed, while Democratic members of the committee were excluded. The experts and clerks of other favored groups were given desks in the committee rooms and became a part of the committee staff. The connection between tariff benefits and service to the Republican Party was never stronger. Those who had responded

most liberally when the campaign hat was passed had the loudest and most effective voices in the distribution of the pie."

What kind of chance has the farmer or the consumer or the average American citizen against a set-up like that?

But, a return to advocacy and defense of the extortionate protective tariff, and its favors to special interests, is not the only way Republicans have shown that they have not changed their ways or their affiliations. They fight the Wages and Hours Act and the Labor Relations Board, two measures of the Roosevelt administration which have done so much to protect labor in its rights and to secure a decent wage for all workers. This opposition has not been straightforward and aboveboard because of their fear of the labor vote, but has taken the underhanded form of hampering these agencies by cutting the appropriations necessary for their successful operation. And they have avoided coming out in the open about this by not going on record in a roll call.

Listen to a report on their behavior by the newspaper Labor, "This arrangement" (avoidance of a record vote), says the paper, "is made to order for artful dodgers and explains why, of the 169 Republicans in the House, only 9 voted against the raid. Many of these Republicans represent large industrial districts with strong union organizations, but they felt they were safe in voting against labor's interests because they were not compelled to stand up and be counted for all the world to see."

Thus the representatives of the Republican Party in Congress reveal that it is still the party of reaction and the protector of privilege. It still seeks to defeat or hamstring every measure taken for the benefit of the country as a whole and to return the Government to the keeping of those who will use its power to exploit the masses for the enrichment of a small special class.

It is not necessary to recall to the wide awake and intelligent what this Democratic administration of President Roosevelt has done in the way of strengthening the structure of democracy against the forces which were at work to undermine it and weaken confidence in its efficiency. The security given to the aged and unemployed, the safety assured to bank depositors, the protection afforded to investors, the energetic measures taken to lighten the burdens of farmers, improve their condition, and extend their market, laws enacted for the betterment of workingmen in the way of rights and wages—these are all due entirely to the enlightened, humane, and progressive administration which the Democratic Party has given to the country during the past 7 years. It is a record to be proud of. Standing squarely upon it victory over any assaults that can be made against it is assured. An appreciative country will not permit that these achievements should be destroyed.

American Legion Program of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the foreign relations committee of the American Legion, adopted January 29, 1940, at a meeting of the committee in Indianapolis, and approved unanimously by the national executive committee of the American Legion at its annual meeting on May 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The foreign relations committee of the American Legion, consisting of Chairman Wilbur M. Alter, of Denver, Colo.; Anson T. McCook, of Hartford, Conn.; and O. K. Armstrong, of Springfield, Mo., met at national headquarters here January 29 and 30. The committee agreed unanimously upon the following report to be submitted for the approval of the national executive committee at its meeting here next May 2 and 3:

"The duty confronting your committee is the announcement of a foreign-relations policy which will avert involvement in international disturbances and leave our Nation in its continued enjoyment of peace, with its sovereignty and independence secure. We base this policy upon mandates of national conventions, rather than embarking on uncharted courses, or expressing personal opinions upon particular phases of this great problem.

"MUST KEEP OUT OF WAR

"To exert every possible effort to keep our country out of war is the definite mandate of the last national convention of the American Legion. That mandate reads:

"'The American Legion views with gravest concern the apparently widespread belief that this Nation must inevitably become involved in the present European conflict. We not only believe that this Nation need not become involved, but insist and demand that the President of the United States and the Congress pursue a policy that, while preserving the sovereignty and dignity of this Nation, will prevent involvement in this conflict. The American Legion is not a law body. It often has recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation establishing a permanent or fixed policy on important national problems. The American Legion has always strenuously advocated that this Nation pursue a policy of neutrality and peace. In the present world crisis world conditions may change so rapidly that a pronouncement by the American Legion at this time on specific legislation might be wholly inadequate in the near future. Therefore, with full confidence in the President and the Congress, we demand that the Congress continue in session during the present grave crisis and that appropriate action be taken to preserve the peace, sovereignty, and dignity of this Nation, and that our armed forces be expanded immediately to maintain our neutrality.'

"EIGHT-POINT PLATFORM URGED

"In furtherance of this and early convention mandates, we urge specifically the support of the following:

"1. To maintain an adequate national defense, including the principle of universal service.

"2. To uphold the principles of nonintervention and noninterference, as embodied in the Monroe Doctrine.

"3. To urge continually upon the President and Congress of the United States that they make every effort to prevent our involvement in the present wars, and to cooperate with them to that end.

"4. To demonstrate that our involvement in war is not inevitable and must not occur.

"5. To combat vigorously propaganda, of whatever kind and from whatever source, designed to break down our neutrality.

"6. To strive for the restoration of good faith and nonaggression among men and nations, without which there can be no lasting peace.

"7. We have necessarily stated this program in basic terms because details change with changing conditions. It is also to be noted that by action of the national convention, resolutions relating to F. I. D. A. C. have become inapplicable.

"8. As our contribution toward this goal of permanent peace and safeguard against war, we of the American Legion have pledged ourselves to seek and keep an honest neutrality; to do our own thinking and to analyze propaganda, whether it emanates from abroad or at home; and above all, to safeguard our own security, our own liberties, and our own Constitution against attack."

Home Defense Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY E. G. B. RILEY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by E. G. B. Riley, of Laconia, N. H., on the subject of a home-defense force.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The crucial battle of this war is now being fought.

Hitler today, by invading Belgium, may have made his first serious error.

It was an absolute certainty that the Germans would invade and conquer Holland if they kept Belgium in the neutral column.

By refraining from invading Belgium, Hitler would have protected his right West Wall flank from both air and land attacks. He is now forced to combat the land and air forces of the Allies on Belgian soil without proper land fortifications.

The Germans must be successful in driving out of Belgium every single soldier of the Allies, or they will be unable to reap the benefits gained by their occupancy of Holland.

On September 17, 1939, over 7½ months ago, and only 18 days after this war started, your analyst, over this same radio station, stated: "Focus your attention on Rumania and note that which will take place in the southeastern section of Europe. It will be most interesting to watch, not the western front, but Belgium, Holland, and Denmark."

On November 23, 1939, nearly 6 months ago, in an address to the Laconia Rotary Club, excerpts of which were printed in the Laconia Evening Citizen of that date, your analyst stated that

Germany would surely invade Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and further stated that Norway would be apportioned between Germany and Russia.

You will note that in the latter forecast I purposely eliminated mention of Belgium because of that country's value as a neutral to Germany as a protective barrier.

Although it must be admitted that Germany will be in a much more advantageous position if successful in occupying Belgium in its entirety than if only Holland were conquered, your analyst believes that the risks taken by Hitler in invading Belgium are not commensurate with the results that may be attained.

The new invasions are motivated by Hitler's realizations that success in Holland and Belgium will bring into this war as German allies Italy, Spain, and Japan.

To date the Allies have been fighting a losing battle. If Germany attains a full measure of success in Holland and Belgium, the Allies will not have more than one chance out of three of winning this war.

Germany's chief Allies in this war are "the traditions of the British Army and naval forces." These traditions are Germany's "fifth and sixth columns" and "the Trojan horse" which will surely bring about the most costly defeat that this world of ours has ever witnessed unless reality and coordination supplants the memory of past accomplishments and the unwarranted assurance of physical and mental superiority.

The victories of Trafalgar and Jutland are still looked upon as proof that the Nation that controls the sea can successfully withstand the assaults of any combination of hostile foreign nations.

The defeats of Gallipoli and Norway are immediately relegated to the category of unimportant trivial incidences and no beneficial changes of tactics, equipment, or armaments result therefrom.

Since the day that the Russian-German alliance was announced, there has not occurred one invasion of any foreign nation which could not have been foreseen.

In spite of this fact, every move relating to the invasion of Finland by Russia, and of Denmark and Norway by Germany found the Allies unprepared and unable to give the assistance necessary to stem the tide of war.

It does not require other than clear thinking and observance of the efficiency of the means and weapons at the disposal of the combatant nations to foresee that which is most certain to occur.

A few hours study of the war tactics and political theories taught by Maj. Gen. Karl Haushofer at the German academy in Munich which was attended by Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels, will give you an accurate insight into that which is to be attempted by the Germans. Hitler has bared his mind to the world in his book Mein Kampf. He has informed his enemies of his plans for the future and because he has done so they will not give credence to these plans.

While the German implements of war continue to prove successful, you can be certain that Hitler will follow the most direct course to this declared end, viz, the subjugation of Great Britain.

The Norwegian debacle has clearly demonstrated that German bombing and pursuit planes operating from properly constructed and situated aviation fields can wrest control of the air from any planes operating from naval airplane carriers or from aviation fields far distant from the scene of battle.

This is more understandable when you are aware that a plane in order to land on the deck of an airplane carrier must have a comparatively slow landing speed.

In addition these planes are catapaulted into the air from the decks of the carrier by machinery. As a result of these two requirements the planes operating from carriers have neither the speed nor maneuverability of planes operating from land aviation fields with their longer and safer take-off and landing runways or their greater propelling power.

The aviation fields of Norway are in Germany's possession, thereby giving them a decided advantage over the Allies.

Now that entire southern and central Norway is under Germany's control, together with practically all fjords south of Narvik, Germany will proceed to consolidate her newly conquered territory by the use of planes and submarines, at the same time harassing and hampering the Allies' attempt to land supplies and reinforcements at Narvik.

Your analyst does not agree with the unanimous opinion of the experts that the Norwegian invasion was for the purpose of guaranteeing to Germany a supply of Swedish iron ore, but believes that Germany's main objective was to secure naval and aviation bases that would be of material assistance in airplane and submarine attacks on the British Isles and British naval units, together with giving Germany absolute control of the Kattegat and Skagerrak. Germany has thus protected herself against attack from the north.

While completing the consolidation of German gains in Norway, Germany will force Sweden to sign a most humiliating secret treaty.

If Sweden agrees to the demobilization of her Army and agrees to trade exclusively with Germany and Russia, she will be permitted to retain a nominal form of self-government. Nevertheless, Germany will dominate Sweden just as completely as though she had invaded and conquered that country.

Germany will willingly waste little time on Sweden. Hitler wishes to reach his objective before the Allies awaken.

If Italy's shadow boxing in southeastern Europe and the Mediterranean Sea has not resulted in some incident that will bring about a war, Germany will encourage tension in order to keep a large part of the Allied fleet in the Mediterranean.

With Holland and Belgium subjugated, German planes will be within less than 15 minute flying time of Dover and only 20 minutes from London, England, and Germany would then be able to successfully contest the control of the air over the English Channel.

The overdone display of friendship for the French on the West wall and in the German press by the Germans can well be attributed to the fact that only from the aviation fields of France can emanate an air attack which would seriously injure German defenses and cause serious damage to German munition and industrial plants.

Until today Germany has refrained from serious air attacks on France only because of her fear of retaliation by the latter country.

After having demonstrated the futility of trying to curb the air activities of Germany and the invasion of all small adjoining neutral nations, Hitler will launch his first serious attempt to bring about peace. He will count heavily on the fact that Germany can unleash an air blitzkrieg that will wreck every important industrial city in the British Isles, and, also, that from Holland and Belgium and Norwegian bases Germany's submarines can wreak havoc on England's food and supply lines.

In the comparatively short period of time that will elapse before Germany can accomplish these results, it will be impossible for England to gain control of the air.

Germany, operating from Norwegian airports, 200 miles nearer the British naval base at Scapa Flow than the present airports in Germany, will either sink every large British naval unit or cause their withdrawal to other waters.

The reported 2,000 antiaircraft guns encircling Scapa Flow have demonstrated that they are little more effective against the speedy armored bombers than putty blowers and slingshots.

Less than 40 years ago the then all-powerful battleship was the admitted master weapon of the world.

The influence of the battleship extended to every foreign port and was the primary means of conquest.

The Whitehead torpedo was the first challenge to its might, then 25 years ago the submarine arose to hurl a more serious challenge at the diminishing power of the sea mastodon.

The submarine brought about the necessity of protecting each individual battleship with a small fleet of speedy cruisers, destroyers, and submarine chasers.

After 5 years of practical wartime experience in Ethiopia, China, and Spain the airplane was developed to a point where it required but minor refinements to prove its superiority over any naval unit or military weapon.

Any observant, clearthinking individual could recognize at that time that the slow, cumbersome battleship was more of a liability than an asset, although anyone daring to state the real facts was made the target of abuse and charged with heresy, lack of patriotism, and loose thinking. No more revealing illustration can be set forth of the peculiar channel of thought utilized by the naval authorities of the world's powers than by quoting you an excerpt from The World Crisis, the author of which was none other than Winston Churchill, the present war lord of England:

"For consider these ships, so vast in themselves yet so small, so easily lost to sight on the surface of the waters * * * on them, as we conceived, floated the might, majesty, dominion, and power of the British Empire. All our long history, built up century after century, all our great affairs in every part of the globe, all the means of livelihood and safety of our faithful, industrious, active population depended on them. Open the sea cocks and let them sink beneath the surface, as another fleet was one day to do in another British harbor far to the north, and in a few minutes—half an hour at the most—the whole outlook of the world would be changed. The British Empire would dissolve like a dream; each isolated community struggling forward by itself; the central power of union broken; mighty provinces, empires in themselves, drifting helplessly out of control, and falling a prey to strangers; Europe, after one sudden convulsion, passing into the iron grip and rule of the Teuton and of all that the Teutonic system meant. * * * Guard them well, admirals and captains, hardy tars and tall marines; guard them well and guide them true."

Thus spoke the First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill.

Less than 48 hours ago, appearing before Parliament, both War Lord Churchill and Prime Minister Chamberlain admitted that the Allies were practically helpless until they gained the mastery of the air and warned that this would take no little time.

War Lord Winston Churchill, defending himself against the justifiable attacks of the opposition, used these very words:

"But the fact remains that we failed to achieve the air parity which was considered vital to our security. Our numerical deficiency in the air—in spite of our superiority in quality, both of men and materials—condemns us and will condemn us for some time to come, to a great deal of difficulty, suffering, and danger, which we must endure with firmness until more favorable conditions can be established—as assuredly they will. He would be a wise man who knew all about this war. There is no use talking about this war in terms of the last one. Power of the air has greatly affected it. In some ways it has decisively affected the movement of fleets and armies. We must not exaggerate this new factor, but neither must we refuse to give it its deadly due."

If Germany is to be stopped or even temporarily restrained by the Allies in her devastating rape of Europe and Asia immediate changes of leadership will have to be made.

It cannot be forgotten that in 1915 and 1916, after the automobile and tractor was a proven means of transportation, the Allies purchased in this and other countries every available horse for their cavalry and every available mule for army transportation purposes. They failed even at that late date to realize that cavalry and mules had been supplanted by mechanized units.

The world will never forget the attempt of the Allies to blast their way through the Dardanelles with the resulting Gallipoli disaster.

Winston Churchill was then the First Lord of the Admiralty and history charges him with the responsibility for the fiasco.

Winston Churchill was the First Lord of the Admiralty during the Norwegian debacle and history will charge him with this second defeat which in many respects closely parallels the Gallipoli episode.

Both of these defeats can be laid to the traditions of the navy; i. e., the belief that naval power is the predominating factor of any war and that the navy is the first line of defense.

Unless the Allies give absolute control of all branches of their military power to a coordinator who is not steeped in the tradition of any specific branch of the service, the Allies will lose this war.

Let us now turn back a few pages of American history and learn that which our records show.

Every individual no matter how high his standing or his record of accomplishments has been deemed a heretic or has been charged with loose thinking or with being pro-German if he publicly expresses views which conflict with the opinions of those who dominate our military and naval activities.

On February 20, 1925, 14 years ago, Brig. Gen. William Mitchell told the House Aircraft Committee, in Washington: "There's no escape of shipping on the sea from an air atack. We have to baby them over the sea. Any ship that floats in the water is absolutely at the mercy of an air attack."

General Mitchell in 1921, 18 years ago, began his drive for a separate aviation department having equality with the Army and Navy Departments.

General Mitchell stated at that time: "The whole training of the Navy is that the armored ship is mistress on the sea, whereas actually it is just as helpless as the armored knight was when the firearm was brought against him."

General Mitchell, then Chief of the Army Air Service, conducted a 5-year campaign, and when he refused to abandon his criticism of both Army and Navy Departments in connection with their aviation policies he was forced to resign, following court martial and an ordered suspension of 5 years.

General Mitchell died 4 years ago, crucified on the altar of tradition, a martyr to his country.

Congress should posthumously award Gen. William Mitchell the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Col. Charles Lindbergh, immediately prior to this war, stated facts concerning the relative strength of the German air forces as compared to those of England and France. He was immediately charged with bias, prejudice, and of being pro-German.

Within 1 year the correctness of his statements has been most conclusively proven.

Colonel Lindbergh, the world's acknowledged aviation authority, who should be immediately placed in absolute control of all governmental production and operations of airplanes, was driven into semiretirement by the ridicule, criticism, and gibes of moronic big wigs.

There is not the slightest doubt but that in our Navy and War Departments we have many officers who are as efficient as those of any nation in the world, but they dare not state their views or even assert themselves.

This military yoke of slavery must be immediately discarded.

Without the weight of public opinion to support them, no admiral or general has the temerity to give voice to the real conditions surrounding our military preparedness.

It can be stated, with few exceptions, that everyone, irrespective of position, who has had close contact with prominent foreign Allied statesmen, becomes steeped in their erroneous conclusion that there is no defense of one's country other than by naval units.

Like millions of others, your analyst is a great admirer of Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, the radio's recognized international authority.

Let us note the results the domination of the air by the Germans over the Allies, as evidenced by the Norwegian invasion, had upon Mr. Swing's opinion.

Under date of February 6, 1940, Mr. Swing wrote your analyst as follows:

"The United States is a naval power, and invasion is the last thing that could happen to us. It would follow after defeat, if it happened at all. The crucial battle that would decide United States independence would probably be fought thousands of miles from our shores. When a nation is weak, other nations will tell it what to do. This is the essence of tyranny. It has very little to do with soldiers in rowboats, with rifles strapped to their shoulders, landing on foreign shores. If you are interested in the defense of the United States, you had better be interested in one of two things—either a two-ocean Navy or the victory of the British Navy."

In reply to Mr. Swing, under date of February 8, your analyst set forth that: You must admit that there has been no conclusive test that proves that aviation will not make ineffectual many present types of naval craft. We should not engage in any naval armament race until we know that which is needed, and we cannot build any eighty- to one-hundred-million dollar battleships unless we sacrifice our cruiser-building schedule, which would be most hazardous."

In reply, on February 14, Mr. Swing wrote as follows: "I am all with you against sending American boys to fight in the trenches of Europe or any other country. What has that to do with your plan? Our defense problem is a naval problem. I am not backing General Drum any more than I am backing you, nor am I backing any particular naval program. But the defense of the United States is at sea. Thank you for your courteous and interesting letter."

Less than 90 days ago, Raymond Gram Swing absolutely refused to give any thought or consideration to the fact that the airplane could prove to be the master of naval units or be the master weapon of defense.

Less than 10 days ago, Mr. Swing, in one of his interesting and instructive broadcasts, acknowledged that recent happenings would seem to indicate that the airplane and battleship were now "running even."

It is sincerely to be hoped that our Washington representatives will prove themselves to be of a mental caliber that will permit their admitting that they have been traveling on the wrong road of thought.

I again wish to present for your consideration my home defense force plan.

You can greatly aid in its immediate adoption, and it will assuredly be of great benefit to you and to every citizen of our United States.

My plan calls for the formation of a home-defense force which would not be sent out of the United States.

The basis for this force would be the Civilian Conservation Corps boys, who, upon volunteering, with parental consent, would be transferred from the said Corps to the proposed home-defense force.

These volunteers, who, in all probability, under our existing laws, would be caught in the first draft, would, under my plan, be exempt from being drafted for the full term of their proposed 2-year enrollment.

My plan provides for the training and education of the enrollees by veterans and Army officers with the expressed intent of developing aviators, aviation ground crews of mechanics, and of developing proper aviation fields in all parts of the United States.

The pay of the enrollees would be the same as in the C. C. C., with the same provisions that now exist, that two-thirds of their allowance be forwarded to their families or dependents.

By such a plan we would attain many desirable ends in a most economical and sound manner:

(1) We would eliminate the formation and expense of the Army of 1,000,000 men which is now being considered by Army authorities, with the resultant temptation to use it as an international threat of foreign action. By so doing we would prevent the transporting of our citizens to fight on foreign soil for foreign nations.

(2) We would be giving the members of the home-defense force an educational and mechanical training which would surely increase their earning capacity even though their military training were never called to use.

(3) We would be aiding in solving our relief problem.

(4) We would be eliminating the possibility of the disruption of business and industry necessarily caused by conscription.

(5) Lastly, and most important, the United States would have the necessary 50,000 aviators, competent ground crews of skilled mechanics, and properly located aviation fields. These latter are the requisites of the successful defense of the United States, but only if supplemented by proper aviation equipment, speedy cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

It must be realized that over 90 percent of the commercial aviation franchises and aviation fields of the Pan American countries are foreign-owned. From this quarter emanates the danger of air attack on the United States.

No pursuit plane can arise from the ground and successfully combat a speedy bombing plane unless the former has sufficient warning of the approach of the said bombing plane. It is, therefore, necessary for the defense of this country to procure a fringe of listening and observation posts located several hundred miles from our borders.

It is absolutely necessary that we take over, by purchase, all islands within 600 miles of the Panama Canal and the borders of the United States. This can be economically accomplished by giving the owner nations credit to the amount of the purchase price against the sum now due this country for their first World War debts.

It will also be necessary to obtain listening and observation posts from our so-called Pan American neighbors, by lease and treaty, in order to protect not only the Panama Canal, but also our southern border.

The New York Herald Tribune set forth salient and deplorable facts and figures developed through hearings on the Army and Navy appropriation bill.

The testimony given before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee by Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, and others, divulged:

1. That the Army had only 52 bombing planes that were not obsolete.

2. That only 6,000 planes will be produced in the United States by June 30, 1941, that is to fill the needs of this country and all the orders of foreign countries.

3. That actual deliveries for the month of March were 80 to the Army, 23 to the Navy, and 193 to foreign purchasers.

4. That estimated actual deliveries for next July are 227 to the Army, 55 to the Navy and 290 to foreign purchasers.

5. That the Army would have only 1,900 aviators by June 30, 1941.

Fellow Americans, this is a far cry from the 20,000 planes needed for the defense of our country.

It is hardly believable that the Army Air Corps has in its possession an instrument which could prove to be the deciding factor in this war.

You have noted ever since the Spanish Civil War a not-too-rapid improvement in the accuracy of bombing planes in hitting their objectives with their limited load of bombs.

Having heard rumors of incredible results obtained by our few Army bombing planes, your analyst wrote a letter of inquiry to Mr. WILLIAM J. MILLER, a Member of the House of Representatives from Connecticut. Under date of February 26, 1940, Mr. MILLER wrote the following letter:

"DEAR MR. RILEY: This will acknowledge your letter of the 21st addressed to the Honorable John E. Miller.

"As you undoubtedly know, the Army Air Corps keeps its data on bombing efficiency quite secret, but I did recently have an opportunity to see the efficiency of the new Sperry bombing sight tested and did see three bombs dropped from an altitude of between ten and fourteen thousand feet; in this test all three made a direct hit on a 12-foot target. I was told by the squadron commander that day that they could score 8 hits out of 10 on this same target. That being true, it is certainly doubtful as to whether or not we should continue building huge battleships.

"I have read with much interest the copy of your home-defense plan, and feel that there is a great deal of food for thought in it.

"Trusting this information will be helpful to you, I am,

"Yours very truly,

"WILLIAM J. MILLER."

Can you visualize that which one bombing plane equipped with such an instrument of accuracy, could do to any battleship, battle cruiser, or any large objectives?

Can you understand how any group of experts with the knowledge that any such instrument of accuracy exists permitting the United States to continue to sink hundreds of millions of dollars in battleships which have no defense against bombing planes equipped with any such instruments?

To any of the combatant countries this bomb sight is worth more than all the gold in this country.

The only question is how long can we utilize, yet keep secret its construction?

Recently Rear Admiral Joseph K. Taussig, commandant of the fifth naval district, stated his opinion before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs that the United States is certain eventually to have to fight a Japan bent on Pacific domination. Admiral Taussig was immediately thereupon nominated for court martial by a Member of our Congress.

Japan, by moral embargoes and canceled trade treaties has been cut off from her usual supply of oil and gasoline, without which she cannot exist. Japan, with her experienced war aviators, her pursuit and bombing planes guarding her powerful fleet operating from nearby air and sea bases is absolutely certain to seize the Netherland Indies for its all-valuable oil.

It is not improbable that at this very moment Japan is making ready to seize the Netherland Indies.

Now, where is our Navy? Having just completed naval war games in the Pacific it has been ordered to remain indefinitely in Hawaiian waters.

Your analyst sincerely hopes that this gesture of backing up our State Department's expressed warning of disapproval to Japan against her indicated intention to occupy the Netherland Indies, will not cause Admiral Taussig's forecast to come true, while we are totally unprepared to even defend our own country.

Fellow Americans, are you going to permit such condition of unpreparedness to exist? There has never been a time in the history of your country that demanded more speedy, intelligent, and intensive action.

Veterans of foreign wars, Legionnaires, your country needs your influence and support to hasten the defensive arming of the United States, to stop immediately the sale of planes so sorely needed by your country and to stop the squandering of billions of dollars on obsolete impractical warships.

By stripping our country of badly needed defensive airplanes, we are courting disaster.

Remember, the Navy is no longer our first line of defense.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, old-age assistance is here to stay. The only question is as to its character and extent and how it shall be adequately financed.

At the present time we are borrowing over one-half the money used to pay old-age assistance. This obviously cannot continue.

A pay-as-you-go program must be developed and that without delay if public bankruptcy is to be avoided. Let us also remember that with the collapse of our public finance will go the entire economic structure of a free America.

In Russia they started out to liquidate the capitalists, but they ended up, as was inevitable, by the liquidation of every form of private property. Particularly did they destroy the kulaks, who were nothing other than those owning a little farm.

In Maine today 14,000 of our older citizens are receiving old-age-assistance payments with an average grant of $20 a month. Meanwhile 14,000 other applicants are on the waiting list.

Four thousand of these applications have been approved. Many others have not even been investigated because State funds are not available to match the Federal funds which have been provided. Many of these cases are in very dire need as one learns from the tragic letters that are received here in Washington.

The deplorable condition of our State finances has been sufficiently revealed with a $400,000 deficiency in the amount required for immediate relief before July 1, 1940. This is entirely aside from the amounts required for old-age assistance.

Meanwhile the Federal Treasury is in no better condition with the Federal borrowing power now bumping the ceiling of the $45,000,000,000 debt limit and the administration completely befogged as to how the Budget may be balanced or the finances of the Government saved from disaster.

Those today receiving old-age assistance are grateful for the grant, but they also realize the precarious position in which their payments are placed by the condition of the Public Treasury. Meanwhile, 14,000 more applicants are awaiting consideration and their number constantly increases.

Sometimes it is intimated that concern over this problem of old-age assistance by public men is entirely incident to the agitation of recent years, and that it represents simply the reaction of politicians to the whims of public fancy.

An attack upon motives is always most unfortunate, as it prevents consideration of the merits of any particular proposal conceived in the public good.

Insofar as Maine is concerned, there happens to be a rather conclusive answer to the suggestion that the idea of a proper program of old-age assistance is a matter of recent origin. As a member of the senate in the State of Maine in 1923, it was my privilege to listen to one of the most moving appeals for a public program of old-age assistance that has perhaps ever been uttered in any legislative hall. The measure proposed by Senator Clyde H. Smith at that time passed the Maine Senate with scarcely a dissenting vote as a result of the eloquent appeal of Senator Smith and the sympathetic consideration of that plea by the members of the Senate of the State of Maine.

The measure failed of passage in the house, but this early consideration of the matter and the stanch stand of Senator Smith in conformity with a lifetime devoted to a program of this character is a sufficient refutation of the idea that interest in old-age assistance is purely of recent origin and is a result of the current popular agitation and concern.

In order that there may be a complete and adequate answer to this occasional attack upon the motives of those who now earnestly advocate a proper program of old-age assistance, I am incorporating in the RECORD at this point the speech of the late Representative Clyde H. Smith, delivered in the Maine Senate in 1923:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLYDE H. SMITH BEFORE THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF MAINE, 1923

The PRESIDENT. The only matter before the senate is the last one on the calendar, S. 320, an act providing for the benefit and assistance for aged persons under certain conditions in the State of Maine, and prescribing penalties for violation of the provisions hereof, and making an appropriation for carrying out of its purposes, tabled on the motion of the senator from Somerset, Mr. Smith, whom the Chair recognizes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to offer a few remarks on this subject at this time.

Fellow members, it seems a little out of order for me to use time that is so much needed during the sunset of this legislature; and had I not refrained from taking part in many discussions during the past 3 months, and if the pending bill did not merit careful attention, I would not now intrude. But since this measure concerns the welfare of many unfortunate men and women of our State, whose very pleadings for assistance must be made to the younger and stronger of their race, it may be only fair for us to give this question careful and thoughtful consideration, for wherever the sun may cast its rays of light human beings alike must come face to face with this uncertainty in the journey of their existence.

From time immemorial kingdoms and nations have been confronted with the problem of how to provide for helpless old age humanely and economically, for each succeeding year has revealed a larger number of aged persons who have lost in life's uneven struggle and through uncontrollable destinies find themselves dependent upon the mercies and charities of others.

Methods pursued in dealing with this issue have varied and improved in keeping with the progress of man. Legend has it that in primeval days old men were placed in trees and, after singing The Fruit is Ripe, they were shaken down and clubbed to death.

When comparing this ancient practice with the modern pension system of Europe it is not difficult to realize that while civilization may ebb and flow, the character of men moves on without retrogression.

It would appear that foreign countries have been more acute to the justice of alleviating the horrors of feeble years; more responsive to those ideals that would make old age a distinction and a privilege, for nearly all civilized nations in the world except our own, have long since provided pensions for their old men and women who are unable to care for themselves.

It is almost unthinkable and inconceivable that in this land of plenty, with its generous-hearted and public-spirited citizens, that ours is the only nation that says to her wage earners "Keep up your work as long as you can, as long as you are able to produce, and when that time has passed we shall discard and scrap you just as we do the machines upon which you work when they have outlived their use." Yet we need not be dismayed, the conscience of the Nation is slowly awakening to a vision not measured by the rim of a silver dollar, for 18 of our States through their legislatures are either considering old-age pension bills or have appointed commissions to devise some method to better care for those in need. The Governor of Massachusetts asked for a pension fund of $100,000. Last Friday the State responded to this call by passing in the house 82 to 64 an old-age pension bill almost identical to this one under discussion. The Governor of New York recently made a similar demand, and the assembly almost unanimously passed a similar bill. Public-spirited men, broad-minded citizens throughout our Nation today are making similar requests.

In our State there are 121 poorhouses representing an investment of $1,118,095. Eight hundred and sixteen persons were committed to these institutions last year; 351 of them on account of helpless old age. The average cost per inmate was $5.86 per week, not including overhead and investment charges which amount to more than $1.50, or a total expense of $7.36 per week for each old man or woman supported in our almshouses, or $1.32 per week per inmate more than it would cost to care for these unfortunate souls through the provisions of the proposed act which limits the amount to $25 per month for those who have attained the age of 65 years, one-half of which is paid by the municipality where the applicant has a legal residence.

Take from our poorhouses those dependents who have been forced there on account of old age, a number representing more than 40 percent of the total commitment, and our towns could liquidate an investment of nearly one-half million dollars by disposing of these antiquated and obsolete homes, a saving in interest money equal to the entire appropriation provided in this resolve.

Besides the pauperized and stigmatized inmates of the almshouses there are many more citizens who in the fullness of their strength were proud and useful men, that today stand at the threshold of life humiliated and tortured with the prospects of filling a pauper's grave.

Let me read one of many letters which I have received during the past few months concerning this subject:

"I am 72 years of age, born in the city of Auburn and spent my life there and in Lewiston, my husband being a dentist there all the years of his business life. We owned a modest home at the time of his break-down and illness, resulting in paralysis from which he never recovered mentally or physically, living for 9 years. In the meantime I was obliged to sell our home and bought a very small one at Turner Center which I now own, on which, of course, I have always managed to keep the taxes paid. Have spent all the time there I possibly could, but have been obliged to spend a part of the time away to earn money to keep up the expense of this little home. I have wanted to feel that I could call some place home. I have often thought, did I have a very little income I could enjoy my own little home again, with garden and chickens. For references I can refer you to such men as George C. Wing, Congressman White's father, and Judge Newell, of Lewiston. I do hope that I may be considered should your kindly interest in the elderly residents of the good old State of Maine prevail."

This morning I read in the headline of our papers over $9,000,000 spent for public recreation last year, appropriated by our towns and cities. When I think of the contents of this letter and of the significance of this amount of money appropriated for pleasure; when I think of the extravagance on the one hand, and on the other we say to that poor old woman, "You starve to death or go to the city farm," I have no words with which to describe such a picture, a condition that should bring shame to every American citizen.

The enactment of this bill would not create a commission or incur administrative expense as is so common to measures of this nature. Not a single person could obtain a pension without the approval of the Governor and council, and the tax burdens would not be increased a penny, for our towns and States are already taxed to support needy citizens. It would simply replace our inhuman laws governing the care of unfortunate persons with economic and progressive legislation founded and builded on the milk of human kindness.

Pensioning of worthy citizens is not a new principle or an unheard-of innovation, even in our own State. The Supreme Court judges, our soldiers and sailors, post-office officials, school teachers, railroad and industrial employees share in this method of preventing old-age dependency.

Why close the doors? Why preclude equally deserving and more unfortunate, the workers of industry, the tillers of the soil, who, through illness and business reverses, are banished from friends, home, and fireside?

It may be claimed that to encourage is to destroy; that an assurance for old age will make us less industrious and more mindful of future years. Anyone who analyses his own mentality will appreciate the fallacy of such an idea. It is a natural ambition to go ahead, to strive for better food, better clothes, better environment and for the comforts of old age. Who would suggest that pensions granted to the boys in blue made them lazy, idle, and indolent citizens? Who would withdraw that aid so recently given the mothers of our State? God knows that both are laudable contributions; but, that no recipient can be more deserving of assistance than are those poverty-stricken fathers and mothers who are drifting in the shadow of the Great Beyond.

Mr. President, neither your father nor mine, who were so recently called from our affections, would have needed the protection of this measure, but in every community there are fathers and mothers who are waiting for the last call, that are ragged and hungry, rather than to beg of charity or meet disgrace at the city farm.

The percentage of our helpless old men is gradually growing larger, increasing at the rate of 4 percent per year. Medical science cannot cope with the unnatural drain on the workingman's energy resulting from the remorseless force and merciless precision of modern machinery which has not only shortened the period of effective service, but is gradually shutting out from gainful occupation the failing eyesight, the enfeebled nerve, and the unsteady hand of old age.

There are those who will contend that there is no need of poverty with all its wretchedness, but no man who has given this subject careful and candid reflection will arrive at such an unpardonable conclusion.

Unskilled employees represent one-third of the total amount of labor. Today the average price paid in the United States is $3.20 per day. Make allowance for vacations and shut-downs, pay for rent, food, clothes, furniture, educate the children, and live respectably. How much have you saved for the inevitable rainy day when old age and sickness comes?

It is glorious to present bills to create great reservoirs as it has been my pleasure to do; to be able to rebuild the Constitution with that skill so characteristic of the senator from Cumberland; to champion the cause of an exposition building with the ability of that favorite son from Aroostook; to father the teachers' pension act with that dignity so common to the distinguished senator from York; but it is a million times more glorious to extend the hand of help to those in need.

When the old family horse has performed its last work we place it in kindly hands and in green pastures. When the pet dog can no longer respond to its master's call every mercy is extended this faithful animal. But the old man in his declining days goes among strangers over the hills to the poorhouse.

My friends, instead of this stigma of charity, let us place the mantle of respect on those fading years by providing an adequate pension for those unable to care for themselves. For some day, my fellow Senators, when our work is done, we may have longings for peace, for comfort, for affection, for some little nook in which to sit and think and dream of life's race well run, life's work well done, life's victory won.

The one thing constant in this life, the one peak that rises above all others, the one window in which the light forever burns, the one star that darkness can never quench, is a mother's devotion. Is there a senator within the confines of this chamber who would challenge that devotion by sending anybody's mother through those gates ajar from whence no traveler returns, with a poorhouse insignia stamped upon her fair face?

Mr. President, I hope that this bill may not be considered from the standpoint of sympathy or from the viewpoint of dollars and cents but in the light of decency and of justice.

I cannot believe that this senate will vote against the only labor measure out of 890 bills that have been presented here during this term, and when the vote is taken I would like it to be by a yea-and-nay vote. [Applause.]

The foregoing speech of the late Congressman Smith would seem to dispose of any suggestion that in the State of Maine, at least, the idea of old-age assistance is a thing of recent origin. It is little wonder that so moving an appeal brought practically unanimous approval from the senate of the State of Maine at that time in 1923. The house, however, at that time was not ready to concur.

Now, however, America has very evidently and very definitely decided to provide old-age assistance. The only question is the character and extent of the assistance and how the program shall be financed.

We cannot much longer continue to borrow from Peter to pay Paul. The day of reckoning will inevitably arrive and the cupboard will be bare.

SOCIAL INSECURITY

Every citizen should clearly understand the system under which we are now operating. To call it social security is most misleading. As a matter of fact, it will soon be found really to be social insecurity.

Old-age assistance is now being paid in Maine to approximately 14,000 people on a 50-50 basis by the State and Federal Governments.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Entirely aside from this program there is now being levied upon about one-third of the workers and employers in this country a pay-roll tax, which is said by the Government to be a premium on an insurance policy to pay an old-age benefit when the worker gets ready to retire.

COMPULSORY INSURANCE

The worker has no option in this matter. If he or she is in a certain category of workers, the payment of the tax is compulsory.

Under ordinary insurance practice, this money would be set aside each year as a reserve against the time when the payments would become due as the workers reached the stipulated age.

There are, however, some curious things about this insurance policy that one-third of the workers are compelled to take.

ONE-THIRD VERSUS TWO-THIRDS

In the first place, about two-thirds of our people are excluded. If it is a good thing, it should be open to everyone. If it is a bad thing, no American should be compelled to participate. Someone is certainly being discriminated against. The two-thirds outside must be provided for in some other way—to which the one-third will be compelled to contribute through the medium of taxes of some kind in addition to the contribution they have been compelled to make for their own retirement. This is most unjust and inequitable.

COLLECTION IMPOSSIBLE

In the second place, this compulsory policy is in a company that cannot be compelled to pay. No citizen can sue the Government of the United States. But you say the Government will, of course, keep its promises.

Unfortunately, the Government within the past few years has repudiated one of its most solemn promises upon which it secured vast sums of money from its citizens, and the Supreme Court was obliged to say that the citizen had no redress, that it was only a moral, not a legally enforceable obligation, and if the Government chose to repudiate its pledges to its citizens, there was nothing either the citizen or the Court could do except to regret the immoral conduct of the Government.

DEPRECIATED DOLLARS

In the third place, a young person at 25 must look forward to 40 years of contributions of dollars of current value and purchasing power. But meanwhile the value of the dollar may be radically changed. It has already been reduced 40 percent. The President today has the power to reduce it 15 percent from its present value.

This means that in 20 or 30 years when one goes to collect the benefits under this compulsory policy the worker who has paid in a dollar may get back only what amounts to 10 cents in the purchasing power of that distant day. In other words, the Government has sold a 10-cent dollar to its citizens for 100 cents. It might well be termed a gold brick—at least to the extent of 90 percent.

NO RESERVE FUND

In the fourth place, the Government is not accumulating a reserve for its beneficiaries as every private insurance company is compelled to do or see its officers sent to jail.

The Government is spending every cent of these premiums as rapidly as they are paid in—not for the purpose of the trust but for the current expenses and extravagances of the Government of the United States.

To be sure it puts an I O U in the cash box to show the cash is missing. But when the day of reckoning arrives and the aged worker asks for his old-age benefit, then the Government must tax someone all over again to pay that benefit for which the worker has already paid once.

Very likely the same persons may be taxed all over again to pay their own benefits along with all others who may be sharing the burden of taxation at that time.

TO SUMMARIZE

Let us remember these things about the present system so far as so-called contributory pensions are concerned.

First. Only one-third are covered. Two-thirds are uncovered. Someone is being discriminated against.

Second. Although certain citizens are compelled to take a Government policy of old-age insurance there is no way the citizen can compel the Government to pay.

Third. The benefits may be paid in a 60-cent dollar such as we have today or a 10-cent dollar such as we may have tomorrow. This is what is called inflation.

Fourth. The money is all spent as fast as it is paid in so that some day someone will be taxed all over again to pay the benefits.

PAY AS YOU GO

This is why more and more people believe that a simple, sane Nation-wide system of old-age assistance upon a pay-as-you-go basis is the only answer to this problem. Then when we close our books each year we shall know that we have not borrowed from Peter to pay Paul. We shall know that we have not taken a wage earner's hard-earned dollars in return for a promise that may be repudiated by a government in another decade or rendered valueless by an inflation of the currency or by a bankrupt Treasury that will necessitate new taxation.

REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

Such a sane, sound program on a pay-as-you-go basis was the pledge of the national platform of the Republican Party in 1936. Such a program was attempted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives in considering social-security legislation. Such a program seems altogether likely to be urged once again in the Republican platform to be adopted at Philadelphia and to be an important issue in the coming Presidential campaign.

This will mean that no one will lose any benefits that they now enjoy. But it will mean that your less fortunate neighbors will also be provided for. It will mean that the perils of the present program to the Public Treasury will be ended and that Government will cease taking money from its citizens under an arrangement that would not for one moment be tolerated by any private company.

Justice and equity will be available for all and that is all any American desires.

In addition the public finances will be placed in order. Pay as you go means a balanced budget. A balanced budget means restored business confidence, which in turn means economic recovery, and that means opportunity will once again be restored to the youth of America, and America will go ahead.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE HERE TO STAY

I end as I began. Old-age assistance is here to stay. The ancient system of condemning those who were in penury to go to the poorhouse is gone beyond recall. The wealth and re-

sources of America and the creative abilities of our civilization are equal to the challenge of this new order. We may recognize frankly that this movement represents a modification of our ancient economy under which the threat of the poorhouse haunted the lives of people everywhere. Whether or not the removal of this incentive will soften our civilization to the point of its ultimate disintegration and dissolution, only time can tell.

America has never been afraid to pioneer. The first essential element in this program is that it shall be put without delay upon a basis of paying as we go. Any other course means inevitable disaster for everyone—old and young alike.

Like every great reform, this subject is one receiving widespread and serious consideration by the people of the United States. Eventually the truth will emerge and the right answer will be found.

PILFERING PENNIES

The contributory program of old-age assistance now in effect simply operates to pilfer the pennies from the pockets of the poor under the guise of premiums for old-age insurance. Those payments are promptly used by the Government for current expenses, without the creation of a reserve of any character. This means that when our younger citizens come to collect their old-age benefits the cupboard will be bare, and the same citizens will be obliged again to pay taxes to secure the benefits to which they are entitled.

Such a program must inevitably fall of its own weight, because it is not founded upon principle.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Eventually all will awaken to the impossibility of this system continuing. Then a simple, honest program of old-age assistance on a Nation-wide basis, properly financed on a pay-as-you-go basis, will be evolved. The National Budget will be balanced, and America will resume its onward progress with proper provision for the older citizens of our country and with new opportunity opening for the ambitions of our youth.

How City Slum Clearance Pays Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer on slum clearance:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 20, 1940]

HOW CITY SLUM CLEARANCE PAYS DIVIDENDS

In its report upon Government-aided low-cost housing projects the Philadelphia Committee on Public Affairs concludes that, while a public housing program raises many problems, the positive advantages to be gained seem preponderant. It believes that further support for such a program is vital to the well-being of the city of Philadelphia.

With these conclusions it is easy to agree. With more than 50,000 families in this city living in substandard homes, it is self-evident that low-cost housing projects are needed on a large scale.

Most of these slum dwellers are in the lowest income group, receiving less than $1,000 a year. The number of standard homes available to them is negligible.

Their present unsafe, insanitary, and overcrowded living quarters are the only ones they can afford. They are not there from choice, but as a matter of economic necessity. If private enterprise is unable to provide homes priced within the means of these thousands of families, public housing is the immediate answer.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority is striving to meet the housing shortage for the low-income group, but its projects will take care of only 6,000 families.

To redeem the remainder of the badly housed portion of our population from slum conditions there are several possibilities open to consideration. One is further expansion of the Housing Authority program, making sure that the new accommodations are priced low enough to take care of the lowest income group and that the building operations go hand in hand with slum clearance.

Another is the encouragement of private building of houses that can be rented in the $20-a-month bracket. A third is a program of rehabilitating existing houses that are worth saving; making them over, reconditioning them, and putting them on the market at a low purchase price.

The problem of substandard residences for the poor is one that cannot be evaded. The city is paying enormous sums for its slum areas, paying the price in public health and public welfare, in police and fire protection, in disease, infant mortality, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

Standard low-cost housing for the poor not only rescues slum dwellers from improper living conditions, it pays dividends to the city in money saved.

Buffalo—Greatest Transshipment Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BUFFALO (N. Y.) COURIER-EXPRESS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item appearing in today's Buffalo Courier-Express. Buffalo's importance as an inland port cannot be overemphasized as the official report from the United States Army engineers states. Have in mind that our great city of Buffalo ranks first among the ports on the Great Lakes in value of tonnage handled and is the greatest center in the Western Hemisphere if not the world. Such a report definitely points to thousands of jobs, not only on the water front, on the boats but through other methods of distribution, by truck and railroad as well. The President's problem child, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, while adversely affecting the economy of our country, would, of course, hit this employment on the Niagara frontier. Buffalo has long maintained its leading position and I am glad the latest report of the United States Army engineers again gives this deserved recognition. The news item follows:

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of May 13, 1940]

UNITED STATES ARMY ENGINEERS CALL BUFFALO PORT BEST IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE—REPORT CITES MAJOR FACILITIES OF INLAND HARBOR

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Prestige of the port of Buffalo as a preeminent transportation center is portrayed vividly in a revised report just issued by the Board of Army Engineers for rivers and harbors. Buffalo, the report states, is the greatest grain distributing center, as well as the greatest milling city, in the Western Hemisphere. It ranks first among the ports on the Great Lakes in value of tonnage handled, and second in volume of tonnage of water-borne commerce.

The report just published is the first of a series about ports on the Great Lakes. It is issued as an informative work for the guidance of Federal, State, municipal, and port agencies and to furnish useful information to shipping and transportation interests in connection with the movement of goods through various ports.

NOTED FOR TRANSSHIPMENT

The report states:

"Buffalo has long had the distinction of being the principal transshipment port in connection with rail and lake traffic to and from the West. The harbor is located at the eastern end of Lake Erie, south of the head of the Niagara River, and is 78 miles northeast of Erie Harbor, Pa., 37 miles northeast of Dunkirk Harbor, and 22 miles east of Port Colborne, Ontario, Canada, the Lake Erie terminus of the Welland Ship Canal.

"The port consists of an outer harbor formed by a breakwater system in Lake Erie; an inner harbor comprising the Buffalo River, the city ship canal, and various basins and slips, and the channels in Niagara River comprising the Black Rock locks, canal, and the

improved natural channel in the river to Tonawanda. The average season of navigation is from April 11 to December 23.

"The port has a total of 93 piers, wharves, and moorings, 12 of which are located in the outer harbor, 64 in the inner harbor, 5 in Erie Basin, and 12 in the Black Rock Canal and the Niagara River. Railroads own 20 of the terminals, but 13 of these are leased to steamship or private interests. Twenty-eight of the facilities serve grain elevators and flour mills, the port of Buffalo being the greatest grain-distributing port as well as the largest milling city in the Western Hemisphere.

"TWENTY-ONE GRAIN ELEVATORS

"There are 21 waterfront grain elevators with a total storage capacity of approximately 44,718,500 bushels. The movement of grain on the Great Lakes is highly competitive, and it is possible that this commodity moves to Buffalo because of preferential freight rates, but there are other factors which appear to be influential and outweigh the element of rates. In this connection there are extensive elevator and "afloat" storage facilities, modern transfer elevators, accessibility to the port of New York, and several modern flour mills which alone convert many million bushels of grain into flour and other products each year.

"Buffalo ranks first among the ports on the Great Lakes in value of tonnage handled and second in volume of tonnage of water-borne commerce, being surpassed only by the port of Duluth-Superior. During the period of 1929–38, the water-borne commerce at the port averaged 16,351,875 tons per year. Grain, iron ore, bituminous coal, and limestone were the principal lakewise receipts, while the principal shipments were anthracite and bituminous coal, iron and steel, and miscellaneous package freight.

"Petroleum products ranked first in volume of the receipts via the New York State Barge Canal, followed by sulfur and sugar, while grain, pig iron, and petroleum products were the principal shipments. Lakewise receipts and shipments comprised a major part of the total port traffic with an average annual movement of 10,836,298 tons, or 66.3 percent of the total commerce. The foreign imports and exports together averaged 2,702,414 tons, or 16.5 percent.

"BARGE CANAL TRADE CUT

"The commerce of the New York State Barge Canal, with an annual average of 1,766,523 tons, comprised 10.8 percent of the total. The local traffic amounted to 6.4 percent, with an annual average movement of 1,046,640 tons.

"The port has provided drydocking facilities which can accommodate vessels up to 600 feet in length and all classes of heavy marine repairs can be performed. Stationary and floating cranes and derricks are available, and cold- and dry-storage facilities have been provided in warehouses on and near the water front.

"The port of Buffalo is served by 12 railway systems and 2 industrial lines, which, together with the various steamship and barge-line services available, places the port in a most favorable position for the transshipment of through traffic and the economic assembly of raw materials and the marketing of its product."

The Townsend Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we must consider the Townsend bill before we adjourn. It is evident that the Seventy-sixth Congress will adjourn in less than a month. If we do, a great many important bills will have to be left without consideration. There is at least one thing that I do not believe any of us want to leave for a future Congress to take up. That is the question of adequate and uniform old-age assistance. Nearly all the legislatures of the States will meet early in 1941. That question is one of the most, if not the most, important in every State of the Union. Every candidate for either branch of Congress and every State legislative candidate will have to face that issue this fall. I believe that most of us can agree that the present Federal, State, county, and local participation arrangement is unsatisfactory, unworkable, unfair, and inadequate. And we can also agree that the Federal Government must collect the necessary taxes and distribute them to those eligible on an equal basis. The State legislatures should know before they meet next January what the Federal Government's attitude is toward ending this shameful and disgraceful method of dealing with this problem.

The new Townsend bill, H. R. 8264, was introduced at the request of a great many Members who last year said they were strong for the idea of a uniform and adequate old-age-assistance plan, but they did not think the turnover tax was workable. So after many months of study the gross-income tax, exempting the first $3,000 of annual income, was substituted. A petition, No. 28, is on the Clerk's desk, and only about 50 more names are needed to bring this bill on the floor for consideration. In fairness to everybody that really means to change the present unsatisfactory method, and I believe that includes most of us, I urge those of you that have not yet signed this petition No. 28 to please do so today or tomorrow. By signing a petition to force a bill out of committee, you are not committing yourself to a vote in favor of that bill, but you will prove to your fellow Members, as well as the people of this Nation, that you are fair-minded enough to assist in bringing legislation of Nation-wide importance to the floor for a fair and impartial debate. By that you show your desire to help shape important legislation, so that you may feel justified in voting for it. If the bill does not shape up as you think it should, you have a perfect right to vote against it. I am sure that the large majority of our constituents are fair-minded people. Even though we might have voted opposite to their views, they will respect us much more than if we block legislation by refusing to bring it up. The American way is to let the majority of the people's Representatives debate important issues, amend them as they see fit, and then finally vote on them. That is all I ask of the Members. Please sign petition No. 28 so that we can bring the bill known as the Townsend recovery plan H. R. 8264, on the floor for discussion and a vote before we go home.

A Lynchless Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A Lynchless Year."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1940]

A LYNCHLESS YEAR

In the year that ended at midnight of May 8 not one person was lynched in the United States. Last year there were three. Statistics of this crime began with 1882. The most hideous year was 1892, which saw 231 lynchings. In the time of the opening of the West to settlement, horse thieves and cattle rustlers were the chief victims. After the War between the States illiteracy and a low economic condition, frequent or usual concomitants or causes of mob violence, made the South, and especially the thinly populated and ill-policed parts of it, the favorite territory of lynchers.

The main effort to root out an evil that seemed to have become inveterate began soon after the close of the World War with the establishment of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation and its creation in 1920 of the Department of Woman's Work. In 1929 there were but 10 lynchings. In 1930 they more than doubled to 21. As a result the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching was formed. It was widely and effectively organized with a central committee, with State committees in 13 States and with cooperating units in hundreds of counties.

This association has worked intelligently and vigorously. It has carried on an educational canvass. It has intervened where trouble between persons of the two races has broken out. It has condemned public officers, cowardly or remiss in resisting mob law, and commended those prompt and courageous in enforcing the law of the State. The association has done a remarkable job. It has given the United States for the first time a record unstained by a long-standing disgrace. These women are to be greatly honored, for they have done much to end a national dishonor.

W. P. A. Projects in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1940

LETTER AND ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN E. MILES, GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Governor of New Mexico, Hon. John E. Miles, and also a short speech delivered by him on May 7:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Santa Fe, May 7, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: I am enclosing a copy of a speech I am making tonight at Roy. It discusses a problem that may become even more serious as time goes on.

If, when the W. P. A. appropriation bill comes before Congress, there is anything that can be done along the lines suggested for making more projects possible for the counties and communities that have no funds it will be a great help to New Mexico.

For your information W. P. A. records here show that the greatest present difficulty is in obtaining projects in Taos, Rio Arriba, Santa Fe, Torrance, Mora, San Miguel, and Guadalupe Counties, with considerable difficulty also involved in setting up projects in Harding and Catron. The first seven counties mentioned were carrying as of this week, 42.7 percent of the entire relief load of the State.

By next winter these counties may be in an even more serious plight in attempting to set up projects to take care of the relief load, and I know you will want to do everything possible to solve this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. MILES, *Governor.*

ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN E. MILES, ROY, MAY 7, 1940

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have made many trips to many parts of the State in the past several months to take part in the dedication of new schoolhouses, city halls, recreation centers, and other W. P. A. projects, and I am certainly happy tonight to have the opportunity to join with the people of Roy in dedicating this splendid new gymnasium and auditorium.

This project, which has been a year in the making, has given work to many men, and now that it is completed it will stand for many years to give pleasure to many people and to the boys and girls of Roy who will be afforded the opportunity to use the facilities provided here.

I hope that this building will serve often as it is serving tonight, as a meeting place for the people of Roy, where you will have your town meetings, your entertainments, your community gatherings of all sorts.

The sponsor's share of this construction, which I am told amounted to only $8,000, is a comparatively small amount for the service it will give to the school district and the city, and I know that you people of Roy will feel that you certainly have gotten your money's worth.

But the $8,000 that was raised as sponsor's share for the structure was, I know, a large amount for a community this size, and you are to be congratulated on your foresight and progressiveness in making such a structure possible.

There are many communities throughout the State where similar projects should be undertaken. Many communities the size of Roy are in need of community buildings and other projects. However, many of these communities find it more difficult to raise sufficient funds to contribute the 25-percent sponsor share of the project cost.

It is this problem I want to discuss briefly with you tonight. This inability in several counties to provide the 25-percent sponsor share has deprived the communities of projects and provides a serious problem in handling relief employment.

The problem is growing in seriousness, since funds that could be used for W. P. A. projects are being exhausted, and these counties are facing the situation where it will be impossible to provide employment because of lack of projects.

This condition exists particularly in about a half dozen counties, and in these same counties nearly half of the relief load of New Mexico is concentrated.

The counties in which this relief load is concentrated normally have the lowest tax valuations in the State, so their problem is intensified not only because of normal lack of funds but because of the heavy relief load and the problem now of attempting to set up projects that will provide work relief.

The W. P. A. appropriation bill is now in committee in Congress, and there is a concerted effort to reduce the appropriation by a half billion dollars under the present appropriation.

If this happens New Mexico will be faced with a double problem. We will not only have difficulty in raising sufficient funds in some counties to provide projects, but throughout all of the State there will be less money available for work relief, even in counties where the sponsor's share is available.

In some counties there is little possibility of the unemployed being absorbed back into private employment, for there is practically no private employment. And it is these same counties that are unable to help themselves.

So until some long-time plan can be organized to put these areas on a normal economic basis we are faced with the continued but, I hope, temporary problem of providing employment. While I favor any reductions in Government spending that will ultimately bring about balancing the Budget and placing the country on a strong economic basis, I am opposed to doing this at the expense of thousands of our people whose only demand is the opportunity to make a living, and who, under the stress of present economic conditions, have little hope of ever being absorbed into private employment in their own counties.

Political speeches in which the speakers tell you over the radio and through the press than a change is needed in our economic set-up, and that if business has the opportunity it will absorb the unemployed, have an attractive sound. But that sound is as hollow as the fine phrases that are used.

From a practical standpoint, the unemployed cannot be absorbed into private employment where private employment doesn't exist.

In order to provide work in counties where it doesn't exist, we must provide projects, and, if projects are to be made available, it will either be necessary to relax requirements as to the amount of money the sponsor must provide or find new sources of funds for the sponsor's share.

Of the latter I can only be pessimistic, for I do not know where many communities or counties are to find the funds.

If action can be taken by the Congress to relax the sponsor-participation requirements under emergency conditions, it would be a happy solution. Although I do not know what success the suggestion will meet, I have today taken this matter up with New Mexico's delegation in Congress and I am urging them to make every effort to seek amending legislation that will make possible continuance of work-relief projects in communities where it is impossible to provide the sponsor's 25-percent share and where it is essential that work be provided.

While I do not think that a suggestion for outright gifts of the entire 100 percent of the project would be practicable, or acceptable by the Congress, it does seem to me that there may be cases where less than the full 25 percent might be acceptable; also, the possibility suggests itself that loans might be made available for the sponsor's share, to be paid back in taxes over a longer period of time than the funds would ordinarily be accumulated.

The problem is a serious one and may be more serious when counties and communities can no longer raise funds for sponsoring projects. Because of the seriousness of the problem, I have discussed this matter at greater length than I originally intended at this W. P. A. dedication program.

I have enjoyed this visit with you and I want to extend my sincere congratulations on the completion of this fine project. I am happy to have a part in the dedication of this building to the service of all of the people of Roy.

Thank you.

Widows' and Orphans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1940

LETTER FROM RUTH MILLER STEESE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Mifflinburg, Pa., May 4, 1940.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As legislative chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary, of the Department of Pennsylvania, may I express to you our genuine appreciation of your signature on the petition calling for the discharge of the House Rules Committee from further consideration of H. R. 9000. Thank you.

Very sincerely,

RUTH MILLER STEESE,
Department Legislative Chairman, American Legion Auxiliary.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, veterans' pensions was the subject discussed on the program of the American Forum of the Air, Sunday evening, May 12, over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting System. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert herewith my address delivered in support of veterans' pensions on the above occasion.

Ladies and gentlemen, veterans' pensions had the earnest attention of this Government on August 26, 1776, 54 days after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, when the Continental Congress passed the first pension law, which has since become the pattern for every succeeding piece of veteran legislation adopted to date.

From the days of Valley Forge our Government has paid pensions to the veteran and his dependent in every war in which our Nation has been involved. The theory that the veteran and his dependent have an honest claim on the Federal Government for assistance was voiced by a truly great American, Theodore Roosevelt, when he declared:

"Pensions are rewards for service rendered or recompense for injuries received in rendering them. They are payments, not bounties; the soldier is no more a beneficiary of the state than the state is of him."

In similar fashion, George Washington, Woodrow Wilson, and Calvin Coolidge expressed themselves in favor of the pension system.

Every war has left in its wake a trail of desolation and the World War was no exception. As an aftermath, 85 United States veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation are in operation today, filled to capacity and unable to care for a long and patient waiting list of the maimed and injured.

These veterans with broken bodies, suffocated lungs—yes, and in many instances, shadowed minds—were in 1917 the flower of American manhood. Is memory so short that one fails to recall these young men leaving their homes and families with the blessings and best wishes of a grateful Nation? Were you one of the untold millions who offered up a prayer for their safe return and in the same breath vowed that this Nation owed these boys a debt of gratitude and that nothing was too good for them?

Today that young army of 1917, in the short space of 23 years, has reached the average age of 48 years, with the appalling death rate of 91 World War veterans every 24 hours. According to statistics, 85 percent of the World War veterans are married and have three children, so that the average veteran's death leaves a widow with three children.

The two great veteran organizations—the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—are conscious of the plight faced today by the 48-year-old World War veteran, whose physical condition is not only below par through his service, whether domestic or overseas, but whose age is a mighty barrier to his prospect of employment. This 48-year-old veteran is not alone in his plight, for be it remembered that statistics tell us he has a wife and three children.

This problem confronting the World War veteran and his dependents has been brought to the Congress of the United States after years of study on the part of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. And while the Congress of the United States tussles with the problem of providing for the World War veteran and his dependents, as well as veterans of all wars, a small group of veterans who happen through the grace of God not to be in need and who are employed in gainful occupations and professions, having no personal knowledge or information as to the actual need of the veteran and his dependents, join with certain publishers in disseminating false, misleading, and vicious propaganda that is intended to smear the recipient of any pension or benefits from a grateful Government. Wearing the dollar sign as a halo, these past masters of malicious propaganda are not strangers to the arena of veterandom. Their holy and horrified voices have been raised on former occasions when they charged the veteran and his dependent with raiding the Treasury and today they are running true to form when mention is made of a pension for the disabled World War veteran and his dependents.

No doubt many of you have been led to believe that every World War veteran receives a pension from the Government. Nothing could be further from the truth. Authentic information taken from Government records discloses that less than 9 percent of the 4,791,172 men and women who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War receive benefits from the Government today.

It is interesting to note that 6½ percent of all Federal appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, is chargeable to the veteran and his dependents, and that this figure includes all wars. Likewise, it is shown that about 13 percent of the grand total of all Federal expenditures since the founding of our Nation represents the total benefits paid to the veterans of all wars and their dependents.

Those who heretofore have charged the veteran and his dependent with raiding the Treasury now have the gall to flatly state that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States seek a general pension. I know of no major veteran organization that has ever advocated payment of general pensions for all able-bodied veterans, nor do I know of any bill that has been introduced in Congress to date on this subject.

There is a vast difference between a general pension and a disability pension. The latter is being advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at the present time, based on the fact that after the World War thousands of veterans developed disabilities which they honestly believed to have been caused by their military service but which they unfortunately have been unable to legally prove to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration.

This bill appears to be the answer to the problem faced by many World War veterans, and regardless of the attack made against it, Congress will undoubtedly place their stamp of approval on it in the very near future.

With the high death rate of 91 veterans daily, and confronted with the fact that 85 percent of these veterans leave a widow and three children, the World War Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives perfected and reported to the House H. R. 9000—a bill providing $20 monthly to the widow and a similar sum to the dependent parent, with a proportionate amount to the children according to age.

Since this bill has been reported out of committee the public has been asked to believe that this legislation will cost hundreds of millions of dollars annually and that every widow and orphan of deceased World War veterans will receive a pension.

On the contrary, those responsible for such rash statements fail to recognize the "needs" clause existing in the bill which will render ineligible 75 percent of the 96,500 widows, 23,500 children, and dependent parents of 32,800 deceased World War veterans. This "needs" clause can best be explained that where the income of the widow, parent, or orphan exceeds $50 monthly there arises a presumption that dependency does not exist.

Regardless of the charges that this bill will cost $100,000,000 annually, it is freely predicted that the sum will not exceed $10,000,000.

Tomorrow afternoon when the House of Representatives passes H. R. 9000 by an overwhelming majority they will recognize the fact that in extending benefits to the widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans they are transferring them from the relief rolls of the country to the honor roll of the Nation. In so doing the cost of maintaining these widows, orphans, and dependent parents is lifted from the shoulders of the respective States and transferred to the Federal Government, where it properly belongs, thereby making it possible for every community and State to provide more generously for other needy citizens.

In concluding my discussion on this question of veteran pensions, and regardless of the frenzied efforts of a group of selfish individuals to spread false propaganda, let me assure you that pensions are part of the cost of war and have been so recognized since the founding of our Nation.

Let's not be afraid to face the music. If our country can get itself involved in war and pay for the cost thereof, then it can certainly pay for the cost of the human aftermath of war.

The people of America who imparted their blessings to the defenders of this Nation in 1917–18 I am sure realize that in the payment of pensions to a veteran and his dependents they maintain an honor roll for those who have or are willing to give their all in defense of a grateful Nation.

Let me repeat that the pension roll has always been regarded as the honor roll of the Nation.

Yes; it has been costly; but in considering this cost let us stroll down memory's lane once more to the frantic days of 1917–18, when the youth of this Nation marched off to war with not only the good wishes of all citizens but likewise the assurance of this country's lasting gratitude for the service to be rendered.

Today, 23 years after, with the rest of the world plunged in conflict and we here in America enjoying the blessings of a great Government at peace with all nations, it is difficult to believe that these same citizens who imparted their blessings in 1917–18 are now opposing the payment of pensions to the veteran and his dependents.

I am confident that the rank and file of the great American public are grateful for the services rendered by the defenders of our Nation, and in a spirit of gratitude recognize the honor roll of our country by standing shoulder to shoulder with the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in upholding a great American tradition—adequate care for the veteran and his dependents.

Great Britain and France Favor a Third Term for President Roosevelt, Believing That a Third Term Means United States Participation in the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Demaree Bess, published in the Saturday Evening Post for May 11, 1940:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of May 11, 1940]

OUR ELECTION AND EUROPE'S WAR

(By Demaree Bess)

GENEVA, April 5.—As far as Europe is concerned, there is only one issue in the American Presidential election this year, and that is the war issue. Europeans are amazed that so many Americans seem to believe they have already settled this question; that the United States can and will remain neutral; and that domestic affairs, therefore, are more important than foreign policy in the coming campaigns.

As seen from Europe, such complacency overlooks the fact that the Allied-German war has taken an unexpected turn. It ignores the evidence that British and French strategists have had to change their ideas about the conduct of the war, and some of their new plans are founded on the belief, or at least the hope, that they will have American military assistance before the war is over.

For years, the British and French peoples have been listening to a whole flock of American politicians and reformers and other citizens crying that the democracies must stand together against the dictatorships. Now that they are actually fighting Germany, they cannot be blamed for expecting their vociferous American sympathizers to attempt to provide them with whatever help they may require. Under these circumstances, they count upon pro-Ally Americans to keep the war issue alive in American politics until the war ends, or until we get into it.

When the war broke out last September, British and French statesmen told some of their American sympathizers: "If you lift your arms embargo, we can win this war. Your airplanes and munitions will give us the means to tip the balance. We can then bring Germany to her knees by an economic blockade." All Americans understood, when we did lift our arms embargo, that we were doing so because we sympathized with the Allied cause, and believed we were thus helping them to win.

The war proceeded for 7 months, and the Allied strategists earnestly studied its lessons. By spring they decided they must take additional measures to make their blockade effective. It was not enough to cut off Germany's imports from overseas. They must also reduce Germany's imports from adjoining Scandinavia and Russia and the Balkans. To execute these new plans they must bring more pressure upon European neutrals, perhaps even compelling some of them to enter the war. And they must call upon their friends in other neutral countries, particularly the United States, to do everything possible to send additional help.

Allied strategists had just begun to reshape their ideas about conducting their war when President Roosevelt sent Sumner Welles to Europe. Preceding him came reports from Washington that Mr. Welles represents the group in our State Department known as the pseudo appeasers. This group allegedly favors a negotiated peace in Europe because they believe that the German Army should be left intact as a bulwark against Soviet Russia. Whether these reports were true or not, when they were reprinted in European newspapers they undisguisedly disturbed British and French official circles. This Anglo-French official alarm was increased when Mr. Welles, at the end of his European tour, seemed to associate himself closely with the so-called peace schemes of Mussolini and Hitler. Those British and French journals which express official viewpoints began to hammer on the idea that the time was inopportune for peace moves of any kind, because a negotiated peace, coming before Germany had lost a single battle, would mean a German victory. Perhaps they were right. Certainly it would not mean an Allied victory.

The whole episode was reminiscent of another American election year, 1916, when President Wilson was getting ready to campaign for reelection. President Wilson also sent his representative to Europe to explore the possibilities of a negotiated peace. Colonel House was authorized to tell the British that Mr. Wilson was ready to call a conference to end the war. Our President was so eager to force a negotiated peace in Europe that he put himself on record: "Should the Allies accept this proposal and should Germany refuse it, the United States would probably enter the war against Germany."

The American public did not know for years how far President Wilson had been willing to commit us in that spring of 1916. If they had known, they might not have responded so trustfully 6 months later to his campaign slogan: "He kept us out of war."

President Wilson's rashness in committing his country was not revealed in 1916 for the simple reason that British and French leaders pointedly ignored his proposal, so that it was never put up to Germany. Anglo-French leaders did not want a negotiated peace in the spring of 1916 because they still hoped to overwhelm Germany. And with American help they did overwhelm her.

OUR PROCESSION OF WORLD SAVERS

When British and French leaders rejected the mere suggestion of a negotiated peace this spring, they naturally called to mind the events of that other spring 24 years ago. Once more the European conflict had reached a temporary deadlock, and once more there were moves for peace. These moves, as before, originated largely from neutral sources. And in 1940, even more than in 1916, British and French leaders insisted that they could not come to terms with what they called Hitlerism in Germany. In 1916 it had been Kaiserism.

Granted that Hitlerism compares unfavorably with Kaiserism and is more difficult to deal with, it nevertheless seems unlikely that the British and French Governments would have so promptly rejected overtures to peace if they had believed the alternative was defeat or deadlock. They thought, and they still believe, the balance of forces was in their favor. They could not be expected to negotiate a peace on anything like German terms so long as they could see that vast untapped reservoir of neutrals which might be more accessible to them than to their adversary.

The most powerful neutral, the United States, had unmistakably revealed that its sympathies are more one-sided in this war than they were in 1916. President Roosevelt had proclaimed himself the allied champion much more definitely than President Wilson did before 1917.

It is almost 3 years since President Roosevelt began to pull and push the American people back into the thick of world politics. His efforts recall those of a long line of American statesmen who had tried to convince us our "manifest destiny" beckons to us from the uttermost ends of the earth. That was the rallying cry of President McKinley, who led us into our War with Spain and presented us with that doubtful prize, the Philippines. It was enthusiastically taken up by Theodore Roosevelt, who plotted naive world schemes with Kaiser and Czar. It lured President Wilson into World War politics. It inspired Henry L. Stimson, President Hoover's Secretary of State, who tried to line up with Britain and France against Japan after the occupation of Manchuria. The chief drag upon the dreams of our men of destiny has been the reluctance of the American people to pay the price for making them come true.

And now, with the Allied-German struggle approaching its climax, Americans once again are waging their own internal battle over this "manifest destiny" issue, which has been fought at intervals over half a century. Alien propagandists are far less active in this contest than some Americans would like to believe. The two opposing groups are almost entirely American groups, composed of our own citizens with opposing ideas.

All European governments are aware that Americans were so thoroughly disillusioned by the propaganda of the last war that we are allergic to propaganda. So the British and French Governments, especially, are leaving us, at least to some extent, to fight out this battle alone. Their hope for further help from us resides largely in the efforts of pro-Ally Americans. It is for this reason that they are watching our Presidential election this year with such eager attention. It is for this reason that they are watching President Roosevelt so closely.

Because, whether he realizes it or not, Mr. Roosevelt has constituted himself, in European eyes, the rallying point for all Americans, whether Republicans, Democrats, or mugwumps, who want to swing further American support to England and France. For almost 3 years he has been dramatized by Europeans as the leader of the crusade which has marshaled the so-called idealistic and progressive portions of America to overcome the selfishness and ignorance of that mass of Americans who must be classed as isolationists.

THE QUARANTINE SPEECH

Naturally the average European cannot be expected to follow closely the intricacies of American political thought. It is hard enough to keep up with the more urgent political complexities of their belligerent neighbors. It doesn't matter to Europeans whether Americans who want to keep their country out of foreign wars are conservatives or Communists, pacifists or Irish-Americans. All are lumped together as isolationists.

Americans living in wartime England and France know that if these countries could name an American President Mr. Roosevelt would be elected by acclamation. Allied men and women echoed the words of one Communist Englishman who said to me: "It would be wonderful for us if Mr. Roosevelt received a third term." His European rooters have no particular interest in our President as a person. They don't care about his views on domestic questions. They simply count upon him, more than upon any other American, to promote the Anglo-French cause in the United States. Is their confidence justified? Do they perhaps appreciate better than most Americans the path which the President has followed in the past and is likely to follow in the future? To answer those questions let us look at the record upon which

Europeans base their estimates of Mr. Roosevelt. Let us look particularly at the European reaction to three sensational moves which our President initiated. First was his Chicago speech in 1937. The second was his message to Congress in January 1939. The third was the peace pledge he sought from Hitler and Mussolini in April 1939.

I was in America when Roosevelt made his famous "quarantine" speech in 1937, and I recall Americans were not much excited about it. It was interpreted as chiefly directed against Japan. But when I came back to Europe that autumn I was amazed to discover what a sensation that speech had created. It was hailed as the death blow to American isolationism and a return of the United States to world politics.

I saw that Europeans already had acclaimed Mr. Roosevelt as the outstanding spokesman for those who divide the world into democracies and dictatorships. At a single stroke, as one English weekly put it, he placed himself "head and shoulders above other men in the authority and power with which he speaks for democracy and freedom."

Mr. Roosevelt's power and authority did not derive from his words, which were no more eloquent than those of many writers and professors. They gained their force because he was the Chief Executive of the United States, and his views were regarded as reflecting American policy. When he spoke, the shadow of the Army and Navy and air force fell across his rostrum.

As events proved, European commentators foresaw the full consequences of that speech better than most Americans did. One Paris journal, L'Europe Centrale, flatly predicted that Mr. Roosevelt had foreshadowed revision not only of American foreign policy but of the arms embargo in our Neutrality Act. The speech proved to this journal that "American collaboration with pacific powers will be proportionate to the danger which threatens the civilized portion of the world."

The French review, L'Europe Nouvelle, derived particular satisfaction from the influence our President's words were likely to have upon England. The British, it declared, were "anxious not to undertake anything without the United States, but they are now assured that they may take certain initiatives and assume certain responsibilities without the risk of being disowned by the American Government."

From this time onward, those of us who lived in Europe could see that an oversimplified and dramatic interpretation of President Roosevelt's actions and speeches was gaining ground. It was easy to understand why Englishmen and Frenchmen, all through the year 1938, snatched whatever comfort they could from encouraging words coming over the Atlantic. That was a terrible year for them; their governments retreated steadily before the inexorable attempts of German militarism. That was the year when the policy of appeasement reached its apex, and when British and French leaders bemoaned the fact that only Czechoslovakia stood in the way of a division of European control with Germany. Czechoslovakia had staked its future upon its alliance with France. To placate Germany, that alliance must be disavowed. And it was disavowed at Munich. But before it was disavowed, the threat of general warfare stirred almost as much excitement in the United States as it did in Europe. President Roosevelt intervened time and again with appeals for a peaceful settlement, and in conversations with friends after Munich, he revealed that he took comfort in the belief that he had helped to prevent war. To those of us who were present at the Munich Conference, there was no evidence that the American President's peace appeals had much influence one way or the other. The British and French Governments did not need Mr. Roosevelt's help to make the peace of Munich. They needed American help only in case they decided to go to war.

Few Europeans honestly believed that the Munich surrender had prevented war. Because they sensed it, Englishmen and Frenchmen joyously greeted President Roosevelt's message to Congress the following January. Our President once again emphatically denounced dictatorships and upheld democracies, and his words were hailed, not as the personal opinion of one individual but as the voice of the American people. The London Round Table found that "President Roosevelt had issued the same warning that the United States would be alined with Great Britain and France in the event of a major European war, although, of course, the nature of the American participation cannot be defined in advance." The New Statesman and Nation assured its readers that "President Roosevelt is using the full power of his leadership to hurry along the change to a strong foreign policy." The German-Swiss newspapere, Voelkerebund, wrote that the axis powers must "consider what the intervention of a country of the importance of the United States would mean to them."

Americans who lived in Europe could see that Mr. Roosevelt's eloquent phrases, combined with certain obscure diplomatic moves that he began to make, were creating exaggerated hopes of American support in England and France. At that time, I wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post, reporting what Europeans thought about our President's maneuvers. I suggested that unless the American people were really prepared to join England and France in war against Germany, when and if such a war came, their President was raising false hopes which eventually would prove humiliating.

THE MESSAGE TO THE DICTATORS

Shortly after that article was published I met a friend of Mr. Roosevelt who had just come from Washington. He undertook to persuade me that our President was justified in taking a hand in the European poker game, because the stake, as he saw it, was European peace, and the risks, as far as Americans were concerned, were negligible. My informant admitted that the President was trying to outbluff Hitler and Mussolini. He was doing everything he could by speeches and diplomatic moves to make the two dictators believe that the United States might forcibly back up France and England in case of further aggression. According to this friend, Mr. Roosevelt was confident he was running no danger of involving the United States in war, because such an overwhelming majority of the American people were isolationists. History has repeated itself. Once again an American President was intervening in European power politics because he believed he could use his great position to force peace in Europe. Woodrow Wilson had followed that same course in the spring of 1916. And, once more, events proved that European conflicts cannot be resolved by sonorous phrases or by diplomatic moves.

The high point of Mr. Roosevelt's efforts to outbluff the dictators came in April 1939, when he addressed his peace pledge to Hitler and Mussolini. In the middle of March, Hitler had made war almost inevitable by rushing his legions into Bohemia and Moravia. The Chamberlain and Daladier appeasement policy lay in ruins. Mussolini became so impressed with Hitler's apparent ability to get away with things that he decided to pick up Albania. This was the most chaotic period of Europe's recent history. And into Europe's turmoil and confusion Mr. Roosevelt hurled his messages to the dictators. This move caused a tremendous reaction in every European country. The Paris Temps described it as a sensation and declared: "This message has put an end, at least in part, to the state of uncertainty upon which the totalitarian states have speculated." J. L. Garvin wrote in The London Observer: "Now for the first time Hitler and Mussolini have no doubts. They know it as a certainty that America will be upon them if they strike again at any independent nation whatever." The Swiss Basler Nachrichten expressed the neutral view that "If the German and Italian Governments return negative answers, it must be known, both in Berlin and Rome, that the United States would very rapidly assume an active role, as soon as the floodgates of war were opened anywhere in Europe."

Mr. Roosevelt gave no sign that he was disturbed by these startling interpretations, and others like them. In fact, they doubtless fitted in with the policy he had adopted to block the dictators. Perhaps he was encouraged also by the bitter comments of the German and Italian press. The Berliner Morgenpost asked whether President Roosevelt "does not want, by such agitation, to push the peoples of the Americas into war against the powers of order and thus supply means for dissimulating his failures in the field of domestic policy." The Rome newspaper, Messaggero, described our President's move as "part of the general offensive launched by the plutocratic democracies against the proletarian nations, which must be considered an act of war." The German Voelkischer Beobachter wrote: "If it were necessary for the western democratic powers to prove their ideological confusions, they could not have done better than to choose President Roosevelt as their spokesman."

When that spring crisis passed without war, many of Mr. Roosevelt's supporters in the United States gave him a large share of credit for saving peace. It is curious to observe that while Americans were thinking of the President's moves in terms of peace, Europeans were estimating them almost entirely in terms of war. By that time, little hope of lasting peace remained in Europe. The question was how far America would help the Allies in a war against Germany.

A few months later, after the Soviet-German pact had finally lighted the fuse to war, the peoples of Europe, in spite of their pressing personal anxiety over the dramatic progress of the debacle in Poland, watched with strained attention our congressional debate upon the arms embargo. Once again the American political arena assumed, in European eyes, the aspect of that familiar drama in which the pro-Ally group, headed by President Roosevelt, battled against the dark forces of isolationism and finally triumphed. For the moment, that victory was accepted as adequate.

The question remained how soon Americans would be ready to make further contributions. While the European peoples watched and waited, President Roosevelt suddenly moved once again. He sent Mr. Welles to Europe. Mr. Roosevelt is too experienced a statesman not to know that this move would create endless speculation in every European capital as well as in the United States, and that his explanations for the trip would nowhere be accepted as complete.

Although British and French official circles were probably uneasy, the delight of the ordinary Englishman and Frenchman was unmistakable. They had steadfastly refused to believe that the coming of war had changed our President's attitude toward the European conflict. Englishmen and Frenchmen would have been profoundly disappointed if Mr. Roosevelt had not given some indication soon that he was still watching for opportunities to help them.

Meanwhile, French newspaper readers were finding even more solid comfort in such reports as those of Georges Lechartier, correspondent in the United States for the Journal Des Débats, where Mr. Lechartier explained that Mr. Roosevelt, by farsighted and subtle political leadership, had made it possible for the United States to intervene in this war with much more immediate and deadly effect than we did in the last war. Pointing out that Mr.

Roosevelt had not made the mistakes during the present war in terms of the last one, the French correspondent continued: "Let us not forget, as President Roosevelt has never forgotten, that one of the greatest weaknesses of the military assistance brought by America to the Allies immediately after their declaration of war against Germany in April 1917, was the total lack of military preparedness of the American people. Three months elapsed before the arrival of the first American contingents in France.

"President Roosevelt has taken care to avoid a repetition of this inadequate preparedness. By his words and his actions, he has persuaded the American general public, first, of the advantage, and then of the necessity, for the United States to have 'the largest Navy in the world' and when the public understood this, he obtained from Congress appropriations to increase the American Fleet and Army enormously.

"Today American is ready, or will soon be ready, for any eventuality."

EYES ON AMERICA

It is obvious that M. Lechartier does not regard our preparedness as wholly defensive in character. He pointed out that American opinion "is infinitely better educated today, thanks to the press and the initiative taken by Mr. Roosevelt, than it was in 1914–17." He found that a growing majority already favored assistance to the Allies "without any restrictions in the economic sphere." As for military assistance, the French writer suggested that the American Army, Navy, and air force are being prepared for action just as quickly and probably more efficiently than if we had actually come into the war last November, when we made the first breach in our neutrality legislation by lifting the arms embargo. This astute French correspondent drew attention to a fact which few Americans have grasped so clearly. The great difference between 1940 and 1916 is that we were totally unprepared then for an extensive war, whereas now our Navy and air force are all dressed up and ready to go.

So there you have the picture as it looks from Europe. Allied statesmen see across the Atlantic a country whose President for 3 years has appointed himself the spokesman for democracies and the scourge of dictatorships. They see that his boldest moves in Europe have been greeted with applause by prominent Americans of every political faith. They see that the American people, under his leadership have created a Navy and an air force which is one of the world's great offensive forces. They see that our armaments, added to their own, might smash Hitlerism just as they smashed Kaiserism.

In this situation, the stage seems to be set for a final struggle between those Americans who want to bring us into the Allied-German war and those Americans who want to keep us out. That struggle coincides with our Presidential election, and seems likely to dominate it.

The Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CAROLINE O'DAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CAROLINE O'DAY, OF NEW YORK

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I made over the radio.

The National Women's Conference on Unemployment is holding a 3-day conference in Washington this week, and at this critical time it is important that the Nation should know what unemployment of 3,000,000 women means to them.

The radio address follows:

Statistics are no measure for human misery and privation. Cold figures cannot paint the picture of what millions of American homes have been like under the ravages of depression. Yet there are some cold facts which the people of the United States should know.

There are 3,000,000 daughters of the American depression. Yet there were only 300,000 W. P. A. jobs for these women in February of this year. There are millions of women, then, who should be the breadwinners of their families, and who are denied the opportunity to earn this bread.

And, in the face of this appalling inadequacy of jobs, 200,000 W. P. A. workers were laid off in April of this year, many, many of whom were women. Two hundred thousand more will be laid off in May, and by July 1 a total of 600,000 must be eliminated from the works projects.

The average wage for women W. P. A. workers is $44.50 per month, or $534 per year, if they work the full 12 months. The food budget for these women is $202 annually. For an average family, this yields the munificent sum of 5 cents per person per meal.

There are over 1,000,000 families and single persons dependent upon relief for their existence. The Social Security Board tells us that the average monthly relief allowance for the United States as a whole is approximately $24. This nets a total annual income of $288, out of which comes an annual food budget of $123. In terms of day-to-day existence, the $123 yields about 3 cents per person per meal, for the average relief family.

Wives of W. P. A. workers are little better off. Their average annual wage is $648 per year, out of which the average family takes $278.64 for food. This sum breaks down to 7 cents per person per meal.

Yet, all of the official standard budgets worked out by Government agencies tell us in plain language that even the most fortunate W. P. A. family in America is far, far below the lowest level at which a family can live in decency and without hazard to the health of its members. The lowest standard budget, the so-called emergency level of the W. P. A., is $75 per month, or $900 per year. In other words, the very lowest standard of living set forth in a standard budget is $252 a year higher than the highest income group from which delegates to this conference will be drawn.

Mass job hunts and individual quests for work in industry have been conducted throughout the country for the past 2 years. The number of positions resulting from these efforts have been pitiful. Even the recent rise in the production index has been so slight that it is quite clear that reemployment in private industry has not even made a dent in our standing army of 11,000,000 unemployed.

No; something more far-reaching than has yet been undertaken must be forthcoming before we can wipe out the scourge of mass unemployment. Something more fundamental in the line of keeping the wheels of industry turning must be tried. And until this is done the 11,000,000 jobless must be given the American right to work and earn their own living.

No single member of any family is in a better position than is the mother to describe in vivid and graphic terms the meaning of unemployment to the jobless people of this Nation. It is a terrible thing to ask a mother to stand docilely by and watch her children starve slowly but surely because of the inability of their parents to provide. It is, in fact, more than any citizen of this country can demand of an American family.

The stories which will be presented by the daughters of the American depression will stand as monuments to the criminal waste of unemployment. These personal histories should awaken America to the immediate necessity of frankly meeting and dealing with the danger of continuous mass joblessness. For the 11,000,000 unemployed are citizens in our democracy. They have a right to participate in it, both as political entities and as a part of the consuming public. If one or both of these rights are taken away from the unemployed, what does democracy become to them? It becomes a mockery, a hollow phrase, or, much worse, an actual agent of oppression.

That is why this conference is so important. That is why, also, it is important that concrete improvements in the plight of the unemployed must come out of the conference. To those who have been closed out of our economy, denied the fruits of democracy, we must prove that democracy is something worth fighting for.

No single citizen would, if he or she were conscious of it, say to another citizen, "You must live on $288 per year and like it. You can only spend 3 cents per family member per meal for food. You must watch your children starve and say nothing about it."

Yet those who fight against W. P. A., those who support the layoff of 600,000 W. P. A. workers, those who would even abolish relief, those who support W. P. A. wage cuts—all of these people are, in effect, saying just that to the 11,000,000 unemployed.

There has been during the New Deal administration an effort made to improve the conditions of these jobless men and women. And certainly today is an improvement over the previous administrations. But we cannot, if we take our responsibilities seriously, be self-satisfied. The few figures I have mentioned to you tonight are ample proof of that. And it is my hope that when the daughters of the American depression meet with their president, when they meet with their congressional representatives, and when they tell their stories to the Nation, something concrete in the way of improvements will result. For I believe that only in a marked rise in the purchasing power of the masses of our people can we find the road to real economic recovery.

With all the ferment and trouble in the world about us, it is my firm conviction that Americans must seek to solidify the foundations of democracy in our land. We can only do this by making it work. And by that I don't mean making it work for a few; I mean making it work for every single man, woman, and child in America. We have not made it work for the unemployed. The delegates to the National Women's Conference on Unemployment will demonstrate this. Their stories will be a challenge to democracy—a challenge which every conscientious American must meet calmly, boldly, and objectively.

We ask you to hear out the story of the daughters of the American depression, and after you have heard them to join with the delegates to the National Women's Conference on Unemployment in their demand for the right to a job and a decent American standard of living.

Does the Present Social Security Law Really Protect the Old Folks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

"THE TOWNSEND CREED" AND AN ARTICLE BY DR. FRANCIS TOWNSEND

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a petition on the desk of the Clerk for the discharge of the committee from further consideration of the Townsend bill, H. R. 8264. One hundred and fifty-nine Members have signed the petition. Those in favor of securing an adequate old-age pension law should sign this petition so that the whole matter may be considered by this session of the Congress.

It is conceded by most all of us that unemployment is our economic problem No. 1. As a part of that problem, and a major part, adequate care for the older workers is uppermost. We all know that one who has reached the age of 60 years and is thrown out of employment is faced by a most serious problem in endeavoring to secure reemployment. Under existing economic conditions of mass production and technological advances, a portion of those seeking employment must look in vain. As a result, it is logical that if any one group of workers should be retired and still be permitted to share in the fruits of industry it should be the older workers who, in the past, have contributed their part.

The Townsend plan is based on such a theory. The Townsend creed is sound American doctrine. Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the originator of the plan, in an article appearing in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 11, 1940, discussed this plan and answered the question, "Does the present social-security law really protect the old folks?" I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the extension of my remarks the Townsend creed and the article by Dr. Townsend. They follow:

THE TOWNSEND CREED

We believe in a Nation-wide retirement security program based on American principles of equity and justice, without the possibility of discrimination on grounds of race, color, or religion.

We believe that technological advances, declining birth rates, with the attendant decrease in the number of those acceptable to industry, and constantly increasing demands for retirement of our senior citizens, require retirement should begin at the age of 60 at the latest.

We believe that the retirement of the elders is a matter of concern to the entire body of society, and therefore should be financed by a universal tax based upon the total volume of business done within the Nation.

We believe that any social-security program should be made operative on a basis which will return to profitable employment all those not retired, and thus open the doors of opportunity to the youth of our land.

We believe that stagnation of business, idle bank reserves, idle factories, idle men are caused by lack of purchasing power in the hands of the many.

We believe this condition can be remedied only by the release of the taxes collected from the people being returned into the channels of trade and commerce on a scale that will permit the living of the people to be on the typical American standard instead of a bare subsistence level.

We believe that the immediate spending of tax moneys and their return through the channels of trade should be restricted wherever possible to the purchase of American goods made by American workmen; that they should be spent within the United States and should be used discreetly to avoid retaining employable persons in idleness, and this principle should be contained in any sound recovery program.

We believe that this and all other Government activities should be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis, as neither this Nation nor any other nation can survive constantly increasing indebtedness. We must have a balanced National Budget to protect the American way of life.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 11, 1940]

DOES THE PRESENT SOCIAL SECURITY LAW REALLY PROTECT THE OLD FOLKS?—"NO," SAYS DR. TOWNSEND

(By Dr. Francis E. Townsend, originator of the Townsend Plan)

Does the present social-security law really protect the old folks?

It most certainly does not.

It is a cruel and deceptive law with pension and charity payments so indecently low as to sicken any Christian soul.

The old gentleman who grinned at us each morning from the social-security placard as we rode to town on the streetcar has been removed. His happy smile in anticipation of age security turned sour when his check, averaging $4 a week, arrived.

The figures I use have been checked by Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, who had them verified by the Federal Security Administrator, Paul V. McNutt.

Under the so-called Federal-State charity plan of Social Security, the average payment is only $19 a month. Can anyone defend that meager sum? Under the worker's contributory plan for which the Federal Government is wholly responsible, the record is a sad one. Fifteen percent of those taxed under its heartless provisions will receive nothing at all in return, because they failed to earn $50 in a sufficient number of calendar quarters. Their contributions will be stripped from them—and they will get not one slender dime!

Another 15 percent of the contributors will receive only the statutory minimum—a miserable $10 a month. Twenty percent more will receive under $19. One-half of all those paying contributions will get less than is given free to the average recipient of State charity pensions.

If a retired worker, enjoying the minimum of $10 a month, has a wife past 65, the Government lifts his allowance to the pitiful sum of $15. But, if the wife is only 60, they must struggle along for another 5 years on 35 pennies a day.

Those who will receive annuities of $40 a month are generally those who won't need the payment, since it is only those receiving salaries of $3,000 a year and up who will get these larger payments.

The Social Security Act is rotten with injustice to its very core. It is hardly at all a contributory plan, but almost wholly a scheme of fake dividends paid from public moneys, with substantial payments to the prosperous and meager pittances to the miserable.

Notice how indecently unfair the act is in its treatment of widows and orphans. If a man dies, who has had a salary of $3,000 or more per year, leaving behind him a widow and two or three children, that fortunate family will be given a social dividend of $85 a month. He may have paid in as little as $90 and yet his family could collect $20,000 to $25,000.

Take now the case of a man receiving the minimum benefit of $10 a month. If he should die, leaving a widow with five or six children, that widow and those children will receive just $20 a month.

Thus, this law gives to the fortunate and well-to-do, out of public moneys, a decent annuity of $85 a month and a miserable allotment of $20 to the needy and unfortunate.

Social Security extends its meager protection to only the fortunate employed in "covered" occupations. Millions of agricultural, domestic, and other employees are left outside the magic circle; and, of course, 12,000,000 unemployed cannot hope to contribute.

This law discriminates against the poor and the lowly. In Michigan, 85 percent of those who pay contributions will receive pensions, while in Mississippi, where one-half the workers earn less than $200 a year, only about 7 percent of those who pay contributions will be paid annuities. The bread filched from these destitute workers will be given to the more fortunate. Five or ten dollars will flow into the more prosperous industrial communities in the north as compared with every $1 that will be received in the Southern or agricultural States.

Finally, in answer to our question, let us take the case of the average employed worker who will receive benefits under the contributory plan. In the covered occupations his earnings are $75 a month. Eighty-seven percent of those who are married, when they become 65 have wives under 65. These will receive no additional benefits. The average worker reports to the Board as follows:

"I am married. I shall be 65 January 1; my wife is 60. I have been employed for 3 years at $75 a month. How much do I have coming?"

The Social Security expert says: "We will give you 40 percent upon the first $50 of your earnings, or $20. Ten percent upon the second $25, or $2.50 additional. So you will receive $22.50, plus 1 percent of that amount for each year, which, for 3 years, would make it about $23."

If we degrade Mr. Average Worker to a home in the slums that he might rent for $14 or $15 a month, and slowly starve him and his wife by cutting his food allowance to $15 or $16 a month, allow nothing for clothing or medical care, we see how shockingly inadequate such a pension is.

The advocates of social security have no apparent conception of the needs of social dividends for increased purchasing power. They do not grasp the necessity of increasing buying capacity by such means, for to seek these ends by pensions of $10, $20, or $30 a month is absurd; it is an amount suited to the age of poverty, not of abundance; of the wheelbarrow, not the steam shovel.

We need a national pension program which will abandon the shame and poverty of the Social Security Act and will pay to every retired citizen over 60 (age 65 is fantastically high) a decent social dividend as a matter of simple human right. We need a program adequate, not merely to assist life, but to grant it a measure of dignity and serenity.

We need a program which will be founded upon a truly equitable base, broad enough to support ample annuities; that is, upon the income of all society—including the well to do—and not simply upon the working class. In short, what we need, and what increasing multitudes want, is the Townsend plan, as submitted to Congress in 1940. And if I am any judge, that is what we are going to have.

Who Can Keep Us Out of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if we were asked to name one principle of public affairs which the people of the United States would not lightly surrender, we should list a determination to keep clear of European politics as our unchallengeable selection. A century and a half of constant attention to the development of our own economic health while Europe was wallowing through an orgy of blood in a dozen wars has made us wary of anything smacking of European intrigue. And the experience of the last war is still too vivid for any of us to look upon our friends across the ocean with anything approaching confidence. George Washington's Farewell Address has gained tremendous support from world history since the day it was delivered. Each year it looms ever larger upon the American scene, gaining stature as one of the most prophetic warnings uttered in modern times. As a solid rock of governmental policy, it has withstood the test of 150 years of constitutional government. Every time we have departed from it we have come to grief. Every time we have resisted the cries of the internationalists to "save mankind" we have gained strength.

The people of the United States must know by this time that nations determined to destroy themselves cannot be dissuaded. Reasoning processes are as closed to them as to the minds of madmen. Not for a moment do the American people fail to sympathize with those who are insane; but we do not take up arms on behalf of one madman to enable him the more speedily to dispose of another. For almost 2,000 years the people of the European continent have battled each other desperately. They have killed, pillaged, burned the towns and farms of their enemies. There has never been a moment when anything approaching a friendly conference, with all cards on the table, has taken place in Europe. Instead, constant division has been fostered; absurd racial and national prejudices have been carefully nourished; and the whole demoniac game of Weltpolitik has been played with millions of helpless men, women, and children as pawns in the struggle.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the Balkans. A half dozen small nations, bitterly hostile to each other, worlds apart in their sympathies, have been created by the scheming minds of large powers which play the game most skillfully. Deliberately they have been taught to hate each other, despite the fact that not one of them is self-sustaining in even the most restricted sense of the term. In truth, the men who guide these Balkan states know full well that they need each other desperately, if they are to maintain themselves at all. Their basic interests are absolutely identical, yet they too join in the mad game of power politics as if the rattle of their swords were as mighty as old Bismarck's.

It does not require the mind of a gifted statesman to perceive that federation, political unity, a common directing agency could vastly alter the state of affairs in Europe. Nor is the situation any the less incredible in the Far East. Much as we dislike the aspirations of imperialistic Japan in the Orient, much as we prefer the peaceful, philosophic Chinese, we cannot help wondering why China's 400,000,000 people cannot unite within themselves to develop a mighty nation.

We Americans must not deceive ourselves into a mistaken belief that it is our role in world history to bring about peace and harmony through the use of the sword. Our task in the records of human destiny is to demonstrate by example that the program of democracy can work effectively. No argument can be made for Federated States stronger than the proof that it can work with millions of men and women who come from diverse backgrounds, who have in fact been brought up in the atmosphere of the same hating nations from which the witch's caldron of Europe has been fashioned.

In those halcyon years before the World War and immediately after, the lesson we have been unconsciously teaching the world seemed to be taking hold. Democracy was the pattern from which many a small nation drew its governmental design. For a time, it worked, even in a war-destroyed Europe. Then the old hatreds flared up again. They bubbled out in Spain, in Italy, in Poland. Forces interested in changing the order of things stimulated restrictive, oppressive measures against minorities.

The democratic principle of compromise, of give and take was abandoned, and majorities sought to rule through force.

The process is still going on today. And already in the United States the demand is rising from those who refuse to learn. "Now is the time," they tell us, "to intervene. Now we can walk into Europe to strike a decisive blow for human freedom. We must crush the Germanic monster to keep the world safe for democracy." The words sound all too familiar. They were the slogan of the last war. Are we to be dragged into foreign lands again on the same basis as 1917? Are we going to shed the blood of our youth on foreign battlefields once more to restore order to a chaotic continent?

We are determined that we shall not. The Republican Party is pledged to a program which rules out war completely.

But the Democratic Party, protest though it may, can offer us no such assurances. It has a long record on foreign affairs, a record which leaves no room for doubt. In the days of 1916, President Woodrow Wilson campaigned on a platform boasting that he had kept us out of war. A few months after the votes had been counted we were in that war. President Wilson was a great public figure. He was thoroughly informed on world affairs. In fact, he too sent an emissary on a fact-finding mission to Europe. Colonel House was the Sumner Welles of the Wilson era.

The similarities are striking, too striking for comfort in an hour of grave international tensions. President Roosevelt, for all his devotion to the interests of democracy, suffers from a weird ailment which seems limited to the leaders of the Democratic Party. He has megalomania, a terrifying word to express a terrifying purpose. It means a passion for achieving great results. It means a deep and frequently incurable desire to do things which will perpetuate one's name in the history books of the future. It means, in terms of President Roosevelt's personal aspirations, a consuming zeal to bring peace to a world racked by war.

Americans have not forgotten the results of the moral crusade upon which Woodrow Wilson launched us in 1917. We have not forgotten the celebrated fourteen points, nor the Peace Conference of Versailles. Still fresh in our memories is the historic expedition of President Wilson to France, where he visioned himself as the central figure in a drama which was to reshape the destiny of Europe, insure a just and lasting peace, stimulate confidence and trade.

Nor have we forgotten that over a million Americans risked their lives on foreign battlefields to give President Wilson

the opportunity to play this majestic role. We have resolved that American blood must never be spilled again for such an objective.

If the utter collapse of Versailles and Wilson's idealism has taught us anything, it has taught us that Americans cannot solve Europe's problems. No matter how objective we may be, no matter how fair-minded our views, no matter how sincere our spokesmen, the politicians of Europe will not accept our program for their continent.

It must be obvious that President Roosevelt has not yet learned this lesson. In speech after speech, the old hankering of Wilson has cropped out to reveal its reincarnation in President Roosevelt. "Aggressor nations," "quarantine," are strikingly reminiscent of the bellicose "freedom of the seas," which stirred our thinking in 1916. The mobilization of sentiment in powerful units must always precede the beginning of hostilities in a democratic state. Emotions must be roused. Dangers to institutions cherished by the people must be conjured up before they can be readied for the battle. Today the processes have become more subtle than they were in the nineteenth century. Then the program called for melodrama, faked telegrams, nonexistent insults, border incidents. Now the nations are bombarded with assaults on ideologies. Isms have replaced the incident. National insults have gone out of style, and they have been replaced by appeals for economic self-preservation.

In all these modern trappings of the old-fashioned chauvinism, President Roosevelt knows no equal. The same voice which proclaims that the only enemy we have to fear is fear itself, can equally glibly assert that the people of the United States do not live in an international vacuum; that our interests are the interests of humanity; that the concerns of Europe are our concerns. With quivering sincerity, the Democratic President of our Nation can point to the damage inflicted upon our trade, upon our industry, by conflicts abroad.

We know all these things, yet we reserve the right to weigh them in the light of our Nation's history. Those students of world affairs who see the United States as no more than an outpost of the British Empire, as a mere continuation of European development, mistake the judgment of our people's temperament. Our political history represents a determination to turn our back upon European entanglements. It is a complete repudiation of the European technique of government and the European approach to the solution of its problems. We believe in conference; Europe believes in conflict. We believe in arbitration; Europe believes in armament.

To those who minimize the dangers before us must be addressed a word of warning. The technique of propaganda is not limited to one or another side in the European war. The Allies and the Nazis are equally adept at its skillful use. In the years from 1914 to 1917, when they were laying the groundwork for American participation in the World War the lessons of subtlety were well learned. No one who reads can doubt the amazing similarity between the basic influences which were at work then and those which are operating now.

In the days of 1914 our ambassadors abroad were not long in revealing their sympathies. They are no less evident today. The Walter Hines Page who served us in London during those fierce days is matched by the William Bullitt who is our Ambassador to France today. The Brand Whitlock, of Brussells, was no more pro-Entente in 1914 than Mr. Cromwell, of Ottawa in 1940. Our roving Ambassador, Norman H. Davis, is no less anxious to witness an Allied triumph than was our Ambassador to Paris 26 years ago.

Yet even more striking than the analogy between our representation abroad in the era of Woodrow Wilson and our representation today is the basic predisposition of both administrations. In 1912 the Democratic Party swept into office on a pledge of a liberal transformation of our national life. In the words of Frederic C. Howe, "The spirit of this young America" in 1912 "was generous, hospitable, brilliant; it was carefree and full of variety. The young people in whom it leaped to expression hated injustice. They had no questions about the soundness of American democracy. They believed that the truth would make us free."

It was a day that heralded as the epoch of the new freedom, startling reminder of our New Deal. Vaguely, international peace, arbitration, disarmament, were the ideals of the new freedom. The new freedom failed to bring recovery, just as its successor, the New Deal has failed. Then as now, the Democratic President insisted that the temporary depression in certain quarters was psychological, artificially created.

All but the blind must recognize the road to war. No signposts could be more clearly marked.

A Democratic President in 1914, already predisposed to regard one side of a European war as holy and the other as tainted finds his counterpart in a Democratic President in 1940 equally determined to champion one side as against its enemies.

A regime with its foreign representatives stationed abroad in virtually unanimous sympathy with the Allied Powers in 1914 is matched by an identical situation today.

The forces of difficult economic circumstances at home under the new freedom were far weaker than they are today.

Every element of President Roosevelt's desire to mediate the crisis which is sweeping up to a climax in Europe today was present in the mind of Woodrow Wilson, and Colonel House in 1914.

Can we be certain that the National Government, under these circumstances will assure our people of peace?

War fevers spring up in America overnight. It may come upon us at any moment, for the groundwork has been carefully prepared.

Those who have prepared the groundwork will surely not seek to resist its results. The democratic National Government, with its pronounced leaning towards international participation, with its readiness to join European governments to "solve" the world's problems must be regarded as suspect. It cannot be relied upon to keep the people of our great Nation at home, working out their own problems in their own fashion.

Let Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia work out their own destinies. We can never hope to solve their problems by force of arms. It has been tried before, with results so disastrous for the economy of the world that no one who grasps reality desires to see it tried again.

Until the rulers of Asia and Europe determine for themselves to end the interminable hatreds, the endless feuding, the deliberately fomented campaigns of misrepresentation, the constant suspicion with which they regard each other, no peace will come to those regions which stretch from the eastern shores of the Atlantic to the western shores of the Pacific.

Our role must not be that of belligerent again. We must make it certain that the political leadership of our country is committed irrevocably to a policy of peace. Only the Republican Party can offer us the assurance our people need. G. O. P. today spells "guarantee our peace." If the rest of the world chooses to destroy itself, we must continue to demonstrate that peace can exist among men.

Freight-Rate Differentials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the South and the Southwest, and especially in the far western section of Texas, of which my home city of El Paso is the capital, the interterritorial railroad freight-rate differentials seriously

burden agriculture and industry. It is one of the major problems in the Southwest. It has retarded the growth and business prosperity of El Paso for many years.

A significant step has just been taken in El Paso looking toward the final elimination of these differentials. Forcing our shippers of the products of farm and factory to pay penalty rates, for which there is no longer any justification whatsoever, the pockets of the consumers are rifled, their buying power curtailed, and their general prosperity hindered.

For many years the economic issues presented by these differentials have been the subject of discussion throughout the sections of the country that I have mentioned. Consumers, chambers of commerce, other organizations of businessmen, and the newspapers have given these questions serious attention and study. Many of the newspapers, indeed, are making the elimination of these differentials a major editorial objective.

Certain of these differentials that affect directly my part of the country are on the way toward elimination by an agreement recently reached there by the railroads. This is a commendable step on the part of the railroads. But the problem is not near a final solution as yet.

A diligent effort was made to bring it closer to solution by provisions in the transportation bill of 1940, the conference report on which was recently voted on in the House. I voted for that report. Subsequently, when asked by the newspapers for a statement, I said, "My principal reason for voting against the motion to recommit the bill was the fact that it embodied the Ramspeck-Hill amendment, directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to initiate action looking to the abolition of the damnable and indefensible differentials. I thought it was our only hope of getting some relief in the Southwest."

I regret that more of the Members from the Southern and Southwestern States that are so burdened by these differentials did not support the conference report for this reason. But, as I said at the beginning, a new and important step has just been taken to eliminate these differentials, and to give us what this country needs—a truly national railroad transportation system so far as rates are concerned.

This was the adoption by both the Democratic and Republican county conventions of El Paso County at El Paso last week of resolutions condemning the differentials, and seeking direct political action to accomplish this purpose.

If the delegations from my county to the two Texas States conventions are successful, planks aimed at abolishing the differentials will be included in both party platforms. And if they are supported by other States, there is a chance that the national conventions may be enlisted in this most important fight.

I sincerely hope that Democratic conventions in other States affected by these differentials will join us in this effort.

The following is the text of the resolution passed unanimously by the Democratic county convention at El Paso on May 7:

We advocate the elimination of the artificial railroad freight rate barriers between sections of this State and regions of this Nation that prevent the producers and distributors of agricultural and industrial products from finding their rightful markets and that reduce the employment of railroad labor, that put unnecessary burdens upon wage earners, and that penalize consumers.

We urge upon State and Federal regulatory bodies the promulgation of rates and regulations that will permit the producers of these products in Texas to compete with other producers elsewhere on a fair and even basis.

And we appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission to pursue the precedent it has already set in the Southeastern Governors Rate case to the end that unjust freight-rate differentials against the Southwest and the South may all be eliminated.

We instruct our delegates to the county Democratic convention on May 7 to submit and fight for the inclusion of this plank in the county platform with instructions to the county's delegates to the State Democratic convention at Waco, May 28, to submit and fight for inclusion in the State platform a plank similar to this with instructions to the State's delegates to pursue the same course at the National Democratic Convention.

The Siren Call of Greed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the argument that the dependent widows, orphans, and parents of veterans of the last war should not be given assistance as provided in H. R. 9000, even when needed to prevent suffering, appeals to me as being neither patriotic nor pertinent when based on the premise that such pensions are expensive. Of course they are expensive, but so is war! America is mature enough to know that wars cost money and that they create pension needs which must be met. The way to save money on pensions is not to neglect the suffering families of war veterans, but it is to maintain a national policy which keeps this country out of war.

It is with great timeliness, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of pensions comes before this body at this particular time in our national history. Even today we have read editorials and speeches and have heard speakers and radio commentators talk about increasing the belligerency of the United States, relaxing our peace-protecting neutrality provisions, and moving this country over closer to the brink of war. Sword rattlers and alarmists who see opportunity for personal gain or political preferment in breaking down this country's decision to keep out of the European war are speaking more boldly today about our involvement "at least to the extent of our credit" than they did 2 months ago. The internationalists and interventionists who have been quiet for a time are again hinting openly that "this is our war"—the prelude to another dizzy, bloody dance with Mars is beginning to be heard from the same discredited group of international financiers whose false motives and selfish moves finally plunged this country into the World War.

Nation-wide realization that wars breed pensions and that pensions must be paid may help restrain some people in this country who are beginning to look at Europe's holocaust with mercenary eyes and starting to urge in surreptitious whispers and by almost imperceptible stages that we should repeal the Johnson Act and once again permit international bankers and brokers to extend credits to belligerents. It is time we let those who would send your sons to battle realize that their dollars are not immune when the time comes to repay in some small degree to the families of these veterans the costs to them of such great personal sacrifice.

WATCH OUT FOR THE CHANT OF THE MONEY LENDERS

The chant of the international meddlers and profit seekers is again beginning with its insidious and deadly monotony. First, we should lend money to warring powers, these internationalists suggest, then when or if the tide of battle goes against our borrowers we must send the flower of American youth forth to win the war so these credits can be collected. Unhappily, we learned from the last war that even when our sacrifice of life and limb makes victory possible, our borrowers turn cold shoulders on their promises. Such financing of international war might again result in a wild epidemic of counterfeit profits, but it would inevitably end by our being drawn into a conflict which this time would first of all result in the entire elimination of American rights and liberties.

Strangely enough, it is largely the same group of internationalists and the same combination of brokers, bankers, and metropolitan newspapers which denounces nonintervention and peace-protecting neutrality which is most articulate in its opposition to pensions to those who sacrificed the most in the last war. These moneyed interventionists must learn that war costs money as well as lives, that war profits are the seeds from which post-war depressions are born, that we

should first do more to repay our debt to those who fought the last war before we move closer to the vortex of a new war.

Even the most casual observer must realize that it is not the widows, parents, and orphans of World War veterans who are urging us to flirt with dangerous international policies which might involve us in today's conflicts. It is not the common people of America who want to chip away at the foundations upon which peace is protected in this country. It is not the poor people, the farmers, the unemployed, and middle-class businessmen who are paying warlike columnists to write war-mongering comments in the newspapers or to broadcast hate-stimulating news stories and opinionated observations over the radio.

The demand to put American money lenders back into the war business does not come from the heart of America nor from the soldiers of 1917. Mr. Speaker, unhappily but indisputably, the trend toward war in this country is financed and fanned by that element of big-town financiers in this country, whose banks and brokerage firms, whose newspaper magnates and principal advertisers, whose munitions plants and powder factories offer opportunity for get-rich-quick war profits if Uncle Sam can again be freed to set about the business of becoming Europe's Uncle Shylock. This is a sordid picture, but an evening spent listening to certain well-known radio commentators or in reading the press of our larger cities pretty clearly indicates from whence comes the still, small voice of intervention, which is getting louder and bolder every day as 1940 threatens to parallel 1916.

THE SIREN CALL OF GREED

Some day, Mr. Speaker, I hope taxes can be devised, and that soon, which will provide adequate pensions for all veterans' needs in America from profits secured by those who make money out of international murder. Making the machinery of war should not be permitted to earn inflated profits in this country; I doubt whether it is good national policy to permit this business to make anything above a normal or minimum return on the investment involved. It is pretty risky business to have so many wealthy influences in this country holding a vested interest in international war.

The siren call of greed is too well-fed in America when some of our biggest businesses with control of so many of our newspapers, radio, and motion-picture facilities can envision riches for themselves by extending their money-lending activities to warring nations with whose armies they would thus entwine the safety of American youth with no other regulations binding them except those motivated by private profit, personal prejudice, racial ties, political philosophies, or individual aggrandizement. Citizens would do well to look far back beyond the printed page, the inspired editorial, or the casual comments of the news casters on the radio to discover what hidden force or "fifth column arm of Mars" is actually responsible for the all too apparent war mongering which is growing bolder and louder in America.

Mr. Speaker and friends, let us enact H. R. 9000 into law. Let us turn deaf ears to the group which urges us at the one time to relax our neutrality safeguards so they can loan money for profit to nations at war and at the other to economize at the expense of suffering by those whose personal sacrifices followed the practices and policies which involved us in the World War.

The soldiers of 1917 have become the best peace salesmen of 1940, and they are still doing their part to expose the siren call of greed which is again preparing to offer America its seductive wiles. America has not repaid its debt to the veterans of the last war; perhaps it can never do so. But today let us vote to provide at least the pensions provided in H. R. 9000 so that the needy and dependent orphans, widows, and parents of World War veterans can be kept from becoming objects of charity.

Let us acknowledge our national responsibility in this regard. Let us rededicate ourselves to peace. Let us do more for those whose heroism gave us victory during the World War and less to increase the hazards of being engulfed in a new war. Let us listen more to the still small voice of conscience and less to the siren call of greed in America.

Our Foreign Policy and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, nothing essentially new has happened in the past few days of the European war. The latest act of Nazi aggression was inevitable in the course of modern dictatorship and differs from past events only because it has increased the intensity of the war and brought its threats nearer to American interests. But because American thinking brings itself to grasp the totalitarian philosophy only with the greatest reluctance, we are shocked by this latest piece of brutality, as though we believed it impossible until we actually saw it occur.

Holland and Belgium had pursued a course of strict neutrality. They took every possible means of avoiding involvement and of preserving peace. But because they unfortunately stood in the way of nazi-ism they have been overrun. I hope this latest in the long series of object lessons will convince us that peaceful desires, no matter how sincere or how earnestly pursued, are no guaranty against aggression. I hope this will convince us that if and when American interests interfere with the course of the dictators we may expect no better treatment unless we are prepared to defend ourselves.

It would be criminally short-sighted to gamble on the hope that we may not be called upon to make that defense. Great Britain's course in the face of threat during recent years should be warning enough that such a hope is horribly costly. For 5 years, in the face of the growing Nazi threat, that empire neglected to rearm or did so reluctantly and inadequately and continued to hope that "appeasement" would satisfy demands that proved insatiable. Fortunately, we still have time to avoid the British mistakes if we will.

Congress will immediately be asked for additional defense appropriations, despite the fact that vast sums have already been assured. I hope and believe that any additional necessary funds will be allotted, but more important than more appropriations is the immediate necessity of clarifying our foreign policy. With all the money and ability to produce airplanes and battleships and to train and equip armies we must have time to perfect an adequate defense. And until we have clearly determined what our real interests are, and how far we are willing to go to defend them, it is idle to attempt to plan and provide our weapons of defense.

It is one thing to plan the defense of the continent. It is entirely another matter to protect our vital and strategic interests outside our territorial limits. It is still another to plan active enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in a world where the British Navy is no longer confining hostile forces in Europe.

There still is no threat immediate enough to cause us undue alarm, which is fortunate. In fact, the problems which we face now will not be solved by sentiment and hysteria. What we need most now is cool, hard-headed thinking and long-range planning by the best leadership we can command. We

need the type of leadership which will take the American people into its confidence—leadership which will clarify a sound, long-range policy and implement it with a program in time so that the country can examine and judge it calmly and without undue pressure from any immediate outside threat.

There has been no such planning and policy making to date. The people have been asked to support vast expansions of our defense arms without knowing what sort of a policy this program is designed to implement. In fact, there has been entirely too much mystery and hocus-pocus about foreign affairs and our arms program.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of our present situation is that it confronts us during an election year, when statesmanship is handicapped by political considerations. The risks involved when such a grave international situation threatens to become the tool of politicians are terrifying to contemplate.

The Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EVENING OUTLOOK, OF SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Evening Outlook, of Santa Monica, Calif.:

PENNSYLVANIA SHOWS THE WAY OUT

At a time when California's State Employment Bureau has been turned into an insurance laboratory for the Federal Government, citizens of this State should be interested in a recent attack made by Pennsylvania upon the great problem of unemployment. Described in an article in the May issue of the Tax Digest this Pennsylvania experiment began with the organization of a businessman's program, supported by the State's Republican administration, for the mobilization of jobs in business and industry.

Back of this movement, which was launched last November, lay an experience of rapidly mounting relief costs very similar to that of California. Thus in the fiscal year 1931–32 (when the depression was at its worst) the cost of public assistance in Pennsylvania was $7,397,000. But by 1939 this cost had mounted to $122,000,000, which figure did not include additional millions paid out in the State by the Federal Government from funds collected from Pennsylvania tax sources.

This terrific increase had meant that $100,000,000 in additional taxes might be necessary unless some way could be found to reduce relief.

Accordingly the job-mobilization program was launched. It is based on the simple principle that more business means more jobs.

In the words of Chairman Walter D. Fuller: "More than 10,000 businessmen, women, veterans, educators, clergymen, and others are actively on the firing line, backed up by the constructive thinking, cooperation, and effort of several million people of the State who have been impressed with the importance of helping to cure the problems of unemployment, relief, and taxation by local initiative and consideration."

The organization is simple. There is a supervising committee in each of the 67 counties of the State, and some cities have as many as 50 local committees, so that relief and unemployment can be treated as near the source as possible. The State headquarters at Harrisburg, with the full assistance of the Government, has acted as the clearing house for reemployment ideas and stimulated activity, but the program has stressed the importance of each industry, each county, and each local committee solving its problems in its own way.

Among other discoveries the program found that, amidst widespread unemployment, there were 20,000 jobs in the State that could be filled if trained workers were available. They found 300 classifications in which there are shortages of employables. And they found opportunities for starting new industries and solving old problems.

By exchanging such information local committees were able to create job opportunities by encouraging businessmen to go forward with expansion programs, such as the addition of a new line of goods, the opening of a new sales territory, or purchase of new equipment. They were able to develop much new business, with gain in jobs, by encouraging the modernization of homes, farms, and factories. As a result, more than $100,000,000 of construction tentatively scheduled for 1941 and 1942 will be done this year by the utility, cement, steel, and other industries.

But the greatest benefit of the program has been a very sharp decrease in the number of jobless and the cost of State relief.

While the Pennsylvania job committee does not claim entire credit for this improvement, statistics show that its activities played a very large part in decreasing the relief rolls of the State by 149,961 persons. Most of these persons found employment in private industry. The same activities have been largely responsible for reducing the State relief costs from $2,000,000 per week to $1,400,000 per week.

While this fine showing was being made in Pennsylvania, its neighbor industrial States of Ohio and New York were adding to their relief rolls, and business indexes throughout most of the country were falling.

Here, it would seem, is a perfectly feasible plan for making real progress toward solving the greatest problem that this Nation confronts today. It is a common-sense plan which combines patriotic cooperation with the virtues of local initiative and enterprise. It is the American way to solve our unemployment problem, as opposed to the ways of State socialism, which have proved—through ample trial—a ghastly failure.

And Pennsylvania's experience shows that this American way can and does work.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ARTICLE FROM FREDERICK (MD.) POST

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to read the sentiments of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, one of the most widely read and widely traveled men in America, on the subject of our foreign policy. Few men in our body politics have as many personal contacts in Europe in the clergy and laity as he. Fewer still have had the chance to maintain as large a personal correspondence. His remarks on the sanity and caution and of the efforts of two of our foremost authorities in foreign affairs come with telling emphasis at this time.

I have taken advantage of my unanimous consent to insert a report of his statement and the facts surrounding it from the Frederick Post, Frederick, Md.:

In a lecture delivered before 2,000 members of the Charles Carroll forum in the red lacquer room of the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., Sunday, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of sociology and social history at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, praised the peace policy of United States Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

Pointing to the calm temper manifested by the American people since the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, Dr. Thorning attributed this happy result in large measure to the constructive statesmanship exhibited by the United States Department of State, whose officials, it was asserted, were "expediting their business in a judicial, fact-finding spirit."

Dr. Thorning said in part: "Secretary of State Cordell Hull, although stanchly vindicating American rights under international law, has not engaged in any battle of words or ideological crusades. When duty required declaration of principle, the United States Secretary of State stated his case in crisp, legal phraseology. His notes of protest both to the German Reich and to Great Britain have safeguarded the neutral position of the United States and at the same time paved the way to appropriate measures of indemnification and reparation. No trace of the swashbuckler manner or sword-rattling technique has been observable. Both in tone and content, the United States diplomatic messages have been marked by dignity and restraint. Without yielding a jot or tittle of American interests Secretary Hull has stated the case for this

country in clear terminology and with a wealth of sound precedents in international law.

"The result has been that respect for America has grown abroad, while at home public opinion has been enlightened and healthy. Everybody knows that the American people are deeply opposed to Hitlerism and Stalinism. The vicious character of nazi-ism and communism is clear to all but the most extreme partisans. The propaganda of Joachim von Ribbentrop and Vyacheslaff Molotoff has been quite generally discounted, if not repudiated.

"The absence of hysteria in American public life is due largely to the noninflammatory statements of Secretary Hull and Under Secretary Welles. The latter, in the course of a most difficult mission abroad, maintained an attitude of discretion that puts to shame the gesticulating and fulminating of numerous European foreign ministers. Mr. Sumner Wells was entrusted with a diplomatic job and he accomplished his work in a high-grade diplomatic fashion. He is a credit to career men in the service. His record suggests that there should be no diplomatic post closed to career men of proved capacity. The whole policy of reserving certain missions as political plums or opportunities for social prestige may well be reconsidered in the light of recent developments. There is no suitable substitute for the trained, experienced diplomat.

"It is gratifying to note that Secretary of State Hull has kept us out of war up to the present. It is my confident belief that a continuance of the current policy will prevent the slaughter of American boys on foreign soil. Nor is there any solid basis for supposing that the American Navy or air force will be required to affect the balance of power in Europe. British sea power has not been crushed; nor has the French Army, larger than that of Germany, been destroyed. If the peace policy of Secretary Hull will be maintained, it will place the United States in a position to contribute to stability after the war."

America and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of May 12:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of Sunday, May 12, 1940]

AMERICA AND EUROPE

War news is strong drink. It stirs the blood and inflames the mind. Accounts of advancing armies, attacks on small nations, the meeting of air armadas, the destruction of cities, rouse the passions. In such circumstances it is difficult to think clearly and the difficulty increases as the accounts become more circumstantial and detailed.

Americans must steel themselves against an emotional response to the exciting events in Europe. The danger is that we shall let passion get the better of us, imprison our judgment, and control our national policy. If that happens, it is as nearly certain as anything can be that we shall make mistakes for which we as a nation will pay a heavy price for years and not improbably for generations to come.

Along the eastern seaboard the clamor for American participation in the war is already rising. We have discussed this phenomenon before and shall discuss it again. Meanwhile it is sufficient to say that those who are demanding America's entry in the war are concerned for the welfare of European nations to which they feel a colonial allegiance and are giving little if any thought to American welfare and interests.

This is the moment to look at the situation with as much objectivity as we can command. It is idle to pretend that we can go into the war half way. If we take steps now which announce to the world that America regards the struggle in Europe as our war, we shall inevitably send another expeditionary force to Europe. Our pride will not allow us to stand on the sidelines while the men of other nations are bleeding for the cause which we have declared to be ours. The victims of superheated emotion may think—as they thought in 1917—that we can do our part with machines and money and leave the dying to others, but the expectation is a vain one, born of wishful thinking. If we go into the war, we shall again go in with all our manpower, all our resources.

Included in the bill will be the death roll and the casualty list. After the strain of war—unless the precedents of history are meaningless—will come another period of economic disorganization and moral and financial disintegration and these consequences will be the graver in view of the precarious financial condition of the country today, before a factory has been commandeered or a man conscripted. It is as nearly certain as anything can be that if we enter the war against the totalitarian powers we shall ourselves fall into the totalitarian pattern and if we recover our freedom in a generation we shall be lucky, indeed.

Those are a few of the items on the debit side of the ledger. What does the credit side show? The people who are edging us toward war talk largely of a better world order but they are singularly vague in detailing how it is to be brought about. They have not told us what kind of a peace is to be made, and in truth they do not know, for the sufficient reason that the peace will be made by Europe, according to European notions and traditions, and not by America in accordance with our aspirations. We went all through this in 1919 and we should have learned the lesson.

They say America's interest demands participation in the war. They are speaking impractically. If the dash into the low countries is checked short of the channel ports, America's help will not be needed. If the attack succeeds, America's help will come too late to be of any account. The Germans are gambling everything upon the power of their air force to disorganize the defense; within a fortnight or so the world will know whether the Germans have won or lost.

We have no military power which we can bring to bear in that short space of time. Our Army is negligible in size. Our air force is inconsequential in comparison with the fleets now engaged. If war were declared tomorrow we could not land a force of any kind in Europe to turn the tide before the decision has been reached.

The clamor for war will rise, nevertheless. It will be checked only if Americans think and think as Americans, for America.

Uncle Sam Has Refunded Illegal Taxes for Just About Everybody Except—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has refunded invalidated taxes for just about everybody but the hog producer who paid the illegal hog-processing tax.

Nineteen appropriation acts from 1878 to 1895 carried a total of $353,578.14 to refund income taxes illegally collected on salaries of State employees.

Twenty-eight appropriation acts from 1896 to 1919 carried a total of $2,759,035.53 to refund a 2-percent income tax later held unconstitutional.

Nine acts in three years, 1920–22, appropriated $91,699,976.36 to refund taxes on stock dividends held to be unconstitutional.

Only four acts were required in 1922 and 1923 to refund $161,327,668.56 for unconstitutional taxes on "futures."

Six acts between April 2, 1924, and February 28, 1927, refunded $591,735,591.51 for an unconstitutional sales tax collected from merchants handling sporting goods. Think of it, Mr. Speaker, over half a billion dollars on one item!

And at least $750,000,000—three-quarters of a billion dollars—has been refunded in the late twenties and early thirties under other decisions which I shall list. More than a billion and a half dollars in other refunds, Mr. Speaker, but yet we cannot get consideration in the House for Senate Joint Resolution 66, already passed by the Senate, which seeks to make it possible for the hog farmer to recover the processing tax paid by him and later declared invalid.

REFUNDED TO RAILROADS 2 YEARS AGO

Many Members were present 2 years ago, May 16, 1938, when I called attention to a precedent we established—no; a precedent we followed—when we passed a bill to refund $138,000 to a number of railroads for a tax later held illegal. From the RECORD:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill should not be passed without calling to the attention of the House just what is being done. Members will get letters from farmers in their territory wanting to know why they passed the bill to refund to the railroads taxes collected under an invalidated tax law and did not pass legislation that is proposed to refund the hog-processing taxes to the farmers under a similarly invalidated

tax. The principle involved is the same. * * * Dr. Black, of the Department of Agriculture, has found that the farmers paid the hog-processing tax. If we pass this bill, we have a perfect precedent for the passage of the bill refunding hog-processing taxes to the hog raisers. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will promptly report that bill.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] asked me to yield and said:

The bill to which the gentleman refers, about the refunding of the processing taxes to farmers, on the processing of hogs, has been reported favorably by the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and is now before the committee.

I replied that I hoped the full committee would report the bill promptly. Two years have gone by. The Senate has passed a bill of that character. The House committee, we understand, by a close vote, has recently declined to report the legislation. A discharge petition is at the desk, petition No. 25, which would bring the matter before the House. Many have signed it; more signatures are needed.

In order to make clear how firmly the policy of refunding illegally collected taxes is established, I have assembled the records on the subject. I believe they will be of interest to the House.

POLICY AS OLD AS THE CONSTITUTION

Ever since the beginning of our constitutional government, Congress has followed the policy of providing for the refund of taxes which have been illegally collected.

By the act of June 30, 1864 (13 Stat. 239), as amended by the act of July 13, 1866 (14 Stat. 111), the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was given general authority to refund taxes illegally collected.

R. S. 3689 provided permanent annual appropriations for the purpose of refunding illegally collected internal revenue taxes. This provision was later repealed by acts of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1145), and November 23, 1921 (42 Stat. 314; U. S. Code 31: 602), and the Secretary of the Treasury was thereafter required to submit annual estimates for such refunds, which were included in the item for "refund of taxes illegally collected" contained in the various appropriation acts, especially deficiency appropriations.

The following list indicates in chronological order the various appropriations made for the purpose of refunding illegally collected taxes, with decisions of the Supreme Court which necessitated the refunds:

GENERAL DECISIONS AND PAYMENTS THEREUNDER

In *Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113), the Supreme Court held the income tax on salaries under the act of March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 477), invalid as to the salary of a State probate judge.

Act of June 14, 1878 (20 Stat. 128), $150,000 for payment of claims originating prior to July 1, 1875.	
Act of Mar. 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 421), $441.35 and $40,000 balance from appropriation of June 14, 1878.	
Act of June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 254)	$3,020.77
Act of Mar. 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 428)	15.78
Act of Aug. 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 275)	11,075.05
	5,519.95
Act of Mar. 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 594)	5,053.52
Act of July 7, 1884:	
(23 Stat. 255)	2,261.28
(23 Stat. 260)	3,030.50
Act of Mar. 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 471)	8,216.83
Act of Aug. 4, 1886:	
(24 Stat. 289)	17,197.13
(24 Stat. 298)	2,996.84
Act of Feb. 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 27)	237.59
	14,128.62
Act of Mar. 30, 1888 (25 Stat. 63)	3,473.01
Act of Oct. 19, 1888 (25 Stat. 597)	95.31
Act of Mar. 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 935)	3,661.82
Act of Sept. 30, 1890:	
(26 Stat. 540)	551.16
(26 Stat. 547)	31,156.43
Act of Mar. 3, 1891:	
(26 Stat. 892)	12,317.62
(26 Stat. 895)	10,373.63
Act of July 28, 1892:	
(27 Stat. 309)	10,009.31
(27 Stat. 315)	5,965.31
Act of Mar. 3, 1893:	
(27 Stat. 668)	7,501.25
(27 Stat. 671)	4,439.55
Act of Aug 23, 1894:	
(28 Stat. 477)	$549.72
(28 Stat. 482)	253.67
Act of Mar. 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 874)	35.14
Total	353,578.14

In the decision of May 20, 1895, *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan and Trust Co.* (158 U. S. 601), the 2-percent tax on incomes in the act of August 27, 1894 (28 Stat. 553–560, secs. 27–37), was held unconstitutional. Payments therefrom:

Act of June 8, 1896 (29 Stat. 311)	$4,963.90
Act of July 19, 1897:	
(30 Stat. 142)	75.95
(30 Stat. 148)	37.71
Act of July 7, 1898:	
(30 Stat. 707)	34.92
(30 Stat. 710)	1,882.19
Act of Mar. 3, 1901:	
(31 Stat. 1053)	28,619.04
(31 Stat. 1056)	18,736.62
Act of Feb. 14, 1902 (32 Stat. 8)	15,881.35
Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 557)	2,919.55
Act of Mar. 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1041)	26,404.22
Act of Feb. 18, 1904 (33 Stat. 22)	14,797.26
Act of Apr. 27, 1904 (33 Stat. 397)	82.83
Act of Feb. 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 29)	16,461.35
Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 638)	7,780.77
Act of Mar. 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1375)	3,238.96
Act of Feb. 15, 1909:	
(35 Stat. 28)	4,141.70
(35 Stat. 31)	281.29
Act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 516)	631.73
Act of Feb. 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 219)	12.50
Act of Mar. 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1321)	462.97
Act of Aug. 26, 1912 (37 Stat. 618)	91.64
Act of Apr. 6, 1914:	
(38 Stat. 330)	61,022.44
(38 Stat. 577)	131,080.73
Act of July 29, 1914 (38 Stat. 579)	1,526.21
Act of Mar. 4, 1915:	
(38 Stat. 1155)	33,927.95
(38 Stat. 1159)	3,207.91
Act of Feb. 28, 1916:	
(39 Stat. 28)	48,335.75
(39 Stat. 33)	28,406.30
Act of Sept. 8, 1916:	
(39 Stat. 824)	111,277.75
(39 Stat. 828)	29,166.86
Act of Apr. 17, 1917:	
(40 Stat. 30)	232,556.16
(40 Stat. 33)	29,187.65
Act of Oct. 6, 1917:	
(40 Stat. 379)	107,010.93
(40 Stat. 382)	146,729.16
Act of July 8, 1918:	
(40 Stat. 838)	366,091.70
(40 Stat. 842)	55,929.55
Act of Nov. 4, 1918 (40 Stat. 1038)	451,496.72
Act of July 11, 1919:	
(41 Stat. 61)	202,602.57
(41 Stat. 63)	93,827.61
(41 Stat. 65)	163,177.50
Act of Nov. 4, 1919:	
(41 Stat. 344)	191,314.82
(41 Stat. 347)	123,690.81
Total	2,759,035.53

In the decision of March 8, 1920, *Eisner* v. *Macomber* (252 U. S. 189) the income tax on stock dividends in the act of September 8, 1916 (39 Stat. 756–757), was held unconstitutional. Payments therefrom:

Act of Mar. 6, 1920 (41 Stat. 522)	$357,389.74
Act of May 29, 1920 (41 Stat. 654)	12,000,000.00
Act of June 5, 1920:	
(41 Stat. 1038)	60,015.86
(41 Stat. 1041)	299,021.54
(41 Stat. 1044)	21,918.34
Act of Mar. 1, 1921:	
(41 Stat. 1161)	4,435,000.00
(41 Stat. 1193)	58.63
Act of Mar. 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1274)	12,000,000.00
Act of Aug. 24, 1921 (42 Stat. 196)	1,537.26
Act of Dec. 15, 1921:	
(42 Stat. 337)	23,057,000.00
(42 Stat. 345)	34.99
Act of Feb. 17, 1922 (42 Stat. 376)	12,000,000.00
Act of Mar. 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 454)	27,468,000.00
Total	91,699,976.36

In the decision of May 15, 1922, *Bailey* v. *Drexel Furniture Co.* (259 U. S. 20), the tax of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1138,

title XI), on manufacturers who employed child labor was held unconstitutional.

In the decision of May 15, 1922, *Hill et al.* v. *Wallace et al.* (259 U. S. 44), the tax on "futures" in the act of August 24, 1921 (42 Stat. 187, ch. 86), was held unconstitutional. Payments therefrom:

Act of July 1, 1922 (42 Stat. 775)	$28,122,500.00
Act of Jan. 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1098)	12,000,000.00
Act of Jan. 22, 1923:	
(42 Stat. 1162)	42,530,000.00
(42 Stat. 1166)	168.56
Act of Mar. 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1549)	78,675,000.00
Total	161,327,668.56

In the decision of April 23, 1923, *Spalding & Bros.* v. *Edwards* (262 U. S. 66), the sales tax on sporting goods under act of October 3, 1917 (40 Stat. 316, sec. 600 (f)), was held unconstitutional as to sales to commission merchants for exportation. Payments therefrom:

Act of Apr. 2, 1924 (43 Stat. 49)	$105,467,000.00
Act of Apr. 3, 1924 (43 Stat. 72)	12,000,000.00
Act of Jan. 20, 1925 (43 Stat. 757)	150,000,000.00
Act of Mar. 3, 1926:	
(44 Stat. 180)	149,250,000.00
(44 Stat. 189)	3,672.34
Act of July 3, 1926:	
(44 Stat. 883)	1,033.27
(44 Stat. 886)	873.13
Act of Feb. 28, 1927:	
(44 Stat. 1254)	175,000,000.00
(44 Stat. 1258)	13,012.77
Total	591,735,591.51

In the decision of May 31, 1927, in *Nichols, Collector,* v. *Coolidge et al., Executors* (274 U. S. 531), the transfer tax in the act of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1097, sec. 402 (c)) was held to be unconstitutional in part. Payments:

Act of Dec. 22, 1927:	
(45 Stat. 30)	$43,000,000.00
(45 Stat. 42)	5.82
(45 Stat. 48)	292.75
Act of Mar. 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 169)	130,000,000.00
Act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 935)	22.89
Total	173,000,321.46

In the decision of June 4, 1928, *National Life Insurance Co.* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 508), section 245 of the act of November 23, 1921 (42 Stat. 261), which provided that the tax exemption on the income of insurance companies should be diminished by the exact amount of interest on tax-exempt securities, was held to be invalid because it would destroy the guaranteed exemption payments:

Act of Dec. 20, 1928 (45 Stat. 1035)	$130,000,000.00
Act of Mar. 4, 1929:	
(45 Stat. 1613)	75,000,000.00
(45 Stat. 1618)	75.74
Act of Mar. 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 129)	67.04
Act of May 15, 1930 (46 Stat. 342)	130,000,000.00
Act of July 3, 1930:	
(46 Stat. 914)	8.55
(46 Stat. 917)	25.65
Act of Feb. 6, 1931 (46 Stat. 1079)	8.42
Act of Feb. 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1223)	26,000,000.00
Total	361,000,185.40

In the decision of March 21, 1932, *Heiner, Collector,* v. *Donnan* (285 U. S. 312), a provision of the estate-tax law of February 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 70, sec. 302), was held to be in violation of the due-process clause of the fifth amendment. The law had provided that transfers of property valued in excess of $5,000, which were made within 2 years of death, without consideration, were to be deemed to be "in contemplation of death," and taxable under the estate-tax law.

In the decision of April 11, 1932, *Burnet* v. *Coronado Oil & Gas Co.* (285 U. S. 393), income from oil produced from lands granted by the United States to Oklahoma for support of schools and by it leased, was held not to be subject to the corporation tax of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1075, sec. 230), under the principle of Collector against Day, decided April 3, 1871 (above). Payments:

Act of Mar. 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1495)	$55,000,000.00
Act of Mar. 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1612)	28,000,000.00
Act of Mar. 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 430)	$40,000,000.00
Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1050)	323.97
Act of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 224)	35,000,000.00
Total	158,000,323.97

In the decision of December 9, 1935, *United States* v. *Constantine* (296 U. S. 287), the excise tax of $1,000 on brewers, and so forth, was held to have fallen to the ground with the repeal of the eighteenth amendment (December 5, 1933). A similar decision was given December 9, 1935, *United States* v. *Kesterson* (296 U. S. 299). Refunds paid:

Act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1834)	$6,000,000
Act of May 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 144)	30,000,000
Act of May 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 640)	3,800,000
Total	39,800,000

Aside from these general appropriations for "refund of taxes illegally collected," contained in the various appropriation acts cited above, Congress has from time to time, and whenever the occasion arose, granted specific authorization for reimbursing those persons who had borne the burden of illegally collected taxes.

AND IN SPECIFIC INSTANCES, TOO

The act of July 13, 1866, imposed a 5-percent tax on railroad-bond interest payments, to be paid by the railroad and deducted by the railroad from interest payments. The Supreme Court, on April 3, 1873, in *United States* v. *R. R. Co.* (17 Wall. 322), held that this was a tax imposed not upon the debtor but on the creditor, and since the creditor was the city of Baltimore, a State agency, its revenues were not taxable. The tax was thus declared illegal, and Congress thereupon, by act of February 27, 1877, provided for a refund of a tax paid under an earlier revenue act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 469), which imposed a similar tax on railroad-bond interest.

The act of February 28, 1901 (31 Stat. 817, ch. 620), provided for a refund of tax of 10 percent on notes used for circulation, "such tax having been held illegal by the Supreme Court of the United States." The tax had been collected by an internal-revenue collector on "due bills" of a mercantile establishment, and the Supreme Court in *Hollister* v. *Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution* (111 U. S. 62) held such collection illegal.

By provisions of the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898 (30 Stat. 448–470), a stamp tax was imposed on export bills of lading. The Supreme Court, on April 15, 1901, in *Fairbank* v. *U. S.* (181 U. S. 283), held the tax unconstitutional, and Congress, by act of June 27, 1902 (32 Stat. 406, ch. 1160), provided for a refund of the sums paid for the stamps representing the illegal taxes. This same act of June 27, 1902, as extended by acts of July 27, 1912 (37 Stat. 240), and March 30, 1928 (45 Stat. 398, ch. 302), authorized refund of legacy taxes levied under section 29 of the War Revenue Act of 1898, and declared by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Jones* (236 U. S. 106) to have been illegally collected under an erroneous interpretation of the law.

The act of February 1, 1909 (35 Stat. 590, ch. 53), as extended by act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1291), provided for a refund of sums paid for documentary stamps used on foreign bills of exchange drawn between July 1, 1898, and June 30, 1901, such stamps representing taxes which were illegally collected. The following appropriations were made for refunding the amounts illegally collected:

On Mar. 4, 1909:	
(35 Stat. 939)	$8,809.32
(35 Stat. 944)	273.24
Feb. 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 219)	2,307.69
June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 809)	633.60
Aug. 26, 1912 (37 Stat. 618)	198.00
Mar. 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1155)	396.00

The acts of February 13, 1909 (35 Stat. 1441, ch. 117; 1442, ch. 119; and 1444, ch. 123), provided for a refund of taxes improperly collected under the act of June 13, 1898, notwithstanding the statute of limitations.

The act of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1085, sec. 252), authorized a refund of income, war-profits, or excess-profits taxes which were paid in excess of those properly due under

Revenue Acts of 1916 and 1917, notwithstanding the statute of limitations.

On May 25, 1931, in *Indian Motorcycle Co.* v. *United States* (283 U. S. 570), it was held that the sale of articles to a State agency was not subject to taxation under the manufacturers' excise tax of June 22, 1924 (43 Stat. 322), and Congress, by act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 255), provided for refund of the taxes thus illegally collected. As a result of this same decision of the Supreme Court, Congress, by act of June 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 973, ch. 551), authorized a refund of processing taxes paid on products delivered to States.

Even more recently Congress has given expression to these traditional principles of fairness and equity and permitted reimbursement to those who bore the burden of illegally collected taxes.

OTHER FARM PRODUCTS RECOGNIZED

By the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1739–1742, 1747–1755), as extended by acts of June 29, 1939 (53 Stat. 884), and August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1402), Congress made provision for refunding the processing taxes collected under the first Agricultural Adjustment Act (48 Stat. 31) and held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on January 6, 1936, in *United States* v. *William M. Butler et al.* (297 U. S. 1). These same acts (June 22, 1936; June 29, 1939; August 10, 1939) provided for refund of the taxes collected under the second Agricultural Adjustment Act (49 Stat., ch. 641, title 1), and declared illegal by the Supreme Court in *Rickert Rice Mills, Inc.* v. *Fontenot, Collector of Internal Revenue* (297 U. S. 110).

By the act of May 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 230), Congress appropriated $15,000,000 for refund of processing taxes and other taxes illegally collected under the Cotton Act of April 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 598), the Tobacco Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1275), and the Potato Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 782).

After the Supreme Court, in *Railroad Retirement Board et al.* v. *Alton R. R. Co.*, declared the first Railroad Retirement Act of June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1283–1289), unconstitutional, Congress by the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608, ch. 315), provided for a refund of the sums paid by the railroads under this invalidated act.

The act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1150), as amended by act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1325), Congress appropriated $2,500,000 additional for refunding internal-revenue collections and $50,000,000 for refunds similar to those appropriated for on May 28, 1937—processing taxes and collections under Cotton, Tobacco, and Potato Acts.

THE HOG-PROCESSING TAX

The hog producers were injured to the extent of $361,230,867.47 by reason of the hog-processing tax levied on the first domestic processing of hogs. Of this total, $263,230,867.47 was paid into the Treasury of the United States, nearly all of which was collected by such processors from the producers by deducting the amount of the tax from the market price of the hogs at the time of purchase.

Ninety-eight million dollars of hog-processing taxes had been impounded by the courts under restraining orders that the processors had not paid over to the Government when the Supreme Court declared the tax unconstitutional January 6, 1936. It is not therefore the responsibility of the farmer that this $98,000,000 did not reach the Treasury. The hog producer, however, was injured because this amount was collected from the producer by the processor during the time the invalid tax was being levied by the Government.

Senate Joint Resolution 66, which passed the Senate August 1, 1939, expands title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936. It makes hog producers eligible to file claims for refund of hog-processing taxes which were passed back to and borne by hog producers. It requires the producer to file his claim for refund with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and to show proof that he was the actual raiser or producer of such hogs, that he marketed such hogs for slaughter, and the extent to which the processing tax was borne by such producer during each month that the tax was in effect. It establishes a formula for determining the extent the burden of the tax was uniformly passed back to the producer each month all over the United States. It binds the Treasury and Department of Agriculture to their own findings of facts in these premises. These findings of facts are supported by the evidence presented by the Institute of American Meat Packers before the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture in 1932 and 1935.

THE MONEY IS AVAILABLE

Senate Joint Resolution 66 does not, in itself, authorize an appropriation. The joint resolution expands title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936. Section 915 of title VII, Revenue Act of 1936, authorizes appropriations for administrative expense, and for refunds and payments thereunder. Therefore Senate Joint Resolution 66 seeks to make any funds now available to pay claims under title VII, available also to pay claims authorized by Senate Joint Resolution 66. And the authorization for appropriations, section 915 of title VII is also authorization for necessary appropriations for refunds and payments under Senate Joint Resolution 66 when enacted.

Upon the President's Budget recommendation to Congress the unexpended balance of funds appropriated in 1940, estimated at $31,120,064, for refunds and payments of processing and related taxes under titles IV and VII of cotton penalty and tobacco and potato sales taxes, be reappropriated for fiscal year 1941. This was done exactly as recommended by the President in the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, H. R. 8068, now Public Law No. 442, Seventy-sixth Congress. This $31,120,064 for refunds and payments is reappropriated for 1941. It is not all being used. Processor claimants have exhausted their proof after 4 years under title IV and VII. Senate Joint Resolution 66 does not permit double refunds or payments. The processors have got theirs. The hog producers are entitled to their share of this invalidated hog-processing tax now, and this is what Senate Joint Resolution 66 aims to accomplish.

Thomas S. McMillan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS S. MCMILLAN, late a Representative from South Carolina

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as a "'way up yonder" northern Republican, I arise to pay my tribute of honor, love, and respect to the life and character of that outstanding, virile, tolerant "'way down south" Democrat, the late Representative THOMAS S. MCMILLAN.

One of the compensating rewards coming with service in the House is the splendid spirit of fellowship and association. With many of us the political center aisle is imaginary except when strict party measures are being considered. TOM MCMILLAN'S friends were limited only by his acquaintances. He was a genuine southern gentleman. Regardless of the size of the group, he was always the life of the party. Few men are blessed with such a personality. Whether up on the baseball diamond, in the cloakroom, in the committee room, or in the forum of debate, our late friend always acquitted himself well. His logic in debate was always strengthened by the fact that everyone had the feeling that he would like to help TOM MCMILLAN. The Charleston (S. C.) district was the beneficiary always.

Few men could iron out an occasional sectional dispute more gracefully, more satisfactorily, and more patriotically than could TOM MCMILLAN. In his going we who knew him best have lost a true and trusted friend and the country has lost a statesman of the worth-while kind.

If the Allies Lose?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1940

EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States News had an editorial this week which is so realistic and so provocative in its assertions that I am including it in my extension of remarks. It would be well for all Americans to study this thought of its editor, David Lawrence, whose writings and life bracket the two great modern world wars. An expert in every sense of the word of the genesis of the first World War, he can be said to possess as splendid a background in world affairs as any man in America for an interpretation of the second World War.

I am especially impressed by his statement that—

> The present war will turn on a combination of naval and aerial elements in the north of Europe and a combination of a motorized army and aerial elements in the north of Europe and a combination of motorized armies and aerial equipment in the south of Europe when the war moves into the Balkans.

In the next paragraph he points out a truth that is forgotten by most zealous people in their efforts to aid the Allies that—

> Those who are confidently predicting that America will enter the war if the Allies lose do not point out just how we are to become a part of the struggle. Germany is cautious about invading any American rights. Her policy in this respect, is the exact opposite of what it was in 1917.

I may be bold enough to suggest the fundamental reason why Germany does not dare antagonize us is that she realizes that the fatal mistake of 1917 was to sell us short. She really felt that our entering that conflict could not be effective in time to deal a lethal blow. She felt that her continuance of the unrestricted submarine warfare was absolutely necessary for her own success. Our protests had curtailed her methods in this direction between 1915 and February 1, 1917. In fact, the allied and neutral tonnage sunk by submarines never got over 200,000 tons until September 1916. Then when the German decision was virtually made it reached astronomical heights, jumping to 881,027 tons in April 1917. The Imperial leaders were gambling that their sea devastations would outvalue the danger of direct American participation. When you recall the deplorable position of our national defense—our failure to uphold the implications of George Washington's maintenance of a "respectable defensive posture," you will see our own weakness here was a contribution to that belief of the Germans. The moral is clear.

Our country had been horrified by the violation of Belgian neutrality. It had felt the sorrows involved in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. It had its feelings developed, too, by subtle Allied propaganda, but until it felt its own vital interests were attacked it did nothing but write notes.

Yet to the date of our severance of diplomatic relations with Germany, February 3, 1917, we had lost over 150 American citizens on foreign vessels. Yet we did not feel the casus belli had been established.

But when President Woodrow Wilson saw the determination of the German Government to employ the unrestricted submarine warfare to the utmost, and when he virtually went out on a diplomatic limb, so to speak, by defining that type of warfare as opposed to the law, ethics, and international comity, and threatened to use the might and power of our Nation in strict accountability if our rights were imperiled, he had nothing to do but fulfill his ultimatum.

George T. Davis, in his A Navy Second to None, a profound book under the auspices of the Institute of International Studies of Yale University, with Nicholar J. Spykman as director, has this to say:

> German declaration of unrestricted warfare against merchantmen permitted no detours from the road that led straight toward the loss of American lives at sea, the nullification of the Sussex pledge, the evidence of the activities of the German agents in America, and the Zimmerman note provided justification for an exultant declaration of war and a basis for popular sentiment favorable to its resurrection.

"Watchman, what of the night?"

[From the United States News of May 10, 1940]

"IF THE ALLIES LOSE?"—ASSUMPTION THAT AMERICA WILL ENTER THE WAR IS NOT SUPPORTED BY PUBLIC OPINION—UNITED STATES IS UNPREPARED TO PLAY DECISIVE ROLE AS IN 1918—ISOLATIONISM STILL DOMINANT PHILOSOPHY

(By David Lawrence)

Whenever the fortunes of war turn against Britain and France, the question asked throughout America is What if the Allies lose?

Undoubtedly Americans feel today a greater concern about the outcome of the war than they did last September. Invasion of Norway and Denmark has made improbable things seem probable and every contingency, no matter how fantastic, enters the realm of the possible because ruthless war knows no rules and recognizes no proprieties or international custom.

But while America is deeply affected, it would be a mistake to interpret the basic currents of thought in the United States as having undergone any substantial change in recent weeks.

We are in about the same state of mind that the British were in the years before the Munich pact of 1938. We refuse to believe as a people that our interests are menaced as yet, and we reserve the right to rush pellmell into national-defense measures if and when the theoretical menace becomes real.

America, morever, is today unprepared for immediate war. We could carry on in defense of our own possessions, but we could not land an Army in Europe if we wanted to do so. We do not have the ships or the troops or the aerial offense. The hazards of transport are greater than they were in the last war, as the British expedition across the North Sea in recent days has proved.

We could give valuable help to the Allies with our Navy, but naval power isn't the factor that will alone turn the scales in the present war. We could be of assistance in air warfare, but not right away. We are not tooled up for airplane production as we should have to be if we became a belligerent. We do not have the pilots trained for air combat. We have made rapid strides since the last war, but we must be rated as deficient in many essential elements of military, naval, and aerial offense.

UNITED STATES COULD AID ALLIES WITH CASH AND MATERIALS

Financially, of course, and materially, we can be of great aid to the Allies. We can lend money and send materials. But the present war will turn on a combination of naval and aerial elements in the north of Europe and a combination of motorized armies and aerial equipment in the south of Europe when the war moves into the Balkans.

Those who are confidently predicting that America will enter the war if the Allies lose do not point out just how we are to become a part of the struggle. Germany is cautious about invading any American rights. Her policy in this respect is the exact opposite of what it was in 1917.

SITUATION NOW NOT ANALOGOUS TO THAT OF 1917

The most frequently heard argument is that America should not wait till the Allies lose, but should cast her lot with the British and French now, so as to avoid the necessity of fighting the triumphant dictatorships later when the Allies are exhausted. But it must be recalled that sympathetic though the United States was to the cause of the Allies in 1917, this was not the main reason for American entry into the war.

The commonly accepted version of what happened a quarter of a century ago is that President Wilson campaigned on a slogan about keeping us out of war and, within a few months after he was reelected took the United States into the World War.

This statement is simply a piece of condensed chronology that is misleading. It omits essential happenings in the interim. Back in December 1916—just after Mr. Wilson's reelection—he made an important move for peace. Rumors of his peace note leaked out and the stock market broke badly in anticipation of peace. Suddenly, in the latter part of January 1917, the German Admiralty announced that on February 1, 1917, all merchant ships, neutral and belligerent alike, armed or unarmed, would be torpedoed without warning. This was in violation of explicit pledges given the United States Government by the German Government.

Promptly the United States on February 3 severed diplomatic relations with Germany as a warning to her admiralty and in the hope that war might be averted. Subsequently some American ships were torpedoed. Still the President did not recommend war. The latter part of February found him arguing with Congress to give him authority to put naval guns on American merchant ships so as to defend themselves against submarines. He called it armed neutrality.

On the morning of March 4 the Senate was filibustering. A small group of "willful men"— so Mr. Wilson characterized them—succeeded in paralyzing the Government of the United States in a crisis. When Congress adjourned automatically on March 4 the American Government had no idea of entering the war but only of continuing to defend our neutrality. We had no intention of becoming a cobelligerent.

Then in the next month came news of loss of more American lives on the high seas and the revelation that Germany was plan-

ning to involve Mexico and Japan against us. American public opinion reacted promptly to the evident threat to our security by a government which had broken its written pledges to us. When an extra session of Congress heard the President's war message on April 6, 1917, public opinion had swung completely to the point of view that war was inevitable and that America had no choice but to accept the challenge Germany had thrown down to us.

It is important to recall these events now because they prove how the sequence, superimposed as it was on an underlying sympathy with the Allied cause, brought the United States into the war. But without the invasion of American neutral rights the chances of American involvement would have been diminished, if not altogether eliminated.

To find a parallel today one looks in vain for violation of American rights by the Nazis. Congress has voluntarily withdrawn from the position taken in the 1914–17 period. Neutral rights on the high seas no longer are defended by America, though for legal reasons we still contend we have not waived any rights.

SOME POST-WAR FRICTION MAY BE ANTICIPATED

For all practical purposes the United States, however, has abandoned neutral rights, not only for herself but for the whole world. Our refusal to stand by the doctrine of neutral rights and our willingness to let the belligerents roam the oceans at will, preying on innocent commerce, is a reversal of our historic position. But an antiwar America took that view last autumn and it has encouraged Germany to ignore neutral rights, not only at sea but on land and in the air.

We are proceeding now on the assumption that the Nazi forces will not attack America during the present conflict. Whatever friction results later out of a Nazi effort to reach into South America presents a wholly different problem of after-the-war readjustment in the world.

The Allied peoples no doubt will look upon America today as shirking a duty to democracy. The issues of the present war may be plain enough, but, unless there is a challenge of a direct character to American rights, the United States will not enter this war.

PHILOSOPHY OF ISOLATIONISTS IS NOW DOMINANT

Revision of the neutrality laws so as to permit the extension of credits may be expected in due course. This would be in line with precedent. The Nazis are the last people in the world to be able to voice a valid protest against America's return to international law in the matter of trade and credits by American citizens. Loans by the American Government itself would be a violation of the rules of neutrality.

There is no obstacle in international law against the lending of money by private citizens to a foreign Government. But our recently adopted neutrality law would have to be revised to permit Canada for instance to get credits in the United States. Maybe this is one of the things Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, talked about in his social visit with President Roosevelt at Warm Springs, Ga., a fortnight ago.

It has been said that foreign policy is usually decided on the basis of self-interest. On that basis, the United States will not enter the European war until a challenge is plainly perceived by the nation itself. The American people hope the Allies will not lose the war, but the present state of our public opinion is such that, aside from a benevolent neutrality, the United States will do no more about an Allied defeat at the hands of the Nazis than the British did when Czechoslovakia was gobbled up by Hitler.

It takes more than an underlying feeling of sympathy or kinship to awaken an Anglo-Saxon people to action. It takes a direct threat against a nation's security. And this has not yet come—at least the direction from which it may come is not yet visible.

American isolationism remains, therefore, the dominant philosophy of the hour. The struggle of human liberty versus human slavery abroad is still academic, remote, and intangible so far as it concerns the readiness of American youth to make the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

Put All Under One High Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM LABOR

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave given me, I extend the following editorial from Labor of Tuesday, May 14, as part of my remarks:

PUT ALL UNDER ONE HIGH COMMAND

[From Labor of May 14, 1940]

Correspondents, commenting on the Allies' reversal in Norway, emphasize lack of cooperation. Army, navy, and air force apparently made no attempt to pull together. On the other hand, the Nazis got their instructions from one headquarters, and each arm of the service supplemented the others.

In an effort to defend the Allies' disastrous tactics some writers insist that democracies always act that way. Of course, there is no foundation for that statement. There is no reason why a democracy should not fight as intelligently as a dictatorship and with much finer spirit.

It is true, however, that the military mind has an unfortunate habit of becoming ossified and of refusing to recognize facts which to a civilian are clear as the noonday sun.

Right here at home, among our own militarists, we probably have exactly the same set-up which produced such unfortunate results for the Allies in Norway. We have an Army, a Navy, and a Marine Corps, and an air force for each.

Common sense would suggest that Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and all air forces be placed under one supreme command, and that each be directed not for the exaltation of a group of officers but for the defense of America.

Since the World War we have spent many billions on our Military and Naval Establishments. Nevertheless, almost every day we read in the papers that practically everything we have is obsolete, and that Hitler could wipe us out with just about one sweep of his hand.

We don't believe that, of course, but we do contend that Uncle Sam has spent enough to give us a highly efficient Army, Navy, and air force, and that there is no reason why all three should not move as one.

National Labor Relations Board against Sterling Electric Motors, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following opinion of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the case of the National Labor Relations Board against the Sterling Electric Motor Co.:

[In the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. *National Labor Relations Board, petitioner,* v. *Sterling Electric Motors, Inc., respondent.* No. 9209. May 7, 1940. Upon rehearing on petition for enforcement of an order of the National Labor Relations Board.]

Before: Denman, Matthews, and Healy, circuit judges.

Denman, circuit judge:

Our opinion in the first hearing of this review appears in 109 F. (2d) 194. The National Labor Relations Board has petitioned for and we have granted it a rehearing of the entire proceeding. This opinion concerns the issue of the right of Sterling Electric Motors, Inc., Employees Association, a self-organized inside or company union, to be made a party or to have notice and an opportunity to be heard before it can be destroyed by the Board's order. We discuss and attempt to appraise the congressional intent under the Board's renewed contention that Congress conferred on it this kind of administrative absolutism.

As stated in our first opinion, it was for the protection of the laborers' human right to regulate their creative effort in American society, with their increased power in union organization, that Congress created the Board. Its protection extends as much to the self-organized unions, provided for in sections, 1, 2, and 7 of the act (July 5, 1935, ch. 372, 49 Stat. 352; 29 U. S. C. A., secs. 151, 152, 157), as to the powerful unions already existing and seeking to increase their membership.

In this case the destruction was attempted by an order forbidding the employer to bargain with its employees' union for higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions—the destroyed functions being the only ones for which the employees created it. The men's association was not made a party or given notice and an opportunity to be heard in the proceeding.

One of the contentions of the Board is that the union, organized solely to bargain collectively with the employer, is not destroyed because the order does not run against the union but only orders the employer not to have anything to do with it. To us this contention is as absurd as if old Procrustes, of the Greek myth, had said to an athlete captured on his journey to the Olympiad, "You are not to be destroyed for the races for I am proceeding to cut off only the one leg which happens to protrude over the footboard of my bed. If you are barred at the starting line it is only because you are indirectly affected. My sword 'runs against' your leg, not against you. Besides, I maintain, Lycurgus has given a decision that you are not a 'necessary party' to the amputating process I administer." Yet, the Board insists, such

was the congressional intent which respect to its and, necessarily, all the many other administrative processes created by Congress.

The reargument offered nothing new on the Board's contention that Congress intended to relieve the Board of the burden (sic) of serving notice of the charges and time of hearing on the officials of the union in the same plant as that of the employer, who must be served, of the vexation to the Board, as prosecutor, in meeting the union's evidence, the cross-examination of the Board's witnesses, and the argument of the union's counsel, and of the disturbance to the Board, as judge, in facility in reaching a decision on its own charges.

The Board did not, because it cannot, deny that the employer's interest at the time of the trial often may be quite different from and opposed to that of the absent union. The employer himself then may want to destroy the union, either because he cannot control it or because a more powerful rival threatens a strike and a picket line. He then may "ride to a fall" at the hearing, preferring to submit to an order to desist from something already prohibited by the statute, to the pressure of a disliked union he does not control, or to a costly shut-down which may throw him into bankruptcy. The likelihood of such motivation of the employer whose trial determines the life of the union is obvious, not only to those of us who have had intimate contact with industrial disputes of the recent decades but to anyone who gives the consideration required here of employer psychology. We cannot believe that Congress ignored it, or rather would have ignored it, if, when the Labor Board bill was under discussion, some Congressman then had had the temerity to propose that the Board should destroy a union without notice and an opportunity to be heard.

Nor has the Board made any answer to the obvious fact that it is a greater evil wrongfully to destroy the union itself than it is to destroy a mere contract made by the union with the employer, leaving the union still existing for future bargaining. If it be true, as held in *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197, 233), that due process requires notice and hearing when a contract between the union and employer is sought to be destroyed, a fortiori is it true where the left of the union is at stake?

The case loses none of its importance because, during a recent congressional investigation, the Board, for the time being at least, divested itself of the power it claims Congress gave it to deny to a union its civil liberty of notice and an opportunity to be heard. This was done by the Board's promulgation of a rule granting that right. The right now exists, the Board claims, solely by virtue of its grant. The strong and now repeated insistence, first, that Congress can create in the administrative process such absolutism of control over human relations; and, second, that it intended to create it in the Labor Board, warrants our inference that the Board may contemplate annulling its rule, abrogating the right, and reassuming the absolute power when the pressure of congressional investigation is removed. Significant is the absence at the rehearing of any request by the Board for a return of the proceeding for service on the employees' association—to give it an opportunity to be heard on the charge of employer dominance.

Preliminarily it may be said that this court recognizes that no case subject to our review could show more clearly the need for a wise and deliberative exercise of the national administrative process which Congress has created for the control of labor relations in industrial plants throughout the United States. This proceeding was initiated by a Nation-wide union of the American Federation of Labor. It was seeking to bring into its organization the 70-odd employees of a small manufacturing plant in Los Angeles, Calif. A rival union, organized by the men within the plant, had a membership of 75 percent of the employees. The great brotherhood's national organizers filed a complaint which led to the Board proceeding in which the destroying order removed its rival. None of the national organizers was an employee of the plant. One of them had his headquarters in Chicago. The central control of the national union was in Washington, with a power and prestige in the American industrial world which, in large part, arises from its millions of associated employee-members in unions in every State. It was such cases as this which must have quickened the congressional intent to enact national labor legislation.

In one of the earliest decisions after *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (304 U. S. 1), this court in *Edwards* v. *United States* (91 F. (2d) 767, 780), construed that decision as extending the congressional power even to the planting in California of orange trees whose product is "to be transported" in interstate commerce. It was on this construction of the act that we upheld the Secretary of Agriculture regulating the flow of the product of orange trees into interstate commerce. True, that statement of the law was by two of the three judges sitting, but it now stands for this circuit as a declaration of the broad area of congressional administrative power under the commerce clause. In that and a succession of cases, this court has recognized the congressional intent in a widely expanding creation of administrative agencies. Nor has any court gone farther in recognizing the congressional intent to free the Labor Board's administrative process from the technicalities of court procedure. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Biles-Coleman Lumber Co.* (98 F. (2) 16, 17).

The many cases now decided show that, under penalizing restraints or offer of reward, the fruit grower now must consider a Washington bureau's decision before he may safely add orange or walnut trees to the few acres of his orchard and a small farmer must do the same before he determines his plowing for next season's crop. The shut-down of the single lumber plant supporting a mill town, by the heavy penalties we impose for infractions of the Labor Relations Act, often means the disruption of the family life of the employees, whose children must shift to the schools of a distant plant's neighborhood, the foreclosures of homes with the loss of part payments and, worse than this, the mental agony of parents and children that the supporting father may be marked with the stigma of the jobless and indigent.

These disturbing and often tragic results may be deemed to have been considered by Congress as necessary for the ultimate good of the creative life of Americans. However, because that good is to be obtained by powerful bureaus radiating out, through a major and minor officialdom from a distant Washington, the danger to our democracy is always present of the denial of those civil liberties upon which its existence depends. If the Anglo-American civil right to be made a party and to have notice and hearing must be observed in the orderly procedure of a court of law before a decision, as here, can immediately and directly destroy a citizen's property or his liberty to contract to form a labor association a fortiori must it be recognized in the looser proceedings we have recognized before subordinate and superior bureau officers, whose administrative decisions are finally made far from the homes of the regulated persons.

It has been said that the Board is accuser, prosecutor, judge, and executioner. This is obvious as to the first three functions. In our democracy their exercise requires the greatest of wisdom and detachment when, as here, the accuser and prosecutor sits as judge. The orders it made in this case are not final against the employer, who is a party in the Board proceeding and has the right to appear here and defend against a petition for our decree of enforcement. With regard to the destruction of the absent union the situation is entirely different.

Here, so far as concerns that destruction, the Board, at the instigation of a rival, accuses the union of employer dominance, the Board's attorneys prosecute the accusation, the Board hears and determines the truth of the charge, and the Board orders the execution of the union by its disestablishment. The Board's orders against the employer, a party, may be regarded as preliminary rules to be made absolute by our decree after a hearing of the employer's defense. So far as concerns any defense which could have been made by the absent executed union, denied its civil liberty of due process, without opportunity to produce witnesses, cross-examine, or to be heard in argument, our decree, the Board claims, must make the preliminary rule absolute.

This is the kind of administrative absolutism denounced in democratic assemblies in America as characteristic of the totalitarianism of the Central European powers. In the consideration of congressional intent the polemics of deeply moved public men, whose apprehensions are now realized in the conquest of two of the Scandinavian democracies, are not to be ignored. We do not believe that Congress in the National Labor Relations Act intended to make a long start on the road where our civil liberties are to be regarded as the "pale phantoms of objective law" which no longer control our deliberations, as the German chief justice on the first session of the newly constituted court in conquered Poland is reported to have told his colleagues.

It is our opinion that, when the Labor Board bill was under consideration, if any Congressman had stated that such absolute power was intended to be conferred on the Board, it would have been denied promptly by the bill's advocates. If its statement had been persistently pressed as expressing the proper congressional intent, we would have expected that its author would have been "shouted into silence."

In making these comments we are not oblivious of the heavy burden thrown on the Labor Board in creating a Nation-wide organization in a period of devastating labor disturbance nor failed to take account of the vast number of labor disputes it has successfully solved both by conference and formal procedure. That a Federal board so burdened should grasp for power as it does in this case is to be expected. To curtail this inevitable overreaching is one of the first necessities of a democratic government and is one of the most important duties of our courts.

The Board cites the same cases of the Supreme Court and circuit courts of appeals on which it relied on the first hearing. In none was there counsel presenting the violation of the civil liberties of the employees and their union. Particularly was there none in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Pennsylvania Greyhound* (303 U. S. 261), where the Board, free of anyone affected to present the question of civil liberty there involved, was able to destroy the absent union.

In our first opinion we decided that these cases have been overruled by or are not in accord with *Morgan* v. *United States* (304 U. S. 1, 22, 21), in which administrative proceedings are commanded to observe "the cherished judicial tradition embodying the basic concepts of fair play" and in them men are to have their day in court and to be given the "essentials of a full and fair hearing, with the right * * * to have a reasonable opportunity to know the claims advanced against them * * *." *Cf. National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1, 47). Our decision in this regard is confirmed by a recent opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in which all the Justices concurred, except Mr. Justice McReynolds, who concurred in the result. In that case, in reviewing the area and content of the expanding administrative law, the court, through Justice Frankfurter, stated:

"* * * To be sure, the laws under which these agencies operate prescribe the fundamentals of fair play. They require that interested parties be afforded an opportunity for hearing and that judgment must express a reasoned conclusion * * *."

Federal Communications Commission v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.* (— U. S. —, —; 84 L. Ed. 361, 366).

The Board cites as determining the congressional intent to create the absolute power claimed here, the case of *National Labor Rela-*

tions Board v. *National Licorice Co.* (— U. S. —; 84 L. Ed. 533). The report of that case shows no counsel representing the employees or the union. As we read the opinion the petition for certiorari raised no question of the disestablishment of the union. The case involves the individual contracts of employees with the employer which on their face showed agreements in violation of the act. The decision that the employer should not perform such obvious violations involves no denial of civil liberty or of the doctrine of fair play established (or rather recognized as fundamental law) in the Morgan and Pottsville cases. The National Licorice case does not mention either of these two decisions.

We cannot believe that an opinion which (at p. 541) holds the function of the Board to be that of "protecting the 'exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment,'" at the same time holds that Congress in the same act conferred on the Board the power to destroy by disestablishment a union, so self-organized, or to frustrate it in the performance of the very functions which the act requires the Board to protect, without making it a party or giving it an opportunity to be heard.

Before we deem ourselves required to recognize that Congress intended such a denial of civil liberty the Congress or the Supreme Court in a case in which the absent union sought to be destroyed is represented by counsel will have to declare it in language so plain that no other possible inference may be drawn from it. We adhere to our detailed reasoning and holding expressed in our first opinion, pages 196 to 200, 109 F. (2d).

On the suggestion of the Board that further evidence might be taken on the issue of alleged fraud of the respondent in statements in its notice to its employees considered on pages 204 to 208 of our original opinion the respondent applied for an order which we have granted for a reference on that issue. The Board has advised us that many of the employee witnesses are widely scattered since the hearing in October 1937 and that it will take a substantial time to prepare to meet the respondent's proffered testimony outlined in its application. The evidence offered in all likelihood will have to be passed upon by the trial examiner and later in Washington by the Board itself; and several weeks more may transpire before the issue is decided and returned to this court.

Since our decision of this issue of disestablishment and frustration disposes of the Board's orders as affecting the association, and since the Board insists on asserting its power to destroy the union without granting it or its members the civil liberty here discussed and has not suggested even now that it will reopen the case as a whole and serve notice on the association, as its present rule requires, we decide it now. We leave to our later consideration the orders solely affecting the employer. Further to delay with regard to this small self-organized union might amount to an unfair labor practice on the part of this court, for in that period the pressure of the Board's order and of its powerful rival well may persuade the men to give up their self-organization as hopeless, and the protection of section 7 of the act a vain delusion.

The Board's petition for enforcement of its order that the respondent employer shall not bargain collectively with the association and that respondent shall disestablish that union is denied. Decision on the petition for enforcement of other orders of the Board is reserved.

Healy, circuit judge, dissenting:

On the reargument in this case respondent applied to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, in conformity with section 10 (e) of the act. Leave was granted, and the matter is again before the Board for the taking of further testimony. The point of fact to be inquired into is the crucial one on which the Board largely predicated its finding of an unfair labor practice and its order disestablishing the employee union as a bargaining agency.

The statute, section 10 (e), provides that the Board may "modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings * * * and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order."

In this posture of the case, with the question of law dealt with in the majority opinion threatening to become moot, I regard its decision at this time as not only unnecessary but as ill advised. That would be true, I think, even though the question were still open to rational debate. But debate, in inferior Federal courts at least, has been foreclosed by *National Labor Relations Board* v. *National Licorice Co.* (— U. S. —), decided March 4 of this year.

Conditions in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA, BEFORE THE INQUIRENDO, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] before The Inquirendo, on May 10, 1940, at the Mayflower Hotel in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Inquirendo, and distinguished guests, I am highly honored by the invitation to address this body of distinguished citizens.

Hitler's blitzkrieg invasion of Holland on yesterday, while not entirely unexpected, startled the world and forced upon our minds a realization of the possible far-reaching effect of this second world war. Again we are witnessing the terrible efficiency and expedition of totalitarian powers in war. We see to what astounding extent a government under the domination of one man, a genius, perhaps, having power over life and death, supported by a great and enthusiastic people, has prepared for conquest during the 7 years of Hitler's rule. We who hold under our Constitution that we have the freest, the most independent, the greatest and happiest government on earth are forced to admit that this very independence and liberty, this rule "by the people" deprives us of the same powers of quick coordination, discipline, and centralization of command that gives so great an advantage to a totalitarian power in war.

Innately we are restrained by the laws of God and of man. We believe that nations have a right to remain at peace. We believe that such nations are entitled to live in safety, free from invasion and attack by warring powers so long as they remain absolutely neutral in word and in deed. We cannot banish from our souls the feeling of humanity which debars us from taking the lives of women and children and noncombatants. These same principles and intuitions govern to a great extent democracies everywhere. It has been these restraints upon the people and the Governments of Great Britain and France which have caused them to be a step behind always in the war with Hitler.

That which seems strange to some of us is that the Government of Great Britain should not have realized years ago that Hitler is a conqueror, imbued with a fanatical determination to make the German race dominant throughout the world. Any person with an analytical mind who has read Mein Kampf should have been convinced that Hitler would not be restrained by religion, by international law, by humanity, or by treaties, or by his word in the accomplishment of his purpose. And yet it is almost impossible for men, even though they be statesmen, who are innately governed by the laws of Christ and the humane and just laws of nations which follow the laws of Christ to conceive that any ruler would be unrestrained by any of these laws. And so Chamberlain must be excused when at Munich he took the word of Hitler that he (Hitler) was not interested in any other borders than the Sudetenland. It is to be hoped that the British and the French Governments at last understand the true character of Hitler and his determined purpose. Undoubtedly, they do. Now they are coordinating their forces and centralizing command.

It would appear that Hitler, aware of the difficulty of supplying his country with raw resources, has determined to force an issue on the west front. Possibly if the issue must be now, it is more advantageous to Great Britain and France that the final battles should be waged in Belgium. There the navies are concentrated. There they control the coast. There the great French Army comes into action. These things are encouraging.

This is not the war of 1914–18. Many of the factors are new. No one knows yet the vital part that airships will take in the present war. In view of these circumstances, the world is uneasy and has cause to be uneasy with regard to what the results may be. It was an old axiom that the nation that controlled the sea could not be conquered. This is a rapidly moving world, and things that were true yesterday are not true today.

In a radio address in Washington on February 20, 1939, I said:

"Of course, this penetration into Latin America does not become pertinent, and will not become pertinent until and unless these totalitarian powers have obtained sufficient domination in Europe and Asia to permit them to move in force against Latin America. Any reasonable man will say that that is possible. Any reasonable man would say we should protect against such possibility."

I was charged in a number of newspapers and magazines with being a war monger. I certainly had no such intention. I have no intention now of arousing a war hysteria in the United States. I realized then, as I realize now, the defects of a democracy in preparing its defense through its slow processes and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. I would not have it otherwise. Preparations for defense cannot be made in a day or a year. Great Britain is a perfect illustration of this assertion. It takes 2 or 3 years to build a battleship, and the number that we may build is limited by our navy yards. Today Germany is engaged in mass production of airships of a quality we are advised superior to any in the world. As she conquers countries, the facilities and the labor of those countries are made available to her.

Again I reassert that while it is not probable, yet is is possible for the totalitarian powers to eventually dominate Europe and Asia. We are in no immediate danger. No government will attack us or our possessions or violate the Monroe Doctrine while this war is in progress. Our Government is not going to send its Navy or its soldiers to Europe to engage in the present war. We are not creating a war hysteria in this country when we advise our citizens as to the facts. They are entitled to know all the facts so that they may make such preparations for defense as shall be necessary. We are not threatened with war now. But in view of the fact of the great length of time it takes for the preparation for defense, it

is the duty of statesmen to look ahead and not to be caught unprepared if and when cause for strenuous defense is forced upon us. Unpreparedness for defense invites attack, while adequate preparedness is the best preventative of war. The people of our country will support unselfishly and without complaint every act necessary for the defense of our country.

There is no country in the world that has the wealth, the natural resources, and the high class of citizenry possessed by the United States. Our Constitution and our institutions will live on. This country will never be conquered.

International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY HULL TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, our Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, is president of the American Society of International Law. On May 13, at the thirty-fourth annual meeting of the society, held at the Carlton Hotel, in Washington, D. C., Secretary Hull delivered the presidential address. This address was broadcast over the National Broadcasting System. Because of its general public interest, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow members, and guests of the American Society of International Law, I am deeply appreciative of the privilege of serving as president of this society, and of opening its thirty-fourth annual meeting.

All of us who, as students or practitioners, are interested in this particular branch of jurisprudence, are profoundly conscious of the fact that today the subject of international law has an extraordinary significance. It is no exaggeration to say, that never before, in the entire history of the human race, has the problem of the preservation and development of order under law, presented itself with such urgent acuteness. Never before has it been so fraught with import for the future of mankind.

The concept and the structure of a law of nations, rose and evolved out of a spirit of protest against the ravages of international anarchy. In the ancient world and during the dark ages of the modern world, there widely prevailed a concept that each nation was a law unto itself, the sole arbiter of its international conduct, fully entitled—if it possessed sufficient strength—to engage in aggression and aggrandizement, to destroy by armed force the independence of other nations, and to subjugate other peoples. Force reigned supreme. Human liberty, national independence, confidence in safety and security on the part of nations and individuals, were in constant jeopardy.

Over long centuries, voices raised in protest against the nightmare of international lawlessness, grew in strength and influence, and ideas of how to achieve a law-governed world, emerged more and more. Three hundred years ago, the genius of Hugo Grotius gathered these scattered voices and ideas into a sharp focus, and gave a powerful impetus to a new spirit, to a more and more insistent demand that relations among nations be based upon acceptance and application of well-defined rules of international conduct—upon a body of international law.

Since then, enormous advances have been made in the character of relations among nations. There has been an ever-deepening and ever more widespread recognition of the inescapable fact that an attitude of unbridled license on the part of nations—in the same way that such an attitude on the part of individuals or groups within nations—is bound, sooner or later, to impair their own well-being and, in the end, lead them to destruction. There has been a wider and wider acceptance and application of the all-important fact that true social progress is possible only when nations in their relations with each other, as well as individuals and groups within nations, are willing to practice self-restraint and to cooperate for the greater good of all. Only thus can orderly processes exist and provide that social stability, security, and confidence, without which individual liberty and a free play of creative forces must necessarily be precarious, and the onward march of man must be halting, if not altogether impossible.

Institutions have been built up to give effect and reality to order under law within and among nations. They have been largely responsible for the flowering of our modern civilization in the spheres of political security, social justice, scientific progress, and economic betterment.

This progress has not been achieved without stupendous effort. There have been interruptions and setbacks. Frequently, forces have arisen which have challenged the very concept of order under law, especially in the sphere of international relations, and have plunged nations into war, the greatest of all deterrents to human progress.

That these challenges and the conditions of international lawlessness which they created have not been permanent setbacks is proof of the inherent vitality and virility of the great principles underlying the whole concept of world order under international law. These facts attest the indomitable strength of the spirit which has been the great driving force behind the determination of the human race to rise from the darkness of lawlessness to the light of law.

Today, mankind is the unhappy victim of another challenge of this sort—a powerful challenge which threatens to wipe out the achievements of centuries in the development of international law, and to destroy the very foundations of orderly international relationships. In the face of this challenge, it is of the utmost importance that every citizen visualize clearly the cardinal features of international law and of order based on law, as well as the conditions which would prevail, if they were destroyed.

Order under law in the relations between and among nations requires scrupulous respect for the pledged word. It requires fulfillment of obligations. Without these, the whole fabric of mutual trust and, in fact, of civilized existence, must crash to the ground. Without confidence that a promise made by a nation will be kept, and that an obligation assumed by a nation will be honored, international relationships become reduced to the level of the jungle.

Order under law in international relations requires that nations respect each other's independence. Unless all nations—large and small—can consider themselves secure in this respect, they must continually live in fear of being confronted with the tragic alternatives of abject submission or armed resistance. National effort must then either be half-hearted in the shadow of ever-present dread, or be increasingly diverted from activities for the advancement of national welfare, to the intensive creation of means of defense.

Order under law in international relations, requires that disputes among nations be settled by none but pacific means, and that treaties and agreements, once entered into, be revised by none but methods of peaceful adjustment. It is necessary, as all right-thinking people agree, to the peace and tranquility of the body politic of a well-ordered state, that individuals shall refrain from self-help and the employment of force, and shall settle their differences by peaceful methods and, when necessary, by the judicial process. It is no less necessary, if we are to have an orderly international society—a society capable of rendering the greatest amount of good to the greatest number of people—that members of the family of nations shall be governed by similar processes for the settlement of their differences. For centuries, efforts have been made to banish the use of armed force as an instrument for settling disputes and revising treaties and agreements. Extensive machinery of judicial procedure, of conciliation, of mediation, and of arbitration, has been built up for this purpose. The efficacy of this machinery has been amply demonstrated. It would suffice, if all nations would but resolve to have full recourse to it. Only by sincere determination to perfect it and to use it, can mankind hope to relegate the international anarchy of war to the limbo of things forgotten.

Finally, if order under law is to be stable and effective, it is essential that trade and other economic relationships among nations be conducted on the principles of fair dealing and equal treatment. Disregard of these principles leads to economic warfare, which undermines the foundations of peaceful and orderly international relations. Search for national economic self-sufficiency, discriminatory trade arrangements, failure to practice the doctrine of equality of commercial treatment are among the most powerful instruments of such warfare. These and other similar policies have the effect of disrupting the channels of trade, of reducing the volume of mutually beneficial interchange among nations of useful goods and services, and of impoverishing all nations. The resulting economic strain and distress create social unrest within nations and lead to resentment and conflict among nations.

In recent years there have been truly terrifying developments in contravention of each of these essential conditions for the effective functioning of an orderly world. There has been a staggering multiplication of instances in which solemn contractual obligations have been brushed aside with contemptuous gestures and destructive action. Powerful nations have built up vast armaments for the avowed purpose of attaining their national aims by force; and their action has compelled other nations—even those most sincerely devoted to the cause of peace under a rule of law, including our own—to increase to immense proportions their own armaments. Peaceful nations have been deprived of their independence by the use of armed force or threat of force, combined with the exercise of fraud and treachery. Conquered populations have been subjected to new refinements of oppression and cruelty. Economic warfare on an unprecedented scale and unparalleled in its intensity has come to dominate the foreign trade and other economic policies of many nations, causing immense material losses to all nations and a marked lowering of the standards of living everywhere.

The specter of a new descent into the conditions of international anarchy which characterized the Dark Ages looms on the horizon today. I am profoundly convinced that it menaces the civilized existence of mankind—of every nation and of every individual. Every nation and every individual should be actively on guard.

Our own Nation, powerful as it is and determined as it is to remain at peace, to preserve its cherished institutions and to promote the welfare of its citizens—is not secure against that menace. We cannot shut it out by attempting to isolate and insulate ourselves. We cannot be certain of safety and security when a large part of the world outside our borders is dominated by the forces of international lawlessness.

We cannot close our eyes to what is going on elsewhere in the world, and delude ourselves with the mere hope that somehow—somehow—all this will pass us by. Never in our National history has there been a more desperate need for a clear understanding by every responsible citizen of our country, of what is taking place in the world, and of how it affects us. Such understanding is essential to a wise charting and application of our National policies. Under our system of government, it is the most effective safeguard for the maintenance and promotion of the National interest.

The world is today torn by conflicts, the outcome of which will affect the lives of the future generations in all countries. The world is today threatened with an orgy of destruction—not only of life and property, but of religion, of morality, of the very bases of civilized society. The spread of international anarchy not only undermines law, justice, and morality among nations, but also inevitably impairs, within nations, these essential foundations of civilized existence.

In the face of existing conditions, we have no choice but to expand our program of armament construction to a degree necessary to provide fully adequate means of defending this country's security and its rightful interests. But if mankind is to avoid a long-continuing period of chaos and retrogression, it can only be through the firm establishment of order under law. Never before has there been a greater need for our people to place the support of a wholly united public opinion behind our Nation's efforts to exert the great weight of its moral influence in favor of a revindication and revitalization of the basic principles of order under law, which alone can give lasting assurance of safety, security, and peace.

Upon those of us who devote their lives to the improvement and application of international law, there devolves today a special duty. It is our task to help our fellow citizens to a better realization of the crucial importance which preservation of international law and of order based on law, has for them and for their country. It is our task to make the immense significance of international law a living reality in the mind and heart of every American.

While doing this, we should constantly and persistently search for ways and means of strengthening the structure of international law, and of making more effective the translation of its principles into firmly established international practice. We should spare no effort to demonstrate that the spirit which has made possible, over the centuries, immense forward strides in the development of international law, still lives.

Stunned by the cruel events which unfold all around them, millions of men and women have become a prey to doubt, hopelessness, and despair. It is all the more necessary for us, who believe in the eternal vitality of international law and of international morality, to hold fast to the conviction that law and morality will triumph over the forces of lawlessness and chaos which have again risen to challenge the very concept of order under law—just as they have, in the past, triumphed over similar challenges. I am certain of that triumph. I am certain that we and others who hold our beliefs, will not falter in that faith, or fail to do everything possible to restore and extend the full sway of effective international law, over relations among nations.

Preparedness and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR LEHMAN AT REDEDICATION OF WORLD'S FAIR COURT OF PEACE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Governor of New York, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, at the rededication of the New York World's Fair, 1940, Court of Peace on Saturday, May 11, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only a year has passed since we dedicated this great fair which we hoped would be a symbol of world peace.

But what history has been written into that 1 year. What changes have come to the world in a short 12 months.

A year ago the world, in spite of acts of aggression, was still nominally at peace.

Since then, many peace-loving, brave democratic nations which had joined with us here a year ago in peaceful celebration, have become victims of a cruel invader. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium all sacrificed to satisfy the insane and monstrous lust for power. Their only sin was that they stood in the path of a power-crazed, godless despot. Their cities are destroyed, their men killed, their churches ruined or closed, their liberties snuffed out, their people enslaved. To those stricken nations go out our deepest sympathy and our earnest hope for their early restoration.

We in America are still at peace. We can still think in terms of homely living and security—of baseball, of schools to which more than 20,000,000 children go in safety each morning, of economic security, of jobs, of this great world's fair, and of the hundred and one simple pleasures and problems which fill the daily lives of a peace-loving, orderly people.

We are deeply grateful, as we should be, that we can still concern ourselves with those simple things without cowering at the roar of guns, without deadly terror of bombs that rain from the sky, without fear of violence and death, and without the horror of concentration camps.

We are deeply grateful that here we still have the blessings of religious and civil liberty; that we live in a land where men can still worship as they please, think as they please, and speak as they please.

But we have become so used to these blessings that we accept them now almost as a matter of course.

Many of us have become smug and complacent. And smugness and complacency are the greatest enemies of man's liberties.

Many of us are wont to say that Poland and the other enslaved countries far across the seas which have become the victims of a pitiless invasion mean nothing to us save as subjects of our sympathy; that their fate is not our concern.

But, my fellow Americans, their fate is our concern.

Only a short time ago they too were peace-loving, orderly, democratic nations—just as we are today. And now? Now they are shambles, enslaved and helpless. The rape of Poland, the enslavement of Norway, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and the ruthless invasion of Holland and Belgium must be matters of deep concern wherever in the world democratic peoples still live.

This war is no longer a fight just between nations. It is a struggle between democracy and religion on the one hand and dictatorship and paganism on the other.

The destruction of each of these democratic countries was another step in the relentless march of dictatorship.

The simple and God-fearing people of those nations, too, wanted peace. They, too, wanted to have their simple pleasures—to play with their children, to enjoy their little homes, and to live in security and at peace with the world—just as we do here.

They thought they were safe. They thought they would have peace because they wanted peace. But when the bombing planes and the tanks and the big guns came they found themselves helpless in the face of overpowering military force.

And yet smug people say it cannot happen here.

But it can happen here unless we, ourselves, make it impossible.

We can no longer delude ourselves with what some people glibly describe as the "safety of isolation." There is no longer isolation anywhere in the world. Wide oceans, which a few years ago were looked upon as a bulwark of defense, no longer afford security. The new and terrible mechanism of warfare, the ease of communication, the subversive Nazi and Communist infiltration, the growth of hatred and intolerance fostered by foreign propaganda, make every nation vulnerable unless it has fortified itself both from within and from without.

We can no longer afford to be complacent.

We can no longer put our trust alone in a righteous cause and in the will to peace.

In this country we must make ourselves so strong on land and on sea and in the air that no power or group of powers will dare to attack us.

No longer can we afford to be influenced by the specious plea that adequate military preparedness makes for war.

Adequate preparedness makes for peace—not war.

Today when the philosophy that "might makes right" has been forced on a large part of the world, adequate preparedness is the only guaranty against aggression and violence.

The last decade has tragically demonstrated that today the weak are at the mercy of the ruthless strong; that might directed by power-crazed rulers has temporarily prevailed over right.

The history of the last few years has proven that timely preparedness is the only effective bulwark of security and peace.

We want peace, now and forever.

But peace as free men.

Peace, to live and to speak and to think as we will, not as we are whipped into doing.

Peace, each man to worship as his conscience dictates.

Peace and security from constant fear of violence and oppression and injustice.

We have lived as a Nation for a century and a half, convinced that it is only under democracy that we can hope abidingly to have the blessings of religious and civil liberty, of tolerance, and of security.

We Americans will continue to have faith and confidence in our righteous cause of democracy and peace; but let us now fortify that faith and confidence by adequate means to defend our peace, our liberties, and our democracy.

We who love democracy must be willing to sacrifice for it just as did our forefathers. Our determination to maintain our God-given liberties must never falter for an instant. Those who are indifferent to the blessings of their liberties may lose them.

The greatest danger to democracy lies in the acceptance by inert people of encroachments on their constitutional rights and on their failure to realize that constitutional democracy cannot survive where the rights guaranteed by the Constitution are not guaranteed to all citizens.

We must protect ourselves from the enemies within by a militant love of democracy and an alertness which will sanction no violation of our civil and religious liberties.

We must protect ourselves from the enemies without by military preparedness adequate to discourage attack, and fully equipped to defeat attack should it come.

We must make ourselves strong, not in the future but now, before it is too late.

Nonsectarian Foundation for Refugee Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT BY OWEN R. LOVEJOY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement announcing the formation of the Nonsectarian Foundation for Refugee Children. The foundation will endeavor to place in American homes children arriving, under existing quota laws, from the war-torn areas of Europe. In cooperation with Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish refugee agencies, the foundation will arrange for the care of children who have been separated from their parents by reason of death, imprisonment in concentration camps, or the general disorganized situation caused by the war. Associated with the foundation are a group of very distinguished Americans from every faith and every walk of life. The foundation is a charitable undertaking dissociated from any legislative activity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Formation of a Non-Sectarian Foundation for Refugee Children which will place in American homes children arriving here under existing quota laws from war-torn areas of Europe was announced today by Clarence E. Pickett, president, and Owen R. Lovejoy, executive director, of the new foundation. Honorary vice presidents are: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman; Bishop Bernard James Sheil; Hon. George Rublee; Prof. Albert Einstein; Archbishop John Joseph Cantwell, of Los Angeles; President Robert M. Hutchins; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher; Most Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in America; Rabbi Henry Cohen, of Galveston, Tex.; President Frank Porter Graham, of the University of North Carolina; Mr. Homer Folks, chairman of the recent White House Conference on Children in a Democracy; President Homer P. Rainey, of the University of Texas and former director of the American Youth Commission; and Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Dr. Marion E. Kenworthy is vice president.

The Foundation, located at 215 Fourth Avenue, New York City, is applying for incorporation as a charitable organization under the laws of New York State. In cooperation with the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish refugee agencies, the foundation will care for children eligible to enter under existing quota laws, but separated from their parents by reason of death, concentration camps, or war-time conditions.

Among those who have already consented to serve as directors of the foundation are: Bishop Bernard James Sheil; Mr. Marshall Field; Hon. Bruce Barton; Mr. Paul T. Beisser, president of the Child Welfare League of America; Dr. Solomon Lowenstein; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert; Dr. Hugo Freund, head of the Michigan Children's Fund; Hon. Caroline O'Day; Mrs. Adele Rosenwald Levy; Miss Ruth Taylor; Mr. Howard S. Cullman; Miss Charlotte Carr; Mrs. Stephen Wise; Hon. Monte Lemann; Dr. Marion E. Kenworthy; Mrs. George Backer; Miss Agnes King Inglis; Mr. Sidney Hollander; Dr. Robert W. Searle; Mrs. Dorothy Lehman Bernhard; Rev. Dr. Maurice Sheehy; Hon. Justine Wise Polier; Mr. Jonathan Daniels; Maj. Benjamin Namm; Dr. John Lovejoy Elliott; Mr. Eugene Meyer; Dr. Paul E. Scherer; Mr. Jacob Billikopf; Dr. Viola Bernard; Dean Dudley D. Carroll; Mr. Harry Scherman; Hon. Whitney North Seymour; Mrs. Maurice Goldman; Hon. Lawrence Dunham; Dr. Otto Nathan; Hon. Francis Shea; Mr. Louis S. Weiss; Mr. George L. Warren; Mr. Lewis Strauss; Mr. Pickett; Mr. Lovejoy; and Hon. Newbold Morris, treasurer of the foundation.

The objectives of the foundation were set forth by Mr. Lovejoy, who, for many years, headed the National Child Labor Committee and has recently served as director of field activities and research of the American Youth Commission.

"One of the special purposes of this foundation," he said, "will be to serve the disinherited children of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. The people of this country must be made to realize that the needs are not confined to any one race but that children are being left defenseless in Europe regardless of religious affiliation and racial inheritance. Catholic, Lutheran, and many other Protestant children are equally exposed to political and social discrimination. Far from depriving American children of any care, it is my hope and belief that this movement will serve to quicken our realization of the needs of all children and to open up new sources of interest and aid for child-welfare work generally in this country. It is encouraging to know that those who are most skilled and successful in present programs of placing helpless American children in suitable homes share this view and are among the most active in advocating this service to children from abroad."

The foundation is developing plans to cooperate with the American Friends Service Committee, of which Mr. Pickett, president of the foundation, is executive secretary, and with other agencies engaged in serving children eligible for entry under the existing quota restrictions. Mr. Lovejoy expressed the hope that a study of the child's personal history, general background, educational record, and other information would be made available before the child's arrival in order to assure wise and careful placement.

The facilities of the child-welfare agencies throughout the country as represented in the Child Welfare League of America will be used in the placement program and the supervision of the child after placement. The foundation's advisory committee on child care is in process of organization and the personnel will be announced shortly.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS AND ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 46, which I presented yesterday, several editorials from the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 14, 1940]

LET'S LOOK TO OUR ARMS

It may be mere coincidence that the first proposal for a full-dress inquiry into our national defenses is sponsored by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, who may be young enough to fight if there is a next time.

It surely is no coincidence that among those who have rallied quickly to the idea were two Senators—TYDINGS, of Maryland, and CLARK of Missouri—who served overseas and who know what happens to men who take the field inadequately trained and poorly equipped.

Senator LODGE is on the right track. This country is more ready than ever before to spend whatever is required for defense, but it needs to find out why, no matter how many billions are turned over to the admirals and generals, we seem forever unprepared; why, each time a new war front develops, our military authorities seem surprised by new methods and implements of war.

We must learn—

Why, though for years our national-defense plan has called for putting an army of 400,000 into immediate action, we are now said to have modern equipment for only 75,000 men.

Why, though air power has gained in importance for a quarter century, this greatest industrial Nation is still short of trained pilots and mechanics, of latest-type planes, and antiaircraft guns.

Why our Navy turns out topheavy destroyers and cruisers that roll unduly—and if the new battleships will have proper armor.

Whether all that is necessary is being done to protect the Caribbean approaches to the Panama Canal.

Why, after years of warnings that a war might dry up the supply of essential raw materials like rubber and tin, we still go along with a few weeks' carry-over of stuff that would be more precious in an emergency than all the gold buried at Fort Knox.

What immediate steps should be taken to bring our defenses up to scratch.

Yes, Senator LODGE is on the right track. But we think a better plan than his—one surer to produce sound information and prepare the way for effective action—would be to have the investigation conducted by a committee including not only Members of the House and Senate, which appropriate the money, but also representatives of the Army and Navy, which spend the money, and of private industry, which must manufacture most of our military equipment.

The problem is too pressing, too vital, to permit working at cross purposes. The need is for energetic cooperation by legislative, executive, and industrial leaders. There is, you can bet your life, no pulling and hauling under Hitler.

PICTURE OF WAR

(By Raymond Clapper)

As seen here, the picture today is about as follows:

Europe: German attack on the low countries is no more than what was expected at outbreak of war. Outcome is in doubt. If attack is successful, Hitler is expected to take a short breathing spell to consolidate and then either turn on England or direct a major flank attack against France. Hitler is thought to be aiming for a decision this year. British and French, outdistanced in advance preparedness, need time, hope to hold on, taking a beating for several months, and in the end make their superior resources tell. Chances on war's outcome are rated at about 50–50.

Far East: Japan is under no pressure to seize Dutch East Indies, as essential supplies from there are forthcoming under present conditions. Some believe Japan intends no move unless it appears Germany is certain to win in Europe, in which case Japan probably would seize islands to forestall any argument with Germany about them. Others believe presence of American Fleet in mid-Pacific is deterring Japan.

Western Hemisphere: Every encouragement is being given to hemisphere solidarity, with assurance that the United States will do everything in its power to protect this hemisphere. Watchfulness over "fifth-column activities" is strongly counseled.

Home front: Intense speeding up of defense has begun and for the time being this is likely to be the dominant interest in Washington, completely overshadowing other questions. It is the conviction that, no matter what may be in store, we cannot go wrong by intensive defense measures. Little dispute exists between the administration and Congress on this point. Appointment of a joint committee of Congress to consider defense would facilitate prompt and wise action.

Over all it should be said that events are moving so rapidly and the possibilities are considered to be of such great moment to the future of this hemisphere that we are on a day-to-day basis. What seemed only a possibility yesterday may be history tomorrow.

Underlying all discussion is the thought here that a German victory would change our outlook materially. In that event it would be likely that within a relatively short time we should be confronted with new German naval power and new Italian naval power, plus expanded Japanese naval power, with pressures of all kinds resulting—trade pressures in Latin America, pressure for commercial air-line footholds, pressure for special concessions, all with political possibilities.

It is those possibilities that are uppermost in consideration of policies. The war is moving so rapidly that our intervention now, even were it possible, would be of little effect, and could scarcely make itself felt if Germany is destined to win during the next few months. If the Allies succeed in holding Germany, and thereby forcing a long war, then nobody knows what will happen. That will depend upon how American public sentiment moves.

The foregoing sums up fairly, I think, the attitude here toward the rapidly moving world situation.

With regard to national defense, many questions are of utmost urgency. For a minimum protective force in the field we have inadequate equipment—for instance, we have one-third as many 37-millimeter antiaircraft guns as we need, and we have shortages of varying degree, some appalling, in 3-inch antiaircraft guns, subcaliber machine guns, semiautomatic rifles and antitank guns, light tanks, scout cars, and other kinds of mechanized equipment which are vital to a modern army and which cannot be produced overnight. We are short on stocks of certain materials like rubber and tin.

Except in Government arsenals, we have little shell-making capacity, no shell-loading capacity. We are worse off than when we went into the first World War, because then we had the benefit of nearly 3 years of munition making for the Allies.

These are matters that we can get our teeth into at once, and it looks as if we are about to do it.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

NEW YORK.—This is a parable. It is being written within the hour that I had two teeth yanked. They were fine, perfect teeth. All mine are. Never before, except for one that got broken in a controversial colloquy, did a dental surgeon ever do anything to me—and I am 58. At 80 my mother had all her teeth. It runs in the family.

I have a complete physical check-up all too infrequently. For several years experts in head surgery have been lecturing me on what I ought to do to keep my teeth. What they recommended was a slight nuisance and a constant chore. I didn't feel anything. I didn't see anything—so I didn't do anything. This year, in the cool, impartial efficiency of the Army Medical Corps, I was told by the chief of the dental surgery section at Walter Reed Hospital:

"These two teeth have to go if you don't want to lose half a dozen."

I was very angry. Even his X-ray showed their perfection. I raged up to New York to consult independently my favorite experts—two of them—Ted Fornarton and Joe Levy. Now my two teeth are gone and, as the anesthetic wears off, it hurts like hell.

Everybody remarked on what swell teeth they were, even after they were out. But an infection had destroyed the foundation in which they were imbedded. By the protective action, advised by experts less than 2 years ago, I could have saved them. I felt nothing, so I didn't do what my experts advised.

England understands this sort of thing now and so do France and Holland and Belgium. We are beginning to understand it in a panicky sort of way. Three years ago a veteran expert on American industrial preparedness, a man with unusual sources of information on Europe, Mr. B. M. Baruch, told the President what was going on there, what wasn't going on here at all, and not going on fast enough in England and France. He said that what was needed most of all was an expert survey of our shortcomings in defense and was told to make it, after a new look at Europe where he was then headed.

What he saw abroad impelled him to report by telephone and to hurry home. Here he was told that, for political reasons, he couldn't have the veterans in experience in this field he thought he needed to make that survey. As an alternative, the Stettinius Board was appointed—and repudiated. It had to be repudiated.

So we rocked along—exactly as I did with my teeth. Now that we see what ingenious fiendishness in the hell of modern war looks like, every drowsy editorial page, column of comment, and panicky legislator begins to demand "billions for defense."

O. K., but it isn't enough. We can't meet this danger simply by passing a law, even if it appropriates billions. We have got to get them exactly when, as, and where they are needed. Saying "when, as, and where" is a problem for military and naval experts but getting the goods isn't. That is a problem for industrial experts.

The answer to three questions is absolutely imperative.

1. What are we to defend? That is an answer to be made by the President and the State Department.

2. What do we need to defend it? That is an answer to be made by the Army and Navy.

3. How can we best and most quickly and economically get what we need? That is for the leaders of industry.

Our first job, as yearlings say to bewildered West Point plebes, is to "make a collection of ourselves" before we begin to pour any more panicky billions into rat holes.

For God's sake, let's show just a fraction of Hitler's intelligence and preserve not only our skin but the teeth we are going to need so badly.

POPGUN DEFENSE

(By Ludwell Denny)

More borrowed billions down the brass-hat sink rather than belated streamlining of our popgun defense is in prospect unless a special congressional and public committee is given power to rescue the air force from the admirals and generals.

President Roosevelt, acting largely as his own Navy Secretary and War Secretary, in the last 7 years has used about $7,000,000,000 and budgeted two billion more this year to produce results which his own experts now say are inadequate.

So this week he will ask for a half billion or so more. The excuse is that German air and motor superiority in Scandinavia and the low countries has suddenly revealed our weakness.

That, of course, is nonsense. Ever since the days of Billy Mitchell, who was crucified by the admirals and generals, the "dumb public" and the "armchair strategists" have suspected the truth which the Army and Navy "experts" denied. And for several years the reports on German aviation by real experts, such as Maj. Al Williams (now a civilian who can talk), have convinced most of the country except its defense chiefs.

Even the European war itself did not convince the President and his favorite admirals and generals. Like Neville (Too Late) Chamberlain, they were unwilling to shift the defense budget weight to air power even after Poland and Finland. The deadly German use of planes, parachutists, and swift mechanized troops today in Holland and Belgium is not new.

The American press reported it in great detail last September when Hitler swept Poland. But in his new defense budget the President merely upped the ante breathtakingly without changing balance from ships to planes.

Thus there is nothing which the President can propose now that he could not have proposed years ago, or at least last fall. Even now it is extremely unlikely that the President will shift the balance from ships and old-style troops to planes and mechanized troops.

For to make that shift he would have to take away some of that budgeted $2,000,000,000 from the admirals and old generals—and Congressmen who insist on keeping useless Army Indian forts in their States—and give it to aviation and mechanization.

The anticipated half billion request will not begin to strike a fair balance between the old and new weapons of warfare. Worse, it probably will go in part for more old-style methods.

Of course the admirals and generals will accept more for aviation provided they first get more for their old pet methods.

Two things are said of the President, who bears such a heavy responsibility:

One is that he has had so many other governmental and political duties it has been impossible for him to function well as his own defense secretary; he has thus been the victim, even more than his predecessors, of the Army-Navy bureaucracy. That is the price of one-man rule.

The other is that his sincere pro-Ally policy led him to give priority in American aviation production to Allied orders at the expense of our own. Unfortunately, the Allies double-crossed him. Instead of placing heavy orders last autumn, permitting large plant expansion and bottle-neck-breaking, the Allies have not placed heavy orders here even yet.

So when Chamberlain missed this bus he also made Roosevelt miss it. And now when the Allies at last are ready—or almost—to use American industry, up jumps public opinion demanding that we cancel a few warship plans in favor of an American air fleet.

Thanks to the Chamberlain-Roosevelt delay in aircraft orders, our plants and trained mechanic supply at this late date are still very small. Our production capacity is only 500 a month, compared with Germany's 3,000. From 1 to 3 years of industrial expansion will be required, after big orders are placed, before they can be filled promptly.

In antiaircraft guns we are even worse off. After spending about $8,500,000,000 of borrowed money on defenses in the last 9 years, we now have a grand total of less than 300 antiaircraft guns—but we have lots of unprotected ships. Likewise, there is a shortage of pilots, mechanics, and training facilities.

To correct these and similar weaknesses there are two proposals:

One is to give more vast sums to the same old system.

The other is to provide a special congressional and public committee to attempt the job in which the admirals and generals have failed—a "new deal" for enlarged aviation, with a unified air corps equal to the Army and Navy.

So far as known, the President is still for the old discredited system.

Silver-Purchase Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD AND WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials on the subject of the silver-purchase program from the Philadelphia Record of May 11, 1940, and the Washington Post of May 13, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of May 11, 1940]

THE SENATE VOTE ON SILVER

War news has obscured one of the most significant votes taken by the United States Senate—to discontinue the Government's silver-purchase policy.

Launched in 1934, this policy has committed the American people to buying, at inflated prices, all the silver that the rest of the world could mine or otherwise gather together to sell to us. That we had no use for the metal was beside the point. Domestically, it served as a subsidy to the silver mines of the West, and at the same time it was embraced by others on the ground that it created buying power for our goods abroad.

Of course silver buying created foreign purchasing power for our goods. But the price was paid by us. We sold useful goods, took in exchange silver for which we had no use, and, therefore, buried in the ground. In all, the process amounted to giving away the products of American labor.

The result would have been the same had Congress chosen to buy tin, lead, soybeans, or elephant tusks.

It is precisely the same with gold.

But because so much of the current world economy is draped around what remains of the gold standard, a sudden departure from our gold policy would have consequences much more serious than those which will follow if the House of Representatives backs the Senate in ditching the silver folly.

Sooner or later we must take a similar step with gold. If we don't we will simply go on giving away the products of American labor on one hand, burying a useless metal on the other hand.

It is Congress' job to find an orderly way out of that miasma, too.

[From the Washington Post of Monday, May 13, 1940]

SENATE AND SILVER

For the second time within a year the Senate has voted to suspend the buying of foreign silver. But it appears to be very doubtful whether the House will act upon the bill. Indeed it is hinted that the silver bloc in the Senate did not put forth its best efforts because of a belief that the measure would be held up in the House.

As Senator BARKLEY says, the Silver Purchase Act "does not take money out of the pockets of the taxpayer in the ordinary sense," because silver acquisitions are paid for by issuance of silver certificates. But for every ounce of silver bought from foreigners purchasing power has been put in the hands of foreigners and can be used to buy our goods. In other words, in exchange for an overvalued metal of which we have a superfluity we are parting with valuable commodities. Furthermore, this silver adds to the volume of excess reserves and constitutes the basis for a potential inflation of credit and currency.

However, it seems futile to reiterate these and other conclusive arguments in favor of abandonment of a program that is among the maddest of all our misguided monetary experiments. With administration support there might be hope of overcoming the resistance of the silver bloc. But with Secretary Morgenthau opposed to any change in the status quo because of the critical international situation, ultimate victory for the Townsend bill seems extremely doubtful.

Parity and Other Substantial Benefits Provided by the Federal Government, With Particular Reference to the Second Congressional District of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALL DOXEY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

On the Conference Report No. 2024 on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1941

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, as long as the high protective tariff for industry prevails in this country, agriculture is definitely entitled to parity.

I have been of this school of thought before I was ever a Member of Congress. Since becoming a Representative in the House of Congress from my native State of Mississippi, I have at all times worked and voted on every occasion for parity payments to the farmers of this country.

Only recently, just during this Democratic administration, has Congress ever provided for any parity benefit payments to the farmers.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member, drafted, fashioned, and passed the bill in this regard in the House. It was then passed by the Senate and signed by President Roosevelt and became a law in May 1933.

Since that time Congress has each year appropriated around $225,000,000 for parity in addition to soil-conservation benefit payments and other direct payments to the American farmer totaling nearly a billion dollars a year.

Since the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States against Butler et al., receivers of Hoosac Mills Corporation, on January 6, 1936, declaring the processing tax levied on processors for the benefit of the farmers unconstitutional, all farm-benefit payments have been made by direct appropriation of Congress out of the Federal Treasury. Each year we have had a hard fight and a close vote to get this money for the farmers. Every year the fight has become hotter and hotter, harder and harder.

Any friend of the farmer can see that we cannot continue to get these benefits for the farmer by direct appropriations out of the United States Treasury year in and year out.

Last year our Committee on Agriculture in the House spent weeks and months considering the cost-of-production plan, price fixing for agricultural products, and other plans designed and submitted to aid the farmer. However, no agreement by the committee could be reached, and when I sensed that we were not going to be able to agree on a permanent farm program and in all probability have no Federal farm program at all, I introduced and reported out of my Committee on Agriculture a bill, H. R. 6598, which continued the present farm program as it then existed.

This bill passed in both the House and Senate and became a law—Public, No. 149, of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Our present farm program would have expired by operation of law on January 1, 1940, had not the Doxey-Hatch bill or some similar bill been enacted into a law.

However, Congress is now still having the same experience and fight as to "How and where are we going to get the money to finance this farm program?"

It is very evident to my mind that we cannot continue to get all these farm-benefit appropriations through Congress each year unless we do provide some additional method of obtaining money for the farmers' benefit. It will not be long before these appropriations will be cut off by Congress, and then the farmer will have no program and no benefit payments either.

The American farmer will then be where this Roosevelt Democratic administration found him—in the midst of poverty and despair.

To avoid this state of affairs, this calamity to the farmers and the whole Nation, I recently introduced a bill (H. R. 8769) which proposes to reenact the processing-tax law and provide permanent and lasting benefits to the farmer, and, by virtue of this processing tax, not make the farmer absolutely dependent for his benefit checks upon money appropriated each year by Congress out of the General Treasury of the Government.

This Doxey bill (H. R. 8769), known as the Agricultural Commodities Parity Act of 1940, is intended just as a supplement to the present farm program. It provides money for parity.

I want the present program to continue and hope to obtain as much direct appropriation as possible to carry it on in its present form. In addition thereto and as a supplement thereof, this Doxey bill (H. R. 8769) is designed to raise the money that Congress refuses to directly appropriate for the aid of the farmers out of the general funds of the Federal Treasury.

I am thoroughly convinced that some time in the near future Congress will have to decide one way or the other whether or not we are to have a permanent farm program that will in some measure provide for permanent farm benefits with money raised and provided by other means than by direct appropriations from the United States General Treasury.

Whether this permanent farm program is to be financed in whole or in part by the method as provided in my bill H. R. 8769, or by the certificate plan, as advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, or by some other taxing and money-raising plan, is a matter that Congress must and will determine sometime before long. I am quite certain that Congress will not continue much longer to each year appropriate out of the General Treasury nearly a billion dollars for the benefit of the individual farmers of this country.

The farmers are entitled to these benefits and my thought in presenting this matter to Congress before the final blow to the farmer comes is to get Congress to consider the processing-tax plan or some other plans that will provide the money for the benefit of agriculture. When you help the farmer, you help all business.

We should certainly not let the farmers down. You all know they are the bedrock of our economic and national structure. The farmers cannot survive on lip service; they must have actual help.

I want to see real, beneficial, and permanent results given to the farmers of this country—not mere promises. Up to now, this Democratic Roosevelt administration has delivered. We have stood by the farmers. Regardless of our critics, the farmers know we have not only done more for them than was ever done for them, but they know we want to continue to help them and do more for them if we can. However, to accomplish this, we must keep fighting and be ever alert, for the enemy never sleeps.

Of course, we have made mistakes and our plans and programs have by no means been perfect. However, we have tried and kept right on the job and have done our best under the existing circumstances. We have done something more than just talk and promise. The people who have criticized and opposed what we were doing and trying to do for the farmer, offered no constructive program and proposed no permanent solution for the farm problem. Those critics just found fault and made mountains out of mole hills. It is much easier to be destructive than it is to be constructive. It is easier by far to tear down a house than it is to build one. So it is with a farm program. A legislative farm program is a long-range program requiring much time, thought, and effort as well as money to make it a success.

There is no committee in Congress that has worked harder or longer and, with modesty I say, accomplished more than has our House Committee on Agriculture. I am proud to be the ranking member of this committee and have the honor to be chairman of one of its great subcommittees.

We realize you cannot perfect a well-rounded farm program in 1 month or even in 1 year—it takes a long time. Neither can you solve the farm problem by one piece of legislation. It takes many separate laws. You have to approach the problem from many angles and sides. Varying conditions and different agricultural commodities demand different treatment and different provisions of the law. One section of our great country is primarily interested in one agricultural commodity; another section of the country is interested in an entirely different agricultural commodity. So it is with the financial structure of the farm problem. Taking it as a whole, the program must be financed by different methods and from various sources in order to take care of the entire farm problem. That is what my bill does—it proposes one of the methods and provides one of the sources of revenue, namely, the processing tax to be paid by the manufacturer or processor, and in turn this money is paid to the individual farmer direct by the governmental machinery set forth in the bill.

But you say this cannot be done; that law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. That Court, by a 6-to-3 decision—the dissenting Justices being Mr. Justice Stone, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Cardozo—held that the business of farming was local, not national. It decided you cannot tax one class of citizens for the specific benefit of another class. The Court, by a divided opinion, also decided that the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was in fact coercion through economic pressure and that the act invaded the reserved rights of the States, and so forth.

I answer you back, that is true. The Supreme Court as it was constituted in 1936 did so declare with three Justices dissenting.

But this is 1940 and many changes have occurred in this country in the last 4 years. I have also made many changes in my proposed bill. I have prepared it with the decisions of the United States Supreme Court before me. I have not the time here to analyze my bill and compare it in detail with the law that our Supreme Court declared unconstitutional, and discuss the legal phases of it and show wherein it differs and give my reasons for believing my bill is constitutional, although the former law was declared unconstitutional.

They both provide for processing taxes, but the approach and machinery provided are somewhat different. I am sure that many of you who are better friends of the farmer than you are constitutional lawyers will agree with me that if the original A. A. Act had never been knocked out and was in operation today, we would have plenty of money now to pay the farmer his benefits due him and would not have to

depend on getting the money from the Treasury by acts of Congress each year. We certainly would not find ourselves up against the obstacles and troubles that we are today face to face with.

Personally, I think the original A. A. Act was the best, fairest, and surest program we have had up to this time for the benefit of the farmer. That is why I am taking this position and have tried to prepare a bill with the good features of the old A. A. Act included and the bad provisions eliminated.

However, here in Congress, regardless of what is proposed for the farmer's general welfare, it is always met with all kinds of opposition. Already there is being circulated all kinds of propaganda against my bill, H. R. 8769, "to obtain parity prices for the farmer." Certain special interests, certain groups, certain organizations, and a number of the textile people have begun a concerted and active campaign condemning my bill. The opposition is organized and working hard, saying and doing all kinds of things to block the consideration and passage of my bill, known as the Agricultural Commodities Parity Act of 1940. The opposition is saying that this bill is unconstitutional; that it will hurt business; and that it will cause our cotton-export trade to fall off. The opposition is even putting out the propaganda that the bill will hurt the farmer and make him pay more for the goods he buys.

If our people in general and the farmers in particular will only reason a little, they will readily understand that this is all just propaganda put out by the selfish interests.

Even if a farmer did have to pay 5 cents more for the shirt he bought, he would get from $25 to $40 more for the bale of cotton he sold.

Consider how this plan worked when it was in operation. Think of the huge amount of money that was spent and put into the cotton South compared to the small cost to the Southern States. Fair prices for the commodities the farmer raises is the farmer's greatest need.

I ask the merchant, the professional and business men in States like Mississippi—What have the subsidy checks that have been paid to the farmer meant to your business? When the Government checks are stopped, what will it mean to your business as well as to the farmers?

The people of the South and of the West—the merchant, the businessman, the laborer, and the farmer—know that these Government benefit checks that have been paid to the farmers of our country have been a lifesaver to all of them.

I want these subsidy checks to continue, but if Congress does not enact some kind of a permanent law based on the pattern of my parity bill or some other similar plan, it will not be very long before our general farm program and these benefit checks will be a thing of the past.

Then you will know who has been the farmer's real friend. Then you will appreciate the difference between talking and doing. I have learned by doing. Results count, not promises. This administration thus far has produced results. Look and you will find all around you evidence of a permanent nature of the worth-while accomplishments of this Democratic administration.

I repeat for emphasis—if our farmers are going to be paid by the Government the money as benefit payments that they are entitled to in order to get parity for the crops they raise, Congress must provide by law some way to get the money other than by general appropriation each year for the entire sum necessary to do the job.

That is my theme song. If you help me sing it, you will make sure the farmer will be taken care of. If we do not raise some extra money, the farmer before long will not be getting these Government checks that in the past few years have meant so much to him. Certainly I wish we could continue them, but I am afraid after this year we will not have the votes in Congress to do so. The number of Members in Congress who come from agricultural sections and who are primarily interested in agriculture are relatively few in comparison to the entire membership; that certainly is one of the reasons why we always have such a hard fight to get anything for agriculture.

Frankly, I am not sold on any one bill or any one plan—just so Congress acts and insures the farmer he will get parity or as nearly so as possible for his products.

I am thoroughly convinced, however, that if my bill, H. R. 8769, known as the Agricultural Commodities Parity Act of 1940 is passed by Congress and becomes a law and is permitted to function, it will prove to be a tariff law in reverse. The farmer will be paid the benefits due him at the expense of the manufacturer. My bill will certainly give the farmer some of the breaks and benefits he is justly entitled to.

With the farm credit structure properly operated in the interest of the farmer, the farm tenant program receiving reasonable appropriations, and the other farm measures already reported by our Committee on Agriculture, most of which have been enacted into law, properly functioning, I can vision the dawn of a new day for American agriculture.

I regret exceedingly that the President saw fit to veto the Cotton Crop Insurance Bill recently passed. Some of us had worked hard and a long time to get this measure enacted into law and were surprised as well as disappointed by the President's veto.

The House has recently passed the Doxey Cottonseed Grading bill, H. R. 8642. I trust the Senate will pass this bill at this session of Congress, and I hope the President will sign it.

The Smith-Doxey Cotton Classification Act, the Norris-Doxey Farm Forestry Act, and other similar laws enacted during this administration will mean more and more to the farmer as the programs develop.

Agricultural legislation is a long-range program and it takes time and money to develop it. Agriculture must have its friends at court, so to speak, to carry on.

My friends, let us consider some of the benefits this great Government, just in recent years, has provided for its people.

Take my own congressional district as an example, the one I am most familiar with and have the honor to represent in Congress—the Second Congressional District of Mississippi—composed of the following 10 counties: Benton, De Soto, Lafayette, Marshall, Panola, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tippah, Union, and Yalobusha.

As a result of the policies inaugurated and the legislation enacted under this Roosevelt Democratic administration, the Second Congressional District of Mississsippi has received the following benefits during the periods indicated:

FARM BENEFITS—A. A. A. PAYMENTS

Farm value of cotton lint and seed and payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs in the Second Congressional District, Mississippi

Year	Cotton			Other Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments [2]	Total Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments
	Farm value [1]	Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments [2]	Total		
1932	$6,149,000		$6,149,000		
1933	9,427,000	$2,322,800	11,749,800		$2,322,800
1934	12,090,000	1,593,900	13,683,900	$7,200	1,601,100
1935	9,266,000	2,201,500	11,467,500	1,900	2,203,400
1936	16,160,000	1,205,000	17,365,000	222,000	1,427,000
1937	16,927,000	970,000	17,897,000	268,000	1,238,000
1938	12,968,000	3,710,000	16,678,000	777,000	4,487,000
Total 1933–38		12,003,200		1,276,100	13,279,300
Average 1933–38	12,806,000	2,001,000	14,807,000	[4] 255,000	2,213,000

[1] State average price received by producers times estimated production.

[2] The following payments are included: 1933, rental and benefit payments, and profits on cotton options in connection with the cotton acreage plow-up; 1934, rental and benefit payments; 1935, rental and benefit payments and price adjustment payments; 1936, agricultural conservation payments; 1937, agricultural conservation payments; 1938, agricultural conservation payments and price adjustment payments.

[3] Includes Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments made to commodities other than cotton, soil-building payments, and the amount of increase in small payments.

[4] 5-year average.

From the above table it can be readily seen that the counties in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi are receiving their fair proportionate share of benefit payments from the Federal Government under the agricultural adjustment program, according to the farm values.

FARM CREDIT LAND AND CROP LOANS BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Loans made by years from 1933 through 1939, and loans outstanding as of Dec. 31, 1939, for the Second Congressional District in Mississippi [1]

LOANS CLOSED

Year	Federal land bank		Land Bank Commissioner		Production credit associations		Emergency crop loans		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1933					[2]	[2]	7,788	$593,845	7,788	$593,845
1934	[3] 199	[3] $603,300	[3] 1,078	[3] $1,091,800	[2]	[2]	3,289	174,185	4,566	1,869,285
1935	19	44,600	107	132,375	[2]	[2]	2,313	124,915	2,439	301,890
1936	10	30,700	58	92,425	[2]	[2]	1,568	67,470	1,636	190,595
1937	20	53,300	40	42,350	945	$801,000	1,316	70,620	2,321	967,270
1938	54	117,600	79	66,800	957	879,000	1,228	63,160	2,318	1,126,560
1939	24	59,300	43	51,200	909	1,049,000	935	49,135	1,911	1,208,635
Total	326	908,800	1,405	1,476,950	2,811	2,729,000	18,437	1,143,330	22,979	6,258,080

LOANS OUTSTANDING

Dec. 31, 1939	[4] 1,447	[4] $3,253,040	1,138	$1,166,175	[2]	[2]	[4] 5,923	[4] $169,964	[4] 8,508	[4] $4,589,179

[1] The Second Congressional District in Mississippi consists of the following counties: Benton, De Soto, Lafayette, Marshall, Panola, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tippah, Union, and Yalobusha.
[2] Not available.
[3] For the period May 1, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1934.
[4] Includes loans made prior to 1933.

From the foregoing table it can be readily seen that the counties in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi received $6,258,080, representing a total of 22,979 applications from the Farm Credit Administration.

FARM SECURITY REHABILITATION LOANS—FARM-TENANT HOMES

The Farm Security Administration has rendered wonderful assistance to needy farm families who could not get adequate credit anywhere else. In the Second Congressional District of Mississippi the Farm Security Administration has made rehabilitation loans totaling $953,422 and grants totaling $34,322.

The F. S. A. has also been of inestimable assistance in giving advice and guidance in sound farming methods and in assisting tenants and sharecroppers to get more secure land tenure arrangements.

Aside from the rehabilitation program the F. S. A. makes loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers to enable them to purchase family-sized farms of their own.

While it has been necessary to confine loans to certain counties, because of the limited funds available, the F. S. A. has made 65 such loans in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, totaling $254,761. This year it is expected that about 80 Bankhead-Jones loans will be made in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, totaling approximately $330,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Statement of funds obligated by the Soil Conservation Service in the Second Congressional District, State of Mississippi, to Feb. 28, 1940

Activity	Headquarters or post-office address	Jurisdictional area	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Obligations to Feb. 28, 1940	Total obligations as of Feb. 28, 1940
REGULAR FUNDS									
Soil- and moisture-conservation operations through demonstration projects.	New Albany, Miss.	Benton, Union, and Tippah Counties.				$42,725.56	$51,348.17		$94,073.73
		Benton, Union, Tippah, Clay, and Monroe Counties.					24,500.75	$66,491.79	90,992.54
Soil- and moisture-conservation operations through cooperation with soil-conservation districts.	do	Parts of Panola, Marshall, Benton, Tippah, Union, Pontotoc, and Lafayette Counties.					435.03	36,027.69	36,462.72
Soil- and moisture-conservation operations through technical cooperation furnished Civilian Conservation Corps camps outside of project areas, the State extension service, and other Federal and State agencies.	do	Northern half of State of Mississippi.				7,528.34	14,692.68	11,899.86	34,120.88
Erosion nurseries for propagation of plants for use in soil- and moisture-conservation operations.	Holly Springs, Miss.	Marshall and Yalobusha Counties.			$6,046.57				6,046.57
	New Albany, Miss.	Union and Yalobusha Counties.				9,193.87			9,193.87
	Coffeeville, Miss.	Yalobusha County					13,330.72	16,492.05	29,822.77
Acquisition of submarginal land in accordance with provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.	do	do						71,380.00	71,380.00
Facilitation, improvement, protection, and supervision of land acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.	do	do					3,397.57		3,397.57
	New Albany, Miss.	Yalobusha, Choctaw, Oktibbeha, Winston, Noxubee, Chickasaw, and Pontotoc Counties.						21,202.29	21,202.29
Flood-control surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds of flood-control projects authorized by law.	Oxford, Miss.	Union, Lafayette, Marshall, Panola, Benton, Tate, Tippah, and Pontotoc Counties.					14,923.21	6,852.86	21,776.07
Total, regular funds					6,046.57	59,447.77	122,628.13	230,346.54	418,469.01

Statement of funds obligated by the Soil Conservation Service in the Second Congressional District, State of Mississippi, to February. 28, 1940—Continued

Activity	Headquarters or post-office rddress	Jurisdictional arer	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Obligations to Feb. 28, 1940	Totalo bligations as of Feb. 28, 1940
CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS FUNDS [1]									
Civilian Conservation Corps camps [2] assigned to this service performing soil- and moisture-conservation operations.	New Albany, Miss.	Union, Pontotoc, Benton, Lafayette, Tate, Yalobusha, and Tippah Counties.	$45,613.12	$202,394.08	$88,344.63	$82,622.79	$84,369.42	$60,729.54	$564,073.58
Total Civilian Conservation Corps funds.[1]			45,613.12	202,394.08	88,344.63	82,622.79	84,369.42	60,729.54	564,073.58
EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS									
Soil- and moisture-conservation operations through demonstration projects.	New Albany, Miss.	Benton, Union, and Tippah Counties.				3,023.42	26,541.89		29,565.31
		State of Mississippi						32,789.84	32,789.84
Total Emergency Relief funds.						3,023.42	26,541.89	32,789.84	62,355.15
Grand total, all funds			45,613.12	202,394.08	94,391.20	145,093.98	233,539.44	323,865.92	1,044,897.74

[1] The Civilian Conservation Corps figures do not include the salaries and wages, subsistence, and other expenses of Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees, since such expenses are paid by the War Department.
[2] Accountability not kept by individual camps.

From the foregoing table it will be seen that a total of $1,044,897.74 has been obligated for the counties in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi as the result of soil-conservation projects being established by the Federal Government in the second district.

HOME LOANS

Refinancing operations by Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Second Congressional District of Mississippi

County	Loans closed	
	Number of applications	Amount
Benton	8	$9,792
De Soto	13	19,873
Lafayette	44	85,277
Marshall	37	68,060
Panola	38	56,362
Tallahatchie	91	169,629
Tate	27	46,444
Tippah	26	37,699
Union	45	82,246
Yalobusha	53	65,835
Total	382	641,217

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation terminated its lending activities on June 12, 1936, but up to that time they made the above number and amount of loans to home owners in towns and villages in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi. (The table under "Farm credit" shows the loans made to farmers.)

ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION IN SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Volume of Federal Housing Administration insuring operations by counties

[Net cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1939]

County	Title I property-improvement loans insured		Title II small-home mortgages accepted for insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Benton	14	$4,329.21			14	$4,329.21
De Soto	157	64,908.78	8	$24,100	165	89,008.78
Lafayette	71	24,575.86	32	125,100	103	149,675.86
Marshall	62	23,044.63	11	43,400	73	66,444.63
Panola	99	38,557.25	13	30,300	112	68,857.25
Tallahatchie	164	65,966.15	23	56,700	187	122,666.15
Tate	83	36,926.14	12	41,200	95	78,126.14
Tippah	29	6,371.43	4	13,700	33	20,071.43
Union	45	18,706.01	13	43,100	58	61,806.01
Yalobusha	126	42,119.58	26	55,000	152	97,119.58
Total	850	325,505.04	142	432,600	992	758,105.04
State total	14,776	6,219,745.40	4,561	14,337,489	19,337	20,557,234.40

From the above table it will be seen that the Federal Housing Administration has assisted many home owners in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi to improve their homes and build new ones.

HIGHWAYS

Summary, by counties, of Federal-aid highway and grade-crossing projects programmed since July 1, 1933, in Second Congressional District of Mississippi, as of Feb. 29, 1940

County	Estimated total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Benton	$419,670	$269,670	17.8
De Soto	646,437	636,966	18.0
Lafayette	975,397	465,147	38.6
Marshall	691,741	362,140	34.5
Panola	1,221,169	644,023	56.4
Tallahatchie	423,561	329,091	23.5
Tate	315,439	314,592	23.8
Tippah	273,333	192,148	17.5
Union	516,460	318,985	27.0
Yalobusha	323,135	196,566	9.3
Pontotoc and Union	20,129	19,599	1.8
Leflore and Tallahatchie	84,237	84,237	5.2
Coahoma and Tallahatchie	57,601	14,400	2.8
Tunica and De Soto	166,978	164,593	7.9
Total	6,135,287	4,012,157	284.1

From the above table it will be seen that the Federal Government has spent more than $4,000,000 in constructing and improving the main highways in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

T. V. A.

The T. V. A. has spent $617,000 in constructing 974 miles of rural lines, and $475,000 for the construction of transmission lines and substations located in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, serving 8,314 customers, as follows:

Contractor	Residential		Commercial		Estimated miles of rural line	Service area (counties)
	Number of customers, Jan. 31, 1940	Average annual use	Number of customers, Jan. 31, 1940	Average annual use		
Holly Springs	684	1,835	266	2,201	60	Marshall and Benton.
Tippah	642	1,017	250	1,611	46	Tippah (Miss.) and Hardeman (Tenn.).
New Albany	1,549	1,446	394	2,735	98	Union, Benton, and Tippah.
Pontotoc	1,533	1,158	358	2,290	228	Pontotoc, Union, Marshall, and Calhoun.
Northeast Mississippi.	411	881	99	722	134	Lafayette.
Water Valley	638	886	164	2,581	0	Yalobusha.
Tallahatchie	1,103		223		408	Yalobusha, Tallahatchie, Panola, Tunica, Tate, and Quitman.
Total	6,560		1,754		874	

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Rural electrification has been provided to some extent in every county in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

Five hundred and thirty-eight miles of rural electrification lines have already been constructed in the district at a cost of $523,000.

Other applications are pending which will be taken care of as soon as additional funds are made available by Congress.

SUMMARY OF N. Y. A. EXPENDITURES IN SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

High-school student-work program

Fiscal year	Number of high schools participating	Average number of students aided monthly	Total amount expended yearly
1935–36	65	355	$9,184.06
1936–37	81	305	10,482.25
1937–38	78	246	7,470.99
1938–39	77	305	9,694.00
1939–40	78	638	[1] 19,412.00
Total			56,243.30

[1] The 1939–40 figure represents the total allotments to the high schools in the Second Congressional District. Actual expenditures by the end of the school year will not be appreciably different.

The large increase in allotments in present fiscal year as compared to 1938–39 was due to (1) an increase in total appropriation by Congress and (2) a special allotment of funds in these counties due to extremely bad crops.

College student-work program

Fiscal year	Average number of students aided monthly	Total yearly expenditures
1935–36	326	$31,429.95
1936–37	335	32,181.09
1937–38	282	21,344.76
1938–39	325	25,110.00
1939–40	303	27,765.00
Total		137,830.80

Out-of-school work program

1935–36	$11,000
1936–37	28,143
1937–38	31,271
1938–39	59,196
1939–40	55,000
Total	184,610

From the above tables it will be seen that the youths of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi have been greatly assisted by the N. Y. A. program of the Federal Government.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Amounts expended in Second Congressional District from funds made available for cooperative health work to Mississippi by the U. S. Public Health Service for the years 1930 to 1939, inclusive

	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935
Studies of rural sanitation, Union County Health Department		$1,400				
Studies of rural sanitation, drought-stricken areas, Union County Health Department		500	$2,850			
Federal Emergency Relief fund, public health work; Union County Health Department						$1,130
Title VI, Social Security Act:						
De Soto County Health Department						
Lafayette County Health Department						
Marshall County Health Department						
Tallahatchie County Health Department						
Union County Health Department						
Federal Emergency Relief fund, flood rehabilitation:						
Sanitary district (comprising De Soto, Tunica, Tate, Panola, Quitman, and Tallahatchie Counties)						
Tallahatchie County Health Department						
Venereal Disease Control Act:						
De Soto County Health Department						
Marshall County Health Department						
Tallahatchie County Health Department						
Total		$1,900	$2,850			$1,130

Amounts expended in Second Congressional District from funds made available for cooperative health work to Mississippi by the U. S. Public Health Service for the years 1930 to 1939, inclusive—Continued

	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total
Studies of rural sanitation, Union County Health Department					$1,400.00
Studies of rural sanitation, drought-stricken areas, Union County Health Department					3,350.00
Federal Emergency Relief fund, public health work; Union County Health Department	$390.60				1,520.60
Title VI, Social Security Act:					
De Soto County Health Department				$1,895.00	1,895.00
Lafayette County Health Department				1,550.09	1,550.09
Marshall County Health Department	1,245.05	$2,500.00	$2,800.00	2,512.86	9,057.91
Tallahatchie County Health Department			3,053.32	2,810.00	5,863.32
Union County Health Department	916.79	1,836.69	1,882.51	1,652.07	6,288.06
Federal Emergency Relief fund, flood rehabilitation:					
Sanitary district (comprising De Soto, Tunica, Tate, Panola, Quitman, and Tallahatchie Counties)		4,635.96	4,253.77		8,889.73
Tallahatchie County Health Department			897.94		897.94
Venereal Disease Control Act:					
De Soto County Health Department				348.66	348.66
Marshall County Health Department				100.00	100.00
Tallahatchie County Health Department				896.76	896.76
Total	2,552.44	8,972.65	12,887.54	11,765.44	42,058.07

SPRING LAKE STATE PARK, HOLLY SPRINGS, MISS.

From July 1935, when camp SP–8 was established, to February 29, 1940, the sum of $92,943.17 had been expended on Spring Lake State Park out of C. C. C. funds allotted to the National Park Service. This sum covers the cost of project overhead and jobs; it does not include the cost of maintaining and operating the camp or paying the enrollees, since these functions are the responsibility of the Army.

From the above, it will be seen that recreational activities have not been overlooked in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

We hope to make Spring Lake State Park No. 8 one of the most attractive State parks in the country.

FLOOD CONTROL—SARDIS DAM—ARKABUTLA DAM—HICKAHALA CREEK

The following statistics show the amount of money spent in connection with flood-control work in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi since 1929 and that required to complete such work:

Location of work	Money spent since 1929	Estimated future expenditures
Sardis Dam and Reservoir	$11,823,575	$3,306,425
Arkabutla Dam and Reservoir	213,261	10,569,739
Hickahala Creek	23,000	

Location of work	Money spent since 1929	Estimated future expenditures
Emergency Flood Relief under sec. 7, act of May 15, 1928:		
Upper Quiver River drainage district	$10,401	
Matthews Bayou drainage district	14,764	
Patterson Bayou drainage district	1,885	
Locopolis drainage district	3,176	
Panola-Quitman drainage district	106,619	(1)
Newsom Lake drainage district	8,612	
Glendora drainage district	6,377	
Roane private levee (Tallahatchie and Leflore Counties)	3,000	
Total under sec. 7	154,834	
Grand total	12,214,670	$13,876,164

[1] Unknown.

From the above table, it will be seen that the Federal Government has already spent over $12,000,000 and approximately $14,000,000 additional has been authorized to be spent in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi for flood-control purposes.

NATIONAL FOREST

The Holly Springs National Forest Unit was established in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi on August 30, 1933, and the first approval for purchase of land therein was given on January 11, 1934.

Since that time the Federal Government has spent $460,971 for the acquisition of 117,406 acres, at an average price of $3.93 per acre, in this national forest which takes in portions of Benton, Lafayette, Marshall, Tippah, and Union Counties.

This amount of money does not include the expenditures for improvements that have been made within the Holly Springs National Forest by the C. C. C. camps and other governmental agencies.

We are now working on a plan whereby the 200,000 acres of land purchased by the Federal Government in connection with the construction of the Sardis Reservoir will be added to the Holly Springs National Forest.

Plans are being developed to make this area one of the greatest recreational sections of our country.

C. C. C. camps will soon be established in this area, and other governmental agencies will soon begin work improving and developing this entire unit as a national forest and recreational area.

C. C. C.

Civilian Conservation Corps activities in Second Congressional District of Mississippi

County and camp location	Camp commenced operation	Camp ceased operation	Authorized enrollee strength	Estimated expenditures April 1933 through Mar. 31, 1940
Benton County:				
F-9, Potts Camp [1]	Sept. 16, 1934	(2)	200	$1,020,000
PE-62, Ashland	July 5, 1933	Oct. 2, 1939		1,125,000
SCS-14, Ashland	do	Sept. 30, 1939		1,010,000
Total			200	3,155,000
Lafayette County:				
F-17, Oxford	Oct. 25, 1934	June 30, 1937		615,000
PE-56, Abbeville	July 14, 1933	Oct. 24, 1934		225,000
PE-57, Oxford [3]	Aug. 1, 1933	Mar. 18, 1935		300,000
SCS-17, Oxford [3]	Mar. 18, 1935	(2)	200	900,000
Total			200	2,040,000
Marshall County:				
F-9, Holly Springs [1]	May 7, 1934	Sept. 12, 1934		60,600
PE-55, Waterford [3]	Aug. 7, 1933	May 25, 1934		135,000
F-19, Waterford [3]	Nov. 1, 1934	Oct. 22, 1935		180,000
PE-58, Holly Springs [3]	July 21, 1933	Mar. 1, 1935		300,000
SCS-13, Holly Springs [3]	Mar. 1, 1935	June 30, 1937		405,000
SP-8, Holly Springs	Oct. 3, 1938	(2)	200	255,000
Total			200	1,335,000

Civilian Conservation Corps activities in Second Congressional District of Mississippi—Continued

County and camp location	Camp commenced operation	Camp ceased operation	Authorized enrollee strength	Estimated expenditures April 1933 through Mar. 31, 1940
Panola County:				
PE-53, Batesville [3]	July 21, 1933	Mar. 1, 1935		300,000
SCS-16, Batesville [3]	Mar. 1, 1935	Dec. 31, 1935		150,000
Total				450,000
Tate County:				
PE-54, Tyro	July 17, 1933	June 4, 1934		165,000
SCS-9, Senatobia	Oct. 3, 1935	Sept. 30, 1939		720,000
Total				885,000
Tippah County:				
PE-59, Blue Mountain [3]	June 30, 1933	Mar. 30, 1935		315,000
SCS-15, Blue Mountain [3]	Mar. 30, 1935	Dec. 31, 1935		135,000
SCS-23, Ripley	Oct. 4, 1939	(2)	200	90,000
Total			200	540,000
Union County: PE-61, Myrtle [1]	July 6, 1933	May 4, 1934		150,000
Yalobusha County: SCS-12, Coffeeville	Oct. 2, 1935	(2)	200	795,000
Aggregate			1,000	9,350,000

[1] This camp first operated as PE-61 in Union County until May 4, 1934, then as F-9, operated in Marshall County until Sept. 12, 1934, and since that date as F-9 in both Marshall and Benton Counties.
[2] Active.
[3] PE (Private Erosion) were under the administration and technical supervision of the Forest Service until Mar. 1, 1935, at which time they were transferred to the Soil Conservation Service (SCS).

From the above, it will be seen that certainly the Second Congressional District of Mississippi has been greatly benefited by the expenditure of over $9,000,000 in C. C. C. activities.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Three hundred and sixty thousand dollars have been spent in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi since I have been in Congress for the construction of a Federal building in each of the following towns: Batesville, Charleston, New Albany, Oxford, and Ripley.

These post-office buildings erected at county sites are modern, and add greatly to the beauty of the town and the convenience of the public.

I am exerting every effort to get an appropriation for another postoffice building in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, but any appropriation for work of this type will necessarily have to be an omnibus appropriation and the town selected for the construction of another Federal building, if one is allotted to the district, will have to be eligible according to postal requirements, and be passed on by the Interdepartmental Committee on Public Buildings.

I sincerely hope we can secure the necessary appropriation and obtain another postoffice building for my district at this session of Congress.

PUBLIC WORKS

Non-Federal projects in Second Congressional District of Mississippi

County	Loan	Grant	Total
De Soto	$54,000	$42,838	$96,838
Lafayette	241,000	462,423	703,423
Panola	14,257	26,305	40,562
Tallahatchie	42,500	39,980	82,480
Tate		95,780	95,780
Tippah	82,850	59,893	142,743
Union		99,079	99,079
Yalobusha		19,018	19,018
Total	434,607	845,316	1,279,923

From the above table it will be seen that many counties in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi profited by the P. W. A. program.

We are indeed glad that our State University in Lafayette County has been dealt with so generously by the Fed-

eral Government in this regard, as we know that students attending the university from all the counties of the State will benefit by the improvements at the university, located at Oxford, Miss., made possible by this P. W. A. program.

Certainly we wish more could have been done in the district by this particular lending agency but, under the law, the P. W. A. could accept no application after September 30, 1938.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amounts authorized and disbursed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the Second Congressional District in Mississippi, from Feb. 2, 1932, to Feb. 29, 1940, inclusive

Class	Amount authorized	Amount disbursed
Loans to banks under sec. 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended	$624,250.00	$519,494.02
Loans to business enterprises under sec. 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended	22,180.00	10,908.79
Loans to public bodies under sec. 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended	1,322,845.53	709,756.10
Authorizations under the act of Mar. 9, 1933, as amended:		
Subscriptions for preferred stock of banks	536,000.00	386,000.00
Purchases of debentures of banks	496,000.00	333,500.00
Total, act of Mar. 9, 1933, as amended	1,032,000.00	719,500.00
Loans to or for the benefit of drainage, levee, irrigation, and similar districts, under the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended	932,515.62	732,768.65
Loan to finance the repair of damage by earthquake, flood, or other catastrophe, under the act approved Apr. 13, 1934, as amended	625.00	625.00
Total	3,934,416.15	2,693,052.56

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Federal funds for State Work Projects Administration projects, approved by the President under the various Emergency Relief Administration Acts through Mar. 9, 1940, for the Second Congressional District of Mississippi,[1] by counties

County	All acts	Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of—				
		1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Total	$6,093,107	$3,183,014	$519,786	$332,392	$1,421,622	$636,293
Benton	470,168	154,599	58,926	11,827	207,833	36,983
De Soto	428,885	289,740	90,331	21,114	13,387	14,313
Lafayette	1,005,397	386,311	102,450	124,281	353,775	38,580
Marshall	871,957	508,413	10,414	28,682	99,328	225,120
Panola	524,828	271,269	59,750	40,217	69,517	84,075
Tallahatchie	504,983	249,702	64,516	24,402	141,800	24,563
Tate	299,788	227,867	38,656	15,281	17,984	
Tippah	723,877	427,526	18,767	21,915	195,134	60,535
Union	710,419	338,422	40,207	17,955	271,061	42,774
Yalobusha	552,805	329,165	35,769	26,718	51,803	109,350

[1] Exclusive of area-wide and State-wide projects approved for operation in more than one county.

FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY

Federal grants to Second Congressional District of Mississippi Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939, for following purposes

Old-Age Assistance

Benton	$8,822
De Soto	19,624
Lafayette	18,113
Marshall	18,856
Panola	22,107
Tallahatchie	28,447
Tate	14,719
Tippah	21,331
Union	22,414
Yalobusha	17,662
Total	192,095

Federal grants to Second Congressional District of Mississippi Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939, for following purposes—Continued

Aid to Dependent Children

Benton	$19
De Soto	90
Lafayette	181
Marshall	41
Panola	18
Tallahatchie	66
Tate	49
Tippah	130
Union	46
Yalobusha	18
Total	658

Aid to the Blind

Benton	$64
De Soto	124
Lafayette	87
Marshall	327
Panola	234
Tallahatchie	182
Tate	109
Tippah	181
Union	225
Yalobusha	132
Total	1,665

FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES DONATED

To the State of Mississippi for distribution to eligible relief clients, in which the Second Congressional District participated, October 2, 1933, through February 29, 1940, with estimated retail values—

Period	Quantity shipped	Estimated retail value
	Pounds	
Oct. 4, 1933, to June 30, 1935	21,386,456	$2,596,120
July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936	12,208,416	1,284,776
July 1, 1936, to June 30, 1937	6,593,337	584,049
July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1938	29,978,116	1,687,827
July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939	58,228,594	4,306,335
July 1, 1939, to Feb. 29, 1940	50,138,000	2,964,458
Total	178,532,919	13,423,565

COTTON LOANS

Cotton loans by crop years made by the Commodity Credit Corporation in Mississippi were as follows:

Period	Amount	Bales
1934–35	$28,978,842.04	475,660
1935–36	100,442.67	1,971
1937–38	27,232,861.64	617,114
1938–39	35,817,777.41	762,317
1939–40	29,332.00	636

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Data with regard to veterans' benefits according to counties are not obtainable but the following table indicates the number of living veterans and deceased veterans whose dependents were receiving pension benefits, including compensation and emergency officers' retirement pay; also the number receiving military and naval insurance as of June 30 each year for 9 years, 1931–39, together with total amounts disbursed for these benefits, adjusted-service and dependent pay and administration during the fiscal years 1931–39 for the State of Mississippi.

An approximate distribution of expenditures for the State of Mississippi: Number of veterans or deceased veterans whose dependents were receiving pension benefits including compensation and emergency officers' retirement pay on June 30 each year and disbursements for these benefits during the fiscal year 1931–39

	1939		1938		1937		1936		1935	
	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year
World War:										
Living veterans:										
Service-connected	8,503	$3,836,831	8,271	$3,761,053	8,164	$3,675,137	7,841	$3,489,470	6,807	$3,326,087
Non-service-connected	885	300,103	806	282,687	780	276,376	721	251,487	570	213,298
Emergency officer's retirement pay	12	20,167	13	22,674	14	24,756	14	27,536	13	23,241
Total	9,400	4,157,101	9,090	4,066,414	8,958	3,976,269	8,576	3,768,493	7,390	3,562,626

An approximate distribution of expenditures for the State of Mississippi: Number of veterans or deceased veterans whose dependents were receiving pension benefits including compensation and emergency officers' retirement pay on June 30 each year and disbursements for these benefits during the fiscal year 1931–39—Continued

	1939		1938		1937		1936		1935	
	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year
World War—Continued.										
Deceased veterans:										
Living veterans	1,674	$927,555	1,670	$782,893	1,710	$607,661	1,742	$509,621	1,714	$580,210
Deceased veterans	238	90,207	146	57,021	106	40,412	62	25,148	37	12,396
Total	1,912	1,017,762	1,816	839,914	1,816	648,073	1,804	634,769	1,751	592,606
Mexican War, deceased veterans	4	2,064	3	2,061	4	2,101	3	2,085	4	2,540
Indian wars:										
Living veterans	3	2,547	4	3,212	5	3,043	5	3,686	7	4,335
Deceased veterans	12	4,011	10	4,081	13	4,651	13	4,779	13	4,700
Civil War:										
Living veterans	17	25,892	32	38,562	42	50,817	57	68,870	77	91,203
Deceased veterans	249	120,164	289	135,860	317	150,257	353	170,955	407	187,625
Spanish-American War:										
Living veterans	992	716,438	1,038	631,485	1,036	617,471	1,071	604,933	1,044	453,675
Deceased veterans	414	149,809	394	144,988	378	138,430	359	137,613	359	106,573
Regular Establishment:										
Living veterans	393	102,641	368	99,781	366	97,611	347	73,720	326	67,627
Deceased veterans	80	20,601	70	18,831	63	19,173	70	18,652	58	14,607
Total compensation and pension benefits:										
Living veterans	10,805	5,004,619	10,532	4,839,454	10,407	4,745,211	10,056	4,519,702	8,844	4,179,466
Deceased veterans	2,671	1,314,411	2,582	1,145,735	2,591	962,685	2,602	968,853	2,592	908,651
Military and naval insurance	424	477,455	1,513	1,035,085	1,901	1,135,649	1,982	1,218,975	2,028	1,298,693
Adjusted service and dependent pay		15,496		17,456		19,496		16,937		27,187
Adjusted-service certificate fund (matured by death)								231,521		222,044
Administration		1,230,900		1,216,703		1,172,296		1,197,771		1,127,915
Construction		113,114		221,801		487,728		2,800		970
Total disbursements		8,155,995		8,476,234		8,523,065		8,156,559		7,764,923

	1934		1933		1932		1931	
	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year	Number on roll June 30	Disbursed during fiscal year
World War:								
Living veterans:								
Service-connected	6,327	$2,608,342	5,370	$2,856,708	5,119	$2,775,527	4,237	$2,461,099
Non-service-connected	630	216,031	[1] 17,487	[1] 3,519,209	[1] 18,238	[1] 3,075,824	[1] 9,242	[1] 1,030,678
Emergency officers' retirement pay	12	18,787	67	106,815	71	120,673	68	112,661
Total	6,969	2,843,160	22,924	6,482,732	23,428	5,972,024	13,547	3,604,438
Deceased veterans:								
Living veterans								
Deceased veterans								
Total	1,723	585,161	1,720	628,124	1,669	628,235	1,529	516,599
Mexican War, deceased veterans	5	2,984						
Indian wars:								
Living veterans	6	3,022						
Deceased veterans	10	3,334						
Civil War:								
Living veterans	110	115,891						
Deceased veterans	443	192,132						
Spanish-American War:								
Living veterans	1,051	331,450						
Deceased veterans	273	59,673						
Regular Establishment:								
Living veterans	136	27,875						
Deceased veterans	34	8,523						
Total compensation and pension benefits			[2] 1,819	[2] 1,126,986	[2] 1,912	[2] 1,117,135	[2] 1,976	[2] 1,131,580
Living veterans	8,272	3,321,398	22,924	6,482,732	23,428	5,972,024	13,547	3,604,438
Deceased veterans	2,488	851,807	1,720	628,124	1,669	628,235	1,529	516,599
Military and naval insurance	2,050	1,330,524	2,070	1,574,424	2,090	1,560,104	2,063	1,474,144
Adjusted service and dependent pay		41,033		53,704		60,317		35,492
Adjusted-service certificate fund (matured by death)		249,496		268,787		206,603		204,795
Administration		870,946		1,018,254		1,040,437		898,940
Construction		70,671		768,597		370,441		
Total disbursements		6,735,875		11,921,608		10,955,296		[3] 7,865,988

[1] Disability allowance.
[2] Pensions—classification by wars or by living and deceased veterans is not available.
[3] Construction not included.

NOTE.—Administration includes all expenditures incident to the maintenance and operation of all offices and hospitals, all forms of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing facts and figures show some of the worthwhile benefits and substantial improvements derived by the Second Congressional District of Mississippi within the last few years as a result of the plans and policies of this Democratic administration.

To have served in Congress during these years as a Representative of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi and to have had a part in this history-making epoch of this great Nation is an honor and privilege that I deeply and sincerely appreciate.

Objections to the Use of Goats In Testing Bombs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week, at Aberdeen, Md., some experiments will take place which, in my opinion, should make the people of America very sad.

Many scores of goats will be bombed for the purpose, as announced, of determining the effects of a high explosive on live tissue. To be exact, my understanding is that 252 of these animals have been selected to be blown up. Arrangements to conduct the experiments are proceeding on schedule, without the approval of the War and Navy Departments, and notwithstanding General Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, said in a letter to me a few days ago:

Neither the War Department nor the Navy Department considers the use of animals either desirable or necessary, as both of these services feel that the required information can be obtained from instruments, which have been developed for the measurement of explosive effect.

There was a time when vivisection was bitterly condemned, but the vivisectors will learn something new if they will take their seats on the bleachers at Aberdeen and see live goats blown to pieces instead of being cut to pieces. Whatever their emotions may be, they no doubt will agree that we are not progressing very far in the direction of humaneness. Nevertheless, the die is cast, and the goats will be made the goat, although the ordnance experts agree that this slaughter of goat life will be worthless from the military standpoint.

I have no criticism of the honorable men who are sponsoring these strange goat experiments. They think one way about it, and I think exactly the opposite, but I respect their good intentions just as I hope they respect mine. My own opinion is that it is absolutely wrong and that no effort to justify it could ever make it right.

I wish to submit for the RECORD, without comment, correspondence that has passed between Senator SHEPPARD and myself during the last few days, as follows:

MAY 8, 1940.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: I note a dispatch in an evening paper of May 7 under a Baltimore date line which says:

"The new liquid oxygen-carbon explosive will be tested on live goats at Aberdeen, Md., on May 16, inventor Lester P. Barlow announced yesterday after the Towson, Md., State court had dismissed the plea of a pet magazine for a restraining injunction."

In my opinion these tests will be revolting to 99 percent of the American people, and I was surprised when I was told that they are to be conducted under authority of a joint congressional committee of which you are chairman. You know my exalted opinion of you as a man of high ideals and Christian character and I have no criticism of you or the other members of your joint committee, who are my esteemed colleagues, but I wonder whether on more mature consideration you would not feel justified in moving for a reconsideration of the authority that has been given to make these cruel tests. It may seem like an unimportant matter, but it is really important in its meaning and implications.

If we have gone so far in the direction of militarism that we are willing to blow live animals to bits to learn the art of blowing human beings to bits we have indeed traveled far on the road toward Hitlerism, Mussolini-ism, and Stalinism.

I call your attention to the fact that the ordnance officials and United States military experts on high explosives do not approve these tests. I quote as follows from a letter I have received from General Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 1, 1940, relative to the use of live animals in connection with the proposed test of the Barlow liquid-oxygen bomb. This procedure was directed by the joint congressional committee created to investigate the bomb if and when the demonstration is conducted.

"Neither the War Department nor the Navy Department considers the use of animals either desirable or necessary, as both of these services feel that the required information can be obtained from instruments, which have been developed for the measurement of explosive effect."

Believing as I do that tests of this kind would run counter to the sentiment and feelings of practically all of the people of America, I hope that the joint congressional committee will withdraw its approval. As I assume that the action of the joint committee in giving its sanction to the blowing up of live animals was expressed in the form of a resolution I will be most appreciative if you will send me a copy of the text of that resolution as I think if the experiments are to proceed the public is entitled to have the facts cited in justification for them.

Again let me say that I have the highest regard for you and the high ideals for which you have stood in public life and I have been glad to follow your leadership, but I cannot approve these tests which seem to me to be a glaring example of cruelty to animals.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
May 11, 1940.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: I am in receipt of your letter of May 8 and note what you say concerning the use of live goats for the liquid oxygen-carbon experiment at Aberdeen, Md., on May 16.

The inventor says that unless he can ascertain what the effect of the explosion will be on live-animal tissue, he will not be in a position to know what its effect will be on live-human tissue. Mr. Barlow believes that the effect of the liquid oxygen-carbon explosive, involving no steel fragments, splinters, or things of that kind, will not cause laceration or mutilation of living beings, but will stop life within so wide an area and to such an extent that the perfection of such an explosive will have a distinct tendency to arrest and stop war as a means of settling human disputes. For these reasons, I favor the test with goats.

While the Chief of Ordnance of the War Department says in his letter to you that he does not believe that the use of animals is desirable or necessary in this experiment, yet it is true that both the Army and the Navy use live animals in many experiments.

I enclose copies of letters from the War Department and the Navy Department which will explain themselves.

Thanking you for giving me your view of the matter, which I profoundly respect, I am very sincerely yours,

MORRIS SHEPPARD, *Chairman.*

P. S.—The resolution the joint committee adopted in this matter is still in the hands of the two Senators who wrote it, and at the moment I do not have a copy.

M. S.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 3, 1940.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: Your letters of April 22 and 29, requesting information whether live animals have been used by the War Department in connection with any tests or experiments in the past, have involved an extensive investigation and search of the records.

As a result of the investigation, it is found that the Medical Department of the Army uses live animals in its professional work in military hospitals and laboratories in the same manner that they are used in all recognized clinical and research laboratories and first-class hospitals throughout the United States. It is estimated that the total number of animals used annually by the Medical Department in the diagnosis and control of infectious disease amounts to the following: Forty thousand mice, 2,500 guinea pigs, 1,000 rabbits, 100 chickens, 100 canaries, and occasionally a sheep or a monkey.

The combat arms have used live animals, including goats and pigs, for testing the efficacy of new arms and ammunition on live tissue, the same results not being obtained by using dead animals due to the absence of moisture. The animals used in these tests are rendered immune to pain by injecting, in an intravenous manner, suitable substances which cause them to pass to a state of comma, and they are killed before consciousness returns.

Tests have also included the effect of various gases on live animals, in order to develop methods of treatment in such cases and devices for protection against gases for use by animals and members of the military forces. Every precaution is taken in animal experimental work with gases to secure the essential data without inflicting unnecessary or unjustifiable pain or death.

I trust the foregoing is the information you desire and regret the delay in complying with your request.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 4, 1940.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: In reply to your inquiry of April 29 concerning the use which may have been made of live animals by the Navy Department in testing war material, you are informed, though possibly other instances might be disclosed by more extensive search, that the following appear to comprise all work of this sort done by the Naval Proving Ground at Indianhead, Md., and by the Naval Proving Ground at Dahlgren, Va., as far back as about 1903:

(a) In 1935 a cat was subjected to gun blast in a shelter where instruments had shown it should not be injured.

(b) In 1919 some dogs were used in tests with poison-gas projectiles.

(c) In 1911, in experimental firings against the *San Marcos*, cats and chickens were used.

(d) In 1906 shock effect inside a turret structure was tested using either sheep or goats (just which kind of animal was used cannot be gathered from the record).

(e) Just prior to this, dogs were used in the same test.

(f) At some previous date, it is understood from the recollection of personnel connected with the work of that time, that chickens were used in tests to determine the effect of gun blast near the muzzles of large guns.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS COMPTON,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

The New Veterans' Administration Hospital for Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

LETTER FROM BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received today from Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Chairman of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, notifying me of the President's approval of a 300-bed general medical hospital for the Massachusetts area. I am delighted that approval has been given this badly needed project. It will make it much easier for the Massachusetts disabled veterans to receive the treatment they need. It will save a great deal of money now spent in transporting these veterans to the diagnostic center in Washington. The veterans will welcome treatment nearer their homes, and it will make it easier for them to establish their claims. The letter follows:

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1940.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In the program of future construction for the Veterans' Administration for accomplishment from year to year within the period of the next 10 years, recommended by the Federal Board of Hospitalization to the President and approved in principle by the President on May 9, there is included a 300-bed general hospital for the Massachusetts-Rhode Island area.

Immediate consultation is contemplated with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to determine upon how funds may best be made available to undertake necessary preliminary work, such as the selection of site and preparation of plans.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Chairman.*

The Dependence of Agriculture and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as the history of American agriculture is written so will the history of this Nation be written. Between agriculture and industry there exists a basic interdependence which closely links the fortune of the one to the other.

In recent years we have come to more fully understand that when the farm population of the United States suffers and loses its purchasing power, the people of the cities, of necessity, suffer. It is absolutely essential that we maintain a wholesome degree of balance in our economic life. Agriculture must be kept on a parity with industry.

But an alarming disparity between the prices which farmers sell their produce for and the prices at which they purchase manufactured articles has been discovered. We are now considering a measure designed to equalize these differences between the price which the farmer receives for what he sells and the price he pays for what he buys. In view of the present situation, parity payments to our farmers are both proper and necessary if we are to reestablish our economic balance.

If farm prices and the prices farmers pay were at parity, it would take no more pounds of cotton now to buy a work shirt than in 1910–14. And no more pounds of hog to buy 100 pounds of nails, but the situation has changed. In testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace recently said, "Work shirts could be ordered from the 1913 catalog at an average price of 57 cents. The average price in the 1940 catalog is 73 cents, an increase of 28 percent. At January 15 prices in 1933, it took 4.7 pounds of cotton to buy a work shirt. The cost now is the equivalent of 7.2 pounds of cotton, or 53 percent more than in 1913.

Common nails haven't changed much, if any, since 1913; but the price has gone up 74 percent. At January 15 prices for hogs in 1913, it took 31 pounds of hogs to buy 100 pounds of 8-penny nails. But at January 15 prices in 1940 it took 70 pounds of hogs to buy 100 pounds of 8-penny nails, an increase of 126 percent.

Furthermore, in making parity payments to the farmer, we are striking at another basic problem, namely, the disparity between per capita on the farm and per capita income elsewhere. Last year, according to statistics prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, per capita farm income was $139 while per capita nonfarm income was $639. The largest per capita farm income during the last 10 years was $172. That was in 1937 when the per capita nonfarm income was $672. Our farm families, which represent over a third of this Nation's total population, are certainly entitled to a larger share of our national income. Parity payments make a blow at this economic inequality.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Not only is the farmer entitled to a larger share of our national income but he is also entitled to a greater share of the comforts and conveniences of modern life. There is no reason why farm homes should not be made just as comfortable as city homes; no reason why the benefits of electricity should not be afforded those who live on the farm just as they are afforded those who live in the city.

With this thought in mind, I wish to call the attention of the House to the outstanding piece of work which is being done by the Rural Electrification Administration. In 1935, only about 10 farm homes in every 100 had central

station electric service and in 14 States less than 4 in every 100 were served by electric lines. Some 6,000,000 American farms were entirely without electricity.

Today, however, there are approximately 180,000 miles of R. E. A.-financed lines serving more than 400,000 farm families and other rural users. The Rural Electrification Administration, in its annual report, also advised that 80,000 additional miles of line were under construction or being surveyed and planned, which when completed will make electric service available to over 750,000 users. The report continues:

During the 4½ years since the Executive order of May 11, 1935, established R. E. A., electricity has shown its worth as a tool for bettering the social and economic position of the American farmer. More farms have been connected to electric-distribution lines during this brief period than during the preceding half century or more since the birth of the electric-power industry. In response to the demand created by the coming of service to hundreds of thousands of farms of all types and in all parts of the country in the last few years, there has been an unprecedented development of productive uses for electric energy on the farm and in the farm home.

Recently, in commenting on the 1939 R. E. A. report to Congress, the newspaper columnist, Charles G. Ross, hit the nail on the head when he said:

The annual report of the R. E. A. has just come to hand. It contains some remarkable facts and figures. I don't see how any fair-minded person can read this report without coming to the conclusion that even if some of the loans which the R. E. A. has made in "thin" areas go into default, the cost of its operations will have been negligible as compared with the benefits. The R. E. A. is deservedly popular in Congress, and you can search the Glenn Frank report from end to end without finding any suggestion that it should be abolished.

Even more noteworthy is the fact that active opposition from the privately owned utilities has about faded out. There is still friction here and there, but by and large the private companies and the farm cooperatives financed by the R. E. A. are getting along comfortably together and in some cases there is cooperation between them. The Georgia Power Co., for instance, has gone out of its way to be helpful to the R. E. A. financed systems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I trust that this House will not retreat from its duty to the American farmer, will not forsake its responsibility to restore agriculture to its proper place in our economic life, but instead will pass an appropraite bill sufficient to meet these and other vital needs of the American farmer.

The Invasion of Denmark and Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD remarks which I had intended previously to deliver as a speech before the membership of the House.

The rapid change in world events makes it necessary for me now to write a sequel or a continuation of this discourse in order to properly cover two additional and valiant nations which as victims are being dipped in a sea of their own heroic blood.

Mr. Speaker, the martian madmen from Nazi Germany stunned the civilized world as Denmark and Norway, two peace-loving nations, were struck down without provocation or warning. These two peoples are outstanding as examples of peaceful and democratic government which typifies all that is highest and noblest in the promotion of amicable neighborliness. The greatest misfortune and danger of these Nordic peoples was their proximity to the hell of insanity and organized fiendishness. Only yesterday, so it seems, Mr. Speaker, I visited Copenhagen, the modern capital of Denmark. It was then serene, active, and beautiful. Some of the finest and cleanest people in the world live there. Thousands of happy, carefree boys and girls, everywhere to be seen, were bicycling all about the city. No thought of war, no fear of harm. They asked nothing of their neighbors except to be left alone.

From there I flew north to Oslo, in the land of the hardy, disciplined Vikings. These practical and peaceful people, who once were among the most daring and warlike of any in the world, learned from experience that there is neither gain nor glory in war. They laid down their arms. They beat their weapons into plowshares and decided to do with and till what productive soil God Almighty so sparingly gave them. They sought no "lebensraum" by a "blitzkrieg" at the expense of their neighbors. They were not causing an everlasting row or casting aspersions upon friendly, peaceful neighbors. Since the available tillable, arable land in all Norway amounted to about 4 percent, they grimly faced the fact that they must go to sea to earn an honest living. They mastered and monopolized by scientific methods the whaling industry. They excelled all other people in the field of fisheries. They became the second or third largest maritime nation of the globe and the Norwegian flag fluttered at the masthead of merchantmen in every seaport in the world. Not only did they furnish bottoms to all the nations but they built for sale sturdy and seaworthy vessels for the maritime use of other countries until they became leaders in this industry. The great timber resources and mineral deposits were exploited and developed systematically and profitably.

While they packed, canned, pickled, dried, and smoked small fish for export, and similarly converted the giant mammals of the deep into oil and fertilizer, at the same time they produced lumber and pulpwood which they shipped for export at a handsome profit, which in turn was converted into food, clothing, and various useful imported products. Altogether by this process they raised the living standard of the Norseman to the highest level on the European Continent. In Norway is to be found the outstanding example of how much can be done with so little if the people are determined and peaceful.

The serene atmosphere of the Northland, even the beauty of the mountains, lakes, and matchless fiords, became more attractive to the tourists because of the gentleness, refinement, and friendliness of the Norwegian people. They were temperate in all things, prosperous, healthy, and gay, and good neighbors to all nations. Their virtues are too numerous to mention, their faults and vices too insignificant to detract from their great moral value.

Then the fury of human madness broke out, and the fiends of a thousand hells invaded their peaceful domain. A studied, coldly calculated plan of invasion was put into effect, and a dazed world, already calloused and inured to mass outbreaks of depravity and base barbarism as evidenced in the subjugation of Austria, the enslavement of Czechoslovakia, and the murder and plunder of Poland and Finland, cried out in horror when two more inoffensive neighbors, Denmark and Norway, were deprived of their national freedom as they were crushed beneath the iron heel of the invader. Treacherous creatures, posing as cultured human beings, came to Norway and to Denmark by the thousands as tourists; cameras in hand, they feigned friendship and kindness. They gorged themselves upon the wholesome and plentiful food in these countries. They came and went as they pleased; ostensibly they were friends. However, they were spies, sabateurs, and trained soldiers of the German Army in civilian clothes. By land they enfiltered the country as tourists; by sea they gained admission as whalers. Their arms and weapons of murder came later. Norwegian seaports were captured after infiltration, a plan similar to that which was used in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and which is being used right now with the ultimate same purpose against Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Hungary.

In a recent speech I predicted the fate of the Scandinavian countries, and I now utter the prophecy that before the madness of the Hun is finally crushed or the disease actually runs

its course and causes self-destruction that Belgium once again and Holland will suffer a blood bath and will join in martyrdom their sister nations of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Denmark, and Norway. Beyond that we might expect to hear even before this speech is finished that the same fate has been meted out to Hungary and the Balkan countries.

They must die, these subhuman peoples, to prove the superior "kultur" of the Germans and to make them masters and all other peoples their slaves. However, they will rise again, these martyred nations. Meanwhile, God spare America, may she remain strong and aloof from the carnage, so when the sanity of the world is reestablished and peace returns our beloved country may aid in the restoration and rehabilitation of mankind.

The brave and undaunted Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvdan Koht, in a broadcast on May 5, said that Norway's only crime was that she was "too strict in her neutrality."

Koht condemned the German invasion of Norway as being like the depredations of the Huns and vandals; said he, "they laid towns and villages in ashes," and added, "the German memorandum to Norway at the start of the invasion clearly showed that Germany intended to force Norway into war against the Allies." He asked, "If our telephone, telegraph, and other means of communication were surrendered to the Germans, could this be called neutrality?" These were nazi-isms' preinvasion demands. The entire world shudders with revulsion at the slump into barbarism of the German militarists.

It has always been my contention that the great bulk of American citizens, without regard to origin or nationalistic antecedents, with relatively few exceptions, condemns this outbreak of madness, murder, and plunder.

An interesting and substantiating bit of evidence is to be found in the clipping from the New York Times, under date of May 6, which I take the liberty of reading into the RECORD:

GERMAN GROUP HITS NAZIS—SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LEAGUE DECRIES INVASION OF NORWAY

LOS ANGELES, May 5.—The local executive board of the German-American League for Culture, claiming 1,500 members in this area, telegraphed the Norwegian consul here today that it "feels the urge to express deep indignation over the ruthless invasion of your peace-loving homeland."

"Like hundreds of thousands of German-Americans," the message stated, "we are convinced that you and we, and all other foes and victims of Hitlerism and violence, will see restoration of their common democratic ideals in a not-too-distant future."

The league is a national anti-Hitler organization of which Dr. Frank Boas, of Columbia University, is honorary president. The league received a reply from Irving S. Bent, Norwegian vice consul here, expressing gratitude.

Address Before National Democratic League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered to the National Democratic League of the National Democratic Committee in Washington last Saturday, May 11:

In speaking to you today I would be passing over the gravest, most critical question of the moment if I failed to take cognizance of what has happened in Europe during the past 48 hours. Suddenly yesterday there came flashing across the air waves and over the newspaper wires news of the greatest tragedy of our time. Europe had plunged into the long-feared total war and the fight to a deadly finish had started.

This Nation with the other nations of the Western Hemisphere are standing by for further developments from abroad. With anxiety and concern we are patiently waiting and hoping, realizing full well that for the world at large there can be no escape from the repercussions of the spreading war in Europe.

We are approaching what perhaps will furnish the most crucial test of this administration. But we approach this test reassured and confident that our national leadership today is equal to the responsibility and ready for the task. This administration is keeping constant vigil over the peace and security of the American people.

For some months now the President and the Congress, under his leadership, have been laying fortifications against this country's involvement in war abroad and the fortifications against invasion of this country by any foreign power. The President called the Congress into extraordinary session last September shortly after the outbreak of the European war. We were not long in adopting legislation which not only reaffirmed our desire to keep America out of war but also effectuated the means of keeping us out.

One of the strongest and most salient features of the neutrality legislation enacted at the extraordinary session of Congress last October was that it placed restrictions on the use of American ships in trade with belligerents. The present Neutrality Act expressly forbids American ships from transporting cargoes and passengers in the war zones. This is proving a great safeguard against our involvement in the European war.

We know that what did most to draw us into the last war was the sinking of American ships and the loss of American lives on the high seas. We have to a large extent removed the danger of a recurrence of incidents which might again inflame public sentiment and lead us down the road to war. Keeping public sentiment strongly against our going into war is, after all, the thing which will do most to actually keep us out of war. We have, I believe, laid the foundation for a firm clear-cut international policy which is best calculated to keep us from again drifting into war as we did in 1917.

And during the years of this administration we have strengthened our national defenses all along the line. Yes, we have appropriated large sums of money for national-defense purposes and the Congress is now giving serious and careful consideration to many supplemental recommendations made by the President and War Department officials. Provision has been made for not only the construction of a large number of planes for our air corps and battleships of our Navy but also for the purchase of large quantities of equipment for other divisions of the Service. Secretary of War Woodring recently stated that "the past 12 months have seen intensive governmental effort to mend the gaps in our military fences."

Because of what has been done to preserve the neutrality of this Nation and to adequately meet its needs for national defense, we may look to the future in the hope that we are prepared to keep America from going to war and keep war from coming to America. It is to these objectives of peace and security that this administration is directing every ounce of its energy at this very moment. And here, without elaboration, I should like to describe the President's foreign policy in a single statement by saying that it is a thing of outstanding statesmanship, protecting American interests in the present world crisis and doing the all-important job of keeping us out of Europe's war.

But conduct of our foreign affairs in time of world-wide unrest has been only one of the responsibilities so competently met by this administration. It has been during the past 7½ years under the leadership and driving power of an administration concerned with the social and economic problems of this Nation, that we have made some of the greatest gains in the history of this country. It is important that when we go into the campaign a few months from now that we let no one mislead the American people as to what party has been responsible for these gains and what party can be expected to continue the fight for advancement.

The real issue before the American people in 1932 and 1936 was the right of the average American man and woman to lead a finer, a better, and a happier life. In 1940 that is still the real issue before the American people although the Republican Party is trying to evade that issue. Their attempted evasions simply consist of declaring themselves in favor of everything we of the Democratic Party have done to affirm the right of the average American man and woman to lead a finer, a better and happier life, and at the same time posing as great believers in all the reforms which have been carried out during the present administration. Yet, is there anything in the record to show that they were the ones who brought about these changes; is there anything in the record to indicate that the American people can depend upon them to carry our program forward? The answer is emphatically "No."

Our duty is to put the questions to them squarely by asking: Under what administration was the Social Security Act placed on our statute books? Under what administration was the wage-hour law placed on our statute books? Under what administration was legislation for the protection of bank depositors placed on our statute books? Under what administration was the right of our farmers to receive their share of our national income recog-

nized? Under what administration were steps taken to conserve our national resources against ruthless exploitation? Under what administration was regulation of the stock market against the abuses of speculation undertaken? Under what administration did we set out to bring electricity to the farm homes of our Nation? Under what administration did we call halt to discriminations against organized labor?

And I could go on, consuming considerable time, in making this inquiry about our legislative gains during the past 7½ years, but enough has been said to prove this one point, it has been during the present administration that we have taken our long stride toward the goal of social and economic betterment. The American people will not be turned away from their drive toward that goal by the promises of the Republican Party but instead they shall assure the continued march forward by entrusting completion of this task to the men and women who started it, the Democratic Party.

The Price of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the World War, which lasted 1,565 days, was the bloodiest and costliest war that had ever been fought. During the conflict about 65,000,000 men were mobilized and forced to participate, for a longer or shorter time, in the economically unproductive activity of organized destruction. Of these men about 9,000,000—one in 7—died in action or of wounds. Approximately 22,000,000—one in 3—were wounded, and of these, 7,000,000 were permanently disabled. A number of the wounded died within a few years after the war as a consequence of their disabilities, while many shell-shocked or gassed veterans continued to lead tortured existences. More than 5,000,000 men were reported missing after the war.

More than twice as many men were killed in battle during the World War as in all the major wars from 1790 to 1913 together, including the Napoleonic Wars, the Crimean War, the Danish War of 1864, the Austro-Prussian War, the American War between the States, the Franco-Prussian War, the Boer War, the Russo-Japanese War, and the Balkan wars. Two-thirds of the men mobilized and two-thirds of those killed were on the Allied side.

The estimated number of civilian deaths owing to the war was slightly in excess of the number of soldier deaths. The noncombatants fell victim to such disasters as starvation, disease, massacres, epidemics, and raids. In addition, the various national birth rates declined, sometimes to dangerously low figures.

Equally staggering were the monetary costs of the combat and the destruction of property on land and sea. The average daily cost to all belligerents of the war in the first 3 years was $123,000,000. In 1918 the average daily cost was $244,000,000, that is, more than $10,000,000 per hour. The total net direct cost of conducting the war thus was $186,000,000,000, the Allies expending $126,000,000,000, and the Central Powers, $60,000,000,000. To this sum must be added property damages on land to the extent of almost $30,000,000,000; damage on sea aggregating $7,000,000,000; production losses of about $45,000,000,000; and war relief and losses to neutrals of more than $2,000,000,000. The total real economic cost amounted to $270,000,000,000.

If to this figure be added the $67,000,000,000 generally estimated as the capitalized value of the human lives lost as a direct consequence of the war, a total of $337,000,000,000 is reached. This sum does not take into account the additional economic loss caused by the wholesale crippling and devitalization of soldiers and civilians, the billions of dollars of interest due on the debts contracted by the fighting powers, or the vast sums which will continue to be appropriated for generations to come as pension money. It is more than double the capitalized value of all the wealth of any one belligerent except the United States. Verily, the men who met to consider the terms of peace after the World War faced a grave responsibility—the responsibility of so settling conditions that the ghastly loss in lives and goods should not have been entirely in vain—(from The World Since 1914, Langsam).

United States and the World War—Statistics

American troops killed in action	37,568
Died of wounds received in action	12,942
Wounded, not mortally	182,674
(These figures do not include casualties of the Navy and the Marine Corps, amounting to about 11,000.)	
Troops engaged in the World War (Americans)	4,057,101
Casualties from other causes (disease, accidents, drowning, suicides, murders, executions, etc.)	69,466
World War debts of Allies to United States	$2,430,730,897.21

The Division of Economic Research of the National Labor Relations Board and Mr. Saposs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, much of the conflict over the work of the National Labor Relations Board has raged around its Division of Economic Research and the director of that Division, Mr. David Saposs.

I have never taken the position that the National Labor Relations Act was perfect nor that the act should never be amended. I realize that improvement is possible in almost any law, particularly a comparatively new one or one so important a measure as this one. I believe some mistakes in choice of personnel have been made by the Board and that they should be corrected.

But I am decidedly in favor of the basic provision of the National Labor Relations Act and of expeditious, fair, and effective work by the Board and its staff. It is important that in all the discussion of the matter no injustice should be done.

The importance of the work of the Division of Economic Research is great and it has been seriously misrepresented. Also the beliefs and position of Mr. Saposs have been terribly distorted and a real injustice done him.

I believe the very best evidence that could be offered, both with regard to the importance of the work of the Division of Economic Research and with regard to Mr. Saposs, is contained in the following letter from Dr. Leiserson, member of the Board:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1940.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VOORHIS: This is in reply to your letter of May 10. I, too, have been much concerned over attacks on the Division of Economic Research, because I feel that this Division is doing a very necessary job for the Board and is doing it well.

Shortly after I was appointed to the Board I made a special study of the work of the Division, and I was convinced that the Board would be very seriously handicapped if the services of the Division were eliminated or curtailed in any way.

Much of the controversy over the Division, I think, arises from a misunderstanding of its functions. Actually, this Division does no abstract or general research in economics. It is essentially a technical service agency to assist the various divisions of the Board in performing their functions. If there is a problem of jurisdiction in a case, for example, the Division of Economic Research assists the regional directors and trial attorneys in securing technical information about the business of the company, its corporate organization, and its accounting, manufacturing, and shipping processes in order to establish whether it is engaged in interstate commerce or not. If the Board orders back

pay for employees illegally discharged, the Division helps secure detailed information to determine the amount of back pay involved. If a pay-roll analysis or other statistical material is necessary in case development for a regional office or for the Administrative Division of the Board, the Economics Division helps with the technical work of assembling, classifying, and analyzing the data.

While the functions of the Division have been misunderstood, the personnel has also been misunderstood. Mr. Saposs, the head of the Division, has been assailed as a Communist, but the fact of the matter is that he has been rather vigorously opposing the activities of Communists. Mr. Saposs is very well qualified for his position. He was appointed from the very top of the civil-service register, and I think the Board is fortunate in having a man of his experience and ability.

Sincerely yours,

WM. M. LEISERSON.

No one in America has written more widely or with more directness against Communist activity in this country than Benjamin Stolberg. Here is what he says about Mr. Saposs:

I have known Mr. Saposs intimately for over 20 years. I share the opinion of most of our responsible economists and journalists that he is the leading national authority on labor. He is no more Communist than you or I. He is a great scholar and a good Democrat.

And we find Time magazine commenting, as follows:

The House Appropriations Committee slashed the 1941 Budget estimates for N. L. R. B. from $3,180,000 to $2,843,000, scratched out entirely a $45,900 appropriation for N. L. R. B.'s research division, which Labor-Economist Saposs heads. * * *

This sabotage really hurt; thus cut down, N. L. R. B. cannot function efficiently. Ludwell Denny, Scrips-Howard labor expert, noted that present delays, with their attendant evils, result directly from an overworked, understaffed N. L. R. B. To abolish the research division on the ground that "no need exists" he called absurdity's height "at a time when both employers and unions are criticizing the Board for knowing too little about the economic facts." Newshawk Denny knew, as did the House, that what N. L. R. B. foes really sought was abolition of Economist Saposs; that the bushy, rumpled little expert—long-time Carnegie Institute and Rockefeller Foundation labor authority—though often denounced as a Communist, is neither red nor useless, but a zealous watchdog of labor rights.

So much for Mr. Saposs. He is neither a Communist nor a friend of Communists. No doubt he holds some views which are very progressive if not radical. But his fundamental loyalty to the basic democratic institutions of America cannot be successfully called in question.

And now with regard to the importance of the work of the Division of Economic Research, I submit herewith a description of that work.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE N. L. R. B. DIVISION OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
THE USE OF ECONOMIC DATA IN LABOR BOARD CASES—COURT RECORD

A statement by James E. Pate, which appeared recently in the Southern Economic Journal stresses the work of the N. L. R. B. Division of Economic Research as an indispensable element in administration of the Labor Relations Act:

These services, especially that of economic research, are a powerful complement to the Board's legal work. No small amount of the success that the N. L. R. B. has had before the courts may be attributed to facts that it has been able to present on the respective industries. * * * Public policy cannot be determined or enforced in a vacuum, or by legal precedents alone. Adjudication as well as legislation must be based on the facts of economic and social conditions. Only in this way can the law be vital. For the purpose of finding these facts a bureau of economic research is invaluable.

The frequent use in court decisions of materials prepared by the N. L. R. B. Division of Economic Research indicates clearly the importance of economic data and analysis to the work of the Board. These were used abundantly in all of the early decisions in which the Board was upheld by the courts, such as: *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1), *N. L. R. B.* v. *Freuhauf Trailer Co.* (301 U. S. 49), *N. L. R. B.* v. *Friedman-Harry Marks Clothing Co.* (301 U. S. 58), *Associated Press* v. *N. L. R. B.* (301 U. S. 103), *Washington, Virginia & Maryland Coach Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (301 U. S. 142), *Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (303 U. S. 453). Economic materials in these decisions included descriptions of corporate structure and the multiple enterprises of a given company, the flow of commodities in interstate commerce, the effects of strikes upon interstate commerce, the labor policy of a given company, and procedures in collective bargaining.

More recent court decisions which take cognizance of economic materials are *N. L. R. B.* v. *Highland Park Manufacturing Co.* (C. C. A. 4), March term, 1940; *Mooresville Cotton Mills* v. *N. L. R. B.* (C. C. A. 4), March term, 1940; and *N. L. R. B.* v. *Sunshine Mining Co.* (C. C. A. 6), October term, 1939.

Direct evaluations of the work of the Division have been made by two different circuit courts. In *N. L. R. B.* v. *The Griswold Manufacturing Co.*, the third circuit commented in very pointed terms:

Brief mention may be made of the respondent's complaint that there was "prejudicial use of incompetent, irrevelant, and immaterial testimony." Particular objection was expressed by the respondent against the admission of the testimony of David J. Saposs, chief economist for the National Labor Relations Board, who was called as an expert by the petitioner. His testimony was on the subject of the process of collective bargaining.

There is no merit to this objection.

In *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines, Inc., et al.* supra (p. 267), Mr. Justice Stone, in a footnote, cited numerous experts and textbooks "on the significance of recognition of collective bargaining." One of the expert authorities cited by Mr. Justice Stone was the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc. Mr. Saposs was a research associate with the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc. Nothing further need be said on this score.

In N. L. R. B. against Crowe Coal Co., the eighth circuit court summarized the importance of economic data in Board cases, quoting from the Board's brief:

The propriety of introducing in evidence economic data of the character of Board's exhibit 11 [Bulletin No. 2, The Effect of Labor Relations in the Bituminous Coal Industry Upon Interstate Commerce] obtained from governmental or other authoritative sources, is well settled. See, for example, *Virginia Railway Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40* (300 U. S. 515, footnotes 4 and 5, pp. 545, 546) in which the Supreme Court referred to the bulletin entitled "Governmental Protection of Labor's Right to Organize," which is Bulletin No. 1 in a series prepared by the Board's Division of Economic Research. The exhibit now under consideration is Bulletin No. 2 of the same series. And see *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1, footnote 8, p. 43); *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines*, (303 U. S. 261, footnote 2, p. 267).

In the course of its decision upholding the ruling of the Board, the Court made direct use of factual material contained in the Division's bulletin No. 2.

It is argued in respondent's brief that it has "no knowledge * * * of the use to which this coal will be put or the place to which it will be transported," but no such want of knowledge was stipulated or found by the Board. It is stated in the bulletin of the economic division in evidence that "typically there is no provision for storage of coal at the mine" and that "production is customarily not undertaken until orders are received and a supply of cars assured."

In October 1939 the United States Supreme Court refused to grant a writ of certiorari in this case.

FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK OF THE DIVISION

The work of the N. L. R. B. Division of Economic Research arises directly out of administration of the Labor Relations Act, usually in connection with specific cases before the Board. Comprising an integral function in administration, this work is sharply differentiated from the activities of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics or similar Government agencies which engage in general research. The prohibition in the act against the appointment of persons for statistical work "where such service may be obtained from the Department of Labor" has no bearing upon the existence of the present Division, since it performs a kind of service that is not and cannot be rendered by the Department of Labor. The major part of the Division's work is nonstatistical, and its occasional use of statistical technique is related to subject matter that is not within the scope of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

If the Board were compelled to secure assistance in the preparation and presentation of economic data from an outside agency, the present structure and organization of the Division would have to be duplicated as a separate unit within

that agency. Even if this unit were attached physically to the Board offices, as it must be for expediency, there would still be a serious administrative problem of integrating the work of the outside unit with the work of the Board.

Additional reasons militate against the use of an outside agency. Efficiency, as well as convenience, requires that the Division be an integral part of the Board's organization. Not only must the personnel of the Division be trained in economic subject matter and analysis, but also they must be intimately acquainted with the established principles and procedures of Board work and its uses of economic material. Use of an outside agency would not only increase the cost of securing economic data for administering the act but would also result in a great loss of efficiency.

Functioning as a service and advisory group within the Board, the Division gathers materials and makes analyses usually upon the request of other Divisions, the administrative offices, or members of the Board. This work is done at various stages of a Board case, chiefly prior to the issuance of complaint or authorization of hearing, in the preparation for or conduct of hearing, and in the preparation of appellate briefs. Economic materials were used extensively in the briefs of all the important early Labor Board cases, and they continue to be used in new cases. In addition to interstate commerce data which were featured in the early cases, increasing use is being made of economic data on labor relations.

After a case has been decided, the Division's service may be required in the course of securing compliance with back-pay and reinstatement orders, usually in the form of employment record analyses (supplemented by studies of employment policy with reference to hiring and tenure), financial data and analysis, and studies of "substantially equivalent employment." A relatively minor part of the Division's work is done at the request of review attorneys and trial examiners, who require information and assistance of a technical nature in handling certain phases of a record. As an outgrowth of work done in connection with a group of cases the Division coordinates separate studies and materials for mimeographing and printing, to make them readily available for subsequent cases and for general use.

Because the variations in the type of data and analysis required for administering the act and because of the unpredictable flow of work coming into the Division, it is necessary to have a relatively large part of the staff professionally trained in economic subject matter and analysis and capable of working with a minimum of direct supervision. Thus, persons may be shifted from one task to another although the major part of their work is specialized in one of the five functional groups discussed below.

ECONOMIC DATA AND ANALYSIS FOR QUESTIONS OF JURISDICTION

The preparation of material on interstate commerce and other questions of jurisdiction has constituted a major function. Initially commerce materials were secured for cases involving the steel industry, clothing, fruit packing, press services, et al. With time, the emphasis has shifted to new industrial groups and to borderline cases of jurisdiction.

The mere procurement and presentation of commerce data is a specialized and technical job. The exact ownership of a company is found through examination of registration statements and other materials on file at the Securities and Exchange Commission or other agencies of the Federal and State Governments and through examination of standard business manuals. Sources of raw materials and destination of products are ascertained by studying publications of the United States Department of Commerce and other agencies, trade papers, corporation reports, and in some cases by examining data on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission. After the data have been secured, they are sometimes reworked and made part of an exhibit for the record.

Where jurisdiction has been widely established for a given industry through court decisions, commerce data are secured in routine manner, but for cases that require more than routine handling, descriptive and analytical materials are prepared. Studies have been made of the nature and functioning of insurance companies, with emphasis on the operations of companies involved in Board cases—John Hancock and others. For the Bank of America cases, studies were made of the historical development and present operations of the modern banking system, including interrelations between credit and the functioning of our entire economy. In a number of dairy cases special studies have been made of the production and distribution of dairy products with reference to the operations of respondents in Board cases; recently a mimeographed memorandum was distributed to the regional offices, outlining the character of the dairy industry and the sources of information for commerce data, as a guide in preparing dairy cases.

STUDIES OF LABOR RELATIONS

In the field of labor relations the Division has made numerous studies of personnel policy and procedures in collective bargaining. Specialized knowledge and training in the organization and functioning of industry, personnel administration, the form and organization of trade unions, and the detailed practice of collective bargaining are essential to this work.

A Nation-wide case involving the Western Union Telegraph Co. illustrates the use of economic analysis in charges of company domination and interference. An exhaustive study was made of the labor policy of the company and the history of the Association of Western Union Employees, to assist the Litigation Division in determining the disputed facts in the case. Members of the staff worked with the attorney preparing the case, assisted at the hearing, aided the attorney drawing up the Board's brief, and assisted the attorney arguing the case before the circuit court.

In addition to this intensive work on the Western Union case, similar studies are made for other cases. These studies of labor policy are supplemented by the collection of materials on espionage, strikebreaking, and the policies and practices of employer associations whose members are involved from time to time in Board cases. The information may be requested by the regional offices before the issuance of a complaint, by the Litigation Division for use at the hearing, or for the preparation of stipulations, settlements, and appellate briefs.

The Marshall Field case (southern textile mills) illustrates the use of economic data on collective bargaining. The case was settled by stipulation during adjournment of a hearing at which the Chief Economist testified on the role of outside parties in the bargaining conference. The respondent had insisted upon the inclusion and possible participation of outside parties as a condition of entering into negotiations with the union. The testimony, substantiated by materials from authoritative sources, described the recent history of labor relations in the southern textile industry, the nature of the negotiatory process in collective bargaining, and the use of third parties as a technique developed in recent years for combating labor organization.

For a number of cases in which the written agreement was an issue, materials were gathered to describe the agreement as one element in collective bargaining. These materials outlined the history and use of the written agreement as revealed in the literature on collective bargaining, the practice of bargaining in a group of industries, and the extent of written agreements. Upon the basis of this research, the Chief Economist testified in a number of cases, and subsequently the data have again been used. They have recently been supplemented and edited for publication and issued in the form of Bulletin No. 4.

Studies of union organization and collective-bargaining practice are also used in cases involving questions of appropriate bargaining unit.

EMPLOYER RECORD ANALYSIS

Cases involving alleged discrimination, back-pay orders, and orders of reinstatement to substantially equivalent

employment give rise to a third major function: Analysis of employer records and related data. This work requires training and experience in statistical analysis as well as a comprehension of business activity and personnel administration. Since the basic data are secured from employer records, the analyses are conducted largely in the field.

In cases of alleged discrimination, a study of employment records makes it possible to determine upon the basis of objective evidence whether discharges were made in accordance with some nondiscriminatory system during the ordinary course of business or whether they were directed chiefly against union members. The record analysis is particularly necessary for charges involving a large number of workers where the statements of respondent and union are confusing and contradictory. The economy and effectiveness of record analysis is illustrated by a recent case which originally involved more than 60 persons. Upon the basis of the record analysis, the regional office found that the charges affecting less than one-fifth of the number could be substantiated with employment-record evidence. A complaint has now been issued for the smaller number of persons, and altogether the preparation for hearing and conduct of the case have been greatly expedited.

Record analysis is equally important in the computation of back pay and in securing reinstatement. At the present time, in connection with the Circuit Court decree in the Republic Steel Corporation case, the division is outlining procedures for the computation of back pay affecting roughly 10,000 workers. Similar analysis is being made for a number of other cases, including Stackpole Carbon Co., Titan Metal Products, American Mfg. Co., National Motor Rebuilding Co., Mayer Handbag Co.

STUDIES OF THE EFFECTS OF THE N. L. R. B. AND BOARD RECORDS

From time to time the Division makes studies of the effects of the act upon industrial relations, chiefly in terms of strike activity and the extent of written trade agreements. For this purpose the Division compiles no basic strike data, but confines itself to adaptation of data compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The data are grouped to permit comparison of strike activity with the record of Board cases and comparison of strikes in industries over which the Board has established jurisdiction with strikes in other industries. For its study of written trade agreements, the Division makes similar use of data gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, supplementing these with other materials that are readily available.

The only statistics compiled by the Board are the record of its own activities, comparable to the administrative statistics compiled by any government agency or the inventory control of a private business enterprise. The Board record covers the number of cases filed, the number of workers involved, the disposition of cases, the number of elections conducted by the Board and their outcome, the time consumed in handling cases at different stages of Board activity, and so forth. From time to time special studies are made, for example, the recent study of the financial strength of respondents in the Board cases, presented to the House committee investigating the Labor Board. The magnitude of this record is such that it requires the supervision and direction of persons trained in statistical method and labor relations, and familiar with the Board's functioning. The bulk of the compilation and tabulation is done by statistical clerks.

REFERENCE, EDITING, ADMINISTRATION

The Reference Section was set up initially to maintain a file of work materials that would expedite the work of the Division and avoid duplication of effort. This function has expanded with an increasing volume of work, and, in addition, the growing number of requests from other divisions of the Board for information of an economic character has necessitated a gradual expansion and reorganization of the Section. Closely related to the work of the Reference Section is the information—"dictionary"—service that is provided by the Division to the Review Division, the Trial Examiner's Division, and the Litigation Division. Frequent requests are received from these offices for factual information of the type that is known as common knowledge and of which courts take judicial notice.

Administration and editorial work in the division are not differentiated from similar functions in other agencies. From time to time materials that have been prepared for a group of cases are coordinated, summarized, and supplemented in order to make them available in subsequent cases. The printed materials, which have appeared as a series of bulletins, are also useful for reference purposes. Other materials are mimeographed for distribution to the several Washington and regional offices of the Board.

The administrative assistant aids the Chief Economist in planning, assigning, and directing research work, including the supervision of specific projects. One of the special projects that has been under his supervision is the preparation of materials for congressional hearings, particularly during the past year. When economic data are needed to throw light on proposed amendments, these have been the subject of study by the division.

A COMMON PRACTICE

This employment of economic experts by Government agencies is no novel thing. On the contrary, the employment of economists by the National Labor Relations Board to make studies and to testify in connection with proceedings before the Board is, contrary to current statements, entirely in accordance with practice that has been well established throughout the Federal Government for many years. The Labor Board is distinguished in this matter only by the small number of economists that it employs and the low percentage of its total appropriation that is used for economic research.

Confronted with technical questions arising in the course of its work, the administrative agency cannot function intelligently without assistance from persons trained in the technical fields—accounting, economics, statistical method, engineering, and so forth. The uses of such personnel vary with the functions of the administrative agency, but their necessity is established by the character of the problems with which the agency must deal.

The Federal Trade Commission, created in 1914 to prevent "unfair competitive practices which are prohibited by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act," maintains a large economic division, headed by a chief economist, to make studies and provide expert testimony in connection with administration of the Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Act and also to make studies of more general intent.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, created in 1887 to maintain just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rates on common carriers, has a large staff of economists, statisticians, accountants, and engineers to study and deal with specialized problems arising in the course of its work; the same persons are used as expert witnesses at the hearings of the Commission. The Commission's Bureau of Statistics collects data concerning the corporate history, organization, investments, capitalization, indebtedness, physical property, and operations of all common carriers subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, created in 1934 to prevent fraudulent practices in the sale of securities and to supervise and regulate the registration of securities, maintains several groups of expert personnel, including marketing analysts, economists, and accountants. Entire administrative units within the Commission are staffed largely with nonlegal, expert personnel. The same personnel testify from time to time at hearings of the Commission.

The Federal Communications Commission, created in 1934 to act as a licensing and regulatory body, has an accounting and engineering staff to aid in administering the Communications Act. Members of this professional staff participate

at hearings of the Commission, testifying on the Commission's behalf, assisting in the cross-examination of witnesses, and acting in an advisory capacity. Similarly, the Federal Power Commission, created in 1920 to act as a licensing and regulatory body, employs engineers and accountants to assist in its work.

Additional examples of the use of expert personnel by administrative agencies are found within the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Labor, and Commerce. There are 23 or 24 statutes administered by various divisions of the Department of Agriculture. The Packers and Stockyards Division—of Agricultural Marketing Service—is an example; for hearings under the Packers and Stockyards Act, rate engineers—i. e., economists and accountants—are employed by the Department to make studies and testify as expert witnesses. The Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior makes use of marketing specialists, technical analysts, and cost experts of its own staff to testify at hearings. Other examples are the Public Contracts Division and Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor and the United States Maritime Commission in the Department of Commerce.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE GRIFFIN (GA.) DAILY NEWS AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted by unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial column by Editor Melton of the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News, addressed openly to me and my reply, I submit the following:

[From the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News of May 10, 1940]

"GOOD EVENING," BY QUIMBY MELTON

Congressman SIDNEY CAMP,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SID: Germany's invasion of Holland, Belgium, and little Luxembourg has spread the German attack into three new countries, countries that wanted above all else to be neutral. The fact that Germany claims she invaded these countries to "protect their neutrality" is a poor excuse that will be believed only by those who are blinded by the cause of nazi-ism. Holland, Luxembourg, and Belgium have been raped, just as Belgium was in 1914.

Hitler has told his people "der tag" (the day) has come and insists that on the outcome of the battle along the Western Front rests the entire outcome of the war. He gives strong intimation that his ambition is to bring the whole world under Nazi sway.

The time has come when we in America, Congressmen as well as the people back home, must make up our minds that what has happened to Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg shall never happen here.

In this connection, I believe it would be wise for Congress to take steps to put this Nation on a war basis, and this suggestion is made, not as a belligerent move but as one to guarantee our peace. Hitler has demonstrated that a nation caught unprepared is "his meat."

By putting the Nation on a wartime basis I mean:

All members of the Organized Officers' Reserve should be called into active duty. You will remember, Sidney, that, during the World War, it took America from April until September to get officers trained to command units in the National Army. And you'll remember it was a year before any United States troops were sent into battle to any extent.

All Reserve Officers should be examined to see if they are fit for training as air pilots; we'll need pilots by the thousands, and thousands of airships as well.

An intensified recruiting campaign should be put on for our Army, Navy, and Marines. Recruiting men for training, not fighting, but training them so well that in case of invasion they will be ready to fight.

We must prepare for a blitzkrieg—we won't have any 6 months to get ready next time! We won't have 24 hours. Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Norway didn't.

Our Government should immediately round up every undesirable alien and see that he goes back to the country whence he came. And at the same time all American citizens who are engaged in subversive activities should be taken into custody and put where their ardor for this dangerous thinking will cool off.

Part of Germany's success in Norway, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, was largely due to the fact that Nazi sympathizers were already there to welcome the incoming troops and to give them information and to lead them to strategic points.

We must have none of that—and don't fool yourself that there are not plenty of Nazi sympathizers and other subversive followers, who would take advantage of any situation that would give them a chance to undermine our Government.

I believe our Government should immediately give orders for war materials to every factory in our Nation that can be converted into a war-material factory. Special attention should be given to speeding up manufacture of airplanes; of antiaircraft guns; of bombs; of automatic rifles; of fast cruisers, and so forth.

I am not being hysterical today, Mr. Congressman. I'm just thinking back some 23 years when you and I were young men at Camp Gordon, training for the war. You'll remember, Sidney, how many of our boys were trained to drill with wooden guns; you'll remember how youthful "90-day wonder" officers were given the responsibility of training these men (and they did a damn good job of it, too); you'll remember how, on arriving in France, our artillery had to borrow French seventy-fives to use as light artillery; how we had to borrow French Chauchat rifles because we had no automatic rifles to speak of.

I'm thinking of these days today, Sidney, as I write you this letter. And I 'm thinking of the days to come when we may be faced with possible blitzkrieg unless we are prepared.

And Sidney, I'm thinking of our boys and girls; the youngsters of today who must bear the brunt of fighting and who would be victims of any blitzkrieg that might be successful. For it would be they who would lose their privileges as free American citizens.

Let's take steps to put America on a war-preparedness basis—for, Sidney, I feel positive that thus we will be able to keep out of war; and if we cannot keep out of the war we'll be able to protect ourselves from any invader.

Maj. QUIMBY MELTON,
Griffin Daily News, Griffin, Ga.

DEAR QUIMBY: The open letter addressed to me and published in the Good Evening column of the May 10 issue of your valued paper is timely and I believe represents the chief thought and interest of the majority of our people. The "total war" inaugurated in Europe and Germany's lightning invasion of the small and defenseless countries have caused thoughtful Americans everywhere to inquire as to the condition of our national defense. You recalled the days of 1917–18 when America entered the World War, how it took us from April to September to train officers to command our National Army, and an equal length of time to finally put these troops in the line of battle. You recalled the days when we were young soldiers of the Eighty-second Division at Camp Gordon training for the war—how the "90-day wonder" officers (and the allied armies had none better) worked to get our boys ready for the front lines, how they drilled with wooden guns because modern rifles were not available and, when the division arrived in France, how we "borrowed" our wagons from the French and British, our light artillery (French seventy-fives) and automatic rifles (French Chauchats) from the French. America was unprepared for that war. Let us see how our Government profited by that example. Armistice Day 1918 found us at last with a magnificient Army. Our Navy was the strongest in the world. In 2 years we had built a great merchant marine. Did we keep it up? The superb organization perfected during the war was virtually disbanded by the Republican administrations that followed. Our Army of 4,000,000 men was reduced to a paltry 200,000. Our Navy was greatly reduced under the Kellogg Treaty, great modern battleships were actually towed out into the ocean and sunk, and our merchant marine rusted away at the docks. Appropriations for national defense were cut to the bone and, while the nations of Europe were mechanizing their armies and building huge air forces, this country was experimenting with a few "samples" of modern equipment. All our military and naval experts agree that our first line of defense is our Navy. Under the Monroe Doctrine we have undertaken to defend the whole Western Hemisphere, our line extending, therefore, from pole to pole on both the east and the west, yet the Hoover administration did not appropriate one cent for naval extensions.

The Democratic administration recognized the plight of our national defense from the beginning, and our President has called the attention of Congress to the same at each session, and we have done more than the average citizen realizes. Since the beginning of this administration we have appropriated $4,200,000,000 for naval expansion alone. We now have 3,200 naval planes, and are increasing this number at the present time to 6,000. We have built and now have the strongest and most efficient navy in the world, and under the Vinson bill we are engaged in a 4-year expansion of the same, building 294 capital and auxiliary ships as fast as our yards can

turn them out. Our naval aviation is the largest and most efficient in the world.

In the Hawaiian Islands we have the greatest naval base in the Pacific, the Gibraltar of the west. The fortifications of the Panama Canal are the best and strongest known. We are training thousands of young men now as aviation pilots and ground mechanics, this training being done at the best technical schools in the country, and we are building planes for these pilots. It is not intended that this expansion will stop until we are supreme in the air. Our Army is being mechanized, and we are training it in a systematic way at Fort Benning and elsewhere in maneuvers as like actual warfare as possible.

It is estimated by experts that it requires 60 tons of shipping for each man carried across the sea in an expeditionary force, and that, therefore, our Navy demands first attention so that we may be able at all times to stop any such force from landing here. But we have not neglected our Army. We have a standing Army, well trained, of 220,969 men and a National Guard of 253,000 men. They are well armed and equipped. We have over 75,000 trained Reserve officers ready for service. The air force of the Army is about the same as that of the Navy, and we have 1,400 commercial pilots besides.

It is agreed that we must be prepared for any emergency that may arise as a result of the European tragedy and be ready to defend western democratic civilization against any combination of forces that may conspire against us.

Our President recognized this long ago and forcefully directed the attention of Congress to prepardness in his January message to us.

We have already recognized the danger of subversive groups here, and the Dies committee has worked long and is now working daily to identify this "fifth column." Chairman VINSON has already introduced a bill to close our doors to immigration during this war. A bill will be introduced this week to greatly increase antiaircraft defense and also our military and naval air forces. Congress seems determined to have this country prepared.

I believe that we should begin the construction of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal at once. Any interference with the Panama Canal might seriously interfere with the mobility of our fleet, and as now constructed the Panama Canal barely permits the clearance of our largest battleships, the Canal being only 2 feet wider than the width of the ships of the largest class.

I am sure the people of our district appreciate your patriotic and wise movement to bring this subject to the attention of thoughtful citizens.

I hope and pray that America will be spared from war, but I believe that our best insurance is prepardness.

Sincerely,

A. SIDNEY CAMP.

New Veterans' Hospital Authorized for Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1940

LETTER FROM BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt recognized the need for additional hospital facilities to accommodate the many thousands of war veterans in Pennsylvania, when on May 9 he approved in principle the report of the Federal Board of Hospitalization which included a new Veterans' Administration facility consisting of 400 general hospital beds and 784 domiciliary beds in the Pennsylvania area.

The action of the Chief Executive is made known in the following letter received from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Chairman, Federal Board of Hospitalization:

MAY 14, 1940.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the program of future construction for the Veterans' Administration for accomplishment from year to year within the period of the next 10 years, recommended by the Federal Board of Hospitalization to the President and approved in principle by the President on May 9, there is included a new Veterans' Administration facility, consisting of 400 general hospital beds and 784 domiciliary beds, in the Pennsylvania area.

Immediate consultation is contemplated with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to determine upon how funds may best be made available to undertake necessary preliminary work, such as the selection of site and preparation of plans.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Chairman.*

Civil Aeronautics Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when the Civil Aeronautics Authority bill was pending before it, it was the duty of every member to determine whether the administration over aviation would rest in the Department of Commerce, where it was, or to determine and create a new agency known as the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

A great discussion arose as to who and what department was best fitted for its supervision and its regulation.

We were all familiar with what was happening to aviation at the time the proposal was made to Congress for a change in the administration of those by departmental interference over this industry—interference manifested for power of control over aviation.

The Government has had a hand in practically every step of this industry from its beginning to where it is today.

The first air-mail routes were operated by the Government. Later private companies carried the mail under substantial subsidies, and every Member of Congress is very familiar with the scandals that followed. Following these scandals the public was aroused and demanded of this administration that proper steps be taken to safeguard this industry, yet in its infancy, from its shameful surroundings. Then the Government tried carrying the mails again by placing Army pilots with Army planes, and we know the results of what happened.

Finally, a complete reorganization was proposed, and on Tuesday, March 10, 1938, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee met to consider and hold hearings on bill H. R. 9733, to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of these hearings my mind was made up to place the Authority of Civil Aviation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, a Commission dealing with the problems of carriers and a Commission that has proven through the years of its capability; its personnel is of the highest type to be found in any Government department. But knowing of its many problems that is was confronted with, especially with new legislation created for the purpose of truck and bus regulation, that this Commission had its hands full, and therefore felt the need of a new agency to deal with aviation.

In the testimony presented by Clinton M. Hester, Assistant General Counsel, Treasury Department, he states:

Before discussing the provisions of this legislation I wish to preface my remarks with a brief outline of the circumstances surrounding its presentation to this committee in its present form.

At the last session of the Congress there were pending several bills dealing with the subject of civil aviation. Because of this fact the Interdepartmental Committee, consisting of Assistant Secretaries of six executive departments—State, War, Navy, Post Office, Commerce, and Treasury—was established last fall for the purpose of studying these bills and making such recommendations thereon to the Congress as the Committee might deem advisable.

The Interdepartmental Committee held hearings for 2 months, during which representatives of every phase of the aviation industry appeared and testified concerning the type of civil aviation legislation that should be recommended. At the conclusion of these hearings the Interdepartmental Committee embodied its recommendations in the form of a bill which it submitted to Representative LEA for his consideration.

Under its provision air lines operating in interstate, overseas, and foreign commerce would be required to obtain certificates of convenience and necessity from the Authority, and the Authority would be authorized to regulate the rates and other practices of such air lines.

The bill would cancel existing air-mail contracts and authorize the air lines to carry mail under certificates of convenience and necessity issued by the new Authority.

To this new agency would be transferred all the powers relating to civil aeronautics which are now exercised by the Department of Commerce, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Post Office Department, with the exception of certain postal functions, which would be retained by the Post Office Department.

The functions to be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the new agency are those relating to the safety regulation of commercial and private flying and the fixing of the rates for carriage of air mail.

Mr. Speaker, there were many fine provisions provided for in this bill, that has helped aviation since the Civil Aeronautics Authority was created. Under the set-up of this act, aviation was lifted out of the terrible mess it was in, and has accomplished an outstanding record for civil aviation of any agency of the Federal Government under this administration.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Authority we know who is doing the job. We, of the Democratic Party, can look with pride of its fine manner under which it has functioned for the past 2 years, for experiences of the past demonstrate the utter failure of the plan proposed here, under the Reorganization Plan No. IV.

There is no question in my mind that selfishness of departmental heads has ill-advised the President, for if my memory serves me right, it was the Administration that wanted the Civil Aeronautics Authority created. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with administrative leaders that now want to abolish this outstanding agency that has proved its worth to civil aviation.

Public Works Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ADDRESS BY RAY C. KIRKPATRICK

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ray C. Kirkpatrick, assistant on Labor Relations, Public Works Administration, Federal Works Agency, convention of the Florida State Federation of Labor, Daytona Beach, Fla., April 9, 1940:

As assistant on Labor Relations for the Public Works Administration, I bring you the personal greetings of Mr. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and Col. E. W. Clark, Acting Commissioner of the Public Works Administration. They desire for you a most successful convention.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be here today, and to tell you briefly something about the Public Works Administration. Further, it is entirely appropriate that I speak to you of this agency for, after full consideration is given to its broad range of objectives and accomplishments it must still be concluded that the P. W. A. was formed as an emergency measure designed to assist the workingman in general, and the building trades in particular.

A moment's reflection will, I believe, serve to demonstrate this idea. You will recall the universal distress experienced by all classes of our society when, in 1933, the legislation forming this agency was enacted. Farmers, industrialists, merchants—everyone felt the fear and stringency of the period. All economic activity languished and the industrial machine faltered seriously. Money was scarce, particularly among those of the lower income brackets; construction of any nature was rare; and hunger and extreme want were common. The present progressive administration, under the direction of President Roosevelt, realized the seriousness of the emergency and undertook forceful measures in an effort to overcome the more pressing problems.

It was appreciated that true corrective measures must begin with those in greatest need. Therefore plans were formulated whereby the destitute and hungry could be given necessities immediately and a means of securing an appropriate standard of living in the future. To that great class of our people termed "consumers" there had to be restored adequacy of purchasing power. With this accomplished, a base would be established upon which true recovery could be founded.

The immediate needs were alleviated through direct relief and made-work projects. An additional plan was then prepared whereby employment could be created on a scale sufficiently broad to be effective, and in such a manner that the efforts of those thus employed would contribute to, rather than burden, society. The purpose of these efforts was to aid in restoring the national purchasing power and thereby, with other means, to initiate a national recovery.

The latter plan was put into operation when the Public Works Administration was established in 1933 and authorized to embark upon the largest program of public construction ever entrusted to a single agency. Powered by an initial appropriation of $3,330,000,000, P. W. A. was charged with encouraging widespread public construction. The program was introduced in two phases—Federal and non-Federal. Under the first, projects such as the construction of navy-yard facilities, Army barracks, Federal prisons, the dredging of navigable streams, and works of a similar nature were undertaken. Further construction was initiated on those huge reclamation projects desirable for the welfare of the Nation, yet too large to be undertaken by private interests. Typical of these are the Grand Coulee Dam, Shasta Dam, and the All-American Canal.

The non-Federal phase of the program was of a different nature. Here an opportunity was given public bodies everywhere to construct schools, highways, sewers, hospitals, or any other project that was desired and needed by the local group to be served. Under this phase participation was encouraged by giving to the public bodies funds not to exceed 30 percent of the cost of labor and materials. It was necessary that all construction be approved as to need, type of construction, utility, and design. Long-term loans at reasonable interest rates were also made available where appropriate. Subsequent legislation by Congress in later years increased the grant to not in excess of 45 percent of costs.

Three factors were outstanding concerning this program. First, it created a large amount of on-site work under desirable working conditions. Second, industry was stimulated because of the tremendous amounts of materials required. In the early part of the program P. W. A. material orders constituted over three-fourths of the total output in some industries. Third, the projects were of a permanent nature designed to serve this and future generations. Through your personal experience, I am sure you are aware that these projects are sound in construction, utilitarian in purpose, and beautiful in design. I refer you to the Life magazine dated April 1, 1940, for illustrations of over 50 of these P. W. A. projects. Gentlemen, expending of funds for such purposes is more than mere "pump priming."

This program was of particular interest to our 3,000,000 skilled building craftsmen. These men had participated in the boom building period between 1922 and 1930, during which time construction costing on an average over $10,000,000,000 annually was accomplished. Strangled by the depression, this annual figure had dwindled in 1933 to less than a third of that of the peak year. As a natural consequence, it follows that less than a third of the building-trades craftsmen were working with any degree of regularity. I am sure you will remember these trying times.

When the Government embarked upon an extensive program of public-works construction, therefore, the building trades were markedly affected. The plan was particularly attractive because construction was to be prosecuted under the normal contract method, and all workmen were to be employed at prevailing rates of pay and under favorable working conditions. Although preference was granted to those men on relief rolls, union locals were designated as proper referral agencies, and with the agencies of the United States Employment Service provided the only sources from which men could be obtained.

This program proved very popular. From July 1933 to March 1939, P. W. A. aided in the construction of 35 percent of the Nation's hospitals and allied public-health facilities, 65 percent of all courthouses, city halls, and other nonresidential public buildings; 65 percent of all sewage-treatment plants; and 70 percent of all education buildings.

You will undoubtedly be interested in learning the extent to which Florida has participated in this program. As of March 1, 1940, 231 projects had been or were being constructed by local public bodies in your State, estimated to cost $40,126,020; 73 of these projects were educational buildings, and 79 of the remaining were sewers, waterworks, or power facilities. An outstanding example of local improvement under this program is the construction of your great bridge-highway system across the keys.

In addition, there have been, or are being, constructed in Florida 285 projects estimated to cost $26,000,882 under the Federal program. This phase of P. W. A. is financed entirely by the Federal Government and is responsible in this State for such works as the flood-control project at Lake Okeechobee, extensive construction at the Pensacola air station, numerous Coast Guard stations, and the conservation program being conducted in the Everglades.

In all, 516 projects estimated to cost $66,326,902 have been constructed in Florida by the Public Works Administration. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has determined that 35.8 percent of the money spent for labor and materials on these projects is received in wages. This program has, therefore, placed approximately $22,000,000 in the pockets of Florida workmen. The figure is particularly impressive in light of a further study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which disclosed that, for every man-hour of work created on the site of a Public Works Administration project, 2½ man-hours of work are necessary to provide the required materials. It may be safely said, therefore, the P. W. A. program in Florida has resulted in the creation of approximately $50,000,000 in wages.

The Public Works Administration is now being liquidated. Because of the lack of funds, it has been necessary to return some 96 applications for grants to assist in the construction of additional projects in Florida, estimated to cost $43,552,982.

There are now pending in Congress bills to perpetuate in various forms the purposes of this administration. Notable among these is Senate bill No. 3589, introduced by Senator ANDREWS, of this State, which provides for an appropriation of $300,000,000 to be loaned to public bodies to assist in the construction of public-health and educational projects, and facilities for recreation and the handling and storage of farm products.

The outcome of this and the other proposed legislation is not known, but, regardless of the future, we who are connected with P. W. A. take great satisfaction in its splendid accomplishments and in the knowledge that a means has been determined whereby depressions can be overcome through cooperative efforts of the Federal, State, and local Governments.

Thirty Millions of Dollars for Home Financing Purposes in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

LETTER FROM STEWART McDONALD

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Honorable Stewart McDonald, Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration, and the summary of operations of that agency in the Fifth Congressional District of Kansas, broken down by counties, through the close of the year 1939:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 29, 1940.

The Honorable JOHN M. HOUSTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOUSTON: The semiannual summary of F. H. A. operations reveals that 24,818 families in Kansas have received loans of $30,405,650.26 for home-financing purposes. These loans were made by private lending institutions and had been insured by the Federal Housing Administration as of the close of business December 31, 1939.

Of this amount, 17,169 families obtained $5,392,633.26 in order to improve, repair, and remodel their properties under the property-improvement provisions of title I of the National Housing Act.

In addition, F. H. A. insured loans totaled $25,013,017 in Kansas for the purpose of financing home ownership for 7,649 families.

At the present time approximately 12,000,000 people in the United States are receiving the benefits of the F. H. A. program.

The F. H. A. insured mortgage has been a most instrumental factor in developing new home construction, the year 1939 breaking all records in volume of loans insured. The 1940 volume thus far exceeds even last year and I feel confident in forecasting that 1940 will show the greatest small-home building program since 1927.

If you desire, I shall be very glad to send you a further summary of F. H. A. operations in Kansas, broken down by counties through the close of the year 1939.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART McDONALD,
Administrator.

Volume of Federal Housing Administration insuring operations, by counties, Kansas

[Net cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1939]

County	Title I. Property Improvement Loans Insured		Title II. Small Home Mortgages Accepted for Insurance		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
McPherson	89	$31,882.75	103	$345,400	192	$377,282.75
Harvey	115	40,373.95	64	168,550	179	208,923.95
Butler	184	80,759.86	142	379,550	326	460,309.86
Sedgwick	2,212	690,880.53	1,364	5,056,455	3,576	5,737,335.53
Sumner	187	56,161.68	28	93,500	215	149,661.68
District total	2,787	890,058.77	1,701	6,043,455	4,488	6,933,513.77

Arm Our Army at Once

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

ARM OUR ARMY AT ONCE

(An Editorial)

Perhaps there are Americans who think they have something tangible to show for the eight and one-half billion dollars spent on national defense in the last 10 years. They are wrong. If our Army were to be subjected to such a test as the armies of Europe are meeting today we should suffer a defeat which would be as prompt as it would be ignominious and humiliating.

Little Belgium is far better prepared to meet an invader than we are. We couldn't stand off a first-class power on land for a week. We have a population of 130,000,000, and the greatest industrial organization the world has ever known, but our factories could not begin to produce the necessary supplies for an army in a year, and by that time they would not be our factories.

An overstatement? An exaggeration? Well, an army needs rifles. The sluggish minds of the Ordnance Department finally decided 30 years too late that an automatic rifle was desirable. We ought to have equipment for half a million men, at least. The Army staff, in fact, is reckoning on an army of a million at the start of a war. We haven't enough of the new rifles to keep even a division supplied with them. At last reports there were fewer than 8,000 of the guns available, and the quantity is being increased by no more than a few hundred a month. It is still far from certain that the new gun is nearly as good as the bureaucrats say it is, but whether it is good or not so good, this country didn't get a supply of modern rifles for its eight and one-half billions.

Our lack of modern artillery is even more appalling. Practically speaking, we haven't any. Such cannon as we have would be outranged and put out of action in a few days if not in a few hours of such fighting as is now being seen in Europe. We didn't get artillery for our eight and one-half billions.

In antiaircraft weapons our deficiency is even more glaring. We have about 50 high-grade guns of 3-inch caliber which were obsolete before they were issued. We have perhaps a dozen modern weapons of heavier caliber. And that's all. We didn't get antiaircraft defense for our eight and one-half billions.

If there is anything to be learned from the war in Europe it is the military value of airplanes. In this department we are hopelessly outclassed. The Army today has only 2,700 planes and of these all but 52 large bombers are regarded as obsolete. They would have been all right in the last war or even 5 years ago, but they would be outfought by the speedier and better armed types which are now flying over Belgium and Holland. We didn't get an air force for our eight and one-half billions.

And so it goes. Perhaps we have enough flags and bugles, but we are woefully short of arms and much of what we have is so inferior in quality as to be negligible. As matters stand today, we are a push-over for any first-class military power which can effect a landing on our shores.

There is, of course, the Navy, but nobody can feel certain that it is able to withstand the kind of punishment which a navy must take in the 1940 kind of war. It may well be true that most of it is obsolete and that the cost of rebuilding the ships to meet modern weapons of attack would be so great as to warrant scrapping the whole fleet and starting anew.

A distrust of the designers and builders of our ships appears to be shared by the Secretary of the Navy himself. Mr. Edison permitted himself to say the other day that he would like to get some civilian brains to assist in the planning of the ships. He could use some, too, in supervising construction in the hope that endless delays would be avoided.

In the world in which we live our country should be strong. In fact, it is grotesquely weak, unprepared, wholly unequal to the tasks which a cautious diplomacy would impose upon it, and our diplomacy is not cautious.

We have paid a fabulous price for next to nothing. We issue grandiose proclamations telling the rest of the world what to do and what not to do, but we haven't the means to enforce our will and we are at the mercy of any first-class nation which calls for a showdown.

The situation demands prompt and thoroughgoing correction. The monopoly of the ordnance officers and the Navy constructors should be broken. The Army and Navy should tell the manufacturers of this country what it wants by way of performance and then leave it to the engineering brains of the country to devise the weapons and to the industries of the country to build them.

The advice of competent men not on the active list should be solicited not occasionally but constantly and followed. Such men as Rickenbacker, Lindbergh, and Al Williams have repeatedly warned the Army and Navy of the extent and power of the German air force, but the warning was long unheeded. In truth, these three men and a few more like them have more knowledge and experience in the field of aviation than is possessed by the entire bureaucracy, and their judgment and advise are correspondingly valuable. In common sense their recommendations should be set up as a guide. Otherwise, we shall continue to spend immense sums for planes and still be unready for war.

America is unprepared and each day finds us falling further behind. We are rich, and fat, and feeble. The confidence of Congress in the ability of our armed services to provide us with an adequate apparatus of defense has been misplaced. The time has come for a radical shaking up and shaking out of the uniformed bureaucracy in Washington. The national danger can be averted only if an aroused country demands from the playboy in the White House the housecleaning which is long overdue.

The Real Agricultural "Merry-Go-Round"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before Congress adjourns legislation should be passed which will be a permanent solution of our agricultural problem. We should not continue from year to year with ill-considered, makeshift legislation, much of which actually is detrimental to our farmers. Agriculture has been used as a political football. It is our basic industry and we shall never have a prosperous condition until we have prosperous agriculture.

The agricultural legislation which has been passed under the New Deal appears so much at cross purposes that I cannot help but feel that millions upon millions of dollars are being wasted each year, these millions being expended largely because of the conflicts of New Deal legislation and activities without producing real benefits to agriculture.

First, Congress appropriates about $500,000,000 a year for controlling agricultural production through the Agriculture Department. The average farmer received very limited amounts of this money.

Second, Congress appropriates over $200,000,000 a year to cut out and control production by parity payments; these parity payments go to cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco farmers. Many States have never seen a dollar of this money. Ten States received over one-half of this money. Texas alone received 27 percent of this money in 1 year. Cotton farmers received 45 percent of the total money set aside for parity.

Third. Congress appropriates over $100,000,000 a year to increase farm production by the Farm Security Administration, which subsidizes new farmers and sets them up in the farming business.

Fourth. Congress appropriates over $100,000,000 a year to take the farm surpluses off the market.

Fifth. Congress continues to appropriate and provide $100,000,000 to put more land under irrigation for the purpose of growing more crops and increasing the surpluses so more appropriations will be needed for control of the surpluses.

Sixth. The President reduced the tariff on farm products to an extent where over $4,000,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products were imported during the last 7 years, at an average of over $500,000,000 worth each year.

In short (1) we appropriate millions of dollars to increase production by putting new farms into production. (2) We appropriate more millions to cut out and control the production which we have already appropriated millions to increase; and then, (3) we appropriate more millions of dollars to take the surpluses off the market, for which, we appropriate millions to increase; and finally, (4) we lowered the tariff thereby allowing the importation of billions of dollars worth of agricultural products. This does not make sense. The farmers have had $3,000,000,000 in subsidies by the New Deal. They lost $4,000,000,000 worth of markets by imports. Their share of the increased debt is $6,000,000,000, which they will have to repay, with interest, when the great day of reckoning comes.

Year by year, month by month, and day by day, we see these follies in Congress. Last year while the Surplus Commodies Corporation was spending $30,000,000 of public money in buying up and giving away surplus commodities we imported $92,000,000 of the same commodities from foreign countries. Would the taxpayers of any county in America reelect county officials who spent $100,000 to take productive land out of production in the north end of their county and at the same time spend another $100,000 to bring a lot of unproductive land into production in the southern end of their county, and at the same time made it possible to have sent into their county great quantities of farm products which take away the markets of their farmers?

This seems to be a real agricultural merry-go-round and a real run-around for the taxpayers of America.

"We Will Go Up or Down Together; Ours Is a Common Destiny"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., AT THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION AT LITTLE ROCK, ARK., ON MAY 11, 1940

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Republican leader of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., delivered at the Republican State convention, Little Rock, Ark., May 11, 1940:

It is an honor I deeply appreciate to be asked to address this convention. As a representative of New England I welcome this opportunity to bring a message to the people of the South.

I come to the glamorous and hospitable Southland not as a citizen of another section alien in interests and ideals to your own. I come to you as one of you; as a fellow American; as one of a united people, to talk over with you our common problems.

I say I come to you as one of your own, because in this day when free constitutional government is threatened we must stand as one nation. We must stand as one people united, as we stood back in the days when the boys of the South marched away shoulder to shoulder with the boys of the North to the battles of the Spanish-American War. We must stand united in this battle to preserve States' rights, and to maintain our liberties and our privileges enshrined in the constitutional Bill of Rights, as we stood united when the boys of the South and the boys

of the North sailed away together to spill their blood on the battlefields of Europe, believing—mistakenly, it is sad to say—but believing they were upholding their ideal of making the world safe for democracy. As we stood united then, in helping to fight a war which we believed was a war to end all wars, so must we now stand united, the people of the South and the people of the North, you of Arkansas and we of Massachusetts, in the determination that we shall not again permit our Nation to become involved in alien wars; that the boys of the South and the boys of the North shall not again march away together to sail overseas to fight in foreign conflicts and to spill their blood in vain.

This splendid gathering of Republicans is impressive. Time was, undoubtedly, when it required great moral courage, and passionate devotion to an ideal, to be a Republican in Arkansas. A singular evolution has come about. Today the Republican Party actually is closest to the ideals of Jefferson. The Republican Party is fighting to preserve States' rights against the encroachments of a great and arrogant political bureaucracy at Washington. You of the South, like us of the North, face a dark menace—a sinister threat to our liberties—in that great political bureaucracy. It has sent its tentacles creeping into every nook and corner of this land like some great octopus preparing to crush every vestige of liberty and privilege out of the people and to suck dry the substance of our citizens.

It is needless for me to remind you today that under the greatest, freest, most enlightened government ever devised by the mind of man, the powers granted under the Constitution to the Federal Government are strictly limited, and were meant to be so. All those powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people.

The true purpose and function of government was well described by the great philosopher, Spinoza, in the 1600's when he said:

"The last end of the state is not to dominate men, nor to restrain them by fear; rather it is so to free each man from fear that he may live and act with full security and without injury to himself or his neighbor. The end of the state, I repeat is not to make rational beings into brute beasts and machines. It is to enable their bodies and their minds to function safely. It is to lead men to live by, and to exercise, a free reason; that they may not waste their strength in hatred, anger, and guile, nor act unfairly toward one another. Thus the end of the state is really liberty."

That is the kind of government, Mr. Chairman, the people of Arkansas and the South want. That is the kind of government Massachusetts and New England want. That is the kind of government the Middle West and the far West want. And, please, God, it is the kind of government we are going to continue to have in this country!

We dare not ignore the implications of the threat which faces us. They were well set forth by Eugene Lyons in his description of conditions in Russia, when he said:

"Absolutism at the top implies hundreds of thousands, even millions, of large and small autocrats in a State that monopolizes all means of life and expression, work and pleasure, rewards and punishments. A centralized autocratic rule must function through a human machine of delegated authority; a pyramid of graded officialdom; each layer subservient to those above and overbearing to that below. * * * Where there is only one employer, namely, the state, meekness is the first law of economic survival. Where the same group of officials wields the terrible powers of secret arrests and punishments, disfranchisement, hiring and firing, assignments of ration categories and living space—only an imbecile or someone with a perverted taste for martyrdom will fail to kowtow to them."

The people of New England want no such government as that. The Arkansas of the Conways, of Walker, of the Cumminses, of the Yells, of Ashley, of Sevier, of Ringo, Fowler, Drew, Pike, Johnson, Miller, and the other illustrious men who in their day put their brand upon history and helped to establish this great free Nation, will have none of that sort of bureaucracy. The South of Robert E. Lee will have none of that kind of bureaucratic government. The West, which that great citizen from my State, Albert W. Pike, helped to explore and develop, will have none of that kind of government.

Neither the people of the South nor the people of the North want to be educated, entertained, or supported by a political bureaucracy.

They don't want to be told what kind of furnaces they shall use in their cellars; how to raise their children. They do not want to be directed as to what they shall or shall not read, hear, see, wear, or eat. They desire none of these things from a Federal bureaucracy at Washington.

It was through steadfast devotion to ideals of liberty that our forefathers established this great Nation on enduring foundations. Steadfast devotion to ideals of liberty made possible all the real progress civilization has ever known.

I sincerely believe you in the South who fight for the Republican Party today are making a mighty contribution not only to the cause of genuine Americanism, but to the welfare of the South as well.

You are the torch bearers of a new era which must eventually dawn in the South. No one can deny that the South would be better off if there were two strong parties. Too long you have been taken for granted. Too long the South has been regarded as a sectional vassal of a political party. Too long the favors and the benefits have gone to those sections which had to be wooed and won, because the solid South was always counted upon to march to the polls and vote the ticket straight, whether she was abused or not; whether she got any benefits or not; whether she received her just dues or not.

No real progress can come to any country or to any section unless there is a genuine advancement of the whole people. With competition between two parties, the people get better laws, more honest and efficient administration, more personal liberty, and better government.

It is not pleasant for a boy or girl born south of the Mason and Dixon's line to face the prospect that, no matter how able or brilliant he or she may be, no matter how high in the leadership of their own section they may rise, they are practically barred from ever being President because they live in a one-party area.

Now is the time—a particularly propitious time—for the South to throw off the chains of a one-party system. The policies of the New Deal—impairment of States' rights, the transfer of control from the community to the Federal Government, regimentation, restriction, and confiscation—all those are offensive to you, the descendants of those sturdy pioneers who developed the Southland.

You do not believe in squandering the assets of the Nation.

You do not want the Federal Government to control and dominate the business life of this Nation.

You do not have to continue to give blind loyalty to a group that has wandered completely away from the principles endorsed by you and your forefathers.

It is a grave decision the men and women of the South are compelled to make. I think there is no question but that after careful study their choice will be for America. They will join the patriotic band of Republicans and Democrats who will unite this year to save this Nation.

The question confronting us all is not so much whether the Democrats or the Republicans will win, but whether America shall be kept American. Alien philosophies which would poison the very life blood of our Nation are finding expression and exercising force in the activities of the bureaucrats. These alien isms must be stamped out of this Nation for all time. America must be safeguarded against "Trojan horses."

The saving of America presents the greatest challenge to our patriotism we have ever faced. It overshadows all narrow partisanship, sectionalism, class hatreds, and suspicions.

We have seen how Europe is constantly in war and turmoil because of ancient prejudices and grievances. We must not permit such a spirit to continue in America. The North, the South, the East, and the West, all have a vital interest in the preservation and upbuilding of our country. The South cannot prosper except that we in the North must benefit. Conversely, the North cannot prosper without benefiting the South. We will go up or down together. Ours is a common destiny.

It was because of this deep sense of our interest in your problems that the Republican agricultural study committee, composed of representatives appointed to study all phases of agricultural problems, has given special attention to the difficulties and possibilities of Southern agriculture. One very interesting and extended meeting was held in Dallas, Tex., last December 8 and 9, and another was held in Charlotte, N. C., March 1 and 2. Much helpful information came from those meetings.

The South is demanding, and the South is entitled to have, economic equality with the North in industrial and agricultural advancement; in production capacity and in purchasing power; in living levels; in wage levels; in working conditions. The people of the South want, and they are entitled to have, the comforts and luxuries which make life attractive in the North.

The South will never be truly prosperous until her people are on such an economic equality with the North. When that is achieved Northern as well as Southern producers will find a great new market here at home that heretofore never has existed.

The South today, fellow citizens, stands on the threshold of a vast new development which before the advent of modern industrial chemistry was undreamed of. I need not tell you of the tremendous strides being made in the Southern paper-pulp industry, utilizing slash pine as raw material. The development of plastics; synthetic resins; industrial processing of woods and sugarcane fiber; rayon and cellophane; starch from Southern sweetpotatoes; cotton roads; aircraft materials from the farm; soybeans; castor beans; perilla seed; tung oil—a great number of new farm products possible because of the favorable conditions in the South—will create for you new industries, new crops, new sources of revenues, new markets.

The South is not merely a one-crop country. Cotton is no longer king. You are standing on the threshold of a new era coming with the aid of the new science of farm chemurgy. It will completely overshadow your present cotton industry and bring to you riches hitherto unforeseen, revenue to free you from the shackles of economic want and insecurity, and open to you the doors of plenty and prosperity.

Many of your most serious social problems are rooted in economic causes, just as the most serious social problems of the whole Nation and of the whole world are rooted in economic causes.

Your social and economic problems are our problems. Time was, for instance, when cotton was considered exclusively a southern crop and a southern problem. Today with the Government owning 6,700,000 bales of cotton, and with the Commodity Credit Corporation having outstanding loans of nearly $127,000,000 on 2,683,000 more bales, we in the North are in the cotton business with you, whether we like it or not.

Take peanuts, one of your great crops. You folks, of course, are aware that this crop is protected by a tariff of 7 cents a pound, enacted under a Republican administration. Your principal competitive producers are India and China. Those two countries, according to recent market reports, were selling their peanuts on the British markets at 50 percent below the price you folks in the South are obtaining for your peanuts. That 7 per hundred pounds tariff protection absolutely gives you the United States market for your peanuts and protects your $50,000,000 a year industry. Therefore, we Republicans are in the peanut business with you. Peanuts are a Republican crop.

Some insist the South has fared well from the standpoint of governmental relief, both general and agricultural. Of course, we all agree that in times of depression such relief as is necessary to prevent suffering ought to be, and must be, provided; but I am sure I speak your sentiments as well as mine when I say the South does not want to be permanently on governmental relief. The South will never consent to be a pauperized section, depending upon the whims and the favors of a political bureaucracy at Washington for existence. The South can be provided with new crops, new industries, and new markets to replace her lost cotton markets. Those markets can be developed to absorb the products of the South at fair prices; your people can be put to work in industry at good American wages. When your people are given their fair economic chance, they will not require, they will not want, and they will not accept governmental relief.

The people of the South always have been a proud people; proud of their honor, and their courage, and their thrift, and their self-reliance, and their initiative, and their vision. And I say the people of the South, throughout the 10 years of our great depression, have lost not one bit of that commendable pride. With an equal chance and a fair field, you will not fail to give a good account of yourselves.

We must uphold, both in the South and in the North, the principle that the States are supreme within the rights they have never surrendered.

The South has a destiny to help save this Nation from the encroachments of this Federal bureaucracy. This is so because you still do things—you are still progressing—in terms of home rule.

That great exponent of the South, Henry W. Grady, of Georgia, once came to Boston, in my State, and said something at a banquet that has always struck me with great force. It was this:

"Far to the South, Mr. President, separated from this section by a line, once defined in irrepressible difference, once traced in blood, and now, thank God, but a vanishing shadow, lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people.

"There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the Temperate Zone. There, by night, the cotton whitens beneath the stars; and, by day, the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf. In the same fields the clover steals the fragrance of the wind and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains. There are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forests, vast and primeval; and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea."

This, my fellow citizens, has always been to me one of the most beautiful descriptions of the Southland.

I should like to feel that today I am returning Henry Grady's visit, and I should like to add in my simple words my own estimate of the South:

Land where the beauty of her womanhood is alike an inheritance and an art; land where the honor of her manhood is more prized than any other human accomplishment; land where liberty is dearer than life itself; land where culture, spiritual values—the finer, the nobler, the more beautiful qualities of life—mean more than all material possessions. That is the land where we may expect to find, unpolluted, untarnished, vigorous, vibrant, and alive that spirit of Americanism, that love of freedom, that sense of the values of the human soul, and of individual liberty which will ever hold aloft the torch of freedom on the continent of North America.

The Work of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, at no time were the American people so interested or concerned with what is going on in Washington as they are today. But few of them are aware of the duties and obligations which a Congressman must shoulder while in Washington.

The legal requirements for a Representative are that he be 25 years of age, a citizen of the United States for 7 years, and a resident of the State in which he is elected. There are 435 Representatives, apportioned among the 48 States according to population. All are elected every 2 years.

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and work his way up. No man should be elected to the House for a frivolous reason or simply to gratify his desires, because a Congressman's work is hard and his hours of work are long. The oath of office is administered to him on January 3, the day prescribed by the Constitution for the annual meeting of Congress. He hears the Speaker intone these words:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

From that moment the new Congressman feels he has become part of our country and is writing its history. Preceding generations have left his people a heritage of freedom and independence which he must protect and preserve.

The drafting of bills, both private and general, and serious study of legislation introduced, requires the Congressman's constant attention. There are over 15,000 bills pending in Congress today. We have bills to revise the calendar, bills to authorize the President to proclaim a day of fasting and prayer, bills for anniversary celebrations, bills to pay pensions, bills to provide rotation of daylight saving, bills to take over relics and historical sites, and bills which seek to give employment to every person in the United States through various schemes or devices.

Sometimes it seems as if a Congressman has become nothing but a glorified office boy. He is called upon as a bill finder, a getter-out of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, a law explainer, issue translator, resolution interpreter, business promoter, veterans' affairs adjuster, recoverer of lost baggage; so that a Congressman is finding it harder each day to consider legislation, because of the many side issues which take his attention. But his main duty is to study legislation, and this work must be done above all things.

Now that the Federal Government has taken on so many new duties, has established so many bureaus and commissions, it has further handicapped the Congressman as a legislator. He is kept busy calling on different departments of government. For example, if someone is not satisfied with the W. P. A., the Congressman is asked to investigate the matter; if someone does not like the set-up of any other relief work or Government agency, the Congressman is asked to check into the matter; if a businessman does not get a Government contract, he wants the Congressman to look into it; if anybody wants a job of any kind in any part of the United States, the Congressman, although powerless to help, is again called upon.

The mail which comes into the Congressman's office is very heavy. Some Representatives have received over 1,000 letters and telegrams in 1 day. Let us take a typical day of a Congressman in Washington. After the mail is looked over and replies have been dictated, which takes a good portion of the morning, the Congressman hustles around for weighty conferences with Government officials, attends committee meetings, keeps appointments with constituents. Usually the House meets at noon, so that the afternoon is spent on the floor of the House, where the Congressman must watch with an eagle eye what takes place. He must act on the legislation being considered and be able to stand at a moment's notice to refute or support a statement. He must be ready to meet any challenge or threat which is made against the rights of his constituents. This leaves the Congressman an evening of work at his office preparing speeches and legislative matters. Yet, the Congressman must appear ready and willing and tireless for any social duties. A Congressman is expected to be present at all important Government functions; he must attend all sorts of meetings and is expected to give timely, informative talks on current issues. But, regardless of the heavy labor involved, practically every Congressman prefers this work to any job he has ever had and will not relinquish his duties as a Representative without a terrific fight.

A very important factor which governs a Representative's standing in the House, one which few people are aware of, is that of duration of service. A Congressman's long service not only gives him experience and prestige with the membership of the House but it acquaints him with every branch and bureau of the Government, as well as with the heads of the departments and the leaders in the various bureaus with which he has to deal. A Member attains high rank on committees provided he can put in several terms of continuous service. If an old Member is defeated in one election and then is returned to the House in a following Congress, he must again start at the bottom of his committees. The Honorable Champ Clark, a former Speaker of the House, had this to say about Members in Congress:

> The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

In a memorial oration before the two Houses in commemoration of the life and death of James A. Garfield, Senator Blaine said:

> There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or the failures of beginners. What a man gains in the House he gains by sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule and where no pretense can deceive and no glamour can mislead. The real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irreversibly decreed.

American citizens are likely to forget or treat lightly the privileges of our Republic, because they receive them so easily the day they are born or obtain citizenship. But remember some of our fellow men in Europe had this right only a few years ago, and now they mark only ghost ballots, or no ballots at all. We shall retain our rights as free citizens only so long as we guard them intelligently.

To exercise our privileges as citizens in one of the few countries where freedom still has a genuine meaning; we should understand how our Government functions, and how our laws are made.

Let us follow a bill from the time it is drafted to the time it becomes a law. A Representative can introduce a bill on any subject, but it is well to note that important bills, such as tax bills and reform measures, are usually written by the members of the majority party on the respective House committees. It has been stated that during the last six or seven years many of the so-called reform measures were written at the White House. After a Congressman has drafted the bill and is satisfied that it meets all legal and technical objections, he introduces the bill by putting it in the "hopper" at the Clerk's desk. No speech is made at the time of introduction, except that a Congressman might ask unanimous consent to speak for a short time, to advise the House that he has introduced a certain bill. After the bill is introduced, it is usually referred to the proper committee by the Parliamentarian of the House, and the bill is given a number by the chief bill clerk. There are approximately 48 committees to which different bills are referred and each one of these committees specializes in some phase of modern legislation.

The bill is printed at the Government Printing Office, which, incidentally, is the largest printing plant in the world. This office prints Government publications, committee hearings, reports, books, pamphlets, and the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains a word-for-word account of all that is said and done in both the House and Senate while Congress is in session. After the committee gets the bill it is considered by the members of that committee. Most of the many thousands of bills that are introduced are tabled or buried in committee and seldom, if ever, heard from again. There is one way in which the bill can be taken from the hands of the committee, and that is through the signing of a discharge petition by 218 Members of the House, but such action rarely happens. All bills are filed in the House document room, and anyone can obtain a copy. If a bill is of some importance to an interested group, they may exert pressure upon Congressmen to get the bill considered, either by hiring professional lobbyists or by sending letters and telegrams urging that action be taken. Normally this pressure means little to Congressmen. When a committee decides to take up a bill it may rewrite or amend it. If the bill is of general importance, usually the name of the chairman of the committee is given to the bill, since he introduces the rewritten legislation. The various committees sometimes decide to hold public hearings on important bills, and interested persons or experts are given an opportunity to present their case for or against the bill. Subcommittees may be appointed who make their recommendations to the full committee for final action. If the committee decides to report the bill to the House, it is referred to the proper calendar. Usually a special rule has to be obtained from the Rules Committee to bring up a bill of major importance for consideration, because the calendar is crowded with hundreds of bills. The leaders of the majority party, who have charge of the House program, then decide when the bill is to come up for consideration. I might mention in this connection that the majority party—now the Democrats—rule the House with an iron hand. Under our system of government the minority party is practically powerless to get any legislation considered or to force action on any measures.

The majority party elects the Speaker. They obtain the majority of the members on each committee in proportion to the number of Members they have in the House. When a bill is brought before the House, it is usually considered in the Committee of the Whole, which permits action with only 100 Members present constituting a quorum instead of the usual quorum of 218. When the House gets ready to pass a bill, one-fifth of the Members may demand a roll call or record vote. Voting machines are not used, and it takes about one-half hour to call the roll of 435 Members and record their votes. If the bill passes the House, it is sent to the proper Senate committee, which considers the bill in a similar manner to the House committee. Like action is taken in the Senate as occurred in the House of Representatives. If the Senate passes the bill in a form which differs from that of the House measure—and I might say that this usually happens—then a conference committee of Senators and Representatives is appointed to iron out any differences. The bill must then be approved by both the House and the Senate, and after such approval it is taken to the President. He can either O. K. the bill or veto it. If the President fails to return the bill to Congress within 10 days it becomes a law without his signature, unless Congress adjourns during that 10-day period, when the unsigned bill is killed by a so-called pocket veto. If the President decides to veto a bill, he sends it back to Congress with a veto message, and the House and Senate can then override his veto by a two-thirds vote. If the President signs the bill, it goes to the Secretary of State, who proclaims it a law.

This is just a short summary of lawmaking, and briefly touches upon the work of a Congressman. But it should give the average person a clearer picture of what confronts his Representative in Washington.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the hour has arrived when our affections, our fears, and our prejudices are to be tested. It has been easy enough to say, "Let us be neu-

tral" so long as the conflict in Europe and the Orient was in a more or less quiescent stage.

We have known—and it has been pointed out in my comments several times—that the time would arrive sooner or later, in all probability, when we would have to meet squarely, face to face, the possibility that the Allies might be defeated. It has also been pointed out that it was entirely within the range of probability that neutral countries would be overrun in this war, neutral cities bombed, neutral innocent and peaceful men, women, and children blown to pieces, or gassed, or riddled with machine-gun bullets. All of these inexpressibly dreadful things have come to pass.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that there should be added to the strain on our sense of neutrality the example of the President of the United States leading the way to unneutral thinking and speaking.

Some of us are old enough to remember that in the campaign of 1916 Woodrow Wilson put a similar emphasis on his determination to keep out of war. We all know what happened.

These sonorous and sweeping declarations against going to war, but approving the use of methods "short of war," are worth little at this time. To be sensible, we should get right down to the unpleasant facts and face them.

Will we continue to support the cash-and-carry policy of the existing Neutrality Act?

Will we approve the release of the latest types of our war planes for sale to the Allies?

Will we permit the Allies to use military appliances such as the American bomb sight and other military secrets?

Will we eventually favor American occupation of Greenland in event of a threat of Nazi seizure?

Are we sooner or later going to occupy Dutch property in the Carribean?

If the Allies run out of money, say 2 years hence, will we forbid further shipment of planes and other supplies, even though a German victory were apparent, or would we weaken and extend them credit?

If Germany continues to win victories, will we repeal the Johnson Act and modify the present Neutrality Act?

If Japan should move in on the Dutch East Indies, and in that way blanket the Philippines, would we remain passive?

What will we do in event of the defeat and subjugation of England and France by Germany?

These are all exceedingly grave questions which we must face, and face now.

There is, however, one outstanding fact that we must constantly keep in view, and it is this:

If our national-defense mechanism is, as we are told, less than 25 percent efficient, both as to size and equipment, quantity and quality, after an expenditure, in the last 7 years, of $8,000,000,000 in direct appropriations, to say nothing of the funds that may have been diverted from other appropriations to military purposes, by Presidential order, are we not, in all common sense, bound to turn to and bring our own national defense up to adequacy instead of thinking of sending either money or men across the seas?

We might just as well recognize the fact now that we are squarely up against the necessity of facing the naked truth, that with a national debt of $45,000,000,000, a national defense said to be less than 25 percent efficient, we may be called upon to assert our traditional position within the zone of the Monroe Doctrine.

Above everything else, every man and woman should face the fact that the most intense strain is going to be put upon our emotions, our sense of justice, of all those principles which make up what we call civilization, because they are all being outraged and trampled under the feet of armies of ruthless, brute force.

We must be on the lookout to guard ourselves against the propaganda that is certain to be loosed upon us in these days when civilization itself seems to be tottering on the edge of the abyss.

We must keep our feet on the ground and our heads clear, and remember that in this materialistic and selfish world our first duty is to the youth of the Nation who must do the fighting and the dying if we should lose our heads and indulge in another attempt to make the world safe for democracy.

Paul V. McNutt's Views on Government and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Detroit, on May 6, at a State-wide democratic rally, Paul V. McNutt made a notable speech outlining his views on the relations between government and business. Reiterating his adherence to the capitalistic system, he indicated his belief that the happiness and prosperity of America lie in the direction of preserving that system and integrating it with the basic objectives of democracy, a real task for the statesmanship of our times. The title of his address was "The Democratic Party and Business."

In Indiana, where Mr. McNutt, as Governor, gave our State the best business administration it ever has had, he is recognized as a man of sound business judgment and broad vision in regard to the application of business principles to the administration of public affairs. His successful management of the State's finances enabled the State to meet every obligation promptly in the darkest night of the depression, including the salaries due to school teachers, whereas in many States the teachers were obliged to go without pay for long periods, and in some of our neighbor Commonwealths the schools had to be closed. He was the sponsor of the Indiana gross income-tax law, which has operated very beneficially in our State. He had the happy faculty of being able to combine a keen realization of the wants and needs of our distressed people with a faithful regard for governmental economy, and the result was that while suffering and distress were amply and sympathetically provided for in Indiana under his administration, he left the State treasury in excellent condition.

Because of the fact that Mr. McNutt is now prominently before the country as a probable Democratic candidate for the Presidency in the event that Mr. Roosevelt chooses not to run, I think his Detroit address will afford citizens of our country an interesting insight of his philosophy as affecting major policies in the relations between government and business and by unanimous consent of the House I present his address for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may know his views. The address referred to was as follows:

We live in an age when both capitalism and democracy are challenged. There are those in Europe, and, indeed, in America, who predict that neither will be able to survive the impact of world forces.

I believe in capitalism and in democracy, and I believe that the political philosophy of the Democratic Party is the only philosophy consistent with both. The United States has repeatedly got into trouble by pursuing a political course which was at variance with the fundamental principles of business in a democratic society. And on every such occasion the American people have turned to the Democratic Party to rescue them from the resulting confusion, chaos, and bewilderment. That is what happened in 1932. And because the question is now raised for reconsideration, I think it is time we looked into the substance of the arguments.

As I see it, the purpose of business in our society is the production of consumers' goods and the distribution of those goods among our 130,000,000 people. It is a tremendous enterprise, running upward now of $70,000,000,000 a year.

In a capitalistic society, this process must be carried on in such a way as to show a profit to the enterprise, and afford employment to the potential consumers of the products of industry. In a capitalistic democracy such as ours, the process must occur in such a manner as to extend as far as possible the advantages of production to the entire community. If business fails in any of these particulars—to make a profit, to afford employment, to extend its benefits widely—there results a serious disruption of our political and economic balance.

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY CITED AS EXAMPLE

In the light of these criteria, let me take for an example the principal industry in this city because it makes a showing that probably cannot be equaled in the entire history of capitalism.

Born in the early years of the century, the automobile industry has grown until it constitutes one-seventh of the Nation's business. In 1939 it sold to the citizens of the United States almost 4,000,000 new motor vehicles. If we include used cars, the total will run approximately to 10,000,000. It has supplied the people of the United States with almost 30,000,000 of the world's 43,000,000 automobiles. This is a magnificent achievement in democracy.

The Federal Trade Commission in its exhaustive study of the automobile industry, has paid high tribute to this accomplishment. "Consumer benefits from competition," it said, "have probably been more substantial than in any other large industry studied by the Commission."

Not often does an industry receive praise of this character from a Government investigating agency.

On the profit and employment side, the record is correspondingly high. More men are kept at work in the various parts of the automobile business than in any other industry in the world. Moreover, the wage record has been good. Throughout the checkered history of the struggle between labor and capital, there has been less trouble over wages here than in most fields of production.

And there have been plenty of profits. One company alone has made a billion dollars in profits in the past 25 years. Another group, under single management, earned a billion dollars during the 7 worst years of the depression. One large concern, producing hundreds of thousands of vehicles annually, has shown a substantial profit for every single year of the depression. Nor are the profits confined to the production end of the industry. Dealers and distributors in 1937 showed an average return of 15 percent on investment, after deducting executive salaries.

It is not too much to say that the automobile industry provides the greatest demonstration in all times of what business can do in a democracy. It has furnished to 75 percent of the people in the land one of the greatest miracles of modern science for the improvement and enjoyment of life. It has done this at a consistent profit to all engaged in the production and distribution, and at a wage level which has made possible widespread consumption of the product by the workers. Progress not only is phenomenal, but steady. Each year there is a better product at lower cost to the consumer with the maintenance of a reasonable level of profit.

The reason for the great record made by Detroit's big industry seems to me to be clear. It has, on the whole, complied with the cardinal principle of capitalism. It has had competition.

You have big companies in this industry. There is nothing wrong with big companies so long as there is competition.

You have millions of dollars combined in a few organizations. There is nothing wrong with combinations of capital so long as there is competition.

MASS PRODUCTION ALL RIGHT IF ACCOMPANIED BY COMPETITION

You have mass production on a gigantic scale. There is nothing wrong with mass production on any scale, so long as there is competition.

The whole theory of private business, as a socially desirable method of production and distribution, is that there will be vigorous, legitimate, effective competition.

Capitalism works so long as goods are produced in as large quantities as possible and distributed as widely as possible at a reasonable profit on the investment. The only possible way in which this can be accomplished is by competition.

It is to insure fair, keen, and effective competition that the Government must exercise some control over business. When there is sufficient regulation to insure this competition, the function of government becomes one of cooperation and encouragement and assistance in the solution of the problems of labor and capital. It must insure collective bargaining and see that labor has a fair chance to get its proportionate share of the profits of industry.

It has been on this basis that the Democratic administration has approached the problems of the depression in an effort to reduce unemployment and help business.

On the whole, its record is one of amazing success. America is well on the road to recovery. We have made tremendous strides. Let us look at some of the facts. We have tackled the curse of unemployment and have reduced the number by half at the end of 7 years.

By putting additional people to work, we have increased the national profits in 7 years by a total of $138,000,000,000. We could pay off the entire national debt of the country which has been accumulating since 1789 and still have a clear profit of $98,000,000,000—a tidy sum even for a rich Nation.

The benefits of this recovery have been distributed widely among workers, farmers, business, and industry. I should like to call your attention to a few comparative earning statements of business and industrial concerns to indicate the progress made in 7 years.

All the corporations in the country which made tax returns in 1932 taken together showed a deficit, before dividend payments totalling nearly $4,000,000,000. After payment of intercorporate dividends and Federal taxes, this deficit exceeded $5,000,000,000. In 1937, the compiled net profit of all corporations was nearly $8,000,000,000—a gain of $12,000,000,000 annually in net profits in the 5-year period. That is progress.

Take a few specific examples selected at random. American Can increased its earnings from 1932 to 1939 from twelve million to twenty-two million annually. After payment of all taxes, Federal and State, this corporation had increased its net earnings from eleven to eighteen million. That is progress.

The Chrysler Corporation boosted its earnings from a deficit of eleven million to a profit of forty-five million in 1939. After all taxes had been paid, it was $48,000,000 better off in 1939 than in 1932. That is progress.

General Foods increased its earnings from twelve million to eighteen million. Taxes didn't eat up all the profits, as is shown by its net after payment of all taxes: ten million in 1932, fifteen million in 1939. Phelps-Dodge went from a four million deficit to a $14,000,000 profit. Sears-Roebuck from a two million deficit to a forty-seven million profit. Du Pont from twenty-seven million to a one hundred and seven million profit. That, too, is progress, according to any theory of prosperity.

VAST INCREASE OF BANK DEPOSITS

A few days ago I received a pamphlet from the Detroit Chamber of Commerce showing a little of what has happened in this city since 1933. Total bank deposits increased from three hundred million in 1933 to nine-hundred million in 1939. The department-store index rose from 64 to 102. Total building from four million to sixty-two million.

The city was far better off than in the boom days before the stock-market crash. More than a hundred thousand more men were at work in 1937 than in 1929. One hundred and thirty million dollars more in wages were paid. A half-billion dollars more materials were bought and processed in 1937 than in 1929. Detroit has reached, after 7 years of the New Deal, an all-time high in wealth, activity, and prosperity. If the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan ever prospered, it has prospered under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party from 1932 to 1940.

There are prophets of doom who predict that America is on the road to communism or socialism. Most of them are in the Republican Party, and, curiously enough, many of them deriving generous profits from the very organizations whose earnings I have just quoted.

Mostly, however, they are to be found in the ranks of Republican candidates seeking office on a platform of terrorizing the American people by false accusations and scurrilous libels. Mr. Dewey thinks we are heading for totalitarianism. Mr. Gannett is sure Roosevelt is a Communist. And Senator TAFT is scared to death because the Democratic administration is completely socialistic. Similar charges have been hurled against every reform movement ever introduced in this country. In the progressive reforms of the early part of the century, the same gloomy predictions were made. The popular election of United States Senators was proclaimed a break-down in our constitutional form of government, and even President Taft declared that the initiative and referendum was taking America straight to socialism. We can readily understand the terrified concern of the current TAFT. It runs in the family.

It's more than that, however. It runs in the party. The Republican Party has always opposed every movement to bring our Government and our economic system into conformity with the major premise of democracy. And it has not hesitated to do so by holding up the bogey man of socialism.

EXPERIENCE WITH COMMUNISM AND STATE SOCIALISM HAS PROVED UNHAPPY

I do not envisage for America a gradual drift toward and final arrival at a system of communism, of State socialism, or State capitalism. There are several varieties of such economically organized States in the world today, and the experience of none of them is such as to induce us to follow its example.

The experience of America, as indeed the experience of all democracies, has been one of synchronizing two systems of economics. We have always had a mixed economy under which the task has been the proper coordination of the principle of government planning with the principle of the free play of economic forces. Theoretical economists can plan out on paper a perfect system under either principle. A political society, however, which could function in such an economic medium would not be a democracy.

It would vary from practically no government at all to complete totalitarianism. No government geared to either theoretically pure economic system has been able to withstand the onslaught of economic forces over an extended period.

Democracy, therefore, represents a political society designed to combine the best elements of a free economic order and a regulated economy. The great hazard involved is that of a house divided against itself, with the forces of government pulling in one direction and the forces of business and commerce pulling in another.

To avoid such a result, farsighted statesmanship is necessary—a statesmanship which can successfully withstand the temptation to withdraw completely from the field of economic regulation and at the same time resist the pressure to regiment and restrict the economic activities of the Nation to a single pattern.

To strike the proper balance at any given time requires vast coordination of effort on the part of Government agencies themselves and the meshing of Government activity with the normal business and industrial machinery of the Nation. Unless this is done with consummate skill, confusion and uncertainty will result on all sides.

SOME MISTAKES DUE TO MISUNDERSTANDING

There have been some mistakes. Business has not always understood government, and government has not always understood business.

On the whole, however, I believe the overwhelmng majority of businessmen recognize the progress that has been made and are willing to cooperate fully in bringing about complete and full prosperity.

The same thing is true with labor. The administration has made good its pledges to labor. It has curbed the abuse of the injunction; it has guaranteed labor's right to organize; it has written into the law of the land the right to collective bargaining.

Here, again, some mistakes have been made. But no one can deny that labor has made more progress under the Democratic administration of the past 7 years than in any other like period of our history.

I believe that both capital and labor will join every other class of American people and show their confidence in the only political party ever to make a sincere, forthright, and effective attack upon the forces that threatened to paralyze this Nation.

When the Republican spokesmen talk about the capitalistic system, they are not talking about what you and I and the average American businessman mean by capitalism at all. And when they yearn for individual initiative and for private enterprise, they no more want a free economic order than the Communists or Socialists who avowedly seek to destroy it.

A STRONG CASE OF NOSTALGIA

There is, in all this Republican tall talk a strong trace of nostalgia. They want the kind of business conditions which we had during those deceptive years of the twenties.

During those years there was no more economic freedom in this country for legitimate, competitive business and industry than there now is in Germany or in Italy or in Russia. Both production and distribution, and both commercial and investment banking were ruled by monopolies and sinister combinations of finance. Labor and consumers were exploited, investors and independent businessmen were helpless. Business was regimented then, but it was not by the Government. It was regimented by powerful groups who "liquidated" nonconformists with a ruthlessness that matches that of any European dictator.

Under this regime, the weakest and most inefficient plants were protected, if they played ball with the monopolies, production was curtailed, and the normal expansion of employment checked. Monopoly and the resulting inflation almost wrecked this country during those years. It was not by a wide margin that we escaped the fate of European nations where monopolistic cartels had followed a similar course of regimentation until a weak and do-nothing Government capitulated and the hope of economic freedom was gone forever. That is the way fascism is born.

In America, the people had too much common sense to become the victim of such a process in 1932. They elected a strong government which has waged war on monopoly and has set out to restore conditions which will allow the free play of business and industrial competition.

And the people are still using their heads. It is highly significant that the latest Gallup poll discloses 31 out of 48 States favoring the Democratic Party. By November not even Maine and Vermont will be left.

It is significant that the recent Fortune survey shows that the citizens of this country believe, by a margin of 2 to 1, that the Democratic Party has the interest of the people more at heart, that it has the most devoted public servants, that it has a greater desire to keep the Nation out of war, and that it exercises more common sense on public problems than the Republican Party.

That, my fellow Democrats, means victory in November—overwhelming, complete, and unequivocal victory.

And it means the preservation of the democratic way of life on this continent.

Dr. John Gorrie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE RELATIVE TO FLORIDA'S DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and comprehensive article on a very distinguished Floridian and a very distinguished American who is one of Florida's contributions to the Hall of Fame, Dr. John Gorrie, who deserves the credit and recognition of being the inventor or discoverer of the process of making artificial ice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. JOHN GORRIE

That Dr. John Gorrie perfected and patented the first ice-making machine in all the world should be as generally known as is the human need for artificial ice.

The manufacture of artificial ice, no doubt, existed in the dream life of others. Gorrie was the first to make the dream a reality. The friction between the historical writer who so credits Dr. Gorrie and the one who dares nominate any other would be such as to "cause the sparks of truth to scintillate" and establish this fact for the world.

As long as men harvest from the fields of the scientific world the fruits of its genius without fear of its loss, it may not be considered strange if they forget the great planter.

A writer recently commenting upon the several statues in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol at Washington, said, "A few are local heroes so obscure and forgotten as to cause derisive mirth among Capitol sightseers. Such a one is the statue of Dr. John Gorrie, sent to Washington by Florida in 1914."

The artificial-ice manufacturers and the descendants of those among whom he lived have not forgotten who he was and what he did. To his memory on a plot of ground at Apalachicola, Fla., known as "Gorrie Square," stands a monument erected by the Southern Ice Exchange. A school in the city of Jacksonville, Fla., and a bridge 6 miles in length, crossing an arm of the Gulf of Mexico, connecting East Point and Apalachicola, are named in his honor. The "John Gorrie Memorial Foundation" has been chartered to provide Apalachicola with a hospital.

Throughout the ages men have placed statues, erected monuments, and established other memorials in an effort to preserve human achievement. Names, birth, and dates of death, with generous inscriptions, are not sufficient to distinguish the objects of the honor for their historic renown. Experience has taught this. Something of the man must be known.

No book-length biography of Dr. Gorrie has ever been written. Historians have been too careless of the fame of this great scientist.

It was during the time Dr. Gorrie was medical officer in charge of the United States Marine Hospital at Apalachicola he first knew he could make ice.

At that time science had not found the way to prevent malaria and yellow fever. Medical science not knowing the cause of these diseases was in continuous experiment to find a remedy. It was obvious to Dr. Gorrie that the oppressive heat of summer had serious effect upon the recovery of fever patients. He worked out a system of air conditioning. Lake ice, for that was all the world knew about at the time, was placed in an urn or basin close to the ceiling, suspended by chains. Immediately above the ice he installed a hood with a pipe, passing it through the floor above and into the chimney. Outside air was sucked through the pipe onto the ice. Chilled air spilled around the room. It was observed that even when the ice had melted the air blown over the water kept the room cool. This led to the experiment of forcing air through small tubes over water. The greater the force the cooler the air.

He built a steam-driven pump which packed air to many times its atmospheric pressure and the released air chilled water until it froze. The first time this fact was noticed is dependent upon a statement made some years after Gorrie's death, by an ex-slave who claimed to have been his office boy at the time. He said the pump had been in continuous operation for 24 hours and he noticed that the air was not coming through the tube as usual and in seeking the reason he found the tube, as he said, "all

clogged wid ice." He fixed the date as in the summer of 1839 or 1840.

To give semblance of correct recollection to the Negro's statement it is known that Dr. Gorrie retired from active practice of medicine to give his time to the study of air conditioning and refrigeration. After his retirement, and in 1839, he began to write a series of articles on science, medicine, and refrigeration, which appeared in the New York Lancet and the Southern Quarterly Review. In the June 15, 1844, issue of the Commercial Advertiser, the editor in writing about Dr. Gorrie's article "on the prevention of malarial diseases," said, "we know of no want of mankind more urgent than the cheap means of producing an abundance of artificial cold. To warm countries it would offer benefits as countless as those that would arise in a cold climate from the finding of illimitable supplies of fuel. The discovery and invention which our correspondent proposes to apply to this object are calculated to alter and extend the face of civilization." No further data is available to show definitely just the date when Dr. Gorrie made the first artificial ice.

Practically his entire library, including his manuscripts and the drawings and working model of his ice machine were destroyed after his family had left their home in Apalachicola, during the evacuation of the city from March 1862 to April 1865.

The first private exhibition of his ice machine and its product and the first public showing of the artificial ice are known. Before record is made of the time and place of these two exhibitions of the ice-making machine and the ice, truth will not be ill at ease if it be boldly stated that it is probable:

Dr. John Gorrie made the first artificial ice at Apalachicola, Fla., sometime prior to 1844 and likely in 1839.

Dr. Gorrie exhibited the ice machine and its product first, to famed Botanist-Physician Alvan Wentworth Chapman; a few days subsequently to the public at a gathering of dinner guests in the Mansion House, at the time the second largest hotel in Florida. Dr. Chapman's story of the incidents leading up to and the first private and public exhibition of the machine and artificial ice has been handed down from family to family. Miss Winifred Kimball tells interestingly the story as it came to her. The story lives in the memoirs of Judge George Raney, a distinguished citizen who lived in Apalachicola at the time, now deceased. The data collected by Hon. George Whiteside when the monument was built to the memory of Dr. Gorrie corroborates the story.

"In all my visits to the laboratory of Dr. Gorrie and our discussion of his study of air conditioning, refrigeration, and artificial ice I never saw his ice machine," said Dr. Chapman, "until a day late in June 1850 he called me into his laboratory. He was excited and nervous, something I had never noticed before. He was not inclined to nervousness and excitement. Jokingly I said, 'Have you found the way to freeze your patients?'"

"Not exactly, but I have made ice."

"The hell you have!"

"If I succeed," he replied, "I can reduce the temperature of that warm country to where it may be classed as a summer resort."

Dr. Chapman said Gorrie never made a positive statement that was not definitely true. "I have made ice." When he made that positive statement, said Chapman, "there was no time for further levity."

"May I see the machine at work and the artificial ice it makes?"

"Of course you can, but I wish for the time being to keep the matter in confidence."

"I was the first person in Apalachicola to whom Dr. Gorrie exhibited his ice-making machine and to see the ice made with it," said Dr. Chapman.

"A day or so after this, Monsieur Rousard, who was the French consul stationed at the port of Apalachicola, also a cotton broker, socially popular and a friend both to Gorrie and to me, was confessing his embarrassment because he could not get ice for a 'Bastile Day' dinner he was giving."

The people of Apalachicola were dependent on lake ice, which was brought in from the North by sailing vessels. There were times when the ice supply was completely exhausted. Sailing vessels then, as now, can make no definite time for arrival. At the time the French consul was talking to Dr. Chapman the ice supply was exhausted. The boat bringing ice was overdue.

"As soon as I could get to Gorrie," continued Dr. Chapman, "I told him of my conversation with Monsieur Rousard and requested him to relieve the embarrassment, to which he quickly consented."

A meeting of Rousard, Chapman, and Gorrie was had in Gorrie's laboratory. Artificial ice was made. The three saw the machine produce a cube of ice. No one else knew about it.

The disappointment which Monsieur Rousard had expressed to his friends over the prospect that no ice would be available for his patriotic dinner was supplanted with the declaration, "For my dinner I will have ze ice." Overnight, so to speak, he was optimistic about ice being available for his dinner. His friends did not understand. He did not explain. The general belief was that the overdue boat would not dock in time for ice to be served at his dinner. Wagers of champagne were offered that he would not have the ice. Rousard accepted all bets offered him. The guests of the mansion house were suffering the inconvenience of no ice. The gamester's chance became common among them. To excite curiosity to the highest pitch Monsieur Rousard answered many good-natured thrusts, by offering the wager of a basket of champagne that he would not only furnish ice next day, but that the ice would be made in Apalachicola. The bet was promptly taken.

No one except the three who last visited Gorrie's laboratory knew that he was working long hours on the hot July days preceding the day of the dinner. His machine was piling up cubes of ice, about 8 inches high and 10 inches long.

The hour for the dinner arrived and the ice boat was still overdue. Good-natured jests were indulged at the expense of those who had backed their host. Some acknowledged the loss of their wager.

The large dining room was beautiful in decoration and brilliantly lighted. The guests were seated. Dr. Gorrie on the right and Dr. Chapman on the left of the host. As honor guest Dr. Gorrie responded to the first toast.

"I can see him now," said Dr. Chapman, "of medium height, with a large head crowning a stout frame, sallow complexion, and dark hair and eyes. His countenance usually serious, verging to sadness, seldom lighted with pleasing smile, never with laughter. He was now a master."

This was perhaps the greatest moment in Dr. Gorrie's life. He gave the toast: "My friends, we drink to France in warm red wines."

Then Dr. Chapman arose and said: "We will now drink to our own country and an American, the world's greatest scientist, who made the machine which has produced the artificial ice which will chill our champagne."

There was silence. There was no ice to be seen. Everyone had a peculiar stare. Just at the moment, when the tenseness must be broken, all eyes were turned on the host. Monsieur Rousard was on his feet. "France gives her people what they want, so if my guests want ice, they shall have it if it demands the work of a miracle." At the moment he stopped speaking, placing his hand on Dr. Gorrie's shoulder.

Attention was now directed toward the opening doors leading from the serving room into that brilliantly lighted, large dining room. Waiters came marching in bearing baskets of champagne covered with ice, and silver salvers upon which rested cubes of ice.

The dramatic effect was breath taking. Monsieur Rousard, with the enthusiasm of the French, continued, "Today it is an American who has worked the miracle."

The guests were on their feet with outbursts of applause. They left their places to grasp the hand of Dr. John Gorrie, extending to him congratulations upon his wonderful achievement.

To make his wager good, that the ice would be made in Apalachicola, Rousard invited the guests over to the laboratory of Dr. Gorrie. The machine and how it worked was explained. It was put to work, and before the eyes of these gentlemen, artificial ice was made.

Dr. Gorrie applied for, and was granted, on May 6, 1851, the first patent in all the world on a machine to make ice. United States patent No. 8080.

"Behind every great project, as in a work of art, there lies a vision, the willful playing and coaxing of the imagination toward certain desired ends—trial, error, disappointment—then reality."

Dr. Gorrie took no thought of fame and fortune. His paramount concern was for the sick. Cooling hospital wards was of more importance than the commercial possibilities of his ice-making machine. He completed the work of air conditioning the sick wards in the hospital. He developed the first process for air conditioning.

The first system of air conditioning in the world was installed by Dr. John Gorrie in the sick wards of the United States Marine Hospital at Apalachicola, Fla.

An application for a patent on his process for "cooling and disinfecting ventilation" was pending in the United States Patent Office at the time of his death.

Gorrie was now ready to consider the commercial possibilities of his ice machine. His friends had been impatient with him because of the wait of more than a year since he had been granted a patent on his ice-making machine. Friends were thinking in terms of dollars and cents. Dr. Gorrie had been thinking in terms of service to the sick. He raised all the money he could by hypothecating all of his property, except the patent on his ice machine. This he kept free of lien to be used to raise such additional money as necessary to build a large ice machine. New Orleans, upon the advice of friends who had financial connections there, was selected as the most likely place to finance the commercial venture. The first ice factory was to be located in his home city.

Dr. Gorrie had been in New Orleans but a short time when he contacted a gentleman from Boston, Mass., who, for a three-fourths interest in the ice-machine patent, agreed to finance the commercial venture. With the pledge of his partner he was assured sufficient money to put manufactured ice on the market. Financial worries out of the way, he wrote home that he was happy and that an unlimited supply of cheap ice would be put on the market. With Gorrie busy with engineers explaining his machine, completing drawings for the making of patterns for the foundry work to build the first large ice machine, the folks at home were busy planning for the erection of the first commercial ice factory. The first machine completed, the others would be less expensive and delivery would be rapid. Soon in every important center artificial ice would be available for all human and industrial need. Industry was thinking in terms of what an abundant supply of cheap ice means in the matter of storage and shipment of perishables to distant markets. Dr. Gorrie was thinking of what an inexhaustible supply of ice means in the treatment of the sick. Those were great days in the life of Dr. Gorrie.

He could not fail; but he did.

His partner died. That source for money to carry on was cut off.

He thought he could interest other capital. The newspapers which had expressed favorable opinion of his process for the manufacture of ice reported the discontinuance of the project. This was the cue for the news to become widespread that the ice-making machine was a thing for the world of mythology. A northern paper, editorially commenting upon the suggestion that ice could or would be manufactured, said: "A crank called Dr. John Gorrie down in Apalachicola, Fla., claims he can make ice as good as God Almighty." Dr. Gorrie traveled over the North and South in an effort to interest other capital. Wherever he went, ridicule of his process for making ice had preceded him. His commercial venture in collapse, unable to inspire confidence in the practicability of manufacturing ice on a profitable basis, his fortune gone, he returned to Apalachicola.

History offers abundant evidence that progress is seldom made except through the suffering of some individual. Dr. Gorrie suffered the humiliation and embarrassment of failure. He was keenly sensitive to the ridicule that was heaped upon him. Laughed at, jeered at, and haunted by increasing debts he could not meet; fearing that his neighbors had lost confidence in him, he secluded himself within the walls of his home, where he spent his last months in sorrow and bitterness. The grim sarcasm of defeat was more than he could stand. He died.

Dr. Gorrie was born on the Island of St. Nevis in 1802; the exact date he did not know. With his father, Capt. John Gorrie, and his mother, a beautiful Spanish woman, he landed at Charleston, S. C., on October 3, 1803. Captain Gorrie was an officer in the Spanish Army.

The family settled in the best hotel and a sum of money sufficient for the use of the mother and child deposited in the bank, Captain Gorrie returned to his post of duty. He never returned to the United States. Each month liberal remittances were received. The son was educated in the best private schools of Charleston. Soon after his graduation the monthly remittances ceased to come. There was no word from Captain Gorrie. What misfortune had befallen him was never known. The spirit of Mrs. Gorrie was crushed. She was heartbroken and did not live but a few months more.

The mystery surrounding the birth of Dr. Gorrie, the flight from St. Nevis, and the disappearance of Captain Gorrie will never be known. Whatever the mother may have told to the son is buried with him. There must have been a great love and a gripping story of romance surrounding Dr. Gorrie's parentage. Imagination may build as it pleases.

After the death of his mother, young Gorrie entered the College of Surgeons and Physicians in New York City. His funds were limited. When his capital had been exhausted and his plan to leave school to seek employment to earn money sufficient to carry on his studies was known, classmates offered financial assistance. His record was excellent. The faculty did not wish an interruption in his studies. Provision was made for him to work his way on through school. At the time of graduation he was regarded as one of the most promising members of his class.

He practised first at Abbeville, S. C. He soon had an established reputation for medical skill. He was socially prominent and popular. Intimately associated with the family of the great Calhoun he absorbed much of the democracy of this statesman.

It was at Abbeville Dr. Gorrie interested himself in the study of malaria. He wished to extend his research work in an effort to find preventive control and the treatment of this disease. At that time the major medical problems of Apalachicola, Fla., were malaria and yellow fever. Although this city was one of the larger cotton markets on the Gulf Coast, it's development was retarded by the spread of these and other febrile diseases. Here was the field for his work.

Dr. Gorrie came to Apalachicola in 1833. After some years of clinical observation he reached the conclusion that the control of the fever was essential in the treatment of these diseases. While his ideas upon the prevention of these fevers were not entirely in accord with subsequent discoveries, he advocated the draining and filling in of swamps to prevent fevers in the interest of public health. He observed that persons who slept under nets rarely contracted the fever. He did not suspect, what is known this day, that the effectiveness of the net was due to the simple fact that it kept mosquitoes from biting the person within.

To apply the idea of controlling fever he developed the unique method of ventilating the room by means of an opening in the wall at floor level instead of using the windows and doors. Ice in a receptacle which he had suspended from the ceiling cooled the air, which, being heavier, descended and passed out of the room through the opening at floor. This arrangement produced a circulation of cool air which passed over the patient. With this method of ventilation in actual service Dr. Gorrie became the father of modern air conditioning as a method for the treatment and prevention of certain diseases.

Ice was essential to carry on his treatment of fever. Often the supply of ice in the city was exhausted. All the ice available was brought from New England, sometimes costing as much as a dollar a pound. Gorrie turned his attention to a method for manufacturing ice. Eventually he succeeded. The original model of his ice machine, now in Smithsonian Institution in Washington, comprised essentially a pump with which to compress air in a chamber in which was a container filled with water. After being compressed the air was permitted to expand rapidly, thereby absorbing heat from the water and so producing artificial ice.

Dr. Gorrie's days were busy days. He found time, however, for social and civic contacts. He made friends. He served as treasurer of the city; a time as postmaster; secretary of the first Masonic lodge organized in the city; was an incorporator and helped build Trinity Episcopal Church. He was resident physician of both the city and of the United States Marine Hospital. Many of the articles which he wrote on sanitation, refrigeration, a system of air conditioning, and artificial ice, are extant.

Dr. Gorrie was respected as the most prominent physician in the State of Florida. In May 1837 he married the socially prominent and beautiful widow, Mrs. Carolina Bierman. There were two children born unto them, John Gorrie, Jr., born May 8, 1838, and Sarah Gorrie, born September 7, 1843. John, educated as a lawyer, was a brilliant man. He served as an officer in the Confederate army—was wounded in battle and died as a result of the wound in 1866. Sarah married a Confederate soldier who was killed in battle in 1862. The daughter had one child. The widow of Dr. Gorrie died in May 1864 at Marianna, Fla. Sarah died at Milton, Fla., December 29, 1908.

Dr. Gorrie chose to die alone. His services to humanity was a matter of jest. The world had rejected the product of his scientific knowledge. It is said that in the trying hours of his last illness he refused to see anyone. This did not keep friends from calling at his home and inquiring about him and offering such services as they could render.

Conscious that the end was but a few days away he asked for paper and pen, expressing a wish to make a will. As item 1 he wrote: "I wish to be buried plainly and neatly, my body to be exposed in the public burial ground situated near the bay of Apalachicola." To request that his body be exposed to public view was the only way left for him to express an appreciation for the kindness, courtesies, and prayers of his people.

Dr. Gorrie died on June 29, 1855. The date of his death as given on his monument is June 16, 1855, which is an impossible date. His last will and testament, in his own handwriting, now on file in the probate judge's office in the courthouse at Apalachicola, Fla., is dated June 22, 1855. A matter of little importance, but in the interest of accuracy should be known.

Dr. Gorrie's property, with the exception of his interest in the patent on his ice-making machine and the process for air conditioning, was under pledge for the money borrowed to finance his venture in the commercial field of manufactured ice. In the commercial world these processes were rejected as collateral. He knew what artificial ice, refrigeration, and air conditioning meant to medical science, to humanity, and to industry. The future revealed to him that some day the world would appropriate his scientific gift. As testimony of his faith he bequeathed these scientific achievements by the fourth item of his will: "I give, devise, and bequeath unto my said wife all my interest in and to certain patents granted or to be granted to me by the United States Patent Office or other patent offices throughout the world. The one for an artificial process for manufacturing ice of which I have an interest of one-fourth extending all over the earth, the other for cooling and disinfecting ventilation, the interest of which (when granted) will be solely and exclusively mine."

Dr. Gorrie's funeral, as reported by the newspapers at the time, was the largest ever seen in Apalachicola. His body was exposed at the burying ground. Friends and neighbors came to honor him. For hours they were passing by the casket viewing the remains of this great man. Great crowds stood around in silent tribute. His unselfish effort to serve humanity stirred many a slumbering sob. Men and women did not blush for the tears that filled their eyes.

If life is but a dream and death be its awakening, then in the world of dreams the work, the fame, the genius, the name of Dr. John Gorrie will forever live.

The old burying ground has long since been abandoned. The remains of Dr. Gorrie's body were removed to the center of what is now known as Magnolia Cemetery. A monument over his grave has been erected by the people of Apalachicola.

Twenty years, approximately, after Gorrie's death, renowned Botanist-Physician Alvan Wentworth Chapman and Harvard's even more celebrated botanist, Dr. Asa Gray, passed Gorrie's grave. Said Chapman: "Gray, there is the grave of the man whom we all recognize as the superior of all of us."

Dr. Gray read: "Here lies John Gorrie," adding: "I was assisting in the chemical department of the College of Surgeons and Physicians in New York City and I distinctly remember Gorrie as occupying a prominent position in that class. He was regarded as the ablest and most promising man in his class. I knew him well."

The workman dies. His work lives on.

"We mortals have not divine patience, nor are we capable of taking the long view of life the Lord takes. In consequence, more often than not, we fail to recognize the possibilities wrapped up in human beings. But He sees them, and unhurried in the knowledge of eternity vastness He quietly waits until they develop."

It was predetermined and inevitable that the first artificial ice in commercial quantity would be manufactured at Apalachicola, Fla. Some years after Dr. Gorrie had made artificial ice in his laboratory there was built in Apalachicola the first commercial ice factory in the world.

There was a time when the world failed to recognize the possibilities wrapped up in Dr. John Gorrie's process for the manufacture of artificial ice.

Dr. John Gorrie rightfully belongs in that Medical Hall of Fame which includes the greatest scientists of the world.

The Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, which appeared in the May issue of the magazine Light, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

[From the magazine Light, Brooklyn, N. Y., May 1940]

THE ROAD TO PEACE

(By Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., Litt. D.)

The war in Europe has not changed the need for rebuilding our social order with a view to justice for the workingman. Indeed, a fair deal for the workers will do much to remove the causes of conflict. Consequently, every move that puts wealth and income into the hands of the laboring population is an advance on the road to world peace.

Prior to the World War in 1914, a start had been made in Belgium to give the workingman his due. Like war, it began in tragedy. The drama was one of labor organization and its leading character was a young man named Joseph Cardijn, born on November 13, 1882. This youngster had held the crucifix to the lips of his father, whose death, in the full flush of manhood, was attributable to toil in a factory where unsanitary conditions prevailed. Watching the agonized features of his dying father, Joseph Cardijn made a pledge that he would devote his life to a crusade for health and happiness among the working people of Belgium. This pledge was repeated and consecrated by a vow he made upon the eve of his promotion to the sacred order of the priesthood. This was in June 1906.

THE PRELUDE

Before plunging into the task of unionization, Father Cardijn studied the subject at home and abroad. A trip to the factory districts of England brought him into touch with the British trade-union movement. Returning to Belgium, he was given a short teaching assignment in the archiepiscopal college and was then appointed curate at the Church of Our Lady at Laeken.

Again, his technique was one of investigation and study, this time on a cooperative basis. In conjunction with "a few high-minded men" he brought to light the vicious conditions which prevailed in the workshops and factories of the neighborhood. Filth accumulated in the washrooms and toilets. Restrooms for young women workers were nonexistent. Pay was scanty, hours long. Both the health and morals of boys and girls were in peril.

Home life did little to counteract the bad influences of mine and shop. The majority of the workers infested, rather than lived, in slum districts that reeked with the odor of clogged drains and uncollected garbage. Was it surprising that the young priest decided that his first job was to create a healthy mental attitude among his parishioners and, more particularly, to help the youth of both sexes to overcome the inferiority complex which, in the haunts of poverty, bred with the speed of weeds in a swamp? He determined that his people should learn to help each other.

In 1912, therefore, Father Joseph Cardijn gathered together the nucleus of a labor organization with spiritual ideals: Seven needle-workers, all girls and all between the ages of 13 and 14. Presently, their numbers were augmented by a group of young men, eager to better their own condition and that of their fellow workers. Piety, study, action were the original watchwords of this little band.

ORGANIZATIONAL BEGINNINGS

The year 1915 was a turning point in a twofold sense: A syndicate of apprentices was formed and the fury of the World War swept through the ranks of the young organization. Many members of the syndicate were mobilized; some were killed; others were wounded and allowed to return to their home communities. Father Cardijn continued his work with the few who remained or returned. These 4 years were a period of intensive training and preparation.

At the end of the conflict in 1919, the stage was set for a genuine youth-labor organization called the Jeunesse Syndicate. The next year, five priests, inflamed by zeal for the cause, joined the movement. Hundreds of workers flocked to the standard of Christ the Worker and a newspaper was founded with the banner headline: Young Syndicalist Workers. The campaign was blessed by archbishops and bishops. Benedict XV in Rome added his august commendation. Finally, the movement crystallized in 1924 as the Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrètienne, more popularly known as the Jocists. Youth in action for the workers, under religious auspices and motivation, tells the whole story in a nutshell.

THE SPIRIT

"Back to Christ, Young Workers!" constituted the rallying cry of the Jocists. They were organized according to their vocational set-up: the students with students; chemists with chemists; transport workers with transport workers; and farmers with farmers. Badges and uniforms were distributed; meetings were held; study circles developed for weekly conferences; and public manifestations prepared.

See, judge, act became the order of procedure. The inquiry precedes every other task. Mr. Paul McGuire calls it the "nerve center of the whole Jocist method." The young worker observes and collects concrete facts which show the real position of the wage earner and his responsibility. In the study circles he discusses these facts with his comrades; together they look for the causes of a given evil and its opposition to the plan of God as revealed in the Gospel. When the moment comes for action, the young laborers choose a remedy: they help a companion who is out of work, sick, or injured, or a worker's family; or they assist some one of their members in the choice of a profession or further vocational training. Each section provides facilities for thrift, insurance, credit unions, labor organization, and moral education.

The atmosphere of a secretariat is electric with plans, ideas, and accomplishments. The movement, working on the imaginations of the youthful members, creates a mass psychology which inspires courage and confidence in the ranks of labor. In these circles the carpenter or miner feels himself better understood, more firmly upheld and more fervently loved. In short, the youth of all classes are fired with blazing enthusiasm for the world of tomorrow which is to be their world. Conquest for Christ is dramatized as the work of "a new youth for a new world."

GROWTH AND EXTENSION

When Father Joseph Cardijn visited Rome in 1925, he was received by His Holiness, Pius XI. The Pope gave his paternal blessing to the Jocists. In the same year, the group of needle-workers who had organized in 1912 adopted the name of Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrètienne Feminine; the first national committee of the J. O. C. was formed; a general Congress was convoked in Brussels, and in October the Jocist Manual was published. By the end of 1926, the Belgian experiment had not only established itself in every parish of the nation, but also had attracted attention in neighboring countries.

Early in 1927, Father Cardijn was invited to the so-called Red Zone of Paris, a Communist stronghold, in order to familiarize the French workers with the apostolic nature of the Jocist organization. The first meeting was held in the dingy room of one of the Parisian clergy. Seven hundred young workers were invited to an organization meeting; 70 accepted. A young layman explained the Belgian activities; what their brothers and sisters were trying to accomplish across the border; what they believed could be done in France. Six workers were interested enough to enroll themselves in the unit. Within 2 years there were 110 similar centers.

Five years later, there were 500 active units in the Paris community alone. The national organization counted 60,000 workers. The Young Christian Peasants (J. A. C.) have an equally large organization, recruited from the sons and daughters of farmers and farm laborers. Forty thousand French students from universities, colleges, high schools, technical and primary schools are united in a movement called the J. E. C. (the Young Christian Students), while the youth of independent groups are gather in the J. I. C. (Youth of the Middle Class). Each member has the zeal of an apostle, influencing the lives of at least 10 of his work mates, or fellow clerks, or fellow students. Every Jocist develops religious and social reform at his or her own point of contact with the world. In this way, the leaven of Christ permeates every environment, or milieu, from the mines to the shops and stock exchange.

CHRIST'S PRESENCE

Why should a single worker be able to radiate virtue, power, joy?

The answer is to be sought in the individual Jocist's sense of the presence of God. Christ is present to these workers in His name. Their minds and their hearts are lifted on high. Religion is the familiar stuff of their lives. Aware of Christ's teaching, they talk of their Leader with the intimacy and ease with which boys and girls speak of their adventures, their amusements, their picnics, the playmates, or their jobs. Not that these activities are the be-all and end-alls of existence; they are but episodes in lives that are meant to be wholly Catholic. If one goes walking, Christ is his companion. If one goes motoring, Christ is in the car.

Daily life is conceived of as a vocation; a complete life; a thorough destiny; writing, studying, games, work, dancing, scouting, courtship, marriage, entertaining, or being entertained * * * all these are dipped in the chrism of Christ stamped with the seal of Christ, blazing with the love of Christ. Or, to use Paul McGuire's happy phrase, all these routines of daily existence are "Christened," vitalized by the heartbeats of God. This is more than strength through joy; it is union with the fountainhead of grace, virtue, and eternal glory.

Is it any wonder that the Revue Des Jeunes (Paris) can write: "After attending some J. O. C. meetings one realizes what gigantic progress it is making toward the rechristianization of the working classes." Besides direct contact work, J. O. C. employs songs, movies, pamphlets, picnics, public manifestations. It conducts vocation and orientation service while other functions include measures to secure work, board, and legal advice for members or

nonmembers. It gives assistance to soldiers and sailors, furnishes medical aid, rehabilitation services, and nursing care. Of course, the backbone of these services is a network of syndicates, savings banks, and insurance systems.

The song of the Third Communist International intones the melancholy refrain: "Stand, ye damned of the earth * * *."

In marked contrast to this depressing sentiment is the ringing challenge of the Jocist hymn. This sings out to youth:

"Stand, the call of Christ resounds.
The task is noble, but stern.
Onward with the struggle,
Never resting nor relenting,
For Christ we must conquer."

TENTH ANNIVERSARY

Canon Joseph Cardijn, at the tenth anniversary celebration of his organization, in the presence of 100,000 devoted companions, described the conditions and motives which had inspired him to create the J. O. C. The spiritual and temporal life of the young workman, he declared, are inseparable. Further, it is not possible to ignore a man's material life, if one wishes to help him to save his soul; living and working conditions formerly prevailing among workmen were in brutal contradiction to what was necessary to help them gain eternal life; the situation can be mastered only by forming and organizing workers in such a manner that they can help themselves and conquer their own salvation. Speaking of the goal of the J. O. C., he added, in a stirring peroration that brought his audience to its feet:

"Not slaves, not beasts of burden, not machines, but sons, collaborators, heirs of God!

"And to accomplish this there must be work; in the midst of work a center of work and an organization of work;

"And for that there must be a home and family life;

"And for that there must be a professional organization, a social organization, a national and an international organization which must be worthy of this origin divine, of this dignity divine, of this destiny divine.

"The young workers are not destined for material wealth, nor for imperialism, nor for materialist nationalism.

"But riches, but work, but economic, and financial organization, but the entire civilization must help all the young workers and the men of the whole world to attain their destinies. * * *

"Against atheism, against nihilism, against materialism, the J. O. C. struggles with energy and courage, with stanch soul and with hearts dedicated to the real and complete royalty of Christ, guided by the church, in the ranks of the Catholic crusade, which groups transform and launch the young workers as apostles among their brothers and in their centers. * * *

"Jocists, be ye the glory of the church,
Jocists, be ye the glory of Christ,
Jocists, be ye the honor of your country,
Jocists, be ye the hope of your times,
I bless ye.
Forward!"

PROTESTANT TRIBUTE

It may be prudent to balance this enthusiastic valedictory with the report published by a distinguished Protestant gentleman, Mr. Harold B. Butler, director of the International Labor Office at Geneva. In the course of a statement which described the social activities of the churches, Mr. Butler wrote:

"The social work done by the Catholics tended to confirm further the supremacy of the moral element over the economic order, and of man over the product of his work. Catholic associations realize more and more that it is useless to establish even the most perfect organizations, if at the same time the spiritual level is not raised; in 1934, there was a new movement on these lines. * * * The work done by the Jocists for the improvement of the laboring classes is well known. The spread of specialization in the important organizations of Catholic youth is due to the Jocist movement. Thanks to its example, to its influence, Jocism has made the papal instructions, now the standard in social movements, possible to all: 'The first apostles for the workmen, are to be workmen, and the apostles for the industrial and commercial world are to be industrialists and merchants' (quadragesimo anno)."

THE RECKONING

There are 200,000 young men and women organized on these principles in France; 10,000 in Holland; 2,000 in Switzerland, and growing centers in Spain, Portugal, Colombia, the Belgian Congo, and Great Britain. Prior to the tragic events of last August the movement was being seriously studied with a view to an organization in Catholic Poland. Lithuanian and Czech and Slovak workers had likewise evinced an interest in the movement. Within a relatively short time, the Jocists have enjoyed phenomenal success in Canada, while the United States has witnessed the spread of this Canadian effort in New England.

The Belgian J. O. C. now counts 68 regional federations for boys and girls; 2,204 local sections in some 2,670 cities and villages in Belgium; 85,000 members, divided equally among boys and girls. It must be borne in mind that each of these units has its own publications, served by national magazines and reviews. During 1935, 1,735,320 pamphlets, explaining the social philosophy of the church, were distributed. One workman, who read some of this material, made a typical remark:

"So Christians still exist; for the 30 years I have been working here the only pamphlets I've been given have been distributed by Communists, Marxists, or freethinkers. I had never been told that a God died for me." This occurred in the factory of John Cockerill in England.

CANADIAN JOCISTS

Jocism in Canada was introduced, as in France, by a priest, Father Henri Roy, O. M. I., who, like Father Joseph Cardijn, belonged to an impoverished workingman's family. Father Roy, a native of Lewiston, Maine, still remembers with a terrible tenseness the days and nights when as a boy of 7 he crept out of the Montreal slums to sell newspapers, carry messages, do odd jobs, anything, for a few pennies with which to buy food for the family. In order to study for the priesthood he undertook a high-school course at the age of 22. Today he stands in the front ranks of 50,000 Jocists in Canada. His motto remains what it was in the initial stages of his career: "On Guard for Christ, young workers!"

At the J. O. C. headquarters in Montreal, consisting of several huge rambling buildings painted red and gray, there is a constant flow of homeless youngsters. Thousands find food, clothing, shelter. Both a doctor and a dentist are on hand to give the young people the care they need.

Every effort is made to find work for both boys and girls. Employers cooperate wholeheartedly with Father Roy, for he has bettered working conditions not only for the youngsters but also for the employers. Theft, breakage, and waste in the factories have been practically eliminated.

"What can you offer your comrades?" one of the Jocists was asked.

"Nothing but a chance. We spread confidence in God and life everlasting. If the workers do not get what they richly deserve in this life, then in another life they will reap their reward. It is eternal hope, my friend, that makes the world go round and keeps us steadfast."

One Sunday last July the Canadian Jocists gave a practical exhibition of their philosophy and their faith. In the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Montreal, 106 couples were united in holy matrimony. The streets were filled with boys and girls in blue and white uniforms with blue berets and the prized J. O. C. pins. Inside the cathedral thousands upon thousands of youthful voices were lifted in song. It was the greatest mass marriage ever celebrated on this continent. It was a triumph of tomorrow over the divorces, childless marriages, contraceptives, and indecencies of today.

JOCISTS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A most interesting study of American jocism has been undertaken by Mr. Paul J. Taggart, president of the student council at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md. According to Mr. Taggart, who visited Jocist headquarters at St. Marie, Sacred Heart, and St. Augustin parishes in Manchester, N. H., the secret of the J. O. C. "miracle" is hard work and an intelligent use of time by young Catholic workers. He describes a meeting in which "the youths are all primed" with knowledge and questions. The Jocist, he relates, "prays * * * attends retreats * * * frequents the sacraments * * * begins his work soundly entrenched in Catholic practice as well as Catholic principles."

Mr. Taggart describes as typical the success of a few Jocists in a shoe factory who managed to quiet the filthy tongues of their fellow workers. Many workers objected to indecent speech and impure topics of conversation, but it took a few Jocists to put their foot down—by their pure example—and clean up a moral cesspool. That won respect for the little band, and now the few are busy teaching the many the inner meaning of jocism.

Father Achielle Lettré, the spiritual director of the St. Augustin parish unit, is quoted as follows:

"We would be suspicious of gifts of money. We don't ask for that. We ask for gifts of self. A man must labor for God before he appreciates jocism. What we want is work."

In other words, the difference between a Communist and a Jocist is that the Communist says to his fellow worker, "What you have is mine"; and the Jocist says to his companion, "What I have is yours."

Loyalty of the Negro People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

LETTER FROM A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following

letter from A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters:

BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS,
May 10, 1940.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALLEN: Permit me to express my sincere appreciation for your kindly expressions on the position I took in the National Negro Congress, which was recently held in Washington, D. C.

I assure you that I was completely disgusted and amazed at the bold and brazen expressions of sympathy for the Soviet Union, even going to the extent of declaring that the Negro people would not fight in a war between the United States and Soviet Russia against Russia. Of course, that body was packed with Communists, and the applause to this statement was an expression of sympathy of Communists of that position, but it was not an expression of the sentiment of the Negro people. Out of some 1,200 delegates, 300 or more were white, and the white and colored delegates were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists, or under the domination of Communists. I was practically alone against this manifestation of Communist sentiment.

However, the American people need have no doubt about the loyalty of the Negro people to the United States of America, the defense of whose flag the Negro has shed his blood upon every battlefield from Bunker Hill to Flanders of France. Throughout the glorious history of the Negro people, we have never been disgraced with a Benedict Arnold, nor would we have anything to do with the Trojan horse and "fifth column" tactics that may serve the interests of any foreign state, for the first, fundamental and main allegiance and devotion of the Negro is to his own country, the United States of America.

When I am in Washington, I hope to enjoy the pleasure of coming in to see you to have a chat.

With cordial good wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH.
International President.

Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT CANNON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ARTICLE BY L. S. REMSBURG

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by L. S. Remsburg, which was published in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News on May 2, 1940:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News of May 2, 1940]

SLUM CLEARANCE, LOW RENTAL PROJECTS REDUCING NATIONAL COST OF SICKNESS AND CRIME

(By L. S. Remsberg)

Elimination of America's slums and the rehousing of thousands of low-income families in decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings should substantially reduce the stupendous cost of crime and disease, prolong the lives of many victims of wretched housing conditions, and improve the general welfare of communities throughout the Nation.

From a dollars-and-cents basis the slum-clearance and low-rent housing program being conducted through the cooperation of the United States Housing Authority and local housing authorities in many cities holds the greatest significance to the taxpayers of the Nation.

CRIME, SICKNESS COST TWENTY-FIVE BILLION

It has been estimated that crime costs America $15,000,000,000 per year, or an average of $10 per month for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Sickness runs crime a close second. According to estimates made by health and welfare activities in the United States, the annual bill for sickness and postponable death amounts to approximately $10,000,000,000.

House-to-house canvasses conducted in 204 communities, with the aid of W. P. A., revealed that 1,100,000 homes in 830,000 buildings were absolutely unfit for use; that 1,166,000 out of 8,000,000 had no private bathing facilities; that 1,221,000 of these had no private indoor water closets, while more than 1,300,000 were badly crowded. Additional studies revealed disastrous effects of these conditions.

PRIVATE BUILDING NOT SUFFICIENT

The very fact that such slums exist and that such deplorable conditions prevail indicates definitely that private enterprise has not been able to cope with the situation. Houses by the thousands have fallen into decay, to become the unwholesome and inadequate refuge of suffering families who cannot afford to pay the rentals required for decent dwellings. Housing shortages have made matters even worse.

Under our economic system private enterprise is powerless to supplant these blighted areas with decent homes which it can profitably sell or rent to the lower-income families. Prices of land, costs of building materials, and costs of labor and financing are too great for the buying power of at least one-third of the Nation.

Actual records of home building bear this out. For example, surveys by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that in 28 representative cities, from 1929 to 1936, only about 8 percent of the dwellings built were within reach of the 65 percent of families having annual incomes under $1,500. Since then building costs and rents have advanced faster than incomes.

It is an accepted fact that a family cannot afford to own a home costing more than two or three times its annual income, also that families of low income cannot afford to pay more than 20 percent of their income for rent. This being true, there is no question that we must go beyond the abilities of private enterprise if we are to properly house the poorer people of the Nation.

HOUSING ACT HELD SOLUTION

The United States has found this out in very recent years, and Congress made possible a national program when it passed the United States Housing Act of 1937, authorizing the United States Housing Authority to lend local housing authorities $800,000,000 to clear slums and build housing projects for slum dwellers, and appropriated $28,000,000 per year for subsidies to insure rents low enough for rehoused dwellers to pay.

As a result of this action by Congress, the local housing authority at Fort Lauderdale has obtained contracts to build low-rent housing projects. Under terms of the Housing Act, an equal number of slum dwellings are to be eliminated by demolition, condemnation, and effective closing, or by compulsory repair or improvement.

Completion of the present program in Fort Lauderdale will mean the elimination of approximately 150 unsafe, unsanitary, and unfit dwellings, and re-housing of an equal number of families in substantial, clean, and comfortable homes, among pleasant surroundings. This will not only increase assets, and reduce liabilities, of this community, but will serve to some degree to cut down the annual bill for crime and sickness.

The Communist Party and the Negro in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1940

STATEMENT BY A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when there is rumor of much subversive influence at work in the United States, it is only natural for attention to be turned toward the American Negro, who constitutes our largest minority group, and who, because of his economic status and political weakness furnishes the most fertile field for subversive activities in this country. There is no doubt but that there is being made a very serious effort on the part of the agents of subversive propaganda to enlist and organize the Negro against this Government. I am therefore calling attention to a statement made recently by A. Philip Randolph, the former President of the National Negro Congress, an organization which is thought to be dominated by communistic influences and partially financed by Russian Communists.

WHY I WOULD NOT STAND FOR REELECTION FOR PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

(By A. Philip Randolph)

I am convinced that the Third National Negro Congress has not succeeded in removing from the mind of the public the idea that the charge of the Dies committee, that the National Negro Congress is a Communist front, and a transmission belt for Communist propaganda, is not true. In fact, the congress has brilliantly succeeded in giving the charge every appearance of truth and validity.

I am convinced, also, that until the stigma of the Communist front is wiped from the congress, it will never rally the masses of the Negro people.

The procedure, conduct, and policies of the Negro congress, as set up in this third national meeting, will make its influence in the affairs of the American Negroes, short lived. The American Negroes will not long follow any organization which accepts dictation and

control from the Communist Party. The American Negro will not long follow any organization which accepts dictation and control from any white organization.

In the last national executive committee meeting in New York City, Brother John P. Davis was authorized to go out and borrow $1,000 to help put the third congress over. He informed me that he had borrowed it and mentioned the name of a man. I was given no specific identity of the man. What was the source of this money? The delegates to the congress should know. Because whatever is the source of the money with which the congress is run, will also be the source of its ideas, policies, and control.

It is a well-known fact that most of the contributions to this congress, expressed by the secretary, Mr. Davis, are from C. I. O. unions. Is this the reason why the congress is taking the C. I. O. line?

In an executive committee meeting in New York City, Mr. Davis informed it that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to the congress. Is this the reason why the congress refuses to attempt to make plain to the American people that it is not a Communist front? These questions should be definitely and unequivocally answered.

When I was asked in a committee meeting in New York to visit some unions, or sign a letter to be sent to certain unions for funds, I refused, because I am unalterably opposed to having a Negro organization, which is supposed to be fighting the battles of the race, depending for its main income upon a source outside of the Negro people themselves.

I am opposed to the National Negro Congress depending upon the Communists or C. I. O. for its financial maintenance because I am opposed to the congress being dominated by either the Communists or the C. I. O. The congress should be uncontrolled and responsible to no one but the Negro people. But it will not be uncontrolled and responsible to no one but the Negro people unless the Negro people supply the money for its maintenance.

Now, there is nothing against the congress receiving contributions from unions, but it is dangerous business where there is a split in the labor movement for it to receive practically the major funds upon which its existence depends from unions on one side of the fence. It is bound to make the congress biased toward one side, and thereby destroy the united front and mass character of the congress, because it will no longer be able to rally the Negro workers in the A. F. of L.

When the National Negro Congress loses its independence, it loses its soul and has no further reason for being. It also forfeits and betrays the faith and confidence of the Negro masses. It will shatter the hopes and aspirations of the Negro people who yearn and pray for the Negro Congress not to sell out either to labor or capital, Communists or Republicans or Democrats.

Since the trend of the National Negro Congress is obviously toward domination by the Communists and the C. I. O., I would not stand for reelection for president.

I do not oppose domination of the congress by the C. I. O. because I am opposed to the C. I. O. I would be opposed to domination of the congress by the A. F. of L., or any other white organization.

With respect to domination by the Communists, I am not only opposed to domination of the congress by them, but I consider the Communists a definite menace and a danger to the Negro people and labor, because of their rule or ruin and disruptive tactics in the interest of the Soviet Union.

It was apparent, immediately the congress got under way, that the temper, flavor, and viewpoint of the congress were communistic and that the resolutions adopted would reflect the Communist line. It was not long before my suspicions were confirmed, for the person who was selected for the chairman of the resolutions committee is an acknowledged Communist. This was an unpardonable, colossal, and childish blunder. I didn't protest against it, because I knew it was useless, since the congress was deliberately packed with Communists and C. I. O. members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.

The Third National Negro Congress was a miserable failure, so far as representing the sentiment of the American Negro people is concerned. Uproarious applause greeted every favorable reference in the congress to Soviet Russia. The statement was even made that the Negro people would not fight in an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. But this is far from the truth. If the United States declared war upon Communist Russia tomorrow, the Negro would fight Russia with all the fervor and patriotism of any other 100-percent American. Anyone who believes to the contrary is living in a fool's paradise.

Soviet Russia was hailed as a land without poverty or race prejudice. But the fact is there are no Negroes in Soviet Russia that would occasion any manifestation of race discrimination. However, it is significant to note that Bolshevik Russia freely sold oil to Fascist Italy to assist the murderous war of invasion of the peace-loving and ancient Kingdom of Ethiopia.

I quit the congress because I was opposed to linking it up with Labor's Non-Partisan League, the political mouthpiece of the C. I. O., since this was a departure from the original minimum program upon which there could be general agreement and a sound basis for rallying the Negro masses.

It seems axiomatic and as simple as one, two, three, that the congress could not rally the Negroes in the A. F. of L., if it were tied up with the C. I. O., and it could not rally the Negroes in the C. I. O. if it were allied with the A. F. of L.

I quit the congress because I was opposed to it, or its officials, expressing sympathy for the Soviet Union, which is the death prison where democracy and liberty have walked their "last mile" and where shocking blood purges wipe out any and all persons who express any dissenting opinions from dictator Stalin.

I quit the congress because I saw that the Communists were firmly in the saddle and the delegates were not subject to the influence of facts and reason. Their minds were already made up when they came there by Communists' manipulations, caucuses, and propaganda. Nothing could shake them. Even poor old men and women from the deep South and from some parts up North, who didn't have the slightest idea of what it was all about, parrot fashion, went down the Communist line, like bleating sheep led to slaughter.

I quit the congress because it is not truly a Negro congress. Out of some 1,200 or more delegates, over 300 were white, which made the congress look like a joke. It is unthinkable that the Jewish congress would have gentiles in it, or that a Catholic congress would have Protestants in it, or that the famous all-India congress would have in it as members natives of Africa. Why should a Negro congress have white people in it?

It is no evidence of religious prejudice that Baptists don't accept Methodists into membership, or of sex prejudice that women's clubs don't take men in as members. It was perfectly ridiculous and distressing, if not comical, to observe the white delegates dominating the applause for Communists' policies and tactics.

But while I oppose white members of the Negro congress, I favor the congress collaborating with nonpolitical white organizations that are progressive, liberal, and sound.

The Negro people must beware of all subtle forms of Communist propaganda poison to save themselves from destruction. It seems to be beyond the realm of debate that the Negro people cannot afford to add to the handicap of being black, the handicap of being "red."

Notwithstanding the fact that these are serious and grave moments for the present and future of all democracies, I am firmly of the opinion that the Negro, because of his unfaltering trust in God, and his love for peace, tranquillity, and justice, and because of his spirit of long forebearing and tolerance, will be the last of American minority groups to yield in any degree to these approaches and appeals from the agents of subversive propaganda. In this connection I should like to call the attention of white America to the fact that the Negro should be treated with fairness and justice in all matters. How long will white America disregard the rights of this group and expect it to withstand the teachings of those who are unfriendly to our country?

If there should ever come a day when the Negro yields to these influences it will be because of the activities of such white organizations in our country as the Ku Klux Klan and other similar organizations founded and sustained on racial prejudice. I think white America should take due notice and immediately modify its attitude in Government and in economic opportunity toward the Negro; give him the same chance and the same consideration that is given all other racial groups. If this is done there need never be any fear of the Negro going astray.

Representative Paul J. Kilday as a Member of the House Military Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, when the Seventy-sixth Congress convened and the leaders of both sides had agreed upon the apportionment between parties on the various committees, we found that on the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, the Democratic Party would receive but one new member in the place of the four Democratic vacancies. By the unanimous vote of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, of the Twentieth District, was assigned to that vacancy.

Today I want to report to this House that the selection of PAUL KILDAY, has proven to be a wise one. The gentleman from Texas, PAUL J. KILDAY, has made good as a Congressman

and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. He has had the good judgment and the good sense to follow precedent in beginning his membership; he has worked hard, studied hard, listened, and learned, so that now he is an effective member. He came to our committee with a background and with experience which admirably qualified him for the important work of the committee. He comes from one of the most important military centers of the United States and knows the Army from long association. In addition, he has a brother who is an officer in the Army, a circumstance which has induced him to manifest a keen interest in the Army over a long period of time. Still further, for a period of 3 years he was a civil employee in the headquarters of the Army Air Service. He has advanced two places on the committee during this Congress and his position on the committee is secure.

The work of the Military Affairs Committee has been important and heavy during this Congress. We have handled the most extensive and important expansion of the national defense ever known in times of peace. In a time when the angry flames of war are surging through Europe and Asia, maintaining the security of American peace through a program of military preparedness for national defense has become a problem of the National Government of first concern, and the work of the Military Affairs Committee of this Congress has become of first-rank importance. In such critical times I am glad that we have on that committee such men as the gentleman from Texas, PAUL J. KILDAY. He has shown marked ability and a thorough understanding of the many perplexing problems of our country's defenses. I am happy to state that he has at all times manifested deep concern as to our military objectives, and has at all times been courteous and cooperative. He enjoys the esteem and confidence of all members of the committee, and so far as I can now recall, he has not, though a busy man, missed a single hearing of the committee during the 2 years that he has held membership. It is my desire and hope that he shall in these crucial and trying times continue as a member of this now strategically important committee. His 2 years' experience has already meant much, demonstrating his native ability.

Draft Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM G. McADOO AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by a great American, Hon. W. G. McAdoo, formerly a Member of this body and formerly Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, on the subject Draft Roosevelt. It is a radio address delivered in San Francisco on May 4, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Permit me at the outset to make a personal statement. When I withdrew from the Roosevelt ticket for delegates, I said that I was "out of politics and unwilling to reenter." Because this has been misconstrued, perhaps for partisan reasons, I wish to say that I meant that I would never again run for an elective political office. I did not mean that I would abandon my right as a citizen to express my opinion or to discuss questions affecting the welfare of our State and the Nation whenever I felt disposed to do so.

When you go to the polls, as every good citizen should, you will, if you are a registered Democrat, be presented with a ballot containing four columns of delegates to the Democratic National Convention. At the top of the first column is this statement: "Candidates preferring JOHN NANCE GARNER"; at the top of the second column is: "Candidates preferring Willis Allen"; at the top of the third column is: "Candidates preferring Ellis Patterson"; at the top of the fourth column is: "Candidates preferring Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

WOULD DRAFT ROOSEVELT

It is, of course, the duty of each voter to determine for himself which of these gentlemen as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States he prefers. If you want to reelect that eminent statesman and patriot who for 7 years has filled the office of President with extraordinary distinction and ability, you will cast your vote for the delegates who favor the renomination of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I have said publicly heretofore, and I repeat now, that I favor the reelection of President Roosevelt. Objection has been raised by some of the President's opponents to the election of delegates favoring his renomination because the President has refused to declare himself a candidate. The American people do not care whether or not he says in words that he is a candidate. They know that they have the right to make him a candidate whether he seeks the office or not.

The President would make a grave mistake to enter into a scramble with other candidates for the nomination. As a dignified, patriotic, and high-minded gentleman he naturally shrinks from seeking the office again. But that does not disqualify him from accepting a nomination if the national convention should tender it to him and, as a dignified, patriotic, and high-minded gentleman, he could not refuse to accept the call of his party to serve the American people for another 4 years.

THIRD-TERM HOAX

Others say that we ought not to elect any man for a third term. Why not? Because, they say, George Washington refused to accept a third term and that it has become a tradition that no man should be elected President three times. I respect the large body of public opinion which believes in this theory, but there is no constitutional provision and there is no law of Congress that forbids a third term. It is merely tradition; and it will survive so long only as it serves the public welfare. Thousands of traditions have had to fall before the forward march of civilization because the developments of the future and the progress of a people cannot be tied immutably to the views, opinions, or customs of a past age.

The time has now arrived when this tradition must disappear before the crucial onrush of another deep and incalculable European convulsion. Before the grave issues involved in this conflict are settled the ablest brains of this country will be demanded for our security, peace, and progress. We must use all possible and honorable means to keep out of the war. I believe the reelection of the experienced Roosevelt, himself an apostle of peace and a tremendous influence for good, is essential. No other man is so well equipped as he, by experience and knowledge of the complicated problems now facing the world and the United States, to serve the best interests of the American people in this critical time.

EXPERIENCE NECESSARY

What would happen to us if we should put a green, inexperienced man in the White House next year? However patriotic and well-intentioned a green man may be, he cannot, in the very nature of things, handle these grave problems with the skill and ability that the man who has been immersed in the tangle of these great affairs, and who knows better than any green man can know what should be done as he confronts the various and serious emergencies that will inevitably arise with the progress of this murderous war.

Many people say that we are far away from the seat of the war, and that all we have to do is to attend to our own business. I am in favor of attending to our own business, but I should like to point out to you that the destinies of America, even though we succeed in preserving our own peace, are bound up in the decisions which will be made eventually on the battlefields of Europe. As a great nation we are inevitably affected by what happens in Europe, no matter how successful we may be in keeping out of the bloody conflict itself.

WHAT COULD HAPPEN

Let me illustrate the point: Suppose that Germany and Stalin should conquer Great Britain and France. The first thing the victors will consider is the disposition of the rich territories and possessions of Great Britain and France. The flag of Great Britain flies over Canada, our good neighbor to the north. It also flies over the important island of Bermuda, only 775 miles from New York and Baltimore. It flies over nearly all the islands of the West Indies which are adjacent to the coast of Florida and command the approaches on the north side of the Caribbean Sea, through which all commerce transiting the Panama Canal must pass. So long as these possessions remain in control of friendly nations we need feel little concern about them.

But suppose that in the partitioning process Canada should be turned over to Stalin and the West Indies and Bermuda should be handed to Hitler. At once our Monroe Doctrine would be violated. Immediately we would either have to abandon the Monroe Doctrine and allow these great powers to take Canada and the West Indies or we would have to challenge any attempt on their part to do so.

MUST FACE FACTS

It is not necessary for me to speculate on the consequences of that issue if presented to the American people. I mention it because I want to emphasize and bring thoroughly to your consciousness the fact that so long as any European powers possess these vital parts of the Western Hemisphere they will always be

involved in the quarrels of Europe, because they must naturally support the flag of the country which flies over them. If Canada were independent and the West Indies were independent they would not be involved if Great Britain and France went to war with other European nations.

I am not attempting to make an argument for the independence of Canada and the West Indies. I am trying to bring out the fact that so long as the flag of any foreign power flies over them, they become involved in any war in which the parent country may become engaged.

It is not at all certain that we may not be forced to face this issue on the ground of the Monroe Doctrine, if not on other grounds, economic and political, that may be even more commanding than the Monroe Doctrine. If that time should come, would we not be far safer to have our wise and experienced President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, represent us than any green or inexperienced citizen, however patriotic and earnest he may be, in dealing with the complicated and dangerous problems which will present themselves in the circumstances I have described?

NOT IDLE SPECULATION

Perhaps you may say that this is long-range speculation on my part. I remember that when I was Secretary of the Treasury under that great statesman Woodrow Wilson during World War No. 1, I said, in speeches during the Liberty Loan campaigns in 1917, that we could not depend wholly upon the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans to protect us; that the time was not far distant when airplanes would be flying these oceans. Many people thought that I was of unsound mind when I made these predictions; but since that time our airplanes are flying the Pacific via Honolulu and Manila to Hong Kong on the Chinese coast; and they are also flying the Atlantic via Bermuda to Lisbon, Portugal. These achievements merely foreshadow what is yet to come in the way of increased, more rapid, and safe air transportation, and the development along with it of air armadas which may have a determining influence upon the destiny of the whole world.

Imagination and foresight are inseparable elements of statesmanship. Without imagination the creative faculty is seriously deficient. It is not testing imagination too severely to visualize the possible attempt in the not distant future for the great powers now engaged in the European conflict to change existing sovereignty over Canada and the West Indies. The world is going to be reapportioned as a result of the present war, and no one can say that the improbable may not become the actual. Roosevelt has the required imagination and foresight, along with his tested experience and ability, to meet all the demands which the future may impose upon our constitutional government.

We occupy a strong position, but we cannot look with indifference upon European events which may, as I have already said, profoundly affect our own destiny; and when the time comes to settle the issues arising out of the present war we want the experienced Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the helm.

There is no danger that he may become a dictator or that he will attempt to found a dynasty. All that stuff is merely political claptrap. I have known Mr. Roosevelt more or less intimately for more than 30 years. I regard him as one of the greatest men we have produced in the present century, and I know that, with his ripe experience and exceptional qualities of statesmanship, he will serve the American people during the uncertain and perilous times ahead of us with rare wisdom, ability, and devotion to his countrymen.

It is for these reasons that I favor the election of the delegation which is pledged to support him in the Chicago convention.

Schools and Training Courses in Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ANSWERS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION TO ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S SPECIAL REPORT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Acting Comptroller General sent to you a letter in the form of a Special Report relating to certain schools and training courses which various Government departments and agencies conduct with a view to increasing the efficiency of their workers. This letter was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which I am chairman. Certain statements were made by the Comptroller General which were answered in part at the time. Wide publicity was given the report, and I placed the answer of the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior in the RECORD. I have two more letters on the subject; one from Secretary Wallace and the other from the Civil Service Commission, which I am including as part of my remarks. They follow:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 13, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: We have read with interest the letter of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States and the Special Report relating to certain schools and training courses which are being conducted in, or by Government departments and independent establishments (76th Cong., 3d sess., S. Doc. No. 182).

On page 2, third paragraph, the Acting Comptroller General says, "Attention is invited to the fact that the acts quoted do nothing more than provide that Government records, documents, and papers shall be available to students and research workers; and the Executive order quoted does nothing more than authorize the conduct of in-service training courses for the training of employees of the various departments and establishments of the Government."

It is hardly necessary to say that this is not the interpretation which has been uniformly adhered to in reference to those acts since the organization in the Bureau of Standards about 1908, of graduate courses in physics, mathematics, and chemistry, and since the organization of the Graduate School in the Department of Agriculture about 1921. In Higher Educational Circular No. 14, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, the acts in question are referred to as "Ample legal authority for the maintenance of such educational work within a Government bureau." (See p. 1, par. 3, public, Feb. 1919.)

The first act, joint resolution of April 12, 1892 (27 Stat. 395) made it possible for qualified students to use Government collections and various types of scientific material under such rules and regulations as the head of the department saw fit to establish. The second act, Deficiency Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1039), considerably broadened the first act making it possible for the use of Government facilities by "scientific investigators and duly-qualified individuals, students, and graduates of institutions of learning in the several States and Territories as well as in the District of Columbia, under such rules and restrictions as the heads of the departments and bureaus mentioned may prescribe."

The only time that this matter has ever been questioned was in a memorandum from the Comptroller General of the United States under date of September 3, 1931, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which the Comptroller General called attention to the graduate school and asked for advice as to the authority under which the school was being conducted. That letter was replied to by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture under date of October 8, 1931, citing these acts and our operations under them. No objection to the procedure set forth in the Acting Secretary's letter was ever raised by the Comptroller General. This correspondence was not included in the report of the Acting Comptroller General, but was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1940, pages 4587–4589.

The long-continued interpretation of these acts by the Government officials who are charged with their administration should be given the most careful consideration.

These acts do not specify the exact types of work for which facilities of the Government may be used. They leave the matter to the discretion of the heads of departments, and in the case of the graduate school of the Department of Agriculture, this discretion was delegated first to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, then to the director of scientific work, who had the status of an Assistant Secretary, and later, when this position was abolished and the Director of Scientific Work became Principal Pathologist, Bureau of Plant Industry, he was requested by the Secretary to continue the direction of the school. When he retired from the Government service a committee appointed by the Secretary made a careful study of the school's program and recommended that the directorship of the school be continued under an administrative committee headed by the Director of Personnel.

On page 3 of the Acting Comptroller General's report, the last two lines of the fourth paragraph state that "no accounting has ever been made to the Government for any of the school's funds." This is true, of course, so far as the General Accounting Office is concerned, because the funds are not Government funds. Accounting has been made by the treasurer of the school to the director each year, from the beginning of the school to the present time. Since 1934 monthly financial reports are filed with the Director of Personnel of the Department, who is chairman of the administrative committee representing the Secretary of Agriculture. These accounts and records were thrown open to the investigators from the General Accounting Office and are always open for inspection by properly authorized individuals.

On page 12, the Director is quoted as saying that the school has 5,000 students enrolled. The number last year (1938–39) was 4,409—2,361 in the regular semester courses and 2,048 in the lecture courses. This year (1939–40) there are approximately 3,000 in the regular semester courses and about 600 in the lecture courses.

On page 13, fourth paragraph, it is stated that "the school is operating in connection with the Council of Personnel Administration under the provisions of Executive Order No. 7916 of June 24, 1938." We have, of course, endeavored to cooperate, as far as possible, with all authorized Government agencies, but the school is not operating in any special connection with the Council of Personnel Administration.

On page 15, under paragraph (f), relating to giving instructions to persons preparing for civil-service examinations, it should be noted that the graduate school has always been extremely careful in this matter, and teachers in its courses have been instructed not to give work with special reference to any civil-service examination. The procedure in this respect has been, from time to time, discussed with representatives of the Civil Service Commission and has been informally approved.

On the same page in the first paragraph quoting Dr. Kaufman, the last two lines are italicized. Evidently they were misunderstood. They refer to in-service training work given during official hours as a part of the official program with which the graduate school has nothing to do.

On page 31, beginning of the last paragraph, it is stated there may be, and probably is, "a tie-in between these lectures and the now well-known and clearly defined movement called union now." The graduate school has no such "tie-in."

The Acting Comptroller General in his letter has not clearly distinguished between strictly in-service training courses, largely given during official hours for training of employees at Government expense for the better performance of their official duties, and the courses in our graduate school given after official hours at the expense of the students.

It is true that these courses are in most cases designed to increase the efficiency of the employee and give him a broader concept of his work and its relation to public welfare. At the same time, also, the student at his own expense is advancing his educational program for academic recognition. Under such circumstances the employee feels that his future development is up to him. He is better satisfied with his job and works to improve himself.

Whatever indirect cost there may be in using Government facilities after official hours is more than offset by the advantages in improved interest and efficiency in official work.

The school serves a valuable purpose to this Department and the Government departments generally and should be continued without interruption.

I hope that it may have the approval of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, though no Government expenditures are involved.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Senate Document No. 182 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), containing a reprint of the report on "Schools and training courses in Government departments" transmitted by the Acting Comptroller General of the United States to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and referred to the committees of which you and Senator VAN NUYS are chairmen, has recently been called to my attention. On page 11 of this document appear certain statements and views ascribed to me which are seriously at variance with the statements I made to the investigators of the General Accounting Office at the time of their visit to my office. I should like to correct the record so far as this particular portion of the report is concerned.

It is difficult to understand how anything I said could have been misconstrued to the extent indicated by the text of the report. No written record of the conversation was made, however, at the time of the interview, and it is barely possible that impressions gained from it were later colored by someone else's views or information gained from other sources by the investigators.

It is interesting to note that the report is in error in other respects, noticeably in the evident confusion in the minds of the authors with respect to the Society for Personnel Administration and the newly organized Society for Public Administration.

Specifically, the errors which exist in the remarks and opinions ascribed to me are the following:

I have never thought of the President's Executive order of June 24, 1938, as having had any direct relationship or bearing upon the Department of Agriculture's graduate school, particularly with respect to any expansion which it may have had, or in relationship to the clarification of the legal authority for its existence. I do not believe, and I am sure I did not say, that this order itself has been responsible for any expansion of the activities of the graduate school which may have taken place since June 1938, except insofar as the order may have stimulated among employees greater interest in training activities. I am certain that I did not express myself with respect to the degree to which the Executive order may have clarified the authority for the existence of the graduate school.

The last paragraph of that portion of the report dealing with my interview by the investigators reveals a complete misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the views which I expressed in that interview. In the first place, I did not say that "schools have multiplied," nor did I refer to Executive Order No. 7916 as "the Executive order creating the Council of Personnel Administration." I did state that the Executive order had increased already existing interest in employee training, and that that increased interest was evidenced by the development of certain new activities and by the making of plans for the expansion of programs already in operation.

It is not clear whether the second clause of this paragraph refers to the purpose of the schools mentioned in the first clause or to the Executive order. In any event, no statement was made by me that could have been construed to mean that the object of training activities is "ultimately to bring all personnel matters, classifications, reclassifications, promotions, and control of personnel under the new personnel management set-up."

The statement which is most seriously at variance with the facts is contained in the last sentence of this paragraph. It is difficult to understand how anything I may have said, even in answer to a leading question, could have been interpreted to mean what is contained in this sentence, "He conceded this would, to a great extent, deprive supervisory and operating management of control over employees of the Government." Here again it is not clear whether the "this" in the sentence quoted refers to schools, the Executive order, or the Council of Personnel Administration. No matter what interpretation might be placed upon the sentence as a whole, I would not subscribe, and have never subscribed, to the sentiment expressed. Even if reference is made to the organizational relationship indicated in the Executive order, the statement is still at variance with my views because of the continuing staff relationship of personnel divisions to management.

I regret the necessity of submitting this letter for your consideration, but feel that not to do so would leave the record incorrect and would be likely to cause embarrassment to the Civil Service Commission.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Senator VAN NUYS.

Very respectfully yours,

WINSTON B. STEPHENS,
Coordinator and Director of Training.

Humanitarian Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, at the Southern Democratic rally held in Los Angeles, California, May 11, 1940:

Humanitarian democracy is on trial. It is on trial in California, in Indiana, and in every State throughout this Nation.

The issue is crystal clear. Will America uphold the magnificent record of a liberal, progressive party which has rescued the Nation from the hopeless despair to which it had been reduced in 1932? Or is this country to be turned back to the hard-boiled, selfish, do-nothing party which wrecked it in 1929?

That party is doing everything within its power to mislead the voters. It is doing everything possible to cloud the issue. Empty phrases and phony arguments, pious pledges, and scurrilous charges cannot obscure the one outstanding, glaring fact that in 1940 the people again face the ancient choice between a party which has traditionally defended the privileges of entrenched wealth and has bitterly opposed every social reform for a hundred years and a party which has championed the cause of the people—the people who do the work of the country—the farmer, the laborer, the businessman.

That was the issue in 1932. It was the issue in 1936. And it is again the issue in 1940.

Look at the record of the New Deal years and compare it with the record of the old deal years.

On which record do you find genuine efforts to relieve the hardships of the aged and the unemployed, to mitigate the sufferings of the sick and physically handicapped, to check the unbridled greed and avarice of the racketeers of finance and monopoly?

The Republicans point with brazen pride to what they called prosperity and normalcy during the twenties. But no move was made during that shameful epoch in speculation and inflation to afford anything like social security to the people.

Then as now we had the aged with us, unable to take care of themselves in their declining years. They had to go to the poorhouse or rely upon the charity of struggling youth.

Then as now we had the victims of the machine—technological and seasonal unemployment. They had to borrow money at ruinous rates of interest and let the installments go on the automobile and furniture.

Then as now there were farmers with an unequal share of the national income, with gullies in their fields, the land blowing away at the rate of a farm a day and washing down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers at the rate of a farm every hour. They had to fight pests at their own expense, and when the land was barren and the topsoil blown away, abandon their investment at ruinous prices and go in debt for another farm at inflated prices.

Then as now there were the blind and crippled children, the sick, and the diseased. They had to suffer, many of them with inadequate medical care and insufficient hospital facilities.

The Republicans had their chance. With all their normalcy and prosperity the Republican administration made not one move to humanize the Government of the United States or to equalize among its citizens what the uneven hand of privilege, birth, and luck had brought about.

But since 1933 the history of this country has been reversed. Three billion dollars have been used since that time to give the farmers a chance to save themselves and their land from economic and physical deterioration.

Eleven billion dollars have been utilized for work relief and for social security.

Two billion dollars have been granted to business concerns to give them a chance to put themselves on a sound financial basis during periods of readjustment.

A billion and a half has gone to home owners, to clear away the filth and disease of city slums and to give clean, sanitary housing to sharecroppers and rural tenants.

Right here in California you have received from the Federal Government grants which need not be repaid of more than a billion and a half dollars, in addition to many millions more in loans at low interest rates.

This money, let it be understood, has not been spent. It has been invested. And it has been invested in securities that will pay far greater dividends than the bogus stock and sour bonds into which widows and old people and farmers and businessmen sunk their savings during those snorting, roaring, booming inflated 20's.

This money has been invested in things the citizens in this country can use and enjoy and benefit from. It was used for highways and streets—$4,000,000,000 of it. For conservation, reclamation, and flood control—four and one-half billion of it. For sewers and waterworks and power plants—a billion of it. For school houses, colleges, and other educational buildings—another billion. For parks and playgrounds, housing and slum clearance, the draining of malaria-infested swamps and the planting of shelterbelts. And finally, it was invested in the happiness and security of the people of California and Indiana, and every other State in this rich, free democratic country of ours.

All this in 7 years—a record in social pioneering and democracy unequaled in any like period of our history.

When Mr. Dewey tells us that a Republican administration would not abandon the social legislation of the last 7 years, we enjoy his youthful exuberance and boyish idealism. And when Mr. VANDENBERG tells us that the Republicans will save the New Deal, we rejoice in the Senator's big, generous, humanitarian heart. But we can be pardoned for a smile at the quaint credulity with which a hundred years of Republican history can be disregarded and the party leaders and money raisers ignored.

And when Mr. TAFT tells us that he, too, has a soul that throbs for the common man, but that he wants to "turn relief back to the States," we look at the record of Governor Bricker's relief administration during the past winter and realize how well both Governor Bricker and Senator Taft are living up to the time-honored traditions of their party.

The Republican Party has always been the party of reaction and it is still the party of reaction. Whatever the platform may be—whatever the candidates may say, the Government which the people would get from a Republican administration would be the same.

Do you remember when Herbert Hoover made a noise like a great liberal humanitarian that was heard round the world? Do you remember when the Lion of Idaho proclaimed him as the great progressive of his day? You may also remember how quick he was to respond to the demands to feed the starving hogs owned by starving farmers in the Southwest during the drought of 1932. But his political conscience was shocked at the thought of feeding the farmers themselves and their starving families. "That," he claimed, "would be playing politics with human misery."

I don't see how you can put in charge of a liberal program a party and a group of men who have consistently opposed that program for 7 years and then expect anything dazzling in the way of success.

Mr. Dewey recently took occasion while in California to discuss the problem of social security, and on that occasion to point out what he regarded as the shortcomings of the Social Security Act and the incompetency of its administration.

No one, I think, who has studied the question of social security will contend that our present laws are adequate. Certainly no member of the Democratic administration would make such a contention. On the other hand, their inadequacy is obvious to all familiar with the needs of the aged, the unemployed, and the physically handicapped. There are two points about the social-security program upon which all leaders of the Roosevelt administration agree. First, not enough people are included in the benefit structure. Second, individual benefits are inadequate.

We can go further and say more. The administrative and research machinery of the Democratic administration are giving constant and continuous study to these two problems to the end that security for all the aged may be attained and that that security will be adequate.

We are thus in agreement with Mr. Dewey that there are defects in the present system of old-age and unemployment security.

Now let us examine Mr. Dewey's charge that the old-age insurance program has been incompetently administered. It is said that over 250,000,000 tax payments (wage items) have been made up to the present time, of which, for the years 1937 and 1938, 7,000,000 are unidentified, also, that including tax payments (wage items) for 1939, the unidentified items will doubtless reach as high as 12,000,000.

Now for the facts. As of April 1940, there has been reported a total of 300,000,000 employee wage items. There still remains in suspense for the year 1937 and 1938 a total of six and one-half million wage items. For the entire period (i. e., from January 1937 through April 1940) the incompletely and incorrectly reported items total ten and one-half million. Mr. Dewey is thus in error by several million items on both figures.

Mr. Dewey says that these incomplete items are wholly unidentified.

The great majority of them are in fact identified by the proper name of the employee to whose credit they should be posted. But because the employer who reported the payment failed to identify it with the employee's social security account number, it has been impossible to post to the proper account with complete assurance of the accuracy upon which we insist. No posting is made until the item has been further identified by reference either to the several existing files, or to the employer or employee.

Mr. Dewey declared that workers will find when they become eligible and in need of their benefits that there is no record of the payments which were taken from them on the promise of protection in their old age. This is pure fabrication.

As of April 15, 1940, over 539,000 claims had been paid without a single question being raised by the worker or his survivors as to the accuracy of his recorded earnings. These unidentified items remain in a suspense file and are regularly referred to whenever a worker's claim for benefit is filed. They are also referred to when a worker inquires as to the status of his wage record.

Up to the present time over 300,000 workers have inquired concerning the status of their accounts, and statements have been sent to them promptly. These statements would appear to have been accurate and fully satisfactory to the worker, as no further questions were evoked from them. To our knowledge, no worker has yet found, upon becoming eligible for and in need of his old-age insurance, that he has been denied all or any part of his benefits because of an inadequate record of the wages upon which he paid taxes.

The significant index as to the adequacy of these wage records is not the number of individual employee items now in suspense, but rather the proportion of all of the wages reported by employers, and upon which work workers' benefits will be based, which have been positively identified. As of April 18, 1940, a total of $85,000,000,000 in wages had been reported by employers for the entire period since January 1, 1937. Of this total, 99.01 percent had been properly identified to the individual worker's accounts. The amount not completely identified for the entire 3 years totals an average of exactly 8 cents per worker—and the amount is being constantly reduced.

The charge that the administration of the old-age survivors' insurance program has been incompetent is the exact opposite to the conclusion of the House Appropriations Committee, to which the Bureau of Old Age Survivors' Insurance willingly presented all of the facts relative to the maintenance of the wage records. The conclusion reached by the House Appropriations Committee, after careful consideration, was as follows: "The committee can see nothing in this picture that is deserving of any adverse criticism; on the contrary, considering the novelty and magnitude of the program that was undertaken, it would seem quite remarkable that such a small percentage of the total collection is still in suspense. It should be pointed out that the amount of tax thus in suspense is being reduced from day to day as the Board is able to establish the identity of individual items."

In this same connection, Congressman ALBERT J. ENGEL, ranking Republican member of the subcommittee which considered this question, personally took time to visit the offices of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, both in Washington and Baltimore.

In further discussing this matter on the floor of the House of Representatives, he stated, "I went through the offices, visiting every nook and corner, examining the files, records, and methods of doing business. I was in every building, including the Baltimore office. I said then, and I say now, that they have an efficient organization. I think the Baltimore office is operating as efficiently as it would be were it a private insurance company. I believe the same can be said more or less of the entire Board's operations."

These charges of incompetency in administration are based upon as many half truths as a half-completed district attorney's investigation.

I do not know how competent Mr. Dewey is as a prosecuting officer or how efficient and thorough the organization of his office may be. I am, however, perfectly willing to give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that, as a prosecuting attorney, he is entirely adequate.

If I have not been overgenerous, then Mr. Dewey would, under no circumstances, conduct a prosecution of a racketeer without a thorough and complete investigation of all the facts.

But he has brought charges of incompetency against the only administration that has ever given the people of this country a chance to construct for themselves a system of social security. These charges are based upon inadequate information, half-truths, and an utter failure to take account of discoverable facts. The result has been a complete misrepresentation of the existing system of old-age insurance, and wholly unsubstantiated charges against those responsible for its operation.

The American people want social security, and they are going to have it. They want adequate old-age benefits, and the country is rich enough to afford it.

But they will never obtain it if they rely upon the Republican Party to obtain it for them. The Republican Party has never been a liberal party, or a humanitarian party. Every social reform which the people ever obtained has been secured through the agency of the Democratic Party. And if the Social Security Act is to be improved and modified and extended in coverage until it provides security for all, as I believe it should, this will be accomplished not through the age-old party of reaction and special privilege, but through the liberal, progressive, humanitarian Democratic Party.

The Republican Party has given the aged nothing but promises.

The Democratic Party, in 1935, gave them a start toward old-age security.

In 1939 it made vast improvements in that law.

In 1941 it will give them adequate security against the terrors of economic want during their declining years.

Amendment To Be Proposed by Mr. Taber to Relief Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

TEXT OF AMENDMENT BY MR. TABER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an amendment I propose to offer to the relief bill for the information of the Members:

SECTION 1. (a) In order to continue to provide relief and work for needy persons on useful public projects in the United States and its Territories and possessions, there is hereby appropriated to the Work Projects Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $975,650,000, together with all balances of appropriations under section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 which remain unobligated on June 30, 1940, including such unobligated balances of funds transferred to other Federal agencies for nonconstruction projects under the provisions of section 11 (a) of such act of 1939 or set aside for specific purposes in accordance with other law: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds heretofore irrevocably set aside for the completion of Federal construction projects under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1938 and 1939 shall remain available until June 30, 1941, for such completion, and any such funds which remain unobligated by reason of the completion or abandonment of any such Federal construction project shall be returned to this appropriation.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available:

(1) For administration, the sum of $3,000,000, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia. Apportionment shall be made monthly on the first day of each month, so that the sum available under this paragraph will be apportioned over the entire 12 months of the fiscal year 1941.

(2) For grants to cities, villages, towns, and boroughs not a portion of a city, and the portion of towns outside of cities and villages, for relief and relief employment prosecuted by them, the sum of $600,000,000. Such sum shall be allotted on the basis of population of the municipalities applying therefor. In the case of counties where relief is administered on a county-wide basis, grants under this paragraph shall be made to the county in lieu of the city, village, or town, but the county may allot the proceeds of such grants to cities, towns, and villages within the county for prosecution of work-relief projects.

(3) For grants to cities having a population of 100,000 or more, for relief and relief employment prosecuted by them, the sum of $372,650,000. Such sum shall be allotted one-half on the basis of population of such cities and one-half on the number of people on relief and relief employment in the municipalities applying therefor. In the case of counties where relief is administered on a county-wide basis, grants under this paragraph shall be made to the county in lieu of the city, but the county may allot the proceeds of such grants to cities within the county for prosecution of work-relief projects.

(A) Distribution of sums in pursuance of allotments made under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection shall not exceed for each of the following months the percentage set forth in the following table:

Month:	*Percentage of total*
July	7
August	7
September	7
October	8
November	9
December	10
January	10
February	10
March	10
April	9
May	7
June	6

(B) Grants made in pursuance of paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection shall be made on the basis of a contribution by the United States of 75 percent and a contribution by the grantee, in cash, of 25 percent of the cost of the relief or relief employment with respect to which the grant is made.

(C) Grants for any month shall be made under paragraphs (2) and (3) only to applicants who have applied to the Commissioner of Work Projects, and the application shall set forth a statement of the current relief load of the applicant and the probable financial burden which relief will represent for the month for which application is made, and also an obligation of the applicant to contribute from its own funds or funds of the State 25 percent of the total amount which will be devoted by the applicant to such relief for such month. No such grant shall be made in excess of the amount applied for or required for the purposes of relief and relief employment.

(D) If the amount of any grant made under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection which is required to be expended or obligated by the grantee in any month is not expended or obligated during such month, an amount equal to such remainder, and any amount of Federal funds not matched during such month, shall be deducted and withheld from any grant which is made to the grantee with respect to the second succeeding month thereafter, and shall be used to increase the amount available under the paragraph under which the grant was made for grants for December and succeeding months.

Advertising—The Spark Plug of Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO, BEFORE ADVERTISING AFFILIATION CONVENTION IN BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the Advertising Affiliation Convention in Buffalo, N. Y., on Friday, May 3, on the subject Advertising: The Spark Plug of Recovery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the profession of advertising, it is an honor and a privilege to come to Buffalo to address the Advertising Affiliation. I hope that I may profit by what I can learn from members of your profession. Politics and advertising are not quite the same, but any politician who wishes to be successful certainly will have to learn all there is to know about advertising.

Until recently there hasn't been much doubt in anyone's mind as to the contribution which advertising makes to prosperity and the improvement of living conditions. It was almost 14 years ago, in October 1926, that President Coolidge delivered an address at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Advertising Agencies. I should like to use one of the thoughts expressed by him on that occasion as a text, if you please, for my talk today.

President Coolidge said: "Advertising creates and changes that foundation of all popular action, public sentiment or public opinion. It is the most potent influence in adopting and changing the habits and modes of life, affecting what we eat, what we wear, and the work and play of the whole Nation. * * * It informs its readers of the existence and nature of commodities by explaining the advantages to be derived from their use and creates for them a wider demand. It makes new thoughts, new desires, and new actions. By changing the attitude of mind it changes the material condition of the people."

But since the depression of 1929 we have been subjected to all kinds of new economic theories, and one of them is definitely hostile to advertising. It was natural that there should be a revolution in economic theory. We thought we had developed a system which would work perfectly, which would insure a job to every man who wanted one, and give him a wage sufficient to take care of his old age and provide for his family. We found that we were subject to the same old hard times which we had seen at intervals before, and that perhaps these times might be just a little harder as the economic system became more complex.

The cause of the depression is still obscure. I have my own view of it, but it probably isn't any better than that of anyone else. But it is perfectly clear that there was a descending spiral of unemployment and purchasing power. As men were thrown out of work, their purchasing power decreased, the demand for raw materials and manufactured products decreased, and this resulted in still more unemployment and still more hardship on the farm.

Ever since we reached the bottom in 1932, we have been trying to find the formula for putting Humpty Dumpty together again. Again it is perfectly obvious that if production increases, employment increases, the workmen have more purchasing power, which in turn produces greater production. The administration has been obsessed with the view that the way to set the cycle of prosperity going is to increase purchasing power by Government doles to the consumers, and by arbitrarily raising wages. There was a time when I thought this method of priming the pump might work. There seems to be no reason why you can't begin at one point in the cycle as well as any other. But we have actually tried the Government method, and it has not worked. There are still 9,000,000 people unemployed. Farm prices are little higher than they were in 1933. Relief rolls have increased beyond our wildest imaginings. The national income is still far below the national income of 1928, and there are 10,000,000 more people now among whom that income must be divided. The Government has a deficit of $4,000,000,000 a year, not because it is impossible to balance the Budget, but because the administration still believes in Government spending as a means of recovery. Surely if we have not set the machinery going by borrowing and spending over $20,000,000,000, there is no reason to hope that we can restore prosperity by a continued deficit of $4,000,000,000 and a direct payment to consumers in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000 a year.

For whatever reason, the only way back to prosperity appears to be a stimulation of production rather than of purchasing power. Additional production will produce jobs, and that kind of purchasing power will stimulate production. Advertising is the spark plug, because without it you can't stimulate production.

After all, if we look back at history, we find that America has grown prosperous through the growth of production rather than through any direct artificial stimulation of purchasing power. We have grown because there has been a constant supply of new enterprises; making new things or making old things in a new way. The genius and the energy of the American people have exceeded that of any other nation. Little industries, beginning with one or two men in a machine shop, have grown to great factories employing hundreds of thousands of men. A man has a new idea. He makes a new product. He advertises his product to his neighbors. He builds up his production and the number of his workmen until their demands increase the consumer's purchasing power of the United States and increase it permanently.

The obsession of the Government with its own method of producing prosperity has led to a determined hostility to the sound and historical method. It has undoubtedly led to a hostility to advertising because that is part of the process which the New Deal has abhorred from the beginning. The New Deal has accepted the general attack on advertising begun by Stuart Chase and Frederick J. Schlink in 1927. It has supported the general attack made on advertising by consumer editors. Mr. Tugwell himself has written a textbook attacking advertising as an aspect of competitive profit seeking, involving enormous waste and fraud on consumers. Mr. Ickes took a shot at advertising in 1934. Attorney General Arnold in 1938, before the T. N. E. C., attacked advertising as either a waste or an aid to monopoly. The Federal Trade Commission has sought power to investigate the cost of distribution, the place of advertising in distribution, and whether or not advertising is rendering a disservice to distribution. It is subjecting all advertising today to a carping and meticulous criticism.

Of course, no one will deny that there has been a good deal of misleading advertising. I think the advertisers themselves should be grateful to the consumers' councils for insisting on fair advertising and debunking some of the worst claims. But the acts of the present administration indicate a yearning for Government control and regulation of advertising. The leading characteristic of the New Deal is its desire to regulate everything, and advertising certainly presents a field in which they can exercise this yearning on the ground that the people must be protected against fraud. Personally, I don't think that the people are fooled by advertising. They accept it as advertising, and their fingers are crossed until they try out the product and see whether it lives up to its advance notices. The American people are intelligent enough so that they don't need a wet nurse. The danger to the whole country from Government control of advertising is much greater than the danger that any considerable number of people are going to be fooled by advertising.

The danger is that Government control in this industry, as in many others, will so tie down and delay the whole process of running the machinery that the machinery won't run at all. We have seen a recent example in the attempt of the Federal Communications Commission to stop the sale of television sets because they are not yet sufficiently perfected. What would have happened to the radio industry if some Government agency had prohibited the advertising of crystal sets and other early radio developments simply because they were imperfect and would probably have to be superseded shortly by other instruments? What would have happened if some Government agency had refused to permit the advertising of the early automobiles?

Furthermore, we have found before that you can't regulate one feature of an industry without regulating it all. If the Government gets power to tell every newspaper what it shall put in its advertising columns, it is only a short step before it will be telling every newspaper what it shall put in its news columns and in its editorial columns. The resentment of the new dealers against advertising seems to be part of their general resentment against all the newspapers for the criticism which has been showered on so many experiments.

I have been a good deal interested in the difference between commercial advertising and political advertising. Some advertising agencies would have you believe that they can sell a candidate to the people of a State the way they can sell a cake of soap. But it seems to me that there is a fundamental difference. Advertising, after all, does not finally sell even a commercial product. It calls the people's attention to the product. It induces them to go down to the store and look it over. It may sell a sample. The actual selling is finally done by a salesman and by the quality of the product itself. Political advertising attempts something much more ambitious. It attempts to convince the people of a whole State that one candidate is better than another. It must convince a majority of all the people. Most of the people never see the candidate, and advertising does no more than call a name to their attention, which they would find anyway on the ballot. In the end, people form their political judgment, I believe, not so much from advertising, but from a combination of the opinions of their friends, the opinions of various newspapers, and the acts or words of the candidate himself. Advertising plays an important part in politics, but I doubt whether it can ever play the same part which it does in commercial business. Perhaps it is just as well that it should not. If money and skill in advertising alone could choose for us our public officials, the mistakes likely to be made would affect the whole public welfare and create conditions from which the State or county could never recover.

There is another parallel which I think is a bad one. I don't believe a government should go into the advertising business itself. We have in Washington today a Government advertising to a greater extent than any other administration in our history, or, I think, any other government in any other country. The extent to which this Government has gone into advertising itself makes an interesting story. Few people realize that employees of the Federal Government, whose salaries total millions of dollars each year, are devoting all or the major part of their time to publicizing the activities of the Government. This publicity takes the form of press releases, press conferences, pamphlets, radio programs, motion pictures, exhibits, posters, and other media. Undoubtedly much of this publicity is justified, but there is much of it that is not. The farmers' bulletins and other informational publications of this nature may be highly desirable and perform a useful function, but it has been estimated that the output of Government printed and duplicated material has increased threefold since 1933. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the W. P. A., the P. W. A., the Farm Security Administration, the United States Housing Authority, the Social Security Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration are the more outstanding examples of agencies which have been responsible for this large increase. Many of these functions of government are of a controversial nature, and the administration has undertaken to sell its program to the public and defend it from its critics.

Almost everyone will agree that it is a legitimate activity of government to give out purely factual information about its decisions and activities. It is necessary to keep the public informed about the rulings and decisions of Government boards and commissions. It is decidedly helpful to have the public informed of the various research activities of the Government in the fields of agriculture and commerce and industry.

The more questionable types of advertising take a very different form. Here we have expensive and purely descriptive literature, radio programs, and motion pictures designed solely for the purpose of selling the public on some new function of government. In some of this publicity the critics of the program have been rebuked, and the advantages of the policy in question have been described in the most glowing terms.

I don't care what kind of administration you have, if it indulges in advertising, it is bound to indulge in propaganda. In effect the bureaus of the Government then are really lobbying with the public to get them to come to Congress and insist upon the continuation or expansion of the bureaus' activities. I don't believe any such propaganda is necessary. If Government activities undertaken with the people's money are not such as attract merit

to themselves without advertising, then I don't believe Government money should be spent for that purpose. The Government's spending programs are particularly subject to propaganda. Highly persuasive publicity has been sent out to induce cities and school districts all over the country to launch public-works projects, to induce private citizens to build homes, to induce farmers to accept payments. A publicity program not only helps to get the money out faster, but it has fostered the growth of pressure groups to lobby with Congress for bigger and better spending programs. Certainly it is foolish for Congress to appropriate money to finance lobbying with Congress itself, to do the very things which it should do, if they are good things, without lobbying. In 1913 Congress passed a law forbidding the expenditure of public money for the compensation of any "publicity expert" unless specifically authorized for that purpose. This is still the law (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 54). This law perhaps accounts to some extent for the difficulty in determining how much is being spent for publicity purposes. Many persons who are actually engaged in publicity work are carried on the rolls as editors, statisticians, and other similar designations like information specialist, information adviser, or information clerk. In some agencies they are called radio script writers or special writers.

It has been estimated that a minimum of 1,700 employees of the Federal Government are engaged in the various types of information and publicity work. Their total annual salaries amount to approximately $5,000,000. This estimate includes clerical help and applies to editing, publishing, exhibits, motion pictures, and radio, as well as to press relations. It should be remembered, too, that these figures probably represent a minimum and include only those whose duties are most obviously concerned with publicity. Most of these experts are well paid. In 1936 a survey by the Brookings Institution found that salaries of over $5,000 were being paid to 47 persons engaged wholly or in part in publicity work. This survey by Brookings also found that in the 3 months' period ending September 30, 1936, Federal agencies (not including W. P. A.) issued 4,794 public releases with 7,139,457 copies. On October 1, 1936, the various agencies had 3,004 mailing lists in use containing 2,280,983 names.

The increase in penalty or franked mail is also a good index of the increase in Government advertising. In the fiscal year 1932 the departments and agencies of the Federal Government (exclusive of the Post Office Department) sent out free mail which would have brought in revenue totaling $9,151,899. In the fiscal year 1938 the free mail sent out would have brought in revenue totaling $35,690,807. This is an increase of almost 300 percent.

No; the best function of advertising is to increase production, to put more men to work in private industry, and thus build up a consuming power and a national income which will lead to a continuously happier people. There isn't any doubt in my mind that the increase of production is the key to the whole situation, and that advertising is one of the things which is essential. There are some others. We must encourage men to go ahead with confidence that the Government will not regulate them to death by fixing all wages, hours, prices, and practices, or by taking away in taxes all the money which may be made in profits. There must be some incentive for a man to save and some incentive to put those savings into permanent capital from which he may be reasonably certain of a long-term income. But advertising and salesmanship are still the spark plugs. Suppose tomorrow all advertising came suddenly to an end. We would probably see a deflation and a downward spiral that would make 1933 look like Coolidge prosperity. I have talked to large manufacturers who would like to save the expense of advertising and have tried it. They don't quite know why, but the actual fact is that when they stop advertising their sales rapidly fall off no matter how essential their products.

The cost of advertising is not excessive. Let us take the automobile industry, for example. Less than 40 years ago the automobile was virtually unknown. In 1910 the automobile industry sold 172,557 cars. The total sale price of these cars was $272,200,000. The average price per car was $1,580. There appear to be no statistics at that time to show how much was spent for advertising. The total expenditure was doubtless small, but it is safe to estimate that the cost per car was high because automobiles were new and sales resistance was high.

In 1939 the advertising bill alone for the automobile industry was $39,000,000, or over one-seventh of the entire amount paid for automobiles in 1910. And yet the cost of this advertising took only 2 cents of every dollar spent for automobiles, because in 1939 2,702,120 cars were sold at a total cost of $2,216,000,000. The average price of each car was $820, slightly more than half of what it was in 1910. Where do you suppose this industry would be today if it were not for advertising?

And the same story could be told about scores of other industries. Radio, textiles, plastics, television are only a few, and some of these are only beginning to grow. Of course, there are some industries where the percentage is much higher. I don't mean to say that it may not in some cases be too high, as in proprietary medicines, drugs, and toilet articles. But the faults of advertising are insignificant compared to the tremendous good that it can do. It can put the spark of life into our whole economy, which the T. N. E. C. last July said was "stalled on dead center." The American people have succeeded before. They are the same people. This is the same country. We have come out of every past depression by working hard, saving money, and building up our private industries. If we throw away the Government spending fallacy and stimulate production by the use of advertising and other policies, we should go steadily on to a better national income; to a higher standard of life than we have ever enjoyed; and to a condition in which every man who wants a job can get a job.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two admirable editorials on the subject of national defense, one from the New York Times entitled "A National Defense Program" and one from the Baltimore Sun entitled "An Adequate Defense Program Is the Paramount Issue."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 15, 1940]

A NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM—1. THE CHARACTER OF THE PROBLEM

The first step on our part that the events of the last few weeks in Europe now makes imperative is an immediate reexamination of the whole state of our defenses. It is not merely a question of whether Congress should vote more money for that purpose. That is the easiest thing that Congress does. The question is to decide precisely at what points such money is needed and, quite as important, from what other points money should be deflected.

For the problem of defense is intimately related to the problem of the Budget. They cannot be dealt with in separate categories, each to be solved by those who pay no attention to the other. This is because they are both merely special aspects of a problem broader than either of them—that of the most efficient use of our national resources.

That has always been the basic problem when considering such a question as a balanced budget. A balanced budget is a requirement of all sound finance under normal and even under somewhat abnormal conditions. In insisting upon this much the Budget balancers have been altogether correct. The New Dealers, on their side, have been right in maintaining that under certain very abnormal circumstances, or to meet some special crisis, an unbalanced Budget may be unavoidable. The real question is one of practical judgment in view of all the circumstances.

Now, the grave error of the New Deal has been, not that it allowed the Budget to remain unbalanced for a few years when that may have been unavoidable, but that it never worked conscientiously and determinedly toward conserving the national resources, using that term in its broadest sense. It has never convinced the people that all the huge expenditures that it has made, totaling more than $58,000,000,000, have been necessary or wise. In the perspective of the situation of today the judgment must be that it has spent an appallingly large part of this sum in a frivolous, wasteful, and irresponsible manner. It has been spending not only far more than it has been raising through taxation but far more than it would even be possible to raise by taxation without either seriously injuring business and reducing the national production or moving toward an iron governmental control. If we had watched our expenditures closely until now, we would have today far greater potential reserves to draw upon for increased defense. But we have already allowed the Budget to get out of hand, we have strained the national credit, we have built up a formidable army of pensioners and subsidy beneficiaries, we have formed demoralizing public spending habits. We have seriously impaired the resiliency that our Budget should have had to meet the critical situation today.

A small nation with very limited resources quickly learns that it is vital for its spending to be concentrated at those points where spending counts most; and that its other needs must all give way before this necessity. We have been so wealthy that we have not really learned even the principle involved here. The principle is simply that what is spent for one thing cannot be spent for another; that the national resources—the man power and materials—deflected to one activity must be withdrawn from another.

The United States is potentially the greatest military power in the world. But it is only potentially so, not automatically, not actually. It can become so only by a concentration and direction of its strength. We cannot afford to scatter our resources, even our defense resources, recklessly in every direction. We need a strong Navy, as we need a strong air force; but as the total

amount that we can spend on defense has its limits, we must remember that whatever is spent in one direction must be withdrawn from the other; that another 35,000-ton battleship, for example, may mean 2,500 fewer pursuit planes.

Under the leadership of the President, important gains in our defenses have already been made. The Regular Army has increased in size from 188,000 officers and men last June to 242,000 today; the Navy has been altered from a somewhat nondescript collection of old and new ships 10 years ago to a strong and formidable fleet; our air forces in the past 5 years have been materially strengthened. Some $10,000,000,000 has been appropriated for the national defense in the fiscal years from 1934 to 1941, and the annual defense budget is already well over $2,000,000,000.

But it is a mistake to think that mere money outlays give an assurance of adequate defense. It is of the utmost importance to decide at exactly what points our expenditure and efforts are most essential. Our great need is for a well-rounded and balanced defense without serious gaps or bottlenecks. That is precisely the kind of defense that we lack today. What we have had is a series of uncoordinated appropriations recommended by separate and often rival committees. We have a great many technical needs that are difficult to dramatize, though they may be much more vital than some needs much easier to dramatize.

More important even than so many ships and airplanes and antiaircraft guns, for example, is an expansion of our industrial capacity for instantly turning out all this and other military equipment in a huge and continuous stream. It is precisely here that our sales to the Allied nations are of such vital importance to us. It would be the height of folly if we should take any impulsive action now to withhold or restrict these sales, in a short-sighted belief that by doing so we were helping our own defenses. On the contrary, not merely is a continuation of these sales the one effective step we can take at the moment to halt the aggressor nations or to delay their threat to our own national interests; these sales also have the great merit, from the most narrowly selfish point of view, that they expand our own industrial capacity for producing military goods, and do so at a minimum of cost to ourselves.

The problem is one of the utmost urgency, and yet it also requires careful study. This means that Congress should take some measures immediately, and that during adjournment a joint congressional committee, or a special committee of experts, should review the problem in detail and in broad perspective. In a series of editorials, of which this is the first, the Times proposes to examine a few of the gaps and bottlenecks, administrative, industrial, and otherwise, which obstruct our defense program, and demand immediate attention.

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 15, 1940]

AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE PROGRAM IS THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE

This week the President will deliver a supplemental defense message to the Congress. It is assured of a generally sympathetic reception by legislators and public, for there is no one today who will deny the urgency of national-defense issues.

But precisely because these issues have acquired overriding importance they require unemotional thinking, and unemotional thinking ought to be critical thinking. Urgency is neither reason nor excuse for a hysterical haste mistaken for genuine progress. On the other hand, progress is not to be had by unduly protracting debate on clearly fundamental needs, nor by obscuring the candid recognition of those needs through introduction of extraneous themes.

The elements of our national defense may be complex in detail, but the essence of them can be stated briefly. As a Nation we are fortunate enough to possess the chief material factors upon which security can be built. We have great wealth. We have rich and varied natural resources, virtually all of them in a high state of development. We have enormous industrial capacity. We have a geographical insularity that for the time being shields us against effective direct attack by sea or air. And to these things we have added a considerable and efficient Navy, capable, certainly in the present balance of forces on other continents, of insuring that any effort to seize footholds in this hemisphere by force of arms would involve terrible risks for the nation making the attempt.

But these things, valuable and essential as they are, are not enough. History is currently being made at such a tempo that we can no longer be content simply with a single defense service that is adequate for the time being, plus our potential strength. Gold, iron ore, productive power are not to be magically transmuted into armor plate and howitzers; factories are not geared overnight to furnish 11-ton tanks in place of convertible coupes. And while it is true that the war in Europe seems to be undoing military traditions and writing new military lessons at ever-accelerating rates, it is also true that this speed-up of history has reached a point at which we can no longer safely wait to read the very last chapter of the handbook or to hedge against obsolescence. The importance of the machine in war, of the tactics based upon it and perfected only by practice with it, and of the skilled technicians who use and service it, has become so clear that we must accept it as one basis for modernizing and expanding our defense establishment.

Several months past Mr. Mark S. Watson pointed out in a series of articles on this page that despite careful planning we were still some 18 months removed from the day when our existing initial protective force of 500,000 men (Regular Army and National Guard) would be fully equipped with the new arms designed for it; that there were many important items, such as a type of truck, that could be supplied in quantity only after 6 months' delay; and that in the case of other vital items (1,200 of them) no large American factory was prepared to produce in masses. As for the air, official comment was that "work on our planes is ahead of schedule." However, in view of the picture Europe presents we must ask ourselves now whether either that schedule or the program for which it was worked out is any longer sufficient.

It would seem that we now need both a long-range plan that will begin at once the preparations for large-scale industrial production of essential arms and also a short-range plan aiming at immediate correction of deficiencies in the equipment and supply of our existing forces.

Obviously this would entail heavy expenditures. We cannot be deterred by that fact. What we ought to insure is that these expenditures are planned with all of the intelligence we can muster and applied with the utmost efficiency. Senator Vandenberg made a real point Monday when he recalled that in 8 years he had "voted for at least $10,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy and each time we were solemnly assured * * * that this was enough to put our national defenses at par on land and sea." He did not, of course, take account of the fact that "par" has been rapidly changed from time to time throughout those 8 years. For instance, it is quite possible that we now need a two-ocean navy. But it is true that from 1935 up through the estimates for 1940 and 1941 expenditures on national defense have totaled $7,305,000,000, and that, considering the vast size of this sum, we have rather less than might be expected to show for it. However, it must be remembered that much of what seems a big appropriation for, let us say, the Army is devoted simply to maintenance of the existing forces, small as they may be. Take for example the year 1939. In that year we spent $540,704,000 on the Army, of which $258,433,000 went for War Department salaries, Army pay and subsistence, civil functions of the Army, operation of the Panama Canal, etc.

It costs heavily to maintain armies, air fleets, and navies. It costs even more to enlarge and implement them. We must face that. But in facing it we must also demand that the money spent be wisely spent, not so much for the sake of economy as for the sake of security. If reckless discussion and indefinite theorizing have no right place in the present picture, neither has a failure to come swiftly to grips with those immediate needs of defense toward the meeting of which we might take rapid strides. Now as at the time of President Roosevelt's first inauguration it is necessary to put first things first—to see them in their true order of importance and to deal with them in that order.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before me there is a clipping which I cut from the Washington Daily News almost 1 month ago. I was so impressed by the closing paragraph of this article, reading "Little by little emotions are inflamed and reason leaves us," that I retained this article by the pen of Mr. John T. Flynn.

And so it is. Little by little, emotions are inflamed and reason leaves us. May God grant that reason will not now leave us to the extent of our so thoroughly forgetting our own here at home that we will permit ourselves to be sucked into the wars that rage in Europe and Asia.

I therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, April 20.—The demand for economy in Government goes on to the accompaniment of a rat-tat-tat of bigger and better appropriations and demands for the same.

We are slowly moving to June 30, the end of the present fiscal year. To date we have a deficit of about $3,000,000,000, which is

about $300,000,000 more than last year. But we are not done. Additional funds may be provided for relief so that the deficit may be as much as half a billion more than last year.

Now we are busy talking about appropriations for the coming fiscal year which begins July 1. At the rate Congress is going it is difficult to believe that the deficit will not be greater next year. But those interested in this subject will do well to keep an eye on the Government. It seems determined to use every kind of stratagem to disguise the size of this deficit.

For instance, when the President's message on the Budget was sent to Congress in January he pointed out how the deficit could be cut down by using some of the funds in the Treasury's cash balance as well as the funds in the various Government corporations.

Of course that is a mere fiscal trick. The deficit is the difference between what the Government pays out and what it collects. You cannot alter that figure by subtracting from the amount you use out of your assets. But it now appears that there isn't very much in surplus funds that can really be used.

But now a new stratagem is proposed. It is suggested that we appropriate $985,000,000 for relief next year but permit the Government to spend it in 8 months. That is just fooling ourselves.

Thus, while every effort is being made to produce economy and everybody is talking about it, we plunge headlong into ever higher and higher deficits.

The Norwegian episode is instantly seized on to demand still vaster appropriations for naval construction and Army preparedness. Every event in Europe is taken as a text for scaring the people in order to lead them to spend more and more money on military preparedness as a means of recovery.

In spite of the difficulties of Germany and England in landing armies on a coast only a few hundred miles away, we are led to believe that the danger of enemies landing men on our coast three and four thousand miles away are increased.

One day we are told that we must get ready to protect Greenland; the next, that Japan is about to spring a brace of mystery battleships on us; the next, we are faced with the possibility of a war to see who shall own East Indies Islands—Japan, Germany, or Holland.

Another day the commander of the Navy warns the American people that we face a crisis. And whatever happens at home or abroad it is the ready excuse to spend more millions or billions.

Little by little emotions are inflamed and reason leaves us.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, Mr. CHAVEZ, at the convention of United Postal Employees of New Mexico, at Tucumcari, N. Mex., on May 11, 1940, on the subject Keep America Out of War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to the officials of the United Postal Employees of New Mexico for the kind invitation to meet with you and for the privilege of addressing you this evening. Needless to say, I am deeply honored by the invitation which I wanted to accept immediately, but as it came in the midst of a busy and trying session of Congress, I thought perhaps I would have to deny myself the pleasure of coming here and being with you. However, as luck would have it, the convention is at the end of a week and with modern convenience of travel by air, I was able to leave Washington last evening and arrive here in time not only to be with you this evening but to stop and visit along the way from Albuquerque to Tucumcari.

I am particularly pleased to be here because of the high regard which I hold for the United States Postal Service. I doubt if there is a corresponding group of employees, either private or governmental, which enjoys the respect and confidence of the public as much as the United States postal employees.

My experience, I believe, makes me a fair judge of you and your problems. I was a Member of Congress for two terms, during which time I came into daily contact with the Post Office Department concerning innumerable problems affecting the post offices and postal employees in New Mexico. I enjoyed the work and value the experience, for it made me acquainted with a fine, outstanding, patriotic, loyal, and efficient group of people.

Since I have been in the Senate, I have been privileged to be a member of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, where again the problems of the Postal Service are matters of constant concern.

I see before me many familiar faces. I find this a friendly and sympathetic gathering. In spite of being the biggest and most efficient business organization in the world, the Postal Service has a record of public service and public approval unequalled anywhere. Your boss, my good friend the Postmaster General, recently spoke to the convention of the Illinois Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters, in which he called attention to the size of the postal business, and in addition said that the organization was not too big to be friendly. That is the main reason why I am here today. I wanted to be with you, and as good fortune would have it, circumstances gave expression to my desires.

In searching for a subject to discuss, innumerable questions came to my mind. I had to brush them all aside but two, not for fear, I must insist, of recent legislation concerning the activities of Government employees but because I consider these the most important problems of the day and feel that you are interested in them, as everyone else is and should be.

These problems are, Keeping America out of war and promoting domestic security.

The second problem, I know, will be carefully debated in the campaign this summer and fall. Some of us will be allowed to express our opinions in various ways. All of us, however, unless they change the law, will have liberty of conscience and the privilege of expression, at least through the ballot.

But the first problem, which is of equal importance, that of keeping the United States out of war, is not apt to be discussed, as public officials, for some unknown reason, are afraid to talk about it.

I have been criticized many times for being too outspoken. The press in New Mexico takes me to task because I take stands which do not coincide with its opinion. Criticism from the press used to bother me; now I take it as a matter of course, and to tell you the truth, I rather enjoy giving them so much opportunity for discussion by my presence. Incidentally, for their information, I take this opportunity of stating that I have no intentions of accepting either a judgeship or ambassadorship to Patagonia in order to soothe their sensibilities with my silence. I plan to stay in New Mexico, and as long as I am there the people will know how I stand on every issue.

The press can never criticize me for failure to let the people of New Mexico know how I feel or intend to vote on public questions. I want my stand on this issue to be made public.

The problem of keeping out of war, in my opinion, is the most important question confronting us today, and it is one on which public officials should make their views known. I am for keeping out of war 100 percent. My views on this question are unequivocal.

Believe me, as long as I am in the United States Senate, no American boy will be sent to Europe to die on its battlefields by my vote. I want my position to be clear on this point.

The problem of keeping out of war is vital. It is one on which the American people have on many occasions expressed their feelings. It is one in which the outspoken desires of the American people for peace have been crystallized into legislation and law. In spite of the unanimous desire for peace and the declaration of our neutrality by law, indirect and subtle means of propaganda urging our participation in the war unfortunately represent a grave threat to our national security and happiness.

Let's look at the record for a moment. After the last war the American people were a disillusioned lot. We entered the war to make the world safe for democracy and got nothing but contempt and scorn from those whom we had helped, and democracy was still as scarce a commodity on the European continent as before the war. The debts which the American people had taken upon themselves in order to prosecute the war themselves and to finance the expenses of the Allies and to aid in the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe after the war were never repaid, and when we asked them to honor their obligations we were laughed away with contempt and called Uncle Shylock.

We learned a lesson from the last war. We learned from that bitter experience that Europe's thousand-year-old problems are not our problems. In trying to solve Europe's problems we were badly burned, but we came out of it with a treasure of experience which may have been worth the price. The American people learned that in Europe lasting peace is apparently impossible.

Then came the attempts to lead the American people into Europe's problems through the back door. The American people did not want the League of Nations; they did not want the World Court; and when Senator JOHNSON of California presented his bill to bar credits to European nations which had defaulted in their war debts to the United States it received the overwhelming approval of the House and Senate, and it is today the law of the land. The Congress which approved that legislation knew full well that the time would come when the nations which had refused to pay just debts to their former allies would again want their friendship and assistance. I was privileged to be a Member of that Congress and to support the Johnson bill. I believed in its principles then and I am for its provisions today.

Through the critical period of the early 1930's, the menace of war in Europe became more and more apparent. All Europe threatened to become engulfed. The American people were fearful lest we become involved. Congress again, noting the anxiety of the people and cognizant of the unanimous demand that we stay out of Europe's quarrels, passed the original Neutrality Act and placed an embargo on the export of arms to Spain. I voted for the original embargo law. I have always felt that trade in munitions contributed materially toward our entrance in the last war and I did not want to see it repeated.

The sky became more ominous—all the signs pointed to war. I feared the consequences of a European war, for I knew that there would be grave danger of our participation. My record is clear on this score.

Before the war broke out, I felt that it was my duty, as representative from New Mexico, a State at the crossroads of two civilizations—where Spanish and Anglo-Saxon cultures have met and merged, to advocate such a program of friendly relations with Latin America on every occasion possible. I said then that in order to cultivate the friendship of Latin America that it would not be enough to give evidence of our friendship by the operation of the good-neighbor policy alone; that the overbearing and swaggering attitude, both official and commercial, which characterized our relations with these nations in the past left sores too deep to be healed simply by extending the hand of friendship; that it behooved us to show these nations that we appreciate a culture which is in many ways totally different from our own.

It was easy for me to see the problem, just as I know it is easy for people who live in New Mexico to appreciate it, because we know that it is possible for two different peoples, living side by side, to get along without strife and entanglements. Just as in New Mexico, where we are divided racially about equally but where we are united 100 percent in Americanism, it is possible on a larger scale for the United States to work with the Latin-American countries for the development of a Western Hemisphere defense. I advocated then that the United States start immediately toward the development of closer ties to insure ourselves against becoming involved in the coming European strife.

In August 1937, when we were originally trying to get an appropriation for the Coronado Cuarto Centennial, I made a speech in the United States Senate in which I called attention to the importance of developing our ties with South America then, in order to cushion the effect of an Europeon conflagration which I felt was inevitable. I knew then that if we did not cultivate markets and friendships with all nations which were to be neutral, that our economic interests in case of war would tend to draw us in.

In 1938 I had an idea that a governmental radio station broadcasting to Latin America would be a good thing for promoting better relations and stronger ties with South America. I spoke over the National Broadcasting Co. system and urged the development of friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. I said then that the United States could not live in complete isolation; that there is an essential difference between economic and political isolation. From Europe I wanted political isolation; economic isolation I knew would come inevitably with the outbreak of the war. For South America I advocated the strongest possible political and economic ties in order that Western Hemisphere defense be organized to such an extent that it could not be assaulted from any other section of the globe, either by military invasion, economic warfare, or by an ideological onslaught incompatible with our concepts of freedom and democracy.

The Spanish civil war came to an end. On March 1, 1939, in the Senate, I urged the recognition of the Franco government on the basis of our historical policy of neutrality and recognition. I thought then that questions of sympathy and ideology were not concerned; that the interests of the United States could best be served by following a consistent and traditional policy of neutrality toward nations and peoples, and that ideology should be reserved for personal discussions and sentiments, but not for official manifestations of national policy. In that speech I traced our historical policy of neutrality beginning with Washington, who, in his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, said:

"The jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. * * * Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."

Washington's plea was for no foreign entanglements. He advocated and insisted upon law and peace and Americanism at home as a safeguard for our Republic. In other words, he advocated then that our foreign policy, and certainly the domestic policies of foreign nations, should be considered entirely from the single standpoint of our own welfare.

I agree with this philosophy; I hold the further conviction that becoming involved or sympathizing too greatly with the domestic affairs of foreign countries will automatically lead us to war. Selfish, perhaps, but certainly just plain, common, ordinary Americanism of the stamp advocated by the Father of his Country.

Again on May 11, 1939, over a national radio hook-up, in a speech entitled "Pan Americanism Versus European Meddling," I said that we had two choices—first, meddling in European affairs, the price of which was war and disaster; or, second, the development of our ties with Latin America. Let me quote from that speech. What I said then I believe holds true today.

"Pan-Americanism is vitally important to us because it offers a solution for the problem of isolation. It represents a haven in which the people of the United States and of this continent can seek refuge from the international tyranny of the world. It is absolutely necessary that we devote all our energy toward developing our relations with the Latin Americans.

"Meddling in the affairs of Europe can have but one result. It will lead to war and disaster.

"Pan-Americanism, on the other hand, tends toward peace. The choice between these two will have to be made. To me the choice is simple. Pan-Americanism is the answer. It creates for us a barrier more extensive than our own shores to the hatred and bitterness of Europe. Toward it we can strive with joyous hearts, because it leads to peace."

Finally, on September 1, 1939, came the event that everyone had predicted: Germany invaded Poland and the war was on. Immediately arose the question of preserving American neutrality. Americans everywhere were worried; our fears mounted. During this period we had one comforting thought, President Roosevelt's solemn declaration on several occasions that while he was in the White House he never expected to see American troops sent abroad.

Immediately there arose the problem of the Neutrality Act. Congress, which previously had refused to amend the law in its regular session, was summoned into a special session last fall and a new neutrality bill was presented.

Originally, we are told, the State Department proposed a law revoking the Neutrality Act and returning to principles of free action, but congressional reaction to this proposal was too strong. Congressional leaders advised the State Department that the people were demanding at the very least the rigid provision of cash-and-carry and a restriction of our merchant vessels. Congressmen and Senators had heard from the people back home, and the answer was clear and impressive. The people wanted to stay out of it.

The debates in the Congress were long and tedious. Spokesmen arose in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and over the radio and from public platforms and acknowledged that it was the intention of the American people that this country should stay out of the war. Senator PITTMAN, one of the leading advocates of the revision of the Neutrality Act, declared in Senate debate that he would never vote to send American troops to Europe.

In my speech on that occasion I said that the experiences gleaned from the last European war would reinforce the determination of our citizens to remain aloof from participation in a struggle which we had neither created nor fostered. I traced the traditional national policy of complete, effective, and absolute neutrality toward all belligerents. I asked on that occasion that we remember that we are Americans first and last, and that when this country was founded and its democracy established we had shaken from our feet the blood-trampled dust of Europe with the primary purpose of escaping from racial hatreds, undying animosities, ever-recurring conflicts, and the utter inability of peace to survive on the European continent.

In my second speech on the Senate floor I again reiterated my declaration to vote against the revision of the Neutrality Act and the proposed lifting of the arms embargo and I offered an alternative to the anticipated profits which proponents of the measure told us would come from the sale of our munitions to Europe. I proposed to substitute the formula "profits out of peace" for "profits out of war." Let me repeat my proposals:

"First. Develop our national defense—at peacetime prices for labor and materials—to such a point that no nation or combination of nations would dare attack us.

"Second. Cultivate our economic relations with Latin America, if necessary by subsidizing our shipping.

"Third. Enlarge the facilities of the Panama Canal.

"Fourth. Provide funds for the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal and possibly the Mexican-Tehuantepec Canal.

"Fifth. Build addition transcontinental highways to and through Latin America comparable to the projected Pan-American Highway.

"Sixth. Under suitable guaranties, arrange for tong-term investments in Latin America, improvements of a permanent nature, such as utilities, including transportation facilities, communications, and water-power resources."

I said in this connection:

"An expenditure of $10,000,000,000 in peacetimes would make possible the development of this program. Such a sum is only one-tenth of the estimated cost of our participation in the European conflict, and will involve no loss of life and no destruction, as an aftermath, of our present political system. If we must have profits, let them be legitimate."

The Congress passed the bill and the sale of arms to Europe was made legitimate, but rigid restrictions were incorporated into the act.

The Neutrality Act as it now stands accomplishes two great results; it restricts the presence of American vessels in European war zones. From the beginning of the war up to date we have suffered not one single casualty as the result of the sinking of an American ship, for the simple reason that American vessels are not permitted to enter the war zones of Europe. The second contribution of the Neutrality Act is the cash-and-carry provision. Though I was opposed to the revision of the original Neutrality Act, if it was to be

revised and the sale of munitions permitted, I favored cash-and-carry. I was in favor of this not because it seemed to me that paying in cash was more defensible than paying by credit, but because it served as a limitation to our participation in the European conflict.

What is our situation today? The latest news from Europe tells us that the war becomes more terrible and widespread every day. Now, more than ever, should we strengthen our determination to stay out.

There are rumors that certain foreign agencies have been trying to make arrangements for buying on credit. This is a point with which all of us should be familiar, because when we speak of buying with credit, immediately the Johnson Act and the cash provisions of the Neutrality Act stand diametrically in the way. In other words, to arrange for credit means that the Neutrality Act must be amended, and, second, that the Johnson Act must be repealed, and both of these acts have been endorsed by the American people.

After the last war, through the disillusionment of the twenties and the apprehension of the thirties, when war threatened to engulf the world, we inserted into the law of our land a declaration that we would never again repeat the mistake of selling to the warring nations on credit.

The dance of death of the last war is very familiar to us. The steps then were simple—there was sympathy; there was profit, followed by credit, followed by the desire for the protection of our investments, and then, notwithstanding solemn promises and election campaigns based on the slogan "He kept us out of war," we found ourselves ready to give one side of the conflict only naval and economic assistance. But it does not stop with that. The next step was the American Expeditionary Force—the doughboys were over there.

The American people know today that when you have a credit interest in war you are economically hog-tied to the cause and victory of those to whom the credit has been extended. The heart is often where the pocketbook is. It is time for us to do some serious thinking about this problem. We must be familiar with all of its meanings, if we are to remain at peace.

In the first place, the question of credit for the Allies must be analyzed. There is no question but that the sympathies of the American people are on one side of the conflict. Equally true is our determination to stay out of war. But in spite of these points, do the Allies need credit to beat Germany?

In the 7 months of the war it has cost the Allies some four billion dollars, but only a small fraction of this was spent in the United States, and this mostly for munitions. The Allies have been buying from us only what they could not get from their own systems. The French and English have some ten billion dollars in the United States with which they can purchase war materials. This is in the form of investments, bank deposits, and gold reserves. In addition, their gold mines alone produce $800,000,000 worth a year. These funds are now available. In other words, at the present rate of purchase, the Allies should be able to carry on at least until 1943.

We have placed at the disposal of the Allies our entire industrial machinery. Our latest designs in airplanes go to supply their needs rather than to fill our own orders at a time when our national defense is so important. The Allies are getting help from the United States in every way short of war. What they need now is not credit from the United States, or, for that matter, even our soldiers—they need leadership. Leadership capable of making decisions and carrying them through. This the United States cannot supply. This they must furnish themselves.

In spite of the above obvious fact, the pressure for revision is becoming stronger every day. Therefore we must familiarize ourselves with the arguments which we will soon hear advocating the repeal of the Johnson Act and the revision of the present Neutrality Act.

Soon we will be told that not to give credit will shut off business and will be dangerous; that unemployment will increase and that industry will be disrupted; then the next thing we will be told is that our own preparedness will be undermined by depriving our Army and Navy of a going war industry if we do not give credit. Then the farmers will be told that they are the victims of the cash provisions of the Neutrality Act because the Allies have been forced to use their resources for war planes and that they must purchase agricultural products elsewhere, and that only if they are given loans can the American farmer get his product to their markets. Other arguments besides these will be presented to the American people. They will be told that the fate of the Allies will be decided by whether or not the American people will stand for revising the two acts to allow credit. To bolster these arguments, America will be told that she must decide whether she wants the dictatorships or democracy to rule in Europe.

We must remember that the question of credit for the warring nations of Europe has already been answered by the American people. There should be only one consideration at this time and that is our own national self-interest. Let us not talk in terms of who is responsible for winning or losing the European war. Let us talk in terms of what is good for America and what the people of this country want. The American people want peace and it is no answer for the defeatists to tell us that sooner or later we will have to be in it. I say that we do not have to be in, now or later. I say that it is against our interests to be in it at any time. American participation in Europe's war does not solve a thing. It merely buys us a greater interest in European quarrels for the rest of time. It means that every 25 years we have to send our boys to hold things down for them over there. It means that in the meantime we exhaust our resources, and tax ourselves to death to pay for wars which are not ours, wars which we do not start, wars which we cannot stop unless we embark on a policy of policing the world, and wars from which we derive nothing but suffering and misery for our people.

Think of our position today. We in Tucumcari, as everyone else in this glorious country of ours, are enjoying the untrammeled benefits of peace. Abroad, the nations of the world are at war. A new world is being formed. Where the victory will lie, we do not know. What the new world will look like is difficult to see, but we know what kind of a world we live in here. We know that we love and cherish our institutions, and our liberties, and our peace. We have our own situation to think of. As I have said before, there should be only one consideration and that is our own national self-interest.

My opinion today is the same as it was in 1937. I think that our interests are intimately tied up with the economic and military defense of the Western Hemisphere. I think we have enough to do at home in saving ourselves without going abroad to save anyone else. In the first place, America does not want war. The American people have been polled, and the answer is always, "Peace." In the second place, the American people are not going to be fooled by thoughts of military invasion of this country, or for that matter, of other places in the Western Hemisphere. I know that we hear that Greenland, Mexico, and South America will be threatened should the outcome of the present conflict be a certain way. But one has only to reflect on the difficulties encountered in transporting troops a few hundred miles to Norway in the recent conflict to be assured of the absurdity of a military invasion of the Western Hemisphere. This does not mean, however, that we should relax our defense. On the contrary, our Navy must be built and maintained to a degree second to none. We must have an air force as good as any on this earth in order to defend our own interests. Along with this we have the task of organizing the economic defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Whenever peace comes to unhappy Europe, one thing can be assured, irrespective of the outcome, whether the Allies or Germany win, there will follow an economic invasion of the neutral markets of the world. The markets which England and France on one side and Germany on the other have lost in South America and the few other remaining neutral portions of the world will witness bitter economic conflict. The economic methods of the dictatorships, which we despise, will be adopted by the Allies out of sheer necessity, should they win. The period after the war will be one of fierce economic rivalry, and to make matters worse, the rivalry will be encouraged and subsidized by governments. Every government in the world by high-pressure trade tactics or other closed exchange arrangements will fight for markets and sources of raw materials.

It will not be to our interests to see such tactics used in the Western Hemisphere and we will be defenseless against them unless we build now. If we are indifferent now, Latin America will be indifferent then.

My program for peace is simple. I think we should maintain a strong determination to stay out of war. We should guard against back-door methods of getting in, such as proposals which will inevitably be made to revise the Neutrality Act to allow the purchase of munitions by credit, and the revocation of the Johnson Act preventing credit to nations in default of their war debts to the United States. Next we must insist on the adequacy of our national defense. Then we should demand of our public officials, especially those elected as our representatives, that they pledge themselves to work for peace. Along with this, I think that the United States should sponsor the development of a strong hemispheric defense. The Americas must be united in a military, economic, and cultural defense and throw about them impregnable walls behind which we can be safe from the onslaughts of Europe or Asia.

It is impossible for us to close our eyes to what is going on in Europe. Modern communications bring us the news as soon as the event has taken place. Friday morning the newspapers told us in boxed headlines the story of the ruthless invasion of peaceful Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg. We must learn to expect this. War is and always has been terrible, and the new implements of destruction which science devised for us make the destruction of modern warfare even more terrible than in the past. This war will grow, but the more it spreads, the more terrible it becomes, the stronger must be our determination to stay out. The task ahead of us, if we are to stay out, is difficult. We will be reviled and insulted by those who want our assistance. We will be scorned and rebuked by those in this country who want us to participate in the war. We will be tempted by alluring baits, such as rich farm markets. We will be threatened by the disaster which will overtake us if we don't help. We must be prepared to go through all of this if we are to have peace. Noting the days ahead, realizing the difficulties, but confident of what the majority of the American people want, I am convinced that we will stay out.

Activities of the Labor Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY PERKINS BEFORE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GOVERMENT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on May 4, 1940, by the Secretary of Labor, Miss Frances Perkins, before the National Institute of Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to report on the activities of the United States Labor Department during the past year and to review some of its accomplishments since the launching of a comprehensive economic and social program in 1933. Substantial improvement in the lot of wage earners has been brought about through more numerous opportunities for employment, increases in wages, decreases in maximum hours of work, and safer and more healthful physical conditions of work. These and other benefits are the cumulative result of a far-reaching 7-year program designed not only to aid workers but to better conditions for farmers, to increase the earnings of business, and to make safer and more profitable the holdings of investors.

The following concrete figures will show you direct economic gains made since 1933: Total nonagricultural employment in the United States was 33,928,000 in March this year. In March 1933 it was 26,086,000. In other words, there were nearly 8,000,000 more men and women drawing pay envelopes last March than in March 1933. This does not include an additional approximately 2,500,000 persons who had work on W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A. Weekly factory pay rolls rose from $72,697,000 in March 1933 to $185,818,000 last month. This is an increase of more than $113,000,000.

These gains have been accompanied by social advances made through legislation designed primarily to benefit the wage earner, but also in the public interest, and the combination has operated to promote the general well-being of this generation and those to come.

Among the programs designed since 1933, to overcome unemployment which have emanated out of the Department of Labor's continuous study of this problem are the following:

1. An immediate recommendation early in 1933 that there be some quick relief in the way of Federal appropriations to assist the States and localities in meeting the primary relief needs of the people who were then unemployed and had been unemployed for a long time in the emergency of general depression.

2. A program of straight public works and the conception of finding special work for those who could not be absorbed on straight public works.

3. The Wagner-Peyser Act, which established well-equipped, free public employment offices as a method of taking care of the effective placement of persons looking for work where there was work to be had, so reducing the loss and waste of poor placement of those seeking jobs.

4. The Public Contracts Act, which required not over 40 hours and a fair minimum pay on Government contracts in manufacturing.

5. The Wage and Hour Act, which was the first effort to establish on a Federal basis a floor to wages and a ceiling to hours.

6. Unemployment compensation, which is an adjustment for the loss of wages due to the accident of unemployment.

7. Contributory old-age insurance for the future and Federal assistance to the States for providing old-age assistance to aged needy persons. These programs were adopted partly to enable the elderly to leave the labor market and so offer more employment to persons at the peak load of their responsibilities.

8. Limitation on the employment of young persons under 16 years in the National Industrial Recovery Act, and later in the Public Contracts Act and the Wage and Hour Act. These provisions were aimed partly at keeping the immature workers out of the labor market and so offering more jobs to those in middle life.

9. The development of the Civilian Conservation Corps as a form of constructive educational employment for young men.

The various programs to shorten hours have been aimed at providing more job opportunities in industry and programs for lifting the wage minimums have been aimed at creating a new purchasing power, which would in turn, by its demand for goods and services create new employment opportunities.

All these programs are in operation and have greatly improved the total picture of unemployment both quantitatively and qualitatively. The purchasing power developed by some of these programs and the reemployment both private and public, brought about by others have notably improved the situation and relieved the strain. The effects will be noted increasingly.

The new frontiers which always have been looked to in our system to develop opportunities for new industry are not closed. They are not necessarily geographical. The new frontiers rest on improvement in the standard of living, not only of the people of the United States but of the whole world. Gradual improvement and increase in the standard of living, and therefore the opportunity to buy the products of manufacture and farm, is one of the things to which we must look in the future for the expansion of opportunity for industries and for employment.

There is a steady building up of employment and increase of pay rolls, which also show that more people are working full time, and therefore have more money and spend it. However, the fact that the index of employment is up does not mean that everybody who wants work is working. It does not take account of all of the additional population of working age who want to crowd into industry. Part of this additional population has now acquired the habit of going to school and college. Unemployment, however, is spotty and variable, not static.

Some industries now employ more people than they ever employed in their history and other industries are employing fewer. Technological changes are taking place in some industries at a very rapid rate and in other industries such changes seem to have reached their peak or not yet to have arrived.

Of all factors involved in the stabilization of employment and bettering the terms under which it is carried on, none is more important than the relationship between employer and employees, and in this connection I can report that there was continued improvement in orderly, effective industrial relations between these two groups last year. This is reflected in the character of the work performed by the Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor, which reports that the emphasis and time charge is shifting from the adjustment of strikes to the prevention of strikes and lock-outs. Ninety percent of all the controversies brought to its attention before an actual strike had taken place resulted in a settlement. Moreover, there has been a great increase in the number of cases where either employers or workers called these situations to the attention of the Labor Department in ample time to make adjustments before the necessity of stoppage of work, and the adjustments, of course, were made by the simple process of conciliation. There also has been an increase in the number of arbitrations voluntarily agreed to and requested by both parties, and a great increase in the number of formal conferences participated in by conciliators, which solved problems that might otherwise have led to industrial disputes.

The Department of Labor is operating through many activities to fulfill its purpose as set forth by law. For instance, it is now concentrating, through the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, on developing proper standards and suitable opportunities for true apprentice training of younger people. The first objective is to provide proper training for those young people now employed in skilled occupations and to establish the necessary standards and organizations to provide full training for other young men and women as they are needed.

The plan is taking hold and gives every promise of proving of high value to many young people and to employers as well. A year ago our apprenticeship staff had a difficult time convincing people that apprenticeship standards should be set up. It was necessary to point out that skilled workers could not be trained in most cases in less than 4 years. It was emphasized that employers and labor groups should get together so that young employed workers might be given thorough training, both through their work and through supplemental instructions in subjects related to their trades. There was no need for training more workers than there would be jobs. This is still true, but there is need for the highest possible quality training job that can be done, and it is toward this end the Department is striving.

The United States Department of Labor itself, as an operating enterprise, has been considerably overhauled since 1933 with the view to making it more effective for carrying out the underlying purpose as expressed in the basic act—to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earner of the United States. Procedures have been simplified, duplication of effort and responsibilities has been eliminated, bureaus having different functions but utilizing the same material for their information have learned the art of having one common pool for statistical and economic information. Inspection and investigation services also have been pooled so that no duplication of effort or waste motion takes place. Business management has been centralized, and all this has been planned for the purpose of getting the best and most complete results on the small amount of money spent, but functional organization and approaches have been maintained.

Even the close relationship of the Department with the activities of the Social Security Board in the field of unemployment compensation and old-age insurance has been developed on a cooperative basis. So has that with the Labor Relations Board.

Two types of activity are appearing clearly in the work of the Department of Labor. One deals with the investigation of situations that appear unfavorable to working people, reporting upon these findings and devising a program with consultation and advice to overcome the disadvantages found under the investigation. For these services the Department's personnel should be sympathetic, alert, and imaginative to find and foresee those conditions which are adverse to the life of wage earners and can be corrected. The other type of activity lies in the field of the enforcement of statutes—the Public Contracts Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, the Wage and Hour Act, and the immigration laws. In all of these the spirit and purpose of the law must be fairly and justly interpreted and applied, with every opportunity to all parties to have their grievance or their objection fairly and judicially considered.

One type of activity in the Department of Labor strengthens the other. The realistic necessities of enforcement and administrative work serve to make the research and investigations more realistic and more practical. While the unfavorable conditions found during investigation serve to illuminate and humanize the administration and enforcement of statutes, the effort throughout is to build gradually a democratic system of order based on truth, cooperation, and justice, out of which peace and freedom in this important sector of human affairs will establish themselves.

Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM JUDGE ALBERT H. SCHMIDT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Judge Albert H. Schmidt, of Manitowoc, Wis., relative to the origination of Citizenship Day in the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANITOWOC SCHOOL OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Manitowoc, Wis., May 9, 1940.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that Los Angeles and other places claim the credit for originating Citizenship Day in the United States. The credit rightly belongs to Manitowoc County, Wis., and I trust and I know you will zealously defend that right and let no one, high or low, deprive us of that honor.

The Manitowoc County plan and program was the first of its kind inaugurated and carried into execution in the United States, with a well-planned course of study by qualified instructors for those who arrived at the age of 21 during the past year for each town, village, and city ward in the county, with appropriate spiritual services in all the churches, and impressive and dramatic public induction ceremonies, with oath administered and appropriate certificates presented to the new electors, preceded by a colorful parade that graphically and dramatically pictured the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution and the origin and progress of our form of government. In other words, it was different, distinctive, outstanding, and alone in its merits and completeness from any other plan or program ever suggested and actually carried out.

People were here from all parts of the country, from as far away as Boston and Montana, and all said there was never anything like it in America. If that were not really true, would the Manitowoc plan have attracted the favorable comment and opinion of the press and the people of the entire country, hailing it enthusiastically as something new and really worth while in America? Would the National Broadcasting Co. have come here and given us a coast-to-coast hook-up as it did? Would the Radio Guide of that week have carried its leading front page, plus article on the Manitowoc plan? Would newspaper editorials, including the country's leading metropolitan newspapers, like the New York Times, the Boston Transcript, the Christian Science Monitor, the Chicago Tribune, California newspapers, news commentators, news syndicates, and magazines everywhere have endorsed it as both new, important, and promising? And would all the big sound news reels have been here last year? Would the Manitowoc parade and ceremonies have been shown on all news films in the movie houses in the United States?

For years others talked of the idea, but nobody did anything about it. Furthermore, the Manitowoc Plan was the first plan of its kind to be planned as a county community project, and was planned from the very start in 1938, not just as a local program, but as a national movement. And I know whereof I speak. I need but direct your attention to the statement in red ink and underlined at the top of our official letterhead, which I personally suggested and designed, towit: "Our aim is to set a pattern for a permanent National Citizenship Day." Yes, from the very outset, I pictured and treated it by speech and newspaper articles here and elsewhere as a national movement and insisted that it be so considered. And my insistence bore fruit and my prophecies came true. Naturally, I am deeply interested. In fact, it was I who, practically single-handed at the start, took the idea out of the realm of mere ideas and put it into the realm of realities. This took time, effort, and enthusiastic persistency, for as usual, there was considerable doubt, indifference, and even opposition; some of it even within our executive committee. Some scoffed and many laughed, even telling me to my face I was crazy, all of which caused me only to redouble my efforts and my interest.

Please do not misconstrue these remarks. I claim nor seek no personal or special credit. I am merely frankly stating the facts. And I cite these only to show that Citizenship Day didn't take form and life and spring into being of its own volition. It took lots of work, and the entire county, as a community, cooperated in fine shape. I was and still am interested only in the success of the movement, and that Manitowoc, Wis., gets its due reward and credit.

Again, where did the idea to have Congress, by joint resolution, establish Citizenship Day as a permanent national day of observance come from? From Manitowoc, Wis. Again I know whereof I speak. For it was I who first conceived the idea of a joint resolution by Congress in 1938, and I didn't only think or dream or talk about it, but I put it into actual execution last year. I personally drafted the joint resolution passed by the Wisconsin Legislature last year (May 10, 1939), and I took pains, without having anyone else suggest it to me, to embody in it a direction that the legislature memorialize Congress to establish Citizenship Day nationally. I also personally drafted and had passed at the National Convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, last year, a resolution endorsing the Manitowoc County Citizenship Day plan, and calling on all its Aeries and 700,000 members to actively participate in such ceremonies and programs, as well as memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish it as a permanent national day of observance. As a result a joint resolution was introduced in Congress last year, but did not reach passage. A joint resolution was again introduced in Congress this year. Where did that originate? Again in Manitowoc. All of the above was given wide publicity, both last year and this year.

As to the claim of Los Angeles and the "I Am an American" Panegyric Foundation. I was in Los Angeles in March, 1939. A leading Los Angeles newspaper carried an extended interview with me on the Manitowoc Plan, and ran a three-column cut of me. Through the efforts of the Los Angeles Rotary Club, I delivered a Mutual System radio address on the Manitowoc Plan, and upon request opened my address with these words: "This is the beginning of a movement for a national Citizenship Day in the West." This address received much favorable comment. As an example, I enclose a most remarkable letter dated May 8, 1939, from Venice, Calif., received after I reached home (exhibit E).

Another letter I received from a Los Angeles resident, mature and reliable: "Los Angeles, May 13, 1939. Dear Judge: I had a nice visit with Mr. Benjamin E. Neal, general chairman of the 'panegyric foundation,' and he was glad to know of the progress made at Manitowoc and the coming 'induction ceremonies' for the 1,200 new voters on Sunday, the 21st (May 21, 1939). He as well as many others will be 'listening in' and later scanning the newspaper reports to learn all about your 'affair' and hopes it will be a big success. I learned from him yesterday that their 'panegyric foundation' was established early last fall but that they had not got 'under way' and had not lined up as yet a real 'public program,' although they had had in mind the so-called 'young Americans.' He said that Luther Mack, one of their general committee, had talked of their getting busy over a year ago. Their June 12, 1939, 'I Am an American' day will be followed out along the lines of the 'Wisconsin-Manitowoc citizenship idea' as advocated by Professor Colbert and made clear by yourself over the radio (here in Los Angeles). I told him Professor Colbert first advocated the idea 3 years ago and that you 'took off your coat and hat' early last fall (1938) and got busy. I showed him your correspondence and news clippings to me, which he read with great interest, and I told him of your standing in the Middle West and in university circles and your political and radio experience. All to which he listened carefully. He told me that he expected to say some nice things in re the Manitowoc work and said he hoped 'we could work in close cooperation with Los Angeles at one end and Manitowoc at the other.' I think you made a 'scoop' when you came here in March. Mr. Neal intimated we must have worked pretty fast."

My radio address at Los Angeles in March 1939, which was entitled "National Citizenship Day—Its Origin and Significance," the Manitowoc plan, brought wide and favorable comment as something new and of vital importance by many prominent people in Los Angeles and the West, including even some committee members of the panegyric foundation. No claim, assertion, or intimation was heard that it was something old in Los Angeles or had originated there. Even the radio announcer and one of the Los

Angeles papers were fascinated by the Manitowoc plan. I am enclosing the telegram dated May 20, 1939, from Mark F. Jones, Los Angeles (marked "Exhibit A"). Furthermore, my address and that of President Dykstra and Chief Justice Rosenberry were read into the United States Senate RECORD last year. Nobody disputed our statements. I enclose a letter, marked "Exhibit B," from a prominent Los Angeles gentleman, who is a member of the Los Angeles Panegyric Foundation.

And yet, in the face of all of the above facts, in the face of the wide, favorable, Nation-wide publicity which the Manitowoc plan received for months, even in California, and is still receiving, including expressions from outstanding men and women from all parts of the United States, all in behalf of the Manitowoc County Citizenship Day plan movement, Mr. Edward Arnold, of Los Angeles, has the hardihood to write me under date of April 27, 1940: "We are much elated over the interest that the entire Nation seems to be taking in the 'I Am an American' movement, and communities like yours who have pioneered in citizenship recognition are deserving of our sincere appreciation."

How can anyone rightly assert as he does, "The interest that the entire Nation seems to be taking in the 'I Am an American.' when since September 1938, newspapers, magazines, commentators, and prominent men and women were pouring out favorable publicity as to the Manitowoc plan and nowhere referring to the Los Angeles program, which at most, though it was not like our plan, was still only an idea and not put into execution until June 12, 1939.

Yes; we insist that to Manitowoc, Wis., rightfully belongs the credit and the honor, and we shall defend that claim to the last and permit no one to deprive her thereof, and we shall be everlastingly grateful if you will constantly be on guard so that no one, by any possible means or method, either fair or foul, shall be able to impair the good name of Manitowoc County, Wis., or deprive her of the honor she justly deserves. I thought it only fair to advise you of the facts so that you could intelligently and successfully perform your full duty in the premises—all, of course, without any ill-will or envy toward any other group, community, or organization—but Wisconsin must always be vigilant lest others take that which justly belongs to her. We ask no more and no less than we are rightfully entitled to.

We feel confident that with your experience and sound judgment you will know what to do, and how and when to do, whatever may be wise and necessary in the premises.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

Judge ALBERT H. SCHMIDT,
Program Chairman.

N. B.: As a part hereof I enclose our official 1939 program, marked "Exhibit C," and all the addresses at our public induction ceremonies Sunday, May 21, 1939, marked "Exhibit D."

A. H. S.

The Meaning of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESSES BY MRS. THOMAS F. MCALLISTER AND MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT BEFORE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Thomas F. McAllister, director of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee, introducing Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the remarks of Mrs. Roosevelt, on the occasion of the final session of the National Institute of Government, held in Washington on May 4, 1940, which was attended by 5,000 women from 48 States and Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MRS. THOMAS M'ALLISTER

In America there is a citizen who has courageously espoused the cause of freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the right of people to live under a government of their own choosing—who has used every effort to advance the cause of women in the Nation and in affairs of government, and whose helping hand has always supported our youth, our aged, the disinherited, the dispossessed—the beloved wife of our President, Eleanor Roosevelt.

This inspiring meeting of so many thousands of Democratic women, who have come from remote and distant places in our country, is a tribute of affection and admiration to Mrs. Roosevelt.

It is a mark of recognition of what she has done for the democratic way of life, for the Democratic Party, and for the cause of women in a democracy.

In affection and devotion, I have the honor to present Mrs. Roosevelt.

ADDRESS BY MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Madam Chairman, Mrs. McAllister, Miss Dewson, madam secretary, and ladies, I don't really know at this late hour when you have been hearing so many things that there is much left that you want to hear so I am going to tell you at the outset that it is going to be very brief. There is just one thing which I have been hearing from a number of old-time politicians in our party. They have been saying the last day or two, "What is the political significance in the coming of all these women?"

Well, the last time I was here it was not quite as peaceful as it is now. You all look very peaceful to me, because on that occasion I was being bombarded with questions, and it was much more crowded. Everybody sat on the floor everywhere, all around. But that also was a citizenship institute, and I suppose that had a political significance, just as this institute has.

I wonder what it reveals. I think it reveals the need that we all have for the reassurance we get when we come in contact with each other, and when we have a feeling of confidence which comes to us from meeting those in authority in our Government, having an opportunity to hear from them, and realizing that together we are facing the problems of the world today, and that we do it cooperatively and not alone.

Alone we might be afraid. Together, young and old, men and women, we can meet those problems. What are those problems? They are going to make our platform. You have been told by the other people the main things that they gather you want in the platform.

You all agree you want peace. I imagine all the world wants peace, except perhaps a very few men, and yet a great part of the world is at war. You have got to do more than just want peace. You have got to think through what you really mean when you say you want peace, what you think will keep peace, what you think will serve the cause of more permanent peace in the future, because just to have peace tomorrow as we had it in 1918 will simply mean again a pause in preparation for another war, perhaps. We have to think through, young and old alike, all of us together, what we really mean and what we are going to do, not only in war but in peace, to really obtain something more permanent when we have the opportunity.

And we want to find the answer to unemployment. There isn't anyone anywhere in the world, I imagine, who doesn't want to find that answer. I don't know just what it is going to be, and I think there are a great many people in other countries besides our own who would like to know what the answer is. But I am quite sure of one thing—I am quite sure that we are never going to find the answer until we all work together. It is a question again of cooperation.

I am quite sure, too, that the gentleman who said to me only today, "I hate to look into the future; I dread the future for my children," isn't going about finding that answer in the right way. I don't dread looking into the future. I am not a bit afraid of the future for my children or my grandchildren.

Somehow or other I have faith, faith that eventually we will work together. I don't just mean confidence in the Government; I don't just mean confidence in any particular group of people. I have confidence in the power that the people of this country have, once they wake up to what is meant to be a citizen in a democracy. Many of us have been asleep. Many of us have taken for granted the things democracy gave us.

We haven't realized what democracy meant. It doesn't just mean having freedom, having a certain amount of personal liberty. It doesn't just mean that you repeat "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Democracy means that you give of your service unselfishly, day by day, that you use your ballot, that you join the political party that you believe in and that you will work in that political party to get better candidates, not to complain about them, to get the very best representatives you can from top to bottom in your communities, in your States, on your national ticket, that you work—and now you as women, if you obtain the opportunity which I think you will have of serving on a platform committee, you will carry the same responsibility to see that you say in your platform things you really mean.

And, for heaven's sake, say it briefly, those of you who serve on the platform committee. I have read so many platforms, and wondered if half the people would ever understand what they meant, and if it really would ever dawn on people that simple things didn't require a tremendous amount of verbiage.

You can really say things you mean in very simple words, and I think perhaps that is a contribution that the women, who are always said to talk so much, can bring to the platform committee. They may talk a great deal, but I hope they will put down very little and it will be simple.

These are the things that democracy means. They mean that you set to work and understand what these problems are that you are facing; that you bring them down into your communities;

that you see what your communities by themselves can solve; and that, having seen that, you then proceed to see what you need from your State government, what you need from your National Government, from a basis of facts that you know. And then you will know what you are back for, you will know what you want in a platform. You will know what you are ready to work for, you will know what you want to ask your representatives to stand for, and you will not just ask them before election; you will watch them, because citizenship doesn't mean just the use of a ballot on election day.

Citizenship is serving every day of the year in a democracy. It is knowing what the problems are as they come up and how they progress, and whether the thing you tried didn't work so well, and how you think it ought to be changed, and whether you think it hasn't had a real trial, and ought to be tried for a longer time, or ought to be really worked out in a different way. Your representatives will represent the kind of citizenship that you give. In other places I often tell a story, and I think I am going to tell it here, though I may have told it to many of you before, but it will illustrate just what I mean by getting the kind of service that you give as a citizen. You know, many of our legislators are very much interested in the farm question, and it isn't confined to any one party. Both parties are enormously interested in the farm question. It happened one evening that two gentlemen of opposite political faiths sat either side of me at dinner, and each of them in turn told me how they wanted to make rural life in America so perfect that every youngster would dream of living in a rural area, and making farm life a way of life, a satisfactory way of life. It happened at that time that we had for some 2 weeks a rural-arts exhibition in the patio of the Department of Agriculture, and it illustrated better than anything I had seen what the rural way of life might be, and so I asked my gentlemen if they had seen the rural-arts exhibit, and each one of them said: "Rural-arts exhibit? What is that? Rural-arts exhibit? Never heard of it." And finally we asked the gentlemen all around us, and 8 or 10 of them, all of them, said "no," they had never heard of the rural-arts exhibit. One man had heard of the rural-arts exhibit.

He wasn't so different from all the others. He came from a constituency where he knew that when he went home someone was going to say to him, "What about that rural-arts exhibit? What did you think of it? What suggestions did you find in that that might help us?"

You see, it was the man back home that counted. It's the votes and what you do as a citizen day by day that counts in what a democracy does for its people.

Now, if you really mean to make democracy work, and you are the people who have got to make democracy work, there is less and less opportunity for anybody else to make democracy work today, so it is a pretty heavy responsibility on all of us. We make democracy work or it fails, and democracy is a curious thing. It works slowly because it demands that the people shall have a free expression of opinion and that they shall make up their own minds and have a right to express any opinion that they may hold. It doesn't mean that if your neighbor does not agree with you, you put him in a concentration camp tomorrow morning. It means that you listen and weigh his opinions against your own and that you abide by the rule of the majority.

Now, the majority is sometimes wrong, but in time, if we stick to the rule of doing our job as citizens, learning by experience and working from what we know on out, the majority opinion has usually proved to be right. One thing we worry about today, and that is whether we can wake up fast enough to really do our job as citizens. Well, I think we can, because the young people came to a citizenship institute. Oh, they didn't all say and do the things you wanted them to say and do. But they came, and they talked about their needs, and you came, the women of the Democratic Party came, and came in great numbers at their own expense, and very often making sacrifices to come. That means you have wanted to know and you have learned and, having learned, you are going to take responsibility.

And that is the most heartening thing that can happen to us in this country. Then you needn't be afraid that your representatives won't represent you. Then you needn't be afraid that your government won't be responsive to you, because you are going to hold it in your hands. It is really going to be a government of the majority of the people based on a knowledge of your communities and your needs and on the determination that you will have leaders who will truly represent you.

I am not sure but what today carries just the same challenge in a different way as the challenge that came to our pioneering ancestors. If they had been afraid to come across in the little boats of their day, across an unknown ocean, if they had been afraid to land in an unknown land, there would be no United States today.

Now, we don't know the answers to many of our problems, but I have an idea that if we are not afraid to adventure, and if those of us who have had security are not afraid to join the great majority of our nation that have never known security, we can make this a real adventure for the good of this country, and let us hope in the future, perhaps, a torchlight and hope to the world which will certainly need it.

Relief for Army Aviators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN G. NORRIS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday, May 12, entitled "Veteran Army Pilots Demand 'Break.'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1940]

VETERAN ARMY RESERVE PILOTS DEMAND "BREAK"—MEN WHO ARE CARRYING BURDEN OF AIR EXPANSION PROGRAM ARE BARRED BY LAW FROM COMMISSIONS; PLEA TAKEN TO CONGRESS

(By John G. Norris)

A handful of veteran Army pilots drifted into town last week, landing at Bolling Field after hitch-hiking by plane from scattered Air Corps posts.

They came with a final plea to the Army high command and Congress that something be done for about 175 aviators of long experience who now hold Army flying billets, but who have no future in the military service. Too old, under the law, to be appointed as regular officers, they have been helping carry the burden of the vast Army expansion program, hoping all the while something would be done to give them permanent jobs.

Told by ranking Air Corps officers on one hand to "stay on, we need you, something will be done" and meeting the continued opposition of the War Department on the other hand to every suggestion of legislation to give them permanent rank in the Army, the "forgotten airmen" are asking for a show-down.

Through the Air Reserve Association headquarters here, the group said in effect last week:

"We have given the best years of our life to the Army. We want to stay in it, but under present prospects we can hang on only 2 or 3 more years as Reserve officers on active duty and then have to go out and make a place for ourselves in civil life. We may then be too old.

THEY'RE UP AGAINST "ACCENT ON YOUTH"

"You say our experience is needed with so many green young pilots coming in, especially during the expansion period. If we are to be kicked out in 2 or 3 years, however, for our own good, we should get out now while we are still young enough to start a new career. Play fair, give us some promise of permanency, or we quit now."

Unfortunately, their case runs counter to long-established War Department policy and to an even more potent barrier—an emphasis-on-youth policy laid down by President Roosevelt himself.

With the President's backing, the Army is pushing legislation to retire overage officers, and at the same time appointments to high rank are being extended to younger and younger officers.

Present law limits original appointments in the Regular Army to men under 30. Normally such appointees are about 24. The plight of the 175 pilots who are seeking permanent commissions comes about as a result of a condition several years ago, when but few Kelly Field graduates were taken into the Regular Army.

At the present time larger numbers of Kelly Field graduates are being given regular commissions, but the Army high command so far has been unwilling to agree to any change in law to permit the older men to come in, either as second lieutenants or as special flight officers.

"Men over 30 years of age are too old for appointment into the Regular Army Air Corps," Secretary Woodring declared, and that has been that.

But the men affected and many of the Army's ranking flying officers think differently. Many of the group have more than 4,000 hours in the air. They are qualified to fly the big ships, the bombers, transports, etc., which may be handled only by veteran pilots. Some of them are flying instructors.

Capt. Corley P. McDarment, a retired Army pilot, told Congress recently that the flyers in question had a much better foundation than the "youngsters will have who are being shoved through the flying schools so rapidly now."

MANY CASUALTIES MAY RESULT

"When they come out and start in with this high-powered equipment now coming into the Air Corps," he continued, "I am afraid there will be a lot of casualties resulting strictly because of lack of proper supervision and the kind of supervision that these men who are represented in this bill can give.

"I know that the War Department policy is centered on youth. And that is all right. That is good. But you cannot have both youth and experience at the same time. The idea is not to go too much to the extreme in either direction but to try to get a middle ground. In aviation, of all branches of the service, experience counts more than anything else, and individual experience at that, because it is the individual who flies these planes."

Lt. James M. Treweek, an instructor at Randolph Field and one of the group seeking a regular commission, told the same congressional committee that pilots turned out of the Air Corps training center are by no means finished military pilots.

"I do not think emphasis should be placed upon youth and that those who do not have it should be discarded, which is what it amounts to," he stated. "I believe from my experience at the flying school and in the service that the ability to fly an airplane is directly proportionate to experience. There is no substitute for experience. It would take someone else 4,300 hours, 7 years as a pilot, to be where I am today."

ARMY WANTS TO KEEP THEM

Brig. Gen. Barton K. Yount, Assistant Chief of Air Corps in charge of training and personnel matters, told the writer last week that the Army wanted to keep the older flyers.

"We need them badly," he said, "and are trying to find some way of keeping them in service that will not discriminate against those now in the service. We opposed the legislation before Congress because it would have jumped them over officers already in service.

"The General Staff is now working on the problem in an attempt to find a satisfactory solution. We all want to find an acceptable plan."

But, as General Yount indicated, it is the General Staff and not the Air Corps which passes on such problems, and there is little sign that the Staff and the high command has changed its views expressed a year ago to the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

MATTER SEEMS TO BE DEADLOCKED

Congress, of course, lays down policy and it can override the War Department, but at present the matter seems deadlocked. The Senate has passed legislation to give permanent posts to the veterans, but the House Military Affairs Committee has sided with the War Department and pigeonholed the bill.

It looks like the flyers will have to go back home and tell their fellow pilots to start ringing doorbells for jobs unless someone in high estate takes up their cause and changes the mind of the Army high command.

Veterans' Widows and Orphans Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, in giving my support to this bill I do so because I believe the Government owes our veterans, their widows and orphans, just and reasonable compensation. When our soldiers were sent to France in 1917 to help win the World War they were turned into fields and forests of disease and slaughter. When these boys marched away to foreign soil our zeal for them was outstanding. They were promised everything upon their return to our shores. The World War should not have been our war. We were told that our entrance into it was to save democracy. If our boys fought for democracy, to protect us and our future, why then is it not our duty to recognize our obligations to the veterans, their widows and orphans? Certainly they are a very large part of our democracy.

I do not subscribe to the philosophy that the passage of this bill would be a raid on the Treasury. It is a shame to think that our veterans, their widows and orphans, who honorably served their country, should be forced to seek relief rolls in order to get enough to eat. If by giving our worthy veterans and their dependents sufficient to have enough to eat, to have clothing and shelter is a raid on the Treasury, then I am willing to go down as one in favor of this so-called raid. It might be well for our friends who are opposing those who are supporting this bill to turn their talents in another direction insofar as raiding the Treasury is concerned. If they were to direct their talent toward stopping the squandering of our money their efforts would serve a useful purpose. We are told by those in authority that our country can stand the amount called for under this bill.

In all fairness to the veterans who made the sacrifice for our country I believe this bill should pass. The enactment of it would, in my opinion, remove some of the now existing inequalities.

The care of the Nation's veterans and their dependents is a part of the cost of our national defense.

I am heartily in favor of the bill and will vote for its passage.

Rural Electrification in Southwest Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 11, was the fifth anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. Having actively supported this splendid activity of the Administration from its very inception, I deem this an appropriate time to review briefly its accomplishments and benefits to the citizens residing in the rural areas in my congressional district in southwest Washington.

The first R. E. A. project established was at Quinault, in Grays Harbor County, for which funds of $75,000 were allotted for construction and $4,000 for working capital, totaling $79,000, for a total mileage to be energized as estimated in the construction-loan contract of 23 miles, and now serving over 100 consumers. Mr. John D. Carmody personally visited the Quinault project when he was Administrator of the R. E. A. and told me that he considered it to be one of the finest projects of its size in the entire Nation. It has been most gratifying to me to listen to the citizens at Quinault express their elation and satisfaction with their plant and the service they are receiving, made possible by the Federal Government. I am naturally happy that I had an important part in bringing this worthy project to Quinault.

The Cowlitz County project sponsored by Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County received an allotment of $141,000 for construction and $5,000 for working capital, totaling $146,000, for a total mileage to be energized as estimated in the construction-loan contract of 187 miles, of which 63 miles have been energized and construction on the balance of which is moving forward. There are 391 consumers, and the estimated maximum number is 751, making this one of the outstanding single rural electrification projects in the State. On my visits to Cowlitz County I have had several meetings with the utility district commissioners and it has been a pleasure to note their enthusiasm and progressive spirit. This project demonstrates the desirability and scundness of the R. E. A. program in bringing electricity and its manifold blessings to the farming population.

Public utility district No. 1 in Lewis County has received an allotment of $69,000 for construction, with $2,000 for working capital, totaling $71,000, together with $27,400 for generating plant and $3,600 for working capital, totaling an additional $31,000, making a grand total of $102,000, to serve an estimated mileage of 74 miles, and 277 consumers. The

Lewis County project, the same in Cowlitz County, is designed to render available to rural home owners all the comforts and conveniences of electrification.

Skamania County public utility district No. 1, with headquarters at Carson, to serve 342 consumers, and Mason County, with headquarters at Shelton, to serve 250 consumers, will be 2 more outstanding R. E. A. projects in southwest Washington.

In addition to the direct service and benefits to the families residing in the rural areas, the program acts as a business stimulant to the local merchants and business firms in the vicinity who sell electrical equipment—radios, washing machines, flatirons, electric refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and similar appliances, thereby giving employment and increasing the money in circulation in those communities.

Our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is recognized as the leading exponent of public power and rural electrification in Congress, has written me the following letter:

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1940.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARTIN: Today is the fifth anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration, and I did not want to let this occasion pass without taking advantage of the opportunity to thank you for and congratulate you on your splendid work in behalf of our R. E. A. program.

As you know, I regard this as the greatest program in the interest of the farmer that our Government has ever sponsored, and I want you to know that I appreciate the splendid cooperation and enthusiastic support that you have given me at all times in my efforts to bring justice to the power consumers of the Nation.

Your work on the Bonneville project has been outstanding. I also want to congratulate you on the five splendid R. E. A. projects in your district. You have labored diligently and courageously to get power to your people at reasonable rates, and your work has been most effective in all the victories we have won for Bonneville and other projects in that section of the country.

I do not hesitate to say that you are one of the best friends of public power in Congress and that no man from that section has ever worked harder than you have to get electricity to the people at what it is worth, and especially to the farmers of your immediate territory.

Sincerely your friend,

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Public Power Bloc in the House of Representatives.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT

Rapid progress is being made in the construction of new turbines at Bonneville and transmission lines to deliver Bonneville power throughout southwest Washington and our R. E. A. projects will eventually utilize Bonneville power. I shall always be proud of my sponsorship of the original legislation creating the great Bonneville project and my active participation during the years in every step taken to bring its benefits to the citizens and communities of our district. On March 4, 1938, the late John D. Ross, administrator of the Bonneville project, wrote me:

I wish to express my deep appreciation of your efforts in obtaining the Bonneville appropriation through the House. The cooperation which I received while in Washington and since I left has pleased me very much.

Bonneville will always remain a monument to the memory of this sturdy champion of public power for all the people. On March 27, 1939, Charles E. Carey, Acting Administrator, wrote me:

With friends like you in Congress we feel that the future of Bonneville is in very safe hands. We will do everything we can to see that your friends in southwestern Washington are fully advised of your service and active support of the Bonneville project.

In this session of Congress I appeared twice before the Appropriations Committee and testified at length in support of increased appropriations this year, which we succeeded in obtaining so that the work can continue unabated.

As long as I am a Member of Congress, I intend to continue to support whole-heartedly the rural-electrification program and the Bonneville power project because of their merit and soundness and great benefits to all our people in southwest Washington.

Looking at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE, TO A CONSTITUENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have forwarded to a constituent in response to a request for my record:

LOOKING AT THE RECORD

Your request for my record in connection with the coming elections is an evidence that in America and particularly in Maine citizens are taking careful thought as to current problems.

EDUCATION

I grew up in Dexter, a medium sized town in the geographical center of Maine. I went to the Dexter schools like all the other boys and girls and helped in my father's grocery store in the summer.

Bowdoin College continued my education and gave me a Phi Beta Kappa key. A year as principal of Castine High School enabled me to save enough money to go to Harvard Law School where I earned most of my own way waiting on tables and tutoring other law students and was made an editor of the Harvard Law Review.

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE EXPERIENCE

Practicing law in Portland for the next 12 years left me enough spare time to serve 6 years on the school committee and 6 years in the Maine Legislature as a representative and senator.

Four years as Governor of Maine gave me a considerable insight into the resources and possibilities of Maine. I sponsored the creation of the Maine Development Commission and the Maine publicity campaign, which has brought such gratifying results.

Under my administration as Governor the State affairs were conducted on a pay-as-you-go basis; the State tax was reduced about 10 percent, or approximately $1,000,000 a year; and a reserve of $1,000,000 in cash was accumulated in the State treasury.

At my request, Walter B. Brockway, chief accountant of the Brown Co., of Portland, made an exhaustive survey of the State finances without expense to the State. His report of the condition of the State finances was published under the title "A Business Man Looks at the Finances of Maine." Mr. Brockway became nationally recognized as an authority on State finances and was one of the principal speakers on this subject before the Conference of Governors in Wyoming in 1926.

After 4 years of my administration as Governor of Maine the Republican Party in Maine received the greatest majority in its history, forecasting the Nation-wide Republican sweep in the following November.

WASHINGTON EXPERIENCE

In Washington during the past 6 years I have served on the House Committees on Naval Affairs, Agriculture, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Invalid Pensions, and District of Columbia. This experience has given me a considerable insight into the problems of the country as well as of Maine.

I continue to stand for a balanced Budget and a pay-as-you-go policy. The country cannot much longer continue to borrow from Peter to pay Paul. Peter is going to peter out. "Pay as you go" must apply to all the activities of the Government—old as well as new—defense, social services, and old-age assistance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

As a veteran of the last war and a member of the American Legion, I have always believed in an adequate defense. Six billions have been spent for defense in the past 6 years, with evidently most unsatisfactory results. Apparently the money has gone for the wrong things.

Two years ago I pointed out to the House as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs that aeronautical development was being woefully neglected and that "other countries were spending 10 times what we were for aeronautical research for defense." My voice was then unheeded.

At the same time, I pointed out the grave shortages in the construction of destroyers and submarines and urged action to remedy this deficiency.

Congress will be wise to find out why $6,000,000,000 has left us so inadequately prepared. Additional billions must not be wasted. Blind voting is as bad as blind flying.

PROTECTION FOR MAINE

Protection for America has been my major interest in Washington. That means protection from attacks of any character. That means protection for American labor and the American farmer and the American fisherman.

Maine can only prosper when Maine products are protected from unfair competition from the output of the pauper labor of other countries with far lower living standards.

In the Senate of the United States I should hope to continue this battle for a square deal for Maine and for America.

Local Filling Station Operators Should Have No Additional Tax Burden Put Upon Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM C. MASSINGALE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration for several days H. R. 1, referred to as the anti-chain-store bill or as a bill to protect the local merchant against the chain-store monopoly. On May 10, 1940, I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to an amendment that was being considered which would impose an additional heavy tax on every person that runs a filling station. My testimony before the Ways and Means Committee was as follows:

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, there is just one phase of this chain-store bill, or Patman chain-store bill, that I wish to discuss with the committee. That involves the question of what it takes to constitute a store within the meaning of the bill.

Now, I will state that generally I am in sympathy with the principles of H. R. 1, because I believe that it is necessary for the welfare of the local home merchant that he be given some protection in a manner similar at least to the provisions of H. R. 1.

The effort on the part of the author of H. R. 1 to eliminate from the list of exemptions the filling-station operator is a matter that I want to discuss very briefly and give you my views on.

I desire to discuss only whether the provisions of the Patman bill, H. R. 1, for the protection of local merchants, local retail merchants, should exempt from the operation of the bill the local distributor of filling-station products.

The definition, as the Standard dictionary gives it, of a store is as follows:

"A place where commodities are stored, a warehouse. In the United States and some British colonies it is a place where merchandise of any kind is kept for sale. A shop."

I don't believe the thought has ever gained foothold in this country that a filling station is a store in the sense in which it is commonly used here. The filling-station operator does not carry a stock of various articles of merchandise to supply the needs of the community. He is only what might be termed a service agent. He carries no general stock of goods. Usually he carries only gasoline and fuel oil and Coca-Cola for sale. The place of business that he operates is almost always owned by someone else. He generally rents the filling station, and the chief thing that gets him his business is courtesy to those customers who want to buy gasoline. If you take away the individual service that he renders, and such free service as wiping off spots of grease and splashes of mud from the car and from the windshield, he would practically be without business.

To put an additional tax on him by refusing to exempt him from the operation of the Patman bill would be an injustice and would in effect prohibit the free service that everybody receives when they go to his filling station.

The filling-station operator is unlike a man engaged in the business of selling all kinds of wares and merchandise, or the selling of all kinds of food products, household necessities, and the like. The store owner, as we know him, owns a stock of goods. He pays taxes on that stock, local taxes, and keeps replenishing that stock, and he gets his business largely because he has on exhibition various wares that he offers to the public.

It is not so with the filling-station operator, and it occurs to me that if you look at it in a common-sense way, in no sense of the word is the filling-station operator a storekeeper.

When a person drives into a filling station he stops only to get that one thing without which he cannot make the next town, gasoline. It is a road service and not a store service that the filling-station operator is rendering.

The suggestion by the author of the bill that the exemption from the operation of the Patman bill of the filling station be stricken would, in my judgment, work a manifest injustice on the filling-station operator, and is almost the equivalent of imposing a tax against a man whose sole business is rendering good, efficient, and courteous public service.

He renders this service, not only to the traveler going through the country but he renders another and a distinct service to the Government of the United States. He is in the field as a tax gatherer or tax collector, and that is a valuable service to the revenue department of the Government of the United States.

Now, then, we are going to tax him, if I understand the effect of this amendment—we are going to tax him simply because he happens to rent a little building or filling station and has no stock of goods from which he derives a profit on its sale.

I don't think there is any resemblance between the business of a filling-station operator and the operator of a store or place where merchandise is bought and sold to the public.

If the exemption is not granted, as I said a while ago, it would be the equivalent, in my judgment, of taxing an occupation only, not taxing a man who runs a store, certainly, because he does not run any. He keeps no stock on hand except what the wagon brings him that morning as a rule to meet the daily demand made upon him by persons traveling through the country on business or on pleasure. He cannot be regarded as a storekeeper under the definition I have just given you that I have taken from the standard dictionary.

Now, I don't believe that I should attempt to go into a discussion of what the record discloses in regard to the revenue that the Government receives through this man, but I think it might be taken for granted, and it is true, that all the revenue that these filling-station operators collect is of immense value to the revenue department of each State in this Union.

In Oklahoma for last year the Federal revenue from lubricating oil amounted to $2,423,850.59, and the Federal revenue from gasoline in that State during the year 1939 amounted to $23,075,794.27; the revenue for the same year in the United States from lubricating oil amounted to $30,000,000 plus, and the Federal revenue from gasoline throughout the United States amounted to $207,000,000 plus.

In addition to that Oklahoma has a State tax on gasoline of 4 cents a gallon, and the State derived in gasoline taxes alone in 1938, $13,905,000. There are other taxes in Oklahoma on the oil industry about which I am not much concerned, but I mention these things simply for the purpose of showing that if there is any industry or the products of any industry that are already heavily taxed in Oklahoma it is the petroleum industry.

Mr. DINGELL. How much tax do you pay per gallon in your State?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Four cents.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think you have made a very fine contribution. It is something I have never thought of before; that is, the distinction between a store and a gasoline station, and I want to compliment you.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing statement made by me before the Ways and Means Committee, I wish to say that the chain-store taxes proposed in H. R. 1, which is the bill known as the Patman bill, and designed to protect the local merchant against unfair competition of the great chain-store systems, is a matter of much concern to every community in the United States. As the bill now reads, there is an exemption clause in it relieving the ordinary filling station operators from the payment of any tax that the bill levies against the chain-store systems. The author of the bill is endeavoring to cut out this exemption and to make all filling stations pay a tax, whatever it might amount to, known as the chain-store tax.

I am opposed to this amendment being made in the bill. I do not want to take any position that would cripple the purposes that the author of the bill seeks to obtain by the passage of his bill. As stated above, the purpose of this bill is to give protection to local merchants, that is, local retail merchants, against the great chain-store systems. In my opinion, these local merchants cannot compete with these great systems when it comes to buying. The chain stores buy in great quantities, and, of course, at a less price than the individual country merchant can buy. The chain-store merchant may have several hundred stores in the State of Oklahoma, and he is a direct competitor in every community with the local merchant.

The chain-store owner pays only a small ad valorem tax on his stock of goods, and he can run this down to suit his convenience, if he is disposed to dodge taxes. He has no

permanent investment in the community where he operates, while the country merchant has all of his worldly possessions tied up in and around his little store. The country merchant is a fixture. He pays taxes on his stock of goods as well as on his land, residence, and other properties. He contributes to every kind of community program, from building churches and school buildings and all kinds of relief, to the poor and unfortunate, and there is hardly any escape for him from such contributions.

The chain-store operator as a rule escapes all such contributions, or if he gives anything it is a small amount. However kindly disposed the manager of the chain store may be, he is rarely allowed to contribute to the hundreds of matters that the local merchant is called upon to do, unless the committee that waits on him will give the manager of the chain store time to write to New York City about the contribution and get an authorization to make it. These are matters of practical experience, and nearly every person interested in community affairs knows it.

The methods of transacting the business of the local merchant and of the chain-store merchant are very different. The local merchant has for years extended credit to workers of all kinds and farmers in the community where he lives. This kind of service on the part of the chain-store operators is unknown.

The local merchant is part and parcel of the material and spiritual lives of the community where his store is located, and he must go along and carry his part of the community burden. All these conditions make for the local merchant a very unfair kind of competition from the chain systems, and I believe that these great systems ought to have imposed upon them some additional taxes that will enable the local merchant to have more of an even break in competition with the chain-store man.

A glimpse down Main Street in most any small town in Oklahoma or elsewhere presents a sad aspect. You will find that the store in which Tom Jones, the local grocer, has done business for 40 to 50 years has been closed up. It was not closed because Tom did not have business judgment enough about him to run a store, for he proved that he had this judgment by remaining in business for 30 to 40 years making a go of it. But since the advent of the chain store the picture has changed. Tom has had to go out of business, or his doors have been closed and his building taken over by his creditors. This condition is not conducive to the proper kind of feeling in a community. It is not going to help the country merchant to place a tax on the filling-station operators, because the two are not in competition with each other. In fact, the filling-station operator and the country merchant are just about in the same category. Both are local men, and neither of them is in a monopolistic business. If my information is correct, the tax that would be imposed upon the filling-station operators, if they have to pay their part of the chain-store tax, would in many instances amount to more than the gross sales of the thousands of little filling stations scattered throughout the country. Of course, nobody would be in favor of that kind of treatment; and, in view of the difference that is so marked and so well known between a store and a filling station, I cannot see why any person would want to place on the backs of the filling-station operators the anti-chain-store tax which was intended to give protection for the local merchant against a chain-store monopoly.

The Appropriation to Combat Venereal Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in approving the item of $6,200,000 for Federal participation in the Nation-wide venereal-disease-control program I would like to call attention to the friendly attitude of the Members of the House as well as of the Senate to this sound and effective program for which $7,000,000 was authorized by the act of May 24, 1938, and voted by the Senate for 1941. Only the exigencies of present financial limitations have prevented appropriation of the full amount. This was clearly indicated in the subcommittee's excellent report on this important item.

I make this statement now because I think our colleagues in Congress and the people throughout the States who are cooperating with their health and medical professions should know how carefully and with what concern for the best interests of the program this matter has been considered. I hope that next year the full amount approved by the Senate, or a larger sum, can be appropriated for carrying on this greatly needed work.

Mr. Speaker, I addressed the House in behalf of the full authorization March 11, 1941. I ask that the arguments I presented at that time, together with the statements of other Members of Congress and the committee reports and documented testimony be kept in mind by all concerned with planning the Budget for 1942.

Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 9, 1940, entitled "The Fight for Air Safety."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 9, 1940]

THE FIGHT FOR AIR SAFETY

President Roosevelt's order to destroy the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority by putting it under the political control of the Department of Commerce is half defeated by action of the House of Representatives. The House voted its disapproval by a marked majority not along partisan lines.

But there is need to remember that the defeat is only partial. The Senate also has to disapprove within the statutory time of 60 days allowed by the reorganization law or the Presidential order will go into effect on June 11.

The Senate will disapprove if it hears the voice of the country. For condemnation of the Presidential action is widespread. The country just does not see why an agency that brought the air lines out of disaster and gave them safety—408 days of flying without a fatality as contrasted to the almost weekly toll that was taken under political air administration—should now be put under the tutelage of Harry Hopkins.

It is easy to see why the New Deal leaders fight for the Presidential order. It is not only to save the President's face, regardless of the error he made, but it is apparently to restore the favorite New Deal doctrine that a Government agency should combine the functions of prosecutor, jury, and judge. Congress separated these functions in its set-up to govern aviation. That is one reason the C. A. A. worked so well. The President recombined them in his order.

This is how it is. Under the old Department of Commerce plan, the Air Service Bureau not only supervised flying and provided the inspection, but it also investigated accidents. It was, of course, after each accident, investigating its own supervision and its own inspection. And accidents did not decrease.

In the new air law, Congress created a board to lay down flying rules and policies and an administrator to carry out these policies. It then created a separate organization, the Air Safety Board to check on accidents. The judge and the jury functions were separated. And that ended the accidents.

It is this very Board—the Air Safety Board—that President Roosevelt proposes to abolish as he orders the aviation set-up back under the Department of Commerce.

There is a big principle involved here, as well as the practical consideration of saving lives. The Senate ought to hit this reorganization just as hard as the House did.

Coinage of 50-Cent Pieces in Commemoration of Arrival of Marquis de Lafayette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. JOHN L. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to ask the House of Representatives and especially the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to give us a favorable report on H. R. 8941, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

This bill called for the coinage of fifty thousand 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the arrival of Marquis de Lafayette. General Lafayette landed in my district near Georgetown, S. C., on June 14, 1777, and we are anxious to show our appreciation of the inestimable aid General Lafayette gave our Army, both financial and physical, by erecting a statue or monument at the point where he landed in America. I feel that we are due this great general this honor and I will personally appreciate it if the House of Representatives will assist in having H. R. 8941 enacted into a law before Congress adjourns.

I ask for unanimous consent to have a copy of the resolution passed by the South Carolina Legislature printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the passage of a bill in Congress authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the arrival of the Marquis de Lafayette near Georgetown, S. C., on June 14, 1777, and known as H. R. 8941

Whereas on June 14, 1777, that eminent Frenchman, Marie Jean Paul Ives Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, and other French officers landed on North Island near Georgetown in this State for the purpose of assisting the Colonies in the Revolutionary War against England; and

Whereas Lafayette thereafter in July 1777 entered the American Army as major general and fought with the Amercian Army until the war closed and the independence of America had become an established fact; and

Whereas Lafayette not only gave his personal services in accomplishing this end, but also spent many thousand dollars of his private funds in assisting the Colonies in the war; and

Whereas in commemoration of the arrival of the Marquis de Lafayette at North Island, as aforesaid, a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, known as H. R. 8941, authorizing the coinage of not exceeding 50,000 silver 50-cent pieces; and

Whereas said bill has been referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and measures, and is now before said committee; and

Whereas one of the purposes of securing the coinage of said 50-cent pieces is to provide a means by which the landing of Marquis de Lafayette may be properly and permanently commemorated, to the end that the future generations may know and realize the great services that this eminent Frenchman rendered to the United States in its beginning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, asked to request the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to report upon said bill as early as possible to the end that same may be acted upon during the present session of the Congress of the United States, and the said Representatives and the Senators from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States are requested to exert every effort toward securing the passage of said bill: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

G. O. P. Fairy Tales for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered over the radio last Monday night by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], entitled "G. O. P. Fairy Tales for Farmers."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these days when war news from abroad is so exciting as to absorb popular interest, it is difficult to get attention for matters close at home which are extremely important for us but devoid of the spectacular. Nevertheless, we are on the threshold of a political campaign the outcome of which will be vital to us as American citizens, and it behooves us as such not to let our minds be diverted from the domestic issues which confront us.

Already a motley array of Republican candidates for President and other Republican spellbinders have been touring the country in an effort to persuade the public that the Roosevelt administration has been a failure and to entrust their party, in spite of its frightful past failures, with the powers of government. One of the principal points of attack in this campaign is the Roosevelt administration's farm program. Not only have all the candidates been trying to convince farmers that they should return to the good old days of Hoover and Coolidge, but the Republican leadership in Congress set up a special committee to go about the country to collect testimony from farmers to support their claims. They held hearings in Illinois and other States.

The committee was so unsuccessful in this effort that at the conclusion of its tour the sense of its report was that the Roosevelt administration's farm program was working to the general satisfaction of most farmers, but what was really needed for its complete success was to put the Republican Party back in office.

One of the most violent denunciators of the New Deal farm program has been that sturdy, horny-handed Fifth Avenue farmer, District Attorney Dewey, of New York. He has boiled over with anger at the terrible plight into which the Roosevelt administration has plunged the farmers, but never with more virulence than in a recent speech at Marshalltown, Iowa. Since this speech is another fine example of his utter irresponsibility and of the general line of Republican attack, it seems desirable in the interest of actuality and truth to devote some consideration to his various misstatements.

"You, in the Corn Belt," Mr. Dewey told Iowa corn growers, "have 1 acre of every 4 out of production, while the acreage in States outside the Corn Belt has actually increased," but the Iowa farmers knew that with cribs bulging with corn held under the 57-cent New Deal corn loan, the price of corn on local markets was advancing steadily toward parity, and had exceeded the loan value at many points in the Corn Belt. Those cooperating in the A. A. A. program also knew that 1 acre out of every 4 of corn land was not "out of production" but was being profitably used in growing pasture and meadow crops, alfalfa and sweet clover, and other soil-conserving crops.

Many of these Iowa farmers and others in the Midwestern section who heard this speech knew that in 1932 10 Southern States planted 29,491,000 acres of corn, or almost 2,000,000 more than they planted in 1939, under the A. A. A. program. They also knew that in the 10 principal cotton States there were harvested in 1939, 388,964,000 bushels of corn, while the average yield for the Republican years, 1928–32, in those same States, was 405,247,000 bushels.

My friends, a misquotation of basic figures by a Presidential candidate is a dangerous symptom. Young Mr. Dewey's Marshalltown speech dealing with the corn farmer and his problems was based upon ignorance or deception, either of which carries virile germs of destruction. Having laid down a false premise, he followed through with statements that had only one purpose, namely, to prejudice the Midwest corn farmer against the cotton farmers of the South. This is Dewey at his best. And yet, it is nothing more than can be expected of one whose experience has been confined to one section of the country and who not only fails to grasp the farmers' problem but underestimates their intelligence.

In view of his total unfamiliarity with economic problems affecting domestic issues, we shudder to think what he would do about international issues in a world so filled with chaos and turmoil.

It is just too bad that the farm advisers of the G. O. P. are serving Mr. Dewey so poorly. They have been filling young Tom with misinformation and sending him out with so-called G. O. P. farm facts to convince the farmers that they don't know how to run their own program—a program which they finally won when the New Deal came into power after long years of fruitless efforts by farmers to get the Republicans to do something for the farmer.

It is no wonder that Mr. Dewey, in announcing his eight-point farm program, borrowed all eight points right out of the A. A. A. program of the New Deal.

Tom should come all the way over, and not let those G. O. P. city slickers load him up with a 1936 line of G. O. P. farm hokum. In that Marshalltown speech they had him saying: "Compare the total farm income of the 7 lean years of the New Deal with the farm income of the 7 last Republican years," and that "the farmer was better off during the Republican years than during the New Deal, in spite of its farm program." They forgot to tell him about the dark days of 1932, when corn got as low as 6 cents per bushel and was not salable in Iowa, hogs and cattle sold at 3 cents per pound, and Iowa farmers were being forced in droves from the richest land in the world; when money was so hard to get that Iowa farmers met at barter sales to trade among themselves.

The farmers of the Nation in 1932—the last Republican year—struck rock bottom with a total farm income of four and two-thirds billion dollars. This has been raised to nearly double under the New Deal, and the 1939 income was about eight and one-half billion dollars—yet Mr. Dewey told Iowa farmers that "in spite of all the money the New Deal has spent on farm payments, the farmer was better off during the Republican years."

In commenting editorially on Mr. Dewey's Marshalltown speech, the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of May 5 stated that "the great trouble with men conditioned by almost exclusively city experience when they suddenly have to deal with a question like that of American agriculture is that they start without real knowledge of the problem and fail to grasp the complexity of it before they get committed to answers that are shallow and unreasoning. Mostly they tend to counsel with spokesmen for agriculture who are political-minded, not economic-minded, and all the advice of these gentlemen looks not to deeply grounded economic solutions but to the mere 'appeasing' of the farm vote. He—Mr. Dewey—has 'missed the bus' in his approach to the farm problem as far as Iowa, at least, is concerned."

Now that the promising season for Republican candidates is on, let's look back on the record of Republican promises to the farmer and Republican performance.

In 1920, after a half century of fooling the farmer by expounding the idea that high protective tariffs in some way helped the farmer, the Republicans, in answer to the farmers' pleas for relief from tariff burdens, referred to the farmers in their 1920 platform as the backbone of the Nation, and then in 1924 forgot their promises and proceeded to inflict upon the farmers of our Nation the iniquitous Fordney-McCumber tariff that forced farmers to pay high protective-tariff prices for manufactured goods needed in farm production and farm living.

They came back in 1924 with more promises, and with the help of Democrats they did, indeed, pass the McNary-Haugen bill that would have increased our farm exports at that time, but the Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, vetoed that bill in February 1927, terming it "unsound economically." Again in 1928 Congress passed this bill, and President Coolidge vetoed it.

In 1928 the Republican National Convention at Kansas City virtually kicked the farmers out of the door when they pleaded for an effective farm plank in the Republican platform.

What they did thereafter was to enact the most disastrous legislation of all times for American agriculture—the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which increased immeasurably the disparity between industry and agriculture; and then the Republicans handed the farmers that famous gold brick, the Federal Farm Board, whose operations broke the farmer's back in 1932 and cost the taxpayers nearly a half billion dollars.

Now the G. O. P. spokesmen are again promising the farmer—and Keynoter Stassen offers as his major contribution—that same old McNary-Haugen principle which a Republican President repudiated. Yes; it is the same old story; nothing new in the way of constructive thinking in the Republican ranks.

Another point worthy of mention was recently discussed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, when he said:

"Now that war has broken out in Europe, farmers need their program more than ever. The new war has resulted suddenly in cutting off a large portion of the export market for farm products.

"In the period of readjustment which inevitably lies ahead, the national farm program, as developed by the Roosevelt administration, will be even more vital to our national welfare than it has been the last 7 years."

No better appraisal of the value of Mr. Dewey's agricultural ideas could be made than that given in an editorial in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, which I should like to quote in part and which I am sure ably expresses the opinions of all intelligent farmers throughout the Middle West. After saying that Dewey's Marshalltown speech was "a bunch of malarkey" the editorial continues:

"The farmers in Iowa are still too close to 10-cent corn in 1932 and to conditions which existed on Iowa farms during the closing years of the Hoover administration, and a 12-year Republican regime to let any man who was just then leaving law school come out and pull the wool over their eyes with flippant words.

"Too many farmers in both Iowa and Nebraska are on their land as a result of the Roosevelt farm program to relish the indictment which Tom Dewey endeavors to bring against it. Too many would have lost through foreclosure except through loans; too many would have failed except through the corn loan and the corn program; too many were at the end of their rope and dangling perilously to heed Dewey's blistering words. To admit Mr. Dewey knows anything about the facts would be to stamp him as insincere. He's simply ignorant of the conditions in the past.

"That does not help his case a great deal, but it does make it possible for farm men and farm women to adopt a more tolerant attitude toward his outbursts. Hundreds of thousands of farmers know the Roosevelt farm program saved them in these last 7 years, and it was all that did save them. If it was 'bungling,' then it was the most inspired and humanitarian bungling that has taken place in the country's history."

What is true of Iowa and Nebraska farmers is equally true of the farmers of Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and all other farmers in the commercial corn-producing section.

War and the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES BY LUDWELL DENNY, RAYMOND CLAPPER, AND GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON, AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS AND THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD certain columnists' comments on war and the international situation, and an editorial. Mr. Ludwell Denny, Mr. Raymond Clapper, and Mr. Hugh Johnson are all nationally known and respected newspapermen. The editorial I ask to have inserted in the RECORD is from the New York Daily News of May 14 and the Washington Times-Herald of May 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

POP-GUN DEFENSE

(By Ludwell Denny)

More borrowed billions down the brass hat sink rather than belated streamlining of our pop-gun defense is in prospect unless a special congressional and public committee is given power to rescue the air force from the admirals and generals.

President Roosevelt, acting largely as his own Navy Secretary and War Secretary, in the last 7 years has used about $7,000,000,000 and budgeted two billion more this year to produce results which his own experts now say are inadequate.

So this week he will ask for a half billion or so more. The excuse is that German air and motor superiority in Scandinavia and the low countries has suddenly revealed our weakness.

That, of course, is nonsense. Ever since the days of Billy Mitchell, who was crucified by the admirals and generals, the "dumb public" and the "armchair strategists" have suspected the truth which the Army and Navy "experts" denied. And for several years the reports on German aviation by real experts, such as Maj. Al Williams (now a civilian who can talk), have convinced most of the country except its defense chiefs.

Even the European war itself did not convince the President and his favorite admirals and generals. Like Neville (Too Late) Chamberlain, they were unwilling to shift the defense budget weight to air power even after Poland and Finland. The deadly German use of planes, parachutists, and swift mechanized troops today in Holland and Belgium is not new.

The American press reported it in great detail last September when Hitler swept Poland. But in his new defense budget the President merely upped the ante breathtakingly without changing balance from ships to planes.

Thus there is nothing which the President can propose now that he could not have proposed years ago, or at least last fall. Even

now it is extremely unlikely that the President will shift the balance from ships and old-style troops to planes and mechanized troops.

For to make that shift he would have to take away some of that budgeted $2,000,000,000 from the admirals and old generals (and Congressmen who insist on keeping useless Army Indian "forts" in their States) and give it to aviation and mechanization.

The anticipated half billion request will not begin to strike a fair balance between the old and new weapons of warfare. Worse, it probably will go in part for more old-style methods.

Of course the admirals and generals will accept more for aviation, provided they first get more for their old pet methods.

Two things are said of the President, who bears such a heavy responsibility:

One is that he has had so many other governmental and political duties it has been impossible for him to function well as his own defense secretary; he has thus been the victim, even more than his predecessors, of the Army-Navy bureaucracy. That is the price of one-man rule.

The other is that his sincere pro-Ally policy led him to give priority in American aviation production to Allied orders at the expense of our own. Unfortunately, the Allies double-crossed him. Instead of placing heavy orders last autumn, permitting large plant expansion and bottleneck breaking, the Allies have not placed heavy orders here even yet.

So when Chamberlain missed this bus he also made Roosevelt miss it. And now when the Allies at last are ready—or almost—to use American industry, up jumps public opinion demanding that we cancel a few warship plans in favor of an American air fleet.

Thanks to the Chamberlain-Roosevelt delay in aircraft orders, our plants and trained mechanic supply at this late date are still very small. Our production capacity is only 500 a month, compared with Germany's 3,000. From 1 to 3 years of industrial expansion will be required, after big orders are placed, before they can be filled promptly.

In antiaircraft guns we are even worse off. After spending about $8,500,000,000 of borrowed money on defenses in the last 9 years, we now have a grand total of less than 300 antiaircraft guns—but we have lots of unprotected ships. Likewise, there is a shortage of pilots, mechanics, and training facilities.

To correct these and similar weaknesses there are two proposals:

One is to give more vast sums to the same old system.

The other is to provide a special congressional and public committee to attempt the job in which the admirals and generals have failed—a New Deal for enlarged aviation, with a unified Air Corps equal to the Army and Navy.

So far as known, the President is still for the old discredited system.

[From the Washington Daily News]

THE CRISIS

(By Ludwell Denny)

The United States was brought closer to war today by Germany's invasion of the low countries.

Dutch possessions in this hemisphere are near the Panama Canal, naval life line of the United States. Any Nazi claim to those strategic areas would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and undoubtedly would be challenged by this Government—by force of arms if necessary.

Those territories are Dutch Guiana and the Dutch West Indies. The latter group of six islands off the Venezuelan coast, in addition to their naval and air-base importance, have the chief oil refineries and storage facilities of Latin America.

Moreover, the Dutch East Indies have just been brought under quasi protective relationship by the unilateral assertion of the United States Government opposing any change in their status. They are a strategic key to the Philippines, and to the British and French far eastern empires.

They are also the chief source of tin and rubber upon which American peace and war industries depend.

Any danger of seizure of that eastern territory, so vital to the United States and to the Allies, presumably would come from Japan, which has been driving in that direction.

The recent Washington warning apparently sobered Japan and pleased the Allies, but was received coldly by the Netherland Government. Despite the threat of Nazi invasion then present, Holland declared that she could protect her eastern possessions without help from anyone else. That proud declaration, however, was generally interpreted as a necessary diplomatic gesture of confidence rather than as a final policy in case of emergency.

Of the two dangers of United States' involvement, that in the Far East causes even more concern here than that in the Panama Canal area.

Germany at the moment is less able to attempt seizure of the Dutch West Indies or Guiana than is Japan to try a quick grab at the Dutch East Indies. Apart from the fact that most of his navy is engaged in Scandinavian waters or bottled up in home bases by the British Fleet, Hitler has given no indication that he wants to add the United States to the alliance against him.

Thus the policy question which faces President Roosevelt today, regarding the Dutch possessions within the Monroe Doctrine zone, is not so much whether to prepare to fight Germany now or whether to take so-called preventive action.

That in turn raises this related question:

Should such action be by the United States alone as the owner of the Panama Canal, or in cooperation with other pan-American nations?

In any event, the United States is not likely to act without obtaining the consent of Holland—unless, indeed, a situation is created by the German blitzkrieg under which the Dutch Government is not free to act responsibly.

The greatly increased danger in the Far East, resulting from Hitler's move today, was foreseen by President Roosevelt. He not only sent virtually the entire United States Fleet to the far Pacific for "maneuvers," but the day before Hitler struck Holland the President ordered the American Fleet to remain between Hawaii and Japan.

In addition to these two major diplomatic and military repercussions here, there is also the immediate effect on this country as an Allied supply source. Now that Nazi planes are in closer bombing range of the English coast, and the Allies are exposed again in all their aerial inferiority, they will increase their rush orders for American planes and other equipment.

More important—and more incalculable—is the psychological effect of all this on the Washington Government and the American public. As for the administration, there is not much it can do to be more pro-Ally short of actual fighting. But in this campaign period, on the eve of the national conventions and with an isolationist Congress still in session, the President must move carefully.

Nobody knows whether this will be considered by him "the crisis," which his close friends have said would be necessary to induce him to run for a third term. Of course the third-termites are certain this is it.

It is too soon to get indications here for the effect on American opinion, except the obvious shock of this latest expected but dreaded advance of Hitler toward the Atlantic. Will it begin to crack that vast 98-percent majority opposed to United States' involvement?

Probably the answer will be determined more by what Hitler and the Japanese do next than by the wishes of America.

[From the Washington Daily News]

AN EFFECTIVE ANSWER

(By Raymond Clapper)

Although it was not his purpose to do so, Winston Churchill has given a most effective answer to those Americans who are saying that we ought to get into this war to save the Allies.

The answer is carried in these revealing words of Churchill in the House of Commons: "Our numerical deficiency in the air—in spite of our superiority in quality, both of men and materials—condemns us, and will condemn us for some time to come, to a great deal of difficulty, suffering, and danger, which we must endure with firmness until more favorable conditions can be established—as they assuredly will."

Time and again Churchill came back to that point, emphasizing Allied weakness in the air, and the time that will be required to overcome it. Without control of the air, the British could not use their Navy to cut off the Germans in Norway. Sir Samuel Hoare, air secretary, described how when the British succeeded in establishing an airdrome in Norway, a mass of 80 Nazi bombers swept over and destroyed it within a few hours.

The Allies have man power and they have overwhelming superiority in sea power. But warfare has changed so that, until they can command the air, their other factors of greater strength are held latent.

So, as was pointed out here recently, what more can we do for the Allies than we are doing? We have placed our entire aircraft industry at their disposal. American Army and Navy orders give way to Allied orders. The Allies can have the latest models that are in production. They have ample funds with which to buy these planes. Our production capacity is expanding almost miraculously. One authority says it is now at the rate of 17,000 planes a year and by the end of 1940 will reach an annual rate of 25,000 planes. Other estimates are lower, but in any case our capacity is considerably ahead of Allied purchasing.

So when Winston Churchill says the reason the Allies do not have the initiative "is our failure in the last 5 years to maintain, or regain, air parity with Germany," he points in the very direction in which the United States is helping the Allies to the limit.

For many months, long before war broke out, President Roosevelt engaged in a bitter battle with Congress over his determination to throw our aircraft industry into the service of the Allies. You recall the French plane incident. Before the war broke out, Mr. Roosevelt urged Congress to repeal the arms embargo so that planes might be shipped to the Allies. Losing the first battle, he returned to it after war broke out and succeeded in repealing the embargo.

That is the record with respect to American aid to the Allies, the kind of aid of which they are in most need. Could we do any more with regard to supplying planes if we went into the war?

As the Allies control the sea, their essential commerce moves with little difficulty. Our Navy would be of little use to the British, because they already have an overwhelming preponderance, but owing to lack of air strength can make only limited use of it. Not even a frontal land attack, even if the British and French were willing to make the sacrifice in men that would be required, could hope to

succeed without command of the air, or at least a fighting chance for it.

Judging by Churchill's analysis, the Allies expect to wait some months until they achieve greater strength in the air and then try to turn the tide. Some reliable authorities estimate that this point should be reached next fall, with the aid which is being given through the American aircraft industry.

If that is the situation, and it appears to be, debate as to whether we should enter the war is beside the point.

[From the Washington Daily News]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This is the way to get mixed up in other peoples' wars: First you sell them your goods. They become your "best customer." They make jobs for your unemployed and dividends for your stocks. When their purchases have become an important part of your economy they run out of cash.

Your business is threatened. They ask for credits. Some old boat rockers begin to croak about this. Some say, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. This will surely compel you to send armies to protect your dollars."

Your politicans reply, "We shall never send an American mother's son to bleed on foreign shores." Your best customers add: "We don't want your military assistance. You are too far away. Your efforts to equip and transport armies would interfere with your value to us as a base of supplies."

The assurance of repayment of such loans is so slender that no private funds are available. No one person wants to risk, but if Congress authorizes the Treasury to loan, all the people will be forced to risk collectively what nobody would be willing to risk individually.

That is reckless statesmanship, but by this time hysteria and emotion have ousted both prudence and judgment.

From the beginning of this sequence there has been growing a sloganeering stupidity. "They are fighting our war. They are paying in blood. We shall only pay in dollars. It is the least we can do." When we opened a credit of $3,000,000,000 to the Allies in the World War the votes in the committees of the House and the Senate were unanimous. To the suggestion that Allied bonds were selling below par the answer was: "All the more necessary to loan them this money at the lowest possible rate of interest." When one Congressman said, "They will use it to retire private loans elsewhere." Answer was: "Do not limit or qualify the use of this money." When mutual guarantees among borrowers was suggested the reply was (prophetically): "If we get this money back at all * * * we shall get off cheap."

Thus we buy an interest in a war we are going to fight with goods and dollars but not with blood—"just a few divisions as a token and a symbol to show the flag."

Then the going gets tough. We are in to the eyebrows on the economic and sympathetic side. Our friends' backs are "at the wall." The whole tune changes. "Send us men. If they haven't equipment, send them in their undershirts."

The demands on us become almost insulting to abandon our organizations and commands and conscript men to fight under foreign flags and officers.

So we finance most of the cost of the war from this point out for ourselves and our Allies. We pack men by the millions like sardines into transports and send them untrained into battle. We are cursed for tardiness, stinginess, and timidity. Then comes victory—maybe—and we learn that we have been fooled on the war's objectives. The victors didn't share our ideals, and under secret treaties they take all and leave us nothing—and then repudiate all debts and vilify us for even asking for repayment.

This is our actual World War experience, neither distorted nor exaggerated. We are going through it again step by chuckleheaded step. We have now reached the stage of "we don't want your men, only your dollars," and "they are fighting our battles," and "we will help them by everything short of war, but not an American mother's son will be sent abroad."

"As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly" (Proverbs XXVI: 11).

[From the New York Daily News of May 14 and the Washington Times-Herald of May 15, 1940]

IF WE INTERVENE

Yesterday we heard Miss Martha Breckenridge broadcast over C. B. S. the heartrending stories of various Belgian and Dutch refugee children in Paris—how some of them were wounded, how others had lost parents or older brothers and sisters in the blitzkreig, how all of them were miserable little victims of war.

Whether intentionally or not, this is the best kind of interventionist propaganda, because it is aimed at the heart of America. So was the President's speech last Friday night, so was his cable to King Leopold of Belgium, so were Secretary of State Hull's Monday denunciations of the German aggressors. The Breckenridge broadcast, incidentally, reminded us of W. L. White's Finn-Russ war broadcasts from Helsinki, said to have inspired Robert E. Sherwood's interventionist play, There Shall Be No Night, a play with a different point of view from Mr. Sherwood's Idiot's Delight.

So it may come to pass that our sympathies and indignation will be worked up to such a pitch against the hell of war that we shall decide to go into the hell ourselves.

TAXES AND MEN

If we do, it is to be hoped we will all bear in mind two things: (1) That we must expect to take a load of taxation which will make present taxes seem like child's play, and (2) that we can intervene effectively only with fighting men, using the latest in scientific weapons. It won't help the Allies for us to send them merely sympathy.

But whether we intervene in Europe or whether we are cool and wise enough to escape, still we shall need a much bigger and much better Army than we now have.

If Hitler wins he may be too busy licking his wounds to attack us next. On the other hand, he may be drunk enough with the wine of victory to do that very thing, with Japan helping him. For insurance we need, as fast as we can create it, an army of 1,000,000 mechanic-sergeants. Among these should be 40,000 or 50,000 pilots.

Senator Burton K. Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HAMILTON BASSO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Hamilton Basso entitled "BURTON the Bronc," which appeared in the April 22 issue of the New Republic. This analysis of the character of one of our colleagues will doubtless prove interesting to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of April 22, 1940]

BURTON THE BRONC

FIFTH IN A SERIES OF "HATS IN THE RING"

The WHEELER household, ordinarily as tranquil as most, is sometimes disturbed by one recurring argument—whether or not the Senator from Montana should retire from politics. The lone affirmative voice is that of Mr. WHEELER himself. Like a sea captain growling against the sea, like a painter threatening to be a plumber, so does the Senator occasionally fume against the life of officialdom and protest that he wants to get away from it all. These periods are short-lived, totally forgotten by the time the next meeting of the Senate convenes, and Mrs. Wheeler is quite correct in saying that were he to carry out his threat he would be one of the unhappiest people in the world.

Politics has a different meaning for different men—a means to power, a way to social or business advancement, a chance for a soft job, even a lark. It may also be a method of personal expression: An instrument, as valid as any of the arts, with which a man might seek to impose his own view—his inner vision, if you like—upon the world. The administrations of Jefferson and Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, were such personal expressions; and the political phenomenon called the New Deal cannot and will not be understood until it is related to the character and personality of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To BURTON KENDALL WHEELER, a New England Yankee with the breezy manners of a westerner, politics is also a means of personal expression. Let us assume that each phase of Mr. WHEELER'S career is a book and that we are examining the collected works of a writer whose name has been nominated for the Nobel Prize. We would find that through this work of a lifetime there runs a consistent central theme: A willingness to forswear the immediate advantage for the ultimate good and a battling independence that does not mind sticking its neck out. We would also find a colorful picture of our times and the portrait of a man who may be called the forgotten liberal of American politics.

Book I. Go West, Young Man, Go West: Hudson, Mass., where BURTON WHEELER was born on February 27, 1882, is one of those New England towns which have developed economically and politically (to filch from Mr. William Allen White's biography of Coolidge) in accordance with the Puritan thesis which Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather preached as a religious faith. "To work and to save,"

Mr. White has written, "were the highest human virtues. The Hamiltonian doctrine of the right of the property class to rule was translated into the shibboleth of the times—brains win."

Mr. WHEELER lived in Hudson until he was 20 years old, going to the public schools there and attending a business college. These were formative years—yet, while the mark of New England is upon him, his political and social outlook is singularly unfettered by that propertied philosophy which Calvin Coolidge held to his heart to the end of his days. In one respect, however, the two men may be said to be alike—their mutual tendency to take the long view. This, perhaps, is part of the New England character—finding expression in such phrases as "looking to the morrow" and, more obliquely, "good fences make good neighbors." From a half year's experience in that part of the world I would judge it to be. Should this surmise be correct, BURTON WHEELER'S principal inheritance from New England is the long view. The other dominant trait of his character, his rough-and-tumble independence, is as western as a gulch.

After completing his business-school education, Mr. WHEELER worked as a clerk and stenographer until he saved enough money to go to college. He selected Ann Arbor and enrolled in the Michigan Law School. For a New Englander raised in the heart of the academic belt, where you can't throw a rock without hitting a Ph. D., this in itself was no mean kicking over of traces. It was the squire of Northampton's proudest boast, for example, that "no Coolidge ever went West." Mr. WHEELER, however, was no Coolidge and no squire. It is even possible that he was not altogether happy in Hudson, for, as the French say in a proverb, happy people never emigrate.

Law-student WHEELER, in good American fashion, worked his way through college by waiting on tables and hiring himself out as stenographer to the dean. During vacation time, to support himself further, he peddled one of those native one-volume encyclopedias that tell you how to do everything from boiling an egg to curing a horse of heaves. Orders were taken on foot in the summer and the books delivered in the early fall.

This phase of Mr. WHEELER'S life recalls a similar episode in the career of another Senator—the late Huey P. Long. The Kingfish, it will be recalled, was at one time a lard salesman, and, before he had taken to the habit of having reporters on the paper I worked for thrown out of his room, he once told a group of us that a large measure of his political success was due to the knowledge he gained of people during those salesman years. Mr. WHEELER gained similar knowledge and, in addition, a wife. He met Mrs. Wheeler, the daughter of an Illinois farmer, while trying to sell her father a book. They now have six children.

Graduating from law school in 1905, Mr. WHEELER pushed farther westward to Telluride, Colo., where he went to work in a law office. Not quite content, anxious to have an office of his own, he soon moved on to Montana and to Butte. There he was offered a job in another law office at $50 a month but declined. He was thinking of going elsewhere, possibly back East, when there occurred one of those trivial accidents which are sometimes more influential in shaping a man's life than major events. He got into a poker game and was thoroughly fleeced. Broke, shorn, perhaps more grim than he now remembers, he went around to the law office and took the $50-a-month job. Butte has been his home ever since.

Book II. Meet the Interests: As cotton quotations are to the South, as the corn and hog market is to the Middle West, so is the price of copper to the citizens of Butte. And copper, in Butte, is a synonym for Anaconda. The story of Anaconda, a subject for a book, cannot be compressed into a paragraph. Its chief essence, however, is distilled in the tale that tells how it got its name. Mike Hickey, the discoverer of the Anaconda mine in Butte, was much impressed by a dispatch that told of the last military phase of the Civil War. "Grant's army encircled the Confederates like a giant anaconda." The symbolism, in relation to the economic history of Montana, is almost too apt.

Butte was general headquarters for the copper kings who, in the early part of the century, were still warring for the right to exploit the mineral wealth of Montana. The smell of politics was almost as noxious as the sulfur dioxide burned from the ore before it was sent to the smelter. Lawyer WHEELER would have no part of it until, in 1910, he was nominated on a "reform" ticket and elected to the State legislature. Then, in his first attempt to use politics as an instrument of personal expression, out stuck the neck.

Thomas J. Walsh was one of those men who, like Senator GEORGE NORRIS, help to justify American democracy. He was bitterly opposed to the copper interests and the copper interests were logically opposed to him. WHEELER was warned that if he supported Walsh for the United States Senate, he might as well leave Montana. He was told that his political career would be over, that his law practice would disappear, that he would be driven out of Butte. Walsh, however, was the hero of Mr. WHEELER'S early manhood. The threats only served to get his mad up—and BURTON WHEELER is somebody to reckon with when he is on the prod. He campaigned for Walsh, and started bucking the interests, and he and the interests have had a vendetta ever since.

Walsh was defeated but in the next election he swept everything before him. Mr. WHEELER, however, had tougher sledding. Running for attorney general, he made a dismal showing. It looked like curtains, and the interests scratched his name off their list of public enemies, but Senator Walsh had taken a deep liking for the young lawyer and in 1913 induced President Wilson to appoint him United States District Attorney for Montana.

The shoe was now on the other foot and the shoe pinched plenty. WHEELER brought as many indictments as have been brought recently in Louisiana. As a lawyer he is what other lawyers call a born prosecutor. This, it will be remembered, was during the time when the I. W. W. first came into prominence. It was also a time of steadily mounting war hysteria. WHEELER by refusing to take action against pacifists and the militant leaders of labor fired a hatred in Montana even more intense than that ignited by Mr. Roosevelt. (The President, for example, has never been accused of being a spy and wanting to introduce free love.)

The blaze of hatred shot so high that Senator Walsh, whose term of office had almost expired, was told that all hope of his reelection was gone unless WHEELER were sacked. Unwilling to jeopardize Walsh's career, Mr. WHEELER resigned. Almost immediately he was offered a Federal judgeship. He declined, saying he wanted "to fight it out with the people of Montana." The long view again.

In 1920 (when Franklin D. Roosevelt was running for Vice President on the Cox ticket) Mr. WHEELER ran for Governor, backed by the Non-Partisan League and the Labor League. Every weapon was used against him except the Anaconda smokestack. It seems unlikely that he could have been elected that year under any circumstances but, to make it more difficult, the country was voting itself back to "normalcy." WHEELER, like nearly every other non-Republican candidate, was snowed under. He made, however, a deep impression on the people of Montana. Two years later, in 1922, he was sent to the Senate for his first term. He has been in the Senate ever since.

Book III. Brand Blotting: One of the puzzles of the moment is how Mr. WHEELER'S reputation as a liberal managed to become blurred. Yet in circles that ought to know better, his right to the title is sometimes questioned. Here is a man who ran for Vice President on the La Follette Progressive ticket (while Franklin D. Roosevelt was supporting John W. Davis), who was one of the spearheads in the drive that led to the exposure of the Teapot Dome scandal, who has always championed the rights of labor and fought vigorously in defense of civil liberties—well, what is a liberal? one is tempted to ask.

The truth of the matter is that Mr. WHEELER has been the victim of what Montana cowpunchers call "brand blotting." This is the phrase used to describe the method by which a brand is made indistinct by applying heat through a wet sack or blanket. The heat, in Mr. WHEELER'S case, was turned on by the professional new dealers; the blanket was the Supreme Court fight.

While the term "liberal" has always been a vague one, never has it been quite so blurry as at present. In Washington, and especially in the inner New Deal circles, the ultimate test of liberalism seems to be a willingness to pledge complete fealty to President Roosevelt. This tendency—and I hope it is not so pronounced as I believe—first became noticeably manifest in the Supreme Court fight. The Court bill was used as a kind of litmus paper to type a man as either "reactionary" or "liberal." There could be no intermediate shadings. Senator WHEELER, one of President Roosevelt's earliest backers, a defender of the New Deal as a whole, once again found himself with his neck out.

The story begins with Teapot Dome and former Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty. In January 1924, after the scandal had been broken, Senator WHEELER introduced a resolution calling upon President Coolidge to ask Daugherty to resign. He also demanded a full investigation of the Department of Justice. These activities, in time, forced the resignation of Daugherty, but not before he put Private Detective Burns on WHEELER'S trail and sent a small army of Department of Justice agents into Montana to "get a case." These agents spent several months in Montana and some $250,000, and finally WHEELER was indicted on a charge of unlawfully receiving money as a retainer fee to influence the issuance of oil- and gas-prospecting permits.

The case was too flimsy to stand up. A Senate committee headed by the late William E. Borah reported no foundation for the charge, and when the case came to court it was the Department of Justice, rather than WHEELER, that was on trial. WHEELER was acquitted in 10 minutes, but to this day his dossier remains in the Department of Justice files.

This experience was deeply influential in determining his position relative to the Court plan. It so happens that in the hullabaloo raised over the Supreme Court, lesser details of the court bill were largely overlooked. WHEELER was against the method proposed to enlarge the Supreme Court, but he was even more opposed to one section relating to the lower courts. This would have permitted any administration to send special hand-picked judges anywhere in the country to try cases in which the Government was interested. Senator WHEELER puts his side of the argument very simply, "Where would I be today," he asks, "if Daugherty had had the power to send a hand-picked judge to try me? Where would anybody's civil liberties be? A weapon like this, in the hands of some other President, could well be an instrument of destruction—cutting down our guarantees of liberty and extinguishing our rights to freedom of speech, of action, and of religion."

This, it may be held, was another example of his tendency to take the long view—but long views, in Congress during the Court

fight, were at a discount. Then, too, Senator WHEELER found himself in the curious position of being a hero to the very groups and interests that had previously damned him as a "red." Such groups and interests found his liberalism most handy for their purpose. "If a liberal like WHEELER is against this bill," the argument went, "it must be a dangerous proposition." So, since politics is politics, it was good strategy, even imperative strategy, for the administration to blot the WHEELER brand.

There are political fashions in Washington as there are intellectual fashions in New York—and hangers-on. In the wake of the whale that is F. D. R., in the lesser wakes of the inner circle, thousands of little minnows are happy to follow. Let the whale lash its flukes, or blow its spout, and all the minnows dart off to speed the news—via gossip, via dinner tables, via typewriters. This is what is generally called being on the "inside." So, when the brand blotting started, it became a political fashion to point out that BURTON WHEELER's past career had been done with mirrors and that he really was a "reactionary" at heart. This fashion has run its course (the coup de grace being the White House's admission that Senator WHEELER would be acceptable as a Vice-Presidential candidate), but it was sufficiently popular a few months ago to cause some people to discover in Mr. WHEELER's vote for a tax on foreign copper a sign that he had "sold out" to Anaconda—though, as the president of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers testified, he cast his vote upon "information supporting our contentions that there should be no reduction in the tariff on copper."

Book IV: The Chicago Cup. The odds against Mr. WHEELER in the July classic are being quoted at 30 to 1. Under different circumstances, they might not be so high because any handicapper would be compelled to list the following advantages: A liberal record, the friendship of both houses of labor, a comprehensive knowledge of domestic affairs gained through the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, plus his long and concentrated study of the railroad problem, a strong and well-reasoned stand against intervention in Europe.

A bookmaker prejudiced in Mr. WHEELER's favor would be tempted to add one thing more—the long view. Most of official Washington is as hypnotized by November 1940 as a Hindu fakir is by his navel. This is understandable; and Mr. WHEELER is also glancing at the calendar. But he takes considerable time out, as any study of his recent addresses and writings will reveal, to look into the future. "The biggest job in the next 10 or 15 years," he understands, "is the preservation of American democracy. Everything we do now ought to be examined with that in mind."

I am in no position to state Mr. WHEELER's economic pilosophy in full. That, properly, is his job. I would assume, however, that it is infused with the basic morality of the New Deal and that his domestic program would be a renewed effort to drive further in the direction of economic democracy. I would also assume that while he might be willing to bargain nonessentials to gain essentials, to use the democratic instrument of compromise, his hard-headed independence would frequently discomfit his foes and sometimes his friends. I would further assume that his long-time defense of civil liberties has been a sincere expression of personal belief and that, as President, this expression would continue. And I would not be surprised to find him, should he spend 4 years in the White House, as admired—and as hated—as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

BURTON WHEELER would like to be President. (He is totally disinterested in the Vice Presidency and has given me permission to say that he will not accept it under any circumstances.) The Senator, however, is under no illusions. He knows that if Mr. Roosevelt turns thumbs down on his candidacy, thumbs down it will be. It is not to be concluded, though, that should the thumb turn down it will be because he is not a liberal. Politics is not conducted in an emotional vacuum; men have personal relationships. As for Mr. WHEELER's liberalism, his career is his best testimonial—and the liberal forces of this country should not make the unforgivable mistake of denying one of their own kind.

HAMILTON BASSO.

Continuance in Public Office of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull Means War for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, startling new evidence has come to light this past week of the war intentions of the present administration. It is convincing proof that continuance in public office of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull means war for the United States.

Testimony at an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing in New York last week disclosed that plans had been formulated by the administration for the transportation of troops overseas via the port of New York. The witness, the chairman of the General Committee of Port Traffic of the Association of American Railroads, a man of high probity, in discussing questions of congestion in New York harbor, said:

> Plans at present are set up for the possible transportation of troops.

This disclosure, taken in conjunction with the fact that legislation for the conscription of man power, for the conscription of business and wealth, for the imposition of confiscatory taxes, and for censorship and espionage, has already been drafted and is embodied in bills pending in the Congress, can in no way be reconciled with the repeated assertions of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull that American participation in European war is not contemplated. It is a complete contradiction of such assertions. It proves such assertions to be mendacious and intended to deceive the American people. The American people should be made aware of their danger and be made to realize that those now in charge of our Government are bent on war. In order to avoid war, they must remove from leadership President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

Menu Illustrating Dinner on Which W. P. A. Worker Has to Subsist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

MENU WORKED OUT BY BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RELIEF DINNER

National Press Club, Washington, D. C.

May 14, 1940, 6:30 P. M.

MENU

	Cents
Beef stew:	
2 ounces beef at 19 cents per pound	2.37
¼ carrot at 12 for 13 cents	.39
¼ onion at 24 for 20 cents	.21
½ potato at 20 for 16 cents	.40
½ slice of bread at 7 cents per loaf	.20
Coffee at 12 cents per pound	.52
1 teaspoon sugar at 10 pounds for 47 cents	.18
Canned milk at 4 cans for 25 cents	.20
1 pat oleomargarine	.25
1 canned prune	.28
Total cost	5.00

This meal is based upon the budget of the average woman worker on W. P. A., who receives a monthly wage of $44, of which $16.91 is spent for food. Assuming she has an average family (3.7 for W. P. A. and relief workers, according to W. P. A.), she can spend 5 cents per person per meal.

This figure was also used by Mr. Milo Perkins, President of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, in his pamphlet The Challenge of Underconsumption as the average per capita per meal budget of relief families.

The menu was worked out by the Bureau of Home Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

America and the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS AND THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one under the heading "Swap," published in the Washington News of today, which refers to negotiations for the British and French West Indies to apply on defaulted debts now past due and owing from the great British Empire and the powerful French Empire. Why not? Uncle Sam's taxpayers want to know—why not?

The other editorial refers to Jimmie Gerard, Knight of the Bath, member of the British nobility, who urges the United States to enter the European war, which is perfectly natural, coming from a man who holds a title at the hands of the British King. The latter editorial is published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 15, 1940]

SWAP

Already agitation has begun for changes in the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act, in order to permit loans to the Allies.

If we learned anything from the last time it is that we must never again lend to nations at war, unless we are reconciled to defaults and to such recriminations as have poisoned American-European relations for two decades.

Yet, if Germany's air power does not win this war within a few weeks or months; if this is to become a war of exhaustion—which is the only type of war the Allies can hope to win—then it is inevitable that the United States and other American republics will come to grips with the issue of Allied financing.

If we made outright gifts of money or war supplies, we would be on the thin ice of belligerent partisanship, which might involve another A. E. F.

If we lent the money, the same thing might happen; and, human nature being what it is, we would once again become the maligned and embittered creditor in post-war years. "Loan oft loses both itself and friend."

Would the only alternative be to choke off supplies, even if German victory were thereby guaranteed?

No; we think the Allies have a better 'ole.

And we think the Americans have a happier choice than to sit idle while the dictators overrun the nations of western Europe, nations whose defeat would intimately involve the geography and politics of this hemisphere because of their numerous colonial outposts in our waters.

When a private individual is out of money and unable to borrow, he cashes in some of his assets to meet the emergency.

There is no reason why nations shouldn't do the same. If the Allies get hard pressed they can relinquish sovereignty over their Western Hemisphere holdings—at a fair price—and use the proceeds for the planes and other equipment they need.

And it would be only enlightened self-interest for the American republics to pay that fair price—even a good price, as friendly buyers—and run up a pan-American flag over the British, French, and Dutch possessions in and around the Caribbean.

We suggest this as a project to be undertaken by all interested American republics—the islands and possessions to be governed under a pan-American mandate.

The United States itself has no imperial ambitions. It is not looking for more real estate. "Manifest destiny" is a dead phrase here.

But in common with our sister republics we do have a vital stake in securing the defense of this hemisphere. And therein lies the tremendous value to us of these strategic holdings: The British Bermudas, 580 miles off North Carolina; the British Bahamas, east of Florida; British Jamaica, south of Cuba; the Windward and Leeward Islands of the Lesser Antilles (principally owned by Britain and France), which form a circle protecting the northern coast of South America and the Panama Canal; the Dutch islands of Curacao and Aruba, closer still to the Canal; the British, French, and Dutch Guianas, on the South American mainland; British Honduras, north of the Canal.

Some of these holdings, like Dutch Curacao and British Trinidad, are economically important; others are white elephants; they would be economic liabilities like our Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. But they would be worth a big price because of their importance to the naval and aerial defense of the Americas.

These possessions have no military value to Britain, France, and Holland, who contemplate no aggression in this hemisphere. But to the Americas, to the United States in particular, their intrinsic worth would be greatly augmented by their strategic value in the naval and aerial defense of the Panama Canal. Consider the cost of doubling our Navy, which would be a plain necessity if the swift acceleration of aggressive technique were to make the present defensive outposts of the Panama Canal inadequate.

The best definition we ever heard of trade was this: The process by which two men get what each wants, both parting with what neither needs, both profiting by what neither loses.

The trade here proposed, where the Allies would get what they must have to defend themselves and where the Americas would secure these defensive outposts against the possibility of a Nazi claim, would be just such a deal.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 15, 1940]

SUPPOSE WE MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS, HONORABLE JIMMIE

The Honorable James W. Gerard, World War Ambassador to Germany, recently emerged from a luncheon with President Roosevelt all full of pep and ginger.

Said the Honorable James:

"We can't let Germany win the war.

"A German victory would be a great danger to this country."

Everyone is shocked at the excesses of war.

Everyone is horrified at the useless and unnecessary slaughter.

But how can we improve this deplorable situation by plunging our people into this maelstrom of murder?

We must not proceed recklessly and impulsively in such an important matter so vital to the welfare of our people and perhaps to the existence of our country.

Perhaps this European war is our war; and perhaps it is not.

Perhaps the last European war was properly our war; and perhaps it was not.

Maybe every European war is our war; and maybe it is not.

Maybe every Asiatic war is our war.

Maybe we should participate in every conflict everywhere and decide when and how and by whom it shall be won; or maybe we should mind our own American business and look after our own peace and our own people.

Maybe it is a great danger to this country not to interfere in foreign conflicts; and maybe it is a much greater danger to be a perpetual and pernicious busybody, meddling in things we cannot help and in which we might do much harm—bringing death and disaster to our own country and our own people, and unnecessarily inviting invasion and destruction here at home.

Let us consider carefully what we got out of the last war before we rush into another, and let us figure out accurately how much strength and resource, how much money and manpower we are going to have left to defend our own country if we have dissipated everything we possess mixing in the quarrels of others.

Furthermore, Honorable James, what do you mean by "we" when you say:

"We can't let Germany win the war."

You certainly cannot mean yourself and the President, or you would have said so—and he would have said so.

Maybe you mean by "we" the Honorable James Gerard and the Honorable James Cromwell, the two honorable Jimmies?

Both are important, both are impulsive, both are belligerent.

The Honorable Cromwell also is intensely anxious that "we" should save the world again for democracy; but neither does he explain who "we" are.

Nobody has heard of his doing any personal saving.

Nobody has heard of his enlisting in the Foreign Legion or anything like that.

He is too busy running for Senator from New Jersey to attend to such trivial details.

He is too dignified and too prosperous to get mussed up in the disagreeable mud and blood of battle.

No; "we" cannot mean the Honorable James Gerard and the Honorable James Cromwell.

There will probably be no ambassadorial escadrille formed in which these two bellicose gentlemen will participate.

Jimmie Cromwell is too busy, and, Jimmie Gerard, you are too old.

You were too old to enlist in the last war, and you are a quarter of a century older now.

You did your part, to be sure. You were a good Ambassador, and you wrote a good book on the Kaiser and sold it to Warner Bros. for a good propaganda picture.

But you did not actually get down in the trenches, and you do not repose under one of those little rented white crosses in France, and you are perfectly sound in wind and limb, with no bullet holes through you.

So, obviously, "we" does not mean you.

Well, whom does it mean?

It means the young blood of America.

It means the mothers' boys, from 18 to 20.

It means the young men just starting out in life, from 20 to 25.

It means the young fellows from 25 to 30, who have got good jobs and good prospects, and who are making their way in the world, hopefully and helpfully.

It means the strong, healthy, happy youth of America, who must take their health and strength across the seas and come back—if they do come back—broken in body and mind—lame perhaps, blind perhaps, bedridden perhaps, wounded or shell-shocked; nerves gone, health gone, strength gone, hope gone, prospects gone, jobs filled, sweethearts married—wholly spent in spirit and handicapped in life—utterly sacrificed to a sordid quarrel that is not theirs.

A quarrel that has been going on for centuries, and will go on for centuries.

A quarrel our ancestors came to this new land to avoid.

A quarrel we abolished here when they made the separate, conflicting Colonies all one harmonious Nation.

A quarrel we can never solve over there, but which can ruin our country and our people if we become involved in it.

No, "we" doe not mean all but withered last leaves upon the tree—like you, Jimmie, and like the writer of this column.

It means the useful, hopeful, valuable youth of this country, whom we in our older wisdom—our accumulated experience and our sincere patriotism, if we have any—should protect against the folly and futility of war, and should preserve for their own happiness and welfare, and for worthy services to their native land.

And finally, Jimmie—a familiar appellation which 40 years of friendship permits—what harm will it do this country if either of these misguided combatants wins in this war or another?

If England wins, we will get along with her as amicably in the future as we have in the past.

She controls Canada and British Columbia and British Guiana and many of the West Indies on this hemisphere, but that does not in the least prevent amicable relations.

We have only had two wars with her in 160 years.

If Germany wins, we will maintain friendly relations with her if we want to.

She controls two large provinces in South America, say you.

What of it? She has controlled them for many years, and nothing disadvantageous to us has happened there.

We have had only one war with Germany in a century and a half—and that one a war that we went into of our own volition and initiative.

The only thing which would prevent our getting along with other nations is not minding our own business.

The only thing which prevents those other nations from getting along with each other is not minding their own business.

Suppose, Jimmie, that we—you and I—mind our own business.

Suppose, too, that "we"—the real youth of America, who would have to fight this war—also be allowed to mind their own business, and to have some business, some happiness, some peace and prosperity, some security for home and family and country to mind.

Pertinent Thoughts Bearing on the Campaign Issues of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pertinent thoughts bearing on the campaign issues of 1940, taken from my Weekly News Letters:

RECIPROCAL-TRADE PROGRAM

The tariff act of 1934 transferred the tariff-making power from Congress to the President, and the President in turn delegated the power to that outstanding free-trader, Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. Mr. Hull is thoroughly convinced that the best way to preserve peace is to let down all trade barriers so that there may be free and unrestricted exchange of commodities between nations. The low tariff base upon which this Nation is now operating is one of the causes of our prolonged depression. It virtually amounts to free trade, and free trade and jobs do not go together. Organized labor understands this and opposes the reciprocal-trade program.

FARM EXPORTS DECREASE, FARM IMPORTS INCREASE

During 1939 our competitive farm imports were greatly increased over the farm imports of 1938, and our farm exports were almost cut in half during the same time. The American farmer should be his own judge as to whether he has been helped or injured by the reciprocal-trade agreements. How many times have you gone into a store and found crowding the shelves manufactured articles labeled "Made in Japan," "Made in Germany," or "Argentine beef"? This is the direct result of the failure to protect our own market for our own people. The continuance of the reciprocal-trade agreements will mean a continued increase in our farm imports, and a continued decrease in our farm exports.

PLAIN COMMON SENSE

Admission into America of foreign-grown products which compete directly with American farm products can serve no useful purpose. It can only have the effect of increasing our surpluses, reducing our prices, forcing more American land out of production, and driving more American farmers from the land. Any tariff revision made through a reciprocal-trade agreement that affects agriculture should be made with the greatest of care at any time, but never should it be made during a time when prices are already depressed. The very uncertainty or doubt concerning the effect of the tariff revision further depresses the prices, and the farmers' pocketbook is bound to suffer.

FAILURE AFTER 7 YEARS

The theory under which the New Deal took over and regimented farm operations was that supply would be controlled to meet demand; that prices would be stable and the farmer would make a profit on his operations. Instead of making a profit, he is getting a hand-out from the Federal Treasury. Experiments that defy the laws of nature and of supply and demand and then make up to the victims by "a gentle rain of checks" from Washington are not getting the farmer anywhere. Market prices last October, before war was declared, were lower than when the visionaries took charge. What the American farmer wants is stability and progress, not checks for acting as agricultural guinea pigs for a lot of socialistic theorists.

CATTLEMEN BURNED UP

The fact that the President used the White House sounding board to disparage American beef, and, in effect, urged the country to patronize Argentine beef because it was better and cheaper has neither been forgotten nor forgiven. The huge increases in imports of both cattle and wool, shown by the official figures of the Department of Commerce, are now adding fuel to the fire. During the first 6 months of 1938 cattle imports into the United States totaled 242,584 head, valued at $4,087,205, while during the first 6 months of 1939 cattle imports totaled 486,497 head, valued at $11,688,106. During the first 6 months of 1938 wool imports totaled 25,415,500 pounds, while during the first 6 months of 1939 wool imports totaled 116,801,000 pounds. It is no use telling the American cattlemen that these huge increases in cattle imports do not hurt them, because they know these imports have a depressing effect upon prices and deprive them of a market that rightfully belongs to them. The cattlemen of the West have become tired of being made the goat in a good-neighbor policy of doubtful value.

FARMERS TAKE NOTICE

Argentina is a direct competitor in beef, mutton, pork, poultry, wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, and flax production with our American farmers. In fact, Argentina is an agricultural country, pure and simple; yet our State Department tried its best to enter into a trade agreement with Argentina the result of which could only mean imports of agricultural products to compete with the products of American farms in exchange for American manufactured products. Our farmers should feel relieved that the negotiations with Argentina have been broken off temporarily.

HOW LONG?

How long can we expect the American farmer—and I care not whether he lives in Florida or Illinois—to continue to sell the products of his land labor below cost of production be-

cause of forced competition with peon labor, many of whom go barefoot the year round and whose sole wardrobe consists of a cotton shirt and a pair of patched overalls? We simply cannot compete with him unless we get down to his living levels.

HE GETS IT COMING AND GOING

Under the former high protective tariff the American farmer was penalized so the American manufacturer could have the domestic market. Under the present reciprocal-trade agreements the American farmer is being penalized so the American manufacturer can build up his foreign market. The American farmer therefore has been getting it both coming and going. When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed 6 years ago the American farmer was promised that the American market would be preserved for him and that the agreements would furnish him a larger export market. Now what does the record show? According to the Department of Agriculture reports the average annual imports of competitive farm products for the 5-year period before the agreements amounted to $495,000,000 per year, while the average annual imports of competive farm imports for the 5-year period since the agreements has been $616,000,000 per year. The average yearly value of farm exports for the 5 years before the agreements was $982,000,000, and the average yearly value of farm exports for the 5 years since the agreements was $784,000,000. Therefore, according to the Department of Agriculture's own figures, the American farmer has been getting it both coming and going.

THE REAL ANSWER TO THE FARM PROBLEM

"Farm chemurgy" means the use of farm products as raw materials in the manufacturing industries. Farm chemurgy seeks new uses for crops we now grow, the establishment of new crops for new uses or old, and the profitable utilization of farm byproducts and waste. Agriculture, industry, and science have combined in farm chemurgy to answer the cry of the unemployed for work and, at the same time, increase the farmer's income. Farm chemurgy is the real solution, the only permanent solution of our pressing farm problem.

TWENTY YEARS LATE

The Government of the United States has recently appropriated money for the establishment of four agricultural laboratories to study new uses for surplus farm products. One of these laboratories is located at Peoria. Private industry has been hard at work on this problem for a long time, and has made remarkable progress. Great laboratories, manned by the best chemists in the country, are maintained by Ford, Du Pont, General Motors, and others, finding new uses for farm products. The results read like a fairy tale:

FARM PRODUCTS IN FORD V-8

Into the construction of every million Ford V-8's today goes: Eighty-nine million pounds of cotton, the crop from 558,000 acres, for making upholstery, brake linings, timing gears, and safety glass; 500,000 bushels of corn, the harvest of 11,280 acres, for rubber substitutes, butyl alcohol and solvents; 2,400,000 pounds of linseed oil, the yield of 17,500 acres of flax, for making paints, core oil, soft soap, and glycerin; 2,500,000 gallons of molasses, from 12,500 acres of sugarcane, for making antifreeze, shock absorber fluids, and solvents; 3,200,000 pounds of wool, from 800,000 head of sheep, which go to make upholstery, gaskets, antirust, floor coverings, and lubricants; 1,500,000 square feet of leather, from 30,000 head of cattle, for making upholstery and hide glues; 20,000 hogs to supply 1,000,000 pounds of lard for lubricants, oleic acid, and bristles for brushes; 350,000 pounds of mohair, from 87,500 goats, for making pile fabrics for upholstery; 2,000,000 pounds of soybean oil, from the crop of 10,000 acres, for making the lustrous and long-wearing enamel.

This is farm chemurgy in operation.

ALCOHOL FROM FARM PRODUCTS

A 5-percent blend in auto gasoline would require 15,000,000 acres of corn or its equivalent; a 10-percent blend would require 30,000,000 acres—which is the acreage declared surplus by the Agricultural Department—and a 20-percent blend, which can be used without changing the carburetors or the engine of any of the cars now made, would require 60,000,000 acres. Sixty million acres devoted to the production of alcohol would probably compel us to go on an importing basis for our foodstuffs. Chemists are rather frank in saying that we have been bungling with the farm problem long enough and that the solution lies in raising more rather than less. This fits in with the gospel that Henry Ford has been preaching for years, "All wealth comes from creative labor."

A Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

LETTER FROM HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1940]

A WARNING BY HENDRIK VAN LOON—BASEST TREACHERY BETRAYED GERMANY'S PREY AND IMPERILS UNITED STATES

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The news is telling its own relentless story and America sleeps. Norway destroyed; Finland is lamed; Belgium destroyed; Holland blown to pieces; Czechoslovakia murdered; Poland annihilated, and America sits by and sweetly says: "Oh, yes, that is too bad, but it is all very far away and it can never happen over here. We must send them a bundle of old clothes and do a little more moral rearming. For we are safe and it can never happen over here."

Until the day it does happen—and then it will be too late—and the hideous part of it all will be this, that we had warnings, endless warnings, warnings which stood in bold black print ever since It came into power.

For this is what It wrote and said just before It came to power, as anyone may read for himself who will stop following the baseball scores just long enough to contemplate his own possible fate should he let It go Its way unmolested, to bring about the universal kingdom of Its Aryan Herrenmenschen:

"When I start to make war, I shall suddenly and in the midst of peace let my troops appear in Paris. They will come wearing French uniforms. They will march through the streets and in clear daylight. Nobody will dream of stopping them. Everything will have been prepared long beforehand and in the minutest details. These troops will march to the buildings of the French general staff and before anybody knows what has happened they will have occupied all the Ministries and Parliament.

"By the use of such methods, within a few minutes' time, Austria, France, Poland, or any other country will be at my mercy. All its leading personalities will be in custody. The people will be an army without officers. The confusion will be indescribable. But long before my men have come I shall have established contact with certain local personalities who will then come forward and will establish a new government, a government which will do as I bid it do.

"We need not buy them. Why should we? They will come to me out of their own free will, driven by ambition or through sheer blindness. And we shall have peace before we have had a war. For that which is held to be impossible must invariably succeed. My own Storm Troopers, disguised as peaceful visitors, will have filtered in long beforehand and nobody will see anything in them except just peaceful travelers, bound on a little holiday.

"Today nobody will believe me when I speak this way, but I will do just exactly that, and I will also send soldiers by ordinary commercial airplane. So what do I care about a Maginot line? My purpose will be to destroy the enemy from within and not from without. And it is my duty to destroy the morale of the people I intend to attack long before I attack them and to demoralize them so thoroughly that they won't even be able to think of the possibility of defending themselves.

"Any one of us who has been at the front and who knows what war means will agree that this makes sense—that everything is permissible as long as it saves one single drop of our valuable German blood, and, therefore, panic has to be my most important method of attack—a panic which will cause such a confusion of ideas and sentiments that all idea of resistance will be lamed.

"All this, I confess it, I have learned from the Bolsheviks, for one always learns most of all from one's enemies. Keep this in mind and then you will know what you have to do when the time comes. Does anybody really think that I am such a fool as to want to start a war the way it was done by those idiots of the year of

1914? No; the trouble is that most people high up in government are completely lacking in imagination. I am not, and this, therefore, is what I will do."

There is the story. The gangster who tells the bank at just what hour he will attack the vaults and in what disguise he will make his appearance. But the bank does not believe him, for the thing is unbelievable. But it is true. Because in that demented brain there is only one truth—the truth (now visible in the ruined villages of the whole of Europe) of a hate which surpasses human understanding as the love of God used to do in another and happier day.

But America won't believe. America, the next victim, talks prettily about amiable theories fit for an imaginary world, intones harmless incantations about a common brotherhood which includes all men, even Nazis, and awaits the knife of the murderer, smiling all the while at that poor misguided man who will not harm us if we will treat him with kindness and talk to him about his mother.

Listen, America, here is something you ought to know: After the last war the people of the Netherlands took care of half a million German children, received them in their homes, fed them, clothed them, and kept them for 1, 2, or 4 years, that they might be restored to normal health.

And 20 years later those nice, dear children, speaking, of course, perfect Dutch (had they not been full-fledged members of a Dutch household for many years?), returned to the land of their hospitality garbed in one of those 50,000 Dutch uniforms (about which our correspondents have been cabling for 3 months), but again nobody would believe them, and thusly disguised those grateful little Germans, now completely contaminated with the Nazi virus, burned down the houses that had been their homes and struck down the hands that had fed them and saved their lives.

But America won't listen and America won't believe. Until it will be too late and the vermin has eaten its way into the fabric of our own edifice of state.

And for this letter I will be called a warmonger and the Nazi boys will smile slyly and say, "Just because we burned down his own birthplace he is perhaps just a little hysterical." Which God forbid. I am merely conscious of a duty toward my adopted country. I am no German and do not intend to betray my own benefactors. I want to save them. I want to save them from a fate which has just overtaken others who talked and reasoned the way we did and do. I want to save them from the fate of being destroyed by their own kindness, their own decency, their own inability to believe in a vileness beyond any of the words found in Dr. Roget's helpful little volume. I want them to wake up before they, too, are dead.

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON.

OLD GREENWICH, CONN., *May 13, 1940.*

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I reproduce a letter written by a minister of the Gospel in a small Alabama town. As instances have come to my attention of reprisals being meted out against those who publicly favor real democracy by abolishing the barriers to voting, I have refrained from either mentioning the name of the town or the name of the writer. This is also according to his request. I believe this is only just to the writer, in view of the recent outrages of the Ku Klux Klan in certain sections of the Southland.

This letter is typical of many that are coming to my office daily:

——, ALA, *May 1, 1940.*

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEYER: I saw your bill to abolish the poll tax in the eight Southern States mentioned in our local paper. Congressman GEYER, I want to congratulate you on your bill and your ability and your principles. I bid you Godspeed and pray to God that you will push the bill through, not for my personal benefit, nor for my people—my wife is 68 years old, and always we kept our poll tax paid up until we were too old—but I have seen poor laboring white men suffer at the hand of these political sharks until it makes my blood run cold. The officeholders here in Alabama are elected by about 30 percent of the citizens, for about 70 percent of the men and women in Alabama have no vote for lack of $1.50 to pay the poll tax. This is shameful. I myself am a voter, a white man, and a minister of the Gospel.

Please do all that you can for the helpless in the South. I think that it would be useless to call on our Congressman to do anything for the common masses of the people so I call on you to help us.

Thanking you and thanking the Lord for the start that you have made, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Reverend ——.

The Relief Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should devote its energy to solving the many serious domestic problems confronting our Government. We should not let the war divert our attention entirely to foreign affairs, as many think an effort is being made to do. Our first duty is to solve our domestic problems. We are confronted with serious facts, not theories. Our national debt is at the $45,000,000,000 debt limit. Farmers are able to live only by reason of governmental grants and appropriations. Business has lost all confidence in the present administration. Many millions of our citizens are unemployed. In fact, we are in a worse condition today than we were in March 1933.

In a few days we will have the relief bill for the coming year before us for consideration. Relief work should be continued as long as it is needed, but I feel that, while we are providing relief work, we should be devoting our energies at the same time to bringing about a condition wherein relief work will not be needed, a condition wherein the unemployed and those working on relief can be employed in regular employment at regular American wages.

W. P. A. has been used as a political set-up instead of one wholly for relief of those needing relief. It has been subject to many abuses. Much of the money heretofore appropriated for relief work has been used to employ nonrelief workers, to pay large administrative costs, exorbitant amounts for travel expenses, telephone and telegraph, and wasted in many ways. Congress should write into the law provisions which will compel those administering this law to expend the money to employ those needing relief and providing that politics should be completely taken out of relief.

I have been unable to learn how many nonrelief workers are employed and being paid from funds appropriated for relief. Those in authority will not give out this information. I introduced a resolution in Congress providing that Congress be advised as to the names and salaries of all nonrelief workers being employed and paid from relief funds, but the committee has not reported the resolution. It seems to me that when Congress appropriates money, the Members should be informed how that money is expended, and how many people who do not need relief are being employed and paid from relief money. Also, the taxpayer whose money is used for this purpose is entitled to know how his money is being spent, but there seems to be no way to find out. Those administering the law will not tell and Congress will not make them tell.

When hearings were held on the last relief bill, Colonel Harrington, W. P. A. Administrator, advocated $1,477,000,000 be appropriated for the fiscal year 1940, which was the full amount asked by the President. The Governor of Indiana, apparently for political purposes, has written letters to people saying that W. P. A. could not employ them because Congress failed to appropriate as much as the President asked for, Congress appropriated $1,477,000,000, the full amount asked.

Colonel Harrington further advocated that the legislation provide that persons employed on W. P. A. be required to work 130 hours per month. I quote from Colonel Harring-

ton's testimony, which appears on page 20 of the hearings. He said:

It is my recommendation that persons employed on projects of the W. P. A. be required to work 130 hours per month, and that the earnings of such persons be on a monthly basis, with the requirement that substantially the present national average labor cost be maintained.

Still W. P. A. bosses have been telling W. P. A. workers that the Republicans are responsible for the 130-hour work month. Of course, everyone knows this is not true.

In an attempt to get the money appropriated for relief to be expended to employ those needing relief, I offered the following amendment:

Provided, That no person whose need for employment has not been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d), shall be employed as timekeeper, boss, or supervisor on any Work Projects Administration works project if there are persons unemployed whose need for employment has been certified as provided in said section 16, subsection (d), who are qualified and capable of performing the duties of timekeepers, bosses, or supervisors.

This amendment was voted down, the amendment receiving no Democratic support.

I also offered the following amendment:

Provided, That the Work Projects Administration shall not employ any person whose need for employment has not been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d), in any position, if there are available for employment persons whose need for employment has been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d), and who are capable and qualified to perform the duties of said positions.

This amendment was also voted down, it receiving no Democratic support.

There is no question but that W. P. A. is seething with politics and favoritism. In today's mail I received a letter saying:

The same power here that caused me to be layed off will see that I do not get back on as long as I stand where I have for a year and a half.

Recently I received a letter advising that in one township "19 men were put to work 1 day; all 19 were Democrats and several were single men, while several men with large families who were in destitute circumstances could not get this work." I made a protest against wholesale lay-off of workmen with large families and much in need of the work, and received reply from the district director containing the following:

The relative-need basis that you referred to was not considered in these reductions; the selection of the people for these reductions was made in the district office by the employment staff composed mostly of young ladies who did not know whether a man was white or black, married or single, or any other circumstances about him.

Just think, people laid off W. P. A. without the question of need even being considered, when, as a matter of fact, relief work was started and has been maintained for the sole purpose of providing for those who are in need. Without this need there would have been no W. P. A. It is also very queer that in these lay-offs they always managed to avoid laying off any of the nonrelief workers.

Much of the relief money is being expended to employ publicity agents. The Washington office has quite a staff, and each State has its publicity division, called the division of information. They have particular officials listed as director, division of information; special representative, senior information writer; senior information specialist; information specialist; and assistant information specialist, all drawing fat salaries and none of them needing relief.

Our Democratic friends are now trying to dodge the responsibility for the provisions in the relief legislation. In the Senate there are 69 Democrats, 23 Republicans, and 4 representing other parties. In the House there are 260 Democrats, 167 Republicans, and 4 representing other parties, and 4 vacancies, so it is apparent that the Democrats have an overwhelming majority in both the Senate and the House, and there are not enough Republicans in Congress to pass any legislation. One hundred and sixty-seven Republicans in the House cannot outvote 260 Democrats, and 23 Republicans in the Senate cannot outvote 69 Democrats. Then, of course, the President has the power to veto any legislation which he does not approve. He approved and signed the relief bill. Our Democratic friends cannot escape responsibility for the legislation passed by this Congress. They claim, and are entitled to, credit for all legislation which is good and meets with public favor, and they cannot escape responsibility for that which is bad and fails to meet with public favor.

In January 1939, W. P. A. had 32,670 administrative employees; this does not include timekeepers, foremen, superintendents, supervisors, and so forth, who are carried on the pay rolls and paid out of relief funds.

In 1936, just before election, W. P. A. employed 105,000 in Indiana, but immediately after election began to lay workmen off until, in 1937, employment reached a low of 40,000. In 1938 they began to reemploy until right before election 101,374 were employed. Immediately after election they again began to lay off, and by December 1938, 84,704 were employed, and in January 1939 this number was reduced to 82,545. During 1939 and the early part of 1940 they lacked about 8,000 of employing the quota in Indiana, although they had available money for employing the full quota. In 1938, right before election, they had a total of 3,334,567 employed on W. P. A. Many of those laid off immediately following the election were told it was because they voted wrong.

In December 1938 there was a total employed of 3,161,080; in January 1939, 3,021,546; in February 1939, 2,996,460. I wonder what is the excuse for having more employed in November than were employed in December of 1938 and in January and February 1939, when everyone knows the greatest need is in December, January, and February. We can again expect increased employment from now on up to election day in November, and no doubt immediately after election they will again begin laying the men off as they did in 1936 and 1938. Apparently, they do not realize that people get as hungry after election as they do before election, and that they need work just as much after election as they do before election, and that Republicans get hungry and need relief work just as much as Democrats do.

A few days ago I received a letter advising that the W. P. A. boss asked the men on one project if they were going to vote the Democratic ticket. Some of the men told him that they would do as they saw fit and were immediately assigned to extra heavy work.

I hope this relief bill will take politics completely out of W. P. A. and will cause the money appropriated for relief to be expended to employ those needing relief. Timekeepers, bosses, supervisors, and so forth, should be taken from the relief rolls and not from the political rolls. There are thousands of highly educated men who are well qualified to fill any position in the relief set-up, who are unemployed and in need of relief work; they are thoroughly competent and should be employed to fill these positions. Waste and useless expenditures should not be permitted; exorbitant salaries and employment of nonrelief persons on relief projects should be stopped.

For 7½ years the present administration has failed to solve a single governmental problem. Our public debt has mounted to the sum of $45,000,000,000; we still have over 10,000,000 unemployed; agriculture and industry are paralyzed and the administration has no solution for all these problems to offer—nothing except continued deficits in an apparent effort to spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect.

American Imports and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the preservation of our American markets for our American agriculture, labor, and

industry, to the end that unemployment and the burdens of our people may be reduced, is the aim of all.

It is impossible to serve two masters. No Member of Congress can serve cheap labor in foreign lands and at the same time serve our 10,000,000 unemployed working men and women who want jobs and cannot find them.

Last year the excess of agriculture imports over exports was approximately $462,207,000.

In 1931 we imported 335,000 bushels of corn; in 1936, 86,000,000 bushels. In 1938 we imported 7,183 bushels of oats; in 1939, 4,293,000 bushels. In 1938 we imported 3,829,000 bushels of wheat; in 1939, 10,747,000 bushels. In 1934 we imported 59,000 head of cattle; in 1939, 753,570 head. In 1932 we imported 34,000 pounds of pork; in 1937, 16,500,000 pounds.

Let us compare prices received by all farmers in the United States which show the effect of trade agreements:

Commodity	Average price, Feb. 15, 1937	Average price, Feb. 15, 1940
Alfalfa hay, per ton	$13.98	$9.38
Apples, per bushel	1.30	.81
Butterfat, per pound	.339	.297
Chickens, per pound	.169	.122
Clover and timothy hay, mixed, per ton	13.55	10.02
Corn, per bushel	1.036	.547
Hogs, per 100 pounds	9.19	4.97
Oats, per bushel	.537	.377
Potatoes, per bushel	1.303	.752
Wheat, per bushel	1.249	.841

Data taken from U. S. Department of Agriculture, vol. 17, No. 3.

Cash income received by all United States farmers

	1937	1939	Farmers' loss in 1939
Meat animals	$2,329,000,000	$2,262,000,000	$67,000,000
Poultry and eggs	832,000,000	722,000,000	110,000,000
Dairy products	1,532,000,000	1,354,000,000	178,000,000
Wool	117,000,000	85,000,000	32,000,000
Wheat	605,000,000	397,000,000	208,000,000
Potatoes	184,000,000	157,000,000	27,000,000
Hay	96,000,000	65,000,000	31,000,000

Cash income received by all farmers in Ohio

1937	$360,000,000
1939	314,000,000
Ohio farmers' loss in 1939	46,000,000

Data taken from U. S. Department of Agriculture, vol. 17, No. 1.

It is my contention that the power given the State Department in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been used, not to protect our American farmer, but, on the contrary, to encourage imports of farm commodities of which we ourselves produce surpluses. Under this policy the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation buys surplus farm products for distribution among relief clients, while at the same time we encourage the importation of additional quantities of such commodities in larger amounts than the Surplus Commodities Corporation buys.

In effect, through the State Department we subsidize farmers of foreign lands to produce more for the American market, while through the Department of Agriculture we subsidize the American farmer to produce less for the American market and to throw away what foreign market he had left. During years 1938–39 the Surplus Commodities Corporation spent over $30,000,000 in purchase of 20 different farm products in an effort to raise prices by removing surpluses. During the same period $92,298,000 worth of the same commodities were imported from abroad.

The pottery industry is very important in my district. Let us see how it is affected by our present reciprocal-trade program. More than 60 percent of the total cost of pottery is the labor cost. The average wage paid in American pottery is 75 cents per hour. The chief competitor in American markets of the American pottery industry is Japan where the Japanese potter is paid an average of 4 cents per hour. How can we expect to keep our potteries going and our potters employed if we continue the present program of reciprocal-trade agreements?

Under our trade agreement with Russia, that country is permitted to ship in, duty-free, to compete with our coal miners and coal operators, 400,000 tons of coal per year.

In this day we are pursuing a high-price, high-wage level—the American standard of living. If these prices, these wages, are to be maintained, we cannot, in all seriousness, carry on at the same time a foreign-trade policy which provides for imports of commodities produced under conditions such as low wages, long hours, and a low standard of living.

The American market belongs to the American farmer, the American worker, and the American manufacturer. Our markets are the best in the world; they are a prize; they belong to the people who developed them—the American people.

In Memoriam—To Our American War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following poems appropriate to Decoration Day, May 30, 1940, which appeared in the May 1940 issue of National Defense, a monthly magazine published at Arcadia, Calif.:

[From National Defense for May 1940]

IN MEMORIAM—TO OUR AMERICAN WAR DEAD, DECORATION DAY, MAY 30, 1940

THE SENTRY'S REVERIE

The sentry paced with measured tread
Before the unknown's tomb,
Is that cold clay he thought with dread
To be my awful doom?

Shall mothers kneel at some cold stone,
In some day soon to be
And, praying, think I am their own?
Is there no hope for boys like me?

Kings have laid their wreaths of flowers
Upon your resting place,
Sad, lonely folks stand by the hour,
Each with a tear-stained face.

Buddy, I'm glad you cannot know
What goes on in these lands.
How children pass by, to and fro,
With gas masks in their hands.

How bells of hell ring out once more,
Once more we're called to school
To learn the awful hymn of hate
And not the golden rule.

Mars quaffs his ruddy cup of gore,
And smacks his bloody lips,
The four horsemen ride as of yore,
Starvation cracks his whip.

They have not kept your gift of peace
You fought and died in vain.
Will human slaughter never cease?
Buddy! What did they gain?

—*Reute.*

COMMENTS ON THE SENTRY'S REVERIE

"What did they gain?" This question as expressed by the author of the above poem, the daughter of a retired soldier, is one which should challenge the minds of all Americans. Those who gave their lives gained the acclaim of our Nation while the war mongers and international bankers (who sent them forth to die) gained an immense profit—a profit which the surviving veterans and all citizens continue to pay to this group whose patriotism is secondary to war profiteering, and who, in peace and in war, evade their just share of the costs of government, and correspondingly add to the burden of the masses, by investment in interest-bearing, tax-exempt bonds.

Kings and rulers, who send our youth forth to die, reserve for themselves the front lines when it is a matter of decorating the graves of the dead. They reserve for themselves the front lines of observation when our boys march forth to die, and loudly applaud their courage and sacrifice—but these superpatriots are singularly absent from the front-line trenches. And in war's inevitable aftermath of suffering and poverty, when the battle is for sound economic readjustment in the interest of all the people, they are conspicuous by their absence from the front lines of unselfish endeavor.

These same superpatriots who sent our youth forth to die have recently indicated that citizens who declare (in reference to Europe's wars) that the Yanks are not coming should be classed with Communists. Emboldened by their success in 1917, they would again send our youth to foreign battlefields to protect the financial interests of the international money racketeers. Recently in California, the students at the University declared: "Let God save the king." In the light of our past experience, this is also the viewpoint of your editor.

We are proud of the efforts of the American Legion and other true American organizations in opposition to American involvement in the European capitalistic war. Let those who control the world's gold fight their own battles to protect their ill-gotten wealth, and let our American youth remain here at home to develop and build a greater and a better United States of America.

We owe nothing to royalty, plutocracy, or any ocracy except democracy. We have problems here at home, with 10,000,000 unemployed and with two-thirds of our population constantly going into debt for the necessities of life. Therefore, it seems to us that our first duty, as Americans, is to our own citizens—that is, to relieve the poverty and unemployment in our Nation and to bring prosperity and contentment to our people.

Let us honor our Unknown Soldier and our American dead, who died believing they were making the world safe for democracy, by dedicating ourselves on this day and every day to the resolution that we will never again have an unknown American soldier to sacrifice his life on foreign soil—that never again will we go forth to battle in foreign lands to save the kings of finance and their nobles.

"FLANDERS PRAYER

"In Flanders' Fields, where poppies grow
We've slept in peace—each silent row,
For twenty long and quiet years,
Unmindful of life's joys and fears.

"But now the war lords' greed and lust
Bring protest from our mouldering dust,
And to Almighty God on high
We raise our weak, sepulchral cry.

"Must din of war and battles roar
Bring chaos to our land once more?
Or has our sacrifice been in vain—
Must mothers' hearts break and bleed again?

"Dear Lord, we plead, we beg, we pray,
Help men keep peace along life's way;
Let not war's grief, sobs, and tears,
Disturb our rest—down the years.

"But let us peacefully sleep again
Where poppies bloom, mid sun and rain,
Where marble crosses, vigil keep—
We're brothers all, in our last sleep."

—L. L Sextan, Company I, First Infantry, Camp Jackson, S. C.

The Lakes Region of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

LETTER FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MINNEAPOLIS CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
May 13, 1940.

Hon. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Once again, with the approach of the summer season, the State of Minnesota and the city of Minneapolis are issuing a hearty invitation to the vacationists to plan on a visit to this land of the sky-blue waters.

Never have the 10,000 lakes of this Commonwealth, the streams, and forest lands offered a more attractive respite from our daily activities than now.

This State offers to the vacationists an excellent system of hard-surface highways which will lead them to modern cities, attractive retreats, or into the very heart of the wilderness itself.

This summer, in addition, there is an opportunity for the visitor to take in the many attractions of the aquatennial, which will be held in Minneapolis July 20 to 28. Outdoor and indoor spectacles and every manner of water sport will be available to the visitor here, as a spectator or participant.

Through you we would like to extend our heartiest invitation to every Member of Congress to visit Minneapolis and Minnesota's 10,000 lakes region. You may assure them that the heartiest of welcome awaits them in Minneapolis.

Cordially yours,

D. W. ONAN, *President.*

A Day for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. LYLE H. BOREN, OF OKLAHOMA, ON ARKANSAS DAY AT HOLDENVILLE, OKLA.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Representative LYLE H. BOREN, one of the ablest Members of this House, delivered by electrical transcription on Arkansas Day at Holdenville, Okla., in one of those rare gems of oratory, an address eloquently portraying those sacred bonds which so closely bind the great Sooner State to her proud mother State of Arkansas. I take great pleasure in quoting it in full:

Friends all, with unusual pleasure and particular pride I extend greetings to all Oklahomans whose original heritage is rooted in the soil of Arkansas.

It is most fitting that there be set aside in Oklahoma an Arkansas Day.

Oklahoma is a child of the Union; her parents are Arkansas and Texas, her grandparents were the Old Dominion, and she is joined in cousinship and brotherhood to Tennessee and Alabama and all the younger States of the Union. One of the youngest, Oklahoma has inherited the gifts of all. Strong in intellectual and physical endowments, vigorous in resources of power and energy, we have begun a journey to incomparable greatness, and our beginnings are made possible entirely by endowments of wisdom and experience from our more than 40 ancestors who have found their way into the hall of fame in less than 2 centuries.

In the veins of Oklahoma courses blood of Arkansas and Texas, of Tennessee and Alabama, of Virginia and Kentucky. The glorious dawn of the east, the magnificent sunset of the west, the cool and spirited breeze of the north, the gentle and fragrant winds of the south we have combined to make Oklahoma's Indian summer. We owe a great debt for our endowments to many States, but Arkansas has contributed most bountifully to our richest inheritance—our people.

From Arkansas's broad and quiet rivers, from the rice fields of the east and the Ozarks of the north, the brave and strong have found their way to Oklahoma. We love the State of Arkansas for giving us men generous and tolerant, for giving us women beautiful, good, and kind; and children strong, courageous, and ambitious.

Arkansas is one of the greatest States. It is located in the center of the Union and is the keystone to the arch of the great Southwest. Her head rests in the lap of the Ozarks; her feet splash in the mightest of rivers. Of the 68 useful minerals known to American geologists, Arkansas produces all save one. Her minerals fill every division of the English alphabet from agate to zinc. Aluminum, coal, glass, iron, lead, and pearl share in the list of valuables stored in the vaults of her hills and vales. Her 33,610,000 acres have never known a total crop failure or a famine. A land of rice and corn, of melons, fruits, and berries, she is the one State that annually reproduces its invested capital. Her products annually exceed the value of all her property. She is indeed the wonder State.

Her ash, her hickory, and her oak supplies the handles for the tools of the world.

Two thousand miles of navigable rivers join her swift mountain streams and many springs of life-giving and health-restoring waters.

To Arkansas belongs the first national park in America. A million gallons of radio-active water daily bubbles from its 48 thermal springs.

Arkansas, whose history dates from DeSoto's exploration, will, on the 15th day of June, celebrate her 104th birthday as a State of the Union. The history of her past is glorious, but the history of her future will undoubtedly be greater than any of her past though you delve into the 50,000 feet of sedimentary rock that is the foundation under her soil and has recorded in its layers leaf after leaf of her most ancient history.

The Congress that determined on statehood for Arkansas was the immortal Congress whose membership was shared by Henry Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and John Q. Adams. The voices of Caleb Cushing, Thomas Harte Benton, Crittenden, Buchanan, and Martin Van Buren were also raised in historic discussion. The bill presented by the last delegate that Arkansas sent to Congress, the Honorable Ambrose Sevier, was signed by the hand of Old Hickory. On September 13, 1836, William S. Fulton, the last of the territorial governors, handed over the mace of authority to James S. Conway, the first governor of the new State.

On July 4, 1836, the twenty-fifth star was added to the flag of the Union.

At the 1837 session of Congress, the last Delegate and the last Territorial Governor, Sevier and Fulton, took their places in the United States Senate to represent for the first time in that body the new-born State; and Archibald Yell, who resigned his seat in Congress to volunteer in the Mexican War some 10 years later, and for whom was named the great county from whence some of you have come, was the first to represent the State in the lower House of Congress.

Since the day that Arkansas sent those three Representatives to share in shaping the destiny of the Nation, the State has given many illustrious sons and daughters to national service too broad to limit by the boundaries of the State. Arkansas is the parent of Albert Pike, Augustus H. Garland, Clifton R. Breckenridge, Edgar A. McCulloch, Joseph T. Robinson, Dr. Clegg, and Mary McCormick. Admirals, generals, Cabinet officers, a Vice President, President of the Senate, many illustrious statesmen, musicians, authors, religious leaders, and leaders of industry have been given to the United States by the State of Arkansas.

The abundance of her natural resources, her majestic mountains, her sparkling springs, her placid rivers, her many grotesque caves, her long season of frostless days stir our admiration and appreciation, but there is a grander and greater resource than all these—the people. Religious, moral, 2,000,000 people of character and intelligence with vigor and enterprise make up the greatest resource of our neighbor State.

It is the people that Arkansas has given to Oklahoma that makes us love her best—as pure a stream of Anglo-Saxon blood as flows in the veins of any American State, a tolerant, noble, and hospitable people who hang the latch string of generous hospitality on the outside of their hearts and homes.

To every man and woman who is now in Oklahoma from Arkansas we extend a hand of friendship and affection. May this land of your adoption bountifully reward you for the fine intellect, the strong character, and generous hearts which you have brought for our endowment. Arkansas Day is a significant and important day in Oklahoma. Long live this day and all for whom it is set aside to honor.

Veterans' Bureau Facility, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 18, 1940, I extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and gave a short résumé of the interest the Maryland delegation in Congress has taken in the erection of a new Veterans' Bureau facility in or near Baltimore, Md. At that time, I included a letter which I had received from the President in reference to the situation and I am today in receipt of the following letter from General Hines which would seem to indicate the matter is now in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget for final determination:

MAY 14, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the program of future construction for the Veterans' Administration for accomplishment from year to year within the period of the next 10 years, recommended by the Federal Board of Hospitalization to the President and approved in principle by the President on May 9th, there is included a new Veterans' Administration general facility of 300 beds for the Maryland area.

Immediate consultation is contemplated with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to determine upon how funds may best be made available to undertake necessary preliminary work, such as the selection of site and preparation of plans.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Chairman.*

In view of the urgent need we have for additional hospital facilities and the fact Maryland has for a considerable time been at the top of the list of approved veterans' hospitals, I sincerely hope it will be possible to include the amount needed for the construction of this new hospital in the final deficiency appropriation bill which is now being considered by the Committee on Appropriations and which will soon be reported to the House.

The Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., Receives an Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the University of Missouri School of Journalism has given its award for distinguished service in journalism for the year 1940 to the Oregonian, published in Portland, Oreg. This is a well-deserved recognition of a newspaper which has played an important role down through the years in the building of a great community, the Pacific Northwest.

The Oregonian was established by the late Henry L. Pittock in 1850. It was the days of the covered wagon and ox teams, when thousands of Americans were turning their eyes toward the Pacific coast and joining in the great migration on to Oregon. Not long after the founding of the Oregonian, Harvey W. Scott joined the staff, and through a long period of eventful years in the development of the Northwest, H. L. Pittock and Harvey W. Scott combined their great talents in building for community service an outstanding publication. Through a long span of years the editorial page of the Oregonian, fashioned by the hand and brain of Harvey W. Scott, commanded an outstanding position in editorial work in our Nation.

The Pulitzer prize for editorial work on the Oregonian during the year 1938 was awarded to Ronald Glenn Callvert, its associate editor. Mr. Calvert's editorial My Country, 'Tis of Thee, published in October of that year, was a masterpiece of editorial work and no doubt played an important part in securing for him this award. I included this editorial in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1939.

In these critical days of our Nation's history, when the map of the world is being remade and ideologies destroyed overnight, and many of the revered underlying foundation stones of civilization are being destroyed, clear thinking and unselfish devotion to the welfare of our country are necessary. In the modern world, with the dissemination of knowledge and information so effective and immediate through the radio, airplane, and other rapid communications, it is important that the purveyors of news keep the bloodstream of information pure and undefiled. Propaganda unfortunately plays a large part in the formation of public opinion. A newspaper under these conditions is in a position to wield an important influence in preserving our civilization and our ideals.

That the award of the University of Missouri School of Journalism was merited is evidenced by the sincere and frank recognition by the Oregonian of its duties and obligations by reason of the trust imposed on it in publishing a daily news-

paper going into the homes of the people of the Northwest. It said editorially, on May 7, 1940, with reference to the award:

OUR AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Selection of the Oregonian by the University of Missouri School of Journalism for the 1940 honor award as a distinguished American newspaper is, in the very nature of such recognition, a tribute which finds its recipient to be somewhat at loss for words. These come readily enough on other occasions, for the printed word is the implement of the craft and the calling, but there is a difficulty in acknowledging the laurels that are for oneself. There is, on analysis, not only a reaction of gratification, but one of humility, too.

Our many readers, some of whom have read the Oregonian for the greater part of a long lifetime, and who have both approved and disputed, are commonly agreed, by recurrent testimony, that this newspaper has maintained the tradition of service and sincerity. In effect this also is the authoritative finding which prompted the present award—the fidelity of the Oregonian to its obligations in handling the news, and its continued vigor of editorial utterances, in a day, as the citation declares, "when other editorial pages have lapsed into the commonplace or have swung to commercial timidity." The confidence our readers have so often expressed, and which the Oregonian has striven to deserve, is phrased by the donors of the award.

It is with something of reluctance that this page directs attention to the citation for distinguished service in the American newspaper field—but the words are not ours, neither are they promotional. In every department of the Oregonian there is pleasure in this recognition—a pleasure which, somehow, we feel our readers share with us. Those whose daily task and privilege it is to prepare and print the Oregonian have ever been convinced that they are employed on no common publication—and naturally they are gratified by this verification of their opinion. They feel that recognition of the sustained usefulness and sincerity of their newspaper is, in a sense, their garland, too.

Pending the formal presentation of the award to the Oregonian, our gratefulness to the University of Missouri School of Journalism is acknowledged, while our pledge is given that the Oregonian shall continue to be deserving of the confidence so generously expressed in the text of the citation. It shall continue to be, as of long fidelity, "a part of the life of the region"—for this is the work and the service to which it was long since dedicated.

The significance of this award is noteworthy when it is considered that only about 20 newspapers have been so honored since the award was founded in 1930. Among others receiving the award in past years are: The London Times, La Prensa of Buenos Aires, the Montreal Star, the Times of India, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Baltimore Sun.

Mr. E. Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Oregonian, very aptly said, in accepting this award on behalf of the Oregonian:

It is a healthy sign that newspapers of today are increasingly conscious of the functions of a newspaper in a democracy. It seems to me that this function can be described in three simple sentences: One, to print the news; two, to comment adequately thereon; three, never to allow these to mingle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave in the extension of my remarks to include the editorial above referred to and the address of Mr. Hoyt in accepting this award. The address follows:

President Williams, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a high privilege to be here to receive for the Oregonian the great honor and distinction which you have this day conferred.

The award is particularly pleasing to us who operate the Oregonian, because it is in effect a seal of approval—a very highly cherished seal of approval—upon new methods which we have been trying to introduce into journalism. We have attempted to keep pace with modern trends—in fact, in the forefront of modern trends—without sacrifice of the high ideals in which the Oregonian was clothed by those remarkable men who founded it.

NEW PRACTICES NECESSITATED

To understand the full significance of this award to myself and my associates, it is necessary to think back a few years, to that time when it suddenly became apparent to students of journalistic change that there was need for altered practices so far as the daily newspapers were concerned. Circulation was dropping in many cases; advertising was falling off. The pressure was great. There was little time for study. And under that pressure a few newspapers became panicky. They thought they could save themselves by cheapening themselves.

Other newspapers faced the problem with less of panic, and in the end, I think, more logically. I know that we on the Oregonian deliberately decided that what the public wanted was not a cheapened newspaper but a better newspaper. They wanted a newspaper which, without sacrificing either the strength of its editorial opinion or the breadth of its news coverage, could make itself part and parcel of the streamlined age in which we live.

I feel today—here and in this place—that we have held fast to that ideal. The Oregonian during the 90 years of its existence has been a truly important factor in the cultural life of the Pacific Northwest. Today, it is the oldest business institution in that section—in the three great States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. And yet you tell us, by your award, that we have kept pace with the changed and increased tempo of the times.

TEMPO SPEEDED UP

It will be of interest, I take it, exactly what we did do. We shortened our stories, demanding a higher skill of our copy readers, in order that the same facts might be given in fewer words. We adopted a type face enough larger to make reading easier and faster. We found these innovations helpful in holding the ever-decreasing segment of audience potential which was available to the modern newspaper. We found also, that elimination of "breaks" from page 1 was helpful. It aided in our effort to make every page a front page. Proper departmentalizations gained immediate response from our readers. By these new techniques, and others of like nature, we were able to give the subscriber what he considers an adequate picture of the day's events.

And, of course, the changes that have been made necessary by modern developments are by no means all typographical. They are editorial also. There are changed public attitudes since the days of Harvey W. Scott, the late great editor of The Oregonian; Marse Henry Watterson, of the Courier-Journal; and those other great whose names are forever blazoned in the history of the so-called golden age of journalism.

NEWS, OPINION DIVORCED

And, I think that if these famous editors were back here with us today they would join with this great university in placing the full stamp of approval upon the Oregonian for its strict separation of the news columns and the editorial page. That is one of the things specifically mentioned in the citation of award. I am happy that it was. The Oregonian has followed, and led, in a national trend against the intermingling of straight news and editorial opinion. It is a healthy sign that newspapers of today are increasingly conscious of the function of a newspaper in democracy.

It seems to me that this function can be described in three simple sentences: One, to print the news; two, to comment adequately thereon; three, never to allow these to mingle. If there are exceptions to this general theorem in the high places in journalism it is a matter of regret, and it is even more a matter of regret that some of those who are worst violators of the sacred objectivity of news howl loudest for the preservation of freedom of the press. It is good to know, however, that those who best serve the people's right to know profit most; and, as I say, if there are exceptions, the rising tide of practical democracy will some day overtake them.

Never before has editorial integrity paid such a premium in the box office. And this fact, it seems to me, is the best proof of the mounting literacy and intelligence of our people—the best-informed people in the history of civilization.

That is well. It is well that there is increasing literacy, increasing intelligence. There also are increasing strains. In these modern days there are so many things demanding the attention and the time of Mr. Average Citizen. Suppose we envision the attention potential of Mr. Average Citizen as a complete circle. Suppose, then, we divide the circle into segments, giving to each segment a name—labeling them "movies," "radio," "news magazines," "picture magazines," "the automobile," "new books" (coming in floods from the presses), and many, many other distracting items.

Fifty years ago the circle was free of many of these intruding segments. The newspaper was able to demand and expect a greater share of the circle than it can today.

And yet, there is the remarkable—and, to us, very heartening—fact that the lessening of time available for newspaper reading has meant no lessening of interest in the newspapers. Quite the contrary. The need for them is real and permanent, as evidenced by the vastly increased circulations during the past 20 years.

Here we have it in cold figures. Editor and Publisher reports that daily newspaper circulations increased 42.7 percent in the past 20 years. Sunday newspaper circulations increased 84.5 percent. These increases should be compared with a population rise of but 24.3 percent. It is highly significant also that the combined circulation of 1,888 dailies in 1939 was 39,670,682, as compared with 27,690,656 for 2,042 dailies in 1920.

"FITTEST" SURVIVE STRAIN

Thus we have the paradox of mounting reader interest, as reflected in the steady increase in newspaper circulations, and yet with the total number of newspapers going down. Quite obviously, it is the application of the old law of the "survival of the fittest." And in this case "fittest" means those newspapers which have streamlined themselves in order to meet the readers' time requirements—and which, at the same time, have maintained their editorial ideals.

I think this phase of our brief discussion should not be closed without one more admonishment. Let no newspaper publisher, even in this streamlined age, forget that a newspaper must be just that—a news paper. This is particularly important in an

age when there is a somewhat regrettable tendency toward "department store" journalism.

Permit me to mention again some of the markers on the highway of editorial progress which you have noted in making this award: Divorcement of news and editorials, to insure fair presentation of news, greater readability, through larger type, more pictures, proper utilization of that great development, wirephoto; practical departmentalization; effective mechanical presentation, through improved type and printing; proper commentative writing, clearly and indisputably marked as such. And, lastly, a rededication of the broader philosophy of objective news reporting and presentation.

EARLY HISTORY RECALLED

At this point I would like to review briefly for you the history of our paper. It was December 4, 1850, that the first issue of The Oregonian, then a weekly, appeared. Portland was a village of 700 persons, cut out of the forest. The editor was Thomas J. Dryer, a young New Yorker seeking his fortune in the West. Henry L. Pittock joined the staff in 1853, after arriving from across the plains. Mr. Pittock slept on a cot in the office. In 1860 Mr. Dryer turned The Oregonian over to Mr. Pittock in lieu of back wages. A year later the new owner boldly determined to make or break. He would change the weekly into a daily. He did, and survived. And in 1865 he demonstrated that insight into character and ability which characterized him throughout life by selecting Harvey W. Scott to fill the editorial chair. With a single interim of 5 years in the 1870's, Mr. Scott directed the editorial policies of The Oregonian until his death in 1910. He made the paper famous throughout the country by the force and logic of his utterances.

OREGONIAN GROWS WITH CITY

Portland has grown from a village of 700 to a city of 300,000, and The Oregonian with it. And we who operate the paper today believe we have kept the faith with the founders. You have testified to it by your award here today.

In closing this acceptance, may I say again that we of The Oregonian feel very humble in the face of this high honor and that we do rededicate ourselves to those basic ideals of newspaper practice as established by those distinguished men who built and shaped this newspaper—Henry L. Pittock and Harvey W. Scott.

Our Relation to the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

LETTER FROM DR. GEORGE HUDSON GILMER

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter received from Dr. George H. Gilmer, of Dublin, Va., in which he sets forth his views with respect to our relation to the war.

I might add that Dr. Gilmer is one of the strong men in the Southern Presbyterian Church. He is endowed with a strong, brilliant mind, is a man of great erudition, has been a lifelong student of history, and I am sure great respect will be given to his views by the House.

Dr. Gilmer is the grandson of Hon. Thomas Walker Gilmer, who was Secretary of the Navy under President Tyler. His letter follows:

DRAPER, VA., *May 14, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I wonder if it would be possible for you to get the subject matter below before the President. There is a strong sentiment, constantly growing, in this section for some change in our relation to the war. I would suggest, if I may do so, the following:

1. Abandonment of neutrality for a benevolent nonbelligerency favoring the Allies.
2. Furnish food and arms for the Allies.
3. Open the way for volunteers to aid the Allies.

It may be said that would get us into the war. I do not think so. It is largely the policy Italy has pursued, and she has not gotten in, and will not do so till the Allies are greatly weakened, if then. Something should be done and done quickly. Civilization is at stake. I know lots of men who would volunteer if given a chance to do so. Incidentally, that would relieve the unemployment situation, which is very grave, in spite of all the administration has done.

The buying up of food would help the farmer in a much better way than that in which he is being helped now.

Such a nonbelligerent policy would, I believe, turn the victory to the Allies. Certainly the President and Congress must do something, and do it quickly, before that madman in Germany goes any farther.

With all good wishes, I remain,
Cordially yours,

GEO. H. GILMER.

What America Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK GANNETT DELIVERED AT FORT WORTH, TEX., MAY 13, 1940

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Frank Gannett, made at Fort Worth, Tex., May 13, 1940:

The question confronting us tonight is what power will pull the wagon of prosperity in which we all hope to ride? What power will there be when business is completely butchered and national credit is finally bled to death?

If American private enterprise didn't have tremendous vitality, it would have been dead long ago. For 7 years it has been hamstrung and roasted by the New Deal. But, thank God, it is still alive!

National credit has been bled by the New Deal to the tune of more than $20,000,000,000 of added debt. Federal Government agencies have borrowed nearly $45,000,000,000. Still national credit lives and can be saved. But its life won't be saved until we drive the wasters and spenders out of Washington.

Only in the dictator countries does government attempt to manage the lives of everybody. Everybody there becomes a slave of government. We don't want that in America. The call of the Republican Party is a call to return to sanity.

Part of the educational job of the Republican Party is to awaken people to the realization that "taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors." Franklin Roosevelt said that was true in 1932—and then he proceeded to make his followers forget it.

Mr. Roosevelt, in the same speech, made a solemn covenant with the taxpayers of the United States. He promised never to stop preaching the duty to reduce taxes, to increase the efficiency of government, and to get the utmost of public service for every dollar paid in taxation. Then he proceeded to give us the most wasteful administration this country has ever known.

HITS INVISIBLE TAXES

I propose to stop that waste. I can carry out Franklin Roosevelt's forgotten pledge of 1932. I can reduce tax rates with the cooperation of a Republican House and a Senate, with the Republicans and constitutional Democrats forming a pro-American majority.

Part of our job is to educate those people who don't think about taxes to the realization that no man, woman, or child, no matter how poor, can ever escape taxation. It is added invisibly to the cost of everything they buy.

We can credit to this wonderful reform known as the New Deal this fact: We have gone backward. Every man, woman, and child, on the average, has lost one-sixth of the income which was his or her right. Going backward! The richest Nation on earth!

I propose that we turn around and go forward.

America would have gone forward if the New Deal had not put obstacles in its way. President Roosevelt has been too busy listening to crackpot schemes, too busy grabbing for unconstitutional power, to think of recovery. Like the dictators of Europe, the new dealers have moved in to "protect" one group after another. And when they once move in, they refuse to move out. The only way to release agriculture and labor is to get rid of the New Deal.

If we go on flirting with communism, which degrades the spiritual concept of life, our civilization will degenerate to the level of the wild beasts that are ravaging Europe. The American ideal gave birth to freedom; it recognized the divine right of the individual citizen, and denied the divine right of kings. The dictator countries are suppressing the individual's rights, denying God and making the state their God.

There is need in America for spiritual regeneration as well as need for economic rehabilitation.

It is easy to criticize. We must have something more than that; we must have a sound constructive policy.

First, let me say that if I should be nominated, I will be elected. The next President must be a Republican.

MUST SHUN WAR

If I were President, I would do this:

Use all the influence and powers of the Presidency to assure the public beyond any question or doubt that this country would not become involved in this war, or any other foreign war. I say we must not send any American youth to fight on foreign battlefields; they should fight only in defense of our country in case it should be attacked.

We must keep out of this war.

One of the most important things is to restore prosperity for the farmer, restore his normal income. Fifty-five millions of our people depend directly or indirectly on agriculture. You can't have a prosperous country unless you have a prosperous agriculture.

We should set up a monetary authority under mandate of Congress and give to it the task of providing for us an honest dollar, a dollar of stable purchasing power, and entrust to it the task of protecting our monetary system.

To solve the unemployment problem, so that every willing worker would have a job at a fair wage, I would first put into our Government the same business management and sound business principles that are used in the management of any successful business.

I am for putting business brains and experience into government and for taking political muddlers and meddlers out of business.

Next, we must reduce tax rates that kill initiative. We have reached a point of diminishing returns in our taxation. Lower tax rates will stimulate business and produce more revenue for the Government than the high rates now in force.

Fire the present Labor Board at once. Rewrite or repeal the Wagner Act. I would appoint a Secretary of Labor who will not be in sympathy with communistic ideas or sit-down strikes.

URGES RIGID ECONOMY

Encourage the sharing of profits with employees in one way or another, so that the largest possible reward will go to the workers after fair wages, a fair return to capital, and a just reward for social management.

Pending the increase in business activities which would result from restoring agricultural income, we must take care of the unfortunate now unemployed and on relief. But we can better provide for those on relief without additional cost to the Government if we will cut out politics, waste, and corruption from our relief program. Fumigate relief.

Cut out the great waste in our defense programs by coordinating the various departments so that we may have the most effective defense at the lowest possible cost, and base our plans for the Army and Navy solely on a defense basis, not on the expectation of waging a foreign war, as I fear we are now doing.

Introduce rigid economy into all departments of government and reduce expenses everywhere.

Stop the extension of Federal control and regulation over everything and everybody and restore to the States the rights and privileges of managing their affairs without interference from Washington.

Take away from the President all those vast extraordinary powers he now holds which should rest with Congress, but which came into his hands when he declared an emergency, though no emergency existed.

Guard carefully the independence of the three departments of government so that we shall be sure that our Constitution, our freedom, and liberties will be protected and preserved.

Promote better international relations and leave the people of other countries the right to determine for themselves their form of government without scolding and criticism from us. Stop deliberately making enemies of other nations.

WOULD LIMIT TENURE

Adopt a constitutional amendment limiting the term of office of the President to 8 years.

Withdraw the Government from private business and from competition with private enterprise.

Promote a policy of abundance instead of a policy of scarcity.

Bring into government service able, successful businessmen, leaders of agriculture and of labor. Today there isn't a successful businessman within a mile of the White House—or in the White House either.

As soon as possible, without restricting recovery by higher taxes or by arbitrary curtailment of relief, balance the Budget. Even a move in that direction will help to restore confidence and aid recovery.

We must begin to live within our income and stop sinking deeper and deeper into debt.

Let's get this great Nation out of the ditch and start it going again on a solid, safe road.

The situation today is the most critical since our Republic was founded. The questions transcend party lines. The decision will affect the lives of everyone. There are only 176 days before election. In that short time the voters of this country must be aroused to the grave dangers that confront us.

A Timely and Forceful Plea for Immediate and Adequate National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OKLAHOMA CITY OKLAHOMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am pleased to present herewith, for the special benefit and consideration of Members of Congress, a very timely, forceful, and informative front-page editorial appearing this week in the Daily Oklahoman, published at Oklahoma City, on the general subject of national defense. The editorial follows:

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

Apparently hordes of German troops will overrun Holland in a brief time—possibly a matter of days, at most a few weeks. Other German troops have already outflanked and captured part of the first-line defense and the strongest forts of Belgium. Unless Belgium's secondary defenses are stronger than represented, German troops will push back both French and Belgian troops, and 30 days may see a clean-up of all Belgian territory.

German power in the air may soon be overwhelming. Germany might lose 100 planes a day and the Allies lose only 50, but if that ratio were kept up for 60 days, Germany, instead of having two planes to the Allies' one, would doubtless have at least three to their one. As the Allied defense of the air diminishes, Germany's air offensive will increase.

With Germany in complete possession of Holland, Hitler's air force can strike at England, reaching London in less than 1 hour's time. She can mass planes at the Dutch airports and attack furiously all British shipping and send swarms of planes over the British naval fleet.

In England there is a "fifth column," just as there was in Holland and Norway, and just as there has been in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

Hilter may elect to hold France at bay behind the Maginot line and attack England and the British Fleet before coming to grips with France. British merchant vessels will have great difficulty in reaching England when flocks of German bombers are flying out of Holland.

With British sea power broken, there would be no hope for France. Italy would then join with Germany in attacking France on all fronts.

If England and France are conquered, it may be accomplished within 90 days. If they are not overrun in 3 months, they possibly will be within 6 months. If England and France are conquered, all British and French ships in all neutral ports will be turned over to Germany. She can mount guns on them and, with the German Fleet, the Italian Fleet, and the remnants of the French and British Fleets, she would have a force which might easily overwhelm the American Navy.

Germany has 250,000 aircraft pilots. The United States has 45,000. Germany has 20,000 planes and is making them faster every day than England and the United States combined.

Huge bombers now carry loads of 40,000 pounds. It would take but few bombs to destroy the aqueducts which bring water to New York City. A suitcase full of dynamite would blow up the Holland Tunnel. Comparatively few bombs could wreck the New York subways. The United States hasn't sufficient antiaircraft guns to defend New York City, let alone Philiadelphia, Boston, Washington, or Chicago. Our stock of airplanes and air equipment is a bagatelle compared with the air forces of Germany and Italy.

The United States has an Army of 400,000 men, 235,000 being militia. She does not have sufficient rifles, let alone other equipment to arm this small Army. She has not adequate artillery to properly defend any of our seaports, and many have no defense whatever.

Unfortunately, we have the largest "fifth column" of Nazi sympathizers and Communists now existing in any country.

In the face of this situation, Congress is about to adjourn. Congressmen and Senators want to spend the summer stumping their States for reelection.

There is no time now to build a new navy. An army of 1,000,000 men could not be equipped within 1 year from date. Artillery defenses cannot be created within 2 years. It requires 4 years to build a battleship.

America ought to form a council of defense. It ought to call for 100,000 youths to volunteer for training as pilots. It ought to advance the money to airplane factories to quadruple their production. It ought to arrange that automobile factories manufacture airplane motors and parts. Airplane designs should be furnished

to all automobile manufacturers who could undertake production of planes. The only possible quick means of defense for the United States is a vast expansion of air forces and equipment.

It is silly to say the United States is in no danger. We have two-thirds of the world's gold buried in Kentucky hills. In resources this country is rotten rich. In defense it is a baby in arms. With England and France out of the way, our riches would be a feast for Germans and Japanese.

Why not wire our Congressmen and Senators to stay on the job and get busy?

Military Training for C. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this House once again to urge the passage of my bill, H. R. 3598, introduced at the last session of Congress and which provides that enrollees of C. C. C. camps be instructed in military tactics and drill during 6 hours of each week.

For 2 years mine has been a voice crying in the wilderness for 1 hour per day military training for enrollees of these camps. Now, at this tragic hour in world affairs I have hopes that I may be heard.

Hitler has given bloody evidence to the world, through the mangled remains of defenseless women and children, that it is utter folly for any nation to remain in a state of unpreparedness in a world gone mad.

During the last 7 years this Congress has appropriated about $8,000,000,000 for national defense, of which about $7,000,000,000 has been used to date. A lot of this money has gone into rat holes while admirals and generals have argued about the relative merits of their arms of the service, about the number and type of planes the Army and Navy each should have, or about one branch of the service encroaching on the other's prerogatives. Out of it all has come a fair kind of Navy, with about 3,200 up-to-date planes with 100 trained pilots turned out each month. Still the Navy needs many more planes and pilots.

The Army has been about doubled in size, has added less than one-fourth of the planes needed, less than one-fifth of the tanks needed, has only a few hundred antitank guns, and only a few hundred antiaircraft guns to protect our almost endless coast line. The all-important immediate need is for a central defense planning board to present a coordinated plan of national defense, a survey of industrial facilities, with a coordinated and central purchasing office. The amount of money wasted now through overlapping Army, Navy, and air force agencies is astounding.

This is a day of mechanized warfare. The Nation with the machinery and facilities for producing it has a great advantage to start with. Germany's Army and air force prove that. We must have more airplanes, more tanks, more mobile artillery, more antiaircraft guns, but behind it all must be trained manpower, and the C. C. C. with its enrollees receiving no military training is evidence of a peace-loving nation gone to sleep. During the past 7 years over 2,000,000 of our young men have been enrolled in C. C. C. camps. The cost to the Government per enrollee is $1,000 per year. The annual cost per soldier in the Regular Army averages only $853.33. The C. C. C. camp enrollees, other than war veterans, range between 17 and 23 years of age. These are the boys who will first be called to the service in case of our involvement in war. We now have approximately 275,000 enrollees in our C. C. C. camps. The average length of service in the C. C. C. is 10 months. If we had given these boys 1 hour military training per day during their service, we would have had a nucleus of over 2,000,000 young men already partly trained in the rudiments of warfare. Every soldier must be first trained in ordinary tactics and drill before he is ready for assignments to a specialized branch of the service, such as artillery, air force, tank service, and so forth. We would thus have saved this Government over $2,000,000,000 in case we become involved in war.

I do not mean that the original purposes of the C. C. C. must be abandoned—these camps have done a great work in soil conservation, forestry, and National and State parks. This work should continue to be their primary duty, and the 1 hour per day military training which my bill suggests would not detract one whit from the work they are now doing. In fact, the increased efficiency of the enrollees, because of this limited military training and the added discipline it would bring, would enhance the value and the volume of his work in the conservation field. I do not propose that it should serve a twofold purpose—one, conservation, the other, a link in our national-defense system.

It must be remembered, too, that this military training for C. C. C. enrollees would not cost our sorely harassed taxpayers an additional dollar. The camps are already there, the uniforms are there, the food is there, the Reserve officers to train them are there, and the physically fit manhood of our country is there. All that will still be needed are the rifles, and the United States Army now has enough obsolete military rifles to take care of that need.

The Army General Staff takes the position that it wants no part of military training in the C. C. C. They say soldiering is a full-time job. The Director of the C. C. C. wants no part of military training for the C. C. C. He says military training has no place in the C. C. C. camps. They fiddle around with mutual jealousies while civilization burns, while our taxpayers pour out additional millions for national defense, while our mothers, sisters, and wives weep for peace, with no means in sight to preserve it.

We Must Not Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Gen. John J. Pershing, which appears in today's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of May 15, 1940]

"WE MUST NOT DELAY"—PERSHING PLEADS WITH NATION TO SPEED UP ITS DEFENSES

Gen. John J. Pershing last night issued on his own initiative the following statement on the Nation's defenses:

"Preparedness is as necessary today as it was for us when war was declared in 1917, and we find ourselves in practically the same condition. Congress has made certain appropriations for matériel, but that is far short of what I think America must do.

"Every energy in this country should be devoted to the idea of putting the United States in a condition of thorough preparedness against the possibility of war.

"None of us can tell when we may become involved in the struggle now raging with such tremendous fury in Europe. In my opinion, the very life of this Republic depends on the energy and determination with which our people undertake the task of placing the United States in a state of thorough preparation in both men and equipment.

"The time factor should be the dominant consideration. In 1917 I sailed for Europe with nothing material available other than the will to do and a hasty plan as the basis for doing it.

"Our Allies protected us during more than a year of preparation. They provided us with the matériel.

"Today the situation is utterly different. This great country must, within itself, be prepared for whatever instant action is required for our security. We must not delay longer in our preparations."

Senator Byrd Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE LYNCHBURG (VA.) NEWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lynchburg News:

SENATOR BYRD AGAIN

The time limit for announcement of candidacy for the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate from Virginia has passed and the only name filed is that of HARRY FLOOD BYRD, junior United States Senator.

This means, of course, that Senator BYRD will have no opposition in the Democratic primary and is the party nominee. It will mean also, of course, his continuance in office for another 6 years. Republican or independent opposition in the November election, if any, will be nominal only.

The people of Virginia will approve overwhelmingly. The fact that no one ventured to enter the race in opposition to the incumbent Senator is evidence enough of that. Recognition of the futility of the effort to unseat him was universal.

The honor that is paid Senator BYRD of an uncontested nomination is a deserved honor. It is a tribute to independence and to courage and to patriotism as well as to ability. Senator BYRD has not always spoken or voted in accordance with the prejudices, or even the convictions, of a large number of Virginians. His opposition to many phases of the New Deal has irritated some of them. At times there have been muttered threats of defeat. But when the time came no man cared to lead any such fight.

And that is because the people of Virginia do not wish their representatives in the Congress of the United States to be mere agents, subservient to a temporary majority, with ears to the ground and no convictions of their own. They wish a man who values his convictions more than he values votes. And so this time, as so often in Virginia in the past, we have the paradox of a man whose defiance of demagogy wins him more than demagogs can ever hope to win, of a man who braves the wrath of his constituents and earns their support. Or is it a paradox?

Record of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at a dinner of the Duckworth Democratic Club, in the city of Cincinnati, on May 10, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ohio is always an interesting State to visit on a mission like this because it is my understanding that you never have a closed season on politics. Not only that, but you cherish your political independence to such a degree that usually you are able to disguise which party is going to get the Ohio electoral vote until the ballots are in and the count is under way.

The old adage that every American boy has a right to aspire to the Presidency is taken seriously in Ohio. I can hardly recall a national election in which the State has failed to offer one of her distinguished sons as a candidate for the Presidency. This year, you are doing better than ever—you have two prospective candidates who are willing to make the supreme sacrifice if the call comes. I sympathize with their aspirations even though, under the circumstances, it would be improper for me to pledge my assistance in furthering their ambitions.

I suppose every voter here is accustomed to hearing each succeeding national election described as the most important since George Washington's day, or at least since Abraham Lincoln's. The American public likes to have things bigger and better, and campaign orators are usually willing to oblige. No party has a monopoly on viewing with alarm, and the charge that the Constitution will be destroyed and the American way undermined if the opposition gets into power is an old story by this time.

Being an optimist by nature, it is not my purpose to compete with those who make a habit of looking on the dark side of things. Yet leaving aside campaign exaggeration, I think you will agree with me that the next 4 years will be of paramount importance in world affairs, and that the United States will be deeply affected by what happens abroad and also here at home.

The man who assumes the burdens of the White House will have to contend with something more than the ordinary problems and trials. He will be forced to pursue the twin goals of peace and prosperity in a world shaken by wars so widespread and terrible that no human being is wise enough to foresee the outcome. In other words, the next President must possess to an unusual degree the statesmanlike qualities of wisdom, prudence, courage, and judgment. A front-porch President who deceives himself into thinking that events will take care of themselves will hardly fit the bill.

The question then to decide is which party is better equipped to provide the Nation with safe and progressive leadership. The Republican Party was turned out of power in 1932 because in the face of a great domestic emergency it was unable to provide the leadership to pull us through. A short time ago that statement was denounced as a political libel invented by conniving Democrats with a sinister purpose. But in recent times it has been said so often by responsible and honest Republican leaders that I think its accuracy may no longer be questioned.

The Democratic Party has been in control of the Federal Government for a little more than 7 years. It has been a period of abnormal happenings in both domestic and foreign affairs. In the face of such a situation the party did not sit back and let things drift. That course would have been a daring and reckless gamble with national well-being and security. On the contrary, the party has made a sincere and honest effort to deal in realistic fashion with economic, social, and foreign problems.

Has the Democratic Party lived up to the solemn responsibilities which it assumed in 1933? Has the Republican Party recovered itself and is it now fit and ready to take over the heavy duties of national leadership in this critical period of world upheaval?

Suppose we look at the domestic picture first. The finest program of constructive legislation in our times has been enacted into law at Washington under the wise direction of the Roosevelt administration. The banking system has been stabilized, bank deposits insured, social security translated into reality, the issuance of wildcat securities halted, and agriculture aided against the double threat of glutted markets and ruinous prices. The unemployed have been given work on useful projects, the C. C. C. camps have provided a means of gainful employment for more than 2,500,000 young men, and hundreds of thousands of home owners have been saved from eviction by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. An excellent start has been made on the great problem of preserving the Nation's natural resources. A sensible plan for stopping the erosion of valuable farm land has been put in operation, and water power has been developed to help lighten the burden of toil for the farming population.

Labor has been guaranteed the right of collective bargaining and standards have been fixed to put a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours of labor. The list of worth-while enactments could be extended indefinitely, but I think most of you are well enough acquainted with the record to make a lengthy review unnecessary.

When these measures were before Congress the task of writing them into law rested almost exclusively on the Democratic leadership. A few Republicans, who were able to rise above partisanship, gave their support to individual measures. But most of the G. O. P. stalwarts were still clinging to bits of wreckage left floating from the disaster of the ill-fated Hoover regime. You recall that for want of a better reason, they denounced these forward-looking measures, including the social-security program, as un-American and socialistic. They wanted no part of the twentieth-century approach to social and economic problems, and they did everything in their power to block the Roosevelt program.

A great light has since dawned on the Republican leaders. Facing another Presidential election, they have awakened to the painful conclusion that the American people want these reforms continued and that the political party which advocates their repeal is doomed again to disaster at the polls. Unpleasant as the prospect may be, they have decided to put a grudging stamp of approval on the achievements of a Democratic administration. They argue now that the program is excellent, but to secure the most efficient execution of these laws, the Republican Party should be given the work of administering them.

The new technique in G. P. O. salesmanship reached its highest peak in the report of Dr. Glenn Frank's program committee, which spent 2 years or more trying to think up a workable substitute for what the Democrats had already done. Dr. Frank finally reached the sensible conclusion that the wisest course was to borrow his major planks from the Democrats and simply add that the Republicans would like the job.

It would be idle to deny that in the paper-profits era of the twenties, the public frequently believed the oft-repeated assertion that the Republicans were better businessmen and hence were able

to administer the affairs of government in more efficient fashion. It was a myth that remained in good standing along with the stories about the full dinner pail and two cars in every garage. In fact, with the stock ticker going ever upward, it was a hardy soul who dared to challenge its accuracy.

Yet I doubt if anyone today is innocent enough to be taken in by the Republican assertion that they can carry on Uncle Sam's affairs with a higher degree of honesty and efficiency and with less waste and red tape. The reply to that argument—final, complete, and unanswerable—was given by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in one paragraph of his recent radio talk from Warm Springs, Ga. I hope all of you heard it, but for those who didn't I am going to repeat that paragraph: "Second, they are telling you that many of the measures of the past 7 years are good, but that they would carry them out with greater efficiency if they were in power. I do not think that we can swallow that assertion, because quite aside from millions of fine citizens who normally vote the Republican ticket year in and year out, we and they must acknowledge that practically every serious Government scandal since the Civil War has occurred under a Republican administration, and that the underlying Republican leadership—the groups and cliques which have always owned the Republican Party—are still just as much in the saddle of ownership as they were in the old days."

I thought that spokesmen for the Republican Party, concerned about its reputation, would rise in wrath to protest and dispute the President's statement that their record of Federal administration has been unsavory almost since the party was founded. I was mistaken. Evidently, with a lively memory of Teapot Dome, the little black bag, and other scandals of a few years past, these Republican apologists were able to restrain their indignation. Not a single Republican candidate for the Presidency has seen fit to answer this challenging remark of the President. The reason is that truth and history speak too strongly against them.

We Democrats are proud of the fact that despite the magnitude of the program which had to be initiated and carried through in the short space of a few years the work has been accomplished with a fidelity to principle and a degree of honesty which have awakened the admiration of the American people. There have been mistakes, because mistakes were inevitable in a program of that size. But, compared to what happened in the preceding Republican administrations, the record stands forth clean and unassailable. If the American people expect greater honesty and efficiency, certainly they will not turn to the Republican Party.

Having given up the idea of undermining the Democratic program as too dangerous the Republican candidates are now concerned over the state of the Nation's business. They charge that the Roosevelt administration has failed to bring back prosperity, that it has shackled business, and taken the profits out of industry. They charge the administration with retarding, instead of advancing, the processes of recovery. One of these candidates, well known in Ohio, said that national income in 1939 amounted only to $68,000,000,000, whereas, to use his phrase, "for 2 or 3 years prior to 1929 it got up to $80,000,000,000."

Now, just to keep the record straight, and to correct his figures, the estimated national income reached $80,000,000,000 in the year 1929 only, and that year was the stepping-off place for the worst economic disaster in the history of this or any other country. There is no disputing the fact that income in 1929 was swollen and bloated by the outburst of mad speculation which swept over the country, encouraged and abetted by the short-sighted policies of the Republican administration which was then in power in Washington. We want that volume of national income back again in this country, and we think it can be attained, but we certainly don't want the reckless inflation of values which accompanied it.

I realize that in this age everyone seems to be an economic wizard. Presidential candidates, whose talents no one suspected, are now blossoming forth as full-fledged economists who know all the figures about big business, little business, and whatever kind of business comes in between. Unfortunately, I am just a businessman who has never had the happy distinction of becoming a self-made economist. Therefore, I shall use figures coming from sources which are usually looked upon as reliable and nonpartisan as well.

The Magazine of Wall Street can hardly be called a radical Roosevelt organ. In its April issue, this magazine carried an article by a well-known authority, which said, and I quote: "The significant fact is that we approximated our 1929 income in both 1936 and 1937, that we exceeded it in 1939, and that we have a good chance of exceeding it again this year.

"Of course, we are not talking of national income in terms of dollars. With the cost of living at one level, an income of $50 a week can have a purchasing power as great as an income of $75 a week would have at a higher level of living costs."

Here, then, is an authority who says that in real purchasing power the American people have already achieved a level of prosperity equal to that which prevailed in the most prosperous year of the wildly speculative 1920's. To express his idea in other words, the same degree of prosperity has been realized without the price inflation. Surely his opinion is worth that of our Republican lawyer friends who are now running for office on the strength of their own home-made business statistics.

Has this administration taken the profits out of business? This same writer in the Magazine of Wall Street said that 100 corporations listed on the exchange earned greater profits in 1939 than they did in the so-called boom year of 1929. The Associated Press recently reported that the first 250 corporations to report for the initial quarter of 1940 showed earnings 50 percent above those for the like period of last year. And excluding the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., one of the group reporting, the Associated Press said the increase for the remaining companies was actually 60 percent. That, my friends, is what the opposition calls taking the profit-motive out of industry.

One self-sponsored candidate for the G. O. P. nomination is a newspaper publisher. His newspapers recently reported a net profit of $1,302,320 for 1939, a substantial increase over the profits for the previous year. About the time this report was made public the candidate made a speech in which he said the New Deal was ruining business. A fellow publisher printed the story under the caption A Candidate Amid the Ruins.

I see no purpose in quoting you figures to the point of boredom. The truth is that, considering the industrial stagnation which pertained when this administration came to power and the chaotic world conditions which have continued since, the record of the Roosevelt administration in restoring business and raising national income is unsurpassed. The proof of this statement is so evident in the daily newspapers that it defies dispute. Industry is in excellent shape today and far healthier than it was in the years of phoney Republican prosperity which preceded the collapse.

There are one or two points concerning the conduct of foreign affairs about which I should like to comment briefly. In the whole history of the country there has never been a time when prudence, caution, judgment, and foresight were more needed than they are today in the handling of international problems. A single rash act or statement may have a vital effect upon the welfare of the Nation.

The administration to date has carried on its foreign negotiations in superb fashion while at the same time protecting the country's interests against the danger of rude shocks from abroad. The public has been told what to expect without any effort to work up an undue state of alarm. A sensible neutrality policy has been enacted, as a result of which not a single American life has been lost in belligerent waters. Thus the incidents which might arouse popular feeling have been avoided. The record is one of which every American citizen, regardless of party, may feel proud.

Last spring, a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination accused the administration of ballyhooing the foreign situation—I use his phrase—to distract attention from domestic conditions. The gentleman was wrong on two counts. He apparently thought there would be no war in Europe and he overlooked the fact that the administration had a solemn duty to take into account the probable happenings on that troubled continent. I trust that by this time the candidate is convinced of his error.

It is to be hoped that in the difficult months ahead, there will be no effort made to create political capital by giving a false impression of American foreign policy. The idea that some individual, utterly lacking in experience, has a patented formula for keeping the country out of war, is too absurd to be taken seriously. I think every sincere man who aspires to the Presidency should be ready to concede that the other spokesmen of his party, and those of the opposition party, are just as anxious as he is to preserve the blessings of peace for America. The safety of the Nation should not be made a political pawn.

The United States has come a long way in the past 7 years. There are problems remaining, of course, but these are slight compared to the economic ills which afflicted the country when this administration assumed office. For those who had no responsibility in the work of rebuilding, criticism comes easy, despite the fact that they are still unable to put together a sane and workable program of their own.

The arguments of the opposition have a familiar ring. They are fond of saying that the present administration promised far more than it has been able to perform. Optimism is an old American virtue and it may be true that the administration has failed to achieve its objective in every instance. The failing, however, is not ours alone. I recall a Presidential candidate who, in 1928, promised that poverty was about to be banished from the Nation—provided the Republicans were retained in power. This still remains the all-time high in political promising.

The Democratic Party has done a remarkable job of administering the affairs of the country under the most trying circumstances. I am content to rest our case with the American people.

Orderly Control in a World of Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, at the thirty-fourth annual banquet of the American Society of International Law

the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered an address entitled Orderly Control in a World of Conflict. Because the address is of general interest, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

When I face an audience as I do tonight two thoughts bring a conflict of emotions. I cannot forget that while Rome burned Nero fiddled. Nor can I forget that when Greek civilization crumbled Plato wrote and Aristotle taught. We cannot be Platos and Aristotles, even if we may assume a crumbling civilization. This I will not because I do not believe it; nor can we stoop to a modern version of fiddling indifference to our burning surroundings.

Only the foolish, with world complications as they are, would dare approach a subject in the spirit of "if I were king" and answer categorically what should be done. One of our wise leaders, upon being asked at one time why he governed his people so successfully, replied, "I merely teach them proper principles and let them govern themselves." Now I am in a box. I dare not give a solution, and yet I have said something about proper principles. Speaking to the American Society of International Law, one must find those principles in the aims of the society itself:

"The object of this society is to foster the study of international law and to promote the establishment and maintenance of international relations on the basis of law and justice."

Broad as those aims are, they have not become world wide, because the system of international law at its broadest has not reached a world-wide characteristic. I say this, even though I must admit that the aim of the League and the International Court of Justice has been universal. The Pact of Paris was almost universally accepted, and the theory that war was of universal concern brought a momentary condemnation of war as an instrument of national action. Thus, in a condemnation of war international law reached its broadest aspect in theory. In one sense, then, modern international law had its origin in a definition of rights in peace and war, and evolved to the position where it actually condemned war as a legal instrument. Still it is not all embracing, as, for example, the aim of the Rockefeller Foundation, which exists to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world.

In this statement of international law's broadening movement I must not lose sight of the theory of natural law as being universal or rather almost inherent among men in society wherever they may have lived; but even when this universal theory is accepted it was accepted by groups who thought of slaves by nature, of the contrasts between Greeks and barbarians, between the Chinese and the Hunsi, and when Indians attempted the democracy of man under the great Buddha the attempt was crushed by the castes of the Hindus. When the early Christian asked the question, Are we not all children of God and brothers? he was met on one side by the concept of the chosen people and on the other by those who had rights because they, like Paul, were born under Roman law.

Law has always been and will always be corrective in its aim and in its nature. That is its worth. What international law we had in our ancient world became coherent as a means of overcoming conflicts. The only time anything like international law evolved in ancient China, occurred during the period of the warring states. If modern international law started with Grotius, or just before his time, both were periods of conflict. Each aspect of the Monroe Doctrine in its changing growth from a unilateral idea to a multilateral concept is a peaceful stand against what might be termed a warlike threat.

Please note, even when we take illustrations from many times and many places, we still have not recognized the world-wide concept that is essential if we are to make our concept of law as wide as are the facts of our world. For the world, whether we like it or not, is a physical and economic unit. It took the tobacco habit about a century to circle the globe. Gold and silver as money are habits which no one needs to be taught anywhere except among some foolish persons in America who assume that both articles are worthless as money because they have lost control of them. Habits in law and habits in religion have been so strikingly world-wide that men everywhere have an idiom equivalent to our "that's natural." St. Xavier is said to have thought when he met some religious practices much like his own that the devil had preceded him in teaching the people the truth in order to deceive them.

Despite Europe's and Asia's wars, the fundamental problems remain primarily the same. Viewed broadly, on the basis of a world-wide adjustment, the three great unknowns are still the great surging revolutions, spiritual, political, and economic, of those parts of the world where socially the mass of mankind is and economically where the ultimate consumer is bound to remain. There is a unity in the three great revolutions of Russia, China, and India. In each of these we have the same fundamental economic facts, we have the same resurgence of political and social protest. It does not do violence to the thought of anyone who views the world as a unit—and it will be a unit to those who come a thousand years from now, for they will look at our times just as we look at the times of the great Han dynasty in China or the Roman Empire. Those who were the victims or the beneficiaries of these great human surges never thought of them as units; still in the economy of time they are that. All three are rebelling against 400 years of the white man's spread over the globe. Hitler's alliance with Russia makes him momentarily an ally of this great movement, for he is in rebellion against one of the results of the white man's spread. Can I justify myself in linking Germany with the three great revolutions of the East in her present struggle? Let us see what made the alliance logical.

What drove Germany and Russia into an understanding for cooperative action? It was Hitler's pronouncement, that the territorial provisions of the treaty of Versailles, and therefore of the other treaties incident to the World War, no longer existed. This pronouncement was an extremely satisfying one to Russia and since it was not challenged, Russia in accepting it found herself in agreement with Germany in the attainment of those objectives which would wipe out the territorial provisions of the after-war treaties. That gave her excuse enough for her actions against Finland and the Baltic States, it gives her excuse enough for her probable future actions in the Balkans. Not only were Germany and Russia allied in purpose as a result of Hitler's announcement, but when Germany moved into Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland accepted the theory and repossessed treaty-taken territory. In Poland's case the irony of her action invited her own destruction, for while the logic of Hitler's pronouncement appealed to her in satisfying her own purposes, she failed to realize that when she accepted the same doctrine for the recovery of land that she though was hers she invited her own end. From a military standpoint Poland is no more.

The force of this unchallenged pronouncement hangs like a sword over the present Balkan States. The pressure from both the east and the west for adjustment, with the rivalry from within, provides a challenge to what is the outstanding contribution toward a unity of purpose on the part of neighbors which resulted from the war treaties, unity in the Balkans with the recognition of these states' interdependence. That interdependence theory assumed in the Balkans today is a healthful reaction to a condition which will preserve the entity of these small states. But if the small states today take upon themselves the doctrine which the major states have accepted as being paramount, namely, the theory of self-sufficiency and the need for keeping themselves self-sufficient, the end of small nations must come and the unity such as we have in the Balkan countries will be broken.

We, ourselves, today, through national acts, for one of which I must assume responsibility, are attempting to make the idea of self-sufficiency a national objective; and to an extent we have made it a national policy by the adoption of the Strategic Materials Act. If the spirit of this act becomes the all-engrossing aim of our Nation and is not tempered by such policies or reciprocal agreements, the restraining influence of Pan American unity and good neighborliness, America may find herself in the position of taking a stand wherein we may declare certain contingencies which we would not tolerate. I may suggest one: If America lives on rubber and out of tin cans, will she tolerate a stopping of the lanes of trade with the tin- and rubber-producing countries?

I have hinted at the three revolutions in China, India, and Russia, and now Germany with them, as being a unity. Is it proper for me to do this? If we consider the British control of the sea the great fact of the modern world and the outstanding culmination of the 400-year struggle of the white man in his spread over the earth, Germany is as much in rebellion as is the East, and Japan's new order in Asia is merely another aspect of this fact. Each strikes in its particular way at something that has been imposed from without. There may not be unity of action, but there is a unity of the factors that compel the actions.

China, Russia, and India are three civilizations made up primarily of small land-cultivating peasants, persons whose standard of life is each year so close to mere subsistence that thousands of them die from actual want. Those who are their temporary allies fighting for temporary advantage are exhausting themselves to where they, too, must become one with the great group of ultimate consumers at the level of mere subsistence. Thus, the problem, in spite of war, in spite of conflict, in spite of adjustments, remains exactly the same problem as it has been since these revolutions were started. The ultimate consumer in any economic unit holds the key to the economic welfare of the whole, for it is on him that the responsibility of taking the surplus of the more fortunate rests. Profit from this surplus raises the subsistence level. The continuous production of a surplus without an outlet means stagnation of economic life.

These are the factors essential to the continuous grinding of the world's economic processes so that surpluses will be taken, wealth will be increased, standards of living the world over will constantly rise, increasing the demand and keeping the supply near at hand. It sounds as if I am about to attempt to solve the problems of this world by simply saying that if we will bring about those conditions where the ordinary rules of supply and demand will be allowed to function, our troubles will be over. No; civilization has become too complicated for this. Life on this planet is so full of checks, curbs, urges, personal and national advantage-taking that even a universal acceptance of any simple economic principle will not solve much.

We must not turn our backs to essential first principles. War is not a new experience, but almost universal revolution is new. It is its widespread unity that is so challenging today. The World War was more extensive. Our Civil War was almost simultaneous with the Tai Ping Rebellion in China, where loss of life was probably greater than that of the World War, but they were not related movements. Today each conflict has aspects very much bigger than those of the parties to the conflict. Assume that Japan will be successful in establishing the new order in Asia,

will not the Mikado cult have a place in the thinking of millions of yellow men in the earth? Turn this cult into a war cry; you may have the equivalent of a second Mohammedan surge. Let the economic theories of Russia become the reason for action in all war-wasted lands and your bank account, big as it is, or mine, little as it is, will have a changed aspect. Let the single-willed state theories become dominant in the world, and political, religious, and economic democracy which we in America have known for 150 years may become a thing of the past. While the single will idea has grown in other places, in America the political liberty gained for us by the founding fathers has now grown to a demand that liberty shall be freedom for property, freedom for the mind, freedom for the soul, as well as freedom for the body. Now comes the assertion that we must streamline our liberty in order to conserve it in competition with those States which work as all-embracing wholes because of the single-willed concept. Can this be done? When we fight fire with fire, both sides must get burned.

My interpretation of the world as it is today reflects the concept of a great world unity. While I consider the three major revolutions of protest as being antiwestern, I do not accept the theory that they mark the decline of the West, for these reasons: Part of the West has joined them, and in each of the three the genius of their rising power has come from the West. The industrial aspect of present-day Russia is western. The nationalistic thought of China is western. Japan likes to speak of her new order for Asia as the Monroe Doctrine of the Far East.

Germany is fighting for a place in the sun. Italy's imperialism is western. England and France are seeking security by cooperative action. Thus there is anything but a decline of the western political thought. There may be an exhaustion of the west, but Asia is more greatly exhausted. Even if western Europe goes, there is still the Western Hemisphere, which when we think of the world as a unit while it will find its standards reduced by decline anywhere, its onward march will only be retarded in terms of world decline. Disorder incident to money economy may come any time because the invention of money came to be used in times of free action. But we must never forget that throughout history gold and silver as money have survived war, destruction, pestilence, and famine; they have been the saving factors whenever all other things have been depressed and destroyed. All other money is a medium only by common consent, and if conditions arise which remove common consent, money loses its most important characteristic. This one fact should cause those who assume debt to be the greatest evil to realize that there is something worse than debt and that that something is the loss of the medium whereby debt is measured and paid.

Having accepted the thesis of world economic unity and having attempted to show that the declines which may come from war waste and depression's exhaustion will not be the west's in contradistinction to the east's, but world-wide declines, there remains for me to attempt to present a series of thoughts about our country's probable contribution toward orderly processes in today's lack of respect for international good behavior and tomorrow's turmoil incident to disorder.

During the last 5 or 6 years, America has reacted true to form as a democracy. By that I mean that in a democracy the standards of right and wrong are not measured by governmental act. Under our system of government, there are certain standards of action in treatment of persons and of foreign States which are the controlling motives behind governmental action. In a single-willed state this need not be the case, and in practice it is not. States directed by these contrasting motives will act for different reasons. One will be guided by expediency, knowing that that which it does will be the only standard of right. The other will show restraint to the extent of measuring its actions by what it terms fundamental rules of behavior. In an international sense, state lines and national independence must be respected, or the fundamental on which a state's very existence depends will be destroyed.

Our country entered the World War in defense of what it considered fundamental rights. Our action came as a result of a sense of outraged justice. Having entered the war on a very high moral plane, it was inevitable that we should compare actions on the part of men and nations, whether friendly or enemy, with our moral sentiments. As all things did not seem perfectly in harmony with our high motives of April 6, 1917, we began to feel that we had been tricked. This fact contributed to two outstanding deductions: first, a condemnation of war; and second, a feeling that we should not pass judgment on the actions of others. Both deductions may prove healthful; they have had an interesting byproduct. The right and wrong of a warlike act has become none of our business.

So completely have we failed to recognize a right and wrong act on the part of warring states that we will not accept a definition of a wrongdoer. We insist upon treating aggressor and victim alike. Thus we have failed to recognize that nonaction may be as one-sided as action. So completely have we refused to take a stand in defense of what we deemed a right that our people and our ships are forbidden to enjoy what we have always thought to be their rights and privileges. We believe that that which has been done will turn out to be for the best. The future only will tell.

If we remain consistent with what is now our national policy, America cannot, without completely reversing her policy, enter either the war to the east or the one to the west. It is best that we should not. Some factors in relation to both the war in Europe and that in Asia are actually larger than the military success our entrance might give to any one of the four major sides we might take. While we have retreated from the position of a neutral standing upon all our rights, America still at peace is very much more important for all concerned than America would be as a belligerent. Our position is a philosophical one; but must not nations, like men, learn from experience? No group of people can be forced into a conversion to peace any more than an individual can be forced into repentance. Some things must come from within. Helping to keep the peace in all the vast extent of the earth where our responsibility lies is a task which will test us. Then, too, we have joined with more than a score of sister nations in an endeavor to develop a community of interest through neighborliness and peaceful processes. While in part of the world we have withdrawn from an insistence on certain rights, we have in another part taken on obligations which may carry with them grave responsibilities. Our new inter-Americanism is not mere sentimentality. Again, considering the world as a unit, we are not going backward but forward in orderly processes.

When the days for peace come, the more belligerents there are sitting around the peace table the worse will be the peace. The more nations of the world there are at peace the greater will be their influence for a temperate peace. If she can keep the lamp of peace lighted, America will cure more black-outs than she will if she attempts to light the lamp of peace again after destroying half of the black-outs. In all matters relating to concepts of federation or voluntary multilateral activities, America, through her actual Federal experience and her inter-American activities, can contribute much to the technique of peaceful process and joint action. America, too, both internally and by her attitude to her neighbors and their attitude to us and one another, is setting an example and proving herself profitable to all concerned. This is a contribution of great magnitude toward better world order.

America is acquiring new experiences which are causing her to understand better the processes of law in their relations to the weaknesses and the caprice of men. Law is finding its proper place. The tyranny both of law and of men is learning new curbs. This may be an added contribution of great worth. America, though, due to circumstances which are by no means all of her own making, is a tremendous power for economic stability and recovery for the whole world. I cannot bring myself to believe that the money habits which men the world over have learned to respect and which have always persisted regardless of political, social, and economic failure will be lost.

The strength behind our gold and silver is possible of immeasurable good. When the proper time comes, these two metals will flow back to the peoples of the world carrying the blessings of a higher standard of living quite as readily as they came to us. These metals will not have to be given away, they will not have to be loaned, they will not have to be wasted, they will not have to be carried arbitrarily, but they will flow quite naturally, giving security to profit and stability to property everywhere. All we need to do is to resume our promises to pay when the time comes. Thus will be reestablished a free gold and a free silver market. The only safeguard we need to place upon this resumption is that there shall be left the power, say, in our Secretary of the Treasury, to decide with which metal the payments shall be made. For ordinary business that which is asked for can be given. If, though, there should be an unnatural and a deliberate run upon our Treasury, it can be stopped by the substitution of the Treasury's way of paying instead of the way of the person who asks for that payment. For this great day of world-wide recovery, America is better prepared, comparatively speaking, than any nation has ever been in the history of money throughout all time. This is indeed worthy of note.

One more word about the three great world revolutions, and then I am through. This word, too, will be entirely philosophical. The social, political, and economic revolutions that exist in the world today can contribute toward the advancement of mankind if the masters of those revolutions will maintain what I shall call a student attitude.

China invented paper at a very early date. India, her neighbor, from whom China was learning everything that she could, turned her back on the little which she thought China might teach. The growth and development of Indian culture stopped; China's went on. Not only did the advantages which have come to the world in the wake of the use of paper stop, but they were retarded from spreading to other parts of the world because India refused to learn a new habit. Three or four hundred years afterward, with the rise of another great culture, the Arabian, paper was introduced into Europe.

In this world of force—and I do not belittle force, since all government rests on it—can we not continue to put faith in those processes which, while probably backed by force, move so that force need never be resorted to? Surely one aim should be ours. This aim should be that the diplomatic agencies of our Government should so act that the agencies of the Army and the Navy need not be called on.

Since we have spoken of America's probable contributions, can we not offer our society's actual contribution by presenting to the world the president of the American Society of International Law as a man of character who has shown his worth by so guiding the affairs of his great office that only the diplomatic and the peaceful processes of our Government have been used when carrying out America's purposes and contributions to world order? Mr. Hull, we salute you.

Science for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of welcome of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, at the first plenary session of the Eighth American Scientific Congress at the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., May 13, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the Government and people of the United States, I take great pleasure in extending the warmest welcome to the Eighth American Scientific Congress. Your selection of Washington as the seat of your meetings is an honor of which the United States is proud. We hope that the distinguished delegates from our sister republics will find their stay in this country wholly pleasurable. We are confident that your deliberations will be useful and stimulating to you and productive of results beneficial to the American nations and to the whole of mankind.

Individually you represent various branches of science which have evolved into distinct and rigorous disciplines through the unremitting labors of succeeding generations of scientists. Collectively you represent the entire body of science, which has been one of the most powerful forces in the advancement of the human race.

No single mind can grasp the entirety of scientific achievement that has already become the heritage of mankind. No human mind can envisage all the possibilities of further achievement. Meetings like this, with the opportunities which they provide for impact of mind on mind and of branch of science upon branch of science, are of immense value for appraising and correlating the results attained and for stimulating further advances.

We cannot foresee the limits of scientific progress. But we do know, through records of the past and through our own experience, that each new discovery opens new vistas and possibilities. We do know that things have been discovered, invented, and developed—and are today being taken for granted—which not long ago belonged in the realm of fantasy or were not revealed to the human mind even in the shadowy province of dreams. One of the most substantial bases for hope in the future is the never-ending onward march of scientific achievement.

You scientists place at the disposal of society the means wherewith life can be made fuller and richer. From your physical, chemical, biological, and other laboratories come the discoveries which enable mankind to multiply the production of useful goods and services, to make it possible for the luxuries of yesterday to become the standard necessities of today; to improve living conditions; to conserve health; to make life more worth living. From your halls of learning and from your workshops of study and research come the ideas which enable society to understand and to master its own ever-increasing complexities, to develop the science of government, and to achieve social progress in general.

Unfortunately, scientific progress does not always go hand in hand with social and moral progress. The results of the scientist's quest for truth become sometimes the instrument of ignoble or selfish aims and sometimes the means of promoting human welfare and happiness. Secrets wrested from nature by the devotees of the physical sciences may serve to create means of destruction or may serve to raise and improve the standards of life. The laws of human behavior and the techniques of social organization discovered and expounded by social scientists may be made to serve destructive or to serve constructive ends.

Today we witness a stark demonstration of the possibilities of antisocial and antimoral use of the achievements of science. Weapons made possible by great scientific discoveries and by marvelous technological development have been created, and are being created and wielded, by some nations in pursuit of policies of aggression and aggrandizement. This compels other nations to create and wield similar weapons in defense or in preparation for defense. In some nations, science has been reduced to the sorry estate of a handmaiden of oppression and brute force.

This is not your fault. This should not—and, I am certain, will not—impair the vigor or diminish the scope of scientific endeavor. But this creates problems for mankind which must be faced squarely and courageously.

The creation of conditions in which the progress of science will, at least predominantly, service constructive rather than destructive social and moral ends is the task of responsible citizenship. This is a task for all mankind. For neither social organization directed toward insuring the greatest good for the greatest numbers nor the cultural and spiritual values which the overwhelming majority of mankind prizes and cherishes, nor science itself, can be expected to survive a too protracted and too widespread abuse of the achievements of science for antisocial and antimoral ends.

Such abuse inevitably creates conditions in which thought is shackled, and science cannot flourish where freedom of thought does not exist. Science cannot advance when it is not permitted to extend its exploratory activities wherever the quest for truth may lead. Human progress is impossible without a strong moral and spiritual foundation. A nation which curbs freedom of thought or denies the dignity of the human soul dooms itself inevitably to decadence.

Science cannot flourish when it is forced into the narrow confines of national frontiers. Its progress is founded upon a universal fellowship that knows no distinctions of race or creed or nationality, of class, or of group. That fellowship is one of the finest and most striking examples of the numerous and varied international relationships in every phase of life which have so enriched the human race—materially, intellectually, and spiritually.

Your Congress is a part of the observance throughout the Americas of the fiftieth anniversary of the Pan American Union. Together with the other phases of that observance, it symbolizes the unity of purpose which actuates the American nations: Preservation of peace within and without; untiring concern for the well-being of the individual; unshakable determination to safeguard personal freedom and to preserve the dignity of the human soul; full recognition of the great mutual benefits to be secured from fruitful relationships between government and government, group and group, individual and individual, who, though separated by national frontiers, have much to learn from each other and much to contribute to the whole of mankind.

For half a century, through the Pan American Union and through numerous other agencies, our nations have sought to give substance and reality to these great purposes. We are determined to go forward along these paths.

We deeply deplore the fact that a blighting shadow of cultural eclipse has temporarily fallen on so many countries in other parts of the world. We are supremely fortunate that in this hemisphere thought is still free, and science is still untrammeled. It is for us to see to it that they remain so—for our own sakes and for the sake of all humanity.

Each of our nations has its own problems and its own preoccupations. Each of you, as a citizen, has a loyalty to your own country and a concern for its needs and problems. But as scientists, in your quest for truth, you have one great common loyalty—loyalty to the human race and to the destiny of man. It is in the spirit of this loyalty, I am confident, that you, free scientists of the free Americas, will approach the work of your Congress.

Permit me, again, to bid you welcome and to wish you outstanding success.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSH LEE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM DAILY OKLAHOMAN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in connection with the national defense, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of May 14, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman of May 14, 1940]

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

Apparently hordes of German troops will overrun Holland in a brief time—possibly a matter of days, at most a few weeks. Other German troops have already outflanked and captured part of the first-line defense and the strongest forts of Belgium. Unless Belgium's secondary defenses are stronger than represented, German troops will push back both French and Belgian troops and 30 days may see a clean-up of all Belgian territory.

German power in the air may soon be overwhelming. Germany might lose 100 planes a day and the Allies lose only 50, but if that ratio were kept up for 60 days, Germany, instead of having 2 planes to the Allies' 1, would doubtless have at least 3 to their 1. As the Allied defense of the air diminishes, Germany's air offensive will increase.

With Germany in complete possession of Holland, Hitler's air force can strike at England, reaching London in less than 1 hour's time. She can mass planes at the Dutch airports and attack furiously all British shipping and send swarms of planes over the British Naval Fleet.

In England there is a "fifth column," just as there was in Holland and Norway and just as there has been in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

Hitler may elect to hold France at bay behind the Maginot line and attack England and the British Fleet before coming to grips with France. British merchant vessels will have great difficulty in reaching England when flocks of German bombers are flying out of Holland.

With British sea power broken, there would be no hope for France. Italy would then join with Germany in attacking France on all fronts.

If England and France are conquered, it may be accomplished within 90 days. If they are not overrun in 3 months, they possibly will be within 6 months. If England and France are conquered, all British and French ships in all neutral ports will be turned over to Germany. She can mount guns on them and with the German Fleet, the Italian Fleet, and the remnants of the French and British Fleets, she would have a force which might easily overwhelm the American Navy.

Germany has 250,000 aircraft pilots. The United States has 45,000. Germany has 20,000 planes and is making them faster every day than England and the United States combined.

Huge bombers now carry loads of 40,000 pounds. It would take but few bombs to destroy the aqueducts which bring water to New York City. A suitcase full of dynamite would blow up the Holland Tunnel. Comparatively few bombs could wreck the New York subways. The United States hasn't sufficient antiaircraft guns to defend New York City, let alone Philadelphia, Boston, Washington, or Chicago. Our stock of airplanes and air equipment is a bagatelle compared with the air forces of Germany and Italy.

The United States has an army of 400,000 men, 235,000 being militia. She does not have sufficient rifles, let alone other equipment, to arm this small army. She has not adequate artillery to properly defend any of our seaports, and many have no defense whatever.

Unfortunately, we have the largest "fifth column" of Nazi sympathizers and Communists now existing in any country.

In the face of this situation, Congress is about to adjourn. Congressmen and Senators want to spend the summer stumping their States for reelection.

There is no time now to build a new navy. An Army of 1,000,000 men could not be equipped within 1 year from date. Artillery defenses cannot be created within 2 years. It requires 4 years to build a battleship.

America ought to form a council of defense. It ought to call for 100,000 youths to volunteer for training as pilots. It ought to advance the money to airplane factories to quadruple their production. It ought to arrange that automobile factories manufacture airplane motors and parts. Airplane designs should be furnished to all automobile manufacturers who could undertake production of planes. The only possible quick means of defense for the United States is a vast expansion of air forces and equipment.

It is silly to say the United States is in no danger. We have two-thirds of the world's gold buried in Kentucky hills. In resources this country is rotten rich. In defense, it is a baby in arms. With England and France out of the way our riches would be a feast for Germans and Japs.

Why not wire our Congressmen and Senators to stay on the job and get busy?

Peak Employment at Eastman Kodak Co. Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ROCHESTER (N. Y.) DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE OF APRIL 19, 1940

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, one of the typical American activities is that of taking pictures. Photography is indulged in by all our citizenship, rich and poor alike. When we find an institution which furnishes material for such an activity flourishing, we know that this institution may be classed as a barometer of our economic conditions.

The report of this barometer is good. Taking of pictures in many instances is what may be styled a semiluxury; one indulging in it is not necessarily doing it as a living, but is upon pleasure bent. A generous taking of pictures indicates a pleasant state of mind, and a monetary condition in America that is wholesome.

The report of the Eastman Kodak Co., which is located in the State I have the honor in part to represent, and which I think is a typical report of many industries, shows a remarkably prosperous condition. Reports of this kind are a tribute to our American governmental policies, to the Roosevelt administration which administers them, and to the men and women of this institution for their enterprise, energy, and efficiency.

It is a pleasure to state that from the standpoint of pictures, they are now pleasing to the eye. The improved economic conditions under the Roosevelt administration are not those of bread lines, riots, foreclosures, or pictures of despair and distress generally, but are pictures showing business and industrial activity, of people comfortably engaged, of people with happy faces and many evidences of enjoying life.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which is from the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N. Y., of the issue of April 19, 1940, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of April 19, 1940]

KODAK PAY ROLLS, EMPLOYMENT HIT NEW ALL-TIME HIGH—EMPLOYEES INCREASE 72 PERCENT OVER 1929—EARNINGS ALSO GAIN, ANNUAL REPORT REVEALS

Eastman Kodak Co. employment and pay rolls hit an all-time peak last year, when the company employed 27,000 persons.

This represented a 72-percent increase over the 15,700 predepression peak of 1929, while the 1939 pay roll increased $19,300,000 over a decade ago, according to the illustrated report presented by W. G. Stuber, chairman, and Frank W. Lovejoy, president.

Income also in on the uptrend, the company and wholly-owned subsidiaries reporting a consolidated net profit of $21,537,577, equal to $8.55 per common share, compared with $17,339,408, or $7.54 per share in 1938.

This compares with a net profit of $6,058,749 in 1932, near the depth of the depresson, and a net profit of $22,014,916 in 1929, highest in the history of the company.

Under the subtitle, "A decade of progress, 1929–39,'" the illustrated report discusses employment and the company's efforts to meet the unemployment problem during the last decade. The report stated:

"During the first 3 years of the depression a decline in the company's business necessitated a gradual reduction in the working force and a shortening of the workweek.

"At the low point of the depression, in 1932, the decline from 1929 in the average number of employees was 16 percent, which compares with 37 percent for the country as a whole.

"During the next 6 years Kodak employment more than doubled. In 1938, because of the drop in general business, employment declined in the first part of the year. This decline was more than made up by the recovery that followed, and employment at the close of 1939 reached a new peak—72 percent above the close of 1929. Employment for the country as a whole still is 9 percent below the 1929 level."

Employment increase was credited in the report to reduction of the normal workweek from 48 to 40 hours, expanding sales stimulated by improvement of products, introduction of new products, lower prices, and improved service.

Along with the employment increase has come a steady decline in the prices of the company's products, the report stated.

"The weighted average of prices of all the company's products in the photographic field was 14 percent lower in 1939 than in 1929, and 22 percent lower than in 1915," the report stated. It ends on a note of satisfaction and confidence:

"Thus, the decade of 1929–39 has been one of progress for the company in the face of difficult conditions. The market for its products has been expanded, employment has been substantially increased, the real annual income of its employees has risen, the quality of its products has been improved, prices to the consumer have been reduced, it has contributed to the general improvement of business in the country by substantial increases in its pay roll and large expenditures for new plants, and, in the face of rising expense burden, earnings have been restored almost to the 1929 level."

Endorsement of Hospital Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENTS BY DR. BERT W. CALDWELL, DR. JOHN P. PETERS, AND EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix statements which have been submitted to me, endorsing the Hospital Construction Act, as reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, from Dr. Bert W. Caldwell, executive secretary of the American Hospital Association; Dr. John P. Peters, secretary of the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care; and Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 4, 1940.*

Senator ROBERT WAGNER,
Senate Office Building:

May I extend you the appreciation and congratulations of the American Hospital Association in perfecting the rural hospital law as amended. It is one of the best pieces of legislation that you have introduced. It will be a blessing to many hundreds of thousands of people who are now deprived of hospital care. It can well be accepted as a model law. I want to thank you personally and for the American Hospital Association for the many courtesies you have so generously extended our representatives.

BERT W. CALDWELL, M. D.,
Executive Secretary, American Hospital Association.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *May 16, 1940.*

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate:

In behalf of Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, express earnest hope that Senate may act favorably upon S. 3230 at this session.

JOHN P. PETERS, M. D.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1940.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to convey to you the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation of Federal aid to the States for better health and medical services through the construction, improvement, and enlargement of needed hospitals and diagnostic centers in rural areas. This objective is partially carried out in your bill, S. 3230, as reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. We therefore hope this bill will receive the approval of the Senate.

We do not regard this legislation as being in any sense a substitute for the broader national health program, which is embodied in your bill, S. 1620, on which extensive hearings have been held by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and which our organization supported in the main. If Congress approves S. 3230, however, it will make possible at least a small beginning toward carrying out a part of the broader program.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolutions adopted in 1938 with respect to rural health, which were reaffirmed and approved by the voting delegates of the American Farm Bureau Federation at the last annual meeting in December 1939.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY ASSOCIATED WOMEN OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IN 1938 WITH RESPECT TO RURAL HEALTH, WHICH WERE REAFFIRMED AND APPROVED BY THE LAST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IN DECEMBER 1939

RURAL HEALTH

Since representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation and Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation attended the National Health Conference, called by the President in Washington, we endorse the principles of the resolutions presented by them at that time.

1. Extension of public health service

Much of the costs entailed by sickness can be averted or reduced by preventive measures. The curtailment of disease is to the betterment of our society, but the costs are beyond the economic resources of many of the people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation hereby approves and urges the extension of all forms of preventive medicine throughout the country, particularly in the rural areas, and that the Associated Women further recommends a greater appropriation of funds under the Social Security Act for this purpose.

2. Rural hospitals

The protection, conservation, and restoration of the health of the people is a matter in which the Government must be interested for its own welfare. Since adequate hospital facilities are indispensable in the proper care of the sick, and since hospitals are inaccessible to many rural people living in sparsely settled sections of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Associated Women of American Farm Bureau Federation urges the establishment of hospitalization facilities and provision for adequate medical care, accessible to all of the people at a price within their ability to pay.

3. Medical care in rural areas

It is impossible for the individual to predict the cost of adequate medical care. Attempts to meet this situation are being met by numerous plans providing for prepayment of medical services and hospitalization on an insurance basis. It becomes apparent there is need not only to protect the members of the medical profession from burdensome regulation but to also protect the insured from exploitation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Associated Women of American Farm Bureau Federation recognizes this problem and recommends that the several State federations of the American Farm Bureau Federation take action looking forward to the enactment of necessary regulation embodying these principles.

Philippine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY PLACIDO L. MAPA

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech embodying a plea for permanent Philippine independence delivered by Placido L. Mapa, a prominent Filipino, at the convocation of the College of Commerce, Ateneo de Manila, P. I.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have followed with the keenest interest the recent debates on the reexamination of the grant of Philippine independence under the Tydings-McDuffie law. This is easily the most vital and crucial problem now confronting the Philippines, for upon its solution rests the fate of 16,000,000 people, their children, and their children's children. The Filipino people have a right to be fully informed of, and to be attentively heard on, all the angles involved before independence becomes an irrevocable reality, and it is clearly to the best interests of the whole nation to have the matter thoroughly and widely threshed out. For this reason I deem it my duty, as it is that of every Filipino citizen, to contribute anything which might help to clarify the points at issue.

There can be no argument on the fact that all peoples in all climes are desirous of attaining independence as the ideal state for individuals as well as for nations. It is an elemental and a universal urge, and there is no Filipino who does not thrill at the thought of seeing the Filipino national emblem proudly flying and waving over the Luneta and all the public buildings throughout the land, all by itself, without the supervisory presence of another flag, proclaiming the soul-stirring significance that the Filipino people are independent and masters of their own destiny at last, after hundreds of years of struggle and waiting. Of course, we all want freedom and liberty, and they do violence to Nature and slander a whole race who say that there are Filipinos who are opposed to Philippine independence. It savors of an attempt to win adherents by beclouding the issue—something which should have absolutely no place in the consideration of so weighty a

problem. As I see it, the only difference between the two camps now discussing this question is that one group wants complete, absolute independence in 1946, while the other would like to have it postponed until a later date.

Speaker Jose Yulo, who was chairman of the Filipino representation in the Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs and is now the spokesman of the legislative department of our government, recently said: "But insurance of good government will not be enough to bring happiness to one's people unless material and economic security can be given to every man, woman, and child living under the mantle of that government." Continuing, he said, "Unfortunately for us, while political independence is assured under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the economic provisions of the act make it impossible for the Philippines to develop an economy independent of the United States. First, because the period of economic adjustment is too short, and is coupled with conditions tending to liquidate rather than to readjust the industries affected by the cessation of free trade. And, second, because the Philippines is not given the means to develop its own foreign trade, independent of that of the United States. * * * the problem simply becomes so baffling that it admits of no other solution but to lengthen the period of readjustment, after independence, and then only on terms sufficiently generous so as to permit a real readjustment, rather than force a liquidation of our major industries." Not long ago, Secretary of Finance Manuel Roxas, who was a member of the same Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs and now chairman of the National Economic Council, spoke from this platform as follows: "The United States considered it necessary to grant the Philippines sufficient time to adjust her economy to a nonpreferential basis. It was thought that 10 years would be sufficient for that purpose. We know now that that period is not enough, not because we are failing to do what we can toward that end, but because it is humanly impossible to effect the adjustment in so short a period." He then went on to say, "* * * if Hawaii and Puerto Rico, for example, were given 10 years or even 20 years to adjust their economy to a nonpreferential basis, * * * their most important industries would collapse and they would revert to the conditions that existed before their annexation to America. Such is our predicament and such might be the result if our trade preferences with the United States were suddenly terminated. * * * A dispassionate study of the situation should convince every thinking Filipino that we are in a highly precarious situation and that our economic problems are both vital and urgent. Unless we solve them correctly we can neither hope to maintain our freedom nor adequately safeguard the welfare and happiness of our people."

Both Speaker Yulo and Secretary Roxas, for whose judgment I have the greatest respect and admiration, are thus agreed (1) that economic security is indispensable to the welfare and happiness of the Filipino people and to the maintenance of Philippine independence; (2) that the loss of the United States preferential market in 1946 will deprive the Filipino people of economic security, because the transition period of 10 years is too short to enable the Philippines to build up a new economic structure that will take the place of the present one; and (3) that the only remedy is to extend the period for economic readjustment. This is an official and the most authoritative opinion on the subject, and I indorse it 100 percent.

In urging the Filipino people to vote for the Philippine economic adjustment law in the plebiscite which was held on October 24, 1939, President Quezon said: "This committee (referring to the Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs) found that if the economic provisions of the McDuffie-Tydings law were to take effect in 1941, as they must, unless the law is amended in this respect, our tobacco and coconut-oil products, as well as other minor products such as pearl buttons, embroideries, etc., would have to pay export taxes when shipped to the United States, and the payment of such taxes will prevent their sale in the American market at a profit; and since they cannot compete with similar products in other markets of the world, the industries thus affected would be ruined, resulting in the impoverishment of millions of Filipinos who are engaged in them both in the factories and on the farms." This was the alarm sounded by President Quezon, and yet this is only the beginning because it refers only to a part of the difficulties which we must face.

Now let us consider some of the effects of liquidating all our basic industries in 1946, a situation which will be inevitable, unless the period for our economic readjustment is extended. Our national income and, therefore, the revenues of the Government will be reduced at least 50 percent. To have a proper background for a clear visualization of what this means, let us look briefly at our situation at this time when the Philippines are in comparative prosperity. Thousands upon thousands are anxious to work, but they cannot find employment. We have annual school crises, and thousands of children cannot be accommodated in the public schools. Sanitation and health conditions are not yet what they should be. Roads are still lacking and many of these which are now in existence are not satisfactory. There are labor strikes and other manifestations of unrest and dissatisfaction. This is the picture today, when we are well off.

What will it be when at least one-half is taken away from the national and the government income and, on top of that, the Philippines, as an independent nation, will be compelled to incur additional expenses for the maintenance of a diplomatic and consular service, the expansion of our army and our air force, the establishment of a navy, etc.? Not much imagination is required to see that thousands upon thousands of the present employees in the government and in business firms will lose their jobs precisely at a time when, through the social-justice program, the masses are getting accustomed to higher wages. Hundreds of schools will have to be closed. Sanitary measures will have to be less rigidly enforced and health conditions will grow worse. Many roads will have to be left in disrepair. Worst of all, there will be social upheavals of dangerous proportions, for when people are desperately in need of food and other esesntials of life and cannot satisfy their wants they become easy prey for subversive movements and will do anything. It is the masses and not the so-called economic royalists who will bear the brunt of the suffering. Since their income allows some margin for adjustment, those who are comparatively well to do can manage to dispense with nonessentials; on the other hand, the laboring classes cannot modify their mode of living without affecting their bare necessities.

In the judgment of our best minds, therefore, unless our preferential trade with the United States is continued, independence granted in 1946 cannot be maintained. In view of this, the advocates of independence in 1946 would like to have the continuance after independence of the preferential position which the Philippines holds at present in the United States market. That may be possible, but the first thought that comes to mind is this: Since, as recently pointed out by United States High Commissioner Sayre, "Until their independence is consummated, the Filipino people are an integral part of the American Nation," does it not follow that if American sovereignty over the Philippines is continued our retention of the United States preferential market will be more likely, more secure, and of more sufficient duration than if independence is already granted? We know that after independence takes effect in 1946, benevolent and altruistic as America is, she cannot be expected, in the face of her own multifarious problems, to have the same degree of interest in the Philippines as now. Morever, if we wish to keep on enjoying privileges which normally are grants in consideration of the exercise of sovereignty, the honorable and gracious course would seem to be for us not to consent to depriving the other party of such benefits as by right belong to it, but, rather, insist upon our fulfilling the corresponding obligation by continuing our allegiance to the United States of America for the time being.

We must also bear in mind that independence in 1946 will deprive us of approximately ₱55,000,000 annually, which the United States has been refunding to us from her own collection of the excise tax on coconut oil and the processing tax on sugar and which has been the lifeblood of our present program for economic development. Without this generous financial aid, our economic readjustment will no doubt be retarded. But, assuming that by some miracle we could have all the funds that would be necessary, an even greater drawback will hamper our economic growth after independence in 1946. We all know that rapid economic progress is possible only in an atmosphere of peace and security. And yet, as I shall presently show, such a feeling of uncertainty and anxiety will pervade the country after independence in 1946 that it is extremely doubtful if the projected tempo of economic advancement will materialize. On the other hand, if American sovereignty remains here and stands guard during the entire period which may be required for readjustment prior to independence, the acceleration of our economic preparedness will be surer and greater.

Let us assume that we can obtain the continuation of preferential trade with America after independence in 1946. Everybody realizes that this is not all that independence entails. Besides maintaining our economic position, we have to provide for our safety from external aggression in these times when treaties no longer count for anything, when powerful nations look upon small countries as nothing more than pawns on the international chessboard; and when, at the flimsiest excuse, countries which are rich in natural resources but weak in the instrumentalities of defense are invaded and subjugated. Competent observers are all agreed that the danger from external aggression is indeed very real to an independent Philippines. Former Justice George A. Malcolm voiced the general conviction when he said recently, "As surely as the sun rises tomorrow, it is certain that Japan or a Japanese-Chinese combination will dominate the Orient. Anyone who knows history realizes that it is inevitable. * * * Any mind with reasonable discernment can foretell that the fulfillment of the next phase of Japanese policy will mean a movement to the south, a movement to encompass Hong Kong, French Indo-China, and the Dutch and British East Indies. Within the sphere of that influence will lie the Philippine Islands." But let us not take anybody's word for it. As in the case of individuals, so it is with nations: habit is destiny. The character pattern is revealed not in the protestations of friendship and humility no matter how eloquent and convincing they may be, but rather in the trend of past performances. Formosa, Korea, Manchuria, northern China, and a cluster of small, nearby islands—successively engulfed with the relentlessness of a rising tide—can there be a clearer indication as to the designs and course of Japanese imperialism?

Not being a military man, I cannot, of course, speak with authority on national defense; but there are competent sources which hold the opinion that, at the rate we are going, with the limited resources and equipment at our command, and with the length of our coastline due to our island formation, the most optimistic estimate is that it is extremely doubtful if we can resist the invasion of a modern war machine like Japan's in 1946, or within 10 years thereafter. This is not difficult to believe when we consider that Poland, with a population more than twice our own, with a better equipped army of 1,700,000 men, or over four times as large as what

we figure on having in 1946, and with a very short frontier to defend, was battered and crushed in less than 3 weeks. And we are not alone in this opinion. President Quezon himself in inaugurating the Department of National Defense, expressed the gravest concern over our safety from external aggression when he said, "The lessons of the present war in Europe seem to show that a country small in population and resources cannot expect long to resist the attack of a first-class, well-prepared military power. * * * These are lessons that we cannot overlook. They give us no assurance that the Philippines will not be the victim of aggression, even if we armed every man in our country." Therefore, until our system of national defense becomes truly dependable, or the world situation becomes more auspicious, our only sure and effective protection is the sovereignty of the United States. No less an authority than Paul V. McNutt, at that time the highest representative of America in the Philippines, said that, as long as the American flag flies over our country, we are assured of safety from invasion by another power. If there be those who doubt the truth of this statement, the record of the last 41 years stands as incontrovertible evidence. On the other hand, what is transpiring in China today, where world powers have done practically nothing to obtain redress for their nationals who have suffered at the hands of Japanese soldiers, is a clear warning that it is idle to expect a third party to come to our rescue once we have our independence. If we precipitate independence in 1946, unless all signs fail, the freedom that we will get will just be a brief transition period from the benign sovereignty of America to another one which we know to be oppressive and which the Filipinos do not want.

Why, then, should we be in such a hurry for independence under these conditions? If we are simply to be placed again under the sovereignty of another nation, we should, by all means, remain under the United States flag, which to us during the last 41 years has meant benevolence, peace, order, security, prosperity, liberty, opportunity, and a host of other advantages. Twice we have fought for independence and twice we had to give up to superior force. Let us profit from this lesson of the past and set up ample precautions this time so that when independence comes we will never lose it. Let us not be so particular about a further delay. We have already waited many years. There will be no harm in waiting a while longer. After all, as President Quezon once said, what are 20 or 30 years in the life of a nation? Besides, if we are truly eager for independence, as I believe we are, the years will never be able to dim our desire for it. If we really love our country, we should be more concerned about the permanency and stability of our independence rather than with its hasty advent, only to lose it for good.

At any rate, except for the form and symbols of a liberal sovereignty, we now enjoy practically the same measure of internal autonomy as we will ever have under independence. As a matter of fact, we have more liberty than the citizens of many independent countries of the world today.

We cannot just petulantly insist on getting anything simply because we want it, regardless of the cost. Even freedom can have too high a price. Our heroic forbears realized this when they surrendered to superior arms; for, obviously, of what good is freedom if those who want to enjoy it all get exterminated in the quest for it? There is no Filipino that will not sacrifice to the limit for his country, if need be. On numerous occasions the Filipino has proved that he knows how to die for a worthy cause. But why run the risk of subjugation and, perhaps, racial extinction when a little waiting will free us from this danger? Patrick Henry was moved to exclaim, "Give me liberty, or give me death!" because he was really being deprived of his liberty. Washington endured untold hardships at Valley Forge because the American people had serious grievances against England and, what is more, they had a reasonable chance of winning against the British, as in fact they won. In our case, there is no injustice or suffering that warrants our taking any hasty step, which might result in inviting invasion by a first-class power like Japan.

Thus we see that the two groups agree on these points: (1) That independence is desirable, and the Philippines should have it as soon as possible; (2) that if our principal industries are liquidated in 1946, the Philippines will collapse economically and will not be able to maintain its independence; and (3) that if the period for our economic readjustment is sufficiently extended, we shall, after a few years, reach such a degree of development that we can really maintain and defend our independent existence. The two groups differ as follows: One insists on complete and absolute independence in 1946, or before the Philippines is fully prepared economically or militarily, in the hope that we can finish our economic readjustment later; in other words, this group wants to have independence in 1946, run the risk of retarding or paralyzing our economic readjustment, and expose such independence to the imminent danger of being lost almost immediately because of inadequate preparedness. The other group wants independence to come after the completion of our economic and military preparation, believing that in this way the Philippines is sure to retain its preferential position in the United States market, and our economic readjustment will proceed with maximum speed and efficiency in an atmosphere of peace and security that is made possible by the supreme guaranty of the American flag. Those who favor postponement desire Philippine independence just as fervently as anybody else does, but want it to be permanent when it comes; they are just as ready as anybody else to meet hardships, but they do not want perpetual subjugation by another power. So, under the pleasant supervision of the United States, they do not mind waiting a few years longer, while the Filipinos build up a solid guaranty for the security and safety of that independence after it is attained. One group insists on taking great and unnecessary risks, all for a brief and passing independence; the other wants to minimize risks in order to insure a lasting independence.

Far be it from me to say that mine is the only correct opinion, or that it is representative of that of the Filipino people. I do hope, however, that I have succeeded in showing sufficient reasons in support of the plan to have the question reexamined. I believe that so important a problem should be thoroughly explained to, and be directly and separably voted upon by, the people, inasmuch as the plebiscite on the Tydings-McDuffie law was not directly and exclusively intended for it, and since then many acts of international violence have taken place and world conditions have greatly changed. President Quezon himself, who is the highest authority on the subject, admitted in a public speech "that those Filipinos who have been working for independence all these years have not taken pains to discuss this question from the new angle which recent world events suggest." The points advanced by those who favor the postponement of independence are so weighty that they should not be merely brushed aside unceremoniously; at any rate, if the advocates of independence in 1946 are sure of their stand, why should they oppose a plebiscite on the subject? Since 1912, or for over 25 years, all the political parties in the Philippines have been pounding into the electorate the benefits of immediate and absolute independence, so that the people's minds have been regimented into believing that independence will be all milk and honey. In view of this, it becomes the duty of leaders of the Government at least to encourage—as, in fact, President Quezon is doing—the thorough presentation of all aspects of independence before the Filipino people so that they will have a fairly accurate idea of what to expect and will not blame anybody when they later find the going hard.

The question before us is so serious and of such momentous significance that the consideration of it comes to every true Filipino as the challenge and the privilege of a lifetime. As such, it demands the fullest cooperation of all elements and rises far above all attempts at recrimination and at parading one faction as more patriotic and independence-loving than others. It requires of us the calmest deliberation, the straightest and clearest thinking, the most sincere speaking, and the most courageous action. Irrespective of what the final outcome will be, let it not be said of us that we have been recreant to our duty by not exerting our utmost to stimulate and promote the widespread discussion of the various phases of such a decisive problem.

American Airplane Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 13, 1940, relative to the use and production of airplanes by the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 13, 1940]

On the basis of talks with War Department heads, Mr. Leach reports that "in case of serious American emergency" our capacity could probably be increased to 5,000 a month. But this would require full mobilization of all potential factories, plus new ones built under forced draft.

Is there anyone who for a moment doubts that a "serious American emergency" already confronts us, on the basis of these official figures?

The fact that the Nazis have at last begun the long awaited "all-out" war against the Allies, using planes as a primary weapon in the assault, constitutes an American emergency.

The fact that our vital interests in the Pacific are flung into the most dangerous possible jeopardy as a result of the attack on Holland constitutes a serious emergency.

The fact that the aggressor states—today our only potential enemies in a world gone mad—are capable of turning out jointly an overwhelmingly greater quantity of planes than we, constitutes a serious emergency.

We alone are responsible for this emergency, and it devolves upon nobody but ourselves to meet it. We have not been building planes for the Allies primarily to help them, but to save ourselves and increase our productive capacity. If, in their own preservation, they are willing to expand their orders still further, well and good. If they

can't afford to do so, or will not do so, we should not wait an instant upon their delay. It is an hour when we must be ready to meet any threat that can come to us, on land, on sea, in the air. It would be infinitely better to expand our production and simply give some of the ships to the Allies than to sit idle while the aggressors improve their planes, test them in combat, and go on increasing their production rates.

At any costs, despite every obstacle, America should build airplanes. Whether we have an immediate cash market for the output matters not a whit. What we must achieve, and as soon as may be, is productive capacity that will outdo every other nation, or combination of nations, that might use this new and terrible weapon—constantly increasing its range and destructive power—against our country and its essential interests.

W. P. A. Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me April 18, 1940, before the Committee on Appropriations:

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. SMITH, the committee will be glad to hear you at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I came here this morning prepared to urge the committee to increase the work-relief appropriation to $1,500,000,000; but, according to recent developments, I am advised that this action has been anticipated as a result of a conference held yesterday by the President with members of your committee and the officials of the W. P. A. If I am correct in my understanding, the President is likely to submit these recommendations in a message to Congress today relative to this matter. If that is so, my understanding is that the action taken would really be equivalent to increasing the appropriation to $1,500,000,000 because the projected $975,000,000, which has been recommended, would be allotted over an 8-month period of work, and the 12-month period would be waived; so it really would amount substantially to increasing the appropriation to $1,500,000,000. In view of that fact, I would like to ask, if that action is taken, would it obviate the necessity, as I am sure it would, of reducing the rolls by making the reductions which started at the beginning of this month? That would necessarily follow, would it not?

Mr. WOODRUM. As I understand it, the regular program of the W. P. A. for this fiscal year, which ends on July 1, calls for a reduction of the work load during the summer months.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. And a pick-up during the winter months. Therefore, if the same amount of money were made available for the next fiscal year, it would undoubtedly mean that during the summer months of this year and of next year they would have less employment than during the winter months; so that, regardless of how much was made available, their program would drop off during the summer months and pick up during the winter months. It would necessarily mean that the program would be cut down during the next few months of this fiscal year. If $1,500,000,000 were appropriated for next year, it would still mean some reduction in the rolls during the summer months.

Mr. SMITH. I assume that would be in the hope that industry will provide employment for them, and that they would be taken care of in private employment.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is because this need is seasonal.

Mr. SMITH. If that action upon an 8-month basis is taken, is there a possibility that some of those being dropped off will be reinstated?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think that would depend on whether they were certified by the relief agencies. It would be a question of selecting those most in need. The W. P. A. would have to get their increased work load from relief certification, and that would be largely in the hands of the local relief agencies as to whom they feel like affording relief.

Mr. SMITH. So far as the money being available is concerned, it would be possible for them to do that if they were so disposed and if the certifications justified it?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, during the summer season less is required for clothing, fuel, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is probably logical, although there are undoubtedly communities where that is not exactly the case and where, on account of the enforcement of the compulsory 18-month proviso and the dismissal of single men, some real hardship has resulted. That would result even now, with the improved business conditions which are prevalent almost everywhere in the country. There would be cases of hardship unless funds were made available. By providing the 8-month basis instead of the 12-month basis those people could be taken care of.

I have received quite a number of letters from my district, and I will ask to read some of them into the record. I have letters from two boards of county commissioners.

Mr. WOODRUM. You may insert them in the record.

Mr. SMITH. I will do that.

Mr. WOODRUM. I would like to ask you this: What is your view as to whether or not we should appropriate $1,000,000,000 on the 8-month basis, or $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year?

Mr. SMITH. I would prefer to have $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year, provided it is spread over 12 months. Of course, I would be inclined to follow the recommendations of the President, in accordance with the message he will send to Congress today, because I know his information is much better than mine. I would not even except the members of this committee, although you probably have almost the same sources of information the President has. However, an ordinary Member of the House, with lesser information, would not be in a position to put his judgment against that of the President or of this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. You know something about the Woodrum amendment, which requires that the appropriation be spread over a period of 12 months?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Suppose we should appropriate $975,000,000 and do away with the Woodrum amendment?

Mr. SMITH. I think that would accomplish the same objective. It would make it so flexible that the Administrator of the Work Projects Administration could use his judgment, and in those communities where it was necessary he could take care of the necessary relief load.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. That would probably run them through 8 months, or until along about the 1st of March. Have you any assurance as to what the complexion of the next Congress may be with reference to W. P. A.?

Mr. SMITH. I have a pretty good idea—according to the Gallup Poll, it is going to remain Democratic.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Suppose our good friends at the other end of the table should be successful, what assurance would you have that W. P. A. would continue to any extent at all?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is a very violent assumption, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. I think it is a very violent assumption, and I would not indulge in it. However, if the worst came to the worst—and that would be about the worst thing that could happen, with all due deference to our friends——

Mr. TABER (interposing). It is the only salvation for the country.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, if they should abolish the W. P. A. entirely, as I understand they would, it would throw the entire burden back on the local communities.

Mr. TABER. There has been no suggestion that it would be disposed of entirely, but it would be under a more intelligent management.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Then if we should have a Democratic Congress, but by some unforeseen event we should have a Republican President, but not a Republican Congress, what position would W. P. A. be in?

Mr. SMITH. That is very problematical. That is pure speculation, I think.

When I came to Congress, in 1933, I had a plan which I submitted to a number of high officials of the Government, who had just taken office, including Gen. Hugh Johnson and Harry Hopkins and a number of others. I still believe, in view of subsequent events, and in view of what has transpired in the country, that if the plan I then suggested had been followed, it would have been even more successful than the W. P. A. What I had in mind was this, and I think I convinced some of those gentlemen of its soundness, but they were never able to get action along the line I suggested. My idea was to go into every community in the United States and make an industrial survey, a survey of every factory, industry, and employing agency in each community, and ascertain how many men they had been employing in the past, how much wages they had paid, and what their output was. I would then have the Government match funds with those manufacturers on, I suggested, a 55 to 45 basis, or the same as the P. W. A., and thereby start up all those industries, the industries to put back as many persons as they thought it practicable to employ, or that they really needed in order to step up their production to at least 75 percent of what they previously had and to be increased to full 100 percent later as business and market conditions justified. They would be paying, under that plan, the regular going wages. They would be employing mechanics, skilled workers, and common labor, producing all of the products that they were capable of manufacturing. I believe that program would have been successful, and that it would have stimulated the revival of business and of our regular industries. We would not be paying those people on a mere bread-and-butter scale, but we would be paying them the regular going wages. While we have these projects under W. P. A., and most of them are useful and of permanent value to the communities, the trouble is that when the project is completed, the workers have not and are not producing any real tangible wealth such as can be sold or that would bring a price. They have not

produced anything that would result in a further turn-over, and increase the circulation of money and create purchasing power throughout the country. The thing stops right there, but if you manufacture some article of household furniture, clothing, merchandise, or manufacture any of the thousands of article that are manufactured throughout the country, they are sold, and there is a turn-over perhaps, three, four, and more times, through jobbers, brokers, commission merchants, wholesalers, etc., and on through the retail merchants. You would have a process of acceleration there that would affect beneficially and for a continuous period our entire economic structure. By that means, you might really get the country back on a normal basis. I believe if that plan had been adopted, it would have been highly successful. I thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for your courtesy and the privilege of appearing before you at this time.

Mr. WOODRUM. We thank you for your statement.

Mr. SMITH. I will submit an additional statement for the record. (The statement referred to is as follows:)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy in affording me this opportunity to be heard in behalf of increased W. P. A. work-relief appropriations. I favor increasing the amount to $1,500,0000,000, because I believe that sum to be necessary to give employment to those who will be unable to obtain jobs in private industry and also provide purchasing power to maintain and continue the present upward trend in business, industry, and agriculture, as well as construct worth-while projects of permanent value in the local communities. Every break-down of the expenditures made by W. P. A. workers has established the fact that they spend the wages they receive for groceries, meat, foodstuffs, and farm products of all kinds, articles of retail merchandise, rentals for housing, and the necessaries of life and that practically every dollar they receive finds its way into the cash registers of the local merchant and storekeeper and the pockets of the farmer in the communities throughout the country. The materials and supplies used in the construction of the projects increase the income of local sales, supply, and jobbing firms. In other words, there is at least a direct twofold benefit; first, work and an existence for the unemployed and his family; second, an added volume of sales and improved market for business, industry, and agriculture.

I desire to take this occasion, if I may, to compliment your committee on its record during the past 7 years. While the committee has not been as liberal as I have sometimes thought it should be, I believe that this committee has had one of the most difficult and arduous duties to perform of any committee in Congress, and that it has performed its duty conscientiously, fearlessly, and patriotically. The appropriations made by this committee for work relief have been a Godsend to the unemployed people of America and their families, have provided useful, serviceable projects of permanent value in every community in America, and have stimulated business, industry, and agriculture throughout America. Your attitude and policy have been the direct opposite of the Hoover formula of requiring the local municipalities, counties, and States to take care of the unemployed, which would have bankrupted every unit of local government, whereas, as a result of the financial burden in caring for the unemployed and defraying the cost of local improvements having been borne by the Federal Government, most of our cities and counties are at the present time in the soundest financial condition in their history and actually on a cash basis. How many of our critics and political adversaries are fair enough to give us due credit for aiding in bringing about this most desirable status?

However, I want to stress the importance and need of increasing the pending appropriation and know of no better way of doing that than by reading two communications which I have received from the county commissioners of two of the counties in my congressional district in southwest Washington. These gentlemen are in daily touch with the unemployed in their counties and are fully conversant with conditions. I will read first the letter from Mason County. It reads as follows:

MASON COUNTY,
Shelton, Wash., April 1, 1940.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
United States Representative,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The joint resolution of the Seventy-sixth Congress concerning work relief provided for assignments to the W. P. A. jobs on the basis of relative needs. The spirit of this section of the resolution we heartily commend, but the administrative interpretation that has been put upon this clause has, in our judgment, gone a step further in the direction of bringing all families dependent on work relief down to a level of absolute destitution.

The procedure works in this way: Persons are classified at present, according to instructions from Colonel Harrington, into two groups: A and B. Those families that can meet less than one-third of their budgetary needs (in this State a budget for a family of four would be approximately $60) are placed in class A. This would mean that a family of four who can gather their own fuel, own their own home, and have a garden would probably go into class B, since their resources would equal more than one-third of their budget. If assignments are limited, such a family would have no chance of getting on W. P. A.

On the other hand, a single person who has made no effort to provide a home, has no dependents, and who has contributed probably very little to the community, would be classed in class A and would be given preference in assignment. If you will stop to consider this arrangement, Mr. Smith, you will see that people are discouraged in trying to provide for their own security by owning a home, by providing their own fuel, or by raising a garden. As we generally find that home ownership and other efforts to maintain something like a decent standard of living are more common with families with children, this ruling really works against the families with children and yet we doubt if anybody would contend that we should give preference to persons without children. Nevertheless, this is exactly what tends to happen under the administrative interpretation of "relative needs."

Here in this State, until recently, the W. P. A. administration provided 3 categories of certified persons. In the A classification went families with some resources such as the family we have described above. Into class C went single persons. The result of this system of classification was that in all instances the family got preference where the W. P. A. quota was not adequate to provide employment for everyone certified. The injustice in this arrangement was far less severe and far less dangerous than the present system of just two classifications. We understand that the Washington State W. P. A. administration was ordered to discontinue the C classification.

As a matter of fact, if the relative-need clause is to be intelligently interpreted it should not be on the basis of whether the family has some resources but on the basis of what the total budgetary deficiency might be. This would operate as follows: The 5-point budget in Washington for a single person is $27; for a second adult the budget is $15, or a total for two adults is $42. The budget for a family of two which had no resources would then be $42. If they owned their own home the housing item would be deducted leaving a budgetary deficiency of $30. This would still make a man and wife eligible prior to the single person with the resources if assignments were made on the basis of relative need since the maximum budgetary deficiency of the single person would be only $27 and the family of two, owning their own home, would be $30.

You can see how this would work in favor of the families with children, even though the family of four, which we first mentioned who had a budget of $60, had housing ($13 allowable), fuel ($6 allowable), and some garden produce ($3 allowable). This family would still have a budgetary deficiency of $39, which would give them preference of assignment over either the single person or the family of two just mentioned. This arrangement does not place such heavy emphasis on resources and does, it seems to us, give encouragement to home ownership and the providing of resources to assure some security and a better standard of living for the family.

We are not arguing that single persons should not be given an opportunity to work on W. P. A. Indeed, we feel that the W. P. A. quota has never been adequate and should certainly not be cut. We see no reason why the W. P. A. quota, as long as the quota exists, should include only a part of the people certified as in need. As regards single people, we do feel that it is unfortunate that W. P. A. pays the same wages to persons with no dependents as it does to a family of 10. This should be corrected somehow so that the family of 10 gets a more adequate budget. This was done under the old F. E. R. A. system of work relief on a budgetary basis.

Very truly yours,

E. J. AHERN, *Chairman,*
VINCENT E. PAUL,
ROBERT TRENCKMANN,
Board of County Commissioners.

The other letter is from Thurston County, in which is located the city of Olympia, our State capital, and it also has a good deal of farming as well as manufacturing and shipping.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Olympia, Wash., March 27, 1940.

Mr. MARTIN F. SMITH,
United States Representative,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Recent reports of the proposed W. P. A. cut for the State of Washington, and hints of still further cuts by Congress for next year, are very disturbing to us, as we feel those advocating a cut in the W. P. A. employment rolls this time are either acting on ignorance or ill will toward the unemployed. In spite of recent estimates, reported to have been made by Dorothy Thompson and others, we are still convinced that the unemployed are closer to the figures of the A. F. of L. or C. I. O.

We are positive that W. P. A. in this part of the State has never come anywhere near providing employment for all the needy unemployed. The standards of eligibility have been kept so low that our welfare departments have referred only those people who are near destitution. We talk about an American standard of living, and yet our own national figures show that a very large number of our people are living on a standard of living much below that recommended for health and the general well being of our citizens. This is certainly true here in Thurston County.

The W. P. A. has relieved the worst distress. Even with W. P. A. only part of the job has been done. Recent figures compiled for Thurston County show that of 234 families with children on W. P. A., the average monthly income per individual was $9.66 per person. This means that if these families are not producing any of their own food and are buying what the relief budget shows to be a minimum amount for a family receiving relief over a long period of time, the family has about $2 per month left after buying their food. This $2 per person must cover clothing, fuel, housing, transportation (particularly to and from the W. P. A. job), and all

the other incidentals necessary for normal family life, including such items as money for the children for school activities.

Of course you realize that while $9.66 is the average figure for this large group of families with children, many of the families have less than that amount, and the more children the lower the income per person, and since the W. P. A. wage is only a satisfactory wage for families of 2 or 3, for the very large families the W. P. A. wage means real destitution.

As a matter of fact this same study for Thurston County shows that the average wage for persons without children is $27 per month on W. P. A. If W. P. A. could be provided on at least the same scale it was last year without too much of a drop in quota during the summer months, it would be possible to prevent some of the ugly distress that results from continuous living on a marginal basis since the existence of W. P. A. does at least provide a backlog of security for the low-wage groups and if a normal number of people are kept on W. P. A., the effect is to keep up wages in the very low income groups, and to provide more income in the families depending on irregular employment.

Armaments, war buying, and the so-called upward trend in business have not eliminated the need for W. P. A. As far as we are concerned here we need at least as much W. P. A. employment during the next 12 months as we have had during the past 12 months. We are opposed to heavy cuts in W. P. A. quota each spring. There is nothing in local employment conditions to justify the cuts that are made.

Very truly yours,

RAY CRUIKSHANK,
Chairman.
FRANK PALMER,
JOHN MAGUIRE,
Board of County Commissioners.

With your permission, I would like to append the letter I have received from Hon. Carl W. Smith, acting State administrator, Work Projects Administration, of the State of Washington, relating particularly to my district:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Seattle, Wash., April 1, 1940.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Reference is made to your telegram of April 1 with regard to the necessary reduction in employment in the State of Washington.

Our quota of employment for the month of March 1940 was 33,230, with a reduction to 30,500 for the month of April 1940, and it is anticipated that additional reductions will be necessary for the months of May and June, but we have no indication as yet of the extent of the contemplated additional necessities.

It is estimated that there will be a reduction of approximately 735 in your congressional district. It is hoped that the major portion of this reduction will be effected by natural separations from the program; that is, persons who leave voluntarily to go into private employment or for other reasons. Additionally, it may be necessary to release a number of those with lesser relative need, but we are unable to base our present opinions on any actual facts until we know better how many people leave of their own accord. It may also be necessary to discontinue less worthy projects or units thereof in order to meet the new figures.

Yours very truly,

CARL W. SMITH,
Acting State Administrator, Work Projects Administration.

In conclusion, I desire to thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for your courtesy and know you will give this entire matter sympathetic consideration as you have in the past.

The Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, probably no agency created by the Government during the last few years has met with such universal and deserved approbation as has the Civilian Conservation Corps. I present a statement which has been prepared concerning the work, activities, and accomplishments of that organization, which I think is well worthy of perusal, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On March 31 of this year, the Civilian Conservation Corps completed its seventh year as a Federal agency for the conservation of the Nation's jobless youth and natural resources. During the 7 years that have elapsed since the first C. C. C. camp was established in George Washington National Forest in Virginia on April 17, 1933, the C. C. C. has furnished employment to nearly 2,500,000 enrollees and advanced conservation projects in every State of the Union.

These men, the great bulk of them youngsters between 17 and 23 years of age, have worked out of a huge chain of forest, park, and farm camps to build up depleted farm and timber areas, to erase the ravages of overcropping, excessive cuttings, fires, storms, and other despoliations. At the same time, the enrollees themselves have found a chance to receive job training, the lack of which prevented them from obtaining employment prior to their entry into the Corps.

In my opinion the day is not far distant when the C. C. C. will be established as a permanent governmental organization, because it has contributed so much to the conservation and rehabilitation of our natural resources, and because it has had such profound influence on the lives of the hundreds of thousands of youths and war veterans who have enrolled in the corps. Democratic government should give each youth an opportunity to earn an honest living, and the training and job possibilities offered through the C. C. C. is one tried and proved method of achieving this aim.

The late Robert Fechner, first Director of the corps, recognized this fact and continually worked toward a permanent C. C. C. because he believed that "the C. C. C. fills a long-felt want in American life," and that so far as it was economically practical its advantages should be extended to every unemployed youth who was unable to receive proper training by other means. James J. McEntee, his successor and long-time friend and associate, is firmly convinced of the need for an organization like the C. C. C. if the Nation's youth is to be properly employed and if our conservation program is to be advanced on the scale our soil and forest conditions demand.

Records from the office of Director McEntee show that approximately 13,125,000 persons have received direct financial benefits from the C. C. C. program. This includes the families and dependents of the 2,625,000 enrollees and administrative officers. Enrollees allot home $22 out of their monthly wage. In itself this relief phase of the program is extremely significant, as it has meant that more than $575,000,000 has gone into the homes of needy families.

To the whole Nation have come the direct benefits from the improvements in our forests, farm lands, parks, and wildlife.

The measure of corps accomplishments can be demonstrated in fact by actual work done. A few typical items of work completed in the first 7 years of the C. C. C. operations follow:

More than 1,800,000 forest trees have been planted in cut-over and burned forest areas and more than 200,000,000 trees on areas being treated for soil-erosion control; nearly 3,600,000 acres of forest stands have been improved through elimination of excessive growth and poor-quality timber and the clearing of deadwood and undergrowth; fire hazards have been reduced on 2,000,000 acres of forest lands; enrollees have devoted 5,800,000 man-days to fighting forest fires and 5,200,000 man-days on forest-fire prevention and presuppression; they have built 75,000 miles of telephone lines, 114,000 miles of truck trails and minor roads, and 5,550,000 soil-saving check dams to aid in fighting erosion; and they have carried on tree-, plant-, and pest-control operations over 19,350,000 acres.

Enrollees under the experienced technical direction of the conservation services of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and State and local governments engaged in more than 150 types of work and advanced a Nation-wide conservation program which embraced projects in every State in the Union and in Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Hawaii.

The corps worked in such fields as the reforestation of waste lands, the improvement of timber stands to stimulate rapid and healthy growth; the protection of timbered areas from forest fires, tree-attacking diseases and insects, and other forest pests; the improvement and development of forests and parks; the improvement and protection of farm lands endangered by soil erosion and the rehabilitation of drainage ditches in agricultural areas; the improvement of grazing conditions in the national forests and on the public domain; water conservation and flood control and the improvement of conditions for big game, migratory birds, and other forms of wildlife.

The work which the corps is doing in erosion control is proving of great practical value. Working under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service, enrollees have assisted in conserving soil resources on 13,000,000 acres of farm and grazing lands. They have helped farmers in all sections of the country to control gullies, construct terraces, plant trees, and do many other kinds of work which assist in soil fixation. Much of this work has thus far been done on demonstration areas under the direction of soil-conservation experts with a view to encouraging farmers to adopt similar soil-saving practices on their own land.

Enrollees have improved and expanded recreational facilities in National and State forests and in National and State parks and re-

lated areas. In National and State forests additional camping grounds and facilities have been provided, streams have been improved for fishing and other recreations, and needed buildings have been constructed. In both National and State parks, the work of the C. C. C. has been aimed at protection, conservation, and development for use according to well-laid plans worked out for each area. Projects have been completed for timber protection and improvement, erosion control, stream-bank protection, construction of picnic areas, overnight cabins, horse and foot trails and bridges, dams to impound water for swimming and boating, and various other types of jobs for the general conservation of these areas. All told, the corps has worked in approximately 1,000 National and State parks and related areas.

Government figures show State-park development has been greatly expanded by the C. C. C. Working under the supervision of the National Park Service, which supervises C. C. C. work in park areas, enrollees have built new recreational improvements and facilities in close to 900 State parks.

In addition to its reforestation, erosion control, and recreational development activities, the corps has helped to improve grazing conditions in Western States, aided in the rehabilitation of reclamation projects, carried on valuable flood-control work, the most notable example being the completed Winooski River flood-control project in Vermont, aided farmers by rehabilitating silted drainage ditches, aided the Bureau of Biological Survey in the development of a Nation-wide chain of wildlife refuges, built fish hatcheries and planted more than three-quarters of a billion fingerlings and young fish in lakes, ponds, and streams; spent thousands of days in emergency rescue work, flood relief, searching for lost persons, aiding after automobile accidents; and engaging in other activities of this nature.

A record of some of the major items of work completed during the last 7 years follows:

Structural improvements:		
Bridges, all types	number	47,020
Lookout houses and towers	do	3,910
Fences	rods	20,550,700
Sewage and waste disposal systems	number	3,170
Telephone lines	miles	75,000
Springs, waterholes, small reservoirs	number	21,200
Transportation improvements: Truck trails and minor roads	miles	114,000
Erosion control:		
Check dams	number	5,550,000
Seeding, sodding, tree planting, all types	square yards	938,000,000
Terracing	miles	26,700
Sheet-erosion planting	acres	554,400
Outlet structures	number	383,000
Contour furrows and ridges	miles	94,200
Preparation for strip cropping	acres	165,000
Flood control, irrigation, and drainage:		
Pond and lake sites	do	179,000
Channel and levee clearing and cleaning	square yards	64,200,000
Water-control structures other than dams	number	28,700
Forest culture:		
Trees planted	do	1,800,000,000
Forest-stand improvements	acres	3,550,700
Nurseries	man-days	4,570,000
Tree-seed collection:		
Conifers	bushels	793,000
Hardwoods	pounds	12,800,000
Collection of tree seedlings	number	11,000,000
Forest protection:		
Fighting forest fires	man-days	5,800,000
Firebreaks constructed	miles	64,300
Fire-hazard reduction:		
Roadside and trailside	do	75,000
Other	acres	2,000,000
Fire prevention and presuppression	man-days	5,200,000
Tree- and plant-disease control	acres	7,650,000
Tree insect pest control	do	11,700,000
Landscaping:		
Landscaping, undifferentiated	acres	208,000
Moving and planting trees and shrubs	number	34,700,000
Public camp and picnic-ground improvement	acres	53,400
Range:		
Range revegetation	do	146,700
Pasture sodding	do	146,700
Wildlife:		
Fish-rearing ponds	number	4,600
Food and cover planting	acres	80,000
Fish stocking	number	795,000,000
Wildlife shelters	do	24,000
Miscellaneous activities:		
Emergency work	man-days	470,000
Insect-pest control	acres	5,300,000
Mosquito control	do	223,500
Rodent control	do	36,000,000

Because of the size of the C. C. C. work organization, it has contributed to business improvement, both locally and on a Nation-wide scale. Virtually every industry engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of staple goods, equipment, or services has benefited directly or indirectly from orders contracted for each year by the Corps. Purchase of more than 40,000 pieces of automotive equipment, including trucks, tractors, graders, and bulldozers have added to the backlog of heavy industries. The C. C. C. operates a housekeeping establishment serving nearly a million meals a day, besides supplying the personal needs of from 270,000 to 300,000 men. All this means substantial orders from dealers in soaps, tooth paste, table and cooking equipment, boots, shoes, clothing, and food.

During the month of February the C. C. C. had an enrollment of 300,241, including 262,365 juniors, 26,640 veterans, 6,915 Indians, and 4,321 residents of Hawaii, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. The junior and veteran enrollees were maintained in 1,500 camps. The work projects are supervised by the various bureaus of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. The War Department has charge of the administration and supply work, including transportation, camp command, feeding, housing, and off-the-job activities.

During the 6-month enrollment period which ended March 31, 485 camps were under the direction of the Department of the Interior. These included 310 camps directed by the National Park Service, operating in national parks and monuments, State and local parks, and in park areas located in the T. V. A. area. The Grazing Service operated 90 camps in 12 western States. Thirty-five camps were under the direction of the Bureau of Biological Survey in wildlife refuges. Forty-four were under the Bureau of Reclamation in 15 western States, and 6 were operated by the General Land Office in Wyoming and Utah.

Of the 1,015 camps under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, 392 of them were directed by the Soil Conservation Service in developing soil-conservation districts and demonstration areas showing the best method of soil-erosion control. The Forest Service operated 321 camps in national forests, 177 in State forests, 100 in private forests, and 18 in forest areas of the Tennessee Valley Authority. One camp was operated by the Bureau of Animal Industry in Montana, one by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in Florida, three by the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md.; and two by the Bureau of Plant Industry in Wyoming and the District of Columbia.

While the enrollees are learning skills of hand, it is vital, too, that they have the chance to fit themselves better mentally for outside employment. The educational adviser in each camp figures in this important phase. Besides raising the educational level of the enrollees and preparing them to be better citizens, the educational adviser is an important factor in developing camp entertainments and other events to build up and keep up camp morale.

The communities near camps welcome the boys and make them feel as though they "belong." Every effort is made to improve and maintain cordial camp-community relations.

The C. C. C. educational program has proved so popular that more than 90 percent of the enrollees participate in it, even though this participation is entirely voluntary. It is a program that combines practical training on the job with academic instruction in organized classes after the workday is ended.

The educational program is under the direction of the War Department, with the Office of Education acting in an advisory capacity. All camps are now equipped with buildings devoted to educational activities, including two or three classrooms, a work-training shop, a library filled with textbooks, reference works, fiction, and a selection of daily newspapers.

On the work-experience side, C. C. C. supervision differs from ordinary supervision in that it is directed toward development of the worker as much as toward accomplishment of work. Enrollees are taught to get along with others, to follow instructions, to develop proper attitudes toward work supervisors and fellow workers, and to acquire proper work habits and job skills. The variety of jobs at which enrollees have an opportunity to work is shown in a recent survey of camps supervised by the Forest Service, which showed 323 different types of jobs available. The training on the job may be broken into two general divisions: First, the instruction necessary to make the untrained enrollee an efficient producer; and second, supplementary instruction directed toward further vocational development which may not be directly connected with the job at hand.

Training given in organized courses conducted outside the regular workday usually relates to the work and broadens the training being given on the projects if this type of instruction has sound vocational value. But if other subjects of high vocational value not related directly to the C. C. C. work can be taught efficiently in camp, they are also included. The whole camp experience—project work, classwork, living with others, and social relations—all is pointed toward development of the enrollee. The camp commander, the project superintendent, the educational adviser, and the camp chaplain cooperate in helping the enrollee get the most out of his stay in the corps.

Between 30 and 75 training activities or classes are offered in each camp, giving the enrollee a wide choice in selecting studies which will best fit him for a job. They range from reading, writing, and arithmetic for illiterates to subjects suitable for enrollees who have reached the college stage. They include, besides academic work, training in motor repair, cooking and baking, laundry, radio operation, carpentry, stone masonry, cement and concrete work, storekeeping, and dozens of other businesses and trades which go to make up the economic life of a community of 200 persons housed in a C. C. C. camp.

Besides the training received in camp, many schools and colleges located nearby have offered their facilities and teaching personnel for instruction. Others have made scholarships available to enrollees.

As for the health of the enrollee, it has been found that he gains from 8 to 14 pounds during his first few weeks in camp. Under careful supervision of doctors and dentists assigned by the War Department, the building of better bodies among these growing youths has become an important function of the C. C. C.

While the placement of enrollees in jobs outside is not a function for the C. C. C. alone, the personnel of the camps have worked steadily toward development of the enrollee for a job through instilling the basic characteristics of good workers and good citizens. The work habits and attitudes, job skills and productivity, health, general knowledge, and social attitudes have been key factors in developing his employability. This training for jobs has been responsible for an increasing number of private employers looking over the C. C. C. rolls when they have vacancies. They have learned to appreciate the advantage of hiring youths trained to work and to respect authority. As evidence of this, 538,576 enrollees have left the corps before the expiration of their enrollment to accept outside employment. This means that about one-fifth of all those enrolled since the corps was established have been able to take advantage of their improved work skill to get jobs before they completed their enrollment. The rest, or at least a large proportion of them, found work as soon as they left the corps. Some are with airplane-manufacturing companies, some with oil companies, others with construction outfits. The camp cooks have found ready employment in the restaurant field. The camp storekeepers have become clerks or bank tellers. The work training in forests and fields has led many of the enrollees into jobs related to lumbering and agriculture.

To assist in finding jobs for the enrollees, the C. C. C. has worked with State and Federal employment services and through State C. C. C. employment councils. Contacts are made by camp officials and by enrollees with employers in the vicinity of the enrollees' homes and their camps. The camp officials, through their experience with each enrollee, know his capabilities and often are able to direct him into a job that is best fitted for his talents.

I think that Mr. McEntee summarized the aims and purposes of C. C. C. very well in a recent radio speech, when he said:

"From the very beginning the purpose of the C. C. C. program has been to strengthen America by saving young men from the moral erosion caused by unemployment, and by the rebuilding and conserving of our natural resources. These objectives have been attained by establishing a chain of civilian camps where young men follow an orderly and well-routined daily schedule of work, study, and recreation, and where they are taught the old-fashioned virtues of hard work, regular hours, discipline, love of country, and the principles of good citizenship."

American Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., for May 15, 1940:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of May 15, 1940]

AMERICAN DEFENSE

Within the past 48 hours the American people have suddenly become aware of the imperative necessity of looking to the state of this Nation's defenses. We have been brought face to face with the possibility that the war abroad may be decided this summer and that the Allies may be crushed. A great many people are ready to agree with General Pershing's warning of yesterday that "the very life of this republic depends on the energy and determination with which our people undertake a task of placing the United States in a state of thorough preparedness in both men and equipment."

Within a very few hours this issue will be placed before a Congress which is more than willing to spend. It will be put in a new defense message from President Roosevelt which will recommend the appropriation of new hundreds of millions of dollars for our armed forces.

We do not question the importance of wasting no time in reaching a decision. The speed with which the German Army has crushed Holland and thrust its steel fingers into France has made it plain that the issue abroad may be decided before many weeks are gone.

But it is of even more vital importance to realize that spending is not enough. Voting more money is the easiest thing that Congress does. For 7 years now it has been frittering away the Nation's resources to the tune of 58 billion dollars. We are weak now financially, when we should be strong.

What it must learn is to concentrate spending where spending counts the most. We must be sure that whatever is spent from now on is translated directly with the least possible waste into the kind of defensive strength that is most urgently needed.

This will not be an easy thing to do. It calls, first of all, for a calm study by experts to determine where our defense program can and should be improved. It calls also, in view of the badly unbalanced state of Government finances, for diverting money appropriated wastefully and thoughtlessly to more vital requirements. This is no time for scattering and squandering our resources; we must learn, above all things, to husband our strength for the time when it may be desperately needed.

Additional Naval Bases in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Caribbean Bases Urged by Senate Naval Group," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of Thursday, May 16, 1940. I am happy to learn that the fine Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate recognizes that something should be done about conditions in the Caribbean.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 16, 1940]

CARIBBEAN BASES URGED BY SENATE NAVAL GROUP

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Serious consideration to acquisition of sites for additional naval bases in the Caribbean area, or to prevent their use as enemy air or submarine bases from which to attack the Panama Canal or continental United States, is recommended to the Senate by its Naval Affairs Committee.

The suggestion is embodied in the comprehensive report accompanying the new naval-expansion bill, a document from which much will be heard henceforth, since it presents a case for the United States remaining absolutely out of the present European war and takes issue, inferentially, with some administration courses of policy.

The recommendation relative to the Caribbean Islands, part of the strictly Western Hemisphere defense system outlined, coincides with renewed suggestions that the United States and other American republics should acquire British and French and Dutch possessions there in exchange for money the Allies may need for war purposes.

FLEET AIR BASE

"A fleet air base in the southeast corner of the Caribbean would undoubtedly add to the security of that area, as well as to the ability of the United States Fleet to insure the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine," the report says.

"The Panama Canal and its approaches must be fortified and protected to such an extent that they cannot be damaged and will be available for the transfer of our fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and vice versa, as necessary.

"The existing submarine and naval air bases there should be extended and improved. It might be desirable to reconsider the question of building a canal across Nicaragua."

TRUE DEFENSE

At another point the committee said:

"So long as our Nation possesses an adequate fleet, an adequate air force, and the necessary number of secure bases from which these forces may operate effectively, there is little chance of a suc-

cessful attack upon us. Our fleet, including the fleet air force, however, must be kept concentrated and must be superior in fighting power to any fleet or combination of fleets which can be brought against us."

The report of the Naval Committee, headed by Senator DAVID I. WALSH (Democrat, Massachusetts) based its case against any involvement in the European war on these grounds:

1. That the United States is not prepared to participate.

2. That if Germany's submarines and aircraft "succeed in overcoming the greatly superior fleets of Great Britain and France and destroying British sea power, there is every reason to infer that they could probably also overcome the United States Fleet if we entered the war and sent our fleet to operate in European waters within ready reach of short-range aircraft and numerous small submarines."

3. This would cripple the United States in its own mission, to protect the United States with its Navy, which could operate effectively from home bases to keep any hostile force far from our shores. This, of itself, the committee held, refutes the argument that the United States must enter the European war to protect itself.

4. Involvement in the war would require creation of a dictatorship in this country.

"An impregnable defense for America will be costly, but infinitely less costly in the long run than engaging in another futile attempt to 'save the world for democracy,' and certainly less costly than conquest and consequent confiscation of resources and enslavement of our people.

"It is believed that the American people are ready and willing to make any sacrifices necessary to protect their birthright and their liberties, but that they are not willing to endure the horrors of war to take part in the age-old quarrels of Europe and the game of power politics."

Let Us Have Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the clouds of war are hovering over almost all of Europe. The terrible disaster there appears to be most appalling. Hitler, with one of the greatest war machines of today, has been waging an unrelenting war of aggression against nations both large and small. The invasion of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg by Germany is indefensible. Yet when a dictator who possesses both greed and hate assumes to conquer the weaker nations and by hasty action invades the sacred precincts of those countries, destroying cities and killing noncombatants, it is then necessary that those nations resist to the fullest extent of their power. At this moment all Europe is aflame; the entire world is disturbed because of the unprecedented effort of Hitler to invade and annex a vast portion of Europe; the people everywhere are appalled by the viciousness and the terribleness of this war, and the people throughout the world look upon the atrocities committed with grave and extreme horror. The people in our country are greatly disturbed because of the agitation emanating from the battlefields of Europe. And some of our people are urging that vast sums of money be expended, in addition to those huge amounts which have already been appropriated for national defense at this session of the Congress, immediately for our defense program. All of this great agitation has been created by reason of the unwarranted invasion of neutral nations by Hitler and his forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is one time in the history of our Nation that we must keep our feet upon the ground and act with extreme caution. We must not permit our sympathies to sway our better judgment in this critical period. One false step made by our Nation at this time might cost millions of lives of our men and boys in our Nation, and it might cost our people billions of dollars in the monetary expenditure for war. We must step cautiously as we proceed. We must remember that we have already appropriated approximately $2,000,000,000 for national defense at this session of the Congress. We wonder, as we pause and reflect, what the end will be. Can it be that this money already appropriated, and the huge sums about to be requested by the President, are to be used to equip our Army and Navy for war, and perhaps actual participation in this war? And if the vast sums of money now available for national defense are used for such purposes, and we have no war, then the money will have been wasted. We speak of these highly important matters because we are now reaching the debt limitation in this country of $45,000,000,000, and that limitation will necessarily have to be raised if all of the requests are granted. We now visualize the necessity of new and additional taxes, if the request of the President to be made is granted. We are confronted with this very serious situation in our country. The administration now in power advocates, and with its majority in the House passes, almost any kind of an appropriation bill which will necessitate the expenditure of money. This money which is so ruthlessly spent and squandered is the people's money. It must be repaid by the sweat of the brow. The people of every class will suffer untold hardships by reason of these huge expenditures. It is with this thought in mind that I caution the leaders to act with great care and caution; let us take the time to deliberate over this grave situation, and let us not appropriate and spend any of the taxpayers' money which is not extremely urgent and absolutely necessary.

We have our problems at home, and these must be solved. We have the unemployed, the poor, the aged, and the infirm, the unemployed youth of our land and the staggering problems of agriculture, business, and industry, all of which now confront us, and these domestic problems are urgent; they are susceptible of solution and they must be solved.

Mr. Speaker, great agitation has become apparent that some of our people desire the Johnson Act modified or repealed, and that the Neutrality Act, which we now have, should be modified and changed. Any change in the Johnson Act would be a very great mistake at this time; and, I am convinced that our neutrality law, as the same now exists, should not be further changed while the conflict continues in Europe. I was one who stood four-square for our neutrality law as it existed before the so-called cash-and-carry provisions were adopted; I said then, as I say now, that the adoption of the cash-and-carry provisions in that law was a step in the general direction of this European war. It would be entirely fatal, in my opinion, to either modify or repeal the Johnson Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we stand steadfast for our country, and that we exercise our calm and deliberate judgment in this time of great stress. That we do not act in haste but that our actions be the result of calm reflection and serious deliberation. We must always be pro-American—never pro-Ally or pro-British or pro-French. We must consider ourselves, and our people, first—just as the nations in Europe consider themselves first. A firm determination on our part to keep out of this war is by no means purely selfish. We must remember that when the war is over, and such a terrible carnage cannot long continue, the world will be a tragic place. Unless there is one nation which is still strong and economically sound, one nation with a sympathetic and firm heart as well as a full purse, the distress of want, despair, and starvation will follow in its wake. Let us assume that essential leadership for the days of reconstruction and take our place among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a very interesting and important editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Wednesday, May 15, 1940, which editorial follows:

Already agitation has begun for changes in the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act, in order to permit loans to the Allies.

If we learned anything from the last time it is that we must never again lend to nations at war, unless we are reconciled to defaults and to such recriminations as have poisoned American-European relations for 2 decades.

Yet, if Germany's air power does not win this war within a few weeks or months; if this is to become a war of exhaustion—which is the only type of war the Allies can hope to win—then it is

inevitable that the United States and other American republics will come to grips with the issue of Allied financing.

If we made outright gifts of money or war supplies, we would be on the thin ice of belligerent partisanship, which might involve another A. E. F.

If we lent the money, the same thing might happen; and, human nature being what it is, we would once again become the maligned and embittered creditor in post-war years. "Loan oft loses both itself and friend."

Would the only alternative be to choke off supplies, even if German victory were thereby guaranteed?

No; we think the Allies have a better 'ole.

And we think the Americas have a happier choice than to sit idle while the dictators overrun the nations of western Europe, nations whose defeat would intimately involve the geography and politics of this hemisphere because of their numerous colonial outposts in our waters.

When a private individual is out of money and unable to borrow, he cashes in some of his assets to meet the emergency.

There is no reason why nations shouldn't do the same. If the Allies get hard pressed they can relinquish sovereignty over their Western Hemisphere holdings—at a fair price—and use the proceeds for the planes and other equipment they need.

And it would be only enlightened self-interest for the American republics to pay that fair price—even a good price, as friendly buyers—and run up a pan-American flag over the British, French, and Dutch possessions in and around the Caribbean.

We suggest this as a project to be undertaken by all interested American republics—the islands and possessions to be governed under a Pan-American mandate.

The United States itself has no imperial ambitions. It is not looking for more real estate. "Manifest destiny" is a dead phrase here. But in common with our sister republics we do have a vital stake in securing the defense of this hemisphere. And therein lies the tremendous value to us of these strategic holdings: The British Bermudas, 580 miles off North Carolina; the British Bahamas, east of Florida; British Jamaica, south of Cuba; the Windward and Leeward Islands of the Lesser Antilles (principally owned by Britain and France), which form a circle protecting the northern coast of South America and the Panama Canal; the Dutch islands of Curaçao and Aruba, closer still to the Canal; the British, French, and Dutch Guianas, on the South American mainland; British Honduras, north of the Canal.

Some of these holdings, like Dutch Curaçao and British Trinidad, are economically important; others are white elephants—they would be economic liabilities like our Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. But they would be worth a big price because of their importance to the naval and aerial defense of the Americas.

These possessions have no military value to Britain, France, and Holland, who contemplate no aggression in this hemisphere. But to the Americas, to the United States in particular, their intrinsic worth would be greatly augmented by their strategic value in the naval and aerial defense of the Panama Canal. Consider the cost of doubling our Navy—which would be a plain necessity if the swift acceleration of aggressive technique were to make the present defensive outposts of the Panama Canal inadequate.

The best definition we ever heard of trade was this—"the process by which two men get what each wants, both parting with what neither needs, both profiting by what neither loses."

The trade here proposed—where the Allies would get what they must have to defend themselves, and where the Americas would secure these defensive outposts against the possibility of a Nazi claim—would be just such a deal.

Return of the Minute Man—A Proposal in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN A. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BINGHAMTON (N. Y.) PRESS

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton Press of May 13, 1940:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of May 13, 1940]

RETURN OF THE MINUTEMAN—A PROPOSAL IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

After what has happened in new technique with reference to the invasion of Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands, it is entirely evident that for countries with any sort of extended coast lines the navy is no longer the first line of defense.

Over last week end we had some interesting first-person narratives from men who had seen what they were talking and writing about, describing the technique employed by the Nazis in landing surprise shock troops, particularly along the Dutch coast, in the vicinity. They were not parachute troops, although they were subsequently reinforced by troops dropped from parachutes. The first contingent came in with 10 Nazi flying boats that swooped down, taxied to the beach, discharged approximately 400 soldiers, each armed with a machine gun, and then were drawn up, to be left there while the detachment went on in a surprise attack on a nearby airdrome. Eventually the 10 transport planes were bombed and destroyed by British airmen. But the interesting point is that they landed in an obscure bay, out of sight of forts and sentries, with only peasants to see what was going on. They wore Dutch uniforms, and no alarm was raised until later when the countryside realized that it had been invaded.

Now Holland is a comparatively small country, fairly well populated. Yet, if those tactics had been carried out in sufficient force, they might well have won the blitzkrieg for Adolf Hitler as far as the Netherlands was concerned.

There is something in this which should be of particular interest to Americans. We have two immensely long and not densely populated coast lines, one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic. But along those coast lines, outside the centers of population and for some 350 miles deep into the interior United States, there are plenty of young men, middle-aged men, and old men who could and should be organized and trained for minuteman service in their neighborhoods only. The organization should be effected, not as a part of the Regular Army, not even as a fighting segment of the National Guard. It should be in effect a resurrection of the minuteman idea which constituted the first-line defense of the American Colonies before we became a nation.

Because of the function of State lines on the seacoast and because it concerns national defense generally, the plan should be laid out, organized, and carried out by the Federal Government. But the National Guard units of the various States, or their successors in depot units when they are mobilized, should be the agency for the Federal Government in the establishment of these "minute men" units.

A deal of flexibility would be required with respect to the size of the organized unit and the standard of physical requirements. Probably the platoon system would be about the best basis of organization, since there would be numerous seacoast communities where not more than a section or a platoon could be mustered within a reasonable distance of concentration.

Since such an organization would depend for its continuing strength upon men not eligible for first- or second-call military service in the event of war, the age limit should be wholly elastic and the physical requirements merely laid down in terms of ability to get around. Some of the best rifle shots in the United States today are men of 65 years and better.

It is highly probable that discipline would be entirely secondary to watchfulness, effectiveness, and totality of the organization. It is also obvious that wherever possible coastal enterprises such as fishing fleets should be included in this volunteer organization. People with motorboats should be encouraged to be a part of it, and every unit should have at least one "ham" radio operator—two, if possible.

On the question of equipment it is evident that while first training would be in terms of rifles, automatic arms should be supplied as fast as they may be produced and as fast as the units can handle them. Uniforms, we should think, would be a debatable and certainly a secondary consideration. Arm bands might be entirely sufficient. Experience in the lowlands in Norway has shown that uniforms work both ways, and certainly minute men so organized would not be subject to espionage charges if, as, and providing the minute-men organization were established and recognized as a formal branch of national defense.

As to the depth of such organizations from the coastline interiorly, that is also a matter open to considerable discussion. However, we have the notion that if the Federal Government were to set up such a first line of national defense, it would have immediate offer of volunteer organizations in smaller communities throughout the eastern and western United States to a depth of at least 350 miles. And that would be sufficient to take care of parachute troops just as the coastal organization, in conjunction with aerial patrols in time of threat, would be adequate to meet the sort of thing that happened in Holland and Norway.

Probably the organization should be confined to infantry work as far as arms are concerned. Again, because of the average equipment of the average American, it would be self-motorized. One jalopy would certainly be available to each squad. In many coastal sections there would be enough motorboats and privately owned automobiles to take care of the entire unit, whatever its size might be, in case of emergency.

As to training, we are inclined to suspect that it might stop with detailed knowledge of local geography, elementary map making for some, radio for others, and marksmanship with rifles and automatic rifles or machine guns for everybody. Some open-order tactics might be handy. But there would always be a leaven of World War, Spanish War, and even Civil War veterans to take care of any elective "squad righting" and parading that the unit wanted to do.

Since the people of the United States always do in a big way everything they undertake, we have the notion that such an organization would be a complete success from the gun; that it wouldn't cost too much; that it would have the effect of making millions of Americans defense-conscious; that it would be thoroughly traditional, and, perhaps quite importantly, that it would be disastrous to any fifth-column idea which might be designed now or in the future. It would give the Government an excellent excuse for better and more decisive control of amateur radio operations; it would unite the American people on a definite objective, and reestablish the citizen-soldier in the proud status he occupied during the earlier period of the country's history.

And if it were only used once—for one blasting 24 or 48 hours in this Nation's history, it would be worth the price.

So we commend it, as at least the nucleus of an idea, to the patriotism of practical America, which has not forgotten that except for the Minute Man of another day we would not now be what we are.

What Should American Foreign Policy Be Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM R. CASTLE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have read the speech made by Hon. William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State, before the Foreign Policy Association on May 14, 1940, at Worcester, Mass., and I deem it a most able, timely, and temperate presentation touching our foreign affairs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD:

Although politics never has and probably never will end at the water line, it is still true that our foreign policies are less affected by periodical changes from one party to the other than our domestic policies. Both parties have to have the chance to "point with pride" and each must minimize the achievements of the other. This sort of thing sometimes causes unnecessary irritation abroad, but so long as the fundamentals of American foreign policy are not touched, no great harm is done. Within both parties, moreover, there is a healthy independence on the part of individuals. This is as it should be, since it leads away from dangerous partisan consideration of primarily nonpartisan issues. Either party, however, drifts away at its peril from the fundamentals, from the traditions established by Washington, and consecrated by Jefferson.

I cannot enumerate the details of foreign policy as held by the Republican Party, because it is a free party whose members have every right to think for themselves. Still less can I define democratic policy, because within the Democratic Party, as between the New Deal and the Jeffersonian Democrats, there are profound differences, profounder even than between Republicans and old-line Democrats. I can only speak as a man who has for years been immersed in the subject of foreign policy. And as such I can deplore the fact that at this immensely critical period in world history we are having an election. The policy of securing votes looms far larger than any other. On certain points which I believe to be fundamental the New Deal, it seems to me, has erred gravely, and these errors injure its ability to give effective leadership in the troubled international waters. For example, the good-neighbor policy has been the basis of American foreign policy since the time of George Washington. Yet at a period of history when rapid communication has made us all neighbors the New Deal has restricted this policy to the Western Hemisphere. In addition, it has made it a one-sided policy, we being responsible for the giving, the others for the taking. The only healthy relationship between nations is one of mutual respect, and this perversion of the good-neighbor policy is destructive of respect on both sides. It has also caused the American Government to throw over the primary tenet of international law which is that the first and sacred duty of any government is to protect its own citizens everywhere.

As illustrating what I mean, the history of our relations with Mexico in the last few years is a dark page in American diplomatic history. The wholesale confiscation of American property under the guise of expropriation has been a disgrace. It has meant the ruin of many an innocent American citizen. The oil seizures were merely a much publicized climax of these thefts, which have continued from month to month. You have heard people say: "Would you go to war over delayed payment for the expropriation of oil property which belonged to American citizens?" The answer is that resort to war would never have been necessary if the American Government had said at the beginning: "Any nation has the right to expropriate on immediate payment of the value of the property taken. If you cannot pay, the property must, under international law, be left in the hands of the owners." If the Mexican Government had persisted the seizure, the American Government could have stopped buying silver. Instead of that, we increased our silver purchases by just about the amount which the Mexican Government lost in taxes on the oil wells. It is true that a few weeks ago the Secretary of State sent an excellent note demanding arbitration, a note which would have been of some value 2 years ago, before the Mexican Government had so deeply committed itself. Today it is useless, as the Mexican answer shows, but this is an election year.

The point in all this is that if property can be confiscated in Mexico, it can be confiscated elsewhere. This has already happened in Bolivia and the disease may spread rapidly. If I owned stock in South American copper mines or indeed had made investments anywhere on the continent, I think I should try to draw out as quickly as possible. But, that is not the point at issue. What strikes me as of extreme importance is that you cannot buy friendship, for friendship is neither gratitude for past favors nor anticipation of new favors. It is the frank and open dealing of equals with each other and must be based on respect. That is why I have spoken of the good-neighbor policy as interpreted today. It has tended to restrict friendship to the Western Hemisphere, and, even there, to build up a false friendship which will collapse at the first strain because it is based on purely material premises. With wars to the east of us and wars to the west of us, we should not try to bribe the nations to the south of us, but should make them understand, rather, that all our interests are identical, that on us all, as individuals in a group of free nations, there may well rest the responsibility for preserving a progressive civilization in this world.

There is little of this idealism in the relationship between the nations of the western world. Such friendship as exists for the United States is founded on exaggerations. For example, 10 years ago it was made quite clear to the nations of Latin America that we considered them our equals, that we believed that they would be fair to Americans doing business there as we should be to their own nationals in the United States, but that even if there seemed to be miscarriage of justice, we should never use force to protect American property. This was not enough for an administration dealing in superlatives. In Montevideo Mr. Hull signed a treaty in which the American nations promised never, at any time or under any circumstances, to use force. Of course, this clause was directed at us. Now, if we live up to the terms of the agreement, we must stand smilingly by even if, in time of revolution or otherwise, American citizens are being massacred. And, if there is enough courage left among us to defend our own people, we shall be hailed throughout Latin America as miserable treaty breakers. In international life, even more than in our domestic life, we must avoid exaggerated or meaningless promises. They only lead to contempt, and misunderstandings, and possible war. We have sold out for a phrase.

There is too much of the guardian attitude in our treatment of the Latin American nations. They are glad to have our money, but they don't want our advice on how to conduct themselves. They feel they have grown up and secretly resent being spoon-fed. We have got to treat them as our equals in sovereignty, but, if we do this, we must expect from them treatment as fair as we give them. Otherwise they cannot fully develop their own natural strength and will be open to all malign influences from abroad. The Germans know how to flatter—know that the best flattery is the appearance of respect. Even with the memory of Poland and Norway and Denmark and Finland still fresh, many a small nation will believe it can deal successfully with Germany and Russia, and the result will be disaster if these nations reach out to the Western Hemisphere.

I have said these things about the Latin American situation because the Monroe Doctrine is still in effect and there is no doubt that we must defend the countries to the south of us against forcible intervention on the part of foreign nations. This being so, we want our neighbors to be as strong in their own right as possible; we want them to feel that it is their privilege, as well as their duty, to share in the protection of the Western Hemisphere. I believe part of our obligation to them consists in not interfering with their legitimate trade with any other nation in the world. Why should the spokesmen of the Department of State emit a wail of sorrow when news comes that the Argentine is making a trade treaty with Japan, or when it is reported that special arrangements for trade have been made with Great Britain? We realize that the more closely we can bind Latin America to us in matters of trade the more we shall all be able to act as a unit when necessary, but we sometimes fail to realize that forced trade is more likely to cause disputes than to encourage friendship. We should repudiate the claim of any nation to dictate channels through which our trade might flow and surely we must treat others as we would be treated. All our relations with Latin America, then, must be aimed at the establishment of a self-respecting, friendly, and understanding group, which will maintain peace among themselves, which will be strong to resist attack from without, which will be an example to the rest of the world.

Your thoughts and minds are turned to the nations at war and you probably wonder why I spend time on Latin America. It is because, if we want to keep out of war ourselves, we must be well protected—must not invite war. If there is real and cordial understanding between all the nations of the Americas, foreign propaganda will have little chance, and it is through propaganda of one

kind or another that we are most likely to be involved. Friendship among our western nations that is based on respect and fair dealing is as much a bulwark against aggression as are fortresses and battleships.

Then let us turn to the world at large. We do not isolate ourselves by minding our own business. Isolation is impossible in the world as it is constructed today. But we should not set ourselves up as censors of other nations. We should not arrogate to ourselves the thankless office of the world policeman. As individuals we loath and detest the form of government in Germany and Russia, but that does not mean that the American Government has the right to tell the Germans and Russians how they ought to be governed. This kind of meddling lays the groundwork for war. We must always remember also that measures, called by the administration, "measures short of war," are in reality measures leading toward war. Too many such measures are being toyed with today. If, as an individual, you want to keep out of a fight, you do not taunt your possible opponent, deprive him of what he believes to be his by right, preach to him about your own virtue—this last is sometimes the most maddening thing you can do. Rather, you leave your opponent alone, carry on as you must, welcome the opportunities of cooperation when your ideas coincide. This is the attitude of a nation which really does not want to get into a fight. But we, today, are playing around the edges of war.

People who understand anything about foreign relations would be with me in asserting that foreign relations should not be conducted in the market place. I can remember many a time, when I was in the Department of State, when foreign diplomatic representatives came to me to complain of things said in Congress or in the press against the nations or the rulers of the nations they represented in Washington. I always told them that we had a free press and free speech in this country, that if Americans did not like the way their countries were conducted they would say so freely and that the Government could and would do nothing to stop them. But, I did not, as seems to be the custom of today, immediately call in the press representatives and repeat the conversation. There could have been no point in this except to curry favor with the American people. Foreign relations ought to be carried on with the aim of protecting the American people by increasing good relations with our neighbors. Publication of private conversations defeats both purposes. I sometimes was compelled to say, again privately, that I regretted inflammatory public statements made by responsible Government officials, this because officials can never speak in their private capacity and have no right to commit the American Government. No Government official, from the highest to the lowest, has any moral right whatever to make statements or to initiate actions which might lead this Nation into war, at least until public opinion demands war and Congress has considered the matter. It is commonly said today that the right to declare war is the only privilege Congress has left. That privilege must not be taken away because we should then be at the mercy of the changing moods of whatever individual happened at the moment to be President of the United States.

This country must not become involved in the war either directly in Europe or through the back door of the Orient. I join with you in deploring the Japanese attack on China and the methods with which the warfare has been carried on. But I also deplore the methods adopted by the administration in continually baiting Japan. If the American Government is willing to say to Japan, with the consent of Congress, "Unless you withdraw from China, we shall go to war with you." I have nothing whatever to say. I should not approve, but the action would at least be straightforward. But for the Government to play with threats and "measures short of war," all the time leading our unconscious country to the brink of war, is a thing none of us should tolerate. For example, when the Wang Ching Wei government was founded in China we naturally could not consider recognition, as we had already recognized the Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai Shek. But why shout abroad that we were not willing to recognize? That sort of thing is contrary to accepted international practice. Wholly unnecessary, otherwise we can hardly escape the reference that the declaration was made solely for the purpose of irritating the Japanese. When the Department of State solemnly proclaimed that there must be no interference with the Dutch East Indies, it did so after it knew that Japan had promised to leave the islands alone unless some other power tried to annex them. What could have been the reason for this statement, again, except to annoy the Japanese? I wonder what Americans, especially bellicose Americans, would think if Japan announced to the world that it could not look on calmly if anybody—meaning the United States—should attempt to annex Greenland. Such a statement would be impertinent, uncalled-for, and provocative. The situations are the same, except that it is our bad luck to be very dependent—as Japan is also—on the tin and the rubber and other products of the Dutch East Indies; whereas Greenland is sterile and, so far as we know, nearly valueless.

Unless we plan to get into the war, this kind of thing must stop, just as the official condemnations of Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini must stop. You and I may say what we please, as we do not speak for the American Government. Practically all of us want to see the Allies win the war. If our participation would assure allied victory, would assure a decent peace, disarmament freedom of speech, and, above all, the recapture by the individual man and woman of that spiritual liberty which has made the democratic world so wonderful—if such results could be assured we might be persuaded to enter the war, to sacrifice the present for the sake of future generations. But they are not assured and they are unlikely. On the contrary, the result might be just the opposite. The people of any nation going to war lose their liberty instantly. This has to be so to insure the efficiency of the state. But the liberty of the people is not easy to recapture when once the leaders have tasted power. We who are middle-aged and old can well remember that we fought one war to save the world for democracy. As a result of the war and of the peace, the world got Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin. Not the cause of democracy, but the cause of dictatorship was served. The dangers will only be intensified, I fear, if we are foolish enough to be led into another war. Are you certain, because I am not, that after another war in which we participate, representative government would survive even in the United States?

People say, especially on the eastern seaboard, that those who want to keep out of the war are selfish, are thinking only of the immediate interests of the United States. Of course, there is a selfish angle to the matter. If we do not look out for our own interests we can be sure that no one else will look out for them. In fact, we must be always pro-American, never pro-Ally, or pro-German. We must consider ourselves first, just as our friends across the water consider themselves first. If they want us in the war they want it for themselves, not for us. I remember once saying to a great advocate of the League of Nations, "When anyone of you is able to say he hopes the United States will join for its own good, not only for the good of the world, I shall begin to be interested." But a determination to stay out of the war is by no means purely selfish. When the war is over, whoever wins, the world will be a tragic place. Unless there can be one nation still strong and economically sound, one nation with a heart as well as a full purse, then truly the black horse of starvation will ride the storm. Few of you realize what it was like in Europe after the last war, when the thousands of those who hungered after bare necessities grew into millions. Few of you can realize what the humanitarian work of Mr. Hoover meant at that time. Few have the prevision that Mr. Hoover has now, when he looks into Poland, balances the food available before the harvest against the mouths which must be filled if death is to be averted. But, this despair and hunger in Poland is only a shadow of what must and will come when the war is finished, especially if it is a long war. If we keep out, as we shall unless the steady pressure of propaganda breaks our morale; if we build up a pan-American solidarity based on respect and common obligations; there is a chance that this half of the world may be able to save the other half when the need becomes desperate.

Many Americans understand this and therefore understand that it is not merely selfish care for our own good which demands immediate and drastic reductions of Government expenditure, the liquidation of unnecessary and extravagant projects, the facing of unpleasant facts in the good old American way. We shall have to tighten our belts, perhaps; we shall have to give up some of the luxuries; we shall have to strive as never before to bring about a unified and determined Nation; we must crush the class rivalry which has been spreading at an alarming rate of speed; we must restore the spirit of self-reliance and independence which has made this Nation great. Unless we do these things we shall be in danger of drifting into the war. Unless we make a beginning now we shall not deserve to keep out. Unless we carry through we shall be incapable of helping the world when the war is over.

People say to me that if Hitler wins the world will be a dreadful place to live in. I agree. I am sure, also, that it is going to be a pretty dreadful place whoever wins. I am certain that it will be no less dreadful if we are dragged in, and probably a great deal more so. Some people will tell you that this war is the dying gasp of civilization. Others will say that it is a necessary illness of the body politic induced by the twin poisons of communism and fascism, that the drastic remedy of war was necessary to restore health, that war is the sulfanilamide that increases temperature and suffering in order to cure. Certain it is that Hitler would not give up if he heard that we were going to be a participant. He is dependent on the United States for nothing. We cannot even help the Allies to close the blockade. American soldiers would have no such places to march forward as they found in 1918 in Chateau Thierry and the Argonne—and anyhow the administration tries to fool us with the idea that somehow we can get into the war when the appropriate time comes and still send no troops abroad. As well go out into a thunder shower and expect not to get wet. War consists in men fighting each other as surely as rain is water.

As a matter of fact, geography has so arranged matters that we can help the Allies without being unneutral. We sell to all who may ask to buy—for this is what neutrality means—but we can have the comfortable feeling that sales to Germany will never get through the blockade. And all the time that we talk about how we can help the Allies we do what we can to injure them in the Orient. We keep on baiting Japan and may succeed finally in driving that nation into the arms of Germany and Russia. That would assure the destruction of the British Empire; it would probably mean that Germany would win the war. It is true that Japan and Russia could not possibly pull long in double harness, their ideals being wholly contradictory, and it is said that this very fact would make a German victory sterile in the end. But it is far too

great a risk to run. We shall do the most good by learning to think things through, by being consistent, by determining in advance whether a certain course of action will bring the result we desire, and then by asking ourselves whether the penalties necessary in achieving the result make the move worth while. I am sure that gradually to incur the enmity of one nation after another is completely bad for us and is eventually bad for the world. That is what we are doing now by permitting our leaders to make promises that will never be fulfilled, because they never should have been made, by permitting them in the name of the Nation to attack verbally whatever in foreign lands displeases them. Nobody is infallible.

Then what can we do in this time of complete uncertainty? We may have to fight because we may be attacked. This is unlikely in the extreme if we are strong. At the moment we almost invite attack because we are unprepared. Our finances are in a deplorable state. We must not further injure them by going into an ill-considered program of military expansion. But there must nevertheless be such expansion and we must cut down along other lines to make it possible. We must build up our agriculture so that it could meet war or world-wide famine. We must take away fear from business so that the Nation will begin to go ahead again in all the arts of manufacture. We must reemphasize the dignity of the individual citizen because it is only a self-confident nation that can refute and drive away the fallacies of communism and nazi-ism. We must have faith in our institutions and in our own ability to improve those institutions as need arises. Is all this remote from foreign affairs and foreign policy? I do not think so. On the contrary, I am sure that only through the development of our national character shall we be able to meet boldly and effectively the problems that face us and the world. This is a time of extreme crisis and crisis means self-sacrifice when necessary, the clear-eyed and clear-thinking study of the questions which will not wait long for answer. It is a time when the narrower aspects of politics, which are always selfish, must be thrown aside. On a wise foreign policy our whole future depends, yet we see that policy today made subservient to the incidences of an election year, subservient to votes and, what is worse, to ignorant and self-seeking votes. Let's get together and clean our own house. Then, truly, we shall be able to help the world.

National Negro Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

LETTER FROM NATHAN WATERS

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more apparent that the Communist-controlled National Negro Congress is repudiated by our honest, patriotic colored citizens themselves. The large majority of American Negroes disown and condemn the activities of the National Negro Congress. The following letter from an outstanding colored leader in my district confirms the foregoing remarks:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
ALLEGHENY VALLEY BRANCH,
New Kensington, Pa., May 14, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT G. ALLEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Dispatches from Washington indicate growing concern over activities of a movement known as the National Negro Congress. It has been intimated that an investigation may be made by the Dies committee, occasioned no doubt by the recent convention of this organization in Washington.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, through its publicity department in New York, keeps its branches informed concerning such spurious movements. Please be advised that the National Negro Congress does not represent the majority of our Negro population, who regard it as being communistic and inimical to their best interests.

We of the Allegheny Valley Branch wish to state our position as one condemning this organization, and urge you to stand behind such action as will bring to light the subversive forces at work therein to the detriment of our race.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN WATERS, *President.*

Cooperation Between Labor, Industry, and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY DANIEL J. TOBIN

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a thoughtful and able address, entitled "Cooperation Between Labor, Industry, and Government," delivered by Mr. Daniel J. Tobin, over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co., on May 13, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The world is now in a serious condition, much more serious than the average individual understands, and much more serious than those who do understand desire to admit. Spreading gloom and discouraging pictures will not help us at this time, but it would be foolish for us as a people to refuse to see and understand actual conditions.

Outside of the United States and some South American countries, the rest of the civilized world is in a condition bordering on anarchy. Certainly the civilization of Europe is in great danger of destruction. Because of this condition it is necessary for labor, business, and Government to endeavor to work together as closely as possible, so that by each other's counsel we may continue to maintain a free government and uphold what there is left of our modern civilization, which guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion.

If the statements made by our best analysts, that the European and Asiatic struggle will last 2 or 3 years, are to be relied upon, it is dreadful and certainly depressing to realize what will happen even to some of the countries that remain out of war. If England is spending $26,000,000 a day, we can safely say that all the countries involved are spending, as a whole, close to $100,000,000 a day. The question that confronts us is: How long can this condition last? The resources of the whole world—certainly of the countries involved in the war—cannot finance this continued destruction of life and property obtaining from these enormous expenditures; and at the ending of the war where is the economic condition of the world going to be? There is no freedom for labor or business now in any of those countries involved in this struggle. In England, where labor unions are still allowed to function, restrictions are being inaugurated week after week, with the certainty that if the war does continue for 2 years more, all the safeguards of British labor that have been established over half a century may have to be discontinued and set aside by the British Government in order to carry on. The labor conditions in France, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries are at the present time almost entirely eliminated; not because the governments of those countries desired such action, but because they were compelled to put such conditions into effect. The rationing of the inhabitants of those countries has been substantially cut down, restricted, and from week to week other restrictions will be imposed. Corporations doing business in those countries have very little to say as to profits. Governments in both France and England have imposed enormous taxes, so much so that all classes of business and enterprise are now working for the Government, or to save their form of civilization, and profits are practically set aside. It is difficult, therefore, for me to understand the continued groaning of business interests in our country as a result of taxation. The worker in England receiving $3,000 a year, pays about $650 in taxes direct. The married worker in this country receiving $3,000 a year pays practically nothing, especially if he has one child. In France taxation is much higher. Besides this there are several other forms of taxes. Certain corporations in England are now paying in some cases 70 percent of their total net income in taxation. In other words, for every $100 they earn in net profits, $70 goes for taxation. The normal tax is 37½ percent. And still we hear business continually bewailing its fate in this country as a result of taxation, where on net profits the taxation is between 17 and 18 percent.

Labor enjoys more freedom today in the United States than ever before in its whole history, and, as stated before, enjoys much more liberty than labor in any country in the world. Recently every decision on every question involving the rights or freedom of labor by the highest tribunal in our country, the Supreme Court of the United States, has been in favor of labor, where some years

ago every decision was against labor, because most of the membership of the Court was composed of men who before appointment were the paid legal representatives of labor-hating corporations.

Still, recently a national labor official delivered an address over these stations and from one end of it to the other he did nothing but denounce the Government for the conditions under which labor was suffering, and strongly censured capital and business for not carrying on greater agitation to the end that Government interference or regulation would be prevented. Governmental bureaucracies, in accordance with the expression of this gentleman, are the cause of all our suffering. The claim is also very often made that there are 10,000,000 individuals, able and willing to work, who are unemployed. The purpose was to blame the condition on Government regulations of recent years. As a matter of fact, no one knows accurately the number of people unemployed. Personally, I question those figures, because there is no direct method of obtaining an accurate count of the unemployed. Yes; I fully understand that statistical bureaus have been set up and departments of economics have made all kinds of statements; and I answer that a great many of the statements are based on mathematical guesswork, and that until the full returns of the United States census, recently taken, are obtained by the Government, there is no certainty as to the number of unemployed. The one thing that has been stated, I think correctly, coming out of governmental departments in Washington, is that there are more people employed now in our country than there were before the financial break of October 1929. That year was somewhat of a boom year. There is no question but what there is considerable unemployment, but since 1929 we have had perhaps 10,000,000 persons in the United States that have come of working age that we have not been able to entirely absorb in our employments. The large organization which I have the honor to represent, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs, is a fair barometer of industry and business.

We have very close to 500,000 paid-up members, and 150,000 of those are running between the States hauling merchandise of every description, and at the present time we have less than one-third the number of individuals out of work that were out of work some 3 or 4 years ago. When the trucks of the Nation are hauling goods it is fair to assume that the wheels of industry are moving. But suppose we have six or seven million persons out of work. That is a condition that unless we relieve it, may become worse. We will have more as time goes on unless we try to step up industry, instead of continually harping and arguing and finding fault with each other. Labor, capital, and Government should put their heads together and try to create some means, or lay some plans, to remedy this situation. If unemployment could be somewhat minimized every year for the next 5 years, we might then be able to overcome this serious situation. It is my judgment that there will always be a chronic condition of unemployment which will perhaps embrace three or four million persons, because we have reached the condition in our country where only those that are most fitted for employment will be continually retained. In other words, because we pay the highest wages of any country in the world, generally speaking, and our workers enjoy the best working conditions when employed, industry and employers demand the best, the top-notch workers, in their employment. We must also remember that each year as time goes on we will continue to have coming to working age the same number, not less than 750,000; and the human brain cannot be crushed or its inventive, creative powers destroyed, so that new machinery will continue as in the past to displace human hands. Consequently, in order to relieve this dangerous condition, not less than 1,250,000 new jobs must be provided each year. It should never be forgotten that hungry men create revolutions and then all classes are destroyed. There should be no hunger, no want, in a country overflowing with plenty. The problem is for us to find a way out. I feel certain it can be done by the great minds of America within capital, labor, and Government. I realize full well, because I am meeting the situation every day, how difficult and how dangerous a continued unemployment condition can be to our country; but I want to emphasize the fact that unemployment is not nearly as bad as it was a few years ago, and that wages have not gone backward in 90 percent of the trades and industries of the Nation; also that conditions for both capital and labor are better than they were and much better than obtain in any country in the civilized world.

Criticism was directed by this labor speaker against employers, industry, big business for failure to protect themselves in Washington against governmental regulations, etc., etc. I am quite closely in touch with what is going on in Washington and have been for the past 30 years, and there never was a time in which capital and industry had stronger forces fighting against everything which would attempt to regulate them than they have in recent years. The trouble is this, as I see it: That anything the Government suggests toward regulation of business is bitterly opposed. Surely our governmental representatives in the House and in the Senate are fully aware that business cannot be destroyed or else the country and its population will perish. Every so-called injustice that the employers say has been heaped upon them by Government has taken place as a result of the abuses by business in the past or in the days before regulation. The national labor relations law would never have been enacted had it not been for the fact that employers, generally large employers, prevented workers from organizing. In other words, the employers are responsible for the national labor relations law. The wage and hour law, which all unprejudiced persons in our country admit is not unreasonable—30 or 35 cents an hour for a worker—why, even that was fought by the employers and their associations step by step. And now industry and employers are endeavoring to so amend the law as to make it practically useless. The result will be that labor, agitating on the other side and with the power of the ballot to elect its friends, will perhaps eventually insist on amendments upward instead of downward.

Intelligent labor officials fully understand that capital must have an honest return on its investment; that capital must make a profit in order to have labor better its conditions. Intelligent labor officials also fully understand that the Government cannot allow business to run wild without regulation, because we all see today that the demoralization in certain industries, especially in the railroad industry, has been due to the fact that for many years the management of those roads were allowed to do as they pleased with the finances and other resources of the roads. Intelligent labor officials, as I understand them, also believe that Government should not paralyze business by unnecessary, unwarranted regulation or by enormous taxation which would make it impossible to find business interests willing to risk their finances.

The time to prepare for the awful demoralization in the world of labor and manufacturing which will obtain at the end of the present life and death struggle going on in Europe and Asia is now. As a result of impoverishment, through the enormous expenditures of governments in other countries, manufactured goods will be dumped on the markets of the world for almost anything that can be obtained. American manufacturers and American labor will be seriously affected. If the war lasts 2 years workers in other countries will be compelled to work for just enough to keep body and soul together, to keep them alive. Therefore, it is my judgment that before that time arrives machinery should be set up establishing a program that will protect our labor and our manufacturing interests in our country against the onslaughts that will be made on our commerce by almost all the other nations of the world. We cannot reach this condition, establish this machinery, or bring about the necessary program without unity of action and without proceeding now to lay the foundation for a better understanding between capital, labor, and Government. After all, with all the grumbling going on from business and labor and from dissatisfied political aspirants, we cannot deny the fact that we are living in a country where freedom and tolerance obtain and where justice is meted out by a jury of one's own peers, and where there is no starvation and cruel suffering such as the people of other countries are now undergoing. We are a self-producing, self-supporting nation, having more than one-half the gold of the world under our control, enjoying overbounteous crops, not crushed with dictators, and with a free government.

Without ever hoping to have complete understanding between capital, labor, and Government, it is my judgment that we can substantially help each other, thereby helping the country as a whole, by working together, endeavoring to reach a better understanding. And it is my judgment that the first step to this end—or at least beginning to bring about this end—should be taken now, immediately, by the creation of a national board consisting of not more than three persons from each division, representing labor, capital, and Government, to the end that some program would be considered; first, for the purpose of laying plans to relieve the unemployment conditions now obtaining; and second, for the purpose of mapping out a program to protect the business and industry of our Nation from demoralization by cutthroat competitors after the ending of the present European and Asiatic wars.

Women Take Leading Part in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in advancement of aviation in this country for a number of years. It is definitely being demonstrated in the war in Europe that the airplane is more essential than battleships. Of course, we need a navy for several reasons, but I do not believe it is necessary to increase it to the extent advocated by Navy officials, by spending over $2,000,000,000 or more in one session of Congress. I believe that a large share of that should be used for aircraft of the most modern type. It has been demonstrated that one modern bomber can de-

stroy a battleship in short order, and that it is very difficult to transport or land troops when the enemy has a sufficient number of modern bombers at their disposal.

I am very happy, therefore, that the women Members of Congress are taking a leading part in the advancement of aviation. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] introduced House Joint Resolution 521, and Senator CARAWAY, of Arkansas, introduced the same resolution in the Senate. I herewith quote from the resolution:

Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of American women's interest in aviation, and directing their attention to, and urging their cooperation with, the coming Nation-wide celebrations of National Aviation Day, on August 19, 1940, and for other purposes

Whereas the development of aviation, both as an important industrial asset and as a strong arm of our national defense, is vitally essential to the welfare of our country; and whereas the partiotism of American women from the very inception of our Republic has been the inspiration of lovers of liberty, respected and admired the entire world over, and whereas today American women have a double interest in the advancement of aviation, first as a potent means of defending their homes against invaders; second, as an increasingly important industrial factor contributing to the pay rolls, and thus aiding recovery and maintaining prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That in recognition of American women's interest in aviation Congress directs their attention to and urges their cooperation with the coming Nation-wide celebrations of National Aviation Day on August 19, 1940.

I am very happy to lend my support to the passage of these resolutions because I have always believed that the women of our country have and always will take a leading part in every advancement of our Nation. The women of America have certainly demonstrated that my fight for granting them suffrage many years before it became a reality was well justified. Therefore I am proud of the fact that Congress recognizes the part that women have and will play in aviation.

They realize aviation as a modern means of our national defense. They have also played a leading part in the splendid safety record reached during recent years in the field of transportation. I feel proud of the fact that the women of my State and my district have always been well represented through the many women's clubs and organizations to which they belong.

I have every confidence that the women of this Nation will be the stabilizing factor in this terrible crisis to keep us from becoming involved to the extent of sending our youth across the water. But they will at the same time see to it that we are so well prepared with the most modern weapons, that none would even dare to think of attacking us or the Western Hemisphere.

Unions Protest Bill to Deport Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram from the Textile Workers Union of America:

Textile Workers Union of America protests bill for deportation of Harry Bridges by congressional mandate. Bill would override legal and democratic processes which have vindicated Bridges.

In addition, I have received similar telegrams signed by the following: Andrew Vigen, secretary-treasurer, Alaska Fishermen's Union; Germain Bulcke, secretary, San Francisco C. I. O. Council; E. F. Burke, secretary, Marine Cooks and Stewards Association; Henry Schmidt, International Longshoremens and Warehousemens Union, Local 1–10; J. Owens, recording secretary, Warehouse Union, Local 1–6; Charles Irvine, executive secretary, San Francisco-Oakland Newspaper Guild; E. E. Reite, Bridges Defense Committee; O. M. Salisbury, secretary, American Communications Association, Local 9.

The Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address entitled "Can Unemployment Be Ended?" delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D., at the regional meeting of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems at New Orleans, La., on May 8, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment has become our worst economic evil and our most baffling economic problem. This statement is almost universally accepted in America today. The situation which it describes is a new one in our history. While we have always had some unemployment, even in times of greatest prosperity, and a great deal of it in periods of depression, it had never before lasted so long nor attained such magnitude as it has since 1929. One of the first books that I read on economic conditions was Socialism and Social Reform, published by Dr. Richard T. Ely in 1894; but this volume does not mention unemployment as one of the problems of social reform. At least three times between 1907 and 1927 I wrote carefully prepared drafts of programs for economic reform by legislation, but in none of them did I stress unemployment. It was not until 1928 that I published a systematic discussion of that subject. Since 1929, I have produced some 30 speeches and magazine articles which dealt either largely or wholly with the unemployment problem, and more than one of these speeches was delivered more than once.

Why has unemployment become so widespread and why has it lasted so long? To this audience I repeat the same answer that I have given to some 50 other audiences during the last 10 years. The answer can be stated in 2 words: "bad distribution." To the question which forms the title of this address, "Can Unemployment Be Ended?" the answer is "yes, if the right methods are adopted and if they are applied over a period of 5 to 10 years."

I. BAD DISTRIBUTION

What do I mean by "bad distribution"? Simply that the actual division of the product of industry among our industrial groups prevents our industrial plant from operating continuously. The actual distribution gives to one group of income receivers more than they can spend for goods of any sort, and to two other groups less than they could and would spend if they had the money. The first group does not want to spend more for consumption goods and cannot spend all their savings for capital goods; that is, in the form of business investments. The second and third groups would like to buy more consumption goods but cannot do so because they have not the requisite purchasing power. The first group is composed of those who receive interest, rent, and profits; the second and third groups comprise, respectively, wage earners and farmers. Speaking generally but not quite accurately, we may say that capital receives too much purchasing power and labor too little.

Another way of stating our economic predicament is to say that too much of the national income is saved and too little spent. Since the great bulk of savings comes from interest, dividends, and profits, the obvious way of correcting the evil is to distribute less of the national product to the owners of capital and more to labor and farmers. If one-half of the national income paid out in the form of dividends and interest were converted into higher wages for labor and higher prices for the farmers, the improvement of business through increased sales of goods would very greatly increase the volume of employment. That too much of the national income can be saved and too little spent is easily shown by a local illustration. Suppose that the one-third of the people of New Orleans who now receive higher incomes than the other two-thirds were to save on the average of one-half of the amount that they now spend for necessaries, comforts, and luxuries. What effect would that conversion of spending into saving have upon the merchants and other classes of businessmen in this city? I do not need to give you the answer. Well, the evil effect of that hypothetical excessive saving by the higher-income classes in New Orleans is actually repeated all over the United States. However, the necessary increases in spending cannot and should not all come from the rich; it should be provided mainly by the wage earners and the farmers who would gladly spend more if they could.

The enormous expansion in business that would occur if the laboring and farming classes could buy their proportionate share of the goods that a productive plant could easily turn out, is indicated in a recent report of the National Resources Board. This report divides the consumer units of the country into three groups of approximately 13,000,000 each. The units in the lowest division had average incomes of less than $780 per year; the members of the second group received between $780 and $1,450, while the incomes of those in the top third ranged from $1,450 to over $1,000,000. Those in the lowest one-third were able to spend only $7,000,000,000 for consumers' goods; those in the middle group expended fourteen billion, and those in the top group twenty-nine billion. Obviously those in the lowest group could readily have expended as much for consumers' goods as did those in the next higher group, if they had the money, while the latter could have raised their expenditures very considerably if they had larger incomes. Recall that the maximum income of this middle group was only $1,450 per unit. If the lowest and the middle groups had money to buy all that they desired and needed, they would add at least $25,000,000,000 and possibly $35,000,000,000 to the amount of goods demanded and sold in the United States. This is merely my own estimate, but it is confirmed by the much more authoritative estimate of Boris Stern of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In a discussion of the report he says that if all the families with incomes of less than $2,000 had obtained between $2,000 and $2,500 annually, the total expenditures of all the families in the United States for consumption goods would have been increased by more than $22,000,000,000. In other words, the national income would have been expanded by more than 30 percent above what it was last year and more than 12 percent above the figure of 1929.

America has more than adequate natural resources, productive power, and human intelligence to provide all its inhabitants with decent conditions of living. If our underprovided people had sufficient purchasing power their demand for goods would keep our industries going at full capacity and our workers fully employed. Such is the long-standing challenge which our society proclaims and which neither our industrialists nor our statesmen have yet accepted.

II. ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT?

The great majority of American industrialists and statesmen, together with a majority of American economists, reject the greater part of the argument set forth in the preceding paragraphs. They maintain that our great quantity of surplus money and credit could all be profitably used for the expansion of business, the increase of capital goods, and the extension of employment, if only investors and businessmen could obtain that intangible and mysterious thing which they call confidence. Confidence, they assert, has been destroyed by the acts and policies of the present national administration. When these critics are asked to specify just what Government policies have produced this evil result they become vague, incoherent, and unconvincing. Instead of submitting facts and cogent arguments they repeat over and over again false assertions or empty formulas. As a matter of fact, few if any businessmen refuse to extend their operations or expand their plants, and few if any savers refrain from investing their money, merely because they dislike what the Government has done or fear what it will do to business. When either of these groups decline to put their money into new industrial operations, the main reason is that they cannot find a market for the new products. What they are seeking and what they need is not greater confidence, but a larger volume of sales. They cannot sell more goods because the necessary purchasing power is not in the hands of those who desire to buy.

To be sure, there are probably a few industrial and financial executives who refuse to increase their activities or their investments because they are not attracted by the lessened profits which result from heavy taxes or certain forms of Government regulation. For the most part these are very rich men who are not satisfied with fair or moderate profits. Our economy can very well get along without such exponents of avarice. There will be plenty of businessmen and investors left who are willing to continue and extend their activities so long as they see a fair prospect of decent and reasonable gains.

Even if we had full employment, great prosperity, and unlimited confidence, our present rate of saving would still be excessive; for the opportunities of investment today are not nearly as great as they were 50 years or even 20 years ago. There are two main reasons for this changed situation. First is the general fact that in the language of the economists our economic system has come to maturity. As Franklin Roosevelt put it in 1932. Our plant is built." In our most prosperous year, 1929, our industrial plant was operated at only 80 percent of capacity. Today the operating percentage is less than 70 percent. We shall need no additions to our productive plant until the purchasing power of the masses is vastly increased.

The particular cause of the decline in opportunities for investment by individual savers is the practice of great corporations of accumulating depreciation reserves, surpluses, and other funds which constantly provide all the money that they need for replacement, improvement, and expansion. Before the National Emergency Economic Committee (sometimes called the Monopoly Investigating Committee and sometimes Senator O'MAHONEY'S committee) a few months ago appeared, one after another, the heads of some of the greatest corporations in the United States—Stettinius, of United States Steel; Young, of General Electric; Sloan, of General Motors; and several others—each testifying that his company did not need to call upon investment bankers or any other custodians of savings when it desired to improve or increase its plant. The same thing is true of the great majority of the larger corporations. In the 3 years, 1935, 1936, 1937, 92 percent of the amount spent by American business for plant improvement and expansion came from within the concerns themselves.

How do the critics of the doctrine that I am expounding deal with this difficulty of decreased opportunity for investment? Partly by ignoring the facts; partly by indulging in naive hopes for new inventions and new industries. Those who ignore the facts refuse to examine the situation and content themselves with stubborn and empty wishing that adequate opportunities of investment will be found somewhere, sometime. Speaking of the men who take this position, Milo Perkins, head of the Surplus Food Corporation, says: "I find that most businessmen are intimately aware of the lack of opportunities for capital investment in their own particular line, but they do a great deal of wishful thinking about the large number of jobs which could be created in the other fellow's back yard."

Those who fondly hope that new inventions will provide a way out look back wistfully to the immense increase in capital investment which was created by the automobile. The same thing, they say, can happen again. Yes; but will it? In his last speech of the campaign of 1932, Herbert Hoover poured scorn upon the theory that our plant is built, and pontifically proclaimed that there are in the lockers of science, 10,000 potential inventions, which will provide almost unlimited opportunities for investment and employment. It is more than 7 years since that comforting assurance was given to the country, but not one of these 10,000 potential inventions has yet obtained actual existence. As the philosophers would say, potency has not yet been transformed into act.

Typical of this wishful prophesying and fond imagining about new inventions as a remedy for what ails us now is an editorial in Collier's Weekly for April 6. In this production, we are told that although the land frontier has long since disappeared there are great new industrial frontiers which will vastly and indefinitely increase the opportunities for investment and employment. But in a whole column of generalities and irrelevancies, we find not a single fact mentioned to show that new inventions will provide employment for as many as 1,000,000 men in 5 years. True, the editorial has something specific to say about the advances made in synthetic, organic chemistry, and optimistic generalities about possible new inventions in existing industries. This is scarcely an adequate basis for the large hopes expressed in the editorial.

Probably the most naive and unsubstantial of all the recent declarations concerning new frontiers in industry is that made a few months ago by John W. Hanes, then Under Secretary of the Treasury:

"Your group should have no sympathy with the view sometimes expressed that we are suffering from a matured economy; that our economic frontiers have disappeared; that there is not ample room in the national economy for new investments in enterprise. We would be sad indeed if we found this restricted philosophy accepted. It reflects upon the genius of American science and upon the drive and ingenuity of our people; it is inconsistent with our insatiable demand for an ever higher standard of living; it is repudiated by the achievements of the past and the prospects of the future."

Some of those who look for a solution of the unemployment problem through new inventions or increased investment without new inventions, assume that the proportion of the national income expended in the capital-goods industries must become again what it was before 1929 and argue that our main efforts, therefore, should be directed toward restoring this condition and this proportion. Obviously, this thesis is devoid of logic, and completely out of accord with recent developments in our economy. The simple and conclusive answer to it is this, instead of putting as much money into new capital instruments as we invested before 1929, we should transfer a great part of our idle funds to labor and the farmers. They would spend it for consumption goods, thus enabling our plants to operate at full capacity and creating a demand for new capital goods. This procedure would put the horse before the cart. New capital goods, such as factories, stores, banks, and railroads, should not be created until there is a demand for their products; this demand will not be forthcoming until farmers and wage earners obtain more purchasing power.

Giving a great share of the national product or national income to these two classes would not prevent useful new inventions or new investments. On the contrary it would assure a market for their products. It would provide a solid reason instead of a pious wish for hoping that the new products could be sold.

In passing, let me say that I have very little sympathy with the desire for new inventions as a remedy for inadequate employment. Most of the new inventions would probably take the form of higher comforts and luxuries. Far better would it be to engage our unused money and unemployed men in creating the necessaries and the ordinary comforts of life for the millions who are now deprived of these goods. These are the farmers and the wage earners, and their needs can be supplied without any new inventions.

I have presented the two conflicting theories concerning the causes of and remedies for unemployment. According to the one, unemployment can be ended only by transferring purchasing

power from those who cannot or will not exchange it for consumption goods to those who could and would do so if they had the money, namely, farmers and wage earners. According to the other theory, the remedy must come from increased investment and increased production. The great majority of persons who do any thinking on the subject cling to one or the other of these theories. I have given you the reasons why I believe that the first theory is true and the second false.

III. THE PROBLEM OF INCREASED PURCHASING POWER

Three principal methods available to expand the purchasing power of farmers and wage earners are: Lower prices, higher wages, and lower interest rates. In the fourth volume of the very valuable Brookings Institution Series on Income and Economic Progress, Dr. Harold G. Moulton relies upon the lower-price method alone. The present unnecessarily high prices, with their evil effects upon business and employment, constitute, he says, a challenge to the businessmen of America. Unfortunately, that challenge has not yet been accepted. Nevertheless, the situation is not entirely hopeless. The recently adopted methods of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice under Thurman Arnold give good reasons for believing that some prices can and will be reduced through the elimination of monopolistic practices. This is particularly true of building trades. When Mr. Arnold has cleaned up this mess, he may find ways to deal with and reduce what are called administered prices. While these are not, in the strict sense, monopoly prices, they reflect the same arbitrary performances and produce the same baneful effects. A substantial reduction in the prices of manufactured goods would principally benefit labor and the farmers, enabling both groups to obtain a greater share of the national income. At the same time the owners of capital would save less and have less to expend in vain investments.

Wages can be increased in various ways. One is through the activities of powerful labor unions. These should be encouraged and extended. A second method would be voluntary increases in wages made by employers who can afford the increases. This program would not only benefit the employees of such employers but would have the powerful indirect effect of compelling competitors to emulate this example. Unfortunately, not many employers are likely to adopt this course which has back of it no other compulsion than conceptions of social justice.

Neither labor-union efforts nor the voluntary action of employers will be adequate. The intervention of government is indispensable. Any intervention by government in the national economy is one form or another of a planned or controlled or regulated economy; and in this connection I would call attention to the amazing tirades against economic planning which we have been hearing from some candidates for public office and from spokesmen for industry and big business. For instance, President Prentiss, of the National Association of Manufacturers, told Virginia industrialists at Richmond that economic planning might eventually lead to the loss of our traditional civil and religious liberties—a perfectly absurd idea, of course—while J. Howard Pew, vice president of the same organization, described economic planners as men who "would have the Government do our thinking for us."

Why all this alarm about economic planning when no proposed kind of economic planning is specified? Economic planning per se is not a bad thing. Industrialists themselves have long had economic planning in their plants and industries. The Tennessee Valley Authority is a great and successful example of an experiment in Government planned and directed economy, and all our pump priming through Government expenditures for public works is another kind of planned economy. I am one who is not to be frightened by any bogeyman monster conjured up by those industrialists, and I would reply to Mr. Pew that perhaps it is high time the Government did do more of the thinking for him and his associates.

The form of economic planning which I suggest for dealing with the wage problem is a far more comprehensive program of minimum-wage legislation by the States and the Federal Government. Some 26 States have already passed such laws and the Federal Government has enacted a maximum-hour and minimum-wage law. All the other States should adopt similar legislation, and the Federal law should be adequately enforced and minimum standards should be raised.

In addition to the minimum-wage and maximum-hour law, in addition to all the feasible devices that may be employed to increase the incomes of the farmers, and in addition to any program of Government spending that is likely to be adopted, there is necessary as quickly as it can be contrived and set up, a comprehensive system of economic planning. This is a very large and complex subject, and it can be only briefly sketched here. Within the last 3 years several bills have been introduced in Congress providing for industrial expansion. The following description of one of the plans is taken from a review in the New Republic, April 19, 1939, of Mordecai Ezekiel's book, Jobs for All:

"The essential features of industrial expansion can be set forth very briefly. Every year a central planning authority would decide upon the minimum national income to be aimed at. It would then calculate the probable output of all major industries assuming such an income level. Finally, contracts calling for the calculated output, and including certain stipulations on maximum prices and minimum wages, would be entered into between Government and industry authorities, the latter composed of representatives of management, labor, consumers, and Government. The Government would agree in these contracts to absorb all surpluses unsold at the end of the year at prices somewhat below the market. Plans for subsequent years would have to provide for the disposal of any stocks which the Government might thus acquire. In this way producers generally would be assured of an increased demand, and the planned national income would quickly be translated into the actual national income."

Finally, interest rates need to be reduced in order to check the excess of savings and to transfer a part of the national income from the owners of capital to the wage earners and the farmers. In the last 5 or 6 years the general rate of interest has fallen considerably, but the process has not gone far enough. Every device that is within the reach of the Government should be employed to effect still further reductions. The goal should be a general rate of interest not in excess of 2 percent.

IV. IMMEDIATE GOVERNMENT POLICIES

While we are waiting for the adoption and effects of the remedies suggested above we should not forget that there are several millions of persons out of work now and that the situation in this respect is not going to cease this year or next year. Those millions of persons are human beings and they have moral claims upon the community. There are some indications that the community is becoming indifferent, if not hard-hearted. In the Catholic Charities Review, March 1940, the editor, Msgr. John O'Grady, has this to say:

"As one moves around the country he cannot fail to be impressed by the increased indifference toward relief of all kinds. In some places this indifference is appalling. People are no longer stirred by stories of hunger and starvation. One naturally keeps on asking, what is the reason for all this? Some say that the American people are tired of relief; others will tell you that it is a return to the old-time spirit of individualism. One, however, can hardly be satisfied with these answers and he begins to wonder if the attitude of the people does not represent a certain amount of helplessness: We have tried; we have done our best; there is nothing more we can do."

The only agency capable of fulfilling the obligations of the community to these unfortunate millions is the Federal Government. Hence, the W. P. A. should be continued and the appropriations for it should be increased. In his Budget message a few months ago, the President recommended an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the current year. This was only two-thirds of the amount spent last year but the President then expected that private industry would absorb the millions unprovided for in his Budget. We know now that private industry will be unable to fulfill this expectation and that unless the appropriation is increased, 800,000 unfortunates will be dropped from the W. P. A. rolls between now and July 1. Therefore, the new appropriation should not be $1,000,000,000 but at least one and one-half billions. Moreover, two or three billion dollars should be appropriated for a continuation of the P. W. A., to be expended on various public works but principally on low-cost houses. Finally, the subsidies to the farmers should be continued until farm prices have approached much more nearly to what is called parity.

The lower House of Congress pretends to be fearful about our large national debt. Some of its leaders frequently assert that under the present administration the Federal debt has been increased by twenty-one and one-half billion dollars. As a matter of fact, the actual increase is only fifteen billion, inasmuch as the Federal Government has proprietary interest in Government corporations to the amount of six and one-half billion dollars. At any rate, there is no need of increasing the national debt further in order to provide the increased appropriations suggested above for W. P. A. and P. W. A. The only thing necessary is to increase taxes.

Prof. Harold M. Groves, of the University of Wisconsin, a very high authority, points out that if the United States adopted the British rates, there would be available two or three times as much as is now collected by our taxes on incomes and inheritances. An incidental and very beneficial effect of such increased taxation would be a reduction in the amount of money saved and a transfer of money to those who would spend it.

If it be objected that this proposal would take from those who have and give to those who have not, the answer is, "Yes"; but the taking and transferring process would be done legally and ethically, not by crude confiscation. All taxation exemplifies this principle of taking from the "haves" and giving to the "have nots"; for those who are unable to pay any taxes receive police and fire protection and other Government services, to say nothing of relief and security against starvation. What is proposed here is merely an extension of the fiscal principle involved and an application of the moral principle which requires all members of the community to promote the common good and practice social justice according to their ability and opportunities. Speaking of the obligation of the state to deal with unemployment, Pope Pius XI said: "The wealthy classes must be induced to assume those burdens without which human society cannot be saved nor they themselves remain secure."

It is frequently objected that pump priming as exemplified in public works has not been successful, since we still have 10,000,000 persons unemployed. This is a very unfair statement. In 1933, when the pump priming began, there were between thirteen and fifteen millions out of work, as compared with 10,000,000 today; since 1932 the national income has been increased by 75 percent, and millions of Americans have been saved from starvation and utter degradation; moreover, the country is richer by billions of dollars on account of beneficial public works and institutions. These are solid, tangible results of W. P. A. and P. W. A. If the opponents of public spending were honest and logical, they would contend that the Federal Government should have spent nothing;

that it should have relied on private industry, private investment, and the magic of confidence to set in motion the automatic forces of recovery. Well, all those methods received a full and fair trial from the beginning of 1930 until March 1933, and we know how they worked. Those of us who reject as futile the investment and confidence methods now advocated by politicians, industrialists, and journalists should never let these critics forget the years 1930–33. We should compel them to show wherein their proposals differ from the methods which were tried with such disastrous results during those 3 years—those 3 years which are now unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

Public works can prime the pump in the sense that so long as they are continued they cause an increase in private business and private employment. The ratio, I believe, is two and one-half men employed in subsidiary private industries for every one engaged upon the public project. After the stimulus of public works is withdrawn, however, private industry cannot continue at the pace that it has artificially acquired. Even if the Government were to put into operation a program of public works so large that all the unemployed found either public or private jobs, private industry alone would not be able to continue this happy condition. Private industry would be unable to continue with full operation and full employment. The reason is to be found in the bad distribution, in the fact that the owners of capital still would receive more than they could spend and that labor would obtain less than it would like to spend. In other words, the industrial pump would not stay primed, unless capital received less and labor more than under the present distribution.

V. CONCLUSION

I sincerely believe that the methods advocated in the foregoing paragraphs are the only means by which we can end unemployment and remove this grave reproach upon our morality and intelligence. Even if all these methods should be adopted, progress would be slow because the difficulties are great. On the other hand, there is no alternative but futile and pitiful wishing. If we heed the objections to our program, nothing will be done. If we adopt this program, we shall make gradual progress, in the meantime taking decent care of the unemployed. The principal obstacle to the adoption of this program is a very old vice: it is simply avarice. Because of avarice, owners of capital do not like the idea of 2-percent interest; because of avarice, a small number of cattle owners in our Western States nearly wrecked Secretary Hull's reciprocal-trade program; because of avarice, the leaders of a few powerful labor unions join with building contractors to plunder the public and to render impossible housing for the poor; because of avarice, many employers are seeking to destroy the Federal minimum-wage law and the National Labor Relations Act; because of avarice every group thinks only of its own miserable little gains and neglects entirely the demands of the common good.

Mr. Thorkelson's Misuse and Abuse of the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the misuse of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the spreading of class prejudice and pro-Nazi ideas through the insertion of altogether too many pages of remarks by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON].

During the present Congress, up to today, the gentleman from Montana has had 420 columns, or 210 full pages of remarks, in the RECORD. This excessive and wholly uncalled for amount of space, at the minimum cost of $45 per page to the Government, has cost the taxpayers of the Nation $9,400—a rather large sum for the type of viewpoint the gentleman from Montana inserts regularly in the RECORD.

I might point out to him and to the House that if every one of the 435 Members had similarly abused the extension-of-remarks privilege—and every one of us would have as much right to do so as the gentleman, if we were so minded—the cost to the taxpayers would aggregate over $4,000,000.

This use of taxpayers' money would not be so serious in itself, if, through the use of parliamentary devices, the gentleman did not try to give the readers of his remarks the misleading impression that the many discourses that appear under his name were actually made on the floor, when in fact they were not.

What does the gentleman do with all these so-called speeches that are not made on the floor of the House but are inserted in the RECORD under leave to print? It might be interesting to the House to have this question answered.

My information is that the gentleman had 43 different inserts or speeches printed in pamphlet form between January 1939 and April 24, 1940, and their aggregate may reach close to 1,000,000 copies, and circulated under the gentleman's frank at the expense of American taxpayers. I wonder if he pays for the printing of the speeches or whether the expense of printing is borne by some of the organizations of questionable loyalty and patriotism for which he is fast gaining the reputation of serving as propagandist and publicity man in the House of Representatives?

COMES CLOSE TO UNFORGIVABLE MISREPRESENTATION

Mr. Speaker, lest the House forget something that it never should forget, much less condone, I wish to recall that it was the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] who had the audacity to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave to print one of the most damnable and amazing documents that ever found its way into the records of the American Congress.

I refer to a letter purporting to have been signed by the late Col. E. M. House, closest confidant and adviser of President Woodrow Wilson throughout the World War, to the Right Honorable David Lloyd George, then Prime Minister of England. In this letter Colonel House was put in the position of carrying on a conspiracy in the United States to actually restore the American Colonies to the dominion of the British Crown.

This monstrous and diabolical alleged secret state paper was placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Montana on October 11 of last year. It was, of course, later proven to be spurious. The signature was shown to be a forgery. But although the Member from Montana was later forced to admit that he had no proof of its authenticity when he placed it in the RECORD under leave to print, the RECORD reveals that he at first tried his best to make it appear that the signature was indeed that of the world-renowned Col. E. M. House, the friend of Woodrow Wilson. When the document was proven false in every line, the gentleman from Montana finally had to have it expunged from the RECORD, but he did not do it very gracefully or with very good will, as the following extract from the RECORD of October 13, 1939, page 713, will, to his everlasting discredit, forever testify:

Mr. THOMASON. May I ask the gentleman if this is the late Col. Edward M. House, of Texas, and at one time the intimate of President Wilson?

Mr. THORKELSON. That is who it is supposed to be; yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Supposed to be? Does the gentleman have positive information that it is the same Colonel House?

Mr. THORKELSON. What does the gentleman mean by positive information?

Mr. THOMASON. I am anxious to know the authenticity of this letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. I think, if the gentleman will read the letter, if he will review the things that happened since the letter was written and what happened before the war, and if he will take other things into consideration, I think he will find that the letter is authentic in the manner it is written.

* * * * * * *

Mr. THOMASON. May I say that Colonel House is not here to defend himself, and I think a rank injustice may have been done a very distinguished citizen.

Mr. THORKELSON. It is not a rank injustice. I do not care if the man who wrote that letter came from Texas or anywhere else.

* * * * * * *

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know whether it is the genuine signature of Colonel House or not, but I do not hesitate for one minute in saying that I have very serious doubt about it.

Mr. THORKELSON. The fact remains that the history in that letter speaks for itself.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to know if Col. E. M. House signed this letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. I did not see Colonel House sign the letter, but the letter contains factual history which proves itself.

SIGNATURE PROVEN AN OUTRAGEOUS FORGERY

Let us go over this remarkable forged document that the Member from Montana placed in the RECORD and so evasively attempted to defend.

In the letter, dated at "British Consulate, New York City, June 10, 1919," Colonel House is made to write to Premier Lloyd George that no stone was being left unturned to restore the United States to the British Crown. For instance, Colonel House is made to say:

From the moment of my arrival here it was evident to me that such an Anglo-American alliance as would result in the return of the American Colonies to the dominion of the Crown could be brought about only with the consent of the dominant groups of the controlling clans.

* * * * * * *

We are replacing with the song America the scurrilous Star-Spangled Banner, which, after expurgating, we socially ostracized. America, which has the same air as God Save the King, is usually played and not sung, so, in effect, we are conferring on this Colony the imperial anthem.

* * * * * * *

We have spread everywhere the Boy Scout movement and placed the 1,000,000 American Boy Scouts under Sir Baden-Powell (an Englishman).

* * * * * * *

Members of the Roosevelt (Theodore), Lamont, and other first families hastened to volunteer for service under our flag.

* * * * * * *

A number of distinguished Americans, including President and Mrs. Wilson and the Presidential son-in-law, have all been very helpful, and all the official family, male and female, have been zealous, even where they have proved expensive.

* * * * * * *

We are at present engaged in a campaign to Americanize the schools to make obedient loyal little Britons out of the undisciplined native young.

* * * * * * *

With the active cooperation of the administration, our "American" defense societies, security leagues, protective associations, and other extralegal bodies enabled us to terrorize, sterilize, and standardize—in a word, "Americanize"—the minds of the people and their legislators, so that their conduct, and even their thoughts, conformed scrupulously to the common pattern we had laid down for them.

* * * * * * *

But I cannot let pass this opportunity to record our appreciation of the innumerable ways in which the loyalty of Mr. Gompers has been demonstrated. He checkmated strikes * * * he controlled the labor press * * * he has made organized labor here more imperial than is labor in England.

* * * * * * *

British born and trained prelates, divines, and pastors have been provided as popular preachers here in many of the leading churches.

We are arranging to augment the number of British professors in the various theological seminaries here.

Within 6 days after the insertion of the humbug and fake document by the gentleman from Montana it had been thoroughly discredited and exposed as pure and unadulterated forgery. On October 16 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] placed in the record a letter signed by Frances B. Denton, who had been for 45 years Colonel House's confidential secretary, in which she stated:

I can testify and will be very glad to do so at any time that the letter was never dictated by Colonel House, never signed by Colonel House, never authorized by Colonel House, and is entirely and altogether spurious, purporting as it does to be a letter of Colonel House.

But the fictitious and forged letter had been printed in the RECORD, and therefore broadcast throughout the United States. The damage had been done, thanks to the gentleman from Montana, to the memory of a great and distinguished and patriotic American citizen. Is it any wonder that now we ask the gentleman exactly what he intends to insert when he requests permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

SPEECH OF JOHN A. MARTIN STILL REMEMBERED

On October 20, 1939, the late Representative from Colorado, the Honorable John A. Martin, took the floor of the House, and delivered a castigation of the Member from Montana unlike anything that had ever been heard in this Hall. Said he, in part, on that memorable occasion:

Mr. Speaker, I have read with the utmost amazement the curious document inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11 by the Member from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]. It must be the most scurrilous, the most reprehensible, the most un-American document ever printed within the two covers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It could only have been conceived by a mind poisoned against America and all its leaders and all its activities, and it could be credited by no man with sufficient knowledge and intelligence to occupy a seat in the American Congress, no matter by what fortuitous chance of politics elected.

I have read but one document in my lifetime which could compare with it in the impress of falsity, of spuriousness on every page, in every paragraph, in every sentence, in every line—the most damnable tissue of falsehood the human mind could conceive. The other document was an alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus, so manifestly absurd, so patently a malicious concoction, that to read it was to refute it. But, no doubt, when the occasion serves it will bob up again as it has in the past to inflame the minds of the ignorant and credulous against a great patriotic American organization which distinguished itself in the service of soldiers of all creeds in the World War.

Withdrawing such a defamatory and injurious document from the permanent RECORD does not suffice. What is written is written. It has been scattered to the ends of the earth in the daily RECORD. Its sponsor should be dealt with in such a manner as to visit the official condemnation of the House of Representatives upon him and it, not simply withdrawing it at his request, while still standing on his avowal of its truth.

I want to mention some of the illustrious American names and American institutions besmirched in this alleged proposal of a distinguished American to make this great Nation again a vassal of the British Crown, which is the whole purport of the document:

Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States; William H. Taft, former President and former Chief Justice of the United States; the entire family of former President Theodore Roosevelt; former Attorney General George W. Wickersham; Gen. John J. Pershing, commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War, contemptuously referred to as "Sir" John Pershing; Gen. Tasker H. Bliss and Gen. Peyton March, distinguished American generals of the World War, referred to as "Sir" Tasker Bliss and "Sir" Peyton March; William Sims, distinguished admiral of the American Navy, listed as "Sir" William Sims; Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor, repeatedly referred to as a most effective tool of the British Government in lining up labor for the proposed colonization of America; Elihu Root, distinguished lawyer and outstanding American; President Eliot, of Harvard, and President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia, alleged propagandists of British treason in America; Senator King; Franklin K. Lane, former Secretary of the Interior; William B. Wilson, first Secretary of Labor; Alfred Noyes, for 40 years head of the Associated Press, and owner of the Washington Star; Frederic Wile, distinguished writer; James M. Beck, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives; J. Pierpont Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Cleveland Dodge, John Wanamaker, and numerous other leaders of American education, journalism, finance, industry, and public life; too many to mention.

No American institution is spared—the American Red Cross, the Boy Scout movement, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Carnegie Foundation, and many other educational and civic and religious and charitable bodies are smeared with treasonable activities in this infamous document. A painstaking effort to besmirch is obvious in every line. Its slime spreads with every paragraph. It leaves nothing American untouched or undefiled. America's illustrious dead are held up to the scorn and contumely of all patriotic Americans.

No; merely expunging such a document from the permanent RECORD will not undo the wrong or meet the ends of justice. It reaches out beyond the confines of the United States. It is an alleged exposé involving our relations with all of Latin America and with countries of Europe. It seeks to array the world against the United States as a venal tool of Britain. Do not tell me that any man in his right senses could have considered this an authentic document or could have sponsored its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless he was thoroughly saturated with the rancorous mind of its author and shared his hatreds.

This righteous indictment, Mr. Speaker, every word of it true, every word of it justified, uttered by one of the best and truest Americans that ever occupied a seat in this historic Chamber, coming back now as it does like an accusing voice from the grave, should become a heavy burden upon the conscience of the gentleman from Montana that he will not be able to throw off, evade, or escape to the last day of his life.

HITLERISM MUST NEVER BE PERMITTED TO OBTAIN A FOOTHOLD HERE

And now, Mr. Speaker, I hope this is the last time that I will have to dignify by an answer the scurrilous insertions of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON], carrying the mouthings of Pelley, Mayne, True, Wilson, McWilliams, Trevor, et al., professional pail vilifiers, poison-pen Nazi publicists, and defamers who for months have been carrying out the policy of the Hitler-Nazi regime in this country as has been done in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, the Polish Corridor, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Luxemburg, and Belgium, all to create resentment against the democratic countries of Europe.

Hitler's methods in all those countries were against every principle of decency, justice, and fair play. He resorted to every possible foul means, even to the bribing of citizens to betray their own countries and permit their invasion and destruction by German troops. Every one of the countries that he destroyed had leaned backward to be neutral. They all had peace pacts or treaties with Germany which Hitler had assured them guaranteed their peace and safety. If Hitler wins this war, which God forbid, no remaining free and independent country can ever feel safe. Any treaty with him would not be worth the paper it was written on.

Months ago on this floor I directed the attention of the House to alleged embezzlement on the part of high German officials, among whom were Goering, Hess, and others. I stated then their explanation that these moneys were obtained for propaganda purposes, was not more than half true; that what they really used the money for was to bribe and pay men to turn traitors to their own homeland.

They connivingly charged real patriotic organizations and patriotic men and women with communism to detract attention from their own subversize pro-Nazi activities. Their continuous attacks upon the international Jew and Jews in general shrewdly and unscrupulously is being used to a far-reaching extent because so far they have been able to succeed in obtaining the cooperation of the Silver Shirts, the unchristian front, and professional poison-pen slingers like Pelley, Mayne, McWilliams, and others. Unfortunately, I regret to say, the cooperation of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] has been enlisted. He has filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with their lying accusations to such an extent that a gentleman in the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol has introduced a bill to prohibit a continuation of such questionable practices in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to familiarize those who might, due to lack of information and knowledge, know the source from whence these articles emanate, I have set forth to what extent the gentleman from Montana has been duped and used by these forces, because I cannot believe that these statements which he inserted were believed by him.

HITLER VIOLATES ALL RULES OF CIVILIZED WARFARE

Press reports in the last few days disclose that the Nazis have painted Dutch flags on their ships, that they have dressed their parachute troops in Dutch uniforms or disguised them as peasants, even as women, while still others have been found in the garb of friendly Nazi-Hollanders. I have never read of an instance in history when even the barbarians of old stooped so low in their warfare against an enemy. Hitler certainly has set a brand new code of "civilized" warfare. For instance, in the past it has been the custom for one nation to fight another only if it is at war with the other. But Hitler, under his code, invades and destroys other nations, all of them his best neighbors, whether he is at war with them or not; nations, in fact, with which his own were enjoying perfect peace. In the effete and humane past, even in declared and justified warfare, it has been held but humane and civilized for armed soldiers to confine themselves to killing enemy armed soldiers only. But under the Hitler code it is much different. He has his soldiers kill not only other soldiers with whom he is not at war, but goes a step further and has them blitzkrieg and bomb civilians and takes in women and children as well. No one will ever know how many women and children and babies have died already in this war, to say nothing of the thousands that have had their legs and arms blasted off, and their eyes shot out.

It is in the fear that the barrage of subversive propaganda that preceded and prepared the ground for the hideous destructive practices now existing in the European countries, that I am prompted to point out that the subject matter contained in the extension of remarks of the gentleman from Montana carry the self-same type of propaganda that Hitler used in Europe. Pray God that it does not have the same effect.

SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA IS AT HIGHEST FLOOD EVER KNOWN IN UNITED STATES

Within the last few days my attention has been called to several extensions of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will certainly have the effect of creating fear and racial prejudice. Many of these statements or inserts appear to be a deliberate effort to instill in the minds of the American people a fear of Communistic activities. To me it is clear that it is done for the purpose of shielding the activities of representatives of Nazi and subversive organizations who are, as I have stated, shrewdly and connivingly utilizing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not only to create prejudice but, also, for the purpose of injuring and weakening organized labor.

I am satisfied in my own mind that many of these articles were written or inspired by Messrs. Pelley, Mayne, Steel, and their kind, who are highly paid and employed for their propaganda ingenuity by subversive organizations. If the American public were aware that some of these men have been convicted for conspiracy, and that others are on trial in New York on the charge of conspiracy to overthrow the Government, very little credence would be given to the half-truths and lies emanating from their pens. But, unfortunately, there are many well-meaning men and women in the United States who do not know that most of their attacks are untrue and without foundation. When I worked to obtain the passage of the first resolution to investigate these subversive organizations and a committee was appointed, headed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and which committee did a fine service, and, later on, when I voted for the authorization of the Dies committee and large sums for its continuation, totaling $200,000, I was in hopes that such investigation would penetrate the activities of all organizations guilty of subversive and un-American activities. But, unfortunately, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] only superficially investigated the dangerous groups and devoted himself principally to attacking and investigating Government employees and labor organizations. He has missed a great opportunity to render a real service to America. He has failed to carry out the intent of Congress to investigate the real culprits working against American institutions, namely, the bunds, Silver Shirts, and unchristian front.

It was the work of the local authorities in Chicago that brought about the indictment and conviction of the persons who were charged with conspiracy. Again, in New York, it was the action of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, that brought about indictments of persons charged with conspiracy. It was only a few days ago that Mr. Hoover's achievements were applauded in this House. Mr. Speaker, not only the men on trial, but those who in any way aided them, should be charged with treason, because evidence has already been produced to prove unmistakably their possession of guns, ammunition, and violent plans to overthrow our form of government.

GREATEST DANGER TO UNITED STATES IS FROM WITHIN

Only a few weeks ago the vile machinations of the Silver Shirts and other organizations came to light. But the leaders, officers, writers, and publicists of these organizations, shrewdly and designedly, in order to minimize their treasonable acts, unerringly write about the alleged dangers of communism on the one hand, and then on the other, with malicious and deliberately false statements, vilify and charge the Jewish people in one breath with controlling the capital of the Nation and then in the next breath charge them with being the agents of Stalin and communism. The sole object of all this hocus-pocus propaganda is in my opinion to camouflage their own questionable and un-American activities.

Mr. Speaker, I know that tolerant, sane, and intelligent persons are not led astray by this loathesome propaganda, but there are many uninformed or misinformed who are not

familiar with the plans and purposes of the conniving and shrewd conspirators and thus are led to believe them. It is to be regretted that some Members of Congress, who take the following oath—

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter—

Seem to fail to realize the duty they owe to the House and their responsibility to the country.

If there is any danger to our country from within, Mr. Speaker, it comes from those repulsive forces that I have mentioned and those misguided Nazi followers who are endeavoring to accomplish here, evidently, the same frightful results brought about by traitors and Nazi propagandists in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

It was vividly pointed out to me the other day that what is being done to European countries may be done to the United States before long. I sincerely hope, however, that no degree of treachery will ever succeed in undermining the patriotism of our citizens. Contemplating the horrible disclosures of the methods of intrigue and espionage employed by the Nazis in the taking of the small, peace-loving countries on the other side of the Atlantic, I can only say that it is my fervent prayer and hope that our citizenry will awake to the dangers of the pro-Nazi propagandists who are now and have been for some time seeking to create discontent among our own people. To our younger generation do I especially appeal to ever be on the alert and guard against such false and un-American propaganda.

AN ANSWER FROM THE NONSECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE

In view of the many misstatements not founded on fact inserted by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON], in answer to the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, I have been requested to insert in the RECORD a letter to disprove his statements and, at the same time, set forth certain of his activities and apparent connections with the real subversive organizations which he has addressed in New York City, and cooperation with various men who are generally known for their reckless charges against the Jewish people under the cloak of branding them with communism. The letter, in part, follows:

On May 6, 1940, Congressman THORKELSON attempted to reply to the speech of Congressman SABATH (made May 2, 1940), in which Mr. SABATH cited the answer of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights to Mr. THORKELSON'S scurrilous attacks.

The word "reply" and not "answer" is used advisedly, for in the 11½ columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his diatribe consumes, he mentions the league only in passing; he just mentions, but does not answer a few of the many arguments advanced against him, and he devotes most of his time and space to a vitriolic, almost hysterical, attack on the Jews of Russia, Hungary, Germany, and the United States; attacking also the Catholic Committee for Human Rights.

We are concerned chiefly with the subversive activities of Nazi-inspired persons and organizations in the United States, and are interested mainly in those parts of his speech which deal with the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League and its activities. We will, therefore, answer those parts of his speech first.

In every court of justice, before a judge or jury can evaluate the evidence attested to by a witness, his reputation for veracity or prevarication (to use a respectable word for lying) must be established.

Let us apply this rule in our case.

Mr. THORKELSON states:

"The gentleman from Illinois next inserted over two columns of names of persons who are supposed to represent the sponsors of a paper called the Voice for Human Rights. This appears impressive. The writer, however, forgot to state that many of these sponsors have withdrawn their names because they found the Voice was edited by Jews who did not express the viewpoints of the sponsors, and for that reason these sponsors compelled the editor to make this retraction in the issue of April 1940."

What are the facts?

The editor of the Voice is Dr. Emanuel Chapman, a Catholic and an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Education of Fordham University, and there is not a single Jew among the members of the Catholic Committee for Human Rights.

To substantiate his claim that many sponsors of the Catholic committee have withdrawn because they found the Voice edited by Jews, Mr. THORKELSON prints 12 letters, apparently hoping that no one will read them and that everyone will accept his word for the statement that:

"It should be clear after reading these letters that the persons named as sponsors for this publication are not in accord with the views expressed in it, and this is perfectly proper and right, as there is no relationship between Christianity and Judaism."

But, if you do read these letters, you find that not in a single one of them is mentioned the fact that the correspondent withdraws because he found the Voice was edited by Jews, nor on account of finding that there is no relationship between Christianity and Judaism. For lack of a more suitable designation we will call it a pure misrepresentation.

In answer to our inquiry, addressed to the Voice, we have received the following reply:

"In response to your inquiry the Voice is published by the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights, whose membership includes more than 300 prominent American Catholics, both clerical and lay, all opposed, naturally, to anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, and all other forms of racial and religious bigotry.

"The Voice for Human Rights is the official organ of the committee," and its editorial board of seven consists of four priests and three Catholic laymen.

"Sincerely yours,

"EMANUAL CHAPMAN.
"Per T. DUNLEAVY."

We submit, gentlemen, in view of the barefaced "statements," by Mr. THORKELSON, how much credence should be given to any other statement made by the gentleman from Montana.

The first relevant remark concerning the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, which Mr. THORKELSON makes in this latest outburst, is in connection with his pet aversion—communism. In his previous three attacks on the league, Mr. THORKELSON accused this organization of being communistic. We quoted in full the resolution (unanimously adopted by 300 delegates representing 150 affiliated organizations of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League) in which the Communists are roundly condemned as "blood brothers" of the Nazis and common enemies of our democracy.

Of late there has been a tendency among the leaders of the bund, Christian Mobilizers and similar organizations preaching foreign "isms" to seek shelter behind the hood of the K. K. K. Their own ideas of totalitarianism, Hitlerism, nazi-ism, etc., are so palpable, un-American, that even your assurance on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Governments of Germany, Russia, and Italy are pure democracies, cannot cover the nature of their propaganda. These subversive groups have therefore attempted to mask their activities by joining the Klan as the organization whose claim of being native American, no one can dispute. We have proof that the German-American Bund offered thousands of its members to organizers of the Klan and on several occasions it was published and never denied that the leader of the Christian Mobilizers went to Atlanta, Ga., and either applied for membership or actually joined the Klan. That Klan cartoon, Mr. THORKELSON, was to show the trend of the subversive un-American organizations to hide themselves under the hood and nightgown of the Klan. May we take this opportunity of notifying your friends, through you, that their efforts to join the Klan will not succeed. To the best of our knowledge, officials of the Klan, at least in the Eastern States, consider the Nazi Bund, Christian Mobilizers, and Christian front, as foreign agents, preaching an alien doctrine inimical to our form of Government and, for the time being, want none of them. You may save your friends a lot of trouble and heartaches by transmitting this message to them.

In another of Mr. THORKELSON'S arguments against the league, he quotes from our answer:

"Perhaps you are not aware of the fact that our native Fascist groups, masquerading under patriotic or Christian names, are Nazi-inspired or Nazi-contrived. Permit us to bring to your attention excerpts from reports of their meetings."

And then adds:

"The letter then goes on and quotes from reports of the meetings of various organizations in which [neither?] I nor anyone else has particular interest. The purpose of these quotations, however, is clear, for the writer of the letter by implication attempts to slander me."

If this statement means anything, it means that Mr. THORKELSON denies any special interest in such organizations as the Christian Mobilizers.

Now, let's look at the record, and in this case it is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date, Appendix, page 2707, in which Mr. THORKELSON prints his speech before the Christian Mobilizers, delivered on March 6, 1940, in New York.

He quotes:

"Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here tonight, on the invitation of Mr. McWilliams, whom I recently had the pleasure of meeting in Washington. * * * Mr. McWilliams, from my observation, is one of those stanch Americans who believe in the principles of this Republic, and it is those principles, and the manner in which they are abused, that I shall discuss here tonight."

And do you know what Mr. McWilliams' principles of Americanism are, Mr. THORKELSON?

In our answer of May 2 we quoted some of the statements made by Mr. McWilliams. Let us refresh your memory:

On March 12, 1939, this "patriot" stated at a meeting in the Iroquois Hotel, New York: "We must hate, we must arouse the people, we must arouse the youth."

Do you agree with that Mr. THORKELSON?

At a meeting in Ridgewood March 28, 1940, McWilliams announced he was forming extermination squads to exterminate Jews when "the day" arrives. (Isn't this similar to the German "Der Tag"?) Do you agree with that, Mr. THORKELSON?

On October 16, 1939, at a Mobilizer meeting, McWilliams called our President "a murderous traitor." Do you agree with that, Mr. THORKELSON?

At a Mobilizer meeting held at Ebling's Casino on October 23, 1939, McWilliams said that "Mr. Hitler is the emancipator of mankind and that we need Hitler over here to clean things up." Do you agree with that, Mr. THORKELSON?

On October 30, 1939, at a meeting of the Christian Mobilizers, McWilliams said:

"It might be a good idea for the Mobilizers to take bedsheets and parade, carrying shotguns under the sheets."

Do you agree with that principle of Americanism, Mr. THORKELSON?

At a meeting held at New Ridgewood Hall, Brooklyn, April 4, 1940, McWilliams said:

"I am forming squads composed of the toughest elements I can find to hold meetings in Jewish districts and cause fights."

Do you agree with this policy, Mr. THORKELSON?

On November 29, 1939, at a bund meeting in Ebling's Casino, Mr. McWilliams said that he was ready to punch anyone in the nose who said that there was anything like one good Jew. Do you agree with that, Mr. THORKELSON?

In your own statement on page 5630 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1940, you state:

"I realize that there are many Jews in the United States who are not internationalists and who are looked upon as being ordinary, plain American citizens."

May we apply for the position of referee when McWilliams criticizes you for stating there are many good Jews in the United States?

And this brings us to another one of your arguments of why the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League needs its own investigation committee. We might not have known of these facts mentioned above and accepted your statements on their face value were it not for our investigation department getting full reports of these sayings and doings of your so-called patriotic friends.

You state:

"I don't know of another group that employs its own intelligence service and that conducts special courts for its own people. Americans are satisfied with our system of courts, so why should not the proponents of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League be also?"

This is a pure fabrication or a delusion on your part. Where have you seen, heard, or found out that the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League has its own courts?

In the report of the McCormack committee to the Seventy-fourth Congress concerning the Nazi activities in the United States, he mentions that the Nazis maintain their "Uschla," a secret tribunal to try those Germans in the United States who do not submit to Nazi domination.

Are these anti-Semitic outbursts placed by you in the RECORD so that the people for whom you are acting can quote them and distribute them without themselves being legally responsible for the libelous statements contained in them?

In its issue of May 6, 1940, Social Justice magazine writes:

"The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights is an organization of Communists and Communist sympathizers who seek to discredit Father Coughlin and other real Americans opposed to communism.

"That was the assertion made recently in the House by Representative JACOB THORKELSON, of Montana."

If this statement would be written in the name of Social Justice, they might be legally responsible for calling the anti-Nazi league and its members Communists. But the assertion that this was stated by you in the House of Representatives is the shield behind which they hide themselves.

Is this the purpose of inserting your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

In answer to a question by Congressman BLOOM, of New York:

"Did I understand the gentleman to say that he never heard of a Jew approving of his own faith?"

Mr. THORKELSON answers:

"I said I never heard a Jewish group proclaim its own faith."

How truthful this is can be seen from the fact that Mr. THORKELSON himself, on April 11, quoted the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee, and the B'nai B'rith, all organizations fighting subversive activities in the United States, all of them proclaiming that they are Jewish groups.

And has the gentleman from Montana heard of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the United Jewish Appeal, which gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to committees helping Christian refugees, victims of Nazi Germany, and had but recently given $250,000 for Catholic and Protestant refugees? Has the gentleman from Montana ever heard about the Jewish federations and the Jewish welfare boards all over the United States?

How does this tally with your statement, Mr. THORKELSON: "I have never yet heard a Jewish group proclaim its own faith?" Have you no respect for the meaning of words?

NON-SECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE
TO CHAMPION HUMAN RIGHTS.

The Maine National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of my speech at the recognition dinner of Bangor Chamber of Commerce in honor of Maine National Guard at Bangor House, Thursday, March 28, 1940:

As recruiting officer for the Third Infantry of the Maine National Guard during the World War and as its first regimental adjutant under Col. Harry N. Bigelow, I have always been profoundly appreciative of the self-sacrificing service rendered by members of the National Guard in war and peace.

The old Third Infantry was highly honored when it was permitted to take over the designation and become custodian of the great traditions of the One Hundred and Third Infantry. Transferring later to the Field Artillery, I learned a little of the old-time rivalry between the different arms of our defense.

A visit to Plattsburg last summer to observe the modern style in infantry equipment with a gas mask, an automatic rifle, a baby tank, and a portable radio receiving set thrown in for good measure leaves one somewhat aghast.

The old argument between the different arms of the service as to which really counts the most begins to disappear as all branches become increasingly mechanized.

Mechanically minded youth are more and more required, and we may proudly recall the verdict of Henry Ford that New England was the greatest reservoir of mechanical talent the world had ever known.

The simple requirements of an assembly line do not suffice when a modern army is on the march.

Then a Yankee tinker is imperatively required. Finland and Russia have just revealed this difference in most impressive style.

In the machine shops of America will be trained the boys who in the future will be the backbone of our defense on land and sea and above all in the air.

The Bangor Chamber of Commerce is to be highly commended for this recognition dinner for the unselfish and patriotic service rendered by the members of the National Guard in Maine. Civic bodies everywhere may well make such an observance an annual event.

Loyalty to our country and its institutions is the dominating motive in the sacrifice of the boys who give so generously of their time to be prepared to serve their country or their community in any period of emergency.

Let Us Be Pro-American and Keep the United States Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over a Nation-wide hook-up, Saturday, May

11, 1940, on the subject Let Us Be Pro-American and Keep the United States Out of War.

Ladies and gentlemen, during our Revolutionary War with Great Britain the Father of our Country, Gen. George Washington, on the eve of the Battle of Trenton, suspecting some of his men might betray his military plans, was reputed to have given the command, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

In the light of our present-day interest in international affairs, I believe George Washington's advice to be timely. Paid propagandists, through the medium of the radio, the pulpit, the motion-picture screen, and the stage, are daily endeavoring to embroil us once again in the blood business of Europe. Let us follow Washington's advice and "put none but Americans on guard tonight."

The war propaganda of today is uncanny in its parallel with that preceding our entrance into the last World War. Unless checked, we are following, step by step, the road that led us to war 23 years ago. Then we were told we ought to be pro-Ally to save the world for democracy. On all sides we are told today we must be pro-Ally to save the republican form of government established by George Washington and the founding fathers.

False and vicious stories of atrocities that never happened inflamed the passions of the American people to such extent that in good faith the Congress of the United States was driven to declare war. The Government was forced to mobilize approximately 4,757,240 Americans—our finest manhood. It seems but yesterday that these young American boys were marching down Market Street in San Francisco, marching down State Street in Chicago, marching down Broadway in New York City, marching down Main Street in every city, town, and hamlet. Remember the enthusiastic farewells from friends and relatives, the ticker-tape confetti, and the strains of military music as the boys marched away? We saw them to the ports of embarkation; we saw them packed like sardines on transports, to be convoyed across the stormy Atlantic to the battlefields of Europe. There, in the filth and horror of the trenches, our American boys took their stand.

America sent 2,747,882 boys to Europe in the last World War. Of these boys, 113,280, never came back. They were killed in action or died from wound and disease. There were 200,430 wounded in battle, many of whom are today in war veterans' hospitals. Many are without legs and arms, some are raving maniacs because of that horrible conflict. Others are sightless, the tapping of canes their only guide through halls and grounds of their hospital homes.

Practically all men returning from Europe after the armistice of November 1918 have suffered social and economic dislocations resulting from our participation in that "war to end all wars." Added to the loss of life is the tremendous expense of compensations, hospitalizations, and pensions. These veterans average 45 years of age, many of whom are unemployed because of the mass-production and highly industrialized system under which we operate. All this came about because we forgot the warning of George Washington to avoid entangling alliances with foreign powers.

Let us return to the sound and safe principles of America's first isolationist—George Washington—then the mistakes of 1917 will not be repeated. Today in many quarters of the United States the term "isolationist" is viewed with suspicion. Assert yourself pro-American today and certain interests characterize you as pro-German or pro-Communist.

We did not create these modern Napoleons. The philosophy of Hitler and Stalin, their cruel and ungodly treatment of minority groups, is repugnant to any decent American. Nor are we responsible for the imperialistic philosophy of the so-called synthetic democracies of Great Britain and France. Between them they hold in subjection almost one-fourth of the world's population and control practically one-third of the world's territory. Imperialism is the breeder of nazi-ism and communism.

To pull the chestnuts out of the fire for any imperialistic group is not our responsibility. There is no obligation on our part to destroy the dictators of Europe—they will destroy themselves. There are those who are concerned with the preservation or destruction of the Siegfried, Maginot, and the Mannerheim lines. But I say we have but one line to watch—the bread line of America. With 10 million unemployed, one-third of our population ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, it is our duty to be concerned with our domestic affairs and not the international affairs of Europe.

We loaned to the Allies in the World War $14,000,000,000. There remains approximately $11,000,000,000 still due Uncle Sam, termed by these debtor nations "Uncle Shylock." Consistent efforts have been made to cancel war debts, but, thank God, the American public has remained determined not to cancel these debts.

Recently I accepted to act as vice chairman of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee, headed by United States Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN. Our committee agrees with the somewhat silent but great American President, Calvin Coolidge, who when pressed for a statement on the war-debts problem said, "They hired the money, didn't they?" We reply, "Yes; and we demand payment now."

We ask your support of the Reynolds-Randolph resolution now pending in Congress. This resolution advocates negotiations for part payment of the war debt the acquisition of the British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras. The possession of these islands will strengthen our military and naval defense, not leaving our position in the Caribbean too exposed if the time should come when we would have to defend the Monroe Doctrine on this Western Continent.

Tomorrow is Mother's Day. From every pulpit will be offered a prayer for peace. We too implore the Almighty God to protect the United States from the insanity of war and to spare us a new group of Gold Star Mothers. The women of the country, through the exercise of the ballot, will keep us out of war. Their voice was silent in 1917 because they were disfranchised, but today they can speak forcefully on this question.

The people who were regimented in the last World War know its price. They know the restrictions of civil liberties when a formal declaration of war is passed by Congress. Two steps toward war have already been taken—that must be clear to every thinking American. The so-called social visit of the British King and Queen to America a year ago was an official visit to pave the way for lifting the arms embargo. Lifting the embargo was step No. 2. Two more steps remain—the repeal of the Johnson Act and the declaration of war.

Repeal of the Johnson Act denying credit to foreign nations in default of war debts is being urged by certain financial interests, and the war mongers of Europe. When this happens, then the declaration of war is inevitable, and boys, boys, American boys, once more will be led to slaughter.

The British propagandist, the Honorable Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty, recently expressing the gratitude of his country to the United States for lifting the arms embargo said, "We are grateful for all this, we do not need your men"—and then he hesitated and said—"not yet."

As in the last World War, newspapers will be subsidized in the interest of the Allies. Again they will play a strong part in molding public opinion for one war group or the other in Europe. The distinguished American author, Quincy Howe, in his book "England Expects Every American To Do His Duty," summarizes the case for the isolationist foreign policy in these words:

"An isolationist foreign policy serves not only the interests of the American people but the interest of civilization, democracy, and progress throughout the world. It will deliver the very goods that the British network only promises.

"A self-sufficient America promoted Western civilization by preserving it in the one country where it has not gone into a decline. Furthermore, an isolated America will not uphold England's dead hand over one-quarter of the earth's surface. Other nations will have a chance to find their place in the sun. Nor will the British people stand to gain the least from a collapse of the British Empire.

"A self-sufficient America promotes democracy by preserving it in its country of origin. The moment the United States fights the war of aggression into which the British network is now forcing it—in the name of peace and democracy—it will establish a dictatorship on its own soil."

To be pro-American is to love the land of our birth or adoption and to defend it at all costs. To be pro-American is to be concerned with our own domestic affairs and not to assume the role of money lender and policeman for the entire world.

The next Congress may be a war Congress. Before it is too late, express your sentiments to those who represent you in the law-making body of the United States. Insist that they be real Americans; insist that the lives of American boys be not sacrificed to the interests of the munition makers and the international bankers.

Gen. Smedley Butler has very frankly characterized war as a racket. Henry Ford is reputed to have said, "If the world were rid of 50 individuals, there would be no more war." Modern warfare adopts a new technique in these so-called undeclared wars. Can anyone in this audience explain why despite our protest of neutrality—and I frankly say we are not neutral—why we loaned twenty-five million to China to fight Japan, and then sell our scrap iron to Japan to be processed into cannon to fight the Chinese? Can anyone tell me why we loaned $20,000,000 to Finland, and at the same time purchase Russian gold, and sell oil and gasoline to the Soviet Union to service their bombers to kill the Finns? Can anyone explain why the warring powers of Europe have agreed not to bomb each other's munition dumps? Can anyone explain why the Allies stood idly by and refused to go to the aid of bleeding Poland; stood by and saw the partition of Czechoslovakia, and the abject surrender of gallant Finland, without giving any one of these small nations material help?

It is all very well for the experts on international law to proclaim that we can remain neutral by selling war materials to the conflicting groups in these undeclared wars. But how can you explain to the plain people of the United States, who after all pay the cost of war and furnish the boys for cannon fodder? Explain the morality of the situation, even though technically it meets the requirement of international law.

We want your support of the Ludlow amendment to the Constitution, providing for a referendum by the people before we enter a contest in any foreign war.

Four million young men between the ages of 18 and 25 are unemployed, young men who are the sons and brothers of World War veterans. We want you to organize and be pro-American to protect the best interests of our country. To the parents of these youngsters we say organize now. It may be too late, and that fateful day may come when the telegram may come to your home from the War Department regretfully informing that your son

John was killed in battle today. One Unknown Soldier Memorial is more than enough for one generation to stand. Be pro-American. Follow Washington's admonition, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

How Accurate Are Public-Opinion Polls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

PAPER BY ABE BLANAR, GRADUATE STUDENT AT UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper by Abe Blanar:

With the 1940 Presidential election on the horizon, interest increases in the prognostication of the American Institute of Public Opinion. For 4 years the Gallup poll has predicted the outcome of elections and the division of opinion on public questions. Today it is widely accepted as a precise instrument by which public opinion can be measured. The same unstinting praise which was once showered on the Literary Digest poll is now lavished on the institute poll.

Political commentators recall with satisfaction how the Gallup poll came within 1 percent in predicting the outcome of the Dewey-Lehman contest. Gallup's sample showed 50.2 percent of the voters favored Lehman. On election day 50.7 percent of the major party votes were cast for Lehman. What the political commentators overlook is that sampling is an inductive process which has definite limits of error. These limits of error have been determined by mathematicians and are reproduced in Gallup's pamphlet, the Scientific Measurement of Public Opinion. In the Dewey-Lehman contest 2,000 ballots were used and an error of 3 percent could have been expected due to chance alone, so that Dr. Gallup, had he sampled again, might have obtained a sample of 47.2 percent for Lehman—a victory for Dewey. In 99 out of 100 samples which could have been taken, the percentages for Lehman could have fluctuated from 47.2 to 53.2 percent due to chance alone. Designation of the winner in this case was guesswork. With equal scientific exactness Gallup might have decided the election by drawing from two straws in a hat.

To those who are not acquainted with the intricacies of statistics, the case might be explained by analogy. A gun is mounted rigidly on a platform with its muzzle pointing toward the bull's-eye on a target a hundred yards distant. Due to defective workmanship, the expected error in the shots is 3 percent. If the first bullet chances to pierce the bull's-eye, does this justify the conclusion that the accuracy of the gun is now 100 percent?

Eight years ago, Dr. Claude E. Robinson, in his book, Straw Votes, admonished straw-poll investigators against assigning victory to any party where "the variation due to the crudeness of the straw-poll measurements" is sufficient to throw the balance in a close election. In such cases "designation of the winner is purely gratuitous and a matter of guesswork." That this standard of accuracy has been ignored by Gallup is surprising, since Dr. Robinson occupied an important position in the institute.

That the public has not become aware of the real error involved in the Gallup polls is hardly surprising, since the only attempts to check the accuracy of the institute's polls have been made by Mr. Gallup himself. To date, the errors in the institute's polls have not impaired its usefulness as a forecasting medium. But one must never forget that the Literary Digest was once successful, and errors which seemed unimportant in elections before 1936 spelled the downfall of the Literary Digest poll in 1936. The failure of the Literary Digest poll and the success of the Gallup poll in the same year is not a good criterion by which to judge the latter. Relatively one may be judged the more accurate. But the intrinsic merits of the institute poll may not be judged in this manner. For it, too, may have weaknesses whose seriousness will not become apparent until other conditions arise.

On the surface the Gallup poll appears to be extremely accurate. But a closer examination reveals that under other conditions than those prevailing in 1936 the Gallup poll might have failed. Thus, had the institute polled the electorate in 1916 with the same degree of accuracy as in 1936, it would have predicted the election of Hughes with 349 electoral votes against 182 for Wilson. Actually, Wilson received 277 electoral votes against 254 for Hughes. Because of the clear division of political opinion in 1936, errors in underpredicting the winner appear unimportant, but these same errors transposed to the situation of 1916 would have changed the position of 12 States, involving 95 electoral votes, and elected Hughes instead of Wilson. In the McKinley-Bryan elections of 1896 and 1900, whose historical importance is known to every schoolboy, Gallup would have predicted victory for Bryan. Thus, out of the 12 Presidential elections from 1896 to the present, Gallup would have predicted wrongly 3 times. That is to say, Gallup would have been in error 25 percent of the time, based on the historical experience of almost half a century. As will be shown later, his record in the congressional elections of 1938 does not inspire confidence.

Professional writers often retell one of Gallup's favorite stories with obvious astonishment. In this story an instructor draws a line on the blackboard. Each member of the class is asked to estimate the length of the line. The instructor then demonstrates that an average of all the guesses approximates the correct length. What these writers have not heard is the other side of the story. Elementary textbooks of statistics are replete with examples which show that this characteristic of the average, to balance errors, often imparts a misleading appearance of accuracy.

A classical example can be drawn from Gallup's statement of the error involved in the 1936 poll. Thus he writes in the New Science of Public Opinion Measurement that "President Roosevelt's victory in 1936 was forecast with an average State-by-State error of only 6 percentage points."

By the use of an average error the seriousness of the errors in each State was minimized. For 21 of the 48 States showed greater errors than 6 percent. Errors ranged from underpredictions of Democratic strength of 14 percent in Arizona, 13 percent in Minnesota, 11 percent in Wisconsin and Montana, to an overprediction of Democratic strength of 1 percent in Kentucky and Tennessee. In 46 States the institute underestimated the Democratic strength. That is, more Republican voters were represented in the Gallup poll than in the official election.

The use of an "average error" may be reduced to an absurdity by the following example: Suppose the official Democratic percentage for the State of Pennsylvania to be 72 percent, the forecasted percentage 47 percent. Subtract the forecasted percentage from the official percentage. An error of plus 25 percent results. Suppose the official Democratic percentage of Delaware to be 52 percent, the forecast 77 percent. Again, subtract the forecast from the official. An error of minus 25 percent results. Adding the two errors and dividing by 2, an average error of 0 results. By underestimating the percentage for Pennsylvania, 34 electoral votes are incorrectly placed, yet the average error is 0.

Dr. Robinson, in Straw Votes, demonstrates that the accuracy of a straw poll in a Presidential election is to be judged by the size of the errors in each State and their possible effect on predictions under different circumstances. Average errors, errors in predicting the popular percentage of a Presidential candidate, errors expressed as percentages of electoral votes are deceptive devices which minimize errors. Since a President is elected by electors in each State, the fundamental percentages in each State must be examined. Judged by this standard, the Gallup poll could fail 25 percent of the time.

In the pamphlet mentioned, Dr. Gallup writes that "42 of the 48 States were correctly placed, and only 3 (Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire) listed as sure for Landon." To judge the accuracy of this statement one must go back to the last preelection forecast of the institute, that of November 1, 1936. At that time Dr. Gallup remarked:

"Because of the possibility of error, the institute does not attempt to predict how a group of 14 border-line States, including Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan, will vote on Tuesday. To do so would be to attempt to use a scientific instrument beyond its capacity for precision.

"As shown elsewhere in today's report, 3 are leaning Republican, 9 are leaning Democratic, and 2 show a tie vote between Roosevelt and Landon. Of the remaining States, outside the "close" group, the poll shows 31 sure for Roosevelt and 3 sure for Landon."

What a contrast is this prediction before the election of 31 sure States for Roosevelt with the statement after the election that "42 of the 48 States were correctly placed." By the use of the equivocal term "correctly placed," 204 electoral votes, appearing under the caption "Doubtful" before the election were transferred to a "correct" forecast after the election. And a scientific instrument which could not assign a home to 204 electoral orphans before the election was forgotten after the election. Even Dr. Robinson could not justify such a change. In his book, Straw Votes, only "sure Republican" and "sure Democratic" were considered correct forecasts. Specifically, he warned against assigning victory to any party where "the variation due to the crudeness of the straw-poll measurements" is sufficient to throw the balance in a close election.

At this juncture the thoughtful reader is likely to wonder what the record of the Gallup poll has been since 1936. In the New Science of Public Opinion Measurement, Dr. Gallup writes: "The most difficult and most successful preelection poll was that on the congressional election of November 1938, in which the institute's error percentagewise was less than 1 percent. And of the 435 congressional seats involved in the election, the institute called the division by parties with an error of only 8 seats."

Again Gallup's statement as to his accuracy is a bit exaggerated. The institute refrained from making predictions in individual contests on the ground that it was not "possible to make continuous and comprehensive surveys in every one of the country's 435 congressional districts." Instead it made forecasts for each of 6 sections.

In the east central section, consisting of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio, Gallup predicted a gain of 34 seats to the Republican Party. Actually only 26 seats were gained—an overprediction of 8 seats in one section alone. In the western section a gain of 2 seats was predicted for the Republicans. Republican strength was underestimated here, for in this section there was a gain of 8 seats, representing an error of 6 seats. In 2 sections alone 14 seats were incorrectly placed. By balancing overpredictions against underpredictions in different sections, the final result showed a net error of 8 seats. Had chance favored Gallup more, his errors might have balanced out to a net error of zero. Yet the change in congressional seats was not correctly reflected in the forecast for each section.

The statement that the institute made an error, percentagewise, of less than 1 percent must be taken cum grano salis. For the 435 congressional districts combined the Democratic percentage of major party vote was forecasted at 54 percent. Actually the Democratic Party received 53 percent. But the base on which these percentages are computed has no meaning. For Congressmen are still elected in each district and not by a national vote. Therefore the error ought to be measured in each district. Since no district forecasts were attempted, the section forecasts were checked. In the western section the predicted Democratic percentage was 61 percent, the official percentage was 53 percent. An error of 8 percent was made and 6 seats wrongly placed in this section. Other sections showed errors in both directions. When all 6 sections are taken together the balancing effect of errors leaves an average error of 1 percent. This was the "most difficult and most successful" of the Gallup polls.

Political writers often criticize the Literary Digest poll on the ground that it contained an income, sex, and age bias. These same writers overlook the fact that the Gallup poll of 1936 contained a distinct Republican bias in 46 of the 48 States.

According to the institute's analysis the underestimates of the Democratic strength in 46 States were probably due to a failure in timing. The November forecast was based on data collected 2 weeks earlier. From July 12, 1936, to November 1, 1936, there was an increasing sentiment toward Roosevelt, as evidenced by the larger percents shown for the Democratic Party in each succeeding poll from July 12 to November 1 for the Nation. The institute argues that had it made a survey closer to the election day the straw poll might have been more in harmony with the official poll.

The only quantitative evidence available to support this hypothesis is a series of percentages of the popular vote for President given by the institute. On June 7, before the nomination of Landon, President Roosevelt was assurred of reelection with 55.8 percent of the major party vote and a majority of the electoral votes. Two hundred and four thousand four hundred and fifty-one ballots were sent out. On July 12 only 105,000 ballots were sent out. Now Landon was named winner in the electoral college, and Roosevelt's popular percentage dropped to 51.8 percent. Thereafter increasing numbers of ballots were sent out and increasing percentages for the Democratic Party were in evidence. Polls were taken on July 12, August 9, August 23, September 6, September 20, October 4, October 18, and November 1. The number of ballots and the percentages recorded for President Roosevelt are presented here in chronological order: 105,000 ballots, 51.8 percent; 166,294 ballots, 52.4 percent; 166,004 ballots, 52.5 percent; 184,955 ballots, 52.6 percent; 210,017 ballots, 52.6 percent; 237,920 ballots, 53.2 percent; 274,273 ballots, 54 percent; 312,551 ballots, 55.7 percent. Are these percentages evidence of increasing sentiment toward Roosevelt or an attempt to create the appearance of a contest where one did not exist?

Of course, it is possible that increases in the size of the samples were not directly related to increases in the percentages recorded for Roosevelt. But it is also quite possible that the bias which existed in the Gallup poll was partly offset in the larger samples. Under the conditions prevailing after the nomination of Landon until election day, what appears as a rising sentiment for Roosevelt may have been a phenomenon of Gallup's sampling process. One must criticize the institute for not holding the size of its samples constant when comparisons are made from one time period to another.

Since a failure in "timing" is not an adequate explanation of the errors encountered in the 1936 Gallup poll, what is a reasonable explanation of these errors? Before the election of 1936 the institute laid the weakness of the Literary Digest poll to an age, income, and sex bias. This bias resulted from the fact that telephone directories and passenger-car registrations were used as a source of mailing lists to voters. Surprisingly enough, the same bias was present in the Gallup poll.

Both the Literary Digest and the Gallup poll underestimated the strength of the Democratic Party. Only in Tennessee and Kentucky did the Gallup poll overpredict the Democratic percentage. And the Literary Digest forecasted almost exactly the percentage for North Carolina. While the Literary Digest errors were approximately two and a half times as large as the Gallup errors, the variation in the size of these errors was similar for the same States. Thus, both polls showed a large error for California. The Literary Digest underestimated the Democratic percentage by 22 percent; Gallup underestimated the Democratic percentage by 9 percent. In Arkansas the Literary Digest underestimated the Democratic percentage by 8 percent; Gallup underestimated the Democratic percentage by 1 percent. Nor are these isolated cases. For in States where the factors which lead to an income, sex, and age bias in the Literary Digest poll were present sufficiently to produce large errors, the Gallup poll also showed large errors. In States where these factors were less prominent both polls showed small errors.

The extent of this agreement between the size of errors for the 48 States can be measured by the Pearsonian coefficient of correlation. This coefficient measures the degree of association between two variables. It varies from 0, showing no association, to 1, showing complete agreement. The correlation coefficient for the Gallup and Literary Digest errors in the 1936 election is 0.8. This agreement is sufficient to leave no doubt that the bias responsible for the Literary Digest errors was also present in the Gallup poll.

The presence of this bias could have been anticipated, for the institute also drew names from telephone directories and passenger-car registrations in composing the list for the mailed ballots. Like the Literary Digest, it suffered from the large percentage of rejections by Democratic voters. Approximately 80 percent of the electorate polled failed to respond to the mailed ballots. Among the 20 percent who responded, Republican voters were represented in greater proportion than in the official election.

That the surveys of Fortune have not shared in the criticisms directed toward the institute poll is no accident, since Elmo Roper has remained aloof from political contests since 1936. By restricting himself to opinion polls, whose accuracy often cannot be determined empirically, Mr. Roper has been able to make predictions which seem above and beyond criticism.

Quite often one hears that Fortune came within a fraction of 1 percent in predicting the popular percentage for Roosevelt in 1936. Again, one must be reminded of the standard of accuracy established by Dr. Robinson 8 years ago, and earlier by Dr. Fabian Franklin, that the accuracy of a straw poll in a Presidential election is to be judged by the extent to which it correctly foreshadows the division of opinion in each State. The Literary Digest came within a half of 1 percent in predicting Roosevelt's popular vote in 1932, yet errors in the States ranged as high as 16 percent. Errors in terms of popular votes are very misleading and involve the same fallacy as that demonstrated in the case of the "average error."

Why did Fortune fail to publish the State percentages? Why, indeed, were surveys made in this all-important election for President, by seven sections in the country when State percentages were required? By making section surveys, errors in individual States were canceled off even though these States were not of equal importance in the electoral college. Encouraged by this strategy of electing the President by sections, it is no wonder that Mr. Gallup chose to predict the change of congressional seats in 1938 by sections also.

If these polls wish to lay claim to scientific principles of accuracy, why do they not publish all the significant data? The size of the samples in each survey is varied according to the whims of the investigator. Why is not the size of the sample published with the results of each survey so the adequacy of the sample may be judged? Why is not some consistent practice followed in computing the errors with relation to the significant percentages? Predictions in a Presidential election should be shown for each State. After the election these State percentages should be published alongside the official percentages. In a congressional election the published comparisons should involve percentages for each district. In each case the size of the sample should appear. Can Fortune and the American Institute of Public Opinion live up to these objective standards of accuracy?

The Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., Expresses Views on National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 21, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by The Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, at the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Easter Week martyrs, and expressing the views of this patriotic organization on the subject of the war debts, the St. Lawrence waterways treaty, and other matters important to our neutrality toward belligerent nations now engaged in the European war.

Whereas the Clan-Na-Gael, for three-quarters of a century, has played a most important part in the preservation of the principles

upon which our beloved country—the United States of America—was founded, and has ever stood firm and unwavering in defense of the God-given right of the Irish Nation to absolute freedom, financing every movement of Irish patriots down to glorious Easter Week, 1916, cooperating in every way consistent with our American citizenship, and raising upward of $6,000,000 in the bond drive for the perpetuation of the Irish Republic, as proclaimed by Padraic Pearse and his immortal associates; and

Whereas the ideals of the Easter Week martyrs are perpetual and undying, typifying as they do the moral supremacy of right over might, and illustrating the fallacy of brute force in strong and imperialistic nations attempting to crush the national spirit of their materially weaker neighbors—ideals which have ever actuated the members of the Clan-Na-Gael in their devotion to principles rather than to individuals, and which have kept the name of our organization synonymous with loyalty to the United States of America and devotion to Irish republicanism; and

Whereas the contribution of men and women of Irish blood to the establishment of the United States of America is immeasurable, as so appropriately expressed by the grandson of Martha Washington, George Washington Parke Custis, in 1828: "And why is this imposing appeal made to our sympathies? It is an appeal from that very Ireland whose generous sons, alike in our day of gloom and of our glory, shared in our misfortunes and our success; who, with undaunted courage breasted the storm which, once threatening to overwhelm us, howled with fearful and desolating fury through this now happy land; who, with aspirations deep and fervent for our cause, whether under the walls of the Castle of Dublin, in the shock of our liberty's battles, or in the feeble expiring accents of famine and misery, amidst the horrors of the prison ships, cried from their hearts, 'God save America.' Tell me not of the aid which we received from another European nation in the struggle for independence; that aid was most, nay, all, essential to our ultimate success; but, remember, years of the conflict had rolled away. Of the operatives in war—I mean the soldier—up to the coming of the French, Ireland had furnished in the ratio of 100 for 1 of any foreign nation whatever.

"Then honored be the old good service of the Sons of Erin, in the War of Independence. Let the shamrock be entwined with the laurels of the revolution, and truth and justice, guiding the pen of history, inscribe on the tablets of America's remembrance 'Eternal Gratitude to Irishmen' "; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, meeting at the Hotel Touraine in Boston, Mass., on April 21, 1940, to commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Easter Week martyrs of 1916, that we reaffirm our loyalty and devotion to our beloved country, the United States of America, and pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the perpetuation of the undying principles upon which our Republic was founded, ever guarding against assaults upon our system of constitutional government and ever watchful against propaganda which tends to weaken the determination of patriotic Americans to abide by the injunctions of Washington and of Jefferson to avoid entangling foreign alliances; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, pledges itself to work diligently in the cause of strict neutrality for the United States of America in the present wars of Europe and of Asia, both declared and undeclared, viewing with alarm as we do, the concerted efforts being made by propagandists to enlist the sympathies of the American people to the side of the so-called democracies or to the side of the so-called totalitarian powers; we recognize the dangerous trend of the present administration at Washington in the bias observable in every dealing with the warring nations; we recognize the danger to our neutrality in the spoken words of officials of our Government, headed by the President, and echoed by diplomatic agents, which well might be interpreted as a subtle pledge of the manpower of our Nation in foreign wars: Therefore, we unhesitatingly commend to the Congress of the United States the immediate desirability of an impartial investigation to ascertain whether there have been any unconstitutional and secret commitments entered into by agents of our Government with any foreign government or governments, whatsoever; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, pledges itself to work diligently in the cause of an adequate national defense as the best method of keeping American manpower out of foreign wars. We protest against the release of airplanes of late American design to any foreign power whatsoever as contrary to the best interests of the American people in that such action tends to weaken our national defenses. We protest against the present tendency toward making the United States of America a service of supplies and an active arsenal for any foreign belligerent powers. We recognize the danger of depleting our own natural resources, such as petroleum and its products, iron, copper, and other essential metals, and lumber and other products of our lands, as being contrary to an adequate national defense. We recognize the danger to an adequate national defense of any internationalization of our boundaries; and as a protection to American security we demand of our governmental officials that no understanding, agreement, or treaty be entered into which will in any way jeopardize the right of our independent action in border matters, whether by land, air, bridge, or water; and we specifically protest against the proposed St. Lawrence Waterways Treaty as a partnership agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which has deliberately chosen to become a belligerent in the wars of Europe rather than an active force for peace in the Western Hemisphere; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clan-Na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, pledges itself to work diligently in the cause of American patriotic nationalism. We appreciate the fact that every American must recognize that the founding fathers left Europe to escape the hatreds, the bitterness and the strife of the Eastern Hemisphere and that all who have come after them have sought a haven of refuge and peace and security under our form of constitutional government. We recognize that the wars of the Eastern Hemisphere are neither moral nor righteous and are purely part and parcel of the ungodly power politics as played by the rulers of nations with imperialistic designs. We recognize the danger to American independence and security of any extension of credit to warring nations whether by individuals or by governmental agencies and we are sensible of the huge indebtedness of belligerents to us both for war loans and for post-war advances, debts long now in shameful default while the debtor powers are expending huge sums for armaments and munitions of war. From our experience in the World War of a quarter of a century ago we recognize the absolute futility of American participation in the embroilments of Europe and of Asia and we demand of the Congress of the United States that proper legislation be at once enacted to protect the youth of our country from being conscripted for service in any foreign wars. As a protection to American security in the Western Hemisphere, we demand of our governmental officials that the strictest neutrality be observed toward the Dominion of Canada as a belligerent power and that immediate proper measures be taken with the Government of Denmark for the acquisition by the United States of the territory of Greenland, by purchase or otherwise. We demand of our said officials that immediate proper action be taken toward dispossession of belligerent foreign powers of their insular territories in the Caribbean Sea and the near Atlantic Ocean and their territories on the mainland of Central and South America and the acquisition of such territories by the United States, with partial liquidation of war debts as a recompense. We demand of our said officials that immediate proper measures be taken for the attachment of all funds and credits now within the territorial limits of the United States of all warring nations who are in default of their indebtedness to this Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clan-na-Gael, Inc., of Greater Boston, stands squarely with our national organization in support of the right of the Irish Nation, as an entity, to a free and republican form of government; we deny the right of the British Government, moral, legal, or ethical, to sovereignty over any part of Ireland; we decry the hypocrisy of the British Government in its pseudo defense of the rights of small nations as against aggressors while it enforces partition in Ireland and holds in subjection millions of people throughout the world by force of might alone; we accept the principle enunciated by the President of the United States in his statement of April 13, 1940, namely, "If civilization is to survive, the rights of the smaller nations to independence, to their territorial integrity, and to the unimpeded opportunity for self-government must be respected by their more powerful neighbors," but we deplore such utterances as meaningless platitudes unless the principle is applied to all small nations held in bondage whether by the so-called totalitarian powers or by the so-called democracies and unless and until the entire Irish Nation is included in that category. We invite all impartial observers to join with us in extolling the virtues of the martyrs of Easter week, 1916, Padraic H. Pearse, Thomas J. Clarke, Sean MacDermott, Thomas McDonagh, Eamonn Ceannt, Joseph Mary Plunkett, James Connolly, and their associates, men who willingly made the supreme sacrifice not alone that their own beloved country, the Republic of Ireland, might be free but that the world might appreciate and recognize the futility of barbaric warfare and the hypocrisy of the rule of might over right. They died martyrs on the altar of freedom, and their memory shall ever be kept fresh in the minds and the hearts and the souls of the Clan-na-Gael until that day when British perfidy shall be replaced by true justice and when the epitaph of Emmet may be truly written and when wars shall cease and when men and women of good will and of all nations may live in amity in accordance with the teachings of the Prince of Peace.

JOHN JOSEPH MURPHY,
Chairman,
PATRICK F. HYNES,
THOMAS J. CONNOR,
PATRICK J. MOYNIHAN,
THOMAS J. MELDON,
The Committee on Resolutions.

Local Gasoline Filling Station Operators Should Not Have To Pay Additional Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1940, I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to an amendment proposed to H. R. 1 which would impose an additional tax on the operators of gasoline filling stations. I pointed out to the committee reasons and arguments why, in my opinion, it would be unjust and unreasonable to assess a further tax upon these citizens who render a very useful and necessary public service. They already pay a personal-property tax and those who own their property also pay a real-estate tax. In my State of Washington the gasoline tax is 5 cents per gallon. I made the following statement before the Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I deeply appreciate this allotment of time in which to present for your consideration the reasons for my opposition to the amendment pending to H. R. 1, which would eliminate the present exemption and provide a direct tax on gasoline filling station operators. I am strongly of the opinion that in all justice and fairness the exemption should be retained and there should be no further tax assessed against these citizens, who are rendering a very useful and necessary public service. We should bear in mind the fact that they already pay a personal-property tax on their pumps and equipment; in cases where they own their property they also pay a real-estate tax, and in the State of Washington the gasoline tax is 5 cents per gallon.

It seems to me that the service-station operator is in a different category from the ordinary merchant and storekeeper who carries a large stock of goods and merchandise. These gasoline filling stations located along our roads and highways are a great convenience to the public, as well as those situated on the street corners in our towns and cities. The only reason at all why they carry any merchandise, small and limited as their stock usually is, is to render a service and accommodation to the driving and traveling public who have need of the articles sold and to whom it is many times a great convenience to be able to obtain them at a service station along the route.

The small quantity of articles which the service-station operator offers for sale is only a part of the service which he renders to the public. It is supplemental to the free service of furnishing water, wiping your windshield, and generally performing those little acts of courtesy and helpfulness which mean so much to the automobile driver. His profit is derived almost exclusively from the sale of gasoline and oil.

He also performs a separate and distinct service to the Government of the United States by cooperating in the collection of the gasoline tax and thereby renders an important valuable service to the Internal Revenue Department. There is certainly wide and vast difference between his activity, as we have briefly described it, and that of the general vendor of goods, wares, and merchandise, and I maintain that he should be treated differently. He should not be required to pay the same tax as those engaged in an entirely different field of business and operations. It would be most unjust and unfair to impose this additional tax burden upon him.

I contend that the service-station operator is working at an occupation, not engaged in a business as it is generally understood and defined, and that if you tax him the same as the proprietor and corporation operating a store, you are interfering with his right to make a living at his individual job, for that is all it is. He is working at an occupation or job, rendering and performing personal, individual service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that your committee give this matter your usual thorough and sympathetic consideration, and when you do I feel confident that you will view it the same as I and our other colleagues do. I will conclude by reading an editorial from the Chrisitan Science Monitor, March 18, 1940, being one of a series of editorials which they publish once per week, and entitled "This Week's Appreciation." It pays a finer tribute to the filling-station operators than I can express, and sets forth some of the truths and facts which I have been endeavoring to express. It reads as follows:

"THIS WEEK'S APPRECIATION

"To thousands of filling-station attendants throughout the country, who cheerfully render such kindnesses to motorists as cleaning the windshield, checking the tires, and filling the radiator, whether or not the customer buys anything. Recently, on a stormy, freezing night, an acquaintance of ours drove into a filling station, explained apologetically that the gasoline tank was full, and asked if the sleet could be scraped from the windshield. 'Glad to do it,' smiled the attendant, who had just left a warm stove inside.

"The other day the family car, thoroughly bespattered with mud, went to a filling station for servicing and repairs. It came back shiny and clean. The sluggish door latches were newly oiled. There was no extra charge. Such small things help to oil the wheels of human affairs. They bring the satisfaction which comes to oneself and to others through making the daily task an opportunity for unselfish service."

Funds for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, if patriotism is ever to be manifested, it should be now.

Every American knows that this Nation must be diligent and prompt to strengthen and modernize our national defenses.

The security of America demands speed and teamwork in meeting this problem.

Yesterday the President of the United States outlined a program for steps for full preparedness for national defense. I feel that every American worthy of the name is 100 percent in accord with what President Roosevelt said in this Chamber yesterday. America is united in its determination to be prepared against any eventuality. I am convinced that every real American is willing to do his part in developing a national-defense program that will be an absolute guaranty for the security of America against any possibility of aggression.

Yesterday, after the President's message, everyone speaking on the floor of the House, in the Halls, and in the cloak rooms were unanimous in saying, "The President is right; it must be done." The question of most Congressmen was, "Shall we raise the debt limit or shall we vote new taxes?"

Mr. Speaker, I am offering here today a bill which answers that question; a bill which will give every patriotic American an opportunity to participate in the defense of his country and will provide the aid and support for President Roosevelt in the objectives indicated in his message and in the program which we universally approve and support.

I do not want anybody to tell me this cannot be done. It can be done. The American people will respond quickly and generously.

I hope that what I am offering here will be brought fully to the attention of the American public. I feel certain that if it is brought to the attention of the public, that your mail and mine will quickly bring pledges that will fulfill the requests of the bill and more.

The Congress Fails the Farmer Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the mills of Congress grind exceedingly slow. This is especially true of this session of Congress. There seems to be an atmosphere of hesitancy—a sort of collective desire to do as little as possible. Individually Members are still alert and alive, but collectively they seem to be passing through the last stage of sleeping sickness. I do not believe that collectively you could wake them up even with one of Mr. Barlow's high-explosive bombs.

Shocked and bewildered over the European war brutality and insanity, Congress and the administration have been drifting along. Not sure as to whether our first line of defense was the solution of our domestic problems or again sending our sons to foreign battlefields. Not sure whether our own peace is a blessing or a curse. Not sure whether we should enter the European conflict or build up our own national defense by looking after the welfare of our own people.

Harassed and misinformed by an international banking clique, the war profiteers, the radio propagandists, the theater, and the metropolitan press, on one side, and the mothers and fathers, together with the sons who do the fighting and dying in war, on the other side, the administration and Congress have forgotten all about the real American problems—the agricultural and unemployment problems.

We are all sorry for the innocent small nations whose territories are again being invaded and made the battlefields of the insane, war-mad brutes of larger nations. While we would like to see all the crimson leaders of aggression go to the place where it never gets cold, yet we must not forget that our first duty is at home—to the American people.

Let us not repeat the mistake of 1917. We cannot better the conditions in Europe. There are no angels among the leaders of the belligerent nations that started this war. Truth and justice are utter strangers to them all. If we permit ourselves to be propagandized into this war, it will be the rock upon which our Republic will perish. We, too, will emerge with a dictator.

Our forefathers left Europe because of intolerance, because of religious and racial hatreds. Let us remain true to their ideals. We cannot police Europe. We have plenty to do to build our own Nation great and strong. Charity begins at home. Let us take care of our own people. Let us preserve peace on the Western Hemisphere. In doing this Congress will best serve the ends of civilization.

In this predicament Congress is about to adjourn, nothing much accomplished, nothing worth while attempted. Of course, we will appropriate relief funds, but we will do nothing to make the unemployed again self-sustaining. We will also appropriate $212,000,000 for parity payments on 5 out of 50 agricultural products—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. This amount will fall far short from paying parity on even these 5 products. Congress will do nothing for the other 45 products, including dairy, the largest single farm industry.

This $212,000,000 will be just a drop in the bucket. It will not give the farmer parity. That statement is a fraud and a deception. To give to the farmers 100-percent parity on all of their products would require $7,500,000,000. Of course, the Treasury could not stand that. If Congress had passed the Massingale cost-of-production—the 100-percent parity—bill, then we would not need any appropriation.

This bill applies to all agricultural products that annually enter into interstate commerce in excess of $10,000,000. It would fix 100-percent parity, as a minimum price, on that part of such products domestically consumed. It would increase the farmers' annual income by $7,500,000,000.

Since every dollar of farm cash income increases the national income by $7.55, therefore, it would increase the national income by $56,625,000,000. That would be prosperity by plenty and not starvation by scarcity—by the curtailment and the destruction of agricultural wealth.

When this bill becomes a law there will be no further need for farm subsidies. There will be no further need for any army of Federal employees to regulate the daily lives of the farmers. Prosperity and security for agriculture means prosperity for labor and business as well. When this bill becomes a law the Government will no longer have to bail out the farmer—then the farmer will bail out the Government.

However, if Congress still wants to do something real during the closing days of this session, then let it pass H. R. 8748—the Wheeler-Jones farm-debt adjustment bill. This bill would authorize the Farm Credit Administration to compromise the old seed loans. These never will and never can be paid. A business concern charges off uncollectible debts. These farmers bought the seed to feed the Nation. Climatic conditions have been against them. Why should the Government be silly enough to spend money to collect that which cannot be collected?

This bill would bring the interest rate down to 3 percent on all farm indebtedness. During the discussion of this bill we heard a great deal about soft credit and soft money. Of course, these expressions are just repeated parrotlike by those who know nothing about money or its functions. These individuals do not know that the difference between soft money, soft credit, and hard money, hard credit is the same as the difference between a soft-boiled egg and a hard-boiled egg. If you get the egg, you can live. If you do not, you may starve.

This bill also provides for the refinancing of farm mortgages where the debt exceeds the value of the farm. It gives the owner an equal chance to get his farm back on the same terms that it would be sold to a stranger. Common decency compels us to agree with that provision. Why not give the owner a new start in life rather than to experiment with a new one? Let us salvage what is left of agriculture rather than wreck it completely.

Then, there is the unconstituional hog-processing tax. The evidence shows conclusively that the farmer paid this tax in lower prices. But Congress has not yet had the decency to pay back this tax illegally and fraudulently extracted from the hog producers. Oh, yes; we paid back all other unconstitutional taxes to the railroads, to the processors, to the packers, and to the cotton and tobacco growers; but the plea for the hog-producing farmer has been consistently ignored. They say the amount is too large. Query—if one steals enough, does that make it legal?

Congress failed the farmer again when it extended the reciprocal trade agreement laws. While this question was up for debate we heard a great deal about logrolling, but I prefer that the Members of Congress representing the people of different sections of our country—different industries—roll logs in order to get justice for all sections and for all industries in the making of a tariff law than to have the Secretary of State, who believes that it is necessary to preserve Christianity and peace, sell our farmer and laborer in foreign market places.

I prefer logrolling to horse trading with foreign diplomats. This especially since our State Department is now and always has been the poorest horse trader of them all. It generally trades off two or three good young colts and gets an old, worthless nag in exchange. This in the name of peace and Christianity. When did it become necessary for this Nation to buy or bribe other nations' Christianity or peace? Such a doctrine is not only lunacy but an insult to our intelligence and our dignity.

During the 5 years that this reciprocal trade agreement law has been in effect we imported $6,189,997,000 worth of agri-

cultural products and substitutes from foreign nations. Again, that is the foreign valuation. The domestic valuation would be $12,379,994,000—equal to a check of $2,063 for every one of our 6,000,000 farm families.

During the same 5 years we imported 2,335,273 head of cattle and 758,466,496 pounds of meat and meat products. This was equivalent to another 1,896,166 head of cattle—making the total importation of meat equivalent to 4,235,439 head of cattle in 5 years. These our own people should have raised, not foreigners.

Foreign nations owe us $32,000,000,000 now—$14,000,000,000 due our Government. One of these nations boasts that it never broke a promise, but we have $4,500,000,000 of its broken promises in the United States Treasury. Let the State Department collect that $14,000,000,000 before it sells our domestic market or extends further credit to nations of this class.

When we get tired of figures, then let us fortify ourselves by using our common horse sense, with pepper and salt added. Why should we insist upon trading with foreign nations just for the sake of trading? Why should we be foolish enough to loan more money to foreign nations—money with which they promise to buy our goods but do not? Our experience tells us that in the end these nations will have both our goods and our money. Then the taxpayers will have to foot the bill.

This administration has been in power for over 7 years. It was pledged to get agriculture out of the "red." It was pledged to solve the unemployment problem. Yet in those 7 years more than one farmer out of every five lost his farm by mortgage foreclosure, judgment, forced or tax sale. The average farmer who still owns his farm is deeper in debt than he was in 1932. We are aware that the farm indebtedness has been reduced; but how was that reduction brought about? It was brought about by mortgage foreclosure, judgment, forced or tax sale—by evicting innocent men, women, and children from their farm homes.

Likewise the unemployment problem is still unsolved. There are as many unemployed now as in 1932. Every courthouse is still a poorhouse. This problem never will be solved until the agricultural problem is solved first, because industry and employment are directly dependent upon the success of agriculture.

As a result of this unemployment, hundreds of thousands of industrial workers have also lost their homes. Here the Government, through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, has been the principal offender in taking away homes. In place of shedding all our tears for the oppressed in Europe, let us shed a few for our own unfortunates who have been so cruelly and so brutally evicted from their homes because of misplaced confidence in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

We are pro-United States. We are more interested in the 130,000,000 men, women, and children of our Nation than in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia combined. We sympathize with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Ethiopia, China, Holland, and Belgium—we sympathize with the persecuted and oppressed everywhere—but, I repeat, charity begins at home. Our first duty is to our own people. There is plenty of misery and suffering in our own country.

Under our Constitution you and I and all of us are "We, the people." We are 48 States—but one Nation. This Government, created by men of iron with nerves of steel—born amidst the privations and sufferings of Valley Forge—is ours. It does not belong to any clique or clan. It does not belong to any official or set of officials in Washington. These are all but our servants.

We must never permit our patriotism to be dimmed or divided because of religious or racial differences. Tolerance and forebearance is our watchword. We shall continue to extend the hand of good fellowship to all. We shall not permit the religious or racial hatreds of Europe to be transplanted to our shores. We are through forever with foreign entanglements. We will not again permit ourselves to be engulfed by the war-mad insanity of Europe.

We are aware that the itch exists on the part of some individuals to again embroil us in this European madness. These individuals will not be in the front-line trenches saying "come" to our sons. They will stay at home and again wrap the flag of glory around themselves and shout "go." They will again attempt to monopolize the patriotism of this Nation that is common to us all. Their patriotism is only skin deep. They are pro-anything if there is a profit in it, although that profit be stained with the blood, the tears, and the agony of an agonized world.

Survey of Natural Resources of the Antarctic Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

LETTERS FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from the State Department and the Navy Department concerning the Government's expedition to the Antarctic to investigate natural resources:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 26, 1940.

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: I have received your letter of March 8, 1940, in which you request my opinion of the value of the acquisition of territory in the Antarctic and the period of time, presumably of actual occupation, which would be required under international law as a necessary condition to such an acquisition. You have also expressed an interest in the reasons for the formation of the United States Antarctic Service and the connection therewith of Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy (retired), for whom I share your high opinion.

The activities and explorations in the Antarctic of the Government and citizens of the United States date back considerably more than a century. They include the discoveries of Capt. Nathaniel B. Palmer in the 1820's and of numerous other American whalers and sealers during the next half century or more; the historic cruise of the United States Exploring Expedition, a Government mission under the command of Lt. Charles Wilkes, United States Navy; and the important geographical discoveries and accumulation of scientific data made in recent years by Admiral Byrd, Mr. Lincoln Ellsworth, and their associates.

Since the beginning of this century there has been evidenced on the part of many foreign governments a very increasing interest in the Antarctic for scientific, economic, and political reasons. The list of scientific results of the many expeditions, both American and foreign, which have studied the south polar regions in the past 30 years, is an impressive one. It includes observations which have been of definite importance in the development of our knowledge of radio transmission, meteorology, astronomy, aviation, cosmic rays, terrestrial magnetism, geology, and other branches of science. The primary source of economic wealth so far has been the whaling industry which recently has yielded some $30,000,000 a year from the Antarctic whaling grounds. Low-grade coal is known to exist in very large quantities and preliminary geological surveys have indicated the presence of various kinds of mineral deposits on the Antarctic continent.

Until the early years of the present century interest in the Antarctic was chiefly scientific and economic. In the past 25 years, however, there has been a marked increase in political activity relating to those regions with the present result that 290 degrees of the coast line of the Antarctic continent and the greater portion of the hinterland have been claimed as possessions of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, France, and Norway, and unofficial or semi-official claims have been advanced by Germany and Japan.

Many of these claims include areas which have never been explored and in which there has been little or no activity by nationals of the nation claiming sovereignty over them. Others include areas which have been discovered or explored by American citizens and which have been claimed for the United States, though no official recognition has as yet been given to such claims. Because of the

general disregard of accepted principles of international law regarding the establishment of sovereignty over newly discovered territory, and in the absence of any special principles or international agreement controlling sovereignty in the Polar regions, the United States Government has never recognized any of the above-mentioned claims and has formally reserved such rights as it or its citizens might possess in the Antarctic.

The importance increasingly being attached by foreign governments to the acquisition of territory in the Antarctic has in recent years led the Department of State, in the normal course of its duties, to a study of the rights which this Government might possess in the South Polar area and consideration of the steps which should be taken to protect such rights. It was concluded that as a matter of ordinary prudence it would be inadvisable to take any positive action toward the assertion of United States sovereignty claims in the Antarctic pending an examination on the spot of the value of the areas to which the United States might possess the basis of a claim. A further consideration was the desirability under international law of some form of occupation of the areas mentioned as a condition incident to the exercise of sovereignty over them should it be determined that such action was in the best interests of this country.

These conclusions were approved by the President, who also suggested that this Department seek the practical advice of Admiral Byrd and of Mr. Lincoln Ellsworth in view of their outstanding knowledge of the Antarctic regions. After conferences with representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Interior Departments and with the Coast Guard, Admiral Byrd's opinion was requested as to the feasibility of an official investigation of those areas in which the United States might be interested. Admiral Byrd expressed his approval of the project and generously offered to place his services and his vessel, the *Bear of Oakland*, at the disposal of the Government, should they be required. So far as I am aware, it was not until his opinion was requested in January 1939 that Admiral Byrd was informed of the proposed expedition. Mr. Ellsworth's absence in the Antarctic made it impossible to consult with him at the time, but a conference with him was held upon his return to the United States. He also expressed his approval.

I believe that you are familiar with the subsequent developments resulting in an appropriation by the Congress of funds for the investigation and survey of the natural resources of the land and sea areas of the Antarctic regions; the formation of the United States Antarctic Service; and the President's appointment of Admiral Byrd as commanding officer. For your convenience I am enclosing a copy of the instructions issued to Admiral Byrd by the President on November 25, 1939.

Members of the Antarctic Service are now in the south polar regions and have established two bases from which it is planned to undertake the work for which funds have been provided by the Congress. Although no specific period of occupation is required by international law as a condition to the acquisition of sovereignty over unclaimed territory, it would not, in my opinion, be in the best interests of the Government to discontinue the operation of the bases already established, until, at least, the present survey is completed and the data accumulated on the basis of which a sound opinion can be formed as to the value of the areas now being investigated. The brevity of the Antarctic summer, the only practicable season for active field work, makes it unlikely that the work of the Antarctic Service can be completed within a single year.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
March 13, 1940.

MY DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: Your letter of March 8 regarding Read Admiral Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy (retired), is acknowledged.

Rear Admiral Byrd was designated commanding officer of the United States Antarctic Service by the President of the United States on July 7, 1939. On the same date the President formed the executive committee of the United States Antarctic Service for the purpose of organizing, directing, and coordinating the conduct of the Antarctic Service. This committee comprises the following members:

Mr. Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., Department of State; Rear Admiral Russell R. Waesche, United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department; Capt. Charles C. Hartigan, United States Navy, Navy Department; Dr. Ernest H. Gruening, Department of the Interior.

This undertaking is a Federal project, made at the expense of the Government, and is not a private enterprise. It is strictly a Government undertaking operating under the specific instructions issued by the President, which instructions have been published in the hearings held by the House Appropriations Committee on the Interior Department appropriations. Rear Admiral Byrd has been ordered to active duty in order that he might properly perform the duties of commanding officer of the Antarctic Service. His Navy pay during the duration of this duty is that which he receives on the retired list.

In compliance with the expressed wishes of the President, the Navy Department has cooperated fully in the organization of the Antarctic Service. Naval personnel have been assigned to duty with the Antarctic Service and considerable equipment has been furnished by the Navy, as well as by other departments of the Government. In addition to this equipage, testimony given before the House Appropriations Committee indicates that Rear Admiral Byrd has made available to the Antarctic Service material, equipment, and appurtenances valued at $225,000, which was provided at no cost to the Government.

An extensive scientific program has been adopted for investigation, but the principal items of interest to the public and the Navy are:

(a) Geographical: The delineation of the continental coast line in the South Pacific Ocean and other areas surveyed. Location of harbors, anchorages, etc.

(b) Hydrographic: Sonic soundings in all waters navigated. Physical properties of waters and collection of bottom samples. Survey of Pactolus Bank off Cape Horn, South America.

(c) Magnetism: Observations of declination, inclination, and total intensity of earth's magnetic field.

(d) Aurora and cosmic ray: Effect of intensity upon radio transmission and reception.

(e) Meteorology: Synoptic observations with Chilean and Argentine observatories for determination of meteorology of southern Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; upper air observations with relation to aircraft operations.

(f) Glaciology: Location of icebergs and field ice, and structure thereof.

(g) Seismology: Determination of epicenters of earthquakes and earth tremors, and their relation to oceanography.

(h) Geology: Investigation of possible oil or shale deposits as potential fuel reserves.

(i) Radio: Observations held on high and low frequencies with naval stations. Study of the Kennelly-Heaviside layer, effect of magnetic disturbances on communications. Development of radio apparatus to meet severe conditions.

(j) Aviation: Aircraft operation in low temperatures; effect on metals and lubricants. Aerial mapping under severe climatic conditions. Training of aviation personnel. Development of polar flying clothing and equipment.

(k) Medical: Effect of living conditions upon metabolism of men; physiologic and psychologic changes of men. Bacteriological investigations. Dietary studies at camps and determination of calorific values of rations.

Although the above investigations are of the greatest interest to the Navy, it is recognized that many of the other investigations are of intense interest to other Government agencies.

The Navy Department is acting as a distributing agency for the release of press, still photos, and motion pictures to newspapers and agencies. The communications of the Antarctic Service are an integral part of the Naval Communication System.

The Navy Department has no information of any contracts entered into by Rear Admiral Byrd with private agencies by which he would acquire financial profit.

Sincerely,

———,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States House of Representatives.

A Commission to Survey the National Defense Requirements and Resources of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the solemn admonition of the President of the United States that we as a Nation must take stock of the needs of our national defense was uttered when he addressed the Congress, May 16, in these words:

> The clear fact is that the American people must recast their thinking about national protection.

This was a frank admission from the lips of the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States that streamlining our national defense is the paramount question of the hour.

As a student of national defense it requires no effort on my part to see eye to eye with the Chief Executive on this momentous problem.

Firmly convinced that streamlining our national defense was an absolute necessity for the preservation of the future welfare and security of this Nation, it was my privilege to introduce on January 10, 1940, House Joint Resolution No. 417 which provided for the establishment of a National Defense Commission for the purpose of surveying the national defense resources, and requirements of the United States, including

the advisability of adopting a permanent progressive national defense policy, the establishment of a Department of National Defense, a National Defense Planning Board, and for other purposes.

This resolution was not offered in a spirit of criticism. On the contrary it was prompted by my desire to provide the American people with a comprehensive picture of what area we as a Nation must be expected to defend, and the type of defense necessary to cope with modern military methods.

A study of the resolution which follows should convince anyone of the justification for the establishment of the Commission which will result in the formation of a Department of National Defense with Under Secretaries for Army, Navy, and Air. This will accomplish among our defense forces:

1. Coordination.
2. Efficiency.
3. Economy.

With these objectives reached the American people will enjoy adequacy of its national defense system through a long range planning policy.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 417) providing for the establishment of a National Defense Commission for the purpose of surveying the national-defense resources and requirements of the United States, including the advisability of adopting a permanent, progressive national-defense policy, the establishment of a Department of National Defense, a National Defense Planning Board, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That to provide for "the common defense," to promote the "general welfare," and to insure "domestic tranquillity" in the United States of America there is hereby established a commission to be known as the National Defense Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

The Commission shall be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate. The Commission also shall include among its members the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, any of whom in the event of their inability to serve are hereby authorized and directed to each appoint a representative to serve as members of the Commission.

The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to select and appoint as members of the Commission one member each to represent the interests of agriculture, labor, business, industry, and finance. The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to select and appoint as members two Army officers and two Naval officers, not on the active lists of the Regular Military Establishment, two aviators with at least 10 years of experience in aeronautics, and two women recognized for their mercies in wartime.

The Chairman of the Commission established under this joint resolution shall be chosen by the members thereof.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of obtaining information necessary for legislation the Commission hereby is authorized and directed to conduct a comprehensive survey and study of the national defense, including the following:

1. The advisability of completely revising the National Defense Act in the light of events in Europe and Asia and the need for legislation to establish a peacetime defensive system, based upon the national objectives of the United States, which can be rapidly expanded into a wartime defensive system, which will carry out the national objectives of the United States.

2. The advisability of establishing a Department of National Defense, under which the armed forces of the United States would be combined and coordinated to provide for a more adequate national defense in any emergency.

3. The practicability under a Department of National Defense of promoting and accomplishing among all branches of the armed forces (a) coordination of effort and efficiency, (b) savings in purchases of military and naval matériel, (c) unified responsibility, and (d) elimination of duplication of effort and conflict of authority.

4. The advisability of establishing a National Defense Planning Board to formulate a long-range national-defense policy that has sufficient flexibility to meet any changes required by developments and maintain an orderly, progressive program.

5. The advisability of expanding and speeding the naval program and to examine the necessity for what is known as a "two-ocean navy."

6. The advisability of further expansion of the air forces of the Army and Navy, the number and type of planes required, and a coordinated program and policy for training personnel and cooperation between Army and naval air operations.

7. The advisability of granting Government subsidies to commercial air lines, requiring their transport planes to be convertible bombers and specifying that their pilots be commissioned in the Reserve Corps of the Army and Navy.

8. The advisability of perfecting a comprehensive program for rapidly mobilizing industry and commercial shipping into a defensive force.

9. The advisability of supplementing "educational orders" by providing an adequate "liquid fund" to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of National Defense for the encouragement of inventions, research, experiment, and development of arms, munitions, and implements of war.

10. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, the Declaration of Panama, and the pledges made in the name of the United States by the Chief Executive to defend Canada in the event of an armed attack by any other power.

11. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States in the Philippines if and when that Commonwealth becomes independent in 1946.

12. The advisability of formulating a definite military and naval program in keeping with the announced policy of the United States in the Orient and the possessions of the United States from the Aleutian Islands to the Samoan Islands.

13. The advisability of acquiring territory in the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea which might serve as enemy bases.

SEC. 3. That the members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 to defray the necessary expenses of the Commission. The chairman shall be authorized to appoint, with the approval of the Commission, such assistants and subordinates as he deems necessary to the conduct of the survey.

SEC. 5. That the Commission shall submit preliminary reports to Congress from time to time, if deemed advisable by the Commission, and shall submit a final report and recommendations to the Congress on or before January 3, 1941.

SEC. 6. That the Commission, or any subcommittee thereof, shall be authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the Senate and House are sitting, have recessed, or have adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Commission or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said Commission, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the matter herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 2, sec. 192).

The Vital Importance of Continuing Our National Program of Fostering Transportation on Our Inland Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in considering the importance of water transportation in our national development and the relation of our waterways to domestic commerce, it is apparent that the constructive policy that has been followed by the Congress and the Federal Government in improving the waterways and fostering water transportation has contributed in a large measure to our national advancement and business prosperity. Particularly was this evident during the early period of our national growth, when the advent of the cotton gin and the cheap production of the staple cotton, with easy transportation on the network of slow-moving southern streams utilized in moving cotton to our seaports, gave America an advantage in the markets of the world and quickly placed the United States in a prominent commercial position, with the result that many of the Nation's great commercial centers owe their supremacy to their location on our arterial waterways. Omitting our seaports, we might mention Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Kansas City, Chicago, New Orleans, and Portland, Oreg. A casual

inspection of the map of our country will verify this statement.

The greatest example of national prosperity resulting from the use of water transportation is found in Europe where Holland, with little in the way of resources except farm land and waterways, has grown to be one of the wealthiest countries per capita in the family of nations. With no timber, no mineral, with little besides farm land and a comprehensive canal system which has been utilized for transportation, Holland has attained a degree of national prosperity that many nations naturally endowed with great resources of timber and minerals have failed to reach.

In recognition of the importance of water transportation in our national economy, a comprehensive program early undertaken has been consistently followed in improving the eastern rivers, but until recently the great river system west of the Rocky Mountains has been receiving little attention.

In studying plans for the future development of our national program, we find that the remaining great unused resources of our country lie tributary to the Columbia River. The bulk of this material is in Government ownership. The vast timber stands on the Snake, the Salmon, the Clearwater, and the Clarks Fork, all tributaries to the Columbia, are embraced in our national forests. Billions of feet of lumber and pulp timber in the national forests in Oregon, Idaho, and Montana are dependent for a market on cheap water transportation to the eastern sections of our country. Vast potential water power in these streams is dependent for development on the utilization of this timber and the production and shipment of the undeveloped metal and nonmetallic minerals that the Government experts have found to exist in great abundance in the areas tributary to this great western waterway.

If we are to continue our program of national development, the Columbia and the Snake Rivers must be opened for water transportation. Our first objective should be to improve the Columbia and the Snake Rivers to the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers at Lewiston, Idaho, which will provide the low-cost transportation necessary for the utilization of the vast resources in Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana.

Taking advantage of the highwater stages of the Columbia and the Snake Rivers, the people in this section have already initiated boat transportation to Lewiston, Idaho, and are now moving in petroleum products and shipping out wheat at a substantial saving in transportation costs.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the ultimate benefits to be gained by the Government itself in utilizing Government-owned timber, and the benefits to business throughout the country by providing low cost water transportation on our rivers, in particular the Columbia River system, it is apparent that our legislative policy should foster this type of transportation and reject any legislative proposals that may hinder this development.

This view is expressed by an eminent authority and former member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in a letter discussing the provisions of the Transportation Act and its effect on the national economy. The recent action of the House in recommitting this measure to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was done with my vote and support.

Mr. Campbell's letter is herewith submitted for consideration and insertion in the RECORD.

JOHNSTON B. CAMPBELL,
Spokane, Wash., May 1, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman for State of Idaho, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am much interested in the Transportation Act of 1940, known as conference report S. 2009, in which it is proposed to take over jurisdiction to the Interstate Commerce Commission of certain types of water transportation.

In my opinion, it is unwise at this time to take jurisdiction of the water carriers.

It is, of course, a well-known fact that transportation on our rivers was rendered "innocuous," in the language of Commissioner Lane, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by competition of the railroads, and that there was no opportunity to develop water transportation until after the passage of the Transportation Act of 1920. That during that period of time the further development of water transportation has been relatively slow, and it has not reached the status of carriers to such an extent as it can withstand competition of railroads if its rates and practices are to be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is true that the conference report exempts certain forms of water transportation, notably that of the Great Lakes; and it is rather difficult for me to understand why the Great Lakes should be exempted and transportation on the Columbia River be taken over.

I also note that certain bulk transportation on the Columbia River is exempted, but that the transportation of other commodities is in its infancy, and an opportunity should be given to develop that transportation before being put under the control of the Commission.

I also note that while the railroads are required to make joint rates with water carriers joint rates are not required by the waterways for trucks. I think that is very vital; and if joint rates are made by railroads, joint rates should also be required by trucks, for it is quite difficult to build up water transportation on the Columbia River without the aid of trucks to haul the commodities away from the river points.

I sincerely trust that you will find your way clear to oppose the passage of this law so far as it pertains to water transportation.

I sincerely hope that I may be able in the near future to see you and personally pay my respects to you.

With very kind and sincere regards, I am,

Yours truly,

JOHNSTON B. CAMPBELL.

Against Evils Attempting to Destroy Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

AN EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 16, 1940]

AN EDITORIAL LETTER TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

It is out of hearts full of compassion for the peoples of all nations in the present great world crisis that those charged with the editing of the Christian Science Monitor are speaking through this editorial letter to the members of its wide subscriber and reader family in every country. Some of you have written that you do not feel a newspaper founded out of a great love for all humanity should "take sides" in the conflict. However, it is that very love for humanity which compels this newspaper to take sides, not against any nation or group of nations, in and of themselves, but against the evils which are attempting to destroy the very basis of civilization.

The issues have become far bigger than any question of colonies or of righting the injustices of the Versailles Treaty. There is at stake the right to live the Christianity upon which men's lives must be based, else they perish. The challenge to Christianity is being made on more than one front, but in this period it appears to be receiving its chief impetus by an attempt to overthrow the Nazarene's love-inspiring doctrines through the forceful application of hatred-breeding Nazi dogmas. For the brotherhood of man is openly scorned.

Worship of person and state are given precedence over worship of God. The rights of peoples and nations to freedom of speech, religion, and self-government are denied. Unjustified, unprovoked attacks have been made on innocent countries and peoples, and their morale weakened through instigated treachery.

That, briefly, is the situation as the Christian Science Monitor recognizes it, and it feels its readers must be kept alert to these dangers, and not be misguided by well-meaning but mistaken arguments that, in order to be just, they and this newspaper must be impartial and aloof. The greatest justice that can be accorded the German people is to see clearly that their present course of action is harming themselves most of all. And then firmly, with compassion and love, we should do everything possible to help free all peoples from the prevailing evils.

The Christian Science Monitor has worked for years to further a loving attitude toward the German people. It recognized the serious plight of Germany after the World War, and it repeatedly has emphasized the necessity of rectifying the injustices of the Versailles Treaty. It cannot, however, uphold or endorse the methods

which have been employed to achieve that end, and it must vigorously oppose the crimes against civilization being committed under the guise of justice-seeking.

It is understandable, from a purely human basis, how an unhappy people, believing they have been mistreated and held down by others, might come to idolize one who would appear to be leading them out of their distress. And how, blinded through false loyalty, they might be unable to see whither they were being led, unable to recognize the difference between patriotic zeal and mad, destructive ambition.

It unquestionably is the right of all peoples and of every nation to have "living room" and an abundance of the necessities of life. However, an attempt to acquire these by aggressive force or by wresting them from weaker nations is, to the enlightened thought of today, a return to the barbaric methods of the darker ages. It is true there are few nations in whose historic pages there are not acts of conquest which would not stand the modern searchlight of truth, but down through the years the majority of them have been attaining, though slowly, a higher moral position, and that progress cannot be retarded by what the German people today feel is their necessity. There is only one right way for any country to seek to supply the needs of its people—by following the injunction of the Wayshower, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." Seeking the kingdom of God, wherein is expressed spiritual right, brotherly love, unselfishness, honesty, fair dealing, truthfulness, is the exact opposite of trying to build up an exalted material state based on material might, hatred, personal domination, persecution, fear, and tyranny. And of what avail is mere space as "living room," when the lives of a nation's people are choked with fear, oppression, and lack of individual liberty? Living room but no life of their own to live. The greatest man the world ever has known often had no place wherein to lay his head, but his life was the freest, richest, and most bountiful of all lives.

The avowed purpose of making a nation one of the greatest in the world naturally appeals to its people, but what really constitutes the greatness of a nation? It is not mere military might nor material possessions. It is chiefly the mental quality and moral state of its people. Germany can again be a great nation in the true sense of the word, but to save itself it must awake! It must recheck its course and aline itself with God's government, which operates solely through the brotherhood of man. And not only Germany but all nations must awaken and yield to this divine government, for there are few without some share of responsibility for the plight of the world today.

In the meantime, much as it deplores war, the Christian Science Monitor realizes that at this moment the Allies have no choice but to defend themselves and friendly smaller nations by military force, and that in so doing they are upholding the democratic rights of people everywhere. In their treatment of the war situation, our editors are seeking earnestly to be guided so that this newspaper may do its part in the establishment of a better world. Its founder, Mary Baker Eddy, has said (message for 1900, p. 10):

"Certain elements in human nature would undermine the civic, social, and religious rights and laws of nations and peoples, striking at liberty, human rights, and self-government. * * * History shows that error repeats itself until it is exterminated. Surely the wisdom of our forefathers is not added but subtracted from whatever sways the scepter of self and pelf over individuals, weak provinces, or peoples. Here our hope anchors in God who reigns."

It is these "elements in human nature" which this newspaper is attempting to lay bare. They must be seen as evils, but rendered powerless in thought by the realization that they are no part of the man made in God's image and likeness and have no place in a universe created by God. The need is for men to learn more of the true nature of God's universe, and approach a more spiritual basis for thinking and acting in everyday life. It is only thus that lasting peace can be brought about. Here the hope of the Christian Science Monitor, too, "anchors in God," for it knows that He does reign.

Veterans' Legislation Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

LETTER FROM GEN. FRANK T. HINES

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate this House on the passage of the World War widows' and orphans' bill and the veterans' preference bill. As an humble Member of Congress, I was happy to cast my support for these measures.

There is a crying need for a veterans' hospital in the State of Maryland. At the present time there are over 500 veterans in Maryland who have made application for treatment in general hospitals, and who cannot be cared for because there are no beds available. In this connection I wish to quote a letter I received from Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Chairman of the Federal Board of Hospitalization:

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1940.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the program of future construction for the Veterans' Administration for accomplishment from year to year within the period of the next 10 years, recommended by the Federal Board of Hospitalization to the President and approved in principle by the President on May 9, there is included a new Veterans' Administration general facility of 300 beds for the Maryland area.

Immediate consultation is contemplated with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to determine upon how funds may best be made available to undertake necessary preliminary work, such as the selection of site and preparation of plans.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Chairman.*

I join with the other members of the Maryland delegation in the sincere hope that funds may be made available for the carrying out of this program to an immediate conclusion.

Deportation of Alien Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have read with some surprise the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], and chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, in the RECORD of May 14, all in connection with my bill, No. 8310, which is a bill to authorize deportation for any person who while in the United States is or has been, by his word or acts, sympathetic with, associated with, or affiliated with or sought the support of Communists in the United States or elsewhere.

In the first place, the bill was not properly reported in the RECORD in this respect, that it should read that "any alien shall be deported in the manner provided by law." The word "hereinafter" appearing on the third line of page 1 of the bill was requested to be stricken out, and it was agreed to.

The gentleman from New York has stated that the word "Communist" is not defined and asks, among his other questions, "What is a Communist?" I do not think there is any question at all but that every thinking person in the United States knows what a Communist is and knows what they stand for, and I think the word applies particularly to three things, as follows:

First. A real member of the Communist Party has pledged his allegiance to a foreign country and has as one of his concepts the destruction of the republican form of government as it is now set up and as we know it in this country; that this allegiance goes so far as to qualify him to bear arms for a foreign country and against our own country. I do not believe that any political party should be permitted to be organized in this country that has as its foundation any such concept as the destruction not only of this Government but of organized business as set up in this country.

Second. With reference to the right of a party to organize, become recognized, and exist in this country, my view is that it has such a right, providing it does not go so far as to become treasonable. That it would work to the destruction of our Government by direct or indirect action or by force or by violence. The Communist Party stands for all of these things.

It is part of their doctrine that there is no limit at which they will stop to accomplish their end. The best proof of this is Russia, where some 12,000,000 people were murdered. What freedom or consideration under any bill of rights did these murdered people in Russia have?

That brings me to a third consideration. The Communist Party has no right to go so far that it interferes with the individual liberty or freedom of our people. I would define the right of individual liberty as freedom to do that which one wishes to do, providing that it does not infringe upon or interfere with the rights or freedom of others. The communistic doctrine would certainly interfere with my right or individual liberty to ever have a republican form of government, as it is established, and my freedom under the Bill of Rights. The advocates of communistic doctrines may hide behind many technical reasons, false premises, and false arguments, which prove to be absolutely impractical, for when their doctrines are reduced to a practical operation it does away with all individual liberty and freedom; and the practice, as shown by results, is that it sets up the most despotic, dictatorial type of government ever known. I am surprised that my colleague, who has been on this committee so long, should not have this same practical view.

Some persons might attack this bill on the grounds of intolerance, but it is my opinion that this attack would have absolutely no foundation, because there are many things in this country that we do not tolerate because they no not inure to the benefit of the greatest number. We do not tolerate murder, robbery, assault, and many other crimes that might be named, because they go against the interests of society. Then, therefore, why should we tolerate a treasonable doctrine that preaches destruction of all law in this country and the destruction of the Government itself? I say it is time that we became intolerant of those things that would destroy us.

The questions are asked:

What is sympathy with the Communists or Communist organization?

What does it mean to associate with Communists or communistic organizations?

What do you mean by support?

How does one use support?

What is a Communist?

What is good order of a community?

What is happiness of a community?

What is a local community?

Does a strike interfere with good order or happiness of a community?

What are established democratic, economic, or domestic relations?

Can it possibly be true that my colleague does not know the answers to these questions? I can hardly believe this. I believe that with his experience, his knowledge, his long service record on this Immigration Committee, he knows the technical answers to these questions and he also knows the practical answers to these questions.

He should also know that if this communistic doctrine were ever permitted to prevail in the United States of America, all religion would be wiped out; all business would be wiped out; every single union would be wiped out, as they all were under its operation in Russia.

I am glad, however, that this only expresses the opinion of the chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, for I believe, when the evidence is taken, that the majority of the members will report out this bill, and I am somewhat surprised that the chairman would make this record in view of the fact that his committee have not fully and finally discussed this bill and taken a vote thereon.

Is it possible that the chairman feels that this bill will come out of committee and that he seeks to fight it even before it is ever brought upon the floor?

My worthy colleague says that the committee is very sympathetic to the proposed legislation, and I believe he has himself stated that he is sympathetic to it, but when he runs in the arguments of the Trotzkyites and the others he has mentioned in his questions he is drawing a red herring across the trail. He heard me state before the committee that I had no pride of authorship in this bill; that I would welcome and would seek constructive amendments that would carry out the word and spirit of this bill.

I have been watching this situation for years, and for the last 10 or 12 years every bill of this type that has sought to restrict or control this doctrine or preachment of the destruction of the United States of America has been talked to death, buried in committee, or become so entangled with questions that a lawyer might say were incompetent, irrelevant, or immaterial; that it has never passed; but, on the other hand, every time a bill of such type has been killed those who have killed it have always made the statement that they had better ideas, but in the long run these ideas have never been carried out; nor have they brought out a bill that would do the very thing that this bill seeks to do. It appears to me that it has been a game of hide-and-seek, of stalling, and goes so far as to actually protect these subversive, destructive, minority communistic interests.

This bill is not retroactive and I have much good legal opinion to that effect. The chairman of this committee heard me make the statement—and I believe it is true—that in qualifying an individual to find out what he actually is his background must necessarily be gone into; and the reason that this bill states that any alien who has been or who has associated with, or who by his action in the past has indicated his position, or who by his sympathies has indicated what his real feelings are, all contribute to qualify him and to tell what he actually is. Certainly one cannot have a preconceived idea as to what a man's future thoughts might be, and this part of the bill is in there for the specific purpose to determine what he actually is. Is there any other way by which one may be judged? This bill will serve to provide practical proof of what a man is. I have implicit confidence in the courts of our United States to carry out justice under the provisions of this bill, and to qualify a man, as to whether he may or may not be deported.

The chairman further heard me say that in the Landis decision, wherein Bridges was whitewashed, but not exonerated, Landis hid behind the excuse that we could not deport any of these undesirable aliens for his communistic sympathies and belief, and this bill therefore was drawn for that specific purpose. If he has read the RECORD, he will find wherein the Assembly of the State of California and the senate of the State of California adopted their resolutions Nos. 11 and 23, and asked that a specific bill be passed to cover this particular point, as there was not, at the present time, any law that would take these Communists. If this law is passed, these undesirable aliens may be deported, as it will have the effect of amending the immigration laws as shown in the United States Department of Labor, Immigration, and Naturalization Service laws, rules, and regulations of January 1, 1930, as amended, up to and including December 31, 1936. Harry Bridges has violated every single one of these, as shown on pages 33 and 34. This section states as follows:

> Exclusion and expulsion of anarchists and similar classes (aliens opposed to, or disbelieving in, organized forms of government; aliens believing in, advising, etc., overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government or all forms of law, unlawful assaulting or killing of any Government officers, unlawful damage, etc., to property, or sabotage; aliens writing, publishing, etc., written or printed matter advising, etc., opposition to organized forms of Government, overthrow by force or violence of United States Government or all forms of law, unlawful assaulting or killing of Government officers, unlawful damage, etc., to property, or sabotage; aliens members of or affiliated with organization, etc., writing, etc., written, or printed matter described herein). (Title 8, sec. 137, U. S. C. A.)

My worthy colleague has questioned the words "affiliated with" and has asked questions in connection with my bill, when, as a matter of fact, this very wording, or terminology, is in the law which is active and in effect now. He must

realize that in interpreting the laws of the country, our courts have been able to determine what an "accomplice" of murder is, and I would liken this terminology to the terminology under which our courts have been able to make satisfactory determination as to what an accomplice is. This section gives clearly, definitely, and positively what are termed "societies," "groups," "organizations," and those who advocate or teach opposition to all organized government; goes into the matter of unlawful damage, injury, destruction of property, and sabotage; goes into the giving, lending, or promising of money or anything of value for the advising, advocacy, or teaching of the above doctrine, both as to individuals and as to organizations, societies, or groups of any such character as above.

It was stated that this bill did not provide a penalty.

The penalty is already provided in that section wherein it states that any alien who at any time after entering the United States is found to have been at the time of entry, or has become thereafter, a member of one of the classes of aliens enumerated above, and it provides further, that any such alien shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody or deported in the manner provided in the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. It provides further that the provisions of this section shall be applicable to the classes of aliens mentioned in this act, irrespective of the time of their entry.

Why, now, does this chairman state to you that the provisions in my bill are unconstitutional, when he already has on the books in the laws that directly affect his own Immigration and Naturalization Committee, and are written specifically for that committee, the same provisions? This does not square out. It appears to me that this chairman does not want this bill passed. This worthy chairman ought to know the difference between criminal and civil procedure. This is entirely a civil procedure, and the United States Government or any sovereign government has a right to deport any of these undesirable aliens under this procedure.

Do not let a red herring be drawn across the trail with reference to this bill by letting someone interpret it to mean that it applies to all aliens. It does not. This bill does not apply to those decent, reasonable, outstanding aliens who would make fine citizens of this country, but deals only with the undesirable alien who comes into this country with the very sinister and subversive idea of destroying what we have here, and who would remake it in accordance with European standards. The penalty in this bill is extremely generous. If these same undesirable aliens would go into the countries from which they came and attempt to preach any such destructive doctrine, they would be immediately executed. Therefore I say that the provisions of this bill are generous.

The situation with respect to this subversive activity, including sabotage and some of the preachments that are being made in this country, has grown to an alarming degree to those who really think and have the welfare of this country at heart. I am going to ask the chairman a few questions:

How far are you going to permit the "boring from within" and the placement of so-called cells in the Government and in positions where they can do us damage in time of stress?

How far are you going to permit this to interfere with the business operation of our merchant marine, our national defense?

What would sabotage do to us in our national defenses if we actually needed them in the manner in which some foreign countries have needed them in the immediate past? Does he advocate that we sit idly by and permit these things to take place, that we sit idly by and permit this Government to be destroyed and taken over by foreign powers?

If there ever was a case parallel to the occasion when Nero "fiddled while Rome burned," this looks to me to be a parallel case in this country. It is my opinion that such committees as the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, when they have in their power such items as these, are just as much a line of national defense as is our Army, our Navy, or our airplane defense. If we are destroyed in this manner, we are just as surely destroyed as if our Army were defeated, our Navy sunk, and our air defense annihilated. I challenge this committee on this point, and I ask that they do their duty in the protection of this country, and I am quite sure that the majority of this committee is certainly going to do this.

There has been much said, and many bills introduced, much discussion, much logrolling, but after the smoke all clears away nothing has been done, and I ask this committee to do something, to get this bill out and do it immediately, in order that this country may be properly defended from all sides, before it is too late, and before we have paid the penalty that some European countries have paid.

We Need the Whole Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing today in the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 17, 1940]

The President asks $1,182,000,000 for defense, in addition to the two billions already ticketed for that purpose.

Congress shows every intention of voting the money, and we think it should do so, with all possible haste. Republican leaders on Capitol Hill have laid aside partisanship and are cooperating with the Democrats, which is what they should do in times like these.

But Congress will not have done its duty if it merely votes the money and then goes home, which seems to be what the President has in mind. To be sure, he promised to call Congress back into special session if the national defense requires it. "The Congress and the Chief Executive," he said, "constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned."

For the congressional part of the team to sit on the bench while the Chief Executive carries the ball without interference—that is not what this emergency demands.

"I know that our trained officers and men know more about fighting and the weapons and equipment needed for fighting than any of us laymen; and I have confidence in them."

So have we all.

Yet if our experience in the last war and observation of the struggle now raging have taught us anything, it is that modern war is not merely a contest of officers and men in the field. It is even more a conflict of economic and industrial systems. It is no longer enough to "get there fustest with the mostest men." The side that wins is the one which can also "get there fustest with the mostest and bestest weapons"—and which can count on the largest continuing volume of the same.

Mr. Roosevelt spoke dramatically of the hours of flying time from possible enemy bases to our shores. But his admirals and generals are still dealing in months and years required to get deliveries on their orders. They have muddled with this procurement problem year after year, unable to spend the money as fast as Congress appropriates it. Is there any reason to believe that the problem will be solved by merely doubling the appropriations to be handled by the same men and the same methods?

No. The situation clearly calls for a change. The President and his admirals and generals need the help of men who know the methods of industry—who know how to turn the cranks of this country's great mass-production machines, and how to convert blueprints into actual weapons coming off the assembly lines.

Call it a defense industries board—call it whatever you wish—so long as it has men who know how to get the job done; "economic royalists," perhaps, a little while ago, but today men who should be drafted into the country's service because they have industrial brains.

No one who heard Mr. Roosevelt's speech yesterday could fail to sense the wartime atmosphere, the feeling that we are in an emergency which demands sacrifice from every man—and, from every man, the President as well as others, the willingness to lay aside past prejudices and work together until the last unit of our economic system has been mobilized to make our country strong.

Congress has rallied to the Chief Executive's leadership, but Congress should not go home until it has also taken steps to rally the forces of private industry, from which our weapons and means of defense must be drawn.

We entered the last war with a national debt of $1,000,000,000. We came out owing more than 25 billions.

Now, we face the threat of a more terrible conflict with a Budget 11 years out of balance and a debt nearing 45 billions.

Is this generation so decadent that, not having yet paid for the last war, it wants to pass on new costs of self-defense to posterity, on the theory that those to come will have no social problems or defenses of their own to burden them?

We think not.

But the President yesterday said not a word about how to raise the extra billion for defense. He is reported to believe that responsibility belongs to Congress.

And indeed it does.

The legislative branch has the constitutional power to appropriate, and the obligation to tax.

Congress should not go home until it has met that responsibility. And the courageous way to meet it is by a direct tax on the incomes of the largest possible number of citizens—from each according to his ability to pay.

To defend our country we ask young men to enlist in a service where, if war comes, they may have to risk their lives at the controls and guns of airplanes, and tanks, and ships of war. Shall we spare the pocketbooks of those who would stay at home—just because they vote?

The Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PUYALLUP (WASH.) PRESS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Puyallup Press, of Puyallup, Wash., of April 25, 1940, dealing with the subject of surplus agricultural products and extolling the food-stamp plan as a sound and practical means of disposing of such surplus farm produce. I believe the editorial is a trenchant expression of sentiment generally entertained by sober and thoughtful people throughout the United States.

The article is as follows:

[From the Puyallup (Wash.) Press of April 25, 1940]

THE ANSWER TO SURPLUSES

An ever-widening market for farmers is being created through the increasing participation in the food-stamp plan. About 2,000,000 needy persons are now taking part in eating needed surplus foods that have accumulated through lack of buying power. It is anticipated that by July 1 from three to four million persons will be taking part in the plan's dual effort to broaden the domestic market for farm surpluses and improve the diet of the undernourished of our country.

The farmers represent one-fourth of our population—yet have only 11 percent of the national income. Obviously, the farmers' market has been curtailed, and for several reasons. Increased efficiency in agricultural production, coupled with loss of our export markets, has greatly increased the need of a wider domestic market for the farmers. Meanwhile lack of ability to buy many needed so-called surplus foods on the part of millions of our people has narrowed rather than widened this market. Recent studies indicate that nearly two-thirds of the families in this country have been living on an average monthly income of $69, and some 22,000,000 people are receiving one form or another of public aid.

Because the food-stamp plan is making it possible for the farmers to sell profitably more produce in the cities, they are enabled, in turn, to buy more of the industrial goods they need from the cities. This increased business activity in the cities tends toward reemployment, and men with jobs further increase consumption.

Ways and means must be found—and the food-stamp plan is one of them—to make it possible for those who want work to get it. Full reemployment is the ultimate goal and answer to the challenge of underconsumption and resultant surpluses of both farm and city goods needed in this country. The unsatisfied wants of two-thirds of our people comprise the greatest new market that has ever loomed before our farmers and businessmen. Reemployment and increased mass buying power is the answer to underconsumption and farm surpluses in America.

Reestablish P. W. A. by Adopting Voorhis Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with those who have spoken of the values of a P. W. A. program. I have believed always that a program of the P. W. A. type should be part of our attack on unemployment. I shall offer the following amendment at the end of the so-called relief bill when it is read for amendment:

Amendment by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 33, line 7, add a new title as follows:

"TITLE II

"SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000,000 and the Commissioner of Public Works (in this section called the Commissioner) is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, to make loans from this fund to States, Territories, possessions, or political subdivisions, or any instrumentalities or agencies thereof (in this section called public bodies), to finance or aid in financing projects which will provide new employment; (b) to organizations created pursuant to law or under the authority of any public body to operate without profit (in this section called nonprofit organizations), to finance or aid in financing projects (including any and all constituent parts thereof) which will produce new employment, will be devoted to public use, and are within any one of the following classes: Hospitals, health centers, clinics, colleges, schools, recreational facilities, or facilities for the handling and storage of farm products; and (c) to public bodies and nonprofit organizations for the temporary operation and maintenance of projects for such period as the Commissioner shall deem necessary for the security of any obligations acquired hereunder.

"SEC. 2. Every such loan shall be evidenced by an obligation or obligations, general or special, of the public body or nonprofit organization to which made, shall bear interest upon the unpaid principal at the rate of 1 percent per annum, shall be secured in such manner as the Commissioner shall determine to be necessary reasonably to assure repayment of the loan, and shall be repayable at one time or from time to time within a period not to exceed (1) 50 years from the first advancement of funds thereunder or (2) the anticipated period of usefulness of the project for which such loan is made, whichever is less, as determined by the Commissioner prior to such first advancement.

"SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Commissioner is authorized—

"(a) To prescribe, from time to time, terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this section.

"(b) To sell any bonds, securities, or other obligations acquired hereunder, or any security therefor.

"(c) To accept (1) in exchange and substitution for any bonds, securities, or other obligations of the same or any other public body or nonprofit organization, whether of the same or longer maturities or otherwise differing, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, are more desirable than those so acquired; and (2) in exchange and substitution for any bonds, securities, or other obligations acquired hereunder, any other security, which in the determination of the Commissioner is more desirable than that so acquired.

"(d) To authorize expenditures for contract stenographic reporting services; supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; travel expenses, including the expense of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding; and such other expenses as he may determine necessary to the accomplishment of the objectives of this title.

"(e) The Commissioner is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such executive and administrative assistants, a general counsel and such other attorneys, and such experts, special consultants, and regional supervisors, and subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint such other employees as he may deem necessary as a regular staff to carry out the purposes of this title, and to prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure: *Provided*, That if the Commissioner shall, within 6 months after the date of the approval of this act, certify to the United States Civil Service Commission that any employee of the Public Works Administration has rendered satisfactory services for at least 6 months prior to the date of approval of this act and is to be assigned to the regular staff of the Administration, and such employee shall, within 6 months after such certification, pass such appropriate

noncompetitive tests of fitness as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, such employee shall thereupon acquire the same status as if certified after examination by the Civil Service Commission.

"SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall require (a) that all workmen, laborers, and mechanics employed in the construction of any project financed hereunder shall be paid without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account not less than the wages determined by the Commissioner, or in accordance with local law, to be the wages prevailing for the corresponding classes of workmen, laborers, and mechanics employed on projects of a character similar to the work in the locality where the project is to be situated; and (b) that no workman, laborer, or mechanic employed in the construction of any such project shall be compelled to work a greater number of hours per week than the applicable maximum established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or be compensated at a rate less than the applicable minimum-wage rate established by said act, whether or not the employment of such workman, laborer, or mechanic is subject to the provision of said act.

"SEC. 5. The Public Works Administration in the Federal Works Agency is hereby continued, and all provisions of law existing on the date of enactment hereof relating to limitations of time for the continuance of the Public Works Administration, and the receipt of applications, are hereby repealed. The Commissioner shall act under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

"SEC. 6. Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the fund shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941."

Construction Work Done by W. P. A. Does Not Compete With Private Construction Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the W. P. A. policy governing eligibility of projects to be operated on the W. P. A. construction program is stated as follows in the Guide to Project Eligibility, operating procedure No. G–1, sections 12 and 13:

The work or service to be undertaken as a project shall not result in (a) the displacement of personnel regularly employed by the sponsor, or by some other public authority or agency, or (b) prevent the employment of persons who would otherwise be employed by the sponsor, or by some other public authority or agency. The project to be prosecuted shall furnish work which is additional to that provided for under the normal budget of the sponsor. In all cases where the proposed work might appear to displace or prevent the employment of personnel who would otherwise be employed by the sponsor, the justification for the project shall be clearly established.

No current maintenance work may be prosecuted under any project. This is construed to mean any work which is customarily carried out by the regular employees of a public agency. The absence of a proper maintenance or clerical force in the employ of such an agency does not, however, justify the execution of the work by the Work Projects Administration if it is of a type which is ordinarily done by a regular maintenance of clerical force.

Since every application for construction projects submitted to Washington contains information showing that this work is in addition to work the sponsor or other public bodies would normally do, the volume of public construction work done by the W. P. A. that would have been done by municipalities through private contracts without W. P. A. funds is, without doubt, negligible in terms of the total volume of private construction work. Furthermore, the W. P. A. does not undertake work which displaces personnel regularly employed by the sponsor or other public authority or would prevent the employment of persons who would otherwise be employed by the sponsor or other public agencies. These specific regulations operate to prevent W. P. A. doing construction work in competition with private construction contractors.

An example of the type of construction work done by W. P. A. is given by Mayor Tobin, of Boston, on pages 270 and 271 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Seventy-sixth Congress, on House Joint Resolution 326. In discussing a project which he proposed to sponsor, Mayor Tobin made the following statement:

The only building construction at the present time I have in mind is there is a possibility we may take a lot of flat lands that the city is going to take for taxes—about $125,000 is owed to us for taxes. It is of no value as it is at the present time. Under ordinary circumstances the city would not have the land. If it does come to us, the chances are I will build a roadway across it and build a bathhouse and make a beach out of it. And as the result we will have to build a bathhouse.

Now, that bathhouse would never be built if it were not for this depression. We are not depriving the contractors of work, because a contractor would never have had an opportunity to bid on the building of that bathhouse building, because the bathhouse building would not have been built, would not have been considered, if we did not have the depression we have at the present time.

A comparison of the volume of public construction work done by private contract during the period 1925 to 1929 and 1936 to 1939 does not indicate that W. P. A. construction is taking business from the private construction contractors. Figures obtained from the Department of Commerce and presented to the House Committee on Appropriations by the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., show that in the boom period, 1925 through 1929, public-contract construction averaged $2,292,000,000 a year. During the 3 years, 1936 to 1939, when W. P. A. was in operation, public-contract construction averaged $2,168,000,000.

These figures show that the volume of public-contract construction in recent years has approximated the level attained in the late twenties; this has been largely through expansion of the Federal public-works program. In addition to this volume of public works, the W. P. A. program has been operated by the Federal Government for the unemployed on the relief rolls.

A public-work program prosecuted by the contract system does not provide jobs for the unemployed who are on relief. Not only is the cost per worker from three to four times as high under the private-contract system as on the W. P. A. program but also private contractors draw only a small proportion of their workers from the relief rolls. Colonel Harrington, Commissioner of Work Projects, testified to the Senate Committee on Appropirations of the Seventy-sixth Congress—House Joint Resolution 326, page 37—to that effect in the following statement:

Even in 1936, when the most strenuous efforts were made to force contractors to employ such persons, they employed less than one-third of their force from persons in need of relief. House Joint Resolution 326 in another section of the bill (p. 33, line 14, sec. 201, item (d)) explicitly recognizes this condition by providing that only 25 percent of the labor employed on these projects must come from relief rolls and then only if in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works such labor is available. I doubt that even this limited requirement is workable.

Contractors who prosecute the work received as a result of competitive bidding use every labor-saving device possible. They do not employ the older workers. They operate only when weather conditions are favorable; and the necessity for bidding on and awarding contracts prevents rapid expansion of the program to meet emergencies or contraction when emergencies cease to exist. In contrast, the W. P. A. secures at least 95 percent of its workers from the relief rolls, operates when seasonal conditions are not favorable to private-control operations, and expands or curtails the program rapidly as the need exists. On both programs materials, supplies, and equipment are secured from private concerns.

Additional work is made for private contractors by the W. P. A. through cooperating with the United States Housing Authority and the Federal Housing Administration in the promotion of low-cost housing. Under W. P. A. regulations, projects for actual construction work on houses to be built on low-cost housing programs are not eligible for operation; but projects for housing surveys; demolition of structures; clearing; draining and grading of sites; construction of public facilities such as streets, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; and work on publicly owned transmission lines are eligible for operation provided such work will enable the marginal prospective home owner to acquire a home which would be denied him if it were necessary to include the cost of street and utility improvements in the price of the house.

Prosecuting projects which makes construction programs such as low-cost housing and other public developments possible indirectly creates work for, rather than takes work away from, private enterprise.

W. P. A. regulations provide, in accordance with section 1, subsection (e) of the E. R. A. Act of 1939, that equipment required for operation of W. P. A. projects be purchased only when the desired type and quantity cannot be rented at a reasonable rate. This policy of renting equipment wherever possible creates a source of income that private owners of equipment would not otherwise receive. A study made by the Work Projects Administration showed that for the 2 weeks ending November 19, 1938, a total of 76,379 units of equipment were rented from private owners. The rental of 38,206 units of this total was paid from Federal funds and the remainder from sponsors' funds.

The private construction contractors who allege that W. P. A. construction work is in competition with their activities urge that Government withdraw from construction work prosecuted through force-account methods and provide funds for such construction work for prosecution by private contractors. In complaining of competition they are simply taking the position that Government construction by force account is a potential market for their services; they are out to get this market, if possible. In this attempt they are, in effect, recommending that the dole be substituted for the work program as a means of providing for the majority of the unemployed on relief. Their position is made clear by the testimony of their representative before the House Appropriations subcommittee holding hearings on the 1941 relief bill who recommended: That W. P. A. operations be limited to activities of a nonpermanent nature; that the unemployed who could not be placed on W. P. A. projects be put in the Army; that the unemployed who did not want to go in the Army be put on the dole; and that recognition be given the principle that the W. P. A. program be replaced with a public-works program prosecuted under private contracts. Such proposals as these ignore the primary objective of the W. P. A. program—that of giving work on useful public projects to the unemployed who are in need.

Victory for the Allies Is Held To Be the Only Assurance Against Invasion of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

LETTER FROM J. H. COFER

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the editor of the Virginian-Pilot and published recently in that paper:

EDITOR, VIRGINIAN-PILOT:

I have always argued that we should have joined the League of Nations at the beginning, and if we had done so, conditions in Europe would not be as they are today. America didn't win the World War; we only stopped it pending the formation of a League of Nations, which we were to join. Woodrow Wilson would never have stopped fighting if he had thought our country would not support him in his fight for a League of Nations. Mr. Wilson knew that a League without our membership would not bring peace. America supported him fully in war, but after the armistice we betrayed him and defeated the best plan ever offered for peace, and finally killed him, for he actually sacrificed his life for what he knew would come as near giving definite peace as anything could. Germany played her trump cards to keep the United States out of the League, believing if she could do so, that she would have nothing to fear from Europe. How true this is proving to be!

The Allies have been slow in preparing, and America failed to do what should have been done at the proper time, which undoubtedly would have saved the inhuman slaughter now going on in Europe. We made a colossal mistake in not joining the League. Why did we fight if we were not to be a party to peace? Our joining could not have made matters worse than they have come to be, and millions of people believe that our joining would have prevented the present conditions.

Now the explosion has come, don't let's fool ourselves and think we are safe because the great Atlantic Ocean separates us. We were 3,000 miles from Europe in 1917, but today, with the advent of fast boats and swift planes, we are less than 1,000 miles away by comparison, and don't be misled by some who say we can't be invaded. Germany has designs on America, and is already stirring up trouble for us in Mexico, and through many sources is carrying on propaganda and spy work right among us. We know it, and yet we are slow to act. The important thing for our country to do immediately is to give the Allies every known assistance and day and night prepare ourselves for the fray that will overtake us if the Allies lose.

At this critical time it behooves every man and woman in America to forget politics and party, throw aside all selfishness, and fully support Mr. Roosevelt in the heroic struggle now on, and in which the United States must play an important part. Our one purpose now must be to stop the war before it reaches our shores, even if we again have to fight with the Allies in Europe. Allied victory is the only certain means of preventing invasion of our country.

J. H. COFER.

NORFOLK, *April 15, 1940.*

Benefits of a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

ARTICLE BY MISS LORNA BRENNAN

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Benefits of a Democracy," which is a prize essay written by Miss Lorna Brennan, a talented girl student of the Kirkland High School, Kirkland, Wash. I am proud to present this article as an evidence of precocity, intellectual attainment, and high-minded patriotism as exhibited by the high-school students of my district.

The character and content of the essay reveal, likewise, that the instructors and teachers of the public schools in my State are admirably adapted to the work in which they are engaged, and inculcate in their pupils a sound appreciation of the benefits of democracy. It is a splendid thing when boys and girls in our high schools understand and speak reverently of democracy and all which it brings to us and all which it entails.

The article is as follows:

[From the East Side Journal, Kirkland, Wash., of April 25, 1940]

BENEFITS OF A DEMOCRACY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following essay entitled "Benefits of Democracy," was written by Lorna Brennan, Kirkland high-school student, and was awarded second place in the East Side contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Bellevue. Because it is an article well worth reading and remembering, we are printing it in full in the column below.)

Because one of the fundamental bases of American democracy is the love of liberty and a nonrestricted freedom in regard to press, religion, and speech, it is reasonably safe to say that the American people would never accept an "ism" government.

Our rights and privileges aren't merely the result of customs built up over a period of time by weakening the powers of the Central Government, rather these independent privileges are specifically granted to us by the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution.

Perhaps if we enumerate and discuss the Bill of Rights we can obtain a clearer idea of the civil rights that have been handed down from generation to generation in the United States. Freedom of religion, speech, press, right of assembly and petition heads the list of rights. This privilege is by far our foremost one, and most "ism" governments would regard it as a dangerous threat to their practices because the people would feel free to take advantage of such a privilege.

We have the right to bear arms. Certainly an advantage such as this wouldn't be granted with wholehearted enthusiasm by an "ism" government or a country that doesn't believe in democracy.

In the United States the right to search a person's house must be authorized by a warrant with a guarantee that the warrant is authentic. In an "ism" country this right seems to be the government's. Your house would be the victim of storm troopers if the government thought you had anything in your possession that was either of detriment or beneficial to them.

We in the democratic countries have that very important privilege of trial by jury.

In an undemocratic country where "isms" are in force you would be subject to cruelty or would be deported to a concentration camp until you learned your lesson. Probably if the government was prejudiced against you you would find yourself in a precarious position. The government could take the trial in their own hands and dispose of you in a way that would make them feel justified.

We in America enjoy our civil rights to the fullest. People in despotic countries do not have even the minimum pleasure out of rights that we do. There is a restriction on what they do or say in regard to government affairs. Freedom of the press is not only unheard of, but it doesn't exist. Editors find it necessary to be extremely careful in their editorials and news articles that would even hint of criticism toward the government. In various despotic countries businessmen no longer handle their own transactions or affairs; the farmer has no choice as to the crop he will raise or the animal he will breed; and laboring conditions are at the lowest wage scale in history. In the United States we are fortunate in having a government that loans money to the farmers and a government that is generous enough to purchase their surplus products and in turn give it to the person who is on relief and in need of aid.

Democracy upholds the right of private ownership of property. Communism and socialism set up a goal to be reached. Because there exists a classless society, this goal can only be attained by revolutionary action by the proletarian, which results, of course, from liquidating classes and societies of peoples.

Politics are the main concern of every nation. It forms the backbone of the country. Democratic nations work by the system of representation. Each group within the state is free to organize. Democracy restricts the powers of a state over its citizens.

In communism the political system is made up of a committee working through the industries. Socialism is much the same as communism, with only slight difference in their political tactics.

Coming back to democracy, there are two types—pure and representation. In pure democracies the questions of public policy are settled by mass meetings of men. This would be called democracy carried out through the medium of assembly.

Representation democracy is a system by which elected officers can be recalled if they fail to live up to the people's expectations or prove unable to represent them in a manner they desire.

Democracy is freedom. Freedom of enjoyment and movement. We in America accept democracy as a matter of course.

The benefits of democracy mean to me representing the youth of today and a part of the Government tomorrow, that I may turn out in a different kind of uniform after my school day is done to participate in a sport and not in a military exhibition; that I may dance to a swing orchestra and not march stiffly to a military band; that I may eat as my stomach dictates to me rather than a list that rations my food allowance; and that I may speak my mind, give my interpretation of the Government without fear of my life.

Democracy is my freedom, my life, and my future. Democracy is a goal to be reached, an ideal to be realized, and the aim of every American today.

New Deal Costlier Than War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SAVANNAH (GA.) NEWS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the News (Independent Democrat), of Savannah, Ga.:

[From the Savannah (Ga.) News of April 28, 1940]

NEW DEAL COSTLIER THAN WAR

Great Britain is preparing to use $14,583 a minute to carry on the war. This spending at the rate of more than $2,000,000 a day, announced by Sir John Simon, Chancelor of the Exchequer, outstrips the World War. It is astounding and lamentable that there must be such a waste for destructive purposes. However, the people of the United States may look at those figures, make a home comparison, and utter some lamentations on their own shores.

During the past 8 years the United States has not been involved in any war. Nevertheless, President Roosevelt's administration has been spending at a greater rate than the British war expense. The Roosevelt outlay of the people's money has been at the rate of $15,607 a minute every minute of the year. During President Roosevelt's two terms in the White House the Federal receipts have been $40,000,000,000, but the New Dealers, through the borrowing plan, have handed out more than sixty-five and one-half billions. All the administrations from Washington to the New Deal show an aggregate of $112,000,000,000.

It is well enough to shudder at England's war costs, if we save a few shivers for contemplation of peacetime waste of this country's most profligate regime. The British cannot get rid of their problem soon. Americans will have their chance at the polls in November.

The Higher Sportsmanship in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to extend my remarks by submitting an address delivered last evening by my colleague from Illinois, Hon. T. V. SMITH, on the Hatch Act.

We must not let the anguish of war keep us from normal domestic improvements. I want to talk to you tonight about the Hatch bill, a grand chance we now have at betterment in our politics.

Politics has been called the great American game, and a game it is in one sense of the term. It requires two parties, at least, and a sense of sportsmanship between them. At least, it requires sportsmanship. Sportsmanship: That's what has saved the Constitution for continued service to our day; that's what makes the two-party system work with us, though it break down elsewhere. America lasts only so long as this spirit of sportsmanship continues.

TWO KINDS OF SPORTSMANSHIP

But there are two kinds of sportsmanship—the lower and the higher. The lower we have always had; the higher we are slowly attaining. Of this higher sort I want particularly to speak, but only after a word as to the lower sportsmanship.

THE LOWER SPORTSMANSHIP

The lower sportsmanship is to lose one's case with good humor after fighting with all one's might for a cause. Even this kind of sportsmanship is unknown to dictators. They take the kingdom of power by violence because they cannot stand to see others win in peace. The temptation to bully proves for some politicians also a strain too great for democratic stamina. Poor sports may seem to submit to an election but behind the scenes be buying votes or bullying employees. That is higher than dictators but lower than decency.

It is a form of political sportsmanship, any losing of one's case without violence. The higher sportsmanship, however, has to do not with losing but with the manner of winning. The American people were spoiled against poor sportsmanship and prepared for higher sportsmanship in the very beginning of the Republic.

Two great men, who in many countries then and now would have cut each other's throats, taught us how to remain democratic through thick and thin. These men were Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. How hard they fought, how bitterly at times they hated each other. Each had his day of success, but neither would ever have harmed a hair of the other's head. Each loved his country, and each was man enough to see his country's need of the other. Their common country, this America of ours, became great enough from the beginning thus to harbor enemies, to stomach opposition, and to turn party contradiction to patriotic purposes. Hamilton and Jefferson taught us by example that in the American way of life, opposition is a standard form of cooperation. It was the greatest possible lesson they had to teach, or we had to learn.

THE HIGHER SPORTSMANSHIP

It is this lesson taught by both Jefferson and Hamilton which is forgotten by those whose conduct made necessary the first Hatch Act, and now makes necessary this second Hatch bill already passed by the Senate. Opponents of this bill forget that the American theory is that both great political parties are equally indispensable. As early America could not afford to be without either Hamilton or Jefferson, so the country today cannot afford to be without either of the parties they founded.

If equally indispensable, each party must, of course, be afforded equal opportunity to live and to win elections. The Hatch measure, first and last, seeks only to protect equality of opportunity for the party out of power by preventing the party in power from using

public money for partisan effect. It is rotten sportsmanship as it is sordid citizenship to compromise this equality of opportunity for the party out of power. Everyone knows, who has reflected upon the matter for a moment, that the party in power has already the advantage, simply because it is in power. I know, for instance, that I start with an advantage over any man who runs against me as Congressman at Large in Illinois. So with every man in office. The party in power has the public eye; it can catch the public ear; it thus has free publicity to begin with. This natural advantage should surely make incumbents ashamed to snatch also advantages artificial and unsportsmanlike.

It is this kind of dishonest advantage which the Sheppard committee reported certain States to have taken of the W. P. A. in 1936. It is this kind of unsportsmanlike advantage which Senator HATCH wishes to stop. His first bill outlawed this advantage in all strictly Federal jobs. But there are several hundred thousand jobs in the States, paid for in whole or in part by Federal money; and it is holders of these jobs which the present Hatch bill proposes to sterilize of political poison. Poor sports never understand how a party in power could voluntarily surrender advantages to the opposing party. But politicians are mostly good sports, and sportsmen hate unfair advantage.

So it happens that Senator HATCH, a Democrat, proposes this legislation. So it happens that Senator BARKLEY, Democratic floor leader in the Senate, saw it through. So it happens that Representative DEMPSEY, a Democrat, furthers this legislation in the House of Representatives. So it happens that I, a Democrat, am this moment urging you to support this effort at fair play, though I alone of Illinois House Democrats voted for the first Hatch Act. So it happens that President Roosevelt has joined other Democratic Party leaders in publicly recommending this display of good sportsmanship. Of course, we Democrats want to win the election, but we do not want to win the dirty way. We want to win it the way that will keep elections worth winning. That's what I mean by the higher sportsmanship in politics—so to win, or lose, as to keep the game ageing.

In a two-party system, for the party in power to use jobs publicly paid for to prosper its private advantage is clearly outrageous; for we have not then really a two-party system at all, but in essence a totalitarian one. It's like a game of chess in which you take all the titled pieces and leave to your opponent only the lowly pawns. This practice would ruin any game and this practice is clearly pernicious to the game of politics. The Hatch Act so brands it and proposes to outlaw it accordingly. Good taste and a sense of sportsmanship ought to prevent such practice. Long ago President Jefferson, the good sportsman in politics, issued an order saying that a public official should not under him "attempt to influence the votes of others nor take any part in the business of electioneering, that being deemed inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution and his duties to it."

That is the whole case for the Hatch Act, stated and ordered by Thomas Jefferson. I admit it unfortunate that we must legislate what good sportsmanship should dictate; but bad taste cannot be allowed to prevail below a certain level. Those who are boors in freedom must have their freedom curtailed so that the freedom of others may be safeguarded. The Hatch proposal simply defines as pernicious and forbids as contrary to law this thing which Jefferson correctly described as "inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution." Those who, with Jefferson, say this should be done, but, against Jefferson, say it should not be done by the Federal Government are making public spectacles of themselves. Such a cult of complacency is today accursed. It is indeed the very States that have most outraged good taste and honest citizenship, as my colleague DEMPSEY pointed out on this network a week ago tonight, these very ones it is who now shout States' rights, and continue to perpetuate States' wrongs. The Federal Government exists, among other reasons, for this very reason: To prevent States' rights from becoming national wrongs.

LEEWAY UNDER OUR BASIC LAW

What needs to be done should be done by whatever agency can do it most effectively. That's the division of labor that has actually prevailed between the States and the Nation, and it is the principle that was intended to regulate the leeway left by our fathers under the not too definite separation of powers. James Madison, the cautious, made this absolutely clear. Said he: "If * * * the people should in the future, become more partial to the Federal than to the State governments, the change can only result from such manifest and irresistible proofs of better administration, as will overcome all their antecedent propensities, and in that case the people ought not surely to be precluded from giving most of their confidence, where they may discover it most due."

That is the whole story against the cult Jeremiahs of States' rights. That's the story of every advance in national power from handling Federal relief centrally to the setting up of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Starting with jealous States who broke up the Confederation and almost ruined prospects for any America at all, we have moved cautiously but surely for the establishment of a national power adequate to deal with whatever ought to be done but is not being done, and we have moved along the groove marked by Madison's powerful words—through "manifest and irresistible proofs of better administration." Those who say politics ought not to be purified are perhaps entitled to respect; for they frankly set against our democratic system an older competitor, the aristocratic or autocratic way of life. But those who say that politics ought to be purified but insist that nobody shall do the purging save the poor sports themselves—such puerile preachers of perniciousness may be left to the pomposity of their own pusillanimous preachment.

A LAW EASY TO ENFORCE

The Hatch Act is dead right. That is its great advantage. But it has another advantage: It will require little Federal power to enforce it. It is one of those fortunate things which, born of good sportsmanship, will enlist sportsmanship to make it effective. In the enforcement of any law one good sport is worth a hundred policemen. With the partisan use of public money (for political jobholders) declared pernicious, the party out of power will so publicize prospective perniciousness as to minimize its actual perpetration. I have seen the principle already working in this way in Illinois. It is a happy case of virtue paying its own way when such a law becomes largely self-enforcing.

There is, moreover, poetic justice, as well as good sense, in leaving to the United States Civil Service Commission, as the Hatch bill does, the initial judgment as to who has been guilty of the practices defined as pernicious. (Of course, the courts have the last say here, as elsewhere.) It is poetic justice because the law itself points to a day, I hope not distant, when the higher sportsmanship will require us to forego the advantage of patronage altogether in partisan struggles for political place. That means the coming of real civil service. Meantime, the justice is not merely poetic in its promise but substantial in its effect. The Civil Service Commission has long experience in handling just this thing, for it is our standard agency to save the most fortunate Federal workers from political domination and to prevent them in turn from officially influencing political outcomes. The Hatch bill only requires of Federal employees still out from under civil service the rules they will obey when they presently come under civil service. Let us regard it, then, as but the schoolmaster to bring all Federal employment to the merit basis. The Hatch bill can stop corruption; civil service alone can furnish correction. The two should advance together, the House now passing the Hatch bill sent over by the Senate, and the Senate now passing the Ramspeck civil-service bill sent over by the House.

It is in the light of these considerations that we join tonight in expecting the House Judiciary Committee to report out the Hatch bill; or, that failing, in working to discharge the committee so as to bring the bill to a vote through petition. Of the 218 signatures required for this, we have already 148. In tragic days we work here, and thus undramatically, to make democracy worthy of the sacrifices elsewhere required to save it. We work to preserve the lower sportsmanship of losing graciously, and to create in our citizenry the higher sportsmanship of winning justly.

Consumers and Chain-Store Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

ARTICLE BY PROF. LOUIS BADER

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article entitled "Consumers and Chain-Store Taxation," from the December 1939 issue of the Journal of Retailing, a publication of New York University. The article was written by a distinguished economist, Prof. Louis Bader, who is also one of my constituents and a professor at New York University. Professor Bader has published many other articles dealing with the science of economics, upon some aspects of which he is regarded as among the very highest authorities. The article follows:

CONSUMERS AND CHAIN-STORE TAXATION

(By Louis Bader)

(A public policy proposed but not yet crystallized into legislation is hanging fire in the Federal legislature. It is a proposed heavy tax on chain stores. The following pages contain a report on the reaction of consumers to this proposed public policy.)

Legislation involving public policies in a democracy usually results from the pressures exerted by interested groups. While this has, probably, always been true, it has been especially pronounced during the past decade with its plethora of Federal and State laws of interest to various groups of businessmen. Since much of such legislation affects the public generally, it would seem to be the part of wisdom for legislators to discover how their constituents regard laws which are proposed, particularly when sponsored by a small group.

ANTICHAIN LEGISLATION

Since 1930 successful efforts have been made in various States to pass laws taxing chain stores in varying amounts. These laws were passed not so much to raise revenue as to handicap chain

stores, which are regarded by many small store owners as a form of competition they cannot successfully counteract through their own initiative. Such tax laws, however, have not been passed in all States and in most cases the taxes were not heavy enough to have the desired effect.

Independent and small store owners have leaned even more heavily on the Government for aid in fighting the competition they faced. Since 1930, particularly, we have seen public policies established in rapid succession, such as State fair and unfair trade laws and the Federal Robinson-Patman and Miller-Tydings Acts. Even all these laws were not enough: Chain stores still continue in business and apparently successfully.[1]

A new Federal law has been proposed, commonly referred to as the Patman chain-store tax bill. The bill if passed would place a multiple tax on chain stores; i. e., a graduated tax varying from a very small tax on a small number of stores to $1,000 on each store where the number in the chain exceeds 500. In addition, this tax is multiplied by the number of States in which the chain may have stores located. The tax would be so large in the case of the leading chain-store companies that when in full effect there would be no possibility of their survival.

ATTITUDE OF THE PUBLIC

This country existed before the advent of the chain store and it would continue to exist if the chain store were forced out of business, but the chain-store development is thought by some students of marketing to be one of the worth-while contributions by businessmen to greater efficiency in the distribution of goods. If this is the case, it would seem appropriate to find out from the public at large what their ideas are on the chain store and its continuance in our economic system.

Apparently not much has been done along these lines. In the February 1939 issue of Fortune, a survey initiated by that publication was reported. How extensive in number is not indicated, although its surveys are purported to be conducted on the basis of sampling adequate for the entire country. Its results are as follows:

Fortune survey on chain-store taxation

	Housekeepers	Executives	Nonfarm proprietors	Students
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Let alone	52.2	52.8	32.3	35.0
Tax extra	32.4	39.0	47.0	50.0
Put out of business	4.8	4.3	14.1	.....
Don't know	10.6	3.9	6.6	15.0

Even if the number interviewed was adequate as a sample, the number of categories is small for a country so varied in its activities and population as ours. A more complete and comprehensive study should be made.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY STUDY

As a contribution to this field, a small study was undertaken at New York University.[2] Under the author's direction, a number of students in marketing undertook to interview as large a number of people as they could. The people interviewed, more than 3,600, lived in New York City or in one of its suburbs. They were selected at random and asked to fill out a questionnaire in the presence of the interviewer. The questionnaire was a black-and-white proposition—the voter had to decide either for or against the chain store. A number of those interviewed could not make such a clean-cut decision. Some were for taxation, but not heavy enough to put the stores out of business. Some were not in favor of either encouraging or discouraging further growth but favored permitting the chains to remain as they now are. The nonvoters shown in the tables represent largely this group. Others voted to encourage further growth, but naturally, that is, as the result of their efficiency, not with the aid of the Government. On the whole, however, those interviewed voted in clean-cut fashion and the results would seem to be their opinions at the moment.

TABLE I.—*Reaction of metropolitan New Yorkers to chain-store taxation*

	For tax		Against tax		Favor discouraging further chain-store growth		Favor encouraging further chain-store growth		Not voting
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
City voters	1,127	45.5	1,355	54.5	1,406	56.6	999	40.2	3.2
Suburban voters	399	36.0	715	64.0	516	46.3	596	53.5	.2
Total	1,526	42.4	2,070	57.6	1,922	53.4	1,595	44.3	2.3

Since it was not possible to work out scientifically a sample which could be regarded as representative of metropolitan New York, each reader will necessarily make his reservations about the results. However, these results plus others now available and still others which may become available, when added together, may yield data sufficiently accurate to be accepted as a guide to a policy worth following.[3]

CITY PEOPLE VERSUS SUBURBANITES

The results of this study are presented in two tables. No. I is an over-all presentation of those living in the city and suburbs and then combined in a total. No. II breaks down this table into a number of classifications which are believed to be representative of the people and variety of activities in and around New York. The number may not be adequate, but, when considered along with the Fortune survey, a pattern may be noticeable.

Table I would suggest that city people are less favorably inclined toward chain stores than those living in suburbs. Many more of them favor heavy taxation than suburbanites, while a substantial majority of the city people favor discouraging further growth. The suburbanites not only are by a large majority against heavy taxation, but a majority also favors encouraging further growth. When the two are combined we get a large majority against a heavy tax, and a somewhat smaller group that favors discouraging further growth.

REACTIONS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS

Table II is most interesting, for it shows the reaction of people by different categories and can easily give rise to considerable speculation. For example, women vote quite differently from men. They vote much more heavily against putting chain stores out of business, and they give only a small majority in favor of discouraging further growth. The break-down by single and married women yields slightly different results, while the break-down by housewives yields the most positive results in favor of chain stores.

The whole group of men gives only a small majority against heavy taxation and a much larger majority against encouraging further growth. On the other hand, single men seem to be more favorably inclined toward the chains than married men. Why should married men be so strongly against chains when the housewives are even more strongly for them? A clue is to be found in some of the remarks made to the reviewers. The housewives facing the necessity of stretching the family purse think they can buy more for their money in the chain stores, while the married men having the job of filling the purse think the chains prevent them from doing so; the chains take away some of their opportunities of making a living.

TABLE II.—*Reaction to proposed chain-store taxation by various classifications*

Classification	Favor heavy tax		Do not favor tax		Nonvoters, percent	Favor discouraging further growth		Favor encouraging further growth		Nonvoters, percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Women	570	36.6	970	62.3	1.1	800	51.4	714	45.8	2.8
Men	938	46.5	1,068	53.0	.5	1,154	57.2	817	40.5	2.3
Single people	604	39.0	933	60.0	1.0	889	57.3	622	40.1	2.6
Married people	897	43.3	1,160	56.0	.7	1,127	54.4	887	42.8	2.8
Single women	222	38.0	338	57.7	4.3	309	52.8	247	42.2	5.0
Single men	392	42.2	529	56.9	.9	537	57.8	364	39.1	3.1
Married women	350	36.0	612	62.9	1.0	464	47.7	481	50.0	2.3
Married men	551	49.8	547	49.5	.7	670	60.6	411	37.2	2.2
Housewives	289	34.5	532	63.5	2.0	392	46.8	419	50.0	3.2
Clerks	358	40.6	508	57.6	1.8	527	59.8	354	40.2	.....
Executives	191	34.9	353	64.9	.2	258	47.2	278	50.8	2.0
Owners of businesses	342	66.1	171	33.0	.9	405	78.3	98	19.0	2.7
Laborers	169	42.9	220	55.8	2.3	207	52.5	180	45.6	1.9
Students	176	38.0	282	60.9	1.1	263	56.8	181	39.1	4.1
Employed by small concerns	556	58.3	393	41.2	.5	666	70.0	266	27.9	2.1
Employed by large concerns	385	32.9	781	66.7	.4	547	46.7	599	51.2	2.1

MAJORITY OPPOSED TO FURTHER GROWTH

As to the taxing and putting of chain stores out of business, the pattern of this study is similar to that of the Fortune survey. Most of the votes were cast against heavy taxation and putting them out of business, but the study opens new ground on the question of further growth. A majority is against it, and that is true of nearly all the different categories. This would suggest that, even if the proposed taxation is killed for the time being, the chain-store companies are not on safe ground. Skillful propaganda could probably win over a number sufficient to give a majority in favor of heavy taxation, and under our form of government that majority might force through the legislatures the measures necessary to tax chain stores out of business.[4] This would undoubtedly be difficult to do, because against this the chain stores now have a majority in their favor and they can take the necessary steps to keep this majority with them and thus prevent the formation of such a public policy. The chains can do this not only by propaganda but by the con-

[1] See my article, Economic Theory and Recent Price Legislation, Journal of Marketing, October 1938.

[2] In the winter of 1939.

[3] The report of the Opinion Research Corporation covering a study undertaken at the request of Sears, Roebuck & Co. showed 45 percent of those interviewed as favoring a tax on chain stores (the New York Times, November 22, 1939).

[4] The National Association of Retail Druggists announced in their publication, issue of November 16, the beginning of a petition campaign in behalf of the Patman chain-store-tax bill. The possibility of a successful campaign by this organization is suggested by their activity in connection with the passing of the Miller-Tydings Act and the various State fair-trade acts throughout the country.

tinuance of a low-price policy, good merchandise, clean stores, and the introduction of a measure of personal attention to customers, all of which numerous studies indicate are the basis of successful retailing.[5]

The Herndon-Weik Collection of Original Lincoln Manuscripts, Documents, and Other Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1940

AN ARTICLE BY EMANUEL HERTZ WITH QUOTATIONS FROM THE LATE ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent revival of interest in the character and personality of the martyred Lincoln, as revealed during the past year in films, plays, and the written word, and in order to further the effort to bring Lincoln into every American home, it is but proper that public attention should be called to the papers which were collected and preserved for succeeding generations by his last partner in the practice of the law, the late William H. Herndon.

For a great many years both before and after the assassination, Herndon devoted himself to the collection and preservation of the facts and circumstances surrounding and revealing the life and philosophy of the Civil War President, facts and circumstances which would some day assist in re-creating in the minds of the American people the great man with whom it was his privilege to have lived in close association for upward of 20 years.

The mass of papers which compose the Herndon-Weik collection have been recently carefully examined and studied by one of the greatest authorities on the subject of Lincoln of our day and generation, Mr. Emanuel Hertz, of New York City.

Because I am quite certain that Mr. Hertz's comments will be found not only interesting but highly illuminating, I ask the consent of the membership of this body to include certain extracts of his findings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings. Of special significance is the appraisal of the Herndon papers by former United States Senator Albert Beveridge which is quoted in Mr. Hertz's essay. So far as I have been informed, Senator Beveridge and Emanuel Hertz are the only two men who have read the papers of the Herndon collection in their entirety.

The unanimous consent of the membership having been indicated, Mr. Hertz's article follows:

THE HERNDON-WEIK COLLECTION OF ORIGINAL LINCOLN MANUSCRIPTS, DOCUMENTS, AND OTHER PAPERS

(By Emanuel Hertz)

WITH SOME EXTRACTS FROM "LINCOLN AS HIS PARTNER (HERNDON) KNEW HIM"

(By Albert J. Beveridge)

By a strange combination of circumstances, as we reached the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln there was made available for the first time the most important collection of unused Lincoln material in existence. The time has at last arrived when, in dealing with Lincoln, the man, the lawyer, and the President, nothing should be taken for granted, nothing be assumed or conjectured. Facts based upon historical data and original and official documents alone must be considered. And here we have them in the vast collection gathered for almost half a century by William H. Herndon, and supplemented by Jesse W. Weik.

"Here is the most important item in this entire collection," said Herndon, as he pointed to a small leather-covered notebook about 6 by 4 inches in size, the two covers being fastened together with a brass clasp. "In its pages you will find * * * all the ammunition Mr. Lincoln saw fit to gather in preparation for his battle with Stephen A. Douglas." He then explains that as the contest of 1858 was approaching, Mr. Lincoln took this book, originally a blank book which had been used by himself and his partner to keep track of citations of cases, and proceeded to paste in its pages newspaper clippings, tables of statistics, and other data bearing on the great and absorbing questions of the day, and with a few sentences scribbled here and there. "When this little storehouse of political information was filled," observed Herndon, "Mr. Lincoln fastened the clasp, placed the book in his coat pocket, there to repose during the campaign and to be drawn upon whenever the exigencies of debate required it."

The book contains about 185 clippings; the first item in the book was the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. Lower down on the same page we find a paragraph from a speech by Henry Clay: "I repeat it, sir, I never can and never will and no earthly power will make me look directly or indirectly, to spread slavery over territory where it does not exist. Never while reason holds her seat in my brain—never while my heart sends the vital fluid through my veins—never."

Next, Lincoln inserted a portion of the opening of his speech before the Republican State convention, wherein he gave utterance to the doctrine that "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

It seems strange that neither Herndon nor Weik have anything to say about a second notebook, made by Lincoln, equally, if not more important, and more scientifically prepared than the Douglas debate notebook—the little notebook he prepared on the subject of slavery. The subject of slavery was ever with Lincoln; it haunted him and perplexed him at all times, from the moment in his youth when he came in contact with the dread subject. This notebook contains about the same number of newspaper clippings and excerpts as does the Douglas book. But this is indexed, so that he was instantly able to find and quote the proper thing on almost any phase of the slavery problem. This little book was smaller than the Douglas book, but was of more permanent importance, as the problem was vaster. This gem of Lincoln strategy and preparedness has, up to this moment, been overlooked by all, and is here presented to public notice for the first time. Note the care with which he prepared the index as well as the dates and sources of each newspaper extract; this was Lincoln's method of making statements which could not be challenged on the score of truth or accuracy. No wonder Douglas repeatedly complained that he would rather face the whole United States Senate than Lincoln alone. No one in the Senate made such meticulous preparation as did Lincoln.

There follow 11 Lincoln letters to Delahey—by all odds the most questionable of all appointments made by Lincoln—based upon an early friendship, and one to which Lincoln remained loyal to the end, in spite of severe and not altogether unjustified criticism. Their importance becomes evident. Next we have Seven Hundred and Fifty-eight Legal Documents—pleadings in law and equity, contracts, deeds, mortgages, agreements, orders, decisions, briefs, trial memoranda entirely in Lincoln's handwriting, a few printed briefs, and a number of surveys. Some of these show the early use of printed legal forms in Lincoln's office, none of which have ever been heretofore seen.

An examination of these legal documents demonstrates beyond a doubt that for a young lawyer who had just entered upon the practice of law, he had a great many more cases in 1833–34 than many leaders of the bar in Illinois or New York had in a similar period of the beginning of their practice; and they were of such importance that if proper charges had been made he would have become prosperous, and the legends about his extreme poverty and about "the poor country lawyer" would never have originated.

If there be a question as to what sort of lawyer Lincoln was, or what sort of practice he had, as was said of Sir Christopher Wren's monument, "Circumspice," look through these 758 and more documents and determine for yourself. That has not been done—that must be done, unless we are to be satisfied with a caricature—a travesty upon his legal accomplishments. We are perpetually confronted with the one criminal case—the Armstrong case—because it appeals to the imagination. But if Lincoln's true measure as a lawyer is to be taken, we must examine these, in conjunction with what has not been stolen from the courts and what has been printed, and then we will appreciate how it came about that he was able to solve the greater constitutional and international legal problems with which he was confronted during his administration. There was no miracle nor accident about his success in their solution. He was adequately prepared and seasoned to solve these greater problems, as he solved the simpler cases at the bar.

There follow about 350 letters, documents, and monographs of William H. Herndon. A great many people who were interested in Lincoln's early life, in his youth, in his numerous courtships—of Anne Rutledge, Mary Owens, Sarah Rickard, Mary Todd, and others—in his work in the legal profession, in his reading, in his speeches and how he prepared them, in his habits, in his married life, in his children, in his relations to his neighbors, in his contacts with the members of the bar and with the judges before whom he practiced his profession, and the members of the legislature with whom he served, in his congressional campaign and his term in the House of Representatives in Washington—would ask Herndon about all these matters and would ask no other person. To all of these questions Herndon painstakingly replied in writing, and retained

[5] A most recent study indicating this was made by the author last year with the aid of some marketing students. See the Journal of Marketing, July 1939, Reaction of Consumers and Independent Stores Owners to Recent Price Legislation. In this latter study, the majority of consumers indicate a preference for price, convenient location, and personal attention.

the original drafts of his replies. These letters are written on one page, on a square sheet of paper, and most of them on as many as 6, 8, 10, or 20 pages. In some cases there are 15 or 20 pages of foolscap paper, all written carefully and painstakingly by Herndon. A great many of them are written to Jesse W. Weik, Herndon's collaborator, in the preparation of the Life of Lincoln which was being published by Belford, Clark & Co. in 1889.

These Herndon letters and documents will forever be the original source, the only source of true information of Lincoln's life in his law practice in his home town and on the circuit. There never was a more devoted partner or friend than was Herndon, and, in spite of all hostile criticism which has been hurled at Herndon's head, these 350 documents will forever exonerate and acquit Herndon of any and all charges of unfairness, partiality, or hostility to Lincoln, and will stamp him as the best and the only reliable historian of Lincoln during that period of his life—Lincoln's Boswell, par excellence. Yet, astounding as the statement seems, the biography of Lincoln in Herndon's own words has not to this very day been printed. It has been locked up these 50 years.

It has been the habit of a great many authors to state that they have examined this, the Herndon-Weik Collection, and have based some of their statements and conclusions upon documents contained therein. These claims are negatived by the actual evidence of the failure to mention as many as a thousand of these important items. The greater part of the collection was never seen, and certainly never reprinted; and, I dare say, was never read by anybody in its entirety. Aside from two pages of the Douglas debate notebook and the title page of the book on arithmetic, comparatively little of importance was used either by Weik or any other author.

In addition to these letters there are about 50 documents in Herndon's handwriting which concern different phases of Lincoln's life. There are other statements in Herndon's writing, consisting of interviews in the form of affidavits by different people who knew Lincoln in life—David Davis, who rarely wrote or spoke of what he knew of Lincoln; Joseph Gillespie, James H. Matheny, Sarah Bush Lincoln, Grigsby, 24 letters and statements by Dennis Hanks and 5 by his brother John; E. B. Washburne, Norman B. Judd, John Wentworth, Jesse K. Dubois, William H. Bissell, Richard Yates, John L. Scripps, John B. Helm, Samuel Haycraft, Joshua F. Speed, John T. Stuart, Hannah Armstrong, John McNamar, William Jayne, Henry C. Whitney, Leonard Swett, Ninian W. Edwards, John H. Littlefield, Jesse W. Fell, R. J. Oglesby, Lawrence Weldon, F. B. Carpenter, O. B. Ficklin, Charles S. Zane, Stephen T. Logan, Pascal B. Enos, Mentor Graham, Rebecca Herndon, Archer G. Herndon, Elliott B. Herndon, J. Rowan Herndon, James A. Herndon, Joseph Medill, Lyman Trumbull, and a great number of others who knew and lived with Lincoln at various times down to 1861 and who, but for Herndon's persistence, would never have reduced to writing what they knew about Lincoln. There can be no gainsaying the enthusiasm with which this man hunted for and gathered every shred of available source material. No detail, however trivial, was permitted to escape him, but he found it and followed it up at the earliest possible moment after Lincoln had been laid to rest. He was deeply absorbed in the work of gathering all the material available to supplement his own vast storehouse of information gained during a lifetime, during which he wrote down in his own handwriting all that he knew and all that he could ascertain from others. From 1865 to the end of his days he was the one repository of Lincoln's history, and gave of himself cheerfully and freely to all who asked or inquired. He stalks throughout the vast storehouse of Lincoln literature, which has been built upon foundations based upon what he is quoted as having said or written.

A long series of letters describe Herndon's agony and his annoyance at the performance of Belford, Clark & Co., the publishers of his great Life of Lincoln—great in spite of the publishers and their unknown editor who took it upon himself to enforce his will on Weik. Herndon was old, and weak, and poor, and could not at that time of life battle for his ideas.

By a strange irony of fate, therefore, Herndon has never been able to spread before the world in printed form the result of his life's work and of the researches into the many phases of Lncoln's life, except for the meager accounts and extracts taken by Weik, "sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought" of the unknown censor in the office of the publishers, who was the final and unreasonable arbiter as to what was, and what was not, to be included in the book; Herndon, who never met his tormentor, had to be content with Weik's efforts to salvage as much as possible, and, judging from the complaining letters of Herndon, Weik accomplished very little. Herndon was not more fortunate with the way Ward H. Lamon and Chauncey Black treated his researches and his writings about Lincoln. In other words, the Herndon documents—fortunately preserved—are yet to be printed, if justice is to be done to Herndon as well as to Lincoln.

Herndon's opinion as to the value of Nicolay and Hay's work is of the utmost importance. He showed conclusively that they were controlled and restricted in their work. Like the colossal painting exhibited some years ago, The Pantheon de la Guerre, which depicted the features and figures of rulers, soldiers, generalissimos, admirals, and statesmen, thousands of important figures, without pointing out one leader, one ruler, one protagonist—so Nicolay and Hay's panorama of the Civil War showed a vast number of leaders, of soldiers, of sailors, of legislators, most of them of small significance, and, incidentally, of Lincoln as well.

Herndon gave a lifetime to portray one man in this vast record, which has not yet been given to the world in its entirety, nor in the words of Herndon. Herndon was a man of one idea, one ambition, and that was to portray and picture and document Lincoln for all time to come, as he knew him and as he was. He was indirectly chosen by Lincoln for this task. He was his last partner, and by Lincoln's wish was to remain the last partner. He was more than a partner; he was a friend, he was his assistant, his representative, his spokesman, his contact man with the leaders in the East. He was his representative in Springfield when Lincoln was away. Lincoln never doubted the honesty, ability, and learning of Herndon. Immediately after the assassination Herndon began to supplement his own recollections of Lincoln by a compilation of additional material. He then visited every scene of Lincoln's life previous to his election to the Presidency; examined acquaintances; took their statements in writing; secured letters and other documents of value.

To those who have had the opportunity to follow the story of Herndon's work, it is plain that Herndon was not in his relations to Lincoln the subordinate character he leaves us to suppose he was. He contributed decidedly to form the mind of Lincoln and to mold his career. But for Herndon, the Lincoln of 1860–65 would not have emerged from the dingy law office at Springfield, precisely what he was, nor would his history up to that period ever have been precisely told.

The remaining 1,250 lots in the collection consist of 105 letters by Horace White, the reporter of the Lincoln-Douglas debate, from members of Lincoln's Cabinet, from Governors, United States Senators, Congressmen, judges before whom he practiced or who knew Lincoln, and from the many lawyers and practitioners with whom he appeared and with whom he practiced, all of whom had reached a time of life when they could calmly reflect upon the achievements and accomplishments of the great war President, both as a lawyer and legislator and as Chief Executive, and who were enabled to give an impartial estimate and recital of those facts which came to their attention and of events which they had witnessed. A complete file of letters from Chauncey F. Black explains how Lamon's Life of Lincoln came to be written, but clearly confirms that all of Lamon's data came from Herndon.

So that, if a complete, unbiased, and accurate life of Lincoln is to be written, this vast storehouse of information, garnered from the four corners of Lincoln's world, covering his childhood, his boyhood, his early manhood, his life in Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, his life in the courts of Illinois, in the Federal courts, in Congress, and on the circuit, up to his departure from Springfield in February 1861, will have to be consulted and arranged and printed in full, so that the testimony of the host of witnesses who made up the generation of legislators, judges, lawyers, newspapermen, friends, soldiers, and his officeholders will have to be compared, coordinated, and examined in order to paint the entire canvas of that generation, beginning with 1809 and closing with February 10, 1861, upon which day Lincoln started for Washington to assume the duties of sixteenth President of the United States. So much of what has been written rests upon speculation and surmise that it is indeed refreshing to see these documents, which definitely set at rest many an invention, especially the statements about Lincoln and liquor—did he or did he not drink—just what did Lincoln do on the day of his first election, which has been written up repeatedly in great detail, but, unfortunately, does not conform with the facts; how did he receive the news of his first nomination; had he anything to do with the nomination of Johnson for the Vice Presidency; Lincoln and patronage; Lincoln and Lamon; just how did he intervene between the judge who did not know how to charge the jury and the jury who persisted in asking questions; just why was the first engagement with Mary Todd broken off; what was the actual reason; and a score of other questions which have never been accurately or adequately answered.

I cannot conclude this chapter without quoting from a paper written by the late Senator Albert J. Beveridge, entitled, "Lincoln As His Partner Knew Him," which stands out in a class by itself among all appraisals of this invaluable collection.

"I do not, at the moment, recall another case in history where, immediately after the death of a great personage, the facts of his personal life were collected so carefully, thoroughly, and impartially by a lifelong friend and intimate professional associate, as the facts about Lincoln were gathered by William H. Herndon. Almost from boyhood Herndon had been an idolater of Lincoln; and for 17 years the two men were partners in the practice of the law. So Herndon saw more of Lincoln and heard more from Lincoln's lips than any other human being, excepting only Lincoln's wife.

"Almost at once after the assassination, Herndon began to collect material relating to his hero. He wrote to everybody who ever knew Lincoln or his parents—everything about Lincoln is covered up to 1860. Herndon's industry and persistence in this are astonishing; and, while a man of little academic training, he shows that nature had given him the distinctively scholar's mind. In his letters he asked questions upon every conceivable point. For instance, what variety of trees were in the Indiana forest where Lincoln's boyhood was spent? Was there underbrush, and if so, was it thick or scanty? What animals abounded, what fruits grew in the woods, what food did the settlers eat, and how was it prepared? What songs did they sing, religious, political, and general? What clothes did they wear, and how were the materials made? What was the stature, color of eyes and hair, complexion, probable weight, manners, habits, speech, and disposition of everybody—of Thomas Lincoln, of Nancy Hanks,

of Ann Rutledge, of Menter Graham, of James McNamar, of Mary Owen, and so on, from the beginning to the end?

"Some questions were not answered clearly, and Herndon wrote again and again, until the smallest detail was made plain. Often, as in the case of Sarah Rickard, he would have to write several times before he got any answer at all. But he stuck to it. Most of those who had known Lincoln as boy and young man had scattered far and wide over the United States. No matter, Herndon traced them. Those whom he could reach personally, he interviewed, and immediately wrote out notes of what they said. I have read in the original manuscript these transcripts; they show on their face that they were written by a trained lawyer, skilled in the taking of depositions and the making of notes of statements by witnesses. I have read, too, the original letters to Herndon in answer to his inquiries, and also Herndon's own letters about Lincoln, as well as his entire manuscript on the subject. Everywhere it is obvious that Herndon is intent on telling the truth himself and on getting the truth from those who could give personal, first-hand information.

"Moreover, Herndon personally visited every foot of ground that Lincoln ever trod. He went to Kentucky, to Indiana; and he had been to New Salem many times when Lincoln lived there, and afterward. More than once he had gone with Lincoln in his circuit riding; and he knew intimately the lawyers and judges with whom Lincoln spent all his professional life outside the office of Lincoln & Herndon, where, of course, the junior partner was in closer contact with his senior than anybody else possibly could have been.

"Herndon was 47 years of age when Lincoln was murdered. For 14 years after that event, he kept up his Lincoln researches, delivering several lectures on phases of Lincoln's life, practicing law, and keeping up a large general correspondence.

"Perhaps it is not unworthy of note that it was to Herndon, and not to Lincoln, that for years before his nomination for the Presidency such men as Parker, Sumner, Seward, Phillips, Greeley, and Garrison wrote. To be sure, the youthful and ardent Herndon always began the correspondence; yet, even so, it was to him and not to his partner that these brilliant men, molders of the public opinion of the time, looked for reports of conditions in Illinois. It is extremely curious that, judging from their letters to Herndon, these leaders seemed not to have realized that Lincoln amounted to anything during that period.

"In 1879 Herndon met Jesse W. Weik, of Greencastle. * * * Young Weik soon gave up Government service and devoted himself exclusively to continuing with Herndon, under the direction of the older man, the work which Herndon had been doing since the spring of 1865. With all the data which Herndon had accumulated to guide him and with the benefit of Herndon's suggestions, Weik again went to all the places Herndon had visited 20 years earlier, as well as many other places—and went again and again. Most of the lawyers, judges, and other people who knew Lincoln were still living, many of them not yet old men and women. Weik met all of them; and after Herndon's death continued his acquaintance and correspondence with them.

"But, in addition to the Herndon data, upon which Mr. Weik's book is largely based, the author uses a large amount of material which he himself has been gathering for many years, all of which is first-hand information; and nobody ever has accused or ever will accuse Jesse W. Weik of untruthfulness, unworthy motives, or, above all, animosity toward Lincoln. I can give testimony on these points myself, for I have known Mr. Weik since my college days in Greencastle, Ind. Nobody ever questioned his veracity, and his lifelong adoration of Lincoln has in it something of fanaticism; yet the truthfulness of the man would not permit the perversion or suppression of any fact in what he writes about his idol. Mr. Weik learned his lesson in accuracy from the bitter castigation of his friend Herndon, and so he makes sure of his authority for every statement. In most cases he had his informants write out what they had to say; in others, Weik himself made extensive notes at the time; in still others, original letters are quoted.

"Mr. Weik did almost as much corresponding about Lincoln as did Herndon himself, if not more; and many of the letters he received are most illuminating. I have read all of them in the original manuscript. These, together with the large number of Herndon's letters to Weik and the extensive Herndon manuscript, constitute material of unusual value; while some of the letters, notably those of Horace White to Weik, are good examples of literary and scholarly criticism."

It required real courage on the part of Herndon to criticize the work of Nicolay and Hay, and their so-called definitive biography of Abraham Lincoln. Herndon, with deadly accuracy, shows that the sentiment of the authors is very much against their showing Lincoln as he was. "They are aiming," he says, "first, to do a superb piece of literary work; second, to make the story with the classes as against the masses. It will result in delineating the real Lincoln about as well as does a wax figure in the museum."

"I finished reading the December number of the Century. * * * If that article is a sample of what is to come, I make a prediction that the whole thing will fall stillborn—dead. * * * Are Nicolay and Hay going to suppress the story of Anne Rutledge, the finest story in Lincoln's life?" * * * (December 5, 1886.)

For a long time the 10 volumes of Nicolay and Hay had become the last word on almost every phase of Lincoln's life. Their pronouncements became sacrosanct, and to question any statement contained in those volumes was heresy. It is here that Herndon's criticisms are of the utmost importance, as they are supported by facts. Here are a series of statements by Herndon which are fatal to the claims of perfection for Nicolay and Hay's work.

"Have you read the January number of The Century? If you have, you will see that Nicolay and Hay have suppressed many facts—material facts of Lincoln's life, and among them are Lincoln's genealogy, paternity, the description of Nancy Hanks, old Thomas Lincoln, the Anne Rutledge story. Lincoln's religion, Lincoln's spells of morbidity, the facts of Lincoln's misery with Mary Todd, Lincoln's backdown on the night that he and Mary Todd were to be married, etc. I do not say that they did not mention some of these things in a roundabout way, but I do say that the kernel—'nib,' or point of things has been purposely suppressed. Nicolay and Hay do know the facts fully, as I am informed on good authority. * * * Nicolay and Hay handle things with silken gloves and a camel-hair pencil. They do not write with an iron pen. * * *

"I used to tell Lincoln in my mild way in 1858–60 this, 'Lincoln, you must take an advanced step if you wish to be successful in your hopes and your ambitions.' I thought he was too conservative at that time. He moved and won" (January 2, 1887).

"I understand that The Nation is giving the boys a considerable lashing. The editor sees, as all men and women see, that the boys are covering up things, evading sharp facts, suppressing important things—facts and events in Abraham's young life. Some of the finest episodes in Lincoln's young life are omitted or evaded or swallowed up in words. Read in Nicolay and Hay's Lincoln's Courtship with Miss Todd and What Became of It, and then tell me if the boys got the real facts of that sad, troubled event. * * * It is important to all persons who read the articles spoken of that something is kept back—facts smothered by many, many words. They are writing the life of Lincoln under the surveillance of Bob Lincoln. Nicolay and Hay, in my opinion, are afraid of Bob. He gives them materials and they in turn play hush. This is my opinion, and is worth no more than an honest opinion" (January 22, 1887).

It is almost impossible to understand the veneration in which men like Nicolay and Hay held Lincoln without going through everything that these men have written about him.

Perhaps one of the finest estimates of Lincoln by John Hay is to be found in a letter written to Herndon, which summarizes Lincoln's life in the White House, and which concludes with the famous paragraph: "No great man was ever modest. It was his intellectual arrogance and unconscious assumption of superiority that men like Chase and Sumner never could forgive. I believe that Lincoln is well understood by the people; but there is a patent-leather kid-glove set who know no more of him than an owl does of a comet blazing into its blinking eyes. Their estimates of him are in many cases disgraceful exhibitions of ignorance and prejudice. Their effeminate natures shrink instinctively from the contact of a great reality like Lincoln's character. I consider Lincoln's republicanism incarnate—with all its faults and all its virtues. As, in spite of some rudeness, republicanism is the sole hope of a sick world, so Lincoln, with all his foibles, is the greatest character since Christ."

In spite of all, it is not intended to charge Hay with ulterior motives. He simply idolized Lincoln and loved Robert. He did want to please his friend—to the extent of omitting anything which Robert desired left unsaid.

We cannot therefore wonder in coming to write the life of Lincoln, in conjunction with the other hero worshipper, Nicolay, that they would under no condition insert anything into that biography which could be construed as criticism or faultfinding.

I found in some of Hay's letters a declared purpose to make it agreeable to Robert Lincoln, even if he (Hay) thought differently. In Hay's letter to Robert Lincoln (January 27, 1884), requesting Robert Lincoln to look over the chapters embracing the first 40 years of his father's life, he says:

"I need not tell you that every line has been written in a spirit of reverence and regard. Still, you may find here and there words and sentences which do not suit you. I write now to request that you will read, with pencil in your hand, and strike out everything to which you object. I will adopt your view in all cases, whether I agree with you or not."

In his letter to Robert Lincoln on January 6, 1886, Hay writes:

"I was very sorry to see by a letter you wrote to Nicolay that you were still not satisfied with my assurance that I would make these first chapters all right. Even before you read them I had struck out of my own copy here nearly everything that you objected to and had written Nicolay to make the changes in his; * * * since then I have gone over the whole thing and will again, reading every line so far as possible from your point of view, and I don't think there is a word left in that would displease you. But, of course, before final publication, I shall give you another hack at it with plenary blue-pencil powers."

To Henry Adams, Hay writes, August 4, 1889:

"I only wonder at the merciful Providence which keeps my critics away from the weak joints in my armor. Laws-a-mercy; if I had the criticizing of that book, what a skinning I could give it. I can't amend it, but I could éreinter it—I would break its back de la belle manière."

In his letter of March 5, 1888, he says: "I thank you for the corrections, all of which I have, of course, adopted."

These letters appeared after the death of John Hay—in his diary—"printed but not published," and distributed among friends of the Hay family only. Clara Hay did not anticipate how, by her devotion to her great husband in publishing his private diaries and letters, she demonstrated the reliability of Herndon's criticisms of her husband's magnum opus.

It was charged repeatedly by those who condemned Herndon for his lectures and his contributions to the life of Lincoln that what he did say was prompted by Herndon's hatred of Lincoln, for not being considered by Lincoln for some prominent office with the administration. Herndon anticipated such a charge, and long ago acquitted Lincoln of lack of gratitude for all that Herndon did for and was to Lincoln.

"You will please find an original dispatch from Mr. Lincoln to me offering me some office—I think a judge of the cotton cases in the South. Possibly you will find a letter from Abraham Lincoln to me." A great deal has been said about resentment at being ignored by Lincoln, having actuated Herndon in his so-called strictures on Lincoln. The above is but one of the instances where Lincoln attempted to appoint Herndon to office. It was the very first thing Lincoln thought of, after his election. He asked Herndon to go to Washington and become a member of the administration, but Herndon refused. He told Lincoln that he was content with the office of State banking commissioner, which he then held, and that if he could be reappointed to the same position he would be satisfied. Lincoln immediately proceeded to Governor Yates and made sure of Herndon's reappointment. There is certainly nothing to the charge of Herndon feeling resentment toward Lincoln on that score. (December 1, 1886.)

Herndon tells us what books Lincoln read and studied:

"I once had an excellent library. Mr. Lincoln had access to such books as I had and frequently read parts of the volumes. * * * I used to read him passages from the books that struck me as eloquent and poetical, philosophic, and the like. * * * Let me give you the kind of books which Lincoln had access to and sometimes peeped into. I had all the following books; i. e., the writers of the works, their names, and the books. They are as follows: Emerson, Carlyle, Parker, McNaught, Strauss, Monnel, Bucher, Feurbach, Buckle, Spencer, Darwin, Draper, Lecky, Lewes, Renan, Kant, Fichte, and others. I took the Westminster Review.

"If I had any influence with Lincoln at all, it was along the line of the good. * * * Possibly I have helped the world a little in my own way—hope so. I shall never state fully or otherwise what I did for Lincoln. I shall never do this in writing" (December 29, 1885).

"I never heard him abuse anybody, nor did I ever, except once or twice, hear him eulogize anyone. He talked of no one on the stump, because he was aware of his own lowly origin. His motto in this particular was, 'Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.' Mr. Lincoln loved such books as Jack Downing, Phoenixiana, and Petroleum V. Nasby. He was a terribly gloomy man, and yet he loved mirth because it gave vent to his gloom and his melancholy. I have heard him say that 'if it were not for these stories (jokes, jests), I should die; they give vent—are the vents of my moods and gloom.' If you were in your office and wished to read something of interest; if you said much, that much would suggest to him a story that he had heard on the circuit or down in Egypt, the lower part of the State. The thing once suggested, there would be an end of your reading. Close the book, you must—you couldn't help it. He would tell one story and that would suggest another, and so the day would roll by, pleasant or unpleasant to you—he had no hold-up in that particular. Tell his stories, he would; and read, you couldn't. Pleasant to you or not, the mill would grind" (November 17, 1885).

Aside from Herndon, and particularly as to the life of Lincoln in the courts, there is none more authoritative than Judge David Davis, before whom he tried a great many of his cases and with whom he constantly traveled the circuit.[1] The judge refused to give information to anyone. As he says in his letter of January 14, 1866, to Herndon:

"It pains me to refuse you any reasonable requests, but I have been written to over and over again to furnish my views about Mr. Lincoln, and have universally declined to give them—I could not give them to you and be consistent—I have no objection in person to talk the whole matter over with you, and hope to do so when I see you. I have always understood that Mr. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was his own conception. That he announced to his Cabinet that he intended to issue it and that he would hear suggestions about verbal criticisms, etc.—it is mean to try to deprive him of the glory of that."

As Herndon did not hesitate to travel, he immediately made it his business to see Judge Davis and procure an 18-page statement from him as to his opinions of Lincoln in the various contacts of a long professional life in the 14 counties which made up the eighth circuit. And he knew Lincoln from 1837 until he finally placed him in the White House by the superb management of the convention work which brought about the nomination.

Herndon prepared a statement which covers all Judge Davis knew about Lincoln from the year 1837 to the very end of his life. He refers to a great number of Lincoln's famous cases and the manner in which Lincoln conducted them. He dwells on his ability as a lawyer; and from the statement made it seems that Herndon spent 2 full days with Judge Davis, viz, September 19 and 20, 1866, extracting from that bulky statesman and jurist everything which he, Herndon, thought would complete the picture of his famous partner.

[1] Lincoln in 1862 appointed Davis to the Supreme Court of the United States, and in 1865, Judge Davis was made administrator of Lincoln's estate.

One of the many instances which shows the attachment of Lincoln to his parents appears in the case of McKibben against Hart, tried in Coles County, Ill., in 1845. This was a suit for slander. Mr. Lincoln recovered a judgment of $50 for his client, of which amount the latter assigned $35 to Lincoln for his fee, which Lincoln in turn left with the clerk of the court to be turned over to his father, old Thomas Lincoln, whose receipt, signed by his stepson, John D. Johnston, is preserved in the records of the court. So we see that not only was his stepmother remembered but his father as well.

It is said by some of the biographers of Lincoln that he "never drank a drop of liquor in his life," and that he never chewed tobacco nor smoked a cigar or pipe. It is not true that Lincoln "never drank a drop of liquor in his life." It is true that he never smoked or chewed tobacco. Mr. Lincoln did sometimes take a horn. He played ball on the day of his nomination in Chicago in 1860 with the boys, or the day before that, and did drink beer two or three times that day and during the game for pleasure. He was nervous then, excited at that particular time, and drank to steady his nerves. Lincoln has been often heard to say, "I never drink much and am entitled to no credit therefor, because I hate the stuff."

A friend once asked Lincoln, "Don't you like liquor, Lincoln?" To which Lincoln replied, "No; it is unpleasant to me and always makes me feel flabby and undone." Lincoln had a low or slow circulation of the blood, and hence had not much wear and tear of the tissues of the body, and hence no very strong thirst or appetite for stimulative drinks—nor the tonics.

He had a good but moderate appetite for food, and was satisfied with almost anything that would satisfy hunger—anything with which to "fill up." * * * Lincoln had a good appetite and good digestion, ate mechanically, never asking why such a thing was not on the table, nor why it was on, if so. He never complained of bad food, nor praised the good. I, on the circuit, have sat down with Lincoln a thousand times, it may be, at the table, and he never made any fuss about the food on the table. He ate and went about his business, though the food was "cussed bad," as 8 out of 10 at the table would say. Some would swear at it and others would laugh at their misfortune in not getting "goodies."

Lincoln did drink when he thought that it would do him good. He was never seen under the influence of liquor more than once or twice in his younger days, when it (liquor) was quite in universal use.

"Lincoln was a riddle and a puzzle sometimes. He loved best the vegetable world generally, though his food was of a mixed kind; he loved a good hot cup of coffee; and specially did he love apples. He would wrap his forefinger of his right hand and his thumb around the equatorial part of the apple and commence eating it at the blossom end, never using a knife to cut or peel the apple. I have seen him read and study his case, and the law of it, intently while eating his apple. His table at home generally was economized to the smallest amount. He never dared as a general thing to invite his friends to his house. Mrs. Lincoln was a very stingy woman and yet she would occasionally have parties. Lincoln himself had none of the avarice of the 'get', and yet he had a tinge of it in the 'keep.' He was not generous in money matters unless he had some view in end. Mrs. Lincoln was the cause of his poor tables. She economized here to swell otherwise—poor, unfortunate woman."

Herndon probably gives the most plausible explanation of the tragic event of Lincoln's failure to appear at the appointed time for the marriage to Mary Todd. And here the method employed by Herndon is typical of how he gathered all the facts and information to complete the picture. He interviewed all the people concerned or who had any knowledge on the subject, supplemented such facts by his own knowledge and by the information he gathered from a life-long contact with Lincoln, and then gives his conclusion. No other biographer has prepared such a powerful analysis of that event, which had a life-lasting influence on this remarkable couple, as is contained in Herndon's chapter on this phase, which has set so many biographers guessing and speculating.

And so, on the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of his birth, we are on the threshold of being able to write a definitive life of Lincoln. We are now able to present him to his countrymen and to the world as he was. We may now compile a full list of his spoken and written words—in order that all may be able to read, not only what was said of him, but what he himself wrote down in ever-living words—in order that future generations may truly judge him by his own words, and in part, at least, atone for the agony which was his, during the years when he was the most libelled and maligned man of his age—in order that we, and those who come after us, may see him as he emerges from the ordeal of fire of the written and spoken anathema which was his portion for almost an entire lifetime.

Thanks to Billy Herndon—Herndon, the young office boy, the young partner of the great man—Herndon, Lincoln's Boswell for 25 years—the man of one idea, of one all-absorbing ambition—to leave a true portrait of Lincoln, his hero, to posterity.

As Lincoln appeared for the last time in the law office and gathered a bundle of papers before leaving, he told Herndon their partnership would go on, their shingle remain in its place—"If I live I am coming back and will resume practice as if nothing had ever happened."

It may now be truly said that the partnership was never dissolved; it remained "Lincoln & Herndon." "Billy" Herndon waited 30 years to rejoin his partner.

Billy Herndon was faithful to the end—this prototype of the "enemy of the people" among Lincoln's biographers—by those who thought they knew Lincoln better than the faithful Herndon.

But they knew him not.

Protest W. P. A. Wage Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1940

RESOLUTION BY IRON RIVER BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution passed by the Iron River Businessmen's Association. I subscribe to the principle propounded but feel that rate should be higher than requested in this resolution:

The following resolution was introduced by Claude Jorgensen, who moved its adoption, and supported by Ray Zerbel:

Whereas the Work Projects Administration has reduced the hours per month of workers on W. P. A. projects and limited their wage to a total of $39.60 per month while it is $44.40 per month in surrounding counties, on the theory that there is no city in Iron County having a population of 5,000 or more; and

Whereas there is in fact a metropolitan area known as the Iron River district, comprising the villages of Mineral Hills, Caspian, and Gaastra, and cities of Iron River and Stambaugh, having a population of 10,136, and whose boundaries and dwellings are contiguous, and which are only separated into these municipalities for tax purposes peculiar to a mining district; and

Whereas, due to the severe climate conditions which prevail in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, the wage rate of $39.60 is not sufficient and our county relief authorities have found it necessary to suplement this wage with direct relief, to the extent that if this condition continues Iron County's extra appropriation for relief purposes will be exhausted long before the end of the year, and we are informed there are no other funds available for relief purposes; and

Whereas the cost of living in the surrounding counties in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is exactly similar to that of Iron County, the present W. P. A. wage scale is a direct discrimination against this county.

Now, therefore, in consideration of the above premises, the Iron River Businessmen's Association, of Iron River, Mich., does hereby urge the various governing bodies of the above-mentioned municipalities to approve this resolution and present the same to the Iron County Board of Supervisors and the Work Projects Administration, requesting them to take such steps as they shall deem necessary and expedient to bring to the attention and consideration of the Work Projects Administration the plight of Iron County and to obtain a wage-scale classification for Iron County as a county having a single municipality of 5,000 persons or more; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, together with the approval of the governing bodies of the above-mentioned municipalities be presented to the following, by the secretary of this association:

The Board of Supervisors of Iron County, Mich.

Abner E. Larned, State W. P. A. administrator, Lansing, Mich.

F. S. Benjamin, district manager, W. P. A., Marquette, Mich.

Senators ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and PRENTISS M. BROWN and Congressman FRANK E. HOOK.

The undersigned municipalities, by their governing bodies, hereby heartily endorse and approve the above resolution of the Iron River Businessmen's Association, of Iron River, Mich.

Dated this 10th day of May, A. D. 1940.

CITY OF IRON RIVER,
By JOSEPH SELIN, *Mayor.*
CITY OF STAMBAUGH,
By E. J. WITTOCK, *Mayor.*
VILLAGE OF CASPIAN,
By JOE VISENTAINER,
Village President.
VILLAGE OF GAASTRA,
By FRANK PLOURDE,
Village President.
VILLAGE OF MINERAL HILLS,
By WILLIAM J. COLLINS,
Village President.

Air Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY COLONEL LINDBERGH

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered last evening by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh on the subject of air defense and other aspects of the national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 20, 1940]

COMPLETE TEXT OF LINDBERGH'S RADIO ADDRESS

Following is the text of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's radio address last night:

"In time of war and confusion it is essential for our people to have a clear understanding of the elements upon which our national safety depends. Aviation has now become one of these elements, and it is about the air defense of America that I speak to you tonight.

"The power of aviation has been greatly underrated in the past. Now we must be careful not to overrate this power in the excitement of reaction. Air strength depends more upon the establishment of intelligent and consistent policies than upon the sudden construction of huge numbers of airplanes.

"Even here in America it is difficult to think clearly amidst the conflict of facts and headlines, the contradictory advice of columnists, the claims and counterclaims of propaganda, and the blind selfishness of party politics. The conservative who scoffed at aviation yesterday has become the radical who says that tomorrow we will be invaded by European aircraft.

"Let us reexamine the position of America in the air. New discoveries and developments affect nations in different ways. In Europe aviation has affected England adversely and Germany advantageously. One nation may have a psychology and topography which promotes the development of aviation, while another finds itself entirely unadjusted to the tempo of the air.

"UNITED STATES IN FORTUNATE POSITION

"Judged by aeronautical standards, we in the United States are in a singularly fortunate position. Our people have natural ability in the design, construction, and operation of aircraft. Our highly organized industry, our widely separated centers of population, our elimination of formalities in interstate travel, all contribute to the development of American aviation. From the standpoint of defense, we still have two great oceans between us and the warring armies of Europe and Asia.

"In fact, there is hardly a natural element contributing to air strength and impregnability that we do not now possess. Aviation is for us an asset. It adds to our national safety. With a firm and clear-cut policy, we can build an air defense for America that will stand above these shifting sands of war.

"But until we have decided upon a definite policy of defense the mere construction of large numbers of aircraft will not be adequate for our national safety. In fact, without a strong policy of defense, we will not even know what types of planes to build. The speed and range of our fighting planes must depend upon the bases available for their use.

"If we are to defend the United States alone, then we must construct numerous air bases along the Mexican and Canadian borders. Such a plan would require numbers of small bombers and pursuit planes, and eventually it would leave us as vulnerable to air attack as the nations of Europe are today. On the other hand, if we are to defend the entire Western Hemisphere, we need long-range bombers capable of attacking a hostile fleet a thousand miles or more at sea. But there is little use discussing types and numbers until a defense policy is established.

"OTHER NATIONS MUST AID

"This brings us to an issue which must sooner or later be faced. An adequate air defense of the Western Hemisphere necessitates the cooperation of the other nations of this hemisphere. Our military aircraft must have access to their bases. Their foreign policy must have some relationship to ours. We cannot hold this hemisphere free from foreign war if nations which lie within it declare war on foreign powers.

"Let us not be confused by this talk of invasion by European aircraft. The air defense of America is as simple as the attack is difficult when the true facts are faced. We are in danger of war today not because European people have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of America, but because American people have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of Europe.

"It is true that bombing planes can be built with sufficient range to cross the Atlantic and return. They can be built either in America or Europe. Aeronautical engineers have known this for many years. But the cost is high, the target large, and the military effectiveness small. Such planes do not exist today in any air force. A foreign power could not conquer us by dropping bombs in this country unless the bombing were accompanied by an invading army. And an invading army requires thousands of small bombers and pursuit planes; it would have little use for huge trans-Atlantic aircraft.

"No; the advantage lies with us, for great armies must still cross oceans by ship. Only relatively small forces can be transported by air today, and over distances of a few hundred miles at most. This has great significance in Europe, but it is not an element that we have to contend with in America.

"Such a danger can come, in any predictable future, only through division and war among our own peoples. As long as American nations work together, as long as we maintain reasonable defense forces, there will be no invasion by foreign aircraft. And no foreign navy will dare to approach within bombing range of our coasts.

"SEES INTERNAL DANGER

"Our danger in America is an internal danger. We need not fear a foreign invasion unless American peoples bring it on through their own quarreling and meddling with affairs abroad. Our eyes should not search beyond the horizon for problems which lie at our feet. The greatest lesson we can draw from Europe today is that national strength must be built within a nation itself and cannot be achieved by limiting the strength of others.

"What of the unforeseen developments of a science? Rocket propulsion? New forms of energy? New methods of destruction? No generation can entirely safeguard the future for those that follow. They must meet their own problems as those problems arise. The greatest inheritance we can pass on to our children is a reasonable solution of the problems that confront us in our time—a strong nation, a lack of debt, a solid American character free from the entanglements of the Old World.

"Let us guard America today as our forefathers guarded it in the past. They won this country from Europe with a handful of Revolutionary soldiers. We certainly can hold it now with a population of 130,000,000 people. If we cannot, we are unworthy to have it.

"But the course we have been following in recent months leads to neither strength nor friendship nor peace. It will leave us hated by victor and vanquished alike, regardless of which way the tide of battle turns. One side will claim that we aided its enemies; the other, that we did not help enough.

"To be successful in modern warfare a nation must prepare many years before the fighting starts. If anyone doubts that, let him turn his eyes to Europe. Years ago we decided to stay out of foreign wars. We based our military policy on that decision. We must not waver now that the crisis is at hand. There is no longer time for us to enter this war successfully. The result of vacillating policies lies clearly before us in the chaos of Europe today.

"STOP CHATTER, HE SAYS

"Let us turn again to America's traditional role—that of building and guarding our own destiny. We need a greater air force, a greater Army, and a greater Navy; they have been inadequate for many years. Let us form with our neighboring nations a clear-cut and definite policy of American defense. But, above all, let us stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion that has been running rife these last few days. It is not befitting to the people who built this Nation.

"That the world is facing a new era is beyond question. Our mission is to make it a better era. But, regardless of which side wins this war, there is no reason, aside from our own actions, to prevent a continuation of peaceful relationships between American and the countries of Europe. If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us, and no one is in a position to do so.

"The only reason that we are in danger of becoming involved in this war is because there are powerful elements in America who desire us to take part. They represent a small minority of the American people, but they control much of the machinery of influence and propaganda. They seize every opportunity to push us closer to the edge.

"It is time for the underlying character of this country to rise and assert itself, to strike down these elements of personal profit and foreign interest. This underlying character of America is our true defense. Until it awakes and takes the reins in hand once more the production of airplanes, cannon, and battleships is of secondary importance. Let us turn our eyes to our own Nation. We cannot aid others until we have first placed our own country in a position of spiritual and material leadership and strength."

America's Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESSES BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, may I be permitted the honor to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two able addresses of the most distinguished aviator of all time—Col. Charles A. Lindbergh—delivered on September 16 and October 14, 1939—and may we who take our places on the ramparts of the Nation in this hour of world trial keep cool and exercise the good American common sense so clearly shown by our loved and greatly admired colonel.

We thank God for the Lindberghs, father and son—the immortal Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, the invincible and intrepid Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

So long as America follows their crystal-clear policies of patriotism we need have no fears for our ship of state.

Let me say further I am glad Senators now strive to place the words of the great Lindberghs in the RECORD, and I now note that several Senators are seeking to place in the RECORD the great speech of Colonel Lindbergh, made May 19, 1940. It was truly a great speech.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of September 16, 1939]

TEXT OF LINDBERGH'S ADDRESS ON NEUTRALITY

The text of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's radio address last night follows:

"In times of great emergency men of the same belief must gather together for mutual council and action. If they fail to do this, all that they stand for will be lost. I speak tonight to those people in the United States of America who feel that the destiny of this country does not call for our involvement in European wars.

"We must band together to prevent the loss of more American lives in these internal struggles of Europe. We must keep foreign propaganda from pushing our country blindly into another war. Modern war with all its consequences is too tragic and too devastating to be approached from anything but a purely American standpoint. We should never enter a war unless it is absolutely essential to the future welfare of our Nation.

"This country was colonized by men and women from Europe. The hatreds, the persecutions, the intrigues they left behind gave them courage to cross the Atlantic Ocean to a new land. They preferred the wilderness and the Indians to the problems of Europe. They weighed the cost of freedom from those problems, and they paid the price. In this country they eventually found a means of living peacefully together—the same nationalities that are fighting abroad today. The quarrels of Europe faded out from American life as generations passed. Instead of wars between the English, French, and Germans, it became a struggle of the New World for freedom from the old—a struggle for the right of America to find her own destiny. The colonization of this country grew from European troubles, and our freedom sprang from European war, for we won independence from England while she was fighting France.

"WASHINGTON SAW DANGER

"No one foresaw the danger ahead of us more clearly than George Washington. He solemnly warned the people of America against becoming entangled in European alliances. For over 100 years his advice was followed. We established the Monroe Doctrine for America. We let other nations fight among themselves. Then, in 1917, we entered a European war. This time we were on England's side, and so were France and Russia. Friends and enemies reverse as decades pass—as political doctrines rise and fall.

"The Great War ended before our full force had reached the field. We escaped with the loss of relatively few soldiers. We measured our dead in thousands, Europe measured hers in millions. Europe has not yet recovered from the effects of this war, and she has already entered another. A generation has passed since the armistice of 1918, but even in America we are still paying for our part in

that victory—and we will continue to pay for another generation. European countries were both unable and unwilling to pay their debts to us.

"Now that war has broken out again we in America have a decision to make on which the destiny of our Nation depends. We must decide whether or not we intend to become forever involved in this age-old struggle between the nations of Europe. Let us not delude ourselves. If we enter the quarrels of Europe during war we must stay in them in time of peace as well. It is madness to send our soldiers to be killed, as we did in the last war, if we turn the course of peace over to the greed, the fear, and the intrigue of European nations. We must either keep out of European wars entirely or stay in European affairs permanently.

"NO DEFENSE AGAINST INVASION

"In making our decision this point should be clear: These wars in Europe are not wars in which our civilization is defending itself against some Asiatic intruder. There is no Genghis Kahn or Xerxes marching against our western nations. This is not a question of banding together to defend the white race against foreign invasion. This is simply one more of those age-old quarrels within our own family of nations—a quarrel arising from the errors of the last war—from the failure of the victors of that war to follow a consistent policy either of fairness or of force.

"Arbitrary boundaries can only be maintained by strength of arms. The Treaty of Versailles either had to be revised as time passed or England and France, to be successful, had to keep Germany weak by force. Neither policy was followed. Europe wavered back and forth between the two. As a result, another war has begun, a war which is likely to be far more prostrating than the last, a war which will again kill off the youth of Europe, a war which may even lead to the end of our western civilization.

"We must not permit our sentiment, our pity, or our personal feelings of sympathy to obscure the issue to affect our children's lives. We must be as impersonal as a surgeon with his knife. Let us make no mistake about the cost of entering this war. If we take part successfully, we must throw the resources of our entire Nation into the conflict. Munitions alone will not be enough. We cannot count on victory merely by shipping abroad several thousand airplanes and cannon. We are likely to lose a million men, possibly several million—the best of American youth. We will be staggering under the burden of recovery during the rest of our lives. And our children will be fortunate if they see the end in their lives, even if by some unlikely chance we do not pass on another Polish Corridor to them. Democracy itself may not survive. If we enter fighting for democracy abroad, we may end by losing it at home.

"LITTLE TO BE GAINED

"America has little to gain by taking part in another European war. We must not be misguided by this foreign propaganda to the effect that our frontiers lie in Europe. One need only glance at a map to see where our true frontiers lie. What more could we ask than the Atlantic Ocean on the east and the Pacific on the west? No; our interests in Europe need not be from the standpoint of defense. Our own natural frontiers are enough for that. If we extend them to the center of Europe we might as well extend them around the earth. An ocean is a formidable barrier even for modern aircraft. Our safety does not lie in fighting European wars. It lies in our internal strength, in the character of the American people, and of American institutions. As long as we maintain an Army, a Navy and an air force worthy of the name, as long as America does not decay within, we need fear no invasion of this country.

"Again I address those among you who agree with this stand. Our future and our children's future depends upon the action we take. It is essential to think clearly and to act quickly in the days which are to come. We will be deluged with propaganda, both foreign and domestic—some obvious, some insidious. Much of our news is already colored. Every incident and every accident will be seized upon to influence us. And in a modern war there are bound to be plenty of both. We must not only inquire about the writer and the speaker—about his personal interests and his nationality, but we must ask who owns and who influences the newspaper, the news picture, and the radio station. If our people know the truth, if they are fully and accurately informed, if they are not misled by propaganda, this country is not likely to enter the war now going on in Europe.

"HOPE LIES IN AMERICA

"And if Europe is again prostrated by war, as she has been so often in the past, then the greatest hope for our western civilization lies in America. By staying out of war ourselves we may even bring peace to Europe more quickly. Let us look to our own defenses and to our own character. If we attend to them we have no need to fear what happens elsewhere. If we do not attend to them nothing can save us.

"If war brings more Dark Ages to Europe we can better preserve those things which we love and which we mourn the passing of in Europe today by preserving them here, by strengthening them here, rather than by hurling ourselves thoughtlessly to their defense over there and thus destroying all in the conflagration. The German genius for science and organization, the English genius for government and commerce, the French genius for living and the understanding of life—they must not go down here as well as on the other side. Here in America they can be blended to form the greatest genius of all.

"The gift of civilized life must still be carried on. It is more important than the sympathies, the friendships, the desires of any single generation. This is the test before America now. This is the challenge—to carry on western civilization."

[From the Washington Star of October 14, 1939]

TEXT OF LINDBERGH NEUTRALITY SPEECH—FOUR-POINT SUGGESTION INCLUDES BAN ON SALE OF OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

Here is the text of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's address last night on the arms-embargo issue:

"Tonight, I speak again to the people of this country who are opposed to the United States entering the war which is now going on in Europe. We are faced with the need of deciding on a policy of American neutrality. The future of our Nation and of our civilization rests upon the wisdom and foresight we use.

"Much as peace is to be desired, we should realize that behind a successful policy of neutrality must stand a policy of war. It is essential to define clearly those principles and circumstances for which a nation will fight. Let us give no one the impression that America's love for peace means that she is afraid of war, or that we are not fully capable and willing to defend all that is vital to us. National life and influence depend upon national strength, both in character and in arms. A neutrality built on pacifism alone will eventually fail.

"LINE MUST FIRST BE DRAWN BETWEEN NEUTRALITY AND WAR

"Before we can intelligently enact regulations for the control of our armaments, our credit, and our ships, we must draw a sharp dividing line between neutrality and war; there must be no gradual encroachment on the defense of our Nation. Up to this line we may adjust our affairs to gain the advantages of peace, but beyond it must lie all the armed might of America, coiled in readiness to spring if once this bond is cut.

"Let us make clear to all countries where this line lies. It must be both within our intent and our capabilities. There must be no question of trading or bluff in this hemisphere. Let us give no promises we cannot keep—make no meaningless assurances to an Ethiopia, a Czechoslovakia, or a Poland. The policy we decide upon should be as clear-cut as our shore lines, and as easily defended as our continent.

"This Western Hemisphere is our domain. It is our right to trade freely within it. From Alaska to Labrador, from the Hawaiian Islands to Bermuda, from Canada to South America, we must allow no invading army to set foot. These are the outposts of the United States. They form the essential outline of our geographical defense. We must be ready to wage war with all the resources of our Nation if they are ever seriously threatened.

"Their defense is the mission of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps—the minimum requirement of our military strength. Around these places should lie our line between neutrality and war. Let there be no compromise about our right to defend or trade within this area. If it is challenged by any nation, the answer must be war. Our policy of neutrality should have this as its foundation.

"QUESTIONS RIGHT OF CANADIANS TO INVOLVE HEMISPHERE IN WAR

"We must protect our sister American nations from foreign invasion, both for their welfare and our own. But, in turn, they have a duty to us. They should not place us in the position of having to defend them in America while they engage in wars abroad. Can we rightfully permit any country in America to give bases to foreign warships, or to send its army abroad to fight while it remains secure in our protection at home? We desire the utmost friendship with the people of Canada. If their country is ever attacked, our Navy will be defending their seas, our soldiers will fight on their battlefields, our flyers will die in their skies. But have they the right to draw this hemisphere into European war simply because they prefer the Crown of England to American independence?

"Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power. American history clearly indicates this need. As long as European powers maintain their influence in our hemisphere, we are likely to find ourselves involved in their troubles. And they will lose no opportunity to involve us.

"Our Congress is now assembled to decide upon the best policy for this country to maintain during the war which is going on in Europe. The legislation under discussion involves three major issues—the embargo of arms, the restriction of shipping, and the allowance of credit. The action we take in regard to these issues will be an important indication to ourselves, and to the nations of Europe, whether or not we are likely to enter the conflict eventually as we did in the last war. The entire world is watching us. The action we take in America may either stop or precipitate this war.

"Let us take up these issues, one at a time, and examine them. First, the the embargo of arms. It is argued that the repeal of this embargo would assist democracy in Europe, that it would let us make a profit for ourselves from the sale of munitions abroad and, at the same time, help to build up our own arms industry.

"HELPING HAND TO GERMANY WOULD HAVE FORESTALLED WAR

"I do not believe that repealing the arms embargo would assist democracy in Europe because I do not believe this is a war for democracy. (This is a war over the balance of power in Europe—a war brought about by the desire for strength on the part of

Germany and the fear of strength on the part of England and France. The more munitions the armies obtain, the longer the war goes on and the more devastated Europe becomes, the less hope there is for democracy. That is a lesson we should have learned from our participation in the last war. If democratic principles had been applied in Europe after that war, if the 'democracies' of Europe had been willing to make some sacrifice to help democracy in Europe while it was fighting for its life, if England and France had offered a hand to the struggling republic of Germany, there would be no war today.

"If we repeal the arms embargo with the idea of assisting one of the warring sides to overcome the other, then why mislead ourselves by talk of neutrality? Those who advance this argument should admit openly that repeal is a step toward war. The next step would be the extension of credit and the next would be the sending of American troops.

"To those who argue that we could make a profit and build up our own industry by selling munitions abroad, I reply that we in America have not yet reached a point where we wish to capitalize on the destruction and death of war. I do not believe that the material welfare of this country needs, or that our spiritual welfare could withstand, such a policy. If our industry depends upon a commerce of arms for its strength, then our industrial system should be changed.

"It is impossible for me to understand how America can contribute to civilization and humanity by sending offensive instruments of destruction to European battlefields. This would not only implicate us in the war, but it would also make us partly responsible for its devastation. The fallacy of helping to defend a political ideology, even through it be somewhat similar to our own, was clearly demonstrated to us in the last war. Through our help that war was won, but neither the democracy nor the justice for which we fought grew in the peace that followed our victory.

"RACIAL STRENGTH VITAL, POLITICS A LUXURY

"Our bond with Europe is a bond of race and not of political ideology. We had to fight a European army to establish democracy in this country. It is the European race we must preserve; political progress will follow. Racial strength is vital—politics, a luxury. If the white race is ever seriously threatened, it may then be time for us to take our part in its protection, to fight side by side with the English, French, and Germans, but not with one against the other for our mutual destruction.

"Let us not dissipate our strength, or help Europe to dissipate hers, in these wars of politics and possession. For the benefit of western civilization, we should continue our embargo on offensive armaments. As far as purely defensive arms are concerned, I, for one, am in favor of supplying European countries with as much as we can spare of the material that falls within this category.

"There are technicians who will argue that offensive and defensive arms cannot be separated completely. That is true; but it is no more difficult to make a list of defensive weapons than it is to separate munitions of war from semimanufactured articles, and we are faced with that problem today. No one says that we should sell opium because it is difficult to make a list of narcotics. I would as soon see our country traffic in opium as in bombs.

"WILLING TO SEE UNITED STATES GUNS BRING DOWN BOMBERS

"I do not want to see American bombers dropping bombs which will kill and mutilate European children, even if they are not flown by American pilots. But I am perfectly willing to see American antiaircraft guns shooting American shells at invading bombers over any European country. And I believe that most of you who are listening tonight will agree with me.

"The second major issue for which we must create a policy concerns the restrictions to be placed on our shipping. Naval blockades have long been accepted as an element of warfare.

"In modern naval blockades and warfare, torpedoes will be fired and bombs dropped on probabilities rather than on certainties of identification. The only safe course for neutral shipping at this time is to stay away from the warring countries and dangerous waters of Europe.

"The third issue to be decided relates to the extension of credit.

"Here again we may draw from our experience in the last war. After that war was over we found ourselves in the position of having financed a large portion of the expenditures of European countries. And when the time came to pay us back, these countries simply refused to do so. They not only refused to pay the wartime loans we made, but they refused to pay back what we loaned them after the war was over.

"EUROPE FEELS INSULTED IF ASKED TO REPAY

"As is so frequently the case, we found that loaning money eventually created animosity instead of gratitude. European countries felt insulted when we asked to be repaid. They called us 'Uncle Shylock.' They were horror struck at the idea of turning over to us any of their islands in America to compensate for their debts, or for our help in winning their war. They seized all the German colonies and carved up Europe to suit their fancy. These were the 'fruits of war.' They took our money and they took our soldiers. But there was not the offer of one Caribbean island in return for the debts they 'could not afford to pay.'

"The extension of credit to a belligerent country is a long step toward war, and it would leave us close to the edge. If American industry loans money to a belligerent country, many interests will feel that it is more important for that country to win than for our own to avoid the war. It is unfortunate but true that there are interests in America who would rather lose American lives than their own dollars. We should give them no opportunity.

"WOULD ADOPT FOUR-POINT PLAN CONTRIBUTING TO CIVILIZATION

"I believe that we should adopt as our program of American neutrality, as our contribution to western civilization, the following policy:

"1. An embargo on offensive weapons and munitions.

"2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments.

"3. The prohibition of American shipping from the belligerent countries of Europe and their danger zones.

"4. The refusal of credit to belligerent nations or their agents.

"Whether or not this program is adopted depends upon the support of those of us who believe in it. The United States of America is a democracy. The policy of our country is still controlled by our people. It is time for us to take action. There has never been a greater test for the democratic principle of government."

Colonel Lindbergh and Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask that immediately following the insertion of addresses by Colonel Lindbergh which have been ordered placed in the RECORD, there also be printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson, in her column On the Record, the article being entitled "Colonel Lindbergh and Propaganda."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 20, 1939]

COLONEL LINDBERGH AND PROPAGANDA

(By Dorothy Thompson)

That Colonel Lindbergh should passionately wish to keep this country out of war is not surprising, but his speech in the debate over the arms embargo is. It is surprising and disquieting. The arguments he advances are not those of Senator BORAH or Senator VANDENBERG. They are much more subtle, for what Colonel Lindbergh clearly implied in his talk over three networks last Friday was that unless this country is prepared to go into war with the full force of all of its manpower and resources, the Nazis will win it, and, this being the case, it is better not to offend them in any way. Sentiment, pity, or personal sympathies ought not, he said, to influence our cold judgment of realities. "We must be as impersonal as a surgeon's knife."

Colonel Lindbergh's whole argument deserves the most searching analysis, and there is not space in this particular column to consider it in detail. We shall do that later. But this column would like to take up one challenge in Colonel Lindbergh's speech and accept the invitation to one inquiry.

That is his warning to inquire about the personal interests of every speaker. "We must learn to look behind every article we read and every speech we hear. We must not only inquire about the writer and speaker—about his personal interests and his nationality—but we must ask who owns and influences the newspaper, the news picture, and the radio station."

LINDBERGH'S STAY IN EUROPE STRESSED

Since the colonel thus raises the question, it seems pertinent to inquire into the personal predilections of Colonel Lindbergh himself. For Colonel Lindbergh, who counsels complete withdrawal from the affairs of Europe, has not himself practiced such withdrawal. From September 1935 until April 1939, except for a brief Christmas visit home in 1937, Colonel Lindbergh lived in Europe, and during that time he played a considerable role in European political affairs and exercised a certain influence over European policies.

It is, therefore—and since he recommends such inquiry—important to ask what his viewpoint and influence were.

When Colonel Lindbergh left this country in 1935 he did not believe that the United States or its institutions were the hope of the world.

He had performed a daring and, up to that time, unique exploit designed for and inevitably attended by vast publicity, which made him a center of the news. He felt himself persecuted by

the press and developed a hatred and suspicion of the press which became an obsession and which is reflected in his Friday speech. He had been the victim of a tragic and outrageous crime committed against his child by an alien illegally in this country. In this tragedy all America wept for him and for his wife with those sentiments of pity and personal sympathy which are characteristic of all human beings so long as they retain their humanity.

CONSIDERED DROPPING OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

But when Colonel Lindbergh left this country and went to England he was so full of contempt for American institutions that he discussed with his English friends the possibility of relinquishing his American citizenship and becoming a British subject. In this he was discouraged by his English friends, who felt that Americans would regard the change of citizenship as an affront, and told him that his natural resentment would not be welcomed by England.

While abroad Colonel Lindbergh traveled extensively on the Continent, studying the air services of the various powers. In July 1936 he received a medal from the aero club of Nazi Germany, presented at a meeting where he first met General Goering.

At the time the Nazi press paid him warm tribute, and in September 1937 the same inspired press touted him as a potential President of the United States.

In October 1937 he attended the Munich air conference, went from there to Berlin, and returned to England. He was back in the United States for Christmas in 1937, returning to England in March 1938.

In April 1938, still pursuing his intention to remain abroad, he bought the French island of Illiec. The arrangements for this purchase were made by Colonel Lindbergh's most intimate friend, Dr. Alexis Carrel, the Franco-American scientist. Dr. Carrel is a distinguished scientist. He also was considered the official philosopher of the French Fascist Party, led by Doriot, until the dissolution of that party by the outbreak of the war.

STATEMENT HELPED "APPEASEMENT" GROUP

In May 1938 occurred the luncheon at the home of Lady Astor at which Colonel Lindbergh expressed his very high opinion of the German air force and of Nazi organization in general, making reports which were welcome to the group working for "appeasement" with Germany—the group which was then dominant in the British Cabinet.

He also deprecated the Russian air force and his remarks were encouraging to those who were denouncing any collaboration between the western powers and the Soviet Union.

In August 1938 the colonel made his tour of Warsaw, Moscow, Kiev, Prague, and Paris. In October of the same year he left Paris for Berlin and made a tour of Germany, including the airplane factories, where he was reported to have been given every access to information.

On October 19, 1938, he was given the second highest German decoration—the Service Cross of the Order of the German Eagle with star. It was presented by General Goering, who hung it about his neck "in the name of the Fuehrer."

In November of the same year he was the subject of an attack in Everybody's Magazine, published in London, which recommended that in the interests of everybody Colonel Lindbergh should return to the United States.

INTENDED TO RENT A HOME IN BERLIN

During the same month it was announced that he intended to rent an apartment in Berlin and settle down there to study aeronautics.

The report of his intention came only a few weeks after the whole world had been shocked by the cynical breaking of the Munich Pact by Germany and coincided with the outbreak of the most ruthless and heartless pogrom which the western world has seen in centuries.

Men, women, and little children were routed out of their homes, thousands of men were thrown into concentration camps, a blanket fine of more than half a billion marks was imposed upon a whole community. Jewish businesses were looted, synagogues were set on fire, thousands of German citizens risked their lives in the Nazi Reich to give aid to the wretched victims of an organized atrocity, hundreds sent letters abroad to plead that the action was not favored by the German people, and protests arose all over the civilized world.

In this country men of all parties and creeds—the President, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dewey—protested. But Colonel Lindbergh did not protest.

Apartments and villas were then available in Berlin because so many had been forcibly evacuated. But the colonel's idea of settling in Germany provoked much adverse comment, and he abandoned the idea of a German residence and removed to an apartment in Paris.

On January 7, 1939, he reported to the United States on German aviation. He sailed for this country last April. His Friday speech is his first public utterance on American political affairs.

FASCIST TENDENCY IS WELL KNOWN

Colonel Lindbergh's inclination toward fascism is well known to his friends. "Pity, sentiment, and personal sympathy" play little role in his life. On the other hand, he has a passion for mechanics and a tendency to judge the world and society purely from a technical and mechanical standpoint. The humanities, which are at the very center and core of the democratic idea, do not interest him, and he is completely indifferent to political philosophy.

A man who has never spared himself physically, but has taken upon himself the most grueling training, keeping himself awake and without food for days, he has the utmost contempt for physical weakness. Cruelty does not affront him. He is himself a cruel practical joker.

He also is a national hero, and because this country loves its heroes, the press, which Colonel Lindbergh hates, has behaved very chivalrously toward Colonel Lindbergh's ideas.

But since he, himself, has warned that all who speak in the present situation should have their personal interests inquired into, he cannot object to an inquiry into his own biases. And his are not the predilections of the majority of Americans or of democracies anywhere.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON COLONEL LINDBERGH'S ADDRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last evening Col. Charles A. Lindbergh delivered an address over the radio on the subject of our national defense. I do not wish to discuss the address at this time, but I have here an editorial from the New York Times of today which does discuss it, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also have an editorial from the Washington Star of this afternoon entitled "Counsel of Disaster," in which the address of Colonel Lindbergh is discussed. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1940]

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S BROADCAST

In his radio broadcast last night Colonel Lindbergh advised the American people to "stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion that has been running rife these last few days." Let us put to one side the question of invasion—since Colonel Lindbergh himself believes that the country needs "a greater air force, a greater Army, and a greater Navy," which is all that the advocates of more adequate national defense have themselves been saying. Let us consider instead "this hysterical chatter of calamity" that also annoys him. The "hysterical chatter" is the talk now heard on every side that the democracies of France and Great Britain stand in imminent danger of defeat by Germany.

Colonel Lindbergh is a peculiar young man if he can contemplate this possibility in any other light than as a calamity for the American people. He is an ignorant young man if he trusts his own premise that it makes no difference to us whether we are deprived of the historic defense of British sea power in the Atlantic Ocean. He is a blind young man if he really believes that we can live on terms of equal peace and happiness "regardless of which side wins this war" in Europe.

Colonel Lindbergh remains a great flier.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1940]

COUNSEL OF DISASTER

In an address which can only be described as remarkable for the inconsistency and confusion of its thought, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has told the people of America that we are in no danger of war and that we will not become involved in war unless we seek it out ourselves.

With an assurance implying a factual knowledge which he cannot have, Colonel Lindbergh says categorically and without any qualification that "no one wishes to attack us." In the same breath he says that we "need a greater air force, a greater Army, and a greater Navy." The self-contradiction presented here is interesting. Since it is not to be supposed that Colonel Lindbergh has access to information concerning the plans of possible aggressors, he is giving dogmatic expression merely to a personal opinion when he says that no one wishes to attack us and that no one is in a position to do so. But if that is the case, or if he really believes it to be the case, why, then, should he urge the

building up of our armed forces? For what reason would he spend money on additional arms if he does not believe there is any danger of an attack upon us?

The colonel also advances as a novel proposal the thought that we ought to decide what we are going to defend before we think about building a defensive air force. If our defense is to be confined to the United States, he says, we shall have to build one type of air force; if we are to defend the Western Hemisphere planes of different types will be needed. That, coming from one who does not shrink from advising the Nation as to the course it should follow in this critical time, is an amazing proposition.

President Roosevelt and other high officials have stated time and again that it is our intention to defend the Western Hemisphere. Fleet and land maneuvers have been carried out with that objective in mind. From no responsible quarter has there come the slightest suggestion that we should confine our planning to a defense of the United States alone. To do so would be the sheerest folly and no one knows that better than Colonel Lindbergh, for he acknowledged that any attempt to defend only the United States "eventually would leave us as vulnerable to air attack as the nations of Europe are today."

Colonel Lindbergh stands alone in his uncertainty as to what our defense policy is. It is a doubt which exists in his mind and nowhere else. But that does not soften the harsh fact that in advancing the suggestion that we do not have a definite policy in this respect he is doing a disservice to the country. If accepted by the people at their face value, his remarks could only serve to shake public confidence in the administration at a time when unity is a paramount necessity.

Any and all suggestions that it is to our interest to aid the Allies in their struggle against Germany are rejected outright by Colonel Lindbergh as being the machinations of unidentified "powerful elements" in America seeking to serve their own selfish purposes. Once again he holds forth personal opinion disguised as fact, without any supporting evidence.

The President, with ready access to sources of information that are denied to Colonel Lindbergh, has stated in effect that France and Britain are fighting our battle and that they must be kept fighting at least until we can prepare ourselves. That will require precious time—a year or more at best—but the colonel counsels delay.

His advice invites disaster, as is evidenced by the fate which has befallen half a dozen stricken nations in Europe, and the American people should have little difficulty in choosing between the course advocated by the President and that which Colonel Lindbergh, a good airplane pilot, would follow.

Europe's War and America's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on May 18, 1940, by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, on the subject Europe's War and America's Security.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preparedness is necessary for our security. Our Army, Navy, and air-force officers are keenly observing the war in Europe in order to see what technical lessons in armament and organization have been developed. I write this address before having the opportunity of hearing the address of President Roosevelt to Congress on the subject of national defense.

One clear lesson from the fighting in Norway is the greater power of the air bomber over naval vessels of war. This increased capacity of airplanes to damage or sink warships is greatest in the narrow seas. But our air fleets on the two coasts will be more valuable to aid in keeping any enemy at a distance from our coasts.

Britain's reverses in Norway showed the great need in Britain for a Cabinet Minister of Defense; one Cabinet officer to devote all his time to personal inspection of the progress made by and to the control of the three armed services. Coordination is not control. Coordination means suggestions, advice, compromise, and delay. A war council is a policy-making body. A committee or council is not an effective executive body. For us the need is crucial for a single Cabinet Minister of Defense. There appears to be at present confusion of thought in Congress about airplanes and several other defense matters. This is largely due to the absence of a Cabinet Minister of Defense. Such a defense minister would have been spending his whole time in personal inspections and studies of these defense matters. His mature and disinterested advice would be at the service of Congress. Congress often studies these matters through the slow process of hearings and investigations.

I am confident that the gentlemen in Congress will study the matter of defense—and the other critical subjects they are to face now—in a calm manner. As to our being drawn into the war in Europe, or, for that matter, into the war in eastern Asia—I see no reason for our entering either of these conflicts. My judgment is that Germany hopes to march toward the southeast—through Europe and to the Dardanelles, Syria, Iraq, and Persia. Germany's present war is an effort to destroy the large battle fleets of Great Britain and France. These fleets would prevent Germany from marching to the east through southeastern Europe. Suppose that I am mistaken as to Germany's intentions. I do not see how even a Germany victorious in Europe can attack the United States or make an attack in force against a South American country. Germany would be too exhausted. Suppose that I am again in error as to Germany being exhausted. A victorious Germany would have no battle fleet—not to mention the loss of so many of her merchant ships—for an expedition to South America.

Every one recognizes that the security of the Panama Canal is vital to our defense. Also that we must be prepared with armed forces sufficient to aid any country in Central or South America which may be attacked by a European power. Vigilance is needed to detect any attempt of a foreign power to set up a base for airplanes in North American or in South American regions.

I believe we should control the seas from the mid-Atlantic Ocean westward to the mid-Pacific; that we should continue the erection of the fortified air bases authorized in the Aleutian Islands and on Johnson, Palmyra, and Midway Islands—all in the eastern part of the Pacific Ocean. This is in accord with Admiral Leahy's definition of our defense line running, he said, from the Aleutians to Hawaii and then to Samoa and on to the Canal at Panama. After many years' continuous residence in the Far East, it is my conviction that Guam—away out in the western part of the Pacific and 3,000 miles west of our base at Hawaii—is indefensible against an attack, even if the colossal sum such as the proposed $250,000,000 were spent on it.

We have discharged our moral obligations to the Filipinos—well and nobly discharged these obligations. They all earnestly desire the independence we promised to them. Japan will not annex the Philippines, with great armies of Russia so near Japan at the north. We cannot aid any country in South America if our fleet is kept alert watching far-off Guam and the more-distant Philippines.

Now, in conclusion, a word on the latest grand war scare. About 50 percent of the rubber used in the United States and about the same percentage of our tin come originally from Netherlands East Indies. We buy the tin from people—in Europe mostly—who have smelters for refining tin. The rubber comes from agents who have imported it from those Dutch islands. But we can readily send—or the purchasing agents can readily send—out to Java by way of the Atlantic Ocean.

America, Remain Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT BY REAR ADMIRAL HARRY E. YARNELL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch from Newport, R. I., dated May 18, 1940, containing a statement of Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, urging that the United States keep out of the European war.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YARNELL INSISTS UNITED STATES STAY OUT OF WAR IF 1918 IS REPEATED—PLANE ATTACK POSSIBILITY REMOTE FOR SOME TIME TO COME, HE ASSERTS

NEWPORT, R. I., May 18.—Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, declared today that America should keep out of war until she is assured that her men and money "will be spent to a far better end than in 1918."

"The people of this country," he said in a prepared address before the graduating class of the Naval War College, "are still painfully aware of the result of the last World War, when we sent 2,000,000 men abroad and spent thirty or more billions of dollars to make the world safe for democracy; then at the end witnessed

a relapse of the high ideals and a resumption of the old selfish, nationalistic policies that planted the seeds of future war.

"Why should we spend our blood and treasure, until there is assurance that they will be spent to a far better end than in 1918?

"Do not enter the war to assist any nation," he admonished, "until that nation unreservedly pledges itself to support a treaty of peace that will be fair to all and will be of some value in discouraging in the future the use of war as an instrument of national policy."

In the event, however, the United States should reach the end of its endurance, Admiral Yarnell said, the war should be made "purely a naval war," and no troops should be sent beyond the limits of the continental United States.

"The Atlantic Ocean still remains a large body of water and the probability of plane attack from overseas on this country will remain remote for some time to come," he asserted. "Command of the sea is and will remain the primary factor in our plan of national defense and as long as we have it we are safe from successful enemy invasion.

"Bear firmly in mind that seapower defeated Napoleon and it will be seapower today and tomorrow that will prevent another dictator who lacks it from acquiring domination."

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of today entitled "Our Defenses," in which the Baltimore Sun goes exhaustively into the subject of our defense. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of Monday, May 20, 1940]

OUR DEFENSES—WHY THE THREAT TO THE ALLIES REQUIRES PROMPT ACTION TO STRENGTHEN OUR LINES

Probably nothing short of the specter of destruction or surrender of the British Navy could make the American people tell themselves the full truth about the great value to us of this Navy over many years of our history.

Students of our foreign relations have understood clearly that the British Navy, as the instrument of a friendly British Government, has made maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine a simple and inexpensive dogma of our foreign policy. It is a half century since the controversy over Venezuela, and in that we were more aggressive than the British. Students of foreign affairs have also understood clearly that, so long as the British Navy was intact, the Atlantic was for us a relatively secure area. Looking toward the Atlantic, isolationists and international cooperationists could join in the early twenties under Mr. Borah's leadership in insisting upon naval disarmament. Students of foreign affairs also have understood clearly that so long as the British Navy was intact there was restraint upon disorder in vast stretches of the Pacific Ocean, and trade routes vital to our economy were protected.

All of that was well known to students of foreign relations, and was frequently discussed, but it made little impression upon the national consciousness. It was one of those familiar things of which men can remain unaware precisely because of familiarity. Our old-time isolationists, for example, never admitted the fact into their minds. They were, therefore, able to be violently anti-British at the same time that, in general, they stood for disarmament. They were able to hate a nation which was a bulwark of the kind of world in which we preferred to live, while doing nothing to provide substitute protection for the United States if the British Empire and the British Navy disappeared from a world in which international order had not been secured.

So indifferent to the facts was the American public mind, so susceptible was the American mind to the arguments of the old-time isolationists, that public men who knew better were forced into silence. It was not that they were cowardly before the public attitude and the effectiveness of the old-time isolationists. They simply recognized, first, the futility of a campaign in the opposite direction; and, second, the danger that such a campaign would do more harm than good.

To understand this, one has only to stop long enough to think that it would have been politically impossible for Mr. Roosevelt to have made the speech last September that he made last week, when he called for a billion-dollar emergency arms program. Intelligent men knew last September—they knew long before last September—that our future would be secure were Britain and France to be secure against Germany, and our future would not be secure were Britain and France to fall. But a hard campaign of education was necessary even to enact such legislation as would preserve enough of the ancient principles of American neutrality to permit Britain and France to buy supplies in our markets, with their own cash, and to move the supplies from our shores in their own bottoms.

If Mr. Roosevelt, last September, had proposed a billion-dollar arms program to protect us in the event of German victory, the only result would have been the riddling of his program by the isolationists with charges that he sought to intervene in the war on the side of Britain. The danger that we see now was apparent in September. The danger of a knockout blow to the Allies had been written 10,000 times. But the national mind remained complacent and the isolationists' arguments remained potent and compelling.

Meantime, our military and naval people were caught in the same circumstances.

They knew that all the measures which were directed to an organization of the nations of the world for the preservation of law and order had failed. Some of the most distinguished of the military and naval people had earnestly supported these measures. Most professional soldiers and sailors had been dubious of projects for world order. In any event, they all knew that failure had overtaken such measures. And, in that failure, they knew the importance to the security of this country of the British Empire and the British Navy and the importance of guarding, in our own arms, against the danger that the British Empire and the British Navy would fall—a danger which had been advertised to the world in successful aggressions in Europe, Asia, and Africa. But their voices were feeble because, like the intelligent men in public life, they had to combat national complacency and national susceptibility to the argument of the isolationists, many of whom were as firmly opposed to armaments as they were to any assumption of responsibility for world order.

The military and naval people also thought, of course, that if worse came to worse, there would probably be time. They knew that, all measures for international law and order having failed, the defeat of the British Empire and the destruction or surrender of the British Navy would place us in danger. But most of them apparently felt that defeat could not come so quickly and so completely as to make danger imminent. They underestimated German power in that respect.

We needed close before our eyes the specter of destruction or surrender of the British Navy to banish national complacency and to make us realize the hollowness of the old-time isolationists' argument that "our boys" would be eternally safe so long as we looked across neither ocean. We have got close before our eyes now this specter of the British Navy destroyed or surrendered. And we are awake. Yesterday, Mr. Mark S. Watson, in the first of the articles he will write from Washington on our problems of defense and our materials of defense, showed plainly that responsible men in Washington are alive to our situation. And the news from the country shows that the people are becoming alive to it.

We know now that, should the British Navy be destroyed or surrendered, protection of Canada, Mexico, and South America, under the Monroe Doctrine, will not be a simple matter of strong words. We know that protection of the Panama Canal will not be the concern solely of a few soldiers, a few sailors, and a few airmen. We know that the use and disposition of British and French and Dutch islands, within easy flying distance of our coasts, will not be limited in interest to well-to-do Americans with a taste for exotic spots as places of holiday. We know that the protection of our shores and approaches and of the lands of neighbors for whom we have assumed responsibility calls for stern, hard measures of defense, and that we are no longer able to take our own time.

Washington has gone to work, with the administration supported by the spokesmen of the opposition. But it must be said over and over again that it is not enough for Washington itself to go to work. Washington must unify the spirit of the Nation. Washington must lead in unifying the economy of the Nation, upon which we rest for the swift production of materials of defense—for the doing quickly of tasks long neglected. Industry and labor must be marshaled and set to work in full energy. Here is one of the principal tasks before Mr. Roosevelt. He should move at once to effect this unity and to release this energy.

Diplomatic Relations With the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM BISHOP JAMES H. RYAN

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in a letter to the New York Times the able Bishop of Omaha presents a scholarly discussion of the question of diplomatic relations of the United

States with the Vatican. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1940]

DIRECT DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE VATICAN ADVISED—ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF OMAHA POINTS OUT ADVANTAGES TO BE GAINED BY RESUMPTION OF CONTACT WHICH HAS BEEN SUSPENDED SINCE 1867

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In annual assembly recently the Methodist Church voted that it is "unalterably opposed" to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican. By this action it joined the Baptists and Lutherans, who had disapproved publicly the sending of an American Ambassador to the Holy See. These same churches even criticized the appointment of Myron Taylor, sent by President Roosevelt as his personal representative to the Pope in order to work in the interests of world peace and for the relief of suffering in the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia.

The thought is expressed by these churches that the appointment of Mr. Taylor is but a first step in the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Should such relations be reestablished, it is feared that grave injury will be done the principle of separation of church and state. Why and in what way the appointment of an American Ambassador to the Vatican would change the traditional ecclesiastical policy of the United States Government is never pointed out. It is simply asserted, and always by the representative of some Protestant group. No one else seems to have any such misgivings.

POLITICALLY IMPORTANT

The question of the eventual resumption of full diplomatic relations with the Vatican is an important one from an exclusive political standpoint. Cannot it be discussed solely from that angle?

With the election of Pius XII now behind us, and the memory of the almost universal approbation it received still fresh in the public mind, the place of the papacy in world affairs seems to stand out in bolder relief than at almost any other epoch of its long existence. In few periods of history have the Popes exercised a larger influence—an interesting phenomenon when one recalls the low political ebb to which the papacy had sunk at the middle of the last century, when, on all sides, reputable statesmen predicted its final and definitive annihilation within their own lifetime. But from Leo XIII to Pius XII much water has flowed under the bridge of international politics. Kingdoms that were kingdoms in the days of Pius IX are no more, and empires that seemed eternal then have collapsed.

Political liberalism and not the papacy was almost completely destroyed in the cataclysm of the World War. On its ruins there have risen, to take its place, such extremes as communism and fascism, which, despite their many and serious differences, meet on the common ground of state totalitarianism.

Instead of doing battle with a defunct liberalism, the papacy is now in deadlock with a no less arrogant successor. If history is any guide to the immediate future, state absolutism will not be any more successful in its efforts to humble Rome than was the dominant political ideology of the nineteenth century.

STUDYING OUR POSITION

All of which, by way of introduction, brings the thoughtful student of international affairs face to face with a most important issue: Where should the United States stand in relation to this force, whose powers of rejuvenation seem only to be equaled by its world-wide influence and authority? What must we, nationals of the United States, think of this international entity, the papacy, upon whose spiritual empire the sun never sets, and to whose authority almost 400,000,000 human beings owe a spiritual allegiance as deep and moving as that which they profess for the state itself of which, at the same time, they are citizens?

Since 1867 the Government of the United States has ignored officially the very existence of the Vatican. Though conscious of the religious power of the Pope, head of the Catholic Church, we have chosen to remain blind to the political power of the Pope, who is king. But is it the part of wisdom not to recognize the papacy for what it is, despite any religious feelings to the contrary? Rather, is it not the function of political realism to calculate dispassionately the advantages which would accrue to the United States by a recognition of the Vatican as a state, in all things independent and sovereign?

If we cannot at this moment answer the question by a catagorical yes or no, we can examine, in a scientific spirit, the claims for recognition of the Vatican, discuss them, and conclude what course of action it would be best for our country to follow should we be called upon to come to a decision. That our Government and the Vatican are drawing, almost daily, closer together there can be no doubt. Recent acts of both the Holy See and the United States speak louder than any mere protestations of good will. The patent community of interests and purposes which exists points to an understanding and a friendship which can only be climaxed by full and spontaneous recognition on the part of both church and state. Should the United States decide to send a permanent Ambassador to the Holy See, what are the reasons which would impel such a momentous decision?

IMPOSING REPRESENTATION

In the first place, it must be recalled that the Vatican is in no sense of the word an orphan child among the nations of the world. Both qualitatively and quantitatively the foreign representation at the Vatican is little short of imposing. According to the Annuario Pontificio, the official yearbook of the Holy See, 36 nations maintain either permanent embassies or legations in Rome. Among this large number we find such important countries as England, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, and Belgium. Russia, it may be noted, is not represented for reasons known to all.

Of very special significance to us in the United States is the South American roster, which includes such important powers as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. To one interested in the political and social welfare of the peoples of this hemisphere it is of large moment that the South and Central American countries almost universally recognize the Vatican state and maintain with it the closest possible diplomatic relations. Anyone who has traveled in South America and has felt the temper of that people knows that, by faith and tradition, they are preponderantly Roman Catholic, no matter what political party may happen to be in power. In truth, the heads of states are the first to recognize this fact of national existence and meet it in the only way it can be met.

The path of Pan Americanism is not strewn with roses, as everyone connected with the movement knows. Solidarity between the peoples of the two continents depends more on the recognition of basic principles in the fields of social ideals and of ethics than on an acceptance of similar commercial or political doctrines. The surest, safest, and most realistic approach to understanding and cooperation between the Americas is along the road of morality and religion. In that large task the representatives of the Vatican in South America could play a really constructive role, were they instructed from Rome to cooperate fully with the forces advocating Pan Americanism, the leadership in which has always been held by the United States.

SELFISH RELATIONSHIPS

The diplomatic history of modern Europe presents few, if any, examples of completely unselfish relationships between nations. When nations act they proceed on the well-known lines of quid pro quo. It is patently absurd to assume that Germany, France, and England now recognize the Vatican state for any high motives of Christian charity. If they give something, they expect something in return.

Nor is it difficult to imagine what the hard-headed diplomatists of the major European powers expect from the presence at the Court of St. Peter. They see clearly that the Vatican, as a world-wide moral power, must be reckoned with, and they proceed so to act on an assumption whose practical truth has been proved times without number. English or German recognition of the Pope as head of the Vatican state no more entails national acceptance of the Catholic religion than does recognition of the Shah of Iran involve acceptance of the religious claims of Mohammedanism.

It seems difficult for many American Protestants to appreciate the distinction between political and religious recognition. That the distinction exists, and possesses validity, is apparent from the acts of the great European Protestant powers who recognize the Vatican but do not accept the Catholic Church; in fact, are legally and constitutionally committed to other churches.

WORTH-WHILE EFFORT

It may be difficult to get all the American people to reach the same soundly logical and practical conclusion. The effort, however, should be made in the higher and lasting interests of the Republic, and, may we add, at no time more than at this hour of the world's history, where understanding among the forces molding public opinion is of paramount importance if civilization itself is not to collapse under the action of subversive philosophies which seem bent on its complete detruction.

The Vatican has been called the "listening post of Europe." Certainly there is no other chancelry where such correct information concerning world affairs and interests is to be found. When one recalls the far-flung outposts of the Roman Church, coupled with its highly centralized organization, in the interest of which thousands of well-trained, official and unofficial, diplomats are constantly reporting on even the slightest changes in public opinion in their respective territories, it can readily be grasped why the information in the possession of the Holy See is of a high accuracy no less than of inestimable value to anyone able to tap its resources. This, of course, can only be done by the powers who are in daily contact with the Papal Secretariat of State.

AUTHORITATIVELY INFORMED

Writing recently in the New York Times magazine, Camille M. Cianfarra summed up the situation from the point of view of a keen observer of international events. "Without the slightest doubt the Vatican is the best-informed power in the world. Information, both political and ecclesiastical, pours into its various offices through gigantic machinery that extends to the farthest corners of the globe."

Constantine Brown, one of the best-informed writers on international affairs, published in his column in the Washington Evening Star an appraisal of the work of Myron Taylor in which he says that Taylor "is doing a remarkably fine job." He continues: "The Vatican has proved so far the best and most reliable source for the American Government, and Ambassador Taylor is a perfect reporter. The Vatican's intelligence service is the best in the world. The 'intelligence officers' are members of the Catholic clergy who are in touch in every country of the world with people of all social strata."

All of which points a moral which only the willfully stupid would be likely to misunderstand. While it is true that friendly powers

can be counted on to keep us informed up to a point of what the Vatican thinks and knows, yet in the game of international politics full trust cannot be placed even in our friends. The only sure way to obtain access to the Vatican is to be represented there, to have built up with the spokesmen of the Holy See a degree of confidence and intimacy which comes largely from personal contact, understanding, and appreciation of each other's policies and motivations.

The Papacy is fundamentally a spiritual, not a political power. But so widespread and all inclusive is the realm of the spirit that it is difficult to segregate it from the political and to say that one thing is exclusively spiritual, the other exclusively political. Even if we were able theoretically to do so, there should always remain open for delimitation a no-man's land to which both sides would lay claim and in which both would endeavor to exercise jurisdiction and to make their influence felt.

At no time in history has there been keener rivalry between the spiritual and the political for the possession of men's souls. The totalitarian states are frankly exclusivist in their claims to complete domination of men's minds, wills, and bodies. The democratic regimes, on the other hand, respect the rights of the individual citizen, and in this action are backed up, philosophically and religiously, by the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, and particularly by the latter, whose basic creed is respect for the individual soul and its rights.

The conflict has now entered its final stages and bids fair to become one of the great battles in the history of human freedom. The Nazi and Fascist ideologies, with their increasing emphasis on racism, have thrown down the gauntlet to Catholicism, which, because of its belief in the oneness of mankind, cannot capitulate to the new theories without sacrificing a fundamental tenet of a creed which is as old as Christianity itself.

The democracies and the Catholic Chuch are one in their opposition to totalitarian philosophies, a fact made clear by statements of the late Pope, Pius XI, and proclaimed as the policy of the newly elected Pius XII in the first encyclical he addressed to the world. On whose standards victory, in this contest, shall perch ultimately, no man knows. But one thing which every follower of realistic politics must admit is that it would be, to put it mildly, foolhardy for a democratic state, whose very existence is involved in the outcome of the struggle, to neglect to make friends with that religious power whose assistance is certain to be of such inestimable value.

SUPRA-NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The moral leadership of the papacy is not bound up with nationalistic policies or considerations. Essentially, it is supranational. It, therefore, places the Pope in a position to regard the problems of peace and war, of national and individual welfare, divorced from the narrowness of nationalistic attitudes and ambitions. For that reason he is able to assume, and actually does assume as occasion requires, an international leadership acceptable to all nations of good will.

More and more are men beginning to see that the materialism of the last century is, as a working political doctrine, extinct as the dodo. In its place we must find an acceptable teaching which, taking due cognizance of spiritual and moral values, will save mankind from the loss of political liberty not only but from the loss of religious freedom as well.

While emphasis is placed on the role of the Pope as an international teacher of morality—and in that function lies the real explanation of his world-wide influence—nevertheless, we cannot fail to mention, in any sound estimate of his position, that he is, at the same time, a temporal ruler—an independent sovereign with juridical powers as valid as those of the ruler of even the greatest empire. Sovereignty does not depend on the size of the state over which one rules. Notwithstanding the fact that Vatican City is the tiniest of modern states, it is always a state, and its ruler, the Pope, is a temporal king recognized by international law, possessing all the rights and privileges of a sovereign. To recognize him for what he is can only be interpreted as a gesture of international courtesy quite in line with the practices of civilized peoples.

Should recognition be given to the Pope by the Government of the United States, the substantial benefits from the act would flow in the direction of this Government, not in that of the Holy See. The Pope, and the church over which he rules, would gain prestige, but little else. The religious situation in this country is almost ideal, as far as freedom of action goes and respect for its ministers and teachings. The Pope could scarcely ask for more.

MUCH TO BE GAINED

There can be little controversy over the fact that the United States Government stands to win much and lose nothing by recognition of the Vatican State. That is the reasoned judgment of almost every man connected with our Diplomatic Service, as it is of students of international affairs, whose views stem from personal experience or the close study of political movements during the last century.

To this writer the problem of Vatican recognition, to which he is favorable and which he has tried to approach from a broad political and not from the religious angle at all, seems at bottom one of education of the American people. Until the great mass of the American people are able to divest themselves of religious preoccupations and view this most interesting problem of national and international conduct in the only light in which it should be viewed, there is small prospect of the Government doing anything positive.

That enlightened Protestants, Jews, and Catholics would welcome a resumption of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the United States does not seem open to serious debate, and I assert this despite the recent pronouncement of certain Protestant groups. All men, of course, are not enlightened and will not become so until they are prepared to discuss such grave international problems as this from the standpoint of value and advantage to the United States with little or no mixture of feeling and prejudice to distort the conclusion at which they may arrive.

The Most Reverend JAMES H. RYAN,
Bishop of Omaha.

OMAHA, NEBR., *May 6, 1940.*

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on national defense which appeared in the New York Daily News under date of May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News of May 20, 1940]

DEFENSE, 1933 TO 1940

WHERE THE MONEY WENT

The President has asked for almost $1,200,000,000 extra defense spending as fast as we can efficiently spend it.

His political enemies have begun to object, as loudly as they have the nerve to, that the New Deal has spent almost six and one-half billions on national defense in 7 years, and that the Nation has next to nothing to show for all this outlay of money.

It isn't really as bad as all that. And it seems to us that people who try to alarm the general public by painting the national-defense picture darker than it is in reality do the general public a distinct disservice.

Here are some figures, gathered by the United Press, on our national defense as it was in 1933, and as it is now:

NAVY

	1933	1940
Battleships	15	15
Aircraft carriers	3	5
Heavy cruisers	11	18
Light cruisers	10	17
Destroyers	229	219
Submarines	82	95
Aircraft	933	2,863
Active manpower	90,150	145,400
Navy reserves	39,935	55,085
Marines	13,600	25,000

ARMY

	1933	1940
Aircraft	1,497	2,700
Active manpower	134,085	[1] 241,000
National Guard	189,000	251,000
Reserves	125,000	144,714
Motor vehicles	9,505	17,791
Tanks, etc	[2]	700
Antiaircraft guns	[2]	400
Antitank guns	[2]	744

[1] This figure believed slightly in error; our best information is that correct figure is 227,000.

[2] Virtually none.

It is further pointed out that, while the net warship increase in 7 years has been only 19 vessels, the Roosevelt administration has actually built 130 warships. The bulk of this construction has replaced vessels that became obsolete under the anti-Navy policy of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations.

The fact is that our Army, such as it is, is in fair shape, though it needs the thoroughgoing expansion and modernization that the President now proposes to give it. The fact further is that our Navy is in better shape, and is bigger and more powerful, than it ever was before in our whole history.

Against American Intervention in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address expressing my opposition to intervention in the European war, delivered by me on May 17, 1940, over the National Broadcasting System from Washington, D. C., in a program sponsored by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, President Roosevelt's impressive appeal to Congress for appropriations for 50,000 military and naval planes, and for everything needed for national defense, will have my support. I am for national unity in time of crisis.

But I am against any program which proposes to make the United States an actual participant in Europe's wars.

The President is right when he says our defense must be invulnerable. In the light of recent developments we need a great air force, a strong navy, and a highly trained army for our own protection to make sure that no power on earth shall attack us or challenge our safety. But I shall continue to oppose any move to send our fighting forces across the seas.

We must make sure that the billion dollars asked by the President will be spent effectively for the national security, free from "pork barrel" methods.

We must be on guard against the increasing propaganda for our active participation in the European conflict. We should stand against the numerous demands for repeal of the Johnson Act.

Now, in the next few minutes I want to tell you why I am opposed to United States intervention in the latest European war.

In the first place, I say without equivocation or evasion or any mental reservation—and I maintain we must not lose sight of this basic fact: This European war is not our war.

And don't let anyone, by working on your sympathies or on your credulity, tell you otherwise.

In the second place, no nation, no head of a nation, is justified in plunging into a war that is not its own war, unless and until it is clearly evident its own national self-interest absolutely demands it.

I hold that this war in Europe is not our war. I hold also that our own national self-interest does not demand that we make it our war.

I am opposed to our participation in this European war, this foreign war that is not our war.

As a Senator of the United States, representing the State of Kansas—and I was war Governor of Kansas a quarter of a century ago when we entered another European war to make the world safe for democracy, to fight the war that was to end wars—I say I promised the people of Kansas when first elected to the Senate 21 years ago, that I never would vote to send an American boy overseas to fight in a foreign war. I intend to keep that promise.

I am not here to speak for any other State in the Union. But I know that I speak for nine-tenths of the people of my native State of Kansas when I take this stand against intervention in another of Europe's wars.

I am glad to say there is no political partisanship in this country so far as the European war is concerned.

I myself am a lifelong Republican from the Republican State of Kansas.

My good friend, Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, who appears on this same program tonight, espousing the same cause that I espouse, is a lifelong Democrat from the Democratic State of Missouri.

Neither BENNETT CLARK nor myself are or ever have been peace-at-any-price pacifists. BENNETT CLARK served overseas in the A. E. F. in the previous world war; he was the first national commander of the American Legion. He shared in the glorious enthusiasm for those high ideals that set us afire 23 years ago. He shared in the bitter disillusionment that followed the peace of Versailles—the peace that was not a peace; the same kind of so-called peace that will follow this war; the same so-called peace that is not peace, which has followed every European war for thousands of years. Peace in Europe is normally a period of preparation for the next war.

And so Senator BENNETT CLARK, of Missouri, Democrat, and myself, Kansas Republican, find ourselves united in opposition to United States participation in this war.

I shall continue to support President Roosevelt's program so long as he says America must stay out of this war. I hope he will go the entire way and say, with me, that it is not our war.

I will vote for any reasonable appropriation for national defense. In the present disturbed state of the world only the strong nation—the nation prepared to defend itself successfully—can be assured of retaining its freedom.

So I am for whatever the President says is necessary to protect us against any possible attack.

The important thing for us to do, in addition to preparing an adequate national defense, is to keep our feet on the ground. There is no need for hysteria. There is need for hard-headed thinking.

This is not the time to be swept off our feet by emotional shoutings and mouthings—not the time to rush into action, head down and eyes closed, just because the rest of the world is in the grip of war madness.

History has lessons for us, if we are willing to study and able to learn from the pages of history.

We can learn from the history of Europe, and profit by the experience of other nations and other peoples over the centuries, or we can choose to learn by experience—maybe. We tried the experience route in 1917. I hope we learned something from that experience. What we do in the next few months will tell.

What is the history of Europe?

For 2,000 years of recorded history Europe has warred and warred and warred. The tide of conquest has swept over the lowlands time and again through the cycle of years.

Caesar marched his legions to Gallic and British conquests and encountered the Belgians on the way.

The Roman Empire stretched over most of Europe; for centuries the then known world had the enforced peace of the Pax Romana. The barbarians sacked Rome. Then came the Dark Ages. Spain rose and fell; the British swept the Spanish Armada from the seas. France became the dominant power of Europe, after driving the English back to their island. Then the Iron Duke and Nelson ended Napoleon's march to European domination. Since that time England has maintained supremacy in Europe through judicious application of the principle of the balance of power.

Today the European problem is not Napoleon, but Hitler, backed by Stalin, by Mussolini, with Japan in the oriental background.

How this war will result I do not say. We must admit Nazi air superiority has been most effective. There can be no question but the swift expansion of air forces and the injection of parachute troops in this European war has introduced a new and highly important factor in warfare—a most important factor in Germany's successes to date. In view of this fact, we must strengthen our own air forces, give the air force the important place it requires in our own national-defense program.

But the day-by-day developments right now do not necessarily chart the course of the war. Germany, prepared, trained, with everything sacrificed for this supreme effort, was bound to be winning at this stage of the war. But there is not yet an assurance that Hitler will win the last battle—the battle that counts in every war.

Europe has been fighting these wars over boundaries; these contests for supremacy, for thousands of years, and will continue to do so.

No matter how high our ideals, how fervent our enthusiasm; no matter how earnestly we try, nor how much we sacrifice in money and men, we in the Western Hemisphere cannot bring peace to Europe.

The American colonists, 150 years ago, won for the people of the United States the right to stay out of Europe's wars. For 125 years we exercised that right and did stay out of Europe's wars.

Under the same kind of appeals and urgings that now are being made, we abandoned that policy in 1917, and won that war for Britain and France.

We can do that again, at this time. If we decide that is the thing to do, we will do it.

But we should be realistic about the matter. We should face the facts.

If we go to Europe again, to uphold the Allies, we will be committed almost irretrievably to this line of foreign policy.

Every time British supremacy is threatened we go to her aid. We start by expressing sympathy. Then we donounce her enemies, we send war supplies, at first for cash. Then we advance credit. The next step will be to make loans. We do all things, short of war, to help the cause of the Allies. After that the final step is inevitable—we go to war.

The situation today is just this: Sentiment in this country has grown steadily stronger for the Allies. Congress and the American people are overwhelmingly on the side of the democracies of Europe, and my own feeling is strong that way.

But that sympathy for the Allies does not justify us in taking on their war. I believe that is the way the great majority of the people of this country feel today.

Before we do take on their war, before we take the measures short of war, that inevitably will be steps that take us into the war, we should face squarely what some of the effects of going to war will be.

In the first place, when we go to war we will go 100 percent.

The first step inside this country, when we go to war to save democracy, will be to abolish democracy.

Just what good the United States, and in the long run the world, would get out of United States intervention is more or less doubtful. But here are some of the things I know, and you know, the United States would get:

1. We would get a dictatorship.

2. We would get a further increase in the national debt of scores of billions of dollars.

3. The loss of life would run into the millions—property losses would run into billions.

4. After the war we would get a depression worse than this one, and very probably a continuation of the dictatorship and then some more European wars.

I say we ought to keep these things in mind and stay out, and stay all the way out.

I pray God that the youth of America may be saved from the horrors of war; that in this crisis America keeps her faith in God, faith in the ultimate triumph of right, faith in our American form of government, faith in ourselves and in our ability to hold what we have in trust for our children and their children.

And may we be blessed with citizens, and with leaders, who will appreciate our great freedoms—freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of contract—and who will not lightly sacrifice these in the heat of passion.

Proposed Participation by United States in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT OF BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a newspaper dispatch having reference to the letter of an eminent churchman, Bishop James Cannon, Jr., urging the United States to immediately get into the European War.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD ENTER WAR, BISHOP CANNON SAYS

RICHMOND, May 20.—In an open letter to Secretary of State Hull, Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Church, today urged Mr. Hull to use his "great influence with the President and Congress to declare war against Hitler and his fellow monsters."

Asserting that defense of the oppressed and of human rights was something both necessary and Christian, Bishop Cannon declared that some things were more precious than peace and that there could be no "permanent peace unless and until justice and righteousness prevail."

"If the United States would today repeal the cowardly neutrality act and declare war against Germany because of the destruction of our rights by her barbarous submarine warfare, there would instantly be a great change in the attitude of the nations of the world," he said. "Instead of fear there would be hope, and I believe that there would be no menace that the sword-rattling Mussolini would enter the war."

Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. MARSHALL E. DIMOCK AT NEW CITIZENS' DAY CELEBRATION, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Marshall E. Dimock, Second Assistant Secretary of Labor, at the New Citizens' Day celebration, Miami, Fla., May 14, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America, land of opportunity! You don't hear it in songs as often as you do "Home of the brave" and "Land of the free," but you have heard it in people's conversations ever since the first colonizing ship set out for American shores. Recent arrival and old settler both have cherished the belief that America is the best opportunity the world affords. And it is. And I am confident it will continue to be, through all the troubles with which the world is beset today.

Opportunities are made. They do not merely exist. America has been made by people who would not take "No" for an answer; by determined, self-reliant men and women. True, there was lots of good land and most of the resources men need. But without the courage and self-reliance exhibited by our forebears, without their boundless energy and their faith in the future, this country of ours would not be standing as it is today at the forefront of all the nations of the world.

We have not changed in these respects. We are today a virile, optimistic, dauntless people. All through the period of hard times in which the world has been plunged, the great bulk of the American Nation has never lost that ingrained conviction that America can and will come out on top of her troubles.

I share this faith. And it is not merely the blood of pioneers in my veins that makes me have this faith. It is a rational, honest conviction that Americans possess the four requisites which will see them through any trouble, no matter how great or how prolonged.

What are the tests? Ask them of yourselves and tell me if you don't think I'm right. To remain free and to solve its problems as they come along, the Nation must first have a citizenry which thinks for itself and thinks common problems through to the end; next it must be prepared to make changes when the need for them clearly appears; third, it must be practical in carrying out these changes; and, finally, it must be drawn together by ethical values which bind us strongly together.

Think it over, and when you have, do you still have faith in America, though she be virtually alone in a troubled and anxious world? I do, and so do you.

As a student of government, as a professor of political science, perhaps I should not be quite so optimistic, so dogmatic, in my beliefs. The voice of caution calls to me as an officeholder from the accumulated wisdom of statecraft's long past. And what do I hear? Why, I hear the political philosophers saying, "Don't you know that no nation stands alone, that all nations are caught up in the sweep of world ideas in the onward movement of forces which are stronger than any one nation?" Am I too sanguine? Are we all too optimistic? America cannot escape, says this voice from the past, because nations must share and share alike. World ideas and world forces will prevail.

The inexorability of world ideas—suppose we call it that. And what is the answer? Fatalistic resignation? No; that is not the American spirit. That is not in our tradition.

The customary way to regard the phrase "land of opportunity" is to think of this country's opportunities for the individual. But I want to broaden this view somewhat and to ask you to think of America's opportunity with reference to the rest of the world. For at this time in the world's history there is nothing more natural or more important to which we could possibly turn our attention. America's opportunity is your opportunity and mine, for we are America. Therefore, when we talk about our country's opportunity we are also talking about our own, for, particularly at a time like this, they are one.

America's opportunity is to be a stalwart example of sanity and true democracy in a world which sooner or later must find its way back to civilized modes of life. I do not say this as the citizen of a Nation which feels proud and superior. I do not assume that the peoples in belligerent countries have gone suddenly mad. Not by any means. No invidious comparison is intended. What I am trying to say, rather, is that we must take stock of ourselves if we are to safeguard what we have gained as a free Nation and if we are to play an unostentatious but nevertheless dominant role in leading the world back to democracy and humanitarianism.

Yes; let us take stock of ourselves. For now it is a race between a widespread awareness of what we have and want to hold on to, and the onward rush of world cataclysms which have the force of cyclones. Puny man! How weak he is after all. Even the strongest are whiffed away by microbes and fast driving. And is not the Nation simply the sum total of its individuals? Why, then, are we so optimistic about this America of ours?

All right, let me explain the four points I gave you. Let me explain what I believe and what I think you believe.

In the first place, I believe that orderly progress is impossible unless our citizens, call them the average man and woman if you prefer, are capable of thinking for themselves and of coming out with the right answers. The right answers, you say? Why, dictators believe they have a monopoly on the right answers and they see to it that everyone thinks as they do. I admit all this, but I still stick to my phrase, "the right answer." The right answer is knowing what constitutes the best interest of the people as a whole, and as a long-range proposition; it means getting access to the facts regularly and reliably; it means being able to think logically; it means being able to exercise a sound instinct concerning rival candidates, picking the one who is sincere and able. And Americans have these abilities in large measure. We are not easily fooled. We have a sound instinct. And education is universal.

Trust the reasoning power of the common man. This the first and foremost conviction in the affirmations of a true Democrat.

The judgment of the average man, whoever he may be, is often better trusted than that of a person ten times as wealthy or twice as well educated. There is something about being close to simple life and its problems, close to the soil, and free to think, that makes the average men gol' darn near right in most cases.

Now for the second point I made, that Americans, instead of being frightened at the prospect of change, are, man and woman, prepared for it. Yes; prepared for it? They are practically born to it. Perhaps the greatest change that has taken place in the thinking of our people during the last 10 years is that even our so-called captains of industry and those who live from their investments, who in the past have been inclined to the greatest caution, now, in most cases look upon social change as something natural and normal, like the movement of the earth. And that is to be expected, for most businessmen are rational human beings, just as you and I. They can see that when problems exist, something must be done about them. The right solution must be found for the particular difficulty. That's the way they run their own affairs.

So, if you think of this analysis of mine as putting factors on the debit and credit side, this factor, America's universal preparedness to accept evolutionary change, must be added as a weighty factor to the credit side.

Americans, being a practical, hard-headed people—due to their long history of hard work—merely insist that reforms shall be practical. That is well. That is imperative. The surest way to kill a reform which is in the popular interest is to be impractical about it. When that happens, even its proponents eventually get fed up with it. But we are a practical people. We cooperate without difficulty; we have an inherent sense of organization, of teamwork; from the top to the bottom of our business and governmental structures we find men with ideas, initiative, and leadership.

At this point I would emphasize another conviction of a true democrat: He is convinced that all men, in varying degrees, possess helpful ideas and traits of leadership, so that the best results are secured by democratic cooperation rather than by exalting the few to run the many.

America's strength is the widespread ability of her people. We simply will not be driven about like sheep or stampeded like cattle. We are independent. We are self-reliant. We do not know what it means to be deferential to class or position. The result: We cooperate. Fortunately for us, obey is a little-heard word and cooperate a common one.

These are simple, homely things I am talking about. A citizenry which is able to think for itself; a people which accepts gradual change as the true order of things; a nation which is intensely practical in all that it does. Homely, lacking in glamor, all of them. And yet, do you know a combination that is better able to keep our Nation on an even keel and heading for widespread public benefits of a lasting character? I certainly do not. And because I am convinced that we as a people have intelligence, reformism, and practicalness in large quantities, universally distributed, I believe, both as officeholder and student of statecraft, that America will keep her promises to herself and to the world.

But there was a fourth point, you will recall. And it is easily the most important of all, particularly at this time in our history. I spoke earlier of a race between popular awareness and world forces. We must be aware of many factors if we are to come through our present troubles intact and at the same time help a very sick and exhausted world to find itself. But at no point do we need a clearer sense of awareness than in realizing now that our ideals as a people, and our ideals more than anything else, are going to keep us on our traditional democratic path and away from the abyss into which others have fallen.

And I don't mean merely war. I mean that we must understand, without any question of doubt, just what our dominant values are, or else we must surely capitulate to world forces which governmental science assumes would normally engulf us. And despite our glorious traditions, the widespread knowledge and sympathy we have for the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, despite the thoughts of our greatest thinkers and leaders—of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and our own great President—I fear that our failure sharply to enunciate our values is the weakest point in our armor. All haste compatible with careful, critical thought must be made if this deficiency is to be corrected. Each of us can help by asking, "What means the most to me as an American, as a citizen in a great democracy?" We naturally think of the Constitution and the flag, and properly, too; but they are symbols, instruments. I want us to think about what lies back of them, what they stand for. Well, you say, patriotism, valor, opportunity. Yes; that is all true. But still I am not satisfied.

Back of all these, as the very innermost essence of our national spirit, is a belief in the essential nobility and perfectability of every human being. A democrat believes in people, likes them, wants to be no better and no worse than they are, feels for them, laughs at pretense and his own conceits, resents injustice, sees hidden possibilities and potentialities in his fellows, believes no legitimate goal justifies the warping of personality or the deliberate sacrifice of life. You reply that this is a high goal to set for a nation? Yes; but it is one that we can live up to. I am simply saying that all people are worth while; that mankind is the end and test of all our institutions. That's simple enough. I think we believe it. All our history attests the vitality of this central belief.

Man the instrument of state policy? We could never adopt that view of statecraft, not for very long. Man is the end, not the means. Men are not pawns; they are the sons of God. Any government is wicked if it sacrifices its people for national ambition or false pride.

And the second affirmation in our national religion is that man is born free, and free he must remain. Life is precious, given by God in trust. And every human being comes into the world helpless, full of potentialities, but undeveloped. Society must see to it that all its young lives are free, free to develop, to grow, and to become strong. Give man everything in the world except freedom and what does it profit him? At first he may think himself rich, but soon he will realize that he is merely a well-provided-for prison inmate. Freedom. Priceless word. Priceless as personality.

Freedom is such a gamble. Some make so much of it; others seem only to get into trouble. But with our shrewd American wit we realize that nothing worth while can be gained without the element of chance. If life were conditioned and controlled, it wouldn't be worth living.

The third word in our national affirmation is equality. Yes—equality. It makes shudders run down some people's spines, but I see no reason why it should. It is so precious that we cannot allow it to decline in our standard of values. Equality. It does not mean, should not be interpreted as meaning, that all men are actually equal in every respect. That is absurd. But it does mean that all men are entitled to equal opportunities. The land of opportunity—where opportunities exist and where everyone has a fair chance to compete for them. That comes pretty close to describing our American idea of equality.

Justice is a synonym for equality. Justice is a term we do not use as much nowadays as people once did in times past. That is unfortunate. It is a fine big word which covers a multitude of experience and wisdom. "Fair enough," you hear it said; "give me a break"; these and many other expressions attest the American insistence upon equality of treatment; and so here is something else to underscore: A sense of justice, among people generally, is imperative of a nation is to remain democratic and humanitarian.

Now I come to the fourth and final value which belongs in our shrine of values. This one is fraternity. Fraternity, you say? Aren't you thinking of the French Revolution? Well, perhaps the French talk about it more than we do, but we have certainly practiced it. That being the case, perhaps we should talk about it. Perhaps this is one of those points at which we would do well be a bit more explicit. Fraternity. Fraternity is a feeling of kinship—of brotherly love. It is an awareness of identity which binds us together. We are a fraternal people. Think of it! We came here from many nations, speaking many languages, bringing diverse customs and accomplishments to enrich our national life, and yet we instantly feel that we are all brothers beneath the skin. Why? Well, we are all ordinary human beings, with the same courage, ambitions, human frailties, and belief in democracy. More than that, we are all opposed to social designations and privileges which would tend to divide us. We are a classless people. We hate social distinctions worse than we hate any other form of inequality.

Do you realize how important this is? It is so important, I think, that it constitutes the principal difference between our democratic society and that of the Old World. Let me underscore it: A true democracy will not tolerate a feeling of social superiority and hence takes every precaution to discourage classes, ranks, and distinctions of any kind. Fraternity, this feeling of being as good as anybody else, is one of the chief assets on which we can bank in the future.

Now, how does all this add up? The science of politics tells us that nations cannot escape world ideas and world forces when they become so widespread and intense that they are beyond the resistance of individual nations. We have a homely American expression that conveys the same thought, "We must all sink or swim together." The assumption is that all of us are in the water. Now, this proposition cannot be ignored. There is much historical support for it. Furthermore, successions of political doctrine have been compared, more or less accurately, I believe, to the swing of a pendulum. First it goes clear over to conservatism, then back across to radicalism, with moderatism in-between. The idea is that one extreme begets the opposite. Aristotle set forth this theory succinctly; there is tyranny; the people revolt and overthrow the tyrant; an extreme form of democracy is then set up; but the pendulum has swung too far; extreme democracy is too chaotic and hence the pendulum starts swinging again.

Looking at the world today, we are forced to admit that the pendulum is moving away from the democratic middle and toward minority rule. Will America eventually be swept along? I for one do not think so. We as a people are too well protected by our continental position, our traditions, our democratic men and women of today. Nevertheless, if we are to maintain our position we must rely upon widespread knowledge, ability to adjust to new circumstances, ability to be practical about reforms, and clearly appreciated standards of national values from which we will not swerve. The four ideals we have been discussing pretty well sum up what is basic in our national life and traditions—belief in every human being, his value and perfectability; that is the first, and it is the core of the Christian ethic; then follow freedom, equality, and fraternity. We do believe in these values. We are willing to do more than die for them; we are prepared to live for them more consciously, more valiently, than we have ever done before. If we do that our optimism will be well founded.

The Republican Party Is on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG AT THE MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on Thursday last before the Republican State convention at Grand Rapids, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, the Republican Party is on the march. It will march to Philadelphia in June and nominate the next President of the United States. It will march to the November polls and elect him. Then it will march to Washington next January and inaugurate a new administration which will restore the American system of free enterprise, free institutions, and free men; recapture mass prosperity for our whole people, substituting jobs for doles; renew the spirit of the constitutional government; dethrone the pay-roll bureaucrats; and reassure anxious American motherhood that its sons will not be sacrificed in foreign wars.

Yes; the Republican Party is on the march. There is no denying the signs of the times. We shall be substantially joined by faithful Jeffersonian Democracy and by embattled independents who want an end to political and economic dictatorship; who demand a sound and solvent government before it is too late; and who reject—above all else—the perpetuation of any political dynasty in this free Republic. We are not yet a one-man country. We have ugly and undemocratic names for one-man countries.

Our subsequent Republican task in 1941 will stand clear. It is to produce an all-American administration in national affairs which, regardless of mere party labels, shall be dedicated to the paramount purpose of ending the blights of idle men and idle money; of restoring sound foundations to our free institutions; and of insulating every hazard that might draw us into other peoples' wars.

The spirit of our people has made its determination clear. In every recent election the Republican surge has been registered beyond mistake. We are in the eighth and final year of fireside chats; of emasculated States' rights; of dictatorial government by Executive decree; and of annually broken promises to balance a sick Budget. Gone is the force of the charm which made the people forget even that they are unemployed. Gone is the easy chance to live indefinitely on pell-mell deficits—because we have at last collided with the statutory debt limit. Gone is the opportunity to play politics with public pay rolls and with human misery. We are about to disenfranchise Santa Claus and to restore Thanksgiving Day to its traditional date and to some justification for its existence.

At long last we are coming to grips with reality—the reality that you cannot make an $80,000,000,000 country out of a $60,000,000,000 country by spending the difference; the reality that you cannot build a solvent prosperity around an insolvent Treasury; the reality that government cannot substitute for business as the source and stimulous of economic progress; the reality that you cannot lift the lower one-third up by pulling the other two-thirds down; the reality that social-mindedness is good, but that socialism is bad; the reality that we must give as much attention to the man from whom we take a dollar as the man to whom we give it; the reality that our peace is desperately important to our own preservation; the realtiy that 4 more years of our present reckless "master minding" in high places at Washington will put us on the rocks.

The country is ready—aye, it is eager—for a change. The great middle class of Americans, the backbone of our institutions, realizes that it is the special and particular victim of the misnamed New Deal. Agriculture fully understands that, despite hysterical hypodermics, it gradually goes from bad to worse. Labor realizes that wealth must be created before it can be shared, and that better jobs do not flow from stagnant factories. Yes; the country is ready and eager for a change.

But, mark you this, my fellow Republicans. It will not change for the sake of change alone. It will have no part of blind reaction which would scrap all the instrumentalities of social and economic progress that have been built up through these recent years. Good things as well as bad have been done. Unfortunately the bad far outweigh the good. The country expects us to abandon failures and correct mistakes, but it equally expects us to move forward with new vision toward an ever-broadening distribution of the opportunities and the dividends of life. That was the Lincoln dedication, and it must be ours again.

The country is ready for a change. But it demands of Republicanism that it shall justify the stewardship it seeks. We must prove that we are worthy of the responsibility which destiny asks us to accept. It is our most important moment since the Republican Party was born under the oaks at our own historic Jackson. And it is this high spirit of dedication, my friends of Michigan, that I hope this convention, and its successor at Philadelphia, will approach its task. We must deserve to win because we owe it to America that we shall win.

This leads me to a word about these conventions and to a personal word which it is difficult to phrase but which it would be disingenuous and ungrateful to avoid. In one capacity or another I have been on the firing line for Michigan Republicanism for more than 30 years. Why, Mr. Chairman, it seems only like yesterday when I was tossed off the platform through a back window and out into an alley in the famous Bay City convention riot of 1912. I do not feel 20 minutes older than when I was keynoting my first State convention back in 1916. Across the years I have known all the Republicans who have made our party great. It is a tremendously stimulating memory. Thanks to your confidence and friendship I have been permitted to serve you for more than 12 years in the Senate of the United States. Probably I have disappointed you upon occasions. But I have done my best; and if I were to return my commission to the people of Michigan tomorrow I am not conscious of any blemish on it due to any failure to consult what I believe to have been the common weal. That is the best proof I can bring you of my deepest gratitude for your faith. And whatever lies ahead in the battle of 1940, I shall strive to keep this faith.

Coming down to the immediate moment, I must take cognizance of the fact that Michigan Republicans voluntarily did me the great honor 12 months ago of suggesting my availability for higher office. No man could be insensible to this compliment from his own neighbors; and I could not occupy this rostrum today without frank reference to the situation that results, though I speak with the complete consciousness that the fortunes of any individual amount to less than nothing in comparison with the fate of the Republic. I have been too familiar with my own limitations—and with the obligations of what, in effect, will be the greatest receivership in history—to pursue this assignment myself. But I could not do less than to place myself and my experience at the disposal of my party in respect to any labor which might fall to my lot.

This, Mr. Chairman, is my position. And I owe it to you to make it plain, bluntly plain, that when I am assigned in this crucial battle of 1940, be the assignment what it may, I intend to fight every inch of the way from the opening reveille to the final hour of victory. You voluntarily launched a great national adventure in my behalf, and no resource at my command shall fail you if the Philadelphia convention should confirm your draft. But whether it does or not, I am earnestly dedicated to the conviction that this must be a Republican year for the sake of sanity and solvency at Washington and for the sake of free institutions, free enterprise, and free men.

I want, here and now, to express my humble appreciation of the kindness and the compliment for which I am everlastingly indebted to all of my Michigan friends; and to the voluntary support that has come to me—thanks to your initiative—in many other States, including some 40 percent of the Republicans of Wisconsin and an even greater portion of the Republicans of Nebraska. I want to acknowledge in advance my obligation to convention delegates from many States who have made it plain that they will respond to your campaign when the rolls are called down yonder in the shadow of the Liberty Bell which, 5 weeks hence, is to signalize a new Declaration of Independence no less significant than the Spirit of 1776.

The friendly convention contest has really just begun. It is wide open. A deliberative parliament at Philadelphia—free of all duress from any direction—is going to consider the best welfare of the whole Nation. I have complete confidence that it will meet its great responsibility in the solemn spirit of its challenge. I want—I intend—to play my full, aggressive part in these decisions. I want Michigan to take her justly powerful place in these deliberations. But above all, and paramount to all else, I hope that Philadelphia shall make the wisest possible decisions, respecting platform and leadership, which, out of common and unselfish counsel, shall produce not only a victory in November, but also—and above all else—a subsequent administration which shall dependably save America.

Save America from what? From the precipice of national bankruptcy and disintegration at home; and from the precipice of war abroad.

Save America for what? For a solvent destiny in which legitimate private enterprise and private investment shall have a chance to produce new national wealth for all our people; and for a peace that shall permit social and economic progress to bless our hearthstones with new happiness.

Emerson said that America is God's last chance to make a world. Well—Heaven helps those who help themselves. America is at the crossroads. We can turn so sharply to the right that we precipitate a Fascist state. On the other hand, we can turn so sharply to the left that we precipitate the American version of the Communist state. Either is abhorrent to our traditions and our aspirations. But make no mistake: "It can happen here," and only eternal vigilance will be the price of our liberty. Our choice must be the high ground of the middle road. Republicanism must be neither reactionary at the right nor radical at the left. It must cling to every sound inheritance; it must restore history and experience to the council chamber; it must live by the spirit of a rediscovered Constitution; but it must ever strive toward new

frontiers of opportunity and advantage for all the people beneath our blessed flag. We must beat the defeatism which says that the American system is at journey's end.

In pursuit of this destiny, Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I would clear the track of every subversive influence that internally threatens our form of government—because if we are ever destroyed it will be from within and not from without. Those who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force are guilty of just plain treason. Our Bill of Rights is sacred and so are all the civil liberties which it protects. But there is nothing in the Bill of Rights which requires us to nourish vipers in the bosom of Columbia; and there is nothing in equity or common sense which requires us, for example, to lend our further hospitality to the representatives and emissaries of Soviet Moscow who are plainly guilty of contemptuously violating the pledges of the Roosevelt-Litvinoff contract upon which our recognition of Russia was mistakenly based in 1933. We do not want the treacherous technique of the Trojan horse reproduced within our own America—and we are on notice that this sort of undermining treachery is at its deadly gnawing work all around the world. We have no business in any sort of partnership with communism—or any other "ism"—at home or abroad. America is not a polyglot boarding house. Those who are not for us are against us, and the quicker we separate the sheep from the goats the safer our institutions will be. One rotten apple can contaminate a barrel. We must condone no rotten apples, not even one.

But a greater though totally different subversive influence flows from the New Deal. It is the more dangerous because it often flows from a deep and wholly patriotic conviction which, in my judgment, is as fatal as it is mistakenly conscientious. Significantly it won the hearty support of Earl Browder and his fellow travelers in 1936. It, too, attacks our form of government by seeking to build a supreme executive who, if he would have his way, would put both courts and legislatures in subservient chains. It attacks our checks and balances—the greatest contribution we have made to the science of free government and the liberties of free men. It attacks our Constitution by asking for laws regardless of their affront to it. It attacks the public credit by undermining it with deficits and debts which our children's children will still be paying in 2000 A. D.—if we have not previously collapsed under repudiation or inflation. It attacks our wage and living standards by an adroit campaign—another Trojan-horse campaign—to strike down the protective tariffs which are indispensable to much of our industry, our labor, and our agriculture. It attacks our money by leaving it at the mercy of a White House whim. It attacks our resources by forcing us to buy all the useless gold and silver in the world at swollen prices. It attacks our business by an endless system of regulation, restraints, and discouragements—and often by the direct and fatal competition of government itself in business operations. It attacks every trust fund, every bank deposit, every insurance policy, by making the returns upon their investments dangerously low. It attacks our national unity by deliberately encouraging class hatreds. It attacks our political liberty by attempting purges—an ugly European word—of all who do not bend a willing knee. It attacks our political economy by attempting to substitute public revenues for private initiative and private investment as the source of national income and national wealth. It attacks our character by spurning thrift and self-reliance. It even attacks our peace by often meddling internationally where it is none of our concern. "Subversive influence?" Put down the New Deal as exhibit A, and, I repeat, get ready to clear the track.

This sounds like the recital of grievances in the Declaration of Independence upon which the founding fathers based their revolt against tyranny and chaos 164 years ago. They went to Philadelphia to assert their vivid cause. And now we go back to Philadelphia to do it all over again. May we catch the spirit of their wisdom and their courage and their faith across the years. Amid the inspirations of those historic shrines and in solemn gratitude for our inheritance, may we write a worthy second declaration, and then go forth to battle with the fighting determination which gave them victory and gave us the Republic.

Yes, but what's your alternative program, our critics like to say to us.

Don't fear; you'll find it adequately detailed when the Philadelphia platform takes its shape. For myself, I have repeatedly answered in many a public speech. But the basic answer is the same as those founding fathers would have uttered in 1776 if they had been asked for their alternatives. They would have said, "Our program is to cure these grievances." And so say we today. When these grievances are cured, America will be well on her way toward sound government, sound economy, and a happier United States. The battle will be two-thirds won.

The New Deal has itself proved what can happen when the traditional American system gets a chance, free from anemia induced by the New Deal poisons. The first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration showed the greatest degree of economic recovery in any like space of time in the history of the world. Why? Because for 100 days the President was clinging to his admirable 1932 platform. He was retrenching. He was building confidence. He was keeping faith. He was giving the recuperative forces of the Nation a fair chance. But then, suddenly, he changed. He discovered the alphabet and made a shambles out of it. Somebody told him you could spend yourself out of debt. Overnight he took to the flying trapeze. We promptly hit bottom—and have been there ever since.

Last fall and this spring a spotted recovery set in again. Why? War orders? Partially, but chiefly because the one-man New Deal party became so engrossed in foreign affairs that it neglected to offer its annual quota of experiments and vivisections, and, perhaps in a sort of death-bed repentance, actually proposed to economize a bit. In other words, when the New Deal "lays on" we sink, and when it "lays off" we survive.

In these two temporarily lucid intervals the New Deal itself has proved how we might restore prosperity and employment if we had an administration at Washington which could be dependably trusted to go in the same healthy direction 48 hours at a time. We have 10 years of frustrated economic aspirations in this country. We have 10 years of enormous obsolescence in plant equipment. We have 10 years of starved capital investment. We have an intense and chastened desire to make capitalism work. The next Republican administration at Washington will release all of these traditional American energies. It has some incidental laundering to do upon the statutes. It has some constructive labors to perform. But the very fact of its inauguration will flash the green light to the American business world. Needless obstacles to prosperity will disappear. Our grievances will be on their dependable way out. Twelve months after Philadelphia our problem may well be not how to fight the New Deal depression, but how to control a square-deal boom.

Of course, it is not so simple as that sounds. There is work to be done to clear away the underbrush. There are specific remedies required as in the case of agriculture which must have its parity share of the national income before there can ever be permanent prosperity in the United States. We must clean out the pay-roll parasites and all the big and little autocrats who mistake themselves for Jupiter. But, by and large, the statement stands; a Republican victory next November will be the "go signal" to prosperity.

One black contingency, however, hangs like the pall of death across this prospectus—the bloody war abroad. Each new expansion of this tragedy multiplies its crime and piles up bitterly rising resentments against such brutal piracy. The horror of it is unspeakable. I belong to that great American majority which hates this rape of neutrals and these contempts of civilization. I have no language strong enough to express my condemnation of the anti-Christ who turns this destruction loose upon peaceful, unoffending neighbors. Yet the greater our resentment the greater must be our cool-headed restraint in official policy and action because the greater must be our determination to stay out unless this war comes to the New World. We cannot go to Europe and control her destiny, even if we would, any more than we could have controlled the history which has produced this crisis Our chance to serve ourselves and civilization is not as a belated belligerent in distant battle zones which we could not now adequately reach in time even to help those with whom we so deeply sympathize. Our chance to serve is as a diplomatic neutral—condemning conquest, serving human needs among all stricken people, ready to speak for them in organizing a new peace whenever possible, but determined to keep at least one sector of this mad globe free of this plague, and to preserve democracy in that hemisphere which is our traditional responsibility.

Our own foreign-born citizens are setting us a magnificent example in their fidelity to our own detachment, despite the anguish with which they view these distant shambles. No matter what our sympathies, we must keep America out of these wars and out of foreign policies which could drag us in. Overnight, our entry would precipitate a virtual war dictatorship in our own America, which would cancel out our liberties almost as completely as they have disappeared among the victims of conquest; and at the end of the adventure, despite our victory, we should sit disconsolately amid the ashes of our own bankruptcy. It is impossible to ignore these hard facts.

We cannot isolate ourselves in this fore-shortened world. But it must be our task to insulate ourselves to the last possible degree against this scourge. We must never surrender to the state of mind which resigns itself to the ultimate inevitability of our involvement—a state of mind which entirely too often possesses Washington. And we must never forget that we have our hands full in saving democracy at home. We owe that not only to America, but to the world.

If any alien war lord mistakes this attitude for the timidity which would buy peace at any price, or which would surrender the Americas to a violation of our neighbors, he will be sadly disillusioned if this sinister plague comes to our shores. In national defense—here and in every essential outpost—we shall, if challenged, fight to the last man and to the last dollar. If we give adequate attention to this national defense, I continue to be one of those who believes we need never fear the issue. Even in the face of an ultimate hazard which some fear might confront us hereafter, we shall be relatively safer against the exhausted victors, whoever they may be, if we have conserved our power. But, my fellow citizens, it would be folly for us not to turn to this problem of national defense with a new and a grim zeal. Not to implement entangling alliances. Not to police the world. But to make national defense—defense of the homeland and its outposts—as impregnable as possible.

Essential appropriations for these purposes must be made on a pay-as-you-go basis. But let's not blind our eyes to facts. This objective requires something more than lavish appropriations. We have had those for 5 years; yet we now find that they have not bought us the degree of protection we anticipated. Shocking deficiencies are coming to light. Without a moment's delay, we should find out why. We should discover what is wrong.

We should swiftly arrange to make all defense appropriations fit the lessons of today's disclosures in the new technique of war. I sharply question whether our Government is geared to meet this end. I think Congress should set up a special joint Committee on the Conduct of the National Defense to sit continuously—not to subordinate War and Navy Department experts to the amateur strategy and judgments of political direction, but to constantly hold the War and Navy Departments to strict accountability for the required results. Congress should not recess until it sees this problem through in some dependable form. This does not mean that the war is coming to us. No one should read that implication in these words. It simply means that prudence and foresight are always better than remorse.

America must be strong. Not to make war; but to defend against war if it comes. I continue to believe that it need not come and that it will not come if we cling relentlessly to foreign policies of noninvolvement. But America must not be left at the mercy of any man's opinion. It must always be ready for eventualities.

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I have been able to touch but briefly on the many important issues of the fast-approaching campaign. Yet I have sought to identify the vital seriousness of the problems to be served and solved. They rise above all ordinary partisan considerations and all ordinary pursuits of political power and place. In my view, when we set our feet once more upon the roads that lead to the shrines and landmarks of 1776 and 1787 we go to face responsibilities no less significant than those which there produced the Declaration and the Constitution. Every step toward the Republican National Convention of 1940 should be taken in a spirit of deepest obligation to the destiny of the United States and its 130,000,000 anxious people. Every undertaking should first prayerfully beseech the blessing of infinite God. Republicanism faces its greatest opportunity for service since its birth. And it also faces its greatest test.

So, on to Philadelphia, in the spirit that took the founding fathers there.

On to victory, and prosperity, and peace.

The American Flag and What It Stands For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very learned and patriotic address delivered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] at the thirteenth annual massing of the colors, held in the open-air amphitheater on the Washington Cathedral grounds, Washington, D. C., yesterday. It is a splendid address, which I am sure Senators, as well as others, will be delighted to read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bishop of Washington, officers of the Military Order of the World War, Sons of the American Revolution, and Americans all: In this magnificent cathedral, erected as a tenement of worship and dedicated to the living God, we have assembled in this service to salute the massed colors and ensigns of the armed forces of the Republic and the emblems of religious and civic organizations. It is an occasion of dedication of our spirit and of our resources and of our might to national patriotism and national unity in an hour of peril to the peace of the world and potential danger to the security and safety of our own people.

The standards and flags here assembled are physical symbols of nobler and loftier things. They are far more than things of grace and beauty. In their folds are written the history of a great people; in their rustling may be heard the footsteps of patriot bands and Lexington and at the bridge at Concord, immortalized in Emerson's phrase:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

These standards are covered by the radiance that glowed at Yorktown, where Washington's ragged legions overwhelmed the armies of a king and lifted in triumph the banners of a free people. They waved on land and sea in 1812. They carry in their bright stars and glorious stripes the triumph of our armies from Vera Cruz, through mountain passes and spreading plains, to the bloody heights of Chapultepec. They represent a reunited country and people after 4 bloody and tragic years in which sections and brothers uselessly but gallantly poured out upon a hundred fields the finest blood of the North and South. A part of their fabric stretches from the battlefields of Cuba to the distant jungles of the Philippines. They recall the vivid and stirring recollection of 1917 and 1918, when American troops carried the colors of the Republic to glorious triumph and brought peace to a warring world.

These colors and standards represent something more than armies and navies, and wars and victories. They represent a mighty yet peaceful people. They are the ensigns of a great freedom-loving Republic—a land of free men, which nurses no dream of conquest or aggression.

The United States did not fight in the World War for conquest. It emerged without one foot of new territory. It neither demanded nor received one dollar of indemnity. It brought under its sway at the point of the bayonet no conquered subject. Its hands were clean. No loot nor plunder stained its hands. Its flag came through the smoke and through the shot and through the blood of a great war, covered all over with a new glory.

Wherever these colors are lifted they signify a concept of nationality and an ideal of democracy and self-government that are distinctly American.

America is something more than 3,000 miles of mountain and plain, and river and valley stretching away to the western sea—there are mountain and plain and river and valley in other lands. It means something more than teeming cities and lonely ranches, something more than noisy factories and quiet farms—cities and ranches and factories and farms are in other lands—it means something more than industry and commerce, and shipping and highways, and forests and mining. It means something more than 130,000,000 people—China has 400,000,000.

Great in material things, above all of these things America before the world stands for a political and social ideal—America means tradition and heroic history—back across its history you may see far out on the highways of the deep bands of sturdy colonists with nothing to greet them but sky and wave as they journeyed to a new home in the wilderness—you may see hardship, and hunger and suffering and massacre as they sought in vain to smother them with misery.

These colors are emblematic of the making of America—of the moving, thrilling, and enthralling story of struggle and hardship and suffering in humble beginnings—of youthful and healthful growth and, now, of mature and hardened strength. They represent the industry and enterprise of the pioneers who mastered the wilderness and conquered the plains and deserts. They represent the inventive genius and toiling labor and business leadership which have developed an industrial structure that commands the admiration of the modern world. They represent the educational and cultural and spiritual forces that have ennobled and uplifted the life of this mighty people.

They represent the government and political institutions of the most splendid Republic ever builded by the genius and daring statesmanship of man. It is based upon a noble concept of the rights of the individual—that government rests upon and is created to serve the individual—that in his personal responsibility lies its weakness or its strength—its vice or its vigor.

These colors are emblematic of the Constitution of the United States and its distribution and separation of governmental power. Every American knows that the Constitution is a great barrier between his liberty and tyranny.

Americans should remember that its covenants have preserved for them and their children what was wrested by turbulent barons from an unwilling king. Through its lines is woven the brave spirit of a Parliament that dared defy the Crown. It throbs with the spirit of that ringing declaration that circled the globe and thrilled the world. In its stately stanzas they may catch the echo of a drum beat and hear the tramp of Continental Armies, and majestically moving through its pages are the statesmanship of Madison and Franklin and other patriot fathers, and the calm courage and lofty patriotism of Washington.

That is the America our fathers gave us. This is our America. We are determined that it shall remain our America. If it is to remain our America we, and we alone, can preserve it and protect it and hand it on to our sons, stronger and nobler for our having lived and served and sacrificed.

Every citizen of the Republic has a task and a duty to preserve it—civilian and soldier alike. Individual right, individual privilege, carries with it individual responsibility.

On November 11, 1921, with a vast concourse I stood in Arlington National Cemetery where sleep thousands of soldiers of the Republic, soldiers of the Revolution, of the War of 1812, of the War with Mexico, the Blue and the Gray, reunited in valor and in death's endless sleep, those who fell in Cuba and the Philippines and those whose blood reddened the soil of France, and in the splendid marble amphitheater I saw the generals and admirals and diplomats, representing the governments of many foreign nations and the United States, lay upon the sarcophagus of an unknown and unnamed American soldier a multitude of flowers and pin upon the coffin military decorations expressive of the tribute and gratitude of great nations, and then I heard the President of the Republic lift up his voice and give noble utterance to the emotions that stirred within the hearts of his countrymen in that solemn and sacred moment—here lay only the poor broken body of an unknown soldier wrapped in his uniform and shrouded in the flag for which he died—unknown, one out of 4,000,000—no one knew his name, no one knew whether there flowed in his veins the blood of some

distant noble or that of an ancestral peasant—no one knew from what home he came, whether from a hovel or a mansion—no one knew from where he came—but all the world knows where he went—he went forward filling the file, the individual file, to which his country and civilization called him and in going forward he leaped to fadeless and undying glory.

He set an imperishable pattern for every American—in peace and in war—in times of prosperity and in times of economic disaster, in periods of domestic tranquillity, and in times of stress and strain.

This is our America, our democracy, ours to govern, ours to advance, ours to perfect, and ours to make more glorious. Every American has a solemn and lofty duty laid upon him, a duty commensurate with his ability, his resources, and his intellect. This is our America. If it is to remain our America we must stamp out and extirpate communism and all the other foreign "isms" and subversive influences which seek to undermine things American. We shall tolerate neither the "fifth column" nor the espionage nor sabotage of foreign agents nor the treachery of any domestic influence or group.

This is our America. It shall remain our America.

The United States and its people are devoted to the ideals of peace. We want no war. We have never drawn the sword except with reluctance and to vindicate the violation of sacred rights. We want to lead our own life and attain our national destiny without foreign aggression or involvement. We entertain no imperial ambitions. A liberated Cuba and an independent Philippines are our witness. We covet neither the territory nor the riches of any other land. We want no entangling alliance with foreign nations. Neither do we propose to be the victim of foreign aggression or conquest. We do not want a foot of foreign territory, not a mile of any country under the sun, but, by the same token, we shall not give up a single inch of American territory to any aggressor on the face of the earth. We do not propose to dictate to any other people or nation on the globe its form of government or political institutions. On the other hand, we do propose to maintain our own system and to lead our own way of life.

Today the world is staggered by a terrible picture of blood and horror. The clouds that hang above one of the fairest regions of the earth are charged with the heaviest and most murderous bolts in the armament of Mars. Great nations and mighty armies are grappling in an embrace of death. Neutral nations have been overrun and conquered. Neutral rights have been violated and extinguished by the sword. Frontiers have been destroyed and sovereignty wiped from the map by the bayonet's thrust. In such an hour of world danger, at a time when the processes of peace and the rule of law have been dethroned, and military might and conquest have usurped the seats of power, what is the duty of the American people and the Government of the United States? It is our manifest obligation to our people, to our institutions, to our territory, and to our lives; to the heroic traditions of a great and glorious past; to those whose blood and treasure established this Republic; to the martyred dead who have defended it and protected it—it is our manifest obligation to all of these to make America so strong upon the land and upon the sea and in the air that no power on earth shall dare to attack us or to challenge our safety. We want peace, but there is no other course if we would remain at peace. We must not, through any sense of false security, through any idealistic attachment to pacifism, hesitate one moment to make our national defense absolutely invulnerable from attack from without and so dominant and commanding as to overwhelm and defeat any assault on our sovereignty or our possessions. In this dark hour the admonition of George Washington comes ringing down to us through more than a century, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Those were inspired words. They had their background in Valley Forge and Brandywine and Germantown and in the Battle of Long Island, when ragged and hungry and unprepared armies and lack of support almost crushed his great heart with despair. They reach back to Yorktown, when, prepared and with an adequate force, he vanquished the armies of a king and achieved peace and independence.

President Roosevelt, in a masterly address to the Congress on May 16, laid before the country a program of preparedness and national defense which will meet the approbation and support of both the Congress and the country. I am standing and you are standing squarely beside the President in plans for the national defense and security of the Republic. It is my own view that we must build an incomparable and unconquerable Navy, capable of dominating both the Atlantic and the Pacific. A vast fleet of military and naval aircraft must be provided. Antiaircraft defenses and heavy artillery must be produced in increasing volume and of the most modern and scientific pattern. The strength of the Army must be augmented and intensified training and modern equipment must be supplied to the National Guard and to the Reserves.

The American people and the American Government want peace. We pray that the United States may not be dragged into a war anywhere on the globe. These flags and colors are the flags and colors of peace and international good will. They are the emblems of a liberty-loving and peace-loving people. There cannot be peace except in armed defense. We shall arm not for war, but for peace. We must be prepared to say to any power on earth who challenges our security or threatens our safety, "We want no war with you, but if you dare assail us, if you challenge our institutions, if you attack our territory, we shall resist on the sea and under the sea, on the land and above the land, with a Navy, with an Army, and with an air fleet unconquerable and irresistible."

To attain these noble ends we look back through the heroic history and treasured traditions of America for more than 160 years. We strike hands with and salute the Continental Congress that gave us the Declaration of Independence, and with them exclaim, "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Sixth Anniversary Celebration of Progressive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] at the sixth anniversary celebration of the formation of the Progressive Party, at Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., on Sunday, May 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens, in November of 1900, 40 years ago, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., led the Progressive movement in Wisconsin to its first State-wide victory. From that day forward men and women like yourselves have given freely of their time and energy in unselfish devotion to make Wisconsin and the Nation a better place in which to live.

We are proud of the long record of achievement in both State and National Government which the Progressives of Wisconsin have made. It gave Wisconsin the deserved reputation of being the best-governed State in the Union, and it can be said fairly that the Progressives have pioneered the cause of nearly every constructive step taken by the Nation for the advancement of the general welfare of the people.

But we are not gathered here simply to point with pride to the great record which the Progressive movement has made in the past. As Progressives, our eyes are turned ahead; we are looking to the future. As we come together to celebrate the launching of the Progressive Party, we reaffirm our faith in the necessity for a genuine political realinement in the State and Nation and a truly Progressive program for a dynamic America and the building up of the Western Hemisphere.

Long before we launched the Progressive Party in Wisconsin, my father realized that a general political realignment would have to come in State and Nation if the people were to have an effective political instrumentality through which they could solve the problems of this day and generation. The two old parties grew up in response to issues of a day gone past, and they are incapable of meeting our present problems effectively because of their reactionary control or internal conflict. The Progressive Party was born of present-day issues. It is made up of people like yourselves who understand and appreciate the issues of national unemployment, economic insecurity, and the dangers which beset democracy both at home and abroad. What is still more important: Progressives have a program to meet these issues.

On this sixth anniversary of its establishment in our State, I can say to you with a great deal of pride that the Progressive Party is the party of today in Wisconsin, and I confidently believe that it will be the party of tomorrow in the Nation.

Reactionaries have speculated as to my political course in the coming campaign.

My answer to all such speculation is that I did not join in the formation of the Progressive Party in 1934 as a political expedient. I gave my wholehearted support to this movement for a new political alinement in State and Nation because I believe it is essential to a dynamic functioning of our democracy. So far as I am concerned, the fight in Wisconsin will be waged under the banner of the Progressive Party in 1940.

We members and supporters of the Progressive Party face the challenge of another campaign. It is vital to unite in a supreme effort which will bring a smashing party triumph that can leave no doubt as to the destiny of this movement.

Important issues are at stake in this political campaign, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Progressives can carry Wisconsin by a decisive margin, providing we bring our full strength to the polls. When you realize that there were actually 35,000 fewer votes cast against the Progressive candidate for Governer in 1938 than were cast against him in 1936, a year in which we scored a

tremendous victory, you will understand the importance of marshaling our full strength at the polls on election day.

If I am any judge of the sentiment expressed here today, the Progressive forces in the State have come back with renewed determination to make up in good measure for the defeat of 1938. Furthermore, Wisconsin has now had a 2-year inoculation of reactionary Republicanism, which ought to serve as an effective vaccination against contracting the disease further. It is my sober judgment that this will be our year.

I appeal to the men and women voters of this State, regardless of class, creed, or former party allegiance, to unite in rededicating the Government of the State and Nation to American principles, and to band together to fight with unswerving determination the tyranny of communism, on the one hand, and fascism, on the other, confident that a full and abundant life for all the people can be attained when "the will of the people shall be the law of the land."

The events taking place in the world emphasize beyond doubt that the democratic way of life is in danger. It is no time for either despair or hysteria, but it is time for every patriotic American to search his heart and rededicate his civic energies to the defense of our American heritage.

Adequate national defense is more than a mere matter of armaments. To achieve great national strength we must build up our human and material resources. We must give youth the opportunity to succeed in life and make employment available to those who are in want of work at fair wages. We must assure the farmer a price for his products which will represent the cost of production plus a fair profit and give business access to the credit which it needs to expand and develop new markets. We must provide security for those who have contributed so much to the upbuilding of this country and who in their later years are entitled to a life of comfort and respectability.

These are essential to our national morale and the efficient use of our economic and social resources. These are our internal defenses against the enemies of democracy.

The Progressive Party is committed to the task of strengthening the internal as well as the external defenses of American democracy, and in this period of crisis there is no time for compromise or delay. As patriotic American citizens we must all make up our minds that we can no longer tolerate a house divided, part idle and part at work. We must have the courage to adhere to a sound, constructive, coherent program to put our human and material resources to work in America for the building of a stronger and better national life.

No one can doubt our capacity to achieve these objectives. The productive facilities on our farms and in our factories are the greatest the world has ever known. I, for one, refuse to join the pessimists who see disaster lurking around every corner. Man created this paradox of privation and insecurity in the midst of potential plenty, and man can solve it.

This economic crisis which has so disorganized our economy was brought upon us by the reactionaries who controlled both business and government almost continuously since the Civil War until 1933. They refused to recognize that permanent prosperity cannot be built without mass buying power. For years they permitted monopolists and the privileged few to drain away the people's wealth and purchasing power.

When people were no longer able to buy the products of our farms and factories, the reactionaries were content to assume that we were facing a problem of overproduction. Their only answer was curtailed production throughout industry and the situation became worse. By the spring of 1933 we were threatened with panic and complete economic paralysis as a result of this reactionary economic policy.

Since 1929 we have lost $250,000,000,000 in income that might have been produced if we had kept our productive resources at work. That sum represents enough money to buy a $6,000 house and a $1,000 car for every family in the United States.

When there is a shortage of 2,000,000 homes, when one-third of our people are undernourished and without enough clothing, and when there is scarcely a family in America that does not have some need that must be neglected for financial reasons, it is time to abandon this reactionary theory of overproduction.

To get our economic system functioning again so that our unused manpower, idle capital, and material resources can be put to work, we must increase mass purchasing power, and make available adequate monetary and credit facilities to all forms of constructive enterprise.

Progressives have long advocated the establishment of public control over our money and credit through a Government-owned central bank. This is clearly a power conferred upon the Federal Government by the Constitution, which gave to Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. In this crisis, when there are billions of idle capital, it is imperative that the people assert their rightful control over money and credit in order that it may be available to businessmen, to farmers, and to all the others who have a legitimate need for it.

Business needs suitable credit facilities in order to undertake new ventures and expand production. The railroads right now, for example, could put three or four billion dollars' worth of new capital to work in modernizing their transportation facilities. Reliable estimates indicate that nearly $18,000,000,000 of credit are needed to bring the machinery in our factories up to date and make it adequate to meet our present requirements. Sixty-five percent of all our metal-working equipment is obsolete.

The farmers in Wisconsin and the Nation are in urgent need of adequate credit, not only to meet the present emergency but to assist them in the larger task of restoring agriculture to a sound basis and making it once more the backbone of a prosperous nation.

Debt has been one of the curses of American agriculture ever since the World War, and it has broken literally thousands of good, honest, hard-working farmers, whose only fault has been that they happened to be farming when times were hard. It has ruthlessly driven them and their families out of their homes onto the highways where they have been forced to join the great army of homeless unemployed.

We are already making a direct attack upon this problem. In the United States Senate I have joined with Senator WHEELER of Montana and Senator BANKHEAD of Alabama in introducing a bill which proposes a comprehensive program of farm-debt adjustment and refinancing. Its enactment would put a stop to unjustified foreclosures. The bill will give the farmer a chance to get unduly heavy mortgages reduced to an amount the productive capacity of the farm can successfully carry. It will give him interest rates reduced to 3 percent on his mortgage, and it will give him up to 40 years in which to repay the loan.

All of this can be done without expense to the Government. The bill will give the farmer the benefit of the Government's credit. By borrowing the money for him and administering the loans made with the aim in view of aiding agriculture in getting reestablished, financially, it will improve the security behind the loans.

Progressives likewise recognize the necessity for raising farm-commodity prices so that the farmer can secure cost of production plus a fair profit on his labor and investment. With this objective always in view, Progressives have fought for legislation approaching it from many angles. We have been successful in securing the adoption of a program through which the Federal Government buys up surplus farm products and distributes them to people on relief who could otherwise not buy them. This program is now receiving new form in the food-stamp plan which is operating in approximately 100 cities.

The encouragement of cooperatives, the elimination of monopoly from the dairy markets, and parity prices are all part of the Progressive program for agriculture.

With the stimulation of business through the provision of adequate credit opportunities and the general rehabilitation of agriculture, will come a renewed demand for the products of labor. As unemployment is reduced and the purchasing power of the people in our cities is restored, there will come a greater market for farm products.

Progressives likewise have a long record of achievement in the field of labor legislation, and I am happy to report to you that at last the Senate is now considering the La Follette-Thomas bill to stamp out industrial spies, strikebreakers, and industrial munitions. I am flying back to Washington to carry on the fight for the passage of this bill which has the endorsement of every important labor organization in America.

To afford continuous protection to the mass purchasing power which is vital to permanent prosperity, the fight against monopoly must be pressed forward with even greater vigor than before. We must secure a system of taxation which is without reservation or qualification based upon the taxpayer's ability to pay.

We can see in the success of the aggressors in Europe that the first essential of a strong, united nation capable of defending itself is a sound economy which affords opportunity to youth, the wage earner, the business and professional man, and security to its senior citizens. In order to make America secure against attack we must restore the dynamic quality of life which marked our development in the decades before 1930.

The youth of a nation is its most precious asset, and there can be no pardon for the crime of denying opportunity to the 5,000,000 young men and young women out of school and without jobs. Our younger generation is entitled to the opportunity for a full and better life commensurate with the productive capacity of the Nation.

The progressive movement looks to youth just as it looks to the future, for youth is primarily interested in the future. Their lives lie ahead of them, and they demand a program of political and social action which will enable them to make the most of their lives.

All patriotic American citizens must enlist in this task. We must all join together in a concerted and decisive effort to build up the internal and external defenses of democracy. Thus we can and will make America safe from any enemy.

America has the opportunity of emerging from this world crisis as the strongest nation on earth if we will follow our determination to solve our own domestic problems and keep out of the European war. We have only to follow that course faithfully and we will be in a position when the war is over to offer some real assistance to the war-torn nations in bringing about a lasting peace and extending aid to the victims of war and aggression. But if we allow ourselves to be drawn into the European slaughter, it will bleed us white and leave us as helpless as the rest.

We must and shall provide adequate military defenses for this hemisphere to protect us against invasion or interference. I would vote the last man and the last dollar if necessary to defend this hemisphere, but in the name of democracy I pledge to you that I shall never give my vote to send American boys to fight overseas in a foreign war.

I am ready to support the President's recent request for more than a billion dollars for national defense. This will bring the appropriations for this session up to three billions for this purpose alone. But I want a joint congressional committee created repre-

senting the Military, Naval, and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, including technical experts, to make a thorough study of this vital problem. The taxpayers and the Congress are entitled to know what the present state of our national defense is. Equally, if not more important, they have the right to demand a sound, coordinated plan for the future development and maintenance of our national defense.

We are determined to defend this hemisphere from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn against all comers. We are prepared to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in order to do so. We will not tolerate a change in sovereignty of an inch of territory needed for the defense of this hemisphere. But there is one lesson which even a layman can see emerging from the smoke of battle in Europe, namely, that all the reactionaries are not in Congress or the State legislatures. They have been revealed in the military and naval establishments of some nations abroad. The responsibility for our own national defense is still by tradition divided between two departments of the Government, the Army and the Navy. This is reflected in the division of jurisdiction in the committees of Congress.

The technique of modern war demands coordination of all branches of military and naval defense. Through a joint congressional committee we can get a proper study and solution of the problem of defense. It would insure an adequate and coordinated program. We can then face the future with supreme confidence. I shall work for and support such a joint committee.

I believe that Congress should provide taxes now to meet as much of the new armament burden as possible. There will be fat profits made from the new defense program. This alone would be a sufficient reason for more taxes. But there is a more compelling one. Progressives have always favored a pay-as-you-go policy, and while we have recognized that there are emergencies when the credit of the National Government must be utilized, at the same time we have fought for increased taxes based on ability to pay. There should be no further delay in facing this vital problem.

I am opposed to the adjournment of Congress. In this foreign and domestic crisis we should stay in session. We should discharge our responsibility to provide the country with a program for adequate national defense, a sound tax bill to meet it and a dynamic program to attack our domestic problems of unemployment, insecurity, and low farm income.

There is no time to waste in meeting the challenge of our day and generation. To guard America effectively against the fifth columns of communism and fascism we must have a contented and united people. We must banish the discouragement and dissatisfaction that breed in the dead atmosphere of idleness and poverty on which ruthless dictators have risen to power.

The Progressive Party program will make and keep democracy safe for America.

Keynote Address at Connecticut Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANAHER

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the interesting and able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] before the Republican State Convention at Hartford, Conn., on May 14, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1794 Zephaniah Swift, who later became our Chief Justice, wrote his System of the Laws of Connecticut. Swift traced the history and the philosophy of government looking to the experimental development of the representative Republic, our own United States of America, then only 5 years old. It seems to me our people too loosely refer to us as a democracy, when in point of fact as well as of principle we function through and by our agents, our representatives. Of the status of the latter, Swift said:

"Our Government originated from the people and was instituted for their sole benefit. The impracticability of assembling a great nation to collect their will rendered it necessary that certain persons should be elected, to whom the power of acting for the people should be delegated. This constitutes our Government, to be a representative Republic, and an attention to this leading feature will unfold the basis on which it is established and the principles by which it is to be executed. A government by representation implies the idea that the representatives stand in the place of the people and are vested with all their power within the Constitution. In the Legislature, therefore, consisting of the representatives, is concentered the majesty of the people and the supremacy of the Government. They are neither bound to obey the instructions nor to consult the will of the people—but, being in their place and vested with all their power, they have a right to adopt and pursue such measures as, in their judgment, are best calculated to promote the happiness and welfare of the community in the same manner as the people themselves would act if it were possible for them to assemble and deliberate on their common concerns. The reason why the instructions of the people are not to be regarded is because it is impossible that the general sense should be collected; and, even if that could be done, they have not those means of information which are necessary to qualify them to deliberate and decide. As to the instructions from any particular district to the representative by them elected, they ought to have no influence, because when elected a person becomes the representative of the community at large; he cannot therefore regard the instructions of his immediate constituents, but must consult the general good of the community and not the particular advantage of a district."

So I greet you not merely as delegates but as representatives of those enrolled Republicans who chose you to act for them in the business of selecting delegates who will represent all of us at the Philadelphia Convention. You are not to consult merely the possible good of a particular section or of a particular town, but will also have in mind those principles which draw us together as a party functioning, as we believe, for the best interests of all of our people and of the Nation. As Republicans we can desire no less, as citizens we can do no more.

There have been times in Republican history when we could take no pride in the results achieved by those in whom we had placed our trust and our confidence. We can frankly confess our dismay at discovering that some were eager to use the name of the achievements of the Republican Party as mere implements to their advancing their own selfish ends. Some had thought that "fat cats" could continue to dominate our party and our Government by misuse of money and to control through personal power as if the people would tacitly acquiesce in and even tolerate such abuses. Happily, the electorate, while sometimes tardy in action, is nonetheless decisive when aroused. And so, in 1940, we find our citizens turning again to the Republican Party as the party of the people and their one hope of bettering their own condition and that of their Government.

Now we are met to select those delegates who will, at the convention to be held in Philadelphia, join with hundreds of others who will select the nominee of the Republican Party to be President of the United States. Our party does not at this spring convention write a platform of the principles or an outline of the program upon which we will seek to elect our candidates for the various offices of our National and State governments. But we cannot be unmindful either of the failures of the incumbent administration or of the problems which will confront the next one. This is not to say that all and singular acts and conduct of the Democratic Party in its current national administration have been failures; quite the contrary, but that administration which has overwhelmingly controlled the legislative acts of the Congress since 1933 cannot escape responsibility for the continuation of such policies as were not only mistaken in concept but have been proved in administration demonstrably fallacious. Nor can the Republican Party simply go before the people with a program to repeal this and repeal that and then expect that blithely and serenely all things will be righted, or that they will right themselves and that, like Pippa, we will find "All's well with the world."

When I got out of high school only 24 years ago, we boys talked among ourselves as to what we were going to do and what we were going to be. Just as through generations previously in the history of the United States boys had looked forward to their future in this land of opportunity, even down through the twenties we found youth at the threshold of life, still free to pick and choose a probable career as an artisan, a professional man, a businessman. The older men knew just from watching him work and from his aptitude that yet another boy would make a good farmer, who would some day own acreage of his own and who would achieve a subsistence for himself and his family.

Over the years since 1916 maladjustments have been growing apace. Millions of women have left the home and have undertaken employment in every walk of life. Machines have been developed so that one machine today can perform the task formerly wrought through the labor of many men. While production of such machinery has made yet other work for yet other thousands who never had known such tasks, the latest available surveys show that down through the 1920's for every 100 men displaced by machines in industry only 91 could find other jobs. Maladjustments in the world scene accompanied by international political and economic disaster combined to produce the debacle in which whole nations of millions of people surrendered themselves and their lives to authoritarian governments in return for a degree of promised security. The United States was not untouched by the swiftly moving sequence of events. And so it was that in 1932 our people had succumbed to a charming voice which promised Americans a sound currency which would be maintained at all hazards, a reduction of 25 percent in the cost of government, a reduction of taxes, taxes which had to be paid for in the sweat of the brow of every man who works. We heard of the intended elimination of useless bureaus, and so responsive were we to such pleas that our people exercising their franchise in time-honored form, elected to be governed by the nominees of the Democratic Party.

And now, after nearly 8 years, there are nearly a million civil servants of the United States, an increase of nearly 100 percent, the number of bureaus and administrative agencies has more than quadrupled, the national debt has more than doubled, and taxes have so far increased that a present recapitulation of them would simply prove wearying.

The millions upon millions of young men and women who have come of age since 1932 find the doors of opportunity closed. No longer can each say I will be this or I will be that, and every one of them would be glad to take any kind of job whatever just so long as it is not actually repulsive and even as to such work, somehow it gets done. There is not a single family among the workers of the United States, who comprise almost exclusively our entire citizenry, but what has seen and is coming to know a lowered standard of living. Millions upon millions of our citizens are without work of any kind. Millions upon millions of our citizens are working part time, and even when they can work an entire week they find themselves possessed of a dollar income which will buy only what they formerly bought from the rewards of 3 days' work. Housewives feeling the pinch of life, and striving valiantly and courageously to maintain happiness in the home, have been going without a piece of finery, some little luxury as dear to the heart of women today as always. Mothers from one end of the country to the other are giving up that their children may have. Bewildered husbands and fathers daily face the struggle of life not knowing just what is wrong, hopes for themselves and their families daily sinking lower as they realize how futile are the efforts of a government which, after 7 years of unbridled power and control, has failed in the essentials of government.

Your citizen, your average man and woman, just simply does not have the time, day by day, to acquaint himself with what factors have been producing and are continuing his plight. He does not know, and could not get the truth if he sought to know, the objectives of this administration which continues to pay $35 of American taxpayers' money for every ounce of gold that some Communist Russian produces for $8. He fails to realize that $35 of his money is being paid for every ounce of gold shipped to us from foreign nations, gold which has a prevailing average price of approximately $20.67 an ounce. But if you tell him that we now have approximately $18,000,000,000 worth of such gold coming from the mines of every nation on the earth and being transferred to a mine of our own where we bury it at Fort Knox, Ky., he should ask: "Do you mean to say that we have bought $650,000,000 in gold from Japan in the past 2 years, and that we are, therefore, helping Japan to finance her war of aggression against China?" Tell him, "Yes, but you don't know why you are doing it." When he asks if we are underwriting the cost in large degree of the European war now going on by this process of purchasing foreign gold, you may answer in the affirmative, but you can't tell him why we are doing it. And if your citizens should discover that merely in the months of September, October, November, and December of 1939, taking Russian gold in return, we sold to Russia, $25,000,000 worth of gasoline, refined copper and scrap, metal-working machinery, wheat, and molybdenum, not to mention tin and crude rubber, adequate supplies of which we now lack ourselves, at least his curiosity, if not his ire, should be aroused. And in due course, in order to restore money value to this very gold already bought and paid for, we will be obliged to dispense it among the nations of the world to the end that international buying power be again redistributed and a monetary basis be established, that international balances may be maintained. Oh, the ghastly irony of it all.

Your American citizen is beginning to realize to what extent goods made abroad by cheap foreign labor, under conditions with which Americans cannot compete, are displacing in the American markets articles and goods which were formerly produced by Americans who today are unemployed. He is beginning to understand that by limiting production there is not only an increase in the price of the products of the soil, but the continued flouting of the fundamentals of economics is being paid for by every consumer in the United States. On March 20 of this year Senator BYRD placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement indicating only the payments of $10,000 or more to sugar growers under the Sugar Act of 1937, one payment in the State of Florida to the United States Sugar Corporation reaching the total of $430,420.97 for limiting production at a time, mind you, when our sugar producers produce less than 30 percent of the total amount of sugar consumed annually in our country.

That our domestic economy is in greatest danger none can doubt, but that is not all. If the war in Europe were to be terminated tomorrow millions of people now diverted from peacetime pursuits would again be released to participate in an economy which is not prepared to receive them. Nations whose burden of debt from the last war is staggering are today suffering from tax loads imposed not only by the need for current expenditures but for those to come. Probably 50 percent of the national income of Great Britain is today being devoted to the daily expenses of the war. Out of it all, even if there were to be an immediate peace, a standard of living will necessarily be imposed upon people throughout Europe lower than any they have ever known. And Americans again will be forced to compete with them, even for the American market, not to mention the markets of the world. On April 14, 1939, in a letter to Adolf Hitler, the President of the United States said, in part:

"The Government of the United States would be prepared to take part in discussions looking toward the most practical manner of opening up avenues of international trade to the end that every nation of the earth may be enabled to buy and sell on equal terms in the world market as well as to possess assurance of obtaining the materials and products of peaceful economic life."

And if peace does not come, as the war continues there will be greater and greater hue and cry that it is our war and that we must relax restrictions upon credits to those nations who never repaid to us their debts of 20 years ago. Once again, in addition to all current expenditures to be met by the American taxpayer, he will be asked to finance a European war. Again the fruits of American production, paid for by Americans, would be devoted to the attainment of objectives of European nations with whose governments and with whose policies we have no political or national concern.

Now, there are others of our citizens who actually want us to go to war, and who, no doubt, are impelled to even greater desire by recent events. There are those who by measures short of war have already committed our Nation to an unneutral position, the consequences of which have not yet been realized. I deny that it is our war. I deny that we either must or should enter that war. But, for the sake of examination of the point, let us assume for the moment that it is our war. What do Britain and France require from us that we can give them? Do they want airplanes? Yes; but if we enter the war we would reserve the airplanes for the use of our own forces, and necessarily, therefore, Britain and France would get less planes rather than more. That is perfectly apparent by a mere statement of it. Do they need men? The armies of France are probably the best trained in Europe, with millions of men, not to mention the great resources of Britain. And where is the American who wants to leave our shores and enter that war? Which among you in this convention tonight has one son in the Army today? And who among you wants his son in an army to fight overseas?

Do they need our money? They can buy at no faster rate than we can produce. Do they need our credits, that is, the products of American labor to be paid for by Americans? If we were to make available tomorrow ten billions of dollars to our former Allies, what could they buy from us for their present defense that they are not now getting? Moreover, were we to adopt that course, we would but follow the pattern of 1914 to 1917, with an actual participation the only remaining step. No; the thought of our becoming a belligerent in this conflict is contrary to reason and to judgment and to logic.

Suppose the question before you at this minute to be—whether or not you will make appropriations for the defense of the United States—it goes without saying you will wish to defend her against any and all foes, if the need therefor exists. Naturally, if there be no danger, you need appropriate only sufficient to maintain your normal and natural and established armaments. But if a need exists and you must undertake plans for the defense of your Nation, you should be thinking about your Nation, not some other; you should be thinking about your people, you should be thinking about their properties, their homes, their children. The President of the United States in a special message to the Congress in January 1939, told us that he was speaking to us as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, that the program he submitted had been considered by himself in that capacity, and his advisers, to be "a minimum program for the necessities of defense." He told us further: "It is proposed that $300,000,000 be appropriated for the purchase of several types of airplanes for the Army. This should provide a minimum increase of 3,000 planes, but it is hoped that orders placed on such a large scale will materially reduce the unit cost and actually provide many more planes." He continued: "Devoid of all hysteria, this program is but the minimum of requirements." When the hearings were held, Major General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, testified in March 1939, two months later, that the United States had only 847 combat planes, while Germany has thousands.

The Congress appropriated the $300,000,000 requested by the President. Of course, we thought we were going to get the 3,000 planes which the President said as a very minimum were necessary. Of course, we thought we were preparing for our defense. Instead, the airplanes being manufactured in this country are daily being released, and the Army and Navy are waiving their priorities in favor of nations overseas. Last fall I offered an amendment upon the floor of the Congress to require that no planes should be shipped overseas until our own defenses had been built up by at least the number of 3,000 planes, which the President himself had told us we required as a minimum. The administration rallied its forces to defeat that amendment. Within the past 2 weeks Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, offered an amendment to the Navy appropriation bill to require that, of the sum to be allotted for aircraft, a minimum of $20,000,000 should be obligated for planes prior to July 1, 1941. As Senator LODGE stated:

"The appropriation in the pending bill calls for 352 new airplanes for the Navy. At the present time we have the policy of helping foreign nations to buy American-made airplanes. This amendment does not oppose that policy. It simply provides that the Navy shall have its regular quota, even if some of the foreign nations may have to wait a little while. * * * Let us make it perfectly clear that, regardless of what our sympathies with foreign nations may be, we believe in preparedness for ourselves, and let us adopt this amendment which will insure that, no matter what happens in the foreign field, the United States Navy will be properly equipped with airplanes. The amendment is not aimed at any foreign country; it is not antianything; it is a pro-American amendment; and it will simply mean, if it shall be adopted, that the United States Senate will have recorded itself in favor of the United States Navy."

Again the administration defeated this amendment.

It has long been apparent that naval vessels unsupported by adequate aircraft are incapable of defense against a sufficient force attacking from the air. Imagine, if you will, providing for two battleships to cost $60,000,000 apiece, or a total of $120,000,000, when the battleships cannot possibly be built in less than 5 years. If we need naval defenses at all, we need them now, not 5 years hence. But that sum of $120,000,000 for two battleships to be constructed in the future would provide for delivery in a few months, twelve hundred airplanes at a cost of $100,000 each, and you will notice that I take the same figure of unit cost as that suggested by the President. There are no two battleships afloat which could withstand the attack of twelve hundred airplanes, or a small fraction of that number, and the Secretary of the Navy only 1 week ago admitted publicly that our naval vessels must be reconstructed, that their topsides are inadequate against attack from the air, that we must install "turtleback" construction.

Meanwhile, we continue blithely to export our planes, the finest fighting ships in the world, while we strip ourselves of our minimum defense requirements, and while our planes shipped overseas are falling and can fall into the hands of potential aggressors against our Nation, thereafter even to be used against us.

Oh, yes, we hear fine American citizens say that they do not agree with our President in anything else but that they certainly approve his "foreign policy." They think of foreign policy in terms of a series of acts which are designed to assist one set of belligerent nations in a war against others. Such people think in terms of their emotion, in assisting a given side to win an overseas war. I say we should think in terms of the United States. I say that the preservation of our own Nation should be our immediate as well as our ultimate objective, even if thereafter she be the only nation left on the face of this war-torn and sorely troubled world.

Those who approve this so-called foreign policy, after all, are approving what? Let me point out to you that throughout our entire history the United States of America pursued what Webster calls a policy: "a settled or definite course or method adopted and followed by a government." We were thinking in terms of the United States. Our people mentally took sides, if you like, in other peoples' wars, their sympathies were aroused one way or the other, to be sure, but foreign entanglements were abhorred and foreign involvements were avoided. The only time we ever relaxed that policy under which our Nation grew and prospered, our efforts while nominally successful, actually ended in disaster. Billions upon billions of dollars were spent, hundreds of thousands of American boys were casualties, scarcely a home that did not feel the effect of the war. We put everything into it, our energy, our idealism, our fortunes, and our lives. We took nothing out of it but misery and loss.

The present President of the United States until 1937 followed our traditional policy. The American people were so fully convinced we should give notice to the world that what had been our policy would continue so, that we declared our position and made it a matter of domestic law. But from 1937 down to the present time, day by day, week by week, month by month, the President of the United States, to whom solely is entrusted by our Constitution control over our foreign affairs, has pursued a policy of internationalism. We have undertaken to police the world from Borneo to Iceland. We have intervened in overseas wars, following a policy of whose very objectives the American people are kept in ignorance. We have followed a course of parallel action with certain world powers and by our very liaisons have become involved in the maintenance of the international status of our collaborators.

Let us rather look first to our own defenses. Let us commence with the proper and adequate expansion of our plants for the manufacture of special machinery. Let us first "tool up" our industry. If, for example, our plane production could be increased to 30,000 a year, of what value, if we can manufacture but 4,000 propellers. If we can manufacture when properly equipped 4,000,000 rounds of ammunition, of what value, if we can produce but 500 guns.

Even during the World War, although we were producing munitions for 3 years before we entered, 19 months after we declared war we were able each month to produce only 400 pieces of artillery of all calibers. Even as late as October 1918 we were able to produce only three-fourths of our total requirement of shells. In the past 6 years we have spent for the Army and Navy $6,890,000,000, in round figures, and yet we have only 450 antiaircraft guns scattered from Honolulu to Eastport while the Germany Army is estimated to have had more than twice that number in Norway alone. We can put only one mechanized division into the field; we lack antitank guns—in short—what are we getting for our money? What are we doing for our defense?

Time will not permit nor would you wish me to detail all of the factors, and the considerations applicable to each, which are involved in the departure by the present administration from our history-long position. The series of unneutral steps, the outright and continued aid to Russia, the assistance extended through economic manipulations, the continuation of the purchase of foreign gold at the expense of Americans, without further enumeration, suffice it to say that by acts and declarations our course is daily in the direction of further intervention.

Stated another way, our foreign policy should be abandoned; our foreign policy should be domestic first; our foreign policy should be one of nonintervention and since there reposes in the President of the United States such vast potentialities for our involvement in overseas wars, let your delegates to the national convention have in mind the selection of one to be President of the United States whose policy will be, America first.

Of course, the United States will not later shrink from bringing to bear its influence, its intelligence, its wealth, in the readjustment of the world. We have no slightest intention, like Pontius Pilate, of washing our hands of the whole affair. But just as surely as we today uphold the torch of civilization, of ordered government, of political obligation, so too, will our opportunity of keeping bright that torch remain only so long as we avoid the abyss of war. If everything we stand for represents the hopes of the peoples of the world, so too, can we lose that status as in the mire of entanglement we suffer the ravages of war upon every desirable quality of heart and mind, upon every vestige of the beneficence of peace, upon civilization itself.

That we may as a nation and as a people be in position to make the greatest contribution to civilization that any nation or any people ever made will demand of us the devotion of our utmost energy to the rehabilitation first of our own domestic economy. We must not only be strong, sufficiently so to resist all forces which would destroy us from within, but to render us capable of the greatest possible negotiatory power in the readjustment of an exhausted and bleeding and war-ravaged world. This is not isolation, it is nonintervention. This is not meddling, it is plain common sense.

That the Republican Party is the political entity upon whom will and should devolve such responsibility will become more evident as our people, perforce, attempt to study the events of the past 7 years and to consider what impends in the years just ahead. It is a responsibility which as citizens sworn to uphold our Government and as patriots we gladly embrace. Difficult though the task will be, our duty is plain but our sense of obligation is deep and reassuring.

As representatives of those who sent you here, you will select delegates to the national convention who will act in our names and for our party. They will select as a candidate for President one whose capabilities and experience and judgment will inspire the confidence of our people. That there are such men available is the result of the opportunities which in the past went hand in hand with the principles of American freedom. That such opportunities may be preserved for all of us is the goal of the Republican Party.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at Stoughton, Wis., on the 17th of May—the Norwegian Independence Day anniversary.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens and friends, I address you as fellow citizens because I would have everyone appreciate the value of American citizenship.

I address you as friends because irrespective of our differences in politics, in religion, and the national roots from which we and our forbears stem, I would have you to be friends under the American flag.

In these turbulent times, I would have each one of you recognize your importance as leaders—leaders of thought and action. Each one of you in your church group, in your lodge, in your business, in your avocation, and your vocation influences others.

I have been asked many times, Will war come to America? And I have said, That does not depend upon Washington—that depends upon the leadership back in the villages, cities, and farms, and homes of the Nation.

And, my friends, I am prefacing my remarks today with some thoughts that were not contemplated when I accepted the invitation to speak to you. At that time Norway was uninvaded, she was free, and in your heart and mine, at that time, there was not the hurt there that there is now. We have suffered with other peoples—with the Finns, the Poles, the Czechs, and the Austrians—but, when the land from which our forbears came went down under the blitzkreig it inflicted another wound which will probably bleed until this holocaust of war is over and Norway is free again.

As Americans, in these distressing times we are called upon to be fit for the task that confronts us. Fitness now demands that we remain calm, mentally poised. Lincoln in his day saw the need of that. He preached the doctrine of malice toward none, yet he

fought for righteousness sake. He was a man of prayer. He said: "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for the day."

Lincoln in strenuous times also knew the need of releasing the safety valve on the mental tension. He could tell a story. He repeatedly turned to humor and laughter. He said: "With the fearful strain that is on me night and day, if I didn't laugh I should die."

I have often told the story of the man who lost all his worldly goods in the depression of 1933—how he made up his mind to commit suicide, and how a friend of his got him to go out and look through the telescope at the Harvard Observatory. Seeing a speck of light, he was told that was Arcturus, and that he saw not the star but the light which had been traveling 25 light-years at the rate of 186,000 miles per second. He was shown other specks of light which were a million times bigger than our earth. He was taken on a trip through the heights and the depths of the heavens. When he got through, the suicide-minded man said to the young astronomer, "I haven't lost anything, have I? I have my wife, my children, my health, and over in that library are 6,000 years of human wisdom in literature, science, history, economics—all mine. I haven't lost anything, have I?"

He had awakened from his dream that the suicide trail was the way out. He had gotten perspective. Before I begin my remarks, may I say to my constituents what we need to face these troubled days is a sense of humor, a faith in God, and perspective. There was a time when Napoleon overran Europe, and for over 15 years there was war. Before him there was Charlemagne, and Caesar, and Alexander, and numerous other "men of war." Since his time there have been in Europe many, many conflicts. We are shocked and angered now by Hitler's methods, but these emotions have never won a war, although they may have started many. I still believe that the sentiment of the thinking people calls for keeping out of war. However, if Hitler should keep on his rampage and should get overinflated with his successes and should attempt to violate the Monroe Doctrine, or should sink our ships, or should invade our rights, he might precipitate this people into war. Therefore, above everything else, let us get perspective. We have to prepare for what the future may hold, but we are masters of the future.

Today is the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of the constitution of Norway. This is the natal day which marks the anniversary of the adoption of the organic law of old Norway. This is a commemoration of great significance to those of Norse blood. But today my kinsmen, this is a sad anniversary.

These are the times that try men's souls. But I am sure that as Americans we shall overcome the trials of this period. I come here today to speak to you about a great people—a people who will also survive the trials of this period; a people from whom many of us stem; a people who by their blood and by their ideas have fertilized many countries in Europe, many states in Africa, and many commonwealths in our own Nation.

This occasion was to have been one to celebrate the independence of Norway, and in spite of the invasion by Hitler's troops, I believe we can still celebrate that independence.

There are 140,000 Norwegian-Americans in Wisconsin. Almost all of them have some family ties with the motherland. The tragedy of Norway today is painfully close to our hearts. In Dane County alone there are 16,000 Norwegians who scan the war news every day. The Koshkonong settlement, south of Madison, also has its roots deep in the motherland. This settlement was one of the first Norwegian settlements in all America.

There are 10,000 Norwegians in Milwaukee County who daily feel a grim growing resentment against the occupation of their homeland. In Racine alone there are 16,000 men and women of Danish descent, and a little over a month ago they hung the flags at half mast before the Danish brotherhood and Dania halls.

Wisconsin has many ties in Scandinavia. The entire population of Norway is about that of our own State. The 140,000 who have found their home here have had a tremendous effect on our history. The folk songs, the legends, the schools, the music and literature, the faith and character of this people from Norway have been closely woven into the fabric of Wisconsin and American life.

Today's events make the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries particularly interesting. With the Scandinavian countries slashed to tatters it is interesting to look back on that period when Sweden, Denmark, and Norway existed under one government. For four centuries Norway was practically a province of Denmark.

Every school child knows that Norway separated from Denmark in 1814 when she joined with Sweden. The lesson there is that during the union of 91 years whatever strife there was, centered about honest differences which were carried to a dignified and peaceable settlement. The final settlement came on June 7, 1905, when Norway and Sweden settled their differences amicably. There was no bloodshed. The bonds of friendship between these countries still existed.

That in itself should be an example today. That kind of round-the-table peaceful discussion is exactly what the world needs today. It is interesting to note that there are other parallels to history in the present situation. Back in the days when Norway was still a Danish province, the Europe of 1805 presented an almost exact parallel to the Europe of today.

Today the war is faster and more destructive, but in other respects it is much the same as it was in the Napoleonic era. Those years present a closer parallel than the war of 1914–18. Then, as now, one single dictator was attempting to unite all Europe by force of arms. Then, as now, one man had the desire to conquer sea power by an extension of territorial dominion. It failed then, and it is likely to fail again.

Because the present attempt so closely involves the Scandinavian peoples it may be well for us to review the background of those of us who today scan the war headlines for news of the land of our ancestors and news of other despoiled lands.

The first Norsemen to come to these shores probably came about the year 1000 when storms on the North Atlantic drove Leif Ericson somewhere between Nova Scotia and Boston Bay.

The second Norse migration came only a few years later. Its purpose, as the Saga of Erik the Red states, was to find Leif Ericson's Vinland and settle there. This migration did land somewhere in western Newfoundland and 3 years later returned to Iceland.

There were many other Norwegian expeditions to America. But here today we might limit our brief discussion to the second great invasion by the Norsemen in 1825 when the 45-ton sloop *Restaurationen* sailed out of Stavanger for New York with 52 pioneers on board. They settled on the shores of Lake Ontario and later moved farther west. They were led by Cleng Peerson, the Leif Ericson of the forties. He trudged on foot from the New York State colony up the shore of Lake Michigan till one evening in August of 1833. That evening the little footsore, blue-eyed Peerson approached a fur trader's cabin near Lake Michigan. A bearded trader, naked from the waist up, was standing in front of the cabin. He was Solomon Juneau, and he told Peerson that if he continued north he would find "nothing but woods to the world's end."

The little Norwegian journeyed southwestward into LaSalle County and then returned to Lake Ontario after a summer hike of 2,000 miles. He told about the "promised land" which he had found in the West. He told about the Illinois land which sold for $1.25 an acre. That started a great ground swell of migration—first to Illinois, then to Wisconsin, and later to Iowa.

The first wave of settlers spread into Wisconsin in Peerson's wake. By 1847 the first Norwegian-American paper was begun in a barn in the Muskego settlement of Waukesha County.

The first Norwegian church in America was founded in that same settlement near Waterford some 97 years ago. We who gather here today are the descendants of those pioneers. It is natural and understandable that we should look to the land of our forbears in these troubled days.

And these are troubled days. Norway was one victim which had been uninvaded since the Middle Ages. Scandinavia's neutrality survived the World War and 7 months of the present European war. That neutrality became a thing of the past with the Nazi invasion.

There are only about 3,000,000 people in Norway, but they are a peace-loving people. They have learned that war does not pay. About three-quarters of this land is unproductive, and in order to get room to live the Norsemen reached out to the sea. There they developed the fourth largest merchant marine in the world. During the World War, the German submarines sank 1,200,000 tons of her merchant fleet, and Norway lost nearly 2,000 seamen, but she did not enter the war. Before the Nazi invasion she had a merchant marine of 4,756,000 gross tons.

This little country was absolutely unprepared. Its people had faith that they would survive this war as they survived the last World War. But now the sons of the Vikings have fought again. Their forefathers battled into Britain and made it Angle land. They settled Normandy. This year the sons of Vikings from Angle land and Normandy banded together for a common cause.

The Norsemen, for a hundred years, had followed a cult of peace. They have tried to stay at peace. They developed the spirit of cooperation among themselves. Among them, the arts and the sciences and religious thinking thrived. They did not bother to build armies and navies. They believed in treaties between nations. They believed in the pledged word, but that confidence has been rudely shattered.

And once more, as at Eidsvold in 1805, they rallied behind their King and pledged "Enig og tro til Dovre falder."

There are moments, or occasions, when a man is too full for expression. There are other moments when a man feels that he would like to blow off steam and talk endlessly. We have all had such experiences.

In the first category I can recall seeing the sunset on the Grand Canyon, seeing the shadows creep up those majestic canyon sides. It was something mystical and tremendously beautiful. For, hours after the sunset, the influence of that experience remained. A great musician related how, after hearing Wagner's Faust for the first time, the beauty and the purity of those mighty harmonies so exalted him that for days he lived above the mundane.

So to all men and women have come at times great experiences reflecting the hidden beauty and symmetry of the eternal.

On the 9th of April last, I had another experience which could be classified under the second category. When the news came that Hitler had marched, without warning, on neutral Scandinavia, I found that I was not the only one whose emotions were aroused. That feeling appeared to be general. Long ago I learned, though, when the floodgates were open, that it was a good time to hold one's tongue, to wait for a cooling interval.

Apparently the President of these United States had a similar experience, because it was not until the evening of April 14, 1940, following the custom that has obtained in this country from time immemorial when great wrongs have been done, that he spoke and expressed the sentiment of practically everyone in this country, irrespective of where they or their forebears came from. This was the language that he used:

"Force and military aggression are once more on the march against small nations, in this instance through the invasion of Denmark and Norway. These two nations have won and maintained during a period of many generations the respect and regard not only of the American people but of all peoples, because of their observance of the highest standards of national and international conduct.

"The Government of the United States has on the occasion of recent invasions strongly expressed its disapprobation of such unlawful exercise of force. It here reiterates, with undiminshed emphasis, its point of view as expressed on those occasions. If civilization is to survive, the rights of the smaller nations to independence, to their territorial integrity, and to the unimpeded opportunity for self-government must be respected by their more powerful neighbors."

The Executive of this Nation, dating back from the first President, has given free expression to this people's indignation when acts of violence were committed and rights of free peoples jeopardized. In other words, it is our policy not to refrain from condemning acts of wanton lawlessness, acts that violate international law and threaten world peace and the structure of civilization.

There was an added reason why I should refrain from speaking in the Senate of the United States. I did not want to say anything "when the heat was on" that I would regret afterward.

As many of you know, I was in Norway last summer as a representative of this Government at the Interparliamentary Union meeting. As I have said before, my forbears came from the "Land of the Midnight Sun." I went over much of the same territory which has recently been mentioned in our papers. I sailed up Bergenfjord and landed in Bergen. I spent a week in Oslo and its environs. I took the Trondheim road to find the homestead of my mother—the same road the Nazi troops are now traveling. I spent a week in Denmark, headquartering in Copenhagen, and then crossed into Sweden, where I took the Kungsholm at Gothenburg and sailed out of Skagerrak, passed Stavanger and north of Bergen—up north passed the Faroe Islands.

In the past few frantic weeks I have lived through the same experiences that other people in this land have undergone recently as they have seen the land of their fathers ruthlessly ravaged and occupied. After all, here in Wisconsin many of our citizens stem from Finland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria-Hungary, Holland, and Belgium—all invaded countries.

Some time has now elapsed and the first shocks are past. I have had time to think things through. After my visit to Norway and Sweden and Denmark, after seeing these people and seeing their land and realizing that they, more than any others in Europe, had developed along the identical lines of our development, with all the freedoms that we have, I can appreciate their experiences; I can realize what these violations of international law, this jumping on neutrals, means not only to them but to the rest of the world.

The Scandinavian peoples who emigrated here, like the great flood of German people who came to this country, have become Americans. Most of them are good citizens. They are hard-working, straight-thinking people.

In these last years the Scandinavian countries have done a great job. They have demonstrated that it is possible for poor, small countries to build a society based on peace, neutrality, and Christian principles, and these same people have developed the highest standard of living in the world. Since the days of Napoleon they have remained at peace. They have gone to extremes to avoid giving offense to the belligerents. Their governments refused to violate neutrality even for Finland—would not permit allied troops to march through.

Let us keep in mind that Denmark had a nonaggression treaty with Germany and that Norwegian waters were used by Germany for her ships, but nothing availed. The mailed fist had to strike.

It didn't avail the Scandinavian countries to live up to the letter of the spirit of international law. The "blitzkreig" struck regardless of their blameless record. With what results?

We may conclude that (if the totalitarian governments control Europe) no longer will there be safety for small nations; no longer will a small nation be permitted to remain neutral. In that respect the hands of the clock have been set back over a hundred years.

But there is always a silver lining. It may mean that in Europe the idea of union now is nearer fulfillment than was anticipated. The democratic nations of Europe will have to become a confederacy.

The second result of all this should be to open up the eyes of South America. Those nations there should get rid of their petty rivalries and becomes a kind of United States of South America. They should pool their resources and get at that job quickly so that they will not become subject to a "blitzkrieg" from quarters in Europe. The third result is apparent—the British Empire, instead of falling apart, will become more unified than ever. The "blitzkrieg" of Hitler has cemented that Empire, showing the dominions and the colonies the imperative need for being one with the mother country.

The fourth result: In spite of the fact that the word of the totalitarian states has been demonstrated as worthless and their treaties but scraps of paper to be torn up, other peoples know that international faith is not dead. The pledged word between nations, constructive international law, the result of conduct between nations, especially between democratic nations, are still vital matters. For the time being the "blitzkrieg" has made everyone power conscious, and if the present policy is continued then the only guaranty that any nation has is to make itself secure from attack, make itself self-sufficient from a military, economic, and financial standpoint.

The fifth result: The basic principles of the law of neutrality still live, although the "blitzkrieg" of Hitler has made them dormant for the time being.

And so we come to the main problem, How can we best preserve our national safety, promote our national interests? As Americans, on this sad anniversary, we seek the answer to this question.

It is a difficult question and its answer is tied up with a number of conclusions arising out of the European melee.

Let us consider some of these conclusions and attempt to evaluate their significance to America.

It is evident from the Scandinavian crisis—

First. The Scandinavians can never be completely conquered unless they are wiped out.

Second. The more alien peoples trampled on by European dictators, the more people there will be to rise some day against their conquerors.

Third. The economic consequences of the present war in Scandinavia will mean that Allied purchases other than war materials will be increased in this country. (Following the loss of Scandinavian sources.)

Fourth. Our own imports from Scandinavia will be curtailed. (This will affect the pulp and paper industries, since more than 15 percent of our newsprint and pulp is imported from Scandinavia.)

Fifth. An extension of the theater of conflict appears inevitable. An intensification of military operations appears more than likely. This will affect the United States because it will bring increased demands from the Allies for our export of war materials and supplies. Our import trade will be further affected.

Sixth. There is every indication that this may be a war to exhaustion or even to the death.

Seventh. The extent of traitorous and Trojan-horse activities in the Scandinavian countries illustrates the necessity of all neutrals keeping a sharp check on alien activities and alien propaganda.

Eighth. Part of the European dictatorship war technique has been the mesmerism of terrorism. This is a bogey which must not affect neutrals—particularly America.

Ninth. In the World War, Russia provided the second front. In this war Scandinavia provides the second front. There will be other fronts. Thus division of Nazi strength divides Nazi force and speeds up the pace of the war; both of these factors should react to the advantage of the Allied forces with their tremendous manpower and vast sources of material.

Tenth. It is vital for us in America to "keep our shirts on"—to refrain from unrestrained emotionalism. Any participation of the United States in this war would probably end in a complete betrayal of democracy.

Eleventh. The Scandinavians themselves furnished an example for the present conflict when they settled their differences peacefully on June 7, 1905. Norway and Sweden parted peacefully with no bloodshed. That was the most noteworthy event of the century and furnishes an example for today.

Twelfth. Preparedness is the best guaranty of inviolate neutrality. That means both mental preparedness and a physical defense preparedness. The lesson of Scandinavia teaches us the value of the latter and our own common sense teaches us the value of the former.

Thirteenth. Let us reason together about a significant situation. It is important that we realize here in America that no matter where we stem from, we are first and last Americans. Just as we of Norwegian blood have now had a surge of sympathy for the "Land of the Midnight Sun," so it is natural that every nationality sympathizes with its homeland and its home people. It is also natural that all of us Americans, no matter who we are, sympathize with the common people of Europe who are bearing the burdens, suffering the loss, and fertilizing the soil with their bleached bones as they have for centuries past.

Let us reason together and think this thing through. It is my opinion that practically every German who was born in Germany and who is now a citizen of this country, and every descendant of Germans who came here in '48, or before and after, are as loyal to the American traditions and American principles of a republican form of government as any other group, but it is natural also that while they condemn the tactics of the Nazi group, that they should have a feeling for their people, just as some of us have a feeling for the Scandinavian peoples.

If there are any military or propaganda traitors in any American group, as there were in Norway, it is imperative that we find them out. America wants to stay out of this war just as the Scandinavian countries did. We must make sure that there are none boring from within. There must be no termites here.

I was brought up in a community where there were Frenchmen, Scandinavians, Germans, as well as Irish, English, and Scotch. I remember back in 1914, before we got into the war, many incidents

that demonstrate what I have mentioned—the heartthrobs and longing of each race for the well-being of their fatherland. But I remember also in 1917, when we entered the war, there were no more loyal Americans than the Americans of German descent. I have heard nothing but condemnation of Hitler's ruthlessness from my brethren of German extraction.

Fourteenth. America must awaken to the realization that she must take extraordinary precautionary measures within her own borders to see that sedition and treason and traitors do not thrive on our soil. But in doing that we must also be extremely cautious to see that we do not delegate an unwarranted police power to any man or group of men who might utilize it in the same manner that similar powers were utilized in Europe. In other words, we must not become hysterical in this direction, but we must become practical and sane. We want to say to any foreigners in our midst: You are our guests and we expect you to abide by the rules and regulations of life in this house. No guest has a right to abuse the hospitality of America. If they do, they should be given a one-way passport back to where they came from. If there are any Americans who have become inoculated with any foreign ideas or "isms" and take steps that are disloyal or are treasonable to violate the safety of our institutions, they should in this world crisis be dealt with accordingly.

Fifteen. While the great heart of America was shocked by what took place in Scandinavia, and is being duplicated elsewhere, and while this same heart bleeds for downtrodden people everywhere, this question arises, What can we as individuals and what can we as a nation do in this international crisis? What should we do? I have said before that in times of great crisis in the life of an individual, or in the life of a nation, it is imperative that the individual and the leaders of a nation tie to a principle.

The first reaction when injustice occurs in the family of nations is for every red-blooded individual to want to rise and strike back at the aggressor. The individual can do that now if he desires. He can enlist in foreign armies and sacrifice his life for the cause if he wishes to. A public official, however, who has a part in shaping the direction that this Government shall take, must, if he is going to be a trustee of the people's Government, think the problem through. While as an individual, any Senator could sacrifice his life and fortune in the cause of Norway, as a Senator of the United States it is necessary for him to realize that when he acts, he acts for 130,000,000 people. When an elected representative to Congress acts, he is dealing away or protecting the rights of this people, the great American values. War, my friends, is hell, and to put this Nation into war is something of a different nature than for an individual to enlist in the army of a foreign nation.

What can we do? As I have said, Hitler and his Nazi government have turned the hands of the clock back so that no small nation now under the doctrine of neutrality can feel safe. The Nazis have destroyed neutrality as far as the small nations are concerned, but America still must stand for honor among nations, must stand for law among nations. If she does that, then when the storm is over, the peoples of the world will look to us as the mariner looks to the lighthouse.

There is one other way for us to help as a nation. We can continue to keep the record straight. We can continue to make a dispassionate appraisal of foreign affairs and then judiciously express the weight of American approval or disapproval in our official utterances. That may sound weak and ineffectual but in reality American prestige makes it a potent force in restraining European excesses. As a positive force, it is an active encouragement for international fair dealing.

What else can we do? As individuals we undoubtedly will be called upon to make contributions during the war to aid our relatives in Norway. My fellow citizens, I see another position where we all will be called upon, in the days that are up ahead, when war-torn Europe is bled white, for America to do what we did once before under Hoover—when he fed the millions at our expense. Then will be given the opportunity for us to demonstrate that the principles of the Christ still live in the hearts of humanity. When that day comes, when the Biblical saying has come true—"They who take the sword shall perish by the sword"—we can demonstrate that they who love their brothers—Germans, Frenchmen, Scandinavians, Poles, Englishmen—will give a rebirth to the spirit of Him who taught us to love one another.

I hear someone say, "How impractical," but to me this is far more practical than any other method that the ingenuity of man has ever devised. Our opportunity will be to bind up the wounds, the broken hearts, to cast out the fears and hates of a lacerated humanity. Perhaps then we will be the great instrument to bring about the fulfillment of the prophecy that nations will beat their swords into plowshares and there will be no more war.

On this 17th of May let us Americans pledge ourselves anew to the faith that is in us, to the faith that says that Norway shall once more be free, the faith that says that America will not permit the "fifth column" of any nation to penetrate our land, to the faith that says that the great American values—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of contract, freedom of worship, trial by jury—shall not be taken away from us by our own neglect or by another's conduct and action.

Yes, my friends, on this day let us pledge allegiance to the American flag, and to this Nation of which we are a part. If we do that and govern ourselves accordingly, we shall make the greatest contribution that anyone can make to this day and generation.

Always the Scandinavian peoples have been law-abiding people. Always they have amalgamated with and become a part of the nation they immigrated to—witness, France, England, northern Italy, and America. Always they have been folks with the characteristics of loyalty, thrift, industry deeply ingrained in the fiber of their being.

Today, therefore, is a day of consecration, a day of rededication. Lifting our heads toward the sky, we can sing God Bless America * * * and Gud Velsigne Dig Gamle Norge.

God bless America—

First. With citizens who appreciate her and what she stands for.

Second. Bless her with citizens who will be on guard against the "fifth column's" attack; with citizens who will not become mentally stampeded and unbalanced.

Third. Bless her with citizens who will appreciate and maintain her great freedoms—freedom of speech, press, worship, contract, etc.—and who will also appreciate the great moral virtues—faith in the pledged word, faith in God, and faith in the forward march of mankind.

Fourth. Bless her, O God, with citizens who through this critical period can walk with hope and courage, vision, poise, strength, and unity in their hearts and minds and souls.

America's Gold Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND ARTICLES FROM THE CANADIAN FINANCIAL OUTLOOK AND THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of May 20, 1940, under the heading "Mr. Morgenthau's doubt"; an article from the Canadian Financial Outlook, of Toronto, Canada, of the issue of May 1, 1940, under the heading "$41 Gold in the offing," by George Williams, financial editor; and an article from the New York Times of May 19, 1940, entitled "Gold Hoard Stirs Growing Concern," by John H. Crider.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 20, 1940]

MR. MORGENTHAU'S DOUBT

Secretary Morgenthau believes that the Government's gold policy has expanded our exports, encouraged domestic industry, and enabled us to acquire "the safest physical asset in the world." After emphasizing the advantages of the gold policy, however, Mr. Morgenthau permitted a note of doubt to creep into the address which he delivered recently before the women's division of the Democratic National Committee.

He mentioned the possibility that the present turmoil may leave the world in the grip of ruthless powers dominating a large number of formerly independent states. In that event international trade and finance might assume the character of domestic trade, with settlement of balances between countries effected by a simple transfer of deposits.

This hypothesis suggests a multitude of disturbing complications. Mr. Morgenthau rightly concludes that, under such conditions, our gold holdings would doubtless be a relatively minor cause of anxiety.

It is, nevertheless, significant that the Secretary of the Treasury has at last publicly recognized the possibility that gold may eventually cease to be employed as a means of international payments. For a long time suggestions of this kind were dismissed as the speculations of irresponsible theorists. Last January, however, Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, writing in the Federal Reserve Bulletin, referred to the problem presented by "the accumulation in the country, in exchange for our products and other forms of wealth, of an asset (gold) which is of little value now and whose value in the future is unpredictable."

Since then the process of accumulation has continued at an abnormally rapid rate and our gold hoard has risen to approximately $19,000,000,000, or nearly three-fourths of the world's monetary gold stocks.

Regardless of the outcome of the war, these gold acquisitions will present an acute problem when peace is restored. Every nation, including Germany, which has shown extraordinary ingenuity in carrying on foreign trade without gold, has heretofore been eager

to acquire that metal, because it could be exchanged for goods. The fact that the United States has been willing to accept unlimited quantities of gold has maintained its traditional prestige as a medium of international payments. But the situation may be very different in the reconstruction years to come.

It is not necessary to postulate a Europe dominated by a few dictatorial powers to envisage an economic and financial order in which gold would lose most, if not all, of its monetary importance. In the past gold served its purpose well because movements of goods and of capital were sufficiently well balanced to prevent excessive concentration of the money metal in any single country. Unless the political and economic maladjustments which have been responsible for the extraordinary gold influx into the United States can be corrected, it can hardly be doubted that gold will lose its value for monetary purposes in the post-war world.

[From the Canadian Financial Outlook, Toronto, May 1, 1940]

FORTY-ONE DOLLAR GOLD IN THE OFFING

(By George Williams, financial editor)

The spectacular increase in Canadian gold production—springing from a spurt following the 1929 depression and again in 1934, when President Roosevelt boosted the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce—continues to be reflected in higher and brighter earnings among Canadian mining stocks.

And now, with the impact of war economy demanding greater and greater spending and wider extension of credit, many observers incline to agree with our view—that a further increase in the price of gold, to at least $41.34 an ounce, may become immediately necessary.

While it is dangerous to generalize about complicated matters, this subject may be reasonably and simply stated thus: At the beginning of the 1914–18 war, conservative economists warned participating governments that war expenditures, at the rate then contemplated, were simply impossible. Yet, the expenditures were made on a scale far higher than that at first contemplated and which the economists had flatly stated were impossible.

What was done? Exactly what has always been done when governments need more money. For money is only what the government says it is. The dollars used in the United States now have often been stigmatized as 69-cent dollars—and, if the present price of $35 an ounce for gold were increased to $41.34 an ounce or higher, conservatives would scream again—but dollars would still buy commodities in the same ratios as previously.

The scale of expenditures for the present war dwarfs that of the previous World War, by comparison. And it is by no means beyond the realm of possibility that, if it lasts for a period of years, increases in the price of gold may become not just a notion to toy with but an urgent necessity.

Now, as to the immediate result of the impending higher price for gold: Figuring on a basis of the expected 1940 Canadian gold crop of 5,750,000 ounces, a further mark-up of the price of gold to $41.34 an ounce would make the current year's crop worth $237,705,000, instead of $201,250,000, based on the present standard price of $35 an ounce—without any allowance for the fact that Canadian gold mines are now receiving $38.50 in Canadian funds for their output. Hence, such a mark-up would put $35,455,000 more into the treasuries of the producing Canadian gold mines—virtually all of which would be clear profit, and would thereby swell their profit margin to that extent. A price of $45 an ounce would give an additional profit of $57,500,000 and a price of $50 an ounce would furnish a further profit of $86,250,000.

Moreover, such a higher price for gold would enable many of the so-called marginal or low-grade-ore mines to operate very profitably.

And virtually all this additional profit would go to shareholder-participants in the form of dividends.

Moreover, this naming of a higher price for gold would be instantly reflected in a spectacular market appreciation of all gold-mining enterprises in the Dominion. It would appear, therefore, that this is the psychological time to procure participating interests in the best of them.

[From the New York Times of May 19, 1940]

GOLD HOARD STIRS GROWING CONCERN

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The Treasury's gold stock, already the largest in world history, will go over the $19,000,000,000 mark in the next few days if acquisitions continue at the recent rate. In the 5 days ended Wednesday $46,000,000 was added, putting the total at $18,949,000,000.

With reports of Allied reverses in Europe, America's holdings of more than two-thirds of the world's monetary stocks of gold become a question of increasing concern in discussions among officials here. The question is being asked whether a Nazi victory might not seriously jeopardize the value of the metal which is a bulwark of capitalism and an avowed target of German revolutionary conquests.

THE 1939 INFLOW TOPPED THREE BILLION

The Treasury's gold stock passed the $17,000,000,000 mark October 20 and the $18,000,000,000 mark in the first week of February. Thus, in less than 7 months the Treasury has gained $2,000,000,000 in gold. In the calendar year 1939 the net inflow amounted to about $3,132,000,000, a figure larger than the total dollar value of the gold stock held in this country in any year prior to 1917.

The coming of gold has been a principal factor in swelling the excess reserves of the Nation's banks to more than $6,000,000,000, an all-time high, and this, in turn has served importantly to create an excessive "easy-money" situation which was the subject of several critical communications from the Federal Advisory Council to the Federal Reserve Board last year.

The Federal Reserve Board has, in effect, thrown up its hands in the face of the flood of foreign gold, stating that "the potential lending power derived by banks from the receipt of this gold creates an unprecedented problem of control, because the unused reserves of the banks are much greater than can be absorbed by the Federal Reserve under present powers."

Housing and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STUDY BY UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very revealing and important study just released by the United States Housing Authority, entitled "Better Housing, Better Health."

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER HOUSING, BETTER HEALTH—THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF HOUSING AND HEALTH, AND HOW THE NATION-WIDE SLUM CLEARANCE PROGRAM WILL BRING HEALTH AND HOPE TO THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS

The caveman had a housing problem, and he knew what to do about it. Instinct led him to protect both his health and his comfort by seeking shelter against the elements.

The housing problem facing America today isn't so simple. Even if every family throughout the country were adequately protected against the elements by four walls and a roof (and we are far from even this partial solution), a problem of tremendous proportions would remain. For to be decent and adequate, modern housing must also protect its occupants against menaces that arise from our more civilized existence in communities—the dangers of contagion and accident.

By these simple standards, millions of the dwellings in which Americans live are shamefully indecent and inadequate. Though families living in unfit housing are well aware that unsafe and insanitary living conditions undermine their health and threaten their very existence, low incomes have made it virtually impossible for them to improve their housing lot.

THE BAD CONDITIONS

Protection against contagion, as well as decent occupancy standards, would call for adequate space and privacy for all members of a household. Yet in 1935–36 the United States Public Health Service, after investigating the housing in 83 representative cities, estimated that some 3,000,000 urban families in the United States live in homes with more than one person per room. A million urban homes have more than one and one-half times as many persons as there are rooms. And in 700,000 urban homes there are at least twice as many persons as there are rooms.

Though running water for drinking and bathing and sanitary sewage disposal are among the first essentials of sanitary living, it is estimated that some 3,457,000 urban homes in this country have no private bathing facilities. Around 2,536,000 lack private indoor flush toilets. These figures are based on a Nation-wide survey conducted (1934–37) by the United States Department of Commerce and the Works Progress Administration. It should be noted that this investigation did not include the housing in rural areas where pure water supplies and toilet facilities of any sort are frequently lacking.

One of the most obvious ways in which housing and health are related is in downright dilapidation. Ramshackle dwellings increase the possibility of accidents through faulty steps and flooring, falling ceilings, and occasionally even the outright collapse of slum shacks and tenements.

Congested, run-down slum areas are also responsible for an alarming number of disastrous fires and for needless injuries and deaths from this cause.

THE EVIL RESULTS

In practically every community for which statistics are available, the areas of high disease and death rates are found to be almost identical with the areas of bad housing. More people get sick in the slums. They stay sick longer. And they die in greater numbers.

This does not mean that bad housing itself is solely responsible for such conditions. A variety of factors complicate the picture, factors so interrelated that it is practically impossible to determine statistically just how much of the excess sickness and death is directly attributable to bad housing and how much to the other conditions.

Poverty is one of the most important factors. Malnutrition and lowered resistance to disease are frequently found in its wake. Low incomes may mean inadequate medical care during illness or even no medical attention at all.

Another point to be remembered is that people are poor because they are sick, as well as sick because they are poor. Thus, there is often the tendency for families already burdened with sickness to drift into areas of cheaper and less adequate housing.

Ignorance of what to do to protect health is also a major factor. Racial susceptibilities vary, and carelessness and inherent physical weakness play their parts.

But even when the various complicating factors are taken into account, if housing and health are considered in their broader aspects, the relation between the two is self-evident.

The health of the slum dweller is menaced from the day he is born. A survey made by the United States Children's Bureau covering some 23,000 births in 8 cities indicates the effect of overcrowding—a prime characteristic of slums—upon a baby's chance of survival. The cities surveyed were Baltimore, Md.; Akron, Ohio; Waterbury, Conn.; New Bedford, Mass.; Saginaw, Mich.; Johnstown, Pa.; Brockton, Mass.; and Manchester, N. H.

In homes averaging less than one person per room, the infant-mortality rate was found to be 52 per 1,000 births. Where the average was between one and two persons per room, the rate was 94.9 per 1,000 births. In homes averaging two or more persons per room, the rate was 135.7 per 1,000 births, or more than two and one-half times as high as in favorable surroundings. In interpreting these results, it was recognized that low incomes and low racial immunity to certain diseases, as well as overcrowding, influence the number of deaths. But even after allowances were made for these two factors, it was found that the infant-mortality rate in congested dwellings was still much higher than in homes with sufficient space.

Other investigations have sought to answer the question: "If children live past babyhood in slums, how safe are they then from sickness and death?" One study of this kind was made in Cincinnati (1929–31), by census tracts, by the Public Health Federation. Four groups of homes ranging from slums (group I) to the best residential neighborhoods (group IV) were investigated. Each of the four groups had approximately the same population. The average annual mortality for four of the common communicable diseases of children—measles, whooping cough, diphtheria, and scarlet fever—for each of these areas was as follows:

Group I: 127 per 100,000 population.
Group II: 63 per 100,000 population.
Group III: 40 per 100,000 population.
Group IV: 29 per 100,000 population.

Although such figures as these reflect not merely the quality of the housing but the economic and social status in general, medical authorities attribute part of the excess death rate from communicable children's diseases in overcrowded areas to the fact that slum children are frequently exposed to and get such diseases when they are extremely young. Records show that these diseases are more often fatal when contracted at very early ages. Yet because of the inadequacy of the home itself, many a slum mother finds it next to impossible to isolate her children—even at times when an epidemic is known to be raging—until they are older and their chances of withstanding such diseases have increased.

Rickets is another disease that is excessively prevalent among children of the slums. Proper diet is, of course, of the utmost importance in preventing this disease. Thus one reason for the excess occurrence of rickets in areas of poor housing is undoubtedly the fact that low incomes frequently make it impossible for slum children to get sufficient milk, butter, eggs, fats, and other foods that are a source of vitamin D, which both prevents and cures the disease.

Studies made in recent years, however, indicate that vitamin D can be supplied not only through the diet, but also as a result of the action of the ultraviolet light in sunshine upon the skin. Adequate sunshine thus becomes of primary importance in preventing and curing rickets. Children who live in the slums often fail to get enough sunshine not only because of deficiencies in the houses themselves, but also—and even more significant—because most slum neighborhoods lack areas where children can play safely outdoors in the sunshine.

Other diseases are unduly prevalent in the slums, whatever the complex of interrelated causes. Respiratory diseases communicated by spray in coughing and sneezing, and in general all diseases that result from contact infection, find more victims and take a heavier toll where there is neighborhood, room, and bed congestion; and these conditions are characteristic of slum housing.

Of 1,077 cases of tuberculosis over a recent 5-year period in Hartford, Conn., for example, more than half were in an overcrowded slum district occupying less than a tenth of the city area.

In one slum area chosen for clearance in Detroit, there were over six times as many deaths from tuberculosis, per 100,000 population, during 1930–32, as in the city as a whole.

In Cleveland, 12.5 percent of all the deaths from tuberculosis over the period 1928–31 occurred in a slum area that occupied only 0.73 percent of the area of the city and contained only 2.5 percent of the city's population.

Statistics show that these cities do not differ greatly from others in the matter. Though such complicating factors as poverty, low racial immunity, and unhygienic habits are not to be underestimated, medical science has an explanation as to why bad housing may contribute to ill health of this sort. Unlike most of the other communicable diseases, tuberculosis may develop months or even years after effective exposure to the disease. There is evidence that the more often and intimate the contact, the greater the risk of infection. Since homes afford the best opportunity for intimate contact over long periods of time, tuberculosis is primarily a family disease. In overcrowded, poorly ventilated homes, the intimacy of this contact tends to be increased.

When a person with an advanced case of tuberculosis lives in such a home, the danger of infecting others in the household is increased many times. The tubercle bacillus in sputum is destroyed by direct sunlight in about 15 minutes; in a dark, ill-ventilated room it may live for months. It is no wonder, then, that tuberculosis is a serious threat to slum dwellers, particularly to those who inhabit the thousands of windowless rooms in America and the even greater number with windows opening onto mere shafts or courts.

In Detroit it was found that pneumonia kills three and one-half times as many people in certain slum areas as in the most desirable residential sections. In addition to overcrowding, which may help the disease reach epidemic proportions, dampness and lack of heat in the home are among the conditions believed to be associated with pneumonia. But here again the housing factor is but a link in the causal chain.

Mortality rates for pneumonia and two other diseases were determined for different geographical zones in Detroit, in which the average number of persons per room was available from a special census, with the following results:

Average number of persons per room	Death rates per 100,000 population			Deaths from all causes (per 1,000)
	Tuberculosis	Pneumonia	Diphtheria	
0.9 or more	132	113	22	10.9
.8	79	87	17	9.5
.7 or less	52	77	18	9.5

In Cincinnati there is a slum district known as the Basin, which contains about 28 percent of the population of the city and covers only 6 percent of the city's area. During the period 1929–31, deaths from pneumonia among the white population in the Basin amounted to 160.5 per 100,00, while the white rate for the rest of the city was 50.3. The Negro death rate from pneumonia for Cincinnati as a whole was considerably higher than the white, but here again the rate for the Basin, 293.5 per 100,000 population, was much greater than the rate of 168.6 for the rest of the city.

Deaths among the white population from all causes amounted to 16.23 per 1,000 population in the Basin, as compared with a rate of 10.75 for the rest of Cincinnati. The Negro death rate from all causes was 23.45 per 1,000 in the Basin, while that for the rest of the city was 16.83.

Studies similar to those already referred to, but frequently less comprehensive, have been made in city after city, including Boston, Philadelphia, Richmond, Atlanta, Tampa, Birmingham, New Orleans, Memphis, Louisville, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, Milwaukee, and St. Paul. The general conclusions have invariably been the same.

SLUMS COST MONEY

Ill-health is costly to individuals in any walk of life in terms of human suffering, and in dollars and cents. But when sickness or death strikes slum families, they are least able to pay the doctor and lose productive workdays and breadwinners.

Millions of dollars are drained from local treasuries annually to foot the slum-swollen public health bill—particularly to meet the excess demand for free medical attention and hospital services attributable to slum areas.

Here is what a Cleveland study showed:

Area	Cost per capita for public-health work	Cost per capita for tuberculosis care	Cost per capita for fire protection
In one large slum area	$2.02	$3.04	$18.27
In the rest of the city	.64	1.21	3.12

Such figures as these, not in Cleveland alone, but for dozens of cities, lead to the conclusion that the excess sickness and death in slum areas are not only morally and socially unjustifiable; they are also economically unsound. Getting rid of bad housing will not, of course, eliminate the need for free hospitalization and medical serv-

ices, but by helping to reduce to a minimum the necessity for such curative expenditures it can free money for the greater extension of preventive measures.

THE SOLUTION

Until recently local governments were unable to do much about wiping out such frightful conditions as these. Shrinking budgets and constitutional debt limits had their hands tied. Thus, while the victims of preventable diseases that flourish in slums went to their graves needlessly and by the thousands, the localities stood by, powerless to undertake a constructive solution to the problem which they all recognized.

But in 1937, armed with an array of startling statistics about the intimate relation between the state of the Nation's housing and the state of its health, communities from the Atlantic to the Pacific petitioned Congress for Federal aid to local slum-clearance and rehousing programs.

The facts they presented got results. With the creation of the United States Housing Authority, loans, annual contributions toward low rents, and technical guidance were made available to localities anxious to wipe out disease-ridden slums and build sanitary low-rent dwellings.

Today hundreds of local housing authorities in all parts of the country are planning, building, or actually managing such projects with U. S. H. A. assistance. Thousands of low-income families from the slums have already moved into healthful new homes that have been built to rent for no more—and sometimes for even less—than they formerly paid for substandard quarters. And thousands will soon follow them from miserable, congested lodgings into projects that mean a healthier, more hopeful way of life.

The new dwellings are designed, built, and maintained with an eye to minimizing the possibility of fires, falls, and other accidents that cause an untold number of injuries and deaths every year. The buildings are well-spaced, fire-resistant or fireproof materials are used, and safe and adequate exits are provided for use in case of fire.

Recreation areas, wading pools, and other play facilities in the new projects are enabling underprivileged children from the slums to develop sturdy young bodies through wholesome activities in sunshine and fresh air, far from the dark, cheerless alleys and the traffic hazards of the slums. Open areas and social rooms set aside for recreational and educational activities on the part of adults are helping to make it possible for them to become better, more energetic, more productive citizens.

Good housing is as essential to a family's well-being as adequate food and clothing. A decent, healthful home for every American family is no less essential to the Nation's health and happiness and to our effectiveness as a democracy.

Cost of Homestead Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HARTLEY W. BARCLAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article in the May issue of the Mill and Factory, with respect to the extravagance incident to the Federal construction operation of the homestead projects.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Mill and Factory for May 1940]

DEAD END IN UTOPIA—DISMAL COLLECTIVISTS FINALLY ABANDON FARM-FACTORY THEORIES AT HIGHTSTOWN, N. J., AFTER $4,000,000 EXPENSIVE LESSON IN INDUSTRIAL MISMANAGEMENT

(By Hartley W. Barclay)

The red sands of New Jersey embraced a little red schoolhouse of collectivism at Jersey Homesteads, when collective theorists founded the great industrial experiment in communal life, known as the Hightstown Project, in 1933. Conceived by Rexford G. Tugwell, matured directly from the White House in Washington, and sponsored by no less than the distinguished Dr. Albert Einstein and Jonah Wise, among others, this amazing venture into sovietized farmer-laborism has for many years provided an oasis of Marxist experimentation in the "deserts of New Jersey capitalism."

What more millions of Government cash were spent than the four millions recorded here are uncounted and known only to the tightmouthed directors of the project. They refuse to make public such matters of public interest as the almost unbelievable pyramiding of governmental gifts, upon grants, upon subsidies, upon mortgages, upon special allowances, upon relief payments and alleged diversions of funds. The most that is known about the project is available through picayunish details reluctantly provided to United States Senators and Congressmen who have demanded that the full facts be revealed about the operations of this closed shop, closed town. At last, however, a summary of the conclusions drawn from continued study of the project reveals that:

1. The project was a complete failure. Utopian objectives have vanished.

2. Government and labor combined, and luxuriously subsidized, could not replace the essential characteristics of management found in private industrial management and lacking here.

3. Private capitalism has been called in to resuscitate the deceased enterprise of the community.

4. Shiftlessness and laziness thrived and prospered.

5. American taxpayers are footing the bill.

You might even get somewhat critical of the practices in Utopia if you heard newspaper reporters ask the Federal Administrator whether any financial statement had been published on the operations of these interlocked corporations and they were told: "No statements have been published and none will be published if we can prevent it."

Then you might look over the utopian houses that cost over $20,000 each to build, according to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, although almost any private contractor would swear under oath that they could be readily built by private builders for $2,900 each. You would wonder at the terms under which the Utopianists purchased the buildings—at one-fifth their cost or less—for no money down, 3 percent interest and 40 years to pay, with no foreclosure in event of default on payments. For good will, loans are said to have been made to the colonists to even buy furniture.

Then, no matter whether you approved of the worthy objectives of part of the New Deal, and no matter whether or not you had ever been an enthusiastic helper in aiding Federal Housing or industrial preparedness you would say to yourself: "It's pretty tough for F. D. R. The boys have taken him for a ride again—and what a ride. This thing smells even worse than the N. L. R. B. It's too bad that liberalism has to hang itself so crudely when there are easier ways of committing suicide."

But the administration does not take adversity without clearing up the appearances of failure. And so on October 30, 1939, 80 percent of the equipment in the plant was sold by one branch of the Goverment to another branch, to whitewash the books.

OBJECTIVES OF UTOPIANISM

After reflecting upon the mess in which Utopia finds itself, you would go back down the road 4 miles north to Hightstown proper and talk to the local citizens. You would find them pretty sore about the whole thing. They would tell you that the experiment ruined local industry, that it ruined farm values in the region, that even the local school system was spoiled by the examples of waste and extravagance found at Jersey homesteads and that local fruit packing and truck gardening had dropped to the lowest ebb in some time. You would be told that dealers who sold cement to the project went to jail for flagrant grafting.

You would hear a lot of personal opinions about America's first lady of the land who sponsored the resettlement project plan and about her failure to keep the experiment on an even keel. You would hear unprintable remarks about some ex-new dealers formerly close to the throne. You would hear that local shops and enterprise had been stifled by the spreading of collectivist notions through the Jersey cooperatives sponsored by the Jersey homesteads citizens who boycotted local merchants to try new theories of production and distribution.

INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS

Just as a matter of recapitulation, it is interesting to itemize a few of the many interlocking corporations with interlocking directorates which do not publicly file reports disclosing the sources of their funds or their operating statements, despite the fact that their funds were obtained largely from Federal sources. The list is incomplete and is merely representative of some of the superficial data gleaned from local villagers who have been barred from participation in the Federal largess.

Borough of Jersey Homesteads Corporation.
Consumers Wholesale Clothiers, Inc.
The Jersey Homesteads Agricultural Cooperative Corporation.
Worker's Aim Cooperative Association, Inc.
The Industrial Distributing Association.
Tripod Millinery Guild.
Jersey Homesteads Industrial Cooperation Association.
Jersey Homesteads Resettlement Administration.
The Jersey Homesteads Consumers Cooperative Association.
The Jersey Homesteads Consumers Services.

While this is only a partial list of the manifold organizations set up at Jersey Homesteads, it shows how thoroughly the settlers took to heart the encouragement of the Federal spokesmen in the early days of the venture when Washington sent up expert cooperative consultants to hold lectures in the factory week after week and to drill into the heads of the cooperators the necessity for organizing a wide variety of cooperative corporations.

Whether by accident or design, the result of this complicated set-up is to make it impossible to break down the distribution of their income from Federal sources.

The factory is owned by the Farm Security Administration. It has been leased on a 5-year lease to Kartiganer & Co., New York, at $1,800 per year, the company to take possession June 1. The Government includes in the lease the sewing and pressing machines which were repurchased at the auction last fall; therefore the company will face only a small capital cost in setting up operations in the plant. This proposal was the one selected by Mayor Philip Goldstein as the one most suitable to the colonists. This arrangement makes it possible for the manufacturer and the union and the colonists to keep other manufacturers from leasing the plant on better terms.

FACTS ABOUT THE FAILURE

The most outstanding fact about this failure of farmer-labor cooperation is that every family could have been given a $5,000 farm and $15,000 operating capital as a gift if the funds had not been dissipated on the experiment.

The land was purchased at a cost of $66.89 per acre, despite other properties selling in central Jersey for less. Foreclosed properties owned by Federal land banks were apparently not considered as suitable for the project. The general administrative expense from inception of the project to 1937 was half a million dollars, or approximately $2,500 per family, despite the expenditure of $167,347 by agencies prior to the Resettlement Administration. The big expense, however, which amounted to almost $4,500 per family was the high cost of planning. Deducting the expense of land acquisition, namely $84,538, the planning cost $863,000 up to 1937 alone. No details are given as to who planned what, or how the money was spent. In other projects of equal size planned by private industry the cost of planning seldom exceeds 5 percent. Since in this case the cost of planning, exclusive of administrative costs, was 900 percent of normal planning costs, the question arises of: "Who got the money?" Since administrative expenses were ample for all administrative operations, a great mystery is involved in where this money went. Naturally, the resettlers do not wish to publish their statements of accounts.

However, that is not half of the sorry tale of extravagance, waste, mismanagement, boondoggling, and favoritism. There remains an item of $2,335,383 for land improvement and construction. Deducting the cost of the factory which has been variously reported to have cost between $100,000 and $125,000 and which is the only really useful piece of property capable of industrial uitlization, the remaining balance of the expenditure of $2,210,000 presents another intriguing mystery. The cost of the factory averaged $5 per square foot. Similar factories built by private concerns to meet similar specifications cost $2 per square foot. If the main street of the borough had been paved exclusively with silver coins, there would be something at least to show for the expenditure. However, no detailed reports concerning these expenditures have been obtained beyond those published herewith for the first time. Up to June 10, 1937, on the surface it looks as though more than $11,075 per family had been spent in land improvement. This amount, if expended for direct relief per family at the rate of $1,000 per year per family would have provided direct relief for every family on the project from 1933 to 1944. As the case turned out, the money was spent as indicated, so W. P. A. had to come along with relief money to take up where the Resettlement Administration left off when their funds ran out.

Prefabricated wall material was to be turned out in still another housing factory erected at Jersey Homesteads, but after $300,000 had been sunk in the proposal the question of patent rights held by Simon Lake blocked further work, according to a reliable report.

In consideration of these elements of failure, it should be remembered that these cannot and should not be charged to the administration of W. W. Alexander, who as Farm Security Administrator, is now in charge of the properties. He deserves only high commendation for attempting to salvage some useful elements out of the wreckage left when the Utopian planners had finished.

But this story is not one intended to criticize the lease, to object to unions determining the disposal of Government property, or to drag in the names of high politicians who have been influential in working out deals for political purposes. It is only a simple recital of hard facts—uncolored by personal prejudices; uninfluenced by personal bias. There is a real lesson in this example of the failure of utopianism. It is such a simple and honest lesson that the meaning of the alleged graft, favoritism, and political machination involved is dwarfed by comparison. The story is an exposition of the fact that all of these forces—all the political pull, all the waste of taxpayers' money—cannot defeat the strength of private enterprise as a way of life here in America. There is more to the story which will never be told, perhaps. There is the part of the story which would reveal how the press has been excluded from access to the facts in the case. There is the part of the story of how the honest new dealers blush with shame at the perversion of true democratic ideals in this example. There is the part of the story in which the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration determined to stand up and take the consequences.

But the important point is that those who worked under cover to sell Marxism to government failed in their purpose eventually. They were defeated by themselves. And in this point there is a most important lesson to America. Private industry may not have all the answers to social problems. But it has the major answer—that no substitute way has been found; no synthetic daydream can substitute for hard work.

And so we come to the end of the story, and it is not a bad story. It is a real story—a true story—of Americans at work. It was a good thing to try the Hightstown experiment; it was good for Mrs. Roosevelt to sponsor resettlement. The spokesman for the project, who called it "the American way," was right. It is the American way. We must make our mistakes and pay for them. But what a small price compared to Europe with Stalin, Hitler, and war.

It is good for us to find out that there is no substitute for hard work, no "stand-in" for successful management. Here in a free country all theories have their chance. The millions were not wasted. They have only met dead end in Utopia.

Report on allotments, expenditures, and encumbrances, projects of Resettlement Administration as of June 10, 1937

JERSEY HOMESTEADS

	Allotments	Expenditures	Unliquidated encumbrances	Total expenditures and unliquidated encumbrances
Administrative planning and land acquisition	$947,034.01	$916,545.19	$28,840.44	$945,385.63
Management	24,039.84	19,686.99	3,092.89	22,779.88
Land improvement and construction	2,335,383.21	2,064,378.98	184,559.99	2,248,938.97
Inspection	27,270.00	17,190.62	1,608.22	18,798.84
Land cost	[1] 238.76		238.76	238.76
Household furnishings	3,200.00	1,818.79	196.57	2,015.36
Payment in lieu of taxes	5,686.00	3,937.20	1,025.30	4,962.50
Total	3,342,851.82	3,023,557.77	219,562.17	3,243,119.94
Estimated general administrative expense	522,414.20			535,212.08
Expenditures, prior agencies	[1] 167,347.63	165,716.26	1,631.37	167,347.63
Grand total	4,032,613.65			3,945,679.65
Number of housing units to be constructed	200			
Average cost per unit	$20,163.00			$19,728.00
Acreage of land acquired	1,278.74			
Cost of land acquired	$84,538.76			
Average cost per acre	$66.89			

[1] The table is as follows:

Land purchases were made as follows:	*Allotments*
Subsistence homesteads (1,274.98 acres)	$84,300.00
Resettlement Administration (3.76 acres)	238.76
Total (1,278.74 acres)	84,538.76

Senator Wheeler's Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the outstanding record in behalf of working men and women made during the 17 years the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, has served in the Senate. The plain, undramatic business of casting a vote day after day tells a dramatic story of unfaltering liberalism. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and Senator WHEELER's votes on matters of interest to labor trace the growth during two decades of the principles for which labor has fought. It is, I submit, a record of which any man might be proud and which few men in public life can duplicate. Because it is a unique story that those who are interested in labor will want to read I ask consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING RECORD OF SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER ON LABOR ISSUES

Sixty-eighth Congress, first session: On final passage of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) providing for an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to regulate or prohibit child labor, Senator WHEELER was paired (jointly with Senator Dill) against Senator Underwood for passage. On seven amendments designed to exempt certain types of employment from the resolution Senator WHEELER was similarly paired against their adoption.

Sixty-eighth Congress, second session: On an amendment to an appropriation bill to strike out the funds for operation of the Railway Labor Board Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

NOTE.—The Railway Labor Board, as a result of certain decisions and actions, had earned the opposition of railway labor groups, and the move to eliminate the Board was backed by all of the Senate liberals.

Sixty-ninth Congress, first session: On a resolution (S. Res. 134) requesting the President to invite committees representing the operators and miners in an effort to settle a strike in the coal industry, Senator WHEELER was not present for the vote (absent while engaged in an investigation), but was announced by a colleague as voting "yea" if present and able to vote.

On final passage of a bill (H. R. 9463) providing for the prompt disposition of disputes between railroad carriers and their employees, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Sixty-ninth Congress, second session: On a motion to dismiss impeachment proceedings against former Federal Judge George W. English, which was agreed to 70 to 9, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On the bill (H. R. 16866) which would provide loans to ex-service men on their adjusted-service certificates, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventieth Congress, first session: On an amendment (to a resolution, S. Res. 105) providing for an investigation of conditions in the coal fields of several States which sought to impede the investigation by requiring a study of coal freight rates, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." (The amendment was rejected 60 to 15, but the resolution passed without record vote and Senator WHEELER subsequently was named a member of the investigating committee.)

Seventieth Congress, second session: On final passage of the bill providing for construction of the Boulder Canyon Dam, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to the Navy construction bill giving notice to the President that the Congress favored a treaty with the principal maritime nations regulating conduct of belligerents to be held prior to the Limitation of Arms Conference, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On another amendment which provided that in the event of an international limitation of naval armament, the President be authorized to suspend naval building, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On a resolution providing for a multilateral peace treaty, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to the Navy appropriation bill providing for withdrawal of United States Marines from Nicaragua, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill to bar from interstate commerce all prison-made goods, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Prior to passage Senator WHEELER voted "nay" on a motion which sought to pigeonhole the bill by referring it to committee.

Seventy-first Congress, first session: On adoption of the conference report on a bill providing reapportionment of Representatives under the forthcoming 1930 census, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." Prior to final approval there had been votes on numerous amendments. On the Sackett amendment to exclude aliens from the total count WHEELER voted "nay"; on the Blease amendment requiring registration of aliens WHEELER voted "nay"; on the Sackett amendment requiring census employees to be brought under the classified civil service WHEELER voted "yea."

On the resolution (S. Res. 19) providing for consideration of all nominations in open, public sessions of the Senate, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On the Borah amendment which would have required that roll calls and a statement of the question considered in executive sessions be published in the RECORD (which was rejected) Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Tariff: During consideration of a tariff bill in this session votes were had on some 40 separate amendments. Some of these amendments affected labor directly or indirectly. Senator WHEELER'S vote on these follows:

On an amendment authorizing a general election in the Philippines for a constitutional convention to provide for Philippine independence Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment permitting importation of literary material Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment requiring the Tariff Commission to furnish Members of Congress information on the cost of production of imported articles Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to create the office of Consumers' Counsel of the Tariff Commission Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment modifying flexible tariff provisions to give Congress power over tariff rates Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to fix a duty on manganese Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-first Congress, second session: On the Norris resolution to deny William S. Vare, of Pennsylvania, a seat in the United States Senate, Senator WHEELER voted "Yea."

On the Reed resolution denying William B. Wilson a seat in the United States Senate, Senator WHEELER voted "Nay."

On passage of a resolution (H. J. Res. 133) reducing the income tax, Senator WHEELER voted "Nay." On an amendment to the above resolution to appropriate $160,000,000 for post roads and buildings (which was rejected), Senator WHEELER voted "Yea."

On the confirmation of Charles E. Hughes to Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On the confirmation of John J. Parker to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On a bill to establish a national employment system, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On a resolution (S. J. Res. 161) suspending authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations or unifications of railway properties, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On passage over Presidential veto of a bill granting pensions to Spanish War veterans, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill providing for service-connected disability for World War veterans, Senator WHEELER voted "Yea."

Seventy-second Congress, first session: On final passage of the bill (Norris-La Guardia Act) barring injunctions in labor disputes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On five amendments preceding final passage, each of which sought modifications of the anti-injunction provision, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On a bill (S. 3045) which would provide Federal aid to States for unemployment relief and road construction (which was rejected by the Senate), Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On an amendment which would provide loans instead of gifts of money to States, Senator WHEELER voted "yea"; on an amendment expanding the Public Works appropriation, Senator WHEELER voted "yea"; on an amendment requiring Governors of States to certify the need for Federal funds before receiving them, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

The legislative appropriation bill (H. R. 11267) was a sharply controversial issue because of a program to reduce Government expenses. On an amendment to reduce Federal salaries by 10 percent, but exempting salaries below $2,500 from the reduction, Senator WHEELER voted "yea"; on an amendment to set up a graduated scale of reductions for all salaries beginning at $1,200, Senator WHEELER voted "nay"; on an amendment providing that no salary shall be reduced to less than $1,000, Senator WHEELER voted "yea"; on a committee amendment reducing all Federal salaries by 10 percent (which was agreed to), Senator WHEELER voted "nay"; on a motion to strike out the title relating to reduction in veterans' benefits, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." There was no record vote on final passage of the bill.

On the resolution (H. J. Res. 230) to authorize the Government to subscribe to R. F. C. capital stock there was no final record vote, but a number of amendments were voted. Included were three providing that no business which borrows R. F. C. funds may pay an officer an annual salary of more than $100,000, $75,000, or $50,000, all of which were rejected, but on all of which Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to an agriculture appropriation bill which sought to eliminate a prohibition against use of Federal funds to employ convict labor, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On a resolution (S. J. Res. 131) to provide rehabilitation of certain storm-stricken areas and relieve unemployment, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On a bill (S. 4860) providing for loans to States for relief of unemployment, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." Prior to final action record votes were had on 81 separate amendments relating to various duties imposed by the tariff act. Some of these amendments affected labor directly. On amendments to fix duty on boots and shoes for a countervailing duty on coal, to fix duties on felt and straw hats, to fix duty on matches, to fix duty on rayon, to fix duty on silver, to fix duty on white lead, to fix duty on varnishes, to fix duty on children's toys, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-second Congress, second session. On final passage of the bill (H. R. 7233) over Presidential veto granting independence to the Philippines, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to a deficiency bill prohibiting tax refunds unless they are approved by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill providing a 5-percent reduction in all appropriations for executive departments, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." On another amendment to the same bill forbidding wage cuts, or other reduced compensation or furloughs, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On adoption of the conference report of this bill (which was rejected, largely because of a mandatory 8½-percent reduction in Federal salaries), Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On a committee amendment to the unemployment relief bill (S. 5125) authorizing $500,000,000 R. F. C. grant to States to aid direct relief under administration of a Federal emergency relief board, Senator WHEELER was announced as voting "yea" if present.

On an amendment to a railroad bankruptcy act providing that claims for personal injuries to employees shall be preferred claims, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the general revenue bill, increasing income and other taxes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Prior to final passage there were record votes on a number of important amendments. On the amendments to revise upward normal and surtax-income rates, to reinstate the 1918 income-tax rates, to sharply increase the income-tax rate on incomes above $10,000, to provide a 4 cent a pound duty on copper, to reduce the duty on crude petroleum, to provide an excise tax of 1 cent a pound on manganese, to eliminate the tax on checks below $5, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-third Congress, first session: On final passage of the bill (S. 158) providing for a 5-hour day and a 5-day workweek, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On the Robinson amendment providing for a 36-hour workweek, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On the impeachment of Judge Louderback charged with improper and nonjudicial conduct, Senator WHEELER voted "guilty."

On an amendment to an appropriations bill to grant the President power to modify or cancel air-mail or ocean-mail contracts, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of the bill setting up the Tennessee Valley Authority, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On a committee amendment to section 7 (a) of the N. R. A. bill, which sought insertion of a proviso forbidding a change in existing employer-employee relations (regarded as a move to write into law the "yellow dog" contract), Senator WHEELER voted "nay." (NOTE.—This amendment was defeated largely as a result of a fight led by Senators WHEELER and NORRIS.)

On adoption of the conference report on the National Industrial Recovery bill (H. R. 5755), Senator WHEELER voted "nay." On an amendment to this bill, proposing a manufacturers' sales tax, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage and adoption of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3341) providing revenue by taxation of beer (repeal of the Volstead Act), Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-third Congress, second session: On adoption of a partial conference report on the bill (H. R. 7527) making appropriations for civil works, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." On the Borah motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On the amendment providing $2,500,000,000 for civil works, instead of $950,000,000, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." When this was rejected, WHEELER voted "yea" on another amendment to provide $1,500,000,000, instead of $950,000,000, which was also rejected by the Senate.

On consideration of the conference report on a deficiency appropriation bill, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." Prior to that action WHEELER had voted "yea" on an amendment providing $4,000,000,000 for public-works projects which was rejected by the Senate.

On the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment for the popular election of President and Vice President, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." (The resolution was rejected.)

On final passage of the bill to encourage housing and set up a system of mutual-mortgage insurance for construction of homes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On passage, over Presidential veto, of the appropriations bill which restored the so-called economy reductions in salaries of Federal employees and the veterans' cuts, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment (to a resolution modifying certain labor provisions in the N. I. R. A. Act), providing that nothing in the resolution shall prevent or impede or diminish the right to strike, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill (S. 3231), providing a retirement system for railroad employees and providing unemployment relief, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion that the Senate consider the bill (S. 3266) to provide for the prompt disposition of railway labor disputes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." (This was the test vote on this measure; there was no record vote on passage.)

On final passage of the Securities Control Act Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session: On final passage of the bill authorizing payment of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Subsequently, on the vote to pass the bill over the President's veto, WHEELER voted "yea." (Motion to override the veto failed.)

On final passage of the Bituminous Coal Mining Act Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion that the Senate consider the 5-day week bill (S. 87), Senator WHEELER voted "yea." (This was a test vote and the Senate rejected consideration of the legislation.)

On two amendments to the Government contracts bill, setting conditions for wages and hours of labor on material bought by the Government, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." (The amendments were designed to weaken the bill; there was no record vote on final passage.)

On final passage of the Wagner labor relations bill (S. 1958), Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On concurrence in House amendments to the so-called neutrality bill (S. J. Res. 173) prohibiting exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the Public Utility Holding Co. Act (Wheeler-Rayburn bill), Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On two amendments designed to eliminate the so-called death sentence, WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of the bill (H. R. 8651), providing for a retirement system for railroad employees, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the Revenue Act of 1935 Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Prior to passage WHEELER voted "yea" on the amendments requiring full publicity of income-tax returns, increasing surtaxes in the upper brackets, and barring issuance of tax-exempt securities

On final passage of the bill (H. R. 7260) providing for old-age assistance and unemployment compensation (Social Security Act), Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On amendments designed to strike out the old-age pensions section and to exempt certain employers who have annuity plans, WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of the bill (S. 2357) providing for operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage and adoption of the conference report on the so-called works-relief bill (H. J. Res. 117), appropriating $4,800,000,000 for general relief purposes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." WHEELER voted "yea" on the amendment providing for payment of the prevailing wage; on the amendment barring use of any of the funds for construction of battleships or munitions of war; on the amendment that not less than $500,000,000 shall be used for construction and improvement of schools; on the amendment proposing repeal of that part of the N. R. A. which suspends operation of the antitrust laws. WHEELER voted "nay" on the amendment to make the appropriation $9,000,000,000 instead of $4,000,000,000, and on the amendment proposing liquidation of all Federal corporations and agencies created for the emergency period.

Seventy-fourth Congress, second session: On final passage of the bill providing for payment of the adjusted-service certificates (bonus) over the President's veto, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion that the Senate consider the bituminous coal bill (test vote because there was no final record vote on final passage), Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of a deficiency appropriation bill, which carried $1,425,000,000 for relief purposes, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the low-cost housing bill (S. 4424) to provide aid in elimination of slum conditions and aid employment, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the seven articles holding Judge Halstead Ritter to be guilty of improper practices, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage and adoption of the conference report on Revenue Act of 1936, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session: On final passage of the bill to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Senator WHEELER voted "nay" on an amendment which would have limited the life of the C. C. C. to 2 years.

On final passage of the Bituminous Coal Act (second coal bill), Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the fair labor standards bill (Wage and Hour Act) Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On the amendments which would have limited the law to employers of 10 or more, which would have exempted certain seasonal employees from the law, which would have embargoed certain foreign shipments, and which would have provided a substitute measure, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." On the amendments which provide for exemption of certain dairy employees from the maximum-hours provision, which exempt certain employees engaged in perishable agricultural commodities work and which would eliminate child labor entirely, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion to recommit the bill limiting the length of freight trains (a test vote because no final record vote on passage was had), Senator WHEELER voted "nay." (Had the motion to recommit carried, the bill would have been killed.)

On two amendments to a relief appropriation resolution (H. J. Res. 361), which would have required the local community to supply 40 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of the cost of a project, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." (There was no final record vote on passage of the appropriation resolution itself.)

On the resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) calling upon the Senate to condemn sit-down strikes as illegal and contrary to sound public policy, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion to recommit the bill (S. 1392) which provided for reorganization of the Supreme Court, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill (H. R. 2518) providing for voluntary retirement of Supreme Court Justices Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to an appropriation bill providing for construction of a dam and investigation for sites for others in the Tennessee Valley project, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the bill (H. J. Res. 96) extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on an amendment which would have required trade agreements to be submitted to Congress for rejection within 30 days before becoming effective.

On an amendment to a War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 6992) providing that no funds therein provided shall be used for the support of any compulsory military-training course in any civil school or college, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

Seventy-fifth Congress, second and third sessions: On the amendment to the second deficiency appropriation bill increasing funds for the Public Health Service from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the motion for Senate consideration of the Hatch clean-politics bill, S. 847, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." (This was a test vote because no final record vote was taken.) On an amendment before passage barring any officer or employee of the Government from being a delegate to a political convention, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the conference report on the flood-control bill (H. R. 10618) authorizing construction of certain public works, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill extending the Low Cost Housing Act, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On an amendment providing for

prevailing rates of wages for all housing construction, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to the naval appropriations bill, H. R. 8993, which would have provided that in all instances where possible ships be built in Government navy yards, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On adoption of the conference report on the bill which would extend the classified civil service to first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On the amendments providing for use of part of the sums for public works for flood control, that no part of the funds shall be used for any political purpose, that monthly payments under work relief shall not be less than $40, that $50,000,000 of the sum shall be devoted to the Federal Surplus Commodities activities, that no person in the Government paid by these funds shall take part in political activity, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On amendments limiting the amount of relief funds and the period for which they shall be available that the funds for the National Resources Committee be tripled, that no funds from this appropriation be used for construction of power utilities, that all provisions for construction of public works be stricken from the bill, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of the bill (S. 3331) providing for reorganization of Government departments, Senator WHEELER voted "nay." Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on the amendments which would exempt from the effect of the bill the Biological Survey, the Civil Service, the Forest Service, the General Accounting Office, and also on the amendments which would require a 10-percent reduction in personnel expenditures, and requiring congressional approval of an Executive reorganization order.

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session: On final passage of the bill (S. 280) prohibiting block booking and blind selling in motion pictures, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the resolution (S. Res. 126) providing for an investigation of violations of civil liberties, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On passage of the third deficiency bill, H. R. 7462, Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on the motion which sought suspension of the rules so that a prevailing-wage amendment might be offered, and "yea" on a motion which sought suspension of the rules for offering of an amendment for wage protection of work-projects employees.

On passage of the bill (S. 1100) to make appropriations for the Florida ship canal, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of a bill (H. R. 3791) authorizing further expenditures for national defense, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." On an amendment seeking to increase airplane authorizations from 5,500 to 6,000, Senator WHEELER voted "nay."

On final passage of the bill (S. 572) providing for the acquisition of various strategic materials necessary to national defense, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On the Regular Navy appropriations bill providing funds for operation of the Navy, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the bill (S. 2009) providing for regulation of all forms of transport, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On an amendment to the resolution providing funds for relief, House Joint Resolution 83, to increase the amount from $725,000,000 to $875,000,000, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." (There was no final record vote on the resolution.)

On final passage of the resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for relief and work relief, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on the amendments which provided that 25 percent of cost of all non-Federal projects shall be borne by the States, that $400,000,000 shall be devoted to non-Federal projects and $100,000,000 to Federal projects, that loans may be made under the Farm Tenant Act from funds provided by this bill, that the sum for rural rehabilitation be increased by $30,000,000. Senator WHEELER voted "nay" on the amendment which would have required that employment on W. P. A. projects be determined on the basis of relative need.

On final passage of the bill H. R. 6635, which increases benefits under the Social Security Act, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on the following amendments before final passage: On the amendment defining "employment"; on the amendment providing for increased authorizations for maternal and child health, vocational rehabilitation, and public health; on the amendment which would grant a Federal pension of $40 a month to all citizens over 60 years of age not gainfully employed; on the amendment requiring the Federal share for old-age assistance shall be not less than $10 per month.

On final passage of the bill providing for regulation of sale of securities and trust indentures in interstate commerce Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the truth-in-fabrics bill, requiring labeling to disclose substitutes in woven cloths, Senator WHEELER voted "yea."

On final passage of the so-called Works Financing Act (S. 2864), to finance a program of recoverable expenditures, Senator WHEELER voted "yea." Prior to passage, numerous amendments were considered. Senator WHEELER voted "yea" on the following: On the amendment granting funds to the Export-Import Bank for financing purchase of exportable commodities in this country; on the amendment requiring that the prevailing wage be paid on all projects; on the amendment reducing the amount for public roads from $2,390,000,000 to $1,890,000,000; on the amendment permitting R. F. C. to aid in financing the purchase of railroad equipment; on the amendment giving persons who have been in need of work for 3 months or more preference in employment.

On "Passing the Buck"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY C. C. ISELY, OF DODGE CITY, KANS.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by Mr. C. C. Isely, of Dodge City, Kans.:

ON "PASSING THE BUCK"

(By C. C. Isely)

Six or seven years ago, many men high in public place in America were saying, "We need a dictator."

Today, not only do we have jitters about dictatorships abroad, but we are trembling lest, in case of war, we ourselves should fall into the hands of such monsters as those who now parade our planet.

Mussolini may have been right when he asserted that democracies are an extravagance, and sneered about their blundering. Yet we dare not relinquish ours for any such reason.

Within the year it has been asserted repeatedly that only pacifism and isolation from the affairs of the world could preserve our freedom and liberty, our representative government. Recent events seem to point that isolation may be untenable.

It is no use now to lament the failure to make a program to liquidate the economic consequences of the World War, although this failure is largely responsible for the economic hurricane in which the world's ship of commerce foundered, and out of which the dictatorships emerged. It is up to us to try to establish some safeguard in our American scheme that in all times, and especially in times of war, would preserve us from such as Il Duce or Der Führer.

The Constitution was the product of the experiences of history. Its makers knew of the Athenian law to forestall dictatorships which granted command of their armies to generals for 1 day only, and that Aristides, on the eve of Marathon, moved to suspend that rule in favor of Miltiades. They were familiar with Dictator Cincinnatus, who, after a military victory for Rome, relinquished his command to return to his farm, but when problems multiplied, Rome had its Caesar, dictator for life. They remembered, too, how that John Hampden challenged the tyrannical usurpations of Charles I. They recalled that dictators waxed strong from the poisoned springs of demagogery. For such reasons they established our constitutional division of powers.

To preserve that balance, the Supreme Court has frequently ruled adversely concerning delegated authority granted to the Chief Executive or to agencies created by the Congress. These assignments of congressional prerogatives have been a concession to efficient government. It is precisely at this point, the necessity for efficiency, that Congress has often relinquished powers entrusted to it by the Constitution. However, the boards and commissions thus created by Congress, and appointed by the President, have sometimes functioned in a cumbersome manner endeavoring to represent both the Congress which created them and the Executive who selected them.

The procedure of parliamentary governments with ministerial responsibility, developed in the school of trial and error, holds a suggestion that might be grafted onto our fixed constitutional system and better preserve the concepts of the founders of our Republic. Our Cabinet, as now existing, is a creation to deal with executive matters. Its advice may or may not be heeded. Lately the President has set up an extra cabinet which has functioned through Messrs. Moley, Tugwell, Hopkins, Cohen, Corcoran, and others, and it probably is very useful to him.

Why not establish another cabinet, a representative-executive cabinet of nine members? There should be the President and two others appointed by him, three Senators and three Congressmen, chosen by each of the Houses. This cabinet should have power to review and to approve or to overrule Executive orders having to do with delegated powers, especially with the broad grants of power essential in times of war. At all times such an arrangement should make for better understanding between the two operating branches of our Government. Each representative group could report back

to their respective bodies either in public or executive session such matters as might be asked for or concerning which the cabinet required advice. A vote in either House could recall their committee. Since House and Senate leadership would sit in this new cabinet, and being assured that granted powers could not be abused without their knowledge, generally more authority would be accorded to the Executive or to the bodies created to carry out congressional directions.

A vote to recall representation would not stop the clock, as it might come from only one House, but it would be a warning. France, with an entirely parliamentary government, is an example of how inefficient parliaments can be. In distress, they grant decree powers to the executive. The German Republic did just that for Bruening and then, alas, for Hitler. We have been on the borderland of according decree powers to our President. Department rules now have the authority of law.

Gov. Henry J. Allen, in exasperation, once said, "Government is the science of passing the buck." Mussolini must have overheard that remark. Some years ago it was the custom for the House to pass a bill expecting that the Senate would kill it. Later both Houses joined in, hoping that the President would veto measures enacted at the behest of pressure groups, or, if extraordinary powers were granted him, that he would not use them. Finally the hope lay in the Supreme Court. Recently, that decorous body has given evidence of passing the buck right back to Congress, where the fathers lodged authority. Only as a spasm can we expect that the Houses will assert their authority, and that negatively. We will be again just where we are.

If a cabinet as proposed were established, it should alleviate jealousies which in the past, many times, have created an impasse between the two operating branches of our Government. The plan should be made flexible so that its utility could be developed by experience. For special problems pertinent committee chairmen from either House could be called to advise, or department heads charged with the specific responsibility could sit in council. The President might see fit to draw his appointees from the floor of the Houses. This would assure greater cooperation. Governmental procedure could thus be made more efficient, red tape be reduced, buck passing discounted, congressional responsibility increased, the "with advice and consent" clauses of the Constitution be made effective, and dangers from Executive aggrandizement minimized.

The Wagner Act is a typical law where Congress, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, delegated its authority. If a cabinet as set forth above had been set up, it is hardly conceivable that the real or alleged abuses of the National Labor Relations Board would have occurred without being called to account. To preserve representative government we must not only make executive departments effective, we must keep a check on delegated powers to prevent a possible seizure of all the prerogatives of state by an individual or by a group.

The Public's Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FT. WAYNE (IND.) JOURNAL-GAZETTE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Journal-Gazette (Democrat), of Ft. Wayne, Ind., of May 7, 1940:

[From the Ft. Wayne (Ind.), Journal-Gazette of May 7, 1940]

THE PUBLIC'S MONEY

Men, sane men, usually are careful about their own money. Put them in charge of other people's money, and see how careless they become.

Consider legislators. Upstanding citizens, elected to the general assembly or to Congress, pinch a pretty penny—as long as the pretty penny is their own.

But send them to the legislative halls, and almost without exception they spend the taxpayer's hard-earned dollar with seeming ease.

Why? Pressure groups are partly responsible. Schemers who have developed fly-by-night "save by spending" notions are partly responsible.

But, at root, the fault lies with the legislators themselves.

Too much of the time, they're so confoundedly interested in reelection that they forget the voters who elected them the first time.

Do you know how hard it is to earn a dollar?

Have you ever earned one?

If so, then you are in a good position to contrast the sweat you bled in order to accumulate a little money and the suddenly acquired largesse of the legislative gentry.

Government cannot be 100 percent good unless it is economical.

Government cannot be altogether bad if the people's servants pinch a penny once in a while, the way they used to do back home.

Don't forget. Most of the liberal governments in the world have been wrecked on the shoals of loose fiscal policy.

In order to be entirely successful, democracy must be economically sound.

Citizenship Day—Rights and Duties of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was celebrated as Citizenship Day by proclamation of President Roosevelt pursuant to act of Congress, and everywhere fitting ceremonies were held in honor of the youth of our land who have attained voting age and of those citizens who have become naturalized. I was happy to have had the privilege of cooperating with my colleagues in the House in the enactment of this legislation and the designation of Citizenship Day.

Those actively interested in this movement suggested as a pledge of citizenship the "I Am an American" creed, which reads as follows:

I am an American!
The Golden Rule is my rule!

In humility and with gratitude
I acknowledge my undying debt
To the founding fathers
Who left me a priceless heritage
Which now is my responsibility.

With steadfast loyalty,
I will uphold the Constitution
And the Bill of Rights.

I will treasure my birthright
Of American ideals:
I will place moral integrity
Above worldly possessions.

Problems of interest to my country
Shall be of interest to me!

I will count my right of suffrage
To be a sacred trust.
And I will diligently strive
To prove worthy of that trust.

I will give my full support
To upright public servants,
But those with unclean hands
I will firmly oppose.

Each obligation that comes to me,
As a true American,
I will discharge with honor!

My heart is in America,
And America is in my heart!
I am an American!

It has always seemed to me that one of the finest expressions of a true spirit of Americanism is set forth in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice,

freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

The American's Creed, written by William Tyler Page, is beautiful and in more condensed form:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

As an example of today's need, the final paragraph of the dedication of senior Boy Scouts is most timely:

I will work for America and will guard our heritage—its liberties and responsibilities—realizing that the privileges we enjoy today have come as a result of the hard work, sacrifice, faith, and clear thinking of our forefathers, and I will do all in my power to transmit our America, reinforced, to the next generation.

There has never been a period in our national history when we had more reason than the present to repeat from the bottom of our hearts the words uttered by Daniel Webster at Charlestown, Mass., June 17, 1843, at the completion of the Bunker Hill Monument. "Thank God—I—I—also am an American." The many reasons why this is so are well stated in the following editorial published in the New York Sun of September 4, 1939:

HE IS AN AMERICAN

He is an American.

He hears an airplane overhead, and if he looks up at all, does so in curiosity, neither in fear nor in the hope of seeing a protector.

His wife goes marketing, and her purchases are limited by her needs, her tastes, her budget, but not by decree.

He comes home of an evening through streets which are well lighted, not dimly in blue.

He reads his newspaper and knows that what it says is not concocted by a bureau, but an honest, untrammeled effort to present the truth.

He has never had a gas mask on.

He has never been in a bombproof shelter.

His military training, an R. O. T. C. course in college, he took because it excused him from the gym course, and it was not compulsory.

He belongs to such fraternal organizations and clubs as he wishes.

He adheres to a political party to the extent that he desires—the dominant one, if that be his choice, but with the distinct reservation that he may criticize any of its policies with all the vigor which to him seems proper—any other as his convictions dictate, even, if it be his decision, one which holds that the theory of government of the country is wrong and should be scrapped.

He does not believe, if his party is out of power, that the only way in which it can come into power is through a bloody revolution.

He converses with friends, even with chance acquaintances, expressing freely his opinion on any subject without fear.

He does not expect his mail to be opened between posting and receipt nor his telephone to be tapped.

He changes his place of dwelling and does not report so doing to the police.

He has not registered with the police.

He carries an identification card only in case he should be the victim of a traffic accident.

He thinks of his neighbors across international borders—of those to the north as though they were across a State line rather than as foreigners—of those to the south more as strangers, since they speak a language different from his, and with the knowledge that there are now matters of difference between his Government and theirs, but of neither with an expectancy of war.

He worships God in the fashion of his choice, without let.

His children are with him in his home, neither removed to a place of greater safety, if young, nor, if older, ordered ready to serve the state with sacrifice of limb or life.

He has his problems, his troubles, his uncertainties, but all others are not overshadowed by the imminence of battle and sudden death.

He should struggle to preserve his Americanism with its priceless privileges.

He is a fortunate man.

He is an American.

I cordially greet the fortunate young men and women in my district who have just attained their legal majority and will vote for the first time this year and those citizens of foreign birth who have recently become naturalized. I welcome each and every one of them to the duties and obligations and privileges of citizenship in the greatest republic and grandest nation on earth.

Facts a Lot of People Want a Lot of People To Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call attention of the House to the following article by John T. Flynn, appearing in the Washington Daily News. Unlike many of the jittery gentlemen writing for Eastern newspapers, Mr. Flynn has retained his sense of proportion and his patriotic devotion to the great existing problems of the Republic. I am sure you will be interested in Mr. Flynn's discussion of what he so effectively refers to as "facts which a lot of people have a tremendous interest in keeping a lot of other people from thinking about." I am sure, too, that most of the citizens of your district and mine want us to do some serious thinking about these facts.

[From the Washington Daily News]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, May 18.—Here are a few facts which a lot of people have a tremendous interest in keeping a lot of other people from thinking about.

Unemployed: 10,000,000 people.

Business index: January 1—107; May 11—94.

Public debt: May 1939—$40,155,000,000; May 1940—$42,730,000,000.

Government deficit this year to date: $3,222,000,000.

New securities: 1930—$4,483,000,000; 1940—$371,000,000.

One might go on with this melancholy catalog, such as that bank loans are hardly more than they were in 1933 at the bottom of the depression and that new security issues are actually less than they were in 1932 close to the bottom.

Now, if you were in power and had promised to clear up and clean up all this stagnation and distress and had to look at these dismal statistics, what would you think? You would think it an excellent thing to get people to quit looking at them and fretting about them and remembering them.

And now comes Mr. Hitler and wipes this all out of the minds of people. And a vast panic is worked up by: (1) Those who think we ought to go into Europe to save the British Empire; (2) the various foreign groups and their leaders (like Mr. Van Loon, a spokesman for the Dutch in America) who think the United States ought to go to Europe to save Holland or Poland or other countries from Germany; who think not in terms of American interests but in terms of their foreign allegiances and sentiments; (3) the politicians who want to get the minds of Americans off our own domestic problems which they do not know what to do about.

I do not want to do any plugging for any candidate for the presidency, and certainly not for Mr. Wendell Willkie. But it must be said that he puts the question very well when he says: "It is useless to talk about loans to the Allies now, since they have money and cash credits here enough to buy more goods than we can possibly manufacture and sell to them for a number of months.

"It is also unimportant to raise the naval appropriation or the Army appropriation for our own country, since the orders already placed are far in excess of our own productive capacity to fill.

"What we must have in this country above everything else is prompt domestic recovery."

But suppose you do not know how to produce domestic recovery? Suppose you have been in office for 7 years and are no further along than the doleful figures at the head of this piece indicate. And suppose an election is right ahead and you are just utterly stumped what to do.

Then what do you do? You work up excitement. You clamor for billions to build ships which cannot be built because the shipyards are crowded. You yell for planes which you cannot produce because the productive capacity of the plants is occupied turning out planes for Europe—and ourselves. You holler for arms although the arms plants are working day and night. What else is there to do?

The Logan-Walter Bill—A Step Back Toward Popular Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR AND EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL GRANGE MONTHLY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a studied effort by some of the opponents to the Logan-Walter bill to confuse the issue involved. For example, these opponents have resurrected a speech by Chief Justice Hughes pertaining to local affairs in New York given in 1907—before some Members of this present House were even born. They have tried to show that this ancient speech might indicate the Chief Justice's opposition to the bill. I do not fall into the error of such opponents by trying to speak for Mr. Hughes, as only he knows what his opinion is of the bill. A recent article has been prepared, however, by the man who more than anyone else is responsible for what is now the Logan-Walter bill. I refer to my friend, Col. O. R. McGuire, a committee chairman of the American Bar Association and general counsel of the American Good Government Society. I therefore quote in the RECORD at this point this article in which Colonel McGuire cites Hughes' 1931 views on administrative law; and also another article on the same topic from the National Grange magazine:

[From the Washington Star of May 12, 1940]

ATTORNEY TAKES ISSUE WITH COLUMNIST ON LOGAN-WALTER BILL—PURPOSE IS TO PREVENT THWARTING JUDICIAL REVIEW, HE WRITES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The Logan-Walter administrative law bill, which passed the House of Representatives recently with 282 members in favor of it, as compared with 97 against it, is termed by Columnist Charles G. Ross in the Evening Star of May 8, 1940, as "a court-packing scheme in reverse" and a device which would "subject the administrative branch to a court censorship as disruptive of the proper distribution of governmental powers as would have been the court-packing proposal." He further says that this Logan-Walter bill would "give the courts an unprecedented and wholly unwarranted power over the day-to-day functioning of the affected agencies." These statements are such that issue must be taken with Mr. Ross.

The ill-fated court-packing scheme, which I am glad to see that Mr. Ross apparently condemns, originated in the Federal bureaucracy. That bureaucracy is fighting the Logan-Walter bill. The court-packing scheme was an attempt to enlarge the Supreme Court of the United States so as to provide places on the bench for sufficient additional judges in favor of certain administrative policies that there would be a pro-Government majority on that great court large enough to reverse some decisions with which the bureaucracy did not agree. The time-honored and constitutional method of changing the Constitution and the statutes was not attempted because it was claimed that the constitutional method was too slow, but the real fact of the matter was and is that the constitutional majorities could not be secured to support such a change, as was proven when the court-packing scheme was condemned from one end of the country to the other and was defeated in the Congress.

ATTEMPTED TO SUBSTITUTE RULE

Instead of a rule of law, the Court-packing scheme attempted to substitute a rule of men, apparently upon the pattern of Nazi Germany, where the court of appeals at Breslau has stated in an opinion that:

"Today's constitution is dominated by the principle of political leadership. The courts have, therefore, no right to decide upon the legal validity of political acts of the administration. Any such decision would be incompatible with the order of the National Socialist state."

This same political and administrative domination of the courts in Nazi Germany was expressed by the Reich law leader, Dr. Hans Frank, in an address of 1936 to the conference of German judges, as follows:

"The party program * * * is the guiding line for decision. * * * Say to yourself at every decision which you make: How would the leader (Adolf Hitler) decide in your place? In every decision to which you are obliged ask yourselves: Is this decision compatible with the National Socialist conscience of the German people?"

The American Bar Association and many State and local bar associations fought the Court-packing scheme to defeat. The same association and a large number of State and city bar associations, as well as national business, patriotic, and labor organizations, are supporting the Logan-Walter bill as vigorously as they fought the Court-packing scheme.

The Logan-Walter bill leaves the Federal administrative agencies just as free as they now are to execute, prosecute, and decide, provided always that they function within the terms of the Constitution and the statutes. Unless they travel outside the statutes the judicial review provisions of the Logan-Walter bill will not touch them. Instead of attempting to substitute a rule of men, as might have been the effect of the Court-packing scheme, the Logan-Walter bill would insure a rule of law by compelling the army of administrative officers and employees to remain within the terms of the Constitution and the statutes. These men, servants of the people, have no reservoir of undefined power. They have no power except that conferred by statutes, and what the statutes have given they may take away or circumscribe as the Congress may see fit. The Logan-Walter bill is indeed in this respect a court-packing scheme in reverse.

QUOTATIONS DO NOT APPLY

Mr. Ross has quoted from a 1907 address by Chief Justice Hughes when he was Governor of New York, but the statements so quoted from the distinguished lawyer, judge, and administrator have not the slightest application to the issue involved in the Logan-Walter bill. Governor Hughes appears to have said:

"You must have administration, and you must have it by administrative officers. You cannot have it otherwise."

This statement is, of course, too true for argument, but as I have above stated the Logan-Walter bill does not attempt to have administration by the courts. Mr. Ross confuses administration or execution of the statutes with the exercise of wholly different powers—the power to legislate, through the issuance of rules and the power to judge, through the decision of particular controversies. The legislative power and the judicial power have been conferred by the Constitution on the Congress and the courts, respectively. It is merely a matter of convenience that the administrative agencies are permitted to exercise some legislative power as to the details of statutes and that they are permitted to judge in the first instance controversies which normally would be for decision by courts. Even the lone dissenting member from the Senate and House Judiciary Committee's reports in support of the Logan-Walter bill declared in his dissenting report that one administrative agency, which he named, "has overridden the plain intent of the basic statute creating it" and "has sought to legislate and replace Congress." He was equally critical of other named agencies.

PUTS US TO NEW TEST

Chief Justice Hughes stated in 1931 before the Federal Bar Association with respect to the judging power of administrative agencies that—

"The power of administrative bodies to make findings of facts which may be treated as conclusive, if there is evidence both ways, is a power of enormous consequence. An unscrupulous administrator might be tempted to say: 'Let me find the facts for the people of my country and I care little who lays down the general principles * * *.' But these new methods put us to new tests, and the serious question of the future is whether we have enough of the old spirit which gave us our institutions to save them from being overwhelmed."

Former judge and later Gov. Nathan L. Miller, of New York, stated in an address of July 2, 1938, before the New York Bar Association that in proceedings before Federal administrative agencies:

"The decisive question involved is usually a question of fact. The members of these tribunals can observe the forms of due process and still get some evidence into the record to support what they have decided to do. Under the present practice they ought to score a hundred percent of affirmances. If they do not it can only be because of their contempt even for the forms of law. In fact the present limited review is as a rule a vain and idle effort and gives their proceedings a purely fictitious appearance of fairness."

In exercising judicial power the administrative agencies should be required to observe a few basic principles of procedure as stated in the Logan-Walter bill, and the reviewing courts should have sufficient jurisdiction to prevent the administrative agencies from doing what Chief Justice Hughes and Governor Miller have stated that they could do—and which we lawyers with long experiences within and without the Federal service know that these administrative agencies do in some cases and may do in almost all of them.

There is no sound argument to support the conclusion that these agencies should be free to follow any general procedure they may see fit in reaching quasi-judicial determinations and that when they reach such determinations they should not be reviewed by the courts to the extent that they have reviewed trial courts in equity, admiralty, and law where the trial judge hears the case without a jury.

The crux of the opposition to this bill is in this provision which would widen the scope of judicial review to the extent that the trial courts are reviewed, but not to the extent that orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission are reviewed in reparation cases.

I commend to all the statement made by Governor Miller in the above-referred-to address that there are men in this country who think that we have outgrown the Constitution and that:

"By the process of trial and error administrative law has been hit upon as the most effective weapon to destroy our institutions. Through its channels those who have been well called termites, can safely attack the foundation of our American system, for it has been discovered that administrative law screens them from judicial scrutiny. Oh, I know that when one is swelled with arrogance, oversteps the forms of due process, he may escape the judicial eye, but most of them are clever enough scrupulously to observe all the forms of due process, while disregarding the substance, of due process, and they can do it in such a way as to thwart judicial review, as we all know."

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the Logan-Walter bill is to prevent the administrative agencies from thwarting judicial review in their exercise of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial power. That is all there is to the bill. Would Mr. Ross have less? Evidently he would, or he does not understand the bill.

Mr. Ross might well read the opinion of May 7, 1940, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at San Francisco as to one of these administrative agencies where the court declared that it was "grasping for power" which was "to be expected" in a philosophy of "administrative absolutism" and that it was the duty of the court "to curtail this inevitable overreaching" as "one of the first necessities of a democratic government."

Yes; the judges who wrote that opinion were appointed by President Roosevelt.

O. R. McGUIRE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Administrative Law, American Bar Association.

[From the National Grange Monthly for March 1940]

THIS MEASURE LONG NEEDED TO CURB POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT, OTHERWISE A PEOPLE'S LIBERTY IN DANGER

One of the most meritorious measures now pending in Congress, and which is scheduled to come up on a final passage in the near future, is a bill placing definite checks and limitations upon the powers of the many administrative agencies of the Federal Government. This bill was sponsored by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania and the late Senator Marvel M. Logan, also a Democrat, of Kentucky.

The bill provides that administrative rules implementing Federal legislation must be issued within 1 year after the enactment of the statute upon which they are based; that they may be issued only after public notice and hearings; that affected parties may obtain hearings upon requests for reconsideration of any rule; and that the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have authority to determine whether any rule conflicts with the Constitution or violates the statute under which it was issued.

SUPPLIES LONG-FELT WANT

That there has been a crying need for legislation of this sort, particularly during recent years, cannot be doubted. There is entirely too much department-made law in this country. In clarifying this statement it should be said that in many instances when an act is passed the agency which is to administer it is given authority to make rules and regulations for its enforcement. These rules and regulations have the force and effect of law. Often there is no appeal to the courts from the decisions of these administrative agencies.

How these powers are sometimes abused was well illustrated recently in connection with hearings being conducted by the special House committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board. In questioning J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the Board, the committee learned that the Board made a ruling requiring a certain company to pay back wages to two men who had never been employed by the company before, on the ground that the men had been refused employment by reason of their membership in a labor union. The company was ordered to give the men jobs and also to pay them wages for the interval of time that had elapsed between the time the men applied and the time the Board made its ruling.

Under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, if the men in question had been dismissed for union activity it would have been legal for the Board to order their reinstatement, and the men would have been entitled to back pay if the Board had so ruled.

If any better way to destroy private enterprise could be conceived than the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board in this connection, it is difficult to imagine what it might be.

This is only one of many instances that might be cited to illustrate the wholly unreasonable length to which administrative officials of the Government sometimes go in making rulings and decisions in carrying out legislation enacted by Congress.

GOVERNORS MUST BE GOVERNED

In recommending the passage of the Walter-Logan bill, the House Judiciary Committee declares that the law must provide that the governors shall be governed and that the regulators shall be regulated if our present form of government is to endure. Continuing, the report of the committee declares:

"The phenomenon of the administrative officers and employees, the so-called bureaucracy, attempting to control all processes of government for their selfish ends is not new, either in this country or in the history of the world.

"The modern-day problems of government are entirely too technical to be performed in many cases by the untrained, and hence it is not possible to emulate the practice in the comparatively simple ways of President Jackson, in discharging all employees in responsible administrative positions and turning the machinery of law administration over to a newly appointed group of officials freshly drawn from the people.

"In order to secure and retain the services of competent people to man the administrative agencies of government, we have been compelled to establish a career service under civil service; but there is no gainsaying the fact that with competency and long tenure of office we also secure employees who tend in some cases to become contemptuous of both Congress and the courts, disregardful of the rights of the governed, and for lack of sufficient legal control over them, a few develop Messiah complexes. They honestly and fervently believe that their mission in life is to at least reform the United States, regardless of the terms of the statutes, the Constitution, or anything else."

There can be no doubt whatever that the enactment of the Logan-Walter bill would provide a powerful stimulus to economic recovery and would go a long way toward reestablishing respect for government among the rank and file of the people of the United States. Those who hold public office must be given to understand that they are the servants of the people and not their masters.

"Blitzkrieg" Approaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN A. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DEPOSIT (N. Y.) COURIER

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Deposit (N. Y.) Courier:

[From the Deposit (N. Y.) Courier]

"BLITZKRIEG" APPROACHES

The hour of decision for the continent of Europe, in fact, for the whole world came at dawn on last Friday, when Germany invaded Holland and Belgium in a desperate bid for victory. Discretion has been thrown to the wind. The time has now passed when we in America can say "this affair in Europe is no concern of ours." From this day until this world war is over this struggle vitally affects the dreams, the hopes, and the religion of every individual in this country.

The reckless assault on small countries, the unrestrained bombing of open towns and civilians have demonstrated that Hitler and his German Army will stop at nothing.

As a democracy, we are a people divided in thoughts and opinions on many subjects. We naturally believe in the power of public opinion, and regardless of background there have always been influential groups in the democracies who believed that Hitler in his course of destruction would shrink before this last of barbarities known to demons.

All the glorious monuments of the past, historic cities, and the homes and lives of peaceful citizens are threatened. This threat is not alone against the British Empire. It includes the United States of America. The Voice of Destruction has been set forth in no uncertain terms by Herman Rauschning. We commend to you the reading of the observations by this man, who revolted from Hitler's party because of the complete recklessness and irresponsibility, the moral insanity of the Nazi leaders. Now we know that the observations of Rauschning and others are true. You will find a copy of this book in our village library. If you would know the truth about the awful destruction that lies ahead for the civilization of the world when madmen control the instruments of science and industry, we suggest you read The Voice of Destruction when Hitler speaks.

When brutality outruns morality then our scientific advancement turns the world into a slaughterhouse instead of a haven of happiness and individual safety.

A totalitarian regime is the most efficient machine that can be devised for seizing power and converting a whole nation into a war camp, because it does not take its own people into its confidence. The processes of democracy are designed primarily for peace, not war. Therefore, it is natural to expect spectacular successes of the German arms in the early months of war, while the moral forces of democracy organize their resistance to aggression. Eventually right can and will be victorious but the price we will have to pay to preserve our liberties is colossal. This is no time for complacency in the face of the growing menace of totalitarian armaments.

The "fifth column" has been an active factor in the invasion of the Scandinavian and Low Countries. We in America are not free from an active German "fifth column." There is such a well-organized unit in every neutral country of the world.

Some of the weaknesses of democracy are inherent in the system itself. This is a time for frankness in our domestic politics. We do not know nor appreciate the truth about the trifilings with our liberties and future happiness on the part of our own leaders. Our New Deal ventures have often been cheap copies of totalitarian ideas. Fortunately, we have a chance this year to vote for a return to domestic sanity.

For several years we have abused all those who took an international view of things, under the arguments of the isolationists. An internationalist has an appreciation of the world in which we live; an isolationist is a destructionist. In this day there is no such thing as "minding our own business" and having security and peace. Witness Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

The war in Europe is fast becoming our concern, whether we like it or not. The main objective seems to be to cross Holland and Belgium and thus obtain suitable bases for an invasion of Great Britain. Beyond England lies Canada and the United States. Such a statement may seem absurd to those with the outlook of an ostrich.

The lesson is clear. We must have a united domestic situation and we must go in for a real program of armament. We must grant credits and give material assistance to the Allies, who are fighting for the defense of institutions we consider essential in this Democracy. Should they fail, our borders will become the first line of defense. What is happening in Europe is of very great concern to all Americans.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD AND OTHER DATA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, in this morning's Times-Herald, on the editorial page, we find a quotation from George Washington's Farewell Address. I ask that this editorial and quotation, together with information on the strength of the Army and the expenditures we have made for defense, be inserted in the RECORD.

The statement from the Farewell Address is as follows:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

That statement is from the Farewell Address, and then follows the editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD. I wish to say that the Times-Herald deserves credit for so frequently printing this excerpt from the Farewell Address of that great American, the Father of his Country, warning us about excessive partiality for any foreign country—warning us not to take sides.

I ask that the editorial and the other matter I have submitted, together with an article from page 7 of the Times-Herald of today, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 20, 1940]

George Washington said:

"Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."—From the Farewell Address.

DEFENSE, 1933 TO 1940

The President has asked for almost $1,200,000,000 extra defense spending as fast as we can efficiently spend it.

WHERE THE MONEY WENT

His political enemies have begun to object, as loudly as they have the nerve to, that the New Deal has spent almost six and one-half billions on national defense in 7 years and that the Nation has next to nothing to show for all this outlay of money.

It isn't really as bad as all that. And it seems to us that people who try to alarm the general public by painting the national defense picture darker than it is in reality do the general public a distinct disservice.

Here are some figures, gathered by the United Press, on our national defense as it was in 1933 and as it is now:

	1933	1940
NAVY		
Battleships	15	15
Aircraft carriers	3	5
Heavy cruisers	11	18
Light cruisers	10	17
Destroyers	229	219
Submarines	82	95
Aircraft	933	2,863
Active manpower	90,150	145,400
Navy Reserves	39,935	55,085
Marines	13,600	25,000
ARMY		
Aircraft	1,497	2,700
Active manpower	134,085	[1] 241,000
National Guard	189,000	251,000
Reserves	125,000	144,714
Motor vehicles	9,505	17,791
Tanks, etc	(2)	700
Antiaircraft guns	(2)	400
Antitank guns	(2)	744

[1] This figure believed slightly in error; our best information is that correct figure is 227,000.

[2] Virtually none.

It is further pointed out that, while the net warship increase in 7 years has been 19 vessels, the Roosevelt administration has actually built 130 warships. The bulk of this construction has replaced vessels that became obsolete under the anti-Navy policy of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations.

The fact is that our Army, such as it is, is in fair shape, though it needs the thoroughgoing expansion and modernization that the President now proposes to give it. The fact further is that our Navy is in better shape and is bigger and more powerful than it ever was before in our whole history.

However, the British Navy is being whittled down a bit by land-based bombers of the German air force. We don't believe the German claims, many of which are clumsy fabrications on the face of them, but it appears to be a fact that land-based German dive bombers have sunk or badly damaged several smaller British fighting ships.

Our Navy is now out near Hawaii (exact location kept secret), which we believe is where the bulk of it should stay for some time to come.

BOMBERS VERSUS BATTLESHIPS

Since the beginning of the biggest battle in the history of Europe on May 10, 1940, the clamor has been growing in favor of sending our Navy, or a large part of it, to the aid of the Allies in the Atlantic. Some people would even like to see it take up duty in convoying another A. E. F. to Europe—though how we could raise another A. E. F. in less than 2 years is not explained.

FRONT DOOR, BACK DOOR

We should think a long time before sending any valuable part of our Navy anywhere near Europe.

Suppose we should expose it to Germany's land-based bombers. If the German claims are true, we'd lose several battleships and innumerable destroyers and quite a few cruisers. Even if the German claims are as phony as we think they are, the bombers would whittle down our Navy, as they are doing to the British Navy.

If the process went on long enough, we'd be whittled down to a naval strength inferior to that of Japan.

Where would we be then? We at least know where the Japanese Navy would be shortly after it got the glad tidings. It would be making for Hawaii, probably picking off the Philippines with a

destroyer flotilla. Having sent our sea-fighting strength out our front door, we'd have invited Japan to move in at our back door.

This is the A No. 1 argument against American intervention in the European war, we believe, and the argument which interventionists habitually never think of at all.

Two ships for one.

Armed strength of the United States, 1940

Army:	
Total Army strength as given by Secretary of War Woodring as of Jan. 31, 1940	624,200
R. O. T. C. figures given for September 1939 (latest available) by Colonel Thompson, War Department	186,750
C. M. T. C., July enrollment (does not include men that have been trained over a period of years)	35,579
Total Army strength	836,529
(NOTE.—These figures include air-force personnel.)	
Navy:	
Officers	10,454
Enlisted personnel	129,575
Coast Guard	12,928
Marine Corps, officers	1,419
Marine Corps, enlisted personnel	25,065
Total Navy strength	179,441
Total combined strength (Army and Navy):	
Total Army strength	836,529
Total Navy strength	179,441
United States armed strength, Army and Navy	1,015,970

Source: These statistics have been compiled from various statistics given by the Navy and War Departments, Mar. 2, 1940.

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, MARCH 18, 1940.
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LUNDEEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated March 13, 1940, in which you inquire whether the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C. are considered a part of our armed forces, thus increasing the total estimated strength of the Army furnished you in response to your letter of February 27, 1940.

The strength of 624,200 men furnished you in answer to your letter of February 27 was the total strength of the Army of the United States on January 31, 1940.

The R. O. T. C. established under section 40, National Defense Act, as amended, and the C. M. T. C. established under section 47 (d) of the same act, are agencies to provide military instruction and training to civilians and are not components of the Army of the United States as contemplated under section 1, National Defense Act, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

MORE THAN A MILLION

Mr. LUNDEEN. Why tell our people we have no army, navy, and air force, when more than a million trained men are available today—air, Army, and Navy?

I ask the Senate to examine this table and to read the letter from the Secretary of War.

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE

The American taxpayer has poured out nearly seven billions in 7 years for defense only to be told he has no defense; he has poured out nearly $37,000,000,000 in 50 years only to be told by hysterical and ignorant people that we have no defense, and perhaps a few have a good sized profit motive in mind.

Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Aviation, 1890–1941[6]

Year	Army		Navy		Combined services	
	Aviation[1]	Total[2]	Aviation[3]	Total[4]	Aviation	Grand total
1890		$24,316,616		$21,675,375		$45,991,991
1891		24,206,472		23,136,036		47,342,508
1892		24,613,529		31,541,646		56,155,175
1893		24,308,500		23,543,267		47,851,767
1894		24,225,640		22,104,061		46,329,701
1895		23,592,885		25,366,827		48,959,712
1896		23,252,608		29,416,077		52,668,685
1897		23,278,403		30,562,661		53,841,064
1898		23,129,344		33,003,234		56,132,578
1899		23,193,392		56,098,784		79,292,176
1900		80,430,204		48,099,970		128,530,174
1901		114,220,096		61,140,917		175,361,013
1902		115,734,049		78,101,791		193,835,840
1903		91,730,136		78,856,363		170,586,499
1904		77,888,753		81,876,791		159,765,544
1905		77,670,301		97,505,141		174,575,442
1906		70,396,632		100,336,680		170,733,312
1907		102,071,670		71,817,165		173,888,835
1908		98,958,508		78,634,583		177,593,091
1909		95,382,248		122,662,485		218,044,733
1910		101,195,883		136,935,199		238,131,082
1911		95,440,568		131,410,568		226,851,136
1912	$125,000	93,374,756	$25,000	126,405,509	$150,000	219,780,265
1913	100,000	90,958,713	30,000	123,151,539	130,000	214,110,252
1914	125,000	94,266,146	10,000	140,718,435	135,000	234,984,581
1915	275,494	101,019,213	10,000	144,868,717	285,494	245,887,930
1916	300,000	101,959,196	1,000,000	149,661,865	1,300,000	251,621,061
1917	60,331,666	267,596,530	14,585,000	313,298,072	74,916,666	580,894,600
1918	10,800,000	273,046,323	51,133,000	517,273,802	61,933,000	790,320,125
1919	952,304,758	10,225,478,313	220,383,119	1,573,468,416	1,172,687,877	11,798,946,729
1920	25,000,000	772,324,878	25,000,000	616,096,839	50,000,000	1,388,421,717
1921	33,000,000	392,558,365	20,000,000	433,279,574	53,000,000	825,837,939
1922	19,200,000	328,013,530	13,413,431	410,673,289	32,613,431	738,686,819
1923	12,895,000	270,563,264	14,803,560	289,336,577	27,698,560	559,899,841
1924	12,626,200	257,274,768	14,793,560	294,456,528	27,419,760	551,731,296
1925	12,798,576	256,515,279	15,328,500	275,105,067	28,127,076	531,620,346
1926	14,911,191	260,757,250	14,981,000	287,402,328	29,892,191	548,159,578
1927	15,256,694	269,339,246	19,256,288	319,650,075	34,512,982	588,989,321
1928	20,602,594	282,118,885	20,300,000	316,215,107	40,902,594	598,333,992
1929	24,630,268	311,167,469	31,956,000	362,145,812	56,586,268	673,313,281
1930	31,690,785	332,404,342	31,430,000	360,236,697	66,120,785	692,641,039
1931	35,823,473	339,106,459	32,033,211	380,573,111	67,856,684	719,679,570
1932	31,479,635	334,705,965	31,145,000	358,253,952	62,624,635	692,959,917
1933	25,439,131	289,500,024	25,245,420	317,583,591	50,684,551	607,083,615
1934	23,324,185	277,050,381	21,957,459	308,669,562	45,281,644	585,719,943
1935	27,396,453	255,526,147	18,643,320	284,658,799	46,039,773	540,184,946
1936	45,383,400	341,348,204	40,732,310	458,684,379	86,115,710	800,032,583
1937	59,397,714	383,104,859	38,588,270	526,546,532	97,985,984	909,651,391
1938	58,618,406	415,263,154	49,500,000	516,258,808	108,118,406	931,521,962
Total, 1890–1938	1,556,835,623	18,974,978,096	766,283,448	11,588,498,603	2,323,119,071	30,563,476,699
1939, revised[6]	70,856,972	521,839,824	48,075,000	597,542,738	118,931,972	1,119,382,562

[1] Army Air Service (Corps) organized in 1918.
[2] Includes appropriations for support of the Army, 1890–1922, and military activities of the War Department, 1923–39.
[3] Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department organized 1922.
[4] Includes appropriations for the naval service, 1890–1922, and for the Navy Department and the naval service, 1923–39.
[5] Includes $1,000,000 available to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for purchase of aircraft patents.
[6] 1939 figures appearing in compilation have been revised according to the U. S. Budget, 1941.

Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Aviation, 1890–1941—Continued

Year	Army		Navy		Combined services	
	Aviation	Total	Aviation	Total	Aviation	Grand total
1940, appropriation bills [7]	184, 464, 936	660, 167, 878	82, 798, 000	720, 789, 461	267, 262, 936	1, 380, 957, 339
Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1940 (approved Feb. 12, 1940)[4]	1, 787, 358	109, 416, 689	28, 661, 000	137, 172, 238	30, 448, 358	246, 588, 927
Urgent Deficiency 1940 (approved Feb. 12, 1940) [7]				28, 000, 000		28, 000, 000
Total, 1940						1, 655, 546, 266
Military Establishment, 1941 [8]	$165, 762, 162	$784, 999, 094			$165, 762, 162	$784, 999, 094
Navy Department and naval service [9]			$94, 202, 900	$963, 797, 478	94, 202, 900	963, 797, 478
H. R. 7934 [10]				5, 725, 000		5, 725, 000
Total, 1941						1, 754, 521, 572
Grand total	1, 979, 707, 051	21, 051, 401, 581	1, 020, 020, 348	14, 041, 525, 518	2, 999, 727, 399	35, 092, 927, 099

[7] This money is not all available in 1940, but is included in 1940 appropriation figures.
[8] H. R. 9209, 76th Cong., as it passed the House.
[9] H. R. 8438, 76th Cong., as it was amended, passed the House, and sent to conference.
[10] Authorizes $5,725,000 for modernizing U. S. S. *New York*, *Texas*, and *Arkansas*. Referred to House Committee on Naval Affairs.
*Includes bills before committees. Does not include H. R. 8026, which authorizes the increase by 218,000 tons of the composition of the Navy under-age vessels, the increase of naval airplanes to 6,000 and lighter-than-air craft to 36, and the acquisition or construction of 125,000 tons of auxiliary vessels. H. R. 8026 passed the House on Mar. 12, 1940. No amounts were specified to meet these authorized increases.

Source: 1890–1938, from ms. of Nov. 21, 1939, of the same title. 1939, 1940—U. S. Budget, 1941, statement No. 2. Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1940; urgent deficiency, 1940; Military Establishment; Navy Department and naval service totals, by telephone from the budget departments of the War and Navy Departments; Aviation figures were taken from copies of the acts and bills.

Army: 1890–1922, 1931–38—Digest of Appropriations, 1938; table C, pp. 852–859. 1928–30—U. S. Budget, 1924–31. 1939—U. S. Budget, 1940.

Navy: 1890–1938—Digest of Appropriations, 1938; table C, pp. 852–859. 1939—United States Budget, 1940.

1940 and 1941 figures taken from Roosevelt's Budget Details as printed in the Times-Herald, Jan. 4, 1940.

Aviation: Army: 1912, 36 Stat. 1038; 1913, 37 Stat. 571; 1914, 37 Stat. 705; 1915, 38 Stat. 353, 359; 1916, 38 Stat. 1064; 1917, 39 Stat. 622, 910, 40 Stat. 187; 1918, 40 Stat. 42; 1919, 40, Stat. 816, 848–849, 1027; 1920–39, U. S. Budget, 1922–40.

Navy: 1912, 36 Stat. 1268; 1913, 37 Stat. 343, 348; 1914, 37 Stat. 894; 1915, 38 Stat. 396; 1916, 38 Stat. 930; 1917, 39 Stat. 559, 40 Stat. 203; 1918, 39 Stat. 1169–1170, 40 Stat. 369; 1919, 40 Stat. 706; 1920–39, U. S. Budget, 1922–40.

(Thomas R. Baldwin, Nov. 21, 1939.)

INVASIONS CONJURED BY HYSTERIA AND PROPAGANDA

This total does not include the enormous amount now asked by the President, and that is only a beginning—more later.

No one has any intention of invading this vast Nation; no nation or group of nations can invade America in this generation.

All are busy with exhausting wars in other continents—and always a generation passes before great fighting nations, victor and vanquished alike, recover strength enough to fight another great war. That is proven by history.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 20, 1940]

IN THE NEWS—WITH REASON AND CAUTION, WE CAN STAY OUT

Mr. Roosevelt's message to Congress is a fine war message, but hardly a peace message.

It is a virtual declaration of alliance with the Allies.

It almost guarantees our getting into the war—Wilsonwise—before the end of the year, and probably insures our going in unprepared, as we cannot hope to be prepared in any major way in that time.

It is a message consoling to the New Deal, as it demands an enormous amount of New Deal spending between now and election on a 24-hour-a-day basis, and makes certain the election not only of Mr. Roosevelt for a third term but the reelection of most of the New Deal Congressmen, because the spending will be shrewdly and practically applied.

The message was received with immense enthusiasm by Congress because it not only allows Congress to remedy its shameful neglect of national defense but to spend money liberally during a preelection year.

Everything has worked out exactly as the administration might have wished to have it; and perhaps Mr. Roosevelt, in his amazing political sagacity, has "planned it that way," or perhaps it has been so ordained from the beginning.

The fly on the wheel often thinks that he is making the wheel go 'round, the while it is being driven by a power that he little understands.

There is no mention in Mr. Roosevelt's message of any economy anywhere to offset and compensate for the immense war expenditure.

In fact, the Congress has unloosed the purse strings—for domestic expenditure as well as for war expenditure—and there is apparent certainty that not only will additional taxes be imposed, but the debt limit will be exceeded as well.

However, we will in due time surely be prepared for defense, if that by any fortuitous chance should be our actual purpose and our genuine desire.

Therefore, the happy condition of absolute security (if our endeavor shall only be directed to that commendable end) is worth the effort and the sacrifice.

By the end of this war in Europe and of the war in Asia, the United States will have a Navy second to none, an adequate Army fully equipped as a nucleus for land defense, and possibly an overwhelming air force which will by that time be recognized to be our chief reliance for national safety.

Wherefore, if by the grace of God, Mr. Roosevelt shall have kept us out of war, he will have met the situation not only as a wise New Dealer but as a great American.

Let us hope that the Republican Party will not then come along to sink our great Navy, as it did in 1922, disband our adequate Army, and neglect our national air defense.

There are economies which are extravagances and the neglect of national defense during the Republican administrations from 1922 to 1932 is partly responsible for the frantic haste and extravagant expenditure necessary in the defense measures of today.

In expending the immense sums to be appropriated for (let us hope) defense, Congress should proceed not cautiously, but intelligently.

There is no conflict scheduled for today for us—unless we project ourselves into it.

There is no Japanese fleet at our Golden Gate, no German Army on our eastern shores, no Russian air fleet dropping parachute men in our interior backyards. So let us be reasonably calm.

* * * * * * *

As for the war abroad, one or the other side must surely win. It always has in the past.

The armies of Napoleon conquered Europe and threatened England, but never disturbed this country.

The armies of Germany swept bloodily across France and occupied Paris in 1871, and then went home to live in comparative peace until 1914, when Austria, or Germany, or France, or England, or Russia, or all of them, provoked the World War and lured us into it, to our cost.

Let us think, therefore, in terms of America.

Let us not be lulled into inaction, nor yet hurried into error.

Let us protect America not only by adequate armament, but by judicious and patriotic procedure.

Let us unite as a people, without partisanship and without prejudice.

Let us follow the advice of the great and wise founders of this Republic—especially of George Washington, the greatest and wisest of them all.

He said:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

He also said:

"Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?

"Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

"Be prepared for war," gentlemen of the Congress, but do not be unduly led into it.

Do not "quit our own to stand upon foreign ground."

Consider primarily the security and the peace of your native land.

Peace means preparedness and protection.

It does not mean partisanship and provocation.

War means the exhaustion of our wealth, the extinction of our liberties, the expenditure of the blood of our people, the sacrifice of the lives and opportunities of our happy, hopeful youth.

It means national prostration for half a century, and it probably means the permanent transformation of our free Republic into a socialistic state.

If we do not like the communistic, socialistic despotisms of Europe, let us take every precaution not to become one.

Build ships, make guns, fortify our shores, protect our cities.

Have and hold the greatest Navy in the world. Do not sink it to suit some other nation, friendly but selfish.

Finally, realize the importance of possessing the greatest air force of any nation on earth.

Construct that overwhelming air force, and rest in safety and security behind its protecting wings.

Surely in times of peace prepare to prosecute war, fearlessly and effectively—if need be.

And in times of war prepare thoughtfully and patriotically to preserve peace.

Totalitarian Ideologies and the War in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT MOUNT NABOR TEMPLE, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 26, 1940, BY MR. JUSTICE JACOB PANKEN, OF THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, by this time, I am sure that the House is more than familiar with my definite stand with reference to totalitarian ideologies, and I therefore think it will be of interest to the Members to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Justice Panken, of the domestic relations court of the city of New York, on the current tendencies as they affect the war in Europe.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to enlarge my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein the address delivered by Mr. Justice Panken.

The European war is a death struggle between ideologies, ways of living, and philosophies governing human relationships. It is a struggle between democracy, progress, and hope for ever-better ways of living on the one hand, and totalitarianism—call it that if you will, but in effect an ideology which destroys self-reliance, self-respect, manhood, and human dignity. One constructive, the other nihilism.

We in America believe in democracy. What does that mean to us? It is the right of the individual to participate as an individual in the determination of the destinies of our country. Democracy means the right to criticize, adversely or favorably, the government and its functions. It is the right to fashion the instrumentality, called government, to serve each of us as individuals and our fellow men.

Man has looked upward and reached forward in search for an instrument which would give him the fullest opportunity for growth so that he might rise to the stature of the divine. That instrument is a government conceived in freedom and guaranteeing freedom to live, freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, and protection against the invasion by government of his individual rights.

The fulfillment of the aspirations of man is only possible in a state of freedom. Without freedom that which is manly dies.

Plato and Moses before Christ, innumerable philosophers, thinkers, patriots like Voltaire, Jefferson, Lincoln since Christ, have blazed the path for the democratic ideal. Democracy fired the imagination and gave substance to the mind of man.

The war in Europe is a struggle between two ideas; the one—that government is the servant of man; the other, that man is the servant of government. Whether authoritarian government is called Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, they are all alike. They all use the same methods.

Hitler overran Austria, raped Czechslovakia, and in partnership with Stalin massacred Poland. Russia overran Finland, strangled Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and in partnership with Hitler massacred Poland. They did not outdo the Fascist, Mussolini. He brought war and destruction to Ethiopia and invaded and possessed himself to Albania. The totalitarian ideology is death to truth. It is the antithesis of decency. It is worse than that. It is the morality of the gangster who at the point of a gun requires you to deliver up, or you die.

Norway is at the mercy of the brutes in human form who call themselves men. Denmark surrendered. The Norwegians would rather die free men than live as slaves of the maniacal Germans.

Are we safe? The experience of Norway and the apprehensions of the other neutral countries in the world, demonstrate the existence of a "fifth column" in each of the neutral countries. A column made up of spies, of agents of the totalitarian governments, striking at the vitals of the neutrals.

From the lips of Hitler came the following when he discussed the United States. He has this opinion of us, he says: "In the spurious blossoming of economic progress and power politics, America has ever since been drawn deeper into the mire of progressive self-destruction."

He speaks of the Civil War and the period antedating it as follows: "The beginnings of a great new social order based on the principle of slavery and inequality were destroyed by that war (meaning the Civil War), and with them also the embryo of a future truly great America that would not have been ruled by a corrupt caste of tradesmen, but by a real Herren-Class (a gentleman class) that would have swept away all of the falsities of liberty and equality."

He speaks blithely of the organization within America of a "fifth column," of building a youth movement ready to take over the United States from the hands of the incompetent who are "in the mire of progressive self-destruction."

Every member of the German-American Bund is either a spy or a potential traitor to America.

Every Communist official appears to be a spy for the Soviets and every Communist is a potential traitor to American ideals and the American way of life.

We have native Fascists, some masquerade in the guise of Christians, profess a Christianity which is vicious and is a libel upon the teachings of the Christ.

I sometimes wonder why the Nazis desire the destruction of the Christian churches. They hate Christianity. What else could they do in face of their ungovernable and unreasoned hatred of the Jew. They must hate the churches of Christ; they must hate Christianity; they must hate its teachings; for the philosophy of Christianity has been given to the world by a Jew. Hating the Jew, they hate the Christian philosophy which he gave to the world.

Let me quote from the lips, or shall I say from the brute teeth, of Hitler to Hermann Rauschning, who was his representative in Danzig. Hitler said: "But for our people (meaning the Germans) it is decisive whether they acknowledge the Jewish Christ creed with its effeminate pity ethics, or a strong, heroic belief in god in Nature, god in our own people, in our destiny, in our blood," and I might add in our "blitzkrieg," in our inhuman, brutal rape of defenseless men and women and children, and that "after we have clothed ourselves in their uniforms and led them to believe that we belong to them and that we have come as their friends."

It is a peculiar kind of religion—a religion of treachery, a religion which raises bestiality to a spurious godliness—in fact, the demoniacal.

This is the holiday of liberation. The Jews have rejoiced for centuries because of their liberation from Egyptian slavery. And now a new slavery is being imposed upon Jew and Gentile, upon believer and nonbeliever—a slavery harder, more pitiless, more merciless than was that of the Pharaohs. A slavery which takes from man his right to choose his employment, which puts him to work building worse than pyramids, building engines of destruction, and put him to work in response to the bidding of a maniac who has taken over control of a hundred million people. Like the Pharaohs, Hitler, Stalin, and other dictators will only be memories in a short time.

Some of our people speak of isolationism. We are to wait, these say, until the war comes to our shores before we will defend our liberties. That is the attitude of the isolationists. We cannot wait until the war is brought to our shores. We must prevent it coming our way.

It is questionable whether we have the right to remain neutral. We are nonbelligerent. Our neutrality helps the totalitarians and hampers the democracies.

We are to remain nonbelligerent, but are we to deny to the men and women who are on the ramparts defending democracy and freedom the means with which to make an effective defense? As nonbelligerent we are in duty bound to make available the resources for effective war on brutality.

We may remain nonbelligerent, but not an iota of help for the totalitarians who are on the rampage to destroy the things we hold dear. America has always been idealist. Some of us are romanticists. It has become engrained in the lives of our people that it is right to aid those that suffer even at the point of self-sacrifice. But we must not aid those who inflict suffering. That is a form of sentimentality which destroys ideals.

No liberty-loving man, no forward-looking American, no one who has studied history and evaluated the forces which make for progress, can remain neutral between totalitarianism and democracy. He may call himself a pacifist; he may call himself an isolationist. High-sounding names. But in effect, he is a stumbling block in the path of the development of a greater and a finer democracy—a stumbling block in the path of progress.

A Menaced America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following timely editorial, which appeared in yesterday's edition of the Washington Sunday Star, entitled "A Menaced America":

[From the Sunday Star of May 19, 1940]

A MENACED AMERICA

Now that the dread specter of total war has materialized in Europe, now that the British and the French are reeling before its devastating fury and are fighting with their backs to the wall for their very lives, the people of the United States must cast aside the last of their illusions and face the grim but inescapable fact that our own security is seriously threatened.

This stark truth that we, too, are in peril and that the peril is imminent, must be accepted now. If we delay in grasping this, if we continue to exert anything less than a supreme and intelligent effort at self-protection in the comfortable but no longer tenable belief that we are relatively safe behind the barriers of two oceans, the time is not far off when we may be brought forcibly to the realization—when it is too late—that we are tragically vulnerable to a concerted attack.

From the outbreak of this war more than 8 months ago the Star has taken the position, and has repeatedly reaffirmed it, that our own economic welfare—even our own military security—has depended upon an allied victory. In other words, it has been and still is the Star's belief that the first and most logical effort for this country to make in furtherance of its own defense is to help check the spread of German aggression at its source, in Europe. To that end the Star has urged time and again that every support short of war should be given by us to France and Britain.

Others, including the President, while obviously thinking the same thoughts and shaping national policies to that end, have felt themselves restrained in making the open, unqualified declarations that the situation demands. The allied cause is our cause. Our best, perhaps our only, hope for peace now lies in an allied victory. The allied war councils undoubtedly know that. The German leaders know it. But do our own people know it? Do the suffering people of France and England know it? Has the time not come to proclaim it, not by indirection, not by suggestion, not by parables, but by a forthright declaration from the President himself that all our resources—save the men not now needed—are at the disposal of the Allies from now on? That is the case. Why not say it?

The menace to America that will arise with a German victory is plain. Perhaps its exact dimensions cannot be estimated at this time with fine precision, but the worst that may happen can be envisioned, and it is for that which we must plan and prepare. If the Allies should win the war or even gain a stalemate, the grave and immediate military threat to this country will have been removed. Therefore it is upon the possibility—and it is a very real one—of a quick and decisive German victory that we must base our calculations.

The first and most obvious move of a victorious Hitler would be to seize any possessions of the defeated nations which might be useful to him. The question for us to consider, then, is what these possessions are and how they might be used to our disadvantage.

It is a foregone conclusion that Hitler or one or more of his totalitarian partners will attempt to take over certain of the strategically and materially important islands and other territories of the British, French, Dutch, and Norwegians. What of Bermuda and the other Allied islands in the Caribbean area? Can we be safe if they fall into strong and hostile hands? What of Iceland, Greenland, the Azores, the East Indies, and perhaps the Philippines, not to mention Allied naval bases scattered throughout the world? These regions are of utmost importance to us from a military standpoint, and their possession by enemies of ours would indeed be a deadly menace to America. And from some of these territories we draw essential raw materials which we do not produce ourselves. Without access to them the perfection of our own continental defenses would be infinitely complicated and most seriously delayed.

A second possibility which we must face is that Hitler, if he triumphs now, may gain possession of the French and the British fleets. This is a possibility which is heavily discounted by some people who prefer to believe that the Allied naval forces never will be surrendered, that they will take refuge on this side of the Atlantic, or, at the worst, will be destroyed to prevent their seizure by Germany. But we would be foolish and reckless in the extreme to rely on that sort of wishful thinking. In the calamitous event that Germany should get possession of the Allied fleet what could we do with our present forces to defend the Western Hemisphere or even the United States?

We have a good Navy. But until it can be expanded it is a one-ocean navy. And let us not make the blunder of believing that it could hold off a combined attack of the totalitarian forces in both oceans, or even that it surely could defend this hemisphere in the Atlantic from an attack by the German and possibly another totalitarian navy, strengthened by the warships that may be taken from France and Britain. At best, the scales would be heavily weighted against us. Our Army is undermanned and underequipped. We could not place more than 75,000 thoroughly trained and adequately equipped troops in the field if called upon to fight in the near future. And what of our air force? It totals about 5,100 planes in both Army and Navy branches. But many of these are out of date and unsuitable for modern combat. The number in this category, of course, is a matter of opinion, but Major General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, is authority for the statement that we have only 52 planes capable of meeting the best fighting ships of the European powers. And all of our planes are obsolete insofar as self-sealing tanks and armor are concerned. Germany alone, according to conservative estimates of well-informed American officials, has 4,000 bombers capable of flying from Africa to South America or from northern Europe to Greenland and Canada.

Another contingency that we must consider is the possibility of "fifth column" activity, if not in this country in some of those nations to the south where totalitarian influence has been most strong. It is quite conceivable that through the now familiar Trojan-horse tactics Germany, for example, might establish a base somewhere in South or Central America and unless we were in position, without depending on help from any outside source, to destroy it immediately such a base could quickly be made permanent.

This leads to consideration of our prepared plans for hemisphere defense. These plans have been formulated in the belief that Britain and France would be our allies in any war in defense of the Western Hemisphere, or, at the worst, that they would be sympathetic neutrals. But if the British and the French are to be destroyed as military factors these plans become of little use and must be wholly revised.

For America all of this is a truly dolorous outlook. Strong and ruthless forces hostile to us by every rule of reason are smashing their way to power throughout the world. We are not prepared to resist them, and we will not be permitted to prepare ourselves if they can prevent it.

We must act with all our energy and act now to get ready for the appalling possibilities that the world of tomorrow holds. The first move is to open our eyes and our minds to what is portending and to do everything that is humanly possible to assure an Allied victory in Europe. The importance to us of bringing about that result cannot be overestimated. No effort must be spared to achieve it. There remains, however, the possibility that our best efforts in that direction will come too late and will fail. Should that tragic result come to pass, our work will not have been wasted, for the means of producing the defensive equipment we will have to possess here will have been vastly expended.

America is truly menaced. We have no choice but to make the supreme effort to guard those things which we hold most dear from the threat of alien attack. To that effort we must give our all and any attempt to divert us, from whatever source it may come, must be recognized for what it is and rejected as an undermining of the Nation's security.

General Johnson Places the Blame Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ARTICLES BY GEN. HUGH JOHNSON AND LUDWELL DENNY

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, General Johnson discusses the situation relative to national defense and places the blame where it belongs in the following news article:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 18, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This column should be and will be the last to oppose the President's object in recommending a vast outlay for motorization, mechanization, and other mechanical equipment for defense. It was the first and most strident to insist on it. Even as a member of the first New Deal family 7 years ago I thought I had sold the idea

to the President. He asked for and got $3,000,000,000 to do it with, in 1933. He used only a little of it. The very first issue of this column, 5 years ago, said: "Modern war on land requires a big and efficient industry. The Germans have a much better one than the French. Today I think the French Army, with its Allies, could march from one end of Europe to the other, but not after the Germans rearm with modern equipment. Fully equipped they would be a military nation far superior to the French, and on the slightest provocation or no provocation at all could bring down on the world a new 1914 or worse * * * he (Hitler) stops at nothing—ethics, mercy, or humanity—and he certainly would not be stopped at a political boundary by so slight a thing as the peace of the world." That was March 15, 1935.

Over and over again that year and many times every year since this column has insisted on what the President's speech now so tardily and dramatically advocates. He is late. He may be too late. Nobody can tell him anything; nothing could move him from his stubborn, ill-informed, and inept inaction but a world-shaking catastrophe.

O. K. The past is past. His 7 years' blundering in this regard may prove fatal, but it is water over dam. We must all move in and help him repair his blunders, if he makes that possible. But it is a little sickening to see the sheeplike rush to swallow whole his bid for heroic acclaim for being finally jolted by an earthquake into action so obviously vital to our security which he had neither the ability to foresee nor the will to take.

Some comment insists that it vindicates his appraisal of Europe and his interventionist policy to date. It does nothing of the kind. It does the reverse of that. If he had correctly appraised the European military situation, we should have begun armament years ago. As to his policy of dabbling, bluff, and threat in military and naval affairs in Europe and Asia, it is ended by the logic of events. We shall have all we can do to defend ourselves now. He seems at last to appreciate that. If he doesn't, the country does. If the recent frequently expressed statements that there is a growing war spirit beyond the Alleghenies mean that there is one for anything except defense, they are wrong. There always was a spirit for that, and the President's sensational conjuring up of possible air attacks in Omaha were as unnecessary as they are absurd.

Fifty thousand airplanes in a fleet. Fifty thousand a year production soon. Thirty thousand production now. It reminds one of our World War threat to "darken the sky with airplanes." At the present rate of war change in airplane design, a fleet of 50,000 airplanes would be folly. We are at a rate of nowhere near 30,000 a year now, and we couldn't get to 50,000 a year in time to be of any use. It takes much longer to train pilots than it does to build airplanes—and they are equally expendible. We are training at no such rate, and it will take a long time to reach that rate. To keep 50,000 planes in the air would require an air force of 500,000—and we are nowhere near in sight of proper balanced equipment for 500,000 men in our whole Army.

Let's do this job. It won't be done by passing an appropriation bill and a lot of boasting and big talk. It will be done by prompt action and intelligent guidance and just in this phase almost wholly on the industrial front. There is no sign yet that we are going to get either the guidance or the action.

WHAT TO DO

(By Ludwell Denny)

The administration today is still without detailed plans for expenditure of the third billion dollars on defense during the next 12 months, requested by the President.

Neither the White House, the Navy Department, the War Department, nor the congressional committees have any more than the foggiest notion of what the administration wants done or how.

The confusion is so great that the House Military Affairs Committee, unable to get answers to its simplest questions, had to adjourn yesterday until Monday.

Not only was the General Staff caught unprepared, but everyone else. On the financial side there has been no preparation whatever. Ranking members of the Senate Finance Committee were never consulted and knew nothing of the idea until it appeared in the press. The President says the method of financing is relatively unimportant.

From the lack of preparation—either on the military, financial, or industrial side—it is now clear that the President shot from the hip for diplomatic and political reasons. If the President and his military aides had been working on the larger defense plan since the Scandinavian collapse, they might have had a little more to show Congress now.

From the standpoint of defense efficiency, not to mention the administration's reputation, it would have been better to withhold the sudden plan for at least a fortnight in order to work out some of the neglected details. A week or a month cannot be decisive in an aviation and mechanization program already delayed for a decade—indeed, too much haste with a half-baked plan will cause much more delay later.

But the President's hand was forced by the Republicans and by Hitler.

The Republicans, looking for a rousing campaign issue to offset Roosevelt political gains from the war emergency, were just beginning to pick up this one. They had never been able to make the administration's aviation neglect an issue before, because the public was not aroused. The Nazi break through in the low countries gave the Republicans their chance.

But before the Republicans could organize their attack the President with his accustomed genius for scooping up his own political fumbles announced that he would ask Congress for aviation funds. Though the performance has been awkward, at least he has the ball. And that is what counts in politics.

Of course, it is considered very bad form here—almost treason—to mention politics in connection with defense. But, regardless of the self-righteous denials, there is plenty of politics on both sides. It could hardly be otherwise with the President riding a third-term movement and the Republicans trying to unseat him.

The second thing that forced the President to shoot with his defense plan before he was ready was Italy. He needed another armament plan to barb his peace plea to Mussolini.

Now that the political and diplomatic purposes of an unplanned defense plan have been served, the gigantic preparedness problem of the United States remains where it was a week ago and last September when Hitler proved our Army and Navy out of date. In the judgment of many Air Corps officers, Congressmen, and businessmen, the job will not be done by more administration pledges and expenditures until there is—

A bipartisan congressional committee of inquiry and council;
A separate unified air force and air department.
A civilian production board to speed output of all equipment.

Our National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON, OF MARYLAND

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered on Saturday, May 18, 1940, over station WJEJ, Hagerstown, Md. Topic, Our National-Defense Program:

These are critical and turbulent days in Washington. I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to report to you upon some aspects of the problem that is absorbing all our interest and concern—national defense. And I deeply appreciate the fine courtesy of Station WJEJ in permitting me to talk with you about some of the developments of the past few days which are of vital importance to us all. I wish each of you could have been in the House of Representatives Thursday afternoon when the President of the United States appeared before a joint assembly of Congress to deliver his national-defense message. I have never witnessed a more solemn occasion. The President's face was grave and serious, his voice deliberate and earnest. Members of the House and Senate listened attentively and when he finished, no doubt most of you heard over your radios the thundering ovation he received.

The reception given the President's message by both Democrats and Republicans is, I trust, a token or a symbol of a national unity and a singleness of purpose that is so essential in these critical times. I further hope that the acclaim and approval with which the President's message was received symbolizes the adjournment of politics and partisanship on so grave a matter.

Friday, the day following the President's appearance, the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives met to consider the legislation necessary to put into action his recommendations. As a member of the committee, I have devoted my energies to a study of national-defense problems and, together with my colleagues of this committee, am prepared to act with the promptness which the President requested. This committee, I think you will be interested to hear, is composed, for the most part, of men who have a background and interest in matters relating to the Military Establishment. And I am proud to say that these men, chosen for their qualifications without regard to political expediency, are concerned only with the welfare of the Army and Navy and the adequacy of our national-defense program. Through experience and study they have become specialists in questions with which they must, as your representatives, be prepared to consider and act upon.

I am really grateful for the opportunity to serve my country and my people as a member of this committee during this period of emergency. I would be less than frank with you if I told you I believe America has nothing to fear. I have no patience with scatter-brained alarmists or uninformed sword rattlers. Yet, as I see my duty, as a member of the committee of Congress charged with making provision for adequate defense, I must be realistic. We all must be prepared to face facts and anticipate contingencies that may seem extreme or remote. To stick our heads in the sand and blindly hope for the best is to live in a fool's paradise.

So swiftly do events move abroad, so strange and unreal seem reports of new and more horrible methods of warfare that it strains our immagination to realize that again a portion of this world is being bathed in the blood of young men. And while I have no fear of any immediate invasion of America by a foreign foe, I give you my pledge that so long as I am your Representative in Congress I will not relax for 1 minute in my efforts to prepare this Democracy against the evil day when merciless men, greedy with power, may seek to extend their aggression to this continent.

Those of us who have studied the history of this country's defenses and appraised its resources, are confident that the capacity and ingenuity of our people is sufficient to meet any test. Yet there has been so much misinformation about our national-defense policy that I would like to sketch for you briefly the more important developments in this field during the past 20 years.

After the World War of two decades ago, this country lost interest in its Army and Navy. It was more than an indifference or lethargy, it was the normal reaction of a war-weary people. I know that you veterans of the last war have shared with me the emotion of the soldier after the battle is won. We all wanted to come home, get back to work and forget. And we felt that a world sick of killing and destruction would not soon want to return to the amphitheater of war. Consequently, during the decade from 1920 to 1930, Congress slashed appropriations for the Army and stopped building ships for the Navy. This seemed a sound policy at the time and it is in no critical spirit that I recite these facts.

However, the aftermath of the first World War soon created new economic tensions and the world-wide depression that followed in the early thirties paved the way for the rise of the ruthless dictators who are responsible for the present conflict. With the rise to power of these totalitarian rulers, we began to realize that America should go about strengthening its own defenses. In 1932 we began to lay keels for new battleships and since that time our Navy has been brought to a parity with the navy of any other world power. A big navy it seemed was the best insurance for the protection of our own shores. Consequently, appropriations for the Army did not keep pace with the provision made for sea power. And so the Congress until 1936 coasted along with moderate appropriations for our military plant. However, since the present session convened and the threat of a European war became a reality, more adequate provision has been made in the way of appropriations for our land forces. Without burdening you with statistics, I wish to make one positive assertion: We have the largest peacetime Army in our history, it is well equipped though small and is staffed with able and experienced personnel. This Army will provide the efficient nucleus for further expansion under the program submitted to the Congress last Thursday.

And further, let me tell you this with all the emphasis at my command: Anyone who asserts that the money appropriated during the past 6 years for national defense has been wasted is either not in possession of the facts or is engaging in deliberate misrepresentation. The truth is, in recent years the defensive power of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps has been greatly improved. Of course, much remains to be done, and it can be done and it will be done.

Under the program proposed the protective mobilization plan will be put into immediate effect. This plan, worked out in advance by military personnel and kept current as developments require changes, will provide for an equipped force of 1,000,000 men with 27 Infantry divisions in both the National Guard and Regular Army, 37 antiaircraft regiments, 6 mechanized cavalry divisions, and the necessary complement of staff and headquarters troops. The modern equipment necessary for such an Army, including the planes, can be obtained within 18 to 24 months after the funds are available. Yet this time can be shortened and speeded up if emergencies dictate quicker action. It is obvious that to double or triple or even quadruple the size of our Army is an enormous job.

The American soldiers have always proven themselves the world's finest, but in modern warfare machines are likewise essential, such as motorized infantry units and efficient aircraft. Thus we must have industrial production and facilities for more production. Aircraft plants must be expanded. Foreign orders for American airplanes have made a vital contribution to our own national defense and without cost to this country. I visited airplane factories on the west coast last fall, and already these plants are beginning to use the assembly line technique of mass production just as the automobile industry does. This program was aided by the sale of planes to France and England and, I repeat, was a substantial contribution to our own national-defense resources.

One point I would like to make clear. I have heard a lot of loose talk about giving away military secrets in connection with our sale of planes to foreign buyers. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I felt it my duty to inquire into these rumors. I have talked with high officials of the Army and War Department and made independent inquiries to other sources.

I say to you tonight that these statements that we have been giving foreign countries any military secrets through the sale of this equipment are sheer nonsense. These sales have been a material advantage in strengthening our own productive capacity. Any secret devices which the Army may possess have been kept secret and, as a flier in the last war, I have the opinion that our planes are the equal if not better than those of any other power.

In conclusion, let me say that while the talk of planes and armies and preparedness may seem exciting to some, I cannot find it in my heart to be other than saddened by the necessities of the hour. My hopes and prayers are for peace, and I view this program of preparedness as essential to our own national defense and for that purpose alone. We must act—act promptly and wisely. And I pray that our action will serve to keep lighted the lamps of freedom and democracy in America. Finally, let me urge upon you to spurn and reject those who would make partisan issues of the necessity for national defense. No party has this responsibility. It is the responsibility of all Americans regardless of party. And those who undertake to make cheap political capital out of the program of national defense I regard as the "fifth column" of America and the Trojan horses of our democracy.

Celebration of Fiftieth Anniversary of Wills Memorial Presbyterian Church, Louisa County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the celebration commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Wills Memorial Presbyterian Church in Louisa County, Va., on April 27, 1940:

Tucked away in the inner recesses of every man's mind is the memory of some sacred, consecrated spot, hallowed by some association of the past, to which ever and anon his mind reverts in reverence and sweet contemplation.

As Jacob had his Penuel, as Moses had his Horeb, as Paul had his sacred spot on the road that leads to Damascus, so many of us here today have our Wills Memorial. While it may not be one of the sacred shrines from which mankind in common draws inspiration, while it may not be one of the sacred edifices whose symmetry and beauty, bedecked with frescoes and paintings fashioned by the hands of the masters, arrests the attention of mankind, yet to some of us it is sacred and dear and means more than a Bethel, to some of us its simple lines and modest spire and unembellished interior are more beautiful than a Rheims, a Notre Dame, or a St. Peter, because here in childhood's happy hour we found peace and surrendered our lives to the keeping of the One whom we are persuaded "is able to keep that which we have committed unto Him against that day."

While to some it may be only just another poor, struggling country church, there are those among us who cherish its rich heritage and glory in its achievements. Conceived in the heart of a godly woman, the sole representative of her faith for miles around, whose Presbyterian lineage numbered some of the builders of old Timber Ridge Church, the old blind preacher whose wilderness sermon was immortalized by the eloquent Wirt, one of the early presidents of Hampden-Sidney, who later became the first professor of theology at Princeton, one of the cofounders of Augusta Female Seminary, a pioneer female Presbyterian school, that later ripened into Mary Baldwin College, and some of the founders of the old Presbyterian school, known as Liberty Hall Academy, that developed over the years into Washington and Lee University, it became her dream by day and her prayer child by night during the years she labored to bring it into existence. Oh, Martha Lyle Willis, woman of great faith and wonderful works, happy am I your humble descendant, to publicly testify that you were the spiritual peer of any of your illustrious ancestors, and that in God's name you wrought mightily in your day and set in motion influences for righteousness far out of proportion to the limited sphere in which you labored. The good that has alone radiated from this humble altar, though only one among your many sacred trophies, has not only acted as holy leaven upon this community; it has blessed the State and Nation as well and made them all debtors to an humble, pious, consecrated woman.

And thou, O Wills Memorial, hast a record of service worthy of thy ancestry. While Presbyterian to the core, thou hast ever remained, like thy founder, above sect or creed, station or rank, and kept thy portals open to all the children of men. Here in thy all-embracing love, those of thy persuasion have found comfort and solace; those of a different persuasion, a spirit that brooked no intolerance; and those of no persuasion have ever caught a vision of the fellowship that should exist among the followers of the

lowly Nazarene. Here those whose ancestry linked up with the great and near great of the past and those of humble origin have alike ever been imbued with the spirit expressed by one of America's immortals that "kind hearts are more than coronets, and simple faith than Norman blood." Here in a spirit of true humility, the man of substance has forgotten his acres, and the man of poverty his hovel, as they communed together in brotherly love. Here in an atmosphere of true and genuine spiritual hospitality the stranger has known that he was in his Father's house. Here the high and low, the rich and poor, the spirited and meek have caught the true spirit of the Master, forgotten creeds and platitudes, found a common meeting place, and worshipped a common God upon a common footing. Truly here, without mixing affairs of church and state, thy democracy has entered into thy religion and thy religion into thy democracy.

And this service, O Wills Memorial, that thou hast been able over the years to render in the name of the Master, I am persuaded, has been brought about in no small degree by the character of the people that God has committed to Thy care and the character of God's servants who have ministered unto Thy flock. Where will you find a people whose history is more deeply rooted in American soil, a more intellectual people, a more patriotic people, a more spiritual people, then here in the Green Springs section of old Louisa? Where, or where, will you find the same sturdiness of character, the same intellectual honesty, the same breadth of vision, the same warmth of heart, the same love of country, the same spiritual fervor, that you find here among the Wilises, the Wests, the Vests, the Hills, the Chewnings, the Pollards, the Burnets, the Peerses, the Goodmans, the Quarleses, the McCombs, the Garths, the Hangers, the Kingstons, the Branhams, the Bostons, the Woods, the Keans, the Meltons, the Leckies, the Valentines, the Hancocks, the Grattons, the Morises, the Hensons, the Turners the Taylors, and—excluding the speaker—may I add with pardonable pride, the Flannagans? And where will you find a church, large or small, city or country, that can number among those who have ministered unto its flock, either as pastors or friends in need, men of greater piety or erudition than Dr. Little, Dr. Strickler, Dr. Moore, Dr. Smith, Dr. Rawlings, Dr. Eggleston, Dr. Petrie, and Dr. Hudson? And, let me hasten to include, thy brilliant, consecrated young servant whose morning bespeaks a glorious day of service, who has so faithfully ministered unto thy spiritual wants during the past 2 years, and who has presided with grace and charm over this assembly today, Rev. William F. Mansell.

And so, dear old Wills Memorial, as one of thy first-born, I have journeyed far that I might be here to salute thee on this thy semicentennial, and to extend to you the greetings of your flock, which is not measured in sectarian terms, and to let you know that with our greetings go our prayers that your years of usefulness and service may be extended on down through the generations yet to come.

And there are other salutations that I bring.

In the name of the people of this community, to whom thou hast ever held aloft the torch of a higher, nobler life, and hast ever ministered unto, even as a father to his children, I salute thee.

In the name of those who, like myself, in childhood's tender, formative years worshiped at thy altar and imbibed teachings that have ever restrained us on down through the years, I salute thee, and humbly acknowledge that oftimes when the clouds hung low memory's treasure chest has opened up and released thy bright rays to dissipate the clouds.

In the name of those of other faiths, true and tried friends all, who have been drawn to you by the spirit of Christian brotherhood, and who have contributed so largely to your success, I salute thee.

In the name of those old saints who shepherded thy flock, and whose memories still linger to renew our strength in hours of weakness, I salute thee.

In the name of the talented Burnet sisters whose nimble fingers and cultivated, God-endowed voices, Sabbath after Sabbath, filled this room with soul-inspiring music and song that I can still hear during my moments of retrospection, I salute thee.

In the name of our old Sunday school superintendent and Bible teacher, Arthur G. Burnet, gracious in manner, fluent in speech, whose strong mind by study, experience, and observation became encyclopedic and was the marvel of all who heard when he expounded the lesson each Sabbath morning, and whose fidelity to his trust was only excelled by his innate zeal for thy welfare, I salute thee!

In the name of that old grandmother of mine, whose name you bear, and whose prayers and vision and genius brought you into being, I salute thee.

In the name of that dear old aunt of mine, who grows more beautiful with the years, Agnes McClung Wills, through whose efforts you have been dressed in new garments befitting this your fiftieth birthday, and whose smiling face, bedecked with tears of love, I behold this minute as she sits before me in perfect peace, I salute thee.

In the name of my departed brother, thy first born, Wills Waddell Flannagan, who ever reflected thy teachings in the life that he lived, I salute thee.

And, dear old Wills Memorial, I want to give thee not only a salute but a fond embrace, in the name of the one who, to me, is thy brightest jewel, who labored not only here in thy vineyard but throughout this entire presbytery in the name of the Master, whose restraining influence has led me out of every bog and quagmire of life, whose presence, though absent, I feel whenever I enter thy sacred precincts, and who, somehow I know, has been communing with us this day as she has ever lingered close to my side, my mother!

And again, Wills Memorial, I salute thee! May God ever bless thee and keep thee, dear old altar of mine!

Acts Regulating Commerce Applicable to the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

LIST PREPARED BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chauncey P. Carter, an attorney of Washington, D. C., has called my attention to the fact that Congress has, especially during recent years, passed much legislation affecting trade and commerce, and has sought to get away from the old phrase, "commerce among the States," and has tended to use the word "commerce" and then to define such word as including not only commerce among the States but all other commerce subject to regulation by Congress, and he cites as an instance of this the definition in Fifteenth United States Code, page 12, from which statute I quote:

"Commerce," as used in sections 12 to 27, inclusive, of this chapter, means trade or commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State, Territory, or foreign nation, or between any insular possessions or other places under the jurisdiction of the United States, or between any such possession or place and any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia or any foreign nation, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in the aforesaid sections contained shall apply to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Carter points out that the word "commerce" as used in the above act is made applicable within the District of Columbia and within "any territory or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States" (as, for instance, Puerto Rico, Alaska, Virgin Islands, Canal Zone, Guam, Samoa, and so forth).

He further points out that many of these various acts governing commerce within the District of Columbia have not been embraced within the District Code, and that the District Code is therefore incomplete in omitting these therefrom, and that it would be advisable to have prepared a list of Federal acts regulating commerce which are applicable to commerce within the District of Columbia, commerce within the several Territories, insular possessions, and so forth.

At my request, Mr. Luther H. Evans, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, had prepared such a list, and under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include same herewith:

ACTS OF CONGRESS RELATING PRIMARILY TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE BUT APPLICABLE ALSO TO COMMERCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TERRITORIES, ETC.

Interstate Commerce Act amendment of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 584): Act to apply to commerce between States, etc., or within any Territory.

Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 768; U. S. Code 21: 1, 2): Separate provisions regulating manufacture in a Territory or the District of Columbia, and transportation between States, etc.

Insecticide Act of April 26, 1910 (36 Stat. 331; U. S. Code 7: 125, 126): Separate provisions regulating manufacture in a Territory or the District of Columbia, and transportation between States, etc.

Interstate Commerce Act amendment of June 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 544, sec. 7): Practically same as act of June 29, 1906, above.

White Slave Traffic Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 825, c. 395; U. S. Code 18: 397, 398): Act to apply equally to transportation "in

interstate or foreign commerce, or in any Territory, or in the District of Columbia."

Locomotive Boiler Inspection Act of February 17, 1911 (36 Stat. 913, c. 103): Act to apply to railroads operating in the District of Columbia, in a Territory, or between States, etc.

Apple Standard Act of August 3, 1912 (37 Stat. 250, c. 273; U. S. Code 21: 20): Standard grades to apply to shipments in interstate or foreign commerce, and to sales in the District of Columbia or the Territories.

Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 832; U. S. Code 21: 151): Sale, etc., of virus, serum, etc., for treatment of animals in the District of Columbia or the Territories regulated on same basis as shipments between States, etc.

Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 719, sec. 4; U. S. Code 15: 44): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Clayton Antitrust Act of October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, sec. 1; U. S. Code 15: 12): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in the District of Columbia or a Territory or insular possession.

Standard Barrel Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1186, ch. 158; U. S. C. 15: 235): Sales in any State or Territory or the District of Columbia regulated on same basis as shipments between States, etc.

Grain Standards Act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 482, sec. 1; U. S. C. 7: 72): "In interstate or foreign commerce" to include commerce within a Territory or district.

Bills of Lading Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 538, ch. 415; U. S. C. 49: 81): Act to apply equally to transportation in a Territory or the District of Columbia and between States, etc.

Food Control Act of August 10, 1917 (40 Stat. 286, sec. 26): Regulation of hoarding, etc., to apply equally to commerce between States, etc., and in the Territories or other possessions of the United States.

Export Trade Act of April 10, 1918 (40 Stat. 517, sec. 1; U. S. C. 15: 61): "Trade within the United States," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Transportation Act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 469, sec. 300): "Commerce," in connection with settlement of railway-labor disputes, to include commerce between States, etc., or within a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Same (p. 474 (1, c); U. S. C. 49: 1): Practically same as act of June 29, 1906, above.

Packers and Stockyards Act of August 15, 1921 (42 Stat. 160 (6); U. S. C. 7: 182): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Grain Futures Act of September 21, 1922 (42 Stat. 998, ch. 369; U. S. C. 7: 2): "Interstate commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1435, sec. 2 (1); U. S. C. 7: 92): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Filled Milk Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1486, ch. 262; U. S. C. 21: 61): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

United States Cotton Standards Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1519, sec. 11; U. S. C. 7:62): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in the District of Columbia.

United States Arbitration Act of February 12, 1925 (43 Stat. 883, sec. 1; U. S. C. 9: 1): "Commerce", as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Act of April 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 326 (f. 2); U. S. C. 7: 116): "Interstate commerce" in misbranded seed to include commerce between States, etc., or within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Air Commerce Act of May 20, 1926 (44 Stat. 568, ch. 344; U. S. C. 49: 171): "Interstate or foreign air commerce," as used in the act, to include air commerce within the air space over a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Railway Labor Act of May 20, 1926 (44 Stat. 577, sec. 1; amended but restated without change by act of June 21, 1934, 48 Stat. 1186, sec. 1; U. S. C. 45: 151): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce between States, etc., or in a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1355, sec. 1; U. S. C. 7: 491): Restrictions on dumping of farm produce "in interstate commerce, or in the District of Columbia."

Federal Caustic Poison Act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1407, sec. 2 (c); U. S. C. 15: 402): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1423, ch. 508; U. S. C. 15: 431): "Interstate commerce," in connection with prohibition of discriminations against farmers' cooperatives, to include commerce within any Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of June 10, 1930 (46 State. 531, c. 436; U. S. C. 7: 499a): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia.

Securities Act of May 27, 1933 (48 Stat. 75, sec. 2 (7); U. S. C. 15: 77b): "Interstate commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia.

National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 199, sec. 7 (d); U. S. C. 15: 707): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia or a Territory or "insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States."

National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450 (6); U. S. Code Supp. 29: 152): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia or a Territory.

Tobacco Inspection Act of August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 731 (1); U. S. Code Supp. 7: 511): "Commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Federal Alcohol Administration Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 989 § 17; U. S. Code Supp. 27: 211): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or the District of Columbia.

Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of June 3, 1937 (50 Stat. 248 § 2 (1); U. S. Code Supp. 7: 610): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in Agricultural Adjustment Act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Agricultural Adjustment Act of February 13, 1938 (52 Stat. 38 § 301; U. S. Code Supp. 7: 1301): "Interstate and foreign commerce," as used in title III of the act, to include commerce within a Territory or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico.

Act of March 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 111, § 2; U. S. Code Supp. 15: 44): Reenactment without change of provision of act of September 26, 1914, cited above.

Civil Aeronautics Act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 978 (20), 979 (21); U. S. Code Supp. 49: 401): "Interstate air commerce" and "interstate air transportation," as used in the act, to include transportation between places in a Territory or possession of the United States (except the Philippine Islands) or the District of Columbia.

Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1040 c. 675; U. S. Code Supp. 21: 321): "Interstate commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia "or within any other Territory not organized with a legislative body."

Federal Firearms Act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1250, § 1 (2); U. S. Code Supp. 15: 901): "Interstate or foreign commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within a Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275 c. 615; U. S. Code Supp. 7: 1561): "Interstate commerce," as used in the act, to include commerce within the District of Columbia.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving hundreds of letters from all over the sixth district of Michigan, my home district, asking for information pertaining to the national defense situation in the United States. I am, therefore, reviewing our national defense situation and calling attention to the effect that propagandists are already having upon public thinking.

On Thursday, May 16, at 1 p. m., President Roosevelt addressed the joint session of Congress at which the Senate, the House and members of the President's Cabinet were present. In the course of the President's message he recommended an immediate appropriation of $896,000,000 to be divided as follows:

1. For the Army	$546,000,000
2. For the Navy and Marine Corps	250,000,000
3. To the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense	100,000,000

In addition to the above the President asked for authorizations for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to make contract obligations for $186,000,000 and an additional authorization to the President to make contract obligations for $100,000,000, making a total of authorizations of $286,000,000. Therefore the appropriation asked and the authorizations requested total $1,182,000,000.

The question has frequently been asked, What has become of all the vast appropriation for national defense that has

been made during the last 7 years? Congress wants to know. The people want to know. From the Budget Bureau we learn that $6,265,000,000 have been spent for national defense since 1933. In addition to that millions of dollars have been appropriated indirectly for national defense.

Congress is willing to appropriate every dollar necessary for a complete national defense for our country both in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and air force, but Congress does want to know if this money is used wisely and judiciously for the purpose indicated and not needlessly squandered.

I want to give you our defense picture for the Army and Navy in 1940 as compared with 1933, as given by the Budget Bureau:

	1940	1933
NAVY		
Battleships	15	15
Aircraft carriers	5	3
Heavy cruisers	18	11
Light cruisers	17	10
Destroyers	219	229
Submarines	95	82
Aircraft	2,863	933
Manpower (active)	145,400	90,150
Navy Reserves	55,085	39,935
Marines	25,000	13,600
ARMY		
Aircraft	2,700	1,497
Manpower (active)	241,000	134,085
National Guard	251,000	189,000
Reserves	144,714	125,000
Motor vehicles	17,791	9,505
Tanks, etc	700	----------
Antiaircraft guns	400	----------
Antitank guns	744	----------

The propagandists are immediately seizing the President's request for additional money for national defense as an indication that the United States is preparing for war. There is a vast difference between the appropriation of money for adequate national defense and the appropriation of money based upon a declaration of war.

The propagandists say that America should enter into the European conflict; that this war is our war; in other words it is another war to save democracy, or, to save civilization. To the thoughtful American citizen, however, this does not appear to be the fact. We must adequately protect our own country. The finest way for the United States to keep out of war is to have a sufficient and adequate Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and air force that will be ready at all times to preserve and protect our country.

No matter where our sympathies may lie in the European conflict, our calm, sane, sober judgment tells us that America should not participate in another European conflict. The memories of 1917 and 1918 still remain with us: thousands of fine American boys dead, billions of dollars spent, thousands of otherwise happy homes rendered sad, all because we were taught to believe that we were fighting the "war to end war." If America forms the habit of participating in every European crisis, then America will be just as bad off as those European nations. For hundreds of years the pages of European history are dotted with war. America has been particularly free, in her history, from participation in European affairs, with the exception of 1917 and 1918.

We have 130,000,000 men and women and children to think about. We have the preserving of American institutions, and we have 10,000,000 men and women out of work. Can we then afford to again be induced by propagandists to enter another European struggle? Would it not be better for the United States to refrain from entering this war, to build up her own national defense, to build up her own domestic economy? Then, when the European conflict is over, we can be the good Samaritan that will help those devastated nations to rebuild themselves upon a more permanent peace basis.

The United States does not want to appear mercenary but our national debt will shortly be $45,000,000,000, the legal limit. The guaranteed obligations of the United States will add at least six billion more to that debt. Our annual deficit now, in peace times is approximately $4,000,000,000. In addition to this financial burden could the United States safely incur obligations of from ten to twenty billion dollars a year to embark in the European war?

I think the fathers and mothers of America, with very few exceptions, would send their boys to fight if the United States was being invaded, fighting for home defense, but if I judge the fathers and mothers of America aright, they do not want again to see their boys sent across the ocean to engage in a European conflict.

The European situation is critical. We cannot help but be sympathetic; but is it not our duty to disregard the incitements of propagandists, and keep cool and sane and sensible in the interest of our own country?

Relief and Work Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append hereto a copy of a bill which I am introducing today, which is intended to provide relief and work relief for the needy unemployed.

The bill provides for the liquidation of the Work Projects Administration, the making of direct grants to the States for the financing of direct relief and a program of public works for these several items. The sum of $1,250,000,000 is to be allocated on the following basis:

Work Projects Administration	$300,000,000
Direct grants to States for relief	450,000,000
Public works (with authorization of $200,000,000 for contract obligations for the next fiscal year)	400,000,000
Farm Security Administration	98,300,000
Indians	1,700,000

The table given below shows the amount of employment and relief that might be anticipated to result from the expenditure of this sum during the next fiscal year:

Month	Work Projects Administration	Direct relief	Public works
July	1,600,000	----------	----------
August	1,200,000	500,000	----------
September	1,000,000	750,000	25,000
October	700,000	1,000,000	50,000
November	400,000	1,300,000	75,000
December	100,000	1,800,000	100,000
January	----------	2,000,000	125,000
February	----------	2,000,000	150,000
March	----------	2,000,000	175,000
April	----------	2,000,000	225,000
May	----------	2,000,000	250,000
June	----------	2,000,000	300,000

Section 1 (a) provides for the general appropriation and specifically provides that $300,000,000 herein appropriated shall be completely obligated by December 31, 1940.

Section 3 is another specific provision terminating the authority of the W. P. A. on December 31, 1940.

Title II. This provides that direct relief grants shall be administered by the Social Security Board. It should be noted that section 201 provides specifically that this money shall be used only for needy unemployed below the age of 65. Thus the Social Security Board cannot use this money for making grants to the States for providing old-age assistance as covered in Title I of the Social Security Act.

Section 202 (a) provides the basis of allocation of funds among the several States and specifically provides that a grant to a State cannot be greater than 75 percent of the total cost of relief per case and that no more than 10 percent of the funds made available herein shall be allocated to any one State.

Section 203 provides that the payment of funds to States by the Board as herein provided shall be made only after

audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office. This will give the General Accounting Office authority to check the method of allocating funds among the several States and will thus provide another check on the discretion of the Social Security Board in allocating funds.

The provisions relative to public works in title III are based essentially on title II of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, which made additional appropriations for the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.

It will be noted that section 301 (a) provides for an authorization of $200,000,000 to be contracted for the fiscal year 1941.

Section 301 (b) specifically provides that no funds shall be allocated to any project that cannot be undertaken before January 1, 1941, and that cannot be completed before June 30, 1942.

In paragraph (c) it is provided that $100,000,000 of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for Federal public works. The types of projects to be covered are the same as that contained in the above-mentioned relief appropriation act. This also provides that the money herein appropriated shall be allocated among the several congressional districts as equitably as possible.

Paragraph (d) provides that no grant to a public board shall be in excess of 75 percent of the cost of the projects and also that no loans are to be made by the Federal Administrator of Public Works to assist sponsors in meeting the remaining cost of the project.

Paragraph (d) provides that $100,000,000 shall be used for grants for roads; it is distributed among the States in accordance with the formula set forth in the Public Roads Act of 1921 as amended; $100,000,000 for farm-to-market roads to be allocated to the several States on the basis of farm population; $100,000,000 for flood-control and water-conservation projects; and not more than $25,000,000 for hospitals, laboratories, and other public-health facilities.

Paragraph (g) provides that the projects be performed by private contractors as a result of competitive bidding. A provision is contained limiting profits to 7 percent.

Paragraph (h) provides for the application of the Bacon-Davis Act (prevailing rate of pay) to all public works herein covered.

Section 401 specifically prevents the use of any funds herein appropriated for the Office of Government Reports, the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, the preparation and distribution of motion-picture films and radio-broadcasting programs, the operation of theater projects, and any projects entirely sponsored by the W. P. A.

Section 402 provides that the funds herein appropriated shall be spent to cover the whole of the fiscal year June 30, 1941, except where otherwise provided.

Section 404 gives priority to veterans in employment.

Paragraph (b) provides for the 18 months' rule on W. P. A. projects.

Paragraph (d) provides for certification of need of all persons herein provided for.

Paragraph (e) prohibits the employment of aliens.

Section 406 is the provision on administrative expenses limiting them to 2 percent unless otherwise provided for.

Section 407 makes the Federal Employees Compensation Act applicable to funds to be spent hereunder.

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941.

TITLE I. WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 1. (a) In order to bring to completion projects that are now being carried on by the Work Projects Administration, and in order to liquidate the activities of that Administration, there is hereby appropriated to the Work Projects Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $300,000,000, together with all balances of appropriations under section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 which remained unobligated on June 30, 1940: *Provided*, That all such funds herein appropriated shall be completely obligated by December 31, 1940.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration, and (2) the completion of projects already approved by the President under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1937, 1938, and 1939: *Provided*, That no new projects shall be undertaken after June 30, 1940.

(c) The funds appropriated in this section, exclusive of those used for administrative expenses, shall be so administered that expenditure authorizations for other than labor costs for all the work projects financed from such funds in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, shall not exceed an average for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, of $6 per month per worker: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated in this section shall not be used for the purchase of any construction equipment or machinery that can be rented at prices determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable and his determination made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him shall be final and conclusive.

(d) In administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects approved after January 1, 1940, to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States; and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

(e) The funds appropriated in section 1 (a) hereof shall be available to provide, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, for medical and hospital facilities for work camp project employees and burial expenses of deceased work camp project employees, including the transportation of remains to place of burial: *Provided*, That deductions shall be made from the earnings of all project employees quartered in such camps in an amount sufficient to offset the estimated cost to the United States for furnishing the foregoing.

(f) When it is found that as a result of bad faith, fraud, or misrepresentation on the part of the sponsor any land, building, structure, facility, or other project, or any part thereof, upon which funds appropriated in this joint resolution have been expended, is used, transferred, or disposed of without retention and control for public use, the sponsor of the project and the person or organization to which the land, building, structure, facility, or project has been sold, leased, or given, shall be liable, jointly and severally, upon demand of the Commissioner or his duly authorized representative, to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds expended on such land, building, structure, facility, or project.

(g) The amount which may be obligated for administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration in the District of Columbia and in the field shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $10,000,000 during the fiscal year 1941, of which sum the amounts so to be obligated for the following respective purposes shall not exceed these sums: Salaries, $8,000,000; communication service, $150,000; travel, $1,000,000, and printing and binding, $100,000: *Provided*, That if the President shall determine under section 1 (a) that the appropriation made by such section shall be expended within a period less than the entire fiscal year, there may be obligated for administrative expenses not to exceed $8,000,000 within the period ending February 28, 1941, of which sum not to exceed $5,500,000 shall be available for salaries; $100,000 for communication service; $650,000 for travel; and $65,000 for printing and binding. Sums made available under this subsection shall not be expended for radio broadcasting or for the acquisition, rental, or distribution of motion-picture film.

(h) The Commissioner shall transmit to Congress, on the first day of the next regular session thereof, a statement showing for each State the names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Work Projects Administration whose compensation is at the rate of $1,200 per annum or more. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall include the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

(i) The functions heretofore vested in the Works Progress Administration and the Work Projects Administration are authorized to be carried out until December 31, 1940, by the Work Projects Administration subject to the provisions of this joint resolution and such latter Administration is hereby extended until such date to carry out the purposes of this section.

(j) The President may detail a commissioned officer on the active list of the United States Army to perform the functions of the office of Commissioner of Work Projects, without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer. Any commissioned officer so detailed shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowance as such officer, an amount sufficient to make his total compensation $10,000 per annum while he is so detailed.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration shall fix a monthly earning schedule for persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by section 1 which shall not substantially affect the current national average labor cost per person of the Work Projects Administration. Such monthly earning schedule shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living. The Commissioner shall require that the hours of work for all persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by section 1 shall (1) be 130 hours per month, except that the Commissioner, in his discretion, may require

a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of relief workers with no dependents, and the earnings of such workers shall be correspondingly reduced, and (2) not exceed 8 hours in any day, and (3) not exceed 40 hours in any week.

(b) The Commissioner may authorize exemptions from the above limitations of monthly earnings and hours of work to protect work already done on a project, to permit making up lost time, in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare, and in the case of supervisory personnel employed on work projects.

(c) There shall be kept from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers whose need for employment has not been certified by (1) a local public certified agency or (2) by the Work Projects Administration, where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

SEC. 3. All power and authority vested in the Work Projects Administration by this act or any other act shall expire on December 31, 1940.

TITLE II. GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE STATES FOR RELIEF

SEC. 201. There is hereby appropriated to the Social Security Board out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $450,000,000 to be expended by the Board in making grants to the States, District of Columbia, Territories, and possessions in order to assist them in providing relief for needy unemployed persons below the age of 65, in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 202. (a) As much of the sum appropriated herein for grants-in-aid to the States to assist them in financing and administering such forms of relief that may be determined upon and undertaken by them as the Board deems necessary, shall be allocated by the Board among the several States upon the basis of the Board's findings and conclusions with respect to the facts concerning and the weight to be given to the following factors in the respective States: (1) unemployment, as determined by the latest available statistics of the United States Employment Service, (2) living costs, (3) population, and (4) financial resources: *Provided*, That the amount allocated to any State shall not exceed 75 percent of the total amount to be spent for relief in such States: *Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of the total amount allocated under this section shall be paid to any State.

(b) The sum allocated to a State under subsection (a) shall be paid monthly by order of the Board if—

(1) The Governor (or in the case of the District of Columbia, the District Commissioners) has certified to the Board that there has been established for the administration of relief in such State a board composed of five members, not more than three members of which shall be members of the same political party, and that such board has the power and duty of receiving and disbursing sums which may be granted such State under this section: *Provided*, That this requirement shall not apply if the constitution of such State does not permit the establishment of a board with such powers; and

(2) The personnel of such State board shall be subject to approval by the Board as to their qualifications, and the Board shall have power for cause to require the substitution of new members; and

(3) The State board has certified to the Board that the State, or its subdivisions, or both, have provided or are prepared to provide an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount to be spent for relief and work relief in such State, including the amount allocated to it under this section, and that the expenditures for administration will not exceed 5 percent of such total expenditures; and

(4) The State board has certified that relief is being provided in all political subdivisions of the State where necessary, and that in each political subdivision which administers relief there is a local board with the power and duty of administering relief in such subdivision and which administers relief there is a local board with the power and duty of administering relief in such subdivision and which is composed in the same manner as the State board provided for in paragraph (1) of this subsection; and

(5) The State board shall disburse its funds by direct administration of relief, or by grants to the local boards upon the basis of inquiry into the relief needs of the local subdivisions and their financial ability to provide for relief, or both; and

(6) The State board provides and uses such administrative methods, including those relating to selection, tenure of office, and compensation of personnel, as are found by the Board to be necessary for the efficient operation of a relief system; and

(7) The State board has agreed to furnish to the Board such reports (respecting the administration of relief or work relief with respect to which funds allocated to the State under this section are used) in such form and containing such information as the Board may from time to time require, and to comply with such provisions as the Board may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(8) The State board has agreed to permit the Board to make such inspection of the administration of relief in the State as the Board deems necessary and to submit to a postaudit of its financial records by the General Accounting Office; and

(9) The State board agrees that none of the Federal funds granted to it will be used to provide relief or work relief for persons who are not citizens of the United States.

(c) If the Board, after reasonable notice and hearing to the State relief board, finds that there has not been compliance by a State or the State relief board with the requirements made in subsection (b) of this section, the Board shall withhold the grants to such State until such time as the Board is satisfied that the State or State relief board has complied with such requirements. If the Board, after reasonable notice and hearing to the State relief board, finds that any part of an amount granted to a State under this section has been diverted to a purpose not reasonably within the purpose of furnishing relief or work relief, or that more than 75 percent of the amount devoted to such purposes has been expended out of grants under this section, or that more than 5 percent of the total expenditures for relief or work relief has been for administrative expenses, the amount of future grants to be made to the State shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount the Board determines has been diverted or the amount the Board determines to be such excesses.

SEC. 203. The Board shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be granted to the States under section 202 from the sums appropriated by this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the Division of Disbursement, and after audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the States at the time fixed by the Board the amounts so certified and approved.

SEC. 204. (a) The Board shall make full report to Congress on January 15 of each year concerning its administration of the functions with which it is charged by the virtue of this act. Such report shall include detailed statements as to the amount of Federal funds allocated to each State, the formulas used in making such allocations, and the total relief expenditures and number of individuals on relief rolls in each State for the last previous fiscal year and the current fiscal year, as far as such information is available.

(b) In connection with the request for any further relief appropriation to be administered as herein provided, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed statement showing the estimated need for relief and the tentative formula to be used by the Board in dividing the cost of relief between the Federal Government and the States in making grants to the States as provided in sections 201 and 202.

SEC. 205. No more than $2,250,000 of the funds herein appropriated shall be used by the Social Security Board to administer the functions hereby vested therein.

SEC. 206. As herein used, the term "State" includes State, District of Columbia, Territory, or insular possession.

TITLE III. PUBLIC WORKS AND OTHER GRANTS

SEC. 301. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works (herein called the Administrator) has heretofore financed or aiding in financing pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, or the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to remain available until June 30, 1942, the sum of $400,000,000: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works is hereby authorized to incur obligations and to enter into contracts for the payment of grants to public bodies as is hereinafter provided in an amount not exceeding $200,000,000. The funds herein provided for are to be expended by such Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of allotments to finance Federal projects, or (2) the making of grants to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies).

(b) No funds appropriated under this title shall be allotted for any project which in the determination of the Administrator cannot be commenced prior to January 1, 1941, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to June 30, 1942.

(c) Under subsection (a) (1) of this section, not to exceed $100,000,000 shall be allotted to Federal agencies for Federal construction projects in continental United States outside the District of Columbia, and such projects shall be selected from among the following classes: (1) Projects authorized by law, and for the acquisition of lands for sites of such authorized projects; (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities; (3) projects for hospitals and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration (including the acquisition of lands for sites thereof); (4) projects for penal and correctional facilities under the Department of Justice including the acquisition of land for sites thereof; and (5) any river and harbor projects that have been authorized by law or that have been approved by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army: *Provided*, That so far as possible the funds herein allotted for Federal projects shall be as equitably as possible distributed among the several congressional districts.

(d) No grant to a public body shall be made in excess of 75 percent of the cost of any non-Federal project: *Provided*, That no additional loans shall be made by the Administrator to any public body for any purpose.

(e) Out of funds available for grants to public bodies, $100,000,000 shall be available for the construction of highways: *Provided*, That this fund shall be allocated among the several States and the political subdivisions thereof on the basis of the formula set forth in the Public Roads Act of 1921, as amended; $100,000,000 shall be used

for making grants to assist in the construction of farm-to-market roads: *Provided*, That such funds shall be allocated to the several States and their political subdivisions on the same basis as their farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States; $100,000,000 shall be utilized in making grants for flood-control and water-conservation projects; and no more than $25,000,000 shall be available for the making of grants for the construction of hospitals, laboratories, and other public-health facilities.

(f) Not more than $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. Such amount and the amount made available in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1941 for administrative expenses for the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes and under the conditions set forth thereof for such act and such Administration.

(g) All projects undertaken by public bodies with the assistance of a grant as herein provided shall be done by contract awarded to the lowest responsible competitive bidder after adequate public notice of such competition for bids. No person, firm, or corporation performing such a contract so awarded shall be entitled to a profit in excess of 7 percent thereon, and any profit made in excess thereof shall be refunded to the Government of the United States. The Administrator shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(h) Section 276 (a) of title 40 of the United States Code shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by this title.

(i) The Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. He is hereby authorized to continue all functions which he is authorized to perform on the date of enactment hereon.

SEC. 302. (a) In order to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and relief to needy farmers and relief to other needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $98,300,000, together with the balance of the appropriation under section 3 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 which remains unobligated on June 30, 1940.

SEC. 303 (a) In order to continue to provide relief and rural rehabilitation for needy Indians in the United States, there is hereby appropriated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $1,700,000.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration, not to exceed $80,000; (2) loans; (3) relief; (4) the prosecution of projects approved by the President for the Farm Security Administration for the benefit of the Indians under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (5) subject to the approval of the President for projects involving rural rehabilitation of needy Indians.

TITLE IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 401. No funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, the preparation and distribution of motion-picture films and radio-broadcasting programs, or for the operation of any theater projects, or for the operation of any projects sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

SEC. 402. Funds appropriated in this joint resolution to the various Federal agencies shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1941, except where a different apportionment is specifically permitted by this act, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such agencies during such period for the purposes herein set forth.

SEC. 403. The funds made available by this act shall be used only for work relief or relief for persons in need except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

SEC. 404. In employing or retaining in employment or in the granting of relief to any person where such is financed in whole or in part out of funds appropriated in this act, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration), unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans, who are in need and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting veterans, unremarried widows of such veterans, and wives of such veterans who are in need, and are American citizens who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (a) the expiration of 30 days after the date of his removal, and (b) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects.

(c) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this act, the agency providing the employment shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such, or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

(d) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects, or from receipt of any other form of relief, all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by, and no relief worker shall be employed on such projects until after his need for employment has been certified by, (a) a local public certifying agency, or (b) the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies; *Provided*, That insofar as possible in the case of any project financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by title III of this act preference shall be given to persons certified by local authorities as being in need of relief.

(e) No alien shall be given employment or relief or continued in employment or relief from the appropriations contained in this act and no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship.

(f) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

SEC. 405. The provision of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured in connection with the appropriations in this act when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

SEC. 406. The appropriations in this act for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this act as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories and periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding; and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this act: *Provided*, That unless otherwise specifically provided for, administrative expenses of any agency operating under this act shall not be greater than 2 percent of funds herein made available to it.

SEC. 407. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from the appropriations in this act for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

SEC. 408. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this act, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this act or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this act.

SEC. 409. No funds appropriated in this act, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes) in competition with existing industries.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received recently from a constituent, together with my reply thereto:

MILES CITY, MONT., *May 15, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: Am writing you in regard to sentiment in our locality on the movement on foot to increase our national defense.

The views of our people here seems to be unanimous that our country should lose not a moment's time in stepping up our defense system to be ready for any emergency.

Most of us know that you are exceptionally well informed on world conditions.

Do you think that our country, which is extremely wealthy, is being put in readiness with sufficient speed in case we should be put to a test in deadly combat? Your views will be appreciated.

Is our air force adequate, and do we now have enough heavy artillery and antiaircraft weapons? We are not in a position to know these things, and relying on your judgment, prompted this letter.

We have two patriotic sons, aged 21 and 24 years.

We feel that it would be nothing short of criminal if, in a war, these young men should be called upon to lay down their lives on account of a shortage of, or inferior, equipment.

Let us not be fooled. We are a peace-loving people, but it seems those are the nations most likely to be attacked.

It is our humble opinion that our great Republic should lose no time in building and manning an air force second to none.

With kindest regards.

Cordially yours,

W. J. ESSLINGER,
Member, Division 761, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

MAY 18, 1940.

Mr. W. J. ESSLINGER,
611 North Montana, Miles City, Mont.

MY DEAR FRIEND: This will acknowledge your very interesting letter of May 15. Indeed, I am very glad to have it.

The President, in his message to the joint session of Congress on May 16, covered the case. He pointed out that air navigation steps up the speed of possible attack to 200 to 300 miles an hour, and called to our attention how attacks could be made on American continents in this fashion: From Greenland to Newfoundland it is 4 hours by air, 5 hours to Nova Scotia, and only 6 hours to New England. The Azores are only 2,000 miles from parts of our eastern seaboard, and if Bermuda fell into hostile hands it is a matter of less than 3 hours for modern bombers to reach our shores. From a base in the outer West Indies the coast of Florida could be reached in 200 minutes. The islands off the west coast of Africa are only 1,500 miles from Brazil. Modern planes, starting from the Cape Verde Islands, can be over Brazil in 7 hours; and Para, Brazil, is but 4 flying hours to Caracas, Venezuela; and Venezuela but 2½ hours to Cuba and the Canal Zone; and Cuba and the Canal Zone are 2¼ hours to Tampico, Mexico; and Tampico is 2¼ hours to St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha.

I am not at all excited about an invasion, as it is my firm belief that when those countries in Europe get through with their insane war they will be bled white. However, as a matter of insurance against possible attack, on the same day that the President delivered his message I made a speech on the floor of the House, and, among other things, I said:

"The President of the United States said in his message here today, in joint session, 'I know that our trained officers and men know more about fighting and the weapons and equipment needed for fighting than any of us laymen, and I have confidence in them.' I wish to add that I have every confidence and profound faith in the President of the United States. Though I shivered when the sum was named, I feel that every dollar he asks this Congress to appropriate will be spent for the express purpose of defense only; that there is no person in the United States, nor any Member of this House, who is more desirous of keeping this country out of war and keeping this country at peace than the President of the United States. He is striving day and night to preserve our peace. I am going to vote for the appropriation that he has asked for, and I am going to vote for it only on the theory that it is for defense purposes. My contention always has been, and is now, that we must keep out of foreign wars; but if any foreign country attempts to invade our shores, we must defend it with the last dollar we have and with the last drop of blood of American citizens to preserve our liberties."

You will see from the above that I am for the President's program, but I do not feel that there is really anything to worry about. The defense program may be likened to taking out insurance against fire.

You, like ourselves, have learned a lot in the last 2 months from what is going on in Europe. Old methods of warfare are outmoded. England may be licked because she failed to keep step with advancing types of death-dealing agencies. There is little doubt but what the time is fast coming when the major battles will be fought in the air. We have learned that ships must be protected against bombs from air. England has found this out. We must profit from her lesson.

Thanking you for your fine letter, and hoping that you will feel free to write to me at any time in the future, I am

Yours sincerely,

JAMES F. O'CONNOR.

White-Fringed Beetle Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

LETTERS AND TELEGRAM FROM STATE OF LOUISIANA AGRICULTURAL OFFICIALS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, May 18, 1940.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please permit us to call your attention to a controversy that occurred in the House of Representatives on May 14.

We want to go on record as denouncing the few Louisiana beekeepers who have attempted to prevent funds being made available for white-fringed beetle control and eradication work, as evidenced by letters being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the above date. These few beekeepers are acting purely from a selfish motive and are not concerned about the white-fringed beetle except to try to stop the control and eradication program in Louisiana.

With the view of attempting to clarify this situation so that reconsideration of the appropriation may be obtained, we have directed to Congressman DIRKSEN, who we are sure acted in good faith, a letter and telegram as per enclosed copies.

Should adequate funds not be made available for the next fiscal year, the work for the suppression of the white-fringed beetle will be terminated as of June 30. In that event there are reasons to expect that the 44 uninfested States would take quarantine actions against the 4 infested States, including Louisiana, to the serious detriment of the agricultural interests of these States, and the opportunity of possibly eliminating this pest, which occurs only in limited areas in the 4 infested States, would be lost.

We feel that it would be nothing but fair to permit the various commissioners of agriculture, State entomologists, and plant-quarantine officials to be heard on this very serious and important question.

Thanking you for your consideration, we remain

Sincerely yours,

H. D. WILSON,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
W. E. ANDERSON,
State Entomologist.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, May 17, 1940.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRKSEN: Our department is very much interested in the white-fringed beetle appropriation in the amount of $600,000 as approved by the Bureau of the Budget to control and eradicate this new pest that has obtained a temporary foothold in four Southern States. The white-fringed beetle has demonstrated its ability to do enormous damage to agricultural and horticultural plants and plant products in the infested areas. Based on our investigation of the damages that the white-fringed beetle is capable of doing, we are justly fearful of the results should this insect spread from the infested areas at New Orleans to adjacent territory or from any other infested area.

There are certain interests within the area under quarantine on account of the white-fringed beetle that are seriously affected as a result of the control and eradication program and will not profit from same. These interests are the beekeeping, dairy, beef cattle, and a few other minor interests. It means nothing to these interests above cited whether the beetle is eradicated or not; yet in the general farming areas of Louisiana, as well as the balance of the Southern States, the presence or absence of the white-fringed beetle means success or failure of crops grown.

The State of Louisiana recognized that in imposing restrictions in carrying out the regulations for the eradication of the pest it necessarily follows that certain hardships and privations must be imposed on citizens in the infested areas in order to protect the balance of the country from the ravages of the white-fringed beetle. In fairness to the various interests affected by the program (by causing these interests to sustain a loss) the State of Louisiana has endeavored to alleviate these losses as much as possible by appropriating money to pay claims for losses and damages.

The beekeeping industry, and I might say the balance of the industries in the infested areas of Louisiana affected by the white-fringed beetle control and eradication program, are infinitesimal in value when compared to the value of other crops that will be protected not only in Louisiana but in other States from the ravages of the white-fringed beetle if the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in cooperation with States affected, is permitted to carry this program on to a successful conclusion.

The testimonials of the Louisiana beekeepers in the infested area that were read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 14 presented a one-sided, selfish picture in order to obtain the avowed objection of a few individuals to stop the program of white-fringed beetle eradication. If the program could not be stopped, then to harass those in charge of the work in every way possible through individual efforts as well as through the so-called organization of Louisiana Beekeepers Association, who, with the exception of less than a dozen, keep bees as a hobby or a side line.

Beekeepers, dairymen, and beef cattle owners have been paid in excess of $35,000 for losses that they have sustained. The beekeepers have been paid on the basis of $7.50 per colony, totaling more than $30,000. Permit me to suggest that you verify the fact from the beekeepers of your State that this is a good price for a two-story colony of bees.

In view of the foregoing facts, we respectfully request and urge that you reconsider this entire matter, with the view to assist to obtain a concurrence in the Senate amendment.

From the knowledge we have obtained with regard to the damage the white-fringed beetle will cause to a wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops, we feel that it is a pest of major economic importance. We hope that the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine will be provided with funds with which to eradicate this pest in cooperation with the various State departments of agriculture that are affected by the presence of the white-fringed beetle within their respective States.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. ANDERSON,
State Entomologist.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 17, 1940.*

Hon. E. McK. DIRKSEN,
United States Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Our State Entomologist W. E. Anderson is writing you at length a'r mail today in reference to the elimination from appropriation bill funds to carry on work of controlling or eradicating white-fringed beetle in several Southern States. We believe this action was based on letters, telegrams, or other information received from a few disgruntled and selfish beekeepers in the section around New Orleans, La. From our observation and from information from the United States Department of Agriculture, the white-fringed beetle is a major pest and if not controlled or eradicated will do untold damage to practically every crop that is grown in Southern States and perhaps will eventually get a foothold north of the Ohio River. This work did damage some beekeepers, and the Louisiana Legislature appropriated moneys to take care of these losses. Would appreciate if you would further investigate this unfortunate situation.

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

Exploitation of Child Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

TELEGRAMS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost unbelievable that there is an obvious attempt on the part of the present administration to encourage and to subsidize the exploitation of child labor. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture, in a letter approving of the passage of Senate bill 3237, advocates that we legislate the payment of benefits—cash out of the Treasury, many thousands of dollars—to those sugar-plantation owners who have been caught during the past 3 years employing children, contrary to the provisions of the Sugar Act.

The most ironical feature of this legislation which I shall oppose in every possible way is the fact that these sugar-plantation owners ask for payment of these many hundreds of thousands of dollars on the grounds that they did not know that the children they employed were under 14 years of age. These same sugar-plantation owners allege that they are favorable to the payment of a penalty of $10 per day when the Government finds that they have or are employing children. Is it fair to expect that the Children's Bureau will be any better able to enforce such a penalty than they have been to prevent the employment of children under 14 years of age when by so doing the employing sugar-plantation owner faced the loss of many thousands of dollars in cash payments out of the public treasury?

With millions of our people unemployed, and with the American people appropriating billions of dollars for relief, surely one would expect these beneficiaries of the Sugar Act to cooperate with the Government by providing employment for persons of mature years.

When this legislation was up for consideration on the floor of the House this afternoon and also 2 weeks ago I strongly objected to its passage and now we find that the proponents of this legislation are seeking a special rule to have this class legislation and misleading measure considered by the House. Since I raised objection on the floor of the House to the enactment of this vicious legislation, national organizations have notified the House leaders of their objection to the enactment of this legislation without the full facts becoming known at a public hearing. It is my understanding that such organizations as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Young Women's Christian Association have already petitioned the Speaker of the House for a public hearing on this bill before it is considered by the House. I have already asked for a hearing if and when a rule is considered. I sincerely believe that once the Members of the House are acquainted with the full facts behind this proposed legislation they will vote to protect the child life of America by rejecting any proposal that calls for the payment of public funds to those who, contrary to the provisions of existing law, employ and exploit the labor of children under 14 years of age.

The following are two of the telegrams of protest I have received against this legislation, also a copy of a telegram written to some of the leaders in the Congress from the board of managers, National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Majority Leader, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
Hon. HARRY B. COFFEE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Board of Managers, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in session assembled May 6, Omaha, Nebr., deplores reporting without a hearing of S. 3237, weakening child-labor provisions of Sugar Act. Urgently requests that bill be recommitted and hearings held.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *May 14, 1940.*

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

New Bedford Teachers Union appreciates your stand on S. 3237 relative to a Sugar Act which will encourage exploitation of child labor.

AMY B. WATSON,
Secretary, New Bedford Teachers Union.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *May 14, 1940.*

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

New Bedford Central Labor Union appreciates your stand on S. 3237 relative to a Sugar Act which will encourage exploitation of child labor.

DOROTHY B. DELOID,
Secretary, New Bedford Central Labor Union.

W. P. A. Project Highly Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1940

LETTERS FROM HON. THOMAS E. DEWEY AND JAMES W. TURNER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, district attorney of the county of New York, N. Y., highly commending the effective work done by those assigned to a W. P. A. project in his office. This letter was written by District Attorney Dewey on April 7, 1938, at a time when the continuance of the project mentioned therein was in doubt.

It is a splendid and deserving tribute to those persons who were and equally applies to those who are now assigned to this project, persons who have contributed greatly in the work of the district attorney's office in the detection of crime and in the prosecution of criminals, and who, in all probability, if it was not for the W. P. A., would be receiving straight relief, with the "pauper's oath" test, directly or indirectly, as the basis for receiving assistance. Instead, under the work-relief program put into operation by a Democratic Congress under the farsighted, courageous, and humane leadership of the great humanitarian, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, those assigned to this project and all other W. P. A. projects are contributing their abilities, mental and physical, or both, in some necessary activity and at the same time are receiving relief, and in a manner where they retain feelings of self-respect for themselves.

The opinions and feelings of District Attorney Dewey, as expressed in his letter, are typical of the opinions entertained by countless of public officials throughout the country in connection with projects which, sponsored locally, are under their jurisdiction or supervision.

The letter of District Attorney Dewey is a splendid and deserving tribute to those assigned to the project in his office. It is just as applicable to all persons who are beneficiaries of the great and humane work-relief program brought into operation under the leadership of President Roosevelt.

I also include in my remarks a letter received from James W. Turner, chairman of the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Scituate, Mass., showing the opinion of the members of the board in relation to this great work-relief program, under which the unfortunate victims of the depression, capable of working, willing to work, unable to obtain work, and who are in distress, receive relief, not subject to the "pauper's oath" test, either directly or indirectly, but in a manner which enables them to retain their feelings of self-respect. The importance of this angle from the broad aspects of citizenship have been too long overlooked.

COUNTY OF NEW YORK,
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
New York, April 7, 1938.

Mr. CORRINGTON GILL,
Assistant Administrator, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GILL: I am gravely concerned at the possibility of interruption of the W. P. A. project now attached to this office, the news of which you conveyed to me yesterday. The discontinuance of the project would be nothing short of a calamity in the administration of criminal justice.

For the past 2 years this project has been continuously assisting in racket investigations of great importance. These successful prosecutions would not have been possible, with one exception, without the tremendous volume of accounting labor expended in each. Unless intimately connected with the office, no one could have any conception of the work done by the 25 W. P. A. accountants and the 10 staff accountants regularly attached to my office. Literally thousands of full sets of books have been examined, the suspicious items isolated, and their histories developed in form to compel the testimony of reluctant or intimidated victims of organized crime.

By way of illustration, my office has been working for more than 2 years upon an organized monopoly in the electrical industry maintained by fraud and violence. This contractor's monopoly has, in my judgment, cost the National, State, and municipal governments for electrical work in the city of New York many millions of dollars in the past decade.

This investigation involves the exhaustive examination of the corporate books and records of several scores of contractors whose total annual business aggregates many millions of dollars. Only in this way can the evidence be procured. With a small staff burdened with many other duties, I think I can fairly state that this investigation would break down completely without the assistance of the W. P. A. project. The savings to the Federal Government alone, after the monopoly has been broken, would in my judgment pay for the continuance of the W. P. A. project for 10 years.

One other illustration may be helpful. For more than 4 years a group of professional criminals directly connected with the notorious Lucky Luciano have, under the guise of a legitimate labor union, extorted money from workers and employers in the taxicab industry in New York City. Officers of four of the largest companies and many of their employees have been intimidated or beaten and their cabs seriously damaged or destroyed. By combining the extensive and skilled accounting work largely performed by men on the W. P. A. project with an investigation by my office, this racket has been broken and the defendants are either in custody or fugitives from justice. The economic loss to the community as a result of this racket has been tremendous, and its destruction by arrests during this past week made an important contribution to the peace and security of industry and labor in New York.

In each of these two illustrations, the work is going forward, with a vast amount still to be done. There are at least a dozen other situations of almost equal magnitude, in each of which it is imperative that the accounting work be continuously available.

This need for additional accountants, I hope, is not permanent but will continue for another year or more. It is a project of the highest social value to the community. While the expense of the project does not appear to me to be substantial, on a comparative basis, it might be possible to make some reduction in cost if that would be helpful.

Should any further information be useful to you in presenting this matter to the President, I will be happy to provide it. It is my sincere hope that authority for the continuance of the project can be procured.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Scituate, Mass., May 14, 1940.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: The board of selectmen approve favorable consideration of the W. P. A. appropriation bill which comes before Congress for debate on Thursday of this week.

Each year our citizens have voted substantial sums for the purchase of materials and supplies for constructive W. P. A. projects to meet allotments of funds granted by the Federal Government for work relief, which has utilized the services of many needy persons who would have otherwise been unemployed. These funds also made possible improvements of permanent value to the town at a greatly reduced cost, which could not have been considered in these times.

Not only have these projects been of distinct benefit to the town, but they have been a source of security for our citizens and have been a great factor in keeping relief costs down.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES W. TURNER,
Chairman, Board of Selectmen.

Further Suggestions To Remedy Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. President, after a period of studying natural resources and unemployment, I wish to include, in addition to other reports, a statement of my belief that new mining developments and also new agricultural developments are possible, and even prospective, in such a way as to afford a considerable measure of employment. I believe that proper assistance afforded by the Government

to aid small-mine operators would result in an unprecedented impetus of mining development, and would afford employment to 200,000 men now unemployed, and would probably save the taxpayer $45,000,000 cut of the Federal Treasury over a 5-year period in supporting those now on relief. This legislation would stimulate new mineral production, especially of the strategic materials on which the prosperity and the defense of our country depend.

I further believe that by proper legislation and governmental aid thousands of farmers can be given employment, or can be enabled to establish themselves in partial self-support, through the growing of new crops and the tilling of new land, which agricultural development would not interfere with present crops or present cultivated lands. The new crops referred to are those that have never been extensively cultivated in this country, but whose products are needed, command good prices and have heretofore been imported. The new lands referred to are limited in area, but are those in certain favored spots on the public domain where men who have a small income and a knowledge of agriculture, such as many ex-service men, can make a part of their living from the tilling of the soil.

I. AS TO AID OF SMALL-MINE OPERATORS

The explanation of one proposal has been already well made by W. J. Graham, president of the Arizona Small Mine Operators' Association, in his analysis of the bill H. R. 8206. This analysis will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2254, as an extension of the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman JOHN R. MURDOCK. This enactment would enlarge the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make mining loans up to $5,000 on class C properties, and would extend the R. F. C.'s powers in regard to the types of mining loans permitted. It would also make available more funds for such loans by impounding the Government's seigniorage on silver domestically produced since July 1, 1939, over a 5-year period. The bill recognizes mining as a hazardous investment, but provides ample security for the total loans, and looks toward ultimate repayment through royalties from producing properties. A future amendment to the bill will provide that only unemployed men shall be given employment by this means.

It is estimated that 200,000 men will be furnished employment by this act in operation without the cost of a penny to the Government, and with a consequent decrease over a 5-year period of forty or more million dollars in relief rolls for these same 200,000 men now on relief. While some mines would not pay out, others will prove profitable and make the repayments; and, better still, the great untouched fields of mining will be opened up and set in a course of proper development by this legislation, whereas now practically no new developments are taking place whatsoever. All this is possible through the aiding of these small-business men and the furnishing of employment in private enterprise at productive work.

II. AS TO AID TO FARMERS

The suggestion outlining the beginning of this statement contemplates new farm employment and opportunity especially throughout the Southwest. Although earnestly advocating the general policy of reclamation and irrigation, and although often asking for large appropriations to build great dams and irrigation works under the Bureau of Reclamation, it is not that type of thing I now have in mind. Rather it is a type of subsistence farming, subsistence with a new meaning, and not with the former meaning of the term. As explained in the beginning, there are only certain spots in the public domain and only certain conditions under which this can be done, and only certain individuals who would be capable of benefiting from this proposal. Some areas may be better than others, some products may be better than others, and of course some individuals would be be better than others. However, I sincerely believe that the following is a worthy suggestion toward ending unemployment for many men now seeking "a way out."

What kind of men might be interested in this proposal and likely successful? First, ex-service men who have some compensation from the Government, but hardly enough to support themselves and their families and who are anxious to bring their abilities and resourcefulness, in a spirit of self-reliance and independency, to better their condition in life. Let it be remembered that when a tract of land containing six or seven thousand acres in the great Northwest was opened for settlement and ex-service men were given preference and only 65 could be provided for, more than 1,500 applied. This shows the land-hunger of our ex-service men.

There are tracts of land lying along the Colorado River not susceptible of extensive irrigation plans, but susceptible to watering by pumping and the first proposal is that such lands be made available by the Government in 5-acre tracts to be leased to qualifying persons at a nominal rent with the view of the occupant making intensive use of the 5 acres in the most profitable way he can and having first option on the purchase of the land eventually. Truck gardening or chicken ranching, or the like, would seem to lend themselves to this use.

There are other portions of the public domain where a considerable number of 5-acre tracts might be developed at less expense and with less water than the ones just referred to. Many valleys, and even so-called desert stretches in various parts of the Southwest, could be made to produce new products which would likely be quite profitable. For instance, it is very likely that safflower seed can be grown with a fourth the amount of water which would be required for vegetables, alfalfa, or cotton; and safflower seed oil would be more valuable than any of the above-mentioned production. Just prior to his death Thomas Edison gave a great deal of thought to the American production of rubber. It is a well-known fact that certain desert vegetation of the Southwest produces a good quality of rubber, and if war abroad or other factors made it necessary and prices high, we could probably produce our own rubber. Perhaps we ought to produce a small part of it, even under peace conditions. We have it on good authority that rubber can be grown in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California.

For several months a gentleman who is producing a high quality fiber for binder twine and many other such purposes has been suggesting the harvesting of yucca plant leaves on the public domain. He has stated repeatedly that if we will make a slight change in the Taylor Grazing Act permitting the harvesting of yucca leaves—not the plant, but the leaves only—that he will establish a factory, using his newly invented machinery to process this valuable fiber, at Deming, N. Mex., Willcox and Kingman, Ariz., and Searchlight, Nev., as well as at Van Horn, Tex. The harvesting of yucca leaves from the public domain may not seem to fit in very well with the above proposal, but we are reliably informed by botanists at the University of Arizona and the Thompson Arboretum, in Arizona, that yucca can be cultivated, and that its fiber is far superior to that which we now import.

In addition to the above, there are other farm possibilities which are more than mere possibilities. There are many families on the outskirts of Phoenix and Tucson and other southern Arizona towns, who are now doing quite well on small ranches raising chickens, squabs, rabbits, and other specialties. Many of these men need to live in a mild climate and to have plenty of sunshine in order to prolong their lives. Of course, ex-service men are more likely to fit into this scheme, but also some elderly folk who have a little income but who wish to retire from farm homes in the north and east and make their homes in a land where they can be outdoors every day of the year. Such persons could very likely take advantage of this program.

This will be more especially true as old-age pensions and benefits come more and more into use, and elderly folk who would not think of running a large farm in the colder part of

our country will find profit and pleasure supporting themselves in the warmer part of our country. With a larger contribution from the Federal Government some of the many thousands of families fleeing from the Dust Bowl toward the west, into Arizona and California, could take root and establish new homes for themselves.

Marvel Mills Logan

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MARVEL MILLS LOGAN, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Senator MARVEL MILLS LOGAN, not only Kentucky but the Nation has sustained a great loss. He served the people of his native State in positions of trust and responsibility for many years, and in the discharge of the duties of the various positions he held, he brought to himself great honors and the confidence and the affectionate regard of his people.

He was nominated for the office of attorney general of Kentucky in 1915 without opposition, and was elected and served until June 1, 1917, when he resigned to be appointed chairman of the first State tax commission of Kentucky, which put into effect a new system of taxation. A progressive and enlightened tax system that does equal justice to all is one of the great fundamentals of our constitutional government. He served in this position with great distinction and rendered splendid service to his State in this new field of economic research and legal progress until November 1, 1918, when he resigned to engage in the private practice of law. In 1926 he was nominated and elected judge of the court of appeals—the highest court of the State. He served as a member of the court until January 1, 1931, when he became chief justice. He held this position until he became United States Senator for the term ending in 1937. He was reelected on November 3, 1936, for a second term. He died on October 3, 1939.

Senator LOGAN was a man of great ability. He was devoted to his profession. He was an able, hard-working, painstaking lawyer, and no one stood higher in that great profession in the State of Kentucky than he. Because of his well-known ability, his services were eagerly sought, not only by the people of Kentucky, but when not holding public office and engaged in private practice, by numerous clients who entrusted him with many important matters. His services on the State tax commission were outstanding, and have been generally recognized.

As Senator of the United States, he immediately obtained and has held the confidence and respect of his colleagues. He was an indefatigable worker, and I presume no Member of the Senate wrote more reports than he. Senator LOGAN did not resort to any of the arts of the politician to obtain publicity or to seek popularity. He was a man of simple tastes, modest in his demeanor, easily approachable, and always willing to render what service he could to all who sought his help. He was a devout man. For years he taught a Bible class in his church at home; and when he came to Washington he immediately connected himself with his church here, and his services were immediately sought as a teacher of the Bible class in Washington. He gained a great reputation as a profound student of the Bible; and his private life as husband, father, brother, and friend, and his public life, was entirely in accord with the religious precepts he taught. As a Senator, because of his indefatigable energy and because of his profound knowledge of the law and because of the great confidence of his colleagues, he was most successful in securing the passage of legislation which he sponsored. In every relationship of life, Senator LOGAN measured up to the highest standards.

The State of Kentucky will miss his splendid services. His colleagues will miss his eagerly sought assistance, and the Nation is poorer because of the passing of this able, kindly, hard-working man. When the history of Kentucky is written in the future, the name of MARVEL MILLS LOGAN will be inscribed in bold letters on its pages, and a grateful people will cherish his memory and will recount his good deeds and his many great services.

More Support for H. R. 8748—Jones-Wheeler-La Follette-Bankhead Bill on Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

LETTER FROM BORROWERS OF FEDERAL LAND BANK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, once again I am glad to insert in the RECORD evidence of support for the Jones bill on Federal land-bank loans, which bill will have the effect of substantially reducing the rate of interest paid by farmers on such loans:

To the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,

House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, being borrowers of the Federal land bank and/or the Land Bank Commissioner, do hereby request your wholehearted support of H. R. 8748—Jones—and we urge you to exert your efforts to secure its passage for the following reasons:

1. We believe the interest rates on Federal land-bank and Commissioner loans should be permanently reduced.
2. We believe Federal land-bank borrowers should be relieved of stock liability.
3. We believe the functions and responsibilities of national farm loan associations should be increased.
4. We also believe that the objections to this bill as voiced by its opponents are exaggerated.

Simeon F. Hanes, Glendora, Calif.; John D. Lyon, Glendora, Calif.; Clark H. Lewis, Azusa, Calif.; George E. Widmann, Glendora, Calif.; L. A. Warren, Glendora, Calif.; W. B. Cook, Glendora, Calif.; Earl L. Comstock, Glendora, Calif.; Manfred Magnuson, Glendora, Calif.; William Siefke, Glendora, Calif.; Albert B. Embree, Glendora, Calif.; Lee A. Bowers, Azusa, Calif.; Alonzo L. Winsor, Covina, Calif.; Effie G. Spalding, Azusa, Calif.; Euphremia Sutherland, Glendora, Calif.; H. E. Jack, Glendora, Calif.; Murray S. Vosburg, Azusa, Calif.; W. I. Heth, Azusa, Calif.; Leanto J. Goff, Glendora, Calif.; Edward G. Widmann, Glendora, Calif.; C. A. Arrington, Glendora, Calif.; W. J. Dennis, Azusa, Calif.; Mrs. Donald G. Sclater, Covina, Calif.; B. G. Richardson, San Dimas, Calif.; A. E. Barnes, La Verne, Calif.; Jack Hastie, Jr., Glendora, Calif.; B. E. Needham, Glendora, Calif.; Helen C. Nusbickel, Glendora, Calif.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on national defense delivered by the Senator from

Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] over the Columbia Broadcasting System on May 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One by one the lamps of democracy are being extinguished in Europe today; one by one the smaller nations, whose only wrong was in being too small, are being ruthlessly destroyed by the greatest juggernaut of military might since the days of Attila the Hun.

While I speak to you today over this Nation-wide Columbia hook-up, at this very moment, thousands of men are being slaughtered on practically the same battlefields where soldiers have fought and died for ages; and the very fate of civilization in Europe hangs in the balance today.

Many of you have been listening to news broadcasts from this station today which describe the bloody battle being fought at this moment near the very fields where Napoleon met his great defeat at the hands of Wellington and Bluecher. But the war today is a different war. Secret and despicable devices unknown to the soldier of other days now spell the difference between victory and defeat and the war is not just a war between nations, but a war waged by mad dictators against the principles of democracy.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I had the honor and privilege of personally hearing last Thursday that stirring speech by the President of the United States. At that joint session of Congress, I was impressed with the dynamic statement of the President that the Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of our land is concerned. I would go further and add that in our democracy every citizen can be truly considered a member of that team.

When the President mentioned the danger in the Caribbean area and the fact that from a base in the outer West Indies the coast of Florida could be reached by enemy aircraft in 200 minutes, I recalled the conversation I had on this very matter at the White House several weeks ago, when I discussed this potential danger at great length with the President. I agreed with him then. I hope you will agree with him now.

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate I have continuously stressed the importance of an invincible air force. In Florida we have long recognized the importance of aviation, and I can report to the rest of the Nation that in my State we have in Pensacola, the naval air training station, aptly called the "Annapolis of the air"; at Tampa, we have under construction, McDill Field, the southeastern Army air base; near Jacksonville we are building the Southeastern Naval Air Base, with an auxiliary air base on the Banana River, part of that historic Indian River section of the tropical east coast; while near Miami, we have the Opa-Locka Naval Reserve Air Base.

Most of this program was initiated in the first session of the present Congress, and having just returned from a personal tour of all of these bases, I can report to the Nation that as far as Florida is concerned, the original air-expansion program is being carried out by your Government in a very successful and efficient manner.

When these air bases are completed, they will act as a secure defense unit, not only for the entire southeastern seaboard of this Nation but for the Panama Canal Zone and the Caribbean area as well.

Democracy is being challenged in Europe today, and democracy must answer in America, not with an armed force that seeks to invade and destroy another nation across the sea but an armed force strong enough to tell the dictators that we in America will defend the right of our people to decide upon their own form of government.

The torch of liberty is growing dim in Europe today, and if our civilization is to continue, it must continue and be protected in the Americas. At no time in history have the 21 American republics been so united in purpose, policy, and action to preserve freedom.

If the dictators are successful in Europe today, the Dark Ages may again descend upon every country across the sea, and it will remain for this hemisphere, at the proper moment, to be ready to rekindle the light of civilization again for the rest of the world.

I am in entire accord with the statement of the President that immediate action is essential, and I pledge my full support to any and every piece of legislation necessary to carry out the national defense expansion program. I am certain that this Congress will immediately pass the legislation asked for by the President.

We in this great Nation do not desire war; we look only for peace; but as the President has well stated, in order that the ways of aggression and force be banished from the earth, this Nation requires a toughness of moral and physical fiber. We must make our defenses invulnerable and provide complete security against potential developments and dangers of the future.

We know the dictators have declared their determination to wipe democracy from the face of the earth, and we must stand ready to spend millions for defense, so that our liberties and the liberties of our children can be ever secure. The most economical policy we can follow at this time is to provide ample appropriations for air defenses, antiaircraft guns, and an invincible Navy on and under the sea.

Had we been prepared in 1917, as we shall be under the plan proposed by the President, the Germans would never have submarined the *Lusitania*, which precipitated this country into the last World War; thousands of lives and billions of dollars would have been saved.

There was never a time in our history when the age-old adage of "a stitch in time" was more appropriate. Genuine preparedness is the only way to keep this Nation out of war.

Tomorrow in our churches let us pray that this Nation will continue to be a Nation at peace, a Nation of tolerance, and a Nation whose faith in God will enable it to remain the stronghold of those persons who believe "that all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Troublesome days are ahead of us, but with our people united, we shall not fail.

American Association of University Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SEÑORA MARIA SALDAÑA DE JULIÁ

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address delivered by Señora Maria Saldaña de Juliá, of Puerto Rico, before a group of members of the International Relations Committee of the American Association of University Women and women members of the Pan American Scientific Congress at the Women's University Club on May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my pleasure recently to participate in a small way in some of the activities of the Pan American scientific assemblage, not as a scientist but as a guest at some of the social gatherings. I met at these affairs many women of my own race—women from the various countries of South and Central America. I met also many women of North America—women of our own United States. As a result of this intercourse with women of the Americas, one conviction has impressed itself firmly in my mind, namely, the fact that all of us—whether we are from North, South, or Central America—all of us who live in the Western Hemisphere, are convinced that the democratic form of government under which we live is that which is best suited to our welfare and our happiness. I am not going to speak of the natural beauty of our dear island, called the Island of Enchantment, nor of its sky, its blue sea, its mountains and valleys, of different shades of green all the year round.

We in Puerto Rico are proud of the fact that our little island has been made an important link in the chain of national defense. We are Latins by race and by tradition, and as such we like to feel that we are the important link between the United States and Latin America. And we are as proud of the achievements of men like Bolivar, St. Augustin, Juarez, and others who fought for the liberty of Latin Americans as we are of the achievements of men like Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others, who fought for the liberty of the people of North America. And we are prepared to demonstrate our appreciation of their sacrifices by dying for liberty if necessary. This, my friends, is no idle boast; I know my people. I know their devotion to democratic institutions. And I am certain that when and if the call comes, the immediate response will be, "Puerto Rico is ready."

I have been asked to explain briefly the aims of the Puerto Rican American Women's League. The league is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of feminine United States citizens, some from Puerto Rico and some from the continent, committed to the task of creating a better understanding between the people of the island and those of the continental United States. It is a work which is close to the heart of those of us who desire closer affiliation with the United States; those of us who desire that the ties be drawn closer; those of us who love the American flag.

Puerto Rico has been an insular possession of the United States for close to half a century. During that time we have demonstrated both our fitness to govern ourselves and our unflinching loyalty to the American flag. Puerto Rico is now being fortified and becoming the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. It thus becomes the watchdog of both Americas against foreign aggressors. Thus in a very practical

as well as a cultural way Puerto Rico becomes the link between the Americas.

We feel that statehood for Puerto Rico is sure to become a reality some day, and the act of admitting her to statehood on the part of the United States would manifest to the Latin-American nations that it is the policy of this country to recognize the political rights of all within her borders.

It costs nothing to affiliate with the league. There are no dues, assessments, or other costs, merely the willingness to assist, in whatever manner is best suited to the talents of the member, in the effort that will be made to accomplish the league's objectives.

And in closing I am going to take the liberty of asking all of you to say every day a prayer to the Creator and Ruler of Nations so that He may enlighten and guide our dear President of the United States as well as the head chiefs of all other nations of this Western Hemisphere, so that the world in which we live may be a better one and that, as the immortal Lincoln said, "The blessings of liberty will not perish from the earth."

I thank you.

Intervention in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, OF MISSOURI

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely address by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] expressing his opposition to intervention in the European war. The address was delivered on May 17, 1940, over the National Broadcasting System, station WMAL.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, we are in the midst tonight of a very dark period of the history of modern civilization. The territories of the lowland peoples—Holland and Belgium—have been ruthlessly invaded by a wanton aggressor, armed with tremendous mechanic equipment—which is the direct and inevitable result of the refusal of the Allies to carry out the disarmament provisions of the Versailles Treaty which threw Germany into the hands of the unspeakable Hitler.

We are faced tonight ourselves as a Nation with the danger of a rush of hysteria, calculated or uncalculated, designed or undesigned, equally potent in either event for us to allow our sympathies to carry us into the war. I speak tonight with full realization of the great force of sympathy for these little countries to urge my own countrymen to remember the fact that the greatest service that we can render to democracy and civilization in the world is to defend and protect the institution of democracy in the United States of America. We can best accomplish that task by remaining out of European embroilments.

Nearly every decent American, almost every decent citizen of the world, has been profoundly shocked by the news of the wanton and ruthless invasion of the heroic little nations of Holland and Belgium. But we must not forget in our righteous indignation that the unfortunate geographical position of those countries has made their lands from time immemorial the cockpit of Europe. Neither England, nor France, nor Germany, nor Spain, nor the old Austrian Empire has ever been too good to adjourn the violent settlement of their own disputes to the fertile acres of the lowland countries. Holland under the great William the Silent defied and, after many years of sacrifice, defeated Spain when it was the most powerful nation in the world. Belgium in the last World War defied Kaiser Wilhelm and emerged as more than conqueror at the end of the war.

All Americans sympathize with Belgium and Holland. But every American who knows anything also knows that their situation at the present moment emerges from their unfortunate location in the strategic cockpit of Europe. This is something which cannot be changed by act of Congress, approved by the President, until such time as we have the power to change the facts and geography and the laws of nature. The physical fact that they inevitably sit in the lap of contending great powers is something that neither the Congress of the United States nor the President of the United States nor even the people of the United States can change, no matter how honestly we might try.

So we have the German mad wolf gobbling Holland and taking a large bite out of Belgium. I might remark that my reading of history leads me to believe that these bites might prove exceedingly indigestible, as Charles V of Austria and Philip of Spain and even the great Napoleon found out aforetime. Napoleon set up his own brother upon a puppet throne in Holland, but the Kingdom did not last beyond the exile of Napoleon to die upon a desert rock in the South Atlantic. The present royal house in Holland does not trace descent from Bonaparte, but from the heroic house of Orange.

With these tragic circumstances going on in the world, the President of the United States is well advised when he asks every responsible citizen to take a realistic view of our own situation.

We are already being deluged with the arguments of kept columnists, subsidized radio commentators, and other editorial influences urging that intervention upon the part of the United States is our plain duty and the path to safety.

I utterly repudiate any such doctrine. I do not believe that it can be sustained on any grounds whatsoever.

Let me say that I am now and have always been in favor of appropriating every dollar, every dime, necessary—even reasonably necessary—for the defense of the United States. During the present administration the Congress has done precisely that, as we were advised of the facts by the experts of the executive departments. During that time we have actually appropriated more than $7,000,000,000 and authorized the appropriation of two billion more. If we are now as unprepared as some of those experts now say we are, the Congress should find out what has happened to the vast sums which we have appropriated in the last few years. If the expenditure of seven billions has not made us safe, what assurance have we that the expenditure of a couple of billion more will make us any safer?

The question with us tonight is not a question of sympathy. That is undoubted and undeniable. The question is one of intervention. By intervention, of course, I mean the entrance of the United States into the war. We cannot possibly pursue the policy of making faces and thumbing our noses indefinitely without being involved ourselves. The pursuance of policies "short of war" inevitably lead to war.

If we regard it as our national destiny to go into this war, it is my opinion that we should go now—immediately. So far as I am concerned, I do not agree with this viewpoint, and I repeat again my statement, often made before, that I will never, never, never vote for an American war on foreign fields in foreign quarrels.

Why should we undertake to engage in a war 3,000 miles from home in a futile attempt to rectify the diplomatic mistakes of power politicians such as Chamberlain and Daladier? Why should we give up the tremendous advantage of our natural position—admitting that the crossing of the oceans has been shortened by modern invention. We are still the most remote, the most invulnerable, the most invincible Nation in the world.

If we should go abroad again to fight we would again be called upon to inject the vital life blood of gallant men into the arteries of jaded and defeated forces. Americans, trained and untrained, were sent into the battle line in the last war. Both the French and the British demanded the relief of General Pershing because he was not willing to permit the breaking up of American organizations and their treatment as mere relief reserves to be fed individually into the British and French lines.

I am in favor of everything necessary to our national defense. I am opposed to the idea of using a particular military situation in Europe either as a means of promoting the granting of blank checks in this country or as a means of whipping up hysteria with the idea of getting us into the war abroad.

I think the United States ought to be fully, completely, more than merely adequately, prepared to resist attack from any quarter of the globe. And being so prepared, I think that we should keep our mouths shut and our pores open.

I do not think that we should again engage in European wars, because I have always had in my head and in my heart a dream of America, a great and lofty belief in the future of our America, which I do not wish to see gassed to death or run over by tanks on ancient everlasting battlefields in a quarrel about lands and power unworthy of being the death place of American ideals.

I do not think America should enter into this war, because I do not think that we need depend upon the help of the British Navy or the French Army to defend this Nation or this hemisphere. I think that there would be less damage to the hopes of our young men—our hope for the future—to their belief in our Nation, to their respect for us as their advisers, if we did not peddle their blood in return for military help which, in the first place, might never be given us; in the second place, might under the changed techniques of modern warfare be of no use to us; and, third, which, in order to have at our disposal, would obligate us to fight in Europe or around the world whenever either the British Navy or the French Army or the far-flung colonial empires of either France or England were endangered.

The safety and well-being of this Republic are paramount to any other consideration. To my mind the most overwhelming proof of the capacity of the great American people for self-government will be their indication to their employed servants, of whom every public official is a part, that we do not wish to, we will not, engage in war.

Anniversary of Signing of Civil Service Retirement Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission with respect to a celebration in observance of the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the original civil-service-retirement law.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1940.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Civil Service Commission and the various employee organizations have planned a celebration in observance of the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the original civil-service retirement law, to be held at the departmental auditorium, Constitution Avenue between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets NW., Thursday evening, May 23, at 8 p. m.

There will be one or two brief addresses and a word of greeting from each of the Commissioners. Music will be furnished by the United States Marine Band and vocal selections by a symphonic choir.

The Commission especially desires the presence of the members of the Senate and House Civil Service Committees, and it is sincerely hoped that you will be able to attend.

Cordially yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

Logan-Walter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN MINTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 24), 1940

LETTER FROM TOM W. CHEEK AND DR. M. F. DICKINSON

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to me by Tom W. Cheek, director, National Farmers' Union, and Dr. M. F. Dickinson, president, Arkansas Farmers' Union, for the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, dated May 17, 1940, on the subject of the Logan-Walter bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1940.

Senator SHERMAN MINTON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is to call your attention to the effect upon our Federal agricultural agencies and upon our farmers which the Logan-Walter bill, H. R. 6324, would have if passed in its present form. This bill which is now pending on the Senate calendar would provide for judicial review of administrative orders and decisions.

Except for lending agencies and grading services for farm products which are exempted by the bill, a list of the agricultural agencies which would be seriously affected is practically the list of important programs which farmers have labored to attain and perfect during many years, and which Congress has declared to be national policy for agriculture. The agencies most seriously affected would be: Agricultural Adjustment Administration; Agricultural Marketing Service, nongrading activities; Commodity Exchange Administration; Farm Security Administration, nonlending operations; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; Soil Conservation Service; Sugar Division.

It is our fear that passage of this bill would tie up in the courts for months and years many of the activities of these agencies serving farmers, with the result that farmers and their cooperative organizations would suffer tremendously. Further, it is our belief, after a careful study of the bill, that powerful interests opposed to the farmers could directly or indirectly undo the clear intention of Congress and of our farmers by pettifogging legalities, disrupting all competent administration of these laws.

For example, take the effect of this bill, if passed, upon the Commodity Exchange Administration. We have worked for over 20 years to get some regulation of gamblers in farm commodities. The rules and regulations issued by the C. E. A. govern trading in 14 important farm commodities on 16 licensed contract markets, on which futures trading averaged $23,000,000,000 annually from 1928–37.

Since the regulations of the Commodity Exchange Administration were all made in the last 3 years, under the Logan-Walter bill any person "substantially interested" could attack any of these rules. Without any clear authority provided in the bill to maintain present rules pending an initial decision by the Secretary (see subsecs. (A) and (C), sec. 4), and with enforcement automatically withheld pending judicial review (sec. 4 (B)), it is clear that the entire activity of the C. E. A. could be effectively hamstrung by persons seeking to manipulate the markets.

Even though very adequate provision is now made for hearing fully all interested parties before issuing rules and regulations, this bill (sec. 4 (e)) would require the members of the Commodities Exchange Commission—the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce and the Attorney General—to personally conduct public hearings before a decision could be made on any examiner's report to which objection had been taken. This would not only be burdensome on their time but would soon become a physical impossibility.

We have no doubt that the usefulness of the Commodities Exchange Administration would be at an end following approval of this bill, since any interest which has large amounts of money for lawyers' fees could keep litigation going for years. It would give virtually limitless opportunities to destroy the intent of Congress to protect farmers from commodity gamblers.

In view of such glaring dangers, we most respectfully urge you to oppose this bill in its entirety—to defeat it or to refer it back to committee for protective amendments. If exemptions are provided in the bill for some agencies, then we urge the elimination at least of all agricultural agencies.

While we are in favor of eradicating governmental bureaucracy, and are favorable to the general aims which the proponents of this bill claim to seek, we are unalterably opposed to the bill as it now stands. We represent in this stand some 350,000 farm families who are members of our two organizations—the National Farmers Union and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Trusting you will give this matter your attention,

Most respectfully yours,

TOM W. CHEEK,
Director, National Farmers Union,
M. F. DICKINSON,
President, Arkansas Farmers Union,
For the legislative committee of the National Farmers Union and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

P. S. For your further information we attach a more complete analysis of the bill's effect upon the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act.

British Purchases in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the pen of Mr. John T. Flynn, entitled "Plain Economics," which I clipped from the columns of the Washington Daily News of April 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 19, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, April 19.—Strange reports are going about the grain and commodity markets of New York. If they are true, then we have to believe that a British purchasing commission is in this country to buy foodstuffs, and that it has been at work in Washington trying to make arrangements to buy here on credit.

This would mean an amendment to the neutrality law. And the strangest part of these reports is that this commission has been making some headway with this plan.

If there was one resolution we took to high heaven before this war started, and after, it was that we would not make the mistake of selling to the warring nations on credit. That is the way we moved head over heels into the last war.

I do not mean the American people went to war to save those credits. I mean that by becoming implicated in the Allied cause to the extent of billions of dollars of credit we became economically all bound up in their cause and their victory.

We may recall now the prophetic words of the late Senator Borah when he opposed the weakening of the neutrality bill. He said Congress proposed to help England and France by permitting the sale of everything but munitions, "provided they pay cash."

The Senator said: "You say you want to do this because civilization is at stake. You want to save civilization; but, you say, the Allies must put cash on the line. But suppose that 6 months or a year from now the Allies are in trouble. The odds turn against them. Will you say, 'We want to help you save civilization—but you must lay the cash on the line'?

"No," he exclaimed, "you are Americans; and if you believe civilization and democracy are at stake—if you really believe that—you will not only grant credits, but you will be willing to give them food and munitions and, finally, men. You will have to do that if you really believe that civilization is at stake. The whole error comes from insisting on what is not true, that this is a fight for democracy. It is a fight for empire."

This is a free-hand quotation. But here we are now, with the tide seemingly against the Empires. And the commission is here to get credit instead of cash and "is making headway." It is being subtly managed, apparently.

England has cut off tobacco purchases here. She is buying but little cotton. She is not buying grain from us in the quantities we would like to sell. The farmer wants to sell his goods. He is in trouble. Therefore what about selling food—food for women and children whose men "are fighting our battle" on credit? Can you not hear the speeches now?

Having amended the Neutrality Act to permit sales on credit for farm products, we will be ready to take the next inevitable step and sell all sorts of things, including war materials.

To do this we will have to sell our people the proposition that civilization and democracy are at stake; that we are in danger; that there is an emergency; that the Germans are about to invade Greenland; and so on.

Washington is leading us step by step. Little by little we shall go on.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered May 17, 1940, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network from Warrensburg, Mo., by Hon. Alf M. Landon on the subject of our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The thin crust of the kind of civilization we believe in is cracking over most of the world. The result of the war in Europe has vast implications for America's future. Inevitably, and immediately, the people of America face a grave responsibility. And while we want to keep partisan politics out of our foreign affairs as much as possible, after all, we are facing the most important American job of selecting a new Chief Executive.

This is a difficult and depressing time to be discussing foreign policies. The chief point I would drive home to every American citizen is that our policy must be flexible and open. No man or group of men is capable of laying down a fixed and final policy, when a battlefield may change America's position overnight. But this does not mean a drifting policy; nor does it mean keeping the American people in the dark as to the direction the administration's foreign policy is taking us.

Our illusions of safety are being shattered. More than ever we must watch our step now; our steps toward national defense, and the steps in our foreign policy.

We have a manifold duty to perform. We owe much to ourselves as a people and as a nation. And we also owe a duty to humanity and our civilization. The course we pursue as a nation must be weighed carefully, taking into account the relative value and importance of everything involved. The gravity of this situation requires the highest order of statesmanship and devotion to national unity. We must as a nation pursue a policy which will be in our own self-interest, knowing that if it is sound it will also be in the interest of humanity and civilization.

In the first place, we are going to keep out of this war. The American people, despite the horrifying developments of this last week, still are opposed to armed participation in it. They do not want to send American soldiers to fight a foreign war on a foreign soil. No one will come here to fight us if we are prepared to meet them on equal terms. Our responsibility, however, does not end with keeping out of the war. There is a great deal to do besides that. We must prepare immediately a modern and impregnable defense. And we must also prepare for a constructive role in the ultimate peace and in its preservation. The need for proper defensive measures should be obvious to every American citizen. It is also obvious that we have much to gain, both individually and collectively, from a stable world. Therefore, we should not assume automatically and in advance that we have no opportunity to exert ourselves for peace in the world without injuring our own peace through entangling commitments. In general, all candidates—Republican, Democrat, or new dealers—say they would keep us out of war. Practically all candidates recognize the responsibility of America in the world. Practically all candidates promise a degree of forbearance from any active participation in dangerous international relationships.

We must have a President who will encourage the American people to stand together in working out dangerous and delicate questions involving foreign policy. It is not conducive to good feeling at home or respect abroad when our President repeatedly attempts to make bitter partisan capital out of every grave issue. One day our President speaks of the spreading horror confronting us in foreign affairs. The next day he starts a political attack aimed to drive people into antagonistic camps, and plans a political swing around the circle.

We Republicans are willing to go a long way for unity on our foreign policy. But the Chief Executive, now as always in the past, must lead the way in the creation of that national unity. The proper national unity has never been established by sharp partisanship. If the President wants the national unity he needs and should have, his political trip across the country should obviously be called off. I notice in the press dispatches today that the President has postponed his western trip. That is as it should be. Unity is not to be had with politics. The adjournment of politics must be by both sides, and it is always up to the Chief Executive to lead the way. It is tragic that this nightmare foreign situation should develop at the time of our national election, when political activity is always at its peak.

In this fateful hour the grave questions of foreign relations and national defense must be discussed, free of the usual invectives that characterize most of the New Deal discussions, and, as far as possible, free from partisan bias.

I said last September that the spirit of unity in America was with the President for the asking. But it was up to him to fuse it together. This he has tragically failed to do. Even up until now he has tended to produce antagonisms when he should have been welding a national unity in American thinking about foreign relations.

However, the President, in his splendid address to the Congress yesterday, spoke as the leader of all the people. He is acting in the spirit of unity for which American citizens have been waiting and in a spirit which will bring him a united support in preparing our defenses. I pledge to support our President in his announced efforts to strengthen the Nation against attack and to continue to cooperate with him in all efforts for complete unity on foreign policy.

We must think in terms of what the duties of this country are now and what they will be when the war ends. We must be prepared, whatever the eventuality and regardless of what person or what party may be governing the Nation. But if we are going to be prepared, whatever the eventuality, we cannot continue to go deeper and deeper into debt. We cannot continue to flirt with inflation. And, above all, we cannot afford to continue the breakdown of human morale and self-reliance.

There must be no political consideration of this problem. But, also, there must be no blindness of the American people to the defects of our national defense. We in the United States are committed to the view that war is destructive of all the finer things in life desired by mankind, but until all governments join in this

realistic view I recognize the necessity of being prepared to defend our freedom.

We have got to face the possibility that the democracies may be defeated. This contains threats of such a character to us that we must consider their significance. The developments of the past week are a real threat to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. Those who are afraid to face this menace, for fear of being called warmongers or interventionists or internationalists, are doing a disservice to their country. The obligation to speak plainly and fearlessly is inescapable. We must face the grim realities. For our own safety we can no longer rest on the assumption of a stalemate with an exhausted Germany. The invasion of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and Holland presents a real problem to the United States. Their possessions bring the war much closer to the Western Hemisphere. No longer can America feel complacent about her security or peace.

We must, as a public duty, plant in the public mind not only the will to go on but the determination to go on if we are challenged.

A big Navy and a big Army are not all there is to a national defense. The big thing in any defense program is to have behind the armed force a united nation, an efficiently functioning industry, and a healthy agriculture.

We cannot afford to continue to incite class feeling at home. We cannot by violent speeches set business apart from the rest of the Nation. We cannot set agriculture against business, nor labor against business, nor business against agriculture and labor. Such incitements are a blow at national safety. "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

If the resources of this country are to be mobilized in the most effective manner behind a great program of national defense, it is essential that Government, management, and labor must be able to move forward promptly in a spirit of complete confidence in the development of all necessary plans.

I consider that the greatest effectiveness and efficiency can be attained only if our American system of free enterprise is encouraged in every appropriate way to make its maximum contribution to the task ahead. Of course, there will be restrictions and legislation, if necessary, to prevent profiteering.

In this hard-boiled world in which we find ourselves today we must be strong enough to have other nations respect our desire to stay out of war. No matter how much you appropriate for armaments, these funds must be vigorously, efficiently, and promptly administered. We are tragically late in the appropriation for national defenses. And we are even more tragically late in execution. There is now a sad lack of definite policy on the part of the administration toward preparedness. The deplorable condition of our national defense is almost unbelievable. The Army is in a pitiful state of unreadiness by reason of being inadequately armed, inadequately munitioned, and almost devoid of modern war planes, antiaircraft defense, or mechanized equipment. In spite of threatening developments, practically no attention was paid to our Army until the last few months. It is true that a few new men were added to our National Guard last fall, but it took practically 8 months to obtain even the uniforms for these new men in Kansas. The equipment now in the hands of the National Guard is so obsolete that it would be almost useless in modern warfare. This equipment is so obsolete, and we have been so slow in replacing it, it would be a joke if it were not so tragic.

There is notorious friction in the War Department, at the top, interfering with its efficiency. We have a great Navy, but the Secretary has confessed to the vulnerability of our battleships to air bombing. We are woefully deficient in strategic war material.

I think the lesson of the European war is preparedness. We are living in a world overrun by a swift plague of brutality, and in a world in which force makes power. We cannot be a power for peace unless we have force. We have no ambitions that require force for their attainment, but we need force to maintain our own safety and security.

If we are going to coast with the problems as the Allies have done in the past years, if we are going to continue to live, as they have done, in the security of the past, we are evidently going to meet the same fate as the Allies in the face of a superior force.

We have a lesson to draw from them, as long as the dictators reign. We must build up facilities that will permit us to go into production of the most important war material in sufficient quantity at any time it appears to be necessary. It will take us some time to build such facilities. But we do not want to be 2 years behind the eight ball, as the English and the French seem to be. The condition of our national defense, in the light of developments in Europe, is alarming, and these developments have taken place during the life of this administration. For the first 6 years the New Deal, instead of building up our defenses, wasted our money on projects like the Florida canal, or the attempt to harness the tides at Passamaquoddy. As everyone knows, these projects have been abandoned as failures. But think of the thousands and thousands of airplanes the money wasted on these failures—and other purely vote-buying projects—would have purchased, or would purchase now if we had it.

Spending for adequate preparedness would truly have been "spending to save."

With nations breaking up like ice in the spring, we need alert, dynamic leadership, capable of pushing military preparedness now.

Of course I favor the additional appropriations proposed for national defense. But it is plainly evident that we cannot continue pursuing our leisurely pace in putting them into effect. We must rush their availability, to begin production now rather than next year, or the year after, as is planned. Even the naval and military improvements now planned are not to produce any worth-while results in new and modern fighting equipment for several years.

At the same time we must pursue friendly international relations, because it is to our interest to do so. We do not want to see Europe disintegrate, for a disintegrating Europe threatens to start a world disintegration. We are concerned as realists with what happens to the world at large, because restoration of healthy economic conditions in America would be greatly enhanced by restoration of healthy relationships with the world at large.

Within the term of the next administration this country will be forced to make decisions far reaching in their effects on world civilization and the future of popular government. These decisions will be enormously difficult and complicated. Our wealth of natural resources and our size will be of decisive influence in the future course of world events.

We do have a vital interest in the survival of those standards of civilization and human rights, which will allow us to pursue peacefully our own manner of life under our own institutions.

There are those who feel that our safety lies in imposing a self-instituted boycott in the way of a strict isolation policy. But, stripped of all idealistic motives, two world wars in a generation require a new kind of solution when peace is made. Obviously the solution following 1918 was not the correct one. If the system of free economic enterprise, free religion, and free speech, and free peoples are to be preserved, we must help to make them safe. Free enterprise and democracy will not survive unless peace and popular government are preserved on more than a year-to-year basis.

World peace and good times, when the average man has the opportunity to make a decent living, go hand in hand. Peace in the world, as well as good times, is built on political stability, and political stability is built on economic stability. It is to our interest to plant America's moral and economic strength on the side of a just and realistic peace if the opportunity presents itself. Our idealistic motives go hand in hand with our material interests in helping to restore an enduring peace in the world.

It is not a question of our emotional friendship for popular governments or our natural and inherent animosity to dictators. It is a question of leaving the door open so that if the opportunity presents itself we can promote healthy world-wide trade. This is the only alternative to a state-controlled trade, barter, and war.

To that end we can well enter into international discussions of economic questions. We are not concerned with boundary lines and political arguments, but we are concerned in broader and more liberal economic relations among the nations. Most emphatically, we can and should, as a nation, work unremittingly to expand the area of American trade, and open up American markets wherever the opportunity exists. We cannot, of course, join in a league of nations or other associations which will involve us in the purely political problems of Europe and Asia. But whatever contributes to the economic stability of the world after the war contributes to our own future and the stability of popular government everywhere. Of course all this depends on what kind of a world we will be living in and doing business in. It is possible, no matter who wins, that we will be in a world doing business on a barter basis, with a definitely lower standard of living. So our program, in the nature of these things, should not be stiff, dogmatic, and inflexible, save only, of course, our immovable determination to stay out of this war unless the United States and its possessions are threatened.

This country has voiced its determination to stay out of war. But, based on all recent experience, determination is not enough. We have seen many countries equally determined who found war thrust upon them. If this determination is to have any meaning it must be implemented with a policy of preparedness permitting us to take all the necessary steps to make it effective.

America is in the mood in which armed participation may come through the carelessness or the impulsiveness of a Chief Executive who does not realize the necessity of giving the American people a steel backbone to resist the pull of their natural sympathy and emotion for the Allies. Despite all our sympathy and emotions for the kind of civilization we believe in, we cannot undertake to preserve the boundaries of all the democracies of the world.

It is futile to think we can escape the financial and political scars of war. First war; then chaos; then fear; then vanished confidence; then depression; then frozen trade; then war again. Who can say we have no interest in collaborating to prevent such a devil's cycle? How long can the already faltering system of free enterprise and free government survive such a devil's parade?

People everywhere cry for peace and the revival of employment that can come on a healthy basis only when peace comes. I recognize that in the critical period which must follow the laying down of arms, the demobilization of millions of men, and the slowing or stopping of war-materials production there must be a peace which offers hope to all the world's peoples. When this time comes America alone may expect to be economically strong and relatively financially sound. But even we cannot expect to be economically and financially sound unless our domestic policies in the meantime are themselves sound. America should encourage and help to realize the aspirations of people for strengthening international law and for revalidating international morality. We cannot be a hermit nation.

I favor the Republican platform permitting the incoming Republican President to cooperate with other nations, if the opportunity presents itself, to banish militarism, to reopen the channels of trade, and thereby relieve the use of financial pressures as weapons in threatening the peaceful independence of small nations. The Republican President must be left free to move vigorously and effectively in these matters when the war ends.

With malice toward none of the people engaged in the present struggle, in the firm determination to preserve our own free institutions, I favor the Republican Party's pledging the United States to collaboration, whenever that may effectively be given, toward the setting up of an economically sound and just peace.

The Republican Party more than any other political agency has brought America through the years to a position of world leadership, and I think it should pledge itself to continue that leadership by a realistic recognition of our place in a changing world, a place that must be held by our determination and ability to protect our own peace.

The Lawyer Looks at the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1940

SERVICE LETTER OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following service letter of the New York State Bar Association:

THE LAWYER LOOKS AT THE WAR

This double issue of the Lawyer Service Letter is devoted entirely to an analysis of a number of questions of international law arising out of the present war. It is hoped that such analyses will be helpful to all members of the bar. In times of public stress and difficulty the layman turns instinctively to the lawyer for his interpretation of the course of events. Every lawyer therefore possesses a high degree of power in influencing the thought and action of his community. Especially today, when so many alien ideas are on the loose in our own country, is the lawyer expected by the more sober elements to think clearly and dispassionately, and to arrive at sound conclusions based upon American ideals and interests, and unaffected by emotional, political, or other appeals.

REALITY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

The statement is commonly heard that international law does not exist, that among sovereign nations the wager of battle is the sole appeal. Such views, however, lose sight of some of the most important facts of international life. It has been well said that no matter what some layman may think or say, no statesman would deny the existence of international law.

The view that such law lacks reality often springs from the failure to perceive that international law is still in the primitive stage of development. Roman law and the English common law took centuries to develop. An even greater period of time will be required for the full flowering of international law which, broadly speaking, came into being as recently as the seventeenth century.

In the second place, those who see only the breaches of international law should strive also to become cognizant of the many instances of its observance. Indeed, John Bassett Moore, dean of American publicists and a former judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, speaking from his profound study and wide experience, has given his opinion that "international law is on the whole as well observed as municipal law." Nor may anyone today hold any brief as to the certainty of municipal law as contrasted with the uncertainty of international law. The ever-growing list of notable landmarks of constitutional law that have been recently overruled in favor of newer doctrine attests to the present uncertainty of American fundamental law.

* * * * * * *

GOVERNMENT LOANS TO BELLIGERENTS

A direct loan by a neutral government to a belligerent is clearly prohibited by international law. As early as 1798 the United States refused a loan solicited by the French Government on the ground that it would constitute a violation of neutrality. Likewise in 1816 our Government denied a loan to the Government at Buenos Aires because of the civil war then existing between Spain and the Spanish-American colonies.

As to indirect aid to a belligerent by means of a loan through a government instrumentality of a neutral state, the rule of international law would seem to be that the neutral is forbidden to make such loan in any capacity or through any agency. Thus during the World War the question was raised as to the propriety of the Federal Reserve banks rediscounting bills arising from contraband sales with the resulting permission of short-term loans. An opinion on the subject was rendered by John Bassett Moore to Governor Strong, of the Federal Reserve bank, in which opinion Judge Moore called attention to the French mint's refusal to coin Spanish silver while Spain was at war with the United States. Judge Moore also referred to Secretary Olney's opinion on national banks holding the funds of Cuban insurgents.

Whatever opinion may be held today as to the relation of the Federal Reserve bank and of national banks to the Federal Government, the status of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is clear. The former was organized by an Executive order, and the latter was created by statute. Both are District of Columbia corporations, all the officers being officials of the United States Government. The entire capital stock of both is owned by the Government, and the funds for the purchase of the same were taken from congressional appropriations. Furthermore, the statute (49 Stat. 4) explicitly refers to the Export-Import Bank as an agency of the United States, and the District Court has held the R. F. C. to be an "agent and instrumentality of the United States" (*United States* v. *Arthur*, 23 F. Supp. 537).

It would therefore seem clear that if the Export-Import Bank or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should make a loan to or for the benefit of a belligerent government, such act would constitute a violation of the neutrality of the United States. Such is the position taken by the Harvard Research in International Law in its draft convention on the Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War, published by the American Society of International Law in July 1939.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS TO BELLIGERENT

The question may arise at any moment whether it would be a violation of neutrality for the United States Maritime Commission to sell one or more of its vessels to a belligerent state. As indicated above, a neutral state may not legally give direct aid to a belligerent. This rule was recognized in 1826 when Sweden, a neutral, declined to sell certain warships which might pass into the hands of Mexico, a belligerent. Similarly, during the American Civil War in 1864, Great Britain refused to allow the Anglo-Chinese Fleet to be sold, lest her neutrality be compromised if such vessels fell into the hands of one of the belligerents.

As to merchant vessels owned either by a neutral state or an instrumentality thereof, it should be noted that Elihu Root in 1915 opposed on the floor of the Senate a bill authorizing the Government of the United States to buy German merchantmen which were then laid up in American ports. To the argument of Mr. Lansing that the purchase of such vessels by a corporation, whose stock was owned by the Government, would not involve the neutrality of the United States Senator Root bluntly replied that such is not the law as understood and applied by the United States Government. He added that "The real and serious affairs of this world are not conducted in that way. Whatever we do through this corporation that we create and own we do as a government and are responsible for as a government" (52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2217).

If it were proposed today that the United States Maritime Commission transfer the title of one of its vessels to or for the use of a belligerent state, the reasoning of Senator Root would undoubtedly be relied upon by those who would oppose such sale. It would be pointed out that the members of the Maritime Commission are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; that the President designates the Chairman of the Commission; that the members are paid by the Government and give their exclusive time to their duties; and that the Commission can purchase and operate a vessel only after receiving the certification of the Secretary of the Navy that such vessel is suitable for economical and speedy conversion into a naval or military auxiliary. Since it would therefore appear that the United States Maritime Commission is an agency of the Government, a sale of one of its ships to or for the use of a belligerent would be deemed by many to be a violation of neutrality.

* * * * * * *

SHIPMENT OF AIRCRAFT FOR USE AGAINST BELLIGERENT

It is a recognized principle of international law that a neutral state shall use the means at its disposal (a) to prevent the fitting out or arming within its territory of any vessel which is intended to engage in hostile operations against a belligerent, and (b) to prevent the departure from its territory of any vessel which is intended to engage in the hostilities and which, within its territory and during the war, has been adapted for use in war. The above obligation on the part of a neutral has been recognized since the time of the Treaty of Washington and the *Alabama* decision at Geneva after the American Civil War. The same principle was also recognized in article 8 of the Thirteenth Hague Convention (1907).

The question now arises, and arose during the World War, whether the foregoing rule applying to vessels is to be applied to aircraft. The view was advanced during the World War by Ambassador Bernstorff that "hydro-aeroplanes must be regarded as war vessels whose delivery to belligerent states by neutrals should be stopped" under the Hague Convention. This view was not accepted by the American Secretary of State, who contended that such aircraft was in the nature of contraband which could be shipped by individual

exporters subject, of course, to seizure by a belligerent. The Secretary of State at that time pointed out that Germany had included in its list of contraband "balloons and flying machines."

On the other hand, there is a respectable body of authority holding that military aircraft should be assimilated to warships and that therefore the neutral must use the means at its disposal to prevent the fitting out within or the flight from its territory of any aircraft intended to engage in hostilities.

The Harvard Research in International Law takes the position that the departure of such aircraft from neutral territory constitutes the "dispatch of a hostile expedition which the neutral state is bound to try to prevent." (Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War, 33 Amer. Jour. of International Law, supp. 771.) The same position was taken by the Commission of Jurists, who drafted the Hague air rules in 1923. These rules, however, were not adopted by the governments. The same view was also taken in 1938 in the uniform neutrality rules adopted by the Scandinavian and Baltic states and Iceland.

During the present war the United States has already taken the position adopted by it during the World War, namely, that military aircraft is merely contraband. Such aircraft has been listed as absolute contraband by Great Britain, France, New Zealand, and Germany, since the beginning of the present war. On the other hand, the Department of State has announced that it will not authorize fly-away deliveries of military aircraft purchased by belligerent countries "since it would appear to be inconsistent with the neutral obligations of the United States to permit such aircraft to be flown within or from the territory of the United States" (Department of State Bulletin, Dec. 9, 1939). The State Department, however, pointed out that the above reasoning was not applicable while the legal title to such aircraft remained with a citizen of the United States. It is at least arguable, however, that the determining factor from the international point of view is not the ownership of the aircraft at the time of its departure but rather the use to which the aircraft is destined.

SEIZURE OF GERMAN EXPORTS

On November 28, 1939, a British order in council proclaimed that after December 4, 1939, every merchant vessel which sailed from an enemy port might be required to discharge in a British or Allied port any goods on board laden in such enemy port. The order further provided that after the said date every merchant vessel which sailed from a port other than an enemy port having on board "goods which are of enemy origin or are enemy property" might be required to discharge such goods in a British or Allied port. Goods so discharged are, according to the order, to be placed in the custody of the prize court either for requisitioning or sale. It will thus be seen that this order in council subjects to seizure, as contraband, enemy goods on a neutral vessel sailing from a neutral port, as well as enemy goods on a neutral vessel sailing from an enemy port.

On December 8, 1939, the United States protested the legality of the foregoing order in council. The American note, while conceding that a belligerent government has a right to visit and search neutral vessels on the high seas for the purpose of determining whether the vessel is carrying contraband to an opposing belligerent or is attempting to break an effective blockade of an enemy port nevertheless denied the validity of any present interference with American vessels or their cargoes on grounds of breach of blockade. Moreover, our Government stated, the question of contraband does not arise with respect to goods en route from Germany to the United States. This would, of course, be true whether such goods were carried on American or foreign neutral vessels (note published in Department of State Bulletin, December 9, 1939).

The identical situation arose during the World War, at which time Secretary Bryan held that the British seizure of German exports was a course of action "unknown to international law," and that "under the rules governing enemy exports only goods owned by enemy subjects in enemy bottoms are subject to seizure and condemnation." The dispute with Great Britain continued until the entry of the United States into the war. After the war the Privy Council held that the order in council was a reprisals order and was justifiable on the ground of right of retaliation (Noordam case in 1920, A. C. 904, and Leonora case in 1919, A. C. 974).

In its recent protest during the present war, the United States has anticipated the argument of the British based upon the right of retaliation. On this point the American note of December 8, 1939, contains the following paragraph:

"Whatever may be said for or against measures directed by one belligerent against another, they may not rightfully be carried to the point of enlarging the rights of a belligerent over neutral vessels and their cargoes, or of otherwise penalizing neutral states or their nationals in connection with their legitimate activities."

This leads us to the next subject, dealing with the question of belligerent reprisals and the effect thereof on neutrals.

REPRISALS

Both Great Britain and Germany during the present war have sought to justify certain acts, otherwise illegal under international law, on the ground of a right of retaliation. Thus, Great Britain seizes German exports on the ground that Germany has sunk British merchant vessels in violation of the Submarine Protocol of 1936. And Germany, similarly invoking a right to retaliate against the extensive British blockade, sinks British and neutral merchantmen en route to the British Isles. As a result of the counterplay of these and similar measures of reprisal, the rights of neutral states have been frequently abridged.

The United States Government has always held that a belligerent is not relieved of its duty to respect the rights of a neutral state, even when engaged in reprisals for the illegal acts of its enemy. The same opinion was also voiced as early as the seventeenth century by the famous publicist Bynkershoek, who asserted that retaliation "can only be exercised against one who has inflicted wrong, it cannot involve a friend."

The first occasion when it became necessary for the United States as a neutral to protest against the mutual reprisals of European belligerents arose during the Napoleonic wars. The Berlin and Milan Decrees of Napoleon establishing the continental system, and the British retaliatory Orders in Council, are familiar history and furnish a striking analogy to present-day circumstances. At that time Secretary Madison protested against measures of reprisal that went far beyond the extent of the suffering sustained by the retaliating party; Madison further asserted that every retaliating step, which affected a neutral, should be preceded by an unreasonable failure by the neutral to put an end, if possible, to the inequality wrongfully produced. In other words, Secretary Madison recognized a limited right of retaliation affecting neutral rights, but only where the neutral has failed to take reasonable steps to make its rights respected by the belligerent first violating the neutral's rights. The British, however, in a note to Madison (February 23, 1808) contended that the right of His Majesty to resort to retaliation cannot be questioned, and that the suffering occasioned to neutral parties is incidental. (3 American State Papers, Foreign Relations, pp. 209–210.)

In the World War Great Britain retaliated against the German sowing of mines in the North Sea by adopting a similar policy and declaring the establishment of a military area in the North Sea. Germany in turn retaliated by declaring an area of war around the British Isles, where neutral shipping would proceed at its peril. Moreover, in 1917 Germany began her policy of unrestricted submarine warfare on the ground of a long list of grievances against Allied methods of warfare.

The United States protested to England that her measures of reprisal were "without precedent in modern warfare." One of the American notes said (United States Foreign Relations, 1915, supp., p. 154):

"If the course pursued by the present enemies of Great Britain should prove to be in fact tainted by illegality and disregard of the principles of war sanctioned by enlightened nations, it cannot be supposed—and this Government does not for a moment suppose—that His Majesty's Government would wish the same taint to attach to their own actions or would cite such illegal acts as in any sense or degree a justification for similar practices on their part insofar as they affect neutral rights."

Likewise to Germany on July 21, 1915, the United States declared (ibid., p. 480):

"* * * A belligerent act of retaliation is per se an act beyond the law, and the defense of an act as retaliatory is an admission that it is illegal. * * * Illegal and inhuman acts, however justifiable they may be thought to be against an enemy who is believed to have acted in contravention of law and humanity, are manifestly indefensible when they deprive neutrals of their acknowledged rights, particularly when they violate the right to life itself * * *."

Both the British and the Germans took issue with the United States. Great Britain argued that (ibid., 1916, supp., p. 368 ff.):

"It would seem that the true view must be that each belligerent is entitled to insist on being allowed to meet his enemy on terms of equal liberty of action. If one of them is allowed to make an attack upon the other regardless of neutral rights, his opponent must be allowed similar latitude in prosecuting the struggle, nor should he in that case be limited to the adoption of measures precisely identical with those of his opponent."

Germany argued that (ibid., p. 259):

"* * * Neutrals cannot expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interest, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality * * *."

The question of the effect of belligerent reprisals through the sides of the neutrals was passed upon after the World War by the German-Portuguese Arbitral Tribunal of Lausanne in the case of the Cysne. (The case is digested in Lauterpacht. Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases, 1929–30, p. 487 ff.) In that case Portugal claimed damages against Germany for the sinking of a Portuguese ship carrying pit props to Great Britain. Under German law pit props were absolute contraband. The tribunal held Germany liable on the ground that, since pit props were not invariably used for war purposes it was contrary to international law for the Germans to make them absolute contraband, except by way of reprisal. On the subject of reprisals the tribunal held that retaliation, however legal as to the enemies of Germany, was not admissible against a neutral. "There is no legal justification for reprisals except when they have been provoked by an act contrary

to international law. This means that they are not admissible except against the state held guilty of the original violation of international law * * * in the present case the reprisals were aimed directly and deliberately against neutral subjects. As Portugal had not violated, in relation to Germany, any rule of international law, acts of reprisals directed against her were contrary to international law."

On the other hand, after the World War, the German Reichsgericht held that unrestricted submarine warfare was legal as a measure of retaliation (4 Völkerrechtim Weltkrieg (1927), p. 337 ff.), and the British prize courts held that the only question was whether the form of retaliation entailed a degree of inconvenience to neutrals which, under the circumstances, was unreasonable (The Leonora (1918), pp. 182, 228).

Professor Brierly, of Oxford University, a few years ago criticized the views of the British prize courts and stated that their decisions went far toward depriving neutrals of their rights, and making such rights dependent on the discretion of the belligerents. He added: "The truth seems to be that the problem of reprisals in naval warfare is one that defies a satisfactory solution by judicial methods; it may even be that it marks the vanishing point of law as a means of regulating the conduct of war." (Brierly, International Law in England, 51 Law Quarterly Review (1935), p. 27.)

During the present war the United States is adhering to its early position maintained during the Napoleonic wars—namely, that the rights of a neutral cannot be invaded or abridged by acts of interbelligerent reprisal (supra, p. 187, note of December 8, 1939).

In this same connection it should be remembered that, if a neutral state violates its neutrality, it may no longer consistently urge the observance of its neutral rights either when abridged incidentally through interbelligerent reprisals or when invaded directly through reprisals by an offended belligerent.

America, Wake Up and Live!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. KARL MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday it was my privilege to hear an address entitled "America, Wake Up and Live!" delivered by my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] before an audience of over a thousand men and women attending a luncheon in the Commodore Hotel of New York City. I was so favorably impressed with the content of that address that I have asked the gentleman's permission to reprint it in the RECORD, and I take pleasure in recommending it to the attention of the Members.

If you cannot take time to read the entire address, may I suggest you begin with the subheading "Democracy is now facing its greatest perils." In these times of stress and strain and of what sometimes approximates unreasoning hysteria it may help us all to give some thought to the following reasoning:

Ladies and gentlemen, as a Republican, I am a member today of an indispensable element of a self-governing society—the opposition party. Just as democracy needs a majority party at any given time in its existence it also needs a strong, virile opposition party, which operating for the time as a minority group exercises its perfecting influence upon Government by subjecting to critical analysis and careful examination every policy or program advanced by the party in power. It is neither good politics nor good patriotism for the opposition party to block legislation simply because it is the creature of the party in power, but it is equally bad politics and unpatriotic to shirk its duties of painstaking analysis and public-serving criticism to the end that Government policies may be seasoned and perfected before becoming operative upon the destiny of a free people.

Every citizen in America at every stage of our country's development should be an active influence in shaping the program of the party in power or in sharing the responsibilities of analysis and study which repose upon the party or parties out of power. Politics in a great Republic such as ours is more than a profession; it is an essential element in the life of any citizen worthy of the right of being free. All of the things which we hold most dear in life in a representative democracy are the products and the privileges we receive as a result of politics. Politics—the art of government—in America is a responsibility of every citizen, and the rights to worship God as we deem wisest, to maintain our families, to earn and to spend the products from our labor, to attain fame or friends or social standing, all depend upon our success as politicians and the results of sensible politics. In self-government, when there is no vigorous, patriotic, determined opposition party, politics cannot function as it should and all that man holds dearest is jeopardized.

A LESSON THE ENGLISH CAN TEACH US

In 1215 King John of Engand was forced to sign the Magna Carta which gave Englishmen their first taste of self-government and which put in written form for the first time the thesis that men have certain rights which even their own governments cannot supersede. Self-government in England is therefore more than seven centuries old, whereas in its constitutional form in America it is barely older than a century and a half. Perhaps it is because self-government in England in its development is more than four times as old as it is in the United States that we Americans have not yet learned the lesson Englishmen understand so well, which teaches that in times of greatest emergency opposition parties become the most important and must function most effectively. In war or peace, England seeks to profit from the strength or suggestions emanating from logical and constructive programs of the opposition party. We have recently witnessed England's replacement of Chamberlain by a new leader in time of war, mind you, because the opposition groups in England had convinced the people there that his leadership was inept, his program unsatisfactory, and that new leadership would bring new hope and new unity to a battle-ridden nation. Perhaps one reason the English have always muddled through centuries of warfare and danger is because when hazards and difficulties are greatest the opposition party contributes the most to reshaping government policies and to reviving national strength.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES THE OPPOSITION PARTY DARE NOT SHIRK

In America, when faced with grave domestic or international situations, surface thinkers and strongly partisan incumbent office holders too frequently run to the public with the idea that politics should be adjourned (mind you, that means the adjournment of self-government in such a land as ours); that all should blindly follow the leadership whether it be good or bad, effective or ineffective, of the majority party of the moment and that opposition denotes a lack of patriotism because it refuses to go along with anything or everything the party in power proposes. Such a fatalistic concept of the art of self-government in this Republic is a tragic disservice to America. It would deprive our country, when its needs are the greatest, of the most effective device it has to successfully meet the challenges it confronts.

At a time when every decision or policy may mean the success or failure of America it is essential that every move be tested in the fierce light of public debate and forged in the crucible of honest discussion and controversy before it is accepted and adopted as the policy upon which a nation's destiny is to be gambled. A time of emergency or crisis is no time to accept untested recipes or to resort to the devitalizing practice of taking orders instead of formulating decisions.

Out on the plains of my native State of South Dakota we have opportunity to witness the activities of herds of sheep when faced with peril. Sheep have no opposition party. When a storm swoops down upon them or some danger approaches which they cannot understand, they mill around aimlessly for a time and then strike out, head to tail, following blindly after some leader from their midst. They do not discuss or analyze the course they have chosen. They do not seek to know whether their leader is intelligent or only impetuous. They do not know or seek to know where their leader is taking them, and they do not care whether or not he knows the answer to that question. They simply go along with an adjournment of politics, hoping for the best. But the creed of a herd of sheep is scarcely the formula by which a free people should practice the art of self-government. Seldom, in fact, does the man of the moment become the man of the hour.

With this background, good friends, I want to discuss for a time the New Deal, and Rooseveltism, and the destiny of America, not as a partisan or as an obstructionist, but rather as a voter, a politician, an oppositionist, inasmuch as I am a Republican, charged with the grave responsibilities of having to help form one flank of our body politic which is just as important to the protection of the Nation as it is that the majority flank fulfill its responsibilities.

NOW—AS NEVER—WE SHOULD ANALYZE NEW DEALISM CAREFULLY

For over 7 years, America has been living with or under a philosophy of Government called the New Deal. At the moment, the New Deal is the majority party of America—it is the party in power. Its oppositionists include Republicans of which I am one, Democrats of the school of thought of Thomas Jefferson, independents who distrust the growing power of Government with its encroachments in the field of private business and individual initiative, and liberals who honestly believe that a liberal government is one which protects its citizens alike against the injustices of entrenched power whether that power be economic or political. During these 7 years most of us have been so busy studying the new adventures of the New Deal we have not had time to settle down to analyze the basic principles upon which these policies are founded. To that extent, we oppositionists have failed America, and to that

extent the New Deal, too, has failed because the lowliest citizen in the land has a right to understand the fundamental concepts upon which his government depends. Or, as Seneca said so long ago, "If you would speak with me, define your terms."

UPON WHAT CREED IS THE NEW DEAL BASED?

The New Deal loudly talks about providing a collective security for all America. But, unfortunately, it has tried to provide that security collectively. By collectivizing the functions of economic enterprise and the powers of government in the central city of the land, it has to that extent imported the foreign formula of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism into a free America. And it has gone the second mile. History has always taught that when a party in power (be it an individual or a political group) has centralized authorities in the capital city of the land, it always, and perhaps inevitably, begins to personalize that power. To this lesson of history the New Deal is no exception. Economic rights which the people had, the Government now exercises. Political rights which the Congress had, the Executive now operates. When the Supreme Court resists, the cry goes out to change the court; when the Congress resists, the call is to delegate more power to the President; when the people resist, the purge is called upon to turn out of authority the obstructionists. Today's President has more personal power than yesterday's prince. Today's free economic enterprises are in many cases as subject as were yesterday's operators under the mercantile guilds of Europe. In degree, communism, nazi-ism, and fascism have gone further; in substance they are linked with the New Deal in putting the state above the citizen and subjecting the whole to the part.

THE TWIN FALLACIES OF NEW-DEALISM

Twin fallacies bedevil the thinking of the new dealers: One is a distrust of individual citizens (especially if they are successful operators) and the other is a deification of the Central Government and the central figure in that Government.

To the extent that these fallacies are present, and each of you in your private thoughts can analyze the trends of the past 7½ years and determine for yourselves how extensively these fallacies exist, the New Deal is in itself reactionary. It has dipped back into history to the Middle Ages to find examples of countries being run from the top down; it has circumvented human liberties after the fashion, although not to the degree, of the modern Moscow, Berlin, Rome, or Tokyo. It is Jeffersonism in reverse. It feels that government is best whose citizens govern least. It cannot permanently succeed. To continue to give synthetic semblance of success it must continue toward the goals its contemporaries in Europe and Asia have already reached. A planned economy with a free people cannot prosper—too many planners spoil the pattern just as too many cooks spoil the brew. And if too few people do the planning, the people are no longer free.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY MILLION PEOPLE AND THIRTY MILLION AUTOMOBILES

Just as the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, Democratic former Congressman from Indiana, says in his remarkable book, Smoke Screen, the difference between the American system and the totalitarian technique is the difference between a country of 130,000,000 people driving 30,000,000 automobiles and a country of 130,000,000 people riding in one automobile driven by one man. There may be fewer highway accidents in the latter alternative, but when an accident occurs it betrays the destiny of an entire people.

The past 7 years have given America more governmental propaganda and less prosperity than any other like period of our Nation's history. The reason is not hard to find. It results from the conflict caused by a free people resisting the fixed pattern of a planned economy. It will perpetuate depression and retard recovery until the people or the planners win the struggle. If the people win, 30,000,000 drivers will make mistakes again, but the traditional American progress will flow on with each incoming wave taking us a little further upward than the last. If the planners win, we shall have security until our one driver makes his first big error, carrying the whole governmental omnibus with all its people into the sudden death of the world's greatest economic crack-up.

DEMOCRACY IS NOW FACING ITS GREATEST PERILS

Democracy now faces throughout the world its greatest trials of history. In Europe, it is threatened by waves of aggressive armies driven forward by one-man planners toward goals the people do not comprehend. In America, it is threatened by socialistic waves of well-intentioned planners, by waves of hysteria about foreign affairs, by waves of abdication of the peoples' powers to the executive branches of our Government. It is today impossible to prophesy the destiny of Europe. It is also impossible to predict the future of America unless we focus our attention upon our great, unsolved domestic problems of unemployment, underprivileged citizens, underpaid farmers, idle capital, and continued economic paralysis. We must first set our own house in order if we are to be of service to our neighbors across the seas.

On its record in the domestic scene the New Deal and its leadership has failed. It has failed to restore recovery. But more serious than that by far, it has failed to protect the American processes of economic opportunity and self-government by which, alone, recovery can ever come and our productive capacity to set up an adequate national defense can ever be restored. As a member of the opposition group, I charge the New Deal has run its course and a change is necessary if we are to resume our march toward better things ahead. The economic stagnation resulting under the New Deal is now even hampering our national defense.

BUT WHAT OF THE NEW DEAL'S FOREIGN POLICY?

But with a world on fire with war, we must look beyond the domestic scene to analyze the New Deal leadership and to evaluate its record. What of the foreign policy of the New Deal? What has been its success in foreign affairs? Has its failure on the domestic scene been offset by success in international relations or does the same death rattle of defeat plague its practices in that connection? These are no times for partisan attack. Let us examine the record carefully and well and judge it fairly and faithfully by what we find. To do more than that would be unduly partisan; to do less would be shirking from our patriotic duty.

WHAT CONSTITUTES WISE AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY?

To honestly evaluate the New Deal's record in foreign affairs we must first of all do more serious thinking about what we should want or expect of such a leadership than is our customary habit. What, may I ask, constitutes sound leadership in foreign affairs? What should Americans expect of their President in his relations with other nations? I have studied this question many years. I think I can suggest the answer and I give it to you for your consideration. It is simply this—sound American leadership in foreign affairs demands that the President project a policy which best protects the interests of America in the family of nations in which we live. To do more might lead to intervention, to meddling, and to war; to do less would be to neglect his duty to the most important member of the international family.

IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS NEW DEALISM HAS FAILED ON ALL FOUR FRONTS

Much as I wish the record were different for the welfare of America and the future of the world, I must submit that the Roosevelt administration has failed us fearfully on all four fronts in its policies affecting our international relations in this world crisis. As it has failed to provide security at home it has also failed at this crucial period to give us security from dangers from without.

First, let us consider the preparedness front as a strong national defense is fundamental to American group security. During the more than 7 years of the New Deal over $8,000,000,000 have been asked and given to perfect our national defense. With what results? On May 16, President Roosevelt addressed a joint session of Congress, asking for a billion dollars more for national defense, and painting a very sorry story about the status of our defense program. No man could hear that speech and feel that this country is well prepared. While billions have been spent and such experiments as the Florida ship canal and the late lamented Passamoquoddy project have been tried, money which should have been spent on protecting our Panama Canal and in modernizing our fortifications has been diverted.

ROOSEVELT HAS FAILED US ON THE PREPAREDNESS FRONT

Military men for years have been asking that our defense program be modernized; that we streamline our Military Establishment to meet the methods and machinery of modern warfare. But after $8,000,000,000 have been spent, horse-and-buggy preparedness prevails and we are unprepared to protect ourselves with modern military equipment of today. Having taken to himself many of the prerogatives of Secretary of the Navy during much of his regime, and having influenced greatly the program of the Army, there is no one to whom the President can pass the blame for antiquated methods or unwisely expended funds. He has been in power since the very first days of Hitler's rule in Germany and has watched the growth of that military machine. But with good intentions always, he has failed to give us a modernized defense. Another billion dollars or another multi-billion-dollar appropriation will not solve our defense problem if we spend it by the same formula and with the same procedure used in spending the past eight billions. The time has come to reexamine our whole program of national defense, to find its holes and plug them up, to bring in experts in industry as well as experts of the Army, Navy, and air force, and to profit from their findings. We cannot longer continue to fail on a front where continued failure might prove so final and so fundamental.

The President's own defense message to Congress proves the point that personalization of power defeats its own ends. No matter how great and good the individual, such a joint problem as national defense calls for study by a joint congressional committee—even while action is being taken—and for the assistance of the best brains in America to join in the undertaking. Witness the following extract from the President's defense message. He said: "Since the first day of September 1939 every week that has passed has brought new lessons learned from actual combat on land and sea. I cite examples: Where naval ships have operated without adequate protection by defending aircraft, their vulnerability to air attack has increased." Very true. But also very late.

As Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker said in New York the following day, the recognition of this fact "came 5 years too late." Colonel Lindbergh told the President and the country about the effectiveness of foreign fighting planes long ago. Billy Mitchell, 20 years ago, pointed to this situation. Arthur Brisbane stressed this need in

his column almost every day during the first years of the Roosevelt regime until the time of Mr. Brisbane's death in December of 1936. It should not take a war to demonstrate that ships without protection in the air are more vulnerable than ships with escorts of fighting planes. Such a conclusion should be inescapable even to a man who had never seen a ship or heard the zooming of a plane. To get a dollar's worth of defense for a dollar's worth of defense appropriations, more of the last eight billion might well have gone for a modernized defense against modernized warfare in the air, on the sea, and on the land.

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE IS OUR WORST

On the financial front, however, the President's failure is most definite. America's financial front is its first line of defense. And our first line of defense is admittedly our worst. With the more than sixty billions spent by the New Deal in 7 squandering years, our national $45,000,000,000 debt limit has been reached. There is no denying that. There is no evading it. But spend we shall and spend we must because our national defense must be strengthened, streamlined, modernized, and that without delay. Developments abroad have united this country in a desire to stiffen our defense program with a realization that the best guarantee today that no American boy need ever again die on foreign battlefields is to make ourselves so strong that no boy need ever die defending his country on battlefields at home. But as a result of the New Deal's neglect of the first line of defense we face the dilemma today of having to improve our military equipment without imperiling our national economy.

THE NEW DEAL FAILED AMERICA ON THE HOME FRONT

On the home front, in his protection of American interests in foreign affairs, the President has also failed us seriously. A wise leadership, to safeguard America in a jealous and angry world, would unite our citizens in a fellowship of good will and friendly feeling between employers and employees, between farmers and city dwellers, between rich and poor. Of even greater importance, wise leadership in crucial times like these, would have divorced all Government offices and services from employment of Communists, bund members, parlor pinks, socialistic theorists, and other misdirected enthusiasts lacking faith and confidence in the American system. But the President has coddled these malcontents. Communists have headed movements given reception at the White House. Earl Browder, indicted and convicted communistic chief, was third-term advocate No. 1. Bund members have gained in number and increased in strength. While "fifth column" leaders in other countries have sapped the vitals of national defense by secretive stealth, in America we have invited them into the headquarters staff, and, according to a statement made by MARTIN DIES on the floor of the House yesterday, we have virtually turned over to them our merchant marine.

In his defense message to Congress the President rightfully called for a speed-up of American industrial production so we can build more planes and other implements of war and peace. Industry can and must meet that challenge. But what a sad commentary on these last 7 years that the greatest industrial nation of them all should now be criticized for insufficient industrial productivity. Were it not for the incessant sniping of New Deal theorists and the socialistic invasions of Government into business, America's industrial capacity would still lead the world. In spite of everything, I think it still does. If the driver will take off the brakes and turn on the green light, this country will jump into an industrial revival which all of Europe, both conquered, conquering, and unconquerable, cannot duplicate.

Such a record on the home front reveals the partisan reasons for men like Ickes and Minton, like Wallace and McNutt, and others who are already gloatingly using the European situation as argument that a third term is now demanded or desired. For what reason? And by whom? Third termites are in bad taste in their hurried attempt to make political capital of the lack of national defense for which they are themselves responsible.

THE FAILURE ON OUR FOURTH FRONT IS MOST FRIGHTENING

On the Government front, the New Deal has perhaps made its greatest failure from the standpoint of foreign relations. When much of the World is fighting to resist the onrush of totalitarian techniques of government, a farsighted American leadership would long ago have recognized that dictatorship was menacing democracy by the infiltration of its agents as well as its armies. Such leadership would therefore have reversed the trend toward dictatorship at home. It would have restored to American citizens their democracy-protecting rights of individual enterprise, private profits, freedom of initiative, protection from monopoly, and the check and balance system of political activity upon which our democracy has grown great, and upon which alone it can continue to maintain its greatness. By making democracy work here, such leadership would have made its retention or recovery seem more attractive to the people over there. As the menace of that man developed overseas, the importance of government by law rather than government by men should have been recognized at home.

Only by reposing in the people more of the responsibilities of self-government can the process of self-government be nurtured and strengthened in this Republic. The present crisis in which democracy finds itself calls for the full development of the great innate and inherent powers of democracy in its greatest proving ground in all the world. Thus, by our successful example of self-government can we show that dictatorships are not the answer to the peoples' needs.

AMERICA—WAKE UP AND LIVE

America—wake up and live. Too many of us have slumbered while the things which make America American have lost their luster. The dullness which we see upon them now is not decay but the surface rust of disuse. Let's meet the challenge to America with American courage and in an American way. Let the people speak. Let parties in and out of power unite in building us an impregnable national defense. The real American frontier as our own JOE MARTIN has so vividly said is "at the factory door and the farmer's gate." Let the New Deal give way for a New America; for effective leadership—Democratic or Republican—which will hold high the torch of freedom here, so that when peace comes again we can help bring light and hope and freedom to the weary people of a war-torn world.

American sympathies in the present conflict are almost universally united. It is a disservice to our peace for public officials to emphasize them, but it is a credit to our Christian ideals that we are so solidly united. The question which we must answer in considering our national policy today is not, What will happen in Europe if the wrong side wins? but rather, What could America write into a peace treaty which would preserve peace and promote justice in Europe if we entered the war and won? In the World War we won the war, but we so badly lost the peace that our Senate refused to ratify what it considered to be an unwise peace treaty. We refused to police the world after the fighting was over. We withdrew from the European scene rather than be drawn into the endless and ageless conflicts overseas. No sooner had we left the scenes of battle than the rechoosing of sides began anew, and political intrigue coupled with a race in armaments was in full swing.

Would we now be willing to maintain standing armies abroad and battleships in foreign ports to enforce a peace? And what could be written into such a peace after a thousand years of failures in Europe which would not again become the seed for a greater conflict than it stopped? These are serious, practical questions which hysterical news commentators ignore but which mean much to the mothers of America whose sons would become the bloody pawns of battle.

WE NEED A BETTER PREPAREDNESS FOR A BETTER PEACE

Until and unless these questions are answered honestly and accurately and in our American interests, it would be both foolhardy and futile to send our boys across the seas to senseless sacrifice. Rather than helping to defend America, such action might well contribute to our decay. War will not come to America unless America goes to the war, provided we sufficiently tighten our national defenses, cooperate in making the Western Hemisphere an impregnable continent of peace and freedom and disband our fifth columns by sending their conspirators to jail or deporting them to the foreign lands from whence they came.

America must disband its Bund camps, its Fascist Silver Shirters, and its communistic cells. We have coddled subversive groups too long in this country and under the New Deal the Attorney General and Labor Department have shown them too much leniency. We have too long kidded ourselves that the disclosures of the Dies committee were far-fetched figments of the imagination, "America, Wake Up and Live!" But we must do more than clean up America—we must develop an efficient and effective military defense for it. We must spend additional billions for such peace insurance. But we must spend it wisely. We must modernize our equipment. We need tanks for defense. We need planes with armored cockpits and self-sealing gas tanks, we need antiaircraft guns. We need to separate politics entirely from preparedness. Our problem is to defend ourself against the methods and machinery of modern warfare; to do this we should create a commission of industrial experts to assist our military men in mobilizing American industry so it can best assist in the modernization of a defense system which has too long measured its adequacy in terms of billions of dollars spent for preparedness rather than in terms of results in the form of up-to-date fighting equipment and military units.

Yes; American sympathies have crystallized. Our hearts go out to freedom where it fights or falters. But we do not want to support these sympathies by sending American sons to rot and die on foreign fighting grounds battling for a peace no man has yet been bold enough to define or wise enough to propound. Let us face the issues squarely. Europe has bent before its Alexander the Great, its Caesar, its Napoleon, and has risen to new heights after the collapse of every leader who would rule the world. It will outlive and outgrow its Hitler, its Stalin, and its Mussolini. And with our aid, when peace has come again, Europe will move into another era of peace and happiness. But from our vantage point 3,000 miles removed we cannot direct the destiny growing out of century-old disputes in Europe.

Unless we annex the continent or patrol the battle fronts until eternity, we cannot control the destiny of Europe—and to undertake such a colossal task might dim the destiny of all the world by bringing the blackout of human liberties to the Western Hemisphere.

By making democracy work at home we can best give service to the world. By protecting what we have on the continent on which

it functions we can do by our example of success that which our armies could not permanently achieve. Right ideals can move eastward from this continent to Europe as readily as wrong ideas can move westward from Europe over here. Let us give devotion to our right ideals at home. In so doing we can keep bright the light of Christian brotherhood and help right the wrongs of human avarice once the dove of peace has again replaced the war dogs now on the loose in Europe.

The Science of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN ON THE OCCASION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY EVENING, MAY 20, 1940

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I was privileged to hear last evening. While peace seems to be a futile objective at the moment, yet peace must some day come again. Dr. Brown has ably set forth the foundational requirements for a lasting peace and gives us a clear view of the true path to world peace.

The address follows:

Nietzsche says that "man is something that must be surpassed." It would seem that man has now been surpassed by modern science. He is not only grateful for the comforts and enjoyments which science has given him; he is its docile creature. He is even beginning to believe that social redemption will be achieved solely through science.

The tragedy of science is that its main trend has been toward the perfection of power and force. The intrusion into the private life of the atom has been animated largely by the desire to measure its energy and exploit its power of destruction.

The supreme expression of modern science is the war machine. But once this machine is set in motion it soon gets out of control. The god of the machine takes command. It runs wild, destroying men, nations, and vast material resources. It also destroys cherished institutions and standards of values. Confusion of thought and, worst of all, destruction of moral character follow in the wake of this Frankenstein monster which science has created. Men lose their mental equilibrium. They cannot anticipate and discount the course of events. The war machine rolls ruthlessly on. Civilization reels and chaos threatens.

The war machine has no respect for democracies. They can defend themselves against dictatorships only by being less democratic. The organization of democracy for war demands great concentration of power and serious limitations on freedom. All the resources of the state, human as well as material, must be surrendered to the government. State capitalism results and in turn produces social revolution. The masses of the people become restless and readily susceptible to subversive influences. A war between nations breeds social revolutionaries.

Under such disintegrating conditions created by the war machine it is obviously impossible to plan intelligently for peace. We do not know on what kind of foundations we may restore the temple of peace. We cannot be sure that the present war may not prove to be only one of a long series. Definite plans for international organization at the present time are futile. They are as derisive as small fountains playing in a deluge.

What then can the advocates of peace hope to accomplish in this hour of world tragedy? We cannot acknowledge defeat and remain silent. The lighthouse is most needed in darkness and storm. We must hold the faith and fight on. But not blindly. Not with empty phrases and slogans. Our immediate duty is to dedicate ourselves anew to the apparently insoluble problem of international peace. We must do so in a scientific spirit. The science of power expressed by the war machine must be opposed by the science of peace.

Now science in its essence is nothing else than knowledge. And knowledge is gained by realistic logical processes of thought. We are warranted in believing that through honest research comparable to the investigations of modern science we may discern the principles that control this science of peace.

The reasonable approach to this problem would seem first to recognize the errors and failures of previous experiments in the laboratory of peace. The lamentable experience of the League of Nations, in particular, should have most important lessons for us. There must be no emotional wishful thinking. Too much of fateful import to humanity is at stake. We are engaged in a scientific research infinitely more significant than the study of the atom.

The basic error in the peace experiments would seem to have been in a false analysis of the causes of war and in the methods proposed to end war. And this error, strangely enough, has been due to the very same error that created the war machine. Both have been produced by a materialistic, mechanistic age. Both have been dominated by a blind belief in force. Both have believed that men can be coerced to behave as desired by gangsters, statesmen, and reforming idealists alike.

The peace advocates have placed their faith too much in institutions, in organizations, and in systems of government. They have persisted in the ancient error that men can be compelled to cooperate and live at peace with one another. The logical goal of this school of thought has been the creation of a gigantic international peace force to impose peace on single nations and on blocs of nations.

The peace movement has been obsessed by this faith in force, in the inexorable power of the machine. It found feeble expression in the attempt to apply economic sanctions against Italy at the time of the invasion of Ethiopia. The League of Nations, when used as a means of coercion, collapsed miserably in dealing successively with Japan, Germany, Italy, and Russia.

No lesson in recent times could be more impressive and poignant than that the way to peace does not lie along the road of force. The god of the war machine can never insure peace. Whether in personal, domestic, or international relations, mankind will always abhor coercion of any kind, be it physical or moral. You may win a temporary and a precarious peace by force, but you cannot reason with men by force.

A most serious mistake of the peace movement has been to urge peace because of the increasing horrors of modern warfare. This argument has been as unrealistic as it has been ignoble. Heroic men never shrink from any call of duty because of the fear of suffering and death. It is an inspiring tribute to the character of the men facing the horrors of hell in Europe and China that they have not faltered in the defense of what they believe to be sacred rights and obligations. The appeal to fear has sadly discredited the peace movement. It has paralyzed normal thinking and obscured the distinctions between right and wrong. It would be difficult for a Finnish, Dutch, or Belgian soldier to understand the reasoning of the professional pacifist. Men who are defending their hearth and home value duty and honor above life itself. The span of life is all too brief, but men still believe in eternal values. They will not be deterred from laying down their lives for others by fear of the horrors of war. This argument has done the peace movement great harm.

Another error of the peace advocates has been to stress unduly the idea that wars are caused by a state of mind. It is true that wars result from a state of mind and emotion. Men do have profound convictions, be they right or wrong, concerning the justice of their cause. They think in terms of national interests, of pride of race, of religious freedom, and material needs. They plan wars deliberately for the sake of their convictions, whether high or low, reasonable or fantastic.

Calling this a state of mind does not serve to clarify the problem. It requires much more than denunciation, derision, or argument. The fervid belief of the German people in a pure race which shall dominate Europe cannot be eradicated by either war or ridicule. The British interest in Gibraltar and Singapore, the demand of Italy for greater economic freedom, the claim by Japan for predominance in the Far East—these all must be considered realistically. Such debatable issues disclose something much deeper than an emotional state of mind. They reveal the motives that inspire and control the actions of men and nations. We must know the philosophy of life that determines conduct. We must know the compelling motives that make men selfish or generous, cruel or kind. What most matters in the science of peace is the basic philosophy that actuates the conduct of men and nations.

It is painfully apparent that our present civilization too long has been dominated by a materialistic, mechanistic attitude of mind. The hard and dangerous work of society has been done not because men and women wanted to but because they had to. Society has been strangely indifferent to many social and economic injustices. The economic law of necessity has prevailed over the law of love. It is easy to understand why the economic determinists have so profoundly affected the thinking of all ranks of society, including many social-welfare workers and members of the clergy. They rightly believe that modern scientific discoveries should make human existence more comfortable and enjoyable. They believe that men will cease to be miserable and rebellious if economic injustices are corrected. This, they hold, is the right way to find peace.

The leading exponents of this philosophy of life are the Marxian socialists. Their idealism may not be questioned though their class hatred and their methods lay them open to serious criticism. The inherent vice of this philosophy is that it restricts man within the narrow limits of economic determinism. They believe that man is merely the product of his economic environment. It is essentially a materialistic attitude toward life. In common with less radical reformers they would solve social and economic prob-

lems by legislation, institutions, and systems. They are substituting one mechanism for another. They would submit man to external controls of a different nature. The freedom they seek is economic. They have slight regard for his intellectual freedom and none for his religious freedom. Such a philosophy of life is too restricted to satisfy his whole nature.

This philosophy of life is also vitiated by its failure to take into account the conflicting desires of men. It ignores the greed, the lusts, the hatreds, as well as the ideals, that animate and control human conduct. It is based on the false assumption that these desires and motives can be regimented by clever regulations and mechanistic systems devised by the state. In his instinctive search for complete freedom man has never been willing to submit to a social control over his desires and ideals.

The ultimate problem in the science of peace is to discover how the desires that control human conduct, whether in the family, in industry, politics, or international affairs may be reconciled and guided into right channels. If these desires are irreconcilable; if men and nations are resolved to take by any means, fair or foul, what they feel entitled to, there is no use in attempting to seek peace by the arbitrary use of force. You may secure a temporary semblance of peace by force but you fail ignominiously to eradicate the basic cause of war.

The advocates of peace through justice are now facing the stark, ugly reality that civilization is rapidly reverting to the law of the jungle. Our materialistic philosophy has been tending more and more to the idea of the survival of the strongest. Disguise it as you will, it is present everywhere—in business, industry, politics, and, saddest of all, even in the church—wherever men find it possible by a sufficient show of strength to gain their ends by means other than reason and moral suasion. There is evident a general cynicism that makes light of ethical standards. We are aware of a prevalent social attitude that demands privileges but denies obligations. The freedom men seek is in the main individualistic and irresponsible.

The plight of the liberal in these times is most tragic. A sense of defeatism and the inadequacy of his convictions make him inclined too often to compromise—to accept restraints and restrictions imposed by both doctrinaires and dictators. He is in desperate need of a fresh renewal of faith in what Walter Lippmann has termed "freedom of personality and inviolability of the soul of man." He cannot be content with any human institutions and devices which, in aiming at social betterment, actually fetter mankind with restrictions on his desire for the freest development of his highest nature. He knows very well that the legitimate desires and ideals of men can never with safety be restrained by any schemes of social reform.

What, then, is the complete solution of this problem of peace? Are we to confess ourselves to be hopelessly defeated? Must we accept fatalistically the prospect of unceasing contentions and wars? If that be our answer, we might as well eat, drink, and be insanely merry before the resounding crash of civilization. But if we are committed in our personal lives to a philosophy that can give contentment, alter profoundly the desires of men, and reconcile them, then we have an adequate answer which we must proclaim resolutely, with undaunted faith.

But this will exact much more from us than intellectual conviction or moral dedication. We must first demonstrate in our own lives, in every relationship, both within and without the family, those standards of behavior which we believe should control the actions of other men and nations. We should acknowledge the simple painful truth so fully expressed many years ago: "Whence come quarrels and conflicts among you? Come they not from your uncontrolled desires that contend within you?" It is axiomatic that if we cannot have peace at home or in our other relationships we cannot expect it between nations. This demands immense discipline and sacrifice. We would much rather seek external controls on human conduct than inner compulsions. We would resort to resolutions, petitions, denunciations, legislation, and punishments to constrain men to keep the peace. But this is to continue the old discredited fight between conflicting philosophies of life, whether Marxism, capitalism, collectivism, or any other form of social reform. The fight is most clearly drawn between materialism and idealism—between those who deny and those who affirm the right of man to freedom of personality and the inviolability of his soul. All other warfare has but little meaning beside this unending battle. Either we must thoroughly alter and reconcile the conflicting desires of men or abandon the fight for world peace.

How can these desires be altered and reconciled? How can they be harmonized into one sole objective, one supreme goal, one great faith to animate and satisfy mankind? If we have the courage of our convictions and the willingness to sacrifice something, the answer may not be as difficult as we imagine. The only adequate, rational, unifying philosophy must be our faith in the actual brotherhood of man and ultimate spiritual purpose in social evolution. Paul, the first of the great internationalists, proclaimed this truth to the sceptics of Mars Hill: "For God hath made of one blood all nations of man to dwell upon the face of the earth, and hath determined the periods and the bounds of their habitation." Rejecting the paltry philosophy of the materialists we must hold to the faith that there is a divine plan of evolution that promises the utmost freedom of personality and the complete inviolability of the soul. We cannot be content with lesser and baser objectives.

I am not pleading for any sectarian creed. Each must be loyal to his own convictions. I am challenging those millions of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, and all others who accept the authority of God in human affairs to present a militant united front to promote the only kind of righteousness that can insure peace throughout the world. Thus a united front would be irresistible. As President Roosevelt has so eloquently said, "There is no problem—social, political, or economic—which would not melt before the fire of a great spiritual awakening." This is the true science of peace which can triumph over the science of war. This has been the great aim of the American Peace Society since its founding 112 years ago by William Ladd, himself a great spiritual leader.

We are definitely challenged to dedicate ourselves to this crusade to check the rising tide of war and to lay the foundations for a sound and enduring peace. After all the yearnings, the strivings, and searchings after peace we must take up the task in a venturesome pioneering spirit.

"All the past we leave behind:
We take up the task eternal, and the burden,
and the lesson!
Conquering, holding, daring, venturing, as we
go the unknown ways—
Pioneers! O pioneers!"

Regional Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY JEROME N. FRANK

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable Jerome N. Frank, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the Kiwanis Club of Cleveland, Ohio, April 25, 1940, in which he describes in detail the creation of regional finance institutions.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I find that no member of the S. E. C. has visited Cleveland since former Chairman Douglas was here in 1938. That is much too long a time. As it is one of the leading financial and industrial centers of the Nation, we are very much interested in Cleveland and its problems. In fact, we have, as you know, opened one of our few branch offices here within the past 18 months, under the direction of your distinguished former State securities commissioner, Dan T. Moore.

Mr. Justice Douglas, when he was here some 2 years ago, addressed the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce's committee of the banks and investment bankers of Cleveland. I wonder if you recall what a resounding challenge it was to the financial leaders of your city. He pointed out that the proportion of the magnitude of your industry and wealth in the fourth Federal Reserve district far exceeds your geographic proportion of the Nation, but that your financial leaders were not obtaining their pro rata share of the Nation's financial business. He pointed to the concentration of financial business in New York and showed that, although in the 2 years just preceding his talk, the Cleveland Federal Reserve district had been the domicile of corporations offering 12 percent of bonds and stocks, dealers in the Cleveland district had participated in only about 5 percent of all issues and had actually managed the distribution of only a little over 2½ percent of all issues.

In conclusion he said:

"Undoubtedly, then, there is a considerable supply of funds available for long-term investment and a large demand for long-term funds originating in the fourth district. Much of this might be matched regionally, but now goes to New York to be matched there. Suppose a part of these amounts were handled locally to form the basis of a regional capital market. What would that mean to you and to the fourth Federal Reserve district?

"I hardly need to tell you that it would mean more business for the investment bankers of the district, for the trust and registrar departments of your commercial banks, and for lawyers and auditors of the district; for printers of the prospectuses, etc. It would, indirectly, mean more business for your banks in the form of loans on new securities and wider opportunities for investment. All of

this is an important aspect of the problem, no doubt. To me, however, there are other aspects of at least equal or greater consequence, though they may seem somewhat intangible.

"First and foremost, I should expect simpler and more conservative finance, where finance is brought closer to the locus of business and where investors are brought closer to finance and investment.

"Second, I should hope regional financing would produce better-planned financing, since under that system there might be greater freedom from the scramble in the capital market for the issues of temporarily popular industries.

"Third, I should hope that regional finance might be able to develop an adequate organization for the supply of long-term capital, particularly in equity form, to enterprises of moderate size.

"Fourth, I should expect that a reduction in absentee financing would result in a reduction of absentee ownership and management, with all of the advantages which flow from keeping business at home for the home folks.

"Finally, I should expect that the development of regional capital markets would bring new capital and new brains into the investment banking industry and the financial management of local business. This is not meant as a reflection on its present personnel. But regional capital markets of sufficient stature should help retain and employ the best of its own sons at home.

"The development of regional capital markets seems to me to be eminently desirable but it will not come just by talking and writing. Regional capital markets, even under the best of conditions, can grow up only if local bankers and local businessmen want them. With local patronage development of regional capital markets is possible. Without it, it is impossible. The problem, therefore, at this stage is largely in your hands."

I understand from friends of mine in Cleveland that Mr. Justice Douglas' talk made a great impression here and, what is more important, that at least some leaders in your community decided to do something about it. I understand that, as a result of their activity, the pro rata share of the Cleveland district's participation in stock and bond issues has substantially increased.

I entirely agree with what Mr. Justice Douglas said about the importance of regional finance, and not only as to its importance, but as to the fact that the initiative in fostering it must, in the final analysis, rest with the leaders in those regions. They have it in their power to give more substantial aid in promoting the promising small-business enterprises in their respective localities. And many small businesses need and deserve such aid.

When I say that I am not to be understood as being opposed to all bigness in business. I believe that there are some industries where bigness is today almost indispensable. But to say that bigness is necessary and desirable in some industries is not, by any manner of means, to say the same thing of all industries. There are many areas of American life in which there is no need for bigness. It is foolish, therefore, to make an antithesis between big business and small business. Each has its legitimate place in the American scheme of things.

Do you remember the first-grade reader story of the little pig and the big giraffe? The little pig said it was better to be small and the big giraffe said, "No; it was much better to be big." They argued all morning, but neither could prove his point. Finally, as they walked along, still arguing, they passed a high wall. Now, on the other side of the wall there was an orchard, and both the little pig and the big giraffe wanted to go inside and eat the apples and the tender leaves. The little pig looked and looked, but could find no entrance. But the giraffe had no trouble in reaching his long neck over the wall and eating all the leaves he wanted. "You see," he said, "it is much better to be big." Then they walked on until they came to another orchard enclosed by a high wall. This time the giraffe found he could not stretch his neck over the wall to eat the leaves. But the little pig found, at the bottom of the wall, a hole which was just large enough for him to squeeze through. Into the orchard he went and ate his fill of the apples. Then he returned to the giraffe and said, "It is really much better to be small."

Bigness as such is not a virtue. Neither is littleness. To worship either, as such, is a neurotic obsession. To fear either as such is a neurotic phobia. The fear of size as such is silly. The worship of littleness, as such, is equally silly. In some situations bigness is more desirable. And the situation in which it is better varies with technological conditions. Bigness and littleness are relative terms. Life is not static, and no size formula can be static. Moreover, there can be no perfection: There is, usually, not a "best" but merely a "better." And when bigness is preferable, devices must be sought which will offset, if possible, its defects. It will not do to show the defects of bigness in any given context without asking whether littleness in that same context would not be worse. And when it comes to reducing bigness one must ask, How much reduction is now desirable? There is need for scepticism concerning the dogma that the biggest is always the best. There is also need for scepticism as to the opposing dogma that littleness is always the best. Both dogmas are equally fallacious. As to any specific industry, the question is always pertinent, What, at this particular moment, is the most desirable size?

It is, accordingly, folly for anyone to say either "I am for big business" or "I am for small business." It is wiser to say, "I am for both, each in its proper sphere." The result of not recognizing the folly of any basic antithesis between the two is that a false issue is presented and that, as a consequence, many persons, who quite rationally defend the rights and needs of big business in certain industries, pay altogether too little attention to the rights and needs of small business. In many sectors of American life, small- and medium-sized businesses will always be the backbone of American business. They often receive insufficient consideration from financial leaders and government.

Local industries and regional industries must thrive and prosper. It is imperative that they, as well as the giant corporations, should have credit and capital facilities. And, with Justice Douglas, I feel that, as a general rule, the fountain head of capital and credit for most local and regional industries should, as far as possible, be in the locality or region where they are located.

Now, I know that you have heard a great deal of talk about how the S. E. C. interferes with small business, and you may wonder how I, as a member of what is said to be such an obstructionist agency, can consistently express sympathy with the needs of small- and medium-size business. The answer is a simple one: By and large, the S. E. C. has practically no effect on small business. That it has is a popular misconception. The fact is that, out of the million or more businesses in this country, the S. E. C. has in its entire life come in contact with probably no more than a few thousand. By and large, we affect only those who want to sell their securities to the public.

Naturally, I think you here in this audience know that those are not small businesses. They are medium-sized businesses. As you know, issues under $100,000 are exempt from the S. E. C. requirements. And a one hundred thousand dollar issue is a small issue only from the standpoint of a big company. From the standpoint of the very great majority of businesses in America, such an issue is a big issue. I assume that most of you are representatives of small- and medium-sized business, and I am sure that few of your companies have much more than $100,000 of stock or bonds outstanding in the hands of the public.

But very likely there are many of you who have felt that your capital and credit facilities were not what they should be. You have felt that it is much too hard to obtain the money you need for the legitimate expansion of your business—even when you have orders on the book which would justify such an expansion. That, at least, has been the problem of thousands of small-business men all over the country. And there is no possible question that it is a very serious problem, not only for the particular businessman but for the country as a whole.

We have stories of retailers and small manufacturers who could not obtain bank loans without pledging as collateral so much of their inventory that to conduct business became virtually impossible. We have stories of other businessmen who have had to go to the commercial loan companies or to the factors or even in some cases to actual usurers to obtain vitally necessary capital at interest rates so large as to be literally staggering. And we have other stories of businessmen whose crying need was for partners to invest equity capital and who could find only creditors who piled the business debt so high that the shadow of bankruptcy was often visible around the corner. I am not to be understood as blaming all those who make such loans for the harsh terms they may exact; for frequently the nature of those loans by ordinary lenders justifies such terms.

There are two distinct problems involved: The first has to do with relatively small loans for working capital. The second has to do with funds to be used for plant expansion. It is with the latter, because of my S. E. C. experience, that I am primarily concerned.

As I have said on many occasions, I am in favor of seeing a great deal more equity money and a great deal less debt money go into business, especially where funds are needed for plant expansion. There is very little elasticity in debt. Interest charges are fixed, regardless of economic conditions. American business is a growing, changing thing. But an excessive amount of interest charges, on funds used for capital expansion, is a static thing. The two are, to my mind, often incompatible. Let me give you a word picture of what I mean. On the one hand you have a spirited horse (American business), rarin' to go. On the other, you have a huge stake in the ground, representing debt created in the past. Tying the horse that wants to go forward to the stake which holds him to the past, you have the stout rope of fixed interest charges on the debt. On the other hand, to carry my picure further, if you release the horse and give him an able rider in the form of a partner with equity money, he will really go places.

It is significant that for many years since the last World War, an increasing number of our giant industrial corporations in our prosperous expanding industries have issued few, if any, bonds, but, instead, have done their financing largely through stock.

The following editorial in the Wall Street Journal for February 5, 1940, is apposite: "A news article in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal recorded the fact that many corporations are now applying cash in excess of immediate working-capital requirements to the reduction of debt, retirement of preferred stock, or reduction of arrearages in cumulative dividends on senior issues. Better net

earnings of the latter part of 1939 have accelerated these processes and it is anticipated that good earnings of the current quarter will carry further this work of simplifying and improving the capital structures of a considerable number of corporations. Reduction of mortgage or floating debt obviously fortifies any unit of business enterprise, both for the performance of its economic functions and for the compensation of those who have committed their investment funds to the use of its management. Retirement of preferred shares and reduction of accumulated unpaid dividends are measures of a somewhat different order, but still they help materially toward a stronger capital structure, one better adapted to meet contingencies either of suddenly expanding operations and the borrowing that may entail or of contracting business volume and resulting smaller earnings.

"It was noted in the article referred to that these applications of earned income will in many instances bring nearer the time when dividends on common stock may be resumed or begun. That means more than merely the pecuniary benefit of common-stock holders. A large corporation of which the common shares are so remote from dividend possibilities as to be little more than trading chips is far from an ideal set-up from any point of view, whereas a corporation able to pay common dividends not only enlists the active interest and support of all its security holders but also, under favorable general conditions, may obtain needed capital for expansion without incurring the potential disadvantage of fixed interest charges."

Once that would have been considered heresy; once it was thought that it was always good business for a corporation to issue an immense amount of bonds at low interest rates to procure money which the corporation could employ to earn a much larger rate of return for the stockholders. That kind of margin trading was once considered invariably wise.

But many of those who manage many of our prosperous big companies no longer adhere to that business doctrine. And if it has proved unsound with reference to many big business, surely it is even more unsound for a small or medium-sized business, which frequently has less capacity to stand up under the impact of a business slump at a time when it has a large amount of interest to pay or a large amount of debt principal to refinance. A proportionately large amount of bonded debt for big business, and even more for small business, is a constricting thing. It produces lack of elasticity, the inability to adjust to bad business weather.

Since much big business has found it wise and possible to avoid the constriction resulting from a large proportion of bonded debt, every effort should be made to make the same possible for small business. And that means that there must be more equity financing of the small, promising business enterprises.

A large proportion of financing by such enterprises through bonds involves dangers to the investors in those bonds and to the owners of the stocks in those enterprises. The chief danger is that if, because of a default in interest payments or the arrival of the maturity date, the bonds come due in a period of recession, bankruptcy, or reorganization is precipitated; and bankruptcy or reorganization is generally harmful to all investors.

More and more that fact is coming to be recognized. In October 1938 a committee consisting of some of our leading conservative bankers, insurance company executives, and other businessmen, publicized such views in an important book called Debts and Recovery. I earnestly recommend that you read it. (You will find that theme expanded in a speech of mine, Too Much Interest in Interest, which I made on September 22, 1938. See also my book, Save America First (1938), pp. 385–386.)

To avoid any possible misunderstanding, let me say, parenthetically, that my preference for increased equity financing is personal and must not and does not affect my conduct in helping to administer the statutes which the S. E. C. enforces. Under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935, the question of lawful financing of gas and electric utilities companies does come before us frequently. But there we must make our decisions in accordance with the standards set forth by Congress in that particular act, and the application of those standards does not authorize us to disapprove of bond financing of such utility companies, if it conforms to those statutory standards. In other words, if the management of a utility company elects to issue bonds, we have the power and duty to interfere with its judgment only to the limited extent that its judgment flies in the face of these statutory standards; on a few occasions we have been required to hold that a proposed utility bond issue was excessive and violative of that act; our position in such cases was substantially the same as that of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which, under somewhat similar provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920, has not infrequently, over the past 20 years, refused railroad companies permission to issue an excessive amount of bonds in violation of the standards of that act. But except for cases relating solely to bond issues of utility companies within our jurisdiction under the 1935 act, the S. E. C. has no power whatever to pass upon the amount of bonds a corporation may issue. Accordingly, when I express a preference for increased equity financing, I am merely stating my personal nonofficial attitude. That is, however, an attitude based upon a study of a very large number of cases involving insolvent corporations which have gone into bankruptcy. For under the Chandler Act the S. E. C. makes advisory reports to the courts in connection with reorganizations of bankrupt corporations; and in connection with such reports, we learn much about the disastrous consequences of excessive bond financing.

I know the problem of equity financing for the prosperous small or medium-sized business is not simple of solution. But I believe the solution must, in considerable part, be regional. And I believe that communities like Cleveland, with its great financial, industrial, and human resources, can solve it. I would like to relate to you one suggestion which I have made on several occasions. It pertains to the establishment of something which, for lack of a better name, might be called regional industrial capital institutions.

You are probably thinking at once in terms of further Government control over business. If that worries you, let me say that it also worries me. If I felt that what I have proposed could not be worked out without giving the Government ownership or control—either direct or indirect—of American business, I would be opposed to it myself. The institutions which I propose might require some financial support from the Government. That would depend upon how much support could be obtained in the community. Under no circumstance would the Government contribution be made in such a way that the Government might eventually take over any businesses which the institution might have aided. But I am getting ahead of myself.

In short, I know from my experience on the S. E. C. that there is no way in which most small business enterprises can raise capital in amounts from $50,000 up to even $1,000,000 unless they have some special connection with an underwriter. Most individual underwriters are not equipped to handle security issues of this size, except at an excessive cost to the issuer. This is not a criticism of the spirit or motives of the underwriter, but it is a frank analysis of their capacities. Our figures show that for small issues of common stock registered with the S. E. C., the underwriting charges alone run to nearly 20 percent of the issue. When the cost runs that high, even I, with my predilection for equity financing, must acknowledge that debt financing is unavoidable, no matter how unfortunate that may be.

I do not deny that it costs the underwriter a great deal to market securities of little known enterprises and that his risks may be high. I am not, therefore, blaming him for charging a large price for his services.

But I feel that money which costs that much is too expensive for most small American business. And for that matter, the underwriting charges for small bond issues and small preferred stock issues are also so very much larger than for big business that little and medium-sized businesses are placed at a terrific competitive handicap in their race for their proper share of the Nation's business.

So I have proposed the creation of these regional institutions. The plan has not been worked out as to detail, but roughly it is as follows: In each of the Federal Reserve districts, a financial institution would be set up, with the common stock owned by private persons in the district. In order to stimulate private investment in the stock of these institutions, the Government would invest in their preferred stocks, carefully safeguarded so as to have little if any voting power. But, the privately owned common stock would control the institution and elect the officers and directors. Each institution would, in turn, buy the stocks of deserving and growing local business enterprises, in good financial condition, which needed money for capital expansion. Generally speaking, the institutions would not make loans. They would supply equity capital instead of debt.

In other words, each of these institutions would be a sort of speculative finance company or investment trust. I want to emphasize that I believe they should not be eleemosynary institutions. They should be run for a profit. We all know that there are hundreds of persons in every community who think they ought to get capital for everything from making gasoline out of salt water to operating a rocket service to Mars. But we also know that there are plenty of good promising businesses which, with a little additional capital, can prosper. And you businessmen in the community know those situations better than anybody else. That is the principal reason why I believe so firmly in localized control of the proposed financing companies. An investment committee made up of local businessmen can judge better than anybody else which are the deserving situations and which are not. They can also judge the likelihood of success of a given venture in their particular community. They can know, for example, that a giant market might succeed in one neighborhood because of competitive conditions, while it would have very little chance in another. Those are judgments that cannot, nearly as well, be made from a distance.

Those regional finance companies, as I envision them, would not merely themselves invest in the securities of prosperous small business enterprises, deserving the opportunity to expand, but would also, in appropriate circumstances, participate with underwriters in the distribution of the securities of such businesses.

Naturally, it would be too much to expect that all the investments of the finance companies would succeed. Some, of course, would not. But I believe that, with a wise selection, most of them would. And I believe that, from time to time, it would be often found that some expert management advice, such as could be supplied by the institution, would pull a business, in which it had invested, into the black when it had gone into the red.

That at least has been the experience of private groups which, on their own initiative, have attempted that kind of project on a small scale. Not long ago I was talking to a man in New York who does almost exactly what I believe these institutions could do. He takes a stock interest in a small business which appears promising at a price agreed upon as fair. He then sends one of his own men out to study the business and give management advice for as long as may be necessary—a month or 6 months. He supplies that management service at no charge. His only profit comes from an improvement in the value of his stock through an improvement in the affairs of the company. He tells me that, of course, he turns away a great many unworthy applications; but he also has to turn away many very promising situations. He is an enthusiastic supporter of the regional finance company idea. He says, incidentally, that he has put none of his money into enterprises in New York City—all in small business on Long Island, New Jersey, Connecticut, etc.

As a matter of fact, the investment trust bill now before the Senate makes provision for this type of company—frankly speculative—frankly for special situations. I believe that finance companies of this nature will aid materially in filling the gap, but I doubt whether such companies, managed from New York, can get down into the local situations. By and large, I think they will have to place their funds with companies a little larger than those I have in mind. But size is no measure of potentiality. A small business venture, in many industries, has relatively as much chance of success as a large one. I would be worried about America if I did not believe that. And I think it requires a knowledge of local conditions adequately to know the prospects of the local industry.

There are two things I want to say about my proposal. First, I do not regard it as a panacea; I am not a perfectionist and therefore do not believe in panaceas. I merely regard it as a step in the direction of filling the gap in our underwriting machinery which presently makes it too difficult for small- and medium-sized companies to obtain capital. Second, I do not suggest it as an alternative to, but rather as supplemental to, the plans sponsored by Senator MEAD, of New York, which would provide governmentally aided credit facilities for small business.

I want, once more, because it is so important, to stress the desirability of regionalization. Greater regional autonomy is important because, I repeat, in many areas, local needs are best known to those in the locality. Regionalization, as to security issues for capital expansion, seems to me to be of very considerable importance. For not only is there need, in general, for assistance to the growing small business enterprise, but there is specific need for stimulating business activities in the several regions of our country where today there is too little such activity.

Now, if I am correct in thinking that there are internal frontiers which call for development, then it seems to me that it follows that, insofar as such internal frontiers are to be opened up through financial assistance to business enterprise, it is necessary that there be localized or regional finance companies for that purpose, so that the regional possibilities will be studied by those who are interested in and sensitive to them. Centralization of all such financial institutions in any one city is likely to foster insensitivity to local potentialities almost to the same extent as now exists as the result of excessive centralization of investment banking in New York. The urge for regional development must come from, and will receive its most intelligent encouragement in, the several regions.

What I have been discussing is, of course, part of the larger problem of stimulating an increase of the flow of savings into capital expansion, in order to add to employment and to our national prosperity. In connection with that entire problem it is well worth considering whether some form of tax exemption should not be given to those who make investments that augment capital expansion which would not otherwise occur. That is a large topic, and I can do no more here than suggest it for consideration.

And while I am talking of tax laws it may be well to refer to another pertinent problem: One deterrent to equity financing is to be found in provisions of the income-tax law which permit the deduction of bond interest (as distinguished from dividends) from gross income in determining taxable net income. There would seem to be a need for considering some revision of that provision of the Revenue Act so as to stimulate equity financing; that is a problem not too easy to solve, and I shall not attempt to work out a solution of it here.

I have said that the Government could stimulate interest in the regional industrial capital companies by subscribing to their preferred stocks. It is by no means certain that such governmental participation will in all cases be needed. There is no reason under the sun why a group of Cleveland men should not get together and do the job themselves—form a corporation to be known as Cleveland Enterprises, Inc., or Cleveland Industries, Inc. If you did, I believe it would succeed. I believe it would also increase the prosperity of Cleveland and reveal again the private initiative that has made Cleveland the great city that it is. And I would like it better if done entirely by private funds than if with Government participation. I am not urging it on you, because it is not my business to do that. But I would be happy to discuss the idea with any of you to whom it appeals.

National Labor Relations Board Versus Bradford Dyeing Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

OPINION OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix the text of the opinion handed down yesterday by Mr. Justice Black for the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Bradford Dyeing Association*. This represents the eighth successive victory for the Labor Board in the present term of the Supreme Court.

In the 25 cases decided by the Supreme Court involving the Labor Act, the Board's position has been fully upheld in 20 cases, modified in 3 cases, and wholly reversed in only 2 cases. In 16 additional cases the Supreme Court, by denying writs of certiorari, has left in force decisions of circuit courts enforcing N. L. R. B. orders. There are only 2 cases in which the Supreme Court, by refusing certiorari, has left in force circuit court decisions setting aside N. L. R. B. orders.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 588. October Term, 1939. *National Labor Relations Board, petitioner* v. *Bradford Dyeing Association* (*U. S. A.*). On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. May 20, 1940]

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

The circuit court of appeals declined to decree effective enforcement of an order of the National Labor Relations Board upon the ground that the Board's order, in material respects, rested upon findings that were not supported by substantial evidence.

In its petition for certiorari, the Board took sharp issue with the court of appeals, asserting that some findings upset by the court were supported not merely by substantial but by "uncontradicted" and "undisputed evidence." The petition also pointed out that the court's opinion was "ambiguous and inconclusive" and "left unclear the court's holding as to whether the Board had jurisdiction." Our inspection of the court's opinion and decree disclosed that the court deemed the Board to be wholly lacking in jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the Board was ordered to proceed in accordance with the opinion which concluded with the indecisive statement that "if the case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction" a large part, but apparently not all, of the Board's order should be vacated. The court's decree did not direct enforcement even of those parts of the Board's order not expressly vacated. The Board's petition further pointed out that its motion for rehearing in order to clarify the question of its jurisdiction and to establish the status of "those portions of the Board's order which the court neither vacated nor enforced" was denied without explanation. Because the Labor Board's petition in challenging the action of the court of appeals thus raised questions of grave public importance affecting the administration of the National Labor Relations Act and judicial review as provided in the act, we granted certiorari.[1]

This proceeding was initiated upon charges filed by the Textile Workers' Organizing Committee of the C. I. O. Thereupon, the Labor Board served a complaint and notice of hearing on the Bradford Dyeing Association (U. S. A.), respondent here.

In the complaint, it was alleged that respondent in order to discourage membership in the C. I. O., had discharged and refused to reinstate its employees, Edward Nelson and Percy Schofield, because of their affiliation and activities in the Textile Workers' Organizing Committee of the C. I. O., (T. W. O. C.); respondent had dominated and supported the Bradford Dyeing Association Employees' Federation, a labor organization, and had refused to bargain collectively with its employees through the T. W. O. C. after a majority had selected it as their bargaining representative.

[1] — U. S. —; *cf. Labor Board* v. *Waterman Steamship Co.*, — U. S. —.

The Board's jurisdiction was unsuccessfully challenged on the ground that respondent's business involved no activities in or affecting interstate commerce within the meaning of the act. And, answering, respondent alleged that Schofield was discharged because he smoked during working hours; "that * * * Nelson was not discharged, that he was insubordinate and defiant, that he did not work and refused to work during the times when he was supposed to be working, that he was on the premises during hours when he was not supposed to be on the premises of respondent and was taking up the time of other employees who were supposed to be working during such time, that * * * Nelson went upon a vacation and has not returned to work after such vacation nor made any statement of his readiness to return to work or made any request that he be put to work again"; that respondent had not dominated or coerced the Federation; and that any labor disputes at its plant were attributable to the conduct of the T. W. O. C.

The Federation was allowed to intervene in the extensive hearing held by the Board.

After this hearing, the Board found that "a labor dispute" in respondent's plant would widely affect "the flow of commodities in interstate commerce", with consequent jurisdiction in the Board, and that the charges of the complaint had been substantiated.

The Board accordingly ordered respondent to cease and desist from (1) interfering or coercing its employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization; (2) dominating and interfering with the federation or any other labor organization; (3) discouraging membership in the T. W. O. C.; (4) refusing to bargain collectively with the T. W. O. C.; and (5) ordered respondent affirmatively to offer reemployment to Schofield and Nelson and to make them whole, to withdraw all recognition from and completely disestablish the federation, to bargain collectively with its employees through T. W. O. C., and to post the usual notices throughout its plant stating that the company would cease its unlawful and unfair labor practices and would treat its agreement with the federation as of no effect.

In its final decree the circuit court of appeals directed that "until a new election has taken place by order of the Board, and the employees have expressed their preference as to what group or body shall represent them in any labor dispute between them and the respondent, the order of the Board, except as to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of the cease-and-desist portion of the order, and the entire paragraph ordering affirmative action, shall be vacated, the Board then to proceed in accordance with the opinion passed down this day." As phrased, the decree is not clear, but apparently the court vacated subdivisions (4) and (5) of the Board's order. The court's opinion did make clear that under its decree the company was left free to bargain collectively with the federation and to decline to bargain with the T. W. O. C. Discharges of Schofield and Nelson were approved, and the company was released from publishing notices which, if warranted, were "essential if the employees were to feel free to exercise their rights without incurring the company's disfavor."[2] Although those portions of the Board's order prohibiting the company's interfering with its employees' union affiliations were not expressly set aside or modified, neither were they ordered enforced.[3] Thus the court's decree gave the Board's order no effect at all.

It did not explicitly so decree, but the court of appeals evidently was of the view that evidence was lacking upon which the Board could have found that respondent's business was in or affected interstate commerce. The court expressly found a lack of evidence to support the Board's conclusion that Schofield and Nelson were discharged for union activities and stated its belief that Schofield was discharged for smoking in the plant and Nelson for insubordination, and that "the finding by the Board that the T. W. O. C. had a majority of the employees of the respondent signed up even to become members of a union under that name is without substantial evidence on which to rest."

Without specifically passing upon the Board's finding that respondent had unlawfully dominated the federation, the opinion of the court stated, "* * * assuming that the president or officers of the respondent influenced its employees to join the federation, so-called, it does not appear by clear and substantial evidence that a majority of the employees ever joined, or indicated an intent to join, the T. W. O. C., * * * ." Since the court did not vacate that part of the Board's order directing the company to discontinue domination of the federation, we might infer that the court accepted the Board's finding that the federation had been so dominated. But this inference is opposed by the court's action in vacating the order of disestablishment. The uncertainty in which the court has left the questions of jurisdiction and company domination of the federation makes necessary a review of the evidence on both, along with other evidence which we think amply demonstrates the justification for the Board's order in every respect.

First. As to jurisdiction:

A major portion of the opinion of the court below is devoted to its expression of doubts about the Board's jurisdiction—i. e., "there is no substantial evidence to warrant a finding that the transportation of these materials by the respondent was ever in interstate commerce"; "there is also lacking substantial evidence that 40 percent of the supplies consisting of chemical and dyes, which were contracted for in Rhode Island and delivered by the sellers to the respondent's plant in Bradford, were transported by the respondent in interstate commerce, or that they were used by the respondent except at Bradford, though the Board assumed without evidence that they were shipped by the respondent in interstate commerce, but its assumption lacks substantial evidence on which to rest, that would compel this court to accept it as a fact"; "the respondent, according to uncontroverted testimony, neither sells, transports, nor arranges for transportation of the goods into or out of Rhode Island in interstate commerce which is done in each instance by the customer, * * *"; and "the Board apparently assumed that the respondent transported goods to its plant and from it, which the uncontroverted evidence disclosed were not the facts." Referring to waste products which respondent sells in interstate commerce, the court noted that they did not "exceed 1 percent of the total goods processed" and said that they were but "a mere incident * * * [of the business] to which the maxim de minimis might well be applied, even by the National Labor Relations Board." And the conclusions of the opinion were only stated subject to the condition "if the case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction."

There was evidence before the Board which showed:

The Bradford Dyeing Association (United States of America), as stated by its president, is "engaged in the dyeing and finishing of cotton, rayon, and acetate piece goods." These piece goods reach the plant at Bradford, town of Westerly, R. I., as unfinished "gray goods." Customers of Bradford, known as "converters," ship the gray goods to the plant, retaining title, and direct shipment of the goods when processed. Bradford owns no goods or means of transportation, and its customers pay the cost of transportation to and from the plant. A New York office is maintained, however, "where * * * solicitors (who contact converters) make their headquarters," and advertisements are run in New York papers and trade journals. A majority of Bradford's (converters) are located in States other than Rhode Island, in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Trenton, and principally in New York City. There are "very few customers" in Rhode Island. In 1936, 57,000,000 yards of goods were processed and for the first 6 months of 1937, 29,000,000. About 90 percent of all goods processed, the processing taking "an average of between 2 and 3 weeks," are shipped out of Rhode Island. "More than half" of the goods processed come from beyond the borders of Rhode Island.

Incidental to its business of processing, respondent accumulates and acquires title to remnants which are ends of cloth processed and goods damaged in processing. In 1936, 558,000 yards of remnants were sold by respondent, 90 percent of which was shipped in interstate commerce. These remnants represented roughly "just less than 1 percent of the yards processed in that year. For the same year respondent purchased $355,856 worth of colors and dyestuffs, weighing over 235,111 pounds, of which 40 percent came from outside of Rhode Island. The company during 1935 averaged 688 employees, with wages of $604,614.68, and its gross income from processing was $2,026,156. In 1937 the employees on the pay roll were nearly 800.

That this evidence was abundantly sufficient to justify exercise of jurisdiction by the Board is not now open to controversy. It is settled that the act is applicable to a processor, who constitutes even a relatively small percentage of his industry's capacity,[4] where the materials processed are moved to and from the processor by their owners through the channels of interstate commerce,[5] and it is not material, as the court below thought, that respondent's customers might be able to secure the same services from other Rhode Island processors if a labor dispute should stop the interstate flow of materials to and from respondent's plant. Since the purpose of the act is to protect and foster interstate commerce, the Board's jurisdiction can attach, as here, before actual industrial strife materializes to obstruct that commerce.[6]

---

[2] *Labor Board* v. *The Falk Corporation*, — U. S. —, —.

[3] Section 10 (e) of the National Labor Relations Act gives the Board power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States for the enforcement of its order; grants these courts exclusive jurisdiction and provides that "Upon * * * [the Board's filing a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding], the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such persons, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to * * * make and enter upon the pleading, testimony, and proceeding set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board." (49 Stat. 449, 454.)

[4] The record indicates that respondent does roughly 1 percent of the national total of business in its industry.

[5] *Labor Board* v. *Fainblatt*, 306 U. S. 601.

[6] *Edison Co.* v. *Labor Board*, 305 U. S. 197, 222; cf., *Labor Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin*, 301 U. S. 1, 43. A strike at respondent's plant in 1929 apparently did result in a stoppage of the flow of the interstate movement of materials to and of processed goods from respondent's plant.

Second. Discharge of Nelson.

In its answer to the Board's complaint, the company contended that Nelson was not discharged April 3, 1937, but was merely "laid off," and on April 2, "went upon a vacation" and did not return or indicate a willingness to go back to work. However, the company insists, as it has throughout, that Nelson was not a diligent worker and was insubordinate; that he trespassed upon company property after work hours Thursday, April 1; that "one or two mornings that week he started work a little late and quit a little early"; that he did not start work Saturday, April 3, until 7:30, a half hour late.

Some of the evidence supporting the Board's finding that Nelson was actually discharged for union activities on April 3, was:

Prior to Saturday, April 3, 1937, when Nelson was "laid off," he had worked for the company 2 years as a carpenter. He had become actively interested in organizing the employees in a C. I. O. union the preceding Monday, March 29, 1937. On that day he had obtained 350 T. W. O. C. cards from a fellow employee (Schofield), who, he heard, "had some applications for joining the union, the C. I. O." His distribution of the cards met with quick response and many signed, so that on Friday the company official "who does all the hiring," approached him and said, "You're a ringleader of the C. I. O., but you are not going to be fired for it." Nelson refused to tell this official the names of his collaborators in forming the union and also told him he would not reveal their names to Mr. Summersby, the company's president and general manager. Later that day, Nelson observed Schofield talking with Summersby and was introduced to the latter as "helping * * * [Schofield] to organize and get these pledge cards signed in the mill." He was, that same day, Friday, refused admission to a meeting in Summersby's office between some employees and Summersby, but that afternoon, after work, he was called to Summersby's office. There Summersby asked "why didn't we form a local union of our own?" and "thought it was a much better plan to form a local union." And Summersby asked that the question of a local union be put up to a C. I. O. committee meeting to be held that night.

All day Friday and Saturday morning his foreman "didn't speak one word to" Nelson. Saturday morning, April 3, this foreman asked him "when [he] * * * intended to start work," but added that he "didn't hold anything against" him. When Saturday's work was over Nelson was sent for by Summersby, who was affable at first, but who became hostile when Nelson indicated he would not go along with a local union. Summersby then asked Nelson if he had been stealing on an occasion when he had returned to the plant after hours to get some T. W. O. C. cards, and asked him if he had begun work promptly that day (Saturday, April 3). Nelson was told by Summersby "to take two weeks off and cool off." Nelson insisted he was ready to go back to work Monday morning. His testimony narrated this conversation in part as follows:

"A. * * * I said, 'As far as being excited about it, you are more excited than I am and you are worried about it and I ain't.' He says, 'Sure, I am excited about it, but you are the cause of all it.' I said, 'I can't help that.' He said, 'You take the 2 weeks off and then come back and see Mr. Pierce.' I said, 'Meaning what, that I go back and see Mr. Pierce? I am not sure of a job when I come back? Or is this just a matter of beating about the bush to fire me?' He says, 'I won't give you nothing definite.' I says, 'I want something definite. I want to know whether or not you are firing me. If you are not telling me whether I go to work when I come back or not, I want to know whether you are firing me.' He says, 'I won't give you nothing definite.' I says, 'I can't go out without money. If you are going to fire me, I can't live without money.' He says, 'Silvia, get his money.' Mr. Silvia went out and got me my money and came in and I thanked Mr. Silvia for my money and went out. When I was halfway across the outer office I heard laughing, and I saw Silvia swing his arm down, and Mr. Silvia and Mr. Summersby were laughing for all they were worth, as though they had pulled a big joke."

"Q. Did you ever go back after that for your job? A. No, I didn't. Mr. Summersby told me if I stepped foot on the premises within 2 weeks he was going to have me arrested."

Nelson never went back because a T. W. O. C. official who conferred with Summersby said Summersby would not take him back. This T. W. O. C. official and a Conciliator of the United States Department of Labor said Summersby wouldn't take Nelson back because "there would be a question of his authority." In fact, a fellow employee told Nelson that Summersby had said something about firing Nelson and Schofield and "that he would find some way of getting around it." On the morning of the day Nelson was fired he had spent a "couple of minutes" telling other employees about a C. I. O. meeting of the previous night.

From the testimony of the T. W. O. C. official in question, a T. W. O. C. director for Rhode Island, Summersby would not rehire "especially Mr. Nelson." And Summersby himself stated that he told the Federal conciliator, "I couldn't take back either of them because it would break down the discipline of our plant."

Nelson's foreman testified as a witness for respondent—

On Friday, April 2, "I could see that he (Nelson) was talking around more or less, and so I had him come in the shop to work on the trucks. I thought that would be the place where I could watch him better." He saw Nelson talking to the men early on April 3, before work and until 7:30, although work begins at 7. He reported to his superior that Nelson was "talking to different ones," and went with Nelson to Summersby who asked Nelson "if he decided, on some question that they were talking about the afternoon before * * * (Nelson) said, "No," and Summersby said, "Well, then, if you can't give me a satisfactory answer on that I have thought it over and I have decided to lay you off for 2 weeks and let you think it over." This foreman "knew * * * (Nelson) was interested in the C. I. O., but * * * didn't know anything he said" to the men Saturday morning. On other occasions he had seen Nelson start late or quit early without ever reporting the fact, and had seen Nelson talk around like that "quite often" but "this is the only time * * * (the foreman) ever got mad at him." This time he was aware that Nelson had been connected with the C. I. O. for the past week "and * * * supposed he was still at it." The foreman admitted that Nelson was "a very good workman," that he may have worked between 7 and 7:10 on this particular Saturday morning, and that on Saturday, April 3, Nelson, after having been spoken to, "said he hadn't any feelings but what he would go on and do his work all right. And he did after that."

According to the chief engineer, who ranked above Nelson's foreman—

Nelson previously "did a whole lot of talking." In his 3 years with the company, he had seen others talking but never laid any one else off for talking. In his view "when men are talking with one another there is very little work done," but the foreman did not report the men to whom Nelson was talking on April 3, although they also were "surely" wasting time. The plant rules do not forbid talking.

Summersby, the president and general manager—

On April 2, "inquired as to who (Nelson) * * * was and what he did and if he had been active in the C. I. O. as an organizer." Nelson, he stated, "automatically forfeited his job" by not coming back at the end of his 2 weeks' lay-off, which was without pay. And if he should apply for work, his forced vacation "would be on his record and would always be a black mark against him."

Third. Discharge of Schofield.

The court below saw no evidence supporting the Board's finding that this employee was discharged for union activities and accepted the company's contention that he was discharged for smoking in the plant contrary to rules. Respondent admits that Schofield was discharged.

Schofield, a machine operator, or "jigger," testified—

On Saturday, March 27, 1937, he attended a C. I. O. meeting, obtained 8 application cards for the C. I. O. and talked to some of his fellow employees about the C. I. O. All 8 cards were signed that night. By Sunday, March 28, he had asked for and obtained 700 cards which he used during the following week, giving Nelson about one-half on Monday, March 29. By Wednesday, the cards gave out. On Friday, April 2, he and Summersby discussed certain difficulties with the piece work of "jiggers." Summersby talking there in the plant, brought up the C. I. O. and said "he couldn't see anything in an organization outside * * * (with) * * * big shots * * * running big automobiles and hotel expenses."

Summersby then suggested "a union of our own in the shop." Schofield attended a meeting in Summersby's office as a member of a committee of "jiggers," and the subject of the C. I. O. arose again. Summersby said he wouldn't recognize an outside union. When Nelson attempted to enter this meeting Summersby turned him away and referred to him as a "troublemaker." Sunday, April 4, there was a C. I. O. meeting at which Schofield and Nelson were both on the platform. Schofield went to work on Monday, the 5th, continuing to distribute C. I. O. cards. On Tuesday, the 6th, at 2:25 (Nelson had been "laid off" on the 3d), a "charge hand" notified Schofield that Summersby wanted to see him "in his office right away." He left his work and went directly to the locker room to wash and change from work clothes. While there he and two other employees were smoking. An official of the company—a boss dyer—whom he had never seen "in the locker room, not while the men were changing their clothes"—caught Schofield smoking and said, "So that's it, you damn fool." Schofield then went to Summersby's office as he had been directed, but did not find him there. Summersby's first words, on entering the office about 20 minutes later, charged Schofield with smoking, but Summersby refused to tell Schofield why he had originally been sent for—before he was caught smoking. Schofield was told to "take a couple of weeks off." He had been laid off once before for smoking.

On the Friday before the Tuesday on which this employee would, he thought, have been taken back to work, a Federal conciliator and C. I. O. officials conferred with Summersby about Nelson and him. The C. I. O. official told Schofield that Summersby refused to rehire either, and as a result he never went back. Although he "wanted to go back the first week," he took the word of the Federal conciliator and the C. I. O. official that he would not be rehired. The two other employees who were smoking when he was caught were not disciplined, although the accosting official could see them. Despite "No Smoking" signs, it was the practice of the men to smoke on the sly. Other men have been laid off 2 weeks for smoking, but Nelson was caught and "others" have been seen by foremen and no lay-offs resulted. Schofield didn't "know of anyone being dis-

charged" for smoking. He was made Textile Workers' Organizing Committee local financial secretary.

In the words of the C. I. O. official, "Mr. Summersby saw red the minute I mentioned Schofield's and Nelson's names."

As told by the boss dyer who found Schofield smoking—

This official had sent an employee to notify Schofield of Summersby's desire to see him; he himself went to the locker room to deliver the message. He asked one of the other employees in the locker room to remember the scene because he "knew Percy Schofield's character." It was his duty to detect smokers and he usually laid off, himself, any man found smoking. He had time to lay off Schofield while walking with him part of the way to Summersby's office, but he did not do so. "It was a peculiar case and I wanted to think before I did anything." This was the only case in which he had ever reported a smoker to a higher up. He had laid Schofield off for 2 weeks twice before for smoking. In 6 or 7 years he had caught seven or eight smokers, of whom, excepting Schofield, only one was discharged. He didn't go to the washroom "very often." "A very short time before" he had heard that Schofield was somewhat active in the C. I. O.

One of the fellow employees present in the locker room where Schofield was found smoking, stated that he also had been smoking but was not doing so when the boss dyer came in, and that the third man was smoking at that time but wasn't observed. He got the impression, then, that the boss dyer said something to the effect that he at last "had" Schofield after having been after him for some time. He "had never seen * * * [the boss dyer] go to the locker room" before.

Summersby testified that he had been told by Schofield that he was "interested in organizing the C. I. O.;" and that he discharged Schofield for smoking.

Fourth. Domination of the federation.

As already noted, the Court of Appeals opinion did not especially pass upon this contention. Since, however, the Court did not enforce the Board's order to cease dominating and to disestablish the federation, as we think it should have, appropriate evidence on this issue will be pointed out.

A machinist, employed 11 years by respondent, testified—

He attended a meeting in Summersby's office on April 6, the day of Schofield's discharge. Summersby "said that he wouldn't recognize the C. I. O. and that it would be much better for us to join our own union than to be bothered by this C. I. O.," which would require the men to go out on sympathy strikes. This employee saw federation cards and literature "on the table" in the company's office. These were "handed around," and one or two were picked up by the employees present; when Summersby and the vice president of the company left the room, the employees "seemed to pick them up more frequently." Temporary officers of the federation were chosen there, in Summersby's office. A day or so later, the federation met in the company's shipping room with 150 to 200 men present; Summersby addressed the meeting and said he would not recognize the C. I. O. and that it was "better to have our own union." The machinist distributed in the plant the federation cards which he had "picked * * * up" in "Summersby's office"; the federation cards "were there."

From testimony of other employees, it appeared that—

At the meeting on the 6th (the day Schofield was discharged) in Summersby's office, federation cards and circulars were seen, and an employee distributed these cards; Summersby said "he would like to have this local union" and "wouldn't recognize the C. I. O." Three "jiggers" had seen Summersby on April 5 about wages and conditions of employment; he "thought it would be better if we had our own union" instead of paying outside fellows. "Someone" suggested that cards be passed out for a local union. Word was passed out by fellow workers that the company would pay for time spent at the meeting in the shipping room, at which Summersby "said he wouldn't recognize C. I. O. or A. F. of L.—no outside union," that it would "be better if we had a local union" instead of paying others to ride around in big cars and that "he would not tolerate C. I. O." Workers were seen passing out federation cards in the plant during working hours. Pay was given for the half-hour spent in the shipping-room meeting, and this time was included by instruction of the "boss of the frames." Federation cards were passed out "openly" by men on the day of the shipping-room meeting. Bosses were seen with cards. One employee was given his federation card by the boss of his department. Another was asked by his foreman whether he had joined the federation.

An employee testified:

"Summersby sent for him on April 6 (the day of Schofield's discharge). The paymaster came to his house for him and said he was glad that this man wasn't 'deep * * * in the C. I. O.,' and took him to the office. There Summersby told him he was sorry that men in his line of work (in the gray room) had been left out of the meeting that morning in Summersby's office. This employee had told the men in the gray room that they shouldn't sign cards from a meeting at which they had not been represented. Summersby told him the C. I. O. would take money out of the plant and that a 'committee had gotten together * * * to form this local union because he informed them that he wouldn't recognize the C. I. O., and they started to organize a union that he would recognize. He said he would recognize the local.' He and Summersby then went into the meeting in an adjoining office ('one is Mr. Pawson's (respondent's vice president) and the other is Mr. Summersby's'). A leader at this meeting in company offices and attended by Summersby said 'a few of them got together and decided they didn't want a C. I. O.; that they thought they would be better off if they had a local union; that they had a talk with Mr. Summersby, and Mr. Summersby wouldn't recognize the C. I. O., and rather than have trouble he was going to see if we couldn't have a local union.' Summersby explained advantages of the local union and spoke of the B. D. A."

Another employee supplied evidence that a week or two after Nelson was fired the timekeeper took him to see Summersby, who asked about a C. I. O. card which had been on the back of this employee's car, and that Summersby then said he "wouldn't recognize it" and could close the plant down.

The financial secretary of the federation stated:

He was given a temporary appointment at the meeting in Summersby's office, April 6, when Summersby said "he didn't like the idea of bargaining outside." The men present in the afternoon meeting in Summersby's office "asked for the privilege of using the office to find out how we had made out on our cards." The meeting in the shipping room was a day or so later. After the morning meeting in Summersby's office on the 6th this temporary federation official started passing out federation cards, for which Summersby had given permission. Federation circulars were posted on plant bulletin boards. Federation application cards were passed out by "all of us that were in the office at that first meeting." Officers of the federation were subsequently elected (April 11). "All us men who were in the office the first day, I think we acted as a committee." Between April 6 and 11 Summersby permitted the temporary committee to meet in an old company office in the plant. The paymaster gave them a list of the men in the plant by which to determine the necessary 51 percent. On April 9, prior to the election of the federation's officers on the 11th, this temporary committee presented a letter to Summersby stating that they represented 51 percent of the men. That same day Summersby granted recognition to the federation. This employee felt no need for organization, except for "better feeling," which he thought "was necessary, because the C. I. O. was going to do the same thing." He helped form the federation "partly" to stop the C. I. O. and because the C. I. O. had already started. A company car was used by him on one occasion for purposes of the federation. Meetings of the executive committee of the federation were held in a clubroom "on property owned by the B. D. A." This witness engaged as attorney for the federation one who he knew "had represented * * * (the company) on some cases"; he himself lives in a house owned by the company. Some federation dues were collected on the company's premises; members were not suspended for dues delinquency and may also be members of any labor union or society. The federation started about a week after the C. I. O. drive; it had no income of its own prior to the last week in April. Eventually it affiliated with an outside union still designated "as the B. D. A. Employees' Federation" "to bring a little more prestige and to prove to the ones that were skeptical that we were not a company union."

The first vice president of the federation testified—

He negotiated recognition of the federation, April 9 (3 and 6 days respectively after discharge of Schofield and Nelson), as its acting president. On that day he called a meeting of the organizing committee in "the little office in the gray room," showed them that they had 51 percent signed cards, and then went to Summersby's office. In Summersby's office the witness and company officials counted the signed cards and checked them against a list of employees which Summersby asked the paymaster to get. The cards were not checked to see if each signer was eligible; the management took the temporary committee's word for it. And the cards were left with Summersby. The witness didn't know that the federation planned to do anything that "was any different" from what the employees previously could have done by grievance committees. He had heard rumors that a boss had federation cards or spoke to employees about them, and believed one man quit work as the result of posting C. I. O. handbills. He spoke at the shipping-room meeting and asked Summersby to speak there. Summersby did speak. Along the lines of his conversation at the two previous meetings in his office, Summersby told this gathering of employees that he preferred a local and "was not in favor of bargaining with the C. I. O."

T. W. O. C.'s State director for Rhode Island stated—

On April 7 he saw Summersby and told him T. W. O. C. had "about 75 percent" of the men signed. Summersby refused to say then that he would recognize T. W. O. C. April 16 the director, a Federal conciliator and a T. W. O. C. organizer saw Summersby again and were told by Summersby that "he had a union" and wouldn't recognize the C. I. O. as he was "afraid of an outside union." It was agreed that he would hear from Summersby's attorney after the first (April 7) meeting, but he never heard. A form contract was submitted to Summersby on the 16th, but by that date "he had definitely decided that he would refuse to bargain with the C. I. O."

According to the company's vice president—

He was present part of the time at one of the meetings in Summersby's office on April 6, where cards and literature were present

and a union was discussed. Summersby was heard to express the opinion "that he would prefer to deal with a union of his own employees rather than to deal with outside influences."

One of the men present when Schofield was found smoking testified that a salaried employee who reports "things which are done wrong" came around and asked everybody if he had joined the local union; at the meeting in the shipping room, Summersby said he would not recognize the C. I. O., but would recognize a local; the witness was paid for the 15 minutes spent at that meeting; the men were told by the timekeeper that they would be so paid. An official of the federation said, "The impression was that Mr. Summersby probably wouldn't recognize" the C. I. O.; this official was "one of the first" organizers of the federation and conveyed to people the impression that Summersby wouldn't recognize the C. I. O.

As related by Summersby, president and general manager of respondent:

A wage increase was announced March 31. After he met in his office on April 6 (the day of Nelson's discharge) with the committee of "jiggers," later the same day he was asked for a place in which the federation's temporary committee could meet. He answered the request by saying, "You can have my office and make yourselves comfortable." That afternoon, as he was ready to leave, the temporary committee met in his office and he was "advised that they were organizing a local union * * * I told them that I would grant them the same privileges I would grant any other union * * * ." Two days after recognizing the federation, he placed and paid for an ad in a local paper, entitled "The Strike That Failed" because in part, as he said, "the B. D. A. Employees' Federation had formed and had taken the organization into their own hands, and had shown that they were still real citizens." Respondent is owned by an English concern, and a statement by him appeared in the local paper on April 25, disclosing the possibility of the company moving the plant out of the United States if there were to be "labor uncertainties."

He recognized the federation April 9, and on April 13 told the Federal conciliator that an election could not be held, since the federation had already been recognized. And on the 16th, Summersby told Salerno that his proposed T. W. O. C. contract would be taken up with Summersby's lawyer.

Fifth. Designation of T. W. O. C. as bargaining agent.

The court below found no substantial evidence to support the Board's finding that a majority of respondent's employees joined the T. W. O. C., or that "the T. W. O. C. * * * ever came into actual existence with authority to negotiate a contract with the respondent." Much of the testimony already referred to bore upon the genesis of T. W. O. C. at respondent's plant.

Schofield said:

By April 4 he had "465 or 467" signed application cards "marked down." The cards were sent to Boston. A few men paid dues but collection was stopped. "* * * we had a majority of cards signed." Dues are not collected until management grants recognition. No local C. I. O. (T. W. O. C.) entity had been formed for the plant; "we had the 51 percent, but this company-union stuff and discharge and everything came along, and we have just had to wait for this hearing * * *."

Nelson stated that he told the timekeeper, on April 2, "It's all over but the shouting. * * * We have well over 60 percent signed up already." And from the testimony of an officer of the federation it appeared that the C. I. O. drive resulted in a number of signatures, and that both organizations could possibly claim 51 percent of the employees signed up.

As explained by the T. W. O. C. State Director—

A charter or local is unnecessary for membership in T. W. O. C.; no charter to a local is granted until after recognition. Members of the federation are members in good standing of T. W. O. C., even if they have not paid dues or initiation fees. The T. W. O. C. cards were brought to him during the first week in April. Summersby, April 9, refused to agree to have the Federal Conciliator, or a third party, count the T. W. O. C. cards. Employees are eligible to membership in T. W. O. C., without formation of a plant local.

The T. W. O. C. director's secretary stated that the T. W. O. C. cards were brought in before April 12. It was agreed at the hearing that, after respondent checked against the original signed cards, T. W. O. C. had a list of 482 names taken from those cards. And it was stipulated that these cards were signed "on or before April 10, 1937."

SHIFT IN MEMBERSHIP

Respondent has contended before the Board, as here, that if the T. W. O. C. did actually represent a majority of its employees on April 4 (as the Board found), a shift in membership had given the federation a majority when the company on April 9 recognized it as exclusive bargaining representative. However, the Board found that "the record is clear that, had it not been for the unfair labor practices of the respondent in organizing and fostering the federation and in persuading, intimidating, and coercing its employees to join the federation and leave the T. W. O. C., the respondent's employees would have remained members of the T. W. O. C." In view of the substantial support in the evidence for the Board's findings that the company intimidated and coerced its employees and dominated the federation, the Board properly concluded that "The unfair labor practices of the respondent cannot operate to change the bargaining representative previously selected by the untrammeled will of the majority."[7] And, accordingly, the Board was justified in its finding "that on April 4, 1937, and at all times thereafter, the T. W. O. C., pursuant to section 9 (a) of the act, was the exclusive representative of all the employees in the appropriate unit for purposes of collective bargaining * * *."

Sixth. The "sit down."

As one of the apparently alternative grounds of its decision, the circuit court of appeals declared the Board without authority to order reinstatement of Nelson and Schofield because of so-called unlawful conduct and the alleged incitement of a "sit down" strike within the meaning of the Fansteel case.[8] The opinion stated that "Nelson even threatened truck drivers delivering materials to the plant with violence, and to destroy the spur track over which materials were delivered to the plant. * * * The affirmative action that is authorized is to make these remedies effective in the redress of the employees' rights, to assure them self-organization and freedom in representation, not to license them to commit tortious acts or to protect them from the appropriate consequences of unlawful conduct. We are of the opinion that to provide for the reinstatement or reemployment of employees guilty of the acts, which it is not denied were committed in this instance, would not only effectuate the policy of the act but would directly tend to make abortive its plan for peaceable procedure."

We find no such issue raised by respondent's pleadings before the Board. Respondent made request for special findings by the Board, but included none that Nelson and Schofield had been guilty of any unlawful conduct. Nelson categorically denied having made threats of violence. The court was apparently referring to the testimony of a truck driver which appears in the record. An objection of the Board's representative to the introduction of this particular testimony was overruled by the trial examiner when respondent's attorney made the following statement: "If Your Honor please, may I point out that while Mr. Nelson was on the witness stand in cross-examination, I asked him if he did not say certain things at this time and place, that this witness has been referring to, which the witness Nelson denies. The testimony of this witness that Nelson did say those things is in contradiction of Mr. Nelson's testimony and is clearly admissible as tending to impeach the veracity of Mr. Nelson's testimony. Aside from that, I also submit it as bearing on the type of conduct and the attitude of the representatives and organizers of this T. W. O. C. getting membership and conducting the affairs of this organization."

This truck driver's helper testified that on the morning of April 8, after Schofield and Nelson had been laid off, he saw Nelson, Schofield, and a third "little fellow from the C. I. O." "outside the mill yard." He noticed Nelson "going up and down motioning * * * going like this [illustrating by waving arms, squatting, and standing]." As this truck driver recollected, Schofield was not "doing anything." "If anybody was looking out the east door they could" see Nelson or Schofield moving their hands that morning; Nelson "made a motion to sit down, that is all," out "on the main road going to the plant." He "couldn't say that" any workers would have seen Nelson; he "couldn't say that, whether they could see out or not. I don't know." An employee, not Nelson or Schofield, who "went through the department shouting 'Sit-down strike,'" was taken for an automobile ride by the company's vice president, talked to, given lunch, and sent home to bed without loss of pay, and was still working for the company at the time of the hearing. When asked, "You remember you said, 'Well, we can blow up the railroad?'" Nelson answered, "No; absolutely not."

In vacating the Board's order of reinstatement on the ground that undenied evidence showed that Nelson and Schofield had, after their unlawful discharge, incited or threatened unlawful conduct, the court acted without any justification.

Congress has placed the power to administer the National Labor Relations Act in the Labor Board, subject to the supervisory powers of the courts of appeals as the act sets out. If the Board has acted within the compass of the power given it by Congress, has, on a charge of unfair labor practice, held a "hearing," which the statute requires, comporting with the standards of fairness inherent in procedural due process, has made findings based upon substantial evidence and has ordered an appropriate remedy, a like obedience to the statutory law on the part of the court of appeals requires the court to grant enforcement of the Board's order. Until granted such enforcement, the Board is powerless to act upon the parties before it. And the proper working of the scheme fashioned by Congress to determine industrial controversies fairly and peaceably demands that the courts quite as much as the administrative body act as Congress has required.

Mindful of the separate responsibilities Congress has imposed upon the Board and the courts, we have carefully scrutinized this entire record. Within the range of our examination has appeared not merely the testimony but also the procedure followed from the filing of the charge before the Board to final decree of the Court of Appeals. The Board and its representatives solicitously guarded respondent's and intervenor's right to a full and fair hearing; manifested liberality in ruling upon evidence proposed by both sides; and conducted the proceedings in a manner calculated to bring about a just result. And as we have pointed out, substantial evidence sup-

[7] Cf. *Texas & N. O. R. Co.* v. *Ry. Clerks*, 281 U. S. 548, 557, 571, affirming 33 F. (2d) 13, affirming 24 F. (2d) 426; 25 id. 873; 25 id. 876, 877–878.

[8] *Labor Board* v. *Fansteel Corporation*, 306 U. S. 240.

ported the result which the Board did reach.[9] Notwithstanding, the court below declined to order enforcement of the Board's order, and the implications of its opinion are that the Board without a proper regard for either the limitations on its power or the evidence made findings all of which had no substantial support.

But in reaching this conclusion the Court of Appeals itself failed to give proper regard to the evidence which was before the Board, which appeared in the record before the court and which we have set out in this opinion. In refusing to enforce the Board's order, the court exceeded the power given it. The cause is reversed and remanded with directions to enforce the Board's order without conditions or qualifications.

Reversed.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Medical Aid for the Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, before the Ohio State Medical Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, Thursday, May 16, 1940:

I appreciate greatly the honor of addressing the Ohio State Medical Association, which for so many years has upheld the standards of the medical profession in this State. It is a pleasure to address you in Cincinnati. You have most conveniently arranged to hold your annual meeting here, and given me an opportunity to spend at least 1 day in my home city. Between sessions of the Senate and occasional trips to all parts of the United States, I don't get much chance to see anything of my home town. I am sure that Mayor Stewart and the rest of my fellow Cincinnatians have given you a warm greeting to the most hospitable city in the United States.

The world is shocked today at the outrageous aggression of Hitler in Europe; at the frightful suffering and destruction brought on innocent and courageous peoples by acts contrary to every principle of justice and humanity and mercy. Compared to the terrible havoc of modern war, our own troubles are easier to bear. But we must not let our concern with what is going on in Europe check the efforts to improve the condition of our own people here. We must show to the world what a democracy at peace can do for its own people, and hold aloft in a distressed world the picture of a goal to which all may return.

The worst cases of hardship which we have to deal with are those produced by sickness, and particularly where sickness is aggravated by poverty. Nothing arouses our interest and sympathy so much as movements of all kinds to prevent and relieve the suffering produced by illness. It is all the more essential that the measures which we take be carefully thought out; that they be based on sound principles and not on an emotion so easily aroused. I believe that government should do more to furnish medical aid to the needy than is now being done. But I also believe that unless it is properly planned, it in the long run may do more harm than good.

There is no question which concerns the medical profession more today than that of medical aid for the needy, and the extent to which government shall enter into the field. We have before us in Congress today the Wagner health bill and many other proposals to spend Government money in connection with health activities. Great emphasis has been laid on assertions that health care in America is inadequate. There have been signs of an organized propaganda to socialize the whole field of medicine.

There is no new principle involved in the extension by the Government of medical aid to the needy. Every State in the Union has considered that field as a proper one for Government activity. Public-health work, particularly in the prevention of communicable disease, has been undertaken without question or doubt. In the field of hospitalization nearly all the States and many cities have provided free general hospitals, and other hospitals for the mentally ill, the tubercular, the epileptics, and other special groups. In connection with general hospitals, local governments have long provided free medical care in greater or less degree. The large field of providing medical care to the needy in their homes has been more difficult to deal with, and has not been undertaken to any great extent.

Of course, free medical aid to the needy has also been the function of private charities and private hospitals. Even more has free aid to the poor been given in tremendous volume by the medical profession itself, the financial value of which is impossible to estimate. All of us have known the typical American family doctor, ready to go to any call at any time of day or night, by horse and buggy, by Ford car. He refuses no service because the patient cannot pay for it. He forgets to send his bills, or he makes no effort to collect them. The Nation cannot repay, and is not asked to tax itself to repay, the services which have been so generously donated by thousands of doctors.

It is probably true that health work has not been very systematically organized to reach every possible citizen. It has been to some extent a patchwork of public and private charity, but it is also true that the field has been well covered in most parts of the United States. Few persons who are really sick have been unable to obain proper medical care. It is hard to believe the general conclusions of the interdepartmental committee when we find that the health of the Nation has never been as good as it is now. This Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities of the Federal Government was a typical New Deal set-up, created to justify and publicize a preconceived plan for extending Federal control over the whole problem of health. Its reports exaggerate the need, and try to present a picture of neglect and medical inefficiency, which is very far indeed from the truth. As a matter of fact, the accomplishments of medicine in the United States in the past 50 years have been extraordinary and have not been exceeded in any other country in the world. The average expectancy of life has been lengthened by 12 years between 1900 and 1937. The death rate has fallen to 11.2, which compares favorably with any of the large nations of the world, and there is still a steady improvement. There are more doctors per population and more hospital beds per population that in any other country. Undoubtedly there is plenty of room for improvement. I venture to think, however, that the difficulty is a social difficulty and arises much more from the inadequacy of the income of millions of families than it does from any faults in the medical profession or lack of medical facilities.

I have pointed out that there is nothing revolutionary in the proposal that the Government provide medical care for the needy. In the same way we have long recognized that Government must provide poor relief, and must see that none of its citizens go without adequate food or clothing because of inadequate income. Every State has laws which provide for such relief by cities or counties.

Many States, even before 1933, adopted old-age pension systems. It has always been recognized, however, that wholesale public aid to large groups of citizens contains certain dangers which must be dealt with. It is easy for people to develop an attitude of mind in which they do not make a sufficient effort on their own account. Such an attitude is demoralizing to the recipients of aid, and if the principle is expanded in practice until it becomes a dole to great masses of the population, without adequate safeguards it may well demoralize an entire nation.

The need for medical aid is more difficult to judge than the need for food and clothing. Therefore, without care, a medical dole may become even more demoralizing. The expense is also very considerable, and unless restrained will become a tremendous tax burden. The proper and natural sympathy for the unfortunate leads to a steady increase in cost once the work is undertaken. This has been true in relief and is likely to be true in the medical field.

In short, the program must be undertaken with care and with economy. After all, the only people who can pay for this aid to the needy are those who are working at or about the same time. With the tremendous scale of Government expenditures in all fields today, additional taxes cannot come from the wealthy alone but must be spread over the entire population. The confiscation of all income over $10,000 a year would not pay our present tax bill for 6 months in any year. The average workman today pays 15 percent of his income in taxes. We cannot make the tax burden so great as to discourage him from the very enterprise which must pay these taxes. And yet the average workman, as well as those of our people better off than the average, are and should be willing to contribute the small additional percentage necessary to help those unfortunate families whose suffering otherwise may be insupportable.

There has always been free medical aid to the needy, and it should be more systematically organized, and Government should spend more money on it than is spent today. But should that money be spent by the State, local, or Federal Government? What principles should govern the increased Government aid?

HEALTH INSURANCE

There is one substantial difference between relief and medical aid. Many families are perfectly able to pay their ordinary expenses, and should be able to pay for medical care, and yet when they run up against an emergency of sickness they have no reserves with which to meet it. Such families should not have to be supported by taxes paid by other families less able to bear the burden than the family which is assisted.

In order to avoid the necessity of extending free medical aid to many more families than actually require it, it is desirable to develop some form of health insurance. Families of intermediate income ought to be able to put aside a weekly amount which will insure them adequate medical aid in any emergency. All kinds of experiments have been made, and there is not much doubt that we

[9] Accepting the underlying findings of the Board, as we do, it was within the province of the Board to draw the inferences that the guarantees of section 7 of the act required disestablishment of the Federation (Falk case, supra, p. —, and cases cited), and that posting of appropriate notices was necessary. Id.

will develop satisfactory voluntary plans, though I claim to be no expert on the subject. Men have shown their willingness to pay premiums for life insurance. If they are willing to set aside money to pay the undertaker, they ought to be willing to set aside money to pay the doctor.

But compulsory health insurance is another thing. Deductions from pay roll or otherwise to support compulsory health insurance really destroy the whole character of the plan as insurance. Such payments are in fact taxes, and they are shortly absorbed in costs and passed on as taxes to all the people. The assistance which is received comes finally from a Government bureau. Look at the pay-roll taxes we already have for unemployment insurance, so heavy and complicated in administration as to hamper and restrict the development of private industry and increase unemployment. Health insurance should certainly be developed on a voluntary basis.

Furthermore, it should provide for the right of the insured to select his own physician, if his physician is willing to enter into the general plan. There should be no Government doctors on a fixed salary taking care of as many cases as the Government chooses to assign to them.

SOCIALIZATION OF MEDICINE

The socialization of the medical profession is a danger which must and can be avoided in any extension of medical aid to the needy. If that aid is confined to the needy the danger is not so great, but even then methods can certainly be developed to give the man entitled to Government aid the right to choose his own doctor and have him paid by the Government. We have such a plan for workmen's accident insurance in Ohio.

But if the Government undertakes to cover the whole field and extend aid not only to the needy, but also to those quite able to pay for it, there is real danger. Compulsory health insurance for all employees, similar to unemployment insurance, would gradually result in a large proportion of the total payments to doctors coming out of the Government fund. In effect, the bulk of the medical profession would be employed by the Government. That is socialization of medicine. We might try to guard against it by provisions allowing the patient to choose his own doctor, but it is not likely that we could long maintain such a restriction.

Once a profession is paid with Government money for the bulk of all its work, it takes its orders from the Government. Gradually most doctors would come to be in effect Government employees. Nothing like that has ever happened to a profession in this country. The American system has been built on independent businessmen, on independent farmers, and on independent professional men, particularly lawyers, doctors, scientists, and professors. Much of the independent thought has originated with professional men. They are largely responsible for the great creative accomplishments of the last century which have so tremendously increased the living standards and happiness of the people. In surgery, in preventive medicine, in methods of treatment, in bacteriology, the steady growth of new ideas has come from an independent profession. In spite of unfortunate exceptions, the average professional man does his own thinking, and is less subject to the influences of power and propaganda than any other group of the people. In a socialized world not only does the Government regulate all prices, wages, hours, and practices but it employs all the doctors, lawyers, and scientists. The world becomes a great bureaucracy, and a progressive democracy dies through hardening of its arteries.

I have said that our difficulties today are rather social than they are medical. It is essential that we confine our free medical care to those who are really needy; that we treat the problem as a relief problem, and work out the difficulties of the intermediate income groups through plans of voluntary cooperation.

PLACE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The specific proposals under discussion today relate to the activities of the Federal Government in the field of health in its attempt to improve general social conditions of the country. From a health standpoint alone, there is little justification for the Federal Government concerning itself in a field which has always been recognized as one for local government. But during the past 10 years we have come to realize that the resources of the local governments to deal with relief and other aid to the needy are inadequate, and that Federal financial aid is absolutely essential. The depression of 1929 created a great unemployment problem which has never been solved.

We thought that in America any man who was willing to work could get a job and support his family—even take care of his old age. But we found we had not achieved that millennium. We found, furthermore, that the cost of proper care for the needy was so great that it could not be provided by the States and local governments. They had limited powers of taxation. They could not tax the wealthy without the wealthy moving to other States. They could not tax local industry without discouraging its development in that locality. Most of the State tax systems were heavily burdened to provide for the normal activities of cities, school districts, counties, and States.

And so the Federal Government was called upon to give financial aid to activities which, under our Constitution, have always been regarded as of State or local concern. In the field of relief the Federal Government, as a condition of financial assistance, and I think very wrongly, insisted on taking over most of the administration, instead of assisting the States to do the task which was really theirs. The Federal Government has undertaken to assist in ordinary relief, in old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and housing. Its assistance has been sought and given simply because the States have not been able to raise the money to handle the social distress of many million families.

I believe that the Federal Government should also aid to some extent in the field of medical care for the needy, and for the same reason. That field has not been largely developed by the States, and in most cases the financial provision has been inadequate. Historically the bulk of local and State tax funds were allotted to the schools, the roads, and other activities of more immediate local demand than relief. On the other hand, we should certainly recognize that many States do provide a large measure of medical aid, and have always done so, and provided the funds for it. The States which have not provided any funds should do so before leaning on the Federal Government. Federal aid should be merely auxiliary—even more so than in the field of relief, old-age pensions, and unemployment insurance, in which fields the States had made almost no provision in their tax systems. Each State should be encouraged to work out its own problem in its own way, the Federal Government merely providing funds to supplement State funds and encourage an orderly and comprehensive plan.

But the dangers of extending free medical aid in the wrong way are intensified when the Federal Government enters the field. At least, under the present administration, there is not the slightest conception of the necessity for economy. They don't seem to realize that sooner or later the whole people, rich and poor alike, have to pay for what they spend. What is the validity of the argument that the Federal Government can afford to pay when the States cannot so long as the Federal Government is $4,000,000,000 a year in the red? Why complain of the inadequacy of State tax systems when no one has the nerve to devise a Federal tax system to pay the Federal bill? Furthermore, if all health control is centered in Washington, the whole Nation may be suddenly subjected to experiments proposed by any group of cranks who may obtain the ear of the Executive or Congress. Socialized medicine is only one of the changes which might be effected overnight because someone knows where to apply pressure at the right spot. Even greater care is necessary in extending Federal aid to health than in the case of local and State government.

The Wagner health bill, in particular, seems to me an extraordinarily dangerous way of dealing with the whole subject. It is true that it purports to be a mere assistance to States which set up the proper plan. But, in the first place, it is immensely complicated. It provides aid in six different categories—two categories of maternal, infant, and child health under the Children's Bureau; two, of public health work and hospitals, under the Surgeon General; and two, of general medical care and health insurance, under the Social Security Board. Each State is required to set up six elaborate advisory committees and deal with three different departments and six different bureaus of the Federal Government.

The bill is typical of New Deal technique. Whenever an abuse occurs or a need arises in any field, the only solution which the New Deal offers is a complete regulation and supervision of every detail of that field by the Federal Government. In the Securities and Exchange Commission, in the National Labor Relations Board, in the Wage and Hour Administration, we see great bureaucratic machines set up, on the theory that you must remedy every evil by giving a Government bureau discretion to pass on every act in advance. Bureaus are created and given power to issue regulations increasing their own power. Instead of the law prohibiting certain definite actions which have produced bad results, and giving the Federal bureau power to enforce, the law gives the bureau arbitrary and discretionary power to tell the industry concerned just how it must run every detail of its business.

So also in this health field. Instead of picking out a particular problem, and attempting to relieve that problem with some Federal financial assistance and a suggestion to the States as to how with that assistance they can eliminate a serious evil, the Wagner Health bill proposes to blanket the whole field with an expenditure of $275,000,000 a year, increasing gradually to $800,000,000 a year. It encourages compulsory health insurance. It provides the funds with which the State, otherwise unable to do so, may socialize the entire medical profession.

In my opinion, each step taken by the Federal Government should be taken with care and to meet a demonstrated need. There should be an effort first to encourage the States to develop sound methods of medical aid to the needy, and the demand for Federal assistance should come from the States instead of that assistance being forced upon them.

Our Senate Committee on Education and Labor has just recommended one step which I think is sound, which illustrates the manner in which the Federal Government should proceed. We are proposing to appropriate $10,000,000 a year for several years to assist the States to build small hospitals in rural sections where those hospitals do not exist. The amount involved is not sufficient to permit any considerable development except where it is very badly needed. The appropriation, one-tenth of that proposed in the Wagner health bill for hospitals should have an equal effect in encouraging States to survey their entire hospital situation and work out a comprehensive plan. The money provided is not sufficient to encourage any competition with existing private facilities. The Wagner health bill apparently contemplated a State plan in each State, entirely disregarding the extensive hospital facilities which ought to be considered in working out any plan of hospital aid for

the needy. It is rather interesting that the original little hospital bill proposed by the President contemplated the construction of a chain of federally owned hospitals with W. P. A. labor. As finally worked out at my suggestion, all the hospitals built are to be transferred to the State, and operated as part of a State or local system. The construction is to be made by contract in the usual way, and some aid is to be given toward maintenance during the first 5 years. It is an experiment, but it should meet the hospital problem to the extent, and in the places, where the need really exists.

In the same manner in which the hospital problem has been met, I believe that Congress should consider as soon as possible the appropriation of Federal money to assist in the development of direct medical aid for the needy. I would like to see specified in the bill the kind of aid which the State and local governments shall give.

I would like to see the assistance so restricted that the funds could not be used toward the general socialization of the medical profession. In my opinion, we owe a duty to the unfortunate members of society who, without fault of their own, or even perhaps with fault of their own, are unable to provide a decent living for their families. We owe the children of such families an equal opportunity to make a success of their own lives. They cannot do so in a family overwhelmed by poverty and illness. No system will work to relieve all hardship. No system will be 100 percent perfect. But I believe that at a reasonable cost the Federal Government can stimulate interest and assist the development of plans that will reduce the hardships of many unfortunate families. In a Federal Budget of $7,000,000,000 the ultimate expenditure of several hundred million dollars a year to supplement the work of States, of local communities, and of private charity does not seem to me an unreasonable sum in comparison with the tremendous good which it can do.

The medical profession in the last hundred years, increasingly in the last generation, has worked miracles. Preventive medicine has checked and destroyed epidemics, and lengthened the span of years. Surgery saves thousands of lives annually. The lives of mothers and infants are more secure. Now we are concerned that society shall be able to share these boons with all; that children be freed of physical handicaps; that the usefulness of the middle-aged be prolonged; that old age be made more comfortable. We all desire that pain, the universal enemy, be frustrated; that we achieve a happier, healthier America.

But let's do it in the right way. Let's not do it at the cost of the independence of the medical profession, which has given so unselfishly of its time and talents. Let's not do it in a way which will only give the needy the kind of treatment a poor citizen gets from a Government bureaucrat in Washington. No human suffering should go unheeded. But let us see to it that self-reliant Americans retain their freedom to cooperate voluntarily in health insurance plans if they want to, and their liberty of choice in the matter of the family doctor. We want an America free as well as healthy. There is no necessary contradiction.

Louisiana Votes for Cotton Marketing Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

LOUISIANA STATE TABULATION OF 1940 COTTON MARKETING REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, 78,816 farmers in Louisiana voted for the 1940 cotton marketing quota and 2,676 voted against the program. Therefore, I submit as part of these remarks a tabulation by parishes showing the results:

Parish	Votes cast		
	Yes	No	Total
Acadia	2,229	110	2,339
Allen	395	154	549
Ascension	45	0	45
Assumption	1	0	1
Avoyelles	4,729	22	4,751
Beauregard	273	2	275
Bienville	2,005	95	2,100
Bossier	1,710	72	1,782
Caddo	3,240	55	3,295
Calcasieu	289	57	346
Caldwell	812	36	848
Cameron	394	31	425
Catahoula	1,406	23	1,429
Claiborne	2,712	112	2,824
Concordia	1,358	7	1,365
De Soto	2,530	97	2,627
East Baton Rouge	658	3	661
East Carroll	2,147	37	2,184
East Feliciana	1,071	17	1,088
Evangeline	2,477	76	2,553
Franklin	3,367	38	3,405
Grant	666	24	690
Iberia	151	2	153
Iberville	168	0	168
Jackson	854	63	917
Jefferson	4	0	4
Jefferson Davis	506	161	667
Lafayette	2,029	22	2,051
Lafourche	5	0	5
La Salle	302	12	314
Lincoln	1,565	80	1,645
Livingston	296	2	298
Madison	1,687	30	1,717
Morehouse	2,563	22	2,585
Natchitoches	2,467	68	3,535
Orleans	10	0	10
Ouachita	1,433	76	1,509
Plaquemines [1]			
Pointe Coupee	1,728	23	1,751
Rapides	1,901	17	1,918
Red River	1,465	16	1,481
Richland	2,947	67	3,014
Sabine	956	78	1,034
St. Bernard [1]			
St. Charles [1]			
St. Helena	786	26	812
St. James	0	0	0
St. John the Baptist [1]			
St. Landry	4,741	25	4,766
St. Martin	1,453	1	1,454
St. Mary	1	0	1
St. Tammany	236	2	238
Tangipahoa	902	47	949
Tensas	1,708	16	1,724
Terrebonne [1]			
Union	2,015	117	2,132
Vermilion	1,113	270	1,383
Vernon	624	25	649
Washington	1,639	51	1,690
Webster	1,524	68	1,592
West Baton Rouge	209	0	209
West Carroll	1,935	180	2,115
West Feliciana	720	1	721
Winn	659	40	699
Total (State)	78,816	2,676	81,492
Percent	96.7	3.3	
Totals for District (Fifth)	25,797	792	26,589

Percentage of favorable vote, 97.02.

[1] No cotton.

W. P. A. Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a very impressive petition, signed by approximately 700 employees of the Work Projects Administration in my congressional district, recommending that Congress make certain changes in the W. P. A. law.

These recommendations, coming as they do from the "men in the trenches," not high-salaried bosses or comfortably situated relief "experts," deserve to receive the sympathetic consideration of Members of this body.

The petition is as follows:

We the undersigned voters of the Fourth Congressional District, and W. P. A. workers, most respectfully request you to use your influence and vote to amend the Woodrum Act, appropriating funds for the W. P. A.

(1) To remove the 18-month lay-off provision of the law.

(2) To provide for 120 hours' work for W. P. A. workers per month.

(3) To increase the wage scale commensurate with living costs.

(4) To make it a felony for W. P. A. officials, supervisors, and foremen to discriminate against W. P. A. employees on account of race, color, or creed.

(5) To make it a felony for any W. P. A. supervisor, official, or foreman to solicit funds, or offer for sale any food or commodities of any kind to employees working on the project of such person.

Mr. Speaker, some of these suggestions, particularly (4) and (5), should not even be subject to debate. In honesty and fairness to the workers and their families, they should be unanimously incorporated in the bill under consideration.

A year ago, when the Woodrum bill was passed by the House, I expressed my opposition to the 18-month lay-off provision of the law. I said at that time that I thought it would work unnecessary hardship and suffering on worthy relief families and that it ought to be eliminated. Subsequent developments have proved my prediction to be correct. In too many instances, the lay-off has not been for 30 days, but has been for a much longer length of time. I believe this provision should be stricken from the law, or greatly modified to exempt workers with dependents and workers of advanced age.

Concerning the recommendations for a longer work month and a more reasonable wage, I wish to repeat what I have said many times before. If less money were wasted on high salaries for political bosses, traveling expenses for W. P. A. officials, and general inefficiency, more funds would remain to be distributed among the deserving needy who, after all, are the ones intended to be benefited by this law.

The recent investigation of the maladministration of the W. P. A. proves beyond a doubt that this money is being wasted. I recommend that this Congress take immediate steps to eliminate this waste, so that the money will go into the pockets of certified workers and not into the grasping hands of well-to-do politicians and relatives of relief bosses. [Applause.]

The Man Over Forty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY REV. B. F. ROGERS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk made over KWKH Shreveport, La., Sunday, May 5, 1940, at 9:15 p. m., in behalf of American Legion Unemployment Week, May 1 to 8, 1940, by Rev. B. F. Rogers:

Good evening, friends. Permit me to make a request that you go immediately to your telephone and call some business executive or manager of some industrial plant, or other employer of labor of any kind, and ask them to tune in on KWKH for the next 15 minutes. You can do this and not miss more than 1 minute of what I shall be saying. I hope no one will think me presumptuous in making this request, because I am making it in the interest of a larger group of our citizens who are in distress, and I am particularly anxious that those who may be in a position to do something to aid in relieving that distress may hear the appeal that I shall make.

This is not to be an appeal for a donation of funds to assist some worthy object of charity, for the average man over 40 does not fall within that realm at all. He is able and willing, yea, anxious, to be a self-sustaining and productive member of society.

At the request of President Roosevelt the Nation is asked to observe what is termed "National Employment Week." In compliance with that request the American Legion, with more than a million members in the various posts of the country, is seeking to draw the attention of all employers to the fact that there is really and truly a forgotten man in this great country of ours. He is the man over 40. Every American Legion post is expected to have an employment committee which is specially charged with the duty and privilege of assisting members of the Legion who are unemployed to find work in order that they may take proper care of their families and meet their other responsibilities as citizens. Mr. J. T. Ringenback is chairman of that committee of Lowe-McFarlane Post No. 14, of Shreveport. But not only is the American Legion interested that men over 40 should receive fair consideration at the hands of employers. There are numerous other groups who have come to the conclusion that the establishment of an arbitrary age limit in business and industry is neither fair nor reasonable. Certainly the church which seeks to minister to the spiritual needs of all men regardless of age, rank, or condition in life is and should be concerned about the whole problem of unemployment. It is all right to say that spiritual needs are of paramount importance and that the destiny of the human soul should receive primary consideration, nevertheless, man is so constituted that it is virtually impossible for him to give much attention to spiritual matters when the voice of physical hunger shouts in his ears, "I am hungry, I am cold, I am thirsty." Therefore, as a representative of the church, not in an official capacity, but simply as a humble minister of the Gospel, I am tremendously concerned that all men shall have employment to the end that they may live happy, useful, and productive lives.

The problem of unemployment is not a new one, though it has been most acute in our country for the past 10 years. The exodus of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt was largely a labor movement and Moses was the first great labor leader. Jesus Christ knew about the unemployed when He was here on earth. Read the parable of the laborers in the vineyard found in the twentieth chapter of Matthew. There the owner of the vineyard is represented as going into the market place where were gathered the unemployed. The third time he went at the eleventh hour and said to them, "Why stand ye here all the day idle"; and they said unto him, "Because no man hath hired us."

And that generous-hearted employer said to them: "Go ye, also, into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive." This employer did not say, "Let me see your birth certificate. We have established an ironclad rule in the interest of efficiency that no man over 40 shall be employed on our grape farm." He manifested a quality of character, I am glad to say, that many modern employers have. At the close of the day, when the workers filed past the pay window, those who had worked only 1 hour received the same amount as those who had gone to work at the first hour of the day. I am not saying that modern employers could remain in business and follow literally the example of this grape farmer, but I am saying that the cold, calculating Shylocks of the business and industrial world would greatly profit by laying in a supply of the same milk of human kindness which he so generously manifested.

Now, I recognize the fact that there are many aspects of the employment problem which manufacturers and business executives must consider in connection with the operation of their respective organizations, one of which is that stockholders and boards of directors demand and have a right to expect some profit from their investments. They are not like the Government in that they cannot year after year pile up deficits and continue in business. Under our system of economics, while profits are not always the chief aim of those engaged in any kind of business, it is absolutely essential to continued existence that at least a reasonable profit may be earned, and I think no far-seeing or thoughtful person will deny that this is true. But in the face of keen competition, many employers of labor during recent years have become somewhat panic-stricken and hastily have arrived at the conclusion that only men under 40 can be of profitable service to them, and so this "40-phobia" has become a sort of epidemic which business and efficiency experts have done but little to check.

As a result there is a large number of men over 40 who are well qualified to fill a great variety of positions, and yet they are not even considered, simply because the calendar is against them. To me and to many other citizens it is little short of ridiculous to say that at 39, 1 minute before midnight of his next birthday, a man is well fitted for a job. At 1 minute past midnight he is 40, and cannot be employed. How in the name of high heaven did business and industry ever come to the conclusion that a rule like that is necessary or desirable? Fortunately, all business executives and employers of men do not believe that to be true, and the purpose of this appeal is to induce all who may be listening in tonight to realize that these men over 40, many of them, who are unemployed, are genuinely capable of filling satisfactorily a great variety of jobs which you may have to be filled in the future. Give them an opportunity to demonstrate their ability. If you want proof that older men can and do produce, read the survey of the 19 leading office-equipment companies made by Mr. Henry Simler, of the Sales Executive Club of New York City, wherein it is revealed that the average of the top salesmen, 183 of them, employed by these firms, is 42.8 years, the average in the

top company being 44.5 years and the runner-up 45.3 years. The average age of 137 branch managers was 44.6 years, and the group close behind these in efficiency averaged 46 years of age. Of course, we all realize that there are certain types of work which make heavy demands upon the physical strength of man for which the average man over 40 is generally not able to perform as well as a younger man, but in all fields of mental, clerical, or supervisory work, the man over 40 is preferred by many executives because of his experience, better judgment, and general poise. I saw recently a picture of 5 men who have been in the employ of a large electric and manufacturing company's lighting division, who have a combined employment service of 179 years and they are still on the pay roll rendering efficient and satisfactory service. Six thousand three hundred and fifty-five employees of this company have been with the company more than 20 years, which means that most of them are men over 40. If this great company finds it a wise policy to retain these men, then is it not reasonable to assume that many other companies could and should follow their example?

Numerous employers have stated that their hiring policy is determined by the suitability of the applicant and that age has little relation to efficiency, although older men are better adapted to some jobs than others. Many believe that workers over 40 or even 50, if in good health, are just as efficient as younger workers. Especially is this true where quality is important. They also recognize the fact that men over 40 are more settled and dependable, thus reducing the labor turn-over, which certainly is an important aspect of employment. A report by the Work Projects Administration covering 1,444 skilled workers shows that the average workers whose output is considered excellent, was 47½ years, while the average age of those in the inferior grade was 41. Only 13 percent of those in excellent grade were under 35.

I realize that when employers manifest a preference for men under 40 that they may have some reasons for doing so, among those being increased rates of compensation insurance; higher accident rate in some industries; greater susceptibility to occupational diseases; increased rates of group insurance; increased rates for employers under their own pension plans; younger men can be employed for smaller wages and trained more readily; public demand for younger people in certain occupations; lack of educational qualifications on the part of older men and pressure from some insurance companies to employ younger men.

It is doubtless true that some of the reasons assigned for giving preference to younger men are valid and tenable with respect to certain types of work, and it is also true that most young men can afford to work for less monetary compensation than the man over 40, because he has oftentimes no dependents looking to him for support. Most of the men over 40 are married and have children to rear and educate. Many of them are trying to pay for a home on the installment plan. Not many of them have wives who work and contribute to the support of the family. On the other hand, there are many young men whose wives do work, and thus some man who is struggling to support his family may be deprived of any job at all.

Please do not misunderstand me; I am not speaking against the employment of younger men, but I am most emphatically trying to impress someone, some manager, some director of personnel, some executive, that we have a lot of men between the ages of 40 and 50 who are unemployed, not because they are physically unfit or mentally decadent, but largely because of this "forty-phobia" which has spread all over our country. Most recent estimates indicate that there are at least 175,000 members of the American Legion in the United States who are able to work, and yet they have no job. These men who, 23 years ago, left our farms and colleges and offices and shops and enlisted in the American Army to fight for what they were told was the noble purpose of preserving democracy to end all war. They are the men that we delighted to honor for a brief time and to pin medals on for courage and patriotism and sacrificial spirit. Can it be true that we have forgotten the sacrifices which they made? Will American business and industry now say to them, We can find no place for you? Wherever you go you will find some of these noble patriots and they are fighting a grim battle with want and hunger and deprivation. They are just as willing to do their share of the productive work of the country as they were to shoulder arms in its defense. Some of them have about lost their courage in this bloodless battle, because deep down in their souls they have a feeling that they are no longer appreciated. Has American business become so mercenary and so absorbed with the idea of technical and theoretical efficiency that all sense of gratitude to these men has been destroyed? I cannot believe that this is true, and so I call upon all employers, large and small, to do what you can to open a place for these men over 40. Do it now. If you can only use one man, call the employment committee of the American Legion of Shreveport, or of the post where you are, and let them know you are ready to give these honorable men an opportunity to earn an honest living for themselves and their families. This will be close kin to the brand of patriotism which they manifested in 1917 and 1918.

Eliminate Politics? Sure; But Not by Way of a Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL AND TWO ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the President wants to eliminate politics from national defense, let him take his hat out of the political ring. That the President is not fooling anyone by his latest political move—that is, by his public appearance before Congress and his demand for new appropriations for defense and his plea for additional power to spend millions—is apparent from current editorials and the writings of columnists who, while personal friends of the President and new dealers in their sympathies, are themselves frightened by the President's latest attempt to establish himself as a dictator. Note this editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

WE NEED TWO PARTIES

Mr. Roosevelt's effort to form what would have the outward appearance of a coalition government is as clever a political maneuver as any he has ever initiated.

If, as is reported to be his design, he prevails upon Col. Frank Knox and three or four other influential Republicans to take Cabinet posts at this time—in the teeth of the national conventions and elections—it will be a neat job of interring Republican opposition without benefit of clergy or even a wake.

We are in an emergency, arising from the turn of the war in Europe and from our lamentable unpreparedness, which the impact of European events has brought dramatically to light. Mr. Roosevelt is appealing to Colonel Knox et al., on the basis of patriotism, asking them to place country above party. Their natural inclination is to accept the summons.

But a cool appraisal of the situation should raise some doubts in their minds as to whether they serve either party or country by abandoning bipartisan government in times like these.

First, let them ask themselves whether such a coalition Government in appearance be a coalition Government in fact. On that point the record of this administration should give them pause. Would this administration, which has tried so energetically to purge dissident opinion within its own party, be more tolerantly inclined toward conflicting views of coalitionists drawn from another party?

Would Colonel Knox, for instance, have a free hand to function as Secretary of the Navy any more than Secretary Swanson had, or Secretary Edison has? Would either Col. William Donovan or Fiorello LaGuardia be in fact more of a Secretary of War than Mr. Woodring has been? Or would they be just window dressing?

Another question, one that has been asked loud and long, is newly pertinent in connection with this coalition talk. That is: Will the President run for a third term? If he sincerely wants a political truce, he can get it, completely and unqualifiedly, by answering that one in the negative.

To go all the way in coalitionism the President would have to renounce the third term, devote himself solely to his duties as head of a nonpartisan Government for the rest of his time in office, refuse to be a partisan in the coming campaign, and call upon the people to elect the best man to the Presidency and the best men to Congress, regardless of party.

But there would be no quid pro quo to Republicans whom he now bids lay aside politics if, instead, he intends to take the Democratic nomination and run on the issue of national unity, expecting his coalitionists to remain loyally mum.

Before they accept political sterilization Colonel Knox and the others probably will want to know the answers.

Then there is an even more important consideration—whether our country, in the long run as well as the short, would be better served by coalition, even though it be a coalition in fact. European governments resort to the coalition device in times of peril or stress. But our Government, though it has been through some tough times, has always stuck to the bipartisan form. Indeed, our Government usually functions best when the minority is most effective—when it is most alert in challenging the errors of the majority.

If we have come upon bad days now, with inadequate national defenses and industry apparently unable to supply weapons of war in the quantities and at the speed needed, then where should the blame be laid? Certainly not with bipartisanship. The minority in Congress has been nonpartisan—indeed, almost coalitionist—in voting the defense appropriations the administration has asked. If the Republicans are to be blamed for anything, it is that they have not functioned effectively as an opposition party. They have voted the money, but they haven't followed through and to make sure that the money was spent as it should have been. And they have been too weak in numbers and leadership to check the headlong administration policies which have been at least in part responsible for the flabby condition of the country's industries.

We have had too much one-party government and too much unrestrained dominance by one faction within that one party. Instead of absorbing all opposition into the New Deal, the country's crying need is just the opposite—a minority strong enough and intelligent enough to keep the majority always on its mettle. In short, a return to real bipartisan government.

Here is another by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

Our problem is in production and not in politics. There is a crisis in national defense. It is a need for immediate rearmament. It is a problem of industrial production and it is that alone. The record of this administration and the published programs of both the Army and the Navy are absolute proof that it is moving to a solution far too slowly to be of any use. It can be made to move much more rapidly. Ours is the most efficient industrial production machine in the world. It has the best production managers—men amply able to get this vitally necessary increased speed for the Government. But this Government has no such men.

The screamingly obvious necessary first step is to get them—right now. They don't have to hold office. They will come on request. They will see what is needed. They will get their fellows in industry to cooperate voluntarily.

Are we doing that? We are doing just the reverse of that. It is well known in Washington that the President is planning to put three Republicans on his Cabinet in the vital posts of War, Navy, and Commerce. Names mentioned are Frank Knox, Alf Landon, and Fiorello LaGuardia. Is that a production measure or a defense measure? It is not. It is pure politics. It is third-term politics.

It is said to be to "unify the country" on the rearmament program. The country doesn't need any unification on that. It is almost unanimous on that. The real purpose is plainly to break down our two-party system, using this as an excuse—and to regiment the election. With the trend toward dictatorship the greatest threat in the world, this is the last thing the head of a democratic party should be trying to do. The two-party system is the essence of our democracy and the American way of life. This is a blow at its heart.

Mr. Roosevelt pleaded for the adjournment of politics. He himself is the hottest political issue. If he wanted to adjourn politics, he would announce himself in public as he has to some people in private as not available for a third term. His failure to do so establishes clearly enough that the only politics he wants adjourned is politics opposing him.

Nobody can believe even Mr. Roosevelt's assurances, except in writing and in public, that he is not a third-term candidate, yet no self-respecting Republican could accept a place on this Cabinet without believing that. If any did, he would be exposing himself to sucker stultification after a third election of Roosevelt, after the powers of a dictator had been granted the President, after the party of opposition had been suppressed, and after he himself had been kicked heels over head into the gutter to the raucous "razzberries" and laughter of the White House jannissariat, which is already gloating over what they regard as the steady progress of this strategy. Some of their intimates tell me that their glee over this progress would raise goose-pimples on the corpse of Andrew Jackson.

In the direction of a real solution of the overwhelmingly vital problem of production to bring an uninstructed political amateur into the War Department, for example, to take the gimp and tucker out of Louis Johnson, would be a catastrophe. It would paralyze progress for weeks. Mr. Johnson has now been educated. He has always had great energy. He now has understanding. If he were freely permitted to create an advisory staff of industrialists, he could do the job. To replace or smother him on the plea of political unity, notwithstanding productive paralysis, would be an act of sabotage in national defense.

This barefaced use of a national crisis for the purposes of a partisan political attempt to perpetuate a particular President and increase his powers is the blackest mark with which this administration has yet smirched its own record—more impudent and impious than the 1937 conspiracy to revolutionize this to a personalized government by the court-packing and other defeated legislative plans—worse than the purges and the W. P. A. political bribery and coercion of 1938. As in those other cases, there is strong hope that its stench is so great that it can't be swallowed.

Still another by Ludwell Denny:

SUSPICIONS AROUSED

(By Ludwell Denny)

The situation here is nasty. The President is getting the kickback from the fear and hysteria created by his bellicose Pan American speech and his panicky congressional message.

The public demands action. The President is revealed without detailed plan or organization to produce his "four alarm" defense. He personally is blamed on all sides. So, instead of the quiet confidence and unity which he needs from Congress, industry, labor, and the defense services, he is meeting much suspicion.

Typical of the industrial distrust are off-the-record statements of several manufacturers after attending yesterday's weird meeting here to throw the aviation industry into high gear. After listening to Army chiefs confess "that this whole thing was thrown at them so fast they didn't have a chance to prepare," some key industrialists left charging, "It's all an administration publicity stunt."

The groggy attitude of military officers is indicated not only by this incident but by the plaintive inability of the Deputy Chief of Staff, General Gasser, and his aides to answer simple questions at the House military hearing. Because the President gave them no warning, they are made to look silly, which hurts.

Labor leaders are furious about the alleged run-around they are getting. Some administration leaders are supporting bills to modify labor standards of the wage-hour and Walsh-Healey laws, and some defense chiefs are pledging such modification to industrialists, while other administration leaders and Mrs. Roosevelt deny it.

The suspicion on Capitol Hill is indicated by demands of the Vandenberg Senate group for the President to give Congress the "suppressed" Stettinius War Resources Board report of last fall. They make this a test of the President's "fair play and good faith."

Yesterday the Army Chief of Staff, General Marshall, told a congressional committee what the President's critics have been shouting for a long time. "It is becoming more apparent every day that the big question is not how much you appropriate but how much can we spend at the present time," the general said. He had testified already that the Army was "totally and completely inadequate" for war.

G. O. P. leaders are suspicious of the President's reported attempt to lure prominent Republicans into his Cabinet as an alleged Trojan-horse move in the third-term campaign. Even Alf Landon, who has hitherto cooperated with the President in foreign affairs and has just been called here for conference, denounces moves for any "party alliance or coalition."

Then there are nonpolitical experts, such as Colonel Lindbergh, whose reaction to the President is that we should "stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion," stop meddling abroad, and efficiently get on with our own defense job.

In fairness to the critics—congressional, industrial, labor, political, military, and civilian experts—it can be admitted that the President brought much of this on himself. In deliberately trying to shock the country into awareness, he overplayed his sensational hand.

But in fairness to the President and for the sake of national confidence in an emergency, it is essential that the public understand the truth. The truth is that the President, far from being hysterical as he appeared, is operating with a cool if somewhat grim efficiency.

He is suffering from past mistakes—such as his naval-mindedness at the expense of aircraft and Army mechanization, the lack of a strong Secretary of the Navy, and the notorious conflict at the War Department between Secretary Woodring and Assistant Secretary Johnson. But it is also true that the President never has been sincerer, stronger, and surer of himself than in these last world-shaking 10 days.

The fact of the matter is that the President has taken advantage of the war situation in Europe; of the disaster which has befallen Finland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, as well as France and England, to add to his drive for a third term and a dictatorship for himself.

An administration which will spend money appropriated to relieve the misery of the sick and the suffering, as the present Administration has spent relief funds, does not hesitate for a second to use the present European situation to promote its political fortunes.

Some of the President's advisers, his political adherents, and his friends are too anxious to remake America, too closely connected with the Communist Party, which would overthrow our Government by force, to permit any patriotic American advised of the situation to look with complacency on the President's ambition for a third term.

Shortly, we hope the whole country will become aware of the President's real purpose, the continuation of a Roosevelt in power.

Toward the Goal of Balanced Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the twentieth century our Nation stood on the threshold of a great era of technological development. Many new, important inventions, such as the telephone, the airplane, the radio, the motion picture, the automobile, were then destined to set the pace for a period of amazing growth in American industry.

Aside from the new inventions which resulted in the creation of entirely new industries, there were during that 30-year period (1900–30) other inventions which enabled established industries to expand and increase their output. According to the National Resources Committee the available mechanical power rose from 70,000,000 horsepower in 1900 to approximately 1,231,000,000 horsepower in 1935—an increase of 1,659 percent.

EXPANSION OF PRODUCTION

Mass production ushered in and with it the economic phenomena of men producing greater quantities of better-quality goods with less expense of time and effort suddenly appeared. The effect of mechanization on human labor is reflected in the fact that 43 men in 1933 produced the volume of goods that required 118 men in 1899. Thus, in 1933 one man, with the aid of the machine, could do almost three times as much work as he was able to do at the turn of the century. During this same period production of manufactured goods rose over 240 percent.

Did the fact that only 43 men were needed in 1933 to produce the same volume of goods as 118 produced in 1899 curtail employment opportunities in industry? The answer would seem "No," since it has been reported by the National Conference Board that from 1870 to 1930 the proportion of gainful workers in the total population rose from 32.4 to 39.8 percent, an increase of 7.4 percent.

It is explained that during the period 1899–1929 technological change aided in the multiplication of employment opportunities, because, through mechanization, costs were lowered drastically, and as costs were lowered more goods were sold, and as more goods were sold, more and more workers were required to make, service, and distribute them. Thus, when a technological improvement is followed by lowering of prices, workers who would otherwise be displaced are required to assist in producing a larger supply of goods which are needed to meet the increased demand. Here we see what happens when the benefits of mechanization are passed on, so that everyone from the consumer back to the manufacturer profits. So far as our study of the problem of technological change and unemployment is concerned, the most important thing to note is that passing along the benefits of mechanization usually results in increased employment.

In reading this report one might readily conclude that your committee has argued the case for technological change. We have done just that. And as we develop the second part of our report we shall still be arguing the case for and not against technological change, although our analysis must shift to the other side of the question. We now examine the damaging, destructive effect of technological change on employment, not because we wish to discredit the possibilities of the machine, but because we wish to expose certain abuses in its use and then recommend ways and means to check those abuses.

CHECKING THE ABUSES IN USE OF MACHINES

What happens when the benefits of mechanization are passed on has already been demonstrated. But what happens when these benefits are withheld? The answer is most important: Withholding of the benefits of mechanization leads to unemployment. When a given technological change is not followed by a lowering of prices, consumption does not register any notable gain; the public purchases the same quantity of goods; fewer men are needed to turn out the same quantity of goods, so the final result: Fewer men at work; more men relegated to the ranks of the unemployed.

The question of whether a given technological improvement or new labor-saving device serves to increase or decrease employment opportunities is decided largely by the subsequent presence or absence of price reduction. If prices are not reduced as new machines are introduced the theory of increasing employment by increasing the total of productivity breaks down completely. It is the significant failure, in recent years, of prices to go down with the introduction of new machines that has created the need for certain adjustments at this time.

In striking at the problem of unemployment as related to technological change, we must adopt either of two courses of action: First, set aright the factors which have prevented price reductions from taking place as new machines were introduced, or, second, throttle the invention of new machines. Since, as it has been noted, the introduction of labor-saving devices accounted largely for the doubling and redoubling of America's volume of production and consequent rise in living standard during the years 1900–1930, junking of new machines would not seem an enlightened or sensible approach to this problem. It would seem best to move in the direction of increased employment by setting aright factors which tend to prevent price reductions from taking place as new machines are introduced.

What has done most to thwart the proper functioning of that process by which new machines lower costs drastically, and as costs are lowered, more goods are sold, and as more goods are sold more and more workers are required to make, service, and distribute them? What, in other words, seems to be the principal factor preventing the necessary price reduction which starts the ball rolling toward increased volume of productivity and employment? More than anything else, the unchecked growth of monopoly has made prices fixed and rigid—so fixed and rigid, in fact, that the introduction of new machines has ceased to be followed by lowering of prices. In the absence of competition producers have little inclination to pass on to the consumer savings wrought by the installation of labor-saving devices. Hence the necessary rise in consumption fails to occur and the reemployment of those thrown out of work by reason of new inventions does not take place.

MONOPOLY AND MACHINES DO NOT MIX

During the past decade technological development has been notable but little has been accomplished insofar as lowering of prices is concerned. In a number of industries, such as that of the automobile—which made tremendous increases in its labor requirements between 1920–30 because of increased consumption realized through constant reduction in prices—labor requirements are no longer increasing in proportion to technological advancement. Consumption has leveled off because prices have not been reduced as new machines have been introduced. And, as already pointed out, if prices are not reduced in accordance with the introduction of new machines, the result is curtailment of employment opportunities or—unemployment. These findings suggest mainly one thing: Monopoly and machines do not mix.

Since the committee on monopoly has already addressed itself to a careful consideration of ways and means to attack the problem of monopoly, further discussion is not necessary here. It is felt that, as suggested by our committee on

monopoly, special attention should be given to the undertakings of the Department of Justice, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Temporary National Economic Committee, and other agencies striking at the problem of monopoly.

Thus far, we have been considering the effect of technological change on employment in general. We now, briefly, touch upon the effect of technological change on specialized fields of employment. The number of men and women who are thrown out of work because particular technological developments render their special skill or trade obsolete may constitute only a small percentage of our total unemployed but their individual problems are the most acute. What happens to the glass blower when the machine comes in and takes his job? If the glass blower is young when this technological advance hits him, he probably will experience less difficulty than some elder associate in making an adjustment, but still he is forced to change his occupation which is certainly no easy task for a man whose whole background of training and experience has been in one field.

TO MINIMIZE PROBLEM

The Federal Security Agency offers the most immediate hope of minimizing the problems of temporary dislocation among workers who are caught in situations similar to that of the glass blower just depicted. Unemployment insurance and old-age pensions are important, as well as Government-sponsored employment offices. The committee recommends careful consideration of legislation which will increase the effectiveness of the Federal Security Agency. The committee also recommends a series of conferences with officials of the Federal Security Agency and Department of Labor for the purpose of fashioning a well-coordinated attack on the related problems of technological unemployment.

Norway's "Fifth Column" Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have read of the bitter experiences suffered in European countries with the "fifth column" during the crisis of war. It is a sad commentary, indeed, when the people of any nation will assume to aid the enemy in time of war to carry out its plan of invasion or to conquer. We, in this Nation, have been forewarned of the active subversive influences which are now operating and which, in the event of our involvement in war, would seek to destroy our form of government and would seek to give aid to our enemy. This plan of unholy alliance on the part of any of our people should be detected and terminated. We have room in our land for those who are wholly American and who in time of distress will fully support and fight for our Nation, and we have no place within our borders for those people who enjoy our freedom and liberty yet who would participate in the overthrow of our Government if the opportunity should be presented. We have our grave problem within, which must be solved; this problem must be solved for our country, and to the end that our form of government may be perpetuated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a brief editorial which appeared in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., on the 19th day of May 1940, which editorial follows:

NORWAY'S "FIFTH COLUMN" EXPERIENCE

Several weeks ago, following the German invasion of Norway, a correspondent for the New York Times wrote an article describing the Nazi "fifth column" methods in the invaded country.

Going back to that period immediately following the first World War, the correspondent told how the homes of Norwegian families had been opened to thousands of undernourished and homeless German children, victims of the great conflict in 1914–18.

These children were fed, clothed, and schooled in Norway, many of them being nursed back to health by their foster parents. Naturally, they learned the language of their benefactors and were familiar with many sections of the country.

The writer declared that just before the German invasion these children, now grown to adulthood and having returned to their native land, were visiting in Norway in large numbers. Like the "merchantmen" aboard German ships in Norwegian harbors when hostilities opened, the male members among the "visitors" quickly revealed themselves as members of the German Army and aided in seizing vital positions. Norwegian defenses were fatally weakened.

It is not difficult to believe this story after reports of German "visitors" in large numbers in the Low Countries before they were invaded, and of the Balkan states being overrun with "guests" as the danger of war in that sector threatens.

Great Britain has imposed restrictions on persons of all foreign nationalities now in the British Isles as a measure of self-defense.

During the past 48 hours the British have interned several thousand enemy aliens as a precautionary measure.

Chairman MARTIN DIES of the House Un-American Activities Committee has announced he will offer legislation that will enable the United States Government to deal with "fifth column" problems in this country "in a constitutional way."

An Answer to the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have two new situations today, both of which are important and either of which is a peril to the farmers of my district and of the Nation:

The first of these new situations is the growing reluctance on the part of the Congress to make huge annual appropriations for so-called parity payments. We are all painfully aware of that fact. If we take a realistic view of this we must conclude that the day is approaching fast, if not already here, when the farmers cannot depend upon the Congress to make these huge appropriations particularly affecting parity payments and crop control under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The second and most dangerous of these new situations is the fact that the war in Europe is certain to end some day—it may be soon—or that day may be far away. It may be within 3 months or 3 years. It may be within 6 months or 6 years. But we know with certainty that each day brings us 1 day closer to the end of the European war. Under our present system the end of the European war will bring a post-war deflation—a deflation that hits farm prices first. Up to this day we have not provided the farmers with worth-while safeguards against that day of post-war deflation and collapsing farm prices.

I am sure that every Member of this House knows well the history of deflation following the first World War. The bitter experience of that depression burned deep into the hearts and minds of the farming class. Their holdings and homes were either immediately swept away from them or were so severely devalued that they had to give them up and look for others and a new kind of employment within short periods. That deflation was the staggering blow to agriculture, for farm products were practically without value, land had no salable value, and thousands of farm communities were disintegrated. We can prevent a recurrence of the

worst features of another post-war deflation if we will only set ourselves to the task of enacting the principles set out in H. R. 2371 into law. We know that when farm prices collapse the little-business man at the country crossroads suffers a decline in business, industrial production slows down, unemployment increases, business stagnation follows, and national income rapidly declines. We are not prepared financially or otherwise to deal with this peril when it comes, but we are intellectually prepared to prevent it.

It is the duty of Congress, it is the duty of this Congress, to enact into law an honest answer to the unsolved farm problem. In my judgment, it is the duty of the House Committee on Agriculture to cooperate with the House and report H. R. 2371, a bill which will put a legal floor under farm prices of products consumed in the domestic market from the unnecessary invasion of foreign competing agricultural products. This bill is safe for the farmer, because it puts a legal floor under farm market prices of products consumed in the domestic market. It is safe for the Treasury, because it requires no huge appropriations or subsidy payments to the farmer. It is safe for labor, because it gives them assurance of employment opportunities. It is safe for business, because it gives business an opportunity to sell an additional $5,000,000,000 worth of goods to our 6,800,000 farmers. It is safe for the 130,000,000 people of the United States, because it assures all of us of prosperity based upon agricultural prosperity.

Now, let us examine the provisions of this bill; let us see what it will do if enacted into law:

First. It would aid and protect the producers of 50 of the 78 agricultural products produced by the farmers of this Nation.

Second. It would aid and protect 98 percent of the value of our total agricultural production.

Third. It would place a legal floor under the market price of these 50 agricultural products consumed in the domestic market.

Fourth. It would assure farmers minimum market prices for the products we consume here in the United States.

Fifth. It would give farmers the world price on the percentage of their production in excess of domestic requirements.

Sixth. It would make agricultural products gilt-edged security for loans, public or private, at nearly 100 percent of the minimum price.

Seventh. It would prevent the importation of competitive agricultural products.

Eighth. It would give our farmers 100 percent of our domestic market.

Ninth. It would protect our domestic market and domestic price level against foreign competitive imports.

Tenth. It would repeal crop control or title III of the Triple A but would leave undisturbed the soil-conservation part of the act, commodity loans, and crops insurance.

Eleventh. It would eliminate the necessity of annual appropriations from the Treasury.

Twelfth. It would provide an annual cash income from marketing to the farmers of the United States of about twelve to twelve and a half billion dollars and would raise the national income to about $85,000,000,000.

Thirteenth. It would eliminate Government control and operation of the farmer and his farm and substitute Government aid and protection of the farmer's market price, his income, and his domestic market.

Fourteenth. It would be self-financing, self-maintaining, without appropriations or subsidies or processing taxes by making agricultural products sell for not less than their actual worth in the domestic market.

Fifteenth. It would stabilize agricultural prosperity—the base of our economic pyramid.

The Committee on Agriculture did not pass the bill out because of protests filed against the bill by officials of the Farmers' Union, who stated that the farmers did not want the bill, and the bill is now pending in the House Committee on Agriculture. In order to assist in getting the bill from before the committee and to the House for consideration I have signed petition No. 5. This petition now has about 120 signatures on it. I trust that every Member who has not signed this petition and who wants enacted into law a legislative program of some kind for the farmer will sign it.

The enactment of this bill into law would give the farmers of this Nation an annual cash income of about $5,000,000,000 more than the farmers received in cash farm income in 1939. This additional $5,000,000,000 in income would increase their own consumption of food and fiber, and it would increase the farmers' consumption of industrial products, which increase in consumption would necessitate an immediate increase in the employment of labor. I dare say that it would produce an immediate reemployment of idle men and women in private industry of not less than four and one-half million workers at American wages. This, my friends, is a sincere approach to a solution of the unsolved farm problem. This is also an approach toward solving the unsolved unemployment problem. I believe the passage of this bill will aid us in finding a market within the United States for the products of industry that is at least five times greater than the elusive and vanishing market which our industrialists are seeking to find abroad. If we will trade wisely with prosperous people among ourselves, we will have the employment, the goods, the money, and the prosperity. We can then trade with the world, not as dependents, but as independents.

H. R. 2371 is in perfect harmony with the historical policy of the United States; it is in harmony with the Constitution; it is in harmony with our democratic principles and our republican form of government; it is in harmony with the principles enacted into law by this Government to aid and protect others of our economic groups since the beginning of the Government. It has been the policy followed by the Government from that day to this.

There are 23 valid laws on the statute books designed to help our several economic groups. These 23 laws have been enacted by the Congress. Each of these 23 acts of Congress authorizes and directs certain Federal agencies to fix by regulation prices, rates, wages, and services. This covers the field of business, industry, transportation, communication, public service, and the wages and hours of labor.

Congress has fixed the administration of these acts and vested the administrators of them with regulatory powers to fix prices, rates, wages, and services, with commissions, boards, bureaus, departments of Government surrounding this very Capitol on every side; and for your information let me just name a few of them. There is the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of War, the Maritime Commission, the President, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Communications Commission, the Security and Exchange Commission, the Secretary of Labor, the National Bituminous Coal Commission, the Tariff Commission, and the Administrator of Wage and Hour Division. These are just a few of the many. This list does not include the governmental powers to fix interest rates or insurance rates, or the price of gold, or the value of money, or the Federal Trade Commission, or many other agencies and institutions of this Government which, directly or indirectly, are engaged under authority of law to regulate prices and enforce fair-trade practices among and between the citizens of the United States. But the laws which I have named for you in principle and application furnish complete authority for all that is proposed to be done under H. R. 2371. We are at long last proposing now to come to the aid of the farmers with the historical aid of Federal law when we should have come first to the farmers' aid. It is the business of the Government and it is the duty of the Government to protect the weak against the strong. We have in times past been aiding the strong against the weak. Now let us fulfill our duty to the farmers; let the House Agriculture Committee report out the bill. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry unanimously reported this cost-of-production bill April 7, 1939, and made this general comment:

GENERAL COMMENT

This bill is a protection to agriculture in general. It may work some hardship on the large producer, but for the average producer it will do the job; and if agriculture is put on the proper base the large producer will adjust his production to the law of supply and demand, and agricultural labor will be taken care of in increased wages and compensation. Purchasing power will put farm labor on an equitable basis, and the farmer will be able to pay his farm labor adequate wages.

This is the best proposal yet offered to solve the farm problem. Our American farmer has sold his crops in the open market at world prices in competition with low-priced labor and very low living standards. Everything the American farmer has bought has had to pay the costs of production plus a profit and be protected against outside competition by the tariff laws. In short, the American farmer sells in an open market and buys in a closed market.

It is either this bill, or one like it, or free trade, which would have the same effect on the industrial worker that the present system has on the farmer. The industrial worker sells his product to the American consumer in a protected market and works only part time. He could sell a greater volume and work practically full time if the farmer, too, had a protected market.

This bill is an attempt to equalize conditions.

Your committee recommends S. 570 as a well-thought-out and seasoned legislative attempt to solve the agricultural problem, and by solving it induce national prosperity. Your committee believes that the American farmer is entitled to the American market at a profit.

Let us pass an honest farm bill which will raise the domestic prices of farm products to at least 100 percent of parity.

If this bill were enacted into law, we would raise the domestic market price of cotton per pound to 17 or 18 cents, the domestic market price of wheat per bushel to about $1.20, corn around 85 cents per bushel, hogs to $9.50 to $10 per hundredweight, butterfat to around 38 to 40 cents per pound, wool to about 25 cents per pound, lambs to about $8 per 100 pounds, and so on down the list of 45 or 50 agricultural products in every section of the United States and in every State in the Union.

There is no use of us begging the question any longer. There is no use of us dodging the real issue. We have 150 years of precedent, and for 150 years we, as a Government, have been engaged in applying this same principle of Federal legislation to aid and protect practically every other economic group in our society. Let us now apply this same principle of Federal legislation to aid and protect the market price of our farmers throughout this Nation and give our farmers 100 percent of cost of production; certainly not less than parity prices, if you please. Let us enact this law in this session of Congress. Let us protect the farmers of our Nation against the peril of inadequate appropriations and the perils of a post-war deflation, which will come upon us like a thief in the night unless we enact into law now an honest answer to the unsolved farm problem.

There will be no prosperity in America until there is prosperity on the farms, and there will be no prosperity on the farms until there is restoration of buying power on the part of the wage earners of the Nation. Furthermore, there will be no prosperity in America until the farmer gets a fair price for his products and has a purchasing power of his own. H. R. 2371 is the honest basic answer to this problem.

Students and Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

POST CARD FROM STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the contents of a 2- by 4-foot post card sent to me by students of the University of California at Los Angeles. Addressed to Congressmen and Senators of California, this extraordinarily large-sized post card contains the following message:

CIVIL RIGHTS IN AMERICA

To end lynch law and abolish poll taxes, which are endangering our democracy, we, students of the University of California at Los Angeles, urge immediate consideration and passage of the Wagner antilynch bill and the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill.

The post card is signed by 431 students of the university. I was very glad to receive this message from the young men and women who are the future voters and citizens of California. The interest taken by them in support of the Wagner antilynch bill and my anti-poll-tax bill shows how sincere they are in seeing that democracy shall be preserved here in the United States.

Drainage Project, Big Creek, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

LETTER FROM BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS AND ONE FROM HON. NEWT V. MILLS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been manifested toward the drainage of Big Creek, located in Richland, Franklin, Caldwell Parishes, La., and rightly so, as this stream runs through a very flat alluvial country and almost each spring, without exception, overflow water results in a tremendous loss to the farmers of these parishes.

Presently a survey is being made by the district engineer's office, Vicksburg, Miss., to determine what remedial measures should be placed into operation that will safeguard the lands from overflow, therefore I include as part of my remarks on this subject a letter I received from Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the War Department and a letter to Mr. Bennie Goyne, Rayville, La.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 17, 1940.

Hon. NEWT V. MILLS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MILLS: Reference is made to your telephone call to this office on April 20, 1940, regarding a proposed drainage project on Big Creek which is a tributary of Boeuf River, La. At that time you inquired as to whether or not Big Creek is being covered in the Department's pending report on the Ouachita River and tributaries, and you requested that a representative of this Department confer with Judge Summerlin, of Rayville, and Mr. George Franklin, of Holly Ridge, on the subject of drainage problems.

Information has now been received from Brig. Gen. M. C. Tylor, the division engineer, lower Mississippi Valley division, and Lt. Col. R. G. Moses, the district engineer, Vicksburg, Miss., that Big Creek is being given consideration in the comprehensive report on the Ouachita River and its tributaries which the Department is now making pursuant to a resolution adopted February 10, 1938, by the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives. They state also that a representative of the district office at Vicksburg conferred with Judge Summerlin and Mr. Franklin on May 3, 1940, at which time the drainage problems of Big Creek and possible remedial measures were discussed. Judge Summerlin and Mr. Franklin showed a keen interest in the problem and furnished information which substantiated the data previously obtained by the Department's field investigations.

It is expected that the afore-mentioned review report will be received in this office on or about December 1, 1940. The Department will be pleased to notify you when this report is received and to afford you or your secretary access to it at your convenience in this office.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Brigadier General, Assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1940.

Mr. BENNIE GOYNE,
Rayville, La.

DEAR BENNIE: You recall I introduced the necessary legislation which was passed by Congress proposing a survey of Boeuf River and its tributaries; however, it is first necessary that a report be submitted by the Mississippi River Commission, Vicksburg, Miss., as to the proper drainage procedure.

As shown by the enclosure, it is hoped to have a report in the Washington office by December 1, 1940, after which it will be my aim, if reelected to Congress, to secure the necessary appropriation to carry out the War Department's recommendation to drain your section.

When I came to Congress the necessary legislation had been passed to construct the Eudora floodway, which was supposed to have been constructed through the parishes of East Carroll, Madison, Tensas, and Concordia, so my delay in not having made more progress toward the drainage of your section is because the necessary legislation had to be adopted divorcing the Eudora floodway from the Morganza floodway. Therefore I am sure you remember the fight all interested parties had to divorce these two floodways.

I talked with Capt. Miles Reber, War Department, this week and he advised me that the main levees of the Morganza floodway were practically completed; therefore I believe that rapid progress is being made toward helping solve the flood question, as it is held the Morganza floodway will probably lower the backwater area of your section 1½ feet.

I have worked diligently in interest of flood protection for the Fifth District, and I believe in 2 more years we will have made rapid progress.

As ever,

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

The United States Has Met the Challenge of Other Nations in Air Supremacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ADDRESS OF OSWALD RYAN AT THE MORGANTOWN, W. VA. CELEBRATION OF THE "FLYING FORTIES"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 18, was an outstanding day in the history of Morgantown, W. Va. On that date more than 25,000 persons visited the million-dollar airport which is nearing completion there. From morning until night events were staged which thrilled and interested our people who are intensely cognizant of the swiftly moving development of aviation.

Six of the latest type bombers from the Navy flew from Anacostia to this splendid West Virginia airport which is now ready to take its place, not only in the progress of civil aviation, but also in the plan of national defense. Oswald Ryan, member of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, spoke at a noon luncheon, where more than 300 civic leaders gathered. He praised the foresight of those individuals who contributed to the building of an airport which is strategically located for close coordination to our defense measures. In the same vein Gill Robb Wilson, president of the National Aeronautic Association, spoke to the air-minded populace. It was gratifying to hear J. J. O'Donovan, vice president of Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, tell of the plans of his company to include Morgantown on a proposed Pittsburgh-Atlanta route.

On behalf of the Morgantown trading area, and voicing the thoughts of its splendid citizenry, I can say we all join in pledging our full cooperation in these trying days. At this point I include the excellent address of Mr. Ryan.

The United States, in the field of civil aviation, in the past decade has met the challenge of the five greatest aeronautical nations of Europe and has won unquestioned supremacy over the rest of the world in this field. If we Americans are now forced in defense of our liberties and our way of life to turn our aeronautical genius from the pursuits of peace to the art of war in the air, that same American genius will be equal to the task of achieving supremacy in the field of aerial defense.

CIVIL AVIATION IS BACKLOG

Nor will it be correct for any nation to assume that nothing has yet been accomplished by this country for aerial defense. Civil aviation is the backlog of military aviation and Congress, realizing the terrible price a democratic nation might be called upon to pay for neglecting its civil aviation, adopted the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That statute, passed months before Munich, established a national policy for the development of a civil aviation adequate to the needs of our commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense.

Under the authority of that national law measures have for nearly 2 years been in process of fulfillment, the significance of which now becomes clear to all. The forces of civil aviation have been on the march. We are not compelled to start from scratch.

In the first place we have, already established and in operation, an aircraft industry which will be the sound foundation for the expansion that must necessarily come as a result of the present defense program. Those little sheds where American airplanes had their beginnings have given way to vast manufacturing plants where scientific research joins with engineering and mechanical skill to produce the best civil and military airplanes in the world. The problem of producing the skilled and semiskilled labor necessary to operate our aircraft manufacturing facilities also has not been overlooked. For more than a year an interdepartmental committee, established by the President of the United States, has been engaged in study upon this vital problem of a labor supply sufficient to take care of the aircraft expansion program and to meet the needs of a national emergency. As chairman of that committee I can say that substantial progress has been made and that the essential plans for the solution of the problem have already been formulated and for months have been in process of fulfillment.

PILOTS TRAINED IN PROGRAM

In addition to the problem of aircraft production and the problem of skilled-labor supply for the aircraft industry, there is also the problem of the civilian pilot. And here also we can report substantial progress in civil aviation. In the second semester of the 1938–39 college year the Civil Aeronautics Authority conducted an experimental training program for the training of civilian pilots in some 13 selected colleges and universities of the country. That trial program was a success and last fall we instituted a Nation-wide training program in some 437 colleges and in a number of non-college training centers. Some 330 pilots were graduated from the initial program and within the next 2 months we expect to add 10,000 more trained pilots to the Nation's supply. The machinery for this vast training program is already established and in operation and its expansion would be a simple problem.

In the last World War it was necessary to train military pilots in terrific haste. The casualty list was enormous. The emergency pressure was so great that more men were killed in this country in the training process than died afterward in battle in France. The British and the French were forced to send some of their boys to the front with only nine or ten hours of training, and the human waste was tragic. We Americans will not be faced with such a terrible choice. The safety record thus far attained by the Civil Aeronautics Authority's pilot-training program is without parallel. Civil aviation is in a position to offer to the military services, in the event of emergency, young men who have already proved their worth. They have taken the first hurdles; they are fit; they have demonstrated their ability to fly safely. They are ready for the additional training which would be required to make them military pilots, and their chance of safely and successfully completing that military training has been enormously increased.

TRANSPORT AIR LINES GO AHEAD

There is still another contribution which civil aviation can offer to the national defense—the development of air transport. Reliable reports from the scene of European military operations within the past week testify to the essential value of civil air transport in moving troops with tremendous speed. American scheduled transport lines have outdistanced all the other nations of the world. Even in normal times our American air transports fly almost twice as many miles and carry more passengers and more mail than do the combined air lines of Germany, Italy, France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, and in speed and safety they surpass the air lines of any other nation.

An equally notable achievement has been accomplished by our international air carriers. Our pioneers of air commerce have linked the United States with Bermuda in the Atlantic, with the countries of Central and South America, with far-off Asia across the Pacific, and within the past year they have established regular air transportation with Europe.

In the event of our involvement in war, these civil air lines would be of invaluable service. Nearly 75 percent of our air-line pilots are graduates of service schools; many of them have kept their reserve commissions, which means that they have kept in training for combat work. Short of dire emergency, however, these pilots would be required for transporting troops and supplies and assisting in the maintenance of the air-transportation system which would be required by the national defense.

NATIONS COME CLOSE TOGETHER

Our international air lines especially would have particular value to the continental defense. It is 7,000 miles from Miami to Buenos Aires in the Argentine—over twice the distance from New York to London or Paris. Before the close of the present summer you will be able to fly that distance in 3½ days, instead of the 5 which is now required. The North and South American continents have shrunk to the measure of man's hand, and it is the hand of good neighborliness, the symbol of all-American unity. Nothing has contributed more to the development of our close and harmonious relations with our fellow Republics of Central and South America than have our American-flag air lines. It would be difficult to overestimate their value to the national defense.

Let me repeat that in these anxious days, while the world awaits the verdict from foreign battlefields, it is worth remembering that American civil aviation has already successfully met the challenge of the greatest aeronautical nations. If a challenge now comes to us in the arena of military aviation, we can meet that challenge in the confidence that the same genius, skill, and courage that gave us air supremacy in the civil field can be relied upon to establish our supremacy in national aerial defense. Although a vast task lies before us, the foundations have already been laid and substantial progress has already been made toward its successful fulfillment.

Recreational Demonstration Areas Are in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

LETTER FROM ARTHUR J. FREUND

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are faced with the grim duty of spending billions of dollars for rearmament. We have no alternative but to be ready for any eventuality; but it is not sound economy to neglect and abandon projects and programs that contribute just as much if not more to national solidarity and well-being as the Military Establishment.

Among the very praiseworthy functions of the Federal Government have been the recreational demonstration projects of the National Park Service. Yet, because we failed to authorize a comparatively insignificant sum of money, these projects will of necessity be discontinued after July 1 of this year.

I feel certain that this House would have provided the necessary funds if the true value of these projects were known.

The recreational demonstration projects were first authorized under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 as part of a vast program of public works. Congress saw to it that these projects were continued out of funds provided in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935 and 1937.

The National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior is responsible for the administration, operation, and maintenance of these projects, and it has done a splendid job.

There are at present 43 projects in 24 States, comprising 341,655 acres of land, which have been improved and made ready for recreational uses, on which there are improvements valued at $30,000,000. There are 70 organized camps, which accommodate 7,500 adults and children every single day.

Most all of these areas are located in the densely populated sections of the country where there is a great deficiency in recreational facilities. No other camping facilities are available in these parts of the country to serve the hundreds of thousands of children who use these camping areas. It is estimated that upward of 3,000,000 people will visit these areas this year, exclusive of campers.

Every Member of this House who lives in or near a big city, or any person who has been a public prosecutor, as I have been, or a juvenile-court official, knows how the lack of proper recreational facilities contributes to delinquency and crime. Any person who is acquainted with living conditions in crowded and congested cities knows that lack of recreational facilities contributes noticeably to health problems. Therefore it would seem obvious that the comparatively small sum needed to continue the recreational demonstration projects is money well spent. This Government of ours has spent millions upon millions of dollars for undertakings and projects of doubtful and dubious value. We have in these recreational demonstration projects something that is contributing immeasurably to the children of this country, and now it is proposed to abandon this great work.

The Government over a period of 7 years has acquired a substantial investment in these areas; the children of this Nation during that same period of time have acquired immense benefits from these facilities that are not otherwise available. Let us spend the few dollars that it will take to carry on this great program which is contributing so much to a better America.

In order to show just how much this program can mean to your district, I want to give you a concrete example of what it is doing in mine. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter which I have received from Arthur Freund, St. Louis attorney, who has been active for a number of years in child-welfare programs.

ARTHUR J. FREUND, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
St. Louis, May 17, 1940.

Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ARTHUR: I understand that the bill for the appropriation of funds for the administration, protection, and maintenance of the recreational demonstration areas of the National Park Service ($250,000 for the areas and $10,000 for vehicles) is to come up before the House of Representatives Tuesday, and I should like to write you in behalf of the measure.

The recreational demonstration areas included in 1939, 56 camps in 23 States with a total area of approximately 400,000 acres. Last year, the attendance in the camps of all classes of campers was approximately a million, and it is estimated that in 1940 this figure will rise to double the amount of last year. Income to the Treasury in 1940 is estimated to be $45,000.

In St. Louis the organizations participating in the camp project are: Girl Scouts, Park and Playground Association, Colored Y. W. C. A., and the Y. M. H. A.-Y. W. H. A. Approximately 2,500 local children, most of whom come from low-wage scale families, are looking forward to the privilege of having a wholesome and healthful vacation out of doors under trained leadership and in safe surroundings. To deny the children the opportunities for healthful outdoor living would, in my opinion, be most unfortunate.

At the present time the "Y" is making plans for the operation of its camp on the Lake of the Ozarks similarly to plans being made by the other above-mentioned agencies. We have had to contract for supplies, employ counselors and other help, and have incurred considerable expense, based on the use of the camp by our constituency, all or part of which would be lost. The situation of the St. Louis agency camps is probably no different from other communities. While I recognize other demands on the Treasury of the United States, I believe the amount requested is comparatively small and will bring excellent results.

Last year a bill (H. R. 3959, 76th Cong.) designed to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to transfer some of the areas to States or municipalities was vetoed by the President. There were certain objections which were raised at the time, and even if the legislation had been enacted, the entire problem of the camp areas would not be solved. There are some States that are not in a position to assume responsibility at the moment for the camping areas and there are other areas of national recreational importance that should be permanently administered by the National Park Service.

In the above communication I have attempted to give you some of the facts of our camping problem, which I trust you will find helpful. I have not overemphasized the humanitarian aspect involved in the possible discontinuance of the camps, but to me this is the most important feature of the entire appropriation. I feel certain that if I were to voice the sentiments of the many thousands of children who are looking forward to their camping experience, you would receive the most appreciative expression of gratefulness that could be given to any person.

If there are any additional facts that you would like to have, please wire me and I will see that you secure the data immediately.

With appreciation for your efforts and kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR J. FREUND.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

TESTIMONY OF HENRY H. COLLINS, JR.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the testimony of Henry H. Collins, Jr. Mr. Collins appeared before a judiciary subcommittee for the Descendants of the American Revolution in behalf of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, at my appearance before this body last month, members of the committee asked certain questions, the answers to which I said I would be glad to supply upon the preparation of the necessary background material.

The first of these questions dealt with the power of Congress to take action eliminating the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections. The Descendants of the American Revolution feel not only that the Congress has such a right but that it also has such a duty. From section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States we read:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, * * *. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, * * * is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged * * * the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State." Section 5 of the fourteenth amendment states, "the Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

Consequently, it is clear that Congress must pursue either one of two alternatives. Either it must eliminate the poll tax on account of its abridgement of the right to vote; or else it must reduce the representation in Congress of those States that require the payment of such a tax as a prerequisite to casting a ballot.

In the non-poll-tax States in 1936 an average of 119,500, and in 1938 an average of 100,600, votes were cast in each district election. If this is a normal exercise of the franchise in the average district of 280,000 people without a poll tax, as it seems to be, then we may estimate the degree by which these figures differ from the 32,400 and 15,040 votes cast in the average poll-tax district election (in 1936 and 1938, respectively) as the degree by which the poll tax abridges the right to vote. This difference was 73 percent in 1936 and 85 percent in 1938. Should the above provisions of article 14 of the Constitution be enforced, therefore, as we firmly believe they should be, the representation of the poll-tax States would be reduced in the following manner:

	Present number of Representatives	Reduced number of Representatives based on elections in—	
		1936	1938
Alabama	9	2	1
Arkansas	7	2	1
Georgia	10	2	1
Mississippi	7	1	1
South Carolina	6	1	1
Tennessee	9	3	3
Texas	21	7	4
Virginia	9	3	1
	78	21	13

Thus, instead of 78 Representatives in the House, the poll-tax States are only constitutionally entitled to 21 or 13. If this bill eliminating the poll tax is not passed, then we ask that Congress carry out the injunction laid upon it by the fourteenth amendment and reduce the representation of these States accordingly.

The second question raised by one of the Members was whether degrees in the exercise of the franchise between different districts might not be occasioned in part by their relative wealth or poverty. If I am not mistaken he expressed the thought that as a rule poor people were less apt to vote, everything else being equal, than were their brethren who were better off. We know that many of the poll-tax States are not wealthy and if this contention were true it might suggest one reason for the small number of persons in them exercising the franchise. To answer this question, it is necessary to study States where the franchise is relatively unrestricted and which contain both depressed and non-depressed areas. Using as criteria for determining relative degrees of prosperity figures from the 1930 and 1937 unemployment censuses and from the lists of those receiving Federal relief in 1935, it has been possible to select in certain States congressional districts that may be described as depressed and others that may be described as not depressed or relatively prosperous.

In the depressed Twenty-fourth district of Illinois 49 percent of the people voted in the last congressional election. In the relatively prosperous 17th district only 42 percent cast a ballot. In depressed district 12 of Michigan, 41 percent voted as against 35 percent in good district 2. A similar correlation is true for Minnesota's eighth and second districts. New Jersey shows that 50 percent of the population of depressed district 2 voted as against 35 percent in non-depressed district 8. The same is true of my State, Pennsylvania, where depressed district 13 showed 41 percent of the people voting as against 38 percent in the relatively prosperous tenth district. On the other hand California's districts 2 and 8 show the reverse; but this was the only eligible State that countered the trend. The evidence, therefore, is not all one-sided but I believe the final averages will sustain the theory that, everything else being equal and the franchise relatively unrestricted, depressed areas tend to cast a somewhat higher percentage of votes than those areas which are not so unfortunate. At least it is clear that the opposite is not true and that poverty does not lead to a neglect of the ballot. I hope to supply later a table showing the details of this study, which may shed further light on this problem.

The third question asked by the committee was whether the sharp decline in the last 60 years in the votes cast in the poll-tax States might not also be reflected in some other States; and what had been the general trend during that period in major Presidential elections. Study of the figures, however, has shown that the decay of democracy in the poll-tax States has been paralleled by a great extension of democracy in the rest of the Nation. Whereas in 1876 18 percent of the people in the poll-tax States voted, in 1936 this had been reduced to 12 percent, a loss of over one-third. But in the non-poll-tax States where 23 percent had voted in 1876, 44 percent voted in 1936, almost twice as many. Adjusted for women's suffrage to show the percentage vote of the sex with the franchise, we find that the potential population voting in the poll-tax States has dropped from 37 to 12 percent, more than two-thirds, whereas in the non-poll-tax States it has remained relatively stationary at 44 to 45 percent.

Taking the percentage of the total population voting, we find that in Arkansas, where 100 voted in 1876, only 49 do today; in Mississippi only 41; and in South Carolina only 26. When we adjust for women's suffrage, however, we find that in every poll-tax State the percentage of potential population voting has dropped practically in half. In Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Virginia it has fallen even further, for where 100 males voted in 1876, less than 31 males and females do today; and in the outstanding case of South Carolina, barely 13 persons voted in 1936 where 100 voted 60 years before. And this in a Presidential election.

During this same period, however, the percentage of the population voting in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Iowa had followed the non-poll-tax average and gone up from 23 percent in 1876 to 44 percent in 1936, while such States as Indiana, Maine, Illinois, and Delaware showed a much sharper rise from 21 percent to 48 percent.

Now, on the subject of primaries. Supporters of the poll tax frequently claim that election figures mean little in the poll-tax States on account of the one-party system. Of course, if there were no poll tax and true democracy there would be no one-party system. But these people tell us, "You must go to the Democratic primaries to see how many people take part in politics down there." Now, Mr. Chairman, going to the primaries is more easily said than done. Primary figures are not consolidated and gathered together in one place either here in Washington or in many States. However, researches made have given us exact figures on 64 different primaries and the 64 ensuing elections. These are taken from 3 election years, 1934, 1936, 1938, from 4 States, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and from 33 different congressional districts. These figures are quite startling. We find, for example, that less than 50 percent additional votes are cast in the Democratic primaries than in the general elections; and the election figures are so small that, even with this 50 percent added, fewer than 23,000 persons voted in the average poll-tax district primary; and this is less than a quarter of the 100,000 who voted in the average non-poll-tax district election.

Going into these figures further, we find that the total primary vote of all 7 successful candidates from Mississippi in the Presidential year 1936 was 105,000. Yet in South Dakota that year 1 successful candidate received 108,000 votes. One Congressman from Oregon obtained 114,000 votes and one from California 119,000. Two Congressmen from Ohio, 5 from Illinois, and 7 from New York each received in the 1936 election more than the 105,000 votes that the entire Mississippi delegation obtained in the primary.

Yet the Mississippians have 7 votes, and each of these others has 1. Now, what kind of a democracy is that?

You have been told of the shocking condition by which 29 Members of the House from the poll-tax States did not receive a single opposition vote in the last election. Not one. You might assume, however, that these gentlemen always had spirited primary contests. Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. Out of 64 Democratic poll-tax primaries, 22, or more than one-third, were absolutely uncontested. Thirteen of these 22 faced no opposition in the election, either. In Alabama in 1934, 4 out of her 9 Representatives received no opposition in the primary; in Georgia, in 1936, 5 out of 10 primaries were absolutely undisputed. In Mississippi they don't even go to the polls, apparently, where there is no opposition, and the winning candidate who, in 1938, received the record low of 2,172 votes in the election *received no opposition in the primary at all.*

The Representative from the Second district of Georgia, who has such a commanding position in the Rules Committee, is supported by an almost invisible electorate. In the last election he received 5,187 votes; 4 years before he received 3,369. His primary vote last year was only 14,802. Almost no one outside of the poll-tax States got such a small vote in either election. In fact, 149 Members of the House each received three times as many votes in the last election as this Representative from Georgia did in his primary, and these 149 represent almost the entire delegations of 25 States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Fifty-six more Members, representing almost half the delegations from Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, received over four times as many. What is worse, this Representative from Georgia is not alone in the small number of votes he received, for 11 others of the 64 received less than 15,000 votes apiece in the primaries.

Mr. Chairman, I have, of course, the statistics to support all the figures mentioned and as soon as they can be put in the proper form I should like to add them to the record for your reference, for the more deeply one studies this problem the more thoroughly is one convinced that as long as there is a poll tax in eight States there can be no real democracy in those States or anywhere else in the country. The Descendants of the American Revolution, whose forefathers fought for democracy in their day, urge you to aid in the fight for democracy in the present day by favorably and speedily reporting the Geyer bill to the House.

Census Enumerators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

LETTER FROM BEATRICE E. McINTYRE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter that I received from an enumerator in my district. This letter is typical of many that I have received from census enumerators.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., *April 26, 1940.*

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: Permit me to congratulate you on the type of supervisors chosen for the census, and then, in turn, for the enumerators selected from the seventeenth district.

Some of these were doubtless political appointments (if we can believe the newspapers), but I have never worked with a more conscientious group of people. Mistakes were made by all of us and the going wasn't always smooth, but on the whole the spirit of cooperation and the desire to do the job right was so unusual that I marvel at your capacity for picking your keymen.

Mr. Pawl was the instructor in the room to which I was assigned during the 3-day instruction course, and he certainly gave us everything he had. In fact, both he and Mr. Pierce wore themselves ragged trying to complete the course in three easy lessons.

It was certainly no easy task trying to cover the text and 36 analytical minds straining to find the reason for all the correct answers.

I was grateful for the opportunity of earning the money and the experience would have been worth anybody's time. In addition, I learned, too, in comparison our standard of living is much lower than those receiving less wages than my husband, and yet, strangely enough, our standard of living is much higher than those in our same wage bracket. So it would seem if we draw a conclusion from 1,102 people enumerated that the average wage earner doesn't use his dollar to the best advantage.

Frankly the above observations gave me a jolt, and I was ashamed when I saw how beautifully others do manage on fifty or sixty dollars a month.

The projects of the S. R. A. and others have enabled people to keep their self-respect, and they do appreciate it. My territory was in the lower wage bracket group, and from all accounts I had the easiest district to work, while the homes of the professional class were the most difficult.

But perhaps it was as one enumerator remarked to me after an unusually trying day, "No wonder you have it so easy, your people are used to being brow-beaten." (After seeing Grapes of Wrath last evening, I wonder.)

In closing, may I also thank you for the cookbook sent me last week.

Very truly yours,

BEATRICE E. McINTYRE.

Proposed Amendments of Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

RESOLUTIONS BY THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit for the information of the House the all-important resolutions adopted by the general executive board of the United Shoe Workers of America, of the C. I. O., urging opposition to any relaxation or elimination of the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act, the Wage and Hour Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, as a result of the present war hysteria:

Whereas labor legislation passed by Congress since 1933 has set only a minimum standard for health and decency for millions of American workers; and

Whereas millions are still unemployed and receive inadequate income to maintain human existence on any scale approaching an American standard; and

Whereas these millions of unemployed are anxious and willing to work if opportunities for employment are available: Therefore be it

Resolved by the general executive board of the United Shoe Workers of America of the C. I. O. in session duly assembled in Washington D. C., May 21, 1940, That the efforts of anti-labor, anti-New Deal forces to relax and eliminate the labor laws properly known as the Walsh-Healey Act, the Wage and Hour Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, and the Wagner Labor Relations Act be condemned and opposed by every trade unionist; and be it further

Resolved, That Members of Congress be urged to resist every effort to eliminate parliamentary Democratic procedure in an effort to amend these laws quickly under the war hysteria; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Perkins, Representative MARY NORTON, chairman of the House Committee on Labor, Senator ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and to Members of Congress in the shoe-producing districts.

The School-Building Program of the Public Works Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

myself at the dedication of the new Berkeley Springs, W. Va., High School last evening:

I am delighted to be with you tonight and to bring you the best wishes of the Public Works Administration.

It has been my pleasure to be present at the dedication exercises for several P. W. A. projects, and it has always been of particular satisfaction to take part in the dedicatory ceremonies of a new school. But it is of particular significance to me when I realize that it is the final stage in the realization of a long-cherished hope—adequate educational facilities for your children.

Education is the first line of mental defense of any nation, and the greatest asset of any nation is its youth, and how true this is of America. From the beginning of the Republic, school construction has always been a major objective, but it has never kept pace with the growth of student population.

The trend of student enrollment has been growing year by year in the face of erratic and inadequate provision for the annual increase in the number of students. In 1918 it was 20,800,000; in 1924 it was 24,300,000; in 1930, 25,700,000; in 1934, 26,700,000; in 1936, 27,300,000; and in 1937 it was nearly 28,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION SLOWS DOWN

During recent years, particularly during the period 1930 to 1933, school construction was not only slowed down but fell far below the actual needs of the Nation. Over a period when educational facilities should have been expanded, expenditures for new school construction were generally curtailed throughout the entire country. In most cases this curtailment was necessary due to a lack of funds. The result, however, was an accumulated shortage of school accommodations, which began in 1926 and reached serious proportions by 1933.

In 1926 school construction had dropped from a normal outlay of $400,000,000 annually to less than $100,000,000 in 1933, with indications of an almost complete discontinuance in 1934. Two out of every five schools in the country had been built before the turn of the century, and a large number of buildings were obsolete. Many of these were unsafe, unsanitary, and dangerously susceptible to fire. Moreover many buildings were overcrowded and far too many communities, particularly of the suburban type, were without their own school facilities.

When the Public Works Administration was established in 1933 President Roosevelt insisted that the thousands of applications which poured in from every section of the country for loans and grants toward the construction of new schools be given priority, and it might be of interest to know that of the more than 34,000 applications that have been received over the past 6 years for P. W. A. projects 43 percent have been for school facilities, and P. W. A. is proud to have been able to aid materially in overcoming the acute shortage of adequate schools throughout the Nation. Over a period of nearly 7 years there have been 7,316 educational building projects involving 12,690 buildings offering 59,522 classrooms with accommodations for 2,380,880 students, the cost of which has been $1,181,536,010, for which the Federal Government, through P. W. A., made direct grants of $481,253,841. In addition to classrooms, P. W. A. projects have added to the educational plant of the Nation 4,300 auditoriums, 3,500 gymnasiums, 1,000 libraries, 1,350 shops, 800 cafeterias, and approximately 12,000 other units, including laboratories, study hall, and science and commercial classrooms.

P. W. A. LEADS SCHOOL PROGRAM

All in all, P. W. A. has accounted for more than 70 percent of all school construction carried on in the Nation since 1933.

In general, P. W. A. allotments for school construction have served four main purposes:

(1) To provide new facilities to meet the needs of existing populations and growing enrollments;

(2) To replace unsafe and obsolete small buildings with modern consolidated schools;

(3) To provide new structures with modern equipment to replace obsolete and overcrowded buildings, without proper heating, ventilation, lighting, and sanitation; and

(4) To provide needed additions and improvements to existing buildings.

Largely due to the Federal Government's willingness to share the cost of local public works, in order to put men to work, a number of communities which had no school facilities whatever for large groups of children undertook to build schools. For example, in Grand Isle County, Vt., there have existed for generations primary schools, but no high school. Students have always been forced to journey to high schools many miles away. However, with the aid of a P. W. A. grant of $28,000, Grand Isle County was able to build a $63,000 building—the first high school in the county. At the other end of the country, in Palm Springs, Calif., a new P. W. A. high school was constructed to save the children a daily bus trip of 50 miles to the nearest school in Banning.

There are many other instances of P. W. A. aid in bringing schools where none existed before. Far more typical is the work done to bring modern consolidated schools in place of one-room structures.

The little red schoolhouse, like McGuffey's Reader, is a product of a bygone era, yet while the reader has disappeared, except as a collector's item, the little red schoolhouse is still present in many localities. There are 142,000 of them out of a total of 246,000 schools, and in these little structures a single teacher most often teaches children of all ages and all grades, and these children must prepare themselves under such handicaps for the future. Despite the appearance of economy, educators point out, the little one-room schools are expensive anachronisms, for it may cost less to do a better job in a centralized modern school.

Lyme, Conn., was one of the first communities to seek P. W. A. assistance in bringing its school facilities up to current times. In 1789 a one-room schoolhouse was built in Lyme. The town added four more one-room structures by 1847. They were good schools according to the standards of those times. However, they lacked ventilation, proper lighting, and other necessary facilities. Heat was provided by cast-iron stoves. Long before 1933 everyone was ready to admit that Lyme had gotten its money's worth out of its century-old schools. However, something better was needed for the children, but it was not until P. W. A. was set up that the school districts could get together with the hope of a new building. An application to P. W. A. brought them an outright grant of $8,400 for a $32,700 modern school plant. The new building, adapted to local architectural style, accommodates 160 pupils, a few more than the total capacity of the five one-room buildings it has replaced. Lyme offers a typical example of what P. W. A. had been doing to help in the movement toward consolidation. In a number of instances P. W. A. has cooperated with State educational authorities and planning boards toward this end.

By providing assistance for the construction of 790 consolidated schools throughout the Nation, P. W. A. eliminated 1,582 obsolete structures. Moreover, the movement has been given impetus by the construction of new and improved P. W. A.-financed roads and highways, on which school busses can travel. P. W. A. also made allotments to school boards and other school bodies for school busses. For example, one Southern State received a grant of $197,000 to provide more than 750 busses, costing $655,000, for school children of that State.

PUPILS NOT PROPERLY HOUSED

When P. W. A. arrived on the scene there were 2,700,000 pupils going to school in temporary shelters. Hundreds of thousands of others were attending on the platoon system, one set arriving very early in the morning and rushing through their lessons by noon to make way for a later shift.

To overcome this deficiency and also to provide facilities for modern education such as laboratories, shops, and auditoriums, communities participating with P. W. A. in a public-works program, not only built new schools but also built additions and improvements to existing structures.

The West Virginia P. W. A. school program, of which this new building in Berkeley Springs is a part, was made up of 43 projects involving the construction of 202 buildings offering 706 classrooms for 28,240 students. The cost of the West Virginia schools in which P. W. A. has cooperated was $12,728,000, for which P. W. A. grants of $5,619,300 were made.

I do not want to burden you with statistics, but I have quoted these figures in order to show that the communities of the Nation have considered adequate school facilities their primary need in the matter of public works.

And Berkeley Springs is no exception. Like many another community, you had the will but not the wherewithal. The old building had become inadequate, resulting in overcrowded conditions, and in some cases extremely hazardous, and there was a serious shortage of certain important facilities. There is no question, of course, but that the old building was adequate in its day and that it has served its purpose and served it well. But today it is a different story.

Your new building now adequately houses your children. It represents the last word in modern construction and equipment and in its construction was incorporated features to promote safety of the school children. Unfortunately, in the years gone by the question of fire prevention and protection was not given enough consideration. Shortly after the turn of the century America became fire conscious, and there was a general improvement in all types of construction aimed at the prevention of the loss of life and property by fires. Gradually the firetrap school began to disappear, but this disappearance has been too slow, and it is safe to say that we have today in the United States at least 75,000 school buildings that do not afford ample fire protection.

While the school construction portion of the P. W. A. program during the past 7 years has been of great importance, we must not lose sight of the fact that the Public Works Administration was created primarily for the construction of useful and permanent public works, the relief of unemployment, and the stimulation of the country's industries. And in this aid to national recovery Berkeley Springs has had a share. Your new school, costing $198,500, provided an estimated 150,000 man-hours of employment here in Berkeley Springs.

EMPLOYMENT IS HELPED

But the stimulus that your project provided to labor did not stop here. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, every man-hour of what is called site employment provided 2½ hours of indirect labor behind the lines in industrial plants and in the transportation of finished materials. So, according to this formula, the construction of the Berkeley Springs High School provided approximately 375,000 man-hours of indirect employment in industry.

The matter of distribution of labor, direct and indirect, as the result of any public-works construction is of interest. Not long

ago my friend, David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, went to the trouble to trace back to their origin the materials and fabricated parts used in the construction of the New House Office Building in Washington. My recollection is that he found that 37 of the 48 States enjoyed some advantage from the building of that single structure. The same principle also goes for practically every Public Works Administration project of the past 7 years, and it is true of your new school building. The homely example of dropping a pebble into a quiet pool and watching the ever-widening circle of ripples is indicative of the far-reaching results to industry that a single project such as yours can have. I dare say that the brick, cement, steel, tile, and other materials that went into your new building came from at least a dozen States. Thus you can see that various industries will be affected as well as the transportation companies. In the same manner materials produced in the State of West Virginia are, no doubt, used in P. W. A. projects in all other sections of the country.

And so you good people of Berkeley Springs should be doubly proud in not only the fact that you have solved your school problem, but that you have, along with several thousand other communities, helped rebuild America.

In making grants for the construction of new schools, the Federal Government has made an investment in human values that will pay dividends to the Nation manyfold. Tonight we are dedicating this new building. Literally this is the formal turning over of the building to those who will use it, but here dedication ends and consecration begins—consecration to the ideals of education and learning—ideals which are an essential part of our American form of patriotism which is so evident in West Virginia.

And I want to offer, for P. W. A. and myself, congratulations to not only all those of you who dreamed and planned and carried out to this successful conclusion a new high school, but to all those who had a part in the construction of this building. I am very grateful for the privilege of being here. May God bless you all and the work that your school will perform.

America's State of Unpreparedness and the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE BUCYRUS (OHIO) TELEGRAPH-FORUM

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials from the Telegraph-Forum, Bucyrus, Ohio. The Bucyrus Telegraph-Forum has a splendid record of being nonpartisan in its editorial policy. The editor, Mr. Roland Peters, is fearless in his support of principles, regardless of party.

These editorials show a wide and comprehensive grasp of the more fundamental problems that now confront our Nation. They represent the type of thought he has been expressing for a number of years. If America is to be saved from the totalitarian disease that is now so rapidly consuming the other nations of the earth, it will be due to the clear thinking, to the fearlessness, and to the abiding faith in the age-old and thoroughly proven principles of sound economy and government that are the sustaining basis of all that we term civilization, which Mr. Peters so ably expresses in his editorials.

I wish every Member of Congress might find the time to read these editorials.

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum of May 17, 1940]

MR. ROOSEVELT ADMITS HE HAS THE UNITED STATES IN A CORNER

When President Roosevelt requested Congress Thursday to enact a defense program costing from a half to a billion dollars and at the same time told Congress that it would be up to Capitol Hill to find a way to finance the program he admitted that he has put the United States in a corner and that he does not know how to get out of it. Congress faces the alternative of creating new taxes to raise funds to equip our national defense as it should be equipped or of lifting the legal limit of the national-debt total.

Neither avenue of action would have been necessary if Mr. Roosevelt had kept the public trust that he assumed in the 1932 election. He entered into the campaign that year on a program of empty promises of how he would save the millions that he charged his predecessor had spent. He campaigned on a platform dedicated to economy and to finding work for the jobless. Carefully he guarded against his communistic plans to employ and pay them with public funds.

Then the billions began to roll out of the public's purse without regard for the inevitable day that always catches up with extravagance beyond ability to keep faith. Four years later he went about the country crying about how he had seen war and of how "I hate war." Fact is, he had one of the most sheltered posts during the World War that anyone could have. Four years ago he could see that world affairs were heading into an eventual conflict, but he did nothing to put the domestic house in order to be prepared for such an eventuality. Instead, he and his spenders kept bearing to the left and continued to spend the public's billions for something common sense tells anyone is impossible—prosperity by way of indebtedness.

Now, the time of which Mr. Roosevelt talked so much at Chautauqua, N. Y., is here. The war he hates is spreading across the countries of Europe. But he has not hated it enough to prepare by holding public expenditures in check in anticipation of the day that appeared inevitable a long time ago. Nor has he hated war enough to refrain from bringing America closer to it by his official blasts at the totalitarian powers and by holding for no sensible reason the liner *Bremen* to further antagonize the Nazi Government. Now the day is here when America must prepare itself for its own defense—and there is nothing with which to, other than new taxes or further jeopardization of the country's welfare by increasing the debt limit. Upon Franklin Roosevelt's shoulders rests the sole blame for America's state of unpreparedness at a time when preparedness is vital. Contrary to his every other message for spending money, each one accompanied by a plan, or rather theory for paying the bill, he now tells Congress to accept the responsibility. He is in the corner clear-thinking people have been telling him for 7 years he would eventually be in.

[May 16, 1940]

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S DUTY OF THE DAY

The increasing startlingness of Europe's war news presents a challenge to the people of the United States to take immediate cognizance of their duty to America's boys. Not many months ago a person would have been called an oaf had he advanced an opinion that Adolf Hitler could successfully seize Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Luxemburg, and Belgium and at the same time launch a drive into France.

Today we are witnessing such a seizure of nations. What next will happen cannot be foretold. In Washington preparations are being made for war, but hopes are for peace. Combined, the news from Europe and Washington is of the kind that creates emotionalism. It is our duty today to subdue this emotionalism and to keep within our minds a clear track for thoughts of the welfare of the millions of American young men who would be the first to be slaughtered were we to permit emotionalism to overpower common sense as we did back in 1917.

Within a fortnight the high schools of every American community will send into the world new crops of boys. Ninety of these lads will be graduated from our high school here. These boys are entitled to the pursuit of what has been and still are their life's dreams—a job, marriage, success. They are entitled to the fruits of democracy as we of other generations have enjoyed them. Those who would survive deserve more than stupendous taxation which would be forced upon them to pay for the war that killed their classmates. They deserve democracy as we have known it instead of the dictatorship and bossism which, without doubt, would be the lot of a nation entering a war with a $45,000,000,000 deficit.

These boys feel differently today than those of 1917. The last World War is still fresh in the minds of those who passed through it. From all sides the boys of today have heard of its hell. Today they are saying, "I won't go unless the war comes here." These are not the words of what was known in 1917 as slackers. They are an expression of self-conviction that patriotism begins and ends at home. They say they won't go, but they would. They would have to go just as the boys of 1917 had to go. They have no choice, but we of other generations can choose for them. We can prevent America's entrance into the war in Europe. We can protect the dreams of these boys until, and if, we are attacked. Then there would not be one real American who would shy away from defensive duty.

Yes; we'd wave goodbye to them. We'd wave flags as they passed on their way to a living hell, but what good would all that do them? What these boys want is a job, security and a future. Now is the time for us to be cool, push aside emotionalism and work hand in hand to keep them from Europe and to build in this America an adequate defense system to protect them even from attack at home.

President Roosevelt has not kept faith with them. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has not nor has Secretary of State Hull. From the hour war clouds began to gather in Europe, these three high representatives of the American Government have lost no opportunity to take a jab at totalitarianism and at the leaders of totalitarian states. As recently as 48 hours ago both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull told the world again that America is against Adolf Hitler. Instead of soothing the stormy waters they are agitating them. If America's boys of today are to be protected against foreign war it is going to be the task of the American

people to protect them. So far nothing but a belligerent attitude has been shown by the Government's keymen who should possess sufficient intelligence to know that name-calling is the first step to actual fighting.

Celebration of Foreign Trade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT AND ADDRESS BY HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of the President of the United States (read by Secretary Hull), and radio address of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in connection with the celebration of Foreign Trade Week, on May 19, 1940:

It gives me great pleasure to read the following message of the President of the United States:

"As on similar occasions in the past, I am happy to extend again my most cordial greetings to all those who are participating in the observance of Foreign Trade Week.

"This important annual observance is becoming traditional in our national life. It is a valuable occasion for renewing our appreciation of the essential significance of foreign trade for the economic well-being of our Nation. It is a reminder that vigorous and mutually beneficial trade relations among nations are essential for the maintenance of enduring world peace.

"Today we are all profoundly conscious of the black cloud of war overhanging so much of the world's surface. The devastating and widespread wars now being waged have far-reaching economic and spiritual effects. Some of these effects fall heavily upon our our county.

"The tragic events now transpiring bear eloquent testimony to the fundamental need for liberal economic policies in international relations, if, in the future, frictions, conflicts, and wars among nations are to be averted. They serve also to emphasize the inescapable fact that our Nation cannot enjoy sustained and satisfactory prosperity unless adequate foreign markets exist for our exportable surpluses and unless our necessary imports are unhampered by adverse developments at home and abroad.

"The promotion of liberal economic policies has been—and will continue to be—a vital part and a dominant purpose of the foreign policy of the United States. In this way, and in this way alone, can the United States contribute to the economic reconstruction of the world when the destruction now going on shall have ceased.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

The observance of Foreign Trade Week occurs this year at a time when the international situation is extraordinarily grave. Large portions of two continents are being ravaged by violent and destructive warfare. The repercussions of these titanic struggles extend to the uttermost corners of the earth. They will have a profound influence, in innumerable ways, upon the future of this Nation and of every nation.

The disorganization and disruption of the normal processes of life in important areas of the globe have already produced serious effects upon our foreign trade and upon our shipping, and, through them, upon many other phases of our economic life.

As regards current trade, both exports and imports are involved. Apart from the other 20 American republics, all of the foreign countries which are the principal customers for our products are affected by war. Some of them have ceased their purchases from us almost altogether because of the exigencies of wartime controls. Others have had to subject their foreign trade to stringent regulation, which has had the effect of changing substantially the composition of our exports.

The result of all this is that while some of our exporting branches of production are experiencing temporarily an intensified demand for their products, others are subjected to a slackening of foreign demand. Our total exports have increased substantially during the war months. They amounted to $2,607,000,000 during the period from September 1939 to April 1940, as compared with $1,952,000,000 during the corresponding period of 1938–39. Obviously, the increases have far outweighed the decreases. Nevertheless, the decline of foreign demand for some of our important export products has naturally created hardships for the agricultural and manufacturing industries involved. We must frankly face the possibility that these difficulties may become greater. The Government is constantly engaged in most earnest efforts to reduce these difficulties as much as possible through negotiations and conversations with foreign governments.

On the import side, too, the effects of war are felt in our economic life. In some cases, disordered conditions abroad give rise to situations in which domestic industries face the impact of additional competition from imports. Where this is the case, the Government, of course, takes appropriate measures to deal with the situation. But there also are other, and entirely different, ways in which the war is affecting our imports. Wartime exigencies have made it more difficult for our manufacturers to secure some of the raw materials which they must bring in from abroad for their operations. War has made it more difficult for our consumers to obtain some of the commodities produced abroad to the use of which they have long become accustomed. Here, too, the Government is making most earnest efforts to eliminate or reduce some of the war-created obstructions to a continued inflow of imports essential to the functioning of our economic life, to our national defense, and to the comfort of our people.

In part, the difficulties experienced in both our export and our import trade are due to dislocations of shipping caused by the war. In this connection, I should like to say a word about our own shipping problem, a reference to which is particularly appropriate at this time, because foreign-trade week traditionally coincides with the observance, on May 22, of National Maritime Day.

In pursuing a course of policy designed to reduce the risks of our possible involvement in war, it has been deemed wise to forbid our merchant vessels from entering certain designated zones of danger. This measure, adopted with the view to safeguarding our highest national interest, has obviously imposed handicaps on our merchant marine, which has been compelled temporarily to abandon some of its most valuable trade routes.

It is immensely gratifying to observe the energy and initiative with which our shipping industry has sought to adjust itself to the new emergency conditions. Some new routes have been mapped out and arrangements have been made for new ports of call. Government effort and private enterprise have worked, each in its own sphere, to bring about the necessary adjustments. Today, most of the merchant fleet flying the American flag is again busily employed in passenger and freight traffic.

Some of the tonnage formerly used for trans-Atlantic sailings now plies in the waters of the Western Hemisphere. This is a consequence of the fact that, as between our country and the other American republics, trade has, in recent months, substantially increased.

In trade, as in shipping, the difficulties to which wars abroad have given rise cannot be adjusted by Government alone or by business alone. The Government, through the various avenues of action open to it, can and must, create conditions in which private enterprise can function most effectively. It alone is capable of inducing other governments to moderate the severity of the restrictions which they impose to the detriment of American trade. In time of war, the Government's tasks in this respect multiply with the multiplication of restraints on trade. But, beyond that, whether in war or in peace, the prosperity of our foreign commerce must depend upon the vigor and ingenuity of those actually engaged in the process of trade, upon their initiative and enterprise.

From this point of view, I have every confidence in the ability of our businessmen to make the adjustments necessitated by the war emergency. They have already shown their capacity in this direction. I have equal confidence in their ability to resume vigorous progress in the foreign-trade field when peace is restored—if our Government and other governments will have the wisdom to create sound conditions for the functioning of international trade.

The qualities I have enumerated—energy, ingenuity, initiative, enterprise—are traditionally American. By possessing them and by using them, in a political system based on democratic institutions and on individual freedom under law, our farmers, our workmen, and our businessmen have been responsible for the vast economic expansion which has characterized so vividly the history of our Nation. Our further national-economic growtn requires the greatest practicable development both of our domestic economy and of our foreign commerce. Neither can function satisfactorily or soundly without the other.

What has happened in the last few months has brought out strikingly—perhaps more strikingly than ever before—the effects of foreign trade upon our national well-being. For the present the difficulties experienced by those of our surplus-producing branches of agriculture and industry, which are being affected by the sudden wartime curtailment of foreign markets, are being relieved to some extent by the general economic improvement in the country, resulting, in part, from the expansion of other exports. But it must be increasingly clear—to everyone who would but open his eyes to what is going on today—that permanent and stable prosperity for our surplus-producing branches of both agriculture and industry—and therefore for the country as a whole—is possible only in a world which is at peace and in which expanding economic activity in all countries makes possible increasing employment and consumption and hence rising standards of living everywhere.

The difficulties which we now experience in securing some of our essential imports provide an added unanswerable refutation to those who indulge in reckless assertions that our country can isolate itself from the rest of the world and prosper. The commodities which we bring in from abroad consist overwhelmingly of raw materials and foodstuffs which we either do not produce at all or else produce in insufficient quantities, and of various products and

specialties which differ markedly from our own production in quality, price, season of marketing, etc., and without which our people cannot maintain their accustomed standards of comfort and enjoyment. There is no occasion for rejoicing when our imports of these essential commodities decline. That is a sure sign that some of our factories stand idle and therefore need smaller amounts of raw materials. That is a sure sign that the purchasing power of our people has been curtailed by unemployment, lower wages, or lower prices. That is a sure sign that our exports, too, must decline.

Loss of foreign markets for our exportable surpluses disorganizes and reduces our domestic market as well, causing disastrous unemployment of human and material resources. Reduced to its simplest terms, the importance of foreign trade to our national economic well-being may be stated as follows:

If we were to shut out by means of embargo policies every dollar's worth of agricultural imports and every dollar's worth of imports of manufactured goods—and thereby shut in our own agricultural exports and our own exports of factory products—we would put into cultivation about 10,000,000 acres and take out of cultivation over 40,000,000 acres; and we would take out of employment at least two or three times as many men as might conceivably be employed to make the goods now imported.

These results would inexorably follow if our country were to enter upon an embargo policy as regards tariffs, quotas, controlled exchanges, or other trade-destroying devices. For the embargo game can be played by foreign countries, as well as by us. And there is nothing more certain in international trade relations than a vicious cycle of retaliation and counterretaliation once any country is short-sighted enough to start the process. The bitter experience of the period following the World War bears witness to this, and—much nearer home—our own disastrous experience under the embargo policy of the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

Six years ago, our country resolutely turned its back upon this type of economic suicide. By enacting the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress created an instrument with which it became possible to meet and overcome some of the pressing and extraordinary difficulties in the field of foreign trade with which our Nation was faced. During the period of its operation to date, the trade-agreement program has amply demonstrated its effectiveness for this purpose. As was proved conclusively in recent hearings before appropriate congressional committees, it has brought marked benefits to all groups of our population and to all sections of the country, without inflicting injury on any one.

The renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years was an immensely important step from the viewpoint of both the immediate and the long-range interests of our country. As things are today and as they are likely to be for some time to come we need to have this and every other appropriate means of safeguarding our trade and of our whole economic life and of maintaining and improving the economic health and strength of our country. At the same time we must be everlastingly concerned with the broad and basic problems of the future.

The principles underlying the trade-agreements program offer the only possible basis on which the economic life of the world can be successfully rebuilt when the present wars are over. Only if these principles prevail in economic relations among nations will it be possible to create a firm foundation for stable peace and for satisfactory economic progress. If the opposite tendencies—those of totalitarian autarchy and all that it means—so ominously spreading today, should come to be widely dominant, mankind will be plunged into a period of chaos and impoverishment, and, inevitably, into moral and spiritual decay.

Our Nation has an obvious and essential stake in the establishment and preservation of conditions of stable peace and of orderly international relations. It is our duty to ourselves to make every appropriate contribution toward that end. Our paramount task today is twofold, and I cannot emphasize too strongly the vital importance of both of its phases. We must increase our national strength, redouble our national vigor and courage, create for ourselves adequate means of defending this country's safety and security against any armed challenge. And we must hold ever in readiness—for use when circumstances permit—the proven and tested instrument of constructive action for economic welfare, free enterprise, and stable peace provided by the trade-agreements program.

War and World Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. COMPTON I. WHITE OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, what will be the outcome of the war now raging in Europe, and what can we as a nation do to serve the best interest of our country and to assist humanity in restoring civilization and insure the stability of governments and safeguard the rights of people everywhere to maintain their liberty and security?

My views expressed on the subject in a recent letter are submitted for inclusion in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1940.

Mr. FRANK E. MEEK,
Post Office Box 774, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR FRANK: Your courtesy and assistance in supplying me with a copy of your letter addressed to Senator CLARK, stating your views on the international situation, is very much appreciated.

I am particularly interested in the national defense and feel that the country should be made impregnable to invasion from any quarter. I know that we are in accord in opposing war in any country, and I have never lost faith in the ideals of President Woodrow Wilson. I believe that our country should do its part in setting up a supreme authority with policing power to prevent any war anywhere in the future.

This is a big subject, and much can be said of past mistakes and measures that might have been taken to prevent the destruction and devastation that is now sweeping over Europe; but in the light of experience, let us hope that order and reason will come out of the present travail, and the family of nations will devise and put into operation an organization with supreme authority that will safeguard mankind in the future from such terrible havoc.

I deeply appreciate your assistance in making known your views on this great issue, and wish that more of the people whom I have the honor to represent would give me the benefit of their good advice on national questions.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.

Counsel of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial, which appeared in Monday's edition of the Washington Evening Star. It is aptly entitled "Counsel of Disaster," and is one of the best editorial comments which I have yet seen on the recent radio address delivered by a young man to whom it correctly refers as "a good airplane pilot":

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1940]

COUNSEL OF DISASTER

In an address which can only be described as remarkable for the inconsistency and confusion of its thought, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has told the people of America that we are in no danger of war, and that we will not become involved in war unless we seek it out ourselves.

With an assurance implying a factual knowledge which he cannot have, Colonel Lindbergh says categoricaly and without any qualification that "no one wishes to attack us." In the same breath he says that we "need a greater air force, a greater Army, and a greater Navy." The self-contradiction presented here is interesting. Since it is not to be supposed that Colonel Lindbergh has access to information concerning the plans of possible aggressors, he is giving dogmatic expression merely to a personal opinion when he says that no one wishes to attack us and that no one is in a position to do so. But if that is the case, or if he really believes it to be the case, why, then, should he urge the building up of our armed forces? For what reason would he spend money on additional arms if he does not believe there is any danger of an attack upon us?

The colonel also advances as a novel proposal the thought that we ought to decide what we are going to defend before we think about building a defensive air force. If our defense is to be confined to the United States, he says, we shall have to build one type of air force; if we are to defend the Western Hemisphere, planes of different types will be needed. That, coming from one who does not shrink from advising the Nation as to the course it should follow in this critical time, is an amazing proposition.

President Roosevelt and other high officials have stated time and again that it is our intention to defend the Western Hemisphere. Fleet and land maneuvers have been carried out with that objective in mind. From no responsible quarter has there come the

slightest suggestion that we should confine our planning to a defense of the United States alone. To do so would be the sheerest folly, and no one knows that better than Colonel Lindbergh, for he acknowledged that any attempt to defend only the United States "eventually would leave us as vulnerable to air attack as the nations of Europe are today."

Colonel Lindbergh stands alone in his uncertainty as to what our defense policy is. It is a doubt which exists in his mind and nowhere else. But that does not soften the harsh fact that in advancing the suggestion that we do not have a definite policy in this respect he is doing a disservice to the country. If accepted by the people at their face value, his remarks could only serve to shake public confidence in the administration at a time when unity is a paramount necessity.

Any and all suggestions that it is to our interest to aid the Allies in their struggle against Germany are rejected outright by Colonel Lindbergh as being the machinations of unidentified "powerful elements" in America seeking to serve their own selfish purposes. Once again he holds forth personal opinion disguised as fact, without any supporting evidence.

The President, with ready access to sources of information that are denied to Colonel Lindbergh, has stated in effect that France and Britain are fighting our battle and that they must be kept fighting at least until we can prepare ourselves. That will require precious time, a year or more at best, but the colonel counsels delay.

His advice invites disaster, as is evidenced by the fate which has befallen half a dozen stricken nations in Europe, and the American people should have little difficulty in choosing between the course advocated by the President and that which Colonel Lindbergh, a good airplane pilot, would follow.

"Spring to Arms"—What Arms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BELOIT (WIS.) DAILY NEWS

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Beloit (Wis.) Daily News on a subject at this time most acute in these United States.

[From the Beloit (Wis.) Daily News]

"SPRING TO ARMS"—WHAT ARMS?

Write it in large letters—courage is not enough.

The days are past when the United States could afford to listen to a Bryan, with his confidence that, when they were needed, "a million men would leap to arms overnight."

"What arms?" asks the American of 1940, his eyes apprehensively on Europe, and especially on the countries which trusted in nonaggression pacts, in meticulous neutrality, in patriotic spirit.

In the days when the United States rebelled against the British Crown, "embattled farmers" could crouch behind the stone fences of Concord with muskets hastily snatched from above the fireplace, secure in confidence that they were not conspicuously worse armed than the British regulars.

That is over. All men skilled in military affairs have known it for years. Now it is written across the face of Norway and Holland and Poland for all to read: "Courage is not enough."

The British should have had their lesson in 1915, when the great Kitchener felt sure that two machine guns to a battalion were "more than sufficient," and that the tank was "a pretty mechanical toy." Yet they have allowed Germany to outbuild them in planes and mechanized equipment.

We also had some object lessons in 1917–18, when our Army in France, more than a year after our declaration of war, was still using European-built artillery, machine guns, and airplanes because we were not even then able to build our own and deliver them to the fighting front.

At last the Garand rifle is being delivered in slow driblets, replacing the 1903 Springfield. The air forces have not been neglected, yet were it not for European orders, the rate of production would still be very slow. Pilot-training, almost more important than plane-building, lags. There is no antiaircraft artillery worth the name, and virtually no munitions industry.

All this is no cause for hysteria, but for sober thought, careful planning, and wise foresight.

We need to calculate carefully just what our military needs are to defend this country from any likely attack, and then supply them promptly and effectively.

For whatever heroic deeds may have been performed in the past by ill-armed and underequipped patriots, it is perfectly plain that today courage is not enough.

A Scientific Tariff Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the May 4 issue of the Christian Science Monitor gives the viewpoint of the National League of Women Voters:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 4, 1940]

STRONG TARIFF PLANKS AIM OF WOMEN'S GROUP

(By Mary Hornaday)

NEW YORK, May 4.—Both Democratic and Republican Parties will be urged by the nonpartisan National League of Women Voters to include planks on scientific tariff making and qualified Government personnel in their 1940 platforms.

Final arrangements for sending a league delegation to the platform-making sessions of both conventions were laid here at a general council meeting, following conclusion of the league's biennial convention here yesterday.

Instead of backing the Hull reciprocal trade program by name, the league wrote its tariff plank in terms it hopes will be broad enough for acceptance by Republicans as well as Democrats.

"Any party should be for a tariff that is not the result of a tug-of-war between special interests but is planned for the good of the country as a whole," declared Miss Marguerite M. Wells, of Minneapolis, Minn., newly reelected president of the league.

"Women got the vote at a time when tariff logrolling had become such a public scandal that they hated it from the beginning," added Miss Wells. "The only difference between league members and party people now on this issue is that we keep on being against logrolling all the time while they sometimes change their minds when they are in office. We believe that the promotion of scientific tariff making and the maintenance of a tariff policy that will tend to free instead of to clog the channels of international trade are very much in the public interest."

AGAINST SPOILS SYSTEM

Of the league's insistent demand for better qualified public services, Miss Wells said, "our stand on qualified personnel in Government will be that of asking the parties to pledge themselves to abolish the spoils system of patronage as destructive to democratic principles. We shall ask them to substitute principles and methods of employment that will attract the best trained citizens to the Government service."

At its final business session yesterday the league adopted a score of policies on which its board and branches in 31 States will be empowered to undertake specific campaigns during the next 2 years. Most important among these projects will be:

Promotion of more efficiency and responsibility on the part of State legislatures, opposition to interstate trade barriers, support of the principle of old-age insurance; extension of the county manager form of government as well as the city manager; development of scientific research into the field of taxation with increased regard for ability to pay; improvement in selection and procedure of juries; and attention to bettering substandard conditions of work violating the wage-hour law.

This article shows a keen interest in the wage and hour problems of our people.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who gives thought to the tariff question must admit that a protective tariff is necessary in order to give the farmer a floor under his wages and a ceiling over his hours. The farmer cannot have a desirable wage or acceptable hours if he is compelled to compete with cheap foreign labor in the production of agricultural crops. The farmer cannot be subjected to the free-trade approach of the reciprocal-trade treaties and hope to obtain the fair wages and the fair hours to which he is entitled in this country.

I expect to see more and more groups discontinue support of the reciprocal-trade treaties that have caused such losses to the dairy interests of our country. It was morally wrong for a "rubber stamp" Congress to delegate its powers to any one man to control the milk check of every dairy farmer in America and also control the grocery bill of every family in our country.

It is high time that the wages and hours of the farmers of this country had consideration, and I am happy to note that the National League of Women Voters join in this movement. As a part of their program for the next 2 years, I hope they will include a study of the wages and hours of the farmers of this country. I am sure they will not give their stamp of approval to the 20-percent reduction in the tariff on cheese in 1938, when cheese averaged only 12.6 cents per pound for the year. Their study of the wages of farmers producing 12.6-cent cheese, 5-cent hogs, and 12-cent eggs will demonstrate to the people of this country the fallacies and injustices of the free-trade approach of the reciprocal trade treaties as executed by the New Deal.

United States Far Behind in Air Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am pleased to present herewith, for the special benefit and consideration of Members of Congress, a timely editorial on air defense which appeared in the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of May 14, 1940:

UNITED STATES FAR BEHIND IN AIR DEFENSE

The United States leads the world in many things—in telephones, automobiles, radios, electric refrigerators, homes with modern plumbing, in railroad mileage, in the efficiency of its industrial production, but it lags far behind one nation—Germany—in one of the most important things of this modern world.

THAT IS MILITARY STRENGTH IN THE AIR

German air forces, by the most conservative figures, are now at least three times the size of the United States, the Nazi pilot force is nearly four times greater, and the airplane-production capacity of Germany is about six times greater than that of the United States.

The United States has now 4,165 first-line fighting planes as compared with more than 12,000 in Germany. The United States has a roster of 7,942 pilots as compared with more than 30,000 in Germany. Ground forces in this country total 53,361 compared with more than 300,000 in Germany. The production capacity of this country is now about 500 planes a month as compared with at least 3,000 a month.

Of that 500 most of them are now going to England and France. Under the expanded defense program in 1 year from next month the Navy will have 3,125 planes, the Army 5,500, a total of 8,625. There is no telling how big the German air armada will be by that time.

It is now 20 months since the Munich Pact, more than a year since the violation of Czechoslovakia, nearly a year since the end of Poland—each one an unmistakable guidepost along the road to war. In that time this Nation could have geared its aviation production to meet that of Germany. Instead we lag far behind every major power in the world.

There are bright spots behind the black picture of comparative air strength. American planes are among the best in the world. American pilots are more thoroughly trained than in any other country. American industry has the capacity to turn out more planes if given the proper incentive. No industry will produce goods unless there is a market for them. That market has increased considerably in the past few months, but still has not answered this Nation's great need for a larger air force of both planes and men.

Wichita went after a new Federal aviation laboratory some months ago. At that time it was the opinion of aviation and congressional leaders that still another laboratory besides that one that Wichita sought, but failed to gain, should be constructed. One is now on the east coast. One is to be constructed on the west coast. Surely the third should be located inland, safe from any sudden foreign attack, and nowhere is there a better location than Wichita.

Wichita failed to sell itself then, but now it has a still more powerful claim. Military leaders are giving serious attention to the dangers of a European invasion by air from a Greenland base. The serious situation in Mexico has caused considerable worry in Washington. Where, in the whole United States, is a more ideal location for an air-research center and the concentration of military-defense power than at that one point in the United States equally distant from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Canadian and Mexican borders?

That place is Wichita, and this city should redouble its efforts to gain the location of the next air laboratory here and to help speed the Nation's plane production until adequate defense in the air is gained.

The Armament Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BUFFALO COURIER-EXPRESS

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of May 20:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of May 20, 1940]

BISHOP DUFFY HITS ROOSEVELT SPEECH—ASSAILS ARMAMENT PROGRAM, FEARS TOTALITARIAN STATE, WARS TO RESULT FROM IT

Denouncing the armament speech of President Roosevelt as "the most fateful and perhaps the most tragic utterance ever made in the United States of America," the Most Reverend John A. Duffy, D. D., bishop of the Catholic diocese of Buffalo, yesterday morning pleaded with 500 members of the Buffalo post-office staff on the occasion of their annual communion breakfast to aid in "bringing back God." The breakfast was held in Hotel Lafayette.

The Catholic bishop declared that preparedness such as President Roosevelt outlined means the delivery of this Nation to the totalitarian system and alinement with the brute force that is endeavoring to destroy the civilization of the world. Speaking directly after addresses by a Congressman from Pennsylvania and an assistant postmaster, who had evoked rounds of applause with ringing pleas for militant upholding of the Monroe Doctrine, the bishop reduced his audience to silence as he presented an impassioned plea for the use of coercive force without arms.

FEARS TOTALITARIAN STATE

"Just as soon as a million men are under arms in the United States then at that moment does America become a totalitarian state and no power of democracy can change it," the bishop warned. "With this Nation and the whole of industry geared to war we can never come back and disentangle force from our civilization and return once more to the ideals of democracy and a free people.

"Because of the hysteria in Europe, because of the aims of imperialistic governments we are told that we must change our basic ideals and aline ourselves with brute force for the protection of our country—and, as far as our need goes—with the ambitions that seek the control of the world. Two hundred thousand men under arms—50,000 planes—that means militarism for ourselves and for our children and all the fine purposes, all the great democratic and pacific ideals for which we have worked for 160 years—the idea of liberty, of equality, and that this Nation, under God, shall endure—are scattered to the four winds, and we have begotten tyranny and a totalitarian government.

"If we do this, mothers, train our boys to become soldiers. And fathers, steel your hearts and souls to watch them as they become the victims of guns and planes and bayonets. Oh, I know that this is an unpopular speech. I know the sentiment. You have been worked up into a fury of fear because distances have been obliterated and the protection of 3,000 miles has been taken away. But this is a Nation under God, with German and Frenchmen and Englishmen alike, with Catholic and Jew and Protestant, white man and black, all colors, all races, all creeds, living side by side in peace. Copy the brutality of Europe today and you join them in a blood struggle that has been going on for 2,000 years.

MUST REMAIN FREE PEOPLE

"I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as a priest if I did not urge you today to use instead the coercive force without arms that we as a nation possess. Let us bring back God—not imitate the foreign program of blood. One hundred and twenty-five million people in this country can, I believe, unite the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere into the real world power—a coercive force without arms, the ideal and envy of the world. It is the function of America to remain a nation of free people."

This unheralded and unprecedented outburst of the bishop was received first with awed silence, then with an ovation. He then proceeded in moving simplicity to express his appreciation of the splendid demonstration of the faith of the assemblage.

"The true interests of the country are the interests of the soul," he said. "These are the ideals that tend to mold us—to meld us—into a great democratic nation."

Colonel Lindbergh's Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial, which appeared in Monday's edition of the New York Times. It is short, but very much to the point, and merits the most careful consideration of the Congress:

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1940]

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S BROADCAST

In his radio broadcast last night Colonel Lindbergh advised the American people to "stop this silly chatter of calamity and invasion that has been running rife these last few days." Let us put to one side the question of "invasion"—since Colonel Lindbergh himself believes that the country needs "a greater air force, a greater army, and a greater navy," which is all the advocates of more adequate national defense have themselves been saying. Let us consider instead "this silly chatter of calamity" that also annoys him. The "silly chatter" is the talk now heard on every side that the democracies of France and Great Britain stand in imminent danger of defeat by Germany.

Colonel Lindbergh is a peculiar young man if he can contemplate this possibility in any other light than as a calamity for the American people. He is an ignorant young man if he trusts his own premise that it makes no difference to us whether we are deprived of the historic defense of British sea power in the Atlantic Ocean. He is a blind young man if he really believes that we can live on terms of equal peace and happiness "regardless of which side wins this war" in Europe.

Colonel Lindbergh remains a great flyer.

Shackles on the Liberties of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

AN EDITORIAL

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SHACKLES ON THE LIBERTIES OF THE PEOPLE

In an earlier period of the New Deal, President Roosevelt said something about "setting up instruments of government" which, if misused, might put "shackles on the liberties of the people," or words to that effect. This pronouncement is coming in for a lively review, according to Washington observers who see the abuse of public power looming as a paramount issue in the impending Presidential campaign. A fair deal for American citizens will be the byword, they believe.

The Walter-Logan bill, revision of the Wagner Act, and amendments governing the National Labor Relations Board will be made centers of attack against the misuse of governmental power by boards and bureaus, it is said, and in the formation of battle lines observers see the Democratic leaders in Congress playing into the hands of the Republicans to give the latter a formidable weapon.

The Walter-Logan bill in particular is demanded as a guarantee of a fair deal to American citizens. It provides for court review of the arbitrary rulings of boards and bureaus and is opposed by President Roosevelt and his department heads on the ground that court opinion would interfere with liberal reforms which should be given a free hand in restrictions necessary to gain the ends sought and give Government a certain control over the economic life of the Nation.

New Deal supporters of the administration set up the ridiculous claim that enactment of the Walter-Logan law would open up a field for the lawyers, forgetting that the New Deal and the arbitrary rulings of its bureaus has increased the necessity of lawyers, accountants, and technical experts and thus advanced the cost of doing business in America—all to the detriment of consumers and employment pay rolls.

Americans will hear much about the abuse of public power to "put shackles on the liberties of the people" although administration forces no doubt will point to all this as a smoke screen to shield reactionary attempts to frustrate liberal economic reforms of the New Deal. However, those who fear bureaucratic power have recent European history to corroborate their fears. It is a matter of known fact that in Italy, Germany, and Russia the first move toward dictatorship was made in the interest of liberal reform with an assault upon the economic system and a popular appeal to labor—just as has been done under the New Deal. The result of this is well known—industry, business, agriculture, labor, and every activity of the citizen has been regimented under the hand of one-man power and orders from a small group of advisers. There is no appeal to the courts over there where the firing squad dispenses justice.

In the United States, however, it is apparent that the rank and file of the people have not yet lost faith in the integrity of the courts, despite the many assaults made upon tribunals of justice by official Washington. The Nation reacted definitely against the attempt to pack the Supreme Court and it is reacting favorably to the Walter-Logan bill, as is evidenced by the fact that the Lower House of Congress passed it by a vote of three to one over White House objection.

Now is a good time to defend the authority of the courts over the misuse of arbitrary power by the administrative branch of government. In a time of agitated hysteria over armament and national defense against an imaginary invasion, when military men are directing public opinion, it might not be a far step from bureaucratic dictation to beating drums and rattling sabers. You know the military department has the plans all worked out for use in an emergency—and an emergency might be made to work for defense as well as in time of actual war. Then would shackles be forged on the liberties of the people.

Bidding for a Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the new dealers think, by yelling "partisan" and "politics," to induce all American citizens tamely to accept their choice of a dictator, they do not rightly gage American public opinion. Hugh Johnson puts their thought quite clearly into words in his release of May 20, which reads in this wise:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

Secretary Ickes, the original triple termite, made a speech before the Amalgamated Garment Workers. It didn't get much publicity, but it was on the air. I have to paraphrase it from memory, for its purpose was a masterpiece.

It first assumed that garment workers are "the underprivileged," then it painted a picture of Mr. Roosevelt as the original and greatest champion of that class. He has only begun to take away from the "have-nots." He saved the country from revolution by this method. To prevent revolution is No. 1 item of defense. Self-preservation is the mightiest law. Therefore Mr. Roosevelt must be reelected or such followers of his may destroy the Republic.

The next point was the necessity for national unity in the face of danger. After a few punches at the economic royalists, it gloated that they are flocking to the Roosevelt standard under the stress of threatened war. The music was not that of welcome. It was haunted by the old Rooseveltian "match and master" motif: "Love me—you, I'll beat you to death." This part was a plug for class war plus a plea for unity, but that inconsistency will pass without notice.

In the third movement of this symphony Mr. Roosevelt appears the great dealer, reformer, and savior of our economic and industrial system, which is now our first reliance for defense. In the fourth he is the inspired diplomatic, naval, and military genius upon whom the whole democratic world relies for championship and who foresaw the necessity for complete rearmament and in a single recent speech united the country for it.

On this skillfully prepared foundation came the pay-off.

Washington was trotted out as the original triple termite in these circumstances, because he once said that in a crisis we should conscript services of the leader universally approved as our best.

Therefore, Mr. Roosevelt—and incidentally, Mr. Ickes—must now be drafted because "democracy universally demands it."

Thus, in a single sound-off, Mr. Ickes said it all for his side. He wrote its platform, uttered its keynote speech, mapped its whole strategy, and prepared an outline for every fourth New Deal speech in the coming campaign.

Pretty soon Mr. Roosevelt will set up either a "coalition cabinet" or a "coalition emergency government" to argue that there just isn't any use bothering seriously about an election. Anybody who criticizes that will be called a war enemy to "national unity" and hence a traitor.

Well, it's all a ton of tripe. Mr. Roosevelt hasn't strengthened our economic system for defense. He has almost ruined it with debt and taxes. He hasn't contributed to unity. His political stock-in-trade has been disunity and class hatred. If there is an incipient revolution here, which is absurd, it should be dealt with otherwise than by tribute, which is very low politics and patriotism.

His diplomacy hasn't prevented the awful results of aggression abroad. It has invited it by raising false hopes of wholly impossible American intervention to push into action nations which, because of their unreadiness, should have stalled for time to prepare. He hasn't shown any military leadership. In spite of many warnings over years in a world aflame, he has permitted our defenses to lapse into disgraceful impotence. He failed to restore our economy after 7 years of unprecedented power.

This is the reverse of a record on which to choose a leader on Washington's formula. A "slicker" who could sell the country that mess could sell heaters in hell. It begins to appear that Mr. Ickes' crowd could do even that.

National defense can't and won't be made a football of politics. But what are we to call this kind of stuff?

Who Is Hitler? The Man Who Made Him Reveals Him as One of the Most Unscrupulous Tyrants in Centuries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, who is this man Hitler? The entire world, fully aroused at last by his barbarous rape of Europe, is now asking this question.

There is an answer, Mr. Speaker, by a man who financed him with millions, and in whose palatial home when he was a poor and struggling young politico, he held his meetings, and was encouraged to seek leadership.

That man is Fritz Thyssen, who was once one of the richest, if not the richest, industrialist in all Germany. Herr Thyssen now regrets that he ever trusted Adolph Hitler, as, it is unnecessary to add, does Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Holland, Norway, Luxemburg, and other nations that once believed in his protestations of friendship and his treaties, understandings, and agreements guaranteeing them peace and good will.

Fritz Thyssen is today an exile. His huge fortune has been confiscated. There is a price upon his head. Murderous and bloody hands seek to encircle his throat. And all this by the man of all men that he trusted, financed, believed in.

LETTERS A KEY TO HITLER'S METHODS WITHIN GERMANY

Because I believe they should be preserved in the official records of Congress as references to one of the most important state papers that has evolved out of the European war thus far, I desire to place before the House of Representatives quotations from a series of letters and telegrams written by Fritz Thyssen in a hopeless appeal to Adolf Hitler, that barbarian who, having ravished most of Europe, may be expected now to seek to control, make no mistake, even Mexico and South and Central America. And in whose mad brain may dwell even designs upon our own United States of America as well.

The average American citizen by this time is, of course, more or less familiar with many of the damnable acts of this crazed Hitler, who seeks evidently to emulate Napoleon, and to outdo him in ruthless conquest if that be possible. But he may not be aware of the new German war lord's policy of confiscating the fortunes and ordering the arrest of every wealthy and outstanding German citizen or businessman who has the temerity to disagree with his mad course in even the slightest degree. But such is, Mr. Speaker, and has been his policy from the very first.

Fritz Thyssen is a member of the German Reichstag. In the beginning he was one of Hitler's biggest financial backers. He believed in him then, foolishly, as he realizes now, because he had been made to believe by Hitler himself that the latter's desire for high place in German affairs was principally to protect the fatherland from Russia and communism, which Thyssen feared and hated above all things, but with which Hitler is now, traitorously, hand in glove. Once Hitler's dominance became absolute, he began gradually to reveal to the astounded Thyssen his hidden fangs now so completely exposed to all the world. The old iron master was amazed at Hitler's cold-blooded, unscrupulous, and theretofore secret plans to plunge Europe once more into a caldron of bloodshed and disaster. Thyssen, as revealed by the publication of these letters to Hitler, Goering, and other of the Fuehrer's raving mad satellites, protested, and kept on protesting, proving himself a strong and courageous character.

The result was that finally he was obliged to flee for his life. Every dollar's worth of his property, and its value runs into the hundreds of millions of gold marks, has been confiscated by a proclamation which proclaims that any appeal is unlawful. His arrest and that of his wife is being sought. But he has not quit fighting. His letters, telegrams, and so forth, made public in Paris on April 10, 1940, to "undeceive the German people, to remove nazi-ism, and to end the war," show up Adolf Hitler for the bloodthirsty, unprincipled tyrant that he really is. The press dispatches have told of Hitler's unrivaled acts of barbarism outside Germany, but these papers reveal his tyrannical acts within Germany. They will convince the world that Hitler is the type of despot that is dangerous to society in any land, anywhere on earth; the most dangerous demagogue that has appeared in world affairs in centuries.

WHO COULD HAVE FORESEEN HITLER'S BARBARITIES EVEN A FEW WEEKS BACK?

As recently as 2 weeks ago the atrocities that he has since perpetrated would never have been believed, but now cannot be denied. The fortunes that he has confiscated within Germany from such wealthy citizens as Thyssen he has used to bribe high officials in other lands for the purpose of making them traitors to their own nations, even to the extent of permitting the invasion and capture by German troops. That he is attempting to practice bribery, and has resorted to it, within the confines of the United States, no longer can be successfully denied. It is almost a matter of public knowledge. The extent to which he has succeeded, however, no one yet knows. But it is a German method of carrying on warfare. Millions upon millions of dollars were expended in the United States during the World War to promote bribery, sabotage, and so forth. And Hitler has proven a more bloodthirsty, irresponsible, and satanic tyrant than the Kaiser ever was.

One feature of the Thyssen case that deserves more than passing notice is the disclosure that after Thyssen's fortune had been confiscated and he had been driven from Germany, he was publicized and condemned as having been a Communist, the one thing in the world that he was not. The significant point about this is that it is an exact duplicate of the methods practiced by Nazi workers and agents in the United States. They seek to evade censure and deserved condemnation for their subversive pro-Nazi activities here by crying that their critics are all Communists, when just the opposite is true, and has been so proven time and time again.

THYSSEN'S TELEGRAM OPPOSING THE WAR

On August 31, 1939, Thyssen sent a telegram to Field Marshal Goering in which he said:

> I am against the war. A war will make Germany dependent on Russia also in the matter of raw materials and thereby she will lose her position as a world power.

As this telegram went unanswered, Herr Thyssen, a few days after the outbreak of the war, knowing that his life was

in peril, crossed the German frontier into Switzerland. He took his family with him as a precaution. When Hitler cannot "get his man," it is his custom to seize members of the families of those who disagree with him, confiscate their fortunes, hold them as hostages, and subject them to the grossest of indignities.

On September 22 Herr Thyssen sent Field Marshal Goering a long telegram of protest against the war, saying, in part:

5. Now, as before, I am against the war. As the war has started already, Germany ought to try to put an end to it as soon as possible, for the longer it lasts the worse will be the peace terms for Germany.

6. It is not Poland that broke the pact with Germany—that pact to which Mr. Hitler himself repeatedly referred to as a guaranty of peace.

7. In order to achieve peace, it will be necessary that Germany return to conditions which conform in every respect to the constitution. Where the constitution is not respected, there will be anarchy in the end.

On October 1 Thyssen sent Goering another message, in which he said:

I protested to you when, on November 9, 1938, the Jews were robbed and tortured in the most cowardly and brutal manner, and when the government chief of Dusseldorf, whom you had installed yourself, was almost killed and driven away. Again there was no response. As a sign of my protest, I resigned at that time my position as state councilor. I asked the Prussian Minister of Finance to stop my state-councilor salary. There was no answer from you. The payments, however, which were made in disregard of my request, are deposited in a blocked account with the Thyssen bank, awaiting your pleasure.

GERMAN SECRET STATE POLICE ENTER THE CASE

Goering did not answer Herr Thyssen, except in this way: A circular was sent to every bank in Germany but not allowed to be mentioned in the press, which, in part, stated:

In compliance with an order given by Field Marshal General Goering * * * the total property of Fritz Thyssen is confiscated by the state police according to section 1 of the law concerning the secret state police.

* * * * * * *

No appeal against this decree is legally admissible.

On December 11 Herr Thyssen sent another letter to the German Government, stating:

My conscience is clear. I feel free of any guilt. My sole error was that I believed in you, Adolf Hitler, the Fuehrer.

* * * * * * *

At an early stage already I felt it necessary to voice my protest against the persecution of Christianity, against the brutalization of its priests, against the desecration of its churches.

When on November 9, 1938, the Jews were robbed and tortured in the most cowardly and brutal manner, and their synagogs destroyed all over Germany, I protested once more.

* * * * * * *

Now you have concluded a pact with communism. Your propaganda ministry even dares to state that the good Germans who voted for you, the professed opponent of communism, are, in essence, identical with those beastly anarchists who have plunged Russia into tragedy, and who were described by you yourself as "blood-stained common criminals." (Mein Kampf, p. 750.)

* * * * * * *

I refuse to cover your crimes with my name, even though you declared in the Reichstag session of September 1, 1939, "He who is not with me is a traitor and will be treated as such."

I refuse to condone this war into which the German nation has been plunged so frivolously, and for the horrors of which you and your advisers will be held responsible.

* * * * * * *

In my own house you pronounced the ultimate goal of the movement. * * * Social justice, social appeasement was to lead to a totalitarian guild state.

* * * * * * *

Your present policy amounts to suicide.

* * * * * * *

Your new policy, Mr. Hitler, is driving Germany into an abyss, and the German people into perdition. Turn back as long as it is still possible. Your policy will terminate in a finis germaniae. Think of the oath you swore in Potsdam. Give back to the Reich a free parliament; give back to the German nation freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, freedom of speech.

* * * * * * *

Listen to me and you will hear the voice of the tormented German nation that is crying out to you: "Turn back; let freedom, right, and humaneness rise again in the German Reich."

FRITZ THYSSEN'S FINAL CHALLENGE TO ADOLF HITLER

And then this brave old man, not a poor, unknown, obscure man, but one of the richest and most powerful in all Germany, had the God-given courage to close his letter with this final challenge:

I demand that this letter shall not be kept from the German people. I am waiting. Should the German Nation, however, be prevented from hearing my words, which are the words of a free and upright German, then I shall call upon the conscience of the world and shall let the world pass judgment. I am waiting.

Fritz Thyssen waited, waited while the madman, Hitler, unleashed one new outrage after another upon the world, until he could stand it no longer. The above letter had been written on December 11, 1939. On May 10 of this year, in Paris, he kept his word and gave out the complete series of letters that indict Adolf Hitler and his accomplice Goering as two of the greatest villians of all history. I am sorry that because of the limitation of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as required by the rules of the House, I have been able to quote but very briefly from the various letters of Fritz Thyssen. The complete series, however, was given publicity in America for the first time on April 29, 1940, by that remarkable pictorial weekly magazine Life, which deserves the gratitude of posterity for the rendering of a great public service.

In presenting the Thyssen letters, Life printed the following enlightening introduction:

FRITZ THYSSEN'S LETTERS

On this and ensuing pages, Life presents a series of heretofore unpublished letters from Fritz Thyssen, No. 1 financial backer of the Nazi Party and currently No. 1 German exile, addressed to Hitler, Goering, and other Nazi leaders. Life's editors believe that these letters have a significance for United States readers far beyond their obvious value as pure news.

When August Thyssen died after the war, he left in the August Thyssen Hütte a huge holding company comprising coal, steel, iron, oil, and foreign investments valued at somewhere between 600,000,000 and 800,000,000 gold marks. This self-made ironmaster had been the industrial giant of the Wilhelminian period, the creator of the modern steel and iron industry of Germany. (Curiously, he was the first German industrialist to realize the vital importance of Scandinavian iron ores and to secure their supply for Germany.) His death, at the most critical moment in the existence of Germany and German industry, seemed to be the final blow to his own enterprises. In the following two decades his son and heir, Fritz Thyssen, proved himself to be a chip off the old block. He not only secured the survival of the August Thyssen Hütte, but also fortified and enlarged the concern. He not only saved his own inheritance but also rescued the remaining independent steel and iron industries of defeated Germany from utter decomposition. At the outbreak of the present war, he was recognized as the outstanding industrial leader of the Third Reich. His power and his influence in Germany, as the principal holder of the August Thyssen Hütte and the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, seemed unlimited.

In the same year, 1923, Ludendorff induced him to join the National Socialist Party. He declared his adherence to Adolf Hitler openly and at once. He did not wait for the Machtübernahme in 1933 to display his Nazi badge. Winning him over was the greatest single triumph the party ever achieved before coming into power. It is more than doubtful if Hitler could ever have succeeded without the moral, political, and financial support which he received from the steel king in the ensuing 10 years. This constitutes a tremendous responsibility, which weighs heavily today on the conscience of the self-exiled patriot.

Like so many conservatives and capitalists in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere, Fritz Thyssen saw in fascism the only salvation from communism. As a deeply religious Christian, he realizes today that trying to save Germany from the frying pan of communism, he only helped push her into the fire of nihilism.

It was a fateful error. If it deserves any punishment, the ironical fact that Fritz Thyssen is being branded now as a Communist by the Nazi authorities, and that his huge property has been confiscated—several months after Hitler's joining hands with Stalin—by force of the anti-Communist laws of the Third Reich, is ample penalty in itself. A further enhancement of it is provided by the appointment of the banker, Baron Kurt von Schröder in Cologne, as a trustee of the Thyssen's confiscated property. It was in the office of this very Baron von Schröder that he, Fritz Thyssen, Adolf Hitler, Franz von Papen, and others assembled in the last days of 1932 to provide a fund of 45,000,000 marks for the tottering Nazi Party, which was then faced with the imminent danger of complete dissolution in consequence of discouragement, demoralization, and impecunity.

Fritz Thyssen did not and does not believe that Germany can win this war. No one knows the economic potentialities and shortcomings of his country better than he does. He is trying his utmost to undeceive the German people, to remove nazi-ism, to end the war.—Editor, Life.

Work-Relief Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the most important legislation that has come before Congress at this session is House Joint Resolution 544, known as the W. P. A. appropriation or work-relief bill, which the House of Representatives is considering today. No domestic problem confronting our Government is more important than that of unemployment, which after 7 years of experiments is more prevalent in America than ever. A permanent solution must be found if our form of government is to survive. I do not here discuss those changes in Government policy which will have to be made to permit industry to function and offer jobs to the unemployed. I want to point out that House Joint Resolution 544 is a temporary relief measure only, and in my opinion inadequate at that.

Not only do we have men with families who are on relief, unable to obtain work, but we have single men who travel about the country looking for work, and there is none to be had. In addition, for several years last past, each year the high schools and colleges have been turning out a class of graduates to take their place in the ranks of the unemployed, adding to the army of the unemployed. One of my constituents, in a letter to me a few days ago, expressed the thought that these young people out of school and idle should be given consideration. With alert minds, ambitious, and energetic, they are the foundation of our Nation tomorrow. Unless something is done to give them work and provide employment, it is only a question of time until they may turn to the alluring and pleasant promise of new theories of government. The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow. Let us not give them the wrong outlook on life. For 7 years money has been squandered with no results to show. Let us spend some for the relief of our unemployed.

The amount of funds provided in the present bill is inadequate and should be substantially increased. With an increase in the amount of funds additional worth-while projects can be made possible, and this means that more people will be furnished employment. The bill should be amended to bring about this result.

I also believe that the requirement that the sponsor of a project shall furnish 25 percent of the cost of the project should be abolished. In many localities where W. P. A. funds are needed the most the local authorities do not have funds with which to pay any part of the cost of the project. In my opinion, the amount of the sponsor's contribution should be left to the Administrator. I also believe that he should be given more discretion in the matter of the 18-month lay-off provision and will support an amendment to this effect.

Amendments along the lines here indicated, as well as other changes in the bill that will improve it, should be adopted by the House.

World-war developments may or may not lead to increased employment in this country. Let us hope that employment does increase. If such proves to be the case, the expenditure of funds provided for unemployment relief can be decreased. But in the meantime proper funds should be voted to furnish work for those who cannot obtain employment in private industry.

Pioneers of Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, AT GIDEON CONVENTION, JANESVILLE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered recently at the convention of the Gideons held in Janesville, Wis.

The subject matter of this speech is somewhat unusual for inclusion in the RECORD, but I feel that in these trying times it is desirable for us to devote more attention to spiritual values. The Gideon Society is concerned with the preservation of such values. Its sole purpose is to distribute the Book of Books.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be your guest this evening. Why? Well, I always like to be with folks who do constructive things. I like to associate with builders. I like to "comrade" with doers. I think the Gideons qualify for membership in all of these categories. They are doers, builders, and constructive thinkers.

You remember the story of the man walking down the street of a big city when he heard an auctioneer's voice saying, "How much, how much, how much," and, being interested, he entered the store. There the auctioneer was holding up a violin. "One dollar is the bid, $2, $3; going, going!" The old gentleman walked up and said, "May I see the violin?" and he examined it and dusted it off, rosined the bow, then started to play. And out of the heart of the violin came the Moonlight Sonata. But something else came also. The violin spoke with authority; its voice commanded respect. A lost Stradivarius had been rediscovered. One thousand, two thousand, five thousand—$10,000 the violin finally sold for. It was the same instrument, but now its worth had been discovered.

Well, the men in this city who in 1898 founded the Gideons and the men who have been carrying on have apparently rediscovered the value of the Bible—the value to themselves and to others. Therefore, they decided that they would place the book where others might discover its value, so they put the Bible in the bedrooms of hotels and hospitals.

Now, why was this done? The wise man before he retires generally takes a bath and then "rolls in"; that is, he bathes his physical body. But the wiser man does more than that. He bathes his soul. And how does he do that? Well, that is where you Gideons showed a great appreciation of one of man's greatest needs. You knew that the Book of Books provides the greatest opportunity for that very experience—cleansing one's soul. You knew also that men come to their chamber—discouraged, lonely, melancholy, dissatisfied, dissipated, heartbroken. Such men are looking for reinvigoration, looking for something that will revitalize their minds, something that will give them courage to carry on, that will fill them with hope and the desire to do right. Knowing this, you Gideons placed the Bible where it could be easily reached.

"I gave a beggar of my little store
Of well-earned gold. He spent the shining ore
And came again, and yet again, still cold
And hungry as before.
I gave a thought, and through that thought of mine
He found himself the man, supreme, divine,
Fed, clothed, and crowned with blessings manifold,
And now he begs no more."

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

Many years ago my mother—who has "gone on" in the journey—gave me a Bible. I did not know why then, but I know now. I have

written out that reason in simple blank verse. Here it is—let my Bible speak:

"I am the Bible your mother gave you. I am the Book in which she found consolation and courage, hope and joy.
"From my pages she also got guidance and direction, light and truth.
"She knew there was much I could tell you that she could not.
"She knew that when she was gone, I would give you the message she would have for you.
"I am not only to prick your conscience, but to lighten your load. I have a message for every occasion. I can meet every need.
"For my truths come out of the hard struggles that human beings before you have had.
"I am no fetish. I speak to you of the bread of life—the bread that refreshes and rebuilds.
"I will lift you from the levels of discouragement, fear, and sin.
"Aye from the low levels of the senses to the mountain peaks of the spirit.
"I speak of a Presence that will go with you—a Presence that is ever with you.
"I will confer upon you power to overcome obstacles, power that will make you free from your mistakes and shortcomings.
"I will awaken you from the dream of the temporal.
"And will put into your being—purpose: purpose to venture forth to find the answers to life's unanswered questions.
"All this is yours, if you will but read, assimilate, and utilize.
"The treasure is within.
"I am the Bible your mother gave you."

This last summer I stood in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, by the side of the grave of Sir Christopher Wren, and read the Latin inscription which translated means "If you desire to see his monument, look about you."

That brought to mind this thought: We are all "monument makers." Christopher Wren built this great cathedral. As for myself, I would rather have a monument in the living hearts of men so that if I'm remembered, it will be as one who helped "build men."

You know, I think you Gideons are daily erecting monuments in men's hearts—monuments of high adventure in spiritual living. Many a man and woman has found the light because there was a Gideon Bible conveniently located which set in motion, through reading thereof, the unseen (but not unfelt) forces of reconstruction. The noblest experience is that of growing toward the light—unfolding real life.

In this fast-moving world it is important that we stop, look, and listen. The Nation needs to do that now, just as much as the individual does.

Someone has said that it's a wise man who can take time off to walk by the side of the brook—walk leisurely and enjoy the voice of Nature. Yes; wise indeed is the man who has learned to appreciate the beautiful in this life, the beautiful in nature, in music, in art, in his fellow man. But wiser still is the man who has learned to evaluate and explore into spiritual truths.

"Tune me for life again, O quiet musician,
Strive to adjust my loosened thoughts until,
Made taut, they shall be yielding to thy fingers
Gladly as trees to winds that touch this hill.

"Rhyme me with life once more, O silent poet,
Out of my weary, fluttering heartbeats make
Cool rhythms, hushed and certain as the circling
Water against the edges of this lake.

"Fit me for life again, O patient artist.
Paint on my tired soul glad, vivid things.
Splash now upon its dullness beauty's pigments,
Lovely as pansies and a bluebird's wing."

—*Violet A. Storey.*

"But how can I become competent in that direction?" I hear someone ask. The answer must be—by understanding more about your real self.

Bobby Burns asked the bishop, "Who am I? Where have I come from, and where am I going?" and all of us are asking ourselves unconsciously the same questions many times, and the most satisfactory place to go for those answers is to this same reservoir of spiritual wisdom—the Bible.

Of course, it is one of the oldest pieces of literature, describing ancient days, scenes, and old ways. Despite its antiquity, it is still a best seller. It is interesting to note that in all the mass of literature—in all the torrents of words and phrases which have been written since the invention of the printing press by Gutenberg—there is still only one great permanent best seller. It has been translated into every language. It is not a book of form or creed. It is a place where great treasure is to be found—but one must go on a treasure hunt to find the treasure. No one else can find it for you. You can't just mumble the words of the Bible and expect to find the treasure.

The Persian proverb, "I was common clay until roses were planted in me," could well be applied to millions of people who have glimpsed the rosebuds in the Scripture.

We are told in Proverbs that, by understanding, a house is established. Men are made over when an awakening within occurs. When men regard themselves as so much clay, they are clay men, but when they, like Paul, realize they "now are we the sons of the Most High," then they are clay men no longer.

I remember the story of the young high-school student who woke up one day to a realization that her parents were no good. According to every human standard, she was foredoomed. The law of heredity started to operate and she naturally said, "They are no good, so I'm no good." But a Bible student who was a teacher—the principal of the school—saw what was going on. She saw that the girl was being crushed between the upper and lower millstone. The teacher talked to her, "You are the daughter of a king," and she quoted the words from Job, "The spirit of God hath made you. The breath of the Almighty hath given you life." The girl caught the import of those significant words. She broke the claim of heredity, and she became one of America's great women.

The sentence, "I have come that you might have life and have it more abundantly," is so full of promise and power and significance that it is just waiting to be picked up by tired, doubting humanity. These, and many more, words of promise are to be found within this Book of Books.

I heard a great bishop of a great church say not so long ago that when the Master spoke these words He meant that the abundant life of the spirit was for men to experience here and now if they are wise enough to reach out for it.

In the days of Lincoln, when books were scarce, the Bible was the great reservoir. From its pages Lincoln continually got inspiration and guidance. He found it a workable manual for everyday life.

I remember on one occasion, when I was speaking to someone, this thought of the Bible's providing a way of life, this thought was questioned. But after discussion this person received a new angle on the subject. He had always regarded the Book as one to be read on Sunday or to be perused as one would peruse a novel.

He has, however, changed his mind in relation to the Book. It no longer is something to be read and then forgotten, but to him it is now a quarry out of which he must carve the great fundamental truths. It must have been in such a way that Sir Walter Scott regarded the Book. It is said of him that a few days before he died he called to his son-in-law, Lockhart, "Read to me from the Book." "What book?" he was asked, because Scott had a large library. Scott replied, "Need you ask? There is but one."

We can read in the Book the story of Moses—Moses the great sinner (even a murderer)—how he went down to Egypt and brought his people out of their bondage. From such a bit of history we can gain courage, but if we dig deeper we will realize that this Moses, when he was directed to go on this mission, stuttered and hesitated (even as you and I), and then something happened to him. He was told, "My presence shall go with thee." And he hesitated no longer. A great experience was his; and it may be for you and me also if we but realize that "His presence shall go with us."

We can read the story of David and his fight with Goliath, which is but an incident; or we can drink deep of his Psalms:

"The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want."

"Round about me are the everlasting arms."

"Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me."

And glean out of these great spiritual truths vitality and fearlessness to front our problems.

The great need of the present is spiritual leadership. America needs that more than anything else, and by spiritual leadership, I mean the insight that comes from spiritual contact with the Infinite One. Just before Goethe died, he called to his listeners, "More light." He knew what his generation needed. And well can we say to this generation, "More light," in politics, in economics—that is the great need.

I have often stated that men have found that it was wisdom to go apart and get away, as it were, from their normal activity awhile. Lincoln, in the midst of his worries, found relief in humor and in reading the Scripture. Woodrow Wilson in the midst of the World War used to recite great poems. The Great Teacher in His life went apart time and time again, and He told mankind to go into the closet and shut the door and pray to the Father. One way to accomplish this is to become so engrossed in the great spiritual values found in the Book that you are apart from your normal activity. That is the reason why so many people start the day with reading out of the Bible. In this manner they get a spiritual food which stays with them throughout the

day, so that they are then equipped to handle calmly, judiciously, and understandingly the problems with which they are confronted.

In the days that are up ahead, America needs men and women everywhere who will maintain their mental balance, who will not become creatures of hysteria or subjects of emotional fever. Such men and women will be real leaders. And if there are enough of them, no amount of propaganda, illogical thinking, or misinformation will sweep them off their feet.

I have a very strong conviction that if America is going to keep clear of the storm which is enveloping other nations it will be only because we will have a sufficient number of men and women who look to the God of Spirit for guidance and direction. More and more men are realizing that they cannot live by bread alone, that man must be fed brain food—great ideas—and only with this food can the individual and the Nation grow in health. Man continually needs an expanding horizon, the vitalizing influence of dynamic ideas, and a constant impact upon his consciousness that he is one with the Eternal—not one with the earth.

Yes; man needs new intellectual and spiritual avenues of adventure. Men strive to become wealthy in material things which rust and decay, but more men are now realizing the need of acquiring a spiritual wealth which depressions and wars cannot obliterate, and so some of us are trying to gather up a few of the ideas which belonged to Moses and Isaiah and Jesus, Paul, and David—ideas which add zest, melody, and enchantment to living.

You Gideons in your work have lighted a candle which will not go out. You are "pioneers of light."

Criminal Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States, addressed to Hon. William Draper Lewis, director of the American Law Institute. The letter deals with the necessity for regulation and simplification of Federal criminal procedure.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 9, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS,
Director, the American Law Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. LEWIS: I take great pleasure in greeting the members of the profession who are attending the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute, and extending to the institute my best wishes for success in its many commendable endeavors.

The institute has made many constructive contributions of outstanding character to the advancement and improvement of the law. I am gratified to observe that it is not restricting its activities by the traditional framework of juridical science, but has extended its studies to such matters as treatment of juvenile delinquents.

Much has been accomplished in recent years in the direction of simplification of civil procedure and coordination of the operations of the courts, especially in the Federal field. Much still remains to be attained in the realm of criminal law and penology. I am hopeful that the Congress will make provision for the regulation and simplification of Federal criminal procedure by means of judicial rule making, similar to that made by it several years ago in respect to Federal civil procedure.

The institute is in a position to render signal service to the advancement of penology. Not only the treatment of juvenile delinquents, to which it is already devoting attention, but also such matters as indeterminate sentences, probation, and parole form fruitful subjects for studies of the type that the institute has so effectively undertaken and successfully pursued in the past.

These phases of the administration of justice touch practical life in a true sense. As members of the legal profession we must always bear in mind that the law is not a detached science, but is the handmaiden of society. It must be adjusted, as nearly as possible, to the requirements of shifting social and economic conditions. As has been truly said, "the final cause of law is the welfare of society."

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Admission of Idaho to Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

HISTORICAL STATEMENT BY C. E. ARNEY

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, on July 3 of this year Idaho will celebrate her fiftieth anniversary of statehood. One of our distinguished citizens, Mr. C. E. Arney, a pioneer journalist, businessman, and historian, has prepared a brief statement covering some of the early history of the State of Idaho as well as since its admission into the Union. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARLY IDAHO

July 3 of this current year marks the half century milestone of Idaho statehood. The bill creating the new State passed the Senate July 1, 1890, having previously passed the House. The father of the bill was the then Delegate from the Territory, Fred T. Dubois. On the morning of July 3, as he was approaching the gate to the White House, he met with the then Secretary of State of President Benjamin Harrison's Cabinet, James G. Blaine. After the morning salutations Blaine congratulated him on the admission of his Territory to the Union and was especially pleased with it, for, as he put it, "Fred, it will give us two more Republican Senators and a Republican Congressman."

Then Dubois said to Blaine that he was on his way to see the President and ask him to sign the bill on the morrow, that Idaho might be known as an independence State. Blaine said to him in substance: "Fred, why don't you have it admitted today? If so, another star, the forty-fourth, will be added to the flag and it will be a great day for your young State." The Delegate told him that he was much obliged for the suggestion and asked Blaine to accompany him to see President Harrison, which he did. Dubois made the presentation of his wish that the bill might be signed "today." The President replied: "Your determination in the matter, Delegate Dubois, will be my pleasure." Dubois asked him for an hour's time and returned at the end of that time with a gold pen, which President Harrison used in signing the bill.

It was my pleasure in the summer of 1907 to go with Dubois to the Idaho Historical Society's room in the Capitol and see him present this gold pen to the curator.

What is now Idaho was originally a part of the Pacific Northwest Territory. Later it became a part of the Oregon country. Later, in 1853, when Washington divorced herself from the Oregon parent, Idaho was a part of Washington. Thus, the Northwest Territory was Idaho's great granddad, the Oregon country its granddad, and the Territory of Washington, its dad. Washington was created a Territory in 1853, divorcing herself from Oregon, and taking with her all the territory east of the Puget Sound country, including what is now Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and over a hundred miles of what is now the two Dakotas, and Nebraska, and having for its northern boundary, approximately 48 degrees north, and extending south of the northern boundaries of Oregon, Nevada, Utah, and Colorado.

Early in 1861, gold was discovered in large quantities in the mountains of north and central Idaho and soon, that small mining area around Pierce City and in the Boise Basin, had thrice the population of both the Willamette Valley in Oregon and the Puget Sound section in Washington. The rich diggings of gold, silver, lead, and copper created an urge for more stable forms of government, for courts of justice, and for the establishment of a legal political regime. An appeal to Congress bore results. On March 3, 1863, Congress cut Idaho loose from Washington and endowed it with all the eastern area which previously was included within the Territory of Washington. Such a large area was cumbersome, and in 1864, Montana Territory was created, and in 1868, Wyoming. This reduced Idaho to its present boundaries, approximately 487 miles from north to south, 48 miles along the Canadian boundary line, and 309 miles along the southern line from Wyoming to Oregon.

Its first Territorial capital was at Lewiston, at the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers. Two sessions of the legislature were held in Lewiston, and the delegates to the lawmaking branch of the Territory came on foot and horseback, from its far eastern counties which had been established from a part of Washington.

William Wallace became Idaho Territory's first Governor, but was soon elected a Delegate to Congress, to be succeeded by Governor Lyon, of Lyondale, N. Y.

Congress passed an act authorizing the removal of the seat of government from Lewiston to Boise in 1864. One Alonzo Leland, early editor of a Lewiston weekly paper, undertook to enjoin the government from removing the records. During the pendency of this action, Governor Lyon took a "fishing trip" in a boat on the Snake River. His craft soon struck the center of the mighty Snake which carried him rapidly to a point some 16 miles downstream, where his pilot veered the boat to the southerly banks of the stream where, most conveniently for His Excellency, was a horse, which he mounted and, with the records and seal of the Territory, rode to Walla Walla, where he stayed overnight, taking the stage for Boise the next day, where he set up Idaho's Territorial government.

Illustrative of the opinion of the public on racial questions where two acts passed by the second Territorial legislative session, which assembled November 14, 1864, at Lewiston, one: "No person not being a citizen of the United States or who shall not have declared his intention to become such, shall be allowed to take gold from the mines of this Territory or hold a mining claim, unless he shall have a lease therefor, as hereinafter provided." And again, "That all Mongolians, whether male or female, and of whatsoever occupation, shall be considered foreigners, and shall pay a license tax of $4 for each and every month they reside in this Territory."

From Lincoln (1861) to Cleveland (1884), all Presidents, clothed with authority from Congress, appointed officers for all Territories. All previous Presidents were Republicans—save Andrew Johnson, who was elected on the Union ticket from Virginia as Vice President—and succeeded Lincoln after his assassination. These Governors were chosen from various States, as New York, Oregon, Indiana, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and each one for some service he had rendered his party in the State from whence he came. It is not within the history of Territorial Idaho that during that almost quarter of a century, anyone appointed Governor had ever seen Idaho, or knew anything about Idaho or her people. In all this time, quite a third of the appointees undertook to run for Delegate to Congress from Idaho Territory, but without success, and at the end of the term, all of them during this period, went hence as soon as their terms ended.

Idaho, like all other Territories, was accorded the privilege of choosing a Delegate to Congress at each recurring biennial election. Such a one had the privileges of the floor but could not vote.

During the existence of Idaho Territory, the following men served Idaho in the above capacity, namely:

1863–65. William Wallace, of Lewiston.
1865–69. Edward Holbrook, of Idaho City.
1869–71. Jacob K. Shafer, of Idaho City.
1871–73. Samuel A. Merritt, of Idaho City.
1873–75. John Hailey, of Boise.
1875–79. Stephen S. Fenn, of Mount Idaho.
1879–83. George Ainslie, of Idaho City.
1883–85. Theo. F. Singheiser, of Boise.
1885–87. John Hailey, of Boise.
1887–90. Fred T. Dubois, of Blackfoot.

Governors of Idaho, after Lyon, were Ballard, of Oregon; Marston and Connor, residence unknown; Thomas M. Bowen, remained 1 week, residence unknown; D. P. Thompson, drew his salary but never came; Brayman, spent a little time in Idaho; Hoyt, never came; Bennett, from Indiana, and a splendid Governor; Thompson, of Oregon; Neil, of Iowa; Irwin, of Iowa, faded away in 30 days; Bunn, of Pennsylvania, a member of the Philadelphia Clover Club.

Then came Stevenson, of Idaho Territory, appointed by President Cleveland; and later Shoup, of Idaho Territory, appointed by President Benjamin Harrison, both of whom royally loaned the weight of their great influence, both as Governors and as statesmen of the very highest type, to the admission of Idaho to statehood. The latter, in fact, took a display at his own expense of Idaho products to the New Orleans Exposition in the middle eighties, and afterward ran a car of exhibits to prominent cities in the East, displaying especially the mineral, timber, and agricultural products of his adopted Territory.

The organic act creating Idaho Territory stipulated that the secretary of the Territory should, during the period of a vacancy in the office of Governor, be the acting executive.

Thus, while the gubernatorial "carpetbaggers" were playing hide-and-go-seek, irrespective of the honor conferred on them, Hon. Edward J. Curtis, first appointed secretary in 1869, served in that ex officio capacity longer than any Governor.

Curtis pioneered in politics and the law in both California and Oregon prior to coming to Idaho. He was capable, an orator of exceptional ability, and most affectionately greeted by his many friends as "Uncle Ned." He served as Territorial secretary from 1869 to 1878, from 1883 to 1884, and from 1885 to 1889.

He lived but a short time to enjoy, with his friends, Idaho as a State.

In March of 1889 and just before his retirement, Governor Stevenson had called a constitutional convention to meet in Boise City on July 4 of that year. Early in April and immediately after taking the oath as Governor of the Territory, Governor Shoup renewed and vitalized the call. While the Republican was the prevailing party in Idaho Territory at the time, there was slight difference in the cumulative vote of the two parties. Governor Stevenson was the acknowledged head of the Democratic Party and Delegate Dubois of the Republican Party. Immediately following the call these two leaders met and made friendly suggestions to the various committeemen from all the counties of Idaho Territory, suggesting the most capable men whom they thought would do the highest honor and render the greatest service in the effort to transform Idaho Territory into a State.

On July 4 the convention met without any authority from Congress. They had precedent for this in half a dozen other States, who in Territorial days had moved toward statehood by voluntary action of constitutional conventions. Nearby Dakota was one, Iowa was another, and in each case there were some misgivings on the part of Members of the two branches of Congress as to the regularity of such proceedings. Many of those old-style statesmen reasoned in terms of orderly procedure, and styled the movement in Idaho as a fresh innovation, and did not see in the movement that degree of dignity of which they were so fond; and, again, there were other things besides the small population which arose to plague the sponsors of the bill in Congress to accept the constitution which these very capable men had drafted in their session beginning July 4, 1889, and lasting 34 days, and passed out to the people to vote upon as the labor of 72 men.

The principal struggle came over the moot Mormon question. With the beginning of Territorial reign, each Governor who made an annual report to the President emphasized the existence of polygamy in the southeastern countries of the new Territory. In the fore part of the eighties, led by Dubois, Henry W. (Kentucky) Smith, Harry Bennett, William H. Crawford, and many others, the Republican Party in the counties where these Mormons were most numerous disbanded locally the Republican Party and formed what was called an anti-Mormon Party. Their aims matured in the legislative session of 1885 when Kentucky Smith, as a member of the Territorial council, elected from Oneida County, put through and caused to be signed, the famous Idaho test oath. The purpose of this enactment, which was later carried to the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Beeson* v. *Oneida County*, was to disfranchise anyone who belonged to an organization, order, or sect which taught or practiced bigamy or polygamy in the Territory, and, furthermore, prevented them from holding office or serving on juries. Thus, of the 84,000 population in Idaho when it knocked at the door for admission to the Union, 25,000 were disfranchised. However, on November 15, 1889, 12,398 votes favored while 1,773 opposed the adoption of the Constitution which had been framed by the July and August convention.

Confronted with the argument in Congress, where Dubois as a delegate had the right of the floor, with the fact that he sought to admit the Territory of Idaho whose Territorial delegates had made a constitution interfering with religious freedom, Dubois retorted in the House as follows: "We want a State for those whose highest allegiance is to the United States, or else we want no State at all."

While on the subject of the Mormon question, the operation of the test oath—which, by the way, is still in Idaho's Constitution—lasted less than 10 years, for the legislative session of 1893 took cognizance of the manifesto previously issued by the authorities of the church renouncing their allegiance to the objectionable practice, and thus loosened the strings for the admission of Utah, and gradually since, harmonious, neighborly, and friendly relations have existed between Mormon and non-Mormon in Idaho, which we now pause to suggest has a greater population of Mormons than has Utah.

As arguments for the admission of Idaho as a State its sponsors showed 55,000,000 acres of land, classified as follows: 12,000,000 acres agricultural; 12,000,000 acres dry sage; 10,000,000 acres timber; 8,000,000 acres timberland, meaning land on which there was timber of lesser value.

Dubois, in addition to being a very keen Republican politician at the time, was lucky. He had formed the acquaintance of an Iowa Congressman by the name of Isaac S. Struble, a Virginian by birth (1843), who had settled in Iowa with his parents, attended common schools, entered the Civil War at 17, serving in Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry. At the close of the war he attended the Iowa State University and was admitted to the bar in 1870, and in 1872 he located at Lemars, Plymouth County, where he was elected successively to the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses (March 4, 1883, to March 3, 1891). He was defeated for renomination in the campaign of 1890, losing the nomination on the forty-third ballot to George D. Perkins, of Woodbury County.

Early in the session of 1889 he came to Dubois and asked him if he would use his influence with Speaker Reed that he, Struble, might be made chairman of the Committee on Territories. Struble explained that he had a sincere wish to preside over that committee and admit Oklahoma, Idaho, and Wyoming as States of the Union. Dubois told him he had no personal call on the Speaker, but that he would see if he could not originate some outside pressure, and to this end the young Delegate, then in his early thirties, went to Dan Voorhees, the United States Senator from Indiana, known as the "tall Sycamore of the Wabash." Voorhees was a distant relative of Dubois' mother, and he knew the family well. The Senator responded most cheerfully and a day or two later called Dubois to his committee room and told him that Reed would name Struble chairman of the Territorial Committee of the House. Struble was overjoyed when Dubois brought him the news and favorable action by

his committee later resulted in the passage of the Idaho Admission Act by the House on April 3, 1890. It went to the Senate, where it was passed July 1, 1890, and as above stated, signed by President Harrison July 3 of the same year.

In the enabling act generous donations were given the new Idaho by the Federal Government, known as grant lands, namely:

	Acres
Scientific schools	100,000
State normals	90,000
Asylums for the insane	50,000
State university	50,000
Penitentiary	50,000
Other State, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions	150,000

As a safeguard for the residue of this land, a minimum sale price of $10 per acre was fixed by the Congress.

We might pause here to remark that it was cold-blooded politics that induced the House and Senate to admit Idaho to statehood. The Cleveland administration of 1885–89 had admitted many Democrats into the two legislative branches, and the Republicans cast about for help to maintain control. They figured that Idaho with Dubois' leadership was safely Republican and recalling Blaine's suggestion, above referred to, proceeded on that basis. And now comes an evidence of ingratitude in politics. Admitted by a Republican House and Senate and signed by a Republican President, the young State of Idaho at its first opportunity to choose Presidential electors chose three Populists. Its third legislative session (1895) had in it but one Democrat, William H. Watt, of Blaine County, and 2 years later (1897) the two branches had but one Republican, T. A. Davis, of Oneida County.

Of the 72 members composing the Constitutional Convention held 51 years ago, but 2 are now living, namely, Drew W. Standrod, who served from Oneida County, now living at Pocatello, and Frank Harris, who served from Washington County, still living in that county, at Weiser, the county seat.

Reminiscent: On the afternoon of July 3, 1890, I was riding in a one-horse-drawn buckboard from Rexburg, where I was running a newspaper, to Idaho Falls, a distance of 45 miles, the first 15 of which was through a sagebrush desert, to the Caldwell ferry, on the north fork of the Snake River, thence down to Menan Island to the dry bed which we forded. I was riding with one of my printers. As we climbed the bank from the stream at pitch dark, I observed occasionally flickers of light in the sky to the south. I observed them closely for a few minutes, for some appeared to be closer to us than others.

Presently I slapped my friend on the shoulder and said to him: "Grant, we are riding in the State of Idaho and those lights we see are fireworks from Eagle Rock (now Idaho Falls), Blackfoot, and Pocatello." Arriving at our home in Eagle Rock near midnight, we found it to be true. The bill had been signed, and not only in that Snake River desert area but throughout the entire State, through its mountains, its hills and valleys and wooded areas, and the mines of the south and north of the new State, people were wild with joyous enthusiasm, such as it has never been my privilege to witness before or since.

The man Dubois, who was in Congress and piloted the bill with other assistance through both branches of the Congress, was born in Crawford County, Ill., May 29, 1851. He was graduated from Yale—a Scroll and Key man—in 1872. He served as United States marshal of Idaho Territory from 1882 to 1886, when he resigned on his nomination as Delegate in Congress. He was elected Delegate in November 1886 and took his seat in the Fiftieth Congress on the 4th of March 1887. He was elected a Delegate in the Fifty-first Congress in November 1888, and on the admission of the State to the Union on the 3d of July 1890 he was legislated out of office.

At the first legislative session Idaho did something that no other State in the Union has ever done—i. e., elected four men to the United States Senate, three of whom were accepted, as follows: On the legislative balloting there were four candidates—Dubois, Shoup, McConnell, and Clagett, none of whom had enough votes to elect.

Dubois wired Congressman Sweet who had taken his seat as Idaho's first Congressman, to confer with Senator Edmunds, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Hoar who was a member of the committee, and Senator Platt, chairman of the Committee on Territories, and ascertain if the legislature could elect one person for the term ending March 4, 1891, one for the 4-year term ending 4 years and 3 months hence, March 4, 1895, and one for the 6-year term beginning March 4, 1891, and ending March 4, 1897. This was done by the election on December 18, 1890, of McConnell and Shoup, who forthwith proceeded to Washington and at the bar of the Senate, drew cuts for the long and short term, McConnell drawing the 3-month term and Shoup the 4-year-and-3-month term. The Idaho Legislature proceeded on the same day to elect Dubois to the long term above referred to. Dispute arose among the members, for Clagett was not only a very able, but a very magnetic man and his friends were legion. By a system of log rolling and trading, they got enough of Dubois' voters, after he had been elected and given his certificate for the 6-year term, to forsake him, and on February 11, 1891, in joint assembly voted for Clagett, giving him a majority and authorizing him to contest Dubois' 6-year seat, which he did on the basis that the two houses voting at the time of his election, had not voted in their separate capacities, but as a united legislative body.

Clagett came to Washington and without a certificate from the Secretary of State, but with a copy of the Legislative Journal, and without objection occupied the floor of the Senate and made a speech in his own behalf, but he only succeeded in getting six or seven votes.

At the end of Dubois' first term, he was defeated by Senator Henry Heitfeld, a Populist of Nez Perce County. Four years later, in 1901, Dubois was elected by a fusion of the Democrats, Populists, and silver Republicans, to a 6-year term beginning March 4, 1901, and ending March 4, 1907, and on his entrance to the Senate, he proclaimed himself a Democrat. At the close of this, Dubois' second term, he was succeeded by Senator William E. Borah, a Republican.

The Science of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. PHILIP M. BROWN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Philip Marshall Brown, May 20, 1940, in Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the one hundred and twelfth annual meeting of the board of directors of the American Peace Society on the subject of The Science of Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nietzsche says that "man is something that must be surpassed." It would seem that man has now been surpassed by modern science. He is not only grateful for the comforts and enjoyments which science has given him, he is its docile creature. He is even beginning to believe that social redemption will be achieved solely through science.

The tragedy of science is that its main trend has been toward the perfection of power and force. The intrusion into the private life of the atom has been animated largely by the desire to measure its energy and exploit its power of destruction.

The supreme expression of modern science is the war machine. But once this machine is set in motion it soon gets out of control. The god of the machine takes command. It runs wild, destroying men, nations, and vast material resources. It also destroys cherished institutions and standards of values. Confusion of thought, and worst of all, destruction of moral character follow in the wake of this Frankenstein monster which science has created. Men lose their mental equilibrium. They cannot anticipate and discount the course of events. The war machine rolls ruthlessly on. Civilization reels and chaos threatens.

The war machine has no respect for democracies. They can defend themselves against dictatorships only by being less democratic. The organization of democracy for war demands great concentration of power and serious limitations on freedom. All the resources of the state, human as well as material, must be surrendered to the government. State capitalism results, and, in turn, produces social revolution. The masses of the people become restless and readily susceptible to subversive influences. A war between nations breeds social revolutionaries.

Under such disintegrating conditions created by the war machine, it is obviously impossible to plan intelligently for peace. We do not know on what kind of foundations we may restore the temple of peace. We cannot be sure that the present war may not prove to be only one of a long series. Definite plans for international organization at the present time are futile. They are as derisive as small fountains playing in a deluge.

What then can the advocates of peace hope to accomplish in this hour of world tragedy? We cannot acknowledge defeat and remain silent. The lighthouse is most needed in darkness and storm. We must hold the faith and fight on. But not blindly. Not with empty phrases and slogans. Our immediate duty is to dedicate ourselves anew to the apparently insoluble problem of international peace. We must do so in a scientific spirit. The science of power expressed by the war machine must be opposed by the science of peace.

Now, science in its essence is nothing else than knowledge. And knowledge is gained by realistic, logical processes of thought. We are warranted in believing that through honest research comparable to the investigations of modern science we may discern the principles that control this science of peace.

The reasonable approach to this problem would seem first to recognize the errors and failures of previous experiments in the laboratory of peace. The lamentable experience of the League of Nations in particular should have most important lessons for us. There must be no emotional, wishful thinking. Too much of fateful import to humanity is at stake. We are engaged in a scientific research infinitely more significant than the study of the atom.

The basic error in the peace experiments would seem to have been in a false analysis of the causes of war and in the methods proposed to end war. And this error, strangely enough, has been due to the very same error that created the war machine. Both have been produced by a materialistic, mechanistic age. Both have been dominated by a blind belief in force. Both have believed that men can be coerced to behave as desired by gangsters, statesmen, and reforming idealists alike.

The peace advocates have placed their faith too much in institutions, in organizations, and in systems of government. They have persisted in the ancient error that men can be compelled to cooperate and live at peace with one another. The logical goal of this school of thought has been the creation of a gigantic international peace force to impose peace on single nations and on blocs of nations.

The peace movement has been obsessed by this faith in force, in the inexorable power of the machine. It found feeble expression in the attempt to apply economic sanctions against Italy at the time of the invasion of Ethiopia. The League of Nations when used as a means of coercion collapsed miserably in dealing successively with Japan, Germany, Italy, and Russia.

No lesson in recent times could be more impressive and poignant than that the way to peace does not lie along the road of force. The god of the war machine can never ensure peace. Whether in personal, domestic, or international relations, mankind will always abhor coercion of any kind, be it physical or moral. You may win a temporary and a precarious peace by force but you cannot reason with men by force.

A most serious mistake of the peace movement has been to urge peace because of the increasing horrors of modern warfare. This argument has been as unrealistic as it has been ignoble. Heroic men never shrink from any call of duty because of the fear of suffering and death. It is an inspiring tribute to the character of the men facing the horrors of hell in Europe and China that they have not faltered in the defense of what they believe to be sacred rights and obligations. The appeal to fear has sadly discredited the peace movement. It has paralyzed normal thinking and obscured the distinctions between right and wrong. It would be difficult for a Finnish, Dutch, or Belgian soldier to understand the reasoning of the professional pacifist. Men who are defending their hearth and home value duty and honor above life itself. The span of life is all too brief, but men still believe in eternal values. They will not be deterred from laying down their lives for others by fear of the horrors of war. This argument has done the peace movement great harm.

Another error of the peace advocates has been to stress unduly the idea that wars are caused by a state of mind. It is true that wars result from a state of mind and emotion. Men do have profound convictions, be they right or wrong, concerning the justice of their cause. They think in terms of national interests, of pride of race, of religious freedom, and material needs. They plan wars deliberately for the sake of their convictions, whether high or low, reasonable or fantastic.

Calling this a state of mind does not serve to clarify the problem. It requires much more than denunciation, derision, or argument. The fervid belief of the German people in a pure race which shall dominate Europe cannot be eradicated by either war or ridicule. The British interest in Gibraltar and Singapore; the demand of Italy for greater economic freedom; the claim by Japan for predominance in the Far East; these all must be considered realistically. Such debatable issues disclose something much deeper than an emotional state of mind. They reveal the motives that inspire and control the actions of men and nations. We must know the philosophy of life that determines conduct. We must know the compelling motives that make men selfish or generous, cruel or kind. What most matters in the science of peace is the basic philosophy that actuates the conduct of men and nations.

It is painfully apparent that our present civilization too long has been dominated by a materialistic, mechanistic attitude of mind. The hard and dangerous work of society has been done not because men and women wanted to, but because they had to. Society has been strangely indifferent to many social and economic injustices. The economic law of necessity has prevailed over the law of love. It is easy to understand why the economic determinists have so profoundly affected the thinking of all ranks of society, including many social-welfare workers and members of the clergy. They rightly believe that modern scientific discoveries should make human existence more comfortable and enjoyable. They believe that men will cease to be miserable and rebellious if economic injustices are corrected. This, they hold, is the right way to find peace.

The leading exponents of this philosophy of life are the Marxian Socialists. Their idealism may not be questioned though their class hatred and their methods lay them open to serious criticism. The inherent vice of this philosophy is that it restricts man within the narrow limits of economic determinism. They believe that man is merely the product of his economic environment. It is essentially a materialistic attitude toward life. In common with less radical reformers they would solve social and economic problems by legislation, institutions, and systems. They are substituting one mechanism for another. They would submit man to external controls of a different nature. The freedom they seek is economic. They have slight regard for his intellectual freedom and none for his religious freedom. Such a philosophy of life is too restricted to satisfy his whole nature.

This philosophy of life is also vitiated by its failure to take into account the conflicting desires of men. It ignores the greed, the lusts, the hatreds, as well as the ideals, that animate and control human conduct. It is based on the false assumption that these desires and motives can be regimented by clever regulations and mechanistic systems devised by the state. In his instinctive search for complete freedom man has never been willing to submit to a social control over his desires and ideals.

The ultimate problem in the science of peace is to discover how the desires that control human conduct, whether in the family, in industry, politics, or international affairs, may be reconciled and guided into right channels. If these desires are irreconcilable, if men and nations are resolved to take by any means, fair or foul, what they feel entitled to, there is no use in attempting to seek peace by the arbitrary use of force. You may secure a temporary semblance of peace by force, but you fail ignominiously to eradicate the basic cause of war.

The advocates of peace through justice are now facing the stark, ugly reality that civilization is rapidly reverting to the law of the jungle. Our materialistic philosophy has been tending more and more to the idea of the survival of the strongest. Disguise it as you will, it is present everywhere—in business, industry, politics, and, saddest of all, even in the church, wherever men find it possible by a sufficient show of strength to gain their ends by means other than reason and moral suasion. There is evident a general cynicism that makes light of ethical standards. We are aware of a prevalent social attitude that demands privileges but denies obligations. The freedom men seek is in the main individualistic and irresponsible.

The plight of the liberal in these times is most tragic. A sense of defeatism and the inadequacy of his convictions make him inclined too often to compromise, to accept restraints and restrictions imposed by both doctrinaires and dictators. He is in desperate need of a fresh renewal of faith in what Walter Lippmann has termed "freedom of personality and inviolability of the soul of man." He cannot be content with any human institutions and devices which in aiming at social betterment actually fetter mankind with restrictions on his desire for the freest development of his highest nature. He knows very well that the legitimate desires and ideals of men can never with safety be restrained by any schemes of social reform.

What then is the complete solution of this problem of peace? Are we to confess ourselves to be hopelessly defeated? Must we accept fatalistically the prospect of unceasing contentions and wars? If that be our answer, we might as well eat, drink, and be insanely merry before the resounding crash of civilization. But if we are committed in our personal lives to a philosophy that can give contentment, alter profoundly the desires of men, and reconcile them, then we have an adequate answer which we must proclaim resolutely with undaunted faith.

But this will exact much more from us than intellectual conviction or moral dedication. We must first demonstrate in our own lives, in every relationship both within and without the family, those standards of behavior which we believe should control the actions of other men and nations. We should acknowledge the simple painful truth so fully expressed many years ago: "Whence come quarrels and conflicts among you? Come they not from your uncontrolled desires that contend within you?" It is axiomatic that if we cannot have peace at home or in our other relationships we cannot expect it between nations. This demands immense discipline and sacrifice. We would much rather seek external controls on human conduct than inner compulsions. We would resort to resolutions, petitions, denunciations, legislation, and punishments to constrain men to keep the peace. But this is to continue the old discredited fight between conflicting philosophies of life, whether Marxism, capitalism, collectivism, or any other form of social reform. The fight is most clearly drawn between materialism and idealism, between those who deny and those who affirm the right of man to freedom of personality and the inviolability of his soul. All other warfare has but little meaning beside this unending battle. Either we must thoroughly alter and reconcile the conflicting desires of men or abandon the fight for world peace.

How can these desires be altered and reconciled? How can they be harmonized into one sole objective, one supreme goal, one great faith to animate and satisfy mankind? If we have the courage of our convictions and the willingness to sacrifice something the answer may not be as difficult as we imagine. The only adequate,

rational, unifying philosophy must be our faith in the actual brotherhood of man and ultimate spiritual purpose in social evolution. Paul, the first of the great internationalists, proclaimed this truth to the skeptics on Mars Hill. "For God hath made of one blood all nations of man to dwell upon the face of the earth, and hath determined the periods and the bounds of their habitation." Rejecting the paltry philosophy of the materialists, we must hold to the faith that there is a divine plan of evolution that promises the utmost freedom of personality and the complete inviolability of the soul. We cannot be content with lesser and baser objectives.

I am not pleading for any sectarian creed. Each must be loyal to his own convictions. I am challenging those millions of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, and all others who accept the authority of God in human affairs to present a militant, united front to promote the only kind of righteousness that can insure peace throughout the world. Thus a united front would be irresistible. As President Roosevelt has so eloquently said: "There is no problem, social, political, or economic, which would not melt before the fire of a great spiritual awakening." This is the true science of peace which can triumph over the science of war. This has been the great aim of the American Peace Society since its founding 112 years ago by William Ladd, himself a great spiritual leader.

We are definitely challenged to dedicate ourselves to this crusade to check the rising tide of war and to lay the foundations for a sound and enduring peace. After all the yearnings, the strivings, and searchings after peace, we must take up the task in a venturesome pioneering spirit.

"All the past we leave behind:
We take up the task eternal, and the burden, and the lesson!
Conquering, holding, daring, venturing, as we go the unknown ways—
Pioneers! O pioneers!"

District of Columbia Primary Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RESOLUTION OF DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on May 13 the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia adopted a very fine resolution, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia believes that in the District, among Democrats and other persons of independent and progressive inclinations, there exists a sentiment for the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President so preponderant that it amounts virtually to unanimity; and

Whereas knowledge that this sentiment exists is based on information gathered from every section of the community, from persons in all walks of life, but mainly from those identified with the residential class, in contradistinction to Federal employees of the more or less transitory groups; and

Whereas it is manifestly a sentiment resting, in general analysis, on three apparent and easily definable propositions, as follows:

1. Mr. Roosevelt took over the reins of government in a time of unprecedented national demoralization. The country was at its lowest ebb—economically, morally, and spiritually. Our fundamental institutions were under threat of danger more frightful than foreign foe and more sinister than civil war. The horrors of revolution lurked in the background. Roosevelt brought courage and action into a situation where before there had been but timidity and ineptitude. He saved the Nation.

2. Mr. Roosevelt, when he had effected this rescue, did not call it a day's work. He proceeded to safeguard the people against recurrence of the acts of maladministration and the misadventures of which they were the victims in the 1920's. With his administration there came in rapid succession a greater list of reforms than was ever before undertaken by any previous President. By his clear vision the course of recovery was charted; and by his stout heart and strong hand, through drought and flood, wars, man-made economic upheavals, and partisan abuse and misrepresentation such as was never before heaped upon the responsible head of the Nation, he consistently and doggedly held to his policy of using the power of his office under the Constitution for the benefit of humanity. History has already acclaimed him the greatest friend of the common people since Andrew Jackson.

3. Mr. Roosevelt, during the past 7 years, has steered a straight course toward peace. In a turbulent universe, with democracies of the Old World torn asunder and disintegrated at the whim of a single individual, with peoples everywhere harassed by the uncertainties of war, and the outlawry of dictators striving for the world knows not what, the President's foreign policy remains irrevocably fixed to its solid basis of justice—justice as vouchsafed in the teachings of Christianity. Particularly is he the champion of peace at home. He is not merely the most potent force for peace in America, but he is the foremost leader for peace upon whom the people of the world can rely today; and

Whereas, in consideration of these things, and because of the acuteness and unpromising condition of affairs in the world, it is the sense and desire of the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia that the people of the District shall have a voice in the nomination soon to be made of a Democratic candidate for President of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That all Democrats and other persons of independent and progressive inclinations, who are residents in the District of Columbia, and who are not under 21 years of age, be and hereby are invited and urged to participate in a Democratic primary election, to be held on Wednesday, June 5, next, by attending at District polling places, set up for their convenience, and there, by ballot, express their preference for delegates to represent them at the Democratic National Convention to be convened in Chicago July 15, 1940.

Onward, Christian Soldiers!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN BY H. L. MENCKEN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, May 19, entitled "Onward, Christian Soldiers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 19, 1940]

ONWARD, CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS!

(By H. L. Mencken)

The Honorable Mr. Roosevelt's heroic attempt to rescue England from the law of natural selection has got off to a good start, and may be expected to develop with undiminishing radiancy. As everyone knows, it has been long in preparation, and it would have been launched months ago if the hazards of the third-term campaign had not counseled caution. But with the Honorable JOHN N. GARNER lying dead upon the field and nearly all the other erstwhile fifth-column men leaping for cover, the way is now open to panic the booboisie in the grand manner, and this, no doubt, will be promptly undertaken and achieved. In a few weeks it will be a primary article of American dogma that it is an act of lunacy, and not only an act of lunacy but also immoral and against God, to change barrels going over Niagara.

The impediment lying in the proletarian disinclination to be butchered must be considered, of course, but it is not likely to last long. The plain people, having abandoned the barber shop, the village grocery, and the dream book for the radio, are now wholly dependent upon it for information and ideology, and in very short order they will be getting a horse doctor's dose of both. Six successive nights of White House crooning will make them pant for Hitler's poisonous blood; indeed, it would take only seven or eight to make them pant for Churchill's. That crooning will be on us anon, beginning for the same at middle C and running up gloriously to A above the clef.

To be sure, there may be some adverse caterwauling in Congress, but it will hardly be heard, and its effects are already discounted. The Democratic opposition to the New Deal has been acting of late like the opposition of the poor Dutch to Hitler's blitzkrieg, and the Republicans have been divided and demoralized by a Trojan horse operated by the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie, LL. D. He will be joined at once by many another agent of the economic royalists, and the end may well be a coalition ticket, with Roose-

velt heading it and Willkie taking the place of the liquidated Garner. If the harder-dying Republicans, refusing this chance to get aboard the band wagon of religion and morality, insist on nominating a ticket of their own, it will be as surely doomed as the ticket headed by the Honorable Roger W. Babson, LL. D., author of New Ways to Make Money, and What About God?

Thus the New Deal prepares for fresh and greater triumphs, and we seem to be in for a third and worse dose of salvation. In a few weeks it will become a kind of treason to mention the Budget. Money will begin to pour out like water from a bombed reservoir, and the national debt will leap agilely to new highs. The taxpayer will not only have to shoulder another half-million jobholders, and enrich a whole new generation of war profiteers; he will also have to take over the sustenance and supply of the English and French, both of whom now teeter on the rim of bankruptcy. I have little gift for prophecy and none at all for figures, but if the deficit for the calendar year 1940 does not smash all records I'll certainly be surprised, and if the national debt isn't above $75,000,000,000 by the time civilization is saved again I'll be glad to put on a dunce cap.

All this colossal looting will go on, of course, not in the name of saving England but in the name of national defense. To the fictitious German submarines which the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt announced last September are already added a huge fleet of imaginary German airships operating from Greenland, the West Indies, and Alaska. And to bring Japan into it, and thus further the Honorable Cordell Hull's pious endeavor to open the channels of trade, there is additional inflammatory talk about an attack from the islands of the southern Pacific, though every schoolboy is presumed to know that virtually all those islands are controlled by England, France, and Holland.

It is hard to discuss such rubbish seriously, but let us assume for a moment that it is true. If it is, who is responsible for the fact that the United States is not prepared to meet the onslaught? Obviously, the baby is squawking on the doorstep of the New Deal. It came into office more than a month after Hitler began his sinister career as Reichskanzler, and before the end of its first year all Europe was aware that a new struggle for power was in the making. By 1937 even Roosevelt himself was sounding loud alarms. But instead of looking to the national defenses while there was yet time, he and his associated frauds devoted themselves to buying votes at home, and in that enterprise they were still engaged at the time the storm broke.

No more gross perversion of governmental function was ever heard of on this earth. It was actually not until last year that the annual expenditure upon defense reached $1,000,000,000, though every year saw four or five times that amount wasted upon schemes to take money away from those who had earned it and give it to those who had not. In 1938 England spent 5.37 percent of its total national income on its army and navy, and France spent 6.36 percent, but the United States spent only 1.47 percent, and most of that small amount seems to have gone for naught. Nearly 2,500,000 boys have been put through the C. C. C. mill since 1933—all of them trained, at huge expense to the taxpayer, in the arts of the Boy Scout, but not one trained in those of the soldier.

The immense sums that the New Deal charlatans have got rid of otherwise have been equally unproductive. There is nothing to show for them now save a national debt of $45,000,000,000 and a horde of 10,000,000 career mendicants, all trained to believe that they are entitled to something for nothing. If half the billions that went into so training them had been spent in preparing them to fight for their country, no dictator would dream of flouting us today. And if half the billions that were frittered away upon costly garden cities for jobholders, imbecile guide books, and obscene communistic art had been laid out in equipping an army, it would now be as formidable as Hitler's.

Were the New Deal wizards the victims of their own Christian innocence? Was it impossible for them, as consecrated lovers of peace, to believe that the bosses of other countries could be so wicked as to make war? The answer is surely not aye. From the time of the first faint alarms they have been bitterly and raucously partisan and provocative. Beginning with Roosevelt himself and running down to such dubs as Cromwell and Bullitt, they have howled for one side and against the other. American neutrality has been constantly dishonest and nefarious, and there is every reason to argue that England would not have entered the combat at all if it had not had clear assurances of American support. At this moment every rational person knows that providing such support is the main business before the House and that all the gabble about attacks on the United States is only cover for it.

Such is the net effect of New Dealism in the field of foreign relations. As in the domestic field, it has let the taxpayer in for a wholesale looting, and in addition it has greatly endangered the national safety. After 6 months of doldrums, the war has suddenly taken on such a tempo that it may very well end before the rescue of England can be achieved or even attempted. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that the English, facing appalling and almost certain punishment, may make peace before any help beyond that which a prison chaplain offers to a condemned man can reach them.

Whether this happens or not, it must be plain that we have been let in for a long series of extremely unpleasant consequences. Our only hope, in fact, lies in an overwhelming English victory, which now begins to look excessively improbable. If it fails, we'll find ourselves face to face with a bloc of mighty and far-from-tender powers, each and every one of them smarting under a sense not only of injury but also of insult. The pecksniffian blather of Roosevelt, Hull, and company has offered them intolerable affronts—maybe deserved in moral theology, but certainly not by their reckoning. History shows that nations remember and resent such insolence long after they have forgotten the wounds of actual war. They nurse and cuddle them as an elephant nurses and cuddles the memory of a Mickey Finn concealed in a peanut shell.

Thus we seem doomed to pay another stupendous bill for the honor and glory of being governed by mountebanks. I suggest that we had better look sharply to our arms. It is an irony worthy of noting that the job of assembling, cleaning, and oiling those arms will probably be entrusted to the same mountebanks.

The American Defense Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Ernest Lindley on the American defense problem, and appearing in the Washington Post of this date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 22, 1940]

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE PROBLEM

(By Ernest Lindley)

In the supreme interest of our national security, diplomatic and naval steps of the most delicate and critical character may have to be taken within a few weeks. This sharp possibility arises from two facts:

(1) That within a matter of weeks the Germans, with or without Italian help, may win a victory over the Allies. Not a partial victory, followed by a negotiated peace, but a total victory, involving the destruction or surrender of the French Army and the destruction or successful invasion of Great Britain.

(2) That we are unprepared to do what we should do to guarantee our national security in the event of an Allied debacle, especially if Hitler should fall heir to the Allied fleets.

The stark realities are that the German war machine is even more formidable—very much more formidable—than it was generaly thought to be, and that the Allies are very much less well prepared to resist it than was generally thought—or than they thought. Various of our experts saw parts of the picture clearly long ago. A few voices were warning of the supremacy of Germany in the air and of its effect on the operations of armies and fleets. Our Army experts knew some time ago of this superiority of the German Army in mechanized equipment, both in numbers and quality. But the total picture was probably not clear to many, if any, people.

In appraising the picture almost everybody has been wrong. The pacifist isolationists and the pacifist internationalists were more thoroughly wrong. Those who advocated defense of the Western Hemisphere—or even the Western Hemisphere plus Oceania—saw the trend, but in most instances underestimated the time we would have to prepare for the moment of action. The President sensed the danger but befogged the situation with a political melange of meddling in Europe, futile expressions of indignation, and insufficient economic, military, and aerial preparation. If he had not misjudged the situation, he would not have supported the will-o'-the-wisp trade policies of Hull, and would not have indulged in the luxury of moral condemnation and halfway economic sanctions, unsupported by armed force. He would have talked, instead, in terms of defense of our national security.

But that is all water over the dam. The question now is not one of meddling in Europe but of our national security. Within a few weeks the Nazis may be able to line up in Norway, Holland, and Belgium, and on the French channel coast 6,000 or 7,000 bombing planes and fighter escort planes. (Meanwhile they may or may not have occupied Paris or knocked out the French Army.) If that happens, we may expect the most gigantic blackmail in the history

of the world: "Surrender the British Fleet intact, or Britain will be devastated." Whether the British would give up at the first threat is extremely doubtful, especially with a man of Churchill's fighting spirit at the head of the Government.

But suppose the Nazis convert London, the nerve center of Britain, into a shambles and then say: "Are you ready now to give up and surrender the fleet?"

Churchill has warned that the battle for the British Isles impends. The British have very considerable defenses against aerial attack but perhaps nothing like what may be necessary if Hitler is willing to gamble all on victory. Even if the British are able to withstand such punishment as no urban people have ever endured, the possibility cannot be eliminated that Great Britain will be successfully invaded and beaten to its knees.

In British shipyards a navy larger than the present Italian and German Navies combined is under construction. If Hitler gets these ships, he will have in short order, with the German and Italian Navies, a formidable force. If he gets in addition the Allied fleets afloat, or even part of them, he will have at his command by far the greatest navy afloat, in addition to by far the greatest air force and the most powerful army.

The power of the German land forces is not our imminent concern. The power of Germany in the air is more important to us. German naval power may be a life-and-death matter to us.

German air power may be indicated by the fact—or belief of our best-informed people—that the German production of military planes now exceeds 3,000 planes per month and will reach 6,000 per month by fall. The German production at present is believed to exceed the total world production outside Germany. Ours this month is about 600 planes and we won't reach 1,200 until about December. The Germans have a vast reserve of fully or partly trained pilots.

German superiority in the air need not worry us unless, or until, it is accompanied by sea power.

With Japan to watch in the Pacific, we cannot defend the naval and aerial approaches to the Western Hemisphere if the Allied fleets, in whole or in considerable part, shortly should fall into the hands of Germany or any firm ally of Germany.

This may prove to be an unduly dark picture. But any national policy which does not take account of the darkest possibilities is foolhardy.

A preeminent concern of American policy at the moment must be to assure that the Allied fleets are never surrendered. If they are scuttled, our situation will be bad enough in view of our inadequate preparations for defense, especially in the air.

We are powerless to influence the result of the great battle now being waged in France and Belgium. But we may be able to do a little to preserve the morale of the Allies if that battle goes adversely to them. To prolong their resistance it might help to guarantee to them unlimited economic assistance. If promptly given, such a pledge might influence the attitude of Russia and even of Italy. Both Stalin and Mussolini must be quaking in their boots. For if the French Army cannot withstand the German onslaught, the infinitely inferior Russian Army would stand no chance whatsoever. And Mussolini must sense that any spoils he might grab as a momentary ally of Germany could be taken from him about as quickly as the Nazis drove through Poland.

In return for whatever we can do to bolster the morale of the Allies and to accelerate economic assistance to them, we should seek to obtain the most solemn assurance that the Allied fleets will never be surrendered, and that if by air power they are forced off their present bases they will fall back on the Western Hemisphere and Singapore.

Endorsement of Third Term for President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the suggestion by Miss Dorothy Thompson in the New York Herald Tribune several days ago, which I had placed in the RECORD, that President Roosevelt be drafted by both parties to serve another term has been endorsed by a member of the Republican National Committee's speaker's bureau staff. These statements, coming voluntarily from Republican sources, are very gratifying, and it is very pleasing to me that my book Roosevelt Again is receiving popular attention. Evidently there is a trend toward adjournment of partisan politics.

I ask that the article to which I have reference, a news dispatch from the Washington Post, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 19, 1940]

REPUBLICAN LEADER URGES ROOSEVELT AS G. O. P. CHOICE

SEATTLE, May 18.—Melvin G. Winstock, member of the Republican National Committee's speakers' bureau staff, recommended today that the G. O. P. nominate President Roosevelt to succeed himself.

In letters to chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees, he asked that the Democratic National Convention nominate as Vice President a Republican chosen by the Republican National Convention; that the President give assurance he would form a coalition Cabinet; and that Congress agree to the immediate passage of legislation to secure the maximum productivity of the Nation and conscript wealth, industry, agriculture, and labor.

"Americans all," he wrote, "should set aside partisan politics and present a united front to the peoples of the world."

Petition for a Considerate Understanding Between the American Government and the Navajo People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

PETITION FROM THE NAVAJO TRIBE OF INDIANS OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition from members of the Navajo Tribe of the State of New Mexico.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PETITION FROM THE NAVAJO TRIBE FOR A CONSIDERATE UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND THE NAVAJO PEOPLE

(To be presented by Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senator, by request of the Navajos)

We, representatives of the Navajo Tribe, residing in the Navajo territory and Navajo Reservation within the State of New Mexico, do hereby protest the rules and regulations being imposed upon us by the administration of John Collier. We protest the following action and ask the careful analysis of our protests:

1. (a) We protest the system of having and maintaining 18 districts or subdivisions administering the affairs of the Navajo.

(b) We ask the return to the system of maintaining the judicial districts comprising six in number and thus situated to be of convenience to our people.

2. (a) We protest the reduction of our livestock under the present system that is destroying our right to free initiative and the right to make a lawful living from occupations that have been ours for centuries, and thus guarantees us life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness as is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

(b) We ask that you analyze the constitutional rights of John Collier, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to confiscate our property by force.

3. (a) We protest the coercion of our people by representatives of the United States Government. The system of force being used upon our people is making them disrespectful of a democratic form of government, to say nothing of the hardships that are being imposed upon our people by this unjust action.

(b) The attached report from the different districts of our reservation is but evidence of the injustice and the malfeasance of the present administration of Indian affairs.

4. (a) We approve action that will tend to improve our ranges and our condition, but the present effort to improve our conditions is so sudden and so forceful that it threatens to deprive us of our very existence. It goes without saying that it is an impossibility for a Navajo family to exist on the limited herds under the stock reduction plan, and we protest the action that tends to make prisoners of our people. We want to be a free people with constitutional rights to make our own living. We believe that the administration of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is unpractical for the future progress of our race.

4. (b) We do not believe that it is practical to administer the Taylor Grazing Act on the Navajo Reservation, and will tend, if enforced, to cause trouble with our people.

5. We define the action of creating a central agency at Window Rock as an act of extravagance at the expense of the Navajo people; that such agency has not been placed in the hands of men familiar with the lives and habits of the Navajo people. We believe the administration of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to be far from the purpose of democracy as is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

6. (a) This discussion brings out the question as to who is owner of the Indian lands. We contend that the treaties of our people with the United States Government present the Navajo people with the ownership of Navajo Indian lands. We therefore contend that our people have a right to self-government under the supervision and considerate cooperation of the United States Government, and we should be given the constitutional right to express our individual opinions and to present our individual arguments pro and con on all matters pertaining to Navajo affairs.

6. (b) Under the regulations and rules of the New Mexico Grazing District 7, act of June 28, 1934, the Indian Commissioner, or his duly authorized representative, may represent individual Navajoes, or groups of Navajo Indians in all district matters. This act alone deprives the Navajo of all rights to free speech, and since so many of our people do not speak or understand the English language, much misrepresentation has resulted, and our people have been persecuted as a result of the misrepresentation and many have been jailed as a matter of force to do things they do not understand.

In one treaty with the United States Government, dated June 1, 1868, we submitted to the protectorate of the United States Government and agreed to bring our trouble to our Government, and today we plead of our Government to come to our aid with an understanding that will benefit our people and bring to rest the unrest and wrongdoing that is caused by the action of the Commissioner and his subordinates who administer our affairs.

We, the undersigned, ask for an investigation of Indian affairs on the Navajo Reservation by men unbiased and understanding of the Navajo, and request the removal of John Collier as Indian Commissioner and his duly authorized representatives who are bringing action by force upon us.

Fred Tososie, Chief, Mascalito, Juan Agustin Guerto, Esquy Martin, Clyde Beyale, George Blackie, Pablo Martinez (Kimbeto), Woodie Harrison, and many Navajo of White Horse Chapter.

NAVAJO REPORT OF CONDITIONS AS REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPH 3–B

REPORT MADE BY TRIBESMEN ON THE RESERVATION

District 1: The Window Rock Agency inform the Navajos about Taylor Grazing Act. The regulation to stock holder were to reduce their sheep, goats, horses, and cows to one family. He should have five sheep, five goats, one horse, one cow; no more, and that will support his family and their older family.

District 2: The old folks will have no stock and they are not to raise no more stock for their families. They will be under Government relief.

District 3: Young folks that were married 2 years ago will have no stock for their family, same as old folks, and they will be under Government relief, too.

District 4: The regulation of the Taylor Grazing Act has to be one section land for winter and one section for summer. We suppose not to build a house or hogan or fence and water. The rules are to pay for water hole and for grass. If we don't accept this regulation on Taylor grazing, there will be $500 fine or you will be put in prison for that length of time if we refuse this regulation.

District 5: We like to get together with our meeting now and make out our plan. We have authority and as much power to talk against these regulations which come out from Window Rock Agency and other different places, because these things are not prove by Congress. We have government and we want the Government to protect our tribe stocks and other things that Window Rock Agency is putting on our tribe. We don't want to have the Government support us. We like to support ourself.

District 6: Please remember and keep in mind and worked for better things, and your delegates and chapter officers must work the rights of our tribe. Your delegate were chosen to stand for the rights of your people and your chapter officers please stand by your tribe and stand up for your chapter meeting and talk for your tribe.

District 7: Indeed, my people, our plan which we meet for here today from different places—and I hope you will like these plans. We want to put our Fryer out of Window Rock Agency and all his guards and his supervise, because they are working against the Navajo Tribe and they are putting the tribe into starvation and destroying Indian stock and other things which we don't believe its prove by United States Congress. We want to get six different agency which was located within the reservation. When we had these six agency the Navajo Tribe were better off, because they had their own agency which located in their own districts. Since the Window Rock Agency was situated on the reservation they have split 18 different districts within the reservation. Therefore, lets get together and fight against these regulations. Lets cut them up in small pieces and throw them out of our way and ask our Government to give us better agency that will work for our Navajo Tribe so our tribe will not get into the starvation with our country.

District 8: It was stated that there was 337,000 different tribe United States within other countries and 227,000 Indian tribes living in United States. Indians living in United States have as much power and rights to ask the Government to protect their stocks and families and other things.

District 9: It was stated to the tribe by a missionary, Mr. Walker, and a lawyer who went to Washington for a visit, that where we find out about these things and it was not prove through Congress and Indian Affairs. And so the lawyer talked to one of our head men. He said get together all of your delegates and chapter officers and all the tribe. Talk against these unlawful regulations which is upon you from Window Rock Agency. Because you have as much rights than I to talk against it. They would not do anything to you if you talk for self-defense. The Government's given you authority and power; talk for the rights of your tribe.

OTHER NEWS FROM DIFFERENT PLACES

District 10: Mount Taylor and Crown Point Districts have accepted the Taylor Grazing Act. That is in some places were Navajo Tribe cannot think for themself. These Navajo will be under starvation as those of the southwestern reservation. They may be under relief record of Window Rock Agency.

District 11: Districts 19 have the same trouble as any other places. Six years ago this regulation was put up among the tribe, and 3 years ago it got worse as ever. It was stated by a Navajo that this regulation was made by rich people from somewhere to get rid of Navajo stocks.

District 12: Navajo stated J. C. Morgan stated that this Taylor grazing was not harmful and will not do no damage to your tribe and your stocks, too. He said it was one of the great things for us and its the benefit to your tribe. He thought that but he was wrong about it. The future is at hand now and we must try our best and keep away and not accept any regulation that come out from Window Rock Agency.

District 13: Districts 4, Black Mountain News. Navajo stated a supervisor came and had meeting 3 day ago. Meeting was about Taylor grazing. One section land was to be use for 6 months and 6 months for the other. For Taylor grazing we have to pay taxes as citizen and go by this regulation. If we refuse these orders we will have to pay $500 fund or they send you to jail for that length of time.

District 14: Navajo stated that Indian trading post grocers were pretty high, and its hard to make a living out here. He stated he wants to take up cheap trading post for his tribe. Again he stated that Fryer stated that there was 254 families that need relief in District 4. You Navajo Indian are better off then where I came from. I drank more coffee than I ever had, and its cheap, too.

District 15: Mount Rose white people stated that the Navajos had as much authority and power to live like white people told us to try our best talk for your rights. Navajo policeman and try to handcuff him and take him to the jail. He told them to handcuff him if they had some authority to do that. But after all they didn't take me.

District 16: Cottonwood Circle Navajo stated that who send these delegates legal. What were they good for. Where have these delegates legal come from. Have they come from the State of Arizona, Utah, Colorado, or New Mexico. It's unknown to our tribe and they never do us any good since the delegate of our tribe got these legal.

District 17: Mexican Spring. Old fellow stated that he was enlisted for scout army and went to the war with some number of Navajos and United States Government promise the Navajos that they will win their country back for their tribe if they would help in the army. So I have given my heart and head and life for my country and tribe. Why shouldn't the Government remember this part.

District 18: Regulations that come out from St. Johns, Ariz., put the Navajo to sleep and they can't hardly talk against it.

Santa Fe, State of New Mexico. Navajos in these counties are wide awake and they took up their trouble in Santa Fe and Albuquerque, N. M., in the courthouse. Number of the courthouse are willing to help our tribe if we do our part and talk against the regulation of Window Rock, because these regulation was

not put out from Santa Fe or Albuquerque courthouse. We will help you people all we can to fight for freedom.

District 19: Notice on Fryer relief for Navajo tribe. A truck load of relief stuff will be issued. Fryer order these relief stuff from Kansas warehouse—150,000 pounds of relief stuff, such as flour, coffee, sugar, beans, cornmeal, B power. These stuff will be issued to those who are under starvation. These relief to be hauled western side of Black Mountain and Mount Taylor districts and other places were it's needed. The relief stuff above hauled before snowfall.

District 20: Fryer stated that radio system was improving on the reservation. Fifty thousand Navajos took interested in radio system.

District 21: Navajo stated not half don't know anything about radio. Some never seen these radio yet.

District 22: 10,000 horses have been destroyed on southwestern of the reservation. Obey the regulation on stock reduction more and horse will not pay Navajo bill.

District 23: Hashtlishmi Nez stated he was clear an acre of land to put some crop for himself. He thought he was doing something to support himself and his family, and so Supervisors came along and told him he done wrong and was against the law of Taylor Grazing Act, and so he stated he is in jail for 12 months.

District 24: Fred Kebeto Districts. States when he made a visit to Washington, D. C., with J. C. Morgan, the Congress made some prove that we had our rights to keep our stocks and we suppose to get our 6 agency back on the reservation, and other things were promise. I am very glad to hear that you all working for our tribe. Thanks.

District 25: Coyote Spring News. A Navajo stated he had his daughter herding his sheep. She has been gone all day, and missed the girl coming home with the sheep. So the Navajo went and look for the sheep and he track the sheep copy mile away and he know who took the sheep. It was the Government stock man that took the sheep and he put the sheep in the corral. The next morning he went to get his sheep and Government men offer him $10 and he can get his sheep out of the corral. His brother had his sheep with him, so his brother get his sheep back. The sheep got into a fence pasture that was the reason why. He was notify before about getting his sheep in that pasture. The Government men gave the Navajo sheep and so they send a sheriff from St. Johns and had him arrest and was put in jail for 35 days.

District 26: A supervisor stated they will be put in court in Santa Fe if they don't accept this branding on Indian horses.

District 27: Two Navajo boys was put in jail for some reason, under 12 years and 13 years of age.

District 28: Navajo pupils that were married 2 years ago were enrolled in relief record.

So the supervisor issue some relief stuff to these fellows and he orders them they will worked 2½ days for their relief stuff and they will pay for them.

The meeting took place January 8, 1940. Number of Navajo attend the meet were 384 Navajos.

Will have a meeting at Pueblo Altro January 18–19–20, 2 days, and 4 other meeting they will have on southwestern reservation.

The Navajo Indians are becoming more and more dissatisfied with the Federal administration of their lives, habits, and reservation. The latest complaint is against having one central agency at Window Rock, Ariz. The Indians want to return to the system that gave them separate agencies in six jurisdictions within the boundary of the reservation. Navajos in the northern half of the reservation have always complained about Window Rock being so far away. To the Indians, Window Rock is a fabled city, inhabited not with fairies but with "Maitso." Few are the Indians in the northern half of the reservation who have visited the Navajo Agency in Window Rock, but they learned of its working when agents came along and reduced their herds and took their ponies. This is done to conserve the range, the theory being that the grass will grow "heap big" if the range is not overstocked, but no provision is made to get water on the range. The Navajo rain dance will take care of that. No doubt much good will come from the soil-conservation work, but this work is limited to soil-erosion control and grazing control, which places the benefits in the future. No immediate relief for the Navajo today is forthcoming, since the action tends to add to the Navajo's troubles of everyday life. He is suffering much for the benefit of future generations. His trade has been stolen by the white commercializers; his herds are reduced to below a make-living standard; his pony, legal tender, has gone through the reduction plant. The jobs that are rightfully his are given to the white men; the money that should be spent to ease his suffering is represented in traveling caravans, large administration buildings, hundreds of bales of mimeograph paper, typewriters, stenographers, and publicity workers.

A common-sense plan to rehabilitate the Navajo would develop the natural resources of Navajo land—timber, oil, mining, water, and irrigation—and thus bring about a self-supporting program. The Navajo set-up, past and present, has made white men rich and the Navajos poor. (George B. Bowra in the Aztec Independent-Review, Aztec, N. Mex., January 19, 1940.)

Responsibilities of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, OF TEXAS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for inclusion therein a copy of an address delivered by me on the 19th of this month as a part of the I Am an American program at Hollywood. In this connection I want to congratulate and thank this community and many others in the country for this timely patriotic service to the country. One of the most hope-inspiring things which I have observed in a long time was this group of American citizens not only attending to a local civic duty but giving their time and money to stimulate a Nation-wide interest in really getting on the job as American citizens in doing a most urgently necessary thing.

The address follows:

Citizens of America, newly come to that privilege and to that responsibility, we welcome you and declare with you in the spirit of dedication and high unyielding purpose, "I am an American."

If we are to survive as a democracy, the serious, solemn, sacred obligation and the all but divine privilege of American citizenship must come soon within the conscious realization of our people. You come to governmental responsibility with many inherited domestic difficulties in what may prove to be for the whole world the most tragic epoch of the ages. Things long established are being shaken to their foundations. The din of battle, the cry of the vanquished, the crash of democracies greet you today as you come to the threshold of governmental responsibility. Upon you as Americans, not upon agents of government, depend the mightiest issues of history.

You have a great opportunity. You are called to responsibility, challenged by a responsibility greater than that which in a thousand years has come to test the fiber and make it possible for a generation—your generation—to tower above all its fellows as they pass again in review before the historian, who must now rewrite the history of the world. I use no figures of speech. I declare the solemn, challenging truth that either you will be the greatest generation that has lived on this earth in a thousand years, demonstrating your greatness by the greatest achievement which in that time has adorned the history of the world, or you will by your failure to measure up to the challenge of your difficulties go down in defeat, carrying with you the wreckage of what will probably for a long time be the last of the remaining great popular governments of the earth. Will you do that? The answer is, "I am an American." The battle cry is, "I am an American." But the answer is not in the waving of flags, the saluting of flags, the singing of anthems, the reciting of creeds.

They have their place, but they warn us of the danger of our patriotism becoming ritualistic. Patriotism without works, like faith without works, is dead. It is good to honor those who have served their country well, but we honor them best not by worshiping at their shrines but by emulating their example with a patriotism of flesh and blood, willing to work at governing, willing to sacrifice, to suffer that the things in government for which they sacrificed and suffered may live. It does not matter how often we salute the flag and sing the national anthem. Whenever the governmental capacity of a people operating a system of popular government becomes less and remains less for a considerable period of time than their governmental difficulties, the form of their government must change.

This is a challenging thought, a challenging fact: May I give you my conclusion based on the facts which I have got as near their sources as it has been possible for me to approach? Except by conquest, no people privileged to govern themselves ever lost that privilege until they had first lost their capacity for self-government. No people who failed to use their capacity for self-government were ever able to retain it. No people who had lost their capacity to govern themselves were ever able to remain free. I am using no idle words; I am declaring the solemn warning truths of history, that when any people become so inefficient governmentally in proportion to their governmental difficulties that they cannot do the business of government, government of necessity turns from them and lays its hand on a Mussolini, a Hitler, or a Stalin to do its work.

Governments are no more accidents than worlds and trees and human beings are accidents. The fact that there shall be government is fixed by nature in human necessity. Human beings have a choice, but the only choice they have is which of two great systems of government they will have. It is either some form of totalitarian government functioning from the top downward, or a government by the people which by its nature functions from the people upward. One is directed by men who believe that might is right; the other is guided by principles which are fixed in the economy of nature.

Human wisdom unaided is not wise enough to operate such a system of government. Confused and muddled by the false belief that men, some human beings in conventions, in a creative sense gave to us our system of government, we have been looking to no higher authority than human wisdom to guide us in its operation.

Each of the basic provisions of our constitution originated out of necessity, and was tested by the experience of a people peculiarly gifted with the genius of self-government long before our constitutional conventions undertook the task of our written constitutional constructions. If we are to emerge from the difficulties that now endanger us, we must rid our minds of the silly, historically incorrect, humanly impossible mythological tales about some supermen having created for us our Constitution and system of government; and, instead of such tales, which have crowded out the truth, and which are as impossible of human accomplishment as the tales of the Grecian gods, we must realize the truth about our Constitution.

The Constitution of a popular government comes from the same source that the constitution of your physical body comes from, the same source that a tree comes from. No political philosopher or constitutional convention in a creative sense ever fashioned the constitution of a living government. Constitutions of popular governments are living things; they must be rooted in the governmental concepts of a people whose governmental capacity is able to sustain them, or they wither and die as a plant withers and dies rooted in a soil which does not sustain it.

We live in a universe of natural law governing everything from the smallest atom to the greatest systems of worlds. In this universe of law there is a live God, a great intelligence, a great power. I say in all reverence He is the Big Boss. We may be His copartners, if we will, but we must work in obedience to His law. Only in the field of government do human beings now ignore this fact, and in the field of government is the one outstanding failure of this age.

We have the choice aided by the guidance of great principles which govern governments, of governing ourselves or being driven by the lash of oppression to the discharge of a neglected duty. This is the fundamental law I would impress. People learn to govern by governing. They retain the ability to govern by using it. They lose the ability to govern by not using it. They acquire the greater ability to meet the greater problems of tomorrow only by using the ability today possessed to meet the problems of today.

The difficulties of popular government, like all other difficulties, have been provided for the development of people. Nature has no disposition to avoid difficulties for people. It creates them. The development of people is the central objective of nature. Difficulties are the gymnastic paraphernalia provided for that development. We know by our own experience and observation that no individual was ever greater than his difficulties. No victory was ever greater than the battle fought to win it. The greatest epochs of the world are those in which peoples with a purpose which would not yield, with a courage which sustained, fought their way through the greatest difficulties of time. The history of the world is but a record of difficulties overcome. Being on top of the hill is not important in the scheme of nature. Had it been so, we would have all been created on the top of the hill. Climbing the hill and gaining the strength from the climbing is what is important, instead of sitting down at the foot of the hill because it is steep and rugged and letting the muscles grow flabby. It is a law, a universal law, and therein lies the philosophy of self-government.

Progress is slow. Progress is uphill. Progress is difficult. Progress is the road of struggle and of strength; along that road lies the thrill of victory, the fitness to live. We are getting soft in America. We want the easy way, the fast way. But the easy way, the fast way, is the road downhill. It is the road of retreat. It may be alluring, but it is the lure of death. Study your own life. Examine history.

When some difficulty comes to our communities, to the smaller units of government, to our States, which function largely through smaller units, where the people choose their chief officers and have the opportunity to control, where the individual's voice may be heard and his influence felt,—instead of grappling with that difficulty and adding thereby to our governmental capacity by the use of the capacity which we possess, we cry out for a supergovernment to come in and do the job for us. As a result we not only fail to receive the increased capacity to govern which nature gives as a reward to those who use the capacity already possessed, but we lose capacity. Nature takes from us the capacity which we fail to use. It is the law of life. Let the greatest athlete go to bed and cease to use his muscles; the strength in his muscles will not remain. Let any self-governing people shift their governmental responsibilities away from themselves and, in proportion as they do, the strength to govern departs.

Basically considered, from the disregard of these fundamental facts, great laws of Nature which govern, not only in government but everywhere, which determine sound policy, which limit human discretion, which fix the program for the development and preservation of governmental capacity of the people, from that disregard, basically considered, our major governmental difficulties and dangers have come. That is my judgment. I have examined the facts. I have been trained in the school of practical experience. I have subjected that judgment to every test to which experience has taught me to subject judgment before yielding to its guidance. I give it to you for whatever it may be worth.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget" that we live in a world of universal law, that we talk through the air, fly through the air, and do all the other wonderful things of this complex age because we have discovered and are obedient to natural law, lest we forget that long ago great thinkers, practical people who had searched the mysteries of life declared as a discovered fact that "there is a God who presides over the destiny of nations." Young men and women, and those from other lands, coming to governmental responsibility, let me impress that government is not the one hiatus in Nature where there is no governing natural law. There is no hiatus in all the universe. Only by obedience to that law can human beings now operate and preserve in this complex scientific age a great system of popular government, such as we have.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget."

Cherries and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS (MICH.) PRESS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much loose talk going on with regard to the reciprocal-trade agreements, foreign competition, and higher costs under the Wages and Hours Act. I do not know whether it is because of ignorance of the facts or deliberate attempts to mislead the public, and I care not. Such talk should stop.

Recently my good friend and colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] made a speech with regard to what he claimed was wrong with legislation concerning the cherry industry. He claimed foreign competition occasioned by a lower tariff and higher costs under the Wage and Hour Act was ruining the cherry industry. The facts do not justify such remarks. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of Grand Rapids, Mich., and no one can accuse the Grand Rapids Press of being either New Deal or Democratic, entitled "Cherries and the Tariff."

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press]

CHERRIES AND THE TARIFF

Michigan cherry growers, who produce about one-fourth of the total cherry crop in the United States, probably were greatly interested in a recent House speech by Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Muskegon, regarding their industry. ENGEL told his colleagues that Michigan growers are being crushed between foreign competition occasioned by a lower tariff and higher costs under the Wages and Hours Act.

There is undoubted justification for the complaints concerning the Wages and Hours Act as it applies to the processing of cherries, but his charges against the tariff gave rise to suspicion that ENGEL was merely following what seems to be the routine custom of so many Republicans these days of blaming all the ills of the country on the reciprocal-trade policy.

ENGEL declared, it will be recalled, that Michigan cherry growers developed a maraschino cherry with the aid of a protective tariff, reduced imports from 22,000,000 pounds to a few thousand pounds a year. Then, he added, the State Department, "over our repeated protests," made a reciprocal-trade agreement with France reducing the tariff on maraschino cherries 20 percent, with the result that "we are now receiving importations of cherries not from France but from Italy under the most-favored-nation clause."

"Farm prices were forced down as low as 1½ to 2 cents a pound, and the growers have been producing cherries at a loss for some time," ENGEL declared, placing the onus on the current trade policy.

That would be a serious charge, if true. But it doesn't check with the facts, which ENGEL might easily have ascertained. James W. Young, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, in response to a query, reveals the following facts about the tariff rate:

"The duty fixed by the Tariff Act of 1930 on cherries—maraschino, candied, crystallized, or glazed, or prepared or preserved in any manner—was 9½ cents per pound and 40 percent ad valorem, the combined duty being equivalent to approximately 105 percent ad valorem in 1931, to 103 percent ad valorem in 1933, and 95 percent ad valorem in 1935. Under the trade agreement with France, the specific duty of 9½ cents per pound was left unchanged, but the ad valorem duty was reduced to 20 percent. On the basis of imports in 1939, the reduced duty was still equivalent to 91 percent ad valorem."

From this it is clear that the difference between the combined duty in 1935, before the trade treaty with France was signed, and the duty in 1939 was less than 5 percent—not the 20 percent which Representative ENGEL charged. His statement apparently was the result of some loose figuring on the reduction of the ad valorem from 40 to 20 percent, in which he completely ignored the fixed duty of 9½ cents per pound. Young also states:

"The Department of Agriculture reports the production of cherries in the United States to have been 278,280,000 pounds in 1938, and an estimate by the United States Tariff Commission places the production of maraschino cherries in that year at about 36,000,000 pounds, compared to 12,000,000 pounds in 1925. * * * Imports (of maraschino cherries), which come almost entirely from France, have not only been negligible but also have shown no material increase since the trade agreement with France became effective on June 15, 1936."

In support of the latter statement, Young cites figures showing that in 1935 maraschino imports totaled 24,863 pounds, valued at $4,275, of which 24,841 pounds came from France. In 1937, after the French agreement was in effect, total imports rose to 57,598 pounds, valued at $10,587, of which 56,019 pounds came from France. Imports dropped below the 1935 figure in 1938, however, and in 1939 total imports were only 35,303 pounds, valued at $4,718, of which 32,798 pounds came from France. The imports from Italy, of which ENGEL makes so much, could not have been more than 2,500 pounds.

It should be noted that total maraschino imports in 1939 were less than one-tenth of 1 percent of domestic production. Of significance, too, are the figures showing that imports in 1931, immediately after the imposition of the Smoot-Hawley rates, were 168,399 pounds, or three times the 1937 imports following the reciprocal trade agreement with France.

In a final word Young comments: "In considering our foreign trade in cherries, account must, of course, be taken of exports as well as imports. In 1939 imports of cherries, including fresh, amounted to 1,609,539 pounds (less than one-half of 1 percent of domestic production), valued at $108,074, while exports of fresh and canned cherries, the only items for which I have statistics readily available, amounted to 5,363,193 pounds (almost 2 percent of domestic production), valued at $481,069, being greatly in excess of imports."

Cherry growers may judge for themselves whether the encouragement of foreign trade hurts or helps their industry. Representative ENGEL probably knows that the troubles of the cherry producers are domestic rather than foreign. It has been frequently suggested that cherry growers and processors might do a great deal more for themselves if they would adopt national advertising and promotion policies to increase their domestic markets. Blaming trade policies for their plight is obviously reduced to absurdity.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZEBULON WEAVER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

TELEGRAMS FROM CLARK FOWLER AND ERIC R. HALL

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams relating to our national defense legislation:

ASHEVILLE, N. C., *May 17, 1940.*

Hon. ZEBULON WEAVER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We wish to urge that you, as well as all of the other Congressmen, support President Roosevelt's program to finance the building up of our defense with the view of protecting our great country. Have just read where Senator GEORGE stated we need 25,000 airplanes, 100,000 pilots, and 1,000,000 trained men. We think we need double the quantity of each, and we need to get busy now. It is better to allot $25,000,000,000 for the protection of our country and be in position to protect it rather than later get in a war that would cost us $50,000,000,000 and then lose on account of not being prepared. For your information, we are a branch of Eli Witt Cigar Co., manufacturers and distributors of cigars, large taxpayers, and we are willing, along with others of our great Nation, to stand our part of whatever the cost may be. Time is essential. When there is an emergency, such as exists today, we should take action. It is to be hoped that we will never have to use arms for defense or otherwise; but with the world in the condition it is today, it is suicide for us to sit still and depend on faith or fate to protect us. We should arrange to protect ourselves.

CLARK FOWLER.
CLARK FOWLER CIGAR CO.

ASHEVILLE, N. C., *May 18, 1940.*

Congressman ZEBULON WEAVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Kiffin Rockwell Post, No. 2, American Legion, Asheville, urges your support of any bill offered that will increase our national defense.

ERIC R. HALL,
Post Adjutant.
MARSHALL W. ORR,
Post Commander.

The Attitude of the Churches Toward the Present World War—Scripture Lesson: Matthew 5: 38–48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

SERMON BY REV. NEWTON N. MANTLE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed a sermon delivered on Sunday, May 19, at the First Methodist Church at Ironton, Ohio, by Rev. Newton N. Mantle. Reverend Mantle is a very capable and worthy man and a credit to his profession.

The sermon follows:

It is almost certain that there are many here this morning who cannot and will not agree with much that will be said in this sermon. This can be expected when the subject itself is considered, for it is a topic over which there is bound to be a great diversity of opinion. If there should be something said that will help stimulate quiet thinking on the subject of peace as against war, and if what is said will help many of us to be just a little less hasty in our judgments and more fair in our decisions, then the preacher will feel that the sermon has served the purpose for which it has been prepared.

The attitude of the church during the past 20 years should be reviewed. When a boy in England and up to the time of maturity (which brought me to the first World War) I do not remember ever having heard a sermon against war. In all those years of easy impressions I do not remember ever having heard a school teacher saying at any time that war was foolish and wrong. But for the past 20 years and up to the present conflict the world has become conscious of the folly and injustice of war, and the Christian ministry of all denominations, the teachers in our schools and colleges, have been preaching and teaching that war is wrong, foolish, and unnecessary. Men like Harry Emerson Fosdick, the late Parks Cadman, and vast numbers of the greatest ministers in the world have been pleading for settlement of disputes without force of arms, and that, regardless of the consequences, they would never again support another war as they had the first World War. One of the greatest sermons on peace ever written is that of Dr. Fosdick when he preached on the subject of the Unknown Soldier, in which sermon he offers his devout apology for ever having encouraged the boys to go to war at all.

Hundreds of books have been written showing the cost and folly of war, and hundreds more have been printed to instruct the world that war is incompatible with Christian teachings.

The result of all this has been that many people have come to believe that there should no longer be a resort to war. Many of the young men have become conscientious objectors. Those attending the Young People's Institutes for the past 15 years have found always a course of study offered on war and peace. Thousands have been taught, and many convinced, that the only way to permanent happiness is the renunciation of war. It is rather safe to say that no institution in the world has had so much to do

with this change of attitude in the public mind as has the Christian church. And I for one have been proud of the church for its great campaign of education for peace.

The foregoing has been particularly true of the democracies, but probably not so true of the totalitarian states. The reason for this is that the power of one man depends on armed strength, and such men will not tolerate any talk about the evil of war. This will also largely explain why the democracies have not been as well prepared for war as have the dictator states.

Now there is coming a rapid change in the thinking of the public. We find that many who have advocated peace at any price are now silent. Many who have felt war to be wrong, and who still feel so, now accept it as inevitable. Many more have been so dismayed and horrified over the needless aggression of innocent countries in the present war that all thoughts of peace have been wiped out, and there is a cry for revenge.

It is encouraging to the speaker, however, that so many of the men of the pulpit are still soundly and strongly against war, and that comparatively few of them have weakened their stand in this matter. Even in Canada some ministers have held out, against overwhelming public opinion, for the stand they had previously taken. It is time for us as Christians to examine once more the problems that face us as a church. There might be a day come soon when such a sermon as this will be refused a hearing of any kind. It has happened before and it can happen again.

Was the church, then, wrong in its attitude during the past few years? Has it made a mistake? Is it now necessary to retract what has been preached in moments when ideals were high? The answer we would like to give to these questions is "no." The church was right, and the church that now stands for opposition to war is still right. The reason we are so emphatic here is that regardless of whether we are forced to go to war or not, we still feel that it is definitely anti-Christian, and that the church dare not back down from its idealistic stand. War generates hate, bitterness, injustice, cruelty, lies, brutality, crime, disease, and low morals. War is evil from start to finish. There is nothing Christian about war. The church, therefore, cannot support it as Christian.

But what if war is forced upon us? Surely it may be truly said that the democracies have not wanted this war. The very fact of their unpreparedness is proof of this fact. Then, too, it is in the democracies that there has been the agitation for disarmament and for the abolition of war. When a murderer is at large there is only one thing to do and that is to try and arrest him, and make it impossible for him to commit another murder. The war in its final provocation has been brought on by the dictators. Russia going into Finland gave Hitler all the encouragement he needed, and he needed very little, for he had already shown his caliber on other smaller nations.

But are not both sides in the wrong? Even if our indignation and our anger have been very much aroused by the invading forces during the past few years, can we quiet ourselves for a few moments to look back and try to see the cause of this conflict, even the primary causes? This is not easy to do. The speaker is English born and fought in the American Army against the Germans in 1918. He finds his resentment growing so bitter that he has to constantly remind himself of Christ and of Christ's great love for all in order to keep hatred out of his heart, and even then he naturally feels a sense of elation whenever there is a report of Allied successes. These statements are made to show that, after all, the minister is as human as any who listen to him. But are not both sides to blame? Suppose we do agree that nothing can excuse the brutal war-mindedness and grasping ambition of the dictator nations. Supposing we also agree that the war could have been averted permanently had only Hitler been more willing to listen to reason, and have waited a few more years for the fairer attitudes of the Allied nations, which we have reason to believe would have become increasingly apparent. Yes; even if we do rightfully throw all the blame on Hitler for the actual combat, yet is it not still true that the democracies forced upon Germany the Hitler regime? In spite of high, hard, bitter feelings, let us try to stop long enough to be fair.

The first World War left all European nations embittered and in desperate conditions. It was bound to take years of readjustment and rebuilding to bring things back to anything like normal. In fact, this was never done. Now, if this was true of the Allied Nations, it was infinitely more true of the defeated nations. With the national treasuries bankrupted, with industrial plants destroyed or dismembered, with commerce with Germany made nigh impossible, because no nation would extend credit nor trade by the system of barter. With a people facing starvation, poverty, deprivation, a lost national pride, and with an allied army watching over their every move, is it not natural that there grew up a bitter resentment in the heart of a people who, after all, are a great and brave race of people? They cried for justice, and most of the world felt that they had it—perhaps they did—so they cried out for mercy, a chance to live as a nation. But the Allied Nations would give them none until it was too late. Then just a few years before the present conflict broke out the English and the Americans began to change their thinking, and it was admitted that the Versailles Treaty was, if not unjust, at least cruel, revengeful, and absolutely impossible.

The Allied Nations came to agree that if another war was to be averted that some concessions must be made to the German Nation. But none were made, and a Hitler was lifted to power. At first Germany did not want him. At first she refused him hearing and he was jailed. At first they waited for their democracy to work in their beloved country, but there was no chance. The Allied Nations, which could be pardoned for their bitterness and vengeance for the few years just following the war, continued to blind themselves to the consequences of constant oppression. And a dictator nation was born. Then it was too late. Too late. Hitler inaugurated a reign of racial and class hatred. The intelligentsia were persecuted and forced to flee the country. The Jews were robbed, banished, oppressed, and murdered. Hate was the word most heard in the German language, or words kindred to it. It was too late. But it need never have been. If only the Allies had been merciful after victory. If only they could have been reasonable, more generous, and more Christlike, even 10 years after the heat of the conflict had worn off; if only they had tried to help place Germany on her feet while she was yet a republic, this whole war might have been completely averted. There would have been no need for a Hitler. There could have been a League of Nations with force of power, especially if the United States had stood with it. But it was too late.

Now look at the results. No matter which side wins the war, the world will be scores of years making any recovery. If the dictator nations win, capitalism is doomed, and democracy will find itself threatened on every quarter. No one can foretell what will happen in the United States. That it will be profoundly affected goes without saying. The entire international relationship will be changed. Commerce will be disrupted, and who can tell what will happen to industry? What will take place in Japan or in South America? And what will Canada do? Who can tell? Probably Canada will declare its independence.

If the Allied Nations win, what will be the result? It will mean a repetition of the Versailles. Maybe worse. There will likely be an attempt to completely dismember Germany. Reparations will be imposed that will be just as impossible as those of 22 years ago. Distrust, bitterness, revenge, hate, suppression, all these will be displayed. Germany ruined, and the other warring nations bankrupt in wealth and men. Years of depression, rapidly growing crime, likewise will follow. Then slowly but surely the German peoples remaining will draw once more together; a national spirit will be revived and secret armies will be rebuilt. Men, women, and children will be trained to go forward once more for national existence, a war that will turn out to be another war for German world conquest. But this period may never again have a chance to come, for by that time Russia will have by far the most powerful war machine in Europe and resources second to none. The weakened nations can be quickly overcome, and the last state of the world will be worse than anything we can now imagine. Gone will be liberty; gone will be free religious thought; gone will be freedom of speech and press; and gone will be anything resembling the capitalistic system.

Not an attractive picture; but who will deny that some such results are bound to be the consequences of a German or an Allied victory or because of a prospective Russian invasion. Therefore, if the war continues the world faces a future that is very dark, and it will be robbed of most of what we have hitherto regarded as precious and most worth while and sacred.

America should stay out of the war if at all possible. This for several reasons. Because we believe that the United States can best serve the world as a peaceful Nation, both to help the world establish peace whenever such is at all possible, and second that it might be able to help steer the war-torn world to sanity again and assist it commercially and industrially when the period of reconstruction sets in. An America at peace will be of vastly more service to the world after the war than an America that has been a nation at war. Then, too, no country in the world has been preaching and teaching peace as strongly as has the United States. To stay out of the war will help America to continue her messages of peace after the war is over. And, finally, if there is to be another attempt to federate the nations of the world, then America can help build this unity better by remaining at peace than by entering the war now.

The only grounds that the United States has for entering the war is that of self-defense. This statement will not satisfy a large number of people, but if there is anything more important than victory in this present war it is the careful planning for the future of the world. The world must come to see that war is absolutely futile, completely destructive, and ruinous for all who participate. Only in the event of a direct threat to the United States should this country consider joining the combat. Then if the present plans of spending billions to build the largest war machine in the world is only for that of a defensive war, we can state that we are in favor of the present administrative program. But when this is said, it should also be added that the United States must stay completely out of the combat except for an actual invasion of our own home territory. If this sounds selfish, we should again remind ourselves that we hold war to be folly, useless, and wrong, and that no nation ever wins a war in this day. All are losers. And let it be emphasized again that America can best serve the world as a peaceful nation.

Now, what should be the attitude of the church? That America should stay at peace. That war is still wrong even when forced upon us, and that since it is wrong we will never resort to it unless it is absolutely forced upon us. The church should stand unitedly behind the forming and maintaining of a federation of the nations of the world. It should preach and teach that in that federation all nations, large and small, be treated with the same kind of justice.

The church must preach that backward nations such as India, Africa, China, and smaller European nations be given every opportunity for self-expression, independence, and self-improvement, with the encouragement of the other nations. The church must preach that selfishness and greed are the basic forces and motives of all wars and that such greed and selfishness must be condemned whatever and wherever its source, home or abroad. The church must preach that all men are brothers no matter what the color or tongue, and that for brothers to fight is unthinkable, and that since all men are brothers all men have an equal right to live. The church must teach that after the war is over and an armistice declared that the coming peace terms must be with mercy and love as a basis, and without hate and vengeance. (That this will be improbable if Germany is the victor seems too strongly testified to be refuted, but the church must still preach it as a cardinal doctrine of Christian love and faith.)

The church must teach that only by the spirit of forgiveness can a right kind of relationship be established in the world and the church must preach that warring nations are built of individuals, men, women, and children, the most of whom are not devils, nor demons, but are human beings asking only for a chance to live with equal opportunities with other nations and peoples. The church should teach that distinctions between race and color and nationality have no part in the program of God, as far as His children are concerned, and that what He has given to the world He has given for all the world to use. The church must teach, preach, and stand for the high principles of love, kindness, understanding, fairness, and justice for all. The church must preach that human nature is not inherently wrong or low but that it is driven to such standards by injustice, misunderstandings, and greed. It must preach that the Germans as a people are just as fine as the English, and it should remind the people in America that there are some of the finest citizens of the world who have come from Germany and England to be adopted by the United States. Surely all the people of Germany are not like Hitler.

Let it be remembered that there can be no permanent victory in this war for any side. No one will win the war, in the strictest sense of the word. The events following the first World War have proved that. If Germany wins, the day will come when a rebellious people will rise up and throw off their oppressors. If the Allies win, then also there will rise in a few years a people in revolt. There is only one answer. It is the way of Christ.

What has the Methodist general conference to say? At the close of the recently adjourned general conference (less than 3 weeks ago) the following position was taken:

"We stand upon this ground: The Methodist Church, although making no attempt to bind the consciences of its individual members, will not officially endorse, support, or participate in war. We insist that the agencies of the church shall not be used in the preparation for war, but in the promulgation of peace. We insist that the buildings of the church dedicated to the worship of God shall be used for that holy purpose, and not by any agency for the promotion of war."

The conference also pledged its support to its conscientious objectors, and recommended that the Federated Council of Churches form a committee "through which Protestant denominations that desire to do so may officially represent the interests of their conscientious objectors before the Government of the United States."

But what more final word can be given than the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: "Ye have heard that it has been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." (Matthew V: 38–48.)

Had this spirit been shown 20 years ago—yes, even now—it would be the salvation of the world.

It is a time when Christian people should keep calm. It is a time for honest and unbiased thinking. It is time for deep religious meditation. It is a time when we should pray that God will keep us from hatred. We must pray for our enemies. This will take a lot of Christian grace, but there are men, women, and children in Germany who will appreciate our prayers, and surely there are some men, women, and children in Germany who are praying for peace and for us.

If the spirit of Christ is freed in human hearts, men will be free. Let us pray that we may be able to live by His precepts. Some day we shall be glad that we have so done.

Flood Control in Red River Backwater Area, Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

RESOLUTIONS FROM CONCORDIA PARISH, LA., CITIZENS AND A LETTER FROM BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS, OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been manifested from citizens throughout northeast Louisiana; however, more particularly recently citizens from Concordia Parish are requesting the War Department to take the necessary remedial steps toward granting relief to the Red River backwater area, and rightly so, as a large part of the backwater area is the finest farming land in the world with improved highways, schools, and churches; therefore, I include as a part of my remarks on this subject three resolutions from Concordia Parish and a letter I received from Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the War Department.

Whereas a large part of Concordia Parish, State of Louisiana, is within the area flooded by backwaters of the Mississippi River backing up through the mouth of Old River or Red River, this area being known as the Red River backwater area; and

Whereas this Red River backwater area comprises several million acres of fertile alluvial land, all of which is suitable for development and a large part of which is now farming lands with improved highways, schools, roads, churches, etc., many of the farms having been in cultivation for more than 100 years; and

Whereas this Red River backwater area suffers greatly from the annual floods caused by backwaters of the Mississippi River, and this situation is growing worse and the floods more numerous; and

Whereas this area has easy drainage to the Gulf of Mexico by the Atchafalaya River and the Morganza floodway; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to build levees in the Yazoo backwater area of Mississippi, the effect of which will be to raise the flood heights of backwaters in the Red River backwater area: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved by the police jury of Concordia Parish, La., That while we do not oppose the efforts of any other backwater area to relieve its situation, we consider that this should not be done in such a way as to add to the burden of the Red River backwater area, but that at the same time relief is granted to other areas, and in the same bill, relief should be granted to the Red River backwater area by reducing the intake of the Morganza floodway to a height low enough to take the floods out of the Mississippi River before they back up on the Red River area, or such other relief as the United States engineers may find desirable, and also that the fuse-plug levees above Concordia Parish on the west bank of the Mississippi River and in the south end of Concordia Parish be first raised to the new standard grade.

MONTEREY, LA., *May 6, 1940.*

Hon. NEWT MILLS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: At a meeting of the Monterey Branch of Concordia Parish Backwater Flood Association, held in Monterey, Concordia Parish, La., on May 5, 1940, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the backwaters of the Mississippi River, backing up through Red River gap in the levees, almost every year flood the Red River backwater area, which is an area of several million acres of rich alluvial land in the center of the State of Louisiana; and

"Whereas, these floods are growing worse every year that the main channel of the Mississippi River is improved, and now ruin our lands almost every year in the planting season; and

"Whereas this situation should be easily remedied because this area has a direct, straight, independent outlet to the Gulf of Mexico by the Atchafalaya River, as well as by the new Morganza floodway:

"Now, therefore, this association urges that the United States engineers and our Congressmen take cognizance of this situation and the increasing damage being done by these Mississippi River backwater floods and adopt such measures as will cure the evil, especially by putting the intake of the new Morganza floodway at

a low enough level to take Mississippi waters there, before they back up on us, and such other measures as may be found desirable, to the end that this rich area be reclaimed and rendered prosperous."

In accordance with this resolution, I transmit same to you and trust it will have your serious consideration.

Yours very truly,

C. B. BURLEY, *Chairman.*

Attest:

JOSEPH J. GODWIN, *Secretary.*

ACME, CONCORDIA PARISH, LA., *May 6, 1940.*

Hon. NEWT V. MILLS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: The Acme branch of the Concordia Parish Backwater Association instructs us to write to you regarding the backwater floods from the Mississippi River in this area.

We are located near the mouth of the Black River, at its junction with the Red River, in what is called the Red River backwater area. This section is thickly populated along Black River and Red River, with farms cultivated in small units, with improved highways, schools, churches, etc.

In 1937, 1938, 1939, and many years earlier back to 1927 our fields have been flooded during the planting season by waters backing up from the Mississippi River through the gap in the west line of levees at the mouth of Old River or Red River. These floods are ruining the country. They add so much to the cost and uncertainty of farming and stock raising, as to destroy our prosperity.

We respectfully ask, that in building the new Morganza Floodway that the intake be lowered so low that the Mississippi River flood waters will go down there before they back up on us, and such other relief as you can find for us.

Yours very truly,

FRED DAVID, *Chairman.*
SHERMAN PECANTY, *Secretary.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 20, 1940.

Hon. NEWT V. MILLS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: I am in receipt of your letter of May 14, 1940, enclosing letters from the Acme and Monterey branches of the Concordia Parish Backwater Association with respect to the backwater situation in the Red River backwater area and asking that the matter be brought to the attention of the Mississippi River Commission.

Your letter and its enclosures are being referred to the president of the Mississippi River Commission for his information and consideration. A similar resolution by the Concordia Parish police jury has been referred to the president of the Mississippi River Commission and a report has been received from him. The matter of providing increased protection for the Red River backwater area will be given careful consideration in connection with the review of the existing project for the control of floods on the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau, Mo., requested by resolution of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, adopted August 2, 1939, and by resolution of Committee on Commerce of the Senate, adopted March 12, 1940. The report will develop the remedial action, if any, that can be undertaken at this time under existing law, as well as any desirable future action that might require changes in the law. The president of the Mississippi River Commission states that the desires of local interests west of the river are known to his office, and will be given full consideration.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Brigadier General, Assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS AT HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, delivered in the Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif., at I Am An American Day gathering celebrating Citizenship Recognition Day on Sunday, May 19, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with a sense of gratitude and deep appreciation, and I can assure you that I consider it a distinct honor and privilege to be invited to address this vast audience, who have assembled here tonight to recognize as citizens of the United States the young men and women of this country, who have become of age during the past year, and also those who have been fortunate enough to become naturalized citizens of the United States during the past year, or previous years; and I want to thank your committee for their generosity in extending to me the invitation that they have.

This gathering tonight, in response to a proclamation issued by the President of the United States on May 3, 1940, carries out the provisions of the resolution introduced by me in Congress and passed by both the House and Senate of the United States, which provides that the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation setting aside the third Sunday in May of each year as a public occasion for the recognition of all who, by coming of age or naturalization, have attained the status of citizenship, and the day shall be designated as "I Am an American Day."

The resolution further provides that the civil and educational authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and for the full instruction of future citizens in their responsibilities and opportunities as citizens of the United States and of the States and localities in which they reside.

The resolution does not, and shall not be construed as changing or attempting to change the time or mode of any of the many altogether commendable observances of similar nature now being held from time to time, or periodically, but, to the contrary, such practices are hereby praised and encouraged.

The resolution further provides that at the time of rendering of the decree of naturalization or at such other time as the judge may fix, the judge before whom such naturalization is held, either shall himself or he shall designate some other person to address the newly naturalized citizens upon the form of our Government and the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. It was the thought of the author of this resolution to enlist the aid of the judiciary, in cooperation with civil and educational authorities and patriotic organizations, in a continuous effort to dignify and emphasize the significance of citizenship.

May I take a moment to congratulate you all upon the vision and the civic leadership in having been willing to undertake this difficult and responsible task of making this great gathering the success it is. Your chairman, your board of education, your superintendent of schools, your teachers and principals, the press and various civic organizations of the community, and the movie industry are all to be commended for their attitude of helpfulness and cooperation.

To you young men and women who have become of age during the past year, and to you new citizens who have become naturalized during the last year, or previous years, and who have volunteered to come together to reinforce your mutual purpose to be good citizens, deserve a special word of appreciation. May the memory of this day abide with you to inspire and guide your citizenship throughout the coming years.

What you are doing here today has more than local significance. It is a response to a need that is Nation-wide. We have taken too lightly in our generation the duties and privileges of citizenship. We have taken it for granted that democracy would run itself. We have failed to impress upon the more than 2,000,000 new citizens who each year reach the age of 21, and those who become naturalized citizens of the United States, the deep significance of their coming into active citizenship. In the past we had no inspiring public occasion to mark that event.

Several years ago I prepared an outline on United States citizenship, which is now in its sixth printing. In that outline, I called attention to the Greek idea of citizenship, which was that a citizen had a right to participate in both legislative and judicial functions of the political community of which he was a member. The right was carefully guarded and was rarely conferred upon foreigners.

In Rome there were two classes of citizens—one consisting of those who had a share in the sovereignty, and who were capable of attaining the highest offices in the State, the other made up of those possessing only the right to private citizenship. The latter class had the right to vote.

In the United States we have a dual citizenship—one to the National Government and the other to the State in which we reside. We owe our highest allegiance to our National Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States has made our duty to our National Government very plain, and for this reason I am going to quote from an early decision of the Court, when it said:

"There is in our political system a government of each of the several States and a Government of the United States. Each is distinct from the other, and has citizens of its own who owe it

allegiance and whose rights within its jurisdiction it must protect. The same person may at the same time be a citizen of the United States and a citizen of a State, but his rights of citizenship under one of these governments will be different from those he has under the other. The Government of the United States, although it is, within the scope of its powers, supreme and beyond the States, can neither grant nor secure to its citizens rights or privileges which are not expressly or by implication placed under its jurisdiction. All that cannot be so granted or secured are left to the exclusive protection of the States. A citizen of the United States owes his first and highest allegiance to the General Government and not to the State of which he may be a citizen."

This day should mark the beginning of a new purpose for not only these young men and women who have become of age during the past year, and those who have become naturalized, but for all citizens, to encourage each year a Citizenship Recognition Day, where every new citizen shall be invited to take part, to the end that our great Republic shall go forward with a new appreciation of its inspiring possibilities.

The spirit of this occaison engendered by your presence here with your friends and neighbors, by this beautiful music, together with the ideals which lie back of this movement, should have a personal meaning for each of you because your future as an individual is bound up with the future of your country.

We have been in the midst of a great depression and we have been very conscious during recent years of our national shortcomings. Perhaps we have all been somewhat discouraged and a little critical of our Republic and of our American system of government. It is well in a Republic that we should be critical and that we should attempt to improve the conditions which surround our lives, but let us never forget our great and noble inheritance, for upon that inheritance we must build our future.

It is difficult to read this history without seeing in it all the hand of Providence, for the struggle which was then taking place in America was in a sense the climax of untold centuries of human struggle upward, a struggle against despotism, a struggle against the destructive forces within the nature of the individual man himself. The birth of our democracy goes back nineteen hundred years to the birth of Christ. It was His teachings, gradually permeating the minds and hearts of the people of the western world, building up their self respect, that led to a demand for larger liberty and justice. Let us never forget that our democratic institutions have their foundation in the principles of life that were set forth by the Great Teacher.

We live in one of the greatest transition ages of all history. We think of the dawn of history, the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and the reorganization of the world's life which followed the discovery of America as marking great turning points in man's existence. In my judgment, the change that is taking place in human life today is even greater than the change which took place in the Middle Ages or during the fall of the Roman Empire; it can be compared only with the dawn of history itself.

With all of the great nations at war, save only America alone, I believe that the world is entering upon a new epoch, that mankind has again come face to face with destiny, that it has reached a point where it can turn backward into the darkness and confusion of bygone ages, or can move forward into a new period of light, self-government, justice, and beauty. Whether it shall do the one or the other may depend—indeed is likely to depend—upon what happens in the United States of America. Here we have the conditions of life, here we have the level of education; and we are the highest civilized people of the world. We, therefore, have the background and, let us hope, the purpose to preserve human freedom and to perfect democracy until every man, woman, and child under the American flag, and all civilized people throughout the world, may enjoy the blessings of security and opportunity.

It is needless for me here now to review the vicissitudes of countries overseas, the break-down of government in one country after another, or the struggle of one nation to conquer the world, or the unsettled conditions that prevail everywhere. We hear it daily over the radio, we read it daily in the headlines of our newspapers, and it all becomes very depressing and disheartening.

It is needless for me to review the difficulties that we face within our own Nation—with over 10,000,000 people unemployed, with a national debt of now over $45,000,000,000, it behooves us, as American citizens, to be calm and collected during a gathering storm which may be fierce and unrelenting as it passes over us. We need not fear so much from without, but our greatest difficulty will be within our own Nation. It, therefore, behooves us to put our own house in order, remain at peace, if we are to make our best contribution toward stability of the world when this holocaust which now envelops most of the world has quieted down again.

We have many new problems for you new citizens to help solve, problems involving relations between capital and labor, problems having to do with our economic condition today, problems involving the housing of our people, problems of education, in the conservation of our national resources, and our greatest problem is to adjust ourselves and our institutions to the new conditions as they occur from day to day.

As I am speaking today to both the native-born and foreign-born, and I want to call your attention to the fact that both those who are native-born and foreign-born alike must experience the process of Americanization. In the case of natives, Americanization involves getting acquainted with the best American traditions and current standards, and practicing and trying to improve the quality of these traditions and standards. In the case of the foreign-born Americanization means giving up one set of well-known and, in part, precious loyalties for another set of loyalties, more or less new and unknown. To renounce one group of loyalties for another group involves a deep-seated and delicate readjustment of mental and social attitudes.

In this process the native-born possess a strong advantage over the foreign-born, because they are surrounded by their homes, schools, and churches and by constant American teachings, while the immigrant or the naturalized citizen is obliged in many instances to learn a new language, and adjust himself to new customs, in most instances in mature years of life, and making such an adjustment at that age is generally quite difficult.

Americanization involves the rebirth of all our fundamental virtues; namely, liberty and initiative, union and cooperation, democracy and justice, internationalism and brotherhood. Average Americans should set the pace for new immigrants coming into this country. Whether the immigrants become social or antisocial Americans depends upon the examples which are set by average Americans, and if we do our part, I am sure these new naturalized citizens will contribute their share to the upholding of American traditions.

You are blessed here in Los Angeles with one of the most powerful instruments for building American citizenship of any other locality in the world—here you have the moving-picture industry, which is the greatest power in building public opinion that we have in the world today. I am grateful to those in the moving-picture industry who have taken such unselfish interest in the program, and my sincere hope is that some writer of movie script may be inspired to write the script for a great moving picture that may involve the thoughts and the purposes of this great gathering.

I have heard much said about there being so few opportunities in the world today. To me there are more opportunities than there ever have been in the history of our Nation. The great trouble is to find time to study and help solve the great problems that constantly confront us. The problems that we face in our country, and throughout the world, cannot be solved overnight. Our present generation will leave plenty of problems to be solved.

Among the two most important problems to face you new citizens today are the menace of dictatorship and the danger of war. Closely tied up with these problems are the many economic difficulties that face people everywhere; and as stated before millions unemployed, the ability to produce far beyond our needs, and inefficient methods of distribution. Although we are appropriating and spending millions of dollars for relief, no permanent basic solution for our economic ills has yet been found. We are living in an age of real challenge. The opportunity and the need for making worth-while civic contributions have never been greater. What the world needs today is men and women who are prepared for meeting these emergencies, and solving these problems as they come up for solution day by day.

It is for you to understand the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy. Under a dictatorship, the individual exists for a state. In a democracy a state exists for the individual, as a means to an end, and the welfare of the individual is of supreme importance. It is the claim of the Nazi, Fascist, and communistic dictatorships that the people will be better fed, better clothed, and have less worries if the dictator does all the thinking and planning. But in a democracy we would all rather share in the worries and responsibilities of state and have something to say about how we are to be governed, fed, and clothed. In the past we have always felt that we had attained life above the mere level of food and shelter.

My sincere hope is that the new citizens will all realize that your education in citizenship is really just beginning and that it will never be completed, no matter how far you go.

If we are to continue as a great Nation, we have a right to expect, and it is going to be necessary, that there be developed among our people a greater interest in public affairs, and a greater appreciation of citizenship. Citizenship is born in the schoolroom, and that is especially true with our native-born citizens; therefore, the ideals of school teachers should be the true ideals of America. The importance of their work cannot be overestimated. First impressions are lasting, and are reflected definitely in all of the future years of our life. The spirit of Americanism can and should have its inception in our schoolrooms, and with this teaching should give lessons with respect to law and order.

Young Americans should be taught to love America, and to support our Constitution and our laws, and at the same time learn that to violate these laws and the Constitution is to trample upon all that is good and distinctive in the high ideals fought for by the forefathers of our Nation.

Our country was founded on certain great principles fundamental in character. It seems to me in times like these through which we are passing it is imperative to consider these principles and see to it that we shape our lives in accord with them. Too frequently these activities of government are left in the hands of a few who have made such matters more or less their life work, when as a matter of civic responsibility we, too, should give them our own consideration. America more than ever before is looking to her younger generation to carry on her great principles and ideals.

This, a peacetime service comparable in urgency to that required in time of war, and this service is the first obligation of citizenship. A good citizen, mindful of his country's traditions and welfare, should uphold a proper respect for constituted authority and assist in preserving and advancing the integrity and prestige of his Government.

In closing, may I say that I have lived over a half century. The shadows for me have begun to fall to the east, while for most of you new citizens they are still stretching to the west. America has been most kind and generous to me. We are now passing through a great emergency, and may I ask of you that you look proudly to our country, revere its traditions, fight for its prosperity and future, and, above all, live that life, whatever be its intrinsic reward, which will cause us to know that we have been honorable citizens, appreciative of the privileges our country affords, jealous of its integrity, and alert in its defense. Be not afraid of patriotism; it is the soul of citizenship. Be not afraid of service; it is the road to contentment, and it is a thing we all can give.

Always realize that the present hour is the only hour that you really possess. It is best illustrated in these few lines:

"Behind me is infinite power;
Before me is endless possibility;
Around me is endless opportunity;
Why should I fear?"

and these words from that beautiful poem "Salutation to the Dawn" should inspire everyone:

"For yesterday is but a dream,
And tomorrow is only a vision;
And today well lived makes
Every yesterday a dream of happiness,
And every tomorrow a vision of hope."

Colonel Lindbergh's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very informative article by Raymond Clapper which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 21, 1940. Mr. Clapper has written a splendid commentary on Colonel Lindbergh's recent radio speech and his article merits the most careful attention of the Congress.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1940]

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S SPEECH

(By Raymond Clapper)

It is taking in a good deal of territory to say so, but no recent public utterance has produced a more unfavorable impression among administration people than the radio address of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

Some of the private comment among high officials is extremely critical. Those whose outlook is closest to that of President Roosevelt are severe and blunt in their reproaches. They regard Colonel Lindbergh's remarks as hostile to the President's policies and, in effect, unduly sympathetic toward Germany. Colonel Lindbergh's acceptance of a decoration from the Nazis a few years ago is being recalled.

This private criticism, frank and impatient in tone, speaks more eloquently than anything else in describing the state of mind in Washington today. It reveals a degree of intensity which has increased rapidly within the last few weeks.

Obviously the famous flyer has eliminated himself from any important role in air-defense activity beyond the restricted sphere of technical aid. Such a national figure, with his prestige in aviation, would have been invaluable in promoting the defense program and in guiding public thought concerning it. There is the greatest respect for his technical knowledge and frank regret that he has not confined himself to that field in his public utterances.

Colonel Lindbergh's remark about "this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion" is being construed as a thrust at recent statements of President Roosevelt, particularly the air timetable into the Middle West, which was outlined in the defense message to Congress. Indeed, the shoe might be considered to fit many important official feet.

At one point Colonel Lindbergh directly challenged the whole fundamental attitude of the administration toward the war. He said that "regardless of which side wins this war, there is no reason, aside from our own actions, to prevent a continuation of peaceful relationships between America and the countries of Europe."

High administration officials, from President Roosevelt down, have argued directly the opposite. Every action of this Government now is guided by the belief that if Hitler wins he will at once turn his pressure against the Western Hemisphere, and that we shall feel the effects in countless ways that will be most uncomfortable. It is not necessarily military invasion of the United States that our officials have in mind in this, but piecemeal penetration of Latin America, not only through trade but through "fifth column" activities and probably efforts to obtain commercial aviation footholds. In fact, such activities were under way before the war began and have not been abandoned.

Therefore administration officials do not agree with Colonel Lindbergh's statement that "if we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war." That is exactly their complaint, that every fact about the Hitler regime and its works indicates that we will not be let alone to go about our own business.

Nevertheless, Colonel Lindbergh put his finger on one soft spot which needs the most skillful handling when he said that adequate air defense of the Western Hemisphere necessitates the cooperation of the other nations.

Thanks to the good-neighbor policy, the solidarity of the American republics has grown. But it is delusion to think that the other nations are ready to sign on the dotted line anything that we may propose.

It would be dangerous for us as well as for Latin American nations if a potentially hostile power established air bases in the Western Hemisphere. It is to the interest of every nation in the Americas to join us in various moves to strengthen hemisphere defense, including perhaps the acquisition of British, French, and Dutch possessions. But the idea has not been completely sold. The situation will not be secure until all countries below the Rio Grande realize that Nazi penetration menaces their independence.

That is as necessary to defense as adequate weapons and manpower.

Our Duty As a Nation in the Present World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY BISHOP MANNING TO THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK, DELIVERED IN THE SYNOD HALL, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1940

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, at the one hundred and fifty-seventh convention of the diocese of New York a resolution was adopted by the convention, as follows:

Resolved, That that part of the Bishop's address which deals with the unprovoked conflict in Europe be printed separately and a copy sent to the President of the United States, to all members of his Cabinet, and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include therein that section of Bishop Manning's address which deals with the unprovoked conflict in Europe. I have read it with the greatest interest and was deeply touched by the bishop's stirring plea that—

God grant that this frightful conflict may speedily be ended, and that it may be so ended that justice, right, and liberty may be upheld * * * for the sake of all that is high and sacred in human life.

No one can fail to read Bishop Manning's address without gaining a fuller realization of the fundamental issues involved in the present struggle, and I hope that each Member of this House will give thoughtful consideration to his address.

OUR DUTY AS A NATION IN THE PRESENT WORLD CRISIS

(By Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, Bishop of New York)

Since its organization in 1785 this diocese has seen many historic moments, and has passed through many experiences and vicissitudes, but never in all its history has any convention of this diocese met under conditions so grave for the whole world as those which we are facing at this time. We are facing the most stupendous crisis in the history of the world in the past 2,000 years. We are in the midst of a world conflict in which every principle of truth and justice, every principle and ideal of the Christian religion, every principle of free and civilized life is assailed and threatened.

In such a situation it is useless to declare, as our ultrapacifists do, that because war is evil we will have nothing to do with any war. Such declarations are in fact worse than useless, they are gravely harmful, they hold up a wrong and mistaken idea of Christian duty, they are morally confusing and misleading, and they play directly into the hands of the aggressors and the war makers, as

some countries are now seeing to their tragic cost. If we are to have a world in which men can live in peace, and without fear, those laws and principles must be upheld upon which alone peace and freedom can exist.

Few of us, I think, can be so blind as to imagine that this world conflict is a struggle in which our Nation is not directly concerned. None of us, as Christians and Americans, can be willing to see this world ruled by the forces and the principles of nazi-ism or of Russian communism. We all know that there has been wrongdoing in the past in which we and all the nations had our part; we all know that there have been, and are, inequitable international conditions which must be righted; but any who say that in this conflict both sides are equally guilty are, indeed, morally blind and are themselves guilty of most grave injustice.

We see the world now threatened by a despotism such as has never before been known. We all know what this despotism stands for, for we have seen this in its deeds. It is a despotism which destroys the very principles of justice and liberty; which ruthlessly attacks and overruns smaller nations and claims to do this for their protection; which crushes all opposition to its rule by the purge and the concentration camp; which drives innocent men and women from home and country to seek asylum wherever they may as refugees; which stands for rule by brutal and naked force not only over the bodies but over the minds and thoughts and souls of men. And it has now added the further infamy of its attack upon the peaceful people of Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. No one can read the proclamation of Queen Wilhelmina without feeling its nobility, its pathos, and its justice, nor without feeling the deep iniquity, the unspeakable wickedness, of this invasion bringing death and agony and terror to people who have asked only to live in peace and have given no offense.

In such a situation can any Christian, or any American, be neutral?

In such a situation is our entire moral duty covered by the phrase "Keep America out of war"?

We all abhor the very thought of war. None of us want to see our country engaged in war.

But in this situation I hold that we owe our fullest help at once, both moral and material, to those who are fighting for the right of the democratic nations, large or small, to live. I hold that it is the duty of our great Nation to let the whole world know where we stand and to give immediately our utmost material assistance to those who are struggling, at untold cost, to uphold the principles of human life for which our Nation stands, and upon which Christian civilization and all that we hold most sacred depend.

What further may be required of us no man can now say.

But in this day of world tragedy and world crisis our prayer must be not merely that we may be kept safe, not merely that we may be spared from the horrors of war, but that justice and liberty may be preserved in this world, and that as a nation we may be given vision to see, and strength to do, whatever is right.

I should like to see one of the candidates for the Presidency of our country now come forward and take his stand clearly on this platform.

God grant that this frightful conflict may speedily be ended, and that it may be so ended that justice, right, and liberty may be upheld, for the sake of all the nations, for the sake of our own land, and for the sake of all that is high and sacred in human life.

A Supreme Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Each new edition of the newspapers carries headlines more glaring and depressing than those of yesterday. I believe, as a result of these "scares" many radio commentators, newspaper columnists, and editorial writers have gone far afield in the character and tone of their remarks on events connected with the European War.

It is reassuring to have a leading newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, discuss the critical world situation in the moderate but forceful language contained in the following editorial entitled "A Supreme Hour." I hope many other papers will follow the splendid example of the Herald Tribune.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

A SUPREME HOUR

With a fearful anxiety the free world has watched the relentless deterioration of the Allied position under the hammer blows of the Hitler "blitzkrieg." With Holland and eastern Belgium overrun it was "serious but not critical." With the great break-through along the Meuse it became "critical but not desperate." Last night, with the terrible armored divisions racing unchecked through Amiens to the sea, leaving a great swath of death and desolation in their wake, "desperate" was not too strong a word. Amiens is the vital center of the whole rail net feeding the northern armies; many remember how the German tide swept up to its very gates in 1918, and how it seemed at that time that, if those last few miles were crossed and Amiens fell, Allied defeat would be irretrievable. Now Amiens has fallen to the "panzer-divisionen"; the Germans believe they have cut off the whole northern Franco-British-Belgian group and trapped a part of it in an "encirclement within an encirclement" in the Cambrai-Valenciennes area. But whether they have done so or not, France and Britain are not yet defeated.

The military position is a desperate one; but there is no hint—not in Premier Reynaud's strong speech, frankly admitting the "disaster" which overwhelmed the French Ninth Army on the Meuse and the "unbelievable faults" which contributed to it, but voicing an inflexible determination to retrieve the position—not in the communiqués and dispatches from the British—that the peoples of the Allied democracies have given way to despair. Under a terrific punishment their morale is firm. They still have great armies in being. The Germans have overrun a vast territory with the surprise of their new tactics; they have not yet demonstrated their ability to hold it. Despite the achievements of the armored columns, it is certain that there is an immense confusion within the areas they have left behind them; in this new kind of warfare the lines on the map have not the definitive significance they have had in the past, and no campaign is ever won until it is over.

France and Britain are in a supreme hour—a supreme hour for their own national existence and for all the values of civilized society—but they are meeting it with a supreme courage and coolness. They are desperate; they are not yet destroyed, and as onlookers we cannot be less cool and firm than they.

Colonel Lindbergh's Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Monday, May 20, entitled "Colonel Lindbergh's Ocean":

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S OCEAN

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh seems to think the Atlantic Ocean is wider than when he flew across it in 1927.

He believes, according to his broadcast Sunday night, that "If we (in America) desire peace, we need only stop asking for war."

Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium did not ask for war.

He says:

"We are in danger of war today not because European people have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of America but because American people have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of Europe."

It would require more documentation than Colonel Lindbergh offers to show wherein the American people have tried to interfere with internal affairs of Europe since the World War. In fact, it could be said with more reason that the conflagration in Europe which threatens America today got its start partly because the United States failed to do its part toward consolidating the peace it helped to win.

Colonel Lindbergh does not object to the $1,000,000,000 defense program advanced by President Roosevelt; rather, he approves reasonable defense forces, including aircraft. Possibly he would recognize that this and most of the $6,000,000,000 spent on defense in the last 7 years by the United States are direct costs of the developments in Europe which he thinks offer no threat of invasion to America.

His recipe for security is that the United States take the other nations of the Western Hemisphere under the wings of its air force, presumably whether they like it or not, and make sure that they do not get into wars with European powers. Does not this sound like meddling with the internal affairs and foreign policies of Latin American nations?

The essence of Colonel Lindbergh's plea appears to be in this: "Let us turn again to America's traditional role—that of building and guarding our own destiny." What is that destiny? Is it to attempt a selfish and insecure aloofness in the shambles of a world engulfed by hate and rapine? Is it America's traditional role to remain blind to the implications of foreign wars and aggressions until it costs more to protect herself from chaos on her borders and sea lanes than it would have cost to help preserve a semblance of world order and decency?

"We cannot aid others," the Colonel concludes, "until we have first placed our own country in a position of spiritual and material leadership and strength." Can spiritual leadership result from self-interest that thinks only of its own safety and advantage in the face of an attack on the moral and ethical standards humanity has spent centuries in building?

Why Have $7,000,000,000 Not Prepared Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

The Roosevelt administration, in its all but 8 years in office, has spent $7,000,000,000 for preparedness, and we have no preparedness.

The Roosevelt administration now asks the people of the United States to spend $2,000,000,000 more for preparedness, which of course the people are willing to do if they can only get preparedness.

But if $7,000,000,000 does not buy any preparedness whatever, how can the people imagine that less than one-third that sum will now buy it.

What has the $7,000,000,000 been spent for?

What has it bought?

Who has spent it, and who has got it?

We cannot find defense behind bales piled upon bales of dollar bills, as General Jackson fortified himself behind the cotton bales at New Orleans.

We cannot make armies out of hordes of New Deal politicians and their hangers-on and handy men.

We cannot make forts out of "pork barrels."

We cannot build redoubts by logrolling.

We cannot be content with airplanes that float only in oratorical hot air.

We cannot feel safe if our country is full of "fifth columns" of incompetent politicians, betraying their country to satisfy their own selfish purposes and wasteful extravagances.

What has become of the $7,000,000,000—a thousand million dollars a year—which this country has spent over the last 7 years for the preparedness it has not got?

Who got the money that Senator CLARK truthfully says was poured down a rat hole, and who were the rats at the other end of the hole?

Before we pour any more money down the same rat hole for the benefit of the same rats, would it not be well to have those questions answered? Says Senator Clark:

"On the recommendations of the President in his various Budget messages, we have appropriated $7,000,000,000.

"We have authorized $2,000,000,000 more this year, and if we include the authorizations, the amount is $9,000,000,000, the most tremendous peacetime appropriations in the history of any nation.

"I think the Congress of the United States is entitled to find out where and how this money has been spent, and whether it has been spent advisedly.

"I do not accuse anyone of stealing the money, but I say the American people are entitled to know what has become of this vast sum of money if we are pitiably unprepared, as the brass hats of the Army and the Navy now tell us we are.

"A little more than a year ago," continued Senator CLARK, "we adopted a vast program for the expansion of aviation service of the United States Army. Now we are told a year later that we have only 58 airships which are not obsolete.

"Having appropriated that money a year ago, and finding that we have only 58 airships that are not obsolete, I think we should find out why that is a fact and where the responsibility lies."

But the air force is not all that is "pitiably unprepared."

We are supposed to have a standing Army of 235,000 men—less than half of the Swiss Army, to be sure, but a presumably serviceable Army—but Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, declared, when questioned before the Senate subcommittee on military appropriations, that the Army could only put 75,000 men in the field today, and that for them "some equipment is still lacking."

"But in general," continued this Army authority, "I will say that in a state of fair efficiency, with many of the most modern weapons, with modernized field artillery, we could put in the field as a mobile force about 75,000 men of the Regular Establishment."

Questioned as to how such a force would be equipped, General Marshall stated that "it would have Garand rifles.

"It would lack almost entirely the 37-millimeter antiaircraft guns.

"It would have a fair complement of 37-millimeter antitank guns.

"It would have at the moment a little less than half of the modernized 75-millimeter guns.

"It would be lacking modern 155-millimeter guns, and some corps troops.

"It would be lacking some essential engineers and communications units.

"Other than that, it would be all right."

Friends and fellow goats and gudgeons, we have spent 7,000 million dollars in 7 years for preparedness, and we can now put into the field 75,000 men only partially equipped—or one-fifth the fully armed and equipped force of Switzerland.

Fellow easy marks and come-ons, we do not need so much to be defended against hostile armies.

We need to be defended against incompetent politicians.

It is the "fifth columns" of our own demoralized democracy which are going to destroy us.

Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, chief of Air Corps, also testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations and declared in regard to obsolete airplanes that:

"If you take the B–18 [which are the Army's twin-engine bombers] and send it out against modern equipment, it would be suicide. However, we will use the B–18's for training purposes."

Asked whether the Army has any ultra-modern planes, with self-sealing tanks and cannon armament, he said:

"None. We are just now going into it."

Asked then how many of the Army's fleet of 2,700 planes could be modernized, he replied:

"Offhand, I should say half a dozen."

In regard to the availability of the National Guard as an auxiliary defense body, General Marshall asserted that:

"At the beginning of the fiscal year 1941 the guard will have on hand or on order 14,000 motor vehicles, out of a normal peacetime requirement of 44,000 vehicles.

"National Guard divisions are now tied to the ground—immobile. They cannot take the field as such."

In regard to a shortage of 85,000 uniforms for the National Guard, General Marshall said:

"We would not have on hand the cloth to commence the manufacture of uniforms for 4 or 5 months."

To epitomize further testimony, the stated facts show that the Army is now equipped with the World War Springfield manual rifle, over 20 years out of date—that there are 38,000 automatic rifles on hand, 131,000 ordered, and 240,000 asked.

That there are 218 antitank guns on hand, 526 ordered, 1,556 asked.

That the British force, when it abandoned Namsos, left 460 antitank guns on a Norway beach—more than twice the number that our Army possesses.

That there is serious shortage of modern 75-mm. artillery, 141 being on hand, 411 ordered, and 1,380 asked.

That there is also serious shortage of 75-mm. antiaircraft guns, but the Army is switching to 90-mm. antiaircraft guns to get longer range, and will need many more in an emergency.

That as to howitzers, we have none at all—48 are ordered and hundreds needed.

That many of our coast defenses are obsolete.

That some of the machinery in our arsenals is over 40 years old.

That even the new funds would create only one mechanized division—and that short of two battalions—while Germany used 30 divisions in Poland alone.

That there is shortage of 30 to 50 percent of tanks in all categories, and that there is critical shortage in ammunition.

In plain words, we have spent $7,000,000,000 for preparedness, only to find out that we are not prepared at all, even to put into the field one-half of the picayune Regular Army we are supposed to have.

We have spent $7,000,000,000 to find that the playboys of the administration have employed the same rat-hole methods of extravagant and resultless expenditure that they have used in every other branch of their ineffective personal government.

Now, Congress is asked to contribute $2,000,000,000 more of the people's money to allow these "Coal Oil Johnnies" of finance, the prodigal sons of politics, to pour down preelection rat holes for what—for the protection of the country, or for the protection and prolongation of the New Deal?

It is a fair question.

Seven billion dollars have been largely wasted in rat-hole politics and we have no preparedness.

Fifty-eight billion dollars have been spent—and largely wasted—in various departments of government in the 7-year itch of New Deal extravagance and incompetence, and little of benefit to the public has been accomplished anywhere.

Sure, as Senator CLARK so moderately asserts, "The Congress of the United States," and the people of the United States are "entitled to find out where and how this money has been spent."

If we cannot have preparedness, we can at least have an accounting.

Security and Defense, the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered over the radio on Monday, May 20, 1940, on the subject Security and Defense, the Road to Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The objective of the foreign policy of the United States is peace. We have come to know, however, that our security and peace can best be assured by adequate armed defense—a defense not alone of men and military equipment but a defense fortified by the spirit and character of our people. In this democracy of ours, both in peace and in war, in times of calmness and quiet, and in periods of danger and peril, every citizen has a lofty duty toward the Republic which guarantees those fundamental rights of citizenship which are the glory of our system.

That is the America our fathers gave us. This is our America. It shall remain our America. If it is to remain our America, we, and we alone, can preserve it and protect it and hand it on to our sons, stronger and nobler for our having lived and served and sacrificed.

Every citizen of the Republic has a task and a duty to preserve it—civilian and soldier alike. Individual right, individual privilege, carries with it individual responsibility.

On November 11, 1921, with a vast concourse I stood in Arlington National Cemetery where sleep thousands of soldiers of the Republic, soldiers of the Revolution, of the War of 1812, of the War with Mexico, the Blue and the Gray, reunited in valor and in death's endless sleep, those who fell in Cuba and the Philippines, and those whose blood reddened the soil of France, and in the splendid marble amphitheater I saw the generals and admirals and diplomats, representing the governments of many foreign nations and the United States, lay upon the sarcophagus of an unknown and unnamed American soldier a multitude of flowers, and pin upon the coffin military decorations expressive of the tribute and gratitude of great nations, and then I heard the President of the Republic lift up his voice and give noble utterance to the emotions that stirred within the hearts of his countrymen in that solemn and sacred moment—here lay only the poor, broken body of an unknown soldier wrapped in his uniform and shrouded in the flag for which he died—unknown, one out of 4,000,000—no one knew his name, no one knew whether there flowed in his veins the blood of some distant noble or that of an ancestral peasant; no one knew from what home he came, whether from a hovel or a mansion; no one knew from where he came—but all the world knows where he went; he went forward filling the file, the individual file, to which his country and civilization called him, and in going forward he leaped to fadeless and undying glory.

He set an imperishable pattern for every American in peace and in war, in times of prosperity and in times of economic disaster, in periods of domestic tranquillity, and in times of stress and strain.

This is our America, our democracy, ours to govern, ours to advance, ours to perfect, and ours to make more glorious. Every American has a solemn duty—a duty commensurate with his ability, his resources, and his intellect. This is our America. If it is to remain our America, we must stamp out and extirpate communism and all the other foreign "isms" and subversive influences which seek to undermine things American. We shall tolerate neither the "fifth column" nor the espionage nor sabotage of foreign agents nor the treachery of any domestic influence or group.

This is our America. It shall remain our America. The United States is devoted to the ideals of peace. We want no war. We have never drawn the sword except with reluctance and to vindicate the violation of sacred rights. We want to attain our national destiny without foreign aggression or involvement. We entertain no imperial ambitions. A liberated Cuba and an enfranchised Philippines testify before all the world that we desire to hold no people in subjection or thralldom. We covet neither the territory nor the riches of any other land. We want no entangling alliance with foreign nations. Neither do we propose to be the victim of foreign aggression or conquest. We do not want a foot of foreign territory, but, by the same token, we shall not give up an inch of America to any aggressor on earth. We do not dictate to any other nation on the globe its form of government. We do propose to maintain our own system and to lead our own way of life.

Today the world is staggered by a terrible picture of blood and horror. The clouds that hang above one of the fairest regions of the earth are charged with the heaviest and most murderous bolts in the armament of Mars. Great nations and mighty armies are grappling in an embrace of death. Neutral nations have been overrun and conquered. Neutral rights have been violated and extinguished by the sword. Frontiers have been destroyed and sovereignty wiped from the map by the bayonet's thrust. In such an hour of world danger, at a time when the processes of peace and the rule of law have been dethroned, and military might and conquest have usurped the seats of power, what is the duty of the Government of the United States? It is our manifest obligation to our people; to our institutions; to our territory, and to our lives; to the heroic traditions of a great and glorious past; to those whose blood and treasure established this Republic; to the martyred dead, who have defended it and protected it—it is our manifest obligation to make America so strong upon the land and upon the sea and in the air that no power on earth shall dare to attack us, or to challenge our safety. We want peace, but there is no other course, if we would remain at peace. We must not, through any sense of false security such as that suggested by Colonel Lindbergh last night, through any idealistic attachment to pacifism, hesitate one moment to make our national defense absolutely invulnerable. In this dark hour the admonition of George Washington comes ringing down to us through more than a century: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Those were inspired words. They had their background in Valley Forge and Brandywine and Germantown, and in the Battle of Long Island, when ragged and hungry and unprepared armies and lack of support almost crushed his great heart with despair. They reach back to Yorktown, when, prepared and with an adequate force, he vanquished the armies of a king and achieved peace and independence.

For many years I have been an aggressive advocate of preparedness. In a speech in the United States Senate on February 27, 1939, I urged the expansion of national defense and of the air program. At that time I said, "Ah, Senators, the armies and the navies of powers which are ambitious, of powers which are aggressors, of powers which love conquest, of powers which are dominated by men whose vaulting ambition reaches the stars—those armies and those navies are to fight some nation when they get ready to fight. We may be that one.

"It is said, however, that we are protected by two great oceans, that we are in no danger, that we have the Atlantic on the east and the Pacific on the west.

"Talk about being defended by two oceans; the only way we can defend ourselves with two oceans, Mr. President, is by having a navy good enough and strong enough to dominate two oceans. We ought to have an unbeatable navy. That is the kind of a navy the Senator from Texas favors."

In that address I advocated the building of an incomparable and unconquerable navy. I urged the increase of our fleets of airplanes, both for the Army and the Navy, and the increase of antiaircraft defenses and artillery and the augmentation of the Army to place the Nation in a state of adequate defense.

It must not be assumed that the Government of the United States has not taken steps looking to the national defense. Today the Navy is stronger, better equipped, and more efficient than at any time in its history in time of peace. Today the Army enjoys its greatest peace-time strength. The Air Establishment, both naval and military, is stronger than at any time in the history of the country in time of peace. During the administration of President Roosevelt the Congress has appropriated more than $7,000,000,000 for national defense. The Congress is ready to vote for military and naval defense, which will secure the safety of this Republic.

President Roosevelt, in a masterly address to the Congress, laid before the country a program of national defense which will meet the support of both the Congress and the country. I am standing and you are standing squarely beside the President in plans for the security of the Republic. It is my own view that we must build an incomparable and unconquerable Navy. A vast fleet of military and naval aircraft must be provided. Antiaircraft defenses and heavy artillery must be produced in increasing volume and of the most modern and scientific pattern. The strength of the Army must be augmented and intensified training and modern equipment must be supplied to the National Guard and to the Reserves.

The American people pray that the United States may not be dragged into a war anywhere on the globe. But there can be no assured peace except in armed defense. We shall arm not for war, but for peace. We must be prepared to say to any power on earth who challenges our security or threatens our safety, "We want no war with you, but if you dare assail us, we shall resist

on the sea and under the sea, on the land and above the land, with a navy, with an army, and with an air fleet unconquerable and irresistible."

This is our America. All that we are and all that we hope to be and all that we possess are pledged that it shall remain our America. We look back through the heroic history and treasured traditions of America for more than 160 years, we strike hands with and salute the Continental Congress that gave us the Declaration of Independence, and with them exclaim, "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." This is our America and by all the gods of peace and by all the gods of war, it shall remain our America.

Colonel Lindbergh's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of May 21, 1940, commenting on Colonel Lindbergh's recent radio speech. I agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of May 21, 1940]

AMATEUR ORACLE

From Colonel Lindbergh's oracular counsel of Sunday night we quote the following:

"Regardless of which side wins the war there is no reason, aside from our own actions, to prevent a continuance of peaceful relationships between America and the countries of Europe. If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us, and no one is in position to do so."

By a daring airplane flight across the Atlantic in his youth, Colonel Lindbergh won world-wide popularity. He was acclaimed wherever he went; wealth and honors came his way. The hero worship and the material rewards of his exploit blended a draught potent enough to turn most heads. So in early middle age Colonel Lindbergh has blossomed into an oracle who feels confident to instruct the world and his countrymen on such momentous problems as war (of which he has had no experience); statesmanship and diplomacy (in which he has had neither training nor service); foreign philosophies, the character and purposes of war lords abroad and the conduct of our own national affairs.

To believers in human freedom and Christian civilization, Colonel Lindbergh's assumption that so far as our "peaceful relationships" with Europe are concerned, it makes no difference who wins the war, seems not only mistaken but foolish. His observation that "if we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war" is mocked by the current fates of nations which fervently desired peace, never "asked" for war, and held the solemn nonaggression promise of the dictator who without warning bombed their cities, committed indiscriminate slaughter of their civilian populations, and blasted them into submission.

The colonel's assumption that "no one wishes to attack us and no one is in position to do so" may be correct for the moment, when the aggressor has his hands full elsewhere. But the predators themselves define this as a war of the "have nots against the haves," and no intelligent person can doubt that they covet the rich resources of the Americas—including this Republic with its temptingly inadequate defenses.

Does Colonel Lindbergh still share the pathetic faith so long displayed by Mr. Chamberlain in Hitler's moderation, honesty, and "friendliness"? Most of us judge that conquest-mad war lord today by his deeds—and put no trust whatever in his continuously broken promises.

So we hope no American will be deluded by Colonel Lindbergh's theory that American institutions and ideals of human rights and freedom will take no hurt no matter how the overseas war against those ideals is won or lost, nor by his assumption that the self-styled "have nots," armed to the teeth and running amok in Europe, have no thought of striking for the greater riches and loot offered in the Western Hemisphere if and when conditions favor the assault.

New Equipment and Great Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, responding to the emphatic demand of the people of the United States that we shall be prepared to defend ourselves in any great emergency which might arise, I have, in common with other Members of Congress, voted for large sums for our war forces and for such equipment as would place the military arm of the United States in a position to defend these shores. I had hoped that there would not be any retelling of the story of 1917 and 1918 in the use of these funds. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I was shocked at the devastating report of the Budget Bureau on defense expenditures which, to say the least, are amazing. I stated some of these facts in an interview which under the signature of that distinguished journalist, Arthur Hachten, has been printed in many metropolitan papers of this Nation in the last few days. It is as follows:

In 1937 the War Department spent $380,000,000. Of that, 2.8 percent went for new equipment. In 1938 the War Department spent $405,000,000 and a paltry 1.66 percent went into new equipment. In 1939 there was $455,000,000 to spend, and this time, in the face of war in Europe, 5 percent only went into new equipment.

There was a total of $1,237,000,000 in war funds in 3 years, and 9.46 percent was spent for new equipment to get ready for war. That was $117,020,200. That won't go far in war to outfit an army.

Therefore, when it comes to Garand rifles, mobile artillery, machine guns, and soldier outfits, I believe I am justified in my statement that if we got only $117,000,000 for new equipment out of $1,237,000,000, we cannot hope to get a greater percentage of new equipment out of what the President asks unless there are a lot of changes in procedure.

We might as well face the cold facts that to equip a real defensive army with antiaircraft guns, mechanized artillery, coast defense, a real Quartermasters Corps, ordnance, and all other necessities, we shall spend, before we are genuinely prepared, up to $10,000,000,000.

I would prefer to prepare to spend $10,000,000,000 and be ready than to skimp and fail, but we want to make certain that the money is spent wisely and not squandered by new dealers.

Let us hope we do not waste millions as in 1918. We want no "war babies" for 1940. Our industry is equipped to go ahead and do its job for the Government on the basic principle of millions for defense but not one cent for waste and graft.

Let us not forget that since and including 1938 and to this date, including the spending bill for the Army as passed by the House, we have appropriated $2,583,606,105 for the War Department, and for the same period for the Navy $3,084,845,394, or a total of defense money of $5,668,451,499.

We certainly should have gotten somewhere on this enormous pot of gold. Where?

Mr. Speaker, if the same proportionate percentage as revealed by these figures for the last 3 years in the expenditure of money for new equipment is applied to the appropriation of $1,180,000,000 asked by the President of the United States, there would be but $118,000,000 for new equipment. I trust, therefore, that not 10 percent, as has been the experience according to the report of the Budget committee for the past 3 years, but 100 percent will be expended. The necessity of administering this fund need not add a dollar to the expenses of the Government. We already have the personnel perfectly able to do it, without the addition of picturesque boards and commissions to handle it. Of course, I know what has become of the other 90 percent of the appropriations made for the years indicated in the interview, but that does not exonerate the War Department from the responsibility when we have for so long a time faced the prophetic possibility of our being obliged to defend ourselves against the storm and debacle destroying Europe. There must not be, Mr. Speaker, a repetition of the waste in contracts and the piling up of useless equipment as we had in the World War, which

scandalized this Nation following that great conflict and which sent a number of people to our penal institutions. Bureaucratic irresponsibility should no longer obtain in this time of our crisis.

Storm Over the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

LETTER OF PRESCOTT DENNETT, TREASURER OF MAKE EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Mr. Prescott Dennett, treasurer of Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee, which was published in the open forum of the May 1940 issue of the American Mercury magazine, under the title "Storm Over the Caribbean."

The letter is as follows:

[From The American Mercury for May 1940]

STORM OVER THE CARIBBEAN

SIR: In his article No More West Indies in your March issue, Mr. Tom S. Hyland levels his guns at the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee and at our national chairman, Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN. He completely obscures the fundamental national defense issue which serves to make the acquisition of European-owned islands in American waters a simple and an easy method for Europe to square up in some measure on the billions in war debts which have been saddled on the American taxpayers.

In his diatribe concerning West Indies "poorhouses" your author makes no mention of Bermuda. He could hardly consider Bermuda poverty-stricken. Senator LUNDEEN, who visited Puerto Rico a year ago, tells us Mr. Hyland's analysis of conditions there is at variance with current facts. Shortly after your article appeared, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, on of the many to join our movement, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statistics which give an entirely different picture of the economic situation in many of the West Indies than that presented by Mr. Hyland. In justice to our committee and in the interests of accuracy, I believe it is only right that you direct your readers' attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4 and 13, pages 2284–2288 and 2784–2787.

Outstanding naval and military authorities have published dramatic reasons for doing substantially what our committee urges. Maj. George Fielding Eliot, for example, has pointed out that our defense in this area rests on Puerto Rico, and contrasted the holes in our Atlantic island-outpost system with the very good island-outpost system we now have in the Pacific, which serves both offensive and defensive purposes. Moreover, I refer interested readers to the leading article in the February issue of the semi-official United States Naval Institute proceedings, wherein Lt. Comdr. Isaiah Olch, U. S. N., devotes 11 pages to a résumé of national interests in the Caribbean area. Will your author attempt to refute such statements as the following?

"The importance of our position in the Caribbean area and along the South and Latin American coasts cannot be overimpressed upon anyone interested in the future safety of the United States. The former naval base at St. Thomas has been abandoned while in that same key area of the northeastern section of the Caribbean we have failed to develop any extensive naval facilities in Puerto Rican waters. * * * Perhaps the time will come for us to withdraw from European and Far Eastern spheres in the face of concerted action by foreign powers before we realize that the heritage left to us in the form of a fundamental and progessive development of interest in the Caribbean and in South America has been lost * * *."

The Mercury will be performing a public service in the interest of accuracy in bringing the above authoritative military and naval defense opinions to the attention of its readers.

PRESCOTT DENNETT,
Treasurer, Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Development of Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a great part of my work in Congress has been devoted to projects for the development of the Red River Valley in Texas, Arkansas, and in Louisiana. A number of projects have been pending for many years and within the last year at least one tremendous project has actually been begun. Within a few short months, it is my hope and expectation some smaller projects in northwest Louisiana will actually see the breaking of ground and the beginning of work on a large scale.

I have assembled numerous facts regarding these several projects and I would like to take each one up in order to give this Congress some of those facts which are so essential and vital to the development of the Red River Valley.

DENISON RESERVOIR

The construction of the Denison Reservoir on the Red River in Texas and Oklahoma for flood control and other purposes was authorized by an item contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938. The basic plans for the development of the Denison project are contained in House Document No. 541, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

The Denison Reservoir will be formed by an earth dam located in the Red River in Grayson County, Tex., and Bryan County, Okla., at a site about 5 miles northwest of Denison, Tex., and about 15 miles southwest of Durant, Okla. The dam will be about 14,000 feet in length and about 165 feet in maximum height above the stream bed. The storage capacity of the reservoir will be 5,825,000 acre-feet, of which 2,060,000 acre-feet are for generation of hydroelectric power and 2,745,000 acre-feet are for flood control. When filled to the top of the power pool, the Denison Reservoir will extend upstream along the main stem of the Red River about 64 miles and about 61 miles up the Washita River Valley.

The construction of the Denison project is in the charge of Capt. Lucius D. Clay, the district engineer at Denison, Tex., under the general supervision of Col. Eugene Reybold, the division engineer, southwestern division. Allotments totaling $7,888,000 have been made for this project to date. In the statement showing the proposed application of funds included in the Budget estimate of $70,000,000 for the fiscal year 1941, which the Department submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in connection with the hearings on the War Department civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1941, it is hoped that the sum of $4,800,000 will be set up for continuing work on the Denison project. A further item of $2,000,000 is included on the list which was also submitted to the Appropriations Committee showing the allocation of funds in the amount of $25,000,000 which could have been profitably expended in the fiscal year 1941 in addition to those listed within the Budget limitation of $70,000,000. These two lists are printed on pages 136 and 143 of the hearings for the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The first contract in the construction of the Denison Dam was for the clearing of land at the dam site. This work was completed during October 1939. Additional clearing of one disposal area in the dam-site area, the construction of a temporary field office building and field concrete laboratory building, and the laying of a water-supply line to the

dam site have been completed by hired labor. Contracts are now under way for the excavation for the outlet works and the construction of a temporary bridge and for the construction of the outlet works. The plans and specifications for the construction of the main embankment of the dam and the excavation for the spillway have been approved by the Department. It is expected that the construction of these items will be initiated about May 15, 1940. The design of the remainder of the project, including the highway railroad and utility relocations is progressing rapidly. The construction of the entire project will be carried on as expeditiously as engineering considerations and the availability of funds will permit.

Flood records of the Red River, especially with regard to the discharges in the upper river, are very incomplete. It is known, however, that floods of considerable magnitude occurred in 1843, 1876, 1892, 1908, 1915, and 1935. The greatest flood of accurate record is that which occurred during late May of 1908, although there is evidence that the flood of 1843 may have been considerably higher. The 1935 flood, which was approximately equal to the 1915 flood, caused a considerable amount of damage in the Red River Basin below Denison. The bottom lands in the Red River Valley are subject to flooding throughout practically the entire length of the river. Between Denison and the mouth of the river the flood plain is wide, and the flood losses are high, due to the size of the flood plain and its relatively large agricultural crop value. Between Denison and the Texas-Arkansas State line 153,000 acres of cleared land were inundated by the 1935 flood. All but 10 percent of this, or 138,000 acres, would have been protected by the Denison Reservoir. If the 1908 flood were to recur under present conditions about 233,000 acres would be flooded in this reach of the river. This flood area will be reduced to about 15,000 acres after the reservoir is in operation. If the estimated maximum probable flood were to occur about 97,000 acres would be protected by the reservoir out of the total of 263,000 acres that would be flooded if the reservoir were not in operation.

Between the Texas-Arkansas State line and Alexandria, La., there are numerous levee districts with levees in various stages of repair and disrepair. The Denison Reservoir will protect in this reach 35,000 acres of cleared land from the 1935 flood, 179,000 acres from the 1908 flood, and 423,000 acres from the estimated maximum probable flood. The crop damages caused by floods are so extensive in the Red River valley that they constitute a major economic problem to the landowners, tenants, and sharecroppers. As a result of a survey of flood damages in the agricultural area between Denison, Tex., and Alexandria, La., it was determined that the average annual flood damages to crops amounts to about $1,007,000. The prevention of these crop losses will be one of the principal flood-control benefits resulting from the operation of the Denison Reservoir.

Many other damages which will be prevented by withholding flood waters or by reducing flood magnitudes include the loss of buildings, bridges, and livestock; business losses due to reduced crops and the disruption of business caused by floods, bank caving, which causes great losses nearly every year; the pollution of fertile fields with weeds, which can be eradicated only with considerable labor and expense; the erosion of rich farm lands; the deposition of silt on agricultural lands; and various others. In addition to the prevention of loss, definite benefits will be obtained through the reduction in the incidence of malaria and the enhancement of property values due to the ability to turn forest or submarginal lands to economic crop production.

Inasmuch as any new navigation system for the Red River would require flow regulation, the Denison Reservoir will be of considerable benefit. It will have beneficial effects in reducing floods, decreasing bank caving, and in substituting moderately high river stages of long duration for high flood stages of short duration. These beneficial effects will be augmented by the increased low-water flow resulting from the regulated power discharge which will furnish more dependable navigable stages. Although at present irrigation is not practiced to any great extent in the Red River Valley below Denison, the reservoir would have beneficial effects on any future irrigation by pumping from the river or from shallow wells due to the improved flow conditions that will result from the operation of the reservoir.

The Red River Valley below the Denison Reservoir has had a serious health problem for many years due to the prevalence of malaria. The principal breeding places of the anopheles mosquito in this area are pools in low places in the bottom lands along the Red River which are frequently filled during floods and in the larger ponds that are often formed by the river cutting a new channel during high stages. The Denison Reservoir will be of considerable benefit for malaria control by reducing the overflowing of bottom lands, caving of banks, and the cutting of new channels.

Bank caving due to high stages and velocities during floods is serious in the Red River Valley, as large amounts of land are lost thereby during every flood. Caving becomes serious as the river approaches bank-full stage and is accelerated during stage recession if banks have been thoroughly saturated by overflow. The operation of the Denison Reservoir would have important benefits in the prevention of bank caving in the river valley below the dam.

At the present time approximately 600,000 acres between Denison, Tex., and Alexandria, La., are completely or partially protected from flood by a system of levees, but there are many additional acres of fertile lands now under cultivation or adapted to cultivation if flood protection is assured. A large portion of these lands will receive further and more definite protection when the system of levees is assisted by reservoir operation upstream.

Floods in the Mississippi River usually occur in the spring, as a result of flood flows out of the Ohio River. The coincidence of flood flows out of the Red River with the Mississippi River spring floods is rare. However, the early summer floods out of the Missouri River occasionally coincide in the Mississippi River with the summer floods out of the Red River. The control provided by the proposed Denison Dam and Reservoir on the Red River summer floods has been estimated to produce a reduction of approximately 0.6 foot at the mouth of Old River on the Mississippi. This reduction, while not substantial with respect to Mississippi flood stages, is important when flood crests seriously tax the Mississippi levee system.

RED RIVER PARISH

The Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, authorized the raising, enlarging, and extending of the present levee system on the right bank of the Red River in Red River Parish between 35 and 55 miles below Shreveport, La. This project was completed during the fiscal year 1939.

BAYOU PIERRE

A project for enlarging the channel of Bayou Pierre from Bayou Wincey to Grand Encore, La., was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936. This project was also completed during the fiscal year 1939.

BLACK BAYOU RESERVOIR

The Black Bayou Reservoir in Caddo Parish, La., about 25 miles northwest of Shreveport, La., was authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936. Local interests have agreed to provide the lands and damages for this project, but to date have not yet made available to the Department any of the lands. It is understood, however, that a large part of the necessary lands are owned by the levee

district. Preliminary plans for the Black Bayou Reservoir have been completed. When lands are made available for the project, every consideration will be given to providing funds for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications. Because the continuation of projects already initiated will require most of the $70,000,000 included in the Budget estimate for general flood control during the fiscal year 1941, no item for the Black Bayou Reservoir is included in the list which the Department submitted to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. A proposed allotment of $289,000 is, however, included in the $25,000,000 additional list.

BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR

Bayou Bodcau Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, and the authorization was amended by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of June 28, 1939. Work on the plans and designs and on dam site, reservoir, and property surveys is in progress. The Department has recently approved the plan of development proposed by the division and district engineers. Allotments totaling $939,000 have been made available for the Bayou Bodcau Reservoir.

WALLACE LAKE RESERVOIR

The Wallace Lake Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936. The preliminary designs have been completed and the field work and office studies in connection with the preparation of construction plans and specifications is in progress. The Department has approved the plan of development proposed by the division and district engineers. The division engineer has recently advised this office that it is expected that bids for constructing the dam will be advertised about May 15, 1940. To date allotments totaling $512,000 have been made for this project.

RED RIVER SURVEY

Pursuant to a resolution by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives dated February 25, 1938, and several other congressional authorizations for investigation of tributary streams, the Department is making a comprehensive review survey of the entire Red River Basin. The field work and detailed studies in connection with this report are being made by the district engineers at Denison, Tex., and Vicksburg, Miss. The preparation of the full review report is being carried on by a special board of officers appointed for this purpose. Brig. Gen. M. C. Tyler, the division engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, is the senior member of the special board. The district engineers' reports are rapidly approaching completion, and the full report of the special board is scheduled for submission to this office on June 1, 1940. The report will then be reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as required by law prior to its submission to Congress with the Department's findings and recommendations.

CONCLUSION

The Denison Dam is just as important to the ultimate development of the local Red River Valley as though it were located in the State of Louisiana. It will have a tremendous effect on future activities along the Red River in Louisiana, and when it functions in cooperation with the Bayou Bodcau and Wallace Lake projects, it will go a long way toward relieving us in the Red River Valley of future floods and river troubles.

At the present time I am not going to enter into a discussion of the probable benefits of navigation that future development of the river may bring. This work is yet ahead of us. But in the not-far-distant future, I can see the bright rays of a new hope to the people who live in this great and alluvial valley. I can see the return of the steamboat and the river barge to northwest Louisiana and the extensive use of this God-given asset for navigation, and for the purpose of aiding mankind in the elimination of some of his burdens and his problems.

The Spirit of Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY REV. EDWARD J. HICKEY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Rev. Edward J. Hickey, pastor, St. Aloysius Church, Detroit, chancelor, archdiocese of Detroit:

Religious-minded people of the Columbia Church of the Air, now if I were a Jew, living in the tempest of an anti-Semitic campaign, I am afraid that I should doubt that Christians ever heard Christ's command to love their enemies. The yellow newspapers of Germany vomit forth the most frightful abuse of the Jews. The brutality of storm troopers falls on Jewish women and old men and little children. Doctors are driven out of their hospitals. It becomes a public sport to smash Jewish shops; it is a national contest to see who can steal most from the Jews that can no longer claim the protection of the police. Jewish families cluster together in the protective dark, wondering when the fist that clutches an automatic will beat on their door. Jewish mothers see their daughters attacked, their sons beaten. Old men feel hot, torturing fingers twisting in their beards. It has become an achievement to smash the face of a Jew. It has become a literary triumph to invent new insults to heap upon them.

Anti-Semitism has been the chameleon of history; it is constantly changing its ground; it is always making new appeals to the particular prejudices of the age. It appropriates the most hated labels of any period and attaches them to this unhappy people. Were the Jews ever guilty of even a fraction of the charges raised against them by their enemies, they would be sunk to a level of moral and intellectual depravity unparalleled in the history of mankind. It is the very diversity and extravagance of these accusations which make them incredible. Whatever the Jew might be, certainly he could not be everything his detractors have affirmed.

Today in Europe anti-Semitism stems from the conception of the absolute subordination of the individual to the state. Now, the chief complaint against the Jew is that he holds beliefs and practices that do not permit his coordination in the absolutist state; that he has loyalties that transcend the boundaries of the Nation; that he professes a religion which is universal and hence inimical to the particularist doctrine of a homogeneous people founded on a common blood and soil.

The very cause of this totalitarian condition is unjustly charged to Jewish philosophers, Jewish international bankers, and the Jewish proletariat.

And while Americans in general are supposed to hate Jewish persecution, as they are supposed to hate all persecution, America is seeing the rise of anti-Semitism on an alarming scale. In New York that rise is notable because Jews are most numerous there.

It is in the highest degree depressing, and not a little remarkable, that among a people and under a Government where freedom of worship, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech are embedded in the rock of fundamental law, there should now exist organizations whose sole aim is persecution and that there should be many thousands of individuals who, singly and in groups, constantly manifest an un-American and un-Christian spirit in their attitude, their language, and their acts toward those who differ from them. The preaching and teaching of Christianity are apparently futile with all such; the spirit of Christ has wholly departed from them. Any comprehension of the underlying principles of American Government and American social order is quite beyond their ken. The persecuting tendency is a distinctive mark of a barbarous people. These persons, though living in the twentieth century, in a free land, and in communities where there are both churches and schools, are, nonetheless, barbarians.

Unhappily the time through which we are passing is one in which, by a few wild words, it is possible to make tens of thousands of the ignorant intolerant of him who is educated and intelligent; tens of thousands of the unthrifty and the poor intolerant of him who is thrifty and has gained possessions; and tens of thousands of those who have failed, through defects of their own character, intolerant of him who has succeeded by brains and untiring devotion in achieving a well-considered purpose.

Many of our contemporaries profess to dislike the Jews because of disagreeable relations with individual members of this people in business or in the professions. But is such an attitude reasonable?

Are these undesirable characteristics of some modern Jews the product of an inherent defect in this people or are they merely the result of historical circumstances?

To deny the actuality of the forces which determined the formation of the Jewish soul is to deny the obvious testimony of history. To pass strict moral judgment on a people who have been bred in the bitter cauldron of hate and oppression is to neglect the basic laws of justice and charity. It is far more reasonable to try to understand the modern Jew in the light of the conditions that have shaped him. Nor is it beside the point to insist that not only is this the rational view but it is the only one consistent with the high principles of our Christian faith.

We have suffered too much at the hand of persecutors, we Catholics, not to have a deep sympathy for the persecuted and a deep hatred for persecution.

Persecution brutalizes the persecutor. It plants the poison hatred in his soul. It leaves upon him indelible scars. It makes him less a man and more a hunting dog. It converts him from a human being into a brutalized wild beast, blood on his fangs, and the lust of murder in his heart.

Persecution never won any man to a faith or to a cause, and it will never win the Jews to the faith of Jesus Christ. The only way in which we can ever win Jews to the Christianity we love is to show them Christian virtue in our lives—notably Christian love and gentleness and forgiveness. Christ cried: "Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy." Mercy is not found in the reprisals, pogroms, ghettoes, discriminating laws, beatings, the burning of homes, starvation inflicted upon an entire people.

Here, in America, we must understand and practice tolerance. It does not mean indifference to truth, or weakness in seeking or defending the truth. What it means is that the tolerant person, realizing the dignity and the worth of the individual human spirit, grants to each and every human being, the right which he claims for himself, namely, to shape his own convictions and his own beliefs in his own way. Arguments, not force, persuasion, not punishment, are the instruments of approach to those whom one would bring to his own way of thinking.

Tolerance, rightly understood, is composed of two elements. These elements are first positive conviction, and second, sympathy with men whose convictions differ from our own.

Catholicism frankly states its position regarding toleration to the world, and in practice abides by its protestations. It proclaims that dogmatically Catholicism is not and cannot be tolerant of error; one religion is not as good as another; there can be no compromise in principles that touch faith and morals. At the same time, it most emphatically proclaims that other men are to be permitted to follow out their conscientious beliefs untrammeled, accountable, not to man, but to God, for the faith that is in them, and that they may not be discriminated against precisely because of their religion.

Brotherly love does not, because of this, blind us to sectarianism, heresy, rationalism, or radicalism on the part of those whom we still call our brethren. It does not prompt us to make compromises, however slight, with error. But it commands us, nonetheless, to love with a deep supernatural love for their souls' true welfare, all who may hold or teach the doctrines of which we do not and cannot approve. To have them united with us in the one and only fold of Christ should, therefore, be our constant prayer and endeavor.

True tolerance consists in the love of truth and the love of man, each brought to its perfection and living in perfect harmony with one another; but that these two great affections are perfect and in perfect harmony only when they are orbed and enfolded in the yet greater affection of the love of God. The love of truth, alone, grows cruel; it has no pity for man. The love of man, alone, grows weak. It trims and molds and travesties the truth to suit men's whims. It is only when truth and man are loved within the love of God, loved for His sake, truth loved as His utterance, man loved as His child—only then is it that they meet and blend in tolerance.

For the individuals, for they have their souls to save, the church has all the love and affection of Jesus Christ Himself who died for them. She is interested in their material as in their spiritual welfare.

Even if the Jews were guilty of all the crimes that propaganda has dumped at their doors, we would still have no course open to us as Christians but the Christ-like course of loving them, praying for them, giving them every possibility of finding their way back to what we know is their Father's house, the church founded by the one sent to be their leader, the promised Messiah.

Anti-Semitism is simply anti-Christianity. It is impossible to understand how a man can hate the Jews and pretend to love the Christ who commanded His followers to love their enemies with a special love. The rule of Christ is the rule of charity and love. How dare Christians, much less Catholics, substitute for that charity, hatred for any man or race.

Hatred is a hideous vice. And Christians who have once let their souls be caught up in the bloody, lustful, hot, vengeful arms of hatred are never again the same. I am afraid of what this hatred of Jews will do to us Christians even more than I am afraid of what it will do to the Jews.

True brotherly love is universal as the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Its light and warmth go forth to all and its blessing is withheld from none; like the sun that shines on the good and bad, like the rain that falls on the saint and sinner. "And this commandment we have from God, that he who loveth God love also his brother."

The man that carries hatred in his heart against a brother is classed by the great apostle of love with the most extreme of criminals: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. And you know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in himself." "He that saith that he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now."

Let us take the classical case of Christ himself. The people of Judea knew Him well. They had experienced His goodness, His kindness, His beneficence, His care of the poor, His help to the sick and the weak, and they loved Him for it. They loved Him so tenderly and so devotedly that they followed Him into the wilderness; they forgot to eat.

And yet, and yet, what happened? Propaganda was started against Him by the clever demagogues, who always start propaganda, who know perfectly well how false it is, but who also know, alas, how gullible oftentimes, the people are, and how fickle is their affection, even for their best friends.

So the propaganda started and the spirit of hatred was aroused. Christ, whom they had known to be the befriender of the poor and the weak and the suffering, was now pointed out as consorting with sinners and no friend of Caesar; and in 5 days—mark how brief is the time it requires for vicious propaganda to do its work—after they had welcomed Him royally into the city of Jerusalem, they were screaming before the palace of Pilate, filling the streets with their imprecations and demanding His death. Here is your typical case of propaganda and this is what inevitably follows.

Although He foresaw that He would be the victim of hatred and persecution during His public ministry, Christ had always been the very soul of love and kindness, and there in Him was set clearly and perfectly before the world the pattern of consummate tolerance. The love of truth and the love of man, each complete, and each in perfect harmony with the other, within the embracing love of God—is not that the life of Jesus? Not for a moment does one doubt His absolute hold on the truth; it is so deep that He not merely holds the truth, He is the truth. And yet His patient, willing indulgence of His brethren, His utter refusal to use any power except reason and spiritual persuasion to turn them from their error—all this is just as clear as His belief; and in Him there can be no doubt that the two essentially belong together.

Public expression of this standard of love of neighbor was given to the world by the late Pope Piux XI in his defense of the Jews against their opponents. In the midst of the loud roar of dreadful anti-Semitic hatred, which came from the totalitarian valley of darkness, the voice of His Holiness was heard calling the racists of Germany, Italy, and elsewhere to the divine command to love their neighbor, for in Christ there is no distinction of Jew and Greek. This aged man of God, arising miraculously from his sick bed, with tears such as must have flowed from the eyes of Christ as He mournfully gazed upon sinful Jerusalem, boldly lined himself and his 350,000,000 spiritual children alongside the persecuted sons of Abraham. * * * Through Christ and in Christ we are Abraham's decendants. No, it is not possible for Christians to take part in anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is inadmissible. We are all Semites spiritually. This is the true spirit of tolerance.

Reserve Officers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following address which I delivered at the annual convention of the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States:

I am highly honored and deeply grateful to my fellow officers for the high honor you have bestowed upon me, and the confidence expressed thereby in electing me as your president, but it is with considerable trepidation that I enter into my new duties, first, because of the fine record of my predecessors in carrying forward our organization in the great State of New Jersey, and, secondly, because of the trying times that face our country in the near future.

An organization is only as strong as its members. I am only one person and cannot individually carry on the work of the department without the unselfish cooperation of the chapters. New Jersey, I am sorry to say, cannot boast too well of its membership or of its

membership's standing in relation to other States of the United States. We, as officers, by accepting a commission in the Reserve have indicated our willingness to serve our country, and have expressed thereby that we are not in any way to be considered slackers in case of an emergency. Yet a very small percentage of the Reserve officers in our State belong to this, their association, and have allowed a few to carry on in their interest. Are they not, in a sense, derelict in their obligation? It is through the efforts of the national committee that many benefits have been derived, and which has carried on the objects of the association for an adequate national defense. They need our support and the support of every Reserve officer in the country. I only hope with the unsettled conditions abroad and the closeness to our country the present situation has been brought it will be sufficiently important to those who are nonmembers to influence them to join this year.

These are indeed serious moments to our country, and it is our duty as Reserve officers to prepare ourselves to be in constant readiness should our country need our services. Not only should we do that, but as Reserve officers we should be sufficiently conversant with the military conditions of our present armed forces to realize the utter lack of preparedness that has existed in our country up to this year. Of the 8 years that I have been a Reserve officer, I have constantly publicly urged the necessity of preparing in peace for what might be in the future an emergency. I know that all of you officers have done likewise, and it has been one of the objects of our organization to impress the people of this country with the importance of an adequate national defense, it being the best insurance against becoming involved with some warlike Nation of the earth.

Unfortunately, our people were not receptive and, as a result, our armed forces were allowed to diminsh until we find today in the light of that which is happening abroad our wholly and pitifully unprepared condition. You officers who went through the maneuvers last summer well know that whereof I speak to be the truth. You know as well as I we are in no condition at the present time, nor will we be, regardless of the amount of money spent, even within a year to consider interfering in the conflict abroad.

Unfortunately, the American people are inclined even personally when insulted, instead of first appraising the physical ability of the opponent to determine the ultimate result should an altercation occur, the first reaction is, "What are you going to do about it?" and sometimes get into something a little bit more than they can handle, with the unhappy result of a sound trimming. It is for us, as officers, before being stampeded into a war with nations armed to the teeth and fully prepared, that we first take inventory of our own ability and determine whether we shall be victorious or not.

This, of course, is not considering an invasion of our country. Every day there are letters arriving in my office urging that we take sides abroad, and it is for us, as officers and, after all, we cannot be considered as pacifists or cowards as we have signified our intention to do our jobs and defend our country in case of need, but it is for us to try to keep our feet on the ground and discourage the hysteria of the public adduced by propaganda which might cause us to enter into a conflict from which we might not emerge.

It might be well also in considering the situation to consider just what might occur in our own country should we send our forces abroad. Unfortunately, we Americans in our desire for freedom of speech and with the usual theory of, "It can't happen here," have allowed foreign groups to organize and undermine and even to the extent of using our mails to further their insidious propaganda inciting a dissatisfaction and racial hatred with the intent of destruction of our form of government. As I have said on the floor of the House of Representatives and on many other occasions, if there are any in this fair land of ours receiving the benefits of the freedom of this country who are not satisfied with our form of government and who constantly praise the advantages of some foreign form, let them take the first boat back to the land they admire so much. We got along very well before they arrived and we can get along much better after they leave. Our country might be likened to a building erected by the finest artisans of time to stand against the ravages of the elements and the storms. Yet a small insect such as a termite, by constantly boring from within, can destroy that which it has taken years to erect. It is for us and all who love our country and the principles for which it stands to be constantly on the alert to counteract the poisonous influence gaining a strong foothold toward its destruction. We wear the uniform of the United States. Let us be proud of it and not be afraid to stand up for our country and its flag.

Where in the world could we meet as we are tonight over the festive board and at a convention free and without worry of the spying eyes of secret police to express ourselves as free-born people on subjects we desire to discuss? It is a heritage and a privilege that has been denied practically every country in the world except our own. It is something worth fighting for, something worth keeping. Let us look to our own defenses, clean up our own back yard, and until our own country is in danger stay out of the conflict 3,500 miles away.

I again seek your cooperation and help, and I pledge to you my untiring efforts to make this association, the Department of New Jersey, one of the outstanding departments of the country and to bring to the people of our country the realization that we in the Reserve have for years given of our time and services to learn to become proficient, so should the emergency arise, we may defend our country with the best possible efficiency and that the Reserve officers are not militarists nor saber rattlers but good, true, patriotic American citizens.

Hollywood, Calif., "I Am an American" Day May 19, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and myself accepted an invitation and attended one of the first citizenship meetings held since the passage at this session of House Joint Resolution 437, known as I Am an American citizenship day held at Hollywood, Calif., on Sunday afternoon and evening of May 19, 1940. The public interest in this meeting prompts me to make a brief report with reference to it.

It was an elaborate meeting, attended by several hundred participants and some 15,000 people. The principal addresses were delivered by the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and myself. The program during the afternoon was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System, and the evening program by the National Broadcasting Co. This was a most hope-inspiring activity.

The meeting was nonpartisan and all civic organizations of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County cooperated in the program. Great credit should be given to Mr. Edward Arnold, the actor; Mr. Ben Neal, and Mr. Leo Spencer, all of whom came east to support the bill in the Senate after it had passed the House, and who had charge of the arrangements for the fine meeting at the Hollywood Bowl. Mr. John B. Hughes, the commentator, was very active in directing the arrangements. Five bands participated and a message from the President of the United States was part of the ceremonies, and was broadcast from Washington by the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins.

Rupert Hughes, the author, had written a special sketch for the occasion, which he called Who Is American? The actors and actresses who gave their services free to act this sketch were headed by Lewis Stone, and included Edward Arnold, Marjorie Rambeau, Hedda Hopper, Mickey Rooney, Marsha Hunt, Rosemary Lane, and William Henry. Rear Admiral Joseph B. DeFrees, of the United States Navy, delivered a brief address at both the afternoon reception and evening program. The moving-picture industry was well represented through M. G. M. and Warner Brothers.

The gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and myself feel that these new citizens of America are entitled to the commendation of the country and he joins me in recommending to every community in the United States the observance of "I Am An American" Citizenship Day, which will be held on the third Sunday of May each year, through the issuing of a proclamation by the President of the United States.

Some 3,000 young men and women who became 21 years of age during the past year, and those who became citizens by naturalization, were present to take their pledge as new citizens.

Both the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and myself commend all people in Los Angeles County and throughout the Nation who cooperated so splendidly in the first meetings held under this new law.

Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House to provide funds for the relief of the needy unemployed will have my support. I have consistently supported such measures ever since the depression came upon us. The need for such exists today as surely as at any time in the past. I regret that this is true. I had hoped that long ago employment at normal wages would be procurable. But, unfortunately, employment in industry is not available at this time for the millions of our unemployed. In fact, relief appropriations seem even more necessary in many respects than heretofore. With each succeeding year there are more and more people who find it necessary to avail themselves of public relief. This is due to the fact that as the depression continues there is an ever-increasing number of persons who have used up all their available savings and credit in an endeavor to avoid going on the relief rolls but who are now faced with the necessity of doing so. They are not at fault. They are entitled to help.

It is a serious situation when 10,000,000 are unemployed throughout the Nation. This bill, though large in the total amount, is not sufficient in itself to supply help for more than a small fraction of those who are unemployed. The situation is made all the more serious because of the emergency that now exists to expend large sums to build up our inadequate national defense. In addition to this is the inability of our States and local governments to supply any material assistance in the way of funds. Already the tax burden upon the home owner has become too heavy to bear. As a result we see the necessity of local governing bodies selling properties for what they will bring. In most every case it means a price far below the real value. But most distressing of all is the fact that every time a property is sold it means that some family has lost the home which it has struggled for years to obtain.

The whole picture is dark and forbidding. I have often asked myself the question: "How long can this continue?" Mere granting of relief such as provided for by this bill is not the answer. It solves none of the basic conditions that have created or continued this widespread distress. All that these relief measures do is to provide some temporary relief, and the available amount is so limited that it does not provide adequately for the need that actually exists.

In addition to the inadequacy of the amount available there is also a glaring defect in the administration of these relief funds. I refer to the political use that is made of such funds. It is a disgrace for any political party to use the need for relief, that arises from unemployment, to be utilized for political purposes. Time and again this condition has been revealed. In fact, it has become so deep-rooted that it seems to be part and parcel of the W. P. A. set-up. This is wrong. To use relief to control the votes of the hungry and needy deserves to be condemned in the strongest language possible. We have passed statutes that seek to deal with the situation, but even these seem to fail of their purpose. It is time for the citizens of our country who have knowledge of such conditions to demand that the law-enforcement agencies of the Government utilize the powers that Congress has given to them to end this un-American practice. The welfare of our Nation requires that every citizen, no matter how humble, shall have the right to exercise a free choice in the selection of elective officials. To give bread and demand a vote in return is destructive of real Americanism and nothing can ever justify such a practice.

The support for this bill will come from Republicans as well as Democrats. The desire to relieve distress is not confined to any one party. Likewise the funds in the Federal Treasury that will be used for relief come from Republicans as well as Democrats. Thus, in no sense is the granting of relief for our needy unemployed a partisan matter, and, therefore, should not be utilized for partisan political purposes. Any political party that seeks to do so should be held to the strictest accountability. The right to vote is only worth while so long as it is an unrestricted right. The future security of our Nation and the individual welfare of our citizens demand that the freedom of the ballot be preserved as a fundamental right of free American citizenship.

Exemptions from Civil Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

LETTER FROM L. A. MAYER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, AND AN EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and Executive order:

MAY 22, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Committee on the Civil Service,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: Referring to our conference and to your request, the Commission advises you that as a matter of good public policy it objects to the exemptions from the civil-service system provided for on page 2 of H. R. 9802 and H. R. 9825, relating to the national defense.

Although the exemptions are stated as being for the purpose of expediting the building up of the national defense they would have the opposite effect.

The Civil Service Commission through its 13 district offices and 5,000 local boards of civil-service examiners throughout the country is already equipped without any preliminary training to recruit, competitively or noncompetitively, all kinds of qualified personnel essential in any preparedness or defense program. This work can be done only by the Civil Service Commission without mutually conflicting recruiting activities by each of the agencies of the Government engaged in such program. Furthermore, each of these agencies would have to go through the expensive process and the consequent delay of building up of recruiting offices, and they would necessarily compete with each other.

The President has full and complete authority under existing law to prescribe the methods of recruiting to meet any emergency condition. One step in this direction was taken by the President on recommendation by the Civil Service Commission in the issuance on September 21, 1939, of Executive Order 8257 (copy attached) authorizing the Commission "to permit an immediate appointment, without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil-service rules, in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government."

A further order was issued on December 12, 1939, authorizing the Commission to sustain objections to eligibles in the case of highly confidential positions in the State, War, and Navy Departments.

General Gasser, the Deputy Chief of Staff, speaking for the War Department, has asked that this exemption be stricken from the military-affairs bill, as the Department is satisfied that the Civil Service Commission is equipped to render the War Department the best possible service in recruiting qualified civilian personnel. If this exemption is continued in the bill and becomes law the Military authorities will be hampered in the work they are established to perform because of the importunities of seekers for employment and because of the fact that they would necessarily be required to

establish and train elaborate staffs of employees for recruiting purposes.

It is further to be noted that there is no such exemption from the civil-service system in the preparedness and defense bill providing for the expansion of the Naval Establishment.

One question that has been raised relates to the elimination of employees of subversive tendencies from the Government, and also the prevention of the appointment of such persons. The Commission is engaged in working out a procedure whereby there will be enlisted all the investigative agencies of the Government to make careful and detailed character investigations of eligibles on the Commission's registers who may be considered for positions connected with the preparedness and defense program of the Government.

Under directions from the President conveyed to the Civil Service Commission through Mr. W. H. McReynolds, administrative assistant to the President, the Commission has been planning for months to meet any emergency need of the War and Navy Departments and other agencies connected with the defense and preparedness program of the Government, and it is clear to the Commission that the President is desirous that these positions be filled through civil-service procedure.

By direction of the Commission.

Very respectfully,

L. A. MOYER,
Executive Director and Chief Examiner.

EXECUTIVE ORDER AUTHORIZING EXCEPTED APPOINTMENTS TO MEET PUBLIC EXIGENCY

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the provisions of paragraph 8 of subdivision 2 of section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403, 404), it is hereby ordered that, subject to appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to permit an immediate appointment without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil-service rules in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government. This authority may be used only under most unusual and compelling circumstances, and the person or persons so appointed will not thereby acquire a classified civil-service status.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 1939.*
(No. 8257.)

Lindbergh Speaks Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, in this hour of hysteria which has overwhelmed so many well-intentioned Americans who have been given a set of war nerves by sensational statements of radio broadcasters and extravagant predictions by some Eastern newspaper commentators and editors, it is necessary that we substitute sound reason for panicky conclusions and scrutinize our problems of national defense.

What America needs now is a belt-tightening program to modernize and streamline our national defenses which have been so badly neglected, despite the expenditure of $8,000,000,000 by the present administration under the authority conveyed by Congress to develop our national defense. We need less hysteria, now, and more logic in analyzing why it is that we have gotten so little in modern fighting equipment for the $8,000,000,000 the Roosevelt regime has spent for that purpose. We need less excitement by undue alarmists and more efficiency by a businesslike administration of our defense system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask in all seriousness how it is we expect to greatly improve our defense system at this time with the expenditure of another billion dollars if we follow the same formula and permit the money to be spent by the same personnel as has been true in the past 7 years. If $8,000,000,000 have left us as completely unprepared as the President now insists, another billion, or even two more billions, will not plug up our weaknesses and perfect our defenses unless Congress insists on setting up a commission or board to handle these defense purchases and to get America a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar appropriated for defense purposes. The mere voting of another billion dollars will not solve our problem of defense. We must substitute efficiency for inefficiency in the executive influences on our Military Establishments.

As a part of this statement, I am asking permission to include a statement recently appearing in the Washington Times-Herald which has a direct bearing on these remarks. It points out vividly the logical conclusion that we should not be swept off our feet at this critical period to the point of pyramiding inefficiently upon inefficiency and of multiplying mistake by mistake. We must appropriate funds for national defense. We must do it without delay. And, my colleagues, we must do it wisely with Congressional direction which will lead to its wise use in bringing out defenses up to date along a pattern determined by a clear-cut analysis of our foreign policy.

I now call your attention to the following item as illustrative of the argument I am making for a sensible and scientific approach to our defense problem rather than a jittery and jumbled stampede simply to spend more money without any clear idea of what we hope to secure for it or how we are to proceed in developing defensive armaments to meet today's methods and machinery of modern warfare.

This editorial entitled "Lindbergh Speaks Again" appeared in the Washington Times-Herald May 21 and reads as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 21, 1940]

LINDBERGH SPEAKS AGAIN

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, Sunday evening, made the third radio speech on the war that he has made since the war began. We thought the speech contained a high percentage of common sense—at least, in the passages devoted to the correct aviation-defense policy for the United States.

All of Lindbergh's adventures in connection with this war have been interesting.

In 1936, while still a self-made exile in England, Lindbergh visited Berlin and said at an Aero Club meeting that modern warfare might easily "destroy the very things we wish to protect"—a remark which didn't please Germany's airmen a little bit.

In 1938, after a tour of Russia, Czechoslavakia, Rumania, and France, Lindbergh was accused by the Russian Government press of having advised Neville Chamberlain's appeasement crowd in London that he thought the German air force could lick the British, French, Russian, and Czech air forces put together.

That Lindbergh had some such hunch was indicated when on May 17, 1939, he told the House military appropriations subcommittee that in all types of planes except heavy bombers the German planes had the edge over the American.

When the war finally broke out last September, Lindberg went on the air, September 15, with a bluntly worded plea for absolute United States isolation. A month later, October 13, he repeated that plea, and went further by remarking, "Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power"—which started Canadians calling Lindbergh names, as Russians, Germans, British, and French had done before.

THIS TALK OF INVASION

Well, the German air force, in Poland and Norway and in the last 11 days on the western front, has borne out Lindbergh's long hunch that it was a most efficient air force. So we surmise that people will listen somewhat more attentively to Lindbergh's ideas from now on than they have done for some time past.

In Sunday night's speech he put forth several ideas:

"The power of aviation has been greatly underrated in the past. Now, we must be careful not to overrate this power in the excitement of reaction. * * *

"Aviation is for us an asset. It adds to our national safety. With a firm and clear-cut policy, we can build an air defense for America that will stand above these shifting sands of war. * * *

"But * * * without a strong policy of defense, we will not even know what types of planes to build. The speed and range of our fighting planes must depend on the bases available for their use. If we are to defend the United States alone, then we must construct numerous air bases along the Mexican and Canadian borders. Such a plan would require large numbers of small bombers and pursuit planes, and eventually it would leave us as vulnerable to air attack as the nations of Europe are today.

"On the other hand, if we are to defend the entire Western Hemisphere, we need long-range bombers capable of attacking a hostile fleet a thousand miles or more at sea. * * *

"Let us not be confused by this talk of invasion by European aircraft. The air defense of America is as simple as the attack is difficult when the true facts are faced."

From this point, Colonel Lindbergh went into a repetition of his previous pleas for absolute United States isolation from the eternal wars of Europe. This part of the speech was obviously pointed at the Roosevelt administration, which Lindbergh seems to suspect of interventionism.

That is a matter of opinion, and of evidence piled up from day to day—and it is a matter which may come to a show-down at the polls next November.

The practical part of Lindbergh's speech struck us as practical, indeed, and very reassuring in these days when some people's imaginations are already seeing the "blitzkrieg" bombers dealing death and destruction here.

We think Lindbergh would be a valuable man on any Government board of air-defense planning and strategy.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we are today facing one of the great and tragic days in world history. If, by any chance, the German Army should overwhelm the French and British forces, reach the channel, and invade England, the United States would be face to face with the greatest crisis in its history.

If Hitler should—and he threatens to do so—invade England and take the British fleet, a fleet that has always protected our interests in the Atlantic, the United States would be in, to use a street phrase, a hell of a position. We cannot protect both coasts, because our people have been, and to some extent are yet, opposed to adequate preparedness.

I do not know how this complex came into being. I am, however, just a bit suspicious. For years we have been told by that group of isolationists, Nye, Borah, Johnson, and others, that we as a nation had nothing to fear. They insisted that their information was as good or better than the information of the State Department. We, of course, know that they were tragically, or, I may say, criminally, mistaken.

The most effective fifth column that has operated in the United States is that group in another body that has insisted, in the face of known facts, that all we needed to do was to remain aloof.

That their position is untenable today we all know.

I do hope that these gentlemen, patriots all, I agree, will abandon their utterly silly position and join with President Roosevelt in a program to erect in our own country a barrier of defense that will keep our people safe from the ravages of Hitler and his crew of ruthless raiders.

To plead for peace is, and always will be, a popular plea. The American people are a peace-loving people. No American loves peace more than I do. No American will go farther than I will to insure peace. But, how are we going to insure peace with a madman loose in the world—a madman armed to the teeth—who tells the world in his book Mein Kampf that nazi-ism is a world philosophy and he is its prophet?

It is my hope, as it is the hope of every American citizen, that the Allies will hold this madman in check and that democracy and civilization, as all Americans conceive it, will not perish from the earth.

Let me say in this connection, however, that wishful thinking will not stop mechanized military might.

I fully realize that the mothers of America are, and should be, opposed to war per se. I also realize that the wives of America whose husbands are of military age should be opposed to war per se. I am in complete sympathy with their view, but the problem that presents itself is not, will my son or my husband go abroad to fight for some foreign cause, but will he be called upon to protect his homeland. That is the question that we face.

I know, of course, that no American mother, no American wife, will answer in the negative insofar as the invasion of our homeland is concerned.

Hitler has announced to the world that his philosophy is a world philosophy. It is a philosophy that is diametrically opposed to our philosophy. If we believe in the philosophy of democracy, we must reject the philosophy of Hitler. If democracy is worth fighting for, it is worth dying for.

Thirtieth Anniversary Meeting of the National Commission of Fine Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENT E. KELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

REPORT OF THE MEETING

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following record of the Fine Arts Commission:

A meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on May 17, 1940, marked to a day, the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of the Commission by Congress. During the 3 decades of its existence 43 leading artists of the country have served without compensation as commissioners, representing the professions of architecture, landscape architecture, painting, and sculpture. The existence of this permanent Commission of distinguished artists has enabled the Government to secure continuous expert advice in matters pertaining to the fine arts. Appointment to membership has ever been regarded a patriotic service to the Nation, "well qualified judges of the fine arts" being requisite for appointment made by the President for 4-year overlapping terms.

Prior to the establishment of the Commission of Fine Arts in 1910, it was the practice of Congress to authorize the appointment of a special committee to advise concerning each specific project. When the project was completed the committee was discharged, leaving Congress and heads of governmental departments without a recognized body to which matters pertaining to the fine arts might be referred.

During the fiscal year 1911, the first in the life of the Commission of Fine Arts, there were 41 submissions; now they number several hundred each year. There is hardly any other appropriation made by Congress which brings such a large proportionate return as that for the Commission of Fine Arts, since a statutory limitation of only $10,000 a year has been made during the 30 years of the life of this body.

The first matter which came before the Commission of Fine Arts concerned the design and location of the Lincoln Memorial. During the succeeding years the Commission advised concerning many other buildings, monuments, and memorials, but none have exceeded in importance that of the memorial to Abraham Lincoln.

The act creating the Commission of Fine Arts specifically states that the "provisions of this act shall not apply to the Capitol Building of the United States and the Library of Congress." However, the Committees on the Library of the Senate and of the House of Representatives frequently avail themselves of the services of the Commission of Fine Arts in matters pertaining to the Capitol area.

The Commission of Fine Arts is an advisory body and does not have the power of veto. In spite of this fact, its decisions are seldom overruled. Occasionally Congress confers the veto power upon the Commission by requiring, in specific legislation, that a design shall have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

At the present time the Commission advises concerning all projects within the realm of the fine arts with which the Federal Government is concerned in the District of Columbia. Recently the Commission called attention of the Members of Congress to the importance of giving more attention to the embellishment of our public buildings through the use of sculpture and mural painting. To this suggestion the Members of Congress have given favorable response.

In the early days of the Republic, President Washington called a committee consisting of Messrs. James Hoban and Stephen Hallet, architects, Colin Williamson and Carstairs, builders, and Dr. William Thornton, to meet in Philadelphia for a conference concerning questions relating to the design for the United States Capitol. In the spring of 1825, during the administration of President John Quincy Adams, a Commission consisting of Dr. William Thornton; Charles Bulfinch, Architect of the Capitol; C. B. King, portrait painter; and Col. George Bomford, United States Army; assembled in the "unfurnished" East Room of the White

House to determine upon a design for the tympanum of the central east entrance of the Capitol. In 1836, during the administration of President Jackson, a committee was appointed to advise concerning the four historical paintings (in addition to those by Trumbull) in the Rotunda of the Capitol. In 1859 Congress authorized the President to appoint an Art Commission of distinguished artists to advise on questions of sculpture and painting for the interior of the Capitol Building. President Buchanan appointed Henry Kirke Brown, sculptor, and James R. Lambdin and John F. Kensett, painters. This Commission, clothed with the veto power, was organized June 1, 1859; they submitted their only report February 22, 1860. A conflict between this Commission and the Congress resulted in an act terminating its existence.

The Senate Park Commission of 1901, the appointment of which was authorized by a resolution of the United States Senate, consisted of artists who had taken a leading part in the Chicago World's Fair of 1893. Danial H. Burnham and Charles F. McKim, architects; Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect; and Augustus Saint-Gaudens, sculptor. Charles Moore, then secretary to Senator James McMillan, became secretary of the Commission. It was he who served as member of the Commission of Fine Arts for 30 years and as chairman for 22.

The Chicago Fair, better known as the World's Columbian Exposition, caused a renewed interests in the fine arts throughout the country and Washington was the first city to profit by that awakening. The Senate Park Commission succeeded in rescuing the L'Enfant Plan from oblivion and, in a report subsequently published (S. Doc. No. 166, 57th Cong.), outlined plans for public buildings, parks, and other improvements. However, there was no existing official body to urge upon Congress the carrying out of these plans. In 1909 President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a "Council of Fine Arts" consisting of 30 artists, but after holding one meeting Congress expressed disapproval of it and it ceased to exist. Then, on May 17, 1910, during the administration of President Taft, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts, a body now 30 years old. Its record of accomplishment may be seen in the present state of development of the Nation's Capital, a record which stands eloquently for unselfish service on the part of a large group of distinguished American artists.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS AND THEIR YEARS OF SERVICE

Architects: Daniel H. Burnham (1910–12), chairman, 1910–12; Thomas Hastings (1910–17); Cass Gilbert (1910–16); Peirce Anderson (1912–16); Charles A. Platt (1916–21); William Mitchell Kendall (1916–21); John Russell Pope (1917–22); Louis Ayres (1921–25); Henry Bacon (1921–24); Milton B. Medary, Jr. (1922–27); William Adams Delano (1924–28); Abram Garfield (1925–30); Benjamin W. Morris (1927–31); John W. Cross (1928–33); John L. Mauran (1930–33); Egerton Swartwout (1931–36); John Mead Howells (1933–37); Charles A. Coolidge (1933–36); Charles L. Borie, Jr. (1936–40); Henry R. Shepley (1936–40); William F. Lamb (1937–41); Paul P. Cret (1940–44); John A. Holabird (1940–44).

Sculptors: Daniel Chester French (1910–15), chairman, 1912–15; Herbert Adams (1915–20); James E. Fraser (1920–25); Lorado Taft (1925–29); Adolph A. Weinman (1929–33); Lee Lawrie (1933–37); Paul Manship (1937–41).

Painters: Francis D. Millet (1910–12); Edwin H. Blashfield (1912–16); J. Alden Weir (1916–19); William Sergeant Kendall (1920–21); H. Siddons Mowbray (1921–28); Ezra Winter (1928–33); Eugene F. Savage (1933–41).

Landscape architects: Frederic Law Olmsted (1910–18); James L. Greenleaf (1918–27); Ferruccio Vitale (1927–32); Gilmore D. Clarke (1932–44), chairman, 1937–44.

Lay members: Charles Moore (1910–40), chairman, 1915–37; Edward Bruce (1940–44).

Total number of members, 43.

Total number of official meetings during 30 years, 261.

Maine Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a brief editorial published at Lubec, Maine.

[From the Lubec Herald of May 16, 1940]

BOUQUETS FOR TWO

Regardless of politics, credit is certainly due to two Maine men whose prompt action and hard work has saved millions for the fishermen of New England.

They are Representatives BREWSTER and OLIVER, who stepped on the project of the General Seafoods Corporation to ship cured, fresh, and processed fish from Newfoundland into this country free of duty. The bill was a steal, pure and simple. It was necessary, however, for somebody to get the matter into the limelight before it became another integer of the trade pact. The bill to kill the proposition to rob the Atlantic coast fishermen and the public was the work of these two men, and their speeches on the floor were at least strong enough to plug a hole in Cordell Hull's plan to hand us over, body and breeches, to Canada.

POTATOES

Representing the congressional district and the State of Maine that produces far more potatoes than any other district or State in the country, I shall not apologize for calling the attention of this House to the problems of the potato grower.

Potatoes are more widely grown than almost any other farm crop. Every State produces potatoes. On the other hand in most States the production is incidental to other farm operations. This explains the average plant of approximately 3 acres among the 3,000,000 farmers who report potato production and also the low yield of around 100 bushels to the acre.

SURPLUS POTATO STATES

In contrast to this there are a few areas where commercial cultivation is carried on extensively. These are the so-called surplus-potato States.

Chief among these is Maine and Aroostook County, where production runs around 300 bushels to the acre and where individual plantings run from 15 to 500 and even 1,000 acres.

Out of the annual production of approximately 350,000,000 bushels, Maine is likely to furnish 50,000,000 bushels, or approximately one-seventh.

This will make clear the tremendous interest of Maine in the welfare of the potato.

POTATOES, THE FORGOTTEN CROP

The potato was left out of the original program of the A. A. A. in 1933. The result was disastrous. When I came to Congress from Maine in 1935 potatoes were selling for 40 cents a barrel, or less than 4 cents a peck, and in the spring of 1935, millions of bushels were dumped upon the ground to rot in northern Maine.

Potato growers everywhere were aroused. Under the leadrship of the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative LINDSAY WARREN, the Warren Potato Act was enacted into law after an extremely bitter and close fight. This put potatoes on a parity with other major crops.

While many of its provisions were repealed when the Supreme Court ended the A. A. A. the Warren Act still remained in force to declare potatoes a basic commodity and this has been the basis of the programs since that time.

POTATOES—1935–40

This spring in Maine potatoes have been selling at over $2 a barrel which is well above parity. This is in marked contrast to the pampered favorites of the South and West which are in the dumps in spite of the parity payments which have been denied potatoes.

AROOSTOOK LEADS

In addition Aroostook County has led every county in the amount of soil-conservation payments under the A. A. A. with a total of $1,465,476.88. Not even the great counties of the West in Texas and California have approached this return. This is a tribute to the cooperation that has been accorded the program by the potato growers of Maine.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE PROGRAM

In spite of this improved position, however, there is nearly unanimous opposition in Maine to the policy of the administration in opening up American markets to potatoes from other countries under the reciprocal-trade program.

The reduction of the duty on potatoes and the almost unlimited increase in the quota that is possible under the latest agreement cannot under any circumstances be helpful to the potato growers of the United States. Nor does the market history of the potato in the last decade lend any warrant to the suggestion that the consumer is in need of protection against any extortion by the producer. Prices

have never been excessive and supplies have always been adequate.

As chairman of the subcommittee on potatoes of the Republican Committee on Agriculture constituted by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., I am sure there is ample warrant for a continuing, vigorous fight against continuance of the policy of reducing tariffs on potatoes and other farm products.

While climate or war conditions may minimize the injury at this time there can be no doubt as to the threat this program presents to every potato producer in the United States.

An historical record of the potato in recent years may be of value as preliminary to the consideration of the extent to which the Government may assist in solving the problems of the potato farmer and the ways in which the Government may wisely aid.

POTATO PROGRAMS DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS

In the early 1930's the only Federal potato programs available were those whereby growers could avail themselves of credit facilities for farm mortgages and production purposes through the Federal Land Bank and the Intermediate Credit Bank. Other efforts consisted of voluntary action under the direction of State and agricultural agencies. These included collection and dissemination of outlook information, current market information, and information as to crop and market conditions in competing producing areas. These programs were also supplemented by seed loans. Since 1933 additional legislation has been initiated through which growers can avail themselves of an opportunity to participate in bettering their conditions.

Potatoes are a semiperishable commodity and can be held only for a limited time. Therefore, a large supply cannot be carried over for a long period of time in order to make it available in short-crop years. Per capita consumption of potatoes fluctuates but slightly. In the past, growers have varied their acreage considerably, depending largely upon prices received for the crop produced the preceding year or the preceding 2 years. Yields per acre also vary so widely that surpluses can occur even though the acreage planted is in line with market demands. Since 1933, programs have been drafted with the primary objective of returning an equitable income to potato growers through the development of marketing procedures. Production of a surplus occasions excessively low prices because consumption by individuals is not greatly increased because of low prices. Consequently, consumers have not profited from the low farm price for potatoes because of the constant costs for transportation and merchandising.

Various types of programs have been tried in an effort to aid potato growers, but none have been entirely satisfactory. These programs include:

MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND LICENSES OR ORDERS

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, such programs were designed to regulate the shipment of potatoes so as to prevent the movement of excessive supplies to market.

Under this legislation the first potato proposal was a marketing agreement and license submitted to producers and handlers in the southeastern area of the United States, including the commercial producing areas in north Florida and the States of Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. This program was made operative July 12, 1934. It was effective, however, in only three districts, namely, the Norfolk-Elizabeth City district, the Eastern Shore of Virginia district, and the Eastern Shore of Maryland district.

The main features were the proration of the quantity to be shipped. Shipments were controlled through maximum allotments that could be shipped from each area by means of allotments prorated among various producers and handlers, and not directly to growers. The program was only partially successful, partly because the market was demoralized but chiefly because the agreement was not made effective until late in the season. However, many proponents believed that it was helpful in that it served to avoid a complete demoralization of price.

A similar agreement for the Kansas-Missouri area was proposed in June 1934 but did not go into effect because of a crop failure. Similar tentative proposals also were drafted for potato growers in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, but were not made effective.

THE 1937 MARKETING-AGREEMENT PROGRAM

Under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, programs were prepared for the 9 major late-potato-producing States, and when a referendum was held among the growers in these States, one of the areas, Maine, decided it did not want such a program. The other 8 States, comprising 3 areas, located in the North Central and Western States, however, voted overwhelmingly in its favor. Marketing orders were issued and made effective in the following 3 areas: (1) Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the 18 eastern counties in North Dakota; (2) the major potato-producing counties of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming; and (3) the 34 southern counties in the State of Idaho south of Idaho County.

These orders not only prohibited the interstate shipment of cull potatoes but also provided that, upon the recommendation of the area committee and with the approval of the Secretary, further restrictions could be placed on interstate shipments of other low-grade or small-size potatoes. These orders became effective on October 19, 1937, and expired on July 31, 1938.

The Idaho area committee recommended that all potatoes less than 2 inches in diameter be withheld from interstate shipment. The Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming committee recommended that potatoes not meeting the requirements of United States commercial grade, and which were less than 1⅞ inches in diameter, be prohibited from shipment out of the States in which they were produced. The Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota committee urged a prohibition on interstate shipment of potatoes grading U. S. No. 2. These various recommendations were approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and resulted in fewer unneeded potatoes than might otherwise have been the case from entering the market to depress prices during this period. Moreover, the improved and more uniform grades sold met with the approval of consumers generally, and prices for the 1937 crop were somewhat improved. These agreements were generally appraised as being helpful, and many of the quality improvement practices as recommended by the committees have been maintained through voluntary agreement among the members of the industry in the States involved.

THE 1938 MARKETING-AGREEMENT PROGRAM

At a conference held during the week of March 14, 1938, at Washington, D. C., the representative potato growers attending gave essentially unanimous endorsement to the development of continuing marketing-agreement programs for early and intermediate, as well as late, potatoes.

Obviously, the first program needed was one for the early commercial potato producing counties in the States of Florida, Texas, California, Louisiana, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Maryland, and work was begun immediately on such a program. It was too late to do anything that year for southern Texas and for southern and northern Florida potatoes since the bulk of their potatoes were marketed in March and April. Other important potato producing counties in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, however, wanted a program that would become effective in time for their heavy movement, which occurs in May and June. An emergency program, not intended to go beyond July 31, 1938, was therefore formulated for this Gulf States area, and was presented to growers at hearings between April 4 and April 9. In view of the favorable grower referendum, a marketing agreement for these States was made effective on May 12, 1938.

The larger 13-State marketing program for early potatoes, which included the Gulf States area, was a continuing proposal. Like the emergency program, it was designed to eliminate culls from interstate shipment, to permit further restrictions on the shipments of other low grade or small size potatoes, and required Federal-State inspection of all out-of-State shipments.

About 75 percent of the growers balloting in the 13 early and intermediate States area were favorable to the issuance of a potato order. In view of the fact that growers in Maryland, California, and South Carolina balloted unfavorably and only about 57 percent of those in Oklahoma were favorable, the Department deemed it inadvisable to make the program effective.

THE LATE STATES 1938 POTATO PROGRAM

At the March 14–16 potato conference at Washington, D. C., the representatives present requested that a marketing program be provided for the 1938 late potato crop grown in the major potato-shipping counties in the States of California, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The provisions of this agrement were similar to those included in the marketing agreement for the early potato-producing areas except that its provisions were much more flexible. The late States were divided into areas, each having a committee to administer the agreement in its own area. The marketing agreement was not made operative because only 65 percent of the growers voted favorably, whereas it is necessary to have a majority of 67 percent.

POTATO ACT OF 1935

The Potato Act of 1935 was designed to regulate the marketing of potatoes by the establishment of tax-exempt allotments equal to the quantity of potatoes estimated to be needed for normal consumption requirements, and by levying taxes on all potatoes sold in excess of the individual allotments. The bill originated with the growers as all farm legislation should originate, and was presented in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman WARREN, in February 1935. After experiencing a rather difficult fight it was passed by Congress and signed by the President in August 1935. This act amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act by designating potatoes as a basic commodity, and then provided for regulation of the marketing of potatoes. The Potato Act was intended to provide a program for potato growers similar to that in effect for tobacco and cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act, and the Bankhead Cotton Act. While the passage of this act caused an immediate rise in the price of potatoes, it was not in effect very long due to the fact that the Supreme Court rendered a decision invalidating the Agricultural Adjustment Act, thus making it necessary to repeal the Potato Act on February 10, 1936, except that title I designating potatoes as a basic commodity was not repealed. This meant that potatoes have continued since as a basic commodity.

FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION PURCHASES

Purchase programs under which potatoes were purchased for distribution to those on relief were intended thus to divert surplus potatoes so as to prevent complete collapse of market prices. Funds for the purchase programs are obtained under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which authorizes the expenditure of moneys equivalent to 30 percent of the gross customs receipts to encourage greater consumption and the export of agricultural commodities by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce. By means of this program, 3,474,507 bushels were purchased from the 1934 crop; 462,423 bushels from the 1935 crop; 5,273,068 bushels from the 1937 crop; and 2,267,051 from the 1938 crop; or a total of 11,478,049 bushels, at an average cost at loading point of about 36 cents per bushel. No purchase program was in effect during the 1936 season because of the short crop, and none was in effect in 1939 due to the moderate crop. The price paid for potatoes by the Corporation was not high enough to be of any great assistance to producers but nevertheless is conceded as giving considerable help in preventing demoralization of market conditions. During this period potatoes were purchased in 26 States.

DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Subsequent provisions were made in the Agricultural Adjustment Act for making financial assistance available to growers and manufacturers who cooperated in the removal of surplus potatoes, and particularly low-grade potatoes, from the normal market channels. These programs supplemented the marketing-agreement programs.

LIVESTOCK FEED DIVERSION PROGRAMS

The first livestock feed-diversion program was proposed in the fall of 1937 as a means of removing a proportion of an extremely large surplus. The program was made available to producers in the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Idaho, who operated under the marketing agreement in the 1937–38 season. A total of 7,962,000 bushels were diverted. The requirements were such that payment of 15 cents per bushel for such diversion were made only on potatoes grading at least United States grade No. 2, minimum size 1½-inch diameter. Since 1,608,000 bushels did not meet requirements, payments were made only on 6,372,127 bushels. The payments totaled $955,808.08, and 14,128 growers participated.

STARCH DIVERSION PROGRAM DURING THE 1937–38 SEASON

The starch industry in Maine was offered a program whereby the Department paid the cooperating manufacturers 40 cents per United States standard barrel, equivalent to 14 cents per bushel for all potatoes grading United States grade No. 2, minimum size 1½-inch diameter, used in the manufacture of starch. The manufacturers in turn agreed to pass this payment on to the growers and pay an additional 20 cents per barrel, making a total payment of 60 cents per barrel to the grower for potatoes meeting diversion specifications. The factories paid 10 to 20 cents per barrel for cull potatoes, the average being a fraction over 14 cents per barrel.

Of the 24 potato-starch factories in Maine in operating condition on September 1, 1937, 23 cooperated in the program. The total quantity of potatoes received by these factories was 1,009,791.5 barrels, equivalent to approximately 2,776,927 bushels. Of this quantity, 2,328,643 bushels met diversion requirements.

Growers used the starch-diversion program as a hedge against falling prices. In reality, it acted as an automatic choke. When the price to growers advanced, the rate of diversion decreased, whereas they increased when prices declined.

The several diversion programs placed a bottom price level for potatoes and gave considerable firmness to the tone of the general market. This in turn resulted in an increased price of 5 cents per hundredweight in all late potato producing States over what the growers would have received without such programs.

In Maine very general interest among potato growers has been shown in the development of a starch program and also in industrial uses for potatoes to be developed at the new Government research laboratories in cooperation with existing research at the University of Maine and Maine Experiment Station.

POTATO STARCH-FLOUR PROGRAM

The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation was authorized to purchase potato starch and flour from manufacturers provided the manufacturer paid growers at least a minimum designated price for specified grades of potatoes. Under this program approximately 2,733,000 pounds of starch and flour were purchased, which was equivalent to 258,000 bushels of potatoes.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

Potato acreage allotments were established for commercial potato farms under the agricultural conservation program,

with payments to producers for planting potatoes in line with the allotment. This program was started in 1938. It does not affect the large number of small farms on which potatoes are grown in small quantities for local market, such as are traded at the local stores, roadside stands, or used for home consumption. Payments are made to producers on farms where the acreage of potatoes planted complies with allotments for that particular farm. Because of an amendment to the act, the rate of payment for farms in 1938 in the northern areas was 3.6 cents per bushel and in the South, 5.4 cents per bushel. In 1939, however, payment was 3 cents per bushel in all producing areas of the United States. This program is very popular among potato producers. There is a high degree of participation and compliance in the program. In fact, many growers are willing to plant acreage slightly below their allotment.

Although the allotments are such that about 3,200,000 acres are provided for, growers have cooperated to such an extent that the acreage planted in 1938 was 3,056,000 acres and 3,068,800 acres in 1939. This has tended to stabilize acreage. Yields during this period have been considerably above average; production has been about 372,000,000 and 362,000,000 bushels, respectively. The average farm price of 55.8 and 68.8 cents per bushel is 65 and 81 percent of parity, respectively. Growers generally consider the lower revised payment of 3 cents per bushel too low to maintain participation of growers in this program at a high enough level to make an adjustment in acreage that will return satisfactory prices to growers.

POTATO BREEDING AND RESEARCH

The importance of scientific research which started about 70 years ago in the discovery of certain genetic principles which were then laid aside and only recently reused has now resulted in dollar-and-cents values to potato growers. In the past, potatoes have looked alike to most people unless there happened to be a difference in color or a distinct difference in shape. The Bureau of Plant Industry recently bred varieties like the Katahdin, which is firmly established as a commercial potato and has entered into South American seed trade because of its attractive appearance and resistance to disease. The following additional varieties have been developed: Chippewa, which is highly productive; the Earlaine, which is early-maturing; the Houma, which is attractive; the Sebago, which is highly productive and resistant to late blight; and the Sequoia, which is highly productive and resistant to leafhopper and late blight.

REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

Four regional research laboratories have been established. Their major projects are the development of feed, food, and industrial uses of agricultural products. The purposes of this work is to increase the outlets of farm products for such uses. In this connection, considerable work is being done with potato starch.

The Department of Agriculture is greatly concerned with the potato problems, since potatoes are grown in every State and commercially in 46 States under greatly varying climatic conditions. They are produced during all seasons with widely varying marketing and transportation problems. General marketing work is going on continually for the purpose of bettering local conditions, improving the quality marketed, supplying current market and crop information, and with the aim toward improving farm income from potatoes.

POSSIBLE POTATO PROGRAM—RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE POTATO CROP IN AGRICULTURE

Potatoes are produced in every State of the Union. In many states, such as Maine and Idaho, they are the most important single cash crop, and in States such as Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Colorado, California, Oregon, Washington, Nebraska, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Florida they are one of the major cash crops and in some years potatoes are the leading crop in these States. The 1934 census shows that potatoes were produced on 3,101,640 farms, which planted 3,601,070 acres to potatoes. On 537,064 of these farms potatoes were a leading source of income, and on 296,213 farms they were the major source of income.

Of the individual crops during the period of 1936 to 1939, inclusive, potatoes ranked fifth in farm crop cash income. During each of the past 4 years cash income from potatoes has ranked fifth among the individual crops and was surpassed only by the cash income received by growers from the crops of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and corn. The cash income from potatoes during this period averaged $174,579,000 per year, which is 5 percent of the total farm income from all crops, or slightly more than 2 percent of the total cash income received by farmers from crops, livestock, livestock products, and Government payments. The cash income from potatoes averages about 75 percent of its gross income.

PRODUCERS' SITUATION

Potato growers received relatively low prices in 4 out of the last 7 years—1934, 1935, 1937, and 1938. Very low prices also prevailed in 1931 and 1932. There is little excuse for a system under which a large number of farmers, who make heavy expenditures to produce a crop, find themselves not only unable to sell the crop for a sum sufficient to offset such expenditures but without coverage for labor costs as well.

There exists a belief among potato producers in various areas that each locality has potato problems distinct and separate from those of all other regions, and that the salvation of each lies in defeating all the others. Sectional competition grows keener year by year in desperate local attempts to regain a lost prosperity. However, income from potatoes largely depends on supplies and the purchasing power of consumers. When the national potato crop is small prices are high, when the crop is large prices in all producing areas are distressingly low. During the last 15 years prices in New York have been high when prices in Maine were high, and low when prices in Maine were low. The fundamental problem of growers in Colorado, Idaho, Ohio, Iowa, and other States is identical in that there is no security offered in the profits that producers make from one crop, followed by several crops returning serious losses. Producers cannot exist on a satisfactory standard of living from a major crop producing a profit 1 year out of 3. Our definite aim is to make potato production the profitable enterprise that it once was and ought to be again. I am going to describe some of the things that growers and others have suggested.

DOMESTIC-AVERAGE ALLOTMENT

It is recognized that there are extreme fluctuations in acreage planted and yields harvested. The yields are controlled by nature, but some definite guidance can be given in respect to acreage. In this connection the acreage-allotment program should be continued but a higher degree of participation must be obtained to make it successful. Reimbursements to growers should be reestablished at the rates of payment existing in 1938, and legislation should be amended rectifying this aspect to reestablish rates as originally promised the farmers. In this manner a reasonable acreage would be planted and the success of the domestic-acreage allotment secured.

MARKET COORDINATION AND INFORMATION SERVICE

For a number of years we have had Federal and State news services which have performed a very valuable function in assembling and disseminating information concerning market conditions, crop conditions, prices, and movements of important crops. Recently large buyers, by means of telephone and teletype, receive information very rapidly from their various connections or offices in the United States. When such information would be advantageous to the producer they take advantage of him by buying his potatoes prior to the news advancing the market. If such news is unfavorable, purchases are withheld until the market has dropped considerably. However, from the standpoint of a potato grower who is forced almost daily to decide

whether to sell or not to sell, and at what price, present market news services, efficient and valuable though they are, are not fast and adequate enough. The seller, and especially the grower who does not have the finances to establish his own connections needs accurate, up-to-the-minute spot information. He needs to know the price in the market to which he intends to ship, the rate of movement into that market and other markets, and prices to growers in his immediate vicinity and elsewhere. He needs to know weather conditions at all shipping points from which the proposed market draws supplies and in that market itself in order to have some idea of what supplies, shipments, and demand are likely to be.

This should be supplemented by clearing houses for performing this function, because accuracy of information and speed are paramount when the pattern of the deal shifts and changes as rapidly as it does in the case of potatoes. The information is valuable to producers in establishing prices in line with demand and supply, but they often receive the information after the potatoes have left their hands. The proposed arrangement would make it possible for every grower to have every scrap of available information in time to use it as a basis for sales operations.

DISTRIBUTION AND TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Inefficient, inadequate, and expensive distribution methods are blamed for much loss of income to potato growers. Distribution, it must be emphasized, begins the moment you start digging the potatoes. Many potatoes are bruised in the digging process, and the quality is lowered by that amount. If the potatoes are bruised or cut at the time of picking, grading, packing, or loading in the car, the producers' income is reduced or he may lose money by allowing potatoes to become sun scalded. If grading method permits potatoes to be packed when caked with dirt, or allows them to tumble from one level to another without adequate padding, or generally permits perishable tubers to be handled like coal, then income is cut and cut again.

An adequate potato program must give attention to these things. It must give careful handling and proper storage a position of real importance.

In this same category are grading, washing, and packing. As a general rule, field-run potatoes are just field-run potatoes and nothing more, whether they would grade out 60 percent United States No. 1 or 90 percent. Under ordinary circumstances there is a heavy loss from the sale of ungraded potatoes except in the rare instances when the production of a particular grower or field is so low in quality as to make grading uneconomical. On the whole, however, the grower who fails to grade, and sells his product field run, actually sells his No. 1's and gives away his No. 2's. If grading is done prior to sale, the No. 1 portion can be sold for practically the same total value as the entire lot when ungraded, and it leaves the grower with some No. 2 grade which can be disposed of for what they are at a price which will increase his total income.

Washing is going to be a very important practice in potato distribution. In Florida, in Alabama, in Louisiana, in Nebraska, in Idaho, in California, and in Colorado, an amazing percentage of the cars shipped last year were washed. Washed potatoes consistently bring a premium over unwashed stock because neither storekeepers nor consumers enjoy the unsightly mess created by dirty potatoes. The time may come when unwashed potatoes will sell at a discount in exactly the same manner as low-grade potatoes do now. We must remember that potatoes are not a staple food to quite the extent that they were a few years ago. Potatoes are in competition with every food that a consumer buys and the variety of foods has expanded greatly in the past 20 years. Per capita potato consumption has gone down steadily in recent years, at a rate of eight-tenths of 1 percent per year, and it is only recently that serious efforts have been made to check the downward trend and to improve the competitive position of the potato. Progressive growers have seen the handwriting on the wall and are mending their fences in every way possible by better grading, properly marking the grade contents on each package, washing the potatoes, and even packaging the potatoes in consumer-sized containers.

In this rehabilitation process packaging has come in for its share of attention. The time was when potatoes could be tossed into a barrel in the field and moved directly to the retail store for repackaging and sale over the counter. But, of course, there was also a time when pickles, sauerkraut, crackers, beans, rice, flour, corn meal, and a host of other commodities were lined up in barrels in the retail grocery store. Those also were the days when no careful housewife would use her corn meal without sifting out the maggots, or her dried beans without examining each one for a worm hole. The housewife did not like it and the storekeeper did not like it. Consequently, we have beans, rice, crackers, and the like attractively packaged in 1-, 2-, and 5-pound containers that are clean, sanitary, and convenient to handle and store. But potatoes? You know how it is.

Many growers and shippers, however, have observed the new trend. They see that a pound of macaroni in a sanitary package leaves no dirt in the sink and requires no tedious preparation, and they realize that something must be done to avoid losing out altogether. Hence, the growth of consumer-sized packages, from 50 pounds down to 10 pounds. Whether of paper or cotton, whether solid or open-mesh, a consumer-sized potato package is an attractive one and a practical one. Individual tubers need not be handled until they arrive in the consumer's pantry. Retail distributors save the cost of repackaging and of shrinkage, and, best of all, the consumer-package forces the seller to pack a high-quality, clean potato. There must be some profit in it, else the practice would not have grown so fast. In fact, it must be worth considerable in the way of extra trouble and higher costs or Idaho would not be shipping matched bakers in half dozens and dozens, individually wrapped in tissue paper and packed in paper cartons. There must be a profit or it would not be done.

The industry is trying to give consumers what they want. One very large Nebraska grower guarantees to the consumer that the potatoes contained in his consumer package will be satisfactory in every respect. I know another large grower and shipper who cook-tests each lot of potatoes as it is dug, and refuses to pack under his private brand any lot that does not measure up from the standpoint of mealiness and color. Consumers in the Chicago sales area like a red-skinned potato, and producers are supplying that demand. Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, and Nebraska go in heavily for the Bliss Triumph variety. The San Luis Valley of Colorado for many years has earned a substantial premium on clean, well-graded, well-packed Red McClures. All markets like a bright, clean potato, hence the swing to Katahdins and Chippewas all along the eastern seaboard. In Pennsylvania there is evidence that the rural variety is waning, and everywhere there is interest in new varieties, not necessarily because they yield more heavily, or carry better, but because they are more marketable. A well-rounded potato program should devote considerable time and effort to cultural research in order to learn how to produce what consumers want.

It is therefore recommended that considerable effort be expended to conduct studies in order to determine and recommend sound and approved harvesting, storage, grading, and transportation practices to the potato industry, with the view of eliminating the losses sustained through waste and reducing the spread and cost of marketing between producer and consumer in order to return to the producer a larger proportion of the consumer's dollar expenditure for potatoes.

CONSUMER EDUCATION THROUGH THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Speaking of consumers, it is necessary now to have a program of consumer education. That program ought to go along two lines—first, education concerning potato quality and grade standards. This also applies to all farm food products. It is frequently stated that consumers in a given

market will not pay a premium for high-quality products, or that consumption cannot be increased, but in practically every case where that statement was investigated it has been found that there are so few good-quality potatoes offered for sale that consumers have not had an opportunity to develop a preference for good potatoes. After all, nobody would offer to pay a fancy price for something they had never heard of. A well-rounded program should include a public-relations project to put this story over to consumers, because by so doing the per capita consumption could be increased enough to absorb all of the surpluses we have had in recent years.

Such a consumer-education program should be included in the programs of the Extension Service, which, through their home-demonstration agents, could conduct such a program. Therefore, adequate appropriations should be made to obtain the necessary informational material and to increase their staff so that our metropolitan areas will receive this necessary information and avail itself of the opportunity of using such farm products.

INDUSTRIAL-USE PROGRAM

Industrial outlets for potatoes have barely been scratched. Modernization of methods of producing and marketing potato starch and of deliveries to potato-starch factories would increase extraction rates and lower costs sufficiently to make material expansion possible. Starch factory waste is an excellent livestock feed and would be a profitable byproduct if there were some inexpensive means of dehydrating it, thus reducing its weight so that it could be transported economically. Some day there will be developed a practical dehydration process for raw potatoes which would open up a whole new field, both for humans and animals, by making extended storage possible. Within the realm of possibility is the manufacture of potato power alcohol for industrial uses. Our reserves of petroleum will not last forever, and it has been demonstrated adequately, here as well as in Europe, that a blend of alcohol with gasoline is about as efficient a fuel for internal combustion motors as gasoline alone. The use of alcohol as fuel probably could be the greatest single outlet, but there are literally hundreds of industrial processes which require the use of alcohol. Further in the future are such possibilities as rubber, paper, plastics, and other products which thus far have merely been demonstrated in laboratories as remotely possible.

A complete program ought to include wide use of potatoes as livestock feed. In Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, and other States producing both potatoes and range cattle, potatoes have long been used as a supplementary winter feed. It is excellent for such cattle as well as for dairy cattle, sheep, and hogs. Potatoes are grown in every one of our 48 States, and livestock is produced in many of them. These animals represent a vast consuming power for a commodity of which even the culls are worth 25 percent of corn, and the same as corn ensilage.

A permanent program to increase the consumption of potatoes for food, livestock feed, and for industrial uses is recommended not only as a surplus-removal program but more especially as a means of finding a greater permanent use for potatoes.

FINANCING, AND ELIMINATION OF USURIOUS PRACTICES

Growers in many areas have suffered losses so frequently that they are no longer able to finance their own production and have turned to all sorts of money-lending agencies for assistance. As a result of this situation there has grown up a condition under which costs of production are much higher than they should be, and some means should be provided whereby producers and producer organizations can secure adequate loans for production, storage, and marketing facilities, whereby they may be able to regain their bargaining power and increase their net income by lowering production and distribution costs. Under many of the present arrangements growers have absolutely no control over marketings, and consequently have lost all incentive to do a job of smart marketing. They have had to stand by helplessly and watch the growth of unsound marketing practices which have further reduced their income. There should be established some means to assist growers in carrying out these projected programs, and especially in performing the necessary services of financing production, marketing, and distribution themselves so as to enable them to obtain independent action in these services, thus increasing their bargaining power and establishing a free market for their product.

INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION

Finally, the potato industry probably has less organization than any other industry of anywhere near its size. Problems of packaging, grading, transportation, and business practices do not recognize State boundaries. One of the most important moves the industry can make, and the one which it should accomplish first, is organization along national lines with existing State and local organizations and societies forming the backbone of the new organization. By such means it would be possible to obtain concerted action when concerted action is necessary, and to provide a free flow of information and ideas, and eventually to put the potato industry on a sound, orderly, and profitable basis. To effectuate this a National Potato Council should be established.

Some matters for inclusion in a fully rounded potato program might possibly require State or Federal legislation.

America Should Not Become Involved in the War in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

LETTER FROM E. E. BRINDLEY

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent of mine.

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS.,
May 17, 1940.

Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS,
Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOSHUA: I am writing you as one of the congressional leaders for the reason that I very much fear the war hysteria that is sweeping the country at this time.

I have been informed by persons who have been at Washington recently that there seems to be a growing sentiment at Washington, and the East generally, for the participation of this country in the European war. I also hear this talk around here where I live. I do not know how it is in the East, but around here this talk emanates chiefly from those who have given the situation little or no thought. The invasion of Norway, Holland, and Belgium by the Germans has aroused the anger of nearly all people, and the more excitable ones think we should do something about it at once.

However, I believe that the older, more sober people, and especially those who are old enough to have participated in the last World War, either as civilians or soldiers, are not persuaded that we have any reason or any business in the present conflict. In my opinion, the present conflict grows right out of the fact that after the last World War the peace terms were so onerous upon the Germans, and the restrictions placed in the way of the German Republic were so impossible of performance that the German Republic failed, and Hitler and his band of thugs are the direct result of unwise and selfish policies pursued by England and France at that time. If that analysis is correct, and I believe it will stand the test, it is perfect folly for us to think of sending our young men over to be killed and murdered to correct the selfish mistakes of men who are still in power. Almost everyone seems to have forgotten that after the excitement of the first World War had settled down certain eminent historians got together and tried in an impartial manner to fix the blame for the first World War. You will recall, as I do, that their conclusions were that all the countries involved were practically equally to blame for the start of that holocaust.

Personally, I do not want to send my sons to war to correct such mistakes, and I do not want to spend any money helping to correct such mistakes by making war.

Furthermore, it is becoming apparent that if the Germans fail in this tremendous drive they are now putting on, the present war will become a stalemate, and that is an additional reason why we should stay on the sidelines. It is, in my opinion, perfect folly to think of sending soldiers and money over to Europe to try to correct their rotten power politics for them. The problems arising out of Europe's politics will have to be settled by the Europeans themselves if they are settled at all.

From a military standpoint, it is becoming apparent, even to a layman like myself, that the problem of invading this country or the American Continent from Europe is insurmountable and impossible for any conceivable combination of powers on that continent, if we but take reasonable and sensible precautions to render ourselves immune to attack. It seems to me that if we had properly spent the money already appropriated we would now be immune to attack from Europe or any other continent, and if we are not, it certainly is a reflection upon the Government that has been in control of our destinies for the last few years.

I know that Dorothy Thompson, in her last syndicated article, is all excited about the situation in Europe and thinks we should postpone our national election and give Roosevelt a third term by consent. That is all poppycock and the sheerest kind of foolishness. It is but the opening wedge for a dictatorship in this country.

I am writing you my feelings in the matter because I wanted you to know that not all the citizens of the country were being carried away by this war hysteria, and I think it is high time that the citizens who are not being carried away by war hysteria remain calm and cool and collected and keep their heads, for Heaven only knows what percentage of the people is subject to be carried away by excitement in times like these.

I do not know whether or not this letter will have any value, but you may show it to any friends or acquaintances that you see fit. I do not pretend to speak for anybody but myself, and I do not hold any high official position, but I happen to be chairman of the county board for Richland County, and have held that position for quite a number of years, and as one of the common, ordinary citizens of the country I think my opinions are entitled to some weight.

I am sending a similar letter to Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY.

Will be glad to have your reaction.

Very sincerely yours,

E. E. BRINDLEY.

Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN AND LETTER FROM P. G. PLATT

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin and also a letter from a prominent citizen of Philadelphia:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 14, 1940]

STATE POWER ABDICATED

Announcement by the State sanitary water board that it intends to approach the problem of stream pollution by "reasonable, practicable, progressive steps, rather than by action harmfully affecting employment and increasing taxation," is mere confirmation of a do-nothing policy that has been in evidence for more than a year.

Nobody wants to bankrupt individuals or corporations that defile Pennsylvania streams. But nobody wants to be forced to drink water befouled and made dangerous by avoidable pollution.

The board long complained that it was powerless under the laws. Those laws have now been changed, and provide a method of reduction of pollution without undue hardship on Government or industry. So long as the board chooses to close its eyes to its duty, just so long will industries and municipalities raise the cry of poverty.

As long as the board holds the view it has just expressed, hope for improvement of the streams from which Philadelphia gets its water supply is virtually nil.

WALLINGFORD, PA., *May 20, 1940.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,

1021 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MYERS: I felt that the enclosed editorial from the somewhat conservative, thoroughly independent, and widely read Philadelphia Evening Bulletin would be of considerable interest to you, inasmuch as it forges another link in the chain of evidence against those who preach the adequacy of State enforcement of antipollution laws.

It has been my pleasure to play an active part in the State campaign for clean streams through four administrations. During that period, all aspirants for the governorship pledged themselves to adequate laws governing the problem, yet it was not until the last administration that such laws were enacted. During that administration, as you are aware, it was my privilege to serve as a member of the State sanitary water board. To the credit of the board on which I served for 4 years, you are familiar with the fact that it served warning to the effect that offenders were expected to meet their public obligation, yet there was no bureaucratic terrorism and in the case of extenuating circumstances, ample time was extended in which to carry out the orders of the board. At last, we conservationists hailed the dawning of a new era in which we were taking the first steps in a plan designed to correct one of the worst crimes ever perpetrated upon the State. We had, at long last, the law, we had a sympathetic administration, we had adequate technical personnel.

But it seems that we who believe that the public is entitled to clean streams were too hasty in our appraisal. In spite of the fact that the present administration pledged itself to enforcement of antipollution laws, the "pollutocrats" are back in the saddle. To all practical purposes, the law for which conservationists had labored so long, so patiently, and so earnestly, is now a dead letter. The ghost of Joe Grundy, who thought, not so many years ago, that he had bought a seat in the United States Senate, now sits as chairman of the board which passes judgment upon the nefarious polluting practices of Grundy and his cohorts. Please note that the present policy is opposed to "action harmfully affecting employment and taxation." During a period of great industrial activity, the Grundy philosophy would no doubt dictate that such activity must not be interrupted for the sake of such silly sentimentality.

At a public hearing before a committee of the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1935, a native son and follower of Grundyism testified in favor of the worthy objectives of the proposed legislation, but stated that its enactment would inflict an unfair competitive burden upon Pennsylvania industry, and that to overcome this inequality, the matter should come under Federal jurisdiction, with uniform regulation. The ink was hardly dry on the report of these hearings when this same lobbyist appeared before a committee of the United States Senate to testify in favor of the worthy objectives of proposed Federal control, but insisted that the control feature was none of the Federal Government's business, and must be left in the hands of the various States.

The Barkley bill (S. 685), providing for Federal study and investigation, but no control over the situation, not only has had wide endorsement by the various associations of exploiters of natural resources, but the hearings actually show this bill to have been sponsored by the "pollutocrats." Now that the House of Representatives has amended the bill by means of the so-called Mundt amendment, designed to curb the spread of a great national scandal, the parents of the bill are disowning their own brain child. There can be only one answer to this situation. The sponsors of S. 685 without the Mundt amendment know that the proposal offers no control but would act as a pollution-protection rather than a pollution-control measure, meanwhile leading the uninformed public to believe that Congress had acted in its interest rather than that of the gluttons who despoil public resources for private gain. As the bill now rests in conference it represents a compromise between the study and the action schools of thought. Conservationists, representing the vast majority of unselfish public opinion, have agreed to support the bill as amended by the House on March 1.

During the next few weeks Congress will no doubt focus its attention upon the emergency-defense program now before it. Let me suggest that preliminary to or at least complementary to any agreement on the national defense we should put our house in order by guaranteeing that we have something worth while to defend. Continued squandering and exploitation of our natural resources at past and present rates can eventually lead only to a condition when we will have a land unworthy of defense.

I urge that your influence be brought upon the conferees to report favorably S. 685 as amended by the House, and in case of any deletion or sabotage of the control feature written in by the House you vote to reject the report as representing the very antithesis of the title of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

P. G. PLATT.

Defense of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a number of liberals have requested me to secure permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights. This release deals with the Detroit raids, the Dies committee's activities, and the protection of the Bill of Rights. Appended to it is an open letter to which is attached some very prominent names of America's leading thinkers, educators, and intellectuals. It will be noted that among the list of names may be found prominent writers, essayists, poets, engineers, college presidents, editors, and actors.

The press release and open letter speak for themselves, and are as follows:

[From Press Service of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, New York]

One hundred and forty-eight prominent American educators, churchmen, scientists, and civic leaders have called upon Attorney General Robert H. Jackson to investigate violations of the Constitution by agents of the Dies committee, it was announced yesterday (Sunday) by Alfred K. Stern, chairman of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, and Rosalie Manning, chairman of its New York affiliate, the Greater New York Conference for Inalienable Rights.

The demand was made in an open letter to the Attorney General in which Mr. Jackson was reminded that in 1920 similar constitutional violations by Attorney General Palmer had been condemned by 12 prominent jurists, including the present Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter; Dean Roscoe Pound, of Harvard Law School; and Ernest Freund.

Among the signers of the recent condemnation of the activities of the Dies committee are Dr. William A. Neilson, president emeritus of Smith College; Dr. Mary A. Woolley, president emeritus of Mount Holyoke College; Prof. E. A. Ross, national chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union; Prof. Harold C. Urey, of Columbia, Nobel prize winner in chemistry; Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale; Dr. Franz Boas, professor emeritus of anthropology, Columbia; Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, foreign secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, editor of The Churchman; Carey McWilliams, commissioner of housing and immigration, California; Borough President Stanley M. Isaacs, of Manhattan, New York City; Deputy Commissioner of Welfare Clifford T. McAvoy; Prof. Harlow Shapley, of Harvard; Prof. Josephine Truslow Adams, of Swarthmore; Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, of New York University; and Freda Kirchwey, editor and publisher of The Nation.

The signers of the open letter expressed the fear that "violations of minority rights, sanctioned and participated in by so responsible a body, should inevitably and insidiously lead, as in certain European countries, to suppression of the rights of all the people."

"The undersigned view with growing apprehension report after report of violations of the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights by the Dies committee and its agents in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Los Angeles, El Paso, Birmingham, and even at its hearings in Washington," the letter began.

After citing recent decisions by Federal Judges F. Dickinson Letts and George A. Welsh, in which activities of the Dies committee agents were characterized as violations of the Bill of Rights and the civil-liberties statutes, the signatories stated: "Not to take a stand now against this conspiracy to violate the Bill of Rights by the Dies committee would indeed be to put the seal of approval on contempt and defiance of the basic laws of the country by a body sworn to uphold them."

They then called to mind a statement issued in 1920 in which Justice Felix Frankfurter, Roscoe Pound, Ernest Freund, and nine other jurists, condemning similar constitutional violations by Attorney General Palmer and his staff, said, "Here is no question of a vague and threatening menace, but a present assault upon the most sacred principles of our constitutional liberties."

"We are not here in any way expressing an opinion on the philosophy or program of the victims of these illegal acts. We speak as American citizens profoundly disturbed to find a congressional committee violating the Constitution of the United States," the open letter continued.

The letter closed with a request that Attorney General Jackson investigate the activities of Dies committee agents and that "our Representatives and Senators move in each House of Congress for the formation of an adequately financed committee to investigate the Dies committee agents and propaganda and urge the dissolution of this committee, should investigation prove its actions detrimental and dangerous to American democratic institutions."

The complete text of the open letter is attached.

The signers of the open letter follow: Dr. Harold Aaron, Dr. E. Stanley Abbot, Comfort A. Adams, Prof. Josephine Truslow Adams, Wayne Adamson, Edward S. Allen, Rabbi Michael Alper, Newton Arvin, F. J. Bagocius, Archey D. Ball, Lee H. Ball, Frank C. Bancroft, Samuel L. M. Barlow, Dr. Henry Lambert Bibby, Katherine Devereux Blake, Rev. Myles D. Blanchard, Rev. W. Russell Bowie, Rev. Clarence E. Boyer, Dorothy Brewster, Rev. Howard L. Brooks, Dr. Esther Lucille Brown, Robert L. Calhoun, W. J. Carney, Morris Carnovsky, T. R. Caskardon, Dr. Emanuel Chapman, Leslie Clarke, Howard Costigan, Malcolm Cowley, Prof. Philip W. L. Cox, Prof. Richard T. Cox, Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, Prof. Ephraim Cross, W. J. Crozier, Joseph Curran, Edgar Dale, J. F. Dashiell, Jerome Davis, Rev. E. A. DeBordenave, Martha Dodd, Robert Ekins, Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Elmer O. Felhaber, Prof. Irving Fisher, Bertha Josselyn Foss, Osmond K. Fraenkel, Horace L. Friess, Ben Golden, Dr. Willystine Goodsell, Abel J. Gregg, Alice Hamilton, Dashiell Hammett, Ruth Gillette Hardy, Prof. Benjamin Harrow, Pearl M. Hart, Marion Hathaway, Aline Davis Hays, Prof. Selig Hecht, Charles J. Hendley, Alexander Hoffman, Austin Hogan, Langston Hughes, Mary E. Hurlbutt, Rev. William Lloyd Imes, Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs, Gardner Jackson, Fleming James, Elsie Voorhees Jones, Matthew Josephson, Robert Josephy, Harry M. Justiz, Rockwell Kent, Ross Kenyon, Carol W. King, Prof. Harold Kirby, Freda Kirchwey, Erwin Klaus, Dr. Philip Klein, Prof. Otto Klineberg, Oliver LaFarge, David Lasser, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, Max Lerner, William Levner, Charles Liebman, Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman, Prof. Alain Locke, Philip Loeb, Prof. Robert S. Lynd, Clifford T. McAvoy, Louis F. McCabe, Rev. J. A. MacCallum, Robert M. MacGregor, Carey McWilliams, Dr. Gerald Machacek, Rosalie Manning, Herbert E. Marks, Sidney Maslen, Dr. Robert E. Mathews, Prof. Jerome Michael, T. R. Molloy, Dr. William A. Neilson, Prof. Mabel Newcomer, John P. Peters, Rev. A. Clayton Powell, Patrick L. Quinlan, Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, Prof. Bernard F. Riess, Mary W. Rittenhouse, Prof. Edward A. Ross, Prof. Eugene A. Rostow, Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Prof. Lawrence Sears, George Seldes, Prof. Harlow Shapley, Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, H. Norman Sibley, Daniel Cranford Smith, Isobel Walker Soule, L. Elizabeth Spofford, Rev. W. B. Spofford, Alfred K. Stern, Donald Ogden Stewart, I. F. Stone, Rev. Paul H. Striech, Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Sigmund C. Taft, Prof. C. Fayette Taylor, Katherine Terrill, Rev. Paul M. Tillich, Edward C. Tolman, Rev. Robert Leonard Tucker, Harcourt Tynes, Jean Starr Untermeyer, Dr. Willard Uphaus, Prof. Harold C. Urey, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., Prof. Oswald Veblen, Rachael Vixman, Mary Heaton Vorse, Dr. J. Raymond Walsh, Goodwin Watson, Prof. Louis Weisner, Henry Wenning, Dr. George B. Wislocki, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, Loyd F. Worley, Dr. Max Yergan.

Additional signatures to the open letter are being received daily at the office of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, 305 Broadway, New York City, and will be released to the press shortly.

OPEN LETTER

To Attorney General Jackson.
To our Representatives and Senators in Congress.

The undersigned view with growing apprehension report after report of violations of the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights by the Dies committee and its agents in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Los Angeles, El Paso, Birmingham, and even at its hearings in Washington.

On April 9, 1940, Federal Judge F. Dickinson Letts ordered the release of Philip Frankfeld and F. F. O'Dea, arrested on warrants procured by the Dies committee on charges of contempt of that committee. Judge Letts held that the constitutional rights of these two men had been violated and rebuked the Dies committee for the arrest in the following statement:

"Congress by these enactments (Civil Liberties Statutes) * * * had in mind the necessity of protecting citizens who might be summoned as witnesses from unfair treatment by reason of the fact that differences of political opinion might prevail."

On April 4, 1940, Federal Judge George A. Welsh ordered the arrest of two agents of the Dies committee on warrants charging them with "conspiracy to violate the Bill of Rights and the Civil Liberties Statutes." He said:

"These civil and constitutional rights of ours were given us as the result of the battle of humanity through the ages and must be preserved. Only by the observance of these rights by all our people can our democracy stand. * * * Not to issue the warrants in this case would be to put the seal of approval on what has been done."

Not to take a stand now against this conspiracy to violate the Bill of Rights by the Dies committee would, indeed, be to put the seal of approval on contempt and defiance of the basic laws of the country by a body sworn to uphold them. In the two acts

condemned by Judges Letts and Welsh, amendments 4 and 5 of the Constitution, and article 18, section 47, of the Civil Rights Statutes, were violated.

With Justice Felix Frankfurter, Roscoe Pound, Ernest Freund, and nine other jurists who in 1920 condemned similar constitutional violations by Attorney General Palmer and his staff, committed in singularly like circumstances, we must point out that:

"Here is no question of a vague and threatening menace, but a present assault upon the most sacred principles of our constitutional liberty."

To that indictment we may add Attorney General Jackson's recent warning:

"Particularly do we need to be dispassionate and courageous in those cases which deal with so-called subversive activities. * * * Those who are in office are apt to regard as 'subversive' the activities of any of those who would bring about a change of administration. Some of our soundest constitutional doctrines were once punished as 'subversive.'"

We are not here in any way expressing an opinion on the philosophy or program of the victims of these illegal acts. We speak as American citizens profoundly disturbed to find a congressional committee violating the Constitution of the United States. We are apprehensive lest these violations of minority rights, sanctioned and participated in by so responsible a body, should inevitably and insidiously lead, as in certain European countries, to suppression of the rights of all the people.

We therefore call upon Attorney General Jackson to investigate the activities of the Dies committee agents and ask our Representatives and Senators to move in each House of Congress for the formation of an adequately financed committee to investigate the Dies committee's activities and propaganda and to urge the dissolution of this committee should investigation prove its actions detrimental and dangerous to American democratic institutions.

Harsh and Unnecessary Sponsor Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE POLICE JURY OF BOSSIER PARISH, LA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the police juries in Louisiana are the governing bodies of the respective parishes. They are the governmental agencies upon whom the burden of local government falls and as such are in close contact with the people of the State.

I have received a resolution from the police jury of Bossier Parish, La., dealing with sponsor requirements of W. P. A. The heavy contributions required under existing law places an onerous financial burden upon the local sponsors. In many cases where parishes are not rich in natural resources, the burden of these requirements often renders it impossible for local sponsors to undertake the work of projects. In some cases the police juries and other local agencies have found it impossible to meet these requirements, and many communities are therefore denied the beneficent effect of these appropriations. Too often the real test of relief is not the local need for it but is rather the ability of the sponsor to meet the requirements.

The police jury of Bossier Parish, La., has placed in its resolution certain matters which are important to a proper solution of this matter. Some of these matters mentioned in the resolution may be corrected by a change in the rules and regulations of the Work Projects Administration. In such cases, I commend to the administration the early and careful study of this important subject with the hope that those regulations which are unnecessary and prove to be harassing upon the local sponsors may be withdrawn. In other cases, proper amendments should be placed in this act in order that those communities which really need work relief may be permitted under the law and regulations to meet the requirements imposed upon the local sponsor.

Rules and regulations of W. P. A. should be simple. They should be simple enough to permit all communities to meet reasonable requirements and yet rigid enough to insure proper distribution of these funds provided in such large amounts by Congress to those in dire need and distress. There is no place in the Work Projects Administration for useless and harassing rules and regulations. Where such exist, they should be abolished.

I have already voted to reduce the monetary requirements of the sponsor. I will continue to work and vote to eliminate the red tape and useless and vexatious rules and regulations which stand between Congress which provides the money and the poor unemployed citizen who stands in a position of real and urgent need.

I quote in full the resolution of the police jury of Bossier Parish, La., for the information of this Congress:

Whereas this police jury has made repeated attempts to secure the cooperation of W. P. A. administrators and officials in the setting up of projects in Bossier Parish for the purpose of giving employment to persons unemployed in Bossier Parish, and have failed in their attempts because of not being able to comply with rulings made by W. P. A. officials; and

Whereas it is our understanding that appropriations have been made by Congress to the W. P. A. for the purpose of setting up projects for the employment of persons throughout the country who are in need of work; and

Whereas this police jury does not believe that Congress intended that this money should only be spent in such localities as might be fortunate enough to have surplus funds on hand with which to bear a large part of the cost of projects set up for the providing of employment; and

Whereas most police juries of the State are hard-pressed to meet the statutory and other absolute necessary expenses of local government and cannot find means of raising funds for the appropriation of any substantial sums for the operation of professional and service W. P. A. projects; and

Whereas the W. P. A. administrators and officials have made rulings and regulations, which are evidently arbitrary, whereby any parish desiring to sponsor a professional or service project must comply with these rigid regulations or else not get the projects set up, thereby causing the citizens of the localities which are unable to meet said requirements to be deprived of employment to which they are justly entitled; and

Whereas it is believed that Congress did not intend for the administrators and W. P. A. officials to make rigid rules and regulations which in some cases effect to defeat the very evident purpose of the law, and it is further believed that some of the said rules and regulations are contrary to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the police jury of Bossier Parish, That this police jury does hereby request the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to correct the conditions as now exist in the W. P. A. whereby poorer communities are deprived of W. P. A. benefits; and be it further

Resolved, etc., That Congress be requested to so amend the W. P. A. laws or take such other steps as are necessary so that W. P. A. administrators and officials may not have the power and authority to make arbitrary rules and regulations which will cause the very communities and localities which are most in need to be deprived of W. P. A. benefits; be it further

Resolved, etc., That the secretary of this police jury be instructed to have this resolution printed and to send a copy to the Representative in Congress, to the Louisiana Senators, and to the President.

W. P. A. Control and Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WISCONSIN RAPIDS DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing demand that the appropriations for W. P. A. be placed to a greater extent in the hands of municipalities. This plan is splendidly supported by the following editorial from the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of May 16, 1940, which is an independ-

ent paper that always follows a policy of the greatest good for the greatest number. It is as follows:

W. P. A. CONTROL AND ABUSE

We believe that the W. P. A. abuses bared at Washington in the report of the special House of Representatives committee that investigated the work program are most highly significant, because they point to the difficulty of running such a far-flung activity from the Federal Capital. It's just too far to Washington.

We think that, though dollar-for-dollar value back to the public in any such activity is impossible to attain, more of that value would have gone back to the public had Wisconsin's relief work program been administered directly from Madison and every other State's program from its capital. And still more of the dollar's value would have been returned had the direction been passed still further down to the county seat.

And it is not alone the saving of administration costs that we are thinking of. In addition to that saving, there would have been greater efficiency in the projects themselves, for the local citizens would have constituted the same watchful body in that event over expenditures and work accomplished that the body exercises over its own municipal tax expenditures.

That is a theme often harped upon—closer local control of the relief expenditures. There would still have been abuses, perhaps, but they would have been far less, we contend.

How many of us today pay much attention to W. P. A. projects? They just exist and go along because we have come to accept them placidly as a part of the times. We don't seem to care how much they cost or how much they accomplish. This, we are sure, would be different if we could go to our county-controlling administrators, or even to Madison, and get in that event immediately to the top of the controlling power. But it's just too far to Washington.

It is easy thus to criticize—lock the stable after the horses are stolen. But these columns have many times before urged that some kind of experimenting be done with the problem of federally provided relief funds. And we say again that the W. P. A. has been most remiss because it hasn't done that experimenting.

Why, at some stage of the game in the last 8 years, were not different control methods tried? Why were not selected States given blank checks and told to run their own programs? Why were not some of those States told to pass the funds directly down to the counties and that method tried? And even the counties told to pass the funds on to the local governments?

Had that been done, we would today have the answers to the questions of closer control, and we would have a program ready, of which we could say, honestly, that this is the best method we have discovered.

We defy anybody to read the story of W. P. A. abuses uncovered by the House investigation and say that the best control method has been used.

The Grand Coulee Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article that recently appeared in the New York Times concerning the Grand Coulee Project in my State.

This article is well written and the factual information therein contained is dependable, and I am glad to give it further publicity through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because as time goes on our citizens will develop a greater interest in this giant undertaking and come to a fuller appreciation of its significance in our national growth and development. The present greatly expanded national-defense program will have in this construction an asset of major importance. The article follows:

GRAND COULEE OPENS VAST AREA—AS MAN'S MIGHTIEST DAM NEARS COMPLETION TOURISTS FLOCK TO THE NORTHWEST IN GROWING NUMBERS TO MARVEL AND PLAY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

GRAND COULEE, WASH.—Where the Columbia River bends sharply on its swift rush through the Inland Empire, the most massive structure ever built by man is nearly completed. This is Grand Coulee Dam, and President Roosevelt recently told newspaper correspondents that he expected it to irrigate enough land to provide new farm homes for 500,000 migrants from the Dust Bowl.

This "mightiest work of man" is located in northeast Washington, on United States Highway No. 10, between Spokane and Seattle. A plane from New York will take you to the "Evergreen State" in 18 hours, a train in 65 hours, a bus in 101 hours, and the auto trip is about 8 days.

DIMENSIONS STAGGERING

The Grand Coulee undertaking has become one of the principal tourist attractions in the far West. Last year 297,015 people visited it. Travelers arrived from every State to glimpse a dam three times as vast as the Great Pyramid of Egypt. The dimensions of the structure are staggering. When the dam is completed by the end of this year, a waterfall twice as high as Niagara will crash over its parapet. The lake behind the dam will contain sufficient water to supply all the needs of New York City for more than a decade.

One of the most Herculean phases of the Grand Coulee job has been preparing the countryside for this huge lake, which has started to be a playground for fishermen, swimmers, boating enthusiasts, and hunters. The largest W. P. A. crew in the United States is clearing the land which the rapidly rising water will cover. Ten towns and villages have been moved to new locations. Thousands of acres have been stripped of trees and underbrush.

PROGRESS UPSTREAM

As the Columbia has surged higher and higher behind the dam an ark-like craft called the *Paul Bunyan* has moved slowly upstream. At each settlement workers have left the *Paul Bunyan* and shifted the buildings to ground beyond the level of the lake. They have dragged and rolled schools, stores, post offices, houses, and barns out of the water's reach. Even cemeteries have been moved. In addition, 25 miles of the Great Northern Railway have been relocated, as well as 145 miles of Washington State roads and highways.

New facilities for tourists and visitors have been installed at the site of the dam. Grandstands are on both sides of the river and onlookers watch construction progress while loudspeakers describe the work. In an observation building hourly lectures explain the project. These are illustrated with a detailed model of the dam. Last July and August more than 100,000 people attended the talks.

In June the President plans to visit the Pacific Northwest, and he may take another look at this structure which has eclipsed all previous construction records. If he does, he will see not only the biggest power and reclamation project of all time but also the beginning of a vast recreation area that already has been visited by thousands of his countrymen.

Back of Grand Coulee Dam a mighty lake is forming. Eventually it will be 151 miles in length, extending all the way to the Canadian border. This is only 40 miles shorter than Lake Ontario. Foot by foot, the lake rises above the banks of the Columbia. Rapids and white water far upstream will be inundated. Like a great inland fjord, the expanding river will lap against rugged mountains and lofty hills. It will be one of the picturesque lakes of America.

Wharves and boathouses are under construction at the base of granite cliffs. Hellgate Rapids have already been buried beneath countless gallons of smooth water. Cruisers now ply where once it was unsafe for Indian canoes. At high water, when the glaciers are melting in the Canadian Rockies, the Grand Coulee lake will connect with the Arrow Lakes in British Columbia. This will make a 300-mile route through scenery studded with imposing peaks and deep canyons.

There is a vast assortment of marvels at Grand Coulee. One of these in the Grand Coulee itself. This is a gaunt, dry chasm which the Columbia River carved in the Pleistocene age. From it the dam takes its name. In fact, the purpose of the dam is to pump part of the water in the river back into the Grand Coulee. The water then will be coasted onto 1,200,000 acres of land which requires only moisture to be fertile and productive.

APPROACHES BY MOTOR

One of the two automobile approaches to Grand Coulee Dam winds up the bottom of the Grand Coulee. The motorist gets the impression of driving through an immense ditch dug by some steam shovel of unbelievable proportions. The floor of the Coulee is gently rolling, like a counterpane. The walls are as sharp-cornered as shoebox edges. Two miles in width, the immense trough is carved a thousand feet into the lava plateau. The pumps that throw water into it will be powerful enough to empty any river in the country. Grand Coulee Dam will raise the level of the Columbia 355 feet. The pumps will heave the water another 280 feet into the Grand Coulee, which yawns cavernously above the gorge in which the river flows.

This is a region rich in historic drama. Near the turn of the century settlers colonized the land below the Coulee. For a few years they harvested rich crops. Then the water accumulated in the soil began to taper off. The farms gradually caked and dried. The wheat became increasingly thin and scraggly. Most of the pioneers migrated elsewhere, leaving their ranches and homesteads to the elements. Barns decayed and houses crumbled.

NETWORK OF DITCHES

The Grand Coulee project will irrigate and reclaim this area. It will provide a network of ditches and canals for an expanse of land as large as the State of Delaware. Already visitors can see the contrast of steel-latticed transmission towers spanning the

abandoned farms. Ruined dwellings stare out of vacant doors and windows at the poles which will carry the 220,000-volt line connecting the Grand Coulee Dam with Bonneville Dam, 345 miles down the river. Soon the dry land will be criss-crossed with ditches in which the icy water of the Columbia foams and bubbles.

The Columbia River is the second largest waterway in America. It rushes out of the Canadian Rockies, originating in the vast Columbia ice fields. In summer, when the most water is needed for irrigation, the sun beats down on the alpine glaciers and the river booms with its full flow. The Columbia surges to the Pacific in rocky canyons. It is constantly flecked with whitecaps and rapids. It is a river that exceeds the size of the Hudson and the speed of the Kennebec. Forty-one percent of all the latent hydroelectricity in the United States is in the Columbia Basin.

The entire Grand Coulee region is a new spot on the tourist map. Before the dam was started in 1934 the area was desolate. Sam Seaton ran an old ferryboat across the Columbia. His friend, Charlie Osborne, cultivated a sparse peach orchard. That was all the civilization in the vicinity of the present site of the dam.

RECREATION PLANNED

On the lake behind Grand Coulee Dam boats are already churning and sailing, and skiffs and motorboats and launches dot the widening river. The Government has bought 2,400 parcels of land at a cost of $1,600,000 to recompense people for ground inundated as the slack water rises. The lake will be 36 miles longer than Lake Mead back of Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, where a variety of recreational activities has been carried on for several years. Men and women in the Inland Empire are planning boating clubs, swimming resorts, and other vacation spots along its wooded shores.

A boat trip up the Columbia now, impossible before the dam was built because of rapids and rough water, is a scenic experience. In some places rugged cliffs frown down on the river. At others the land slopes up gently to low, forested hills. Thousands of Americans have visited this area in the past few years. Many more will come in the future, especially after Grand Coulee Dam is finished by December.

Make America Safe—in America Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BERGEN (N. J.) EVENING RECORD

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting and illuminating editorial which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J., on Saturday, May 18, 1940.

Every American is urging an adequate national defense. Yet, in the face of the hysteria which comes when a bitter warfare is waged in the world, we must keep our poise and dignity and stand four-square upon the ground and not permit ourselves to be rushed into any untenable position. This is Europe's war. We had no part in the making of it, and we want no part in fighting that war. We must be prepared for any emergency, and one of these is to aid the world in readjusting and rehabilitating itself after this vicious and cruel war is over. And, too, we must not forget in these hours of great anxiety that we have that continuous problem of rehabilitating our own Nation and of solving our own problems in the interest of the American people.

The editorial follows:

[From the Bergen (N. J.) Evening Record of May 18, 1940]

MAKE AMERICA SAFE—IN AMERICA ONLY

In the light of Nazi Germany's current disregard for every law of God and man, her wholesale slaughter of peaceful, neighboring peoples, and her threat to all civilized mankind, practically every American agrees with President Roosevelt's stirring armament speech in principle.

But there is nothing sufficiently new in his speech to now stampede the American people into ventures that may cost them and their posterity all the constitutional liberties and opportunities purchased by the blood of past generations of their fighting and farseeing ancestors. Hitler's future course and the necessity of American preparedness to meet it were outlined in these columns almost 2 years ago in an editorial which said, in part:

"But what of America and its future safety in the light of the land hunger of the three international bullies (Japan, Hitler, and Mussolini), that grow hungrier with each new conquest; what of the Monroe Doctrine? * * * Uncle Sam has his Panama Canal to protect, that vital sea artery which enables a Nation's navy to be concentrated rapidly on either coast instead of being divided between both. It must therefore be apparent to the Nation, all well-meaning pacifists to the contrary notwithstanding, that the United States must now make vast preparations—not to wage a war but to avoid one. Totalitarians know only one language, and its name is force. They fear only one potential opponent, and that is a stronger one. The trend has long been self-evident, despite international peace treaties and Kellogg Pacts."

Columbia is still the gem of the ocean, and it is a priceless one. Other nations not so fortunately situated geographically or so lavishly endowed by nature with almost limitless natural resources are too prone to look covetously and enviously upon such a valuable acquisition. In this era of space annihilation by speed and its future potentialities, our geographical barriers, comprising two oceans, are no longer adequate for America's international treasure vault. And recent history proves that while the meek may inherit the earth, the strong take it away from them. Altruistic Uncle Sam is deluding himself about this inescapable fact, while the totalitarians are once more preparing to prove its sordid soundness.

Either its future national-defense requirements or its present unemployment problem therefore indicates the wisdom of a comprehensive heavy armament program that would immediately provide the United States with a navy and an air force second to none anywhere. To provide the momentum for these desirable ends, a 10-year program should be authorized now. * * * It should include annually four fast battleships of the heaviest type and guns, with all the necessary cruisers, destroyers, and submarines to round out such a future fleet. It should build thousands instead of hundreds of planes annually and train the men necessary to fly them. * * *

Armed might and its threat of frightfulness forced European unpreparedness and fear of wholesale civilian murder to bow submissively to the Nazi bullies. * * * England and France retreated before the prospect of Germany's new air armada, said to number 8,000, all built in the past 3 years. So be it. Germany has set the pace, and now threatens the safety of the world.

America has thousands of partly idle factories and millions of unemployed workmen to man them. If nations that want to dominate the world by terrorism can build 3,000 planes a year for that purpose, the supremely industrial United States can and should build five times that number to checkmate them, at least on this continent. And it should start at once, unless it is content to relegate itself in the not distant future to the unenviable subordinate position that now confronts hitherto potent Britain and France in Europe.

And on Sepember 22, 1938, these columns stated:

"But of one thing Europe should be convincingly assured. America, having no conquered territory to surrender, is going to keep out of the European diplomatic shell game. This Nation needs no foreign territory, and it will not squander its human and material resources to protect that of others. But it can and will defend itself against the world.

"Its slogan should be, 130,000,000 citizens and $300,000,000,000 for national defense at home, but not one man or one dime for foreign conquests, by whatever new euphemisms they may be camouflaged. The people of a nation so dedicated are not mollycoddles, nor do they lack intestinal fortitude. They merely resolve that their primary national obligation is to make America safe for Americans, in America."

The Danger of Civil Service Exemptions in National Defense Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

LETTER FROM ARTHUR S. FLEMMING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following

letter from Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commissioner:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1940.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In response to your request, I am very glad to provide you with the following information relative to the proposed exemption from civil service as incorporated in the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee relating to the preparedness program.

Our position in connection with this exemption is that, first of all, it is absolutely unnecessary. If, because of the demands of the national-defense program, it is necessary to exempt positions from the competitive provisions of the Civil Service Act, the President has the power to make such exemptions. In fact, the President has already delegated such power to the Civil Service Commission in Executive Order No. 8257, dated September 21, 1939, which reads as follows:

"By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the provisions of paragraph 8 of subdivision 2 of section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403, 404), it is hereby ordered that, subject to appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to permit an immediate appointment without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil-service rules in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government. This authority may be used only under most unusual and compelling circumstances, and the person or persons so appointed will not thereby acquire a classified civil-service status."

Through the Deputy Chief of Staff, Gen. Lorenzo D. Gasser, the War Department has indicated to the Civil Service Commission that it does not desire to have this exemption a part of the bill. Consequently, if the Congress insists on including the exemption, it means that it will be placing a recruiting burden on the War Department which it does not want and which will have the effect of diverting time, energy, and money from the national-defense program.

The Civil Service Commission, in the judgment of the War Department, is equipped to render the service which it needs at this critical point.

Certainly at no time in our history should the country be more careful about obtaining persons who are qualified than in a critical period such as this. Furthermore, working in cooperation with other investigating agencies of the Federal Government, the Civil Service Commission is in a better position than any single department to make the kind of character investigations which will insure keeping out of national-defense positions persons who might utilize their positions for the purpose of injuring the country's defense program.

If the exemption stays in, the War Department will be immediately subjected to political pressures to make appointments, and in responding to these pressures this country knows from past experience that in a large majority of the cases the appointments will be on the basis of political background and not on the basis of merit.

If politics is to be adjourned at a time such as this, it is no time to mix political appointments with the defense program.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE IROQUOIS CHIEF

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Congress this week enters upon consideration of ways and means for strengthening our national defense with a unity of purpose and a seriousness of intent which transcends all party lines. For many weeks, prominent citizens in both major parties have been calling for a reexamination of our national defense system and a scientific and intelligent approach to the problem of plugging up its weaknesses and modernizing its methods and machinery. Conspicuous among those urging America to protect itself and its way of life with up-to-date preparedness equipment was Thomas E. Dewey from my home State.

As reported in the attached editorial from the Iroquois Chief, one of the leading papers in South Dakota, Mr. Dewey, speaking in Louisville, Ky., almost a week before the President addressed Congress on the subject of national defense, put his finger on this defect in the administration's program and called upon America to bring its defenses up to date. It is my hope that Congress will now take this job in hand and complete it satisfactorily.

In a speech at Louisville, Ky., Saturday night, Dewey, the fighting candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, not only went on record as favoring adequate national-defense measures but called attention to the fact that the New Deal spending program has impoverished the country at a time when ample resources are badly needed. Dewey put it this way: "With ruthless military aggression unleashed in the world, America must lose no time in strengthening her defenses. The New Deal has wasted billions of dollars of our money, but it has failed to make adequate provision for the needs of our armed forces. More than that, its destructive policies have seriously threatened our national economic strength—the strength which is our greatest safeguard in a warring world. Two things we must do to secure our future: We must restore our whole economy to health and vigor after the ravages of the 7 lean years, and we must build up the power and efficiency of our Army, Navy, and air forces to levels which will make this country impregnable to attack."

"Fifth Columns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK STAR-LEDGER

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on May 20, 1940:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of May 20, 1940]

THE "FIFTH COLUMN" HITS PREPAREDNESS

The "fifth column" is just as busily engaged in undermining American morale and unity as it was in preparing the way for the "blitzkrieg" in Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

The "fifth column" has many duties assigned to it in this country. The German-American Bund, openly organizing storm-troop formations and preaching racial and religious hatred, is only one of many forms of "fifth column" operation in the United States, and by no means the most dangerous form.

The most effective and therefore the most dangerous campaign of the "fifth column" has been the concerted effort to prevent the United States from strengthening itself to face new war dangers. This "fifth column" detail has taken the form of a counterfeit "peace" drive designed to manipulate the emotions and sentiments of millions of Americans who would not, knowingly, give aid or comfort to subversive elements.

The "fifth column" in this propaganda campaign is able to operate through a diversity of "fronts," full advantage being taken of the existence of sincere groups of pacifists, advocates of nonresistance, isolationists, and optimists, who, in spite of all the evidence in Europe, still refuse to believe that our defenses are inadequate. The "fifth column" is able to take on the masks of all these innocent, sincere groups. Communists, who argue that the present preparedness drive is merely a campaign of hysteria by manufacturers and munition makers for business, thus make their contribution to the campaign of the "fifth column" to keep the United States impotent in the face of danger.

A so-called mothers' peace rally staged at the Newark City Hall Friday night furnished a vivid illustration of the technique employed by the "fifth column" in striking at belated patriotic efforts to unify and strengthen our country. A "capacity audience," we are informed by our reporters, cheered a statement by Dr. Annette Rubenstein, principal of a New York high school, that President Roosevelt, because he is advocating American preparedness, "is not on our side and is not trying to keep us out of war." Other speakers are quoted as having urged that instead of spending more money for armaments, we divert the money to build more schools, hospitals, and create more jobs.

Here we have so-called radicals and liberals who profess to be combating Hitlerism, seeking to destroy the opportunity to make the United States a bulwark against the further spread of Hitlerism. Here we have an instance of self-proclaimed defenders of

democracy, striving to bare democracy's heart to the dagger of the enemy.

It but emphasizes the insidious nature of this "fifth column" effort to observe that the majority of the people who participated in the city hall demonstration were probably innocent of all thought of giving aid and comfort to Hitler. It is part of the "fifth column" approach to keep the intended victim in a rarefied atmosphere of pacifistic idealism, while the Nazis and the Communists make ready to attack.

However innocent members of the audience may have been, and perhaps some of the speakers, the Communist influences behind the demonstration are visible except to those who would be blind. It would be recalled that a participating organization, the American Youth Congress, which appears to be so outspoken in condemnation of President Roosevelt's preparedness program, found nothing to criticize in the Communist invasion of Finland or in the Russo-German rape of Poland.

Never in all the history of our country have we been as free from militarism, jingoism, or a romantic conception of war as we are today. Our attitude on war is grimly sober. Since the Japanese invasion of China our newspapers, our broadcasters, and our movie news reels have given the American people years of education in the horrors and futility of war. Now, the Nazis, the Communists, and the "fifth column" seek to turn our detestation of war into a weapon against us. They make a bold bid to stamp peace sentiment as their property and to require all lovers of peace to accept, blindly, their leadership.

American mothers will not be taken in by "fifth column" propaganda for they know that if the Allies should, by some happy turn, stop the Nazi hordes in their tracks in Belgium and France they will be spared concern for the future of their sons. American mothers know, too, that regardless of the outcome in Europe, if America makes itself defensively the most powerful nation in the world their sons will never be called upon to give their lives for their country. And American mothers know, too, that if by our weakness we tempt aggression American blood will be spent just as freely as the blood of Europe is now being spent on the battlefields of Belgium and France.

If the Communists and the near-Communists in America wish to prove their sincerity in the latest wave of pacifist antipreparedness propaganda, they can do so by taking their campaign to Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, where a little self-restraint would do the world a maximum of good. As long as the communistic allies of Nazi Germany have nothing to say against Soviet militarism, as the ally of Nazi militarism, the criminal attempt to mislead peace-loving Americans is transparent.

Wister Dam on the Poteau River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement I made recently before the House Committee on Flood Control:

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, also General Schley and staff. I am appearing before you again in behalf of a project in my district in which I am very deeply interested—the Wister Dam on the Poteau River in Oklahoma.

As you no doubt know, the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1938, approved the Wister Reservoir in connection with the general plan for flood control on the Arkansas River Basin, but limited the amount to be spent on this plan to $21,000,000.

Of the reservoirs to be selected and approved by the Chief of the Engineers I had hoped and expected that the Wister project would be given priority in the recommendation of the engineers, but I am now informed that the entire amount of this initial authorization will be required for the construction of other reservoirs which are further advanced and that it will be necessary to either get the ceiling raised for the Arkansas River Basin or a specific authorization for the Wister project.

For this reason I have introduced H. R. 8421 to amend the authorization to provide sufficient authorization for an additional appropriation in such amount as may be necessary to construct the Wister Reservoir.

This dam is urgently needed and its early construction has been strongly recommended by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, an able member of which, Hon Frank Raab, is with us today.

I am informed that a dam at this point would not only benefit residents of the Poteau River bottoms but would reduce flood crests on the Arkansas River by at least 5 percent. Thousands of dollars' worth of damage occurs every year to both mining property and farm lands through floodwaters of the Poteau River. Each year the citizens and farmers in this territory have hoped for final assurance that relief would be given them by the construction of this dam, and have seen their hopes fade as War Department engineers have given priority to other projects which do not appear, at least in our estimation, to be any more worthy.

The speech of President Roosevelt from the rear platform of his train in 1938, in which he said he hoped to return again some day to dedicate the Wister Dam, renewed the hopes of many people in this county who were almost in despair, and ever since then the prospect that the dam would be built has sustained them in their effort to hold and save their properties. This part of the State has no large industries other than coal mining, which operates only a few months of each year; therefore they must depend largely upon agriculture to support it. The farmers each year gamble against the floodwaters and there are many with whom the rise and fall of the river is the difference between comfort and poverty.

I have been working on this project for many years and believe I have done everything that is reasonably possible to advance it. I have kept in constant touch with Army engineers, appeared before both this committee and the Appropriations Committee, and have conferred with the President. I have talked and begged for this project until I have almost gotten black in the face. Yet, in spite of this, some of my opponents have charged that I have not pushed it as much as I should. Therefore, I wish to give here a little history of my activities in behalf of the Wister Dam and quote excerpts from letters I have received from War Department officials in reply to my many letters and personal calls urging the early construction of this dam.

I believe the first report in which the Wister Reservoir was mentioned by Army engineers was made in 1931, but no definite recommendation was made. Early in this administration, when the present flood-control program started, I advocated the building of the Wister Dam and have kept it to the front ever since. In 1935 I was instrumental in having it included in the flood-control bill, H. R. 8455, when it passed the House. However, this item and many other similar projects were stricken out in the Senate and in conference before the bill was finally approved.

On January 24, 1935, Lt. Col. F. B. Wilby, Acting Chief of Engineers, wrote me in part as follows [reading]:

"This Department has completed a survey of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, including the Poteau River, under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. The field work in connection with this survey has been completed, and the report is now in this office for the preparation of the report of the Chief of Engineers. The report has been delayed at the request of local interests who desire to submit additional data on the improvement of the Arkansas River in the interests of navigation.

"The survey developed that approximately 44,600 acres in the Poteau River Valley are subject to floods, with an average annual flood loss less than $73,000. The best plan for the provision of flood control would be the construction of two reservoirs, one near Wister, Okla., and the other near the mouth of the Brazil Creek, one of the important lower tributaries of the Poteau River."

On April 22, 1937, Maj. Gen. E. M. Markham, Chief of Engineers, wrote in part:

"This Department is giving consideration to a flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi River Basins, to be submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives at an early date. The plan has considered a dam on the Poteau River having an estimated cost of $4,750,000. The justification for this dam depends not only on the local benefits which it will afford, but also on its effect in reducing flood stages in the lower Mississippi River. The Poteau River Dam appears of considerable value for this purpose."

On March 14, 1938, Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, advised me as follows:

"As you doubtlessly know, the Wister Dam was one of many reservoirs recommended by this Department in its comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers and published in Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session. As the plan was not adopted, the Department is without authority to undertake the construction of the dam.

"Section 6 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, authorized the examination and survey of the Wister Reservoir site. The report of the examination was received in this office on February 3, 1938, and is now before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for consideration."

In the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, the Wister Dam was included in the general comprehensive plan for flood control in the Arkansas River Basin, which authorized for the initiation and partial accomplishment the sum of $21,000,000, the reservoirs to be selected and approved by the Chief of Engineers.

On August 30, 1938, in reply to my request for funds for the project, Maj. Gen. M. C. Tyler, Acting Chief of Engineers, wrote me as follows:

"In connection with the Wister Reservoir, the Department has presently no available funds which may be applied to this project.

However, an application by local interests for a Public Works Administration allotment for $200,000 has been transmitted to that Administration on August 6, 1938. The sum requested in the application would cover all preliminary work on the Wister project, including foundation explorations, soil investigations, and other preliminary studies."

I then strongly urged the P. W. A. to take favorable action on the application, but was advised by H. A. Gray, Assistant Administrator, on September 13, 1938, that—

"In view of the large appropriations made by the recent Congress for river and harbor and flood-control work, it is not the policy of this Administration to allocate any of the funds made available for Federal projects under the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 for work of this type."

I continued my fight before the engineers and on January 26, 1939, Brig. Gen. M. C. Tyler, Acting Chief of Engineers, advised me:

"As you are doubtless aware, the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is solely one of authorization and makes available no funds with which any project authorized therein can be undertaken. The studies on which the selection of the various reservoir projects will be made by the Chief of Engineers are now under way, but to date no definite selection has yet been determined.

"I regret to inform you that the existing data regarding the Wister Dam are only of a preliminary nature. In the preliminary report the maximum elevation of the spillway crest was set at 512 feet above mean sea level and the maximum pool elevation at 525 feet above mean sea level. The above figures are tentative only and are subject to change when final plans are prepared. A more detailed study of this dam is now under way."

On April 20, 1939, in reply to a personal call, Brig. Gen. John L. Kingman, Acting Chief of Engineers, wrote me, in part, as follows:

"Funds available to the Department for flood-control investigations during the fiscal year 1939 have been limited and are not sufficient to complete all of the investigations that Congress has directed the Department to make. For this reason it will not be possible to complete this survey report until further allotments can be made. It is expected, however, that the War Department Civil Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940 will make available funds for flood-control investigations, and that an allotment will then be made to Colonel Scott which will permit him to complete this survey as rapidly as is consistent with full study and sound engineering practice. After the survey report is received in this office it will be reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as required by law and by the Chief of Engineers and will then be transmitted to Congress with the Department's recommendations as to development of the Wister Reservoir."

"On the assumption that the studies of the Department indicate that the Wister Reservoir should be recommended for early construction, there are two lines of procedure by which that reservoir might be placed under way. The first of these would be authorization by Congress of the construction of the Wister Reservoir in either a special act or some future general flood-control act. The Department would then be authorized to initiate this project as soon as funds were available for its construction.

"The other method would be to select the Wister Reservoir as one of the projects to be constructed pursuant to the basin authorization contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, for reservoir construction in the Arkansas River Valley, since that reservoir is one of the projects recommended in the comprehensive plan of the Chief of Engineers for flood control in the Ohio and lower Mississippi River Basins. Congress in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan as set forth in Committee Document No. 1, House of Representatives, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, for flood control and other purposes in the Arkansas River Basin, and authorized the expenditure of $21,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of this plan. As the authorized amount of $21,000,000 is not sufficient to construct all of the reservoirs recommended in the comprehensive plan, the Department is now making a study to determine those projects to which funds to be made available by the War Department Civil Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940 should be applied in initiating the construction of the comprehensive plan. * * * At the present time it appears that other reservoirs in the Arkansas River Basin, the plans for which are in a more advanced state of completion, will exhaust the existing authorization, and that it will therefore not be possible to undertake the Wister Reservoir pursuant to this authorization.

"Allotments totaling $12,200 have been made to Colonel Scott in order that he might initiate site investigations and other studies pertaining to the Wister Reservoir, but completion of these investigations and preparation of detailed construction plans will require at least 1 year's time. The present studies will, however, develop a great deal of the important basic data needed in making the detailed designs and will facilitate the preparation of the construction plans and specifications in a much shorter time than would be required if the project were to be undertaken before the survey is completed."

After passage of the War department civil-functions appropriation bill referred to above, an allotment of approximately $78,000 was made for continuing field investigations and studies on the Wister project. On October 23, 1939, I again called on the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, and he wrote me, as follows:

"The Wister Reservoir on the Poteau River, Okla., has been considered by the Department for construction pursuant to the authorization contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, for $21,000,000 for reservoirs in the Arkansas River Basin. It appears at this time, however, that other reservoirs in the Arkansas River Basin, the plans for which are more nearly complete than are those for the Wister Reservoir, will require the full amount of the presently authorized expenditures, and that consequently the construction of the Wister Reservoir cannot be initiated until Congress provides additional authority applicable thereto.

"I am pleased to inform you, however, that funds have been allotted to Capt. H. A. Montgomery, the district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., with which to carry on the necessary detailed field investigations and office studies and to prepare a detailed report presenting the definite plan for development of the Wister project. It is expected that this report will be received in this office early next spring. With the basic data that is acquired in connection with this report on hand, it will be possible to undertake the preparation of construction plans and specifications without delay when the necessary authorization for this project becomes available to the Department."

Again on January 31, 1940, I urged favorable action on the Wister project, to which General Schley replied:

"As you know, the Department is now making the necessary field investigations and office studies required to obtain the basic engineering data for the design of the Wister project. Allotments for this work have been made to Capt. H. A. Montgomery, the district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., from the funds made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act approved June 28, 1939. I am informed that multiplex mapping and field surveys have been completed, that the necessary studies of geology, hydrology, and hydraulics are about 50 percent complete, and that the preliminary subsurface explorations and land appraisals have been initiated. It is expected that a report from Captain Montgomery, together with the comments and recommendations of Col. Eugene Reybold, the division engineer, southwestern division, will be received in this office about March 1, 1940. That report will contain detailed information on the results of these investigations and will present the basic engineering plan for developing the Wister project. With this engineering data in hand upon the completion of these investigations, the Department will be in a position to initiate the construction of this project without delay when the necessary additional authorization and funds applicable thereto become available.

"In addition to the above-mentioned investigations and the report thereon, the Department is now preparing a survey report on the Poteau River and the Wister Reservoir for submission to Congress in accordance with the authorization contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936. I am advised that the field investigations required for the preparation of the report on this survey are progressing rapidly and that the district engineer's report, together with the comments and recommendations of the division engineer, is scheduled to be submitted to this office on or about October 15, 1940.

"To call again to the attention of the division and district engineers your great interest in the Wister Reservoir, I am taking the liberty of forwarding your letter to them. You may be assured that the Department recognizes the importance of this project and that within the limits of available authorization and funds every effort will be made to undertake its construction at the earliest practicable date."

On February 23, 1940, in reply to another call, the Chief of Engineers wrote me as follows:

""The Wister Reservoir is one of the projects that was recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report of April 6, 1937, on a comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. This report is printed in Committee Document No. 1, House Committee on Flood Control, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, a copy of which is enclosed. The Wister Reservoir is the project numbered 11 on the third map following page 12 of the document.

"Congress, in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control in the Arkansas River Basin as proposed in Committee Document No. 1 and authorized $21,000,000 for reservoirs for the initiation and partial accomplishment of this plan. In accordance with this authorization the Department has given careful consideration to the selection of the Wister Reservoir for construction. It appears, however, that the full amount of the initial authorization provided in the 1938 act will be exhausted by the construction of other reservoirs in the Arkansas River Basin, the plans for which are more nearly complete than are those for the Wister Reservoir. Consequently, this project cannot be undertaken until further authorization is provided by Congress.

"In connection with this need for additional authority, I am informed that on February 2, 1940, you introduced a bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 8421) to amend the authorization for the Arkansas River Basin to provide authority for an additional appropriation in such amount as may be necessary to construct the Wister Reservoir.

"I am pleased to inform you that under the authority of existing legislation the Department is now conducting the detailed field investigation and office studies required to secure the engineering data needed for the detailed design of the Wister project. Allotments totaling $92,500 have been made to Capt. H. A. Montgomery, the district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., for carrying on this work. Captain Montgomery's latest report indicates that at the end of January preliminary core boring, land appraisals, multiplex mapping, and field surveys had been completed, and that the studies of geology,

hydrology, and hydraulics were more than 50 percent complete. A detailed report from Captain Montgomery on the development of the Wister Reservoir is scheduled to be received in this office about March 1, 1940, together with the comments and recommendations of Col. Eugene Reybold, the division engineer, southwestern division. This report will be carefully reviewed by this office and upon its approval the district engineer will be ready to undertake the detailed design of the project and the preparation of construction plans and specifications. The basic engineering data that will be presented in this report and the other information acquired by Captain Montgomery in connection with its preparation will enable the Department to initiate the construction of the Wister Reservoir without delay when the necessary additional authorization is provided and funds applicable to the construction of that project are made available.

"You may be assured that the Department is fully aware of the importance of the Wister Reservoir project and the desirability of continuing the Department's activities pertaining to it. Within the limit of the funds available every effort will be made to pursue the design of the structures and all other field and office work that will be required prior to the initiation of actual construction."

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have your statement, and I may say you have sized up the situation correctly. Your project has been authorized, but it is necessary to have an additional appropriation or additional authorizations for appropriations before it can be considered for construction.

Mr. Speaker, since the above statement was made two things have happened which affect the Wister project. First, on April 17, when the War Department civil functions appropriation bill was before the Senate, Senator THOMAS, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which has charge of such funds, was able to secure an amendment to the bill to raise the ceiling for the Arkansas River Basin. As the House has already passed the bill, it will now go to conference, and it is largely up to the conferees as to whether or not the amendment stays in the bill. Second, on May 7 the House Committee on Flood Control reported H. R. 9640, an omnibus flood-control bill, which also contains a provision raising the ceiling for the Arkansas River Basin. This would have practically the same effect as the Senate amendment and gives the Wister project another chance in the event the Thomas amendment is stricken out.

Work Relief or Direct Relief?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme reluctance because of my recent advent as a Member of this distinguished body that I inject myself into this discussion, but I indulge in the hope—faint though it be—that I might be able to make some little contribution that will be of weight in the ultimate consideration of this very important House Joint Resolution 544. During my brief association here I have been impressed by the oft-repeated question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], Where are we going to get the money?

It is a question that insofar as this resolution is concerned holds dire possibilities. It seems to me that unless we pass this resolution the question "Where are we going to get the money?" will echo and reecho throughout the country. Unless we pass this resolution that question will be asked by our State, city, and county governments, which will then be confronted by heavier local relief rolls to take care of dismissed W. P. A. workers. If our local communities are unable to carry a heavier relief roll, and it is undeniable that they are unable to do so, the same question will be asked by hundreds of thousands dismissed W. P. A. workers, when they hear their children crying for food and they see their families evicted from their homes.

That momentous question can be answered by this Congress—it must be answered by this Congress and I am confident it will be answered by the affirmative action of this House upon this resolution.

I am not dealing with the causes of the unemployment of some nine millions of people in this country—I am concerned at this time with the fact of their unemployment. I am concerned with the vital necessity of presently providing our people with the necessities of life to keep their families together until the breadwinners are restored to employment in private industry.

I have heard criticism of the W. P. A. It would be strange if there was none. I have heard isolated instances of abuses of the W. P. A. In an undertaking as vast as the W. P. A. and as unprecedented, it would be beyond reason not to have some instances of abuse, but to state that because of some abuses this appropriation should be defeated, borders on the absurd.

I listened to the incident of the person who, on several occasions, went to the Kentucky Derby apparently on W. P. A. funds and it seemed incredible to me that so great concern was shown with respect to the shortcomings of one man, and not a word said on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of W. P. A. workers, who trudged daily to their work, endeavoring to keep their families together and maintain their self respect by honest toil. An editorial recently published in one of our New York newspapers, noted for its antagonism to President Roosevelt, said in part, I quote:

> Many of these charges are so serious, their implication so strongly unfavorable to Federal management of work-relief funds, that not a penny should be appropriated by Congress until the accusations of fraud and incompetence are thoroughly examined.

To my mind that is the most cruel and ruthless declaration that I have heard. I would like to ask the writer of that editorial if not one penny should be appropriated by Congress until the accusations—accusations mind you—of fraud and incompetence are examined, what is to become of those families whose breadwinners are now on the W. P. A.? Are they, during the pendency of the examination to be dispossessed from their homes? It means either that, or back to the local relief rolls. And where are our cities, counties, and States going to get the money to take care of these additional relief cases?

There may be an honest difference of opinion as to whether the Democrats or the Republicans can best administer the W. P. A., but it seems to me that there can be no difference of opinion as to the necessity for the W. P. A. I am in favor of this appropriation of $975,650,000 as recommended by the committee. I voted in favor of the larger amount of $2,232,000,000 as provided in the Casey amendment which would have provided jobs for 1,250,000 additional persons already certified for relief, for the reason that I feel that the Government has a solemn obligation to provide for the people who are ready, able, and willing to work but who cannot find employment in private industry.

I am thoroughly in accord with the provision of this bill which would exempt those heads of families over 45 years of age from separation from the W. P. A. because of 18 months' continuous service. They are the ones who most need W. P. A. work funds, heads of families who are now looked upon as too old for private industry. Many of them will probably never get back into private industry. They are, nonetheless, ready, able, and willing to work and they have a God-given right to work. It is our solemn duty to see that they get the opportunity to work and in my opinion W. P. A. offers that opportunity.

As a Representative of a district in New York City, which is largely composed of the laboring class and lower-paid white-collar worker, I am deeply concerned with the passage of this bill. Let me show you the results of the curtailment of the W. P. A. activities in our city at various times.

In July and August 1937, 40,000 persons were separated from the W. P. A. in New York City and over 50 percent of them were immediately forced upon the local relief rolls.

Between July 1 and December 31, 1939, 100,000 persons in New York State were separated from the W. P. A. by

reason of the 18-month limitation of service and 34,000 were separated for other causes, or a total of 134,000 persons in all. During these same months 70,000, or 52 percent, of these workers were forced back upon the general relief roll.

Of all the workers dismissed from W. P. A. in New York City in July and August 1939, 54.7 percent were back on relief by the following November and in Buffalo the percent was 63.8. Only 13.37 percent were able to get back into private industry within that time in New York City and only 16.2 percent in Buffalo.

In New York State W. P. A. employment during July–December 1939 averaged 153,700 workers. If there is a reduction of the W. P. A. in our State 50 percent of that reduction will shortly be back upon the local relief rolls and our local communities simply cannot carry the load.

I am in favor of the humane and progressive program undertaken by this administration to give work to the needy, and despite some shortcomings of administration which I have no doubt will be corrected in time, I intend to vote for this resolution.

Sam D. McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAM D. MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I should certainly be derelict in a sacred duty if I completed my first session in the Halls of Congress without paying tribute to my distinguished predecessor, the late lamented Judge SAM D. MCREYNOLDS. The post I occupy is hallowed with the memory of the services he rendered to his State and his Nation. I bring to this assembly, not only my personal lament, but the voice of the entire Third District of Tennessee, united in its sorrow for the passing of the man whom they loved and honored.

Judge MCREYNOLDS for 20 years graced and distinguished the bench as judge of the sixth judicial circuit in the Volunteer State. His personality softened the accuracy and correctness of his decisions, his mien dignified the court, and his brilliant mind left deep its impress on the jurisprudence of the State.

When elected to the National Congress in 1922, he brought to his seat the mellowness and maturity of a life most men would then have been willing to acclaim as a fulfilled and successful career. A larger and more useful public service was in its incipiency. Seventeen consecutive years the citizens of the Third District were privileged to be represented in Washington by this man who so consecrated his personal life to a sacred public trust.

In 1932 his elevation to the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs marked the beginning of the final glorious chapter of a man whose life had been dedicated to the public weal. As chairman of this important committee during a period of international unrest, his service transcended the local bounds of a congressional district and his stature assumed national importance. His leadership stamped him forever with the imprint of statesmanship. When Judge SAM D. MCREYNOLDS was called home to his well-earned rest and reward, this earnest east Tennessee patriot's passing was mourned by a sorrowing nation. The United States had truly suffered a loss. Yet, for all of his glorious public service, the most compelling memories of Judge MCREYNOLDS are associated with his private life, which, as so many of his colleagues have said, was most exemplary. He was truly a kind husband, an indulgent father, and a warm and consistent friend. Add to this his ability as a lawyer, his service as a judge, and his accomplishment as a statesman, and the dimensions are those of a man who has been truly destined to receive the blessings of history.

Deny W. P. A. Favors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM SCOTTISH RITE BODIES OF TAMPA, FLA.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from the Honorable Frank O'Berry, secretary of the Tampa Scottish Rite bodies of Tampa, Fla.:

TAMPA, FLA., *May 15, 1940.*

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Associated Press story in Tampa Times today that the W. P. A. in Tampa made 400 aprons for the Scottish Rite is false. We have never requested nor received any favors from the W. P. A. Our executive committee requests you to deny this false story and retell to the Associated Press.

FRANK O'BERRY,
Secretary, Tampa Scottish Rite Bodies.

The telegram speaks for itself. Mr. O'Berry is a fine, outstanding citizen, and any statement he makes is correct.

An Answer to Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] on May 22, 1940, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, entitled "An Answer to Lindbergh."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the greatest clause in our Bill of Rights is that guaranteeing free speech. In the exercise of that freedom, which totalitarian government is fast wiping out in Europe today, Mr. Charles A. Lindbergh went on the air last Sunday night to urge the American people to continue to bury their heads in the sands and give no thought toward the shocking conflict now raging across the waters, which threatens the very fabric of Christian and democratic civilization.

Mr. Lindbergh's speech was announced as a discussion of our air defense. Like many other Americans, I listened in anticipation of hearing a technical and practical discussion of our aviation problem by the man who thrilled all of us by his spectacular flight across the ocean. But instead of giving us advice on a subject about which he should be qualified to speak, Mr. Lindbergh gave another discourse on American foreign policy, about which he is no more qualified to speak than "Wrong Way" Corrigan or any other aviator who may fly the Atlantic Ocean.

A few years ago Mr. Lindbergh went to Great Britain to live. It seemed natural to us that his interest in aviation should cause him to inspect the air forces of other countries in Europe—France, Germany, and Russia. We thought nothing of it at first.

Later we were somewhat surprised by the news that he had accepted a decoration from Hitler. We were further surprised by the reports, about the time of the Munich settlement, that he was volunteering his advice in important circles in England and France thought to be favorable to a policy of appeasing Germany by offering no resistance to her aggression upon small countries to her east. He had always been regarded as a shy, retiring young man, and the reports of his intermeddling in Europe did not seem in keeping with his character.

Since last September he has taken it upon himself to speak thrice to the American people upon what their attitude should be toward the conflict now raging in Europe.

When his first speech was delivered the question of the arms embargo was uppermost in the minds of Americans. Mr. Lindbergh failed to state in so many words where he stood. But few who heard his speech could doubt that its net effect was to give great comfort to those opposing the shipment of planes even under the cash-and-carry clause to the Allies fighting in defense of their national existence.

The following month Mr. Lindbergh addressed the American public a second time. He pleaded that "for the benefit of western civilization we should continue our embargo on offensive weapons." He wanted to forbid the sale for cash and delivery in this country of bombing planes to Britain and France while their people would lie unpitied beneath the bombs of German planes.

In that speech Mr. Lindbergh even went so far as to attack our neighbor Canada for joining in the defense of the Commonwealth of Nations of which she is by her free choice a member.

He stated in effect that we must demand that Canada separate itself from the British Empire.

The United States cannot start something it does not intend to finish. Had we followed his advice and made such a demand, and Canada refused to comply, we could enforce that demand only with force. He was in effect pleading that we make war upon Canada.

Last Sunday the once shy and reticent Mr. Lindbergh again thought that the American people were in need of his advice. This time about what he professed to call "the air defense of the United States."

This third speech of Mr. Lindbergh was a singular performance. President Roosevelt had recommended appropriations for national defense which were extremely conservative in light of the recommendations of his military experts and in light of the shocking and ominous developments abroad which have threatened with destruction the most inoffensive neutral nations. Even Mr. Lindbergh, at the end of his hysterical protest against other people becoming hysterical about our national-defense program, admitted that "we need a greater air force, a greater army, and a greater navy," and nowhere indicated in what respects the President's program is defective.

Yet Mr. Lindbergh spoke as if the United States was somehow being rushed into an air-defense program before a definite policy of defense had been formulated. He pointed out that an air-defense program based on the defense of the United States alone would be quite different from a defense program based on the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere, and he proceeded to argue what no responsible person has ever denied—that America cannot effectively defend herself without defending the whole Western Hemisphere.

But the President has stated that policy of hemisphere defense time and again during the past 2 years; it is a definite policy of defense already formulated.

Why then does Mr. Lindbergh try to create the impression that the American people are being rushed hastily and impulsively into a national-defense program?

Why does he scorn as hysteria this belated rising of the American giant from sleep?

Mr. Lindbergh said "If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war." What official of the United States Government is asking for war? Does he think the President is asking for war because he asks the Congress to provide additional appropriations for the defense of this Nation? The people of America know that a nation does not have to ask for war in order to have it visited upon them. Did China ask for war? Did Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium ask for war? No; not one of them did. Yet today these nations have been wiped out and their men, women, and children slaughtered.

When Mr. Lindbergh says, "No one wishes to attack us," is he authorized to speak for Hitler or Goering? Even if he is, can the American people, in the light of recent history, rely upon that assurance?

Mr. Lindbergh states that while it is true that bombing planes can be built with sufficient range to cross the ocean and return, no such planes exist today in any air force. Would Mr. Lindbergh have us wait until they are built by a nation capable of producing thousands every month?

You and I know it is no feat at all for planes now in existence, in fleets to make the jumps the President described in his message—from Iceland to Greenland to Canada to New England.

When Mr. Lindbergh states that "regardless of which side wins this war, there is no reason, aside from our own actions, to prevent a continuation of peaceful relationships between America and the countries of Europe," I shudder to think of the kind of America Mr. Lindbergh is willing to accept.

Mr Lindbergh seems not concerned with the flagrant violations of the rights of peaceful little nations; the cruel and bitter persecution of God-fearing men, women, and children because of their religion, race, or political opinions; the burning of books; the bombing of helpless women and children fleeing in terror from their homes; the parachute spies and the torch troops. To Mr. Lindbergh all these seem to be only little, trifling, insignificant incidents to an age-old struggle for power. Read his speeches. He has no word of criticism for the aggressors; no word of pity for the victims. The world should know his voice is the voice of Lindbergh and not the voice of America.

To me the vile, barbaric deeds now being inflicted on democratic peoples in Europe represent an attack against everything that we hold dear; an attack against international good faith, against religion, against learning, against political freedom, against civilization itself.

Apart from all moral values, does Mr. Lindbergh really believe that our problem of national defense would not seriously be affected by the destruction of the British Fleet or its surrender to Germany?

Is there among us a thoughtful person who believes that should England be brought to her knees within the next few weeks or few months, that Hitler would permit her to scuttle her fleet? Must we not realize that Hitler would warn that if Britain destroyed her fleet, he would destroy England? Could we expect the British Government under such circumstances to sink its fleet or send it to help the United States? If Britain did what you would do under the same circumstances, and surrendered its fleet to save its people, we would be confronted by Hitler possessing a Navy superior in strength to our own, and with more warships in the course of construction in England than in any other country.

Even if we do not know the terms, we know there is an understanding between Germany and Japan. With the combined sea power of Japan and Germany, vastly superior to ours, could we rely upon the assurance of Mr. Lindbergh that war would not come to us unless we ask for it?

England and France were lulled into a false sense of security by those who pleaded as Mr. Lindbergh has pleaded that they could continue to live in peace with nations which trample ruthlessly over the rights of other nations, and that those who dared to warn them of their dangers were actuated by "personal profit and foreign interests."

England and France were also told as Mr. Lindbergh has told us that appeasement was of primary importance, and "the production of airplanes, cannon, and battleships is of secondary importance."

England and France discovered too late that refusing to aid the victims of aggression and trying instead to appease the aggressor did not keep them out of war but only served to bring the war flaming out of the heavens upon them.

"Fifth columns" are already active in America. And those who consciously or unconsciously retard the efforts of this Government to provide for the defense of the American people are the "fifth column's" most effective fellow travelers.

Mr. Lindbergh may tell us to "stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion," but I thank God that America has at last been aroused to the dangers that beset her in a world menaced by brute force and strident ambition, and is grimly determined to arm in self-defense.

We have witnessed the effect of lack of unity in Britain and in France. We should profit by their experience. Forgetting all personal grievances and all political ambitions, the American people should unite under the leadership of their President, and work to preserve our lives and our liberties.

War Planes Versus Battleships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESSES BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, today we authorized an appropriation of $1,301,000,000 for the Navy. At this time I ask that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 11, 1940, entitled "The American Forum: Are War Planes Stronger Than Battleships?", which forum was participated in by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and myself.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORUM: ARE WAR PLANES STRONGER THAN BATTLESHIPS?

THE QUESTION

(By Theodore Granik, director, the American Forum)

Cataclysmic events in the European war, including the speedy occupation of Norway by Nazi forces; the reported sinking of British battleships by Nazi planes; and the transportation of troops by airplane into Norway, Holland, and Belgium, have again centered attention on the relative strength of the airplane versus the battleship as a weapon in war.

Many believe that the traditional strategy of ruling the seas with a large surface navy will have to be revised, or even abandoned, as a result of new aerial techniques in waging war. Proponents of the airplane contend that a comparatively low-priced plane can disable a high-priced battleship. Supporters of the battleship maintain that methods of defense will be perfected against any airplane threats.

Two United States Senators, each an authority and a student of this question, here present their views, written exclusively for the American Forum.

THE DEBATERS

Any legislation bearing upon new methods of warfare must pass through one or both of two committees of the Senate. Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, is the ranking Democratic member of the Military Affairs Committee, while Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, also a Democrat, is chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Senator REYNOLDS is a lawyer, an automobile enthusiast, author of travel books. Senator WALSH is a former Governor of his State, a lawyer who has held public office since 1900.

YES! SAYS REYNOLDS

(By ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, United States Senator from North Carolina; ranking Democratic member of Military Affairs Committee)

On the floor of the Senate and in public and private utterances I have repeatedly declared that "the airplane is our first line of defense." That this statement is borne out by recent events in the cataclysm of war now involving Europe is apparent to any newspaper reader.

It is a known fact that the Germans did successfully shuttle whole regiments over the defending allied fleet and out of range of that fleet's guns to bring about occupation of Norway with a speed that has never been equaled. It is history that the airplane was the principal factor in the subjugation of Poland. It is also history that but for her superiority in the air great Russia might still be battling little Finland. And while German planes transported troops into Norway other planes of the pursuit and attack type stood by to machine-gun the slow-moving landing parties that moved from capital ships to smaller vessels for landing.

As this is written, German planes form the vanguard of an attack on Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg that may be the beginning of the great offensive of the present war.

Secretary of the Navy Edison says it will be necessary to make a number of changes in battleship design to afford better protection from bombing planes. This statement is significant in view of the one word, "changes." If any word can describe the effect of aviation on military and naval tactics, it is this word "changes."

NEW FORM OF WAR

Aviation has changed the whole concept of military and naval operations. It has turned vast theaters of war into tiny spaces. It has brought to the science of war a new and terrible striking power which can sweep over military objectives (and unfortunately over civilian targets as well) with unheard-of speed; which can strike and be gone almost before its bombs have struck the earth.

Here, then, is a new tool of war. Even to the uninitiated it must be apparent that it requires a new approach, a new conception of defense, if a defense is to be made. It is unfortunate that some men in high office still cling to the outmoded belief that basically war is still war, and that nothing has been changed.

One of our aviation leaders recently stated that "the only defense against air attack is a superior air force." Note that word "superior." Newspaper correspondents and military observers in Europe write continually about air superiority. All agree that the nation having superiority in the clouds will have a tremendous advantage. As a ranking officer in the Army recently said: "A second-best air force is like a second-best hand at poker—you simply can't win with it."

Recognizing this, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to listen to a group of "has beens," living in the past and schooled only in outmoded theories of warfare, and so fixed in their ideas that they are unwilling to recognize that there has been a great change in the military order of things? Or are we going ahead to build an air force second to none—an air force that will provide us with such strength that no country will dare attack us, knowing the striking power we hold in our military air fields?

PLEA FOR FINEST AIR FORCE

It is my recommendation—yes, my earnest plea—that we throw overboard our old conceptions, face reality, and recognize the fact that we must have the finest air force in the world. No other single measure can so well insure the fulfillment of the Nation's desire to keep war from coming to America.

In his recent statement, Secretary Edison said that the airplane has made inadvisable certain types of naval activity, particularly some types of action close to shore. What a blow this must have been to members of the old school—the Secretary admitting, and correctly, that planes can prevent successful maneuvers close to shore. This means landing operations, of course. The answer was written in Norway.

The first principle of all warfare is the advantage of the element of surprise. This means speed. Here the airplane comes into its own. Many of our planes today are approaching the 425-miles-per-hour mark and we must assume that other countries have made similar advances.

Can an airship sink a battleship? I don't care to discuss this old question because it isn't necessary to sink a battleship. All that is necessary is to disable it, a feat easily accomplished by damaging its sensitive controls.

If there is anyone who doubts that 10 or 15 bombers, carrying 2,000-pound bombs, could damage a battleship, I refer them to Secretary Edison's recent remarks in which he pointed out clearly the vulnerability of the complicated control system of a big ship to air attack. I would add just this question: What good is a battleship if you can't control it?

ECONOMY OF AIR POWER

I have pointed out, on the floor of the Senate and on the radio, the easily understood economy of air power. Simply stated, it means that you can build a large air force for the price of a single battleship. And when the air force has been built its very numbers provide protection against complete destruction.

To make this clear let me state that a single hit on the deck of a battleship might put this huge implement completely out of action, while a single hit on a group of 100 planes would leave the air force still 99 percent effective.

Let us not fail to realize that changes have come to modern warfare. Let us realize the need of meeting those changes with advanced methods of our own. This naturally does not mean that we should neglect the Navy. This gallant arm of the service still has its place in any calculations for defense of our country.

We simply must build a great and powerful air force to supplement our naval strength. It means, in the final analysis, that we must place emphasis where emphasis is due, and today that means in the air.

If any man doubt this, let him look for a moment at the progress of military operations in Europe.

I repeat, our need is for superiority in the air.

NO! SAYS WALSH

(By DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senator from Massachusetts; chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee)

Among the many questions that have arisen in current discussions of our national defense needs, and of our national defense program, in general, and our naval building program in particular, is one question of wide public interest with respect to which there appears to be considerable public misunderstanding.

This question is as to the comparative value, the importance, and the military effectiveness of battleships and aircraft. One form of this question is: "How vulnerable is the modern battleship to attack from the air?" Sometimes the question is put: "Does the offensive power of aircraft, of the latest and most powerful types, make the battleship obsolete?"

These questions have been accentuated by reason of reports from Europe of the damage inflicted upon the British naval vessels by German aircraft.

Let me say at the outset that the importance of aircraft in present-day warfare is universally recognized. No one will minimize the offense capabilities of combat planes and bombers. Everyone perceives the vital part that aircraft play as a defense mechanism in repelling attack.

Our program for expanding and strengthening our national defenses at every point and by every means gives full recognition to the prime importance of aircraft and its large place in military and naval establishments. No force ashore or afloat can afford, under any circumstances, to be without ample aircraft support. We are proceeding on that basis.

But there is not a particle of evidence to support the theory that aircraft alone can supply the primary defense needs of our country. Indeed, we can be very positive that such it not the case.

BATTLESHIPS NOT OBSOLETE

To the question whether, as an abstract proposition, aircraft, as matters now stand, have rendered battleships obsolete, the short answer is "No."

To the other form of the question, namely, as to the comparative value from our national defense standpoint of battleships and aircraft, the answer is that each complements the other and both are indispensable.

All new weapons of importance have had their effect on naval strategy, tactics, and on naval construction. In the case of aircraft, as in the case of weapons such as the torpedo, submarine, and high-powered gun, the threat of attack has been anticipated by the inclusion in naval vessels, from destroyer to battleship, of appropriate counterweapons and powers of resistance. Increased power and effectiveness of antiaircraft batteries, increased speed and maneuvering ability, increased thickness of deck armor, and greater compartmentation are all characteristics included to resist air attack.

In addition, naval air forces are employed, both offensively and defensively, to reduce the effectiveness of enemy aircraft. By these means, and by appropriate consideration of enemy air strength in the carrying out of strategic and tactical operations, aircraft attack is effective only to a degree compatible with the introduction of any additional and important weapon.

The latent effect of preponderant battleship strength is frequently overlooked by the lay mind, due to the absence of the drama of the frequent naval and air battles of lesser naval war craft. Whether actively engaged or not, battleship strength, around which are shaped the activities of lesser craft, is of preponderant effect in the control of sea lanes and areas.

CONTROLLING THE SEA

Aircraft alone, or battleships, or cruisers, or destroyers alone, are unable to control the sea. Together, in properly constituted forces, supported by suitable and properly located bases, they can. So long as other nations possess armed surface ships, a navy of adequate surface, subsurface, and air strength in suitable proportion is necessary.

Developments in the art of war and in the international situation will undoubtedly change the acceptable composition of the fleet and will cause modification in the characteristics of ships and aircraft, but there are no developments apparent which will render obsolete surface ships of existing types or the basic principles under which they are employed in the national defense.

In considering at this time the question of air power versus sea power, the following must be kept in mind:

(a) Our situation is entirely different from that of the British.

(b) Germany's air power from the very beginning of the war has been greatly superior to British air power.

(c) For a period of about 9 months British sea power has held a greatly superior air force in check, and without this sea power Britain today would probably be another Poland.

It is probably true that the British Navy has suffered severe losses in protecting shipping in and around the British Isles and in supporting the landing of troops in Norway. It must be realized that the British Navy is forced to operate under the worst possible conditions, as it is under the necessity of operating in restricted areas and is subjected at all times to the hazards of shore-based aircraft and small submarines.

OUR SITUATION DIFFERENT

Due to the limited range of aircraft, our self-sufficiency in food, and our geographical location, the United States is not confronted with a similar situation.

If we prevent the establishment of enemy air and submarine bases in this hemisphere, our Navy will not be subjected to the hazards of shore-based aircraft and small submarines. It will be subjected only to the hazards of surface ships, long-range submarines, and ship-based aircraft, an entirely different set of conditions.

Manifestly all naval powers have given serious consideration to the effectiveness and relative security (ability to remain effective) of naval ships against all threats contemplated under the conditions of their employment in war. It is significant that all are continuing their naval-building programs. The heavily gunned and heavily armored battleship, built to withstand the plunging fire of the heaviest armor-piercing projectiles, is least affected by air developments.

We live in a dynamic, not a static, world. Undoubtedly the facts will change. More powerful explosives may be developed, more efficient fuels may become available which will increase many times the effective radius of action of aircraft, submarines, and surface craft, or other more effective weapons of war may be invented.

If the basic facts change we must reorient ourselves to new situations, re-evaluate the facts, and readjust our military establishments to meet these new conditions.

National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the New York World's Fair on May 22, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure for me to participate in this annual celebration of National Maritime Day, particularly under the circumstances which make possible the conduct of these exercises here at the New York World's Fair. No one can be here today without sensing the beauty and the splendor of these surroundings. This is a notable occasion in a notable location.

I feel privileged to join in the distinguished company of those who are speaking to you today—men better equipped than I to discuss the progress and achievements of our vast maritime industry.

However, as a Member of Congress for over 20 years, and as a Member today of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, I feel that I have absorbed some of the real spirit that motivates the leaders of American maritime affairs.

I am, of course, more familiar with the advances made by the labor elements in this vast national enterprise. Sometimes, in the more recent years, criticism has been leveled at some segments of the maritime unions. Some of this criticism may have been justified, but I believe, on the whole, the cause of labor has advanced with moderation, with effectiveness, and with intelligence in this industry, just as it has in other stable enterprises of the Nation.

As we observe this famed annual celebration, and as we gather here today under the most pleasant of domestic conditions, there is not one of us here present who does not carry in his mind and in his heart a heaviness caused by the unfortunate events abroad.

The flames of Europe's most devastating war have spread within the last few weeks like the rapacious rush of a destructive forest fire.

Morality and decency and neighborliness have been ground under the heel of despotic, militaristic, aggressive demands. We shudder to contemplate that which the future may hold in store. But we know that our supreme desire is to hold fast to our system of government and to the blessings which we have inherited from a century and a half of struggle to make this Nation what it is today.

Therefore, only a Pollyanna would say that we are completely happy today. We are living under conditions of safety and sanity, but the instability of free government and of free people throughout the world will not permit us to ignore the apprehension that always accompanies the threat of the unknown and the unpredictable.

We want peace and security under our formula of self-government. To the American mind there can be no lasting peace or security under any antidemocratic system. In order to preserve for the generations to come the prerogatives which we enjoy, we know that we must be equipped to defend our liberty, our independence, and our way of life.

The great American merchant marine, the most vital adjunct to our national defense as well as the great bulwark of our trading power, becomes increasingly a major concern.

What I say today, therefore, is predicated on the importance and essentiality of a strong merchant marine for the United States.

We are indeed fortunate, during these perilous and emergency days to have functioning in Washington an ably staffed and intelligently administered United States Maritime Commission.

Under the very able and distinguished chairmanship of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, the United States Maritime Commission is discharging with singular success, and with expeditious administration, its responsibility of providing the United States with an adequate and well-balanced merchant fleet.

The provision of an adequate and well-balanced merchant fleet demands that full and complete treatment be given to the matters of foreign and domestic trade, and to the national defense. I would like to draw to your attention some of the activities of the Maritime Commission in carrying out its responsibilities which are so vitally important to the Nation.

Let me draw as clear and simple a picture as possible of the progress that is being made under the guidance of the Maritime Commission, so that we can all understand just what is being accomplished through Washington.

I shall endeavor to clarify these activities by breaking them down into 10 major items:

(1) The Maritime Commission, since its creation, has completed a very thorough survey of the entire American maritime industry. That survey was studied by Congress, and every detail was carefully investigated.

(2) As a result of the extensive and thorough survey made by the Maritime Commission, a minimum program was undertaken, which calls for the construction of 500 new ships within 10 years. This means that approximately 50 new ships will be added to the American merchant marine each year. This is a forward-looking program, and one which carries the support of all our people.

(3) At present the Maritime Commission is building its new ships in 15 yards located in 12 States of the Union. These yards are located on our east coast, on our west coast, and on the Gulf—they are not clustered in any one particular geographical location. The advisability of that, from a national-defense viewpoint, is quite obvious. Since the Commission began its program, it has let contracts for 152 ships, or more than 1,000,000 gross tons.

(4) This vast shipbuilding program is providing jobs for thousands of skilled and unskilled workmen; it is improving the merchant marine service by leaps and bounds; it is contributing to the national defense in unmistakable fashion; and it is adding to the prosperity of our farms, our mines, our factories, and our transportation systems. Shipbuilding spreads employment over a great many services, and is therefore a particularly helpful industry to the Nation's economy.

(5) Last year the Maritime Commission submitted a comprehensive report to Congress on coastwise and intercoastal shipping. As a result, legislation was developed and is now pending which is

designed to make available ships now in the Commission's laid-up fleet. The Maritime Commission, some 10 years ago, voluntarily surrendered control over these laid-up vessels at the request of the domestic operators. Today there is every indication that these ships, even though they are older vessels, should be made available. They ought to be put into good shape and they ought to be made available. The Commission is supporting legislation which would make this possible.

(6) When Congress approved the Neutrality Act last year, it was widely feared that the withdrawal of our ships from European commerce would endanger our merchant marine industry. It was even said that additional subsidies would have to be granted, otherwise this great and vital industry would not be able to withstand the economic shock. It is, therefore, a happy fact that the fears which many persons entertained last autumn have not materialized. Our neutrality policy withdrew over 100 ships from regular runs to Europe. As the war zone of Europe broadens, almost day by day, there is strong likelihood that even more American vessels may be withdrawn from trade in foreign waters. Nevertheless, the elimination, or at least the reduction, of our merchant-marine service to Europe has not crippled our maritime industry. Our merchant fleet has not been rendered idle. As a matter of fact, it is now busier than ever with new trade with Asia and, particularly, with South America. There have been no serious nor substantial lay-ups because of the Neutrality Act. In fact, our maritime industry is on the upward trend, and I am reliably informed that this upward trend is not all chargeable to the war. Much of it is new activity—new trade—that will, in all likelihood, remain ours.

(7) Splendid progress has been made over the past year in adding to passenger traffic on our merchant marine. More Americans are traveling on American ships. That is a wholesome trend, likewise.

(8) The Maritime Commission, in 1938, established a training program designed to afford to American merchant seamen an opportunity to improve their abilities. Nearly 5,000 licensed and unlicensed men are now enrolled in this course of training.

The program, as it is developing, is removing to a large extent some of the initial fears of the maritime unions. The wholesome intent of the Maritime Commission has evidenced itself and there is every reason to believe that these training programs will be broadened for we need more and more men efficiently trained in the merchant-marine service.

9. The activity of the Maritime Commission is stimulating patriotic interest in our merchant marine. There is now an ever-widening desire to make our merchant marine the best in the world. Our position is steadily improving, but we still have a substantially long road to travel. It is heartening, however, to realize that we are now definitely headed in the right direction.

10. The Maritime Commission is soliciting the cooperation of all elements essential to the development of an adequate national defense. Therefore, the present program of the Maritime Commission ought to be carried out with utmost speed and with a minimum of obstructive criticism. This is a time for unity, for nonpartisanship, and for coordination throughout the Nation.

In the 10 points which I have brought out I have covered in a very cursory manner the outstanding contributions which your Government, through the United States Maritime Commission, is making toward the development of a bigger and better American merchant marine.

The history of the merchant marine is a dramatic and interesting story. Like the occasion which inspired the establishment of National Maritime Day, there is adventure and romance and drama in the success story of the merchant marine.

There will be new legislation as developments at home and abroad demand it. We received some of those recommendations from the President last week, and they all had to do with providing for our security and our future happiness through adequate defense. If we must quarrel and bicker and criticize, let us by all means confine our protests so that they will not impede the present drive toward national defense. Our homes, our families, and our welfare are at stake.

I salute the merchant marine as a great American enterprise—one that is growing and improving day by day. Its strength, its prestige, and its effectiveness must be augmented and encouraged by our patriotic interest and support.

Peace and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT OF OHIO AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on Peace and Preparedness, delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at St. Louis, Mo., on May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is not a citizen of the United States who is not sick at heart when he reads the news from Europe. There is no one who is not deeply resentful at the attack made on courageous but helpless people by the German war machine. We see before our eyes a scene of death and destruction threatening to wipe out, in a few short months, the civilization which has been builded in Europe for thousands of years. We are stunned at the implications of modern war as it may affect ourselves.

The very seriousness of the crisis, however, should be an argument for a calm consideration of the situation as it now exists without preconceived prejudice or excitement or emotion. All of us are deeply concerned with one thing above all—the lasting welfare of our people and of the America we love so well. On May 12 the President said, "Surely it is time for our American Republics to spread the problem before us in the cold light of day, to analyze it, to ask questions, to demand answers, to use every knowledge, every science we possess, to apply common sense, and especially to act with unanimity and a singleness of purpose." In that spirit I wish to discuss the position of this country in the world today.

There are those who believe that there must be no criticism of the President in his conduct of foreign affairs; that we must achieve an outward appearance of unity at all costs. I am quite willing to agree that leadership in foreign affairs and their practical working out must rest with the President. But with regard to fundamental questions of foreign policy there is no reasonable argument against public debate. Of course, no man's position should be guided by selfish partisanship; but after all, selfish partisanship should not enter into the discussion, even of domestic policies. Certainly so long as we are not actually engaged in war, no question of foreign or domestic policy concerns the people of this country so much as the possibility of becoming involved in war. The Democratic process demands that the people have a voice in determining that policy. It is the duty, as well as the right, of every man in public life to state clearly his position on such a question, even if he differs with the President. On the other hand, it is equally his duty to state his agreement with the President, even if he differs with the other members of his party. In November, I voted for the repeal of the arms embargo, because I felt that that repeal would tend to keep us out of European war. It has accomplished that purpose. No American ships have been sunk—no American lives have been lost. For the same reason, namely, my desire that we remain at peace, I am somewhat doubtful today of the President's position.

We are not engaged in the present world war. But there are a number of vociferous writers who think we should be. Have they the support of the President of the United States? He has made no definite move toward war but he has made a number of disturbing statements which indicate that he might favor that position if the people would permit it. It is all the more advisable that the people consider soberly the reasons for and against our becoming involved in the war. The President has talked of quarantining the aggressor nations. He has talked of methods short of war which might easily lead to war. He implies that we cannot permit Europe to go totalitarian.

On May 14, the President approved a statement made regarding his position by his secretary, Stephen Early, in which Mr. Early said, "The feeling here is that if there is a four-alarm fire up the street and the wind is sweeping it in the direction of your home, the issue at once becomes the protection of your home. What you want to do is to put out the fire immediately and keep it from reaching your home." If this means anything, it means that we should undertake our defense in Europe. Why should the President dwell upon the possibility of a German attack on the United States by air, picturing German airplanes approaching by way of Africa and South America to drop bombs in St. Louis or Kansas City? Apparently it is to enforce the argument that we must not permit Germany to win the war, because we would be immediately subjected to an attack by air for which we are not prepared. Why otherwise stir up the emotions of the people when their feet ought to be firmly planted on the ground? It is certainly unnecessary as an argument for preparedness, for Congress is only too anxious to appropriate whatever is necessary for an adequate defense.

We have had presented to us repeatedly the reasons why our participation in the war is necessary in the cause of democracy or for defense. I believe we should first consider the reasons why we should not become involved in war.

Those reasons are obvious. Modern war has none of the glamour which we were taught to associate with war in our childhood. It is nothing but horror and suffering and mechanical destruction. It leaves the victor as exhausted as the vanquished, and a train of economic distress in its wake. It is said that we might participate in the war through the loan of money or the action of our Navy, without sending troops to Europe, and thus escape the worst features of the war. I do not believe it. If we abandon our position as a neutral which we have always maintained with respect to wars between nations, if we admit that our safety and defense are at stake in European war, then we cannot go halfway. If we are justified in spending billions for the Allies and supporting their navies, then it would be cowardice not to support them also with men.

There is plenty of death and permanent disability and suffering resulting from the World War, but it would be nothing compared to the loss of millions of Americans if we become involved in this war. No American parent desires to see his or her children sent to the trenches of Europe. It is said that we must participate in this war in order to defend democracy in the world. No one can sympathize more than I do with the success of democratic governments against dictatorships. No one desires more strongly than I the end of communism and nazi-ism. But I question whether war is the effective method of destroying them. Our experience in the World War did not indicate that we can interfere in European quarrels and work out any permanent or satisfactory solution. The World War did not save democracy. It resulted in the creation of the very dictatorships whose military forces threaten the world today. Nothing is so destructive of forms of government, particularly forms of democratic governments, as war.

Our going to war would be more likely to destroy American democracy than to destroy German dictatorship. The President already has wide powers in case of war—to take over the railroads and manufacturing plants, radios, and public utilities. Mr. Edison, Secretary of the Navy, demanded recently that additional arbitrary powers be granted at once. There are pending in Congress measures designed to have the Government take over all business and property, fix prices and wages, draft every workman and every clerk and every executive for civil duty as the Government may assign, and regulate every detail of private employment and commercial life. I have little doubt that the present Government will ask for and exercise these powers. In the World War the Government had exclusive powers, but actually accomplished results largely through the cooperation of industry. The so-called mobilization of wealth, however, carried out in a New Deal spirit, is likely to destroy forever the operation of private enterprise and local self-government in the United States. There is an indication even today that the cooperation of industry is not to be wholeheartedly sought in carrying out the preparedness program.

I believe we will do the cause of democracy much more good if we stay out of the war. There is only one way to spread democracy throughout the world; not by the sword, but by showing the peoples of the world that under democratic government they are more likely to have peace and happiness than under any other form. Efforts to change the governments of other people by force have not often succeeded. Democracy spread through the world in the nineteenth century from our example, and it will do so again.

The third argument for entering the war is that of Steve Early's conflagration, the argument that if Germany wins the war they will immediately attack the United States. Therefore, it is said, we should participate in this war purely as a defensive measure. The argument cannot be lightly dismissed, but I do not think it is sound today. I see no reason why the Germans, if we remain neutral, should attack the United States even if victorious. Their hands would be fully occupied with the problems of Europe. No dictator has ever dominated all of Europe for long. The markets of Europe and Asia would be open to them, and there seems no reason why they should pick out the strongest nation in the world, when we have nothing that they could not secure elsewhere.

Nor have they any reason to suppose that an attack would be successful. Our Navy is three times the size of the German and Italian Navies combined. The ocean barrier is still tremendously effective. The Germans have felt the necessity of violating Holland and Belgium to get within 100 miles of England because apparently even 500 miles is too far for an effective attack by air. The fact that airplanes can fly the Atlantic in a few hours does not indicate for a moment that armies can be moved across an ocean commanded by a predominant navy. I doubt if any competent expert would consider even the possibility of a successful German attack on the United States at the present time.

It is said that our foreign trade would be destroyed. I don't understand why, if peace is once restored, we could not trade as well with Germany as with England. A supposed hostility to Japan, a totalitarian nation, does not prevent Japan being one of our best customers.

Then we hear of our being conquered by a wave of totalitarian ideas which we will be too lacking in intellect to resist. We are to be a kind of Caspar Milquetoast among nations, ashamed to hold the banner of democracy aloft because it is not fashionable to do so. There is a good deal more danger of the infiltration of totalitarian ideas from the New Deal circle in Washington, than there will ever be from any activities of the Communists or the Nazi Bund.

I cannot see that a German victory, regrettable as it may be, would leave the United States defenseless against aggression.

If we are considering the proper means of defending the United States there seems to be little doubt that our line of defense is the Atlantic Ocean, and not the battlefields of France.

Furthermore, the argument that we should defend ourselves by participating in the European war overlooks the difficulty of conducting any such defense. We have no army to send to Europe, we have no airplanes of our own in any material quantity, and those that we have we need at home. Two-thirds of our production is already going to Europe. The Allies have sufficient gold and credits to pay for their purchases for many months to come. The weakening of their control of the seas does not seem to be the result of any lack of warships, but rather of German superiority in the air. We cannot defend ourselves in Europe today.

On the other hand, we cannot minimize the seriousness of the situation produced by a German victory. While I do not think that there would be a German attack on the United States, nevertheless it is a possibility in the future which we cannot ignore, particularly in the case of a German, Italian, and Japanese alliance. We must not be taken unprepared as were the British. If Germany should win, we would have to consider defense in the light of defending the entire continent of North America, the Caribbean Sea, and, at the very least, the northern part of South America. This would require a substantial change of our entire foreign policy, particularly in that section of the world. It would require the expenditure annually of a much greater sum for armament than we have heretofore spent and a much heavier burden of taxation. We would find ourselves in a world where ruthless force had been triumphant over every principle of justice and where the possibility of its continued triumph would be always before the peoples of the world.

Yet even that alternative seems to be preferable to present participation in the European war. The possibility of having to spend two billions a year more than we have been spending is better than spending thirty billions a year for armament while we engage in the present war. We are in a very vulnerable financial situation. We began the last war owing nothing and with a balanced budget. If we entered the war today we would start owing $45,000,000,000 and with an annual deficit of $4,000,000,000 merely for peacetime expenditures.

How foolish and dangerous does the New Deal spending policy look at the present moment! Sound finances are an essential part of national defense. We cannot risk an economic break-down in the midst of war. We have spent billions for boondoggling, public works, and subsidies which now we need for defense. It was the Roman Emperor Augustus, who, when he was beset by enemies, cried aloud, "Varus, Varus, give me back my legions." We may well cry now, when our need is so great, "Franklin, Franklin, give us back our billions."

A world in which force rules is not one we look forward to with equanimity. But I believe that a wise foreign policy with adequate defense would enable us to avoid war even under those conditions. While it is not a pleasant alternative I believe it is better than to plunge blindly into the war today, with death and suffering for our young men, with suspension of our domestic liberties, with financial bankruptcy and with complete futility. I don't believe we can lay down any unchangeable principles for our foreign policy. Conditions change too rapidly in the world today and foreign policy is a practical question which must be adjusted to meet new conditions as they arise, but I do not believe there will be any such change in conditions, at any rate before November. Let's stop playing with the idea that we may enter the war and devote ourselves to a genuine program of defense.

For there can be no argument against a sound program of adequate preparedness.

We have been appropriating tremendous sums for the Army and Navy—more than we have ever appropriated before in time of peace—and yet there are ugly rumors of complete inadequacy. Our Navy is efficient but apparently our naval-construction program has gone forward very slowly, indeed, compared to that of the Japanese. A year ago we authorized 6,000 additional airplanes for the Army. The actual deliveries on this program have not exceeded 350. The largest number of military and naval planes delivered in any 1 month including those for our Army and Navy and foreign exports has not exceeded 337, and deliveries in February and March 1940 were less than those in December 1939 and January 1940.

The Secretary of War states that if additional large-scale orders for types of airplanes now in production are placed immediately it is estimated that the major companies would attain a potential capacity of 1,200 military airplanes per month by the end of 1940. This would still be very much less than the German capacity. Our supply of antiairplane guns appears negligible; the mechanization of our Army units extremely limited. It is certainly fair to ask the administration where the money has gone which has been so liberally appropriated during the past several years. Why has it not been devoted to those things which all the expert opinion considers to be necessary? Was our Government as ignorant of what the Germans were developing as the British were?

It seems to me absolutely essential that a joint committee of Congress make an immediate and thorough study of the entire problem. After consultation with Army leaders, Navy leaders, and business executives, they should submit a plan of defense which will command the support of every party and class of the population.

We face a political campaign in November. I hope there will be no great issue between the parties on the subject of foreign policy, but neither do I see the slightest reason why the present situation in Europe and our own inadequacy in defense should be used as an argument for the reelection of President Roosevelt or the continuation of the New Deal in domestic affairs. The Republicans are accused of partisanship when they criticize the foreign policy of the President. If there could be any course more selfishly partisan than that which seeks to use a great world crisis to boost a third term, I don't know what it could be.

There is certainly nothing to indicate, from our experience in recent years, that the present administration has any peculiar ability to provide an effective Army or Navy for defense or to keep up with modern developments in aviation. Even the program presented recently by the President seems to have been hastily

thrown together, and includes requests for blank-check appropriations, the purpose of which is still uncertain.

Secondly, in the important field of finances, the President has shown his complete incompetence and lack of interest. He said recently that it was minor detail how Congress financed the new national-defense program, that he was not much interested in how the money was raised, but only in the power to spend it. If we become involved in war, there is no more important question to determine than whether we should finance by additional taxation, by increasing the public debt, or by a combination of both. On the proper determination of that question may depend the whole success of a possible war. The present administration has shown its complete incapacity in that field.

Thirdly, the administration still permits its prejudice against business to hamper the development of defense. Only this week the leader of the Senate called up the La Follette civil-liberties bill and insisted on presenting it to the Senate, over the adverse reports of the Army and Navy. These reports assert that its drastic provisions will hamper the production of Army and Navy equipment, which is already slowed up by the regulations of various New Deal bureaus. The La Follette bill incidentally prohibits any employer from making any inquiry whatsoever, or employing others to make inquiries, regarding the union or party affiliation of those who apply for work. An employer cannot protect himself against the infiltration of Communists into his plant. It is a Trojan horse under which Communist and Nazi "fifth columns" may establish themselves in our most essential industrial plants. How secret would our military and naval secrets be in wartime under such a law?

The rights of workmen can be adequately protected without binding the manufacturers hand and foot with red tape. Even today, with all the additional war work, the administration is increasing its demands for relief and proposes to spend a billion dollars on W. P. A. in 8 months of an election year instead of in 12 as originally contemplated. No administration which subordinates preparedness to domestic politics is entitled to ask for a third term under present conditions.

And, finally, the forcing of the third-term issue will destroy that very unity in whose name the third term is proposed. The people will deeply resent any effort in peacetime to set aside the constitutional safeguards which are necessary if we wish to retain a democracy in this country. The tradition against a third term has become as much a part of our Constitution as it could be without being written into that Constitution. It is based on the same reasons as the other limitations of the Constitution, the belief that concentrated power threatens the very existence of democracy. The reason for the tradition is even stronger in time of war for the powers which may be concentrated then in the hands of one man are infinitely greater. Nothing would contribute more to an effective and unified defense policy than a declaration by the President that he does not propose to accept a third term or permit his friends to use the present crisis as an argument for a third term.

If a joint committee of Congress is selected and makes a report to which all agree, it will do much to remove the whole preparedness issue from the national election. Then the campaign can be fought out on the domestic policies of the two parties and their competency to handle the administration of foreign affairs.

We can achieve unity in foreign affairs without abandoning our determination to retain in this country that form of American democracy and American enterprise which in 150 years has made this country the greatest and the most powerful and, yes, even today, the most peaceful and prosperous country in the world.

Spawn of the Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an impressive editorial entitled "Spawn of the Trojan Horse," written by Ben Hur Lampman, and published in the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of May 18, 1940]

SPAWN OF THE TROJAN HORSE

We do not need the warnings of MARTIN DIES and others to remind us that the Trojan horse already has emptied its capacious interior in free America; that the "fifth column" is here, and has been here for some while. Or do we? The besetting weakness of Americans is a sort of self-sufficiency that amounts to complacency. Let the crackpots rave and rant from their soapboxes—nothing untoward can happen to the land of the free and the home of the brave. "When Freedom from her mountain-height"—and all that sort of thing. Enduring. Imperishable. Tolerant and even contemptuous of the envious and malevolent forces. Serene. So was Norway serene.

The "fifth column," the termites, the cargo of the Trojan horse, the apparently innocuous individuals who withhold dispraise of totalitarian methods, the adroit apologists with an accent, or with no accent whatsoever—for some of them are graduates of our universities—these are here. But it were folly to suppose that they are soapboxers, obvious firebrands, definite and open inciters of treason and revolt. These have craftiness and have counsel; they have direction and foreign command. You won't catch one of them on a soapbox. These people profess an admiration for and loyalty to the United States of America. There are few of them who wear semimilitary shirts. The calling they follow has for its first instruction the injunction, above all, not to be obvious.

We need not wait for their arrival, for their infiltration, for they already are here. Not only are they here, but when they have been suspected some of us have invoked the guaranties of the Constitution, as well as the conscience of our own traditional liberalism, to give them aid if not comfort; to shelter them in the folds of that flag they have designed to pull down. This is true. There is at least one conspicuous instance. Its title character, said to be strongly persuaded that American institutions must fall, and be succeeded by an alien and hateful ideology, passed through the form of a trial to a species of vindication. In yet another instance we have placed a foreign-born enemy of the Republic in prison only on the subterfuge, though warranted by the circumstance, of misappropriation of funds. We have condoned and dissembled. The ostrich of fable with its fatuous head in the sands of delusion.

Perhaps the F. B. I. knows how many of them are among us, working and waiting, eager for the word that will permit them to cast aside their flimsy disguises; eager to tell the invader where to land his troops and deposit his bombs; eager to strike down by betrayal the country that gave them the generous shelter of its liberties. Are they so base as this? The answer is that they are without scruple, and that the subversive calling to which they are committed, and to which they were congenitally inclined, practices treachery as a paramount virtue. They are the "fifth column." The dry-rot. The termites. They are the masked enemy within.

As for their baseness, it should be remembered—the betrayal is so recent—how the young Nazis whose boyhoods were passed in Norway, as the otherwise homeless and friendless children of German defeat in the earlier World War, were first to reenter the land of their affectionate foster parents, and by an intimate and presumably beloved knowledge of the land and the language enable the stratagem of assault which left their benefactors stretched in death or dazed in strange and sudden slavery. In the Scandinavian countries the status of foster father is immemorially and peculiarly intimate and well-nigh sacred. The returning foundlings of the Nazi "fifth column" did not scruple to profane it. Would the leopard change its spots out of exceptional consideration for America, the land that has ever been sanctuary to the friendless and oppressed? We may judge the smuggled cohorts of the Trojan horse, the "fifth column," only by their performance elsewhere. They have a purpose in America. And the "fifth column" is here.

It has been reasonably suggested, and here the tentative explanation is offered for no more than appears, that the mysterious paralysis of the Belgian garrison of Eben Emael, stormed and taken by Hitler's troops with a minimum of resistance, was in simple fact attributable not to some secret mechanical or chemical device, but to the corruptive presence of the "fifth column" within the fortress. Whether this is true, or is not, the indisputable evidence remains that the comparatively easy conquest elsewhere of enemy territories and citadels by Nazi troops can be and is explained in part by the existence of traitorous elements, schooled to their function, previously established within the lines of defense.

There is much talk of arming against the possibility of an Allied defeat—which scarcely would be less than ominous to us—on the ancient battlefields of Europe, where the dead men of the last great war have not yet returned to the elements. A formidable and impregnable democracy of the western world, as a torch that burns strongly and will not be quenched. A beacon for the reassembling of the scattered and consecrate forces of mankind's will to be decent and free. And this talk must be solidified into action, it must be productive of effective attainment—but not through neglect of immediate obligations essential to national security, essential to victory if need arises, essential to life as we Americans know it.

The Oregonian is not an alarmist; it suggests no national furor of spy plots, no panic of eleventh-hour trepidation. But it has heard from foreign parts, as you have; it has conveyed testimony. And it has but this counsel to offer, nor need it cite the example of failure: This is the time when the Trojan horse must be captured and curbed; this is the time that never will come for the purpose again. Smash the "fifth column" now.

Blue Ridge Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY LOUIS AZRAEL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have here an article which was clipped from one of the Baltimore newspapers in reference to the Blue Ridge Parkway, which, incidentally, leads into my State of North Carolina through Virginia to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, in which the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I have been interested for a number of years. This article is a very vivid description of the beauty of the parkway leading southward to one of the loveliest sections in all the world. I ask that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BALTIMOREAN'S PART IN A GREAT PROJECT

(By Louis Azrael)

To those who are interested in America, in touring to see this Nation's scenic beauties, one of the greatest improvements of recent years, undoubtedly, is the Blue Ridge Parkway, which already stretches more than 300 miles through Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, between the Shenandoah National Park and the Smoky Mountain National Park.

Part of these 300 miles are not yet finished, though they are useable. And almost 200 more miles are yet to be constructed.

Already $15,000,000 have been spent on the project; an equal amount is still to be spent.

Although important parts of the road were not opened until last summer, 300,000 people have already used it.

This summer, it is believed, more than half a million will take the lovely drive along the Blue Ridge mountaintops, through masses of azalea and laurel and rhododendron, past scattered farms with their early, picturesque buildings of hewn timber with hand-split "shake" roofs, through valleys where streams run clear and cool in the shade of the pine and the hemlock.

Accustomed as we are to driving along roads lined with billboards, "hot dog" stands, ugly gasoline stands, the Blue Ridge Parkway drive will be a new, refreshing experience.

They will find the roads edged with wide expanses of grass and trees. They will find no signs or stands to mar the placid beauty of the scenery.

They will find, at intervals, semicircular aprons at high places where they can park their cars and observe the view without obstructing traffic.

They will find places set aside for picknickers, trails for hikers, places for camping.

I write about this magnificent roadway not only to let you know about it—if you don't already know.

It is well worth knowing about. Last year I traveled on part of this highway—the less beautiful part, I am told.

And I have seen no roads in the western part of the Nation; nothing in the Rockies or the Sierras to surpass it.

Nor did I find more beauty when I traveled on the mountainous roads in Norway—roads which then told a story of peace and contentment and placidity and which now creak beneath the weight of German tanks.

I write this only to tell you that there is a place, only a short distance from your home, where you can tour in surroundings as beautiful as those which are found abroad.

I write it also to give public credit to a Baltimorean.

I have just received from the Public Works Administration—which has charge of the entire project—a brief history of the work.

It gives the following story of the parkway's origin:

"During September 1933 a meeting of the League of Virginia Municipalities was held in Richmond, in the Assembly Chamber of the Capitol Building.

"After the meeting, at a luncheon in the Executive Mansion attended by George L. Radcliffe, regional advisor of the P. W. A. District, Executive Officer Maj. Philip B. Fleming, Mr. Theodore E. Straus of the Public Works Administration, Gov. John Garland Pollard, United States Senator Harry Flood Byrd, State Engineer J. A. Anderson, and others, the possibility of such a parkway was proposed by Mr. Straus, and received the approval of Governor Pollard, who immediately appointed a committee, requesting Senator Byrd to act as its chairman."

Mr. Straus, a Baltimorean, was formerly a member of the city school board.

When GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, who had not yet been elected to the Senate, was named regional director of the P. W. A. activities, he appointed Mr. Straus as his assistant.

In this capacity, Straus not only made the suggestion which started the Blue Ridge Parkway movement he also participated—and is still participating—in carrying the project to fulfillment.

Executive Department Cable-Desk Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY BOAKE CARTER

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when Boake Carter was best known as a radio commentator with definite ideas which he expressed most forcefully. Months have elapsed since you have heard him regularly over the air, and his admirers are now forced to content themselves in reading his comments. These comments are widely read, and especially do citizens digest his words concerning Europe. They ponder his words because of his intimate knowledge of Europe, including the British Isles, the land of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I insert at this point Boake Carter's article, Cable-Desk Diplomacy, which was specifically called to my attention by a mother of my district intent on seeing to it that policies are changed at our Nation's Capital. She insists that we stay out of war, and that we keep war out of this country. I hope you will read Cable-Desk Diplomacy.

[From the Daily Mirror]

CABLE DESK DIPLOMACY

(By Boake Carter)

WHITE PAPER

I have just finished reading American White Paper, by those two alert youngsters, Alsop and Kintner.

It is short. It is easy to read. It should be read by every American citizen.

There have been other newspaper spokesmen from time to time, but nearly all have had their knuckles rapped by the White House.

Not so in this case. Hence it must be assumed that the American White Paper is, as far as it goes, an authentic document on existing American policy.

The chief aim of Mr. Roosevelt, Alsop and Kintner make clear, is neither neutrality nor keeping America out of war.

The Roosevelt policy, instead, is to help the Allies win the war with every means short of dispatching American troops abroad.

Anybody with a grain of common sense can understand the absurdity—and recklessness—of playing at partial participation in war. It is just as absurd to assume that if the Allies found all our other forms of assistance not enough, that we wouldn't send our own doughboys abroad again.

PEOPLE'S FAULT

Thus American White Paper reveals most clearly that there may, indeed, be no limits to Mr. Roosevelt's determination to see an allied victory—even to send a United States army abroad.

If most Americans don't realize this, 96 percent of whom are opposed to going to war with Germany (Gallup polls), it is because Mr. Roosevelt has avoided telling the people.

The authors declare Mr. Roosevelt to have been evasive. But they blame the people for that condition, ironically enough.

The President's special message calling for the lifting of the arms embargo they dismiss as "the least meaningful of all documents of the time what everyone knew to be the real reason for repeal * * * was not directly mentioned."

Whom do the authors mean by "everyone"? Presumably the President's immediate circle of intimates, and no more. If all the Nation knew—meaning everyone—then there would have been no need for deception.

CABLE COUNCIL

Back of this deception there is a new, unique theory of government. The authors say there are those who read the cables coming to the State Department and those who don't.

Those who read the cables, apparently, are the President, the Secretary of State, and half a dozen other men. These are the individuals who really know what's going on. No one else in the country fully does know.

Therefore, assume the authors, no one else in the Nation is qualified to lay down America's foreign policy—except this little handful of "cable readers." The balance of the Nation is too ignorant.

With dope supplied by cable and telephone by Messrs. Bullitt, Kennedy, Biddle, Cudahy, et al., advised by Hull, Welles, and Berle, it is Roosevelt who is making American foreign policy, not the people of the United States, though they suffer and pay the bill.

That is the grim danger to American neutrality. The menace lies not abroad, but, as clearly shown in American White Paper, lies within the White House.

"Fifth Columns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following thought-provoking article by Frank C. Waldrop. A new system of industrial sabotage is apparent and merits immediate investigation by responsible Federal authorities:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, May 20, 1940]

A HIDING PLACE FOR THE "FIFTH COLUMN"—NAZIS USE OUR PATENT SYSTEM TO SABOTAGE US

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Where is the Nazi "fifth column" hiding in America? It must be here, for Hitler has improved on all the Kaiser's devices for trouble, and the Kaiser had a very effective "fifth column" here as everybody knows who can recall Franz von Papen, Captain Boy-ed, and the Black Tom explosions.

Undoubtedly, the G-men, handicapped as they are by the recent orders not to tap telephones regardless of circumstances, are having a hard time keeping track of foreign agents who do not have to worry about scruples of the law. And, undoubtedly, something will have to be done very soon to correct that handicap if our Government has any hope at all of defending itself against sabotage and spying.

But in the meantime there is one place where the G-men and all the rest of the Government can be looking with full legal authority and with absolute certainty that it will find important evidence of Nazi assaults upon our defense.

The place where Hitler's "fifth column" is committing sabotage upon the United States every day is in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce. The Nazis are using American patents as effectively in the United States of America as they have been using bombs in France. And legally.

They actually use American law to block off and harass American rearmament, and the Congress which has the power to prevent such things by a simple patent-law amendment forbidding anybody to withhold patents from license applicants sits idly by. If the Germans were using bombs here the governmental action would be terrific to behold.

But because there is no noise and no blood visible in a patent restraint—that is not until the consequences are registered on the field of battle—Congress looks elsewhere for its laurels as a protector of the people.

Here is how the "fifth columnists" work in our patent system:

They take out patents for industrial processes in the name of captive American firms and then refuse to let American manufacturers use those patents to make American goods. This is a form of industrial sabotage permitted in no other country in the world. In Germany if an American attempted to block off a method of making steel by taking out a patent and then refusing to allow the patent to be used by Germans, he would simply be laughed at. In England and France there is positive law against such things.

But, in contrast, the Germans, the Japanese, and the Russians have for years been stealing American patent processes and using them as their own at home without paying royalties or otherwise acknowledging the source of the idea which made their machines go. At the same time they have all used our wide-open patent law to prevent us from parallelling any of their ideas.

The operations of the Nazi "fifth column" in our Patent Office are of long standing.

On May 20, 1921, the Army Intelligence Service, G–2, reported to the Secretary of War that the Germans were rearming in violation of the peace treaty. This was discovered by a check-over of patents taken out here in the one year of 1920.

German citizens were found to have assigned some 228 patents registered in 1920.

It was found that 228 American patents held by German citizens in 1920 had been assigned to the Frederick Krupp Co., which had armed the Kaiser's army and has since armed Hitler's. These related to artillery-fire-control devices, naval gun controls, fuses, projectiles, and "a considerable number relate to airplanes and their accessories, chemicals, dyes, radio apparatus, and naval equipment."

The Krupp Co. was followed up by Siemens-Halske, the huge chemical and general industrial cartel, which took out patents on countless industrial devices and methods which have since been proved as useful in war as in peace.

How many of these German-owned patents are working in the interests of the United States, by comparison with the number which are working against us because we are forbidden to exercise the knowledge they encompass? Nobody really knows.

Only recently has anyone begun to care. Preliminary surveys have disclosed some startling facts. It is time we got busy.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9232, a bill authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to deal with patented and secret inventions affecting our national defenses, would go a long way toward removing the objectionable features of our present patent system. This proposed legislation was introduced by me on April 4, 1940, and I trust that it will receive the proper consideration before Congress adjourns.

Points to Failures of Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER FROM J. H. BILBREY

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, amid the hysteria of war and our own preparedness program, there are persons who shout loudly that ours is the duty to make democracy work at home and preserve democracy in Europe.

It has been said that a purely democratic form of government is subject to the passions and emotions of the multitude and frequently resorts to mob rule. Communists boast of being democratic and favoring a democracy instead of a republic for the United States. Thank God we are a republic and that there are men in this Republic who will not be stampeded into mob rule by any of the dramatic incidents of the last few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and encouraging that amid all this excitement and passion, a voice has spoken to warn our people of the impending dangers, first of pressure groups and secondly from the indifference of our own people. I commend, sir, the reading of a letter published yesterday in the Washington Star from the pen of J. H. Bilbrey, a member of the bar and a distinguished American.

The letter follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 21, 1940]

POINTS TO FAILURES OF OUR DEMOCRACY—ACTIVITY OF PRESSURE GROUPS HELD MENACE TO ANY REPUBLIC

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

During nearly a decade the public ear has been assailed with the phrase "make democracy work." Under the guise of these inoffensive words many things have been done. An encyclopedia of new statutes has been enacted. Our revamped judiciary has given new construction to our old laws. A whole alphabet of boards, commissions, and bureaus has been created. Treasure almost beyond imagination, upward of $60,000,000,000 has been spent for relief, subsidies, salaries, pensions, and hand-outs. All

of these things, so it was said, were done to make democracy work.

At this critical time is it not fitting that we seriously and honestly search our souls and inquire whether any of these things or all of them together, have made any substantial contribution toward making democracy work! If they have, the price, although high, is not prohibitive.

Unless history and reason lie, the primary purpose of government is to provide, as a minimum, security in person and property. Security of worship, of thought, and of expression are but refinements and extensions of the primary security. Always important, these latter rights, recently spoken of as civil liberties, have received a plethora of attention and publicity. It might be truly said that the public is civil liberty conscious. This is not an unhappy circumstance, unless our attention has been distracted from the foundation of all of our rights, security of person and property; for what shall it profit us to attain a full measure of civil liberty at the expense of national unity and national security?

The Frenchman could give us some excellent advice on this subject. It was he who invented the sit-down strike, and, of all places, in the aviation industry. It was the Frenchman who invented the week with two Sundays and the vacation with pay. The Norwegian could also give us some advice on national unity and security. Liberality and collective effort were their shibboleths. In fact, their liberality was so genuine that its legislative body until 1935 was a member of the Third International. Its liberality filled its country with spies and saboteurs, destroyed the unity of its people. and invited national calamity and disgrace from which it will never recover.

But what of our national unity and security? Is democracy working in this respect? Although threatened on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, little of the $60,000,000,000 has been spent to strengthen our Navy, our first line of defense. Our Army, with one mechanized division, is literally contemptible when compared with the world of today. We have not enough antiaircraft guns adequately to defend the city of Washington. Although charged with the defense of the Panama Canal our air force in planes and personnel is not sufficient for this one mission, not to mention our unprotected Atlantic and Pacific Coasts and other strategic points. Plants for production of fighting planes are gradually being built up, thanks to foreign purchases and not our own foresight. The Government has taxed and taxed, and spent and spent to make democracy work, but we have no Army or air force and but an inadequate Navy.

Among the numerous new enactments to make democracy work, one was designed to provide "social security." Under this enactment vast sums have been collected, but only a small moiety remains in the Treasury for the purpose for which it was collected. If our economy is adversely affected by our national weakness, our social security cannot be very secure.

While under the sway of foreign agents the Frenchman invented the sit-down strike, the week with two Sundays, and vacation with pay to make democracy work; we provided pay for work not done and a bounty to farmers for not producing, all for the purpose of creating prosperity through scarcity. Notwithstanding the use of public funds to organize and protect the workingman, an army of racketeers, padrones, and others of such ilk gained lucre and high place. With all of our statutes, all of our good will, and all of our liberalism, the crackpot, the inept, the visionary, the left winger, and the agents of foreign governments clog and distract the functioning of the Government service and of the many laws passed to make democracy work.

In spite of all our liberal laws and liberal interpretations by a truculent judiciary, and the never-ending stream of treasure poured out by a liberal hand, there came into being a class of organized mendicants and class unrest, with constant warfare between capital and labor, resulting often in the destruction of private property. To make democracy work only those able to pay were taxed. Unhappily, these taxes were regarded by those paying them as confiscatory, rendering insecure all manner of property, from the widow's mite to the millionaire's yacht, and driving capital from industry. To make democracy work sharp distinctions were drawn between human rights and property rights, between corporate property and individual property. All too many persons refused to acquiesce in these subtle distinctions and have bitterly maintained that human rights and property rights are inseparable, and that the widow's mite is oft invested in corporate enterprise; that laws come with property and leave with it.

Besides the "fifth column" of foreign and domestic origin, whose entry into strategic positions has been so rapid, we have with us an organized host whose primary idea is to get something for nothing; to live on the fruits of the labor and thrift of others; and the iron in whose blood has been distilled away, leaving a softer but much less useful substance.

Considering our potentiality as a going concern, the new laws and the staggering sums laid out in that behalf, it cannot be said that democracy has not had a chance to work. The plain evidence is that if it has worked, it has worked poorly or in reverse.

That democracy will not work is a fact as old and as large as civilization itself. It should be the common knowledge of every grade pupil that an attempt to make democracy work is an attempt to change our republican form of government and revert to a form of government which is bound to destroy itself.

Much of our confusion of thought and lack of national unity arises from the belief, all too general, that our Constitution set up a democracy providing for direct action through organized pressure group, impulse, and emotion. Actually our form of government was carefully designed to prevent this sort of thing.

J. H. BILBREY.

MAY 15.

Lessons From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Louis Johnson, The Assistant Secretary of War, at the annual meeting of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, at New York City on May 23, 1940:

Members of the National Board of Fire Underwriters: Fires always must have had a real fascination for you. As small boys, the clanging bells and the rumbling wheels probably brought most of you in mad pursuit. Many a time, every one of you must have stood spellbound on the curbstone watching nimble-footed firemen running up and down the ladders. Often the more romantic or imaginative among you must have seen yourselves climbing to the third-story window of your home town's most magnificent residence, there to rescue your best girl or her pet cat or even a poor stray pup. The more realistic among you, however, knew that you had neither the temperament nor the training to be firemen and merely stood by enchanted by the destruction itself.

As you grew older and became interested in underwriting, the fire alarm undoubtedly continued to beckon you, but when you responded, it must have been with a feeling that the needless waste and destruction must be checked. You learned that fires can be stopped, or, even better, can be prevented, but you also realized that rushing headlong into the flames is not necessarily the best way to save your home, or your property, or even to put out your neighbor's fire.

Tonight, I want to talk to you about a great fire, the worst conflagration of modern times. Europe and Asia are ablaze. Some of us, like helpless children, feel that we can do nothing but stand idly by, spellbound by the awful destruction. We seem to be fascinated by the interplay of forces in the Baltic and in the Balkans, in the Near East, and in the Far East, and on the Maginot lines of various depths and proportions. Perhaps, in the nature of grandstand quarterbacks, we try to figure out where the next surprise play in the deadly game of war will be pulled, but appear to have nothing constructive to offer.

Others of us, romanticists at heart, think that we should jump in and fight the flames that have entrapped civilization. To such people it does little good to explain that our efforts may leave us with burned hands and nothing more.

Realists among us recognize grave dangers, both in standing idly by and in rushing madly in. Neither method will save us or our property or our civilization. There is a third way and a more certain way to save ourselves and the Western Hemisphere from war. It is in a strong and united America—so strong on land, on sea, and in the air that no marauding nation will dare risk battle with us and so united in spirit and in good will that no international buccaneers will undermine our institutions or loot our possessions.

Nations that have tried in other ways to save themselves from the holocaust utterly have failed. We should profit by their experience. We can learn from their misfortunes. Let us see, therefore, what lessons we can derive for our guidance from the recent campaigns in Europe.

First comes the lesson that the will to peace, unsupported by adequate national defense, is a certain way to invite war. Holland wanted peace. Belgium wanted peace. Denmark wanted peace. Every one of the small states that now writhes under the crushing heel of a ruthless invader wanted peace. So bent were they on peace that one of them deliberately disarmed. They put their faith in professed friendships only to become vassals of the very state that had promised to protect their sovereignty and their independence. Yesterday, these peaceful, so-called little, nations of Europe slept secure in their isolation. Today, many of them, too many of them, have awakened to find themselves in bondage.

No; the will to peace alone is not sufficient to protect a nation in the world of today; and it makes no difference whether that nation

is little Denmark or big America. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are on a rampage. Those in the saddle are determined to gobble up what others have, and, to gain their ends, they will be governed by no accepted or well-established code of international morality. They bide their time. They attack when the prospect for victory is brightest, without regard to any principle that may be involved.

What has happened in Manchukuo, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Holland, and Belgium can happen to others. It may happen to us; not today, no; and maybe not tomorrow, but when nations live by the sword their moments of peace with other peoples may prove to be but armistices of convenience or interludes between aggressive acts. Given reasonable prospects of success, they will rip off all masks of pretense and show themselves in their true light.

That is the kind of a world we live in today in 1940. It is not the world of yesterday in which reason had its innings, and we hope it will not be the world of tomorrow; but today force is dominant and we dare not ignore the realities of the situation. We must not be apathetic to what is going on across the seas. An apathetic America is a doomed America. It finds its chief expression in the extreme isolationist who calls out, "Who would dare attack us? We still have the oceans as great barriers. Whom do we fear? The warring nations have all they can do in the present theaters of operation without taking us on in addition."

These arguments are specious. In the first place, the Atlantic Ocean never has been an insurmountable barrier. It has been jumped before. In 1812 the British landed troops along the Chesapeake and marched on to Washington because our Navy was too small. In 1864 the French dropped anchor in Mexican waters and set up a puppet state in the capital because we were too busy fighting elsewhere.

What has been done before can be done again. If our Navy is not big enough and strong enough, hostile troops again may land on the shores of the Western Hemisphere. If our fleet becomes involved in one ocean, we may find ourselves without the ships and the men to thwart attack in the other.

Besides, we have a new weapon with the sky as its limit. With what has taken place in the Low Countries, and in Scandinavia, and in their adjacent waters, who would be so bold as to say that our ships at sea and in our territorial waters are immune to air attack? The bomber is in its infancy. Who knows its full potentialities?

To be sure, the ocean has not yet shrunk to the width of a river. Its crossing is still a military hazard. It is still a barrier, but it never was completely formidable, and is even less so, now that the modern bomber has entered upon the military scene.

In the second place, we must realize that the present war already has jumped the Atlantic Ocean. Greenland is America. Denmark, its erstwhile owner, has lost her sovereignty. The Dutch West Indies are in the Western Hemisphere. Holland, their owner, is fighting for her life. In the past, we have been very careful to preserve the tone of our zoned district. We forbade intruders. We kept out those who did not live by our American standards. Who will rule over Greenland, therefore, is the business of America. Who may try to take over the Dutch West Indies is the concern of the free republics of the western world. In the hands of an un-American power, these parcels of American territory may prove not only distasteful to our American way of life but dangerous to the security of our whole Western Hemisphere. The repercussions of the war in Europe, therefore, already are felt on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. It is folly to blind ourselves to facts.

Finally, we must recognize a new technique in war which does not necessarily depend on the crossing of oceans by hostile ships, planes, or transports. I refer to the Trojan-horse strategy of the so-called "fifth column."

The Communists may have been the first to adopt this technique but their methods are crude and archaic when compared with those of the efficient Nazis. Both cater to the instincts of greed, jealousy, force, and ill will. The Communist aims to set up the solidarity of the masses against the so-called classes to cut across all national boundaries. He preaches a reign of the proletariat by the proletariat for the proletariat. He plots revolution against capitalist society everywhere. He bores from within to attain his diabolic purposes. In the end, he serves none but an oligarchic clique in thirst of world power.

The Nazi tries to set up a solidarity of the so-called Nordic race. He appeals to all who suffer from an inferiority complex. He, too, cuts across national borders and beckons to his banner malcontents of all countries. He, too, plots revolution. He, too, bores from within. First, he pits Aryans against non-Aryans, and then one religious group against another. He threatens and frightens. He distorts and confuses. He, too, plans for the overthrow of capitalism. In the end, he serves not a race, for who are more Nordic than the Norwegians, and who are more Germanic than the Dutch, but a self-anointed group who crave world domination.

Both the Communists and the Nazis plant cells in foreign countries to overthrow existing governments and to drag other peoples into their own orbit. Both make the "fifth column" part of their military strategy. Yes; there have been significant victories, on land, on sea, and in the air, but before we are ready to hail the military achievements of the Germans in the low countries and in Scandinavia as superior feats of arms, weapons, and leadership, we would do well to recognize the contributions of the "fifth column" which in many cases paralyzed resistance.

Here we have a most important lesson to learn from the war. America must be immunized against the Trojan-horse technique. We must be on the alert for any manifestations of un-Americanism in any form, not only in the United States but in every one of our American republics. They mark the beginnings of the despicable infiltration of revolutionary ideas whose ultimate aim is a weak and pusillanimous America.

In our American stables, there should be no stalls reserved for Trojan horses. On our American picket line, there should be no room for these instruments of revolution. The color of the horse is unimportant. Communist or Nazi, the motive is the same—confusion and distrust in the ranks of America as a means of destroying the capitalist system, of overthrowing the American Constitution, and of weakening our national defense. There is no halfway house between despotism and democracy.

The best defense against this Trojan horse, however, is not in our arms, but in our hearts. Intelligent loyalty must be built out of hearts and brains of whole people. If we, every one of us, adhere to the code of America as laid down in the Bill of Rights, neither nazi-ism nor communism, nor any other cult of chaos will find fertile soil here. If we uphold and protect our American institutions, we will keep down the elements of sabotage in any form.

So far, I have discussed some of the political implications of the present campaign. Now, let us look at the purely military lessons.

First, I would place the vindication of air power. At Munich, the bomber was but a threat. In Poland, against decidedly inferior planes and fliers, it was a fact but met little or no opposition. In Norway, it came face to face with more formidable weapons and won a clear-cut smashing victory. Today in Belgium and in France, Germany's mighty air armada is reducing fortifications to shambles and smashing columns to bits. He who is ready so soon to count out the navy, as the German high command tries to do, is hasty to the point of foolhardiness. Certainly I do not. Brittannia still rules the waves. Germany is still relatively landlocked. British ships still ply the seven seas. The German merchant marine has disappeared. Even if we granted that in narrow straits, such as the Kattegat and the Skaggerrak, the plane is more deadly than the battleship, the fact still remains that the navy is supreme on the high seas. Nor am I ready to cede supremacy to the air over ground troops. The bombers may lead in the blitzkrieg but it is the mechanized columns that have broken through the lines.

The lesson to us is not to put our eggs in one basket, not to overestimate the importance of any one service, arm, or weapon. Adequate national defense dares not ignore any service, arm, or weapon. We must have a Navy second to none; yes, and a well-balanced air force second to none. Each has become an M-day force whose power may be tested on the immediate outbreak of hostilities. Each must be ready to get into action at a moment's notice.

The next important military lesson is to recognize the part that bases—sea and air bases—play in modern war. As soon as Berlin gave the green light for the campaign in Scandinavia, Germany seized the principal sea and air ports. As soon as London recovered from the paralysis of the first shock of surprise, Great Britain moved out, but too late to get more than one or two bases for herself. When the Nazi troops captured the key bases, the outcome of the campaign became settled.

On the heels of raiding parties, Germany invariably has marched in with mechanized columns and infantry divisions, and, as always in warfare, the ground troops exploited and solidified the initial gains. Had the invaded possessed strong land forces, they could have driven out the enemy from the air and sea bases as soon as they sized up the situation. Again, as since time immemorial, it was the presence or the absence of well-organized, properly equipped, and fully trained ground troops that ultimately accounted for victory or defeat. In Holland and in Belgium Germany repeated the same technique of raids, raiding frontiers, establishing bases and exploiting the initial success by the use of mechanized columns and infantry devices.

In America, too, air and sea bases hold keys to national security. We must have a strong Navy, a powerful air force, and a well-balanced Army, capable of establishing and manning forward bases anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. To hold these bases and to protect those we already have, we must depend principally on ground troops, on infantry, artillery, antiaircraft, and other land units. The need for a well-rounded team of land, sea, and air defense is obvious.

Another lesson is the importance of military intelligence. In war, one must know not only the capacity of the enemy but his probable intentions. It is not safe to figure that he will observe the established rules of warfare and of international law. In the world of today, we can well expect deliberate violations of neutrality. We must prepare accordingly. One must be ready, therefore, to meet thrusts of all kinds in any direction. To do so effectively requires efficient intelligence service. We must give it every thought and every consideration in our own national-defense program.

Above all other considerations, the present war emphasizes the need for well-balanced and fully equipped national-defense teams. It did not need a war to prove that fact to any student of military history. Not only Germany, but Great Britain and France realized it. The difference was that Germany has had in all theaters of operation the required engines of war. It took years to build them. Military arms and equipment cannot be bought in the open market

place. They cannot be built in a hurry. Today, we behold a spectacle of Great Britain and France, rich in money but weak in munitions, forced, temporarily at least, to bow to Germany, poorer in wealth but stronger in sinews of battle. On M-day, Germany had the guns, the planes, and the trained men. The Allies did not.

There is the lesson for us. Yes, we have enough money to buy anything that is for sale, but munitions are not available at the counter. We have the capacity to build them, but we cannot do that in a hurry. Weeks, months, and, in most cases, a year or two may elapse before we can get all of the military equipment we need, even if we ordered it today. Every day we delay is a day lost in our quest for supply preparedness. We have begun to build, but let us not be satisfied until we have put aside in our vaults of national defense all of the sinews of battle that present production problems in terms of time.

I have devoted my remarks to a discussion of lessons from Europe to assure you that we in the War Department are following the campaign analytically and dispassionately, ever on the alert for developments in tactics, technique, and weapons that will help us to strengthen our own defenses. We think only in terms of defense. We see a devastating fire across the seas, and we must not let it spread to our shores. We must build our ramparts so high and so strong that the flames will not be able to shoot over them or through them to endanger our lives, our homes, and our institutions.

Relief Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. GARRETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of the American life today is that vast army of unemployed who wander along hopelessly lost without work for their hands and with desperation in their hearts. We have heard much said about this bill for the relief of these people.

In my section of the State of Texas there is a crying need for every job which has been proposed under this bill and every amendment which has been offered. These people whom I represent are not necessarily just the common laborers who have for years gone from one job to another. There are a few such people in the numbers. Many of them are men who have worked at skilled trades, many of them are farmers forced from their tenant homes by the mechanization of the farms, and many of them skilled office men and men of education. They need work. They can and would do good work but they are stranded in our part of Texas with the passing of an oil boom which offered them much and did so little for them.

I have voted for every appropriation asked for these people. Human welfare and human happiness goes before in my creed that of the money changer and the selfish greed that motivates too many lives in this country. Daily letters come through my office telling the story of still-born babies, due to malnutrition of the mother, crying children who want food, and fathers in desperation asking that something be done to alleviate the condition of their families.

Had I heart of stone, ice water for blood in my veins, and a soul that was dead with greed, I could not resist the pleas that have come to me. Many of them are men whom I have known in better circumstances, many are from men whom I knew as children and with whom I went to school. Their cry is my cry, and their plea is my plea. I will stand by them until some economic change is made whereby they can earn the provender for their children and secure the happiness for themselves which is their innate and inborn right. The condition of many of our west Texas counties and cities is desperate. Their tax resources are fixed by law, and they have to meet their expenses under the schedule laid down for them in the law. They cannot handle the problem by direct relief, and they do not have the money for huge outlays and the sponsor's part of such a program. The requirement of 25-percent average is too high with most of them far in debt, and the funds of their taxpayers already, in some instances, pledged for years ahead. They have borrowed their limit, their tax rate at the maximum, and the valuation of their property far beyond its sale value. It is a gloomy picture which I could present, but we face the problem with courage and continue making an effort by all legitimate means to secure our part of the program.

I have favored the increase which was made last year in the wage scale, for I knew that many hungry families were sacrificing food that the bread winner might have enough to eat. It is at best a mere pittance and I do not believe that men should be required to work for a mere bread-and-meat allowance. They do their best and the wage scale is still too low for those who have homes and responsibilities.

I was opposed to the 18-month rule which required that men or women who had worked for that period of time should be laid off and compelled to go without the necessities of life in a land where there was no work to be had. It was cruel and unjust to a people who were in desperation. I was opposed to it then and I am still opposed to it.

The W. P. A. has meant much, not only to our needy and deserving unemployed but also to our towns, schools, and cities. But in the building of these schoolhouses, courthouses, jails, farm-to-market roads, parks, and other public conveniences the funds of the local people have been exhausted. The sponsors have about gone their limit. Now there is no more except a sum which slowly comes in from taxes in an ever-dwindling stream. The load is heavy and the burden excessive. It is now becoming a struggle to find something to do and something to do it with. What the future offers for these people I cannot say.

Discriminations are alleged against those who have passed what the cold business world calls their days of usefulness. Men of 45 and over have a hard time even getting on the W. P. A. No private employer wants to hire a man of that age. Therefore I favor those men above 45, who have dependents and who are in need of employment, being given preference on W. P. A. projects. They are those who now have the least chance in life. Our veterans who need this work are given preference, but we failed to say one word in the last law about that wife who has a sick husband—a veteran—and must work to support him and his children or that widow of a veteran who has not been given the benefit of a pension. Why not show them and the older people some consideration in this bill and give those who have passed the age at which they can or will be employed in private employment the first chance at the work.

The W. P. A. program and workers have faced sneers, jeers, and criticism from the unthinking and uninformed people. Let us look at a few of the things which have been done under the W. P. A. program. Multiplied miles of good roads are to the credit of W. P. A. Courthouses in several towns in my district, schools in almost every town in the country, parks for the use of the public, auditoriums, libraries and clubhouses, playgrounds dot the landscape. Hundreds of needed garments have been made in every town in the country in our splendidly equipped and well-supervised sewing rooms, and this clothing has been productive of some pride and the development of skills which will be of untold benefit to our people. Some have referred to these W. P. A. projects as "rat holes" down which public money has been poured. Yes; they may be rat holes, but I am still in favor of them when they are used as the means of feeding the hungry, caring for the sick, clothing the needy, bringing hope to the hearts of the young, and easing the burdens of the aged. I am supporting the W. P. A. and the requests of the President, and will continue to do so until something better can be offered, and I have no apology to make for any vote that I have cast for any sum which has been offered. One hungry child fed or one sickbed eased of its pain is all the payment that I ask for having let my heart dictate to my mind and not my mind sour the milk of human kindness in my soul.

General Johnson Ridicules Lippmann-Kaltenborn-Dorothy Thompson Third-Term "Blitzkrieg"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson is a Democrat. He recently addressed one of the big Jefferson Day Democratic dinners. His true allegiance to genuine Jeffersonian democracy is not doubted by friend or foe. But Gen. Hugh S. Johnson is more than a Democrat. He is an American. As a patriotic, soldierly American General Johnson calls his shots as he sees them and resents and resists any attempt to utilize the dislike for dictators abroad to foster one-man government upon Americans at home. So in the following article, reprinted from today's issue of the Washington Daily News, General Johnson exposes the shallow, panicky reasoning of those who argue that to defend America adequately we must continue in office a President who has failed to modernize our defense in the past despite the expenditure of $8,000,000,000 in the past 7 years. If it were not plagiarism, I presume General Johnson would call such reasoning "spinach."

THE PRESIDENT MAY RENOUNCE THIRD-TERM AMBITIONS IN SUNDAY NIGHT'S FIRESIDE CHAT

Alf Landon yesterday asked the President to publicly announce that he would not accept a third-term nomination if offered to him at the Chicago convention. Mr. Landon stated that this would do more to contribute to national unity and to the preservation of democratic traditions in America than any other one thing. Mr. Landon pointed out that such a public disavowal of any intention of using the European war situation for political self-advancement would be heartening news throughout America. The President's secretary stated he was too busy to answer that question immediately. Since the President is to deliver another fireside speech next Sunday night, he may well take the occasion to eliminate himself as a third-term contender and thus contribute mightily to the unity of purpose which all Americans agree is important at the present time. He is taking time out to make the speech. America will be listening curiously to learn whether he will take the occasion to answer Alf Landon's question. If he does, whether Democrats or Republicans win next November, American self-government and traditional concepts of democracy will be preserved and the President will be able to present his programs to America during the remainder of his term devoid of either political significance or suspicions.

ONE-MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

ST. LOUIS, MO.—One principal reason why I came out here to St. Louis, the metropolis of the great valley, was to check up as well as I could on certain statements so frequently repeated in the East recently.

One is that this great hinterland people so short a time ago opposed to our taking any part in the war in Europe have now changed their minds. Another is that the President's message on defense has so "electrified" and "unified" them for his foreign policies that an election this fall would be a mistake—that it is no longer necessary. They want a third term for Mr. Roosevelt as a measure of national preparedness.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, Miss Dorothy Thompson, and radio commentator H. V. Kaltenborn seem to have fallen for this line, or at least have stressed various angles of the move to suppress our two-party system on a belief that what we need is unity. That is also the White House janissariat and third-termite line. It is at the bottom of the President's dramatic but tricky presentation of the preparedness bill and of his coquetry to seduce a healthy opposition party by the so-called coalition Cabinet idea.

Well, it is my observation among this valley people of my own beginnings that it is all a bunch of bunk. This Midwestern country no more approves the President's policy of sticking our necks out into the foreign imbroglios of Europe and Asia than it ever did, and that was not at all.

It does approve the spending of whatever is necessary for American defense. It always did. It needed no "unification" on that either by the President's speech or "coalition Cabinet." It is shocked to learn at so late a date that this administration, while spending so many billions for boondoggling and some useful work, has permitted us to remain so delinquent in defense that we have practically no armament against the dreadful weapons of modern war. It is beginning to realize that it has not heretofore been told the truth about this defenselessness.

It is especially indignant to learn that as early as 1933, when Hitler started the "mechanization and motorization of army tactical units" which is now conquering civilization, and which then erased the unemployment problem in Germany, Mr. Roosevelt was authorized by Congress to spend any part of $3,300,000,000 that he chose for the same purpose—and spent it and many billions more for other and far less necessary purposes.

Mr. Roosevelt made an effective rearmament speech and got a lot of applause. But the facts are leaking out that he was making a virtue out of his own neglect and inaction in defense; that the appropriation he asked for was unplanned and inadequate; that the speech and the subsequent coalition Cabinet stuff was pure third-term politics and had little to do with increased industrial defense production, which is the essence of our problem.

The Lippmann-Thompson-Kaltenborn theory that we must perpetuate Mr. Roosevelt and pipe down any opposition because of the administration's great capacity for major effort and defensive dependability is beginning to look silly in view of the slowly appearing fact that the administration has failed and fumbled in defense. This tragic failure is of a piece with its unbroken record of failure in every major effort—industrial recovery, reemployment, and agricultural "parity." It has had unprecedented powers. It has spent billions. It has tried no less than 20 major plans. It has succeeded with almost nothing.

This is no record upon which to base a demand for reelection, the suppression of opposition, and a coalition to support such invariable and dangerous errors. If anybody believes that burghers of the Middle West swallow this stuff, they must have been born east of the Hudson River.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM THE NEW JERSEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I insert herewith a telegram forwarded to the President of the United States offering cooperation of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce for national defense, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce tenders the cooperation of the industry, agriculture, and commerce of this State in support of any adequate and sound defense program which the Congress of the United States may formulate to meet the Nation's needs. We are prepared to aid the National Government by assisting in the coordination of the commercial and productive activities of New Jersey behind such a program.

The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce believes it can render a useful service in helping to gear New Jersey enterprise to the national requirements. We suggest that this program include cooperation with Federal and New Jersey governing bodies to foster increased business activities. We will aid in reporting to the public and to the National Government the problems of business and the necessity for maintaining confidence in private enterprise during these critical times.

We volunteer our services to assist National and State authorities in aiding New Jersey manufacturers in the production of materials and equipment required for our national defense.

We offer to cooperate with the proper public officials in developing a plan through which employable persons may be placed in new production activities incident to our defense program and thereby help to reduce relief rolls.

ROBERT T. BOWMAN,

President, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

Maladministration of Public Affairs in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTERS FROM MILES H. FAIRBANK, HARRY S. BARGER, AND E. K. BURLEW

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the following correspondence should be carefully studied in connection with the recent testimony of Miles H. Fairbank before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, pages 93 to 162. Further reference is made to certain reports filed with Mr. Burlew by Mr. Barger. Those interested in Puerto Rican affairs can well afford to study carefully all of this data which is made available to Members of Congress.

PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
San Juan, P. R., October 8, 1937.

Memorandum to: Mr. Harry S. Barger, Chief of Investigation Unit.
From: Mr. Miles H. Fairbank, Acting Assistant Administrator.

I have just finished reading the report on the Del Rio land purchase. I must confess that I consider this report (like the previous report on the compensation section) practically worthless from the standpoint of advising this office. Both reports, instead of sticking to a bare recital of the facts, as required in any impartial investigation, are so replete with personal opinions and rather vehement statements that one is constrained to believe that the investigator proceeded with predetermined prejudice. Obviously no such report was requested or is required.

If you have under consideration any other matters, please be advised that an impartial statement of facts is what this office desires.

MILES H. FAIRBANK,
Acting Assistant Administrator.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of, and made by me from, the original of the memorandum dated October 8, 1937.

ALFONSO GRAU.

OCTOBER 9, 1937.

Memorandum to: Mr. Miles H. Fairbank, Acting Assistant Administrator.
From: Harry S. Barger, Chief, Office of Investigations.
Subject: Your memorandum of the 8th instant, concerning the investigative reports submitted in the Del Rio land purchase and compensation section cases.

In all the work I have done along investigative lines, for and with other governmental agencies, it has been requisite that the reports should not only show and recite the facts disclosed by the investigation, but conclusions, findings of fact, and recommendations as well.

When I came to Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, I was instructed to submit like reports; and the numerous reports submitted by me to date have been meant and intended to conform to those instructions.

Your memorandum is taken as instructions for the future reporting of investigations, and I shall omit therefrom conclusions of facts drawn from other proven facts, conclusions of ultimate facts, and findings of facts.

Recommendations will be continued unless you indicate a contrary wish in that regard.

HARRY S. BARGER,
Chief, Office of Investigations.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 12, 1938.*

Hon. E. K. BURLEW,
First Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURLEW: As you doubtless know, the writer served the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration in the capacity of chief, office of investigations, for approximately 19 months; and that my appointment to that position has just been terminated.

Numerous facts, circumstances, and conditions came to my notice during that employment which have impelled me to the conclusion that very many things have happened, and are happening, in the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration which, due to its organization and set-up, are unknown to the Administrator and you; and my sincere belief is that, if those things were known, they, or most of them, would not receive ultimate official sanction and approval.

Recently I endeavored to see you with a view to discussing these matters in person. Your secretary, Mrs. Rowe, quite naturally inquired the nature of my business, and when I stated in a very general way that I desire to discuss with you certain aspects of the P. R. R. A., she suggested that I present the matters in the form of a memorandum. Accordingly, I am sending with this letter, a memorandum stating, as briefly as possible, the matters I have in mind, for whatever they may be worth.

If I did not do this, I should not feel that I had discharged a duty I owe to the Administrator, to you, and to the Government, or that I had kept the faith with my own conscience.

Very truly yours,

HARRY S. BARGER.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, January 11, 1939.

Mr. HARRY S. BARGER,
2844 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARGER: On July 12 last you presented a memorandum outlining observations concerning the relief and rehabilitation work carried on by the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.

The 21 charges made in your communication have been gone into carefully and, with the exception of two, which had already received administrative consideration and action, we are convinced that they have no foundation in fact.

The Department has every wish to protect the interests of the Government and I believe it has taken all reasonable steps to safeguard them.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. BURLEW,
First Assistant Secretary.

Why a Dictator?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, confronted with the mad onrush of totalitarianism abroad and the third-term "blitzkrieg" here at home, it is important that the American people keep their feet on the ground.

I include herewith an interesting and well-written editorial touching on this subject that appeared, under date of May 21, 1940, in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of May 21, 1940]

WHY A DICTATOR?

Alfred M. Landon was not a narrow partisan when, in the role of titular leader of the Republican Party by virtue of his Presidential nomination in 1936, he asserted last Sunday that a vigorous partisan Presidential campaign, as usual, is a national necessity. He and many other thoughtful Americans are deploring the suggestion cabled from Paris by Dorothy Thompson that President Roosevelt be reelected practically by acclamation as a demonstration of American unity to bolster British-French and European neutrals' morale and frighten the Nazis.

The Thompson suggestion, however, is valuable in one sense; it gives the American people tremendous incentive to study their established political system and its vital relationship with the general system that has contributed to national progress. The United States, if it is to survive as "the land of the free and the home of the brave," needs at least two perennially vigorous major parties. What Miss Thompson proposed, in effect, was dictatorship by acclamation. If her plan were adopted, if the Republican Party did not make a Presidential nomination this year, notice would be served on the world that the United States, even without being involved militarily in the European war, was voluntarily swallowing the political poison that has contributed to the current debacle overseas.

Miss Thompson did not suggest that Republicans also refrain from contesting with Democrats for seats in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, but she might as well have extended it. If the Republican Party, with public approval, permitted Franklin D. Roosevelt to be elected for a third term by

default to "demonstrate American unity" it would amount to service of notice on every person elected to Congress this year that the Presidency was paramount. If it were dangerous, as Miss Thompson says it would be, to oppose Mr. Roosevelt for the Presidency, to which he has already been elected twice, it would be just as dangerous, for the same reasons, for Congress to question his judgment after the election.

An important point that Miss Thompson did not mention when the German invasion of Holland, Belgium, and France set her afluttering in Paris, is that the man elected President this year cannot be removed from office, if the experiment turns out badly, so easily as the parliamentary heads of government in Great Britain and France. The man elected President this year will be President for 4 years—and that is a long time in this period of quick general changes—barring death, voluntary resignation, or formal impeachment. The latter process naturally is complicated. To counsel election of anybody to the Presidency practically by default with that long-term prospect in mind is to reason that the United States is ripe for a rule by a "benevolent" Mussolini or a Hitler.

If the American people, in a great emergency, were to consider seriously bestowal of another term upon a President practically by acclamation the first vital requirement would be a White House incumbent possessing a broad mind. The present incumbent, of course, is not a partisan on the traditional pattern. He is not, however, nonpartisan in a constructive sense. He has made it plain that he regards the label of the party that he has used for election and reelection merely as an instrument for personal government. He has been a vindictive President.

He has used Government power to assault every important individual and every organization, including the Democratic Party, that has refused to bow to his will. He is a partisan in a sense more dangerous than the normal Republican-Democratic rivalry. Intemperate expressions and intemperate acts are the most distinctive stamps of this Roosevelt administration. In sum, this President whose reelection without opposition would be classified by pansy-and-pink light theorists as a convincing demonstration of unity has incessantly promoted national disunity. The theory that constructive unity could be achieved by establishing him as a practical dictator would appear peculiar even in the pages of Alice in Wonderland.

It seems that Miss Thompson is a mere reflector of the European opinion, at least that part of Europe embraced in the Allies and neutral nations, that Mr. Roosevelt is the best possible American President—for European "democracies." By going to Europe, making certain of that European attitude and becoming a propagandist for it in her own country Miss Thompson has provided Republicans with even more practical incentive to make the best possible nomination for the Presidency from their own ranks this year. She has unwittingly bestowed an accolade upon the Republican Party to attack the radical New Deal with maximum courage and intelligence.

Labor's Stake in Free Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES KRAMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, May 18, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of Interior, delivered an address on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at the New York World's Fair Grounds.

Secretary Ickes' remarks were a splendid and deserving tribute to Mr. Sidney Hillman, president of the garment workers' group. It was most gratifying to learn of the great strides that have been made in behalf of labor through the aid of the Democratic Congress, and the far-sightedness and leadership of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The closing remarks of Secretary Ickes inspire me to ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks this radio address, so that it may be read by those who for some reason were unfortunate not to hear the most inspiring address and tribute paid to our great national leader, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whom we know will not let the people down and will carry on as a faithful soldier by accepting the demand of the people of the Nation to continue on as our leader for another 4 years.

Friends and fellow workers, I am glad to participate today with members and friends of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in this celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary. You who are members and we who are friends should be very proud of our association with an organization which has not only vindicated the dignity of labor in its struggle to bargain collectively but which has also demonstrated the capacity of organized labor to be a moving force in promoting industrial efficiency and in maintaining a socially just democratic society.

I have always been sympathetic with and interested in the trade-union movement. To me it is a truism that organized labor, effectively and intelligently led, as your phase of it has been, not only gives strength to the workers but to the Nation as a whole.

Shortly after the Women's Trade Union League was organized in Chicago in 1904, under the brilliant leadership of Mary McDowell and Margaret Dreier Robins, I volunteered my services when it decided to go to the legislature with a bill limiting the hours of labor of women in industry. It was not an easy fight. The manufacturers associations were fighting us, the lawyers were fighting us, and there was a troublesome decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois that seemed to say that our bill was unconstitutional. Fortunately, however, about that time a distinguished lawyer from Boston, Louis D. Brandeis, appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States to defend the State of Oregon in a similar case. He spoke with an eloquence and social consciousness which caused even the Supreme Court of the United States to forget its old precedents. That gave us the strength to press our 10-hour law through the Illinois Legislature and to defend it successfully before the Illinois Supreme Court. Other States soon followed the trail that Oregon and Illinois had blazed, first with 10-hour laws and then with lower limitations.

I am also proud to recall that my association with the Amalgamated really antedates its actual birth by several years. That association dates back to the clothing workers' strike in Chicago in 1910, known as the Hart Schaffner & Marx strike.

My friends of the Women's Trade Union League also threw themselves heart and soul into that fight. So did Hull House, that living monument to the greatest woman of her generation, Jane Addams. Pickets came not only from the ranks of the workers and sympathetic trade unionists but from Hull House, the University of Chicago, and the North Shore. My wife was one of those who took her place in the picket line, while her mother sat in the police station signing the bonds of all arrested strikers and pickets.

The police were needlessly rough with the picketing strikers, but they were careful to be duly respectful to those of us who were lending a helping hand. However, they made an extraordinary slip. They arrested Ellen Gates Starr, cofounder with Jane Addams of Hull House. I undertook to defend her, and much to the distress of the authorities, I insisted that her case be tried even after the strike had been settled and other arrested pickets had been released. Despite the sworn testimony of three hefty policemen that they had arrested Miss Starr, who was a frail little lady, because she had put them in physical fear, she was triumphantly acquitted by judge and jury.

I do not want to give you the impression that the strike was won for the union by its friends outside of the union. On the contrary, the so-called respectable element in Chicago, by and large, was alarmed at the efforts of the garment workers to assert the right to organize and bargain collectively for the improvement of their working conditions. It was bruited about that many of the workers, including their leaders—the "ringleaders," as they were contemptuously called—were immigrants who had no understanding of American institutions.

From my associations at Hull House with Jane Addams I knew too much about the immigrants—"those huddled masses, yearning to be free"—to be taken in by the horrendous reports about their "un-American" activities. But I must confess that when I first undertook to help the strikers—some of them boys still in their teens—I feared that, however good their intentions may have been, they had been rash, impulsive, and headstrong.

But when the first excitement of the strike subsided and employers and workers gathered around the table to discuss their common problems, my smug complacency was jolted. I found that I had more to learn from these boys than they had to learn from me. Even Jane Addams, Raymond Robins, and Margaret Dreier Robins, who had known the strikers much better than I, glowed with relieved satisfaction as accounts of the progress of the negotiations came in. The employers who had come to the conference table reluctantly, expecting an unpleasant ordeal with arrogant troublemakers presenting exaggerated claims, reported back a rare and inspiring experience.

Fortunately some of the members of Hart, Schaffner & Marx were socially minded to a degree that was unusual in those days for a typical employer. They were willing to put their own cards on the table and to listen to the case of their employees. They found that the strike leaders whom they had suspected, resented, and distrusted as young hotheads, had a keen and amazingly broad understanding of their common problems and a social vision and idealism which revealed a rare and abiding faith in the democratic way of life. So impressed were the employers by the

case presented that they were willing to set up an impartial board on which both industry and labor should be represented and which should be presided over by that rare personality, James Mullenbach, once a coal miner and Protestant preacher, and then the head of the Chicago Municipal Lodging House.

The reports which came back from those conferences to us invariably singled out for especial praise one young man, slight of stature and with gleaming black eyes from which flashed intellectual integrity, indomitable courage, and irresistible idealism. He was, we were told, wise beyond his years and a man destined to be a leader among men. He displayed a rare ability to understand the problems and difficulties of those with whom he had to negotiate and in return he expected an equal readiness on their part to understand the problems and difficulties of the workers.

That young man was Sidney Hillman. He has traveled far since those days, but he has never disappointed those who have put their trust in him.

As president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Sidney Hillman has applied himself wholeheartedly and without stint for more than a quarter of a century to the advancement of the interests of American labor.

As president of the Amalgamated, Sidney Hillman has been no partisan politician, but he has eloquently and effectively asserted labor's need for legal recognition and protection. Although he has served the Amalgamated well and faithfully, he has also recognized that labor's strength lies in labor's unity; in labor's willingness to work together to promote the interest of the common man and woman.

No one has worked more ably and assiduously than Sidney Hillman to bring about the enactment into Federal law of fair labor standards for the protection of those workers, organized or unorganized, who are least able to protect themselves.

The Amalgamated may be proud of its leadership, and its leadership may be no less proud of the Amalgamated.

For successive terms the Amalgamated has maintained a continuity of effective and responsible leadership. You have been too wise and too regardful of your own best interests not to retain as your leaders those best qualified to serve you without paying any attention to the length of that service. And it is not without significance that there are few labor organizations more democratic than the Amalgamated.

I believe that it is as much the essence of democracy that people should have the right freely to continue a leadership which they desire as it is that they should have the right freely to discontinue a leadership which they spurn. Modern democracy is not a play where each member of the cast takes his turn at enacting the star role. In the dangerous world in which we live, democracy cannot afford to deny itself the most effective leadership available. This is, indeed, a time to recall the salutary and truly sage advice of George Washington, that there is "no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who in some great emergency shall be deemed, universally, most capable of serving the public."

We are not living in an era of peace or tranquillity. We are passing through one of the most fateful periods in the history of mankind. At home our domestic economy is adjusting itself to profound social and economic changes. Abroad brute force and strident ambition march mercilessly against peaceful nations. Dictatorships are on the march to enslave the spirit of free democracy and we have been brought up against the realization that the world cannot exist half Fascist and half free.

However high or low our station, each and every one of us is deeply, anxiously concerned about our country's and our children's future; about their safety, their peace, their welfare in the years which lie just ahead of us.

There is no blinking the facts which President Roosevelt reemphasized in his message last January when he said that "the social and economic forces which have been mismanaged abroad until they have resulted in revolution, dictatorship, and war are the same as those which we are here struggling to adjust peacefully at home" * * * and "dictatorships—and the philosophy of force which justifies and accompanies dictatorships—have originated in almost every case in the necessity for drastic action to improve internal conditions where democratic action for one reason or another has failed to respond to new modern needs and modern conditions."

We have reached a fork on the way of industrial progress. We cannot, if we would, go back to the economic habits of our fathers before the power age. America must choose. On the one hand is the path which we elected to take in 1932 under the leadership of President Roosevelt—the path which calls for the strengthening and revitalizing of the processes of democracy, so that, through them, we may meet the exigent social and economic problems of our time. On the other hand is the primrose path which we chose in 1920—the path which we blindly trod for 12 long years—dodging, concealing, forgetting, and ignoring the pressing social and economic problems of our time—and finding ourselves at the end facing chaos. If we again choose the primrose path we may not be so fortunate, when chaos comes, as to have a President with the self-restraint and wisdom of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to save us from abandoning liberty for the illusion of security.

During the last 7 years, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, we have made more peaceful adjustments to profound social and economic changes than in any period of our history. In the interest of free enterprise and of free labor we have challenged the right of a few to control and exploit the lives, the property, and the labor of the many. We have taken effective measures to protect labor's rights to organize and to bargain collectively, and labor's right to obtain a fair wage for a fair day's work. We have taken effective measures to help the farmers to obtain a fair price for their products and to conserve their precious and irreplaceable soil. We have taken effective measures to protect the savings of investors and bank depositors. We have given work to the unemployed. We have initiated a low-cost housing program. We have made a start at providing social security against old age and unemployment.

These things, and many others, we have done to strengthen and revitalize our democratic way of life. Much has been accomplished; much is yet to be accomplished. And in doing and planning all of this, we have given the common man a real stake in the preservation of our democratic way of life. In doing all of this, we may have trod on a few arrogant vested interests, but let no man say that what we have done has not strengthened our national unity. Let no man say that we have destroyed hope, confidence, or enterprise. The hope, the confidence, the enterprise of the American people lies not in the luxuries of the few but in the opportunities of the many.

If American democracy is to survive, the social and economic gains of the New Deal must become a part of the American heritage. The unemployed are not going to be left uncared for. The industrial workers are going to be organized and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; they are not going to be content with company unions organized for them by Ernest Weir or Tom Girdler. The social security now afforded against old age and unemployment is not going to be scrapped, but is going to be extended upward and downward, and also outward into the field of health insurance. The Securities and Exchange Commission is going to continue to protect our people's savings from the arbitrary control of private economic power.

This does not mean that New Deal reforms are safe from attack. This does not mean that the administration of New Deal reforms can be safely entrusted to men who were openly hostile, or coldly indifferent, when President Roosevelt and his liberal followers were struggling to write them into the law of the land. It is not unfair to ask who are the men, who, having worked night and day to accomplish these great reforms, have come to the conclusion that they could be improved or better administered by others who derive their support from those who bitterly opposed or grudgingly accepted them.

At this critical stage we can afford neither the luxury of a reaction nor the stress and strain of the counter-reaction, if not counter-revolution, which would inevitably follow such reaction. The continuance of the Roosevelt administration is necessary to permit the New Deal's concept of social and economic justice to become an accepted part of our American system. Farsighted men of affairs realize that it is better for business to adjust itself to the new order than to fight to upset it. They know that such a fight would stir up bitter resentment and social discontent and, at best, could be only temporarily successful. They realize that this is no time to turn back the clock. They do not want again to be chargeable with the appalling consequences which would almost inevitably follow a relapse into the primrose path. They look across the war-darkened Europe where the ruling classes thought that it cost too much to buy time, and they say that it is much more important that everyone should have enough than that those who have more than enough should have still more.

As all of us look across at tragic Europe and shudder at the barbaric attacks against religion, freedom, and international good faith, we thank God that we have a President who was the first among us to see what was happening there, and seeing, has stirred us to the need of national defense and national unity.

There has been no man in our time in whom our people have placed their faith as they have placed it in President Roosevelt. There is no man whose word carries courage, conviction, and hope around the world as does President Roosevelt's. The inspiration of his leadership to those about to die for democracy was eloquently told by Dorothy Thompson in her column from Paris last Wednesday.

Nor has there been any time since the founding of the Republic that America has needed such leadership as President Roosevelt has given us to hold America—the whole of America, without regard to faith, race, or wealth—united in the face of great danger.

Today, despite the shoutings of politicians and the clamors of newspapers, which no more represent the people or realize what they are thinking than they did in 1936, there is more political unity in America than at any time in the past. There can be no question of partisanship in a year when our need for strong and experienced and trusted leadership is so great; when the lack of continuing such leadership may mean irrevocable disaster.

It is the people who are calling President Roosevelt. It is the people who are looking to President Roosevelt for continued leadership and will not be denied, because they have the right—the right of a democracy—to choose their Commander in Chief. It is the people, regardless of party, and not the politicians, who constitute the movement to continue President Roosevelt at the helm of the ship of state. The politicians, some of them belatedly, may think that they are doing the leading, but, regardless of their place in the procession, they are only following the people. The surprising thing about this popular movement toward the goal of national

unity is that it is being joined daily by many people, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat, who opposed the President in years past and who still differ with him on many points of domestic policy. As these people express it, Roosevelt, at the present juncture of affairs, is the greatest unifying force of the Nation today, and the unifying force which he represents is the country's greatest need today as we see the uncertainties and, perhaps, even the terrors of a social revolution that is shaking the world.

There is no higher law than the law of self-preservation. This law became part of the consciousness of man while he still dwelt in dark caves. This law is just as compelling today as it was in the beginning. It is this law that is bringing together, at a time of grave crisis, men who never before have seen alike on a political issue.

We know that President Roosevelt is not seeking another 4 years. We know that after 7 exacting and exhausting years in office it is his desire to retire to the quiet of his home on the Hudson—a desire that his true friends would be eager to see gratified, if it were not for the imperative need that the Nation, and humanity, has of him.

At this turning point in our country's history President Roosevelt is in exactly the same position as was George Washington when the country confronted a similar crisis 150 years ago.

Washington, after 7 exacting years as the Commander in Chief of the American forces in the War for Independence and after 6 years of patient struggle to establish an enduring Federal Union, was about the present age of President Roosevelt. He desired to retire to his Mount Vernon home, leaving the management of the affairs of state to other and younger hands. Yet, although independence had been won and the Union established, the people looked to him for the leadership necessary to make national unity a living reality. Washington was a faithful soldier in the cause of democracy, and he did not let down those who had fought democracy's battle with him.

And so we say to Franklin Delano Roosevelt: We the people of the United States have twice elected you President of the United States. We have followed and supported your leadership in your efforts to strengthen and revitalize our democracy. You have served us well, but your work is not done. We consider your continuance in office for another 4 years necessary to give a free people national unity at a time of grave crisis—necessary to give hope and courage to those offering their last full measure of devotion to preserve freedom in a civilized world. At such a time, Mr. President, we must hold you to your promise not to let the people down. We propose to nominate you, we propose to elect you, and we, the people, command you to serve as our President.

Parties and the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Parties and the Poll Tax."

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 15, 1940]

There is excellent reason to believe that eight States of the so-called solid South will be let down pretty badly by the Democratic Party, to which they have so long and loyally adhered, when it meets in national convention the last of July. But it will not do them the least bit of good to get sore. There just isn't a thing they can do about it.

The only alternative they have is to go over to the Republicans, and there is even less tolerance in that party for their especially cherished political device for disfranchising the colored voter than there is in their own. The States affected are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia; the device is the well-known poll tax, now under so devastating fire from so many important quarters that it seems doomed, indeed. There is slight doubt that the Republican convention which meets in June will vigorously denounce the poll tax as an iniquitous discrimination which violates the spirit of the Constitution and pledge itself to find some means of exterminating it.

Primarily, the Republicans will do this because of the Negro vote, so large a part of which in the northern debatable States was stolen away by the New Dealers, and which, since 1936, they have been making the most strenuous efforts to recapture. In 11 or 12 of these debatable States for 3 generations the Negro vote had been the basic Republican asset. In 1936, 96 percent of it went for Mr. Roosevelt. In 1938 about 53 percent swung back to the G. O. P. Republican success in the 1940 election hinges upon ability to hold that 53 percent, or increase it. Recent agitation about the poll tax presents an opportunity. It can be accepted as sure that they will not overlook the chance to convince the Negro that the Republicans are his real friends.

On the other hand, it seems equally certain that the Republican denunciation of the poll tax at least will be matched by the Democrats. It is the obvious and almost inevitable politics to play. In the first place, President Roosevelt is already on record as against the poll tax. In the second place, the importance of the Negro vote in New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Illinois, and Michigan is recognized by every Democratic leader outside of the South. Whether Mr. Roosevelt runs again or not, the Democratic politicians in these States will compete with the Republicans for this vote. The southern protest, in or out of the convention, will not deter them from steps to block any Republican bid.

The case against the poll tax is a strong one. Recently it has been well presented by Mr. Ulric Bell, in the Louisville Courier Journal, and by others. The most devastating point is that, while this provision does keep the Negroes from voting, it also keeps the whites from voting. In some States it keeps more whites than Negroes from the polls. Its net effect has been to reduce the total vote in the eight poll-tax States to a ridiculously insignificant size. For example, in 1936 only 20.4 percent of the adult population voted in Alabama; 18.5 percent in Georgia; 16.2 percent in Mississippi; 14.1 percent in South Carolina; 26.2 percent in Texas; 25.7 percent in Virginia, 33.5 percent in Tennessee.

But an even more trenchant point is made. The election figures appear to convict these Southern States of clear violation of the provision of the Constitution which bases a State's representation in Congress not upon total population but upon the number of citizens who vote. If this provision were applied to the eight poll-tax States, election statisticians assert that they would lose 57 of their 78 House seats, on the basis of the 1936 election figures. Using the 1938 figures, 65 of the 78 would be eliminated. In 1938, 32 southern poll-tax Congressmen received fewer than 11,000 votes each, and the combined vote for all 32 was 221,270, which is 60,000 fewer than the approximate basis fixed for one Congressman in the last reapportionment. One Representative in Chicago, in 1938, received 28,000 more votes than all these 32 southern Congressmen.

Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in agricultural credit which confronted the administration when it took office in 1933 threatened to bankrupt the farmers of the Nation. It was this emergency need that called the Farm Credit Administration into being by Executive order in 1933. This order not only consolidated within one organization the powers and functions of all the then-existing Federal agencies dealing primarily with agricultural credit, but it provided them with additional capital and authority to deal with the crisis.

In addition to meeting a critical condition through emergency measures, the Farm Credit Administration has as its broader purpose the development of a complete, unified system of farm-credit institutions on a permanent basis to provide farmers and their organizations with long-term amortized mortgage credit and short-term credit at the lowest cost consistent with sound business practices.

FORTY PERCENT OF FARM DEBT HELD BY LAND BANKS

From the organization of the Farm Credit Administration in 1933 through March 31, 1940, the Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner have loaned a total of over $2,400,000,000, involving almost 600,000 borrowers. Approximately $1,400,000,000 of this amount has been loaned by the land banks, and $1,000,000,000 by the Commissioner. At March 31, 1940, over 800,000 farmers were indebted to these institutions in the amount of almost $2,700,000,000, the latter figure representing about 40 percent of the estimated farm-mortgage debt of the United States.

FARMERS GREATLY HELPED

The farm-mortgage credit institutions under the Farm Credit Administration were confronted in 1933 with an

emergency situation. Defaults on farm-mortgage loans had mounted to large proportions, foreclosures had risen and a large volume of outstanding mortgage obligations needed refinancing. Sources of farm-mortgage credit had practically disappeared under the conditions prevailing after 1929. The administration's immediate task, therefore, was to stop foreclosures and to render such assistance to farmers whose mortgage loans were delinquent as to enable them to continue in the farming business and share in the ensuing improvement in agricultural conditions. To accomplish these ends the Farm Credit Administration undertook to refinance with Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans farm mortgages and short-term indebtedness held by life-insurance companies, commercial banks, and other creditors, and at the same time Congress provided funds to enable the banks to defer principal payments, grant extensions, and reduce the interest rates for a temporary period. To reimburse the banks for extensions granted and deferments of principal, Congress has appropriated in the aggregate $189,000,000. Payments for the temporary interest reduction on both land-bank and Commissioner loans through March 1940 totaled more than $193,000,000.

DEBTS SCALED DOWN

During the emergency period in 1933 and 1934 about 90 percent of the Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loan proceeds was used to refinance indebtedness. In the course of this refinancing some creditors scaled down their claims to bring the borrower's indebtedness within the amount which could be loaned by the banks and the Commissioner. Such scale-downs were effected in the case of one out of every four borrowers and averaged about one-third of their previous indebtedness. For the entire period, May 1933 through 1939, such scale-downs have amounted to more than $200,000,000.

INTEREST RATES GREATLY REDUCED

Interest rates paid by farmers refinancing through the Federal land banks and the Land Bank Commissioner during the period May 1933 through December 1939 have been lowered materially from those previously paid. The average rate paid by such borrowers prior to refinancing was 6.2 percent, which compares with a rate of slightly less than 5 percent after refinancing. In addition, these borrowers received the benefit of the temporarily reduced interest rates on land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans provided by Congress. The competitive effect of the land-bank lending activities has also tended to reduce the interest rates charged by other farm-mortgage lenders which, in turn, has been beneficial to farmers outside the land-bank system.

FARM HOMES SAVED FROM FORECLOSURE

Through the refinancing program of the Farm Credit Administration, thousands of farmers were able to retain possession of farms which in 1932 were threatened with foreclosure. In that year forced sales of farms through foreclosure, bankruptcy, and so forth, averaged 38.8 per 1,000 farms for the United States as a whole. Since then the rate has fallen steadily and for the year 1939 is estimated at about 11.

FINANCING AND REFINANCING FARMS HELPS OTHERS

Farmers were not the only beneficiaries from the refinancing program since insurance companies and commercial banks which were hard pressed for funds in 1933 by reason of the general financial collapse received millions of dollars in the refinancing of their farm-mortgage loans and frozen short-term agricultural paper which permitted these institutions in turn to meet the demands of their policyholders and depositors. Likewise, State and municipal authorities were the recipients of similar sums in connection with the payment of delinquent taxes with the proceeds of land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. Thus the refinancing activities of the Farm Credit Administration during the period 1933–35 stand out not only as an important contribution to American agriculture, through assisting many farmers to retain farms which might otherwise have been lost through foreclosure, but also as a contribution to the restoration of order in the economic structure of the country.

GREATER NUMBER OF LOANS FOR PURCHASE

With the decline in the demand for refinancing after 1935, there has been an increase in the percent of loans made for the purchase of farms. While only about 3 percent of land-bank loans closed in 1934 was used to purchase farm property, about 23 percent of loans closed by the land banks and the Commissioner during 1939 was used for this purpose. Since 1935, when the Land Bank Commissioner was first authorized to make loans for the purchase of farms, to the end of 1939, about 25,000 farms, involving almost $85,000,000, have been bought with the proceeds of land-bank and Commissioner loans. In addition, during this period about 57,000 farms, representing approximately $124,000,000, were sold by the banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

SYSTEM ROUNDED OUT

To round out and complete a system which would be fully prepared to meet the credit needs of American agriculture, the powers and resources of certain agencies were enlarged by the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 and provision was also made for certain other institutions. With the addition of these institutions, the Farm Credit Administration now has under its supervision four permanent lending agencies: First, the Federal land banks established in 1917 for the purpose of making long-term amortized loans on farm real-estate security; second, the Federal intermediate-credit banks created in 1923 as agricultural banks of discount; third, the production-credit system authorized in 1933 and made up of production-credit corporations and associations making short-term loans; and, fourth, the banks for cooperatives also authorized in 1933 which make loans to farmers' cooperatives. These institutions are designed to meet the entire range of needs of farmers for credit accommodations to finance their production, marketing, and purchasing operations upon terms suited to their particular requirements and at the lowest rates of interest consistent with those prevailing in the money markets.

OTHER AGENCIES SUPERVISED BY FARM CREDIT

Closely affiliated with the Farm Credit Administration is the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which was established in 1934. It is an independent corporation which has availed itself of the existing organization and services of the Farm Credit Administration and Federal land-bank system in the making and servicing of Land Bank Commissioner loans, which were first provided in 1933. The Farm Credit Administration also exercises general supervision over emergency crop- and feed-loan offices, Federal credit unions, joint-stock land banks, regional agricultural credit corporations, and the Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund. With the exception of the first two, the remainder are in process of liquidation.

FUNCTIONS TAKEN OVER BY FARM CREDIT

The functions taken over by the Farm Credit Administration in 1933 included general supervisory authority over the joint-stock land banks, which are private institutions established in accordance with the Federal Farm Loan Act to make amortized farm-mortgage loans with the proceeds of the sale of tax-exempt farm-loan bonds. The Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 provided for the orderly liquidation of these institutions. At the beginning of liquidation in 1933 the gross assets of the 44 joint-stock land banks aggregated slightly more than $487,000,000, with indebtedness totaling about $415,000,000. By March 31, 1940, 7 years later, the number of banks had been reduced to 35, assets to $139,000,000, a reduction of 71 percent, and outstanding indebtedness to $94,000,000, a reduction of 77 percent.

SHORT-TERM PRODUCTION CREDIT

Under the Farm Credit Act of 1933 Congress provided assistance to farmers and stockmen in building a system of local cooperative production credit associations designed to make loans on crop and chattel security and serve as permanent sources of short-term credit. These associations, 528 of which were in operation on March 31, 1940, make short-term loans to farmers. The present rate on such loans is 4½ percent.

The greater part of the capital stock of the production credit associations is owned by the 12 production credit corporations which were established in 1933 to organize, assist in the capitalization of, and supervise the activities of the production credit associations. The remainder of the capital stock is owned by the farmer members of the associations, who subscribe to stock in amounts approximately equal to 5 percent of their loans.

From organization through March 31, 1940, the production credit associations made 1,412,800 loans in the amount of almost $1,525,000,000, and at the end of the period loans outstanding amounted to over $173,800,000.

The Federal intermediate-credit banks provide loan funds for the production-credit associations. These banks, of which there are 12, one in each farm-credit district, were organized pursuant to the agricultural acts of 1923, to supply short-term credit for purposes more suited to the seasonal needs of agriculture than are usually granted by commercial banks. Loans and discounts made by these banks may have a maturity of not more than 3 years. The banks make loans to and discount agricultural paper for State and national banks, livestock loan companies, and other private financing institutions, as well as for production-credit associations and banks for cooperatives. The present discount rate in the continental United States is 1½ percent. Federal intermediate-credit banks obtain the major part of their loan funds through the sale of collateral-trust debentures to the investing public. From May 1, 1933, through March 31, 1940, the intermediate-credit banks have extended credit in the total amount of almost $2,925,100,000, of which about $214,100,000 was outstanding on the latter date.

As the production-credit associations took over the function of furnishing production credit, the regional agricultural-credit corporations, which were organized in 1932 for making loans direct to farmers and stockmen, were placed in liquidation. The amount of regional agricultural-credit corporation loans still oustanding on March 31, 1940, was approximately $7,888,310.

EMERGENCY CROP AND SEED LOANS

In addition to assisting farmers to build a cooperative system of short-term production credit Congress has, from time to time, authorized emergency crop and feed loans from Government funds to meet the credit requirements of those farmers who do not have adequate security to obtain loans through the permanent institutions. This type of loan is made by the Farm Credit Administration from Government appropriations. A total of $199,985,000 has been loaned for this purpose from May 1, 1933, through the end of March 1940. In addition, about $72,000,000 was loaned in 1934 and 1935 to farmers in drought-stricken areas, primarily for the purpose of maintaining livestock in areas seriously affected by the drought. At the end of March 1940, about $124,000,000 of emergency crop and feed loans and about $52,000,000 of drought-relief loans were outstanding.

CREDIT FOR FARMERS' COOPERATIVES

To meet the credit needs of associations of farmers engaged in marketing farm products, purchasing farm supplies or performing farm-business services, a central bank for cooperatives located in Washington, D. C., and 12 district banks for cooperatives located in each of the farm-credit districts were established under the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

These banks make three types of loans to farmers' cooperative associations; commodity loans, operating-capital loans, and loans on physical facilities. The current interest rates on these loans are 1½ percent, 2½ percent, and 4 percent, respectively. Commodity loans are rediscounted with the Federal intermediate credit banks.

From organization through March 31, 1940, about $504,668,000 has been loaned to cooperatives by the 13 banks for cooperatives and at the end of the period about $69,300,000 was outstanding. Following the establishment of the banks for cooperatives the Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund established in 1929 to make loans to farmers' cooperative associations and to stabilization corporations was placed in liquidation. On March 31, 1940, loans from this fund were still outstanding in the amount of $19,763,000.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

In addition to its agricultural activity the Farm Credit Administration is charged with the duty of chartering, regulating, and examining Federal credit unions established under the act of June 26, 1934. A Federal credit union is defined as a cooperative association for the purpose of promoting thrift among its members and creating a source of credit for provident or productive purposes. Membership in a Federal credit union is limited to groups having a common bond of occupation or association or to groups within a well-defined neighborhood, community, or rural district.

The first Federal credit union was chartered on October 1, 1934, and during the period ended March 31, 1940, a total of 3,766 charters had been granted. This rate of growth evidences the widespread interest in the credit-union method of saving and borrowing and is of particular interest in view of the fact that these credit unions do not depend for their operation on Government loans or financial aid of any kind.

As of December 31, 1939, the 3,127 reporting Federal credit unions in the United States had a total membership of 837,362 and a total share balance of over $42,000,000. These credit unions have made over 1,850,000 loans for over $170,000,000 from organization through December 31, 1939, and had about 407,000 loans outstanding in the total amount of almost $37,000,000 on December 31, 1939.

CONCLUSION

The accomplishments of the Farm Credit Administration during the past 6½ years should be considered in relation to the objectives of a system designed to meet the credit needs of farmers. Basically the Administration's objective was to provide the facilities through which farmers and their cooperatives having a reasonable basis for credit could reach the investment market and borrow funds essential to their business on terms appropriate to the business and at reasonable cost, or briefly, to achieve credit equality for agriculture as an industry—a credit equality unattainable by farmers as individuals. Such a system could be organized to provide the types of credit ordinarily required in agricultural operations. It should also furnish a permanent and dependable source of credit sympathetic to agriculture to take care of needs in both good times and bad times, upon terms suited to the needs and at the lowest costs consistent with sound business operation. Measured against these objectives it is apparent that the institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration have made substantial progress in the development of such an agricultural credit program.

Widows and Orphans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER FROM RUTH MILLER STEESE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MIFFLINBURG, PA., *May 21, 1940.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I express to you the appreciation of the American Legion Auxiliary for the recognition accorded it by your remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives, May 13, 1940.

As legislative chairman, speaking for 42,000 members in the State of Pennsylvania, and for the personal courtesy, I wish to offer a sincere "Thank you."

Very truly,

RUTH MILLER STEESE,
State Legislative Chairman, American Legion Auxiliary.

The Formula of Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY FELIX MORLEY

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, few authorities in America have a more comprehensive and cogent knowledge of the philosophy of federation than Felix Morley, editor of the Washington Post and president-elect of Haverford College. Recognized as one of America's foremost authorities in the field of collectivism, anything that he says about post-war conditions is of compelling interest. In the current issue of Asia he has written an article on The Formula of Federation. I have asked permission to include it here.

[From Asia for June 1940]

THE FORMULA OF FEDERATION

(By Felix Morley)

The character of international organization after the war depends primarily, of course, on the outcome of the war.

If Germany should obtain a complete triumph there will undoubtedly be a punitive peace, designed to cripple or at least greatly reduce the war potential of Great Britain and France. In that event no form of league, still less of federation, need be anticipated in Europe. The major question would be how soon the victorious dictatorships—Germany and Russia—would run afoul of each other. And while one might then anticipate an anti-Russian coalition, perhaps including Japan, it would be a temporary grouping having no purpose deeper than nationalistic aggrandizement.

If, conversely, the Franco-British alliance should win a knock-out victory, the peace would also, in all probability, be punitive—at Germany's expense. It might well be even more punitive than in the case of a Nazi triumph, for the French and British will want to insure that there could be no repetition of Germany's remarkable revival as a military power. But since Great Britain and France are not anxious to assume full responsibility for the permanent policing of a disarmed Germany, some sort of league, camouflaged as a peace organization, would undoubtedly be formed to undertake this invidious task.

An alternative to this would be if, after an overthrow of Hitler, Germany should join the Allies in what would be pictured as a crusade against Russia. In that event the Reich would be a member, rather than the victim, of the post-war European league. Again, however, the combination would have been formed for an essentially military and narrowly political purpose.

Obviously, therefore, it is academic to discuss the form of post-war international organization in advance of some positive evidence as to how the war will end. Many imponderables are involved.

At the same time this discussion, as the editor of Asia evidently realizes, is of far more than theoretical importance. Blueprints of a workable mechanism must be drawn, and public opinion must be made receptive to these plans in advance of any settlement. Otherwise civilization, so horribly prepared for war, will again be unprepared to make a lasting peace. And a primary duty of the United States, as the most powerful and most secure neutral in the present conflict, is to concentrate on such plans as promise establishment of a peace which can be relied upon by Americans as well as by the people of other lands.

The consideration is the more feasible because of the possibility—it may well be probability by the time this article is printed—that neither side will achieve a knock-out victory in the present war. And it may be argued that military stalemate, followed by a negotiated peace, offers the best, perhaps the only, opportunity for a more ordered post-war world.

A dictated peace, no matter how enlightened the dictator, cannot be a constructive peace. A dictated peace has as its primary objective the humiliation and degradation of the defeated. No matter how this fact is justified by attributions of war guilt, or glossed by provisions for international cooperation on a new basis, the essential maladjustment between the dominance of the victor and the subordination of the vanquished will remain. In the psychology of this situation, not in the specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles, lay the seeds of the overthrow of the last peace settlement and the collapse of the League of Nations.

A negotiated peace, on the other hand, is from its nature one in which neither party holds the whip hand. Its terms are reached by agreement, reluctantly given, perhaps, but nonetheless free from that searing stigma of enforced subjection which is inherent in the dealings between conqueror and conquered. A negotiated peace, in other words, provides a lasting basis on which stable international relationships can be built up. A dictated peace, as the history of the 1919 treaties shows, is a rotten foundation which threatens eventual ruin to all the superstructure reared upon it.

For this reason many who hold the Nazi doctrine in abhorrence are nevertheless reaching the conclusion that a compromise peace is in the long-range interests of civilization. Of course this would imply that Germany will have her way in Central Europe, but that is as economically inevitable as it is politically unpleasant. The indications that the Allies lack the strength to prevent this outcome, and the certainty that the United States will not resist it, are confirmatory of a conclusion which is not less probable because it is ethically indefensible.

To argue that such an outcome would represent a "betrayal of democracy" is emotional sentimentality in its most idiotic and vicious form. The betrayers of democracy are really those who want to see the war continued until all the belligerents are utterly exhausted—physically, morally, and spiritually. Far from insuring the triumph of democracy, such an outcome would to a certainty guarantee its extinction in the nations now endeavoring to defend that doctrine by force of arms.

Little reflection should be needed to realize that present-day democracy is a luxury system. In the modern world it can operate only among peoples which have developed on a broad basis the wealth, the leisure, and the relatively easy living conditions necessary to maintain a complicated and essentially inefficient form of government. Dictatorship, on the other hand, is primitive. It will inevitably come into control wherever and whenever the conditions of life for the masses are desperate and devoid of promise. When men are confronted with a collapse of living standards they have neither the patience nor the desire to operate the intricate mechanism of democratic government.

It is, therefore, a contradiction in terms to speak of a war to make the world safe for democracy. Modern war, rapidly destroying the ease and stability in which democracy roots, can only make the world unsafe for that system of government. Modern warfare, involving ever-increasing state controls, can only hasten and accentuate the trend toward totalitarianism. The longer the present war continues, therefore, the more parlous the future of democracy will be, in the United States as well as in Great Britain and France.

With peace, on the other hand, and with the rapid growth and better distribution of wealth and leisure possible in a peaceful world, democracy as a refined system of government comes into its own and dictatorships are at an increasing disadvantage. Given protracted peace, the certain evolution of the dictatorships will be toward democracy. Given protracted war, and dictatorship will become ever more strongly fettered on those peoples which have resorted to it; it will also become more probable as the outcome for those nations which are engaged in the ghastly paradox of trying to strengthen democracy by war.

The spreading realization of this simple truth is one reason for expecting a negotiated peace, once a greater or less degree of further suffering has undermined Nazi confidence and convinced all the weary but evenly matched belligerents of the futility of this war. And although the German dictatorship will perhaps seem to gain most from a negotiated peace, as the British and French democracies seemed to gain most from a dictated peace in 1919, the mere appearance of gain will probably hasten the amelioration of totalitarism and the evolution toward democracy of both the Nazi and Communist parties. Indeed, it is only this prospect which makes consideration of post-war organization of a profitable exercise.

The probabilities in Europe therefore seem to point toward some form of continental federation under the leadership of governments which will be drawn together alike by the exhaustion of their strength, the weakness of their currencies and the similarity of the autarchic controls which war is fettering on the economic systems of both democracies and dictatorships.

The lines of this union are already forming in the rapid coordination of Great Britain and France on one side of the fighting lines and the scarcely less definite alinement of Germany and Italy on the other. When the time comes, these axis combinations may readily be extended to group together at least the four major European powers. For political and economic reasons Russia, a continent in herself, is likely to remain outside the western European grouping.

It is insufficiently recognized that the Berlin-Rome axis and that of London-Paris are steadily being hammered on the anvil of war into a malleability which will facilitate their eventual combination. It was also unrecognized by many, prior to last August, that a Russo-German alliance was highly probable, in spite of the superficial antipathies of Nazis and Communists. Mutual necessity can very soon bundle erstwhile enemies into the same political bed, and the necessity for a permanent cooperation between Germany, Great Britain, and France is increasing with every day that they waste their substance in fighting one another.

The role of Italy, seemingly, will be to forward this four-power combination. It was premature at Stresa and premature at Munich, but is now being steadily, if almost imperceptibly, forged in the fires of a war which is rapidly converting Great Britain and France into state socialisms more and more akin to the Nazi and Fascist patterns.

To this anticipated grouping of the great European powers the unscathed nations on that continent would quickly and gladly

adhere. This is so certain as scarcely to need discussion. The role of these neutrals will be to assuage such bitterness as will linger between the belligerents after a war in which singularly little nationalistic bitterness is felt. And the more enlightened neutrals should also exercise effective leadership in liberalizing economic restrictions and lowering trade barriers between the members of a European league who will all be reduced to an appalling poverty.

In the Western Hemisphere, which aside from Canada will presumably not be dragged into the European war almost regardless of events, the general line of development is already clear. Pan Americanism, now actively fostered by the Government of the United States, will develop to the extent that this country is willing to expand its trade—meaning imports as well as exports—with the Latin American countries.

That willingness will increase somewhat as our European markets contract with the growth of autarchy there. We shall, moreover, meet the stiffest kind of post-war European competition in Latin America. To offset that there will be greater effort to give Pan Americanism a political complexion—to build a league of the Americas. And the other New World republics will tend to fall in line to the extent that the United States is willing to advance them loans and credits. This, despite the experience of the twenties, we shall probably do—by action of the Government rather than of private banks. Indeed, such advances will be essential to offset state-aided European competition.

In the Far East political evolution will probably be somewhat similar to that which may be expected in Europe. The condition of mutual exhaustion and stalemate is even more definitely reached in the Sino-Japanese war than is as yet the case in the European conflict. Japan cannot wholly conquer Nationalist China, and the Chungking government cannot successfully loosen the stranglehold of the invader on China's ports and arteries of communication. Whether through the agency of Wang Ching-wei or another compromise, some face-saving formula permitting eventual collaboration between China and Japan will be attained.

A fair guess is that there will emerge a wholly independent but much contracted Chinese republic, two or three antonomous but Japanese-supervised areas more or less after the model of Manchukuo and a debilitated and chastened Japan in which the voice of business will for the first time become politically influential. Regularized cooperation of a regional variety may readily be anticipated between these units, the more so because federal development is logical for a country as vast, as undeveloped, and as parochial as is China.

We may thus anticipate the formation of three rather clearly defined regional combinations—in Europe, in the Americas, and in the Far East. The picture is incomplete primarily because the future of Russia and of the British Empire has not been envisaged.

In the case of Russia, prognostication is fairly safe. This sprawling empire is itself a federation of peoples, ranging from the newly subjected and highly civilized Finnish population to the primitive nomadic tribesmen of Outer Mongolia. To govern this huge and heterogeneous population effectively, and to carry through the tremendous Communist experiment successfully, Russia will need a long period of tranquillity. A western European league, involving the disappearance of a Poland of any consequence, would not arouse antagonism in Moscow. Nor would a far eastern federation which would automatically absorb Japanese energies in the development of eastern China. Stalin, or his successors, could view the outlined picture with complete equanimity.

The future of the British Empire is more difficult to foresee. The war is certain to weld Great Britain herself firmly into the European system, as already indicated by the comprehensive Anglo-French union now in effect. This development is of itself likely to accelerate the centrifugal tendency of the great self-governing dominions, only temporarily checked by their voluntary war participation. On the other hand, the sense of unity in the British Commonwealth of Nations is very strong—perhaps as strong as in the far-flung chain of Crown colonies. Particularly in a world where all the basic forces are working toward unification it is not easy to anticipate a dissolution of the British Empire.

A more likely possibility, it would seem, is that the British Commonwealth, with its self-governing units in Europe, America, and Asia, would operate to pull together and integrate the three anticipated regional combinations in those respective continents.

In such a task British statesmanship could rely on the practical assistance of the present League of Nations, which will undoubtedly come into its own again as a clearing house for technical cooperation in all fields, among all nations. As a central political institution, however, Geneva will be at least temporarily replaced by the three great regional federations, presumably operating under the leadership of Germany, the United States, and Japan, respectively. The rapidity with which the present league, or any other central agency, can bring these three groups into collaboration with one another would seem to depend primarily on the genius of British statesmanship. It will be assisted by that of France; for these two nations, losing their dominance in Europe, will be the more anxious to develop world-wide collaboration among the three regional groupings.

The Inter-Democracy Federal Union idea seems, as a practical development, completely outside the realm of attainment, although this is no reflection on its great educational value in a field of thought alien to most American minds. It is not merely that the scheme would take the United States out of the geographically logical Pan American development and merge it in a European grouping toward which the mass of opinion in this country is apathetic, to say the least. More to the point is the fact that the war is steadily chiseling down the area of capitalistic democracy in England and France. It is converting those countries into state socialisms and thereby giving them a far more natural affinity with Germany and Italy than with the United States.

That is the trend which this war is bringing, and from observation of that trend forecast can be attempted with some degree of assurance. Nor, at this stage of the trend, does it take a large degree of vision to anticipate the general shape of things to come. Those who have studied Spengler will remember the precision with which he mapped the outline, in essentials at any rate, nearly 20 years ago.

Relief Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. BUCKLEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the year 1935, when my service in Congress began, I have carefully studied the legislation dealing with appropriations for work relief and relief. I have also had innumerable contacts with the men and women who were obliged to avail themselves of this governmental aid. Too, I have noted the improvements that have been added to our national assets. Of course, there have been some imperfections, as there would necessarily be in connection with any program of such magnitude. However, I have come to certain definite conclusions as to its necessary continuance.

The bill now before the House will appropriate approximately $975,000,000 to be spent from July 1, 1940, to March 1, 1941, a period of 8 months. At this rate we will be spending approximately $1,500,000,000 annually, which was the amount that was appropriated the last fiscal year. Under this schedule there will be employed about 2,000,000 persons. If we appropriate less than this amount, or, as some suggest, reduce the appropriation by one-third of the present schedule, employment will be provided for an average of only 1,300,000 persons, or a reduction and dismissal of 700,000 workers.

In the past I made certain statements to the House which I would like to read at this time. On May 12, 1938:

> What shall we do with these people, for most of them, through no fault of their own, have come face to face with a situation where relief and W. P. A. aid is the only alternative to starvation. We cannot follow the do-nothing policy of the previous administration and just let nature take its course. We must help them until such time as private industry can absorb them into its ranks. I am not of the opinion that relief and governmental work is the solution to this economic problem. I do not even claim that the plan is perfect, but I cannot deny that it is the only way to help these people continue life until a change for the better develops.

Also:

> We will not adopt the do-nothing policy. Congress must and will act in behalf of the people. Any other policy will but give incentive to agitators who foster communism and fascism. We will continue to show the world that democracy can still solve this country's problems.

On June 16, 1939, in my remarks to this body, I said in part:

> I am still as ever convinced that the W. P. A. is responsible for many valuable contributions that are now permanent assets of the Nation, States, and local communities. More than that it has afforded employment to many people, thereby providing money with which to purchase the bare necessities of life. Further, it has preserved the skill of the worker and his morale which are so important for the continuation of an orderly democracy. It has helped the small-business man as those on work projects had means to purchase essential commodities.
>
> We had hoped that private industry would absorb the people from the relief rolls. A certain percentage were successful—a great portion of the unemployed did not receive this opportunity. * * * We are also aware that business conditions are as yet not normal so that we can discontinue or curtail this program.

The provision in the bill for removing all persons who have been employed on relief projects continuously for more than 18 months will work a great hardship on many people. There are many persons who cannot obtain employment in private industry. We have hundreds of thousands of able-bodied men and women between the ages of 40 and 65 who are unable to obtain jobs in private employment solely because of their age. This cannot be denied. I believe these persons should be allowed to continue on W. P. A.

In these days we are appropriating moneys in the preparation of activities for the defense of the Nation from outside forces. It is just as important to defend our country from the subversive forces within who challenge our democracy and preach and point to communism, nazi-ism, and fascism as the panacea. I have always contended that this country will weather the storm and work out its problems. It must, therefore, continue its policy to aid the deserving, who, through no fault of their own, need this comforting hand of our Government. This Nation will not let them down, and so today, in considering this program, let us do what we can to help those who merit our favorable support. I am sure that the moneys disbursed for these purposes will return dividends in the form of happier and healthier American citizens.

On August 5, 1939:

I am wondering how the Relief Act is going to work out. I hope that business makes rapid strides so as to make it unnecessary for Congress to make additional appropriations for W. P. A., but I have doubts in that direction.

The hardship and suffering that the dismissal provision will cause is something that we should try to remedy. I think it was a mistake to enact such a provision in the first place, but Congress owes it as a duty to the many men, women, and children who now suffer as a result of this provision to remedy it and show the unfortunate and underprivileged that they are concerned with their welfare.

Prior to that time, on July 12, 1939, I introduced H. R. 7164, a bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 to provide for the reestablishment of the prevailing rate of pay for persons employed upon work projects. The bill also contained a provision to repeal section 16 (b) of the Relief Act which relates to compulsory removal of persons who have been on the W. P. A. rolls for 18 months or longer. This bill, I regret to say, was never passed.

Though we had been in high hopes that employment would increase in leaps and bounds, especially due to the war abroad, we have noted in recent months no such hoped-for improvement. Our foreign markets have been virtually closed to American commerce. Outside of a limited field of war implements, there are very few countries in the world that are receiving our wares.

To reduce the small appropriation contained in this bill would be most unfair and would cause suffering in the homes of 700,000 families, cause loss of trade to the small merchants and industry, and would depress the income of farmers who are now feeling the effects in the loss of our foreign markets for disposal of their agricultural products. In fact, I favor a larger appropriation than this bill contains.

With regard to the 18-month clause on W. P. A., I note that the bill contains a provision excepting heads of families, 45 years of age or older, with dependents. This provision is a good one, and I regret that the committee in charge of this bill retained the 18-month clause. A great hardship has been caused to those affected by this provision, and I hope that we will eliminate it and thereby remedy the situation.

The majority of the people in the United States agree that the W. P. A. program has increased the material wealth of this country, and that as a result we can point to the many fine improvements in every city and State of the land, such as the construction and erection of schools, libraries, hospitals, health centers, airports, and swimming pools. Our parks have been enriched in beauty and scope of purpose so that the people can enjoy these facilities to the greatest extent. Other services rendered by the Works Progress Administration are the medical, dental, and nursing assistance supplied to those who require it; furnishing of housekeeping aids; luncheons served to the poor school children; sewing projects furnishing clothing to the poor and needy; educational and recreational projects. I could go on, but many of us are acquainted with this fine work.

The W. P. A. program is necessary, for it conserves the skill of unemployed workers.

In the next few days we will consider the defense bill to provide against possible foreign aggression. We cannot, in face of what is happening in the world today, remain unarmed if we wish our democracy to continue. I shall certainly vote for that bill. By the same token I believe that it is just as important to provide for the needy. As in the past, I have vigorously condemned communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, and stated that inadequate relief measures and social legislation would give aid and comfort to these agitators for foreign philosophies. It is at this time, the most crucial in the history of the world, when we must preserve our democracy against the prospect of any possible foreign aggression, that we provide as a part of that defense sufficient moneys to sustain the morale of our men and women, who through no fault of their own are unable to obtain employment and provide themselves with the necessities of life.

Credit for the Captains of Connecticut's Clipper Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut has been justly proud of its intrepid men who went out in clipper ships. I have addressed the House before on the exploits of many of them, and especially Capt. Nathaniel Palmer, whose activities in the South Pacific have made us all more conscious of that area's value. I note that the distinguished cartographer, Lawrence Martin, chief of the division of maps of the Library of Congress, has paid additional tribute to Captain Palmer, Capt. Benjamin Pendleton, and others in his address before the Eighth American Scientific Congress.

Incidentally, it might be helpful to those who are interested in maps to know that there is an excellent exhibition of maps in the National Academy Building. There, under the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, the division of maps has on exhibition the resplendent and valuable showing. The acknowledgment to the catalog says:

The maps have been made available by the diplomatic missions of the several American countries, members of the Pan American Union, by the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, by the departments and bureaus of the Government of the United States of America, and by our leading geographical and geological societies, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, the American Geophysical Union, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress.

The arrangement is by Lawrence Martin, Ph. D., chief, division of maps, and incumbent, Chair of Geography, Library of Congress, whose personal services and erudition have quickened the appreciation and enthusiasm of many a Congressman for the entire field of maps and map making.

Of especial interest to Connecticut people are these entrants:

21. Map of the Western Hemisphere, compiled in 1940, in the division of maps, Library of Congress, on a base map provided by the National Geographic Society, and showing the area concerned in the Monroe Doctrine, together with portraits of James Monroe, President of the United States, and of John Quincy Adams, his Secretary of State (from the division of fine arts, Library of Congress), and facsimiles of three pages from President Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America (from the original manuscript of this message in the division of manuscripts, Library of Congress, written, signed, and dated in the President's own hand).

27. Connecticut at the time of the ratification of the Constitution, from a 1780 original in the Library of Congress at Washing-

ton—a facsimile of Bernard Roman's Map of Connecticut and Parts Adjacent, 1777. United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

66. Manuscript map of Antarctica showing the route of Commander Byrd's barkentine *Bear* from Little America to East Base in the Palmer Peninsula, and routes of airplane flights from the ship to the mainland at several points in 1940. Compiled especially for the Eighth American Scientific Congress by Lt. Comdr. R. A. J. English. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

67. Map of the world showing relative areas and populations of the various continents and countries, and demonstrating that Antarctica is larger than Europe. Compiled by Laura H. and Lawrence Martin, Washington, D. C., 1925. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

68. Antarctic regions, chart No. 5411, 1939, by the United States Hydrographic Office. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

69. Southern base, Marguerite Bay, from a survey by A. Stephenson, from Southern Lights, the Official Account of the British Graham (Palmer) Land Expedition, 1934–37, by John Rymill, London, 1938. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

70. Antarctic regions, chart No. 5412, 1939, by the United States Hydrographic Office. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

71. Map of the world in 1822, the first map showing any part of Antarctica, from school atlas to accompany Woodbridge's Rudiments of Geography, Hartford, 1822. Note the words "Palmer's Land." (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

72. Antarctica, May 12, 1939, scale 1:16,000,000, with manuscript additions showing various claims to sovereignty. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

73. Maps of the Ellsworth trans-Antarctic flight of 1935, from the Geographical Review, volume xxvii. No. 3, 1937. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

74. Bathymetric map of the Antarctic. Compiled by the American Geographical Society of New York, 1929, scale 1:20,000,000. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

75. Map of Antarctica showing the claims of seven nations, from Life, volume 6, No. 24, June 12, 1939, pages 44–45. (U. S. Antarctic Service.)

EARLY EXPLORATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS IN SOUTHERN SOUTH AMERICA AND ADJACENT ANTARCTIC WATERS BY MARINERS AND SCIENTISTS FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Abstract by Lawrence Martin, chief, division of maps, and incumbent, chair of geography, the Library of Congress)

In October 1829 Capt. Nathaniel Brown Palmer, who had discovered the mainland of Antarctica 9 years earlier, sailed from New York in the brig *Annawan*, and Capt. Benjamin Pendleton sailed from Stonington, Conn., in the brig *Seraph*. With them traveled five scientific investigators—Dr. James Eights, of Albany, N. Y.; Dr. John Frampton Watson, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. Jeremiah N. Reynolds, of Wilmington, Ohio; and two associates whose names are not known. These five gentlemen were, as it seems, the first persons from the United States of America who carried on scientific investigations and inland explorations on the continent of South America. The captains of the two brigs independently explored the waters, largely uncharted, between South America and Antarctica.

Eights, of Albany, is the great name in the group. He was a trained physician and an accomplished naturalist, adorning the science of geology, including glaciology, and being highly competent in botany and zoology as well. Testimonials to this effect are to be found in the writings of Pierre Louis Antoine Cordier, distinguished French geologist and academician; of John M. Clarke, State geologist of New York; of H. D. House, State botanist of New York; of Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker, a great English botanist; and of W. T. Calman, celebrated zoologist and president of the Linnean Society of London.

The scientific investigations by Eights commenced in southeastern Argentina where he landed at several places on the east coast of Patagonia in January 1830. He collected, inter alia, a crustacean which he called Brongniartia trilobitoides, and which is now known as Serolis trilobitoides (Eights), and also a plant subsequently identified as Adesmia candida, by Hooker.

In the Isla de los Estados, or Staten Island, southeast of the Straits of Magellan, Eights continued scientific collecting. Here the botanical results included the plants Viola magellanica, Stellaria debilis, Galium antarcticum, Senecio eightsii, Clarionia magellanica, and Pratia repens. Doubtless some of these names have been modified in modern botanical practice.

In extreme southern Chile, upon islands near Cape Horn, Eights pursued his botanical and zoological studies shortly after January 22, 1830. A previously unidentified isopod, described as being found in unusual abundance in pools left by receding tides, was Sphaeroma bumastiformis.

Eights' principal geological studies were carried on in the South Shetland Islands, an archipelago much nearer to Antarctica than to South America. Here he spent the month of February 1830. He was the first professional geologist to say "let (Antarctic) rocks their silence break." He showed that the South Shetlands were underlain by argillaceous conglomerate and sandstone, dipping southeast at angles of 12° to 20°, intruded by basalt, and with carbonized wood in the conglomerate. Among recent plants, he found Usnea fasciata, Aira antarctica, some species of Polytrichum and one or two other lichens of Avena, and a marine fucus.

The sea life included two new species, Glyptonotus antarcticus, and Decolopoda australis, a 10-legged, red sea-spider, to say nothing of the more familiar fur seals, elephant seals, sea leopards, whales, porpoises, etc. Eights identified at least 16 species of South Shetland birds besides 5 species of penguins. He worked out the regime of the South Shetland tides, finding only one ebb and flow every 24 hours in most localities and studied the ocean bottom deposits.

The substantial geographical contribution of the two North American mariners in 1829–31, aside from taking the scientists to the places where they worked in Argentina, the South Shetland Islands, and Chile, was their demonstration that no oceanic islands are to be found southwest of South America along the particular courses independently traversed by the two brigs. A logbook in the Library of Congress, that of the schooner *Penguin*, a consort of the *Annawan* during the voyage from Staten Island to the South Shetlands and on to the Island of Mocha in Chile, contributes to meteorology, oceanography, and ornithology by indicating (1) directions and forces of the wind day by day, (2) days when there was rain or sleet, (3) presence or absence of icebergs and other sea ice, and of floating kelp, (4) distribution of penguins and other oceanic birds. During the 6 weeks' voyage of Capt. N. B. Palmer and his brother Alexander in the South Pacific, they sailed some 3,500 miles between February 20 and April 3, 1821, starting from Potters Cove in the South Shetlands, continuing to a point in the ocean near 58°01′ south latitude and 103°03′ west longitude, and ending at the Island of Mocha south of Concepción, Chile. Watson and Reynolds sailed westward on the *Annawan* with Captain Palmer.

Eights anticipated Charles Darwin some 9 years in observing glacial boulders carried in or left by floating icebergs and deducing from them the geology of unvisited lands poleward from the points of observation in the South Pacific Ocean and in the Shetland Islands. He probably sailed from this archipelago about March 1, 1830, in the *Seraph* with Pendleton and reached Chile early in May, after exploring southwestward and westward from the South Shetland Archipelago in the waters between 60° and 70° south latitude and 54° and 101° west longitude. By convincing deductions from two months of collecting meteorological, oceanographic, zoological, and botanical data, including facts about the prevailing winds, the fogs, snow, sea ice, icebergs with rocks in them, ocean currents, kelp, penguins, terns, and so forth, the Albany naturalist established the existence of a long stretch of unseen land. He thought it to be insular, that is, an extensive chain of islands—but it was actually a portion of the Antarctic mainland west of the Palmer Peninsula, a part of the terra incognita which Admiral Richard E. Byrd mapped by airplane flights from the *Bear* in 1940. The logbook of the brig *Seraph* for this voyage in 1829–31 is probably in some sea chest or some attic in Connecticut. If it is found, the division of maps at the Library of Congress would like to learn promptly where it is.

In southern Chile, where the *Seraph* and the *Annawan* operated together in 1830–31, Eights presumably continued his geological, botanical, and zoological studies, chiefly in the lands adjacent to the Chonos Archipelago, the Gulfs of Ancud and Corovado, the island of Chiloe, and adjacent islands and waters. Reynolds and Watson, landed by Pendleton and Palmer at the mouth of the River Arauco on July 23, 1830, spent 4 months or more in the interior of the so-called Araucania, exploring the lands, investigating the resources, and studying the native people. They brought back 13 chests of scientific specimens which were placed in the Lyceum of Natural History at New York City and two chests which were given to an institution at Philadelphia, Pa. Reynolds presented to the Boston Society of Natural History in Massachusetts a substantial collection of ornithological, botanical, marine, and mineralogical specimens, not only from the South Shetlands and Chile, but from Peru and the Galapagos Islands as well. Fragments of Eights' herbaria are in the State Herbarium at Albany, N. Y., other portions being with the collections of Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker in England. His geological and zoological specimens and his field notebooks have not been located.

These explorations and scientific studies in the southern parts of Argentina and Chile, and in adjacent islands and waters, resulted indirectly from a message which John Quincy Adams, President of the United States of America, sent to our Senate and House of Representatives on December 6, 1825, only 5 years after the discovery of the Antarctic mainland by Palmer. If Pendleton and Palmer had not taken Eights and Watson and Reynolds in 1829–31 to the localities alluded to above, there might never have been a United States exploring expedition of 1838–42 under Admiral Charles Wilkes. Eights' field work in Patagonia and Isla de los Estados in Argentina and near Cape Horn in Chile is one of the very early professional scientific investigations in the coastal regions of South America, as well as in the South Shetland Islands and South Pacific Ocean not far north of Antarctica, by a technically qualified scholar from North America. Reynolds and Watson's studies in Araucania, Chile, seem to constitute the first exploration and scientific field investigation in the interior of South America by learned men from the United States of America.

Let's See the Expense Bill, Tony!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 12, 1940:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 12, 1940]

LET'S SEE THE EXPENSE BILL, TONY!

One of the minor horrors of war, its cost, is brought home forcibly by Senator GUFFEY'S bill to pay Anthony J. Drexel Biddle $243,361 for personal property lost in the German invasion of Poland. Apparently, in sending Mr. Biddle to Warsaw, it was not the original outlay that counted, but the upkeep.

In the course of his flight, it appears, he left behind him at his two ambassadorial residences a lot of valuable trinkets, antiques, paintings, and the like. In order to have a fitting background, he had had his villas redecorated at considerable cost, and a few vanloads of tapestries and furniture moved in. As the Ambassador didn't want to be encumbered by any chaise longues, champagne buckets, old masters, or similar excess baggage during his strategic retreat, all these valuables were lost.

Mr. Biddle has frequently been cited as one of the world's best-dressed men. His homburg, spats, double-breasted jackets, and his gloves carried just so have elicited sighs of admiration, envy, and heartache from authorities in such matters.

Whether the Ambassador's wardrobe is included in the list of losses is still undetermined, but as he traveled lightly, as well as swiftly, it may be assumed that some of Warsaw's most precious loot was made up of assorted Biddle haberdashery. Perhaps, perish the thought, some of the brighter items have even now been made over to fit the more exuberant style of Herr Goering, in his way another fashion plate.

Mr. Biddle is now resting in France, where, it is hoped, he will keep his person and personal property secure from further expensive losses to the citizenry of this country. Meanwhile, it should not make him wince too much if the taxpayers whom he invites to put up the tidy sum of $243,361 should ask him in turn for a little itemized statement. If we are to pay for such luxuries, we should know what they are.

Boys Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I sent to be read at the Thirty-fourth Annual Convention of the Boys Clubs of America:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1940.

Mr. HUNTINGTON R. HARDWICK,
Boys' Club of Boston, Charlestown, Mass.

DEAR MR. HARDWICK: It is a great pleasure to send this message to the Thirty-fourth Annual Convention of the Boys Clubs of America, and I regret that due to official business in Washington, I cannot be with you personally.

It is a well-known fact that many of our hero headliners—whose names are constantly in the limelight, on the radio, in the sports and magazine pages, on the stage, and in the movies—have had the good fortune, as growing youngsters, to belong to boys clubs. I say, in all sincerity, and from personal observation, that I know of no better place for an adolescent boy to supplement and round out his home training; no better place to develop stamina and toughness and ability to take it on the chin," all necessary requisites if he is to carve his name in high places and forge ahead to success and happiness.

Sportsmanship is quickly developed through participation in club activities, either educational or competitive. We know that almost the first lesson a boy learns is that although he may win today, he may also lose tomorrow. This primary lesson, which is sometimes a cruel one, teaches a proper respect for another's abilities, toleration and consideration of another's frailties, and the beginning of a larger understanding concerning humanitarian ideals.

With natural and refreshing spontaneity, boys lavish their worship upon national idols; therefore, the responsibility of maintaining that high place in the affections of the boy becomes the obligation of the hero. We all know how this responsibility is accepted without reservation by the hero headliners. It is true that boys need heroes, but I believe it is equally true that heroes need boys.

The Boys Clubs of America are a tremendous moral force whose influence it is impossible to gage. Their past accomplishments in the field of human endeavor will never be fully known; for what they hope to achieve in the future in an almost limitless field of service, they have the good will, best wishes, and earnest support of the American public.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. FLAHERTY, M. C.

Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER FROM JOHN W. HOWE

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter written to me by Mr. John W. Howe, vice president of the Truax-Trear Coal Co., of Chicago, Ill. A close study of Mr. Howe's statements demonstrates again the disruptive influence of bureaucratic control of private industry. In maintaining the present Bituminous Coal Act we are gradually suffocating by regulation and red tape one of the greatest American industries. If the Members of Congress would study the history of this legislation instead of yielding to the pressure of self-interested groups, they would wipe the Coal Act from the books with little hesitation. I represent a bituminous coal mining district. If the Bituminous Coal Act had produced a single benefit to operator or miner, I would be among its stanchest supporters. Because this legislation is placing the kiss of death on one great segment of our system of free enterprise, I shall continue to oppose it until modification or repeal has been accomplished.

Mr. Howe's letter to me follows:

On April 25, Director Howard A. Gray, of the Bituminous Coal Division, issued an opinion construing one of the marketing rules established under the Guffey Act, in which he said, in effect, that the Division would not consider invalid agreements whereby the seller of coal agrees to refund the difference between the current market or contract price prior to the effective date of minimum prices and the applicable minimum statutory price paid, in the event that the prices are invalidated in court. Innocent appearing on its face, this statement by the Director upon analysis proves to be one of the most insidiously powerful weapons yet devised by the Division in its efforts to bring the bituminous mining industry under its complete control and dictation, and should be given the widest publicity by members of the industry and their Representatives in Congress, to the end that an aroused public opinion will repudiate this latest step in the progressive demoralization of a great industry.

Director Gray's statement was issued in connection with a request to construe section VII, rule 1 (H) of the Marketing Rules and Regulations, which specifically states that no sales may be made under a condition that a part of the sales price (the applicable minimum price established by the Division) is to be withheld by the buyer or deposited in escrow pending a court decision on the validity of the act. Surprisingly enough, it is Mr. Gray's opinion that his ruling that sales may be made with a clause providing for a refund is not in conflict with this established rule, although it is evident that the rule itself is thus rendered completely impotent, and an insurmountable barrier created to any fair trial of the prices to be established under the Guffey Act in the near future. Mr. Gray has made a distinction without a difference.

Naturally, the immediate effect of this pronouncement will be that every buyer of coal will insist upon a provision in every contract of sale to the effect that a negotiated refund is to be granted

in some specified amount in case the statutory prices are invalidated at any time in the future.

It is illuminating to find how this will work out in actual practice. First of all, it will render absolutely meaningless the established minimum prices under which all coal is supposed to be sold, and substitute therefor a competitive system of promised refunds, with the business going to the seller who is prepared to enter into a sales contract providing for the largest refund in case of the invalidity of the act or the prices established thereunder. The viciousness of this kind of competition can easily be imagined, and all producers, regardless of how irreproachable their business ethics, or how honestly interested in cooperating in a fair trial of the price-fixing provisions of the act they are, will be forced to enter into the mad scramble for business on the basis of who will promise the largest refund in order to survive at all.

After the producer has collected the sales price of his coal, including the portion covered by the refund agreement, he is not to be permitted to put the possible excess into a separate fund to be held against the possible eventuality of paying the refund provided for in the contract, but must put it into his general corporate funds, where it will be regarded as tangible income and be subject to Federal and local taxes, both as to income and personal property. In the case of the larger operators, the amount thus collected will run into hundreds of thousands of dollars per year, all of which must be held idle by the operators, subject to periodical assessment and taxation, because of the fear that at some future time it may be necessary that it be refunded to the various customers. Thus it is seen that this new development will inevitably postpone any possible benefits to be derived from the higher prices to be realized under the Division's proposed schedules for many years to come, until all phases of the act and the proceedings thereunder have been thoroughly litigated, and the statutory period during which such actions may be brought has expired. When understood, this will be a very great disillusionment to those few in the industry who still hold to a hope that some benefit may come from the price-fixing provisions of the act.

Thus, we are left with the inescapable conclusion that the only real beneficiaries of this new development are to be those who are solely interested in the perpetuation of the strangle-hold of the powerful bureau which has been created under this act, at the expense of the complete disorganization of the bituminous mining industry. For it is to be found, on examination, that the inevitable result of the application of Director Gray's ruling will be that the overwhelming majority of the members of the industry who neither believe in nor desire Government control of their business will be effectively prevented from exercising their constitutional privilege of testing the validity of the act and the proceedings thereunder in court, because of the fact that they will have so much invested in possible refunds that they cannot afford to see the act declared invalid and be forced to return the large sums which will have accumulated during the inevitably lengthy period necessary to bring any action before a court of final determination.

This is an insidious new development in the campaign of a powerful few high in the inner councils of the administration to bring one of the country's largest industries under complete bureaucratic domination, and it should be resisted to the utmost by every citizen of the United States who realizes that it is vital to the continued progress of this country that free competitive enterprise not be destroyed. Given complete publicity, it is believed that the people of the country will unmistakably indicate their dissatisfaction with the entire scheme embodied in the Guffey Act, with its record of a completely fruitless expenditure of over $12,000,000 during the past 5 years, which is resulting in the complete demoralization and bankruptcy of this great industry.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. HOWE.

Forget War Jitters—Look at Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the following news article indicates that the American people are protected by a competent, efficient, and strong Navy. There is no reason for war jitters or for feeling that the United States is vulnerable to attack and invasion. Let us look at the naval strength of the leading nations in the world, for only in that way can we properly estimate the potential incursive ability of any future enemy or combination of enemies. We know that no invasion can be successfully carried out without supplies, men, and military equipment, including tanks and artillery.

Let us prepare for defense and keep our Army, Navy, and air force in perfect shape supplied with the latest military devices. But let us prepare with reason, not with emotional abandon.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1940]

LOSSES OF OTHER NAVIES ADD TO UNITED STATES SUPERIORITY—PERSONNEL BETTER THAN ANY IN WORLD, OBSERVERS ASSERT

(By Walter Trohan)

The American Navy today is confident it can defeat any fleet afloat. The Navy high command is certain the fleet can exercise its function of bringing an enemy to terms at a safe distance from American shores.

In his last annual report, released last November 25, Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison told President Roosevelt:

"I am glad to report that in my opinion the battle efficiency of the United States Fleet fully measures up to the confidence reposed in it by the citizens of our country in whose service it is dedicated.

PERSONNEL SUPERIOR

"The morale of our personnel is high. The education and mental caliber of our enlisted men are superior. The fine quality of the leadership of the officers has been again confirmed by gratifying accomplishment in the naval operations conducted during the year."

The American Fleet in numbers is larger than any afloat. War losses of other powers have made and are making it stronger. Though more of its vessels are overage than in the British Fleet, the fleet could, as it stands, hold off the British Navy, in the opinion of its officers.

BALANCED BUILDING PROGRAM

The Navy has a well-balanced building program designed to replace overage vessels. If the Navy should keep within its present limits with underage ships, it would be able to protect the United States, its possessions, and enforce the Monroe Doctrine, officers are confident. A 25-percent increase would provide a margin of safety, which may be desirable, it is felt.

The strength of the American Navy as compared with that of other powers is given in the following tables:

Type	Underage	Total	Building
UNITED STATES			
Battleships	12	15	8
Aircraft carriers	5	5	2
Heavy cruisers	18	18	0
Light cruisers	15	17	8
Destroyers	57	219	40
Submarines	27	95	19
Total	134	369	77
GREAT BRITAIN			
Battleships	14	14	9
Aircraft carriers	6	8	7
Monitors [1]	3	3	0
Heavy cruisers	15	16	0
Light cruisers	26	49	23
Destroyers	109	182	32
Submarines	44	56	10
Total	217	328	81
FRANCE			
Battleships	6	7	4
Aircraft carriers	1	1	2
Heavy cruisers	7	7	0
Light cruisers	11	11	3
Destroyers	72	73	32
Submarines	73	77	25
Total	170	176	65
ITALY			
Battleships	5	5	3
Aircraft carriers	0	0	0
Monitors [1]	5	5	0
Heavy cruisers	7	7	0
Light cruisers	12	14	14
Destroyers	98	130	12
Submarines	104	154	26
Total	231	315	55
JAPAN			
(Following are only available estimates of Japanese Navy, which has refused to exchange any data)			
Battleships	10	10	3
Aircraft carriers	11	11	2
Heavy cruisers	12	17	0
Light cruisers	15	23	5
Destroyers	75	134	9
Submarines	40	59	3
Total	163	254	22

[1] Monitors are vessels of light draft carrying guns of more than 8-inch caliber for duty in shallow waters.

Increase in submarines since the outbreak of the war unknown.

As to Politics and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer:

The usually reliable New York Times says President Roosevelt is "seriously considering the appointment of several Republicans to secretaryships in a coalition Cabinet." And among the prospective appointees mentioned are Col. Frank Knox, Chicago, publisher, as Secretary of the Navy, and Alf M. Landon as Secretary of War.

If this isn't playing politics with national defense it would be interesting to know what it is. Mr. Landon and Colonel Knox were the Republican candidates for President and Vice President in 1936. That, apparently, would be their sole qualification for the Cabinet posts suggested. Certainly neither man has had the practical experience to fit him for the task of heading either of our arms of defense, at a time when we are told we must prepare to repulse invasion. Presumably, the functions of these two gentlemen would be to line up the Republican Party back of Mr. Roosevelt for a third term; to satisfy the political appetite of the opposition.

If Mr. Roosevelt is considering these or any similar appointments, nothing could expose more fully the hollowness of the whole movement for a third term on a national defense basis. If we can safely switch the heads of the Army and Navy at a time of alleged crisis, and particularly if we can entrust the portfolios to men without specialized training in, or particular knowledge of, the business involved, what danger is there in trying a new President?

The whole thing, of course, is absurd. And the louder the ballyhoo gets, the clearer it becomes to this newspaper that Mr. Roosevelt is anybody but the man to lead us in time of crisis.

It is illuminating, we think, to note the reaction of airplane manufacturers to yesterday's dramatically called Washington conference. When it was all over, some of the men who had come to the Capitol with the expectation of hearing something definite and concrete expressed the disgusted opinion that the whole thing was chiefly a "publicity stunt" to help influence speedy enactment of the President's new defense program, and all agreed that little or nothing was accomplished. As one man expressed it, according to the United Press, "The Army people indicated that this whole thing was thrown at them so fast they didn't have a chance to get prepared for the meeting."

In this connection The Intelligencer is in complete agreement with the statement made by Colonel Lindbergh on Sunday night, and it directs attention of readers to what General Johnson has to say on page 1 of today's issue. As Colonel Lindbergh says, we are in no danger of attack from anybody unless we bring it on by meddling in foreign affairs; nor is our defense job, whatever enemy we may face eventually, one of rushing through, pell-mell, an order for 50,000 airplanes to be built on the spot, etc. The job is one, as indicated in this column yesterday, of working out a long-term program for defense of this continent. That is a task for years, for decades, not for days or weeks, and it has nothing whatever to do with the Presidential succession.

Many strange things happen in American politics. But we cannot believe that the judgment of the American people has been so warped that they will keep in the White House, in defiance of the sensible third-term tradition, a man who has so bungled the job of managing the country in peacetime on the ground that he is the only one capable of leading us or in protecting us from war.

Cooperation Between the Republican and Democratic Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER FROM MELVIN G. WINSTOCK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein, at the request of Melvin G. Winstock, journalist and radio broadcaster, Seattle, Wash., his letter to Mr. John D. M. Hamilton, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C., as follows:

MAY 18, 1940.

Mr. JOHN D. M. HAMILTON,
Republican National Committee, 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: I submit the following suggestions and trust that you will find it expedient to act thereon without delay.

First. That the Republican National Committee authorize negotiation with the Democratic National Committee in the discussion of all matters concerning the present national emergency.

Second. That the Republican Party offer to nominate Franklin D. Roosevelt to succeed himself without opposition.

Third. That the Democratic National Convention nominate as vice president a Republican who shall have been chosen by the Republican National Convention.

Fourth. That the President give assurance that immediately he will form a coalition cabinet embracing representatives of major political, industrial, and financial groups.

Fifth. That Congress shall agree to the immediate passage of such legislation as will secure the maximum productivity of the Nation and shall conscript wealth, industry, agriculture, and labor.

Sixth. That in spite of all outcries that all "fifth columnists" be segregated and rendered harmless for the sabotaging of our program for national defense.

Seventh. That we make more certain the cooperation of all Central and South American republics for the defense of this hemisphere.

When Hoover, Taft, Knox, all Republicans, whose deep-rooted Americanism cannot be questioned, endorse the President to the limit in his foreign policy and declaration for national defense, it would seem to me that Americans all should set aside partisan politics and present a united front to the peoples of the world as evidence of the fact that democracy can speedily work to maintain the happiness and security of its people.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a similar letter to the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, confident that if you two loyal, devoted, patriotic American citizens sit around the council table in conference over this vital situation that as realists and practical men you will agree that the course herein recommended will solidify the Nation and go far toward saving our Government and its institutions from grave peril.

Respectfully,

MELVIN G. WINSTOCK.

Federal Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Evening Star of this city referring to 1,116 Federal strikes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN FEDERAL STRIKES LISTED IN STUDY BY DR. DAVID ZISKIND—NUMBER IS INCREASING STEADILY, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LECTURER ASSERTS

Eleven hundred and sixteen Government strikes are recorded in a study by Dr. David Ziskind published by the Columbia University Press.

These have been, according to Dr. Ziskind, at least 66 strikes in agencies whose function is public protection, 3 in public legislation and administration, 23 in public education, 94 in public health and sanitation, 72 in public-road construction, 18 in public parks and recreation, 62 in public-property maintenance, 114 in publicly owned utility operation, and 664 in the depression employment program.

"This list is incomplete, and the number of Government strikes is increasing steadily," says Dr. Ziskind, who is lecturer in labor law and legislation at American University.

The peculiarities of Government strikes are found not so much in their character as strikes as in the nature of the Government employment in which they have occurred, Dr. Ziskind points out.

SAME STRIKE TECHNIQUES

"The strike techniques of Government workers have been for the most part the ordinary methods of strikers in normal private employment," he adds. "The formation of unions, the election of grievance committees, the presentation of complaints or the spontaneous protest of the unorganized and the declaration of a strike have been similar for all employments.

"The picketing of places of employment and the delegation of representatives to bargain for adjustments have been essentially the same. Even the calling of police and the prosecution of offenders against the law have proceeded in the same fashion. But the difference between Government strikes and private strikes—differences in cause, conduct, and social import—have arisen because of the different types of employment interrupted by the strikes.

"A strike of W. P. A. bricklayers has differed from a building-trades strike in the construction industry because of the nature of the W. P. A. program, and W. P. A. strikes have differed from city firemen's strikes primarily because of the different jobs involved. It is essential, therefore, to observe the peculiarities of Government employment.

NO ABSOLUTE CHARACTERISTIC

"There is no absolute and universal characteristic of public employment that distinguishes all of it from all private employment. The nonprofit, monopolistic, impersonal, impartial and indispensable characteristics of the Government have been offered at various times as the distinctive aspects of Government employment. Those qualities are supposed to elevate Government work above all private enterprise and to entitle it to special consideration in labor disputes. However, these pretentions to uniqueness are not always well-founded.

"The nonprofit character of most public works does not apply to Government business such as the Panama Railroad, nor are public works any more nonprofit in nature than many privately endowed institutions such as universities and hospitals. The monopolistic character of most Government enterprises, such as the mail service, does not differ from the noncompetitive character of most private utilities, such as water systems and telephone companies.

"The impersonal quality of the Government and its absolute dependence upon human employees is shared by every private corporation. The alleged impartial, nonsectarian, nonfactional virtue of government is often more true of large-scale business organizations such as railroads and the telephone system.

PUBLIC'S DEPENDENCE

"The public is as much dependent upon various private utilities as upon certain branches of the Government. It would be much simpler to forego the reporting of weather than the packing of spring vegetables, and perhaps just as dangerous to dispense with private garbage disposal as with public street cleaning.

"The attributes of public employment that may call for special consideration do so not because they are unique or peculiar to Government employment, but because they have important social consequences—social consequences that flow from some private as well as some public employments. The correlation between these social consequences and Government employment must be sought separately in each form or type of Government employment."

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution, which I have today received from the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, of Omaha, Nebr.

The Omaha Chamber of Commerce has set an example of patriotic conduct which will commend itself to all Americans who are unselfishly interested in the welfare of their country. Sound national defense calls for the subordination of sectionalism and desire for personal profit to the broad aim of united action for united security. The following letter and resolution point the way to such action:

OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Omaha, Nebr., May 22, 1940.

Hon. CHAS. F. McLAUGHLIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McLAUGHLIN: We have naturally sensed an opportunity for Omaha and Nebraska in the new defense program. We feel, however, that this opportunity should be subordinated to the defense needs of the country as a whole.

Actuated by this feeling, our directors have unanimously passed the enclosed resolution which will guide and control our actions with respect to the proposed new units of the national defense. In the spirit of this resolution, we expect to make a complete and dignified presentation of the assets and advantages of this territory.

At the same time, however, we expect to refrain from pressure tactics and lobbying of a kind which would divert you and the other congressional and administrative officers of the Government from the discharge of your duties.

It may be of further interest to you to know that we are sending this resolution to the principal chambers of commerce throughout the United States, urging them to emulate our example. If this is done, we feel that it will represent a major contribution to the efficient rearming of the United States.

Yours very truly,

J. L. HAUGH, *President.*

RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PASSED BY THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MAY 21, 1940

Present world conditions, with millions of men engaged in the most destructive war in history, plus the demonstrated efficiency and ruthlessness of modern warfare, convince all thinking men of our inadequate preparation for defense and immediate need of military preparedness.

While our Government now proposes to spend hundreds of millions, and possibly billions of dollars for this purpose, organizations of every kind are already taking action seeking to have a part of these moneys spent in their respective communities.

This is no time for political or sectional log rolling. In the past our governmental expenditures for military purposes have been influenced by organized groups lobbying for the commercial or financial benefit of particular communities and without regard to military efficiency. With the world ablaze, such activities are deplorable and cannot be countenanced. An adequate defense for our Nation is paramount to the commercial or financial advantages of any city or section of our country.

The only question is where and how can this money be spent to attain value for every dollar and effectively place our country in a condition to withstand assaults of every kind from within as well as without: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Omaha Chamber of Commerce states its policy to be one of offering and tendering its services to our Government for the attainment of the objectives stated. We stand ready to furnish information, make researches, assemble data, and to cooperate with the military and naval branches of our Government, local and national, in every possible way, and

We call upon the various chambers of commerce of the United States and all other groups of our citizens to join us in putting a stop to the deplorable practice of hounding the governmental departments for their own selfish purposes. We ask every citizen and every community to permit our military and naval branches of government to determine their necessities based on their technical knowledge and not on political pull.

We take this stand and ask others to do so, to the end that we shall be enabled in the shortest time possible, without waste and without favoritism, to make America safe and America efficient.

OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
J. L. HAUGH,
President and Chairman, Board of Directors.
W. C. FRASER,
Vice President and Chairman, Executive Committee.

Being Fair to T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 17, 1940. This short editorial describes well a situation in which the House is interested. The bill mentioned was introduced in July 1939. Hearings were started before the House Military Affairs Committee on January 21, 1940, and were concluded many weeks ago. No testimony whatever was offered in opposition. Nevertheless, the measure remains locked up in the committee.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 17, 1940]

BEING FAIR TO T. V. A.

Critics of Uncle Sam's big power experiment in the Tennessee Valley have repeatedly emphasized the charge that T. V. A. is taking millions of dollars' worth of property off the tax rolls in the States where it has built reservoirs and bought up private utility systems. Clearly, T. V. A. ought to do something about this. It is estimated that the State of Tennessee and its counties will lose this

year $800,000, much of it badly needed to keep schools open and roads in repair.

But, rather interestingly, T. V. A. is eager to pay Tennessee and the other affected States the equivalent of these taxes. The T. V. A. Board is asking Congress to authorize it by legislation to distribute 10 percent of its gross revenues to the States and counties in question instead of the 5 percent which it now is instructed to pay only two States. This bill, sponsored by Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS and Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN, was passed by the Senate on April 30. The House Committee on Military Affairs more than 3 months ago held hearings in which testimony overwhelmingly favored the proposal, yet the committee has not reported the bill.

What is holding it up? Opponents of T. V. A. have insisted that it ought to pay taxes or their equivalent if it is to pretend to be a yardstick for power rates or to compete at all fairly with the private electrical industry. Are these same people now responsible for holding this bill in committee? If so, by what reasoning can they justify hindering it from doing what they have demanded it should do?

The Third-Term Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PASADENA (CALIF.) POST

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief editorial from the Pasadena Post of May 17, 1940:

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Post of May 17, 1940]

MISS THOMPSON IS PERSUASIVE BUT NOT WHOLLY CONVINCING

Dorothy Thompson, always a surprising person, has taken one grand plunge and landed squarely in the middle of the third-term movement. The feeling and part of the reasoning which prompt her commitment to President Roosevelt can be understood and appreciated. The President has more truly expressed the prevailing and growing sentiment of the American people on foreign affairs than has any other present-day leader. This column attempted to point out in June 1939 that the Republican Party, with victory assured on questions of domestic policy, seemed about to commit the blunder of permitting the campaign of 1940 to be fought on questions of foreign policy.

As matters have turned out foreign affairs would have assumed great importance in the campaign without Republican help. And it is true also that the Republican leaders have not blundered quite as badly as then seemed likely. The fact remains that the chances of Democratic victory in November have been greatly increased by reason of the foreign-policy issue.

The second of Miss Thompson's points is undoubtedly sound. It is that President Roosevelt today occupies a position somewhat comparable to that occupied by President Wilson in 1917–19 as a leader of world democracy.

The third point which seems tenable is that a hard-fought political campaign in a democracy is often interpreted as an evidence of grave national disunity. This is an interpretation which could only be made by nations and peoples having little knowledge of democracy and little experience in its practical operation. But unquestionably it would affect the attitudes of the aggressor nations.

When all this is said, there still remains an undisguisable error in the premises accepted by Miss Thompson, and on which she rests her half-emotional and half-intellectual case for the reelection of President Roosevelt. This error, in my opinion, destroys the soundness of her conclusion. Miss Thompson says:

"Alone among all the leaders of the three great free nations, the President of the United States has from the first faced and grasped the whole bitter reality."

And again:

"The President has been right. He foresaw what has happened, when people were branding him as a calamity howler. He has been thinking ahead of events while the rest of the democratic world has been thinking one lap behind them."

I submit that these statements are not true, and that to accept them as true would be to brand President Roosevelt as the worst of all Presidents.

If the President "has from the first faced and grasped the whole bitter reality" and has at the same time piled up such a mountain of public debt in time of peace as to make it tragically difficult for us to face a defensive war or even an adequate armament program, then he is a man inhumanly callous to the fate of his country.

I do not believe it. I believe President Roosevelt is a patriotic man who can voice America's aspirations eloquently. But the man to lead the country through the next 4 years must be one who can so revive our domestic economy that we can afford to have a foreign policy.—W. L. B.

Franklin Foresaw Mischief in the Skies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, one never gets tired of encountering the amazing versatility and imaginative faculties of Benjamin Franklin. With the present interest in the development of transportation of armed forces by air and their descent by way of parachutes it ought to be of interest that the sagest of American geniuses foresaw the possibilities of the mischief in the skies.

SCIENTIFIC CONSCIENCE

In two of the recent numbers of Science, Professor Ashley-Montagu has pointed out how two early writers (Leonardo da Vinci and Francesco Lanza Terzi), both pioneers, exhibited fear that inventions with which they were concerned might be used for the destruction of mankind, rather than its preservation. In this light, it is interesting to note what Benjamin Franklin had to say on the subject.

Franklin had been present at the balloon ascents of Montgolfier and Charles, and had written from Paris detailed accounts of these ascents to Sir Joseph Banks, the president of the Royal Society. In a letter to his friend, Jan Ingenhousz—the physician to Maria Theresa—dated January 16, 1784, he wrote:

"It appears, as you observe, to be a discovery of great importance, and what may possibly give a new turn to human affairs. Convincing sovereigns of the folly of wars may perhaps be one effect of it; since it will be impracticable for the most potent of them to guard his dominions. Five thousand balloons, capable of raising two men each, could not cost more than five ships of the line; and where is the prince who can afford so to cover his country with troops for its defense, as that 10,000 men descending from the clouds might not in many places do an infinite deal of mischief, before a force could be brought together to repel them?"

Franklin's abhorrence of wars is well expressed in another letter to Ingenhousz, dated February 11, 1788, in which he said:

"I lament with you the prospect of a horrid war, which is likely to engage so great a part of mankind There is little good gained and so much mischief done generally, by wars, that I wish the imprudence of undertaking them was more evident to princes; in which case I think they would be less frequent."

I. BERNARD COHEN.

Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Colonel Martin, of the Congressional Library, for this facet of the many-sided American polygon.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one week has gone by since the President startled the Congress and the country by appearing in person to deliver a message to a joint session of the House and Senate. I listened attentively to the message of the President. I have read and re-read that message. In addition to asking Congress to appropriate another billion dollars for the purpose of strengthening our national defenses, the President asked for the cooperation of the Congress and, in turn, pledged his cooperation to the Congress.

In such a trying period there must be teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. No loyal American can permit his decisions or actions to be influenced by partisanship. With such thoughts going through my mind, it was indeed a shock to read in the Washington Evening Star, just 3 days after the President had delivered his message to Congress, the following words uttered by Mr. Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and, of course, a member of the President's official family:

Today the continuance of President Roosevelt in office is necessary to give a free people national unity at a time of grave crisis and to permit the New Deal's concept of social and economic justice to become an accepted part of our American system. Speaking before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at the World's Fair on the occasion of their twenty-fifth anniversary, Mr. Ickes said, in a prepared speech, that the people are looking to President Roosevelt for continued leadership "and will not be denied because they have the right—the right of democracy—to choose their commander in chief."

Such a statement should be repudiated at once by the President.

Going back to the President's message, there is no doubt in my mind that Congress will, as speedily as possible, appropriate the money asked for by the President. A strong Army, Navy, and Air Corps is the best possible insurance the country can have. We must, at the earliest possible moment, provide whatever is necessary to make certain that if the occasion ever arises we will be able to defend ourselves from any possible attack from any possible direction.

While I intend to vote for the appropriation of the money requested by the President for the Army and Navy, I have serious doubts as to the wisdom or necessity of giving the President a blank check in the amount of $200,000,000. Under the emergency powers of the President—powers he now possesses by virtue of the emergency proclamation issued last fall—he can transfer funds within the Army and Navy Departments' appropriations. Undoubtedly it will be claimed by those who favor the issuing of this blank check that such a blank check was given to President Wilson in 1917. However, it is well to remember that at the time Congress gave President Wilson $100,000,000 to spend as he saw fit, we were at war, while at this time we are at peace and, with the help of God, we intend to remain at peace with all of the world.

In connection with the question of issuing this blank check for emergency purposes, I want to quote the words of Congressman Mondell, spoken on the floor of the House during the debate on the question of giving President Wilson $100,000,000 for emergency powers. He said:

In time of peace, in a country like ours, there should be no large general fund in the hands of the executive officers to be used at their discretion.

On June 17, 1918, President Wilson asked for an additional $50,000,000 and, at that time, he gave to the Congress a report on the expenditure of the first $100,000,000. This report was as follows:

Department	Permanent	Reimbursable	Reimbursed
Treasury	$1,454,161.54	$4,200,000.00	
War	14,706,986.37	77,583,280.00	$65,000,000.00
Navy	1,498,000.00		
Interior	200,000.00		
Commerce	1,715,550.00		
Labor	1,067,000.00		115,370.24
Secret Service	6,807,507.00	275,000.00	
Executive Office	5,000.00		1,180.00
Civil Service	250,000.00		
Committee on Public Information	2,100,000.00		
Council on National Defense	600,050.00		
Priority Transportation	25,000.00		17,265.37
Alien Property Custodian	50,000.00		
Export Advisory Board	250,000.00		
War Trade Board	1,605,500.00	200,000.00	
Director of Railroads	50,000.00	25,000.00	
Shipping Board	19,561,211.07		
Food Administration	590,000.00		
Food and Fuel	2,400,000.00		
Fuel Administration	300,000.00		
Federal Trade Commission	700,000.00	116,000.00	
Total	55,935,965.98	82,399,280.00	65,133,815.61

Regular allotment		$55,935,965.98
Deduct amounts returned		133,815.61
		55,802,150.37
Reimbursable allotment	$82,399,280	
Deduct amounts reimbursed	65,000,000	
		17,399,280.00
Net allotted		73,201,430.37
Balance unallotted		26,798,569.63
Appropriated		100,000,000.00

Is there any good reason why Congress should not have allocated these funds to the departments concerned? Note the item of $2,100,000 turned over to Mr. George Creel for publicity purposes. How important such an item could be at this time if an effort should be made by the President to influence public opinion to approve another American expeditionary force.

Last Friday the President told his press conference that if Congress gave him the first $100,000,000 he had requested, he would, in all probability, use some of it in the expansion of aircraft factories. I have also been told that the President intimated that if any of this money was used to expand the aircraft industry it would be used to build new factories or to have new factories built in the Middle West. To put it bluntly, this money could be used as a club to force units of the aircraft industry to move to the Midwest.

On February 13 last I addressed the House in opposition to the suggested plan of moving our aircraft factories to the interior. It might be of interest to the Members of the House to consider the fact that if we take the 10 most probable points of attack by air, Chicago, Ill., is closer to the probable point of attack in 5 cases, than is Hartford, Conn. To be sure Hartford is equally near the probable point of attack in 5 other cases. I shall not mention the locations I have in mind as we are on rather thin ice when we start to discuss points of attack on the United States, but taking the 10 most likely points of attack we find that they divide 50–50. We cannot put a great deal of weight in the suggestion that the East or even the Pacific coast is more likely to be subjected to attack from the air than is Illinois.

Not so long ago a manufacturer of national reputation employed a firm of industrial engineers to make a survey of several different parts of the United States with the view to building a very necessary part of an aviation engine. This group of industrial engineers surveyed several States of the United States and then made their recommendation to the manufacturer who engaged them. Among other things mentioned in the report was that Connecticut has the largest supply, generally distributed, of skilled labor in the United States. The following table shows, for a number of States, the number per square mile of workers in certain machine and technical product industries requiring skilled labor:

	Per square mile
California	0.17
Connecticut	13.69
Illinois	1.58
Maryland	.25
Massachusetts	6.27
New Jersey	5.29
New York	1.53
North Carolina	.01
Ohio	2.10
Pennsylvania	1.66
Virginia	.02

This same firm of industrial engineers, having ascertained from experts on defensive tactics against aircraft the ideal type of territory to defend, stated in this report that of all the places studied in the plant survey, the central part of Connecticut appears to be closest to the ideal.

Last Sunday I received the following message from a constituent of mine to whom I often turn for advice. Before our entry into the World War, this gentleman spent a great deal of time, effort, and money to point out the need for preparedness, and I believe he was at least partly responsible

for the establishment of the first officers' training camp at Plattsburg, N. Y. He says:

You have so often proved that the Nation comes ahead of local considerations with you that I hope you will oppose the President's suggestions of establishing new airplane factories since this would not step up production but slow it down. First it would discourage existing plants from expanding in size or production. Secondly, it takes more time to build new factories and get them into production than to expand those now in operation. Thirdly, airplane design and construction requires engineers of very special training and experience and they must be at point of manufacture. Therefore, establishing new plants would either deprive existing plants of the expert engineers they need or leave new plants without them. In either case inferior airplanes would result since aircraft and engines cannot be turned out like tin cans and poor quality means weak air defense besides death of many pilots. If efficient and speedy defense is our real objective we should strengthen and assist all existing airplane facilities wherever they are. This danger which you and I have seen for so long and which the President now points out has become an immediate danger and therefore the remedy must be immediate. Clearly the quickest and best method is to use and improve what we have rather than attempt experiments which will require months to complete and then produce inferior product. The public wants what is truly fast and efficient rather than what is spectacular or hysterical. Finally, we should combat delegation of expenditures or other centralization under excuse of emergency. Sound defense and preservation of democratic methods help each other while any attempted short cut of Government control is dangerous both to liberty and to defense. Why aid democracy abroad and lose it here? In the World War, General Pershing refused to scatter our strength in spite of Allies' wishes but insisted on creating an American Army and everyone now recognizes that this helped both ourselves and our Allies. In like manner we should develop our own strength in this crisis along American lines. Our liberties go hand in hand with our safety. They should be maintained together.

Speed, quality, and quantity are essential at this time. If we want the best possible aircraft at the earliest possible date, it is apparent that the thing to do is to provide adequate protection for our aircraft factories at their present sites, where trained skilled employees, power, and other utilities are already available. Perhaps it can be done in a totalitarian state but in a democracy large groups of our citizens cannot and will not be uprooted and moved to another part of the country for no good reason.

In at least one respect the President's message was a typical New Deal message, in that no mention was made of where the money was coming from to pay for this enlarged national-defense program. Admitting, as I do, that the needed defense must be provided at once, it can do no harm to consider where we are to get the needed money. Right now we are over our legal debt limit of $45,000,000,000, and let it be noted in the RECORD that our huge debt cannot be charged to the cost of providing a more adequate national defense. Comparatively little of the billions spent since 1933 has been spent on building up our Army, Navy, and air services.

Following the World War we heard a lot about the war millionaires. Much has been said during the past 20 years about taking the profit out of war but nothing has been done to prevent the growth of another crop of millionaires. Before going home, Congress should consider legislation to take the profit out of war and to tax any excess profits that may come from the spending of $3,000,000,000 on national defense during the next year, to say nothing about the huge sums that the Allies will spend here for aircraft and other war materials. This legislation should be tax legislation, and nothing more. It is not necessary to set up a dictatorship, nor to extend additional powers to the President in order to capture excessive profits, if any are made.

In these trying days, when the blood of every red-blooded man boils as he reads of the attacks on peace-loving people; when he reads of the bombing of innocent women and children in quiet, peaceful villages, it is important that we keep our feet on the ground and our heads as cool as possible in order that we can do whatever is best for our people, our country, and for the world.

Influx of Germans Into Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from this morning's New York times:

[From the New York Times of May 23, 1940]

INFLUX OF GERMANS DISTURBS MEXICANS—INQUIRY BEGUN INTO ACTIVITY OF NEWLY ARRIVED "TOURISTS" AND "SALESMEN"—NAZIS WORKING WITH "REDS"—AIM IS TO KEEP UNITED STATES OCCUPIED ON BORDER TO FORESTALL INTERVENTION IN EUROPE

MEXICO CITY, May 22.—Concern over the influx of Germans into Mexico has spurred a Government investigation of possible "fifth column" activities, it was reported reliably today.

Normally about 6,500 Germans live in Mexico, with approximately one-half in Mexico City and the others scattered, chiefly in the states of Chiapas and Vera Cruz. Most of the new arrivals were believed, however, to be concentrated in the capital, with some in the ports of Tampico and Vera Cruz.

Between 50 and 60 Germans have entered Mexico since the middle of April. They came from all parts of Latin America and a few from the United States. Nearly all, it was said, arrived by Pan American Airways.

One German-born anti-Nazi author said he had "never seen so many Germans as there are now in Mexico." Other sources said they did not believe the influx included refugees.

"There are many new faces," said another informant, "mostly of men upward of the age of 30. They include tourists, some actual salesmen and some posing as salesmen.

Arthur Dietrich, press attaché of the German Legation, disclaimed any knowledge of increased German arrivals.

AIM TO DIVERT UNITED STATES ATTENTION

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

MEXICO CITY, May 15.—The "fifth column" tactics used with success by Adolf Hitler in Europe are likely to give further proof of their effectiveness if plans of the Nazis in Mexico work out as they hope.

The objective in Mexico is not, as it was in more than one unfortunate European country, to pave the way for invading armies, but is no less important from the German point of view. It is to create a diversion south of the Rio Grande capable of diverting the attention of the United States in peace or in war, from events in Europe.

Germany's purpose in Mexico now, as in the World War, can be achieved only by working upon the domestic situation, since the Nazis, even with the help of their partners, the Communists, have obviously not sufficient strength to undertake even the slightest independent action against the United States. They intend to exploit the nuisance value of Mexico by stirring up internal trouble, and at the same time by playing upon Mexican public opinion in such a way as to make sure that whatever outbreak may eventually take place shall have a marked anti-American character.

If an upheaval of sufficient proportions can be brought about in Mexico, the Germans trust that the dreaded intervention of the United States in the European war may be delayed long enough to enable Herr Hitler to realize his dreams of empire without interference from this continent.

BASE FOR ESPIONAGE

Should this fail and the United States unsheathe the sword in aid of France and Britain, Mexico would still have uses for Germany. A convulsed Mexico, especially a Mexico hostile to the United States, would require Washington to keep an army in the territory just north of the Rio Grande, and every soldier occupied in watching Mexico would mean one less available for service in Europe. Moreover, Mexico would be an excellent headquarters for espionage in the United States and an equally excellent base for submarines and other commerce raiders whose activities would oblige part of the United States Fleet to remain in home waters.

A glance at the map shows how admirably suited Mexico is for the purposes Germany has in mind. The frontier between Mexico and the United States is 1,700 miles long. Much of the land immediately to the south of it, wild and sparsely populated, is

full of good hiding places for bands of guerrillas who could immobilize a considerable force on the American side of the border by the mere threat of their presence. In case of war the whole of the frontier would have to be watched to prevent the entry of secret agents on missions of espionage and sabotage.

Moreover, Mexico has long coast lines on the Gulf and the Pacific, from either of which submarines and surface vessels could operate against American shipping. Especially in southern Mexico the coast is deeply indented and virtually deserted. Necessary bases could be maintained there with little risk of detection.

The Germans can count up to a certain point on the cooperation of the Communists, each operating in the field that is particularly adapted to their special talents. The Germans work principally in the political sphere, pulling the hidden strings that move some politicians, exercising a strong influence over the Mexican press, and carrying on an intense propaganda campaign by every means at their disposal. Joseph Stalin's emissaries, on the other hand, have found ready tools for their needs in the Mexican Communist Party and have reached eager hands toward the Mexican labor organizations, most of which are decidedly radical and not entirely deaf to the siren voice of Moscow.

WORK FOR SAME END

The Germans and Communists, although possibly actuated by different motives, are working toward a common end. The Germans are interested chiefly in exploiting the internal Mexican situation as an aid toward winning the war in Europe. The Communists aim at a social revolution, having apparently selected Mexico as the American republic in which communism is most likely to gain the foothold it needs if it is to spread to the whole of the continent.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CAROLINE O'DAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks many inquiries have come to me as to the status of the housing bill, and many women from New York, as well as a number from other States, are calling daily at my office to ask if something cannot be done to speed up the interest of Congress in the matter of providing decent homes for low-income families.

The need for such homes is acute and the women who voice this need fear that the housing bill may be overlooked or put aside in the rush of the closing days of Congress. They fear, also, that the great appropriations asked for defense will curtail the appropriations made for housing and slow up work on these vitally important projects.

Feeling keenly the danger of any such happening it is heartening to find that the wife of our President is, also, deeply interested in the plans for low-cost, decent housing.

In a recent column Mrs. Roosevelt writes:

A group of people interested in housing came to see me this morning to talk about housing bill S. 591. They made the point that, unless housing went on in this country at an accelerated pace, we would be paying more year by year in every community for the evils that come from bad housing and that we would build a better defense and healthier young people through giving them decent places in which to live. I am in entire accord with their stand, and I only hope that women all over this country are going to take up the crusade for better housing. They should write to their Representatives and say that they would rather pay for preventing crime and disease through better housing and that they have a personal interest in improving the homes of the Nation both from the economic and moral standpoint.

Outstanding Examples of "Fifth Column" Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of our emergency defense program, and the President's recommendations thereon, I believe we should be concerned about present real danger from within, as well as future possible danger from without. To put it more directly, the danger we are in from airplanes that may cross the ocean at some future time to attack Omaha is not nearly as immediate nor as threatening to our welfare and our institutions as the "fifth column" agents that have already crossed the ocean; that are now in our midst; that are now carrying on their subversive activities, doing their best to undermine our form of government and destroy our economic system; and while doing so are enjoying the sympathy, the encouragement, and the protection of Federal officials and people in high places.

To my mind the danger from within from these so-called "fifth columns," judging from what has happened in European countries, is much more immediate, much more threatening, and much more dangerous, than 100,000 Hitler airplanes could possibly be. For that reason I cite 3 concrete outstanding examples of protection, of sympathy, and of encouragement lately given to "fifth column" agents that are at work in our midst. I leave it to your judgment as to the importance of these examples.

HARRY BRIDGES, COMMUNIST

Every American has heard of the case against Harry Bridges, but few Americans know the real facts in the case. I propose to give you those facts as found in the testimony presented to the Dies committee.

Bridges is an alien, a guest within our gates, possessing no rights as a citizen, enjoying only the privileges this Nation extends to its guests. Bridges is a Communist. He has advocated the overthrow of this Government by force, and we have the sworn testimony of witnesses to that effect. This is a deportable offense under our present law.

Bridges has been arrested twice to face deportation proceedings. The first time the proceedings were canceled by Madam Perkins, our Secretary of Labor; the second time the proceedings were postponed while awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court in the Strecher case.

The Strecher case was not a parallel case to the Bridges case in any sense of the word. The Strecher case was to decide whether past membership in the Communist Party constituted a deportable offense under our laws. The Bridges case, on the other hand, was based upon present membership in the Communist Party, and advocating the overthrow of this Government by force.

After the Supreme Court decided in the Strecher case that past membership in the Communist Party did not constitute a deportable offense, the Bridges case was then brought to trial. However, the Federal judge in whose district Bridges naturally and normally should have been tried was not permitted to sit in the case. He had previously ordered deported other aliens who had advocated the overthrow of this Government by force. The Secretary of Labor insisted that a special judge be selected to try Bridges, and Judge Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, and one of the best legal minds in the United States, was selected to try the Bridges case. Agents of the Department of Labor prosecuted the case before Judge Landis. They presented much questionable and flimsy evidence in support of the charges, but neglected to present much real evidence that was available. Since a judge may not go behind or beyond the evidence presented in his court, Judge Landis, on the basis of the evidence presented to him in this case, had to find that the charges brought against Bridges were not sustained by the evidence, and so Bridges was cleared and let loose. Bridges, therefore, is free to again foment trouble in the maritime unions on the west coast and to tie up all transportation in that area.

That was the status of the Bridges case until the Immigration and Naturalization Committee of the House voted out a bill to deport Harry Bridges as an undesirable alien, and ordering the officials of the Labor Department to do so forthwith. This is a move without precedent. It is predicated upon the principles that if Congress has the power to pass laws to permit aliens to enter the country and specify the

conditions upon which they may enter, and if Congress can pass laws to cancel deportation proceedings against aliens that have entered this country illegally, and grant permanent residence to such aliens—hundreds of bills of this kind have been passed—then Congress must also have the power to expel any alien that is considered a menace to our well-being and a threat to our American institutions. This new method of attack upon the problem of getting rid of Bridges is a direct outgrowth of the work of the Dies committee and was suggested by a member of that committee. It will be interesting to watch the action of Congress on H. R. 9766, a bill providing for the deportation of Harry Bridges. If passed, I predict its effect upon other alien leaders of America's "fifth column" will be immediate and salutory.

WILLIAM HINCKLEY

I wish also to call the attention of this House to an astonishing appointment to a position in our Federal Government. Two months ago William Hinckley was appointed Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner of Education.

For a number of years William Hinckley was national chairman of the American Youth Congress. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the American Youth Congress, from its inception, has been a subservient follower of the Communist Party line. There is not a shadow of doubt about the Communist Party's control of the American Youth Congress. The organization has been functioning for several years as Stalin's "fifth column" among the youth of this country.

The Dies committee has had presented to it testimony which clearly indicates that William Hinckley was, and, for all I know, still is, a member of the Communist Party. I call the attention of this House to the testimony of Kenneth Goff, formerly a member of the Young Communist League and of the Communist Party, who stated under oath that he had personally known and worked with William Hinckley as a member of the Communist Party.

Up until the time the American League for Peace and Democracy went out of business William Hinckley was a member of the national committee of that Communist-controlled organization.

Another item in Mr. Hinckley's Communist record is his appearance as a sponsor of the China Aid Council, an organization which was set up by the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Still another item shows that Mr. Hinckley was secretary of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts. This organization was a Communist united-front group functioning in the days when the Communist Party vociferously advocated the doctrine of collective security against Nazi Germany.

In a recent issue of the New Masses, an out-and-out Communist publication, there was published a letter which was signed by scores of Communists and fellow travelers. Mr. Hinckley's name appeared on the list of signers of this letter, which was a protest sent to the President of the United States against various efforts of governmental agencies to expose the "fifth column" of the Communists.

A few years ago the Communists published a periodical known as the Champion. A glance at its place of publication, its editorial board, its articles, and policies will show that the Champion was a straight Communist Party publication. Mr. Hinckley was one of the contributors to this Communist Party publication.

Finally, among other items which I might mention, Mr. Hinckley sent greetings to the International Workers Order, an organization which the Dies committee has unanimously found to be a Communist outfit. Every national officer of the International Workers Order is publicly known as a member of the Communist Party. Its national chairman, William Weiner, has recently been convicted as an imposter, falsely claiming to be an American citizen. I read you the greetings which William Hinckley, our new administrative assistant to the Commissioner of Education, sent to the International Workers Order:

Congratulations to the International Workers Order on passing its first milestone on the road to a membership of 1,000,000 militant workers. The work of your youth section earned my admiration long ago.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. HINCKLEY.

It is my understanding that Mr. Hinckley obtained his present position in the Department of Education through the recommendation of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is nothing short of a national disgrace that one so prominent in the operations of the Communist "fifth column" as Mr. Hinckley, should be placed in a strategic position in our Federal Government and particularly in our Department of Education.

AN INTERESTING DINNER

We have heard a great deal lately about the American Youth Congress, about its communistic units, about its communistic guidance and control, and about its communistic actions and sympathies. I am sure we were all shocked a few weeks ago when the members of this American Youth Congress, then holding its annual convention in Washington, were so lacking in respect as to boo the President while they were guests upon the White House grounds, when the President in an address to the group condemned the Soviet Government for its unjustified attack upon Finland.

In view of these facts, and especially in view of the present serious situation in Europe, which has had, and still has, a direct impact upon our own safety and preparedness, the following copy of an invitation to a buffet supper sent out to a selected group by Edward J. Flynn, of New York City, should be of interest to the Members of the House. The interpretation of the purposes of this buffet supper, as given in the accompanying newspaper editorial taken from the May 16, 1940, issue, page 22, of the New York World-Telegram, should also be of interest.

EDWARD J. FLYNN,
60 East Forty-second Street, New York.

At the suggestion of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, I am asking a small group of people to my home, 2728 Henry Hudson Parkway, for a buffet supper, on Wednesday evening, May 8, at 7:30 o'clock. I should be delighted if you could join us.

The purpose of the gathering is to introduce a few representatives of the American Youth Congress who are anxious to present their problem to people who are in a position to help them financially. As you know, Mrs. Roosevelt is keenly interested in assisting these young people, and she will be with us on that evening to introduce their members.

Will you be good enough to let me know if it will be possible for you to join us? Would you address your reply to 2728 Henry Hudson Parkway?

Yours very truly,

EDWARD J. FLYNN.

New York World-Telegram, May 16, 1940, page 22:

"COME ACROSS" DINNER

Not all successful dinners get into the society news. Not even the one Edward J. Flynn, Democratic patronage supervisor of this State, gave on May 8, last, at the suggestion of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to raise funds for the American Youth Congress, an organization to which Mrs. Roosevelt still clings despite charges from many of its own members that it has been dominated by Communists. This dinner was informal, not to say secret. The guests were carefully selected. Mr. Flynn's invitations made it plain that contributions would be expected. Mrs. Roosevelt's speech at the dinner doubtless made this plainer still. While the dollar-and-cent results have not been announced, it was hoped they would amount to much more than the $2,000 needed to finance the American Youth Congress convention at Lake Geneva, Wis., next July. The American Youth Congress is indeed blessed in its sponsors. Few other groups, Communists or not, could count on the President's wife and the Democratic job dispenser of New York State, who is the President's friend, to engineer these little "come across" dinners, invitation to which might almost be considered a command. All done, in Gilbertain phrase, "most politely, most politely." Quite different, of course, from the kind of thing courts brutally term "coercion."

I have cited these three examples—protection for Harry Bridges, a Government position for William Hinckley, and the "come across" dinner, sponsored by the First Lady of the Land—because they illustrate the protection, the help, and the sympathy that has been given, and is now being given, these "fifth column" agents of a foreign government by high

Government officials. I am sure each of these three examples can be multiplied by hundreds of similar cases that have happened during the past 6 or 7 years. Is it not time to clean house?

New Tax Set-Up Called for by Defense Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY PHELPS ADAMS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following special dispatch to the New York Sun by Phelps Adams:

[From the New York Sun of May 20, 1940]

Indications that the New Deal may be forced to revise its entire tax policy in order to finance its huge new program for national defense were evident here today as both Houses of Congress were flooded with proposals ranging from the inflationary Boren bill, calling for the issuance of $2,000,000,000 in non-interest-bearing bonds, to demands for the enactment of a stiff excess-profits tax.

While President Roosevelt was criticized in several quarters for his failure to recognize in the United States Treasury the vital nerve center of the Nation's defense system and to recommend a specific program for the protection of the Federal credit. Majority members of both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee were rapidly arriving at the conclusion that no action to raise the existing debt limit or to increase taxes should be taken at this session of Congress.

In part, this growing determination to let the whole fiscal question slide until after the election, is the outgrowth of the realization among experts, both in and out of Congress, that the wealth-distributing, profit-curbing tax theories upon which all New Deal revenue legislation has been heard, cannot be expanded to meet present needs without destroying the tax sources themselves and greatly impairing the productive capacity of industry.

NEW TAX LAW DEMANDED

The need, according to these experts, is not only for new taxes; it is for a fundamentally new tax law.

The whole problem that confronts the Congress, together with a detailed and specific plan for coping with it was discussed today by Ellsworth C. Alvord in an exclusive interview with the Sun. Mr. Alvord, formerly special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, is widely regarded in Washington as one of the outstanding authorities of the country on problems of taxation, and has aided in writing some of the most successful tax legislation passed since the income-tax amendment to the Constitution was adopted.

The fundamental points raised by Mr. Alvord in this interview, and the basic proposals and arguments he advanced, may be outlined briefly, as follows:

There are three essential needs in any national-defense program:

1. Adequate military and naval forces, adequately equipped.
2. Maximum industrial productive capacity, including plant facilities, machinery, equipment, and an adequate supply of skilled labor.
3. A sound Treasury.

Without maximum industrial productive capacity it is impossible to have adequate armed forces adequately equipped, and without a sound fiscal system it is impossible to have maximum industrial productive capacity. Therefore a sound Treasury is the foundation stone of a sound defense program.

FOUR SOURCES OF FUNDS

There are only four possible sources of Treasury funds:

1. Taxation.
2. Borrowing within limits permitting ultimate repayment.
3. Confiscation.
4. Inflation and repudiation.

Only through the last two—confiscation or inflation—would it be possible for the Treasury, burdened as it is with $45,000,000,000 of debt, to finance American participation in the present war; but it is still possible to devise a reasoned tax program that would finance national-defense needs during the coming years out of taxation and controlled borrowings.

At this point it should be noted that there is no such thing as an unrelated, unintegrated tax policy. Every national tax policy must conform to the broad economic and political policies of the administration in power. The existing law does so in that it is essentially a reform program, designed to break up and to prevent the accumulation of concentrated wealth, and to limit the profits of industry sharply.

In the light of altered world conditions, however, the Treasury's needs now demand a new tax policy aimed at two wholly new objectives:

1. The production of the maximum possible revenues over a period of years.
2. The maximum productive capacity of industry.

STRUCTURE OF NEW BILL

In attempting to devise a tax bill consistent with these objectives, it is necessary to recognize three indisputable facts:

1. Present tax rates—the highest on peacetime record—have soared far above the point of diminishing returns. Just as a company which charges unreasonably high prices cannot sell its product, so a government that levies unreasonably high taxes cannot collect maximum revenues. Therefore, taxes must be reduced to the point at which their productivity is most efficient.
2. If larger revenues are to be collected from lower tax rates, then obviously production must be increased through plant expansion and more efficient operation. New plants and new machines require the investment of new capital. Therefore the tax rates must be so devised as to permit investors to get and to retain a large enough return on their capital to compensate them for the risk they incurred when they invested their funds.
3. Total revenue collections of Government bear a close relationship to the corporate tax yields, and corporations pay taxes only on their net income; in other words, their profits. Therefore it is not enough that business activity and the total corporate income should be increased. In order to produce greater revenues, it is necessary that corporate net profits also be increased.

WHERE PROOF IS TO BE FOUND

Ample proof of these contentions is to be found in the Treasury's own records, as may be illustrated by a comparison of the years 1927 and 1936, when industry produced approximately the same amount in each year, the index of industrial production being 106 and 105, respectively. Under the fiscal and economic conditions of 1927 corporate net profits were nearly $9,000,000,000, while under the burdensome policies of 1936 they were only six and three-quarter billion dollars.

The low tax rates of 1927 yielded the Federal Government $1,131,000,000 in corporate income taxes, while the confiscatory rates of 1936 netted the Government $1,191,000,000—a negligible difference. Actually the Treasury suffered a loss in 1936 because it had a national income of only sixty-two and one-half billions upon which to levy taxes of all kinds, as compared with a national income of seventy-three and one-half billions in 1927 under the lower rates then prevailing.

Thus, by applying lower tax rates to a larger volume of industrial profits the Treasury can actually raise not only a larger revenue than at present, but can also—by its tax policy alone—contribute to the industrial expansion which is regarded by the President as such an essential feature of his defense program. Additional incentives to industrial expansion through the removal of unnecessary legislative curbs placed on business in the last 8 years would, of course, be an essential corollary of such a program.

A SIX-AND-ONE-HALF-BILLION RETURN

On the basis of these facts Mr. Alvord advances a tax program which, he asserts, would produce an average annual revenue of six and one-half billion during the next 10 years—a sum considerably higher than the New Deal has ever been able to reach by any tax system it has devised during the last 8 years.

The main features of a program he outlines is as follows:

1. A stable tax law to remain unchanged in its essential features for 10 years. Constantly changing tax legislation would wipe out many of the advantages of the proposed policy, just as industrial production has been hampered by the enactment of nine different tax laws in the last 8 years.
2. A maximum surtax of 40 percent.
3. Maximum corporation tax of 15 percent.
4. Substantial earned-income credit.
5. Maximum capital-gains tax of 12½ percent.
6. Consolidated returns for affiliated corporations.

Even with such a revenue system Mr. Alvord points out, the Treasury must still be protected from the opposite—or expenditure side—as well.

To this end he recommends that at the outset of every session when the President's Budget is submitted, Congress should by concurrent resolution fix a definite ceiling on total expenditures of the Federal Government for the year—this to be done after a thorough canvass of the Budget and before any appropriation bill is considered. Should the prospective expenditures exceed the estimated revenues Congress would also authorize the Treasury to borrow a specific sum calculated to make up the difference and would increase the statutory debt limit only by the amount it decides to borrow for that year.

Thereafter it would be impossible for Congress to exceed this authorized total of expenditures without reconsidering and amending this act.

This, Mr. Alvord believes, would tend strongly to prevent runaway appropriations, pork-barrel legislation, and Treasury raids by organized pressure groups, and at the same time would focus public opinion sharply on the Government's fiscal condition.

W. P. A. Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE POTTSVILLE (PA.) REPUBLICAN

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican on W. P. A. pay.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of May 22, 1940]

W. P. A. PAY

Congressman FENTON is again making an effort to have the pay of W. P. A. workers in this region raised to at least $60, the maximum provided for these jobs. About 25 percent has been cut from the pay of these workers by the Federal authorities who are enforcing regulations to establish pay rates according to the population of the community in which these workers live and are employed.

The employees from the largest metropolitan centers are given the high rate of pay, under the assumption that wage rates are higher in those sections than in Schuylkill County. Such is not the case. The pay of workers in this section compares with that paid in the metropolitan areas in most lines of work, and the cost of living is also proportionately high.

By cutting the pay of these workers they are being unfairly discriminated against. There are some rural communities in this or other States where rate of pay may be low, and where the cost of living is proportionately low, but Schuylkill County does not constitute any such locality.

Another Republican Congressman, Representative DITTER, from Pennsylvania, demands that W. P. A. regulations be put into effect to bar Communists from W. P. A. employment. This should be broadened to include Nazis and Fascists. If these fellows are not satisfied with the type of American Government, and would conspire to overthrow it, they should not complain if they are denied the financial support of the Government in their personal lives.

It has been shown throughout Europe that strong revolutionary groups and organized bands of traitors, known as the "fifth column," were organized in every country to assist in the overthrow of those governments. Norway fell largely because of treason within. Holland lost the use of its defensive dikes through these traitorous groups, which made possible the landing of a parachute army.

The Dies committee has exposed the revolutionary organizations in this country that are functioning, even in the ranks of Government employees, and it is charged, within the ranks of the Army. These "fifth columnists" may well be expected to be largely represented in our most important industrial plants, ready to destroy them or handicap them through sabotage activities, when the word is given.

We have been nurturing these organizations on the theory that to destroy them is to destroy free speech and personal liberty. Free speech and personal liberty do not give license to any band of revolutionists to operate to overthrow our Government and, since it has been forcibly presented by this congressional committee and by the developments in Europe, it is time that we become alert to the danger surrounding us.

An organized band of this kind, though relatively small, can accomplish much by carefully worked out plans against peaceful communities, unarmed and unsuspecting.

Ukrainians in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered this morning before the Congress of Ukrainian Organizations in the United States, with more than 1,000 delegates present.

It is estimated that in the United States and Canada there are 1,000,000 Ukrainians. Most of them were born across the water. They came to this country to escape terrible oppression, intolerance, and exploitation. Here are a people who have tasted the bitter pills of despotic imperialism and dictatorship. In this country they have tasted the more pleasant things of life. Their desire is that the fellow countrymen they left behind may enjoy the freedom and good living they have experienced in this land of opportunity. Their's is a noble purpose. They are fine, upstanding, patriotic Americans, wishing for others the good things they are able to enjoy.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I come here today as one who was born on foreign shores. Our ancestors and many of us here today were also born on foreign soil. We have brought with us and transplanted on the fertile soil of this young Nation the best that our native countries had developed down through the centuries. We left behind those things which we thought were not fair nor just. The roots you planted were firm, the soil was rich, and America has taken your offerings and made them a part of the American way of life. The American way of life did not result from the contributions of any one group of people. It is a mixture of the best that many national groups have brought with them and planted on the soil of this Nation. You may be justly proud of the fact that the Ukrainians have done their part.

The Ukrainian people are a distinct asset to this Nation. Their tradition has always been the essence of vitality. From this spirit has flowed a quickening of life for the entire Nation. What you have given America you have given freely and from the heart. You have claimed nothing in return but the advantages of liberty through which you have ever sought to add more and more to the noble stature of the American way of life. The Ukrainian people are hard workers and have an everlasting faith in all that is good. You are here today because of your ability to define an ideal and pursue it with the characteristic persistence of your people.

As one who came to these shores at less than 8 years of age, I have rubbed shoulders with many Ukrainian workers during my early life in the iron and steel mills of Pennsylvania. My father and I both were iron puddlers and worked in the Pittsburgh district—the Sharon, Woods Run, and the South Side iron and steel mills.

I remember one Ukrainian boy with whom I worked. He taught he how to say "How are you" in Ukrainian, and I still remember greeting him each morning as we met with "Yak-sha-my-yet-te." In return I taught him how to say "How are you" in Welsh, and he answered my Ukrainian greeting with the Welsh "pa fodd yr ydych."

We are not strangers to each other. It may surprise many of you when I tell you that had fate been different I might possibly have come to this country not from Wales but from the Ukraine itself. The Ukraine has some very rich iron-ore deposits. When the czar decided to industrialize Russia he called upon Welsh iron and steel experts to come into the Ukraine to build blast furnaces to develop the iron and steel industry, and to open up coal mines. My grandfather was one of the many Welshmen who went to the Ukraine. There he spent a number of years building blast furnaces and instructing the Ukrainians in the art of making iron and steel. After a number of years my grandfather returned to his native Wales. But had he decided to remain in that beautiful country on the Black Sea my father and I might have been born there and became good Ukrainians.

With her rich resources and her advantageous position on the Black Sea, Ukraine has been coveted by foreign powers in the past. Today she is under stranger's rule and is looked upon as a choice morsel for conquest by ambitious imperialists of the hour.

At the same time, the flame of freedom in her is still burning. Through the centuries governments have tried to extinguish this flame which Voltaire called "Ukraine's aspiration to be free." The history of the Ukrainian people is largely a record of their exploitation, persecution, enserfment, and struggles for freedom. Here indeed is a people of whom it might well be said that—"They were tortured, they were stoned, they were sawn asunder; they were set wandering in the deserts and mountains, in caves, and in dens of the earth." So it is that leaders rose among them from time to time fired with dreams of freedom and national independence. These leading men and women were exiled, imprisoned, and even put to death. But nothing has been able to stamp out their desire to be free and independent. The task of your countrymen is not impossible, for they have already tasted freedom. In 1918 the prompt formation of a Ukrainian government at Kiev proved that the Ukrainian people were constantly on the alert. Their opportunity will come again.

You realize that the Ukrainian people can win their rightful claim to mastery over their own land only through their own efforts. But you also realize that it shall be easier to attain this right with the victory of democratic freedom in Europe. Your duty is to bring to the attention of the whole world the plight of your fellow countrymen. Your efforts shall not go unheard nor without reward. There must be a reward far better than this material world can provide awaiting all of you on that far and green shore of the Great Beyond.

You and I came to this country at a time when America needed us most. America needed hard-working, clear-thinking, and clean-living men and women to develop the natural resources of this Nation. We and others from across the waters responded in a way that soon this Nation became the envy of the world. You have shown that given freedom of action, freedom of religion, freedom of education, and freedom to participate in the institutions of America that you as a people have proven conclusively that Ukrainians can govern themselves. You have built large organizations, mainly on a fraternal basis. As a fraternalist I would say that, if the children of Ukraine understand the work of fraternal orders as well as you do, then they deserve to be masters of their fate in their own homeland, where they have lived and toiled for centuries untold.

Ukrainians live in every country in the world. In all of them it is your custom to give your first and unquestioned allegiance to the flag under which we dwell. The Ukrainian spirit in America is a thoroughly loyal American spirit. It should be so. Your patriotism has proven true under every test and has never failed. This same loyal spirit is expected of Ukrainians in every land of their adoption. You give your very best where you live and work. This has made of you a constructive influence in the world because wherever you go you uphold the cause of peace and good will.

It is with gratification that I note that you have sought within the fold of your Ukrainian ancestry to avoid petty jealousies which so often eat as a cancer into the hearts of those who strive for a common goal. You know that the principle of cooperation is necessary in order that you may be of the greatest service to Ukrainians in this country and to your fellow countrymen in the homeland. Long experience has shown that the deepest satisfactions of life come through the united acceptance of responsibility rather than through the isolated efforts of the individual who tries to work out his personal destiny in a lonely way. The spirit of fraternity and brotherhood must guide all of you as you move forward with your tasks.

The Ukrainian people have a long history of loyal devotion to the liberal faith. They have long believed in the rights of the average man. They have believed in the principles which make for better conditions of life and labor. Centuries of struggle for freedom and better living in your homeland records the Ukrainian people as giving firm support to liberalism and labor. They have always stood for freedom of opportunity in business, education, and politics. They have believed that the state exists for the best interests of the greatest number of individuals rather than the regimentation of individual lives for the dictatorial advantage of the few who control the state. When they came to this country they brought with them the ideals of liberalism and unoppressed labor. Most of you here today and your ancestors have observed through practical experience the bitter lessons of bureaucratic control which oppressed the lives of working men in Europe. You turned your backs upon a regime which gave privileges to the few and came to this land in order that you and your children might enjoy freedom of opportunity for the many. Your people brought with them a passion for liberty and an undying hatred of tyranny.

The Puritans, William Penn and his Quakers, and countless other groups came to this wonderful country to escape something. They came to escape oppression, intolerance, poverty, wars, and misunderstanding. You people are unique in that you have tasted a portion of these bitter pills. That is why you came to America. That is why you are so much more appreciative of the fine things America has to offer than many people who have been born in this country. They take their liberties and blessings for granted. You are a people kindly and hospitable by nature. You have known the crushing burden of life in the homeland. Tied to the soil by a knot your countrymen have been unable to untie, they could have been one of the people about whom Edwin Markham wrote in his poem The Man With a Hoe, when he said:

"Bowed by the weight of centuries, he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes at the ground;
The emptiness of ages in his face
And on his back the burden of the world."

Successive generations of Ukrainian folk have added their contributions to a better life for the many in this free land; in mine, mill, field, forest, and factory, but never have you turned your backs on the ideals of Jefferson and Lincoln, which we early came to love, even before we landed on these shores. The liberal faith has given your people a love for the productive forces which have advanced the well-being of the average man. You have rejoiced with all of us that out of our abundance here it has been possible for every normal, hard-working, thrifty person to enjoy possessions and opportunities for improvement which far exceeded the best which Old World kings knew a few generations ago.

Many of your people have gone back to the homeland. They have undoubtedly told their countrymen of the freedom and growth that is possible among people in a representative government. I do not believe that if the Ukraine had its own government that it would be communistic or fascist. I do not believe that the Ukraine would be intolerant of religion. At the present time a new type of state religion has been superimposed on your countrymen. But you can never destroy a faith. Suppression only makes their faith more fervent. I don't believe that freedom of speech or press would be stifled in the new Ukraine. Knowing the spirit of the Ukrainian people, I believe they would have a constitution similar to that of the United States. The Ukrainians, who have fought for freedom all their lives, would know what to do with that freedom when they got it. They and their land could become a bright, shining star in a part of the world gone mad. They would be for peace. They would fight, but only when their freedom and country was threatened. And woe befall the nation that would want to take that freedom and country for their own. The Cossack spirit and the Cossack bravery would prove too much for any would-be conqueror. They would fight just as hard to retain their freedom as they are now fighting to achieve freedom. It is relatively easy to fight for something one has already, but it takes courage, stamina, and faith to fight for something one does not already have. That is why I want to take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate all of you for defining a purpose and fighting for it.

Your's is a noble purpose. It is a purpose for which none of you should feel ashamed. Neither is it un-American. On the contrary, the spirit you are showing is typically American. America has always stood for fair dealing and freedom for all people. That was the breath which gave life to this Nation. It is now the blood that has kept this Nation healthy and full of life. The precepts of liberty, humanity, and tolerance are universal. We in America—all of us—have a strong desire that such principles should prevail throughout the world.

Your appeals for a free Ukraine do not take away from you the fact that you are loyal Americans. You have seen the happiness that is possible in a land where freedom and not oppression rules. It is only natural that you contrast this with your experiences in the homeland and realize how shameful the plight of your countrymen is. It is only natural that you desire for them some of the good things that are yours today.

It must be a wonderful feeling on the part of your countrymen to know that somewhere in a land that is free and where one can speak without censorship, that their cause is being brought before the world. It must be a wonderful feeling on your part to know that you are able to do something in behalf of a cause that is noble and just. You have manifested a spirit of love of man for man. That is in direct contrast to the principle of man's inhumanity to man that has become so prevalent in Europe today.

God speed your efforts, and good luck to all of you.

An Appraisal of the New Deal—Defense, Politics, and Other Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock in today's New York Times:

[From the New York Times of May 24, 1940]

AN EPISTOLARY ACCOUNT OF THE SITUATION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—If one of the many gifted spokesmen of the New Deal were authorized to write a candid account of its present attitude on defense, politics, and other matters he could accurately turn out—though with greater literary skill, of course—something like the following open letter:

"DEAR COUNTRY: The apparent success of the German drive has greatly imperiled our national security, and more suddenly than even the President thought likely. If the war should be terminated as quickly as the Germans say it will, the United States must be ready to defend that security sooner than we had feared.

"Accordingly, your Government is taking immediate steps to organize defense and make it invincible. This will be done principally by members of the President's executive staff. Unlike previous administrations, we, thanks to the high efficiency and broad experience of New Deal statesmen in all pertinent matters—industry, finance, engineering and the military arts—will require only subordinate assistance from outsiders who are the heads of American production.

"Some of these will doubtless have good ideas. But the measure of a man's wisdom is determined by his ability to rise to an occasion. Therefore, any industrialist, financier, engineer, etc., who is critical of the record of this administration, or thinks a change of party control would be good for the country, obviously cannot be looked to for such ideas.

"We have in 7 years spent something more than $7,000,000,000 for national defense, and the results are impressive. We have one modern antiaircraft gun; the Army is in a position to defend the Mexican border and to garrison the Panama Canal; the Navy is strong enough to prevent the capture of Hawaii, or to protect the Atlantic coast from a threat in that quarter. But only one at a time.

"The air force is splendid, but unfortunately afflicted by unavoidable obsolescence. It can protect our shores, but hemisphere defense would be a bit beyond its powers. However, steps

are now being taken to bring the air force and the Navy into the scope of the President's 1937 foreign policy. This will not require more than a few years.

"To contract this period it has been suggested by volunteer advisers that we should bring to Washington from the aviation industry an experienced coordinator who has had years of training in this field; who knows how to allocate contracts according to types and how to remove the bottlenecks in this production. It has also been unnecessarily proposed that pilot training be coordinated under an expert outside the Government.

"Fortunately none of this is needed. We have in Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau a man who in a few weeks has fully acquainted himself with every detail involved in this problem. Under his guidance the industry will soon be turning out 4,000 planes a month; the machinery and engine problems will be solved; and we shall have five pilots for every airplane.

"Other administration heads, who have had long training in politics, law schools, and welfare associations will assume full control of the coordination of technical business matters on which national security and defense depend. Notable among these is Secretary of Commerce Hopkins, whose labors in C. W. A. and W. P. A. have brought him the deserved reputation as the finest industrial mind in America.

"Because of the careful staffing of the Government with business and production experts of this type, it will not be necessary to risk the great social and economic reforms of the New Deal by giving leeway to outside experts. We shall be able to retain all the restrictions on production which are represented by New Deal laws, and keep the well-known clubs over the heads of business and finance, yet still quickly gear the production machine to the required speed and efficiency. Our record is proof. Other governments may be obliged to suspend peacetime reforms to meet a crisis; not this one.

"We shall make no concessions of any kind to nonmembers of the Government of the New Deal while requiring from them absolute conformance to plans and policies. This, of course, will not apply to organized labor. But it applies to every other group, and we shall insist on this in the name of patriotism.

"Patrictism is forsaken when any critic questions what has been done with defense funds so far, or when Congress asserts a right to check the disposition of whatever appropriations we shall require.

"We were willing to abandon partisan politics completely in this crisis by permitting titular Republican leaders to enter the President's Cabinet. Our only condition was that they accept the third term and all policies, past, present, and future, and refrain from campaign discussion of defense and foreign affairs. Mr. Landon presumed, before lunching with the President, to express disapproval of this plan, and the President instructed his secretary to call off the luncheon. But Mr. Landon refused to say, as requested, that he had called it off himself because of illness; the resultant press looked pretty bad; and so the President gave him lunch but naturally asked no counsel of such a noncooperator.

"Trust us, and listen to the fireside chat.

"THE NEW DEAL."

Press Opinion on Proposed Labor Board Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House is scheduled to consider bills providing large expenditures of money for national defense. I am sure that all my colleagues realize how imperative it now is for us to adequately equip and prepare our armed forces. They also realize that the work and efforts necessary to be done must go forward without delay or retardation from any source.

There is no question but that the maladministration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board is a potent factor in the retardation of our national recovery. This fact makes it all the more important for us to amend the act and change the personnel of the Board that our labor relations may not be further jeopardized by a Government agency that has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

My colleagues, if you are inclined to believe that I am alone in the expression of these sentiments, kindly peruse the following:

A study of Nation-wide editorial opinion made during the early months of the investigation of the National Labor Relations Board by the House committee headed by my colleague from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD W. SMITH, showed practically unanimity on the part of the newspapers of the Nation in its condemnation. Out of 1,000 editorials selected at random by the Division of Press Intelligence, but 1 was found that defended the Board, and its support was a questionable compliment since it was from the Daily Worker, reputed official organ in this country of the Communist Party.

Examination of an additional 1,000 editorials, taken 3 months later, after the report was filed recommending 17 amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, the situation was found to have changed a little, but not materially. Where there had been 1 defender of the Labor Board in 1,000 found in the earlier study, it turned out that there was 1 editor out of each 150 or 200 who put himself on record as disapproving the Smith amendments.

Here are extracts from the current editorials of the newspapers of the Nation, taken as they came:

The San Antonio Express:

Constant failure is the New Deal's record for 7 years' meddling with employer-employee relationships. The National Industrial Recovery Act was invalidated by the Supreme Court after it had all but wrecked the American system of free enterprise and had added several million persons to the unemployment lists. Its successor, the National Labor Relations Act, continued the N. I. R. A.'s destructive work after a brief interval during which business and industry—given respite from governmental controls and an attendant opportunity to exercise initiative—had begun to recover.

The Wagner Act became law in 1935 and was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1937. Even by that time the detrimental effects of its administration had become apparent. Its entire history to date is a record of unwarranted strikes and violence, jurisdictional disputes, coercion of employers, vanishing investor confidence, stagnation of private enterprise, and aggravated employment.

The San Francisco Chronicle:

Do any of these (Smith committee) changes attack the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively? Do any of them injure the original declared purpose of the Wagner Act to bring labor justice and peace? On the contrary, they seem calculated to advance that purpose. They would put fairness into the act. This we believe to be as much in the interest of the workers as of employers and the general public. An unfair statute cannot operate indefinitely with unjust favoritism to one group and, without bringing about a popular revulsion, likely to go to the other extreme and visit injustice on the erstwhile favorite. If there is emasculation in these amendments, it is not of the rights of labor, but of an unbalance dangerous to labor.

The Portland (Maine) Press-Herald:

Everybody knows that the recommendations (Smith committee) go directly to the heart of the matter and would form an excellent basis for such amendments as are badly needed, both in the Wagner Act and its administration. The conclusions are inescapable. Sometime, and the sooner the better, they must receive enactment.

The Boston Transcript:

The Smith body struck with pile-driver force against the entire fabric of the administrative process. For there can be no other meaning to the committee's proposal that the present Labor Board be abolished and divided between a judicial board and a single administrator. * * * This newspaper is certain that the remedy for the difficulties lies in such a basic functional reform as the Smith committee has proposed.

The Wilmington Journal-Every Evening:

By the recommendations of the special congressional committee the door is open to a sorely needed and long-overdue revision of the Wagner Act. Congress itself, therefore, has an opportunity to pass a constructive piece of legislation and to make a notable contribution to the cause of industrial peace.

Dissatisfaction with the present Wagner Act and its creature, the National Labor Relations Board, is so widespread that any effort to shelve the 17-point program now presented will be highly regarded as an affront to the whole public. The very least that Congress should do is to give the matter immediate and sympathetic attention. Every consideration of justice and fair play to both parties to our industrial structure demands that some action be taken.

The Brooklyn Eagle:

We have long urged in these columns the need for amendments in the Wagner Act. Its defenders have generally conceded that there was room for improvement, but they have consistently objected when specific suggestions were advanced. Yet they have done nothing about it themselves. * * *

A crying need of the day is to put an end to the constant turmoil which now marks industrial relations. This will never be accomplished until the present Labor Act undergoes an overhauling. Any attempt to pigeonhole in committee the recommendations of the Smith group is bound to be widely resented throughout the country and become a leading issue in the coming election.

The Cedar Rapids Gazette:

According to reports from Washington, the apparent disposition of Congress is to change the personnel of the Labor Board and postpone proposed amendments to the labor law itself. This may be political prudence, but there is reason to doubt that it is good common sense. Until the bugs are culled out of the Wagner Act, undesirable and unnecessary friction is bound to arise in the process of administering the act, regardless of how wise the members of the Labor Board may be. The best way to get a new Labor Board off to a good start is to give it as flawless a law as possible to work with.

These criticisms are from the most important papers of the Nation, many of them beyond any charge of representing mere self-interest.

The Salt Lake City Desert News:

There is nothing more important in the entire field of national legislation than the working out of just and honorable relations between employer and employee. The relationship between these two may hamper business recovery to the injury of both, or may promote recovery for the benefit of both. The purpose of the recommendations of the Smith committee is to obtain a Labor Board which will be absolutely impartial in its decisions and which will put the Government in the position of an umpire rather than in the position of a labor partisan. * * * It is within the power of industry and labor to establish intelligent and honest industrial democracy voluntarily without the coercion of Government. Neither labor nor the leaders of industry should be compelled to fight for life against injustice and wrong.

The Christian Science Monitor:

Possibly it (the appointment of a five-member board) may forestall any other amendments for the current session; or it may not. But whether at this session or next, there is sure to be insistent demands for other perfecting amendments to the Labor Act, demands which cannot be denied. Among these are the clarification of the right of free speech on the part of an employer, an outlawing of the use of force or intimidation from whatever source, and a solution in some form for the troubled question of how to determine the bargaining unit. These and some other amendments will continue to press for consideration, whatever the size of the Board.

The Dayton Journal:

Turned loose to draft its own rules and regulations under a loose statute, permitted to administer those rules and regulations as it saw fit, and allowed to pass sentence on those men it convicted of violating rules and regulations, the Labor Board did become a dictator which a democracy had created. The three branches of Government serve as checks on one another; but there were no checks on a Board that was a law unto itself.

The application of this democratic system to labor relations should accomplish what the Wagner Act administered by a dictatorial Labor Board failed to do—promote industrial peace. It is a system which has worked equally well in that phase of human relations where democratic principles are most needed.

The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

Changes in the Wagner Labor Act recommended by the special House committee which has investigated the operation of the present law move straight toward the heart of complaints that have been made both by employers and labor. All in all, they appear to be well-conceived and in the best interest of all concerned. * * * Much of the resentment aroused by the present administration of the law has come from the Labor Board's power to act as prosecutor, judge, and jury, an obviously unworkable combination. * * * The aim of the law should be to hold the scales of fairness as evenly as possible for all parties concerned in labor and industrial relations. Continued experiment may be necessary to find the exact point of balance, but a much closer approach to it can be made than the present law permits.

The New York Sun:

Senator WAGNER's attack on the proposed amendments to the Labor Relations Act was made up of arguments which, to those who have read the amendments, are baseless. * * * The truth is that the Smith amendments, if adopted by Congress, would still leave the Wagner Act a piece of legislation that only employers could violate. The amendments do include long-overdue protection of employers: Federal courts would be authorized to void decisions of the Labor Board not supported by substantial evidence. Without such a provision the Labor Board will continue to be the oppressor of both employers and labor. But that fact seems to be of slight consequence to Senator WAGNER when his own prestige is suddenly exposed to the hazards attending congressional repair of his pet legislation.

The Pittsburgh Press:

Regardless of the outcome after all the other recommendations of the Smith investigating committee have been debated at Washington, one proposal certainly should go through. That is the abolition of the present National Labor Relations Board and a complete new deal.

For the other recommendations stem to maladministration by the Board at the top and its agents through the country. If there had been justice instead of zealotry in the conduct of the Board from the beginning, most of the hullabaloo and the public resentment would never have occurred, and investigation such as the Smith committee's would not have been necessary.

The National Labor Relations Board has been weighed and found wanting. A clean sweep is the first move toward making the Wagner Act what it originally was intended to be—an instrument to bring about peace in industry through orderly collective bargaining.

The Houston Post:

After investigating the National Labor Relations Board, three congressional committeemen have devised a series of amendments to the Wagner Labor Act. Such an inquiry should impress anyone deeply of the need for fundamental revision of that law, for it is so one-sided and the functioning of the Board under its terms is so biased as to render the whole thing a farce in the eyes of disinterested observers.

The operation of the Labor Board in considering charges against an employer is a legal travesty; the presiding trial examiner, who acts as judge and jury, is a Board employee, and the prosecuting attorney is a Board employee working more or less under the trial examiner's supervision. And most of the rulings are such as would be expected of such a set-up.

The Camden Courier:

It is not surprising that three of the five members of the House N. L. R. B. Investigating Committee should recommend 21 amendments ripping the Wagner Act from stem to stern. From the first the committee has been hostile to labor. * * * In the face of such a set-up the wonder is that the majority of the committee did not recommend wiping out the Wagner Act completely and putting all labor leaders in jail. * * * There is no secret about the amendments. They are sabotage. They would defeat the very purpose for which the Board was created: To settle labor disputes so as to reduce the number of strikes and stoppages of production.

In the entire South no single editorial voice is found that is raised in defense of the Labor Board. Here are a few typical declarations:

The Miami Herald:

The Wagner Act, particularly as it has been applied by the N. L. R. B., has satisfied no one, neither industry nor the two great labor organizations. Something is wrong with it. Even Mr. Roosevelt, in questioning the proposed committee recommendations, makes it clear that he does not oppose some changes. N. L. R. B. is an embarrassing issue for a Congress facing elections. But something ought to be done, and that quickly, to remedy a situation which has thoroughly disturbed industry and contributed directly to intensifying the strife between the battling labor groups.

The Fort Smith American:

The majority of the special investigating committee proposes that the present Board be abolished and a new Board of three members be created. Two members of the present Board, J. Warren Madden and Edward S. Smith, have been subject to much of the criticism. William M. Leiserson, newest member, has met more general approval. He was put on the Board by the President to try to mollify criticisms by improving administrative practice, but he had met resentment and opposition by other members. The basic principle of the Labor Act, collective bargaining, will stay and ought to stay. Abuses that have been so evident ought to be wiped out.

The Nashville Banner:

The faults which America by and large has found with the National Labor Relations Board are not such as could be cured by enlargement of its personnel any more than physical afflictions of the human body can be remedied by multiplication of the conditions causing them. Congress has a duty to perform with relation to the Labor Board and the act creating it. That duty has been outstanding now for two congressional sessions. Unless the Board is Americanized as public sentiment so widely demands, those responsible will be on the defensive far more strenuously than they now realize. Developments now in the making will show whether bureaucracy has, or can, become bigger than government.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal:

The Smith committee, not contentious about the precise letter of its suggestions, proposes to end the state of affairs in which the N. L. R. B. may and does function as detective, witness, prosecutor, judge, and jury in the same case. With that simple, forthright, and democratic idea the people may and do agree. It remains to be seen whether the Democrats are smart to satisfy the popular demand for justice in this connection or will leave it as a splendid campaign issue for the Republicans.

New Orleans Times-Picayune:

Under ordinary conditions some revision of the Labor Act could be taken for granted. The attacks—aimed chiefly at the administrating Board, but seeking remedial amendments of the law itself—have come from nearly all directions, from one of the greatest labor organizations, as well as from employers and the spokesmen of business and industry. The Labor Board's undertaking to function as detective, prosecutor, judge, jury, and examiner has been

widely condemned as unfair, contrary to sound policy—and in practice harmful, rather than helpful, to labor relations.

The Nashville Banner:

No more striking proof of the disregard by intrenched political power of laws objectionable to its interests can be revealed than that which has been disclosed before the House committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board. Convincing proof was laid before the committee of lobbying by regional officials and employees of the Board to prevent reduction of congressional appropriations for it. Edwin S. Smith, a member, went to the extent of telephoning a subordinate in Seattle requesting him to get in touch with labor leaders and others in that section in regard to a possible cut in the Board's revenues. Mr. Smith nonchalantly replied, when he was asked if the message was paid for by the Government, "Oh, yes." Yet there is a direct statute which Mr. Smith and his subordinate violated.

Among the papers of the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital, so close to matters of legislation, there is no difference of opinion.

The Washington Post:

Smith committee has certainly assembled evidence showing the need of prompt action to enable the N. L. R. B. to function more efficiently * * *. For various reasons the present Board has suffered a serious loss of prestige, and its usefulness has been correspondingly impaired * * *. It should be apparent by this time that the Wagner Labor Relations Act is a faulty legislative instrumentality in need of overhauling. If the task is delayed too long, the progress of collective bargaining is likely to be seriously retarded due to public hostility aroused by public bungling.

The Washington News:

It is already clear that the Labor Act has been badly administered in many respects; that amendments are needed to correct present abuses and prevent future ones, and that delay plays into the hands of the act's bitterest enemies. Mrs. NORTON typifies the attitude of a New Deal group which is determined to "save" the act and the Labor Board by staving off action on even the mildest proposals for change. Meanwhile, evidence of bad administration is piling higher and resentment is increasing. The result may well be that administrative action, when it does come, will not be moderate and corrective, but extreme and destructive.

The papers of the West speak as with one voice in their condemnation of the Labor Board.

The San Francisco News:

We believe that this session of Congress should remedy those defects that have become so obvious in the National Labor Relations Act. Therefore, we welcome the suggestions now offered by a majority of the special House committee which is investigating the enforcement of this law.

The Kansas City Star:

After months of special investigation the special House committee has reported its recommendations on the Labor Relations Board and the Wagner Act. It appears that the committee has done a thorough piece of work and that the changes its majority now advocate are in harmony with the professed purpose of the legislation, which is "to diminish the causes of labor disputes."

The Butte (Mont.) Standard:

The idea of one-way justice—a Board which listens to but one class of complainants and concedes the other side no rights of standing whatever, which is at once prosecutor, judge, and jury—is abhorrent to the American idea of justice. Neither the law which permits such a mockery of justice, nor the Board which carries it out, can long prevail under the American idea of fair play.

The Tulsa World:

No law of such wide and deep application can succeed without changes suggested by experience. It has already been shown that the Wagner Act, as administered by the N. L. R. B., is more an agent of explosion and distrust than of composure and fairness. Therefore, the logical thing to do is to abet radical procedure and so distribute powers that equity may come into practice and that discrimination may be avoided.

Los Angeles Examiner:

Robert H. Jackson, the recently appointed Attorney General of the United States, is accused of misquoting the law in an attempt to defend his Department's apparent unwillingness to prosecute certain New Deal officials and employees for an alleged violation of the law. No doubt, when he has thought the matter over fully, Attorney General Jackson will agree with Representative SMITH of Virginia that he may, and should, "resort at least to the documentary evidence."

The Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic:

In view of Chairman HOWARD SMITH'S House Committee on Labor, the Wagner Act needs a good many changes, requiring at least 21 patches, so many that seemingly adequate repairs may be made only by repealing the act and kicking out the National Labor Relations Board. The act would be bad enough even if it were administered by a board composed of honest and intelligent men. It has never in the last 2 years been so administered.

The Los Angeles Times:

If the amendments proposed by the committee were adopted immediately, as they should be, the original purposes of the Wagner Act as they were set before the country at the time of its passage would be furthered. The public was told that the act was intended to further the principle of collective bargaining in industrial relations for those who desired it. It was never intended that a partisan and biased board should take advantage of certain equivocal sections of the act to thrust unionism down the throats of free workmen, to cut off free speech and put shackles on a free press, to encourage strikes and disorder, and to put the management of industry into the hands of the unqualified.

In a thousand editorials a few less than one in a hundred defend the Labor Board. Here is one:

The Philadelphia Record:

Some facts are clear enough now. One, that the Smith committee, regardless of hearings or findings, is out to kill the N. L. R. B. * * * There is no secret about these amendments. They are sabotage. They would defeat the very purpose for which the Board was created—to settle labor disputes so as to reduce the number of strikes and stoppages in production. * * * Fortunately the Smith report is nothing more than a report. We do not believe the House, faced with the question, will undercut the rights of labor it guaranteed only 3 years ago.

The mass of them run along like the following:

The Columbus Citizen:

Regardless of the outcome after all the other recommendations of the Smith investigating committee have been debated in Washington, one proposal certainly should go through. That is the abolition of the present National Labor Relations Board, and a complete new deal.

The Cincinnati Times-Star:

Not content with browbeating employers and promoting strife among the unions, the National Labor Relations Board, through the testimony of its own Chairman, now admits attempting to blackjack business by persuading other governmental agencies to hold up loans and contracts with forms against which it has not made a case but which it accuses of unfair-labor practices, or perhaps merely suspects. Fortunately the congressional committee has been able to bring these things to light.

The Troy Record:

To the long list of Labor Relations Board's incongruous activities, including the role of investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury, there must be added that of legislative lobbyist. The astounding story of the Board's efforts, fortunately futile, to block loans from Government agencies to employers who had incurred its displeasure has already been spread on the record. Now from the lips of unwilling and interested witnesses comes the sordid tale of a campaign organized by the Labor Board to prevent adoption of any amendments to the Wagner Act that would weaken its arbitrary powers.

The Newark Call:

Washington observers, watching the tactics of friends of the Wagner Labor Act, are reminded of the stubbornness of the prohibitionists a decade ago. Volstead Act supporters would accept no modification, no compromise. Blandly indifferent to conditions which demanded correction and contemptuous of growing popular dissatisfaction, they resisted changes which would have retained what was good and diminished what was bad in prohibition. They stood out to the end and the end was destruction. The attitude of the Wagner Act people is much the same. They oppose all the amendments proposed by the majority report of the Smith committee. They dismiss the whole program as a foul attack on labor. It means nothing to them that some of the Smith recommendations appeal to a lot of folks as common sense and justice. Failure to accept modification of the Volstead Act * * * created the irritation that repealed the eighteen amendment. The parallel is deadly.

The New York World Telegram:

Regardless of the outcome after all the other recommenadtions of the Smith investigating committee have been debated at Washington, one proposal certainly should go through. That is the abolition of the present National Labor Relations Board and a complete new deal.

The Macon Telegraph:

When the Supreme Court of the United States hands down decisions in accordance with what the New Deal wants it to decide, perhaps we should not be surprised to find the Attorney General of the United States adapting law enforcement to the requirements of the New Deal * * *. The special committee appointed to investigate the N. L. R. B. and the Wagner Act had before it the admission of J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the Labor Board, that Government funds were used in bringing pressure to bear on Congress for appropriations to the Board. Chairman SMITH * * * wrote the

Attorney General asking if Madden and his colleagues had not violated the law * * * replied that the Attorney General could only give out opinions by request of executive departments. * * * It is an outrageous situation, but we need not be surprised at anything the New Deal may do when we consider the degree to which it has debauched the Supreme Court of the United States.

The newspapers had this to say of Attorney General Jackson, when he declined to give the Smith committee an opinion as to whether the Labor Board was violating the law in its lobbying activities.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

Attorney General Jackson will not tell the House committee investigating the conduct of the National Labor Relations Board whether the Board has violated the Federal Antilobbying Act. * * * Perhaps Mr. Jackson should not advise the committee. But the question the committee raised involves violation of a Federal statute, and even though he cannot go so far as to give the House committee an opinion, Mr. Jackson, as head of the Department of Justice, should be interested in the matter himself.

The Charleston (W. Va.) Mail:

It will be extremely interesting to see what course the Attorney General adopts toward evidence uncovered—of Labor Board unlawful lobbying—not by his department, but by the investigating committee. If the Attorney General shows the same high regard for ethics and legal precedent as he correctly did in the matter of rendering an opinion to the congressional committee, a thorough and vigorous prosecution would seem to be assured.

The Los Angeles Times:

Jackson declines to say whether Madden was violating the lobby law, declaring that the Department of Justice can give opinions only to the President, or the head of an executive department, and says that this uniformally has been held from the beginning of the Government. That is true enough, but Jackson is the last person who ought to be saying so or can consistently take advantage of it. One can only wonder what he would have said if it had been somebody opposed to the administration who was under investigation.

The Canton (Ohio) Repository:

It would be interesting to hear Attorney General Jackson announce that he is looking into the allegation that Labor Board funds have been misused. His hands are not washed of the Labor Relations Board merely because precedent restrains him from making a report on it to Congress.

The Greensboro (N. C.) News:

A large segment of the citizenry is going to wonder, with no subsequent development of confidence and respect for the Department of Justice as a byproduct, whether the Attorney General would have assumed such a position had the issue not involved such political factors or had the opinion sought been aimed at unfriends rather than friends of the Labor Board itself.

The Kansas City Star:

Attorney General Jackson finally has refused to give the House investigating committee a legal opinion as to whether the Labor Board's lobbying activities were in violation of a Federal law. * * * It is suggested that if the Attorney General does not feel that he can pass directly on the case the evidence can be submitted for court and grand-jury action.

The almost universal exasperation of the press of the Nation goes on thus with almost no dissenting voice, Democratic and Republican, north, east, south, and west, week after week and month after month. Was there ever an issue in the history of the Nation, one wonders, with relation to which there was such universal agreement.

The Augusta Kennebec Journal:

The National Labor Relations Board has become No. 1 problem child of the new dealers. Revelations of the unorthodox, to be as kind as possible, tactics and policies of the Board have made it obvious that the severest sort of discipline and most careful sort of training are needed if it's ever to amount to anything. Even hardened Congressmen from the big city districts have been astonished by some of the evidence before the Smith committee that has been investigating the Board. Congressional sentiment, especially in the House, has plainly turned strongly against the present personnel of the Board and even the Wagner Act that brought it into being.

The Greenville (S. C.) News:

If the Democratic leadership in the House fails, through indifference or hostility, to make genuinely sincere efforts to remedy the glaring defects of this measure at this session, the party will face the serious charge of neglecting to make any move toward making workable one of the main policies of the administration. As the measure stands with its present administrative set-up, it can accurately be charged with being a detriment to economic progress in this country.

Up New England way.

The Hartford Courant:

The net result of the Wagner Act and its administration has been not to diminish but to increase the number of labor disputes. There is nothing of greater importance to the rank and file of employees, to honestly conducted labor unions and to fair-minded industry than that the act should be made an equal and exact instrument of law, and that the Board administering it should be shorn of its power to perform the function of prosecutor, judge, and jury.

The New Haven Journal-Courier:

It would be charitable to conclude that Representative MARY T. NORTON was misquoted. But obviously she was not, for she stands by the statement. She is chairman of the House Labor Committee and she has announced that she will do everything in her power to prevent committee approval of the Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. Why will she do just that? Because the Labor Committee was organized "to protect the rights of labor * * *."

The House Labor Committee is simply organized to act for the House itself and give guidance on measures in its field. It is not supposed to be representative of any single group within the Nation, the champion of any pressure bloc. It acts for Congress which in turn acts for the entire country.

The Providence Journal:

One amendment seeks to separate the legal and judicial functions of the Labor Board, and, to that end, provides for the appointment of an administrator whose duty it will be to receive and investigate charges of unfair labor practices, to issue complaints, and to prosecute such complaints before the Board.

This plan should be adopted, for there is every reason to believe that it will go far toward eliminating some of the worst evils in our system of administrative law. Certainly it is worth trying out on a board which up to this time has been conspicuous for acting, in most cases, as judge, jury, and prosecutor.

In the Middle West.

Chicago Journal of Commerce:

It cannot be questioned that the act was passed in a spirit of labor partisanship. The administrative board accepted this spirit. Only after great pressure and long resistance did the Board finally make a gesture toward impartiality by agreeing to entertain petitions from employers for bargaining elections. If amending the act to prevent abuses revealed by the Smith committee's investigation of the Labor Board deprives labor of its fundamental rights, then we have come to a distressing state of affairs in this country. If labor persists in its resistance to changes which give the employer equal rights at law, it may count with certainty upon the day when the public will demand repeal rather than amendment.

The Indianapolis News:

The amendments to the Labor Relations Act which were proposed to the House on March 6 by Representative SMITH, chairman of the special committee that inquired into the working of the act, were referred to the committee on labor. This committee demonstrated during the 1939 session, in its handling of proposed amendments to the Wage and Hour Act, that its policy is one of obstruction. It has taken the same attitude toward the Smith proposals.

The Cleveland Press:

We believe that this session of Congress should remedy those defects that have become so obvious in the National Labor Relations Act. Therefore, we welcome the suggestions now offered by a majority of the special House committee which is investigating the enforcement of this law.

The Grand Rapids Herald:

Elliot Roosevelt, second son of the President, seems to be once more in rather violent conflict with the policies of his father. Elliot Roosevelt openly says that he thinks the Wagner Labor Relations Act should be amended in order to give business an equal right with labor, and calls for "a thorough house cleaning of the National Labor Relations Board." If only the President would take as realistic a view of the situation as does his second son, not only would business rejoice, not only would honest labor—not the racketeers—bless him, but many of our problems of unemployment and relief would be solved.

The Portland (Oreg.) Journal:

The Smith bill to amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act provides a basis for action on a reasonable revision that will bring that law and its administration closer to what Congress intended—and closer to the hearts of the American people.

The Smith bill is not the last word. It should be laid alongside other proposals and given consideration with the rest. But the country does not want to go backward. The people want a law that will operate with judicious regard for the rights of all concerned, one that will contribute to labor peace and sweep into oblivion the absurdities and backstair procedures exposed by the Smith committee's investigation. An intelligent effort along these lines is now due.

The Colorado Springs Gazette:

Impatience is again manifesting itself in the House in the delay in a show-down on the Wagner Act. As before, the butt of criticism is the Labor Committee. * * * The testimony already adduced leaves no doubt of the necessity for amending the act. In fact, the Labor Board itself settled the point when it radically changed its rules. The fault, however, is in the act itself, and the only sure remedy is amendment.

The Pueblo Chieftain:

None of the fundamental principles of the Wagner Act were changed by the committee. All the rights of employees are preserved, but protections are provided for employers who feel that they have been forced or coerced into organizations through opposing labor groups. * * * We sincerely hope that the Congress takes upon itself correction of the evils, which are administrative evils rather than defects in the purpose of the law itself.

Here is another voice raised in opposition.

The New York Evening Post:

The difference between this destructive (Smith committee) approach and the measured responsibility implicit in every word Senator WAGNER spoke is impressive. It seems clear to Senator WAGNER, for example, that to change the act so as to deny reinstatement to any striker guilty of any unlawful action is an economic sentence of death. He points out that the Labor Act does not take a corporation charter away and put it out of business for violation of the law; it merely restrains the corporation from repeating the violation. The Senator cannot see why extraordinary punishment should be laid upon a striker, after he has paid the specific penalties provided under local law for disorder.

And again the reputed official organ in this country of the Communist Party appears as a defender of the Wagner Act. It, in fact, has presented many editorials, of which the following is typical.

The Daily Worker:

The Smith amendments to destroy labor's basic rights as embodied in the Wagner Act are meeting with opposition from every section of labor. The C. I. O. has launched a vigorous drive for the defeat of these ripper amendments. * * * Even William Green has been forced to state that the Smith amendments "as a whole strike in a destructive way at vital fundamental principles of the act. * * * But the fight against the Smith amendments is threatened from another quarter, namely, the apprehensive policy of the Roosevelt administration, which began with the appointment of William Leiserson to the National Labor Relations Board.

Labor must speak out more emphatically than ever if the rights it has won over the course of years are not to be destroyed. The Senate Education and Labor Committee, headed by Senator ELBERT THOMAS, and the House Labor Committee, headed by Representative MARY NORTON, should be notified of your unqualified opposition to the Smith and all other amendments which would emasculate the act. Let the cry be: "Unless Congress is willing to put teeth into the Wagner Act, as provided by the C. I. O. amendments, then keep hands off the law altogether.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, to prepare this Nation against any eventuality—that must be our major objective during these grave days. Well do we realize that in the swiftly changing world of today this Nation faces a future charged with great uncertainties. There can be but one answer to our problem: We must prepare and prepare quickly; defend and defend adequately. In short, there is but one thing for us to do, and that is to provide for our country a system of national defense adequate to cope with every conceivable threat to the happiness and security of the American people.

Today, as never before, we witness the grim tragedy of unprepared nations throughout Europe falling to pieces under the shattering impact of modern warfare. It is a ruthless affair, in which one nation after another, unable to defend herself against invading armies, loses freedom and independence—and the end is not yet in sight. "Unprepared," that is the word which is spelling disaster for two great democratic nations of Europe, who, at the beginning of the present war, had every economic advantage over their enemy.

But to possess economic advantage is not enough; to have superiority in resources is not enough; to live by the high ideals of justice and right is not enough; nothing will suffice save force. England and France did have the resources to match Germany tank for tank and plane for plane, but the important point is that they failed to build the necessary tanks and planes. Because they failed to build defenses when defenses should have been built, their fate at this very moment hangs in the balance. They may be building feverishly at the present time, but on every side there seems to echo an awful cry, "Too late! Too late!"

The lesson for us is clear: We must not, we shall not, wait until it is too late. Of course, it is the events of the past 2 weeks which have suddenly made us realize that things fantastic, almost impossible, can and do happen. What has occurred in Europe seems almost incredible, and a short while ago we were prone to regard as utterly fantastic the idea that the United States could be made an object of invasion. From now on out, however, there should be no excuse for lulling ourselves into a false sense of security, because the facts will not support such wishing.

We must do a tremendous job in the upbuilding of our national defenses before we can count this Nation invulnerable. We need airplanes, thousands of them; we need units of antiaircraft artillery, thousands of them, plus millions of other pieces of equipment. Then we need to double and redouble the size of our Army, so that it will no longer appear infinitesimal in point of numbers with other armies of the world.

Without delay we must at once take this long step toward meeting these defensive needs by adopting the bill which the President has recommended and is now before this House for action. In his speech to the Congress the President clearly outlined the ends which this appropriation would serve. Support of the measure has been urged from all quarters. Ours is the responsibility to take immediate action on this national-defense measure. The path we take is clearly indicated. We must, as already pointed out, provide for our country a system of national defense adequate to cope with every conceivable threat to the happiness and security of the American people.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, our main objective is peace, but I firmly believe Washington was right when he urged full preparation for war as the surest guaranty of peace.

Last year we adopted a vast program for the expansion of the aviation service of the United States Army. Now we are told we have only 58 airplanes that are not obsolete.

Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of Air Corps, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations and declared, in regard to obsolete airplanes, that—

If you take the B–18 (which are the Army's twin-engine bombers) and send it out against modern equipment, it would be suicide. However, we will use the B–18's for training purposes.

Asked how many of the Army's fleet of 2,700 planes could be modernized, he replied:

Offhand, I should say half a dozen.

Asked whether the Army has any ultramodern planes, with self-sealing tanks and cannon armament, he said:

None; we are just now going into it.

We are supposed to have a standing Army of 241,000 men, but Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, declared when questioned before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Ap-

propriations that the Army could only put 75,000 men in the field today, and that for them "some equipment is still lacking."

Our Army is now equipped with the World War Springfield manual rifle, over 20 years out of date. There are 38,000 automatic rifles on hand, 131,000 ordered, and 240,000 asked.

General Marshall stated that it should be equipped with Garand rifles.

It would lack the 37-millimeter antiaircraft guns.
It would have a fair compliment of 37-millimeter antitank guns.
It would have at the moment a little less than half of the modernized 75-millimeter guns.
It would be lacking modern 155-millimeter guns and some corps troops.
It would be lacking some essential engineers and communications units.
Other than that, it would be all right.

There are 218 antitank guns on hand, 526 ordered, and 1,556 asked. There is a serious shortage of modern 75-millimeter artillery—141 on hand, 411 ordered, and 1,380 asked.

There is also a serious shortage of 75-millimeter antiaircraft guns, but the Army is switching to 90-millimeter antiaircraft guns to get longer range.

We have no howitzers at all—48 are ordered and hundreds needed.

Many of our coast defenses are obsolete. There is a shortage of 30 to 50 percent of tanks and there is a critical shortage in ammunition.

In regard to the availability of the National Guard, General Marshall said:

National Guard divisions are now tied to the ground—immobile. They cannot take the field as such.

We also have a shortage of uniforms.

This administration has spent seven thousand million dollars for preparedness. Most of the money spent on national defense has gone to the United States Navy, which is stronger today than at any time in the Nation's history. Why should our Army and air force be inadequate? With ruthless military aggression unleashed in the world, America must lose no time in strengthening her defenses. We must restore our whole economy to health and vigor after the ravages of the 7 lean years, and we must build up the power and efficiency of our Army, Navy, and air forces to levels which will make this country impregnable to attack. We must have a well-equipped Army and Navy, which must be accompanied by the best air force in the world. Republicans and Democrats should work together on our defense program and remain in session until the job is completed.

We are determined that no American forces shall ever again be sent to fight in Europe. Always remember, our biggest danger lies from within. Let us ever be watchful of the "fifth column" movement in America. Keep cool, and do not become freightened, in order that we shall always be able to preserve, protect, and defend our American liberties and institutions.

Our Representation in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I insert the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of May 23, 1940. When you read it, I know the membership will agree with me when I say that the editorial calls to our attention a deplorable situation.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of May 23, 1940]

CANADA TREATED CASUALLY

Canadians have reason to be critical of the Roosevelt administration in the matter of the diplomatic representation of the United States at Ottawa. Ministers come and go so fast that even officials of the Dominion Government must find it difficult to keep track of them. James H. R. Cromwell, who was appointed Minister to Canada last January 4, resigned the post on Wednesday to run for United States Senator from New Jersey on the Democratic ticket.

"Ministers have been staying with us so short a time," says the Ottawa Journal, "that they saw little of this country beyond the vicinity of the capital itself and had no opportunity to study Canadian conditions and the place of Canada in the continental picture."

Mr. Cromwell had had no diplomatic experience whatever when he was appointed Minister to Canada. Indeed, he had no qualifications for the post, as he soon demonstrated in a most undiplomatic speech at Toronto, a speech which drew a rebuke from Secretary of State Cordell Hull. But the administration felt indebted to Mr. Cromwell, because his wife had contributed $50,000 to the Democratic campaign fund. The rich young man, wanting dignity of any performance as a private citizen, was invested offhand with the dignity of the high office of Minister to Canada. Straightway he proceeded to kick over the diplomatic apple cart. But his offense did not cost him the esteem of the President. Not at all. Mr. Cromwell entered the New Jersey senatorial primary with the blessing of the administration. It was as if his service at Ottawa had been altogether commendable. Since he had the stamp of New Deal approval no one dared contest with him for the nomination.

The casual treatment of Canada in the matter of diplomatic representation does not sit well with the American people; for they regard the position at Ottawa as one of the most important in the Diplomatic Service. Not only is Canada the best friend that the United States has among the nations but also it is this country's best customer. In view of the close relations existing between the United States and the Dominion and the multiplicity of their common interests a representative of the highest type should be selected as American Minister to Canada. The close of the war may see matters of vital importance claiming their joint attention; and the United States should then have at Ottawa a representative who has the confidence of the American people and who will deserve the respect of the Canadians. The post at Ottawa should be filled by a career man of the State Department.

Strain Would Be Too Heavy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Banner, Nashville, Tenn., under date of May 10, 1940:

[From the Nashville Banner of May 10, 1940]

STRAIN WOULD BE TOO HEAVY

It is said that Rear Admiral Joseph K. Taussig, in reading a prepared statement on the pending Navy appropriation bill to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, omitted reference to the national debt. The sentence which the admiral is said to have struck from his manuscript is reported to have been as follows: "Our financial structure, none too proud at present, on account of the huge public debt cannot stand such a strain."

If the admiral indeed did omit such a statement it must have been that he realized that the continuous expansion of the national debt already nearing the legal limit might be a positive factor affecting the national security.

In the last decade that debt has increased by nearly $30,000,000,000 and it is increasing now at the rate of $10,000,000 a day. The question arises, How long can such a condition be continued without serious peril?

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau is on record as declaring that the indebtedness could safely be raised to $50,000,000,000, though he would not venture an opinion beyond that figure. The direct and indirect, but positive, obligations of the Government approximate that figure now.

It will be recalled that when the United States entered the World War it had a debt of less than $2,000,000,000 and it encountered no really serious difficulties in increasing it by $25,000,000,000; but war is much more costly now to every nation than it was a quarter of a century ago. It is estimated that the expenditures of the United States now would approximate $20,000,000,000 the first year.

With taxes already high and the public debt rapidly nearing the point where it would be twice that at the end of the world conflict of a quarter of a century ago, the matter of raising enormous funds would be much more serious now than then. The needful money could be obtained only by raising taxation to a point imposing

well-night intolerable burdens and by increasing the public indebtedness to a staggering and dangerous point.

The interests of the taxpayers of the country, who would be called on not only to provide all the current revenues possible but would have ultimately to face, in this or ensuing generations, the discharge of the enormous and almost confiscatory public debt, constitute strong reason, quite apart from the even more important consideration of preserving the institutions of the Republic from impairment, calling for the avoidance of the United States from involvement in the struggle across the seas.

The American Way Versus Dictatorships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on this day, when we are voting to increase our national defense, I think it well also to guard ourselves against those things that we do not lose by invasion, but by our own indifference and folly. I hope that every Member will carefully read the following editorial. It was published in the Omaha World-Herald. It expresses the American view.

Liberty can only be preserved by following a middle course, between the one extreme of blindly following a dictator, or the other extreme of resorting to a course of unfair, unjust partisan bickering. In time of an emergency or crisis we should think things through clearly and give due consideration for the opinion of all men. Then as intelligent Americans we can stand united and loyal. We need two parties.

ON CHANGING HORSES

All of a sudden a number of political orators have awakened to the supposed danger of "changing horses in the middle of the stream." Some of them have become so alarmed that they suggest that politics be adjourned for the duration of the war while everybody climbs on the New Deal bandwagon.

Harold Ickes, the secretary of the ulterior, may be taken as the spokesman for this group. He says another term for Mr. Roosevelt is necessary "to give a free people national unity at a time of national crisis," and "to permit the New Deal's concept of social and economic justice to become an accepted part of our American system."

It is, of course, perfectly preposterous.

Great Britain found that "to give a free people national unity at a time of national crisis" it had to throw out one government and get another. France found, not only that it had to change governments, but also that it had to remove its commander in chief, right at the moment when the most savage battle in history was at its furious peak.

At a time of crisis there is even greater need than ordinarily for debating national issues.

The New Deal has been in office for more than 7 years. For most of that period it has been blessed with a compliant Congress. It has been given unprecedented sums to spend. Never, except in time of war, has any administration had such authority or such appropriations.

Come next November that administration will be represented on the ballot, either by the President himself, seeking an unprecedented third term, or by some substitute approved by him.

That candidate, whoever he may be, should be called to account just as sharply as Daladier and Chamberlain were in their respective lands. He should be asked about the state of our national defenses, about the condition of our Treasury, about the foreign and domestic policies which he proposes to follow if elected, or reelected, to the White House.

Against that candidate there should be the strongest man that the Republican Party can find, running on a platform written by the wisest men of his group. He, too, should be asked in specific detail about his plans and purposes.

After a furious and typically American campaign the free voters should choose between those two.

Another curious proposal is the one recently made calling for a coalition, or national, Cabinet. Under the latest of these suggestions, Alf Landon and Frank Knox, the Republican candidates in 1936, would be invited into Mr. Roosevelt's official family. In return, it must be assumed, they would advocate a political truce for the duration of the war.

Such a coalition seems not only unnecessary but a foolish yielding to hysteria. There are plenty of good, honest, and patriotic Democrats who can perform any routine secretarial jobs just as well as the Messrs. Landon and Knox. Republican leaders would do better to stick to the traditional role of the minority—the role of critic, gadfly, and rival candidate.

We Americans are interested in world politics largely because we love democracy and despise despotism. Why, then, at the first sign of danger, should we throw our own democracy overboard?

We don't believe the mass of American voters will do it. We don't believe the suggestion comes from them. We believe that it comes mainly from men like Harold Ickes who have reasons of their own for wanting a coalition—on their side of the fence.

Belgium, We Salute You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. DAVIES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, knowing that the entire citizenry of the United States has been touched by the stirring valor of the Belgians in the recent days of its national catastrophe, I wish to insert here a copy of an address by the Honorable Joseph W. Davies, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Belgium. It expresses the sentiments of our Nation fully and adequately. His address, delivered at the opening of the Belgian Pavilion at the New York World's Fair on Saturday afternoon, May 18, 1940, is as follows:

In these terrible, tragic days the heart of America and of the liberty-loving world aches for Belgium, its gallant King, its great people. I am but one of millions of Americans who have been shocked and saddened by the cruel disaster which has befallen the brave people of Belgium. What makes this disaster all the more horrifying is the realization that it was no act of its own, either of the Belgian Government or the Belgian people, which brought upon their lovely country the horrors of war.

For me it is particularly painful to give witness to my own emotions in the face of this catastrophe, for I came to know Belgium well and to love it. As Ambassador of the United States, I came into contact with the strength of government and people and made many warm and lasting friendships. I know, personally, of the thrift, courage, energy, Christian faith of the Belgians. I traveled through the country extensively. I saw the boys and men who made up their army. I came into contact with the peasants who cultivate their farms—the same families for many generations—and I respected their love for their soil and their pride in their civilization. Belgium is to me more than a beautiful country; it is a country of friends. Belgium has always had a warm place in the heart of the American people and today more than ever before.

Under the wise and far-sighted leadership of King Leopold, 3 years ago, Belgium gave its honorable commitment that it would remain neutral between the great nations of Europe. Belgium then gave its solemn word that would prevent the territory of Belgium from being used by either belligerent as a passage or as a basis of operation by land, sea, and air in case of any aggression by another state. This pledge, in turn, was met by the voluntary formal agreement on the part of all the three warring powers that they would respect Belgium's sovereignty, the inviolability and integrity of its territory and each gave formal promise of assistance to Belgium in case Belgium were attacked or invaded.

When war broke in September, at back-breaking cost to itself, Belgium prepared to honorably fulfill its pledge of strict neutrality. One-tenth of its entire population was mobilized into an army to safeguard this promise which Belgium had given to both sides. Despite great pressure, the plighted word of Belgium was sacredly held and scrupulously maintained as a matter of the personal honor of the King, his government, and the Belgian people. Until the very moment when their country was invaded, Belgium maintained scrupulous and sincere neutrality in the belief that it could rely on the pledged word of governments and upon the traditions of morality in the European civilization.

Whatever else may be said, the honor of Belgium has been kept clean and high. Never did knight in shining armor go forth to do battle for honor more nobly than did King Leopold, his Government, his troops, and his people.

If to be worthy of life as a nation is to be capable of fighting for the preservation of its existence, for its peace and its honor, then the Belgian nation has demonstrated that worthiness a millionfold.

And so in conclusion I say to you:

Belgium, the heart of America and of the entire Christian and liberty-loving world aches for you in these sad days. You and we

are sustained by the faith that man was created in the image of his Maker and so we know that love of liberty and honor will never die in the hearts of men. Whatever else may come, the names of Albert of Belgium, his great and noble son, Leopold, and that of the Belgian people will live while civilization lasts to inspire the hope, courage, and faith of free men. Liberty-loving men and women everywhere are hoping and praying that the day may soon come when peace, justice, and the rule of law shall again be restored to a free, independent, self-respecting nation of God-fearing men and women—Belgium.

Belgium, we salute you.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today as Members of Congress we are face to face with a situation that is so vital to the security of our people that it precludes the propriety of discussion based upon solely partisan considerations. In a time such as this our patriotism and love of country carries us beyond the usual limitations of party affiliation. We move forward into a great and united American party that destroys the middle aisle of the House as a line of separation between Republicans and Democrats. We become members as of one party to establish and make certain the security of our people and the principles upon which this Nation was established.

The President has announced that our national defense is inadequate, and that an emergency exists that requires it to be immediately strengthened. The announcement of the insufficiency of our national defense was in itself very disturbing; but, even more disturbing have been the revelations of how woefully inadequate our national defense now is. To me it is inconceivable that, notwithstanding the wars and rumors of wars that have enveloped the world during the last 7 years, little, if any, attention seems to have been paid by the present administration to providing an adequate national defense.

During the last 7 years Congress has appropriated about eight and one-half billion dollars for our Military Establishments. Approximately $7,000,000,000 of this has been expended. What has been done with it? Why are we not better prepared? In the face of the demand now made by the President for additional funds to buy what we lack in military equipment, how can it be denied that the money already appropriated and spent must have been to a large extent unwisely spent? If this is not so, then why do we not have more to show for it in the way of military equipment? There has been no satisfactory answer. But the fact does remain that we are deficient to such an extent that the President considered it necessary to appear in person before Congress and state the need. Congress has responded with patriotic fervor, and party lines have been eliminated for the time being, in order that there may be unity of thought and purpose. If the appeal had been made by the President at an earlier date the response, in my opinion, would have been equally enthusiastic as it is now. While it is unfortunate that there has been delay in calling the attention of Congress to our needs until a crisis in the European war impelled the President to do so, yet that is no excuse for further delay based upon useless criticism. The time for action to remedy the situation is at hand. It is our duty to respond—and I do so in the hope that it may be never necessary to use the implements of war to be provided, but that the military strength they give will ever be a deterrent to nations less peaceably inclined than our own.

In times such as these there are many individuals throughout the Nation who are fearful that the present program to build up and strengthen our Military Establishment is but a forerunner of our entrance into the war now raging in Europe. I do not think so. I believe it will help us to remain clear of the war no matter what the final result will be as between the nations now engaged. As long as force is the dominating policy of aggressor nations it is incumbent upon us to have the means that will help make certain and secure our own peace. We have seen in the last few months that good intention and the desire to remain neutral is no guaranty against war. Force does not recognize or respect any such considerations. Thus, for this Nation to overlook the consequences that have come to other peaceably inclined nations through lack of preparedness would be foolish, and no Representative of the people in Congress, or elsewhere, would be true to the trust reposed in him if he should fail to do everything within his power to provide adequately for the continued peace and security of our people.

Frequently the question is asked of me, "Are we going into the war?" It seems to be a fear that is in the heart of the mothers and fathers of the young manhood of our Nation who would be called to service in such an event. I reply to all such inquiries with a positive "No." I tell them that Congress in my opinion would never vote this country into war except to withstand an invader.

America is a peace-loving Nation. The desire for peace is the very heart and soul of America. We have led every effort that has been made to substitute peaceful means for settlement of differences between nations. Thus, there is nothing further from our thought than a desire for war when we, as Representatives in Congress, vote in favor of the bill now pending before us to give additional strength to our Military Establishment. When we do so we respect the overwhelming desire that exists in America for peace. We vote for defense, not war.

My Obligation as a Citizen Under the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1940

ORATION BY FLORENCE HAMMONS, OF WEWOKA, OKLA.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present for the consideration of my colleagues, an original oration by Miss Florence Hammons, of Wewoka, Okla., entitled "My Obligation as a Citizen Under the Constitution."

This oration won the American Legion contest. It is full of good thought and is an expression of the splendid citizenship that lives in the mind and heart of America's youth.

Miss Hammons is a young lady of unusual fine character, ability, and good training. I present this production of her thought with sincere pride in her achievement.

MY OBLIGATION AS A CITIZEN UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Miss Florence Hammons, of Wewoka, Okla.)

As one of the representatives of the younger generation I feel that it is time for us to think of our obligations as citizens under the Constitution. Although we are not of voting age we should start training ourselves for good citizenship. You, the American Legion, are, in my opinion, the best example of citizens bound together trying to fulfill their obligations under the Constitution. I feel that we could find no better example to follow than you and the obligations set forth in the preamble of the American Legion constitution.

Recent world events have made Americans realize how lucky they are to live under their Constitution, and started them thinking of their obligations to the Constitution which has survived the changes of over a century and a half. Today, more than ever before, it is a distinction to be an American citizen. It may be heard on nearly every street corner of America: "Thank God I'm an American" or "Boy, it surely is great to live in a democracy and have 3,000 miles of water between us and Europe." These are typical of the feelings of all loyal Americans. They are proud of their Constitution and that they are Americans. When the flag goes by we stand erect and salute, not in dread or fear, not because some law compels us to do so, but because we are proud of what

our flag symbolizes. But too often we forget that we owe something to this Nation of which we are so proud.

As I thought of this subject, the following obligations came into my mind and these are the obligations that I am going to try to fulfill as a citizen.

It is my obligation as a citizen to vote and take an active part in the Government. This is the obligation in which many of the so-called best citizens fail. As long as business is good and things go all right, people have a tendency to say, "My, we have a good Government"; but they let the Government run itself. The minute something goes wrong they start criticizing the Government and taking an interest in it. This apathy of the American people is one of the greatest weaknesses of our democracy. The best friend of graft, inefficiency, and extravagance is public indifference. The right to vote is a very powerful weapon placed in the hands of our citizens and as citizens we must be careful of how we use this weapon. We all know that the ordinary man is not fit to lead us in our Government. Men of superior abilities should be selected to run our Government. The United States has a mixed population. There are men and women from parts of Europe and Asia who have never known self-government. There are men and women from remote parts of our country who are illiterate and ignorant. There are men and women from the slum districts. There are respectable citizens who have no public spirit and then there are just plain crooks. We must keep these people in the minority. This problem will be partly solved when all good citizens vote. It is my duty to know for whom and what I am voting before I go to the polls.

I am obligated to help maintain law and order. I don't mean that I should join the police force, but that I should obey all laws and try to influence others to do the same. Many of us are guilty of disobeying some laws that don't seem important to us, such as running stop signs. A good citizen will try to obey all laws rather than avoid them or merely stay within them. Parents often neglect to teach their children the importance of respect for the law. These children grow up with no respect for the laws of their country. We little realize how much we influence others. Some person may hold you or me up as an example and they will say, "Well, if he does it, it must be all right." So as a citizen I believe I should obey all laws, no matter how insignificant they seem to me. J. Edgar Hoover said: "I believe that respect for the law is the highest type of patriotic citizenship."

It is my obligation as a citizen to help promote the education of Americans in the principles of Americanism and good citizenship. Too many of us take patriotism for granted. We leave the studying and spreading of the principles of Americanism to the other people. Education is the foundation of our democracy; therefore the schools today are the foundation of our Government tomorrow. The schools today are realizing their responsibility to mold better citizens. They are including in their curriculums more and more the teaching of good citizenship. Much of this can be attributed to the great work done by the American Legion. This organization has done more than any other to promote the education of both adults and young people in the principles of Americanism and good citizenship.

There are several un-American activities in our country that are trying to undermine the principles of our Government. I believe that the growth of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all other un-American organizations should be watched carefully. Their chief aim is to destroy our democratic Government. President Roosevelt, while talking to the American Youth Congress, said: "It has been said that some of you are Communists. That is a very unpopular term today. As Americans you have a right, a legal and constitutional right, to call yourselves Communists, those of you who do. You have a right, peacefully and openly, to advocate certain ideals of theoretical communism; but as Americans you have not only a right but a sacred duty to confine your advocacy of changes in law to the methods prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. You have no American right, by act or deed of any kind, to subvert the Government and the Constitution of this Nation." The people of the United States hold very dear their civil and religious liberties, and they will never follow any foreign system of government so long as they have hope for a job, security for their family, and reasonable economic opportunities under our system of government. You can't talk to an unemployed slum inhabitant of the advantages of liberty and of living in a democracy when living in a democracy means the kind of life he is living. As citizens we should study these problems of unemployment, slum districts, conflict between capital and labor, and other problems of our Government, and we may find some way that we can do our part to help solve them. I know that it may seem that what one citizen does or thinks makes little difference in our Government, but that is wrong. It will take all of the citizens of America and what they think and they do to make our Government better. These problems must be solved or partly solved before some Americans can be taught the true spirit of Americanism and good citizenship. It is my obligation as a citizen to do all I can to solve these problems.

Lately there has been a lessening influence of religion. No one can say exactly what caused it, but one thing for certain is that the influence of religion must not decrease any more. We must take the warning of what has happened to the young people of Germany, Italy, and Russia. Bishop E. Freeman said, "It is the recognition of our moral obligations and those enduring principles that have been our stay through the 150 years of our existence as a Nation. Those who founded the Republic and the strong leaders that led us in later years acknowledged the dependence of the state upon the Almighty God." Washington once said that morality and religion were the two indispensable supports of the Republic. Patriotism and religion are closely related. The kind of citizenship that shows its patriotism in consecration to American ideals has its beginning in obedient recognition of God's place in all human concerns. Loss of confidence has been directly responsible for our economic decline. Confidence is lost when moral and religious rules are forgotten and abandoned.

As citizens we believe in all our Nation stands for; today we are called upon to give new and definite exhibition of our citizenship. It is more than exercising our civil right at the polls. It is that in all our relations we should show those qualities of character which bear the mark of faith in God and faith in our country.

I am obligated to use in my everyday life those religious and moral precepts that show faith in my God and my country.

When I think of my obligation as a citizen under the Constitution, I feel as Webster did when he said, "I was born an American, I live an American, I shall die an American, and I intend to perform those duties incumbent upon me in that character until the end of my life. No man can suffer too much, no man can fall too soon, if he suffer, if he fall, in defense of the liberties and constitution of his country."

Methods of Public Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson wrote a column on May 8, 1940, which I believe is deserving of consideration, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

General Johnson, in this article, gives his views on the various types of public forums.

The general calls attention to the type of radio forum being conducted by Theodore Granik. Mr. Granik is a well-known attorney in this city, and has devoted a great deal of time to the development of the nationally known program called the American Forum of the Air. A number of Senators, like myself, have appeared on this program, and I think we all agree that it is an important public service.

Evidently Mr. Granik and General Johnson are thinking along the same line, for I understand the American Forum of the Air has inaugurated audience participation as a regular feature of the program. I understand that it was a great success.

Programs of this kind are typically democratic and genuinely American. They should be fostered and encouraged, and I believe that Mr. Granik deserves a good deal of commendation for his work.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

NEW YORK CITY.—General Motors gave a party at the New York "World of Tomorrow" Fair—to 400 students selected by the presidents of 80 colleges without regard to size or age of the seat of learning—from fresh-water Siwashes to the greatest universities.

It was a youth congress without communism or even politics. High point was a forum conducted by Clifton Fadiman, impresario of Information Please, along lines developed in that popular program. His experts were college presidents, a General Motors' chief of research, and a newspaper columnist. The subject was Opportunity of Youth in Industry and the few questions were culled from hundreds which the eager kids had asked.

This forum coupled with short, sensible, and highly appreciated talks by Mr. Sloan, Mr. Knudson, and Mr. Kettering—General Motors' chairman, president, and chief of research, completed the first attempt of one of our greatest employers to give guidance to the solution of a principal social problem. It was a complete success.

It also helped prove another theory to which I am devoted—the tremendous value of the public-forum type of discussion. There are several varieties. I think I have participated in them all.

One is the so-called Town Hall debate. In this, an advocate of an idea reads a canned speech, his opponent another, and then both respond to fairly well-regulated heckling from the audience. Another is the Granik method of more or less informal discussion

by a panel of four—two on each side of a particular issue without questions from an audience.

The Chicago University round table uses a moderator to regulate a face-to-face argument between two adversary advocates—without an audience. The Information Please type is confined altogether to selected written questions to a panel with no controversy involved—just like this General Motors youth dinner.

Finally, there is the one-man show of some speaker who, without any moderator, conduct their own debate by means of unpulled punches in questions from a more or less adversary audience after a brief discussion by him of his particular subject. Every single one of these methods has been successful in various degrees, depending on method.

Our public is more alert than ever and more skeptical. It wants to hear both sides. It loves a scrap. It has ideas of its own. It also wants to participate—just as any fan at a ball game or a prize fight finds himself tensing his muscles and gritting his teeth. If that analysis is right, all these methods have panned "color" on the edge of a rich vein of ore but none has struck the mother lode.

The first requirement is to get a real issue on which public opinion is hotly divided. The Information Please approach doesn't do that. Neither did this General Motors show. Both are attractive as mental acrobatics but there was only one difference of opinion at the World of Tomorrow and never any in Information Please.

"Town Hall" recognizes the element of human wish for getting in there and socking—public participation—by heckling, but the preceding debate is no contest. It is just one stuffed shirt exhibiting his stuffiness against the other. This is no real debate.

The Granik and University of Chicago method recognizes this shortcoming and puts debaters on their own resources, but it does not give the public the joy of active and instantaneous participation. Also, the moderator in the university contest insists on debating himself—and usually nobody cares to hear him.

Out of all this confusion of good principle and proved popularity I think there is an ideal answer: (1) A specific issue; (2) a panel of say two against two adversary advocates to start a veritable contest; (3) a very short but peppy argument without any butter-in partisan moderator; (4) absolute freedom of audience questioning. You can call it heckling, but it supplies the missing link of popular participation. Put these three necessary elements together honestly and we shall have one of the most valuable and popular American institutions.

War Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK SUN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Sun entitled "The Short, Sad Story of the War Resources Board."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHORT, SAD STORY OF THE WAR RESOURCES BOARD

In the Senate yesterday Mr. VANDENBERG suggested that President Roosevelt make available to Congress the report of the War Resources Board. The President received this report last fall, but it has never seen the light of day. Senator VANDENBERG realized that there might be something in the document the publication of which would not be compatible with the public interest, but at least the Senate and the House, now engaged on preparedness, should be allowed to inspect it. Whatever the contents of the report, the history of the War Industries Board and its sudden demise is highly interesting now.

The announcement of the formation of that Board as a civilian advisory committee to work with the Army and Navy Munitions Board was made on August 9 last, about 3 weeks before Britain and France declared war on Germany. The Board was to do, so far as preliminary work could be done, what the War Industries Board, with Bernard M. Baruch as chairman, did in the World War. The new agency had the approval of President Roosevelt, but the personnel was chosen by the Acting Secretary of War, Louis Johnson, and the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Charles Edison, who were joint chairmen of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., head of the United States Steel Corporation, was named as Chairman of the War Resources Board, and his fellow members included:

Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Walter S. Gifford, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

John Lee Pratt, a director of General Motors.

Gen. Robert E. Wood, chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution.

Many rubbed their eyes on reading the names and positions of the members of this War Resources Board. Here was the New Deal, after fighting business for years, calling upon corporation heads and scientific investigators to help in getting ready for what the future might hold. The Board met on August 17. Louis Johnson described its task as "a precautionary measure to guarantee that our great national-defense asset, which is our material resources, can be effectively mobilized and controlled in an emergency." Mr. Stettinius said that his Board would "consider primarily how the industrial and economic resources of the Nation can best be prepared for the part which they must play in the event of war." In short, this Board was setting out to answer the questions that are being asked now, 9 months later.

And what happened? On September 26, with the European war in motion and the War Resources Board engaged only 5 weeks on its huge task, President Roosevelt announced at a press conference that the Board would complete its work within 2 weeks and then disband. What had happened was told in the columns of the New York Times, a supporter of Mr. Roosevelt, on September 28 by one of its Washington staff, Mr. Kluckhohn:

"New dealers of the inner circle believe that after weeks of effort they have succeeded in neutralizing or sidetracking the War Resources Board * * * as an administrative unit. The inner circle, of which Thomas G. Corcoran and Benjamin Cohen are members, is convinced that the President has shifted from favoring the use of industrialists as key men in meeting emergencies created by the war to their position, namely, that the agencies created during the New Deal, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, must bear the chief, if not the entire, burden of present and future wartime problems. * * * The new dealers took up the gage of battle as soon as the industrial complexion of the War Resources Board was made known. * * * The Corcoran-Cohen group is reported to have gone into action immediately."

On September 29 the Times, in an article by its chief Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock, said:

"The young radicals and business baiters of the White House circle * * * are giving out private victory communiques and assuring the even younger band of Government employees for whom they have found places that Wall Street has been routed and the President's heart is, as ever, in the right place. * * * The entire experience of the War Resources Board has been typical of what happens to businessmen and financiers drafted by the New Deal."

Thus was torpedoed a Board which by now, or at least by a year after its beginning, could have offered a complete report on American resources in wartime. Mr. Roosevelt having announced the doom desired by the Corcoran-Cohen group, the Board presented to Assistant Secretary Johnson on October 19 a preliminary draft of a report, and this was submitted to the President. The public has never seen it. The Board members, not having had time to complete their job, may not wish to have it made public even if the White House so desired.

It may seem grotesque, this picture of Corcoran and Cohen, and their like, stopping the work of men who know business from A to Z. But there is the evidence. Will the New Deal maintain that attitude? It would be pleasant to say that it cannot maintain it and that Mr. Roosevelt must turn, as President Wilson had to turn, to businessmen in the hour of preparation. Let us see what Mr. Krock had to say on this point in the Times last Sunday:

"Mr. Roosevelt can have the services of the leading industrialists, as Woodrow Wilson had, merely by asking for them. Up to the hour of this emergency he has reflected the objections of his young new dealers to such assistance, but the emergency may change his policy in this regard. Political appointees and military officers cannot run the industrial machine."

Whatever hopes the country may have for a change of heart in the White House, the story of the War Resources Board is illuminating: Created on August 9 without the consent of Corcoran and Cohen; dissolved by the President on November 24, and never heard of again.

Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL BY RAYMOND MOLEY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

by Raymond Moley, published in Newsweek of May 27, 1940, entitled "Perspective."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of May 27, 1940]

PERSPECTIVE—ON ALL FRONTS

(By Raymond Moley)

We shall be dealing with what has been happening these hours and days and with its consequences, as long as we live. What we face isn't a matter of walking—not running—to the nearest exit. It isn't a matter of exits at all. There are no exits for a nation. It must stand, fall, or kneel to conquest. It cannot escape. Whether we like it or not, we, the people of the United States of America, are in this world, and we are going to have to continue to live in it.

We couldn't avoid emotion, even if we would, in the present situation. Indignation, horror, and the sense of frustration that springs from our inability to do much about what is happening in Europe at this juncture are so poignant because the values at stake are so transcendently precious to us, and yet we must do the impossible. We can't permit ourselves either agonized hand wringing or unthinking bursts of activity. We can't retreat into national hysteria except at our mortal peril. We must prepare ourselves for whatever lies ahead. A clear mind must be our first line of defense.

It is plain at the outset that we shall be making a fatal error if we do not accept the fact that either side may win this war. Our course of action cannot be shaped by our hopes alone. It must take account of all possibilities. Unless it does all our talk of preparedness, all the thousands of millions of dollars we appropriate for preparedness, all our calculations about our Army, Navy, air force, industry, may not serve us in the years to come. We shall be incapable of those major adjustments that events may enforce.

Peace may be dictated in Paris or Berlin or London, but, in any event, the machine has won. The future has already been determined in the laboratories and machine shops of the world. Our traditional identification of our own interests with those of the Allies may momentarily blind us to the significance of that fact in terms of our own defense needs and our needs after the war has ended. What has made Germany so formidable in a military sense is what we have or can have. Germany's instruments of conquest are what can make for our own security. Is it the submarine, the airplane, tanks, tractors, other motorized equipment? We have the capacity or the potential capacity for the production of such material.

But there are critical economic problems involved in getting from industry the essential and immediate requirements of our defense program. Some of these are suggested in this issue of Newsweek by Mr. Robey. Fundamentally, they are problems of scarcity—scarcity of men and of plant. That so many of them center in restrictions of one kind or another is tragic. No one wants to break down the general gains achieved by labor in the past few years. But we must either be shown how production can be speeded up despite present restrictions or remove those restrictions. Investors are going to face heavy taxation and tremendous risks; management faces exacting problems of production; labor must meet its responsibility, too.

Government is right in concerning itself primarily with those specific areas of industry that supply the immediate needs of our military machine. But it cannot get very far unless it considers the whole of industry. For industry, as Maitland said of history, is a seamless web. American industry is strong and resourceful—the strongest factor in world affairs. Yet the stark fact to which the country has awakened only within the past 2 weeks is that American industry is not as strong as it must be. There must be vast replacements, the perfection of new techniques, of new products, some of which will act as substitutes for essential raw materials we have dillied and dallied about acquiring. The factors that have blocked these developments—blocked them needlessly—must be removed if industry is to play its part in building the national strength to meet any emergency.

It goes without saying that if our objective is to defend our institutions on this side of the world, we must do it in terms of the democratic method. We must not and we need not, in the process of protecting freedom from possible foreign attack, lose that freedom at home. That would be to give up the substance while we gird ourselves to safeguard the shadow. And that, exactly, is what we are asked to do when we are told that one of our two great parties should fail to nominate an opposition candidate for the Presidency this year.

The French and English judge governments and test the work of those governments in parliamentary debates and votes of confidence. We cannot. Our chosen constitutional system provides for periodical elections in which such decisions are made. One of those periodical elections is at hand this year. To observe it only in form would be to succumb to the disease we are trying to ward off.

This is not to say that the campaign should not be as calm as possible, as reasonable as we can make it. But it should not, for specious reasons, avoid the basic issues of national defense as well as domestic policy. There is no other way of enforcing responsibility in our democratic Republic.

This year the opposition will present its case to the country for a change of administration. It is already clear that it will ask a number of pertinent questions. It will ask:

Has this administration, while professing to know a great deal about conditions and developments abroad, failed to take account of the possibility that Germany might win this war and thus revolutionize American conceptions of defense? Has this administration failed to prepare the way for such a contingency?

Has it been unnecessarily slow in executing the authorizations and appropriations of Congress for arms of defense—especially for mechanized equipment for the Army and the air forces?

Has it, like the Blum Government of France, given undue attention to social reform while it neglected the basic necessities of national security? In short, has it pursued the ideal of personal security to the neglect of national security?

Has it hampered the expansion of American plant and the spirit of initiative to the point where our industrial strength is seriously impaired? And, in the light of the past, can it be expected to provide the leadership for the greatest job of industrial production this country has ever faced?

Has it weakened our financial security by deficit spending without achieving the objectives at which it aimed?

Has it failed to call to the service of Government experienced and able men, especially in those fields that involve our military, naval, and industrial preparedness?

Has it permitted the efficiency and adequacy of skilled labor to fall below national needs?

Has it impaired national unity by setting class against class and interest against interest?

That these questions should be asked—and answered—is a sign of strength, not of weakness. Democrats as well as Republicans should welcome the opportunity to face them and to get a clear-cut verdict from the country. For all the questions are facets of a supreme question—the competence of this administration. The issue is not one of good intentions, nor of wholly admirable objectives. It is the simple need to get things done.

"Give us to build above the deep intent,
The deed, the deed!"

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

STATEMENT BY CHARLES HALL DAVIS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., entitled "Americanism Defined." Mr. Davis is a member of the Virginia bar.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM DEFINED

We affirm that Americanism is a political philosophy based on a religious creed, coupled with a governmental plan for carrying into effect the principles of that philosophy in the social relations of human beings in a politically organized State, and designed to establish and maintain the ethical teachings of Jesus—not requiring the acceptance by anyone of a belief in the diety of the Christian God, but recognizing and guaranteeing to each citizen complete religious freedom, along with an equality of other God-given individual rights.

BASIS OF AMERICANISM

That Americanism is based on a belief in a personal God who created all things visible and invisible, who established and maintains general laws and principles of right and justice for the regulation of the universe, which laws and principles control all matter and forces, all human beings, and human institutions, and govern governments.

In that belief, we deny all idea that might makes right or that force should control in individual, national, or international relations, and affirm our allegiance to the principles of right and justice, divinely imbedded in the common conscience of mankind.

THE SUPREME IMPORTANCE, UNDER AMERICANISM, OF THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS OF MAN

We recognize that man is the highest creation of God, made in His own image and likeness, endowed with free will and free choice, so as to enable him to develop his personality along lines of his own

choice, with individual accountability to his Maker for that development; that each human being has been directly and equally endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable and individual rights, the orderly exercise of which along such lines of his own choice is necessary under the divine plan for the spiritual growth and development of human personality and for the promotion of the happiness and welfare of the human race; that among these inalienable, individual human rights are the right to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness, to religious freedom, to freedom of speech, to freedom to write and publish what one chooses, to freedom of assembly, and countless others, subject in all cases to individual liability for any abuse of those rights which defeat or impair the equal and similar rights of others; and that each human being is justly entitled to an equal opportunity for the orderly exercise of those rights with every other, and is justly chargeable with an equal duty or burden to maintain this equality of rights and of opportunity.

GOVERNMENT IS A HUMAN INSTITUTION AND HAS NO INHERENT RIGHTS

We hold that government is a human institution, having no God-given or inherent rights, but established by men so as to enable them to enjoy ordered liberty in a politically organized social state, and justly administering only such delegated and limited authority as may be temporarily entrusted to it by the sovereign people who created it from time to time.

THE INDEFEASIBLE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OVER GOVERNMENT

We assert the indefeasible sovereignty of the people as creators over their governmental creatures, their inherent right to govern themselves without a master, and declare the essential falsity of all political theories which assert the sovereignty of government over the people, or which advocate a government of unlimited purposes, powers, and functions.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY IS A LIMITED SOVEREIGNTY

But while each independent politically organized group of people is sovereign over its governmental agents, yet this national sovereignty is a limited sovereignty, and is not absolute. National sovereignty imports complete independence of outside human beings and human institutions, but it does not import exemption from the operation of divinely established principles of right and justice, nor does it import authority to disregard or defeat the individual human rights with which the Creator has directly and equally endowed each human being; so that any national sovereignty which is so administered as to defeat those principles of right and justice, or so as to defeat or impair divinely bestowed human rights, is improperly administered, is a distortion of such sovereignty; and, in its last analysis, is really an assertion of the sovereignty of government or rulers over the sovereign people, whose inalienable rights are thereby defeated, and who are thereby deprived of a rule of justice, and subjected to a rule of force. Absolute and complete sovereignty is vested only in Deity itself.

WHY TOTALITARIANISM IS CONDEMNED AND REPUDIATED

We condemn and repudiate the political theory of totalitarianism, whether functioning under the guise of communism, bolshevism, sovietism, socialism, social democracy, nazi-ism, fascism, paternalism, or under whatever political guise; because it is based on the rule of force, rather than of justice; because it asserts the sovereignty of government over men, rather than of men over government; because it denies the supreme dignity of individual human rights, rejects the theory that they are held under a title higher than that under which government holds its powers, and the theory that the just purpose of government is to secure their orderly exercise; because it repudiates the idea that the principles of right and justice established by the Creator should govern governments, asserts that the state is an end in itself rather than a mere means to the end of securing ordered liberty to the people, advocates the rule of materialism, and in some of its manifestations denies God and endorses atheism.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND ITS LIMITED PURPOSES

We affirm that the Government of the United States is a Government expressly limited both as to its purposes and as to its powers.

The Declaration of Independence, which was the first political act of the Original Thirteen Colonies as independent States, which formulates our political philosophy, and in the light and spirit of which all our governmental activities should be construed, declares that the purpose of American Government is to secure the inalienable individual rights with which each human being has been equally endowed by the Creator. That is the sole declared purpose of American Government.

Hence the only justifiable activities of American Government should be directed:

1. To securing and guaranteeing to each American citizen the recognition of an equality of God-given rights with every other;
2. To assuring to each citizen an equality of opportunity for the orderly exercise of those rights along lines of his individual choice;
3. To imposing on each citizen an equality of duty or burden in maintaining that equality of right and of opportunity.

The limited purpose of American Government is therefore to secure "equal rights to all, and special privileges to none."

THE LIMITED POWERS OF AMERICAN NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Being established to accomplish limited purposes, the Government of the United States was necessarily entrusted only with limited powers; for if unlimited powers had been delegated to it, that Government could have extended its purposes indefinitely, becoming a tyrant and the master of the people.

LIMITATIONS ON NATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL POWERS

The powers entrusted to the National Government of the United States were enumerated, defined, and limited by the Constitution of the United States; and the Government of the United States has no just power or authority except that expressly conferred by the Constitution, plus those implied powers necessary to the exercise of the granted powers.

WHENCE NATIONAL POWERS WERE DERIVED

The delegation of powers to the National Government was made by the several politically organized State groups of people, each acting separately and as an independent sovereign group, and each reserving to itself as such an independent sovereign group all powers not delegated by the Constitution, or the exercise of which by the States was not prohibited thereby, so that each State group remains as completely sovereign as any independent nation on earth, except as to that portion of its sovereignty delegated for administration to the Government of the United States by the Constitution. All such sovereignty so delegated to the United States was to be administered only to carry out the declared purposes outlined in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution itself.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE OF RESERVED STATE POWERS

Hence the Constitution of the United States equally guarantees to the National Government the authority to administer its delegated powers for these declared purposes, and to each politically organized State group the complete power to administer its reserved sovereignty. The protection of each State group in the exercise of its reserved powers is as much the duty of the National Government and of Federal officials as is the protection of the United States Government in the exercise of its delegated powers.

USURPATION OF STATE POWERS BY THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT CONDEMNED

We condemn all invasions by the National Government of the reserved sovereignty of the respective States, all attempts of national governmental agencies to extend the purposes, enlarge the powers, or increase the functions of that Government beyond the limits imposed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES CONDEMNED

We pledge ourselves to the effort to abolish as rapidly as possible special governmental privileges of any and every kind as being contrary to the spirit and purpose of Americanism, and to the effort to reenforce on all national governmental agencies the limitations, both as to their purposes and powers, which have been imposed on them by the American people through the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT TO BE PRECLUDED FROM BUSINESS COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE CITIZENS

In particular, we pledge our efforts to terminate the business activities of the United States Government now carried on in competition with private citizens.

BUREAUCRACY TO BE ABOLISHED AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE

We pledge ourselves to abolish as rapidly as possible all national bureaucratic government.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF THE COURTS TO BE REASSERTED

We pledge ourselves to recognize and enforce the judicial power of the courts, conferred directly by the people through the Constitution, and to maintain their inherent right to review and adjudicate the rights of the people under any rules or orders promulgated by commissions or bureaus established by the Congress, in spite of any congressional declaration to the contrary.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE COURTS

We hold that the existence of independent and impartial judicial tribunals, fully empowered to hear and determine controversies involving questions of whether government is exceeding its delegated authority, is necessary to the maintenance of any plan of limited government; and particularly we reaffirm the power and authority of the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress

FEDERAL EXPENSES TO BE REDUCED—THE FEDERAL BUDGET TO BE BALANCED

We pledge ourselves to the effort to reduce Federal expenses by the abolition of unconstitutional and non-Federal activities by the National Government; by opposing bonuses, special privileges, and Federal largesse to special groups, and by attempted simplification of governmental operations; and to the effort to balance the Federal Budget, and to recognize the obligation of contracts on government as well as on individuals.

CONDEMNATION OF ATTEMPTED REDELEGATION TO THE EXECUTIVE OF POWERS ENTRUSTED TO CONGRESS

We condemn the attempted redelegation by Congress to the Executive of the legislative powers entrusted to it by the Constitution; and pledge ourselves to use every proper effort to preserve the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers as provided in the Constitution.

CONDEMNATION OF BLANKET APPROPRIATIONS—TO BE ALLOCATED AND EXPENDED UNDER EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY

In particular we unreservedly condemn the so-called appropriation by Congress of lump sums to be expended in the uncontrolled discretion of the Executive; and pledge our efforts to reenforce the constitutional provision that no money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury but in consequence of congressional appropriations made by law—such legal appropriations involving the allocation by Congress of definite sums to definite and specific purposes and objects authorized by the Constitution.

TOTALITARIANISM FUNDAMENTALLY CONTRADICTORY OF AMERICANISM

We declare that totalitarianism is fundamentally contradictory to, and destructive of, Americanism, and that the conflicting principles underlying the two political philosophies make it impossible to graft totalitarianism on, or blend it with, Americanism, without undermining and destroying the latter.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES CONDEMNED

In this belief, we condemn all un-American activities, directed to promoting and establishing these alien philosophies in the United States.

While we insist upon the preservation of free speech, free radio, and a free press, we condemn any attempted exercise of these individual rights in advocating the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Such proceeding is not ordered liberty, but criminal license; and should be prevented by governmental force, if necessary.

SUBVERSIVE ALIENS TO BE DEPORTED

Where such subversive action is taken by aliens enjoying our hospitality, or where such aliens engage in subversive activities against our Government, we pledge ourselves to use every proper means to secure their proper deportation, and to prohibit the entry into our country of any aliens who hold, and publish here or publicly advocate, such views.

IMMIGRATION TO BE CURTAILED OR TEMPORARILY DISCONTINUED

In view of the world-wide conflict now waging between the totalitarian and the democratic nations, of the widespread use of propaganda as a weapon in this struggle, of the insidious attempts to drag the United States into the conflict, of the danger of permitting a further influx of peoples holding to these alien philosophies, and of the need for reestablishing the principles and governmental plans of Americanism in the hearts and minds of our people; we advocate that immigration from all countries be greatly curtailed, or else completely stopped, at least until the termination of the present conflict; and we advocate the strict enforcement of legal punishment on all native-born or naturalized citizens, who openly advocate any change in our form of government by force or violence, or who teach the justice of such doctrines in any of our schools supported in whole or part with public funds.

KEEPING THE UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR

We declare our opposition to the United States in any way becoming embroiled in the European war, or in any war save to repel invasions of our territory, to maintain our national honor, or to maintain and protect the rights of American citizens.

We reaffirm our historic slogan of "Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute," paraphrasing it to meet the present situation to "Millions (in money or men) for defense of our territory, our national honor, and our rights, but not a cent or a man to settle wars to which we are not a party, and about which we have had no voice."

PREPAREDNESS

Recognizing that the unequaled wealth of our country, produced under the political theory of limitations on governmental purposes and powers, places us in a position where totalitarian dictators covet control of our resources, and desire to abolish this outstanding proof of the superiority of the democratic over the totalitarian ideal as a means for producing individual and national happiness and welfare, so as to bring the entire civilized world to an acceptance of their false political theories and to establish their universal rule; we declare our belief in the necessity for national preparedness against any assault upon our territory, rights, and liberties.

Specifically declaring the friendly feelings of the American people toward the peoples of other nations (whatever may be their differing sentiments toward any rulers who disregard justice, persecute minorities, and seek to subjugate and oppress weaker nations) and disclaiming any purpose to grasp additional territory at the expense of other nations, or any desire to enforce our ideals or rule on other people, we pledge our efforts to secure such enlargement and perfection of our Army, Navy, and air forces as may be adequate to protect the United States against aggression by any nation.

A PLATFORM OF PRINCIPLES, RATHER THAN OF SPECIFIC REFORMS

We hold that political platform pledges are solemnly binding upon the party making them; and should be substantially carried out, or attempted to be carried out, by those who secure the suffrages of their fellow citizens on the basis of such pledges.

In this belief, we submit to the American people a platform of principles, rather than a set of pledges of specific legislation.

We recognize that the fluctuating conditions confronting the world from day to day make unwise too definite a commitment to specific legislation which may prove inadvisable under a different state of facts.

We appreciate that the problem of arresting our present trend toward complete centralization of power in government, and hence toward ultimate totalitarianism, inevitable dictatorship, and loss of liberty, involves the defeat of entrenched power and privilege; that it will require the cooperation of all three of the great departments of government, legislative, executive, and judicial; and that it can succeed only if the American people themselves (thoroughly reconsecrated to the political theory and governmental plan to which the founders and framers of the Republic pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor") shall endorse and support this attempt to return to the faith of the fathers, and shall be willing to forego and surrender any temporary group or class privilege in the supreme effort to assure that human liberty does not perish from the earth.

OUR OBJECTIVES

Our objectives are:

To preserve Americanism as a citadel of human freedom.

To reestablish the just idea of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

To put into force again the theory and plan of a government of limited purposes, powers, and functions.

To preserve the democratic ideal as against the totalitarian ideal.

To maintain the rights of man—of each human being as such—against the aggressions of power and of rulers.

To perpetuate individual and political liberty.

To maintain, in an embattled world, where force strives to establish its universal rule, a great and powerful Nation, consecrated to a rule of justice and as a nucleus around which a new international structure of ordered liberty can be erected when the present struggle is terminated.

SUMMARY OF OUR PLATFORM

In order to attain these great objectives we pledge our best efforts:

A. To restore Americanism, involving—

(a) The reestablishment of American government as a government of limited purposes, powers, and functions.

To that end we pledge our best efforts:

1. To abolish special privilege.

2. To take the National Government out of business competition with its citizens.

3. To limit Federal activities to those authorized by the Constitution, with those activities exercised only in furtherance of our declared national purposes;

4. To reduce as rapidly as possible, and ultimately to abolish, Federal bureaucracy;

5. To reduce the cost of National Government by:

a. Discontinuing, as rapidly as possible, all activities of the National Government which are non-Federal in their nature, which are not authorized by the Constitution, or which are not directed to carrying out our declared national governmental purposes;

b. Discouraging, and eventually ending, the grant of business and special privileges (either in the form of grants of money, or of exemption from the operation of general laws, or otherwise) to any groups or classes;

c. Abolition of the practice (under the guise of public works or under other guise) of Federal financing and construction of local improvements not directly contributing to the general welfare;

d. Simplification of government;

e. Balancing the National Budget;

f. More equitably distributing the burden of national taxation, so as to carry out our national objective of equality of duty and burden on each citizen in maintaining an equality of rights and opportunity to all, and so as to enable business to function on a substantially fixed and constant basis.

6. To terminate the attempted redelegation by Congress to the Executive, or to boards, commissions, or bureaus established by it, of the legislative power entrusted by the Constitution to Congress alone.

7. To end the present practice of blanket so-called appropriations, to be allocated and expended in the uncontrolled discretion of the Executive or of someone else; and to require that no sums shall be drawn from the Public Treasury except by an act of Congress allocating a definite sum to a definite and specific purpose authorized by the Constitution.

8. To enforce the separation in Government of the legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

9. To preserve the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, free from domination or control, direct or indirect, of the executive or legislative departments; and to recognize and maintain the constitutional power of the courts to adjudicate questions of whether Government is exceeding its entrusted authority, whether an act of Congress is constitutional, and to review the decisions of boards, bureaus, and commissions created by Congress with the alleged power to establish rules and regulations having the force of statute law.

10. To protect the several States in the exercise of their reserved sovereignty, and to prevent invasions of that sovereignty by the National Government.

11. To deport all aliens who publicly advocate here changes in our Government by force and violence.

12. To reduce, and perhaps prohibit, further immigration until the termination of the present World War.

13. To bring to trial all citizens, native-born and naturalized, who publicly advocate changes in our Government by force and violence.

14. To impose on government, as well as on individuals, the duty of observing the obligation of contracts.

(b) Reeducation of the citizens of the United States as to the true political theory and governmental plan of Americanism, its logical political, economic, and social soundness, its adaptability and responsiveness to the needs of a liberty-loving and progressive people, and its demonstrated superiority over all other political theories and plans yet evolved for promoting the individual and national welfare of human beings, coupled with education of the American people as to the unsoundness and viciousness of the totalitarian theory and plan of government, as being destructive of human liberty, welfare, and happiness, and of national greatness, so as to revivify in citizens of our country a love for, and support of, Americanism and its underlying principles.

B. To keep the United States out of war, except wars of defense to resist invasions of our territory, to preserve our national honor, and to protect the rights of our citizens.

C. To maintain peaceful and friendly relations with the peoples of all nations, without attempting to impose on them an acceptance of our governmental theories and plans, without interference in their domestic affairs, and without designs against their territory or sovereignty.

D. To use all proper efforts, as friends of the peoples of all nations and as neutrals in the present conflict, to bring about a just peace, to restore ordered liberty throughout the world, to promote mutual respect and friendly trade and intercourse among all peoples, and to remove the menace of force and to substitute therefor the rule of justice in international relations.

APPEAL FOR SUPPORT

On this platform of principles, and so as to make possible the attainment of these objectives, we appeal for the support of citizens of the United States, choosing as our slogan the appeal to "Honor God and Save the Republic," urging them to reject totalitarianism, with its materialistic basis, and to preserve Americanism by strengthening its spiritual foundations.

Colonel Lindbergh's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY GRAND RAPIDS PRESS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press entitled "A Voice of Reason," referring to Colonel Lindbergh.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOICE OF REASON

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh may not have increased his popularity by the frank statement of his ideas concerning America's defense needs, but his voice was one of moderation that should be heeded. He has raised a valid protest against hysterical and directionless rearmament.

For one thing Colonel Lindbergh effectively dealt with the emotional appeal for a vast air fleet of 50,000 planes. Even more effectively he met the "scare" propaganda that America is in imminent danger of invasion. Whatever may be the value of his word as an authority on foreign affairs, he certainly may be recognized as one of the foremost spokesmen of the Nation when it comes to questions of national defense, especially in the aviation sphere.

He effectively answered the scaremongers with his assurances that a foreign power could conquer the United States only if bombers were accompanied by an invading army and "great armies must still cross oceans by ships." In other words the Atlantic and the Pacific are still barriers over which invasion will be a difficult if not impossible role if our own defenses are reasonable.

One trouble in America is that so many seem to lose their sense of proportion as they watch events abroad. They forget that distances in Europe are as nothing compared with the distance between that continent and this. They see invasion of the United States carried out with the same facility as the invasion of the Netherlands. They seem to assume that crossing the Skagerrak is no lesser feat than sending an army across the Atlantic. There is simply no comparison, as Colonel Lindbergh so ably points out.

Lindbergh's analysis of actual defense needs seems to be wholly logical. He visualizes close cooperation among all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, which would not leave the entire burden of defense on the United States. And he minimizes the likelihood of attack if this country will stop meddling in foreign affairs. His advice that we adopt definite defense policies before, not after, we spend our billions is as sound a piece of advice as any that has been offered.

It is well that the Nation has at this time a few who will dare to speak a bit out of tune with the chorus in Washington. It is fortunate that there are some whose sense of proportion has not been destroyed, who can watch the unfolding drama abroad without being thrown into hysterical fits of apprehension. Colonel Lindbergh is serving his country today in a capacity more valuable than that which he filled when he was the object of acclaim by the multitudes.

National Aviation Forum of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS H. BECK

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, commencing next Monday the National Aviation Forum will commence a series of meetings in Washington. This probably will be the greatest gathering of aviation experts which has ever been held in the United States. Every branch of this great industry will be represented—both civil, military, and naval aviation. This gathering will be especially significant because of the stress which is now being laid, and rightfully so, upon our national defense in the air.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short article by Mr. Thomas H. Beck, general chairman of the National Aviation Forum of 1940, outlining the purposes of the Forum and the program of the meeting next week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM OF 1940

(By Thomas H. Beck, general chairman)

During the week of May 26, thousands of residents and visitors in Washington, D. C., will witness a spectacular demonstration of this Nation's aeronautical strength and potentialities, civilian and military.

The occasion is the National Aviation Forum of 1940 and its complementary aeronautical exhibition at nearby Bolling Field.

With civilian air travel constantly reaching new peaks, and with questions regarding the true air strength of the Nation inevitably in mind at this time, this year's forum, under the auspices of the National Aeronautical Association, is bound to be of interest to every American. Nor is it confined to those of us of the North Americas, for President Roosevelt has instructed the State Department to invite representatives of 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere.

"I know of no way better to promote the best technical development of aviation than through meetings such as that which is to take place in May," President Roosevelt wrote. "I need hardly say that in the interest of all the Americas such development is essential."

While the forum in the Department of Commerce auditorium will consist of talks by leading aviation figures, emphasis this year is being placed upon getting home to the entire public of the Americas the story of where this Nation stands and where it is going in the ever-widening field of aeronautics.

The aeronautical exhibition at Bolling Field, therefore, will be the public's own show. Two tremendous hangars will contain exhibits by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Post Office Department, Work Projects Administration, Office of Education, Air Transport Association, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, and Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The manufacturers of airplanes and accessories will be represented in full force and the public will see everything, from the huge stratosphere planes to the most delicate of precision instruments.

More than 300 private fliers from coast to coast will converge on Washington during the week. Then there will be formation flying by Navy and commercial blimps and flights to and from Washington by the latest aircraft developed for commercial flying.

In the Department of Labor auditorium, free motion pictures will show the progress of flying from the days of the fabled Icarus to present-day flying fortresses.

American aviation has a story of profound significance to tell at this National Aviation Forum of 1940.

The United States and the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald entitled "Hot Heads, Bone Heads, and Cool Heads on the War."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 24, 1940]

HOTHEADS, BONEHEADS, AND COOL HEADS ON THE WAR

There are many hotheads, and quite a proportion of boneheads, in the United States who are urging the country to get into the European war.

These folk probably think they are moved by some sort of high idealism.

As a matter of fact, they are merely the weak and vacillating victims of propaganda and hysteria.

A few months ago they, like all other intelligent Americans, were cool-headedly calculating the unavailing cost of the last war, the utter failure of America's high objectives of permanent democracy, of open covenants openly arrived at, of self-determination of all peoples.

The facts of history have not changed.

It is the thistledown thoughts, the tumbleweed minds, blown hither and thither by every changing puff of propaganda or breath of hysteria, that have changed.

Some of our leaders are probably influenced, as Wilson was influenced, by a desire to occupy an important place in history and to take a big part in world events—violating the injunction of the fathers of the Republic to keep free from foreign entanglements.

But most of us small fry are animated by no more intelligent motive than the moth which sacrifices itself in the flame, impelled by hysteria and dazed by the blinding glare of publicity and propaganda.

Fortunately there are experienced men in responsible positions in the United States to warn us foolish and flighty moths to keep our impressionable heads and preserve our inflammable wings.

Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, spoke last Saturday before the graduating class of the Naval War College.

Said the admiral:

"The people of this country are still painfully aware of the result of the last World War, when we sent 2,000,000 men abroad, and spent thirty or more billions of dollars to make the world safe for democracy; then at the end witnessed a relapse of the high ideals and a resumption of the old nationalistic policies that planted the seeds of future wars.

"Why should we spend our blood and treasure until there is assurance that they will be spent to a far better end than in 1918?

"The Atlantic Ocean," continued the admiral, "still remains a large body of water, and the probability of plane attack from overseas on this country will remain remote for some time to come."

The admiral concluded with this sound statement:

"Command of the seas is and will remain the primary factor in our plan of national defense, and as long as we have it we are safe from successful enemy invasion."

Fortunately for our blessed and beloved country, our sea defenses are in better condition than our ridiculously insufficient land defenses.

According to Secretary Edison, our Navy will be adequate as soon as our battleships now building are redesigned to resist the powerful weapons of modern airplanes, and as soon as we shall have a fleet of airplanes sufficiently large and powerful to cooperate with our ships of war, and to defend them from the attacks of the enemy airplanes which might otherwise annihilate them.

This cooperative fleet of modern airplanes, however, we do not seem to be in a very good way to secure soon.

In the debate in the United States Senate Saturday on unpreparedness, Senator CLARK, of Missouri, a World War veteran and former commander of the American Legion, said the United States at the present time, according to General Arnold in his testimony before one of the House committees, has only 58 planes which are not obsolete.

Said Senator CLARK of Missouri:

"I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, but I am advised by members of those committees that General Arnold testified before the Appropriations Committee, not once, but a number of times; that the maximum production of the American airplane factories by July 1, 1941—somewhat more than a year from now—would be slightly in excess of 6,000 planes, 2,800 of which were to go to the American Army, and the remainder to the Allied armies, or various other foreign countries."

So even if all the plane production of 2,800 planes allotted to America should be delivered to the Navy, it would be 2 years before the Navy would have the 5,000 up-to-date modern planes necessary for successful cooperation in American defense.

The contention of Senator CLARK of Missouri, Democrat, was sustained by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, Republican who is a member of the military subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and in addition an Army Reserve officer.

Senator LODGE said:

"The facts, as the Army officials have stated them to us, and they have not been controverted, are that by July 1, 1941, there will have been produced in this country about 6,000 military planes, about half of which will go to our own defense establishment, and the other half will go abroad."

So it will be clearly seen that we are far from adequately prepared even in our best-prepared and most-important arm of defense—the Navy.

And the best thing for an unprepared nation to do is to stay out of war if it honorably can.

Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, typically sound and sincere American, speaking under the auspices of the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, said last Saturday:

"The President has a right to make the United States invulnerable, but I will continue to oppose any move to send troops abroad. I will protest against pork-barrel methods and stand against repeal of the Johnson Act.

"In the first place, I will say without any reservation, that this European war is not ours, and don't let anyone tell you otherwise. In the second place, no head of any nation is justified in plunging a nation into a war that is not theirs. * * *

"No matter how high our ideals and no matter what we sacrifice in money and men, we cannot bring peace to Europe.

"The situation today is sympathy for the Allies. This sympathy does not justify taking on their war. * * *

"Here is what that would mean to us. First, we would abolish democracy and get a dictatorship. Second, there would be an increase in the national debt. Third, there would be a loss of life running into millions and a loss of property running into billions. Fourth, there would be a depression worse than this and a continuation of dictatorship, and then more European wars.

"Keep these things in mind and stay out of war. I pray in this crisis we will keep faith in ourselves and faith in our form of government."

Senator CAPPER's words of warning are apt and immediately applicable when he says:

"Every time we send supplies, advance credit, and do all the things 'short of war,' then we have the final step—war."

Our position on the side of the Allies is getting to be like the position of Italy on the side of Germany, except that we are not as neutral as Italy.

Italy does not supply Germany with arms and ammunition, to the detriment of its own forces and the injury of its own safety and security; nor does it tolerate any hostile interference with its own political rights and national independence.

Those who wish our America to abandon its neutrality and plunge into a terrific war do not realize what that would mean in our utter unpreparedness.

We would soon find ourselves fighting not only Germany, but Italy, Russia, and Japan.

We would be harried on our east coast as well as on our west coast.

Men we would have in plenty for defense, but no munitions, no modern guns, no modern planes, no sufficient mechanized forces.

We would be unable to send aid to our allies.

We would be unprepared even adequately to defend ourselves. In 2 years we might be properly prepared; but in 2 years our country might be destroyed.

Says Colonel Lindbergh, truthfully:

"If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us and no one is in a position to do so."

As a matter of plain fact, these European nations have their own private quarrels. They have always had them and will always have them.

It is a species of tribal warfare, based on alien interests and foreign policies and jealousies, which are none of our affair.

Our ancestors founded this great free Nation to be independent of these race antagonisms and tribal conflicts.

Let us keep free of them.

Let us maintain our independence.

Let us defend our own land and our own liberties, and neither sacrifice our own interests to fight on foreign ground, nor invite alien conflicts to invade our shores.

If the Allies Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "If the Allies Lose" by Miss Dorothy Thompson. The article appeared in the Washington Post on the 23d of this month.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 23, 1940]

IF THE ALLIES LOSE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

NIGHTMARE INTO REALITY

If the Allies lose this war, it will prove to be the worst catastrophe for the United States in our whole history.

Four empires—the British, the French, the Belgian, and the Dutch—with their vast raw material resources and markets in Africa, Asia, and throughout the world, will have fallen into the lap of the Nazis, with sops thrown to Mussolini for his willingness to act as foreign Gauleiter No. 1.

This world empire, of a size undreamed of by Caesar or Napoleon, will feed raw materials into a huge European workshop drained of capital, and will produce goods by enslaved skilled and unskilled labor working under taskmasters at maximum hours and subsistence wages; it will dump these goods at prices with which no free country can possibly compete.

The idea that North America can hold South America economically under these conditions is illusory. The very products of which South America has a surplus are the products of which we, too, have a surplus. The markets of South America have always been chiefly in Europe, and Hitler's Europe will buy South American products in exchange for armaments, machinery, and consumers' goods offered at prices with which we cannot compete unless we cut our own standards of life to the bone.

The economic drive which we have already seen on a large scale will be carried forward on a stupendous world scale and will be accompanied by a political and propaganda campaign through "fifth columns," augmented by every commercial agent.

The fall in the standard of living, and the loss of markets and possibly even sources of raw material such as rubber and tin will produce new unemployment in America, and social unrest, which these "fifth columns" will systematically inflame.

In the crises they will set class against class, race against race, and party against party. Old racial and national allegiances will be appealed to, and America will escape this war only to risk the worst kind of war—revolution, civil war—fomented from without and carried on through agents within.

What America risks is to be turned into another Spain.

It is hard to write what one sees, what one has seen coming, irresistibly and ruthlessly and encountering only the resistance of words, for 7 long years of nightmare. There is another "fifth column," and perhaps it is the most dangerous of all. It is found in those who pooh-pooh the danger and strangle the words in the throats of the warners by wisecracks. They tap their foreheads and smile in a superior way, whispering sympathetically, "hysterical," "poor fellow, a little cracked; he sees bogies." "Why does he speak so loudly?" Or they look severe and say, "If he keeps on talking about this, he will conjure it up. He is inciting to action, and action is dangerous." They are close to the very entourage of the President, some of them, and they have stripped his own words of much of their strength. He has not dared to tell the whole truth.

One must not tell the people more than they can bear.

Who knows how much truth the people can bear? Do they not in the end see it—in the eyes of the gangster at the door and the bayonet at the breast?

We should send aid to the Allies, now, today. Every airplane that can be shipped, every gun that can be crated, in every ship that can be floated and convoyed, while there is a toehold in Europe where they can be landed and while there are still men alive offering their bodies to be broken. We should send aid regardless of all mistakes which all the Allied governments have made; for their mistakes are our own mistakes—the errors of incredulity and complacency. They, and we, have been giving away our world, inch by inch and position by position, retreating to the last stand, in the last trench.

The last trench is a trap.

This war is not lost for a world where men can still live, free and unafraid. It is not going to be lost. But 1,000 airplanes today will be worth 20,000 tomorrow.

Armaments are useless unless one uses them on the right side. Czech armaments equipped 40 Nazi divisions and revealed the secrets of the Maginot line. They are being used all right—to kill a Czech legion in France and to keep down the Czechs at home.

The fleet that fights in our interests today will, if captured, be used against us tomorrow.

Hitler's secret weapon is not a thermite bomb or a surface detonator. It is bacteria, all right, but new bacteria—the germs of defeatism. It is his knowledge of the deathly slowness, the childlike credulity, the easy-going complacency of democracies and their apparent incapacity, in the twentieth century, to make an audacious decision in time.

Hitler won his first war against the German Republic, and observed then that the characteristics of democracies is that they wake up too late.

The British and French thought they would get really going in 1941.

This is no time for panic—for the organization of American mothers to receive parachutists. The Nazis won't come to America in parachutes—not for a long time, anyway, and probably never. But they have already been among us for some time agitating American mothers not to permit us to be drawn into war by sending aid to the Allies.

What we need are not minute ladies with rifles but a council of national defense with full powers to plan the organization and speeding up of our industries for the most rapid delivery of weapons to England and France—and the delivery of what we have now.

Failures in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

LETTER FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR, BY J. H. BILBREY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, May 22, 1940:

POINTS TO FAILURES OF OUR DEMOCRACY—ACTIVITY OF PRESSURE GROUPS HELD MENACE TO ANY REPUBLIC

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

During nearly a decade the public ear has been assailed with the phrase "make democracy work." Under the guise of these inoffensive words many things have been done. An encyclopedia of new statutes has been enacted. Our revamped judiciary has given new construction to our old laws. A whole alphabet of boards, commissions, and bureaus has been created. Treasure almost beyond imagination, upward of $60,000,000,000, has been spent for relief, subsidies, salaries, pensions, and hand-outs. All of these things, so it was said, were done to make democracy work.

At this critical time is it not fitting that we seriously and honestly search our souls and inquire whether any of these things, or all of them together, have made any substantial contribution toward making democracy work? If they have, the price, although high, is not prohibitive.

Unless history and reason lie, the primary purpose of government is to provide, as a minimum, security in person and property. Security of worship, of thought, and of expression are but refinements and extensions of the primary security. Always important, these latter rights, recently spoken of as "civil liberties," have received a plethora of attention and publicity. It might be truly said that the public is "civil liberty" conscious. This is not an unhappy circumstance, unless our attention has been distracted from the foundation of all of our rights, security of person and property; for what shall it profit us to attain a full measure of civil liberty at the expense of national unity and national security?

The Frenchman could give us some excellent advice on this subject. It was he who invented the sit-down strike, and, of all places, in the aviation industry. It was the Frenchman who invented the week with two Sundays and the vacation with pay. The Norwegian could also give us some advice on national unity and security. Liberality and collective effort were their shibboleths. In fact, their liberality was so genuine that its legislative body until 1935 was a member of the Third International. Its liberality filled its country with spies and saboteurs, destroyed the unity of its people and invited national calamity and disgrace from which it will never recover.

But what of our national unity and security? Is democracy working in this respect? Although threatened on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, little of the $60,000,000,000 has been spent to strengthen our Navy, our first line of defense. Our Army, with one mechanized division, is literally contemptible when compared with the world of today. We have not enough antiaircraft guns adequately to defend the city of Washington. Although charged with the defense of the Panama Canal, our air force in planes and personnel is not sufficient for this one mission, not to mention our unprotected Atlantic and Pacific coasts and other strategic points. Plants for production of fighting planes are gradually being built up, thanks to foreign purchases and not our own foresight. The Government has taxed and taxed, and spent and spent to make democracy work, but we have no army or air force and but an inadequate navy.

Among the numerous new enactments to make democracy work, one was designed to provide social security. Under this enactment vast sums have been collected, but only a small moiety remains in the Treasury for the purpose for which it was collected. If our economy is adversely affected by our national weakness, our social security cannot be very secure.

While under the sway of foreign agents—the Frenchman invented the sit-down strike, the week with two Sundays, and vacation with pay—to make democracy work, we provided pay for work not done and a bounty to farmers for not producing, all for the purpose of creating prosperity through scarcity. Notwithstanding the use of public funds to organize and protect the workingman, an army of racketeers, padrones, and others of such ilk gained lucre and high place. With all of our statutes, all of our good will, and all of our liberalism, the crackpot, the inept, the visionary, the left winger, and the agents of foreign governments clog and distract the functioning of the Government service and of the many laws passed to make democracy work.

In spite of all of our liberal laws and liberal interpretations by a truculent judiciary, and the never-ending stream of treasure poured out by a liberal hand, there came into being a class of organized mendicants, and class unrest with constant warfare between capital and labor, resulting often in the destruction of private property. To make democracy work, only those able to pay were taxed. Unhappily, these taxes were regarded by those paying them as confiscatory, rendering insecure all manner of property from the widow's mite to the millionaire's yacht, and driving capital from industry. To make democracy work, sharp distinctions were drawn between human rights and property rights; between corporate property and individual property. All too many persons refused to acquiesce in these subtle distinctions and have bitterly maintained that human rights and property rights are inseparable and that the widow's mite is oft invested in corporate enterprise; that laws come with property and leave with it.

Besides the "fifth column" of foreign and domestic origin whose entry into strategic positions has been so rapid, we have with us an organized host whose primary idea is to get something for nothing; to live on the fruits of the labor and thrift of others; and the iron in whose blood has been distilled away, leaving a softer but much less useful substance.

Considering our potentiality as a going concern, the new laws and the staggering sums laid out in that behalf, it cannot be said that democracy has not had a chance to work. The plain evidence is that if it has worked, it has worked poorly or in reverse.

That democracy will not work is a fact as old and as large as civilization itself. It should be the common knowledge of every grade pupil that an attempt to make democracy work is an attempt to change our republican form of government and revert to a form of government which is bound to destroy itself.

Much of our confusion of thought and lack of national unity arises from the belief, all too general, that our Constitution set up a democracy providing for direct action through organized pressure groups, impulse, and emotion. Actually our form of government was carefully designed to prevent this sort of thing.

J. H. BILBREY.

May 15.

Allies Need Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Ernest Lindley, published in the Washington Post on the 24th of this month, entitled "Allies Need Arsenal; the American Role."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 24, 1940]

ALLIES NEED ARSENAL

(By Ernest Lindley)

THE AMERICAN ROLE

The dreadful euphemism "melee" which has appeared almost daily in the French Army communiques applies to the entire world situation. Any attempt at a short analysis must be oversimplified. Insofar as the Allies are concerned, however, the major possibilities of the next few weeks include these:

(1) The miracle which saves the Allied Armies on the Continent from destruction.

(2) Surrender by France.

(3) Surrender by Great Britain.

(4) Surrender by both Great Britain and France.

(5) The refusal of either France or Great Britain to surrender, even though both may be overrun or bombed into shambles. In other words, their insistence on carrying on the war as world empires even if their home bases become untenable.

Many complications can be introduced—the roles of Italy, the Soviet Union, Sweden, Turkey, and the Balkans, and Japan.

Whatever ensues, the United States must become a great arsenal as rapidly as possible. Whatever ensues, Germany, for a long time to come, will be the world's most formidable air power and probably its most formidable land power. If it succeeds in forcing the surrender of the British and French Fleets and captures the naval ships now being built or repaired in British and French docks, it will also become the world's greatest sea power.

Whatever the result, Great Britain, and perhaps France also, seem destined to be during the next few weeks the victims of terrible destruction from the air. The tragic fact is that they were unprepared for this war. In war, to be relatively unprepared may be as disastrous as to be totally unprepared.

The cold reality is that we must pay heavily for the diplomatic and military blunders of France and Great Britain—and of the Netherlands and Norway, and of every other small European neutral which did not arm itself and join with its neighbors in maintaining an iron ring around the Germans. We may have to pay also for Italy and Russia. For if the Allies are quickly crushed, neither Italy nor Russia, nor probably the two in combination, can muster the strength to stop the Nazi power on the ground and in the air.

At present the only nation combining the raw materials, the industrial capacity, the organizing ability, the energy, and the relative security from attack to serve as a base for the effort to limit the expansion of Germany seems to be the United States. We have also a formidable instrument in our Navy. Despite their dark outlook, the Allies may yet be able to do the job, by relying on us only as an arsenal. But this prospect has been getting dimmer hour by hour. The time may be near when we will have to decide whether we are going to assume major responsibilities for directing the resistance to German expansion.

It is conceivable that within weeks the British Isles will become untenable as a base for British sea power. If the British or combined Allied fleets, or what is left of them, in the Atlantic fall back on Canada we will be all the way into the world struggle, whether or not we declare that we are at war.

At the moment our formal entry into the war, even if we were disposed to make it, could accomplish nothing beyond bolstering the morale of the Allies, and possibly deterring other nations from jumping on the German band wagon—a band wagon which may prove to be a Moloch. We are not prepared, in the air or on land, to give effective assistance immediately. And if sea power without air power can save Great Britain and France, as distinguished from their empires, they already have it.

There are practical ways, however, in which we can give more help, and in which, if worse comes to worst, we can collaborate in

saving as much as possible of the non-European world from the domination of Germany and her potential satellite allies. We have available very little material that would be useful to the Allies. We do have, however, 2,000 or more old light artillery pieces from the World War, which could be shipped abroad. Their mountings have not yet been modernized, but it takes a long time to bore the barrels of 2,000 field pieces. This semiobsolete equipment might be valuable to France.

We might also ship immediately from 700 to 1,200 of our Army and Navy planes. Those are planes which are obsolescent or obsolete, and which will quickly be replaced by better models already ordered from American factories. Although out of date, these planes, if sent immediately, could be of substantial help to the Allies.

Looking ahead a bit further, we could much more rapidly rearm the Allies and ourselves if we had the help of several thousand highly skilled workmen. Even now among the Belgian refugees in France there may be skilled gun makers. If French arsenals are bombed, both French and Belgian artisans with high skills may have no place to work. And if the destruction extends to Great Britain, as it almost certainly will, there may be available shortly thousands of British machinists, gun makers, and ship loftsmen, fitters, coppersmiths, and other men in the naval shipbuilding crafts.

If these highly skilled artisans cannot be kept at work in France and Great Britain, they can be put to work in the United States. We can use all of them we can get to expedite our rearmament program.

In the present struggle several thousand of these men, with highly specialized skills which take years to acquire, are far more valuable than all the gold, diamonds, and other precious articles which are being moved westward from the continent of Europe. It may be well to begin to think now about the organization of a selective migration, which, with our already available assets, will permit the acceleration of our defense program. This program must include the strengthening of the Allies, simply because we are not yet ready to assume the consequences of their total defeat.

America's Real National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR-JOURNAL

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star-Journal, of May 21, 1940:

AMERICA'S REAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Extremely disturbing to thoughtful Americans is the rumor from Washington that President Roosevelt will invite two or more Republicans into his Cabinet and form a coalition government to meet "the present national emergency."

What national emergency?

The United States is not about to be invaded.

The people of the United States are not about to declare war on anybody.

It is true that our national defenses are far from adequate, in spite of the Roosevelt administration's expenditure of more than $6,000,000,000 for defense in 7 years, and that in view of the turn the war has taken we must get ready—promptly, but without hysteria—for whatever situation may confront us if the worst happens in Europe.

To make ourselves strong is a national objective. It is in no sense a partisan one. Whoever the President appoints to direct America's rearming as head of a national-defense council must be a man who can unite industry, labor, Government, and all the people in the common effort for preparedness which all are ready to make.

But this does not require a coalition Cabinet.

AND CONCENTRATION OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY WOULD BE THE BEGINNING OF THE END OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Suppose Governor Landon and Colonel Knox—who, as 1936 Republican nominees, are nominal heads of the party—or any other prominent Republicans were to accept the portfolios of war and navy, or any other Cabinet posts.

President Roosevelt would then be able to say that in view of "the present national emergency" politics had been adjourned.

The proposal already has been made, with the apparent connivance of New Deal strategists, that the Republican nominating convention be postponed from June because of "the present national emergency." It would be only another short step to the proposal that it not be held at all, inasmuch as a government of "national unity" was administering the Nation's affairs.

If some Republicans nevertheless held a convention and nominated a candidate for President, he would be weakened and disarmed by the argument that his supporters were keeping partisanship alive, against America's interests, in a time of national crisis.

The election in November might then become one at which voters could only ratify the continuance of President Roosevelt in office, at the head of a coalition government, for another 4 years or for as long as he might deem the "national emergency" to exist.

Mr. Roosevelt may genuinely believe that if the Allies are defeated and if the British Navy is captured or driven from European waters, it would create a national emergency for this country. He may genuinely believe that a coalition government with himself at its head, could serve the national interest most wisely during the indefinite future. For no man lives—including Mr. Roosevelt—who can dissociate his own convictions from his personal aspirations.

There may be prominent Republicans who could be persuaded that they would be serving the Nation by joining a coalition government.

There may be voters who, without thinking the thing through, would endorse the suggestion that politics be adjourned and that both parties be united under one leader for as long as the shadow in Europe falls across the outposts of America.

But the Star-Journal does not believe Governor Landon or Colonel Knox or any other responsible leader will take any part in such a potentially dangerous first step toward the abrogation of democratic processes.

The Star-Journal does not believe the Republican Party will be persuaded that it should, in the national interest, postpone its 1940 convention or waive the nomination of a candidate for President.

The Star-Journal does not believe the voters of the United States would surrender to a "national emergency" their right to choose their leaders by genuinely constitutional methods.

Democracy which depends on one man or one party is no longer democracy.

THE REAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY WE CONFRONT IS THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY

We cannot serve or defend democracy by letting it go by default in the United States.

The day is long past when a physician bled the patient instead of diagnosing his illness and acting intelligently to cure it.

America cannot be made strong by letting democracy's blood.

America Seen Facing Nazi Peril if Allies Are Defeated in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of May 19, entitled "America Seen Facing Nazi Peril if Allies Are Defeated in War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 19, 1940]

AMERICA SEEN FACING NAZI PERIL IF ALLIES ARE DEFEATED IN WAR—"ROMAN PEACE" WOULD BE DICTATED BY AXIS LEADERS AND RICH POSSESSIONS WOULD BE DIRECTED FROM BERLIN

(By Constantine Brown)

President Roosevelt has asked Congress for new and substantial appropriations for the Army, Navy, and air force. The tragedy of the western democratic states in Europe has made the White House, the State Department, and the majority of the Members of Congress realize that wars are no longer waged with swords and pistols, and that manpower is only cannon fodder unless backed by the most up-to-date war paraphernalia.

The truth is that Washington leaders believe we are facing Hitler and his partner. While the prospect that the totalitarians may actually attack the United States is still remote, there is a strong

feeling that the defeat of the Allies would mean, in the end, a defeat for the United States, and we must be prepared for any eventuality.

Those who are worrying about the unfortunate developments in Europe—for the Allies—are not sentimentalists. Few among them talk about making the world safe for democracy. If we are drawn into the present holocaust, it won't be for sentimental reasons. Nor will it be for the sake of billions the Allies may owe the United States in the future.

Here, in brief, is the thesis put forth by the molders of our national policies: If the French and the British are defeated, a "Roman peace" will be dictated by the totalitarians. Whichever side is defeated will be downed for many years to come. As things are now, it is not unthinkable that the British and the French may have the short end of the stick. Under such circumstances, Europe, parts of Asia, and a major part of Africa would be in the hands of the totalitarians, with the master brain in Berlin.

COMPETITION IS KEEN

The economic system of Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan is based on state socialism. The individual is a wheel in the machinery—the state is supreme. All the rich possessions of the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian colonies would be transferred to the powers of the axis. These Governments, then owning vast resources and all kinds of raw materials, could produce far more cheaply than we can in this country. Hence, unless we change our form of government and follow the totalitarians economically—and by inference politically—American manufacturers and farmers will be out of luck. As it is, we have been having a hard time competing with the Germans and Italians in South America and in southeastern Europe and have had to erect powerful economic barriers—sometimes unsuccessfully—to compete with the Japanese in our own country. But since they had to buy from the United States the oil, cotton, copper, and other raw materials needed for their industries, the competition of the totalitarians outside our own borders was tolerable.

If the British and the French are defeated, our cotton and oil will choke us. We shall not be able to sell them abroad. The totalitarian governments, having all these materials free, will be able to produce and sell at prices with which the United States cannot compete. Hence an increase in unemployment and a rapid drop in our standard of living.

The South American markets will be taken away from us within a short time after a Roman peace has been dictated. For the time being the governments of the South American republics are playing along with us, but there may come a time when the pro-axis elements in those countries will have the upper hand and will prefer to deal with Berlin and Rome rather than with their comparatively new friend—Washington. Nations more frequently than individuals fraternize with countries offering more profitable economic dealings; they are seldom bound by such ideologies as democracy and economic individualism.

MOST SERIOUS LACK IS PLANES

These, in short, are the considerations which worry the leaders in Washington when they read the disconcerting news from the Western European front. The paramount thought in their minds at the moment is to facilitate supplying the Allies with all the material they lack. The democracies do not lack man power. But they are sadly deficient in airplanes and, up to a point, in antiair artillery and in mechanized forces.

Their most serious lack, however, is airplanes. The Germans have managed to build an air force of incredible strength. Even if the figures of the German Government—60,000 machines—are exaggerated, it is believed here that they have between 18,000 and 30,000 pursuit and bombing planes. Some 30 percent of these must be used for training purposes—some are slower than others. But there is no doubt that the Germans, in the last 6 years, have been able to build an aerial fleet incomparably superior to that of the Allies.

Reports emanating from Paris state that Germany is now building 1,900 planes a month. The British factories deliver 1,200 planes—the French only 700. Even if these figures are correct, the Allies have a long way to go before they can achieve parity with the enemy. The airplane is a much more important weapon for the Reich than the mysterious nerve gas or whatever new electric and chemical inventions the Germans may have up their sleeve. And for the present, in order to achieve a quick and decisive victory, the Reich is reckless in the use of its air fleet.

ALLIED PURCHASES VITAL

The United States, says Washington, must not be niggardly in providing the Allies as rapidly as possible with enough airplanes to offset the German superiority. This will be no easy task for our factories are not equipped for mass production and the output is still slow. After January 1, 1941, it is probable that American factories will be able to produce as many as 40,000 airplanes a year. But January is still a long way off.

Moreover, Washington is deeply concerned lest the Germans may put into effect their threat to bomb England and France out of existence. This would not mean that they intend really to wipe out the two countries. That would not be necessary for the war purpose of the Reich. If French and British industrial centers are mercilessly bombed, the production of war material will fall behind, and it is conceivable that the entire industry might become paralyzed.

The Germans would gladly sacrifice 9,000 or 10,000 planes to achieve this objective. Should such an undertaking be successful, the millions of men at the front would be completely useless. The Maginot Line—regardless of its strength—would immediately become like the branch of a dead tree, falling to the ground as soon as a strong wind should blow from the other side of the Rhine.

ITALY A BIG FACTOR

All these considerations are examined without taking into account the possibility of Italy entering the war. In that eventuality the situation would become grimmer. The Italians have a strong air force. To fight it the allies would have to detail flights from the German front, further weakening their position. The French and the British can afford to spare few airplanes these days. The flying forces at present in Tunisia, in Egypt, and in Syria with the army of General Weygand are insignificant compared to the 8,000 or 10,000 planes the Italians now possess.

Lack of gasoline is one element on which the Allies have been reckoning to defeat the axis. Yet the restricted amount of gas owned by Germany and Italy is sufficient to wage a relentless war for about 5 months.

A gloomy picture—but it is the picture as seen from Washington. It is based on irrefutable facts and reliable information. To try to minimize Germany's ability to cause the Allies irreparable harm, and to glorify the preparedness of the Allies would be following an ostrich policy—a policy which is the cause of the present plight of the Allies.

The principal hope of Washington officials is that the Allies may be able to hold off the Germans until the somewhat clumsy American war industry can be put on a more efficient basis and can export sufficient matériel—especially airplanes. Should the German blitzkrieg be so effective as to make French-British resistance impossible for more than 3 or 4 months, the general belief here is that we shall be face to face with Hitler.

What policy this country will be compelled to adopt in the event that the Allies weaken to the point of crumbling, is a question which will be decided in Washington in accordance with future developments. The one paramount thought of the administration today seems to be: Great Britain, France, and their Allies must remain the buffer between us and the totalitarians.

Republican Leadership United in Defense of American Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing too much these days from the alarmist and hysterical pronouncements of radio commentators, jitter-minded columnists, and a few editorial writers in the panic-stricken press of a few eastern cities. These salesmen of sensational war emotion and atrocity stories speak in glib and glittering terms about war but they seem entirely unmindful of the bloodshed, the heartaches, the broken homes, the bankruptcy, and the black-out of human liberty and Christian brotherhood which war involves. It is highly gratifying therefore that the more substantial elements of America are settling back to exercise their serious second judgment and concentrating on the job of improving our national defense rather than being stampeded into an armament panic.

The following statement by Ludwell Denny is taken from the Washington Daily News for May 22 and represents a summary of opinion by serious-minded Americans and Republican leaders who recognize the obligation which this country has to solve its own serious problems, to perfect its own defenses, and to give genuine service to our Christian idealism by keeping America out of foreign wars.

Ludwell Denny's statement in the Washington Daily News of May 22, 1940:

The President has failed to "blitzkrieg" Republican candidates in acceptance of his anti-isolationist foreign policy.

Hitler's bloody sweep through the low countries and northern France and the President's shrill cries that the United States is

in danger have only increased the demands of Republican candidates that we keep out of European war and concentrate on defense of this hemisphere.

What will happen if and when Paris falls and actual fighting is carried to England is a matter of guess. Some of the President's supporters, who insist that this is "our war," predict that large-scale German bombing of England will inflame American sentiment and force the G. O. P. campaigners to change.

Meanwhile the leading opposition candidates, Dewey, Taft, and Vandenberg, continue their attack on the ground that the President's policy tends to the warlike and that his defense methods are belated and blundering.

Of the three Republican leaders, Democrats have expected Taft to come around first. Vandenberg has long been an isolationist leader. Dewey began last January by underwriting Roosevelt's foreign policy, but switched to the isolationist position during the Wisconsin primaries and won. Since then he has gone the limit of opposing American participation in European negotiations and of opposing modification of the neutrality and Johnson laws to permit allied loans.

But Taft was one of the eight Republican Senators who voted last fall for Roosevelt repeal of the arms embargo. Although in April he started the campaign criticism of the President's foreign policy, he has not been as vigorous as Dewey or some others.

Hence the importance of Taft's speech this week in St. Louis. In reply to the sensational statements of the President to the Pan American meeting and to Congress, Taft went further over to the isolationist side than ever before.

In view of his following St. Louis declarations, it is difficult for those who know him to believe that TAFT will retreat on this issue:

"Let's stop playing with the idea that we may enter the war, and devote ourselves to a genuine program of defense. * * *

"The President has made no definite move toward war, but he has made a number of disturbing statements which indicate that he might favor that position if the people would permit it. * * *

"If Germany should win, we would have to consider defense in the light of defending the entire continent of North America, the Caribbean Sea, and, at the very least, the northern part of South America. * * * Yet even that alternative seems to be preferable to present participation in the European war. * * *

"If we are justified in spending billions for the Allies and supporting their navies, then it would be cowardice not to support them also with men.

"Our going to war would be more likely to destroy American democracy than to destroy German dictatorship."

And here is Candidate VANDENBERG's reply to the President:

"No matter what our sympathies, we must keep America out of these wars and out of foreign policies which would drag us in. Overnight, our entry would precipitate a virtual war dictatorship in our own America, which would cancel out our liberties almost as completely as they have disappeared among the victims of conquest. * * *

"We must never surrender to the state of mind which resigns itself to the ultimate inevitability of our involvement—a state of mind which entirely too often possesses Washington. And we must never forget that we have our hands full in saving democracy at home."

Wendell Willkie says: "This present administration has proved itself incompetent to defend us from ourselves. We dare not, therefore, trust it to defend us from strangers."

BRUCE BARTON says: "I cannot see circumstances under which I would vote to put this country into foreign war. To do so would be to abandon our own democracy in an effort to defend and preserve democracy abroad."

Back Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the May 16 issue of the Fort Myers News-Press, of Fort Myers, Fla., entitled "Back Again."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK AGAIN

The armistice is over.

The Germans are back in Sedan. That is where the World War left them. Sedan is just inside the French border. They had been chased that far by American troops who broke through the Hindenburg line in the Argonne Forest. The armistice saved them from being chased any farther. From that point they were allowed to march home and disband.

Now they are back where they left off. All that work the American boys did 22 years ago has gone for nought. In fact, for worse than nought. For there is no exhausted, vanquished army licking its wounds in Sedan today. It is an army fresh and strong, flushed with victory and keyed to revenge. After being allowed to recover and prepare, it has regained every military advantage it lost in 1918 and has literally turned in its tracks to resume the war in which it had been decisively defeated.

Now at Sedan, where democracy once triumphed, it again stands menaced. It is no longer safe in the world. It was on November 11, 1918, when the Germans waited at Sedan for orders to march home and give up their Kaiser's dream of conquering the world. There was no force anywhere that could change the way of life for which Americans fought. Back home our people were free to speak and walk the streets. They had no need to tax themselves huge sums for battleships and a standing army. They could spend that money for social security and peaceful construction. To remain forever safe they had only to maintain their part of the army of occupation on the Rhine, and that at Germany's expense, to see that the enemy did not rearm and renew his depredations.

But the American people did not do that. They called their troops home. They bought worthless German marks with valuable American money. They sent loans to Germany and Red Cross funds to feed children now grown to sturdy parachute troops. They scolded France for being too hard on the vanquished and finally influenced England into also withdrawing from the watch on the Rhine.

Modern history knows the rest. Crying poor mouth and whimpering for sympathy, the Germans—not Hitler alone but all of them in what is now clearly a national conspiracy—armed with our money and trained secretly to get even, not only with France and England but also, you can bet, with the Yanks who came to deprive them of their booty 22 years ago.

Does that have to be done all over again? Must we again drive them out of Sedan so that our people need not worry about the kind of lives they wish to live? If so, dead eyes in Flanders field are going to turn accusingly on the influences in America that destroyed the work our soldier boys so gallantly performed in 1918.

Landon Asks the President a Fair Question—It Demands a Fair Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, national defense is not a partisan matter in America—it has never been considered such at any time in the past and it must never become so at any time in our future. Americans may differ regarding the relative merits of various types of defense, and administrations may differ in the degree of efficiency with which they spend national-defense appropriations; but the basic American policy of millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute, which has always governed this country, is as true today as it has always been, although the figures have become larger.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is today stalking across America the widespread and apparently well-founded suspicion that the present occupant of the White House seems bent upon using the European war situation and his own failure to bring our national defense system up to date, as a smoke screen behind which to hide his own determined maneuvers to secure a third term for himself and his associates. It is unfortunate for America's future that the President should inject his own personal ambitions into the picture at a time when national unity is highly important, and Alf Landon, of Kansas, was precisely right in calling upon President Roosevelt, here and now, to manifest a sincere desire for an "adjournment of politics" by publicly announcing that he will neither seek nor accept a third-term nomination. This country has many serious issues to face in the coming campaign—should the President insist on running for a third term, all other issues will be overshadowed by this threat of

one-man government in America. Such an attempt to scuttle traditional democratic traditions at this time would be a great disservice to the United States, and it is difficult to believe that President Roosevelt would place self-interest above country in times like these.

ROOSEVELT EXPECTED TO TELL AMERICA IN SUNDAY NIGHT'S FIRESIDE CHAT THAT HE IS RENOUNCING THIRD-TERM ASPIRATION

It is rumored among newsmen today, that President Roosevelt will avail himself of the opportunity made possible for him in his fireside speech next Sunday night to declare himself definitely out of the running for a third term. Many Democrats have insisted right along that the President has no desire to establish a family dynasty in this country or to circumvent the continuance of free democratic elections by using his huge patronage machine to seek to perpetuate himself in office. If that be true, Sunday night affords him a great opportunity to give new hope and fresh confidence to America by openly, definitely, and publicly disclaiming any third-term ambitions and pledging himself not to run again. That would be a great patriotic service to his country, and would go far toward settling the uneasiness which America now feels as it contemplates the possibility that the President and his lieutenants are trying to capitalize on current European developments to create political advantage for themselves.

Mr. Landon put the proposition squarely to the President. Thus far he has evaded a direct reply to Alf Landon on the basis he was too busy to make a statement. He is now taking time to prepare a talk to the Nation which he will deliver Sunday night. He has created his own opportunity to speak frankly and fully to his fellow citizens. America is expecting a candid reply to the fair question propounded by Mr. Landon. This is no time for further evasion; it is time for frank talking and complete candor. Upon the President's answer Sunday night to the question concerning his own political plans, depends to a large degree the reaction of the country to his future declarations on foreign policy and the European situation. America has a right to be assured that now as always there is no politics seeping into our national attitude on foreign affairs or military preparedness. This is no time for toying with the destiny of 130,000,000 freedom-loving people.

MR. LANDON ASKS THE QUESTION, "MR. PRESIDENT, ARE YOU RUNNING FOR A THIRD TERM?"

[From article by G. Gould Lincoln, in Washington Evening Star, May 24, 1940]

THIRD-TERM ATTACK BY LANDON FOLLOWS WHITE HOUSE CALL—G. O. P. LEADER MYSTIFIED BY INVITATION LEADING UP BLIND ALLEY

Former Governor Alf M. Landon of Kansas, titular head of the Republican Party, today is wondering just why he was asked to come all the way from Topeka to have luncheon with President Roosevelt.

Mr. Landon had the luncheon yesterday and an hour-and-50-minute conversation with the President. He had expected to be consulted about the national-defense program.

As far as could be learned, however, the President put no concrete proposals to the Kansan. He did not invite Mr. Landon to become a member of his Cabinet, nor did he suggest any other way in which the Kansan might be of assistance in promoting the new national-defense program.

The Kansan, after leaving the White House, issued a statement in which he expressed a hope that President Roosevelt would eliminate himself as a third-term candidate.

THE LANDON STATEMENT

Mr. Landon, at a press conference after he had left the White House, said that he was issuing a statement—not in any way based on his conversation with the President—because of the widely spread reports that the New Deal administration was seeking some kind of a coalition government, with Republicans in Cabinet or other key positions, to meet the national-defense emergency situation. He said in his statement:

"National defense organized and carried on with reason and calmness is necessary for the same reason that fire extinguishers are necessary even in a fireproof building.

"It cannot be denied that the present European situation has serious implications even for this country.

"As a further means of defense, a national council—a small group of leaders and experts in their own fields, the members of which are not merely administration satellites—is desirable to head the defense program.

"But unfortunately for the country, the leadership is in the hands of a man who has not eliminated himself as a candidate for an indefinite term as President, who at the moment has pledged to him more than enough delegates to take the Democratic nomination if he wants it.

"Political implications, consequently, are inescapable.

"Unfortunately, any Republican leader who takes a position in the present set-up from the standpoint of unselfish national service is making himself a party to this third- or indefinite-term move.

SHOULD ELIMINATE HIMSELF

"If President Roosevelt is equally interested in unselfish service, he should publicly and forthwith eliminate himself as a third-term candidate.

"Instead of weakening his position, this action would strengthen it. The President would become the leader of the Nation instead of the head of a party.

"If he does eliminate himself as a candidate, Republicans can and will participate. It is to be noted that even in the midst of actual war the Labor and Liberal Parties in England refused to enter the Cabinet until there had been a substantial agreement on policies.

"To suggest that President Roosevelt is the only man in the Nation to carry on, or that the national elections should be canceled or allowed to go by default, is to use the same argument the Nazis use in behalf of Hitler.

BASIC PRINCIPLES NECESSARY

"If democracy is important, and is in peril, there is a particular necessity to preserve all its basic principles, including that of two Presidential terms.

"Fortunately, under our tradition and usages, stepping out of the White House does not mean that the Nation is deprived of a President's experience and ability."

It has been repeatedly published that President Roosevelt recently offered Col. Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, the office of Secretary of the Navy, without any denial issuing from the White House. And it was rumored that the President had in mind the offer of a Cabinet place or some other important job which he would make to Mr. Landon.

Mr. Landon, however, issued a statement in Topeka last Sunday night opposing anything that resembled coalition government. Friends of Mr. Landon say that his statement was responsible, first, for a cancelation of the invitation to luncheon at the White House, which reached Mr. Landon in Chicago on his way to Washington, and finally to the indefinite conversation which took place at the White House, after Mr. Landon had been reinvited by the President himself.

NO POSITION OFFERED

Prior to giving out the statement, Mr. Landon said the President had offered him no position in the Government, Cabinet or otherwise.

"Why were you asked to come to Washington then," Mr. Landon was asked.

"You will have to ask the President about that," was the reply.

Will Roosevelt Answer Landon Sunday Night or Again Dodge the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday night the President is scheduled to address the country in another so-called fireside chat. This would be an opportune time for Roosevelt to answer Alf Landon and publicly announce that he would not accept a nomination for a third term. We have heard so much talk about coalition and national unity that the public is beginning to wonder whether there are not some political implications in Roosevelt's desire to confer with leading Republicans at the White House. A public disavowal by Roosevelt of any intention of using the European war situation for political self-advancement would be encouraging to many Americans who feel the President is making political capital out of the misery and suffering of warring nations overseas.

The following news article written by Mr. Flynn discusses the 50,000-plane program suggested by the President. The

last paragraph of this article indicates there might be such a thing as politics in the defense program:

F. D.'S AIR FLEET WOULD COST ABOUT SEVEN BILLIONS

NEW YORK, May 23.—When the President talked to Congress about providing for 50,000 planes and asked an appropriation of over a billion dollars, like many Americans I began to ask myself some questions.

Not being a military or naval expert, I did not know the answers. So I went to some experts. I did what most readers would do if they had the leisure and the facilities.

I wanted to know: Is the billion dollars to build airplanes?

Can you build 50,000 airplanes for a billion dollars?

How are we fixed to build 50,000 airplanes? And after we build them, how much will it cost?

The first information I got was that it would cost not less than $3,000,000,000 to build them, not including equipment. Then I learned from authoritative sources that at the price England and France were paying for planes, $3,000,000,000 wouldn't buy half 50,000 planes.

However, with the best information I could get I wrote a piece saying that we must not think we were being let in for a billion-dollar program but for at least a $3,000,000,000 one. I wondered if I had made a mistake. I felt that the President ought to have said something about the cost of all this.

However, asking further, I was informed by aviation production experts that the smallest amount 50,000 planes could be built for was not a billion or even three billion but $6,000,000,000. And now the head of the country's air forces puts the price at seven billions. So the President told Congress he wanted to plan immediately a program for 50,000 airplanes, which he must have known would cost seven billion, yet said nothing about that.

On further questioning of experts, I am informed that we must figure on an army of pilots, mechanics, helpers, laborers, attendants, and other ground workers of 30 men per plane. That would make 1,500,000 men—an army almost as large as the one we sent to France in 1917—and that for planes only. With the 750,000 men the Government is talking about in a Regular Army Establishment, we are actually talking about an army of 2,000,000 men.

There is no way to get an Army of 2,000,000 men in America save by conscription—universal military service. And the cost would be staggering—billions every year for men, supplies, and equipment.

I find these figures, fantastic as they seem, confirmed by official statements, for a naval aviation expert says that a force of 10,000 planes will require 320,000 pilots and men—which is 32 to each plane.

At this point I ask myself a question which there is no expert to answer. Either the President is actually talking about precipitating this country into this 50,000-plane program and an Army of 2,000,000 men, or he is kidding us, or he is ignorant. With his access to Army facts, I cannot believe him to be ignorant.

And then I remember that there is such a thing as politics. Is all this terrifying of the American people, all this talk about 50,000 planes and a standing Army of airmen and mechanics that means conscription in times of peace, part of a political game? Either the President really means to do this or try it, or he is feeding this to the American people for some concealed purpose. What is the purpose?

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK E. HOOK OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered on the Townsend plan.

SHERMAN J. BAINBRIDGE. Dr. Francis E. Townsend takes pleasure in presenting Representative FRANK S. HOOK, of Michigan. Congressman Hook.

Congressman HOOK. Thank you and greetings, friends. Two-thirds of the people of the United States have become so adjusted to poverty that even a scale of living in accord with health and decency seems almost impossible of achievement. Through all the centuries man has never been free from the fear of want—we have always thought, lived, and been governed on the principles of scarcity. There was never—until just recently—enough to go around. It is little wonder, then, that we have such difficulty in adjusting our lives to our new world of potential abundance. Subconsciously we feel that it is impossible to improve the condition of the impoverished without taking something from the prosperous. This is no longer true. We need only to create and distribute more goods—to multiply instead of subtract. At present scarcity governs our every action. Goods are put up in smaller and smaller packages—dime stores multiply. We buy our automobiles, homes, furnishings, and our clothing on the installment plan. We read learned articles by dietitians on how little food we can eat and still manage to exist. It is not surprising, therefore, that when Dr. Francis E. Townsend first proposed generous pensions for the aged as a recovery measure that he was hailed both as crack-pot and national deliverer according to the individual viewpoint. The new Townsend bill is now up for consideration and the senior citizens who have long suffered privation and want are asking, "How much income may we expect when the new measure becomes the law of the land?"

First, let me state that the Townsend plan was not designed just for the benefit of the aged. Dr. Townsend's original idea was to first bring about a recovery and then an expansion in our economy. And so it is essential that the pension payments made under the Townsend plan shall be generous in order that the major objective of releasing stagnant savings and starting a fresh flow of money through the channels of trade shall be realized.

The bill provides for a 2-percent gross income tax but exempts all earnings and income under $250 per month, or $3,000 annually. It reverses the social-security procedure where the man of small earnings does most of the paying and says to the great corporations and the wealthy, "Come; you, too, must carry your share."

Much misinformation is being broadcast as to the returns to be expected from the proposed new tax. I shall now give you the results of a recent painstaking analysis of the Townsend bill. Our national gross income is estimated by conservative authorities at approximately $365,000,000,000. Our net income has varied in recent years from thirty-eight to eighty-three billion dollars. Some estimate our gross income as being nearly $150,000,000,000 higher than the figure I am using. When we exempt from the payment of the 2-percent gross income tax all wages, salaries, and incomes below $250 per month, as well as other exemptions, we exempt a total of $65,000,000,000 from the taxable total. That leaves us with an amount to levy upon of three hundred billion—and the proposed 2-percent tax will therefore yield $6,000,000,000 annually, which is to be divided equally among approximately 10,000,000 senior citizens—or about $50 per month to be paid to both men and women who have reached the age of 60, not 65 as under social security, but age 60. The 5 years from age 60 to 65 cover the most heartbreaking period in the lives of most people. Sixty-five as the age of retirement is fantastically high when we confront actualities.

The pension money to be paid under the Townsend bill must be spent within 35 days after it is received—no hoarding is permitted. Remember that $50 per month is only the start. Dr. Townsend is certain that, as the Nation returns to full employment and widespread prosperity, the initial amount should soon be increased and in a short time reach an amount which will actually make possible the prosperity we so greatly need. An important point in the bill, and one which I have not heard others stress is a provision that the 2 percent gross-income tax shall not be applied to fraternal societies, churches, hospitals, scientific, educational, business, or labor organizations operating for the promotion of social welfare and not for profit.

The right to receive retirement compensation is not transferable under the Townsend Act and none of the moneys or rights are subject to attachment. It is, however, considered to be the duty of the annuitant to pay his just obligations and to allot at least 10 percent of any monthly installment for obligations incurred before any pension money was received.

The Townsend bill has teeth, and fines not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 10 years, or both, may be imposed for attempts to evade the payment of the 2-percent tax or for the making of false returns or statements. Those receiving the pension are not permitted to engage in any occupation for wages or profit, but past thrift or business acumen does not go unrewarded and pensioners are permitted to collect interest, rents, or other revenues from their prior investments. They may not, however, support an able-bodied person in idleness except it be wife or husband, nor will the annuitant be paid while confined in any penal institution.

Under Social Security the allowance to wives is only 50 percent of the amount paid to the husband, and a widow receives only 75 percent of the husband's allotment. It is indeed strange reasoning that considers a woman's needs for food and raiment less than those of the man. Under the provisions of the Townsend plan, the wife will receive her full share and in her own right.

Certain opponents of the plan have expressed a fear of additional taxation, but it must be remembered that the proposed rise in per capita income for those past 60 is actually offset by lower per capita living costs for the balance of society. For instance, there is immediately eliminated the 6 percent tax on pay rolls for social security—a saving of about one and a half billion dollars. Charity age pensions of five hundred million with Federal and State contributions are eliminated, together with other expenses. So that the net additional tax load, for which provision must be made,

should not exceed $3,000,000,000, and this sum is but 5 percent of the national income.

The total increase in the cost of living will not, therefore, exceed 5 percent—but the low wage and income groups will enjoy a 2 percent tax exemption on their income and so the total cost of the Townsend tax to the little man will be a net increase in the cost of living of about 3 percent—and this is precisely the amount of the pay-roll tax which will be imposed as the workers' share under social security.

But social security gives no return to 15 percent of those who pay for it—and another 35 percent will receive about $15 per month. Whereas, those who have enjoyed large incomes are the only ones to receive allotments sufficient to furnish a decent scale of living. A 3 to 5 percent increase in price, when absorbed in a 50 to 100 percent rise in general income means nothing.

The Townsend plan, through reemployment pay increases for the workers, greater business profits, and the lifting of the support of parents from their children opens a new world to America. The abolition of charity, poorhouses, and doles brings us nearer to the heart's wish of humanity—and a dignified living for our veterans of industry.

Cotton Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT TEXAS COTTON GINNERS' CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on April 4, 1940, Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General and Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made a notable speech in my State at the convention of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, on the subject Cotton Marches On.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have given me two pleasures this morning.

The first is the privilege of addressing your meeting: The second is the opportunity to be in Texas, now that April's here and spring is sweeping through the Texas valleys, across the plains, into the forests, and up into the mountains of your majestic State.

But best of all, I like to come here to meet your fine people, and the oftener I come, the deeper insight I get into the spirit which inspired the Alamo, rebuilt Galveston and brought the ocean to Beaumont. It is this heroic spirit which has lifted the industry, commerce, agriculture, and the oil production, as well as the education and culture of Texas into a front rank in the United States.

While this spirit is alive here, and in the Cotton States, the future market for your great empire of cotton will be enlarged by the application of your natural talent and ability for organization and salesmanship. Knowing of your enterprising spirit, I am sure the people here who are interested in the success of cotton will be first to take advantage of every opportunity which can be uncovered and developed by modern business methods of scientific research and marketing.

Because you are businessmen and practical men, I would like to talk to you in business terms. It is needless for me to dwell here upon the importance of the cotton industry in the United States. Cotton is one of the major industries, upon which millions of our citizens depend for a livelihood. Cotton is so vital to the economic welfare of the Nation that when cotton suffers, the whole Nation feels it. Not long ago, as many of you well know, a group of economists declared cotton to be the number one economic problem of our country. This revelation within itself should awaken the American people to the necessity of finding a proper solution for the cotton problem.

I understand you have in Texas an organization composed of representatives of every phase of the cotton industry and allied industries, called the State-wide Cotton Committee of Texas. The program of this committee, as I understand its work, deals with several important phases of the cotton problem, including research. I commend the emphasis on research. Modern business can deal only in facts; and the two greatest difficulties we now have are, first, to learn what the facts are, and then how to make use of them after we get them.

It was an important step when we learned, through research, that over 2,000,000 farm families in the United States produce cotton; of whom more than 400,000 families average 2 bales or less per year; over 700,000 produce from 2 to 5 bales; over 200,000 produce 5 to 6 bales; and the balance, or over 900,000 families produce more than 6 bales per year. In these figures we find the accurate income picture for every family to whom cotton spells livelihood and purchasing power. We can now measure cotton in terms of humanity as well as economics.

More progress was made when we discovered, again through research, that if the national purchasing power of all American families could be increased by a comparatively reasonable margin, that is, from 10 to 15 percent a year, textiles would share materially in the increased consumption. It has been often said, that if the people of the South alone would use cotton goods, in such volume as to meet their ordinary needs, the surplus cotton problem could be largely solved. In many cases the fault lies in a lack of funds for families to purchase the proper quantities of bed sheets, mattresses, clothes, towels, and other things made from cotton. But in the majority of cases it is a matter of salesmanship, a matter of educating the people, not only as to the necessity of purchasing, but as to the real value of cotton items.

As businessmen, you and I think in terms of more buyers for better goods, goods in which we take personal pride because materials and workmanship are of the best, the price is right, and our name and word are behind them as a guarantee. Cotton and cotton products have always enjoyed a market and a reputation based on this method of doing business.

Before I left Washington I saw a report of the research begun in August 1938 by the Department of Agriculture on the best ways to use cotton for hosiery. As I read it, I was proud of this practical achievement in the field of business research under this administration. This new research is one of the first in disclosing new possibilities for increased consumption of cotton. If this first research under the new program could open up a revolutionary new method of using cotton for hosiery, with potentially millions of customers for it, what limit would there be to the possibilities resulting from extensive research, salesmanship, and cooperation in a dozen other directions?

The Department of Agriculture began, as you will recall, with an appropriation of $13,000,000 to promote domestic consumption—voted by Congress because Congress was vitally interested in the cotton-surplus problem. The unfortunately small portion of this appropriation devoted to research on the subject of new cotton threads and weaves for hosiery has already paid rich dividends on the investment.

The Department of Agriculture began by studying hosiery and fabric designs, current fashions, style trends, and the problems of manufacturers and distributors. More than a dozen attractive new weaves were evolved. Then the Department interested yarn manufacturers in spinning extra-quality threads. The next step was to interest hosiery manufacturers in knitting the thread—and the Department obtained their cooperation even to the extent of knitting this extra-quality thread on silk-stocking machines, so that full-fashioned, sheer, attractive hosiery would result.

People in the hosiery trade already welcome this new form of cotton. Some hosiery firms want cotton hose for international reasons. Others want this new hosiery for patriotic reasons—they favor American cotton growers. Others are dealers in hosiery in cold climates—they want warmer, yet lightweight and fashionable hosiery. Still others are dealers in the lower-priced fields—they want smart but less expensive lines.

Next, there are new users yet to be attracted—nurses, laboratory workers, cosmeticians, clerical, and others—more than a million women of this category alone, the majority of whom wear white stockings on duty. The new cotton thread, knit on silk-stocking machines, is attractive as well as economical and practical, does not turn yellowish, and can be sterilized without deterioration.

I cite these details as a matter of practical business interest. According to the report I read, beyond even the foregoing markets there is yet another unexplored field—the market among American women who use special hosiery for housework, gardening, athletics, special stockings for different types of shoes, and the like. Having two daughters of my own, this subject is of acute personal interest to me as chairman, in my own family, of the committee on ways and means.

In my opinion, research and salesmanship are just beginning their greatest work. I am positive that they can give cotton a new security and luster for its throne and crown.

I am happy to note the beginning of the cotton-stamp plan. I hope the experiment is so thoroughly successful that it will spread as rapidly as the food stamps have spread, into more than 40 areas and approximately 100 cities of the United States. I say this most emphatically, because cotton and its products supply a livelihood for approximately one out of every ten people in this country. Even if the cotton-stamp plan does not increase consumption as rapidly and as much as we would like, it would still be a success if it increased cotton processing, and therefore increased employment and income. One of the most urgent needs today in this country is for increased buying power. So long as 50 cents of every cotton-consumption dollar is spent for processing, and another 30 cents for transportation and distribution, in other words, so long as 80 cents of every dollar spent for cotton products goes to keep people at work and helping them to keep buying the things they want and need, what we should do is to see to it that the American public have

sufficient employment and attractive forms of cotton products to buy.

Cotton is a world commodity. America, for many years, supplied the rest of the world with a considerable portion of its cotton needs. This export of American cotton has been an important factor in the proper balance of our foreign trade. The cotton policy of the United States necessarily must take into consideration our export markets, if there is to be a permanently successful solution of our domestic problems in cotton production and distribution. I share your hope in the success of any program that will keep the market open for American cotton abroad.

I pay you my earnest compliments on the constructive work you and the other cotton States are doing, and particularly on the work your organization is doing, to improve the staple quality of cotton. As ginners, I pay my special respects to the manner in which you are meeting your responsibilities as a vital link between the grower of cotton and the market for the ginned product. So long as Texas and the cotton States strive for better and better quality of staple, the competition of foreign cotton in the world market will serve to direct attention to the superior quality and value of American cotton.

Valuable and important work also has been done in developing cottonseed oil as a basic food and commercial product of public acceptance. Here again, research and marketing have demonstrated their importance to increased volume at present levels and proper development of future markets.

I was encouraged when I heard the details of the Cotton Research Congress, planned for Waco in the early summer. I wish that meeting all success, just as I congratulate you on this meeting. It is programs such as these that inevitably will find complete solution of the cotton problem. Godspeed to you in your great work.

National Aviation Forum of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS H. BECK AND PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, commencing on Monday next, the National Aviation Forum will assemble in the city of Washington. Thousands of private planes, and some from the military and naval branches of the Government, will give a demonstration at Bolling Field. On Monday evening, at the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, the Forum itself will assemble. On behalf of the Forum I desire to extend to the Senate an invitation to attend the show which will take place at Bolling Field, in which our private and military fliers will participate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject by Thomas H. Beck, general chairman of the National Aviation Forum.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the program of the National Aviation Forum.

There being no objection, the article and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM OF 1940

(By Thomas H. Beck, general chairman)

During the week of May 26 thousands of residents and visitors in Washington, D. C., will witness a spectacular demonstration of this Nation's aeronautical strength and potentialities, civilian and military.

The occasion is the National Aviation Forum of 1940 and its complementary Aeronautical Exhibition at nearby Bolling Field.

With civilian air travel constantly reaching new peaks, and with questions regarding the true air strength of the Nation inevitably in mind at this time, this year's forum, under the auspices of the National Aeronautical Association, is bound to be of interest to every American. Nor is it confined to those of us of the North Americas, for President Roosevelt has instructed the State Department to invite representatives of 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere.

"I know of no way better to promote the best technical development of aviation than through meetings such as that which is to take place in May," President Roosevelt wrote. "I need hardly say that in the interest of all the Americas such development is essential."

While the forum in the Department of Commerce auditorium will consist of talks by leading aviation figures, emphasis this year is being placed upon getting home to the entire public of the Americas the story of where this Nation stands and where it is going in the ever widening field of aeronautics.

The aeronautical exhibition at Bolling Field, therefore, will be the public's own show. Two tremendous hangars will contain exhibits by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Post Office Department, Work Projects Administration, Office of Education, Air Transport Association, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, and Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The manufacturers of airplanes and accessories will be represented in full force, and the public will see everything from the huge stratosphere planes to the most delicate of precision instruments.

More than 300 private flyers from coast to coast will converge on Washington during the week. Then there will be formation flying by Navy and commercial blimps and flights to and from Washington by the latest aircraft developed for commercial flying.

In the Department of Labor auditorium free motion pictures will show the progress of flying from the days of the fabled Icarus to present-day flying fortresses.

American aviation has a story of profound significance to tell at this National Aviation Forum of 1940.

PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 22.—With representatives of more than 100 airplane, aircraft-engine, accessory, and machine-tool manufacturers gathered in Washington in response to the Government's call for a program of 50,000 planes a year, attention turned today to the National Aviation Forum and its aeronautical exhibition at Bolling Field, at which these very manufacturers are exhibiting their latest productions and are indicating this Nation's true potentialities in the realm of aviation.

Subject to the necessary military requirements, this year's Forum and exhibition which open this coming Sunday, May 26, present to the American public a graphic picture and story of our air strength, civil and military. The Forum, which is sponsored by the National Aeronautic Association, will last through May 29, being climaxed by a banquet at which Cabinet officers and others will address some 1,000 of the leading figures in the world of aviation.

"The question of national defense, especially in the air, has been raised in Washington this week as never before," Thomas H. Beck, general chairman, pointed out today. "This National Aviation Forum of 1940 and its aeronautical exhibition at Bolling Field will provide a good part of the answer."

More than 125 manufacturers will exhibit at Bolling Field from 3 p. m. to 6 p. m. on Sunday and from 3 p. m. to 11 p. m. on the three following days.

From Monday through Wednesday the most prominent of this Nation's aviation leaders will speak at Forum sessions in the Department of Commerce auditorium. Two of the outstanding addresses will be made by Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, of New York, who has promised to let go full blast on the subject Let's Tell the Truth, and Al Williams, who will speak at the banquet on the subject Real Air Power for the United States.

The 4-day program has been outlined as follows:

Sunday, May 26, model exhibition day.
Monday, May 27, private flyers' day.
Tuesday, May 28, air-line day.
Wednesday, May 29, national-defense day.

The program for the forum at the Department of Commerce is:

Monday, May 27, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, District of Columbia Commission, American Aviation Moves Forward. (Greetings to the forum.)
2. Ruth Nichols, Rye, N. Y., Woman's Place in Aviation.
3. J. B. Hartranft, Jr., executive secretary, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Flying Clubs and Group Flights.
4. Oliver Parks, president of Parks Air College, East St. Louis, Ill., How You Can Get Into Aviation.
5. Helena Mroczkowska, of Hofstra College, What the Civilian Pilot Training Program Has Meant to Me.
6. Mrs. Louise Thaden, veteran woman pilot, The Ninety-nines and the Future of Women in Aviation.
7. Dr. Edward C. Elliott, president, Purdue University, Civilian Flight Training in National Service.
8. Gordon M. Curtis, president, Aviation Funding Corporation, How to Buy Airplanes.
9. Haven B. Page, Washington representative of the Private Fliers Association, A New Status for Private Pilots.
10. Grove Webster, Chief, Private Flying Development Division, C. A. A., As We See It.
11. William B. Stout, president of Stout Laboratories, Inc., Flivvers of the Future.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. W. W. Brinckerhoff, secretary, Private Fliers Association, The Insurance Status.

2. Rudolph Loening, president, Seaplane Flying Association, What the Seaplane Offers.
3. Fred E. Weick, chief engineer, Engineering and Research Corporation, Simpler Flying.
4. C. G. Taylor, president, Taylorcraft Aircraft Corporation, The Light Plane.
5. Arlene Davis, Cleveland, Private Flying As I See It.
6. Alfred L. Wolf, secretary, Association of Aircraft Owners and Pilots, What Are You Waiting For?
7. A. I. Martin, Watkins Glen, N. Y., Ox Team to Airplane.
8. Alfred Brokaw Bennett, Hightstown, N. J., Merchandising Light Planes for Defense.
9. Hon. Robert M. Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Nonscheduled Civil Aviation and Government.

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Capt. Robert Dawson, United Air Lines, What Are We Going To Do About the Weather?
2. Al Near, Bowman Field, Louisville, Ky., The Importance of Aviation in the Small Town.
3. Roger M. Combs, Jr., New York, Why It Pays To Fly.
4. Norman Bel Geddes, New York, Tomorrow's Airways.
5. Mrs. Ogden Reid, New York, Air Transport From the Passenger's Viewpoint.
6. Charles A. Rheinstrom, American Airlines, When the War Is Over, Then What?
7. F. W. Reichelderfer, Weather Bureau, Department of Agriculture, International Character of Airways Weather Service.
8. Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, Air Transport Association, The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and Reorganization of 1940.
9. Grover Leening, New York, Cargo by Air in War or Peace.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. Maj. R. W. Schroeder, United Airlines, Behind the Scenes of Safe Air Transportation.
2. Devon Francis, Associated Press, News Is Where You Find It.
3. Richard du Pont, All American Aviation, Inc., Feeder Lines.
4. Dr. Alfred N. Goldsmith, New York, Radio and Aviation.
5. Kinsey N. Merritt, Railway Express Agency, Progress in Air Express.
6. Roscoe Turner, Indianapolis.
7. H. M. Bixby, Pan American Airways.
8. T. B. Wilson, T. W. A., Public Relations in Air Transport.

SPECIAL FEATURE

Lowell Thomas, broadcasting on the subject of the forum at 5:45 p. m.

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Gill Robb Wilson, National Aeronautic Association, Forecast of the Flying Forties.
2. Ralph McClarren, Franklin Institute, An Action Story of Aviation.
3. Charles H. Babb, Los Angeles, Air Freight.
4. Ernest R. Breech, General Motors Corporation, Outlook for Civil Aviation.
5. Rear Admiral R. R. Waesche, United States Coast Guard, Aviation in the Coast Guard.
6. Zack Mosely, New York, Aviation in the Comics.
7. Dr. Vannevar Buch, National Advisory Council for Aeronautics, Aeronautical Research, A Vital Link in Our National Defense.
8. Col. John H. Jouett, Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, Industry's Position in Accelerated National Defense.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. C. S. (Casey) Jones, Newark, N. J., South American Sidelights on National Defense.
2. Capt. A. L. Patterson, New York, Flying in China and Its Lesson to Us.
3. Rear Admiral J. H. Towers, United States Navy.
4. Harold Montee, Aero Insurance Underwriters, Insurance and Its Part in the Development of Aviation.
5. Commander C. E. Rosendahl, United States Navy, The Case for the Airship Today.
6. Jacqueline Cochran, New York, Women in Air Defense.
7. Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, United States Army, the Army Air Corps.
8. Hon. F. H. LaGuardia, New York, Let's Tell the Truth.

In addition to the two main features of the forum and its exhibition, thousands of visitors and residents of Washington will have an opportunity to see many of the following features in the realm of aviation:

One hundred and eight Army planes taking part in maneuvers over the city.

Approximately 500 private planes flying in cavalcade.

Films depicting the development and drama of aviation, free to the public, in the Department of Labor auditorium, noon to 5 p. m. and 6 p. m. to 9 p. m.

Lowell Thomas broadcast, Tuesday, 5:45 p. m.

American Forum of the Air, Sunday night, May 26, Mutual, coast-to-coast.

Winthrop Rockefeller and T. H. Beck will speak on Air Youth of America, Monday, 6 p. m., N. B. C.

Postmaster General Farley is among others on the banquet program, Wednesday, 10 p. m.

Model flying on Sunday at Bolling Field from 3 to 6 p. m.

A Pan American clipper ship in the Potomac River.

Pan American also will have a DC–3 Douglas of the latest type on exhibition.

The air mail stamp collection of the President of the United States on display in the Department of Commerce.

Exhibits by the Patent Office and Library of Congress, in addition to those of 12 Government agencies already announced.

An aviation fashion show with beautiful models at the Raleigh Hotel, Saturday at 1 p. m.

Visits especially arranged for Forum guests to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Formation flying by Navy blimps from Lakehurst, N. J.

The *Stratoliner*, recently acquired by Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., is flying in for the show.

Maj. Roscoe Turner will exhibit his Thompson record-breaking racer, arriving at Bolling Field about 11 a. m., Monday, May 27.

Jacqueline Cochran, famous woman flyer, has promised to show her Seversky (Republic) pursuit plane in which she set recent international records.

Forty members of the Aviation Writers Association are coming to Washington and will make the Forum the occasion of their annual convention.

Johnny, Get Your Gun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by John T. Flynn published in the New Republic of May 27, 1940, entitled "Johnny, Get Your Gun."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of May 27, 1940]

JOHNNY, GET YOUR GUN

(By John T. Flynn)

It is here. And a little more swiftly than I supposed it would come. I mean the war mania.

Before September and Herr Hitler's dash across Poland everybody in America believed that the declaration of war would mean the immediate clash of Germany and France, the possible entry of Italy, the swarming of German planes over England and France, with the slaughter of their citizens and the destruction of their cities, and, sooner or later, the rape of Belgium. Notwithstanding all that, Americans, as yet quite calm and in possession of their senses, were resolved to remain neutral. Mr. Roosevelt called himself a neutral—the one true neutral. Now, terrible as are the events in Europe, they are merely what Americans, still acting upon reason, supposed they would be. But now the war fever flames up—or is said to flame up—everywhere.

In the early days of this war I warned that Americans were all set to protect their minds from propaganda from England, but that in this they were mistaken—that the propaganda that would inflame them and slowly coax them from their neutrality would come, not from England but from Washington. I think this prediction has turned out to be true.

We are now definitely presented with an issue of war or peace. And the danger of it lies in the fact that those who are for war are still proclaiming that they are for peace. They are clamoring for billions for arms. These, they say, are for defense. But—and they never fail with the "but"—they keep on repeating that if Germany wins our democracy is ended, that "we cannot sit by and see civilization reduced to ashes," that "the defeat of England and France means that we shall be left single-handed to save freedom in the world," that "the defeat of the British Navy will leave us exposed to the German terror," that "within 6 months after Hitler has crushed England he will be knocking at the door of this continent." Now, if we are raising an army because all these things are true, then the only object in raising the army is to help England defeat Germany. There is no doubt that there is a party in Washington which, 1 inch at a time, one little step after another, as fast as it thinks the American people can be drawn along, is leading us into this war. That is the war party. And the President of the United States is the leader of this party. Can anyone have the slightest doubt about this for a moment?

We now face a national political campaign. In both parties there is a struggle going on for the nomination for the Presidency. In good time these two parties will select candidates and write platforms. But the platforms will be meaningless and no one need concern himself about what they will say. There are just two issues before the American people. One is the issue of recovery—how to get the economic machine moving again. The other is war.

I have talked with all or nearly all the candidates for President in both parties on the first issue—recovery. I cannot for the life of me find any great difference among them. On the Republican side all of them sing the tune—"get the Federal Government off the neck of business," "free enterprise so that it can function," "change the personnel of the S. E. C. and N. L. R. B., and other regulatory bodies so that they will cease to be hostile to business." They range all the way from moderate modification to a grand strip tease of New Deal garments—bringing back what Lawton Mackall calls the "bright Coolidge years." But in fact we can expect that whoever is elected will take down the barriers as far as possible.

On the Democratic side, it really isn't very different. There would be somewhat more feeling for the liberal viewpoint if WHEELER were named than if McNutt were nominated. Roosevelt, if renamed, would perhaps make a wee bit more effort for some of his pet measures and labels, but Congress is going to be for turning business loose, no matter who is President, and, for that matter, the next President will be for this too, no matter who he is. The only difference will be in the language he uses. One candidate will say business ought to be freed and will free it. Another will say business must be curbed and will free it. The difference is merely in the patter that goes with the act.

On what basis, then, is the choice of candidates to be made? There is only one issue on which any genuine difference will be found among the candidates for the nominations—that is on the question of war. Remember, all candidates are telling us that we must stay out of war. All candidates are telling us that we must be neutral. But all do not mean it. Some of them are deliberately fooling the American people—and it is a terrible responsibility they take before the bar of history. On the recovery issue, all talk differently, but will act alike. On the war issue, all talk the same, but will act differently.

To me the most important issue now is to keep this country out of war. If war comes, all the other issues will be meaningless. If we enter this conflict no man can predict what our condition will be when the final disaster comes and the whole world is in ruins. I am no politician and take no part in political parties or movements. I shall put my vote on the side of that candidate who I believe will most energetically and honestly try to keep us out of this war. Who he will be, Heaven only knows. But it strikes me that the first duty of Americans now is to look behind the words of the leaders, behind all the fair protestations of peace, and decide who is telling the truth and who is kidding us. For we are being kidded—kidded into war.

There has suddenly flared up a great panic about our defenseless state—as if somebody was on the point of invading us or attacking this continent. Does not every American know that those who are now making the air blue about our lack of strength are those who are friendly to the idea of using that strength in Europe and not America? If we are planning to go to war in Europe, then we are most certainly in no position to do so. If we do so it will be in a state of unpreparedness. And if we are going, we had better prepare. But if we are not going to war in Europe, then what is all the shooting for? Who's coming over here? And in what? And when? There is not one of those military gentlemen in Washington who has the slightest doubt on this point. They know no one is coming here. They are thinking about "over there."

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

LETTERS AND STATEMENTS TO SENATOR PEPPER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain statements which, in my opinion, are very eloquent and moving, as to what the foreign policy of the country should be at this time.

There being no objection, the statements and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As one democracy after another crumbles under the mechanized columns of the dictators, it becomes evident that the future of western civilization is being decided upon the battlefield of Europe. Here is a life-and-death struggle for every principle we cherish in America, for freedom of speech, of religion, of the ballot, and of every freedom that upholds the dignity of the human spirit. Here all the rights that the common man has fought for during a thousand years are menaced. Terrible as it may seem, the people of our country cannot avoid the consequences of Hitler's victory, and of those who are or may be allied with him. A totalitarian victory would wipe out hope for a just and lasting peace.

The time has come when the United States should throw its economic and moral weight on the side of the nations of western Europe, great and small, that are struggling in battle for a civilized way of life; that constitute our first line of defense. It would be folly to hold this Nation chained to a neutrality policy determined in the light of last year's facts. The new situation requires a new attitude.

From this day on America must spend every ounce of energy to keep the war away from the Western Hemisphere by preparing to defend herself and by aiding with our supplies and wealth the nations now fighting to stem the tide of aggression. This is no time for leaders to consider party or factional advantage. All men and all creeds and clans may well call upon our President to confer with leaders of all parties looking to a foreign policy providing for an increase in armaments to defend ourselves and for every economic effort to help the Allies. In foreign affairs we must present an unbroken, nonpartisan front to the world. It is for us to show the people of England, of France, of Holland, of Belgium, and of Scandinavia that the richest country on earth is not too blind or too timid to help those who are fighting tyranny abroad. If they fail, we shall not have time to prepare to face their conquerors alone.

Will you join with me and several hundred others in the formation of a committee which would carry these points of view to the American people?

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE.

COMMITTEE TO DEFEND AMERICA BY AIDING THE ALLIES,
New York City, May 22, 1940.

"There is only one course open to us at this tragic moment: We must go to the Allies' aid with all the power that we can command," Robert E. Sherwood, author of There Shall Be No Night, declared in a letter to William Allen White, accepting membership on the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. "We cannot send an Army now," said Mr. Sherwood, "and every present circumstance in Europe indicates that the war will have ended before we could possibly raise, train, and equip an army of sufficient strength. We cannot send our Navy, which is doing vital guard duty in the Pacific. We can contribute money and materials, planes, and guns and food, and we can pray to God that the British and French won't weaken in their will to fight for freedom."

Additional new members of the committee released by its chairman, William Allen White, at 8 West Fortieth Street, include: Robert E. Lucey, Catholic bishop of Amarillo, Tex.; Governor William H. Vanderbilt, of Rhode Island; Governor Barrows, of Maine; James B. Conant, of Harvard; President Charles Seymour, of Yale; Msgr. John A. Ryan, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; Robert Millikan, Nobel Prize winner; Samuel Seabury, Gerard Swope, of New York City; and Bishop James de Wolf Perry, of Tennessee.

Mr. Sherwood's letter follows:

"DEAR MR. WHITE: Of course, I shall be glad to join in the formation of your committee.

"The American people now are beginning to realize the extent to which they have been betrayed on the false prophets of isolationism; they are beginning to realize that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull and patriotic citizens like yourself who have been branded as "alarmists" and "war mongers" have been telling nothing more than the truth. "Keep us out of war," the isolationists have cried, fomenting a kind of peace hysteria. They believed, complacently, that this hollow slogan was all the protection we needed against the swelling forces of evil. Now we confront, and face to face, the terrible, immediate problem of how to keep war out of us.

"Hitler may win this war this year. Following his victory and the ruthless reduction of Britain and France to the present status of Poland, the Nazis or Fascisti or Japanese or Russians or all of them together can easily establish bases in this hemisphere. And not only bases. They can occupy whole territories to the north or south of us just as quickly and easily as they occupied Scandinavia, and our attempts to stop them or dislodge them would be just as futile as the pathetic efforts of the Allies to defend Norway.

"To say that the totalitarian powers will be too exhausted to commit further aggression is to indulge in childish, wishful thinking. To say that they will instantly start warring with each other and leave us alone is equally nonsensical. The one purpose they all have in common—their first, avowed objective—is the destruc-

tion of the last vestiges of democracy on earth. After they have accomplished that they will probably start the semifinals for the supreme championship, but we shall not be here to enjoy the spectacle.

"This is a subject about which we cannot quibble or kid ourselves, as England did. Only a Nazi, a Communist, or an idiot can deny that the Allied armies and navies are now our own outpost line, our first line of defense. If they are overwhelmed, then we will be virtually as helpless as little Holland; the enemies won't wait the years which we will need to build up adequate hemisphere defense.

"There is only one course open to us at this tragic moment. We must go to the Allies' aid with all the power that we can command. We cannot send an army now, and every present circumstance in Europe indicates that the war will have ended before we could possibly raise, train, and equip an army of sufficient strength. We cannot send our Navy, which is doing vital guard duty in the Pacific. We can contribute money and materials, planes and guns and food, and we can pray to God that the British and French won't weaken in their will to fight for freedom.

"Ever since this war started, we have been quivering behind the cardboard mask of neutrality. It has fooled nobody but ourselves. It has been proved a useless protection against reality. We are now casting it off. But, there is one important point for us to bear in mind when we take the action that is essential to our own self-interest: We must establish the understanding, among the Allies and between ourselves, that we shall have a controlling voice in the ultimate peace, and that then we shall not rat on our obligations for helping to keep the peace as we ratted so disastrously 20 years ago.

"Sincerely,

"ROBERT E. SHERWOOD."

Others who have accepted membership on the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies include: Dean Acheson; Dean Paul Shipman Andrews, Syracuse; Dr. Frank Aydelotte, of Swarthmore; Paul Blanshard; Robert Woods Bliss, of Washington, D. C.; Dr. Frank G. Boudreau, president of League of Nations Association; Bishop Wyatt Brown, of Harrisburg; Zechariah Chaffee; Henry Sloane Coffin; Paul Cruikshank, headmaster of Taft School; George B. Cutten, president, Colgate University; Col. Henry Brickenridge; Walter Damrosch; Victor Elting; Silas Evans, Ripon, Wis.; Dorothy Canfield Fisher; President Harry Gideonse, of Brooklyn College; Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve; John Henry Hammond; Walter M. Howlett, secretary, Greater New York Federation of Churches; Rupert Hughes; Fannie Hurst; Louis Kirstein, of Boston; Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw; President Daniel Marsh, of Boston University; Robert Lncoln O'Brien, of Washiugton, D. C.; Chester Rowell; George Rublee; Mayor Scully, of Pittsburgh; Ellery Sedgwick; Bishop Henry K. Sherrill; Marshall Stimson, Los Angeles; Mrs. Raymond Gram Swing; Herbert Bayard Swope; Huston Thompson, of Washington, D. C.; John Perry Wood, of Los Angeles.

SOME OF THE FIRST SIGNERS

Among those who have already accepted the invitation to join the committee are: Herbert H. Lehmann, Governor, Albany, N. Y.; Henry L. Stimson, New York; Frank Knox, publisher, Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Ill.; Nicholas Murray Butler, president, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Anita McCormick Blaine, Chicago, Ill.; William L. Clayton, Houston, Tex.; Frank L. Polk, New York; Gene Tunney, New York; Miriam Hopkins, Hollywood, Calif.; Ernest Minor Hopkins, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Robert Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; John Temple Graves II, Birmingham, Ala.; Grover C. Hall, Montgomery Advertiser, Ala.; Henry W. Hobson, bishop, Cincinnati, Ohio; Alexander Mann, Episcopal bishop, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Theodore Marburg, Baltimore, Md.; Freda Kirchwey, editor, The Nation, New York; James Truslow Adams, Southport, Conn.; Harry Best, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.; Esther Caukin Brunauer, Washington, D. C.; Philip Marshall Brown, Washington, D. C.; Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor, New York University, New York; Evans Clark, Twentieth Century Fund, New York; Martin J. Collins, St. Louis, Mo.; Frederic Coudert, New York; Samuel A. Elliott, Arlington Street Church, Boston, Mass.; William Yandell Elliott, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John W. Frazer, Methodist Church, Mobile, Ala.; James W. Gerard, New York; Samuel R. Guard, editor, Breeder's Gazette, Spencer, Ind.

Sidney B. Hall, superintendent of public instruction, Richmond, Va.; Roswell G. Ham, president, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; Oscar Leser, judge, Baltimore, Md.; Stephen Keller, Episcopal bishop, Minneapolis, Minn.; William P. Ladd, dean, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.; William T. Manning, Episcopal bishop, New York; James M. Maxon, bishop of Tennessee, Protestant Episcopal Church, Memphis, Tenn.; Reinhold Neibuhr, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Elinor Purves, Princeton, N. J.; William Jay Schieffelin, New York; Samuel Seabury, New York; Robert Emmet Sherwood, New York; James T. Shotwell, New York; Ernest Stires, Episcopal bishop, Garden City, N. Y.; Clifton M. Utley, Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.; George E. Vincent, Greenwich, Conn.; Charles A. Webb, Citizens Times, Asheville, N. C.; Stephen S. Wise, New York; Mary E. Woolley, Westport-on-Lake Champlain, N. Y.; Quincy Wright, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Allen D. Albert, past president, Rotary International, Paris, Ill. Lindsey Rogers, Columbia Unversity, New York; William Allan Neilson, New York.

MAY 22, 1940.

SIR: I want you to know that I fully approve of your plan to send all possible help to the Allies.

Let us take our stand by the side of those who are fighting a world enemy. The moral effect of a declaration of war would be tremendously beneficial.

I served at the front throughout the World War, and I'm eager to go again.

May our leaders lead wisely.

A. W. POWELL, *Swift Run, Va.*

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1940.

I am glad there was one man on that committee who approved of selling planes to the Allies. We should help them in every possible way, even to giving the planes if necessary, for they are in a desperate situation, and if those Huns wins (as they will, you watch and see), then we are going to be. We would want other nations to help us if we had our backs to the wall. We are lost without England's Navy. Japan will then attack our Pacific coast, and we have a Navy for only one. Germans will own Canada, Bermuda, Greenland, and with their spies within our borders (as there now are), what then? Our billions have been wasted that should have gone for defense.

Don't let F. D. R. handle any of that appropriation. Only Congress should do it. They made that mistake once, and we all know how the money was used.

You are from the State I love.

Sincerely,

G. B. PEIRCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1940.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: As a thinking American citizen I protest the inaction of our Congress in the world emergency.

I urge upon you to immediately initiate action to repeal our neutrality laws, in order that we may proclaim to the world that we favor justice—wherever such a proclamation may lead us.

We will be obliged to face the facts sooner or later, and it may be better to do so while our own house is in order rather than later when chaos reaches us.

I, with thousands of others, believe that the people of the United States would gladly extend every possible aid (excepting manpower) to the Allies, and that such action should be taken before it is too late.

Respectfully,

A. M. PARKINS.

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA., *May 23, 1940.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAUDE: Yours of the 21st at hand. Burrell (nicknamed Pete) is one of my closest friends, a straight shooter, and law partner of Jacob S. White, my cousin and former law partner. I appreciate the compliments you and he both have expressed.

When you made your motion to let the Allies have airplanes and help, I decided to interview a group of representative men, representing a fair cross-section of this community, to ascertain whether your move had local public opinion behind you.

Out of 27 men hastily interviewed, 25 favored the plan without equivocation or quibbling. The only 2 who had some doubts were lawyers, and they were not explicitly opposed but they were raising some questions about possible involvements, etc. I have agreed with your plan for months.

The butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers were enthusiastic and favored selling or giving them anything we have.

Yours, as ever,

H. A. HENDERSON.

P. S.—None of those interviewed dreamed that I was taking a poll, and none knew I would report to you.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1940.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I am writing to express my warm approval of the proposal you made to authorize the sale to the Allies of planes and equipment now belonging to the Army and Navy, and my very keen regret that the Committee on Foreign Relations rejected this proposal. It seems perfectly clear that our own best protection is the victory of the Allies—apparently Americans now understand that almost unanimously; and there can be little doubt that the Allies are in a most critical position and in need of substantial and immediate help, especially in planes. As you very aptly suggest, "the very existence of international law (and I would add, our own safety and the preservation of some semblance of civilization) depends on the Allies getting planes from us in time"; and under these circumstances it is hardly in point to consider this kind of help a violation of international law.

I know I need not urge upon you the importance of any other kind of aid as well, for you clearly understand the situation. I very much hope you will continue to press your resolution.

Perhaps I should add, for your information, that I am a professor of political science at the University of Illinois, now in Washington on leave of absence. I had the privilege of being in the same round table of the American Political Science Association with you a couple of years ago, and have seen and heard you in the Senate on several occasions. I happen to know Senator ELBERT THOMAS particularly well, and if you care to quote to him my feeling about your resolution, you are quite welcome to do so.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
May 22, 1940.

The Honorable Senator PEPPER,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The American people are awaking to the dangers facing it from the dictator nations. Sentiment in favor of helping the Allies is growing stronger daily as they watch the inhuman tactics of the Germans.

Please do not give up your fight to provide the Allies with American planes. Also help the fight for democracy in any other way possible.

Very respectfully yours,

R. J. FRANKLIN.

BOX 876, PORT ST. JOE, FLA.,
May 23, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: After reading your stand in paper regarding arming this great Nation and helping others who are our brother nations and need help so bad, I sure feel proud more than ever of you as though I did risk my job to vote for you.

Being an ex-service man, I think I know the real need of having an Army and Navy double any other nation.

I just wanted you to know I was with you.

May God bless you in your work.

Respectfully,

M. L. FULLER.

CANTON, OHIO, *May 23, 1940.*

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of your sympathies for the cause of righteousness, I take the liberty to advise you that it is high time that the United States Government breaks off relations with the Hitler regime and thus part with bad company and a great deal of malefactors in the United States.

Every German Consul in the United States and elsewhere, for that matter, is a Nazi spy and organizer for the "fifth column," and the sooner they are sent back to Germany with diplomatic passports, the sooner the country will be free of bad propaganda, hatred, spying, sabotaging, misinformation, lying, and trouble shooting.

The recent scandals in Pittsburgh and Cleveland amply proves my contention, and I sincerely trust that you persuade our President to take immediate action in that direction before the damage done here may become irreparable.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED ZIFF.

THE WOMAN'S CLUB,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 23, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am directed to send you herewith a copy of the resolution passed by our club at the meeting yesterday.

Very truly,

MOLLIE LENOIR,
(Mrs. C. O. LeNoir.)
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION PASSED MAY 22, 1940, BY THE WOMAN'S CLUB OF JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

The Woman's Club of Jacksonville, in session May 22, 1940, unanimously adopts the following resolution:

"Whereas, the world is facing the greatest crisis in history because of betrayal and ruthless aggression,

"And, since this aggression has succeeded largely through the unpreparedness and negative optimism of the peaceful countries, and through the ability of false prophets and traitors to enter their inner citadels and rob them of their strength and unity, thus rendering them easy prey for the enemy at their gates,

"We, therefore, earnestly request our Government to profit by the experience of these other countries.

"We demand that all saboteurs and repudiators of our flag be routed out, labeled, and imprisoned.

"We demand that our people be awakened fully to the great responsibility resting upon them and upon our chosen leaders to protect our country on land, sea, and in the air, while lending such aid to other countries struggling to uphold civilization as seems expedient and right in the sight of men and God.

"We pledge, as a body of clear thinking women, to refuse to be influenced by selfish aims or narrow political propaganda; to stand clear-eyed and unafraid.

"We pledge, as members of a United States of America, to maintain an active neutrality worthy of our mental, physical, and spiritual integrity."

On the Job in Washington—National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, flying up from Washington to Bangor, Maine, in approximately 5 hours reveals the annihilation of distance by the airplane. Europe is learning this lesson in a very tragic way.

MAINE A EUROPEAN LANDING FIELD

Maine as the nearest point to Europe, with a series of land areas that are convenient stepping stones, must realize that we cannot expect indefinitely to remain aloof.

Our isolation is being modified, whether we like it or not. This does not mean that we need tomorrow to fear clouds of bombers in the skies.

But it does mean, in the words of George Washington, that we should put ourselves in a "posture of defense."

AMERICA GOES IN THE AIR

To one who has for 6 long years in Washington contended day in and day out for aeronautical development, it is profoundly gratifying to see the Congress and the country awaken to the need of planes.

Even as late as 2 years ago I pointed out to the Congress in a formal report, as a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, that the proposed bill sponsored by the administration—

> Limits naval aircraft when the importance of aircraft for defense is increasing with revolutionary rapidity and other nations are spending 10 times what we are for experimentation in aircraft development for defense.

It seems incredible that on February 6, 1938, when I filed that report, I was one of a small minority, while today everywhere there is recognized the vital importance to defense of supremacy in the air as well as on sea and land.

LINDBERGH

I repeated the plea of Lindbergh for money for research and for the development of construction facilities for planes.

Whatever may be thought as to Lindbergh's views on foreign policy, there can be no question as to the authority with which he speaks on airplanes. No one in the world has seen more from the inside of the aeronautical preparations in Europe for this current holocaust. Certainly events have vindicated Lindbergh's estimate of the superiority of the German Air Corps. It is a matter of regret that this tremendous range of experience and trained capacity for observation is not now actively identified with our expanding air program. He is one of the first who should be called as a Reserve officer of the United States Army Air Corps. Research and production facilities are the two things he has constantly emphasized.

AIR DEFENSES

The lesson has at last been learned. America seems likely now to turn its tremendous energies and resources to a proper preparation for aeronautical defense.

Let us realize, however, that we have still much to learn. The factories to fabricate these planes, and particularly the mechanics to construct and maintain the planes, cannot be created overnight.

TRAINING MECHANICS

Maine has reason to be gratified that it has been selected as a pioneer in the mechanical training of our youth in the

schools that have been established by the National Youth Administration at Quoddy, at Dexter, and at Houlton. Ground training to service airplanes and mechanical training to serve in their construction is already being given to Maine boys and to boys from all over New England and New York here in eastern Maine. Maine Yankees take naturally to machines. Henry Ford characterized New England as the greatest reservoir of mechanical genius the world has ever known.

Substantial expansion of these schools may be expected under the great program that is now planned. The trail here has been blazed and the courses of instruction developed which are imperatively required in connection with the training and equipment of the boys who are to be the backbone of our defense.

Washington is still intoxicated to some extent with talk of billions, with all too little realization of the things that are required to produce the planes, the tanks, the guns, the gas masks, the airplane detectors, and all other paraphernalia of modern war.

EXPANDING PLANT FACILITIES

In the past year under the stimulus of orders from the Allies we have expanded our production capacity from 6,000 to 12,000 planes a year, or 1,000 planes a month, which is about one-third of what it is believed Germany can now turn out.

The President suggests a production capacity of 50,000 planes a year and also a goal of 50,000 planes for our defense.

This means quadrupling our present plants and the personnel with which they must be manned.

Fifty thousand planes mean a million men upon the ground and in the air with all the varied training that is required to service these complex giants.

AIR BASES FOR MAINE

The Army has repeatedly shown great interest in the development of a modern air base somewhere here in central Maine. A glance at the globe will make the reason for this interest easily apparent. The great circle from Europe passes close by our shores. Already the Army Air Corps has urged the development of 12 advance air bases in Maine. This crisis seems likely to supply the funds.

Let us not delude ourselves, however, with the idea that our problem is solved by a billion-dollar appropriation. Enormous executive and engineering talent is required to make this program a reality.

DEFENSE DEFICIENCIES

More than $6,000,000,000 has been expended for defense in the past 6 years. Aside from a first-class navy, our defenses are lamentably deficient. Our Army, our Air Corps, and our coast defenses are a travesty so far as adequate supplies of modern mechanized equipment are concerned.

One of the first problems that must be faced is the question of curtailing shipments to the Allied Powers. The President has strongly urged that the Allies shall be permitted to receive the planes now under order or that may be ordered during the coming year. This inevitably means that our requirements will be met somewhat more slowly during the next 18 months, while production capacity is being expanded.

PLANT CAPACITY

Some suggest that with an inadequate air force it is unwise for us to export planes. Let us realize, however, that the primary problem with planes is capacity to produce. Planes are not like ships, or even guns, but far more nearly resemble shells.

Germany has superiority in the air not only because of the great number of high-speed planes in the air but more especially because of the capacity to turn out 3,000 planes a month to replace the thousand planes a week that are the toll of total war.

Let us realize that lifting the embargo—for which I voted along with Senators HALE and TAFT and AUSTIN and Congressman WADSWORTH—has meant a greatly expanded productive capacity for planes here in America, and that is a tremendous asset, as we now discover.

RESEARCH IS KEY

Research and constant progress in plane types and performance is the key to success coupled with the factory facilities to produce. Henry Ford and General Motors might well be called in to advise on the organization of American industry to turn out planes. Research in America has been woefully neglected as Lindbergh has repeatedly pointed out.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Meanwhile in the same neutrality legislation it was provided that American ships should stay out of the war zones. This has meant that not a single American ship has been lost while 652 ships were being sunk. Nearly half of those belonged to neutrals.

Sinking of American ships and the loss of American lives was one of the chief causes of our entering the last war. That cause has been practically eliminated by the legislation of last fall.

Opponents of this policy objected that we were sacrificing the American merchant marine. The American merchant marine, however, today is experiencing a prosperity it has not known for 20 years. Ships are commanding tremendous prices for sale or charter. Congress has just been compelled to release 112 ships over 20 years old to supply the insatiable demand for shipping.

That fear for our shipping has been shown to be groundless.

It is gratifying to find America becoming air-minded. The lessons of Europe do not seem likely to be lost.

If it were not for the thousand planes that America has furnished to the Allies during this past year since the lifting of the embargo the Allies today would be even more hopelessly outclassed. It is probably no exaggeration to say that without the aid America has been able to furnish in equipment the German prospects of victory today would be far better than the 50-50 estimate that is now accorded to them in Washington.

The German "blitzkrieg" has also probably been precipitated by the growing menace of American production which threatened in another year to tip the balance perhaps decisively in favor of the Allies. Hitler evidently decided the war must be settled now, if ever.

Without a decisive victory this summer, Hitler is probably condemned to slow starvation in a military sense by lack of the essential materials that are required for the conduct of modern war and are measurably being eliminated by the British blockade.

RUBBER, TIN, AND MANGANESE

We realize suddenly here in America that our civilization seems to be dependent upon rubber and tin and manganese. We look to our supplies and find them coming across 6,000 miles of ocean with less than 6 months' stock on hand.

This indicates it is time for taking very serious thought. It is high time that we made a careful survey to determine to what extent the resources of the Western Hemisphere may be sufficient to supply our needs.

Curiously enough, a Maine boy, Lieutenant Commander Talbot, of Portland, has written one of the most authoritative articles upon the subject of the resources of the Western Hemisphere published in the proceedings of the Naval Institute.

Maine has manganese deposits that are even now being explored to determine their extent and quality.

Maine may be able to make a substantial contribution to our immediate task of liberating America from dependence upon overseas supplies of this essential material in the making of modern steel. The difference in cost of production on account of the difference in quality of the manganese ore is, of course, a factor of no importance in the event of a major crisis.

These deposits have long been known in Aroostook and Hancock Counties and elsewhere in Maine, but their major

significance has only been brought home to us by the events of recent days in Europe.

BERYLLIUM

Maine also possesses what are the largest deposits of beryllium in America if not in the world. Reports have been current for some time that beryllium alloys may be the key to some of the amazing German progress in the air. These alloys are by far the lightest and toughest ever produced and may be used both for bearings and also possibly for casing pilot's cabins to stop bullets.

A reducing plant for beryllium has been started in the United States recently, and experiments are now in process with test orders by the War Department. Curiously enough it now develops that in handling beryllium we are dependent upon American patents owned in Germany.

These resources emphasize the strategic significance of Maine in consideration of American defense. Perhaps America will not abandon us to the European vultures.

Tin, however, must come from Bolivia and rubber from Brazil, its native home.

It is interesting to note that James G. Blaine, of Maine, as Secretary of State 50 years ago was one of the first in high position to urge the wisdom of cultivating far more intimate relations with our neighbors to the south.

Today it is imperative. Not a day must now be lost. Any menace to America will come either across the Atlantic from the northeast or will approach us from south. First may come peaceful penetration of South American countries by alien systems from Europe or Asia. This will present increasingly difficult problems to combat. European cultural and commercial approaches may be in very attractive form, particularly to the Latin temperament, with which we here have taken far too little pains to become familiar.

South America may very properly be considered our Achilles' heel.

With the continued cultivation of more intimate relations with our South American friends must go far more adequate preparation for defense of the Americas, particularly in the air and in the mechanized marvels or monsters that are abroad in the world today.

Great Britain, France, and their allies have approximately $9,000,000,000 in credits available in the United States to supply the sinews of modern war. This is sufficient to supply the British needs for approximately 2 years. This means it is not necessary now to consider modification of the Johnson Act.

NO WAR FEVER

The mothers of Maine will be interested and reassured to know that in Washington there is less evidence of war fever than anywhere else in the United States.

Within the past week I have heard several leading Members of the Senate on both sides express themselves in the strongest terms publicly and privately against United States involvement in the European war.

On the other hand, there is everywhere evident the firmest determination that America shall be far more adequately prepared, and that without delay.

In the past 6 years more than $6,000,000,000 has been appropriated for defense by the Congress—practically every dollar that the administration has requested. In addition, more than $15,000,000,000 has been poured out in projects outside normal governmental activities simply to create work.

Now evidence indicates that our defenses are woefully inadequate, particularly in the instruments of modern war on land and in the air. The Navy is first rank in quality and quantity except—and this is a big exception—except that it is deplorably weak in aircraft.

Recent months have indicated this deficiency might well be fatal in the days ahead.

MAINE AIR BASE

Maine has a vital stake with 2,000 miles of tidal coast line holding out welcoming arms to Europe with convenient aerial stepping stones all along the way—in Iceland, Greenland, and Newfoundland.

We must think not in terms of today when we may still be reasonably secure but of the tomorrow that rushes on us as relentlessly as the hosts that have poured over Poland, Norway, and the Netherlands in very recent months.

Maine must have an adequate air base, and that without delay. Here pilots may be trained to scout the stormy North Atlantic in weather very different from what our Navy enjoys at Pensacola or San Diego.

Here pilots may learn to operate in all the kinds of weather that Maine may offer at all seasons of the year. Familiarity with the fog banks off our coast and with the tricks of wind and storm may some day be a vital factor in our aerial defense. Now is the time to train the boys against the need that may some time arise, in justice to the boys and to the country they seek to serve.

To fail now to train our youth in the instrumentalities of a modern mechanized defense is flying in the face of the plain lessons of events across the seas. It is like giving them bows and arrows to defend the land they love.

NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT

Preparation prompt and adequate is now the order of the day. Planes must be provided and pilots must be trained. The existing naval program must be vigorously carried out. In my report on the Navy only 2 years ago it was necessary to point out that our fleet then lacked 40 destroyers and 17 submarines that were then authorized by existing law. Kittery and Bath must be kept constantly busy in essential replacements for the next 10 years.

Meanwhile the Regular Army and the National Guard must be adequately equipped. The picture at Plattsburg last summer at the National Guard maneuvers was pitiful. I wondered what was passing through the mind of the German military attaché as he watched our guard in training with a 75-percent deficiency in the equipment required to meet the demands of the modern military machine.

Those intricate mechanisms cannot be created in a moment nor can even the mechanical genius of a New England Yankee be expected to learn overnight how to operate or repair a sound detector for air attacks.

But let us always remember that putting our domestic house in order is the first step in an adequate defense. The sinews of modern war are found first in a sound economy.

A $45,000,000,000 DEBT

Pitiful as is the condition of certain phases of our military preparation let us realize that a $45,000,000,000 debt and a budget continuously out of balance by more than $3,000,000,000 is our most serious handicap in preparing to defend the United States. Twenty-five years ago America had practically no national debt.

Let the people of America resolve to place high on their list of defense needs a budget honestly and annually balanced. We shall have then taken the first great step in preparing an adequate defense against foes from without or from "fifth columns" and "Trojan horses" within. This will mean that this generation of Americans is ready to pay the price of life in the modern world.

GUIDANCE OF GOD

Let us also remember that man shall not live by bread alone. In this time of world travail let us keep ever in mind that while our grandfathers were wresting this wilderness from the savage and converting the forests into farms creating a free America that has been the envy of the world they also found time to build churches. Let us see that they are occupied. At this memorial season let us make very sure that America is still mindful of the spiritual impulses that gave us birth and have guided us for three centuries.

With that inspiration America cannot fail. The faith of our fathers will not falter before the fear of foreign foes.

America is still prepared to defend its faith in the free government of a free people in the American hemisphere.

America will be united in a great crusade to save the American way of life under the guidance of an Almighty God.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state I am happy to support the National Defense bill which is before the Congress today. It has been my firm belief for sometime that our country should further prepare itself for any type of eventuality. With the war demons and warmongers of Europe—those who care nothing for the rights of people—surprising us every day and shocking the world with each news despatch, it would, indeed, be unthinkable to fail to appropriately and effectively prepare to protect our Nation. We have a country and a form of government—a great democracy, yes, a workable democracy—which are worth perpetuating and protecting to the fullest extent.

For this Congress or any Congress to be unmindful and oblivious to its duty in this connection would be unpardonable. I am happy to say I have supported every national-defense measure which has been before the Congress since becoming a Member of this body. Certainly, I favor authorizing and appropriating sums of money now and in the future which will adequately protect this country, its citizens, and institutions from attack by any country or combination of countries.

Would-Be Dictators Out in the Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Thompson, Harold Ickes, and other new dealers have so far forgotten the Nation which has given them their opportunities, they unwittingly or otherwise preach a doctrine which would destroy it. They not only "bite the hand that feeds them" but they "befoul their own nest" by advocating a policy which would bring to us the tyranny, the brutality, and the destruction which is now sweeping Europe.

A logical statement of such activities is given in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 23:

DISLOYALTY TO AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

The efforts of the third termers and Mr. Roosevelt to silence the Republican opposition by trying to form what is called a coalition government to meet what is called national emergency reveal how far away they are from the ideas, traditions, and practices of the American Republic. The purpose of the New Deal proposals, supported by people who no longer pretend to keep the United States first in their thoughts, was to blanket the Republican convention and, indeed, to suggest that it would be unpatriotic for the party to make nominations and conduct a political campaign at this time.

No politicians or self-seekers who had not already in their own plans junked the entire American system of representative government, with an executive dependent for office upon the consent of the people, could come before the public at this or any other time with any sort of an intimation that political action be suspended. Only persons who wish to get rid of government by consent would put forth such ideas.

We have known occasions when it was necessary for loyal Americans to support a government regardless of their party affiliations. That meant that when the national welfare required it, the party of opposition did not seek partisan advantages by maneuvering against the administration. Some of the political tactics which were regarded as permissible in normal times were thought discreditable when a united national effort was needed. There has never been any difference of opinion about this. But no one really loyal to American principles can propose that a political party shall not hold its convention, nominate its candidates, and conduct a campaign for their election.

In 1864 Lincoln went into a campaign for renomination and the Republican Party felt that the outcome was uncertain. The party made a concession to Democrats who wished to support it by putting Lincoln on what was called a Union ticket. But it did not think its Democratic opposition should not nominate a candidate or that the people of the country should not have the right to reject the policies of the administration if that was their desire. There was no question about the national emergency in 1864. It wasn't as great as the anxious Unionists thought it was in its military aspects, but it was in its political phase because a great many people did want to stop the war.

No persons in authority have ever proposed heretofore that American citizens be denied their franchise rights or that a party be required to suspend its activities, whether the country was at war or not. The country is not at war now. It is yet to be determined that the majority of American people now would want to face any emergency under an administration that has proved it couldn't run the country in peacetime, an administration which has already put the United States at a disadvantage financially for any great additional undertaking. The very excitement which that administration is now raising about emergency and defense is an admission of its incompetence in times of peace to give the Nation the safeguards it says are necessary.

This is just such a time as requires the adherence, without hindrance, to the full use of American franchise rights and political privileges. Whoever tries to promote the idea that the Republicans should not nominate the strongest ticket the party can present and make the strongest campaign it can against the policies prevailing in Washington is, in truth, disloyal to what makes America a land of free people. He is promoting the cause of dictatorship and he is doing so either because he is emotionally unbalanced or because he is craftily seeking to undermine a form of government he does not like.

The Requirement of a Poll Tax as a Prerequisite to Voting Is a Dilution of Democracy and a Violation of Basic Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

STATEMENT BY PROF. EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a statement in support of my anti-poll-tax bill—H. R. 7534—written by Prof. Eduard C. Lindeman, professor of social philosophy at the New York School of Social Work. He believes that we are moving toward a moral crisis and that we and our generation will have to show our faith in democracy by eliminating with courage all vestiges of anti-democratic regulations, such as the poll-tax requirement. Under the permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include Professor Lindeman's statement:

Having once been a resident of a Southern State I have a deep realization of the disastrous effects which the Civil War brought to this region. One of the chief of these consequences may be designated as economic, political, and cultural lag; the South did not and could not keep pace with progress attained in the North and the West. Happily, however, these various lags are slowly being overcome. The bitterness of feeling between the North and the South was all but eliminated during the last World War, and economic and cultural relations between the two sections have constantly improved. The South is once more taking its rightful place in a unified nation.

There remain, nevertheless, certain aspects of lag which seem to me to endanger, not merely the future of the South, but also that of the Nation as a whole. One of these remnants of a former fear is the existence of a poll tax in eight of the Southern States. Such

a tax no longer exists in any other modern democratic nation and it should be eliminated as quickly as possible. I am glad to see that the progressively minded citizens of these States are devoting themselves to this task. I realize that this goal can be achieved more quickly by means of Federal action and I have, therefore, alined myself with those who are striving to bring about the enactment of the Geyer bill, H. R. 7534.

There remains in my mind not the slightest doubt concerning the desirability, the legality, nor the practicality of this proposed legislation. So long as the poll tax exists, the people of the Southern States will not exercise a genuinely representative role in American life. Their Representatives in Congress are at present the delegates of minute minorities, and if democracy is to survive we must rest our judgments upon the will of true majorities. Indeed, I can discover no argument in logic nor in recent experience which justifies the continuation of this undemocratic practice in a nation which is by declaration and tradition a democracy.

Like many other reforms of a similar nature, the chief impediment is habit. I have a strong feeling that on the day which sees the abolishment of the poll tax there will come to the minds of southern men and women a sense of profound relief, a clarifying feeling that at least this section has brought its political practices into alinement with those of the remainder of the country. Our Nation seems now to be moving steadily and implacably toward a great moral crisis; we and our generation will be required once more to validate our belief in the democratic way of life. The best way of bringing our faith into conformity with our practices is to eliminate with courage all vestiges of antidemocratic regulations. In a democracy the right to vote is a basic human right which rests upon the person and not upon his property. The payment of a fee for the privilege of voting belongs to the age of feudalism. It constitutes for our time a perversion of the meaning of freedom.

Hence, I repeat, I aline myself gladly with those liberal citizens of the Southern States who have dedicated themselves to the achievement of this reform. Those who have not given the matter in hand their earnest thought seem to believe that it is a question which concerns only the eight States where poll-tax systems still prevail. This is a grievous error. To admit that democratic methods are desirable in one section of a supposedly democratic country and to deny their validity and practicability in another section is to assume that democracy is a privilege for a selected fraction of our citizenship. This amounts to a denial of the essence of the democratic principle. There are at present hundreds of thousands of American citizens with full constitutional rights for the exercise of their suffrage who now do not vote, and the poll tax is one of the principal deterrents. Representatives from some of these States come to Congress on the support of less than 2 percent of the population of their districts. To call this a democratic system of representation is to reduce democracy to the level of absurdity and shame. Heaven knows, the antidemocratic leaders of other nations can find enough flaws in our democracy, but we should not leave ourselves vulnerable at this obvious point.

A Department of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on May 23, 1940, on the subject A Department of National Defense.

Ladies and gentlemen, 23 years ago tonight America was an armed camp, having been at a state of war with Germany a short period of over 30 days.

Congress was in session, President Wilson was given emergency powers, industry and manpower was mobilized in a supreme effort to defend our national honor, and, as we were told, to make the world safe for democracy.

On November 11, 1918, an armistice was signed, hostilities ceased, battle lines disappeared, and the air was rent with joyous sounds as bedlam broke forth in relentless fury heralding the end of the conflict. America was at peace—the war was over.

With grateful hearts and a prayer on their lips the people of America turned their attention to the many tasks yet to be accomplished. From the tomb of the past came the sound of the voice of the Great Emancipator—Abraham Lincoln—who in surveying the ruins of the Civil War uttered this advice to a heart-weary people:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

With these words ringing in their ears the American people began to realize and experience the aftermath of war.

While they lovingly buried their dead, and with compassion for the sick and wounded caused veteran hospitals to be erected almost overnight, the world's greatest depression invaded the business and industrial life of this prosperous Nation. Millions found themselves unemployed, the economic stability of our Nation was destroyed, and America was face to face with the grim reality that war is not ended on the battlefield.

From the day America entered the World War it was realized that we as a nation were woefully unprepared, and the conviction grew that never again must the security and peace of the American people be jeopardized.

While America proceeded in an orderly way to rebuild its military defenses a series of armament-reduction programs were accepted by the major nations of the world which had as their objective world peace.

As a nation we religiously adhered to all treaties as a result of the World War, as well as armament-reduction programs, thus assuming a stationary position, and did nothing to promote our national-defense program. While enjoying this period of world peace, the utter disregard of certain nations became apparent as they proceeded to cast caution to the winds in their feverish anxiety to provide for what they termed their economic needs. Under this guise there developed dictatorships, who, in pursuance of their objectives, launched a period of ruthless and relentless persecution of peaceful nations that gave birth to World War No. 2.

As the world gazed in stricken horror at the invasion of the Lowlands and saw Holland and Belgium in turn devoured by the world's mightiest military machine, once more the attention of the American people was called to the necessity of an adequate national defense.

President Roosevelt, in a surprise and dramatic appearance before a joint session of Congress, revealed in no uncertain terms that the clear fact is the American people must recast their thinking about national protection.

In other words, from the lips of our Chief Executive—the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States—came the frank admission that streamlining our national defense is the paramount question of the hour.

With the President's message came a literal command, Awake, America! echoing those prophetic words uttered by the late Gen. William Mitchell, World War hero, who, in 1929, said:

"The coming of air power has made a greater difference in war than anything in history. Armies are mere holders of land. During the war armies only moved back and forth for 60 miles and killed hundreds of thousands. That isn't war—war is getting at the vital centers of the enemy—where they live, their food, their communications. Air power can go straight to them now, 3,000 miles away, and destroy.

"What we need in this country is a single department of national defense, with a separate department for air force, Navy, and Army. Until we have that we cannot protect ourselves. No rules or regulations or treaties can do away with the necessity of protecting ourselves. If we don't protect ourselves, no one else will."

This timely warning from an unsung hero fell on deaf ears, but there is no man to deny the truthful accuracy of what was then considered a bold assertion.

Billy Mitchell, as he was affectionately called by those who admired him as a friend, evidently knew whereof he spoke.

One has only to consider the development of the German military machine of today compared with 1914. For the past 7 years Hitler has directed the energies of the second greatest industrial country in the world toward a single national objective. Spending close to $40,000,000,000 in 7 years, there has emerged the greatest and most powerful military machine the world has ever known. Functioning at top speed, there is unfolded before the eyes of the world the threatened destruction of our former Allies—France and Great Britain.

As this mighty military machine rolls on in ruthless fashion, the Congress of the United States is eager to approve the Chief Executive's request for additional millions of dollars for national defense. Partisan politics give way to love of country and a desire to protect our most cherished possessions—peace and freedom.

In keeping with the spirit and purpose of the President's solemn warning that we in effect streamline our national defense, there is a crying need that the words of the late Billy Mitchell be translated into positive action.

The American people are entitled to a survey of our national-defense policies which will determine the following pertinent facts:

I. The area we as a nation are expected to defend.

II. The cost of adequately protecting such area.

III. The adequacy of our present national-defense system.

IV. The advisability of a separate department of national defense to insure cooperation, efficiency, and economy among our defense forces.

The findings of such a survey will give the American people a comprehensive picture of the needs of their national defense, and

once they know the area to be defended, money and manpower will unite in true American fashion in defense of their liberties.

No one will deny in the light of present world conditions that America must expand its national defenses immediately. With Congress ready to appropriate billions of dollars the time is ripe for an immediate and thorough survey to develop a maximum of security at a minimum cost.

The necessity of such a survey was conveyed to Congress when on January 10, 1940, it was my privilege to introduce House Joint Resolution 417 which provides for a Commission to survey the national-defense requirements and resources of the United States. This Commission will be truly representative of the American people since it will be composed of Members of the House of Representatives, Senate of the United States, Cabinet officers or their representatives, representatives of agriculture, labor, business, industry, and finance, retired Army and Navy officers, two aviators with at least 10 years of experience, and two women recognized for their mercies in wartime.

Under the terms of this resolution this group will function for the purpose of placing in the hands of Congress information necessary for legislation as a result of their comprehensive survey and study of the national defense, including the following:

1. The advisability of completely revising the National Defense Act in the light of events in Europe and Asia and the need for legislation to establish a peacetime defensive system, based upon the national objectives of the United States, which can be rapidly expanded into a wartime defensive system, which will carry out the national objectives of the United States.

2. The advisability of establishing a Department of National Defense, under which the armed forces of the United States would be combined and coordinated to provide for a more adequate national defense in any emergency.

3. The practicability under a Department of National Defense of promoting and accomplishing among all branches of the armed forces (a) coordination of effort and efficiency, (b) savings in purchases of military and naval material, (c) unified responsibility, and (d) elimination of duplication of effort and conflict of authority.

4. The advisability of establishing a National Defense Planning Board to formulate a long-range national-defense policy that has sufficient flexibility to meet any changes required by developments and maintain an orderly, progressive program.

5. The advisability of expanding and speeding the naval program and to examine the necessity for what is known as a two-ocean Navy.

6. The advisability of further expansion of the air forces of the Army and Navy, the number and type of planes required, and a coordinated program and policy for training personnel and cooperation between Army and naval air operations.

7. The advisability of granting Government subsidies to commercial air lines, requiring their transport planes to be convertible bombers and specifying that their pilots be commissioned in the Reserve Corps of the Army and Navy.

8. The advisability of perfecting a comprehensive program for rapidly mobilizing industry and commercial shipping into a defensive force.

9. The advisability of supplementing educational orders by providing an adequate liquid fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of National Defense for the encouragement of inventions, research, experiment, and development of arms, munitions, and implements of war.

10. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, the declaration of Panama, and the pledges made in the name of the United States by the Chief Executive to defend Canada in the event of an armed attack by any other power.

11. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States in the Philippines if and when that Commonwealth becomes independent in 1946.

12. The advisability of formulating a definite military and naval program in keeping with the announced policy of the United States in the Orient and the possessions of the United States from the Aleutian Islands to the Samoan Islands.

13. The advisability of acquiring territory in the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea which might serve as enemy bases.

In other words, what I proposed in this resolution to Congress last January was that we should do a thorough job of surveying our resources of national defense before taking any action.

If the National Defense Act should be dusted off with a view of making necessary amendments—if the Navy should be overhauled fore and aft; if the Army should be given a rigid inspection; if we must secure islands in the Atlantic and Pacific to serve as air bases; if we need a separate Department of National Defense; if we need 50,000 airplanes—then in the name of God and in memory of those who gave their all that this country might enjoy peace and freedom, let us do the job without delay.

Common sense tells us that instead of doing a piecemeal patchwork job that might find us almost as unprepared as we were in 1917, the national defense must be examined and explored from every angle—to the end that an up-to-the-minute policy can be established and place us in readiness to meet any emergency.

The cry of Keep America Out of War! is ringing in the ears of every American. The bitter memories of the World War are still fresh in the minds of all of us. Who can forget the horrors of the last World War that took from home, office, and factory the flower of American manhood, whose blood later irrigated the meadows of Europe? Who can forget the human aftermath of the World War, with its toll of wrecked bodies, economic depressions, and huge national debts?

The American people hate war, but in these trying days they recognize that the only way to avoid war is to maintain military defenses that will keep America safe, thereby adhering to the philosophy of the great American, Theodore Roosevelt—"Speak softly, but carry a big stick."

That is the type of national defense the American people want, should have, and are entitled to; and, with such national protection, every American mother will have the assurance that her son will not follow the pathway of the youth of 1917—to join in death those brave young Americans who now sleep in Flanders fields.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for national defense the Army School of Nursing should be reestablished for these reasons:

To insure adequate nursing care to the increased numbers in the Army and affiliated services.

To insure adequate nursing care to the civilian population which would be definitely impaired by the recruiting of nurses into the Red Cross for Army use.

To protect the sick, both now and in the immediate and later future, against the lowering of the standards governing the training and accrediting for service of that group of the general services caring for the sick known as registered nurses.

To protect the civilian sick, as well as the Army, from the inefficient unskilled care of inadequately trained groups.

Shut down in 1932 after a very fine record, the framework is still in existence and it should be reopened.

Entrance requirements should be:

1. College:

(a) To give maturity to the service.

(b) To give constructive occupation to a group who have found it exceedingly difficult going and who are especially well fitted for nursing training.

(c) To set up a method that will not draw from civilian nursing schools and so deplete the ranks of nursing in the United States.

(d) Retain high standards of nursing that our sick may be assured proper nursing care in the future.

2. Two units could be opened at once, one at Walter Reed, Washington, D. C., and one at Fort Letterman, Calif.

RED CROSS NURSES

These are recruited from the all too inadequate number of civilian nurses.

To deplete these ranks will very quickly demoralize the civilian population, as was demonstrated conclusively during the first World War.

Therefore, there should be immediate reopening of the Walter Reed and Fort Letterman units of the Army School of Nursing.

If this seems reasonable, there can readily be prepared cost figures as well as estimates of numbers, and so forth.

The Life, Character, and Unselfish Accomplishments of Mrs. Nettie Coryell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I am delighted to include a brief statement con-

cerning the outstanding work of a very personal friend of mine, Mrs. Nettie Coryell, of Chickasha, Okla., whom I have known for nearly a quarter of a century. She is the efficient, tireless, and much-beloved home-demonstration agent for Grady County, Okla., which position she has held for many years. The life and character of Mrs. Coryell is one that the present generation, as well as generations yet unborn, might well emulate. Mrs. Coryell is active in church and civic work and never too busy to lend a helping hand to those in need. The splendid unselfish service rendered by this good lady to the women of Grady County cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Her very useful life will long remain a beacon light for others.

Although she is now in her seventy-seventh year, Mrs. Coryell is one of the most energetic, hard-working, and best-beloved women in the State of Oklahoma. I am indebted to my good friend, George Crouse, a young newspaperman, of Chickasha, Okla., for the information set forth herewith. I agree heartily with him that the world needs more Mrs. Nettie Coryells.

In reply to a letter from me requesting some data and other information about this unusual lady, Mr. Crouse writes:

DEAR JED: I do not know exactly what information you desired about Mrs. Coryell, but to what I have written I might add a warning to you, or any other man, to never attempt to accompany her on one of her daily jaunts, even if she is a mere youngster of 77, or nearly so.

I was foolish enough once to decide I would enjoy making the rounds with her, and came home worn out, dusty, and perplexed. How on earth does a woman her age manage to drive, get out of her car, open gates, walk over plowed ground to look over gardens, can a whole beef at a community demonstration, attend a couple of club meetings, talk her head off, go on to give a chicken-culling demonstration at another place in the afternoon, and then drive thirty or forty miles on home? It is too much for me, but perhaps you can answer it.

Understand, too, that Mrs. Coryell isn't just a home-demonstration agent. She is mother adviser, supreme lecturer, and a saint in the eyes of these women and girls. I have heard her talk religion, economics, sociology, farm engineering, and practically everything but politics. She's a born optimist, and the cheer and good faith she spreads has been worth several millions. The world needs more Mrs. Nettie Coryells. That's all.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE H. CROUSE.

The statement follows:

A quarter of a century ago Mrs. Nettie Coryell, dean of Oklahoma home-demonstration agents, started out with a candy bucket to spread her teaching in home building, culinary art, needlecraft, and carry her philosophy and optimism to farms of Grady County.

That candy bucket served as an improvised fireless cooker and was the first utensil used by Mrs. Coryell in a work that today reaches 1,056 women in 47 home-demonstration clubs, and 750 girls in 37 4-H Clubs in communities throughout the county.

Just how strongly that work has affected the lives in farm homes may be understood when one realizes that not a single home-demonstration club woman has been listed as a relief client during the 25 years Mrs. Coryell has served them and her county.

She will round out her quarter of a century of service next August, and November 4, she will reach her seventy-seventh birthday, and it is doubtful that any younger woman serving as a home-demonstration agent is any more active. Mrs. Coryell travels many miles daily in her visits with women's and girls' clubs, giving demonstrations in canning, culling farm flocks, and attending to many other lines that she regards her duties.

She was born November 4, 1863, on a farm in Winnebago County, Ill., and moved with her parents to Crawford County, Kans., in 1868. She was married in 1894 and her husband was the late Dr. Martin Coryell Mrs. Coryell is the mother of three children, two of them living.

Something of the background where Mrs. Coryell was prepared for the many offices she fills as county home-demonstration agent may be gained from a study of her early life. She attended rural schools and a county normal, received a teacher's certificate in 1879, attended high school in Girard, Kans., then taught in the rural schools in that county. She continued teaching until 1884, when she was appointed a deputy county clerk of Crawford County, Kans., holding that position 4 years. She continued her studies while teaching in the Girard city schools.

In 1894 she married Martin Coryell, a country doctor, and lived on a 20-acre farm, where they kept cows and poultry that paid the expenses of their household. She organized a neighborhood reading club, worked in the rural church and Sunday school, and nursed the sick in nearby homes. In 1905 the Coryells moved to Chickasha, Indian territory, and Mrs. Coryell served as field secretary of the United Charities here, a position she held when asked to enter the Extension Service.

In the first year Mrs. Coryell served as home-demonstration agent. Five women's clubs were organized in the county.

She estimates that during her 25 years of Extension Service in the county she has worked with around 7,000 individuals, and she believes work with food preservation alone has contributed $1,228,427.70 to farm incomes alone in Grady County. Approximately 135,831 garments and other articles have been made in home-improvement and clothing projects by women and girls.

During the 25 years of Extension Service Mrs. Coryell has traveled approximately 325,360 miles, 307,558 of which has been by auto. During the first few years she made her way about the county by rail and with a team. She has used 11 automobiles and drives from 50 to 100 miles daily now in making her daily rounds.

Legal Philosophy in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ARTICLE BY REV. LINUS A. LILLY, S. J.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very learned article on legal philosophy written by Rev. Linus A. Lilly, S. J., regent of the St. Louis University School of Law and an outstanding authority on constitutional law. It will be recalled that Father Lilly was called as an expert witness by the Senate Judiciary Committee during its deliberations on the bill that was proposed several years ago to enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court. I commend this splendid article to every Member of the House.

LEGAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Linus A. Lilly, regent of the School of Law, St. Louis University)

In our United States of America there has been comparatively little said and less written about legal philosophy. Yet our people have done more than any other nation of modern times to make law and government philosophical in a true sense. Our reticence in matters of philosophical discussion and our failure to produce a legal literature, available for teachers and students, became emphatically plain some 30 years ago, when the Association of American Law Schools undertook the task of promoting the study of legal philosophy. A committee, appointed to inaugurate the work of encouraging philosophical study of the law, learned not only that American scholarship had nothing adequate to offer but that practically no treatises or suitable sources for study were to be found in the English language. They therefore deemed it necessary to begin the labor of translating works produced by continental scholars. After about 15 years of very commendable work the Modern Legal Philosophical Series, in 12 volumes, was offered to the law schools and law students of the United States. (Modern Legal Philosophy Series (New York, the Macmillan Co.).) Apparently, there are no encouraging results to indicate that the laudable purposes of the association and the committee have been attained.

Law school professors, members of committees, and translators were all, no doubt, inspired by one aim and hope, that of encouraging and supporting a more thorough and general study of legal philosophy. They are neither to be charged nor credited with sponsoring the type of teaching contained in the Modern Legal Philosophical Series. To a very great extent the teaching of the series is such that imputed authorship or support might be considered as constituting a very grave charge. This fact, rather than a marked decline in the philosophical movement from the enthusiasm which characterized its inception, may account for the failure of the philosophical series to exercise an appreciable influence on the study of law in the United States. Since the authors repeatedly inculcate theories that are directly hostile to elementary principles of popular government, we may count the absence of effect upon our legal thought as a fortunate escape rather than a serious loss. Inasmuch as law follows philosophy even as action follows thought, it is not difficult to trace in the works of Von Ihering, Berolzheimer, Stammler, and Kohler germinal principles of the state apotheosis and irresponsible arrogance which have darkened Europe with chaos and carnage. There is reason indeed to be profoundly grateful that our scholars have not produced so copiously the letter which may be lethal, and that leaders who organized and maintained our Government have been more effectively actuated by the spirit which leads to a more prosperous and contented life. However, the theories propounded in the series may serve as convenient and helpful bases for comparing and contrasting unproductive speculation with effective action.

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF OUR GOVERNMENT

Governmental organization began in the United States with an affirmation of faith in God. It began indeed where the Book of Genesis begins, with the assertion of man's creation, and the rights

guaranteed by the Creator. The men who established our Government were convinced that necessity compelled them to dissolve the bonds of political union which had connected them with another people. They announced, in severing ancient ties of political alliance and establishing a new and independent Government, that they were but assuming a separate and equal station—to which they were entitled by the laws of Nature and of Nature's God. In thus taking a place among the powers of the earth, they yielded to what they considered a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, both in declaring the compelling causes of separation and in giving a clear, succinct statement of their governmental philosophy. They put more sound philosophy of law and government into the Declaration of Independence than can be found in the 12 volumes of the Modern Legal Philosophy Series. As a matter of fact, the 12 volumes fail not only by deficiency, but advocate, or cite with approval, numerous statements and tenets which contradict implicitly or specifically, and positively and emphatically, cardinal concepts of democratic government.

Imbued with an abiding trust in Divine Providence, the Founding Fathers made manifest their belief in God as the foundation and inspiration of their political philosophy and faith. They not only grounded the colonial title to a separate national existence on the laws of Nature and of Nature's God but on analogous grounds they claimed for individuals as well, rights which were theirs because of their human nature and because of their creation. To them God was the Author of Being, the Source of Right, and the reason for their relation of equality, one with another. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that all are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Some who support and praise our form of government, speaking with more enthusiasm than accuracy, refer to our Constitution as if it were a source of right, or assert that certain immunities or privileges belong to them because they are given by the Constitution. Our Constitution is not, primarily, a source of right, nor is it, indeed, a philosophical document. It is rather an instrument, of practical nature, intended to translate into action the principles of the Declaration of Independence, making operative the philosophy the declaration teaches and correcting the abuses it enumerates. It is the proper function of government to protect rights, not to grant them. This was well understood by the founders of our Republic, and they did not desire to establish a Government that would or could be a source of right, for well they knew that a Nation, claiming the prerogative of granting rights, might insist on taking them away at will, without notice, and without reason, save that of Shylock, "It is my humor." They based their claims to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness on natural and divine law, believing it to be the major end and aim of human laws to protect, defend, and preserve the rights given to men by their Creator.

AN ANTIDEMOCRATIC THEORY

The authors of the Modern Legal Philosophy Series did not regard God as the Author of Being, the Source of right, the Reason for equality among men. When they evidence any comprehension of a supreme being, they propose some vague concept of the evolutionist or the pantheist, who usually begin with ruling God out of His universe and come finally to doubting or denying His existence. Witness, for instance, the words of an eminent jurist quoted in Stammler's Theory of Justice, "It is enough for us that the universe has produced us and has within it, as less than it, all that we believe and love." (Rudolph Stammler, The Theory of Justice, translation, Isaac Husik, New York, the Macmillan Co., 1935.) It seems to be a part of their consistent state deification, not only to assert that fundamental human rights are derived from state grant, but even to maintain, strangly enough, that men owe their being to the state. This is the doctrine of Rudolph Stammler—and it is not gleaned from his work by mere inference or interpretation. It is made manifest in clear and emphatic language scarcely susceptible of misunderstanding or misconstruction. "As an individual," says Stammler, "is and has nothing which he does not owe to the community to which he belongs, so every exclusive power of disposition that he has, comes to him from it" (ibid., p. 246). Lest this be taken as an isolated passage, another is offered with the assurance that these are representative of many more which could be cited but for limitations of space. "But the individual would not exist without the community. From the community he has received what he is and what he can do. He owes to the community his being, his true being" (ibid., p. 329).

Obviously if man owes to the state his being, all he is, all he has, and all he can do, he must look to the state for his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The author follows his deceptive premises to their logical, but pernicious, conclusion, and though it be only the consistency of delusion, Mr. Stammler is consistent. "The rights," he tells us, "which a man calls his own, he has because he has received them from the law" (ibid., p. 146). Again, as if to make this strange doctrine still more plain and emphatic, we are told by the same author: "The individual in himself, taken merely as such, is for social consideration nothing at all. He has not merely taken everything he has from the community, but is still continuing to take from it" (ibid., p. 347).

Mr. Stammler is not a solitary protagonist, nor does he bear a sole responsibility, in sponsoring theories that are distinctly antidemocratic. If called to bar for the doctrine herewith challenged, he might page his fellow countryman, another author of a volume in the Modern Legal Philosophical Series, a former president of the International Society of Legal and Economic Philosophy at Berlin. Fritz Berolzheimer, by way of supporting his colleague in denying the existence of inalienable rights derived from man's creation, would say, "There are no primitive or inalienable rights. Man acquires rights only as a member of a community" (Berolzheimer, the World's Legal Philosophies, translation, Rachel S. Jastrow (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1924), p. 197). Neither is Mr. Berolzheimer less bold than his brother philosopher in accepting the manifest corollaries of state creation and asserting the dependence of individuals as owing all they have to the state. "To the state," says Mr. Berolzheimer, "belong the people, the land, and the sovereignty. The sovereignty of the people is a meaningless term" (ibid., p. 257). He also joins Mr. Stammler in minimizing the importance of the individual. "The welfare of the individual," he tells us, "is never a purpose in itself, but ever a means of securing social welfare" (ibid., p. 247).

To show the sharp antithesis between the theories of these legal philosophers and the thought that has been dominant in the United States, the words of Mr. Justice James Wilson, in *Chisholm v. Georgia*, may be of value. On one side of this controversy was a sovereign state, and on the other, a lone individual. Mr. Wilson, writing an opinion in favor of the individual, insisted that he was interested in the cause, and not the parties, whether numerous and powerful on the one side or weak and alone on the other. "Causes," he said, "and not parties to causes, are weighed by Justice in her equal scales; on the former solely her attention is fixed; to the latter she is, as she is painted, blind" (Wilson, *Chisholm v. Georgia* (2 Dallas, 1893)).

EQUALITY OF INDIVIDUALS

That society can have no rights more sacred than those of the individual is a proposition that is basic in our philosophy of government. It is as an individual that man derives from his Creator rights so essential to human existence and human welfare, that they cannot be alienated. President Lincoln, at Gettysburg, bore witness that this truth, explicitly stated in the Declaration of Independence, remained as the warp in the woof of our political fabric. "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Whether or not they are impelled by force of logical sequence from other hostile tenets, eminent authors in the Legal Philosophy Series reject our structural principle of equality before the law. "Is the concept of justice," asks Von Ihering, "based upon the principle of equality in the law? What is there so great in equality that we measure the highest concept of right—for that is what justice is—by it? Why should law strive after equality, when all Nature denies it?" (Von Ihering, Law As a Means to an End, translation, Isaac Husik (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1924), p. 276). Lest Van Ihering appear unsustained by his fellow philosophers, we may call to his aid a comrade in fallacy, though not a countryman by birth, Leon Duguit. "Men are not born equal," observes Duguit, "they are born different. * * * The natural fact, as they called it in the eighteenth century, is not that men are equal but that they are unequal, and the general tendency of evolution is toward an even greater inequality" (Fouillee, Charmont, Duguit, and Demogue, Modern French Legal Philosophy, translation, Scott and Chamberlain (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 274). It may be very true that men differ widely in advantages and opportunities, in reputation and honor, in qualities and powers of mind and body; yet it is equally true that so far as regards the right to live, to enjoy liberty, to pursue happiness and trust in the law's protection, the greatest of mortal great and his lowest lackey stand together on terms of complete equality, just two free men in a free country.

SOURCE OF RIGHTS

Men are equal and endowed with the same natural rights, because they owe both their being and their rights to the Author of their common nature. If man is, by gift of God, vested with inalienable rights, he must be privileged to adopt such measures as seem to him best calculated to provide for their maintenance and enjoyment. This brings us directly to the obvious necessity and primal purpose of human authority, indicating that free and equal men may of right establish, preserve, and control governments, to promote their safety and happiness. Hence the statesmen who drafted our Declaration of Independence, after enumerating the principal inalienable rights of man, continued "To secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Essential as these truths clearly appear, consistent reason would seem to postulate their denial by the totalitarian philosophers—and these are not found wanting in the requirements of consistency. If men owe their being and all they have and can do to the State, if they belong to the State even as the soil of the earth, it must follow that they cannot establish, maintain, and control governments, and that there can be no derivation of power from the consent of the governed.

Readers therefore will suffer no shock of surprise when they find in the long-drawn chapters of Berolzheimer, "The sovereignty of the people is a meaningless term." Neither will they think it strange when they discover that the author makes his position even more emphatic by saying, "In its origin the state is remote from the will of the people" (Berolzheimer, op. cit., p. 257). Surprise, however, may be conceded as incident to intelligence, when readers meet Von Ihering's confirmation of his countryman's philosophy, "But the experience of all times has shown that the force of the state may have the entire population against it, and yet be in a position to maintain its power" (Von Ihering, op. cit., p. 236). This bewildering statement, a possible deduction from teachings of Stammler and Berolzheimer, is confirmed by Josef Kohler in propositions too long to be quoted here. (Kohler,

Philosophy of Law, translations, Adalbert Albrecht (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 294.) To make evident how far these eminent authors depart from our fundamental concepts of legal philosophy, Chief Justice Marshall may be cited as a competent witness. "That the people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected (Marshall, *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch, 137, 1803).

THE CONSTITUTION

Chief Justice Marshall, in the words cited from *Marbury* v. *Madison*, only paraphrased the sentiment expressed by those who formulated the fundamentals of our legal philosophy and who were planning even in 1776 to establish a new government, "laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form," as would seem to them "most likely to effect their safety and happiness." When Lexington and Yorktown had become memories of tragedy and triumph, and when the last argument of kings had ratified a resolution declaring the united colonies free and independent States, 55 men met in convention at Philadelphia to frame a constitution for the United States of America. Being ordained and established by solemn sanction of a free people, this document made effectively enduring the assertions of liberty proclaimed amid the opening cannonades of revolution. Powers of government were distributed among three departments, each being limited to its proper sphere of action and prevented from encroaching upon or absorbing specific functions of the other two. Rights considered too valuable to be jeopardized by current changes in national policy, were made expressly exempt from possible invasion or violation by either legislative or executive authority. Powers of government could be exercised only by consent of the governed, because the people retained within their own firm grasp effective means of ultimate control.

Constitutional government in our country has proved to be a most successful agency in translating few, but exceedingly comprehensive, philosophical principles into vital and lasting realization. Experience under a written constitution, through a century and a half of vigorous, national growth, has shown with conclusive emphasis that the people of the United States of America, who have said and written so little about legal philosophy, have indeed done very much to make the law of the land follow and interpret philosophical truth.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered last evening by the President of the United States over a Nation-wide radio hook-up on the subject of national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this moment of sadness throughout most of the world, I want to talk with you about a number of subjects that directly affect the future of the United States. We are shocked by the almost incredible stories that come to us of what is happening at this moment to the civilian populations of Norway and Holland and Belgium and Luxembourg and France.

I think it is right on this Sabbath evening that I should say a word in behalf of women and children and old men who need help—immediate help in their present distress—help from us across the seas, from us who are still free to give it.

Tonight over the once peaceful roads of Belgium and France millions are now moving, running from their homes to escape bombs and shells and fire, without shelter, and almost wholly without food. They stumble on, knowing not where the end of the road will be. I remind you of these people because each one of you that is listening to me tonight has a way of helping them. The American Red Cross, which represents each of us, is rushing food, clothing, and medical supplies to these destitute millions. Please—I beg you—give according to your means to your nearest Red Cross chapter; give as generously as you can. I ask this in the name of our common humanity.

Let us sit down again together, you and I, to consider our own pressing problems that confront us.

There are many among us who in the past closed their eyes to events abroad, because they believed in utter good faith what some of their fellow Americans told them—that what was taking place in Europe was none of our business; that no matter what happened over there, the United States could always pursue its peaceful and unique course in the world.

There are many among us who closed their eyes, from lack of interest or lack of knowledge; honestly and sincerely thinking that the many miles of salt water made the American hemisphere so remote that the people of North, Central, and South America could go on living in the midst of their vast resources without reference to, or danger from, other continents of the world.

There are some among us who were persuaded by minority groups that we could maintain our physical safety by retiring within our continental boundaries—the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, Canada on the north, and Mexico on the south. I illustrated the futility—the impossibility—of that idea in my message to the Congress last week. Obviously, a defense policy based on that is merely to invite future attack.

And, finally, there are a few among us who have deliberately and consciously closed their eyes, because they were determined to be opposed to their Government's foreign policy, to be partisan, and to believe that anything that the Government did was wholly wrong.

To those who have closed their eyes for any of these many reasons, to those who would not admit the possibility of the approaching storm—to all of them the past 2 weeks have meant the shattering of many illusions.

They have lost the illusion that we are remote and isolated and, therefore, secure against the dangers from which no other land is free.

In some quarters, with this rude awakening has come fear bordering on panic. It is said that we are defenseless. It is whispered by some that only by abandoning our freedom, our ideals, our way of life, can we build our defenses adequately, can we match the strength of the aggressors.

I did not share those illusions. I do not share these fears.

We are now more realistic. But let us not be calamity howlers and discount our strength. Let us have done with both fears and illusions. On this Sabbath evening, in our homes in the midst of our American families, let us calmly consider what we have done and what we must do.

In the past 2 or 3 weeks all kinds of stories have been handed out to the American public about our lack of preparedness. It has even been charged that the money we have spent on our military and naval forces during the last few years has gone down the rathole. I think that it is a matter of fairness to the Nation that you hear the facts.

We have spent large sums of money on the national defense. This money has been used to make our Army and Navy today the largest, the best-equipped, and the best-trained peacetime military establishment in the history of this country.

Let me tell you just a few of the many things accomplished during the past few years.

I do not propose to go into every detail. It is a known fact, however, that in 1933, when this administration came into office, the United States Navy had fallen in standing among the navies of the world, in power of ships and in efficiency, to a relatively low ebb. The relative fighting power of the Navy had been greatly diminished by failure to replace ships and equipment which had become out-of-date.

Between 1933 and 1940—7 fiscal years—your Government will have spent $1,487,000,000 more than it spent on the Navy during the 7 years before 1933.

What did we get for this money?

The fighting personnel of the Navy rose from 79,000 to 145,000.

During this period 215 ships for the fighting fleet have been laid down or commissioned, practically seven times the number in the preceding similar period.

Of these we have commissioned 12 cruisers, 63 destroyers, 26 submarines, 3 aircraft carriers, 2 gunboats, 7 auxiliaries, and many smaller craft. Among the many ships now being built and paid for are 8 new battleships.

Ship construction costs millions of dollars—more in the United States than anywhere else in the world; but it is a fact that we cannot have adequate naval defense for all American waters without ships—ships that sail the surface of the ocean, ships that move under the surface, and ships that move through the air. And, speaking of airplanes that work with the Navy, in 1933 we had 1,127 useful aircraft and today we have 2,892 on hand and on order. Nearly all of the 1933 planes have been replaced by new planes because they became obsolete or worn out.

The Navy is far stronger today than at any peacetime period in the whole long history of the Nation. In hitting power and in efficiency, I would even make the assertion that it is stronger today than it was during the World War.

The Army of the United States in 1933 consisted of 122,000 enlisted men. In 1940 that has been practically doubled. The Army of 1933 had been given few new implements of war since 1919, and had been compelled to draw on old reserve stocks left over from the World War.

The net result of all this was that our Army by 1933 had very greatly declined in its ratio of strength with the armies of Europe and the Far East.

That was the situation I found.

Since then great changes have taken place.

Between 1933 and 1940—7 fiscal years—your Government will have spent $1,292,000,000 more than it spent on the Army the previous 7 years.

What did we get for this money?

The personnel of the Army has been almost doubled. And by the end of this year every existing unit of the present Regular Army will be equipped with its complete requirements of modern

weapons. Existing units of the National Guard will also be largely equipped with similar items.

Here are some striking examples taken from a large number:

Since 1933 we have actually purchased 5,640 airplanes, including the most modern type of long-range bombers and fast pursuit planes, though, of course, many of these which were delivered 4, 5, 6, or 7 years ago have worn out through use and been scrapped.

These planes cost money—a lot of it. For example, one modern four-engine, long-range bombing plane costs $350,000; one modern interceptor pursuit plane costs $133,000; one medium bomber costs $160,000.

In 1933 we had only 355 antiaircraft guns. We now have more than 1,700 modern antiaircraft guns of all types on hand or on order. And you ought to know that a 3-inch antiaircraft gun costs $40,000 without any of the fire-control equipment that goes with it.

In 1933 there were only 24 modern infantry mortars in the entire Army. We now have on hand and on order more than 1,600.

In 1933 we had only 48 modern tanks and armored cars; today we have on hand and on order 1,700. Each one of our heavier tanks costs $46,000.

There are many other items in which our progress since 1933 has been rapid. And the great proportion of this advance has been during the last 2 years.

In 1933 we had 1,263 Army pilots. Today the Army alone has more than 3,200 of the best fighting flyers in the world, who last year flew more than 1,000,000 hours in combat training. This does not include the hundreds of splendid pilots in the National Guard and Organized Reserves.

Within the past year the productive capacity of the aviation industry to produce military planes has been tremendously increased. This capacity today, however, is still inadequate. But the Government, working with industry, is determined to increase this capacity to meet our needs. We intend to harness the efficient machinery of these manufacturers to the Government's program of being able to get 50,000 planes a year.

One additional word about aircraft: Recent wars, including the current war in Europe, have demonstrated beyond doubt that fighting efficiency depends on unity of control.

In sea operations the airplane is just as much an integral part of unity of operations as are the submarine, the destroyer, and the battleship; and in land warfare the airplane is just as much a part of military operations as are the tank corps, the engineers, the artillery, or the infantry itself. Therefore, the air forces should be part of the Army and Navy.

At my request the Congress is voting the largest appropriation ever asked by the Army or the Navy in peacetime, and the equipment and training provided by them will be in addition to the figures I have given you.

The world situation may so change that it will be necessary to reappraise our program at any time. In such case I am confident that the Congress and the Chief Executive will work in harmony as a team—as they are doing today.

I will not hesitate at any moment to ask for additional funds when they are required.

In this era of swift, mechanized warfare, we all have to remember that what is modern today and up to date, what is efficient and practical, becomes obsolete and outworn tomorrow.

Even while the production line turns out airplanes, new ones are being designed on the drafting table.

Even as a cruiser slides down the ways, plans for improvement, plans for increased efficiency in the next model, are taking shape in the blueprints of designers.

Every day's fighting in Europe, on land, on sea, and in the air, discloses constant changes in methods of warfare. We are constantly improving and redesigning, testing new weapons, and seeking to produce in accordance with the latest that the brains of science conceive.

We are calling upon the resources, the efficiency, and the ingenuity of American manufacturers of war matériel of all kinds—airplanes, tanks, guns, ships, and all the hundreds of products that go into this matériel. The Government of the United States itself manufactures few of the implements of war. Private industry wil continue to be the source of most of this matériel; and private industry will have to be speeded up to produce it at the rate and efficiency called for by the needs of the times.

I know that private business cannot be expected to make all the capital investment required for expansions of plants and factories and personnel which this program calls for at once. It would be unfair to expect industrial corporations to do this, when there is a chance that a change in international affairs may stop future orders.

Therefore, the Government of the United States stands ready to advance the necessary money to help provide for the enlargement of factories, the establishment of new plants, the employment of thousands of necessary workers, the development of new sources of supply for the hundreds of raw materials required, the development of quick mass transportation of supplies. The details of this are now being worked out in Washington, day and night.

We are calling on men now engaged in private industry to help us in carrying out this program and you will hear more of this in the next few days.

This does not mean that the men we call upon will be engaged in the actual production of this matériel. That will still have to be carried on in the plants and factories throughout the land. Private industry will have the responsibility of providing the best, speediest, and most efficient mass production of which it is capable. The functions of the businessmen whose assistance we are calling upon will be to coordinate this program—to see to it that all of the plants continue to operate at maximum speed and efficiency.

Patriotic Americans of proven merit and of unquestioned ability in their special fields are coming to Washington to help the Government with their training, experience, and capability.

It is our purpose not only to speed up production but to increase the total facilities of the Nation in such a way that they can be further enlarged to meet emergencies of the future.

But as this program proceeds there are several things we must continue to watch and safeguard, things which are just as important to the sound defense of a nation as physical armament itself. While our Navy and our airplanes and our guns may be our first lines of defense, it is still clear that way down at the bottom, underlying them all, giving them their strength, sustenance, and power, are the spirit and morale of a free people.

For that reason, we must make sure in all that we do, that there be no break-down or cancelation of any of the great social gains which we have made in these past years. We have carried on an offensive on a broad front against social and economic inequalities and abuses which had made our society weak. That offensive should not now be broken down by the pincers movement of those who would use the present needs of physical military defense to destroy it.

There is nothing in our present emergency to justify making the workers of our Nation toil for longer hours than now limited by statute. As more orders come in and as more work has to be done, tens of thousands of people, who are now unemployed, will receive employment.

There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a lowering of the standards of employment. Minimum wages should not be reduced. It is my hope, indeed, that the new speed-up of production will cause many businesses which now pay below the minimum standards to bring their wages up.

There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a breaking down of old-age pensions or unemployment insurance. I would rather see the systems extended to other groups who do not now enjoy them.

There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a retreat from any of our social objectives—conservation of resources, assistance to agriculture, housing, and help to the underprivileged.

Conversely, however, I am sure that responsible leaders will not permit some specialized group which represents a minority of the total employees of a plant or industry to break up the continuity of employment of the majority of the employees. The policy and the laws providing for collective bargaining are still in force. And labor will be adequately represented in Washington in this defense program.

Also our present emergency and a common sense of decency make it imperative that no new group of war millionaires come into being in this Nation as a result of the struggles abroad. The American people will not relish the idea of any American citizen growing rich and fat in an emergency of blood and slaughter and human suffering.

And, finally, this emergency demands that the consumers of America be protected so that our general cost of living can be maintained at a reasonable level. We ought to avoid the spiral processes of the World War. The soundest policy is for every employer in the country to help give useful employment to the millions who are unemployed. By giving to those millions an increased purchasing power, the prosperity of the whole country will rise to a much higher level.

Today's threat to our national security is not a matter of military weapons alone. We know of new methods of attack.

The Trojan horse. The "fifth column," that betrays a nation unprepared for treachery.

Spies, saboteurs, and traitors are the actors in this new strategy. With all of these we must deal vigorously.

But there is an added technique for weakening a nation at its very roots, for disrupting the entire pattern of life of a people. It is important that we understand it.

The method is simple. First, discord. A group—not too large—a group that may be sectional or racial or political—is encouraged to exploit their prejudices through false slogans and emotional appeals. The aim of those who deliberately egg on these groups is to create confusion of counsel, public indecision, political paralysis, and, eventually, a state of panic.

Sound national policies come to be viewed with a new and unreasoning skepticism, not through the wholesome political debates of honest and free men but through the clever schemes of foreign agents.

As a result of these new techniques, armament programs may be dangerously delayed. Singleness of national purpose may be undermined. Men can lose confidence in each other, and therefore in the efficacy of their own united action. Faith and courage yield to doubt and fear. The unity of the state is so sapped that its strength is destroyed.

All this is no idle dream. It has happened time after time, in nation after nation, during the last 2 years. Fortunately, American men and women are not easy dupes. Campaigns of group hatred or class struggle have never made much headway among us, and are not making headway now. But new forces are being unleashed, deliberately planned propagandas, to divide and weaken us in the face of danger as other nations have been weakened before.

These dividing forces are undiluted poison. They must not be allowed to spread in the New World as they have in the Old. Our moral and mental defenses must be raised as never before against those who would cast a smoke screen across our vision.

The development of our defense program makes it essential that each and every one of us feel that we have some contribution to make toward the security of our country.

At this time, when the world—and the world includes our own American hemisphere—is threatened by forces of destruction, it is my resolve and yours to build up our armed defenses.

We shall build them to whatever heights the future may require.

We shall rebuild them swiftly, as the methods of warfare swiftly change.

For more than three centuries we have been building on this continent a free society, a society in which the promise of the human spirit may find fulfillment. Commingled here are the blood and genius of all the peoples of the world who have sought this promise.

We have built well. We are continuing our efforts to bring the blessings of a free society, of a free and productive economic system, to every family in the land. This is the promise of America.

It is this that we must continue to build—this that we must continue to defend.

It is the task of our generation. But we build and defend not for our generation alone. We defend the foundations laid by our fathers. We build a life for generations yet unborn. We defend and we build a way of life, not for America alone but for all mankind. Ours is a high duty, a noble task.

Day and night I pray for the restoration of peace in this mad world of ours. It is not necessary that I, the President, ask the American people to pray in behalf of such a cause—I know you are praying with me.

I am certain that out of the hearts of every man, woman, and child in this land, in every waking minute, a supplication goes up to Almighty God; that all of us beg that suffering and starving, that death and destruction may end, and that peace may return to the world. In common affection for all mankind, your prayers join with mine, that God will heal the wounds and the hearts of humanity.

Organization for the Protection of American Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING, BEFORE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD, AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for several years—in fact, ever since he introduced his first bill dealing with the subject of our system of free enterprise—has been pressing for consideration of this vital problem. A few days ago he addressed the National Industrial Conference Board, at New York City, on the subject. His address was considered of such significance as to form the subject of an editorial in the Washington Post this morning. I ask unanimous consent to have the address and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was with great pleasure that I received and accepted the invitation of Dr. Jordan to participate in this significant discussion of the "possibilities of the reconstruction and improvement of American enterprise." It is, by all odds, the most important question of our time, a question which loses none of its importance even by reason of the shocking events of the last few days. We are in fact dealing with one of the great crises of human history, a crisis which is intimately bound up with the subject matter of your conferences.

There is no disagreement anywhere in America today that this country must be made absolutely impregnable against every possible attack. There will be complete cooperation among all our people with the program now gaining speed and cohesion in Washington to complete our defense. None will cooperate, I am sure, more freely and effectively than those who are assembled here. Minor divisions and differences of opinion will be forgotten in the knowledge that a new political system which would destroy all the ideals of democracy, threatens to engulf the world.

In this crisis I find it a profoundly encouraging and hopeful sign that so many busy business executives have found the time to attend your sessions and to give attention to the many varied problems listed on your program. More important, however, than this catalog of problems is the fact that in your program they all have been tied together by the two words, "American enterprise."

I have come here tonight to talk to you because I believe in American enterprise and because I believe that the preservation of American enterprise, as our Nation has conceived it, is the greatest service that the people of America can perform for a bewildered and tortured world. Let no one imagine that war developments abroad, nor rising emotion in America, have in any way diminished the need of such conferences as this. On the contrary, what is happening in Europe only demonstrates the necessity of a united and determined defense of the principle of free, American enterprise by all the people of this country.

Before we can make this defense, however, we must understand just exactly what American enterprise is, and we must comprehend the dangers which beset it.

FREE OPPORTUNITY IS BASIC

I conceive American enterprise to be the right of every man to work and to possess the fruits of his toil. This enterprise as we know it is worthy of defense because it represents that free opportunity, guaranteed to every citizen of this Republic by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, to use the faculties with which he has been endowed by an all-wise Creator. If there is anything distinctive in the American way of life, if there is any mark which differentiates American ideals of political and economic organization from those of other peoples and other countries, it is that here we hold it to be a self-evident truth that to every individual God has given rights which no other individual, or no organization of individuals, whether political or economic, can take away.

Unless enterprise is free, it is not enterprise. For if it is not free, it is controlled, and when it is controlled it does not represent the spontaneous reaction which proceeds from the unfettered flow of individual energy and intelligence. America has grown great because we have managed somehow in this country to keep individual enterprise free. European civilization is tottering upon the brink of complete destruction because Europe has not succeeded in finding the way to protect the individual from organizations, both economic and political, which claim the right to restrain his freedom and direct his activity.

The failure of Europe and its present catastrophe are the result of complete misunderstanding of the fundamental concept upon which our institutions have been founded, namely, that governments are instituted among men to preserve the inalienable rights which individuals derive from their Creator. This fundamental American philosophy is spurned by those leaders who preach the doctrine that man has no rights which certain races or States may not disregard or destroy. If we are Americans and if we believe in American principles we know that this is not true. We know that the individual comes first, that he derives his being and his independence from a power which man cannot control, and that kings and constitutions are only the creatures of man, not his masters.

This is the principle which we must understand and defend if we are to understand and defend American enterprise. But we must go a step further and we must understand also that the problem of our time is to preserve the rights of men in an era which compels a higher degree of organization, both political and economic, than was ever before necessary in the whole history of the world. Those who selected the subject matter for these discussions understood this principle, for the prospectus of this Institute of Enterprise sets it forth as a "series of private conferences devoted to systematic discussion of the position and prospects of the American enterprise organization and possibilities, programs, and procedures for its reconstruction and improvement."

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATION ON PEOPLE

This title is a lecture in itself and could be subjected to most stimulating analysis, but I shall be content to point to the emphasis which is placed upon organization. No group of American citizens, indeed, no group of individuals anywhere in the world, could understand better than do the members of this conference the importance of organization. Modern business would be utterly impossible without it, for most of the activities upon which it depends are group activities. Consider the nature and significance of some of the subjects you have had under discussion since last September—capital, production, power, transportation, and taxation. All of these are problems of group or collective activity. One of the reasons why the investment of savings has become so important a subject of general discussion is that so many of the avenues of modern investment are to be found only in enterprises which are carried on by groups of individuals. Power is made available only through the cooperation of large numbers of persons, because no single person is capable, under modern conditions, of making steam or electricity available for practical use. All of the elements of transportation and communication which only a few decades ago were wholly within the control of individuals are today, so far as modern enterprise is concerned, wholly within the control of groups of individuals, and these individuals have found it necessary to impose organization upon themselves in order to make their purposes effective. Old-fashioned methods of transportation are, to be sure, still available, but they are no longer convenient; they no longer serve our purposes. Our greatgrandfathers, everyone of them, could provide themselves with all the transportation they needed because every practical man of a century ago could, under the press of

necessity, build himself a wagon and acquire a horse, but none of us can equip ourselves with the means of transportation which the modern world demands. We have to depend upon the collective organizations which manufacture locomotives and railroad cars, automobiles and airplanes, and which make steam, electricity, and gasoline available for instant use by every man.

Thus, organization is the mark of the modern world. The troubles of this generation arise from the simple fact that we have not yet learned how to shape this necessary organization in such a manner as to preserve that individual freedom for the protection and preservation of which the United States of America was established. If we understand the meaning of organization and the necessity of making it serve the individual needs of all our people we shall understand that the economic organization, like the political organization, must not be permitted to become more powerful than the people. Then we shall be in a position to offer to mankind the prescription for peace and prosperity, for lack of which the nations of Europe are today destroying one another and tearing away the roots of civilization.

Europe has organized for war, and, though much against our will, by that very fact we are compelled to organize for war; our real duty is to organize for peace. Europe has organized for destruction because of fear, fear that races and individuals cannot live without pillage and rapine upon one another. We can organize for constructive purposes once we realize that the world provides more than enough for all and that by intelligent distribution of the abundance which surrounds us we can actually, through organization, make robbery and pillage as unnecessary among nations as it is among men. Not upon fear of one another, but upon faith in the capacity of our people to cooperate, can we give the world that organization of free enterprise which it so much needs.

PEOPLE ALWAYS COME FIRST

If we are to achieve this end, we must begin by recognizing that people come first; that they precede all forms of human organization; and that all organizations justify themselves only in the degree in which they serve people. A railroad system is built across a continent only because it makes cheap transportation available to people. A telephone system is brought into existence only because people want to communicate conveniently at long distances. A great electric company is possible only because people want electricity in their homes for light and for power. Automobiles, airplanes, electric refrigerators, and every imaginable device which has been invented to supply the luxurious tastes of the modern world are possible only because living people demand them; and so, all industry, all business, and all commerce are organized to produce and distribute the unlimited variety of products which human ingenuity discovers and invents. Though we know that none of these things would be possible without people to buy and to use them, we seem to have overlooked the fact that the complex industrial organization necessary to produce and distribute these products will finally defeat itself if it is not so constructed as to guarantee to people the opportunity to acquire what business offers.

This is the organization which American enterprise must perfect and defend if it is to preserve itself and offer the world an alternative to the horror that now makes us all tremble. The totalitarian governments of Europe sprang into existence and seized all power because the economic organization had failed to preserve opportunity for the people.

Germany, Italy, and Russia, because they were unable to create a democratic peace organization that would preserve prosperity for people, chose the horrible alternative of creating an arbitrary war organization in the attempt to preserve their own lives and property by destroying the lives and property of their neighbors. Great Britain and France, blind as we have been blind to this organization of death, allowed the years to pass as it grew in power, and having failed within their own countries to protect the rights of people in the modern economic world, now find themselves in a disastrous extremity, an extremity which we ourselves now share because the arbitrary organization of whole peoples for war has repudiated the old concepts of neutrality and international comity as well as the principles of democracy.

PREPARE FOR PEACE AS WELL AS WAR

Though as a result we find ourselves compelled, in defense of our ideals of life, to organize for war so that we may not find ourselves utterly unprepared as other peace-loving nations were, we shall make a tragic mistake if we allow ourselves to think for a single moment that such organization will be a substitute for the necessary organization for peace of which I speak. War and even preparation for war may, for a time, seem to solve the unemployment problem. Armies which are assembled for purposes of destruction will, to be sure, use the hands which we have not had the intelligence, by organization and cooperation, to put to work in the productive enterprises of peace. But war solves nothing, for when it is over the same stark problems of people and their relation to the economic structure remain unanswered.

He who imagines that in this great crisis America can dodge this phase of the problem of organization, by preparing for war, misses the fundamental fact that there is neither peace nor prosperity save in production. American business can find no permanent prosperity in the sale of commodities to a modern world at war. Modern war, the aggressors have told us, is a total war. That means not only the destruction of soldiers and of civilians and of women and of children; it means also the destruction of the ability of whole peoples to produce. No European country can pay for anything it gets unless it can produce, for commerce among nations, as among people, is merely the exchange of goods and services, and when the ability of one man, one group, or one nation to produce is destroyed the whole basis of commerce is destroyed. Even when we ourselves prepare, as we must prepare for our own defense, upon the modern scale we necessarily incur an expense of staggering proportions that can only be met by increasing cooperation and production.

Let no one delude himself, therefore, into the belief that our problem of organizing people so that they may all reap the benefits offered by modern science can be postponed by either war or preparation for war. We must ask ourselves, and never let the question for one single moment vanish from our minds, what is to happen in this world after the war is over? Who is to bind up the wounds of war? Who is to assuage the suffering of stricken population? Who is to preserve the American ideal of free enterprise if we are not to do it? And how can we do it if for one moment we consent to set aside the problem of economic recovery for the benefit of all?

I have no blue print to offer, but I can recognize the elementary principles which have made America great, just as we all recognize them. We know that the progress of America has been the fruit of liberty, the liberty of every man to work out his own destiny. That liberty has been protected heretofore because here in America men, until recently at least, have always been economically free. Political liberty is the product of economic freedom. When economic freedom is lost, political liberty is endangered. That is the lesson Europe teaches us today. The genius and energy of Americans have been free to bequeath all manner of discoveries and inventions to mankind, but as these discoveries and inventions produce a more complex economy, depending in greater and greater degree upon complex economic and commercial organization, the individual has been finding it more and more difficult to preserve his economic freedom. The steady increase of tenant farmers and of industrial workers whose only property is an uncertain job has marked the growing instability of our economic system. When people are without property and when, for any reason, they cannot command the opportunity to work, then the danger to established order arises.

We hear a great deal nowadays of the demand for security. That is the phrase, to be sure, but it is not what is actually meant. People want opportunity much more than they want security. People have always been ready to risk everything, even life itself, in the pursuit of an objective. But when organizations become so complex that the individual is overshadowed and has no sure and certain part in the organization, then it is that dissatisfaction and unrest begin to appear. America has heretofore always sought to preserve the open door of opportunity to people. We have boasted, and rightfully so, that in this country every man who is able and willing to work could work and by energy and intelligence could rise to the highest positions in business and in industry. It is impossible to read the names of modern American business executives without knowing that this is so. The greatest personal satisfaction I have had as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee has been the realization, as a result of my contacts that America is still devoted to the old traditions of freedom and that American businessmen, no less than American workers, are willing to protect and defend the elementary principles of human rights, upon which our country was founded.

ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION NEEDED

Once before the people of this land faced a great crisis of organization. It was after the Revolutionary War when 13 sovereign States were struggling to cooperate for the mutual benefit of their people in an imperfect union. They saw the need of political organization then and they called together a convention chosen from among the rank and file of the people to draw a constitution which would give them the more perfect union that was needed to protect the general welfare.

The political organization which proceeded from that convention was the work of all and it gave to the world a government of the people, that is to say, a government of all the people; a government which derived its authority, not from the desires or needs of any single group, however powerful, but from the desires and needs of a whole people who were determined to provide opportunity and freedom for all.

Our greatest need now is a conception of an economic organization upon the same broad national scale, one which shall not be designed to serve the interests of any group or class, but which, like our political organization, shall be founded upon the abiding conviction that our economic system must be made to work so as to serve all.

We must therefore comprehend clearly the nature of the organization and the source of the authority which the individual must obey.

Organizations of minorities, whatever they may be, represent only part of the people, each group acting according to its own function. This is obviously true in the economic sphere, for even those huge and efficient organizations which have produced the triumphant industrial successes of America, represent only parts of our population. The railroad expert cannot speak for the automobile manufacturer. The manufacturer cannot speak for the

financier. The leaders of the petroleum industry cannot possibly know the problems of the steel maker, and so it goes through the whole variety of commerce and industry with those mighty and far-flung complicated organizations which produce, fabricate, and distribute all the commodities of trade and commerce.

GOVERNMENT ACTS WHEN ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION FAILS

We have seen from what has happened in Europe that if the modern economic organization, for all its internal efficiency, fails to preserve economic opportunity for people, the state inevitably steps in to attempt the task which business is not performing. When people cannot find employment in the avenues of private industry they turn to government. When, as in Germany, the dominant figures of the economic world, in order to protect their own interests, seek to obtain control of government, they only lay the ground for the inevitable result, that government will in the end dominate and control business. When that happens, free enterprise is gone and the state has become not only more powerful than the economic organization, but more powerful than the people.

It seems to me, therefore, to be perfectly clear that the organization of American enterprise which will protect the birthright of mankind is an organization which, by preserving free opportunity to all, will make unnecessary the appeal to Government to perform the economic function. This is the task this generation faces. Like our predecessors who drafted our political Constitution, we must draft an economic constitution. Just as they undertook to preserve political freedom for men by fixing the powers and responsibilities of political organizations, so we must preserve economic freedom by defining the powers and responsibilities of economic organizations.

This is the opportunity and the duty of America. Here in the New Yorld the challenge must be met, for Europe has failed before our very eyes.

I have no hesitation in predicting that the totalitarian states of Europe cannot endure, for every dictatorship contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Such an organization is founded on the negation of a principle that all history and all religion, fortified by human instinct, tells us is true that every individual soul is free and independent, created so by the Author of all life and capable of being subjugated only by the Author of its being. Whatever may be the temporary advantage of the mechanized legions of the totalitarian organization, they will in the end perish, because they will be defeated by the free spirits of free men, who, all history teaches, can never be held in permanent bondage.

We stand at the crossroads of history. By what we do will it be determined whether democracy and freedom shall prevail. I place my faith in the wisdom and ability of the people of America to preserve for all mankind and American heritage of free enterprise and economic liberty for all.

[From the Washington Post of May 27, 1940]

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

In an address before the National Industrial Conference Board last week Senator O'MAHONEY clearly formulated the nature of the task ahead of the United States if it wishes to preserve a system of free enterprise based upon freedom of individual action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY reminded his audience that war and preparation for war, however imperative under present conditions, will not solve the problems confronting this Nation. Permanent prosperity is not to be achieved by selling commodities to a world at war. We have to keep in mind the question of organization for peace, even in the midst of the present turmoil. Our institutions are threatened not by war alone but also by the forces that led to prewar political upheavals.

The Senator from Wyoming, in statesmanlike fashion, tries to explain the triumph of totalitarian political systems over democratic methods. The problem of our time, he well says, "is to preserve the rights of men in an era which compels a higher degree of organization, both political and economic, than was ever before necessary in the history of the world."

In a society in which extensive organization based upon collective activity has become essential, it is extremely difficult to achieve maximum efficiency without ignoring the claims or invading the rights of individuals. Yet, if either economic or political organizations become too powerful, individual liberties are extinguished.

To avoid the fate that has overtaken Germany and other European nations, Mr. O'MAHONEY concludes, the United States must preserve economic opportunity for the people. This means, in simpler terms, that a way must be found to provide employment for the individual without making him a ward or employee of the Government itself.

Senator O'MAHONEY has repeatedly emphasized the danger to our established order of a propertyless people, denied the opportunity to work. The existence of such unfortunate classes abroad undoubtedly has played into the hands of political demagogues who have used the economically disinherited and the spiritually dissatisfied as tools for the work of destruction.

Senator O'MAHONEY sees the danger ahead and he has presented the problem clearly. It is a challenge to which we have not yet found the answer. But we are less likely to blunder if we understand its universality and its critical significance.

Iceland—First American Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Iceland.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On whether Iceland is a part of the New or Old World, whether it belongs more closely to America or to Europe, most geographers will agree with a characterization in a State Department publication of 1868 which was signed by Benjamin Mills Peirce. It has on its first page the statement that—

"* * * (Iceland) belongs to the Western Hemisphere, and is an insular dependency of the North American Continent."

The rightness of this 1868 characterization is even more apparent today; for we have learned in the meantime that Greenland, always considered a part of the North American complex, extends some 2° of latitude farther east than Iceland—a line drawn straight south from the most easterly tip of Greenland passes about 50 miles east of the most easterly tip of Iceland.

The main arguments for Iceland being American which were available in 1868 remain in full force. You can see Greenland from the mountains of northwestern Iceland. A ship rightly placed in the 185-mile gap between the two countries will see Iceland to the southeast and Greenland to the northwest; by contrast, the nearest considerable European land, Scotland, is 520 miles from Iceland. Even the Faroes, problematically situated so that you can argue reasonably whether they are European or American, are far beyond the range of ordinary vision from the mountain tops of southeastern Iceland. Norway, the nearest part of the European Continent, is separated from Iceland by 630 miles of sea.

Historically Iceland is a part of the New World in that the Old World had to discover it. Some believe that the discoverer was the Greek navigator, Pytheas, around 325 B. C.; what we know definitely is that the knowledge of Iceland was a commonplace to the Irish in 795 A. D.

The Norsemen seem to have learned about Iceland from the Irish during the spread of their conquest over northern Ireland in the early part of the ninth century. In 850 the first known Scandinavians went to Iceland; in 870 they began moving there in considerable numbers. Scandinavian reports agree with the Irish—the Irish say they were there first and the Scandinavians say they found Irish people in Iceland. Many of these Irish, or at least their leaders, were clergy. This was before the institution of celibacy was taken up by the Irish priesthood, so that there would have been wives and families.

However, it was more from later emigration of the Irish to Iceland that students derive that share of Irish blood which is estimated by different authorities at from 10 to 50 percent. If we add the highest and lowest estimates and divide by two, we get 30 percent, which appears reasonable. It is agreed that there were no people in Iceland when the Irish moved there. Accordingly we feel that most of the rest of the blood is Norwegian, about 60 percent, with the remaining 10 percent from Scotland, England, Denmark, and Sweden, perhaps in that order. The total of Icelandic blood of other sources than Scandinavian and Irish will be less than 1 percent.

The chief motive for the Norse colonization of Iceland was similar to that of the colonization of the territory which became our Thirteen States—the colonists were oppressed minorities. Their leaders were earls and petty nobility who had been defeated by King Harald the Fairhaired, first to become master of all of Norway. It was dislike for his overkingship that produced the migration, with a necessarily resulting antipathy for that type of government. Accordingly there was only the rudest kind of sectional organization until the country grew to a population of around 50,000. Then there was established, in 930, a republic for the whole of Iceland, functioning through a parliament that is still in session—in its one thousand and eleventh year.

It is commonly said that in 1261 Iceland voluntarily ceased to be an independent republic and became a province of Norway through requesting admission. This is true in practice; in theory, there is a difference between the Dano-Norwegian and the Icelandic view. The Scandinavians claim that what was true in fact was also true

in theory and principle—that Iceland was a province. The Icelanders, somewhat after the manner of the Scots, claim that what they asked for and expected to get in 1261 was a partnership. This theoretical position they held through the centuries, actually gaining little home rule, however, until about 100 years ago.

By 1874 Iceland had worked up to approximately dominion status, similar to the relation between Canada and Great Britain just before the 1914 war.

In 1918 Iceland became an independent state. By a treaty it was arranged that the same man who was King of Denmark should be King of Iceland—one man with two jobs. The Danish kingship was inherited and for life; the Icelandic kingship was by arrangement and for a limited period. There was to be a plebiscite in 1943 as to whether the same man should be reemployed as King of Iceland.

Several months prior to the German invasion of Denmark three of the four political parties of Iceland announced that they would at the coming plebiscite oppose the continuation of the arrangement with the King of Iceland. The only party which had not taken this position prior to the fall of Denmark was the Communist, represented by four members in a Parliament of 49. Therefore the declaration which Iceland made April 10 was an action taken in 1940 that would have been taken in 1943. The following is a translation from an article on the events of April 10, 1940, published by the Reykjavik daily newspaper Morgunbladid of the same date:

"The two Houses of Parliament assembled in joint session at 2:25 a. m. [April 10] and decided unanimously upon two crucial matters. The first concerns 'leadership in affairs of the state' and the second 'the administration of foreign affairs and of the coast guard service.'

"The first decision reads: 'In view of recent developments which have made it impossible for the King of Iceland to exercise those powers which were entrusted to him by the constitution, Parliament announces that it has transferred to the Cabinet of Iceland, for the time being, the exercise of the said powers.'

"The second decision reads: 'In view of recent developments it is not possible for Denmark to carry out those transactions of the foreign affairs of Iceland which were entrusted to it by paragraph 7 of the Danish-Icelandic joint declaration of law [of 1918] nor can the Danish Government carry forward the coast guard service provided for in paragraph 8 of the same law. Therefore, Parliament announces that Iceland for the time being will handle its own affairs under both the above heads.'"

Mississippi, the Heart of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS GARNER JAMES

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Thomas Garner James entitled "Mississippi, the Heart of the South," published in The Industrial Expansion of the South, the special edition of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 20, 1940]

MISSISSIPPI, THE HEART OF THE SOUTH—MOST SOUTHERN OF STATES HAS PAPER, LUMBER, OIL, AND COTTON, OLD AND NEW AGRICULTURE, AND A POWER LINE GRID LINKING EVERY TOWN

(By Thomas Garner James, Mississippi Advertising Commission)

The oft-quoted phrase, "Mississippi, heart of the South," comes close to stating a truth with universal applications. Mississippi is the heart of the South, not only by virtue of its central location; it is also a composite and the epitome of the Southern States, the most characteristically southern of them all.

What is possible to any part of the South is to some extent possible in Mississippi. The South's challenge, the South's hope is represented in Mississippi. Industrial news from the South begins in Mississippi.

White paper from southern pine?

The first mill to manufacture bleached Kraft paper from southern pine is at Moss Point, Miss., a mill founded by the South's first successful papermaker. Pulpwood from Jackson County, Miss., was the first southern pine ever to be made into paper.

Low cost hydroelectric power?

Tupelo, Miss., was the first city to use T. V. A. power. Since January 1, 1925, Mississippi has built up a gridwork of high-transmission lines linking every town in the State and supplying power at rates comparable to those of any State.

New industrial-crop resources?

Mississippi leads all other States combined in acreage planted to tung trees. Mississippi has the Nation's first ligno-cellulose plastic plant in operation. Mississippi has the Nation's only commercial sweetpotato-starch factory, which in addition to its starch product is now producing a cattle feed from sweetpotato hulls which may revolutionize stock feeding practices in the South. In the past 7 years Mississippi has tripled its cash income from sales of livestock and livestock products. As a result of soil-building practices the State's yield of lint cotton has increased from an average of 185 pounds per acre for the 5 years 1928–32 to an average of 328 pounds per acre for the past 4 years; an achievement in increased crop production without a parallel in the history of American agriculture.

New fuel sources?

The Nation's newest major oil field has opened in Yazoo County, Miss., following a strike made at the end of 1939. As of March 1, 1940, there were two dozen producing wells in the Yazoo field, as many more drilling, and more than 6,000,000 acres in the State under lease in the revived hunt for oil.

LOCATING MISSISSIPPI

It is not surprising that industrial news from the South is largely industrial news from Mississippi. For, lying alongside the great river which divides the South in two, Mississippi extends across and athwart the concentric arcs of southern development from geology to politics.

Physiographically, Mississippi lies nearly entirely within the Coastal Plain province characteristic of the southeastern United States—extreme northeast Mississippi being the exception—and extends completely across the Coastal Plain from north to south at a point halfway between the Atlantic coast and the Rio Grande.

Climatically, Mississippi lies entirely within the humid's subtropical region characteristic of the southeastern United States, extending almost across this climatic belt at its midpoint from east to west.

Mississippi lies entirely within the belt of red and yellow soils, characteristic group of the southeastern United States, the latitudinal extent of the State almost equaling that of the soil belt, and the State's position being only slightly west of the geographic center of this major soil group.

Mississippi is centrally located relative to the southeastern forest region of the United States and stretches completely across that region from north to south.

Thus does Mississippi occupy the approximate center of each of the four major natural regions descriptive of the South's physiography, climate, soils, and natural vegetation. And thus does Mississippi's geographic composite nearly epitomize the natural resources of the South. Mississippi's latitudinal extent traverses the whole series of geologic deposits of the Coastal Plain in its 800-foot range of elevation. The frost-free season grades from 275 days along the coast to 200 days in the northern part of the State. Average annual precipitation varies from as much as 65 inches along the coast to less than 48 inches in the extreme northwest. Mississippi soils, developed from alluvial, loessial, and sedimentary parent materials, represent great graphic position and drainage. Mississippi includes portions of four major forest regions of the United States. Nine distinct vegetation types comprise its varied pattern of plant associations.

THE STATE'S RESOURCES

So then a summary of Mississippi's resources samples the South's resources. The South is Mississippi spread out and diffused. One is the index to the other.

The tabulation should begin with climate, the resource which cannot itself be remade, nor transported, nor manipulated, nor exhausted. The framework within which the State's agro-industrial development must be projected, Mississippi's climate is one of frequent changes within moderate limits, being relatively predictable rather than monotonous. The repeating annual cycles of Mississippi's weather changes are remarkably uniform, a feature in the physical resources of the State which hardly can be overemphasized, Mississippi being rivaled by few other areas in this respect.

For agro-industrial expansion, Mississippi's climate is excellent. It is amiable yet stimulating in the autumn, winter, and spring months. With the development of refrigeration and air-conditioning, the high summer average temperature occurring in the interior of the State no longer presents an industrial problem. The frost-free period allows an unusually long growing season and a wide variety of pastures and crops. The seasonal variations in precipitation between northwest and southeast Mississippi likewise allow for a maximum variety in crops and timber within the limits fixed by the annual aggregate precipitation averages. The combination of high average precipitation and mild temperature is highly favorable to forest growth and is an important consideration in low costs of crop production.

Then next are the minerals in evaluating which availability and accessibility are as important as possession. Located midway between the coal and iron fields of the Southeastern States and the oil and gas fields of the Southwestern States and being readily

available to the mineralized areas of the southeastern and midcontinent regions Mississippi is in an ideal situation for the coordinated use of a great variety of mineral products from all parts of the South.

Of special importance is the proximity to both types of mineral fuels, the coal of the Southeast and the oil and gas of the Southwest. As a result of this favorable position, and because of voluminous production of natural gas and oil within the State, some parts of Mississippi enjoy lower industrial rates on natural gas than any other section of the United States. Mississippi is unsurpassed in the variety and quality of her undeveloped clay resources, detailed tests of which are now being conducted by the State along with State surveys of surface and ground-water resources.

It was from a preliminary survey of the mineral resources of Yazoo County that the present oil play there developed. Surveys of other counties in the State, now being carried out on a multiple-county scale, promise equal rewards.

TRANSPORTATION

A factor in evaluating all other resources is transportation. Railways, inland waterways, motor routes, and airways which foreshadow the supertransportation routes of the near future show Mississippi to be the transportation crossroads of the South. Raw materials to factories, finished goods to markets are carried easily to, from, and through Mississippi.

More than 4,000 miles of trackage operated by a half dozen major companies serve Mississippi by rail. In the Illinois Central system the State's western half is served by one of the Mississippi Valley's greatest trunk-line carriers. The recent merger of the Mobile & Ohio and the Gulf, Mobile & Northern into the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad gives the State another giant railway system to its eastern half.

The Nation's largest inland waterway, the Mississippi River, carries Federal and private barge traffic from half a continent along the western border of Mississippi.

Mississippi's deep-water harbor at Gulfport is advantageously accessible to the mid-South area. The harbor's nearness to the open Gulf effects time savings as high as 24 hours over its chief competitive ports, and new wharfs provide economies in handling.

Mississippi's new $90,000,000 arterial highway system is the peer of any other State, and with the second largest system of secondary roads in the Nation, Mississippi is well known for its all-weather farm-to-market roadways. Serving an evenly distributed population, Mississippi's motor freight lines are extending their operations rapidly.

Labor to convert raw materials into finished products is another factor in the evaluation of resources. Here the damaging of previous migration from farm to city is backing up a reservoir of farm youths of the most productive age for release in the channels of new industries. Harvard University found Mississippi farm youths to possess greater endurance and capacity for work than eastern college students. Factory superintendents are finding them quick to learn new trades.

This Land of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 26:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 26, 1940]

THIS LAND OF LIBERTY

America's course is clear.

We must stay out of this European war.

If destiny has decreed that our democracy is to be threatened, we must prepare to protect it, not in Europe but here at home.

The great American statesman, Daniel Webster, said that "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." If Daniel Webster were alive today, he would be preaching impassioned sermons from this text, but it is doubtful whether they would be one-tenth as impressive as the lessons being drawn by the American people from the smashing victories of Adolf Hitler over the liberty-loving peoples of Europe.

One of these lessons is that we Americans can no longer take liberty for granted. It is not free as the air we breathe. It is something that was won for us by the blood, the tears, the sinews, the genius, and the fortunes of our forefathers, and it is something that may have to be defended by the blood, the tears, the sinews, the genius, and the fortunes of ourselves. We in this country have for so long luxuriated in the atmosphere of freedom that it is sometimes hard to remember that liberty has a price.

If we look back upon the pages of history, we recall that in the long chronicles of mankind the kind of freedom Americans enjoy today is of comparatively recent origin. The ancients never tasted it. They lived under strict tribal rules or under tyrannies which, even though often benevolent, were still tyrannies. The boasted civilization of ancient Athens, glorious though it was in many ways, was founded upon the labor and complete subservience of the helots, or slaves, who far outnumbered the freemen.

Liberty in the modern sense dates in England, not from the Magna Carta of 1215, by which the King surrendered certain rights to the feudal lords, but from 1688, when William and Mary recognized the supremacy of Parliament over the crown. In France, liberty in the modern sense dates from the fall of the Bastille in 1789, though it had to be rewon from the two Napoleons. In America, it dates from 1776, 164 years ago, a short span in history's long perspective.

A cynical Englishman once wrote that "liberty can neither be got, nor kept, but by so much care that mankind are generally unwilling to give the price for it." Yet in all ages, even in the most benighted, men have suffered and died in aspiring for liberty. In all ages to come, men will suffer and die to preserve liberty because it is a perfect expression of the human spirit.

One of the most illustrious of all libertarians, the great Garibaldi of Italy, in rallying his ragged soldiers to his banner, addressed them in these words: "Those of you who will resist the stranger at the gate will come with me. I offer you hunger, cold, forced marches, battles, death." Not bright uniforms, dazzling swords, victory, and spoils, but hunger, cold, forced marches, battles, death.

The world has now arrived at a juncture when liberty and American democracy must be reexamined in the light of world events. Liberty is fast disappearing everywhere. It has been taken from the vast population of Russia, inert under Stalin's iron dictatorship. It long ago disappeared in Italy when the country of Garibaldi became the Italy of Mussolini. It was never known in Japan. It is gone from Spain, from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, and from Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands—and now, as the mechanized forces of the ruthless, reckless, revengeful genius, Hitler, crunch the armies of France and Britain, perhaps liberty will soon be gone from those countries, too.

Who knows but that in a few short weeks the last great power on earth where men can still call their souls their own will be the United States of America? If that be true, this country must now prepare, in Daniel Webster's words, to "guard and defend" its liberty. This does not mean that we must succumb to hysteria, that we must be stampeded into panic, that we must overexaggerate our dangers. Far from it. There is no strength in hysteria, there is no efficiency in panic, there is no sense in overexaggeration.

When Adolf Hitler began to prepare for war in 1933, he did so quietly, calmly, and skillfully. He put his technicians to work. He built the best airplanes. He trained the pilots. He constructed air bases. He built military roads. He built tanks and antiaircraft guns and all the other devilishly powerful weapons of modern war. All this was done coldly, systematically, methodically. More, he devised the ways in which these weapons were to be used, drafting the best brains of the German nation to scheme and plan and devise everything from the grand strategy down to the smallest detail.

If we are to prepare ourselves against a possible foe like Adolf Hitler, we shall not do it by listening to inflammatory and ridiculous speeches, but by buckling down to work. If Hitler has mechanized war, we have the genius to beat him at his own game. If Hitler can build a magnificent fighting airplane, we can build a better one. If Hitler can turn out tanks like battleships, we, with our great mechanical skill, can make even more formidable ones. We have the brains, the driving energy, the plants, the money, the raw materials.

We only need the will. We only need to exercise this will. We only need to show that we think liberty is worth saving, is worth making sacrifices for, is worth a certain national discipline, is worth higher taxes, is worth some of the material comforts which we now so heedlessly enjoy.

Garibaldi's soldiers gladly accepted hunger, cold, forced marches, battles, death. But they were a ragged little band forced to the last extremity. We are a Nation of 130,000,000, with great, shining cities, vast and fruitful fields. We are strong, rich, vigorous, daring, ingenious. We are invincible, unconquerable, if only we use that proportion of our energy, that proportion of our brains and skill, that proportion of our wealth, which is needed to preserve all of the magnificent things that are symbolized by the noble Goddess who stands triumphantly above the waters of New York Harbor.

If destiny has decreed that our American democracy is to be threatened, let us prepare to protect that democracy, to crush for all time its attackers, and to crush them here at home on our own beloved American soil.

National Cotton Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. MALONEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL H. MALONEY, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I delivered to the citizens of New Orleans last week during the observance of the National Cotton Week.

REMARKS OF HON. PAUL H. MALONEY ON COTTON WEEK, MAY 24, 1940

National Cotton Week is drawing to a close. The observance has brought home to us once more the vital importance of this staple for the well-being of our people.

Cotton is and will long remain the great natural American fiber. Cotton for some time will continue to furnish the chief source of livelihood for about 10,000,000 farm people. The processing of cotton yarn into clothing and industrial products plays an indispensable role in the life of many manufacturing centers in this country and provides the source of livelihood for about 3,000,000 additional people.

The Cotton Belt, in its broad sweep from the Carolinas to western Oklahoma and Texas, comprises still the largest single, homogeneous market in the world for the output of American factories.

The overseas movement of cotton from our ports is a factor of undiminishing importance in our national economy as well as in the larger picture of international commerce.

These facts stand in the foreground of the present cotton situation, whether we view it individually as a shipper in New Orleans, a sharecropper in Louisiana, a textile worker in New Orleans, or an automobile-tire dealer in Louisiana. What we have is an intricate network of interests, world-wide in extent, the welfare of each element affecting the welfare of all the rest.

Let us keep these fundamental facts in mind as we confront today the actualities of the cotton industry in its manifold ramifications. Calm, dispassionate thinking is the plain duty of everyone of us. We do not need to be told that the going is getting rough. Incalculable events on the battlefields of Europe and Asia make all our predictions worthless. Predictions of disaster are just as groundless as forecasts of sunny skies day after tomorrow. Pessimists and optimists alike are disarmed by the onrush of military, political, and economic forces loosed among us.

In the midst of the alarms, however, we can be realists if we will. We can stick to the facts. We can strengthen our resolve to deal with the complex problems of cotton in the light of our experience and not in the darkness of our fears.

Let us look at some of the cotton facts. The most outstanding one of recent months is the export program made possible by the action of the Federal Government on the initiative of the Department of Agriculture. Not since the upsurge in 1933 has the foreign trade in cotton been so active as during the 9 months ending April 30 of this year. More than 5.7 million bales were shipped abroad in that period, whereas for the corresponding period a year ago the total was under 3,000,000. This has meant new life and hope for an important section of our export trade, particularly that section centered in New Orleans. It has helped to remove the specter of a still more burdensome surplus. Money has gone into the hands of the producers. Our uncertain hold on the foreign market has been strengthened to the extent of these recent recoveries. It was no easy accomplishment to ship this cotton at a competitive price on the world market and at the same time assure the American farmer a return commensurate with his needs.

Predictions as to the immediate future of cotton exports are as futile as prophecies in any other field where the hazards are comparable. It is justifiable, however, to take pride in the cotton export record of the 9 months preceding the furious turn of events in western Europe. The American cotton industry and the Government at Washington have demonstrated afresh that their common efforts can be directed to desirable ends.

Not only is it necessary to the well-being of the cotton industry that a substantial portion of the crop be profitably moved into the channels of world trade, but also that domestic consumption hold up to a high level. Here, again, the facts of recent months are reassuring. Indications are that our home consumption of cotton will amount to more than 7,000,000 bales for the season ending July 31. This is well above the total of 6,858,426 for 1938.

Many factors have contributed to this increase. The generally favorable outlook prevailing in business stimulated demand. Concerted promotional activities have helped. Aggressive invasion of new commercial fields by the industry has done its share.

I mention these two outstanding facts—the revival of exports and the increase of domestic consumption—to illustrate the basic vitality and resourcefulness of the people actively engaged in the cotton industry. These are the prerequisites of any Government program to help and of any private agencies hopeful of lifting business by its own bootstraps.

It is upon these qualities that the future fortunes of cotton depend. No one should minimize the difficulties ahead. The war in Europe, regardless of its outcome, will force upon us far-reaching readjustments.

Our foreign-trade prospects for the months immediately ahead challenge us to new approaches to this aspect of our problem. There is the long-standing story of trade barriers between the nations. As a great creditor country our position in the export field is gravely complicated. In the world market American cotton is facing keen and growing competition from crops grown in other lands. The increasing use of synthetic fibers as a substitute for cotton, both in textiles and in many industrial outlets, endangers the position of the southern staple. Against these difficulties we must pit the good sense, the energy, the imagination, and the combined will of our people.

The attack is going forward on many fronts. Our State Department, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, is steadily advancing the cause of reciprocal-trade agreements. The A. A. A. program is being used by farmers with unrelenting vigor to maintain a fair balance between cotton production and the prospective demands, foreign and domestic. The distressing depletion of our soil, long attending the cultivation of cotton, is being retarded. Soil-building and soil-conserving practices are being carried out on millions of acres of cropland in the South. New acreages are being planted to food and feedstuff for consumption on the farm. The cash income of cotton growers from their staple crop has advanced from $464,300,000 in 1932 to $815,000,000 in 1939, including A. A. A. payments.

Dirt farmers themselves operate the A. A. A. program through their own county and community committeemen.

On other sectors of the front new outlets are being sought and developed for cotton consumption. The growing movement to ship in cotton coverings is a good example of this tendency. Research experts are disclosing the possibilities of cotton as excellent bagging material. Other use requirements are being studied in governmental laboratories such as the great research center established in our own city of New Orleans, and tested in practical experience. I select at random the most promising at the moment; open-mesh bags for packaging fruits, vegetables, and other farm products, cotton bagging for cotton bales, and mats for curing concrete. Each year from 400,000 to 500,000 bales go into the manufacturing of bagging alone. With judicious promotion it is felt that this could be easily raised to a million and a half bales. Men's summer suiting, wall coverings, insulation material, and building equipment are also absorbing the attention of the cotton trade.

All these trends are indicative of a vigorous people attacking their problems with courage and confidence. It should be the role of the Government at Washington to do all within its power to help the people in their own efforts toward maintaining a decent standard of living during these difficult and critical but not disheartening days.

I do hope our citizens will appreciate what the cotton industry in its many ramifications contributes to the general welfare of our Nation and respond to the fullest in its use. I may also say that I do believe Congress should approve my bill, which would give authority to use a postal cancelation stamp, Ship It in Cotton, the purpose of which is to keep our citizens continuously cotton-minded.

To the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY REV. W. C. PORTER, WATERLOO, IOWA

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Rev. William C. Porter, minister of the First United Presbyterian Church, of Waterloo, Iowa:

Months ago I stood in Arlington before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The perpetual pace of the guard of honor, the still glory of the pure marble, the volunteering pulsebeat of that melted

dust within, all burdened my thought as I turned away. So my heart returned to speak America's grace—

Once living. Dead. Unknown.
Beneath vast marble thine mere guarded rest!
Thou, mature, aware, gave all for liberty and right.
After thee our countrymen vow,
And, in war or peace, will pay to oblivion.

Dead? Unknown? August and eternal thy renown!
Thy high love America's unutterable song!
To God, our Glory, thy gleaming tomb
Hymns a silent, never-ceasing psalm.

God restore the noble grandeur of such manhood. Divine overruling maintain American patriotism on holy principles.—W. C. Porter, minister, First United Presbyterian Church, Waterloo, Iowa.

New Deal Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MARSHFIELD (WIS.) NEWS-HERALD OF MAY 16, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are a few fundamental issues about which the people of this country are entitled to know. They are entitled to know how every Representative stands on communism without any shadow-boxing or sidestepping.

The following editorial from the Marshfield News-Herald, Marshfield, Wis., May 16, 1940, expresses the responsibility of the New Deal:

THE NEW DEAL'S OBLIGATION

The New Deal has been accused of harboring many Communists, some of whom have been placed in important positions in Government. Spokesmen for the New Deal have denied this, but from time to time evidence has been uncovered to prove it is true.

With the air and the press filled with Trojan-horse tactics in Europe, the average American citizen has been set to wondering if we have a "fifth column" here in this country. It seems fairly certain that the Government will be asked to move the extreme "left wingers" from their posts. That seems assured as a result of the disaster which befell small European countries where "fifth columns" gained control of strategic points.

There should be no "red" hunt; there should be no Nazi hunt; what should never have been permitted must now be stopped. The Government—Federal, State, and local—must rid itself of those who have expressed dissatisfaction with our representative form of government and who would replace it with some foreign and un-American "ism."

The New Deal is responsible for placing thousands of these "left wingers" in Government jobs. Investigation by the Dies and the Smith committees prove their presence as well as their influence in these posts.

Not because of what has and is occurring in Europe but because it is unsafe, men and women who disbelieve in our form of government should have no right to hold any Government position. Those who would replace representative rule for authoritarian rule, even unto dictatorship, are not to be trusted as servants of the people. They never should have been given Government posts.

This is not to say that they should be denied the right of expression. This Nation must always maintain the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech and press and the right of petition. Those who disagree with our form of government have the right to advocate change by peaceful constitutional methods. Since they have that right, they can have no squawk because they are frustrated in their Trojan-horse efforts.

In this connection it is well to point out that in times of crises it is difficult to retain the right of freedom of speech by minorities. When public opinion becomes inflamed against minorities, as it is today with foreign "isms" of all kinds, it becomes dangerous for spokesmen of these "isms" to publicly advocate change, even though it be peaceful change. We have reached no crisis in this country, but it is not difficult to perceive the increasing tension in the land as a result of what is happening in Europe. It is a time when the individual must exercise a large degree of self-restraint and tolerance of viewpoints that may be contrary to his own, so long as those viewpoints are openly expressed and do not contemplate overthrow of our Government by force.

The New Deal would do well to clean up its myriad of alphabetical creations by replacing radical left-wingers with persons known for their honest intentions toward representative government. The time is past when radicalism of the type encouraged by the New Deal is a political asset. Communists have aided the New Deal in many ways only because the New Deal was traveling in their direction. The New Deal owes the subversive groups exactly nothing for their support. On the other hand, the New Deal is heavily obligated to the American people for the safety of our representative form of government.

South Seeks New Uses for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY OSCAR JOHNSTON

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Oscar Johnston entitled South Seeks New Uses for Cotton. This article was published in The Industrial Expansion of the South, the special edition of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 20, 1940]

SOUTH SEEKS NEW USES FOR COTTON—LARGER AND MORE DIVERSIFIED DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION REGARDED AS PERMANENT SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS OF COTTON GROWERS

(By Oscar Johnston, National Cotton Council of America)

In the opinion of many of the Nation's most able thinkers only a few years ago, cotton was doomed as a major factor in the American economic scheme. It was rapidly coming to be the belief of thousands of those connected with the cotton industry. And there were many factors which indicated that this opinion was well-founded.

Export figures driven to all-time lows, the world price of American cotton dipping to ruinous levels, steadily decreasing domestic consumption and multiple other factors had caused the greatest of America's agricultural industries to sink into a slough of despond.

That the Federal Government stepped in desperately attempting to stem the tide with such legislative dams as benefit payments, soil-conservation payments, cotton-adjustment payments, crop loans, production control, etc., did not alter the fact that the situation remained desperate, with the economic fate of 25,000,000 people hanging in the balance.

The very fact that such a situation did exist, and to a large extent still does exist, makes interesting a brief résumé of what the cotton industry, awakened to the true facts of the case, has done, is doing, and proposes to do, to lift itself by its own bootstraps to the level of prosperity which it formerly enjoyed.

First step toward the organization of a permanent coordinated agency to fight the battles of cotton was taken by representatives of each of the five branches of the raw-cotton industry at Cleveland, Miss., in June 1938. Funds for preliminary organization of a National Cotton Council of America were provided by a $9,000 appropriation by the Mississippi Legislature.

Such a council, composed of elected representatives of all raw-cotton interests in the 19 cotton-producing States, is today working actively toward its one goal of increasing throughout the world the consumption of American cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof.

A DEFINITE PROGRAM

The National Cotton Council has advocated a definite agricultural program. It was largely through the activities of the council that the Federal Government adopted a program which applied the so-called export subsidy to the 1939 crop, and not the ten-thousand-odd bales of cotton that had been accumulated by the Government as a result of the 1934, 1937, and 1938 loan programs. The effect of this was that a crop of 11,500,000 bales has moved with relative freedom. Some 7,000,000 or 7,500,000 bales of it will move directly from the producer through normal channels to the mills and ultimate consumers. Aided in part by the high price of Indian and Egyptian cotton resulting from war conditions, in part by the export subsidy, the exports of American cotton will this year approximate a minimum of 6,500,000 bales.

It is now apparent that our domestic consumption, plus our exports, will approximate 14,000,000 bales. The crop produced in

1939 was approximately 11,500,000 bales. This development means that price levels have been, or will be, such as to enable producers, who took advantage of the 1938 loan program, to withdraw between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 bales of the 1938 loan cotton, and to realize a fairly substantial profit from this transaction.

During 1939 the council was responsible for advertising and publicity to cotton such as has never been known in the history of the industry. Approximately 15,695,862 agate lines of publicity have been given to cotton at the instance of the council through newspapers, trade journals, and general magazines in the United States. The cause of cotton has been preached in civic groups, dinner groups, trade organizations, fashion shows, throughout the length and breadth of the land. It is not possible to measure in dollars and cents the results which have flowed from this publication.

The fact stands that the domestic consumption of cotton for the season, August 1, 1939, to July 31, 1940, will be above 7,500,000 bales as compared with a domestic consumption of 6,858,426 bales for the year ended July 31, 1939, and 7,747,978 bales for the year ended with July 31, 1938. This increase has not been an accident. There may be much argument as to what factors have contributed to this result, but the fact stands that the domestic consumption of cotton began increasing with the development of the activities of the National Cotton Council, and has increased proportionately as the council has increased its activities.

NEW OUTLETS

Seeking new outlets for cotton, the council conducted the first exhaustive survey of the possibility of successfully using cotton fabric as a membrane in the construction of bituminous roads. Dr. Gibb Gilchrist, dean of engineering at Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, conducted this survey. Though Dr. Gilchrist's studies revealed that cotton fabric at present manufactured is not sufficiently durable to make its use of material value in the construction of highways, they did prove the value of cotton fabric in curing concrete roads, in the construction of irrigation ditches and canals, and other sundry purposes.

Through the instrumentality of the Cotton Research Foundation, the research agency of the National Cotton Council, the council maintains at the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, Pittsburgh, Pa., a multiple research fellowship in which a number of chemists and scientists are employed. The fellowship is engaged in scientific research in an effort to develop new uses for cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof, and to so improve these materials as to develop increased consumption thereof in known uses.

In the future the research division will cooperate closely with the activities of research laboratories established under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture. Every effort will be made to harmonize the activities of these two agencies, and to avoid duplication and needless expenditures. The regional laboratories will deal with many agricultural commodities; the Research Foundation will deal exclusively with cotton, cottonseed, and their products.

Recognizing the value and the necessity to the industry of foreign markets and in an effort to meet world competition, the council has gone on record as recommending so-called "tariff adjustment," or "cotton price adjustment," or "parity" payments to American producers in such amounts as would bring the normal returns from an average crop to a price level comparable with returns realized by those engaged in other lines of endeavor. An export subsidy can be made most beneficial in our efforts to export in competition with other cotton-producing countries, provided, however, the plan contemplating such a subsidy be so developed as to permit the free marketing of cotton by producers through normal and established trade channels, and not by diverting the cotton into a governmental agency to be marketed by a Federal bureau.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Definitely going on record in favor of continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program which expires June 12, 1940, the council is lending tremendous Cotton Belt support to the act extending authority for the negotiation of such agreements.

Through a period of 75 years we have demonstrated definitely and conclusively that international trade policies and tariffs cannot be economically and scientifically developed by direct congressional action. For this action there was substituted the plan of reciprocal-trade agreements, confessedly an emergency measure. It has been successful and would have succeeded infinitely more but for the development of the European war.

State and Federal trade barriers against cottonseed food products, particularly oleomargarine, have been vigorously attacked by the council during the past year. Early oleomargarine, made largely from imported oils and fats, fell easy prey to the dairy-products industry which feared the new product would encroach on its butter market. As a result of their activity, the manufacturers of creamery butter have been able to cause State and Federal Governments to so restrict margarine sales through taxes and license fees as to make its use in many instances virtually impossible.

With the rapidly increasing use of cottonseed oil in margarine during recent years, it has fallen to the cotton industry and its agency, the council, to seek the removal of discriminations against the cottonseed-oil product. So successful has been the council's campaign that in 1939 a total of 29 legislative attempts to place new restrictions on margarine were defeated and early in 1940 the Mississippi State Legislature so amended its statutes as to exempt dealers in margarine made from domestic oils and fats from license fees. Efforts are being made to have other State and Federal restrictions removed.

PROGRAM FOR 1940

So much for what has been done, and for what is in process of being done. Let us turn now to the cotton industry's program for 1940.

The council will continue its efforts to obtain extension of the life of the authority of the President to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements. So long as the authority to negotiate these agreements is in existence, the council will continue its efforts to bring about the negotiations of specific agreements designed to promote the export of cotton, cottonseed, and their products.

The council will continue to wage a campaign against high tariffs where those tariffs interfere with international commerce in such a manner as to affect adversely the cotton industry. The council will continue its efforts to bring about tariff reductions where such reductions will not seriously adversely affect our domestic economy.

In the specific instances of the abrogation of the Japanese trade treaty, efforts will be made by the cotton industry to have negotiations handled through customary diplomatic channels rather than through legislation. The Japanese market is one of the largest open to the cotton-export industry. Despite the fact that to a major extent Japan is largely dependent upon the United States for oil, scrap iron, and other materials vitally essential to her economic life and as a market for her raw silk, this country depends upon Japan to absorb approximately 1,000,000 bales of cotton a year.

Although the termination of the treaty does not necessarily mean that either the American Government or that of Japan must necessarily alter trade conditions which have existed under the treaty between the two nations, the situation leaves each country in a position to modify, or to terminate, trade relations between the two countries. The council takes the attitude that the Japanese Government and our Government should, at an early date, reach a mutually satisfactory agreement which will permit the negotiation of a trade agreement and treaty between the two countries, thereby enabling business interests of the two countries to resume the mutually profitable trade relations which have existed between them in the past.

AN UNSOUND PRACTICE

In search of a reason for America's declining foreign trade, the members of the raw-cotton industry early determined that the gradual development of a high-tariff policy, culminating in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, had resulted to the detriment of agriculture as a whole and of cotton in particular.

We are now engaged in a policy or practice which, in my judgment, is utterly economically unsound, and which will, unless timely action is taken, result in an enormous financial loss to the United States. The policy referred to is that of buying gold.

This country is now annually exchanging millions of dollars of goods, wares, and merchandise for the commodity gold, which has not appreciable real intrinsic value. Without regard to its cost of production, we have fixed arbitrarily a price of $35 per ounce, and announced to the world our willingness to purchase, regardless of the quantity offered, the gold of the world at that artificial and exorbitant price level.

For wheat, cotton, and other commodities, raw and manufactured, produced in America, we are taking vast quantities of gold, which is being buried at Fort Knox. Already there has been accumulated some $18,000,000,000 of gold, valued at the artificial value of $35 per ounce. Expressed more accurately, we have acquired by volume or weight 63 percent of the monetary gold in the world. It may be asked, What is the relation between our gold policy and the objectives of the National Cotton Council? The answer is obvious. The people of the Cotton Belt are interested in future foreign markets for cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof. The economic situation which is developing throughout the world by reason of America's silly and short-sighted gold policy threatens the future of the cotton industry in that it threatens to destroy export markets.

It probably would be unwise at the moment to discontinue arbitrarily the gold-buying policy, unwise though it was in conception and inception. There are, however, steps which can be taken. Congress should terminate the discretionary power given the President to further devalue the dollar by reduction of its gold content. Congress can remonetize gold by making available, on demand, to every holder of an American paper dollar gold on the basis of an ounce of gold for $35. Holders of American dollars should be allowed to redeem against these dollars at their election in the form of gold coin, or gold bars, or bullion.

An ideal opportunity now exists for the United States to make the dollar the world standard of value to the end that when peace is restored international commerce may be on a dollar basis. This can only be accomplished if the dollar is stabilized, and is supported by the basic monetary metal, gold; and that metal made available to the holders of dollars throughout the world. The only value of gold is its value as a base for national currencies and a basis for international trade. If we own all the chips, the international poker game will have to come to an end, or the players agree to use a new variety of chips.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Looking now to the domestic side of the picture, we find that if through promotional activities planned by the National Cotton Council, the domestic consumption of cotton per capita per day

should be increased to the extent of fourteen one-hundredths of an ounce, 10 percent, we would increase our annual domestic consumption 750,000 bales, which, added to our last year's consumption of 6,858,426 bales, would bring our domestic consumption to within a few bales of an all-time high record.

That such an increase is possible through promotional work outlined for 1940 is obvious. Since November 1938 the council has engaged in the most extensive promotional campaign in the history of the cotton industry. For the first 5 months of the current crop year domestic mill consumption has been 3,312,000 bales, an increase of 18 percent over last year. Assuming normal conditions for the next 6 months, we are warranted in anticipating a domestic consumption this year of a minimum of 7,750,000 bales, a consumption equal to that of 1936–37. This has not been the result of an accident. It has been the direct and provable result of a Nation-wide effort to promote the use of cotton.

That the supply of ordinary cotton clothing of the average American family is woefully inadequate is best shown by the fact that men's and boys' dress shirts average for persons of the age who wear these shirts two and two-thirds garments per person; sheets, four per family; men's overalls, one and one-half suits per worker; towels, eight per family; work pants, one and one-half per worker; men's underwear, two and one-half suits per man.

In every field where cotton is used much greater usage can be expected if proper promotional activities are pursued. It is such a promotional program which the cotton industry is preparing to launch.

Cotton is the great natural American fiber. Twenty-five million people are directly dependent upon its production for a livelihood. Other millions are supported by having the benefit of the buying power of those dependent upon cotton. The great manufacturing centers of America find their best markets in the Cotton Belt of America. Millions of dollars are invested by trust companies and others in securities dependent directly upon cotton for servicing as to principal and interest.

It is only through the efforts of the cotton industry itself that cotton's battle will be won. Cotton men are beginning to realize the fundamental soundness of this statement. With a continuance of the principles and policies newly adopted, the industry and the Nation will within a relatively few years see the consumption at home of a minimum of 10,000,000 bales and an annual export of a minimum of 6,000,000 bales of cotton.

America's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY W. W. WAYMACK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me a speech delivered by W. W. Waymack on the subject of American foreign policy, delivered by him over the radio on May 15, 1940, from Chicago, on the American Retail Federation Forum, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all I want to insist that the common differentiating between some problems as domestic and others as international is not only largely meaningless but that it is mischievous if taken seriously.

A blazing and exploding Europe today, not to mention Asia, is so obviously a concern of ours that words are not needed to prove that. The uncertainties about tomorrow are such that we know now perfectly well that we may even be drawn into the hell. We hope, pray, and intend that we shall not be, but surely all can see by now that the illusions of safe detachment "though the Heavens fall" that have been preached to us have been reduced to a wisp of smoke. If we have a grain of realism in us, we shall reassess today our concepts of what foreign policy means for us, shall consider the role that we want America to play on the stage of the whole world.

Isolation and internationalism have unfortunately become epithets. That is the usual thing. Words get polarized. And from that moment on they appeal to emotions instead of sense. So, not because as words they are in any degree better but wholly because they are different words, therefore not yet emotionally charged, I shall put the question this way: Shall American policy toward world problems henceforth be participationist or nonparticipationist?

Now, the moment we get out of the epithet atmosphere, I think we find that the area of agreement is wider than is commonly assumed. For instance, we know, and no matter what else they say practically all political leaders on both party sides concede it, that America is part of the world. We know, as a result of the first World War, of the great depression, and of the present war, that we are inevitably and drastically affected by what happens elsewhere. We know that is true economically. We know it is true politically and socially. We know it is true culturally and spiritually. We know it is perfectly impossible for this country ever so to insulate itself that we can have economic soundness and a rising standard of living, which in turn is essential to all our ideals, if the rest of the world destroys itself.

We know we can never so insulate ourselves as not to be vitally affected in the long run by the philosophies that prevail elsewhere in the world.

We know that the only nation which, in modern times—using that term very broadly—has ever insulated itself from the rest of the world, either as to economics or as to ideas, was Japan; that Japan did this for three centuries, before steamships and railroads and submarine cables and telephones and radio and airplanes, before "the machine age," in short, and did it only by virtue of a complete hermit life—nobody coming in, nobody coming out; no trade, no ambassadors, no information, and no ideas coming in or going out. We also know that it was we of America who jerked Japan into the modern stream; and the moment we reflect we know that America was but the agent of forces as wide as the world, as deep as the ocean, incapable of being resisted.

Nothing that men can count upon, in heaven or on the earth, can prevent America from being concerned in its own interest, for all the tomorrows, with what happens in Europe, with what happens anywhere. We shall be moved by economics. We shall be moved by moral judgment. We shall be moved by considerations of the preservation of our free way of life.

We know, in short, that we are not going to be nonparticipationist in determining world affairs. We know, despite our brief experience as a "great power," that both our ideals and our material resources make us, whether we will or not, one of the world's determining factors, possibly the greatest. Everyone of intelligence among us knows that no matter what policies we pursue, whether they be affirmative or negative, whether they be thought-through and guided or 100-percent drift, whether they be action or inaction, they will affect the course of events. We are participationist, of necessity, even if our decision is just a refusal consciously to participate. To do nothing is to do something, and that something is just as likely to be determining as any other something.

So the question is not whether America shall be participationist in world affairs. The question is purely as to how we shall participate, when we shall participate, whether we shall participate intelligently and constructively or otherwise.

Broadly speaking, it is a question as to whether we shall throw our weight, or even let our weight fall, eventually on the side of the forces that make for peace, stability, economic opportunity, and what we believe to be the true values, or, contrariwise, whether by action or inaction we reinforce the opposite things.

It may seem very foolish, I grant you, to talk of an eventual peace now, in the face of the news of the terrific battle that is developing in western Europe—a battle of such violence and desperateness, of such possible vast consequence as this one may have. Particularly it may seem untimely since the battle is not going too reassuringly.

Yet there must be either peace ultimately or no peace. We are able to see now, surely, what no peace, or a mock peace, would inevitably involve for America. The great illusion that we can afford to "let the rest of the world go hang," or even, by declining to cooperate for a better order, sabotage the chance of a better order, is surely exploded now.

The dreamiest of all the dreamers have been those who for 20 years told us that our immunity from risks lay in attempted secession from the planet. That thing cannot be done.

Meantime there are the problems at home, some of which may be made by war impossible of solution in the democratic way. They are not impossible of that kind of solution now. And the major ones all are involved in the question whether democracy can maintain itself against the totalitarian idea.

Even a casual study of the means whereby the totalitarian idea is made to take root in additional countries will convince any sensible man that the principal means is a breaking down of confidence—at a certain stage the deliberate fomenting of this collapse of confidence—in the capacity of any great people to solve its social problems well enough and fast enough by democratic processes.

Both fascism of all varieties and communism feed on discontent and democratic defeatism. They interfere with the solution of problems, then use the nonsolution to promote democracy's overthrow.

And the Fascist brand of antidemocratic revolution, though it does not omit to appeal to narrow and stupid men of property, is just as dependent upon mass grievances and mass support as the Communist brand is. Both are revolutions from the bottom, make no mistake about that. Both appeal to unhappy youth, to classes and groups of huge size that are either oppressed or can be made to believe that they are oppressed. Both promise security, stability, a better day to great strata near the bottom.

And either, once established, becomes a complete dictatorship dedicated ostensibly to the interest of the common man, founded on mass support, utilizing all the enginery of suppression against every possible kind of ideological dissent, including religious, and each proceeds to tax and confiscate utterly without limit for "welfare" purposes. The most significant thing about the two revolutionary menaces is the ease with which they have been able to merge, as far as nationalist interests make it expedient, on the ideological base of a joint contempt for "pluto democracy."

The principal reason for facing starkly all the important, unsolved economic and social problems we have is because doing something convincing about them is indispensable to the preservation of all our freedoms here.

We cannot shut ourselves up and ignore the wars. Everything that we do domestically will be affected favorably or unfavorably by the wars. Nevertheless, a primary necessity for the defense of all the values of a free society—which, after all, is our real objective—must be an honest and intelligent attempt at intergroup cooperation to put our domestic problems definitely and perceptibly in the course of ultimate solution.

To the extent that we can do that, and only to such extent, we can become mentally easy about the mongers of hate, prejudice, passion, and violence in our midst. Insofar as we progress in this line, and only insofar, the manufacturers of "personal devils," be those "devils" Jews, international bankers, atheists, or whatnot, will be made futile mountebanks incapable of inflation into "fuehrers" or their equivalent.

Let me add that the antidemocratic ideologies and systems not only promise security and an economic lift to the masses that they enslave, but they also make tremendous use of a sense of national unity. The emotional appeal of this in the world at its present stage is enormous. If democracy permits this to be monopolized by totalitarian regimes, the conflict is most unequal. The question here is whether democracy, too, in its own free way, cannot also create a national unity of its own free kind, into which enthusiasm and the zest of accomplishment for great ends can be thrown.

The New Deal and the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM J. THOMPKINS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the Honorable William J. Thompkins, Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, made a speech at a meeting in Chicago of the United Colored Democratic Association of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As each election year approaches we find numerous prophets in both of the major political parties who contend that their political party is going to win in the national election. During the last three national elections there has been a miraculous drift of Negro votes to the Democratic Party. The change of Negro voters from the politics of the Republican to the Democratic Party is due its share of credit for the success of the Democratic Party in the last two national elections.

As both parties map plans for their national conventions the question has reached a new high, with the Republicans contending that the New Deal has done nothing for the Negro which would justify his remaining with that party. They contend that the Negro is no better off than he was before he left the Republicans, and that his only salvation lies in a return to that party.

It is my opinion that the Democratic Party will not only hold every Negro vote it now has, but that the benefits Negroes have derived from the New Deal administration of President Roosevelt will win for the party thousands of additional Negro votes. For 65 years the Negroes perpetuated the Republican Party in office. This was conclusively shown by the lily-white organization started by Taft, down through the grand finale of the Hoover administration, which divorced the bulk of the Negroes from the Republican Party. Recent elections in such cities as Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Indianapolis where the Negro wards showed a much larger Democratic vote proportionately than the white wards, give evidence that peace and contentment in the Democratic Party are on the upward trend with assured permanency. The treatment which the race has received at the hands of Democratic administration justifies its continued support of that party.

For the first time in the history of our country it has given us a colored man in the White House on the secretarial staff—absolutely unprecedented. It has given us representation as economists in the National Recovery Administration. It has given us several architects and engineers in the Subsistence Homestead Division of the N. R. A.; it has given us representation on the legal staff of the Public Works Administration and in the Post Office Department; it has given us a representative in the Farm Credit Bureau of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to look after the needs and opportunities of the colored farmers of the country; it has given us a clearing house in the Department of the Interior, presided over by a highly efficient representative of the race, assisted by a competent staff, to promote the economic status of the race; it has given us representation in the vast welfare operations of the W. P. A. under Colonel Harrington; it has given us significant representation in the Department of Justice, and in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia; it gave us our first Federal judge, in the person of Wm. H. Hastie, and upon his resignation, Attorney Moore, of Chicago, was appointed as his successor; it has given us 25 outstanding high-salaried posts of distinction, including representation among the conciliators of the Department of Labor and an advisor to the Secretary of Commerce on racial matters.

It has given us $2,000,000 for improvements at Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital; $262,000 to Virginia State College; $87,000 for Lincoln University in Missouri; $500,000 for the Wendell Phillips High School at Chicago; $40,000 for West Virginia State College; paid $100 per month to 114 colored school teachers in Chicago engaged in the work of reducing adult illiteracy, and has extended this benevolent aid in other directions.

According to the 1930 census Negro youth represented 11 percent of the total youth population between the ages of 16 and 24. It is estimated that in January 1940 approximately 82,800 Negro youths were employed on N. Y. A. programs. This was 11.1 percent of the total employment on these programs, or almost exactly the same proportion which Negro youth of this age bears to the total youth population.

It has done more than any other administration to eliminate the slum districts of our great cities through its public-works program, and that work has but begun. As a result of this program low-cost housing projects have been completed or begun in such cities as Atlanta, Washington, Chicago, New York, Nashville, New Orleans, Newport News, and others.

This record excels that of all previous administrations—Democratic or Republican—and there is nothing the Republicans have done in the past 8 years, or is there anything they are likely to do, to offset the benefits which the race has received from the New Deal.

There can be no doubt that the New Deal, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, holds out greater promise to the Negro than the Old Deal under Taft, Harding, and Hoover. Beginning with the Taft administration, through the Harding, and with the tragic ending of the Hoover regime, all of these administrations showed the descendency or the decline of the Negroes in Republican politics. These administrations disqualified the Negro and annihilated him, politically and economically. The New Deal under Franklin D. Roosevelt has given him new hope and a representative place in every department of the Government. Never before in the history of our Nation have Negro scientists, architects, engineers, and educators been given even the semblance of an opportunity such as has been given scores of the members of the race. In fact, the Taft, Harding, and Hoover administrations offered us nothing but platform promises which were forgotten as soon as they were made.

The New Deal has brought and is calculated to bring more economic and industrial benefits to the Negro. More than 45,000 Negroes in the C. C. C. camps have been taught to read and write. Thousands of Negroes have been employed in the scientific and industrial projects throughout the country, to the point of developing themselves into the classes of skilled tradesmen and artisans. This opportunity, which has come for the first time, has lifted them to a higher efficiency, has enabled them to meet the economic and industrial requirements of the present better, and has strengthened them to meet competition in a bigger way in the future, whereby they are enjoying more freedom and more representation in the councils of labor.

Much has been said about the political and civil rights of the Negro in the South and what the President has failed to do in promoting them. No statesman can fail to be pragmatic if he would be of service to his day and generation, and, as "actions speak louder than words," we can say that President Roosevelt has advanced the economic and social welfare of the race immensely in the South and, indeed, all over the country by setting the example in very practical ways of demonstrating his allegiance to constitutional government. As evidence we have several of the Southern States encouraging Negroes to assume and maintain their political and civil responsibilitiles in the councils of Democracy. This policy of the President has been far-reaching, bursting even the confines of the Democratic Party, brushing aside old southern traditions with astounding amazement. Only recently Negro athletes were invited to Texas and competed with whites in Dallas. Negro pictures and classics are appearing in southern newspapers. Texas, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia, as well as Oklahoma, recently competed with Negro athletes in the Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Kansas relays. In every phase of our national life, Roosevelt's policies have lifted the race higher.

The continued ascendancy of the Democrat in national politics with the aid of millions of colored voters is breaking down the spirit of southern intolerance and is raising the status of the Negro as a whole. The Negro must profit, however, by the mistakes of this Negro Republican leadership. He must rise to the occasion of assuming and maintaining his due social position. He must practice loyalty, unity, and impress upon the race the necessity of sharing the responsibilities of the party as well as the assets. He must be taught to pay the poll tax and register. He must be taught that which he has never been taught by the Republican Negro leadership—that citizenship carries with it the responsibility of financial support, effective organization, and activities just as strong on the "givers" end; yes, stronger than on the "receivers" end. To achieve you must serve. To receive you must give. With these principles, advocated and practiced, there will be no adverse status.

Frequently I have been asked my opinion concerning the relative attitude of the old-line bourbon Democrats of the South and the new issue of lily-white Republicans of that section. My answer has been that the old-line bourbon Democrats of the South live in the realm of their traditions and retain their traditional pride. However, back of this, they like the Negroes and long for them to be one of them, but they cannot rise to the occasion to ask him. Thus they ask no grounds and give none to those who have opposed them for 64 years. The lily-white Republicans of the South are the selfish offsprings of the old carpet baggers—the dregs of the bourbons; they have no traditions, no special respect for the South as is, nor for the North; but are rather opportunists and wolves in sheep's clothing, who want the support of the Negroes in the party but are not willing nor have they any intention of sharing the legitimate spoils of office with them. They have no principles and little respect. They have failed in their own ranks and are constantly hoping to share the spoils alone when the opposite party is in power. The lily-whites are the Negroes' most despicable opponents, far worse than the most rabid bourbons. They will seek and use you and then desert or destroy you, while the bourbons ask no grounds and give none.

Certain sources are conducting a whispering campaign to smear all that the New Deal has done simply because the Senate has not passed an antilynching bill. For 25 years the Republican Party bluffed about the Dyer antilynching bill, and it was never brought to discussion in the Senate, notwithstanding the Republicans had the House, the Senate, and the Supreme Court for more than a half century. At the first opportunity where voting cloture would have ultimately brought the antilynching bill to a successful end, the Republicans declined to vote because they knew that the Democrats would have been given credit for the passage of the bill. In the beginning many of the southern Senators did not think that the antilynching bill would have failed, and as filibuster was approaching its end, the late Senator Borah's speech did more to rejuvenate the filibuster than anything else; and he is, perhaps, the person most responsible for the defeat of the bill. The status is almost a stand-off with the exception that the Democratic Party made a more persistent effort for its passage than was manifested in any other session of Congress; when the Republicans were overwhelmingly in the majority. When the crucial test came the Republicans failed.

The Negro knows that the New Deal has been his salvation during these days of turmoil, strife, and depression. He knows that his continued salvation lies not in switching from a party that has been truly a party of the people by the people and for the people but in remaining in the Democratic Party that has thrived on deeds, not on broken promises.

This race will stand firmly faithful and loyal to democracy and the New Deal in helping to achieve even greater goals for all people.

Greenland, Denmark, and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Times-Herald of April 13, 1940, entitled "Greenland, Denmark, and the United States."

In this connection I may say that Iceland is also part of the Western Hemisphere, 180 miles from Greenland, 700 miles from Norway, and 600 miles from Scotland. The island of Jan Mayer, near Iceland, is an American island. We must own and control all these territories in the interest of American defense. These islands furnish ideal naval and air bases. If we want defense, here is real defense for the American Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of April 13, 1940]

GREENLAND, DENMARK, AND THE UNITED STATES

OUR "KEEP OUT" SIGN

The United States Monroe Doctrine, as set forth by President James Monroe in 1823 and extended by later interpretations, puts the United States in the position of (quoting the Britannica)—"being opposed (1) to any non-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American states under any guise, and (2) to the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in the Western Hemisphere by any non-American power."

Many are the European raids, conquests, and plots against Western Hemisphere nations that this doctrine has prevented or nipped in the bud. The most notable instance was that of Maximilian in Mexico.

DENMARK GETS GREENLAND, 1814

The big island of Greenland was discovered by Viking sea rovers early in the tenth century and was explored and colonized by Eric the Red, a Norwegian, beginning 982 A. D. Leif Ericson brought Christianity to Greenland about 1000 A. D. Ericson did a lot of voyaging westward from Greenland and, in all probability, colonized a bit of the North American mainland, most likely near New Bedford, Mass.

When Norway and Denmark split apart in 1814, Denmark got Greenland, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands as colonies. Denmark recognized Iceland as a sovereign state, united with Denmark under the Danish King, in 1918. Greenland went on being a Danish colony.

Denmark was occupied early this week by Adolf Hitler's armies, blitzkrieging their way toward Norway.

GERMANY GETS DENMARK, 1940

Greenland is in the Western Hemisphere.

That fact, as soon as Hitler's occupation of Denmark was accomplished, raised the question: What about Greenland now?

The British have occupied the Faroe Islands, promising to restore them to Denmark when and if Denmark is restored. Iceland has said it will carry on on its own, though there is talk of the British forcing a protectorate on it. But how about Greenland?

WHO GETS GREENLAND?

Greenland is an Arctic and sub-Arctic island of great size—about 740,000 square miles, the main drawback being that about 705,000 of these square miles are capped with ice averaging 1,000 feet thick.

Greenland's population, about 16,600, lives on the fringes of the great island. Its big mineral export is cryolite, of which it has the world's largest deposits; and it ships considerable fish, fur, and graphite. The island's trade has been a Danish monopoly since 1776.

Greenland's coast has various fjords which could be used as submarine bases or hideaways; there are some flat areas which might be turned into air bases.

WE'D BETTER TAKE IT OVER

All this makes us feel that the United States had better lay plans for assuming protection of Greenland until and unless Denmark regains enough independence to claim it back. The same arrangement, we mean, as the British have made about the Faroe Islands, or much the same.

The object would be frankly to keep the Monroe Doctrine sovereign in this hemisphere, and to keep grabby European hands off Greenland.

We don't want any European nation planting air bases or sub bases on Greenland. There will be much less danger of that if we take over Greenland's protection than if we leave it lying around loose for any nation to pick up.

Whatever we do or don't do about Greenland, it looks more and more as if the rights of small nations are reaching the vanishing point.

UNITED STATES AS "SUN" OF THE WEST

Denmark, for example, may be resurrected by the Allies, and so may Norway. But that will only mean that these Scandinavian nations, instead of being German protectorates, will be British protectorates. It looks to us as if the world is moving toward a few big planetary systems of nations, with various small nations drawn into the orbit of the biggest nation in each system, and a good deal of free trade and pooling of natural resources enforced inside each system.

The logical "sun" for the Western Hemisphere nations to revolve around is the United States.

A Program and Market for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR AIKEN, OF VERMONT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered on Tuesday, May 21, by Governor Aiken, of Vermont, in Springfield, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To be here in Springfield at the home of the greatest of our Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, is an inspiration. Whenever I think of Lincoln's leadership, I also think of the men among whom he grew up, the men who first rallied around him as a public figure and whom he typified.

Those who swayed the destiny of our Nation at that time were men who labored long and hard wielding the ax and following the plow from sunup to sundown. They knew poverty and hardships that are almost mythical today. Yet they were the strength of America, and the future of the Nation is ever dependent on such as they. Much of the greatness of Abraham Lincoln rested on his ability to understand and serve the needs of those people who lived by the labor of their hands.

Today we must not forget that the Americans who work in farm and factory are still the backbone of our country and that they view the national scene and recognize that many problems of a critical nature in America today are not being solved. Some of these problems are regional, such as a lack of balance in economic activities in the South, the industrial readjustment of New England and the regional agricultural problem of the "dust bowl."

It is only natural that each individual or each group or each subarea feels that his or its own problem should receive first attention. We often hear the South called the Nation's number one problem.

The labor leaders will tell you that unemployment is our number one problem. Get a group of businessmen together, and they will tell you with feeling that taxes and overbearing Federal regulations are the number one problem.

We folks who are engaged in farming feel that we have the right to call agriculture the number one problem.

In size, agriculture is our greatest occupation. Besides being the greatest body of consumers of manufactured goods, we produce many of the raw materials that keep the wheels of our factories turning, and we supply most of the food which our population consumes.

But we know that there is no single "number one problem" in this Nation, because to the welfare of the country as a whole, all are interrelated and are equally important. All must have a reasonable solution before economic and social conditions in the United States can be readjusted to their rightful places. These joint and several problems can be resolved into four main objectives which the American people are seeking.

First, peace. Peace with ourselves and with the other nations of the world. Second, an adequate and profitable employment for American men and women. Third, due reward for the days of toil on the farm. And last, but by no means least, the preservation of our cherished heritage of liberty.

Concerning the first, the balance of peace or war is precarious, not because of any doubts in the minds of the American people, but because it is wholly possible for a small group or for a single individual possessing power and authority, to disregard the wishes and welfare of our people and plunge us into international conflict.

Billions of dollars have been poured out to overcome unemployment. Still we have, according to Federal figures, nine million unemployed, humiliated by a relief status while the Nation staggers under an ever-mounting tax and debt burden.

Farmers have received in exchange for loss of their market, billions of dollars in the form of "hand-outs" or subsidies. And still after years of this, we cannot break even without accepting Government donations and Government domination.

The bureaucratic centralization and direction put upon us in the name of benevolence and social justice has not permanently alleviated the lot of the underprivileged. Unless checked before it goes any further, our legacy of liberty will be a hollow vestige.

These are the problems which still face us. Most of them are in a more aggravated form after several years' tampering by an administration that was entrusted with national power because its promises and professed leadership renewed the hope of a discouraged Nation

We have tried this program for 7 long years. We have given it every opportunity to work. Now if we would preserve to ourselves those liberties earned with a century and a half of sacrifice and toil, if we would give to millions of our people the full and satisfying realization that they are independent and earning their own living, if we would keep from our borders the specter of war and poverty and pestilence now haunting the minds of all the people of the world—then America must turn to another kind of program—an American program conducted in an American way.

We must devote ourselves to a task which seems difficult, if not almost superhuman. We must unite among ourselves with the strength that will overcome the forces that have brought so many to dependency and despair. We must make up our minds at the start that in getting behind the program that will restore Americans to their rightful status, we must, above all things, be sincere and honest.

Let's talk about farming today. I have never lived off a farm except for the time I have been in the service of my State government. My interest through life has been primarily concerned with the land and its uses.

Farming is the largest of our occupations. It is the greatest in inherent difficulties. For a century it has been the main source of population for our industrial nation. In considering agriculture, we are starting from the ground up in attacking our national problem.

What has happened to this most individualistic occupation in this individualistic Nation? During the last few years, we have been precipitated into the chaos of artificial price fixing, of loans on crops above market prices, of a thinly disguised political soil conservation program, of crops plowed under, and the slaughter of beef and hogs while millions of people unemployed or on relief were without proper food.

We have wandered through a maze of imposed production control. We have seen Government subsidies for the farmer pushing the national debt higher and higher, but only making up a small part of the income we would have received from the sale of our crops in a normal market. These attempts made by political farmers have brought to the practical tiller of the soil, the following results:

The American farmer has lost his place in the agricultural markets of the world. The cotton farmer especially has seen these world markets plowed and traded out from under him, until today one South American country has come into cotton production to capture many foreign markets which previously and properly belonged to our southern planters. This permanent loss of our markets has been partially made up by subsidies paid from the earnings of our lowest-paid industrial workers.

The hungry people of our Nation have seen American crops dumped upon foreign countries at a price far below that which they have been compelled to pay unless they have been willing to admit pauperism and accept certified charity.

We have seen the Agricultural Department and the agricultural services fathered by a great Senator from the State of Vermont, Justin Morrill, develop into a maze of political bureaucracies far removed from the original and legitimate purposes of a Department of Agriculture and become involved among quota cards, work sheets, and benefit checks. And in this expansion of bureaucracy we have seen the disastrous effects of mistakes and wrong guesses magnified to a Nation-wide scale.

Futile efforts have been made by white-collar farmers in Washington to devise programs, national in scope, to fit the needs of the citrus-fruit growers of Texas, the vegetable growers of California, the corn producers of Illinois and the tobacco growers of the South all at one and the same time. The real farmer who knows the problems of his own community and of his own production has been expected to say "yes" and sign on the dotted line.

Don't think that I am advocating a return to the days of a generation ago when every farmer worked out his salvation for himself. It goes without saying that almost every farmer in the United States demands that constant efforts be made to bring American agriculture out of the present chaos, rejecting methods that have been tried and failed and applying properly and efficiently methods that promise to succeed, and thus to build a sound program for agriculture.

Farmers realize changing conditions in our Nation. We realize our obligation to social betterment. We realize that for our welfare, we are dependent not only upon each other but upon other groups of labor, industry, and the professions as well.

But we are getting sick of having agriculture made a political football with bribery here and threats there. I think it is time for the 30,000,000 farm dwellers of the United States to rise in their might and demand that an agricultural program be promulgated and administered by men motivated by something more than good intentions or political expediency, and so to restore prosperity and pride and independence not only to our own group but to others as well.

What kind of a program would we suggest? A prominent Grange leader when asked what the farmer needs most today, promptly answered, "to be let alone." Anyone can sympathize with the inner feelings which prompted this reply. Perhaps his suggestion might work if the business of the world were conducted purely on

a supply and demand basis. But when that basis is disrupted by man-made regulations in the marketing field, those disruptions compel artificial adjustments for producers also.

Any kind of a program, no matter how well devised, will fail—if it is not wisely and efficiently and intelligently handled. Every man who works the soil with his own hands knows that you can't apply in detail the same methods to Oklahoma cotton that you would to Connecticut Valley onions.

But I feel safe in saying that most farmers of America can and will support a program which embodies the following:

For those crops which we produce for domestic consumption, such as meats, cheese, casein, and grains, and which are meeting heavy competition from federally encouraged imports, we would provide effective and reasonable protection either by tariff or treaty. By the same means we would encourage the production of crops which could be economically and abundantly produced here except for foreign competition with its low-cost labor. In this field particular reference is made to fats and oils.

There are, however, American farm products of which we produce an exportable surplus and the price of which is made in the world market, such as cotton and wheat. The present administration has attempted to eliminate this surplus through arbitrary crop reduction and control. The results have been disheartening.

On those crops whose price is made in the world market, and on which direct protection would not avail, we would guarantee the farmer a fair return on that part of his crop needed for domestic consumption. He could grow as much more as he wished and take his chances on the world market for this surplus.

This would necessitate a domestic allotment plan for these crops, and sometimes a subsidy to be paid directly from the Treasury instead of from processing taxes. With American industry demanding and receiving protection from cheap labor and world-wide competition, no one can honestly object to equitable protection being given the American farmer.

We would continue the principle of the ever-normal granary. In view of the year-to-year variations in crop prices and yield, American farmers deserve a moderate average return adequate to meet the normal costs of production instead of taking the losses in low-price years and seeing speculators reap the benefit of high prices.

Individuals and cooperatives that have adequate storage and preservation facilities should receive loans on their crops at moderate prices on the sole condition that they must market these crops before they deteriorate. The farmer should decide when to dispose of his surplus on which he has a moderate loan. He should decide this on his own opinion, warranted by local or national or personal conditions.

This is better for the national economy and more democratic. The consensus of opinion of tens of thousands of farmers throughout the country is much safer and much more likely to be right than a large-scale decision of a single individual or small group of Government employees, who have previously demonstrated an uncanny ability to guess wrong.

The American farmer favors a soil-conservation program, but not a general and blanket policy to be used as a thinly disguised political subsidy. We want soil conservation in places where it is needed to remedy bad conditions.

The farmer of today realizes that there are vast areas of land designated as submarginal that are not yielding proper returns and ought not to be used for the growing of crops. When practicable, such land should be retired from cultivation. But when it is economically occupied by free-born Americans, they should not be forced to give up their homes, which mean liberty to them, and submit to resettlement under a burden of debt from which they can never escape merely to satisfy the whims and hallucinations of a Government bureau.

Submarginal land can be temporarily retired and used for a generation or 10 generations for forestry or other purposes. It can be put into the public domain, local or State or national. But it should always be kept available for reoccupation as homes should the needs of the future so dictate. It is far better to own a home on poor land than to own no home at all.

The American farmer believes that with a national crop surplus as a problem that no further extension of vast and expensive irrigation projects should be undertaken unless it is clearly evident that Government investment can be repaid dollar for dollar from project income on a basis that users can afford to pay. It is just plain folly to use taxpayers' money to build up one section of the country to destroy the agricultural prosperity of another.

We believe today, and I say this with the feeling that it does represent the opinion of several million American farmers, that we should encourage family agriculture in every possible way. It should be made possible to secure a living from the land wholly or in part without the factory methods used in large-scale commercial, specialized agriculture. Millions of farmers or part-time farmers engaged in general family agriculture make up a backlog of security and prosperity and happiness for our Nation.

This kind of agriculture is a means to an independent living and is conducive to good citizenship. I never knew a man and woman living in a home of their own with rambler roses growing on the porch and a garden behind the house that were interested in overthrowing a government of the people. The United States Government should encourage self-sufficiency and part-time agriculture to the fullest extent.

Facilities of the Extension Service should be made available to these people. County and home-demonstration agents should be given full opportunity to help them, instead of having to take all their time filling out millions of cards which furnish names of voters to headquarters in Washington.

Every farmer in the United States would encourage the diversification of agriculture by farm and by region to an extent that would insure greater security. By every means we should encourage the organization of cooperatives where small-scale farmers can pool their interests in order to deal more successfully in the market and to secure services which would be impossible to them acting as individuals. Even on a national scale, cooperatives which are suited to the individualistic natures of a group of farmers might well prove to be an alternative to Government regulation.

We do not approve in any way of political manipulations which seek to take over control of cooperative banking or any other cooperative enterprises. We farmers consider our cooperatives as our own organizations, and not company unions of the Government.

Part-time and cooperative agriculture, properly encouraged and fostered by the Federal Government, but without the menace of Federal domination attached, would go far toward solving the rural problem and make farm life attractive to young people. Government might well provide financial assistance at the start, as it helps young people in the cities with the National Youth Administration.

The future welfare and the security of our Nation depends largely upon maintaining a proper balance of farm and industrial population. Through the generations of our history we have learned that the farm is the source of supply for new leadership for industry and new population for the city.

As substitutes are found for farm crops in certain fields, and as uses for these crops become obsolete, a broad and legitimate field for government appears. It is the field of research.

Industrial chemistry, agriculture, and government should unite in an effort to find new uses for agricultural products and new methods of economical production. Research will prove mightier than regulation in cutting down surpluses, enlarging farm markets, and providing greater national stability.

For centuries nations have tried to legislate agricultural prosperity, and every success attained by this means has been only temporary. Economic evolution and research eventually prevail.

The present administration has done everything, almost, for the farmer except to give him a market. Without that he cannot be self-sustaining or even self-respecting.

This greatest need is not being met now. It is our job to enlarge and protect his markets. It is also our job to see that our monetary system is managed so as not to bear with greatest unfairness on the producers of basic commodities.

May I in closing sum up the points which I believe that farmers themselves would incorporate in a national agricultural program:

1. Effective tariff protection to carry tariff burden of farmers' purchases along with a domestic-allotment plan.

2. Individual farmer-controlled program of loans for carry-over of crop surpluses.

3. Real instead of political soil-conservation program.

4. End to competition from uneconomic expansion of subsidized irrigation projects.

5. Expansion and improvement of general family farming as a means of living for thousands of families, assisted by expansion of the cooperative movement.

6. More aggressive research for industrial agricultural products as a sound and effective method of eliminating crop surpluses.

7. Expansion of home market for agricultural producers; most important of all is a market which can be created to a large degree only through industrial prosperity.

These things we ask for American agriculture. These things could restore the purchasing power of the farmer. These would create jobs in industry, for all the foreign trade of the world cannot restore industrial prosperity as can a prosperous agriculture at home. More jobs in industry mean better markets for crops, both as raw material for manufacturing and food for human consumption.

May we never forget the interrelationship of agriculture, industry, and labor. They are necessary to one another; and prosperity cannot permanently return to one group alone.

The Federal farm "planners" do not understand the individual character of the farmer. They do not see why the needs of Texas, Illinois, and Maine cannot be met by blanket regulations. Their misguided efforts leave discouragement in their wake.

The spirit that prompted men and women to leave their overseas homes in search of freedom and face the perils of a new world for independence' sake still lives on the American farm.

Let us resolve that the thrift, the self-reliance, the charity, and the will to sacrifice which typified the character of the pioneer shall be sustained. Our farmers are chattels of no government; they are pawns of no sovereign. As free-born Americans they stand, the backbone of a nation, deserving the destiny of their heritage, determined to preserve a government by the people, and ready to do their part in an American program.

Eyes on Britain's Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HARLAN MILLER

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on the 23d of May there appeared in the Washington Post a very excellent article by Harlan Miller headed, "Eyes on Britain's Fleet." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

EYES ON BRITAIN'S FLEET

(England's $10,000,000,000 sea power, safe from Hitler, would give American defense extra years of grace.)

In the Capital's highest official circles a single anxiety has during the last 24 hours emerged with overwhelming force from the vague forebodings of the last 10 days—that the British Fleet must at all costs be preserved and kept out of Hitler's hands, no matter how complete the Nazi victory.

To put it with total candor: There are some high officials who obviously feel in their heart of hearts—but who still find it impolitic to say so aloud—that our immediate declaration of war on the side of the Allies would not be too high a price to pay for the fleet. Any help short of war, they feel, would be a cheap price to pay for it.

The fog has cleared away. The wishful thinking that the Nazis can't smash to victory this summer is dying. With it has passed any doubt that Hitler will demand the fleet.

There is no doubt that he will enforce this demand with the most brutal threats of mass murder and devastation in England.

And there is no longer any doubt here that he will carry out these threats, even if it means the demolition of every great English city and the destruction of millions of English lives—men, women, and children.

In a sardonic vein, an observer here told a high official that his most optimistic mental image for the last week has been one of the British Fleet steaming desperately westward across the Atlantic with the Nazi bombers in swift pursuit beyond Ireland.

"That is an optimistic dream," said the high official grimly. "If Hitler demands the fleet, and if the alternative is a brutal and murderous assault on a defenseless England, there is little reason to think that the British won't surrender it."

"But what of the Empire? Wouldn't Britain preserve its fleet at any cost to preserve its Empire?"

"There is little reason to think so," he replied. "The fleet belongs to England, and it would be English lives and possessions at stake."

"But is the British morale so low?"

"For the last decade," he answered, "English morale has decayed more and more swiftly. Today it is a question whether England could stand up to such a threat from Hitler—knowing he would execute his threat."

With the British Fleet intact, and based either in Canada or the West Indies or at Singapore, leaving our fleet undivided either in the Pacific or Atlantic, this country would have several extra years to prepare for any assault on the Western Hemisphere—assaults by trade pressure with political strings attached, by "fifth columns" or by Nazi-inspired revolutions in South America or by armed forces.

Without the fleet in his power, any demands by Hitler for Allied possessions in the Americas would be mere empty bluster. At worst, he'd need 5 years to build one.

With the British fleet he might conceivably be able to seize some of them—Bermuda, Nassau, Jamaica, Trinidad, Nova Scotia—within a year.

Our fleet could not cope with him and Japan simultaneously; our air force is still insufficient to resist; even the Panama Canal would not be safe.

There are, of course, some (the Chamberlain type) who think we should let England worry about her fleet and the possible seizure of her American possessions by Hiter; that two wars in the bush are better than one in the hand.

As an incredible footnote, but one which few here are now willing to disbelieve, the story reached Washington this week that English-speaking German officers with the Nazi army of occupation in Poland have received circulars from Berlin asking them to volunteer for duty in England and America.

This story comes through official channels.

"What possible help now would assure the retention of the British fleet in British hands?" was the final question.

"Adequate assurance that whatever sacrifices the British might have to make to retain it would lead eventually to the preservations of England and the Empire."

These are the views of a highly placed and responsible American official who has never, to my knowledge, talked through his hat.

The British navy is now the most important pawn in world politics.

The "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which this morning appeared in the columns of the Washington Times-Herald under the heading of In the News, by the pen of Hon. William Randolph Hearst pertaining to the "fifth column," which in more well-known terms means principally alien enemies, Trojan horses, Nazis, Fascists, and Communists, and all other "isms" that are foreign to our American form of government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 27, 1940]

IN THE NEWS

President Roosevelt sent a fine and timely message to Congress, aimed at "those aliens who conduct themselves in a manner that conflicts with the public interest."

The President said:

"The startling sequence of international events * * * has necessitated a review of the measures required for the Nation's safety."

The President's plan is to transfer the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the Labor to the Justice Department.

He declares that—

"Much can be said for the retention of these functions in the Department of Labor during normal times.

"I am convinced, however, that under existing conditions the immigration and naturalization activities can best contribute to the national well-being only if they are closely integrated with the activities of the Department of Justice."

The need for the transfer is described by the President as "pressing."

In the Senate, Majority Leader BARKLEY declared that a resolution would be offered to make the transfer immediately effective, and Senator REYNOLDS, calling Harry Bridges "one of the stallions in the herd of Trojan horses grazing in this country," endorsed a bill by Representative ALLEN of Louisiana to deport Bridges to Australia.

There is no question that the President's proposal of reorganization is pressing and necessary.

The only possible criticism is that the recommendation should have been made and the action taken a long time ago.

That, however, is mainly a good reason why the action should promptly be taken now.

The traitorous betrayal of their own countries by Communists in Finland and Norway, and probably in France and Belgium as well, has shown how dangerous the treasonable activities of these "fifth column" disloyalists can be in time of war.

Their activities are not quite as spectacular but almost as dangerous in times of peace.

We do not observe the effects of their sapping and mining operations as clearly in peace, but we come to note a yellow streak of disloyalty cross-cutting the honest Americanism of our youth, a subversive sentiment demoralizing some of the citizens of our Nation and permeating certain political and social organizations.

Gradually the institutions of our free country are weakened and undermined.

Then, when the stress of war comes, or any stress that requires the resistance of a sound body politic—of a sturdy patriotism—the structure of our society collapses.

The termites have done their work. The cohesive construction we depended upon is nothing but an empty shell.

The time to have begun the crusade against subversions was some years ago.

But our house has not fallen yet, and there is still time to strengthen it at every crucial point before any stress or strain of unusual severity shall find its weaknesses.

Over 5 years ago your columnist began an attack against the coddling of the communism of Russia or of its activities in this country.

On January 6, 1935, your Demosthenes delivered the following philippic over the radio—rather rhetorically, perhaps, but with all truth and earnestness and sincerity:

"Well, citizens of free America, do we want the cruel class rule of the proletariat in our country?

"Do we want a dictatorship based upon force and limited by no kind of law and absolutely no rule?

"Do we want to see the violent overthrow of the entire traditional social order?

"Do any genuinely American workers want to see the American working class led toward revolutionary class struggles?

"Do our farmers want to be starved to death to support a "red" army, a blood-stained army, which will murder them?

"Do our competent businessmen, who have built the wealth of this Nation, want to be plundered and driven out of business by a thriftless and shiftless crew of organized incompetents?

"Do our orderly political leaders want to be replaced by a revolutionary band of ruthless assassins?

"Does anybody want the bloody despotism of communism in our free America except a few incurable malcontents, a few sap-headed college boys, and a few unbalanced college professors, who teach the young and inexperienced that the robbery and rapine of communism is—God save the mark—ideology?"

On March 3, 1935, the writer of this column published in a signed editorial the following impeachment of fascism and nazi-ism:

"In Italy the Fascist government has suppressed all freedom of thought and expression, has drilled and dragooned all independent industries and all prosperity out of the country, and has utterly impoverished the people in order to gratify the Government's imperial ambitions, and to maintain the nation in arms.

"In Germany not only is all liberty lost but all modern ideas of freedom of thought and speech and publication ended, but as further evidence of complete return to the Dark Ages the Nazi government has revived medieval methods of execution and political processes of wholesale assassination."

At that time these indictments of the activities of communism in Russia and of fascism and nazi-ism in Italy and Germany, and of their reactions in this country, were considered extravagant and unwarranted.

There was little realization of the conditions of oppression which existed in these despotisms or of the subversive situation that existed here.

Since that time a gradual awakening to the danger of all disloyal activities has occurred among our people; and since that time the menace of fascism and nazi-ism has become as great as that of communism.

Now communism and nazi-ism are doubly dangerous because they are united.

They stand today revealed as twin tyrannies, brought together not only by the desire for conquest but for the purpose of proselyting through treasonable propaganda.

The time when these two dangers to democracy could have been pitted against each other for their mutual destruction has passed.

The clumsy diplomacy of France and England has lost that wonderful opportunity.

Now the one thing left us is to guard against them—to protect ourselves, not only by military preparedness against possible attack, but by every sound precaution against the contamination and contagion of disloyal propaganda.

A good beginning could be made by exterminating the Communists and Fascists in the public service.

An equally important step would be the suppression of all political parties and organized movements whose avowed object is the destruction of American institutions.

Another necessary move is the elimination of disloyal teaching and teachers from the schools.

And of course there should be the general arrest and deportation of those aliens who conduct themselves in a manner that conflicts with the public interest.

Your columnist confidently believes that the attitude of the United States Government in regard to alien enemies is more nearly vigorously and rigorously right today than it has been at any time in the last 5 years.

With high hope and some satisfaction he repeats, as the conclusion of this column, the policies here signed and outlined on June 13, 1938:

"The fundamental policy of the Hearst papers is to keep America out of war.

"Keep it free from foreign entanglements.

"Keep it free from foreign propaganda.

"Keep it free from communism, bolshevism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all class antagonism.

"Keep it free from anarchy on the one hand, or autocracy on the other.

"Keep it free from racial prejudice and religious intolerance.

"Keep it free from the hateful causes of war, and the dreadful consequences of war.

"Keep it free.

"WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST."

Articles on the Youth Problem in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT AND THE COUNTRY HOME MAGAZINE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in current literature I have found two very interesting and, I think, valuable articles relative to our so-called youth problem.

One of the articles, entitled "Keeping Youth at Home," appeared in a recent issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and the other article, entitled "Banking on Youth," appeared in the Country Home Magazine.

The articles refer to the development of youth policies in two towns in my State—the towns of Jay and Cyril, Okla.

I ask that the two articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 5, 1940]

KEEPING YOUTH AT HOME

However generously Oklahoma-at-large may have contributed to the wandering migrants who have come to be known as Okies, it is not likely that many of them come from Jay, which is in Delaware County. Anyhow, not many of the younger members of footloose America.

Jay, it seems, has a way of keeping youth at home and satisfied with home opportunities. It is a matter of training. Jay B. Earp, 36-year-old superintendent of schools, figures that most of his 714 present pupils will spend their lives in the community and he goes to lengths to fit them accordingly. With the aid of the National Youth Administration, several State agencies, and a group of Jay businessmen, the program has been under way for 7 years and as a result, Superintendent Earp says, there have been fewer and fewer persons leaving town. Through training and opportunity they are given something to do at home.

The program reaching through 7 years has included the construction of seven community buildings, with the labor performed by high school and N. Y. A. youths. The buildings contain shops, recreational facilities, libraries, and other departments in which young people are learning occupations which will permit them to help build up their town and provide for themselves. Maintenance of school busses, for example, provides an excellent laboratory for the training of automobile mechanics. There is metal working, carpentry, leather craftsmanship, and many other stated activities. Agriculture training is given on a 117-acre farm, the gift of businessmen of the town, with boys spending half of each school day on the farm. Girls are schooled in home economics, sewing and household maid service, learn to cook on wood- and coal-burning stoves as well as gas ranges, to wash and scrub and plan.

The Jay program is pridefully generous and worthy of any forward-looking community, larger or smaller than Jay. It is said that unemployment has been greatly reduced in the community and that persons who might otherwise have traded their possessions for the open road have found jobs for themselves at home because they have the training needed to find jobs and are of a community which is chock full of neighborliness and cooperation.

[From the Country Home Magazine]

BANKING ON YOUTH

(By Don Eddy)

In 8 years T. D. Call, the town banker of Cyril, Okla., has transformed his community from a region of run-down farms and dispirited farmers into a bustling, progressive district. When Call took over the bank in 1931, he found $90,000 worth of farm loans on its books—this at a time when farms were being abandoned wholesale and the scrubby range cattle were starving. Call tried

to get the farmers to borrow money to buy blooded stock and rotate crops on scientific lines, but they showed little interest. So he arranged to have the school boys and girls taught scientific agriculture, and loaned them money for stock raising. When young Bob Mosier borrowed $45 to buy a pedigreed brood sow and sold the first pigs for considerably more than any local farmers had ever received for shoats of the same age, his father, who had refused Call's offer of a loan to improve his cattle, became interested. He went to the banker, and, with his help and that of his several sons, put his farm on a scientific basis, and was soon on the way to financial independence. That, in a nutshell, is how Cyril was rejuvenated.

Call has loaned more than $12,000 to Cyril boys and girls, with a high of $4,175 for 62 projects last year, and has never lost a penny in his dealings with them. The livestock population of Cyril has increased 42 percent in value; milk and cream output has gone up 300 percent. At San Francisco's Golden Gate Exposition last summer 50 of the 51 Oklahoma hogs exhibited won prizes, and 40 of the prize winners came from Banker Call's county. The $90,000 worth of loans has shrunk to $50,000—"every cent good," says Call. He charges interest on his loans to youngsters, but every spring he spends the interest on a banquet for them and their families.

Let Us Not Fool Ourselves As to What We Lack, What We Need, or How To Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

WHAT WE LACK

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, the Army high command, on May 17, told us that the United States was wholly unprepared to meet the test of war; that it had neither plans, equipment, ammunition, ordnance, nor the men necessary for defense. That was the substance of the testimony of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, who told us that we lacked men; of Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, who informed us that our airplanes were inferior, that to send the Army's best bomber "against modern equipment would be suicide"; of Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson, Ordnance Chief, who disclosed the lack of ordnance.

We should be prepared. As Colonel Lindbergh asked, prepared for what? Prepared on the first line of defense which, as the President once said, was on the Rhine? Or prepared, as all of us agree, to defend America from invasion? We cannot prepare and, in my judgment, we should not think of preparing, to send an Army or a Navy abroad. No American who loves his home, his family, his country, should for a moment hesitate to give everything, to do his utmost, in the defense of our Nation. We should not seek war; we should avoid it; but be ready if it comes to us.

WHAT WE NEED

In view of Hitler's overwhelming victories; with the knowledge that, in other countries, so-called fifth columns have been a potent force in the destruction of the existing governments; that in our midst are similar forces with a like purpose, we must have guns, motor transportation, aircraft, forts, and warships, and, in addition, a live, alert patriotism that will seek out and render incapable of action every subversive group and influence, every disloyal individual.

HOW TO GET IT

Long have we prided ourselves upon the fact that we are the richest nation in the world. We have a store of billions of dollars' worth of gold. We have mammoth factories, with mass production; almost inexhaustible resources. But our gold will not buy, and our factories cannot create, the guns or the aircraft, the munitions of war, the warships, which are necessary to defend us, should Hitler decide to come to our shores. Only through cooperation between industry and labor, between the Government and business; only by the self-sacrificing efforts of all of our citizens can we hope to so prepare that even a Hitler, triumphant over all the rest of the world, would hesitate to undertake the task of imposing his brutality upon us.

This means that ambition, not only on the part of every petty officeholder, but on the part of the President of the United States, must be thrown aside. It means that the manufacturer's desire for profit must be limited; that the worker's hope of an ever-increasing wage and shorter hours cannot be realized. It means that each and every one of us must make sacrifices. The manufacturer must give up the expectation of becoming a millionaire. The worker must forego for the present his desire to labor but 30 or 40 hours per week and to receive a wage like unto that paid during the first World War. You and I—yes, each one of us—must be ready and willing, and begin, to give up some of the luxuries which heretofore we have regarded as necessities; to get back to a simple life, to longer hours of toil, to a whole-hearted devotion to our country.

The Government itself—and by the Government I mean the administration—must cease playing politics, catering to pressure groups for political support, assaulting business and businessmen in the hope of catching a labor vote, for, just as surely as we continue, as we have in the past, to waste our national income for things which, while desirable, are not necessary, we shall find ourselves, when the day of reckoning comes, at the end of the present war or a few years thereafter, as unprepared as were the Belgians, the folks of Holland, and of those other nations which have been wiped out of existence, and we will meet a like fate.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

LETTER FROM R. H. WEAVER TO PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there is herewith inserted the following letter written to the editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh, Pa., and appearing in that newspaper on May 10, 1940.

The writer of this letter, Mr. R. H. Weaver, DuBois, Pa., is treasurer of Townsend Club No. 1, of that city, and is one of the most energetic Townsend workers in the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, where 87 clubs are flourishing with thousands of active members.

The letter follows:

EDITOR PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Under date of May 4, as reported by a news item in your paper, President Roosevelt challenges candidates for the Presidency, daring them to tell how to balance the Budget. This, our President could do himself, if he would consider the needs of the people of our country more carefully, and get behind bill H. R. 8264, General Welfare Act. I am no candidate for office, nor am I a politician, but I believe that balancing the Budget could easily be accomplished.

If bill H. R. 8264 were passed and put into effect, this depression or recession would cease in 2 years' time.

It is my opinion that every Congressman or Senator not in favor of said bill is indirectly guilty of the crimes and starvation we are now experiencing in this country. Some of our Congressmen and Senators seem to forget who sent them to Washington, after they are in office.

We must have forced spending to bring us out of this depression. Townsend bill H. R. 8264 would do this.

Respectfully yours,

R. H. WEAVER,
Treasurer, Townsend Club No. 1 of Dubois, Pa., 437 Reams Street, Dubois, Pa.

Editorial Comment on Purchases of Silver and Strategic Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM CURRENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several editorials on our purchases of silver and strategic materials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 26, 1940]

THREADBARE PRETEXT

When the Townsend bill suspending purchases of foreign silver was passed by the Senate it was freely predicted that it would be shelved by the House. It now looks as if these pessimistic predictions are about to be fulfilled. For Democratic leaders are urging a return of the Townsend bill to the Senate on the ground that it is a revenue measure which should have originated in the House.

Some faint color of reason is given to this contention because the bill provides for the repeal of a tax on profits derived from silver transfers. However, a tax-repeal measure can hardly be regarded as falling within the scope of the constitutional mandate concerning bills for raising revenue.

Moreover, the silver-purchase bill was never intended to raise revenue. Senator GEORGE rightly declares that "it is stretching the Constitution beyond all reason to say that merely because an incidental tax feature is involved, one Chamber can't express itself on a broad question of policy."

The real purpose of this maneuver is clear. The House leaders, knowing that the administration is opposed to the Townsend bill, are merely seeking an excuse to bury it. A vote for the resolution to return the bill to the Senate will, therefore, be tantamount to a vote to continue buying overvalued foreign silver in pursuance of an unattainable monetary objective.

Congress ought to abandon this futile and dangerous experiment without further delay.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 25, 1940]

THE MEXICAN MYSTERY

In this crisis, we feel that it is no time to pin-prick our Government. And that is not our intention.

Nevertheless, we have long been puzzled by the present Government's policy toward Mexico—or lack of policy, maybe. Our bewilderment is renewed and refreshed by Hal Burton's series of articles on Mexico, now running in the Times-Herald and New York Daily News, and full of interesting and alarming material.

Soon after he was inaugurated in 1933, President Roosevelt announced the good-neighbor policy. It was to apply to all Latin America, which, of course, includes Mexico. About the same time, our Government began buying silver from all comers at inflated prices, the object being to give the western silver producers an economic boost and to help certain silver-standard countries, notably China.

In March 1938 the Mexican Government seized about $450,000,000 worth of oil properties in Mexico belonging to various American, British, and Dutch companies, and undertook to run those properties on its own.

Our State Department filed various protests, which were received with extreme politeness by the Mexican Government. But the story President Cardenas' press agents and newspapers told the Mexican people was that the United States Government approved the oil grab. And the Mexican Supreme Court O. K.'d the oil grabs.

We went on buying Mexican silver at inflated prices, and are still doing so. That had and has the effect of staving off a complete financial break-down in Mexico—though Cardenas' government is having pretty tough going nevertheless.

Cardenas is selling the expropriated oil wherever he can find buyers or swappers; and those buyers and swappers were chiefly German and Italian before the war and are chiefly Japanese now.

In short, we are subsidizing with silver purchases a government which takes the property of Americans and sells or swaps it to governments which are less our friends than any other first-rank governments in the world.

"FIFTH COLUMNS"

We've heard it asserted that this United States super-good-neighborliness toward Mexico was at bottom a New Deal effort to pay off its political debt of the 1932 campaign to John L. Lewis, who contributed about $500,000 of his United Mine Workers' funds to the Democrats that year and who is very friendly with Vincente Lombardo Toledano, Mexican labor leader. We have no reason to believe that there is anything in this charge, no way of verifying it. But it has been whispered about, nevertheless, and has apparently convinced some people.

Our softheartedness toward Mexico now begins to threaten to kick us in the face.

As Mr. Burton reports, the coming Mexican Presidental election has already fanned up a revolutionary situation in Mexico. Cardenas' candidate, Manuel Avila Camacho, and the conservative candidate, Juan Andreu Almazan, are making ready to contest the election with guns, whichever way it goes. The result may be a dangerous explosion to the south of us, at a time when Europe is exploding to the east of us and Asia to the west of us.

Even worse than that, to quote Mr. Burton:

"The 'fifth column' is closing ranks in Mexico, facing north toward the American border. Germany has 200 busy agents at work—more than in World War days, when Carranza maintained a dubious neutrality.

"Russia, too, is busy behind the scenes. Native Communists and fellow travelers run many of her errands. Some of the anti-Franco refugees from Spain do the rest. Japan hovers on the side lines, distributing discreet largess in the form of investments that never will pan out."

That is the kind of country to which we go on being a good neighbor by buying its silver at uneconomic prices, then burying the silver at West Point, where it does us no good.

Mexico is already on the ragged edge of complete communism, its Government having taken many a lesson from Leon Trotsky, its long-time-honored guest. Nations unfriendly to us are already using Mexico for purposes best known to themselves. It is conceivable that Mexico may sometime be used as the jumping-off point for an invasion of the United States—or at least for some kind of violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

To repeat, we cannot understand why this Government goes on being such an extra good neighbor to Mexico.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 24, 1940]

STRATEGIC RAW MATERIAL RESERVES

"During the war the country was constantly threatened with a shortage in available supply of nitrogen, manganese, chrome, tungsten, dyestuffs, coal-tar derivatives, and several other essential materials * * *. The Government should devise some system for protecting and stimulating their internal production."

This statement was one of the key conclusions reached in his final report on American Industry in the War by Bernard M. Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board. Since 1921, when Mr. Baruch wrote his report, this country has ceased to be dependent upon imported supplies of a number of the commodities he specified. Particularly in the case of nitrogen, dyestuffs, coal-tar derivatives, and other chemicals, American manufacturers can now supply not only our own requirements, but in many cases have a surplus available for export which can be diverted to defense needs if necessary.

On the other hand, this country remains dependent upon imports of rubber and a number of nonferrous metals, among which tin and manganese are the most important for national defense. The substitution of domestic products for these materials has hitherto proved impractical for one reason or another. The troubled situation abroad has directed attention to an increasing extent to the need for accumulating within this country large reserves of at least the strategic raw materials which enter directly into the production of war materials, as an elementary precaution in the event that overseas sources of supply should be cut off. A program involving the expenditure of $100,000,000 for this purpose over a 4-year period has been advanced by the administration, but only $10,000,000 was actually appropriated by Congress early last year. The President has since asked for additional appropriations of $60,000,000 to be spent during the coming fiscal year, but Congress has yet to act upon this request. In addition, relatively small reserves of rubber are being obtained through barter against cotton with Great Britain.

A vigorous attack upon the dilatory manner in which this program has been pursued to date was made by President Ernest T. Weir, of the American Iron and Steel Institute, before the annual meeting of that body here yesterday. Mr. Weir favored the investment of at least $800,000,000 in the accumulation of important raw materials as soon as feasible.

Mr. Weir properly pointed out that this problem cannot and should not be solved by industry alone. The investment required is often too great. The reserves are needed for the general welfare perhaps even more than to assure continuity of operations of individual concerns. If any one company should accumulate large stocks of some raw material so that it owns most of the available supply in times of emergency, charges of restraint of trade and monopoly may be leveled against it. Finally, such commodities as rubber and tin are marketed by Government-dominated cartels,

and only the United States Government can negotiate effectively with the foreign governments concerned for added reserve supplies.

On the other hand, the accumulation of large reserves of strategic raw materials as a national-defense measure must be carried on with suitable safeguards, if mischievous consequencies are to be avoided. The possession of large reserve stocks of such materials by the Government may undermine market stability, unless the release of such supplies is permitted only under stated conditions specified in advance, such as the outbreak of a war or the cutting off of normal sources of supply. For example, a policy of releasing supplies out of such reserves capriciously, to check what are regarded by Government officials as excessive price rises, could work serious injury to the industry.

In carrying out a program of building up reserves of strategic raw materials, as in other phases of the vast national-defense effort that is now taking shape, only close and intelligent cooperation between Government and industry, based upon mutual respect and trust, will assure sound results.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 24, 1940]

OPPOSITION TO SILVER LEGISLATION

Despite the fact that not a single persuasive argument has yet been advanced for retaining the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 on the statute books, cessation of purchases of foreign silver by the United States Treasury appears to be as far away as ever. The Senate has passed the Townsend bill to halt the buying of silver abroad, it is true, but the House Ways and Means Committee proposes to kill this measure for all practical purposes by taking the stand that it is a tax bill, and as such should have been originated in the House. It seems quite doubtful that a new bill originating in the House will be passed at this session.

The chief reason advanced for continuing the purchases of silver is the desire to maintain American exports. It is claimed that the United States may hurt its exports if the Treasury stops buying silver abroad, however useless this metal may be. This contention would be just as valid if it were asserted that the Treasury should buy trainloads or shiploads of gravel from some foreign country at an artificially high price, in order to give that country buying power for our goods.

In point of fact, the desire of the Administration to continue the silver-purchase program reflects its failure to evolve an effective foreign policy with regard to Latin America. The good-neighbor policy, well-intentioned though it was, failed to bring about that close economic and political collaboration between the United States and Latin American countries which was desired. Fearing to antagonize Mexico, despite the cavalier treatment accorded by that country to a number of American interests, the administration has fought for a continuation of the silver-purchase program, which benefits Mexico far more than any other country. It has vague fears that to do otherwise might cause Mexico to draw closer to authoritarian regimes abroad.

The United States should cooperate wholeheartedly with Latin American countries especially now when defense of the hemisphere is a practical issue. Sound relations will not be promoted, however, by favoring nations which trample on American interests and discouraging those which are ready to cooperate on a reasonable basis with us. A firmer attitude toward Mexico, for example, and a friendlier policy toward Argentina, which has sought in vain to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with the United States, would be far more likely to promote sound Pan American relations.

Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, on May 25 the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] delivered a very able and inspiring radio address on the subject Defense of America. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, tonight I wish to speak to you as a citizen and as a Senator about the defense of America.

I believe in the democratic principle of taking the people into confidence about America's defense. I am not afraid to ask the people of America to make decisions about America's defense—courageous, bold decisions. Nor am I afraid to say that every minute decision is delayed may be a tragic moment lost when split-second decisions are determining the fate of the world.

Only one purpose is as close to my heart as the defense of America and that is to keep the war over there. The people of America do not want our fair land ravaged with the fiendish, devilish machines of modern war; our great institutions torn to shambles by the vultures of the air; our innocent children strafed by machine-gun fire, or stifled by poisoned gas.

Accordingly, I have pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a resolution which, in plain American language, says that it is wise, it is in the interest of America's defense, it is helpful in keeping war away from America, for us to sell to the Allies here, for cash, at a fair price, certain of our war machines and war materials where they will do the greatest good in the shortest time—to help the enemies of Hitler crush Hitler, over there.

The wisdom, of course, of carrying out this resolution, of determining what airplanes, what war materials we can spare without imperiling our own defense, is left to the President, who can be trusted to act as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy only in the interest of the national safety. You know, and I know, that if this resolution were adopted and the President were given this authority he would not send one single airship, one cannon, one old ship which would imperil our national defense.

Under the terms of the resolution, the President would let no nation have such war equipment or materials unless it had first authorized the President to replace any material he might let them have out of any construction which might at any time be in progress in the factories of this country for the account of such parties abroad.

As a selfish American, I speak. One old plane at the front in Flanders now may be worth a hundred planes, maybe a thousand, a short time from now if Hitler becomes the greedy master of the Old World. A few cannon, which it takes time for the Allies to bore and deliver at the front now, may mean a thousand batteries later upon the Rio Grande or the border of Canada or elsewhere. A few older ships which are being put back in commission in our Navy in the English Channel in the next few days might mean more to save our country and our people from the iron heel of Hitlerism than a new fleet a few years from now.

Time is of the essence. The Allies and the whole civilized world are threatened as never before in the memory of men living. The Nazi military machine, with typical Nazi thoroughness and ruthlessness, has rolled in the unimaginable period of 2 weeks across four countries, and today the mighty empires of Great Britain and France literally totter upon the precipice of destruction. Fortresses, canals, rivers, forests, everything that responsible statesmen and experienced soldiers have counted upon to save their countries and their peoples, have collapsed almost like match boxes, under the mailed Hitler fist. These armored, steel-clad monsters, these military Frankensteins, are reaching out to crush every defense that the courageous defenders of Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France and Britain, and Britain's associated nations, in desperate defense and counterattack, have been able to interpose. The next hour may bring the news that whatever we may do is too late; that Hitler could not be stopped in Europe; that these years of ruthless and unscrupulous preparation with but a single aim—to make nazi-ism the master of the world; that these hundred billions of dollars that he has spent; the one-third of the German citizenry which he has used in the building of a war machine the like of which the world has never even dreamed of, has made him invincible.

In all history, not until Hitler, was there an instance of where a man coldly, calculatingly, unabashed, and unashamed declared in an authentic book like Mein Kampf that his single aim was, by every perfidy known to a mad genius mind, to conquer the world. An aim declared so openly, so utterly devoid of any sentiment of the civilized world, based upon a method more devilish than any fiend had ever been able to conceive, made little impression on the world because it seemed like the rantings of a drug addict. The world couldn't believe that it could happen. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Great Britain, Chamberlain didn't think it could happen. Yet tomorrow the old world into which you and I were born, in which we grew up, which the sacrifices of the Master and the martyrs and the heroisms of 2,000 years of patriots we thought had made secure, may breathe its last choking, sobbing breath.

There are still many "Chamberlains" in America. There are some in Congress—honest, sincere, conscientious, deluded men. They have not even read Mein Kampf.

It is not really their judgment—if they could take their thoughts apart and look at them—that tell them that if Hitler crushes the Allies in Europe and becomes the master of the Old World, with his alliances with Mussolini, Stalin, Franco, and Japan, the master of three-fourths of the world's area and over four-fifths of the world's population, that he would sit idly by while we built 50,000 fighting planes, trained 50,000 pilots, built a new Navy, created and trained an Army of one to two million men, fortified our coasts and the islands of the Atlantic and Pacific, established air and fleet bases throughout the Western Hemisphere, stifled the "fifth column" and the "Trojan horse" in every nation in the New World, including our own, aided the nations of the Western Hemisphere in the building up and in the training and direction of their own armed forces—

our leaders really do not believe that a dominant Hitler would let us do that. They, just like hopeful Mr. Chamberlain with his umbrella, somehow hope and pray that he would not.

Some of our "Chamberlains" buttress their hope and their wishful thinking with legal arguments about international law not permitting us to do anything to help the Allies, short of war, in Europe because we would be violating a fine theory of international law.

I say international law as to whom? Have they forgotten the unprovoked aggression of the Nazis upon Czechoslovakia and Poland? Have they forgotten the scrupulous and strict neutrality of the Scandinavian countries and the Dutch who stayed out of Europe's wars for over a hundred years, of the Belgians, who would not even let the Allies, upon whom they knew they would have to depend for their defense, send a single soldier or a single airplane to the border that lay next to the massing Germans, even after they knew they were going to attack? Have they forgotten helpless, unarmed, little Luxemburg, with an army of only a few hundred, defended only by the integrity of nations' vows and the decent principles of what was international law?

Have they forgotten that Hitler, and we, and Great Britain, and France, and many of the ravaged nations of Europe were all parties to the Kellogg Pact which prohibited war as an instrument of national policy? Do they seriously mean that Hitler, who has not declared war upon a single nation which he has either conquered or attacked, could claim the benefit of a civilized principle of international law against signers of the Kellogg Pact trying to defend, by methods short of war, other signers of the Kellogg Pact in resisting unprovoked and unjustified aggression from Hitler, whose government itself was a signer of the Kellogg Pact?

What troubles me is that some of our Chamberlains don't seem to understand this mad world in which we today are living. Hitler has destroyed our old way of life. He has not only murdered helpless men, women, and children, he has murdered international law and the things that restrained the brute forces of the world; he has crushed every fine, fragile thing that the spirit lived by.

It is a part of his technique to assume that his opponents will fight by the civilized code while he fights by the jungle code.

I see so-called statesmen in the Congress heave and croak like a bullfrog full of buckshot, at some technical, legalistic fear that the United States, if it adopts my resolution of doing what it can now short of war to resist Hitler, is committing a breach of international law which will get us into war. That is what troubles me. The idea that they seem to have that what Hitler does against us and the Western Hemisphere will be based upon the way we legally behave. It is not that the argument itself is so bad. It is the symptom of a tragic, pathetic, misunderstanding of the whole nature of the vulture which even now turns his covetous eyes toward our rich and unprepared Nation.

In these brief moments, I cannot draw for you the outlines of the horrible picture of the future America from the day Hitler might win the war in Europe. We have spent $3,000,000,000 in less than a week upon our national defense, and we have only begun. Money will flow like water. Every energy of our national life will be centered upon one thing—warlike preparation. In the sky of every new day, the cloud of inevitable war will hang like a pall over everything that we do. Every boy will know that some day he will probably be in his country's Army. Private enterprise, free initiative, American lives, will be demanded by their country to meet the inevitable day when Hitler will come.

I see that. You see that. You know that to be true in your heart. You must let the Chamberlains of your country know that you do see it and that you will to act in the many ways we can effectively act without war—now.

Every other nation has waited while the tragic sands of time have fallen through the hourglass. They believed Hitler, with his lying assurances, and they waited. They believed the Baldwins and the Chamberlains who said "we can appease his ravenous appetite"—and they waited. They believed the lawyers and the legalists who talked about international law and declarations of the League of Nations and civilizing restraints—and they waited. They believed those who said it was so monstrous it could not happen—and they waited. Even while others were being devoured before their very eyes—some waited.

Now, some ask us to wait for the same reasons that the others waited. Wait, they say, because we must not violate international law. Wait, because we want peace. Wait, because maybe Hitler will not want what we have. Wait, because maybe the leopard will change his spots. Wait, because we believe in isolation. Wait, maybe we can make Hitler like us. Wait, maybe a miracle will happen and other boys by dying in Europe, other nations by giving up their treasure, will save us.

Hitler marched into the Rhineland, they say, with orders to go back if the Allies resisted. But the Allies waited. He armed the Rhineland, when a few divisions might have sent him scurrying back to Potsdam—but they waited. He took Czechoslovakia, which had a brave and strong army, great munitions plants, and a fortified frontier, when they might have held him back—but they waited. Each nation, in turn, thought maybe somebody else would fight its war.

Finally, a few are left to fight. Now there are no rules. There are no neutrals. The few fight for life or death. The few fight to save our way of life—the American way. Armageddon is being fought. We know in our hearts it is Armageddon and yet they say, "Wait."

The judgment of history will be upon those who lead today. Generations yet unborn shall look back into our faces to see in what direction they were pointed; to see the look in our eyes, the stuff we had in our souls. The traditions of America will rise up to confront us. America's dead in Flanders fields, who are now being desecrated by the relentless military machine which they fought in 1917–18 without even a protest from their country, will rise up in the silhouettes of the dead to ask if we have forgotten them. Those who have given their lives for an ordered world where things of the mind and the spirit might grow into a rich fruition, they, too, will come back to ask if we have forgotten them. If America has a rendezvous with destiny, the next few weeks will determine whether or not America keeps it.

American Aviation Moves Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the opening session of the National Aviation Forum, Monday morning, May 27, 1940, at Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am genuinely grateful for the opportunity of welcoming all of you to this opening session of the National Aviation Forum. I feel I express the appreciation of everyone when I sincerely congratulate Thomas H. Beck, the distinguished general chairman of this great gathering; energetic and able Gill Robb Wilson, president of the National Aeronautic Association, and all the coworkers, who have formulated what promises to be an interesting and profitable program.

COUNTRY WATCHES PROGRESS

You have come to Washington at a time when the people of the United States, and the world for that matter, are watching closely the appraisal and further development being made of our aviation strength and security. It was my pleasure a little less than a year and a half ago to speak at the opening session of the 1939 forum. If you will pardon a reference to my remarks at that time, I should like to recall that I said on that occasion:

"This Nation has endured as a monument to peace and to democracy, and the teeming millions of our continent propose to maintain that monument in the centuries to come.

"Our first duty, therefore, is to assure that we shall always possess the means to defend that monument. On the sands of Kitty Hawk a new means for that defense was given birth, but so also was a new means for attacking our ocean-lapped citadel.

"So with new weapons of defense we must combat new weapons of attack, the possibilities of which are as yet quite unplumbed. We cannot sit by and permit others to explore those possibilities while our wings grow rusty and our propellers idle.

"We must be alert to take every advantage of the air, to fill the heavens with pilots and with planes, to provide the factories and the technicians which we need, to inform our people of the myriad purposes which aeronautics may serve, to encourage them to use and to enjoy the benefits of flight. And with an aeronautical industry thus assured, we may face the future with confidence. Let the genius of an enemy do its worst—we shall match him and surpass him."

My friends of aviation, those words are double true today as we enter the "flying forties," with the prospects for aviation staggering our imagination.

We who have watched closely the day-to-day development of this great new industry oftentimes find it difficult to stand apart and survey the broad sweep of America's advance in its conquest of the clouds. It is true that anecdotes from hardy pioneers of the airways sometimes recall sharply to us the dramatic progress which we have made. More revealing, however, is an analysis of the cold figures showing the extent of our aviation activities at the beginning of the decade just closed and the figures describing those same activities during the last year of the 1930's.

Let us glance hastily at the advances made by the domestic air lines alone during those 10 years.

AIR LINES MOVE AHEAD

In 1930 they carried less than 350,000 passengers. In 1939 the number had grown to approximately 2,000,000. With the enormous rate of acceleration during the past year it is apparent that, long before the "flying forties" have ended, the figures for 1939 will seem tiny, indeed. With the increase in the number of passengers there

has been an increase even more sharp in the passenger-miles operated. In 1930 our domestic air lines operated less than 85,000,000 passenger-miles; in 1939 they operated nearly 750,000,000 passenger-miles.

Another figure which is particularly significant is that showing the average trip per passenger. During the early years of aviation and even during the first 3 years of the past decade average trips were relatively short. With the development of a more extensive air-line network the average trips rapidly increased in length. In 1937 the average reached its peak of 432 miles. The preponderating development of long-haul traffic was not, however, altogether healthy. The air lines cannot subsist solely on long-haul traffic. The great bulk of the travel market is within the range of shorter trips. The steady development of smaller air lines, including the feeder and pick-up systems, reaching into every corner of this vast country, upon which the future welfare of our Nation so heavily depends, marks a wholesome movement for American aviation.

It has been a happy and promising sign that during the last 3 years the average trip per passenger has steadily fallen. In the year just gone the average trip was actually less than it was in 1934. In fact, surprising as it may seem, the average air-line trip in the United States is less in length than the average trip of railroad Pullman passengers. Few recent developments indicate more clearly the sound and permanent base upon which scheduled air transportation is developing.

AIR MAIL ON INCREASE

The air-mail service has made a remarkable advance during the past 10 years. At the beginning of 1930 there were less than 15,000 miles of domestic air-mail routes, but at the end of the decade 37,000 miles of air-mail routes were used in this country. In terms of pound-miles of performance our domestic air-mail system has grown apparently by more than 300 percent. This growth has been accompanied by a gratifying increase in postage revenues in relation to payments to the carriers. At the beginning of the decade postage revenues were only a little more than one-third of payments. But even before the end of the 1930's the revenues had overtaken the payments to the carriers and today, despite necessary increases in the payments made, the postage revenues and payments approximately balance.

Similar advances have been made in the development of air express. The air-express revenue during 1939 was more than 25 times the revenue from air express in 1931.

With this remarkable advance the safety of operations has increased even more rapidly. In 1930 the domestic air lines operated only 3,500,000 passenger-miles per passenger fatality. In 1939 that figure had increased to more than 80,000,000 passenger-miles, and we are now in the fifteenth month without a single fatality or a serious injury—a record of accomplishment never achieved by any other form of transportation.

There is one portion of this great country of ours which promises a more significant and important development of air transportation than will perhaps be witnessed in any other part of our land. I refer to Alaska. The vital location of that vast section from the standpoint of our national defense is being slowly realized. The development of aviation has increased the importance of that Territory incalculably. At some day of doom in the future it may prove to be the vital key to our national security.

ALASKA IS IMPORTANT

It is indispensable that aviation should stride ahead in Alaska even more rapidly than it advances in the States. Fortunately the great development of the 1930's did not pass by Alaska. In terms of passenger freight and mail traffic, aviation there leaped forward. In 1930 there were only 24 planes operating. By the end of the 1930's that number had increased more than 700 percent, with a resulting jump in plane-miles flown from 338,000 miles to more than 3,200,000. Passenger-miles flown increased from 684,000 to more than 5,200,000, and a great development in freight traffic, which doubtless will be of vastly increasing significance in the future, is demonstrated by the jump from 103,000 pounds of freight carried in 1930 to more than 4,100,000 pounds of freight carried in 1939. Great, too, was the increase in the amount of mail transported. In 1930 just over 17,000 pounds of mail were flown in the Territory, but in 1939 the amount had increased to nearly 550,000 pounds.

These dull figures tell a story that is packed with drama when we look behind the statistics to the efforts of the thousands of men and women who have made this record possible. Both in private fields and in government an increasing army devoted to the cause of advancing aviation has been working steadily and patiently, overcoming handicaps that would discourage the faint-hearted, all united in the common aim to achieve for this country an aviation industry which will carry our flag to heights unequaled by any other nation on the globe.

If, in picturing this advance I have referred to the records made in air transportation, I do so only by way of illustration. The air lines are not alone in exploiting the vast potential of the heavens. Shoulder to shoulder with them the charter and miscellaneous commercial operators have marched forward. The private fliers, too, have contributed enormously. The close observer of aviation must conclude that we are on the threshold of a development in the field of private flying which will dwarf the accomplishments in commercial aviation.

Slowly our Government has come to realize its responsibility for providing encouragement and the means for sound development of all phases of aviation. Slowly our Government has come to realize that we must advance on all fronts steadily and surely. Fitful, sporadic, vacillating half measures must be abandoned in favor of a long-range policy that holds firmly in view the goal of absolute supremacy in civil aviation.

AIR SUPREMACY NEEDED

We who have known civil aviation so intimately of course understand why it is that absolute supremacy is of such importance. Gradually there is dawning upon the entire country a similar realization. But there are still those among our countrymen who question our efforts to push civil aviation ahead. There are still those who question the importance of this activity, who think of aviation as a luxury or as merely a thrilling sport. But they are fewer each day.

To them we can say only that the prophecies of a few years ago that aviation is changing the very face of the globe have already come true. Conquest of the air has shaken ancient faith. An insular nation can no longer rest in peace within the embrace of an encircling sea. Barricades of mountain ranges are no longer impregnable. Noncombatants cannot live securely behind the front lines of fighting. Even the laws of nations fail to impose rules upon warfare. The strangling tentacles of conflict now reach from the skies and snatch away the security which those who have failed to understand the place of aviation had foolishly thought they had achieved. This fact, made so starkly clear in Flanders' fields, has aroused from lethargy our whole Nation. A few months ago the slogan Flying Forties was used by only a few of the aviation fraternity. Today that slogan takes on new meaning as an awful understanding of its implication dawns upon us all.

I had hoped that we could keep inviolate the prophetic lines of Tennyson, penned a hundred years ago:

"For I dipped into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be.

"Saw the heavens filled with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales."

But as I speak these words I recall the further horrible prediction in the same poem:

"Heard the heavens filled with shouting,
And there rained a ghastly dew,
From the nations' airy navies
Grappling in the central blue."

AVIATION OPENS NEW RICHES

To those who still question our efforts to push civil aviation, we can point in justification to the miserable state of the European nations which have failed to build their fortresses among the clouds.

But there appeals to me, and I am sure to all of us, a value in our efforts to develop civil aviation which transcends security in time of war. The promise which aeronautical development holds for increasing the happiness and welfare of our people in the ordinary pursuits of peacetime life is quite as great as was the promise of railroad transportation a century ago. Then the grasp of railroads brought to the hands of our people the bounty of a continent. But today and tomorrow, if we will but recognize the fact and act accordingly, the grasp of aviation can bring to our people the riches of a hemisphere.

Aviation is moving forward the world over. Due to the foresight and fidelity of a few people in our own Nation, progress under our flag has led the world. But our leadership is challenged. And with the holocaust in Europe giving new release to inventive genius and to destructive energies we cannot afford to rest content with the laurels we have already won. American aviation is poised for successful flight into the Flying Forties. It is my high hope that this forum will serve as the take-off for that journey.

Parity Prices for Farm Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, out in our country we have a very practical man, who does some clear thinking on farm

problems. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very forceful editorial on parity in respect to farm crops in our country, written by Mr. O. L. Brownlee, editorial writer for the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune of May 17, 1940]

PARITY A WINNING ISSUE IF G. O. P. WILL ADOPT IT

There is one issue which, if taken up and met squarely in the coming national campaign, will not only insure a Republican victory but the economic and perhaps the political salvation of America. That issue is parity—parity prices and parity tariffs—equality for all Americans.

A clear-cut Republican declaration for parity prices and tariffs not only will carry the Republicans to victory in Iowa but in every middle-western State.

A survey made by a Virginian recently in the South indicates that a clear-cut parity platform would enable the Republicans to carry at least six southern States.

We refer specifically to the State of Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Florida.

This reference to the six States just named is not based on surmise or hearsay, but on a careful inquiry made by a competent investigator.

Parity will open the way for Republican gains in the South which, if ever won over to the Republican cause at all, will have to be won on an economic program that will appeal to the pocketbooks of southern people.

We know, of course, exactly what the Republicans are up against. They have a divided house on the parity question.

The principal beneficiaries of the Hawley-Smoot high tariffs, which the New Dealers have not molested, and the big-shot bankers, whom the New Deal has enriched, are on one side of the question.

The millions of raw-materials producers—farmers, miners, forestry operators, fishery interests, common labor, organized labor, and small-business men—generally are on the other side.

We know, too, that the tariff beneficiaries and big-shot bankers are among the most liberal campaign contributors. But they don't have the votes. And it takes votes to win elections.

Forty of the forty-eight American States are primarily engaged in the production of new wealth—farm products, minerals, forestry, and fishery products.

The people of these States are overwhelmingly for parity prices and parity tariffs. They must have them if this Nation shall be preserved.

We must price our primary wealth adequately and the American market must be restored to Americans.

Imports of farm products now amount to more than the total wealth production of Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

What are the Republicans going to do about it?

Farm imports alone amount to more than the total wealth production of Texas.

The southern cotton States know that the New Deal has lost them their foreign market for cotton, that it is letting in jungle fats and oils to drive cottonseed oil and peanut oil and other southern products out of the American market.

They know—they can't help knowing—that there is no relief in sight for them unless it can be obtained through a political change.

Great mines, entire industries like lead and zinc and manganese are prostrate because of the Hull policies. Other industries, such as coal, machinery, tools, etc., languish because these industries are stifled or suppressed and because all production has been slowed down.

Will the Republicans heed their appeal for price parity with industry and tariffs to protect them equally?

The tariff beneficiaries and the "big shot" bankers are not friends of the Republican Party. They have always used the Republican Party in the past to promote their selfish ends.

But they're getting more out of the New Deal now than they ever got out of the Republicans.

If the Republican Party writes a platform that suits these elements, it really should nominate Cordell Hull as its Presidential candidate. He is the greatest and most effective living exponent of what the "big shot" bankers and tariff-fed industries favor.

Will the leaders of the Republican Party be "saps" enough to listen to this group?

The American banker bund and the American tariff bund prefer Roosevelt or Hull to any man whom the Republicans might name—unless it would be BOB TAFT.

They don't want Tom Dewey or Arthur Vandenberg or Jack MacNider or Styles Bridges or any Republican whom they suspect they couldn't control.

They want the Republican Party to adopt a "weaseling" platform and to nominate a "weaseling" candidate. They really don't want the Republicans to win at all. They are supremely satisfied with what they have. They're afraid the Republicans would molest their sacred ox.

This is no time for "weaseling" or "pussyfooting" or obedience to the commands of the short-sighted economic dumbbells who run the international banks and industries and who for almost a century have used the Republican Party to serve their selfish ends.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, the opportunity is yours to do for this Nation the things that must be done.

You have it within your power to end the disparity in the exchange value of factory goods and raw materials by means of which so much of the wealth produced in the past has been siphoned from the pockets of the producers.

You have it within your power to start American farms and mines producing wealth at full capacity once more, thereby transferring men from the relief rolls to pay rolls and freeing them from bondage to an undemocratic bureaucracy in Washington.

You have it within your power to dry up the pools of mass poverty where subversion is being bred by making it possible for men to earn their livings in the traditicnal American way.

You have it within your power to open the doorways of opportunity for our young men and young women whose slogan is "We want jobs," not "W. P. A., here we come."

The eyes of the real honest-to-God American people who want to work and live in the American tradition are upon the leaders of the Republican Party.

The producing masses who toil on the farms, in the mines, who labor at the hard, dirty jobs; those who are skilled workers in the factories; those who believe that the mission of man is to produce—they all look to the Republican Party this year.

The Democratic Party is helpless. It has been kidnaped by the new dealers.

Millions of rank-and-file Americans want a change. They are willing to vote for a change, especially those who reside in the 40 raw-materials producing States.

They ask for the bread of parity; will you give them a stone? They ask for words of meaning; will you give them weasel words? They ask for constructive Americanism; will you give them destructive internationalism in the Cordell Hull and Des Moines Register pattern?

Think, gentlemen, think seriously. You dare not equivocate or evade the issue.

Victory will be yours, but you must deserve it. If you win by default, America still may be lost.

Unprepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 19, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with news from Europe indicating that France and England may be dominated by Germany, Italy, and Russia; with the knowledge that Hitler has no conception of the rights of other peoples; aware that Germany has great influence in Mexico and some South American countries, it is essential that the American people, keeping their feet on the ground, their thinking clear, join as a unit to meet whatever may come when the war in Europe ends.

Hitler may demand, if his present drive succeeds—and it may have succeeded as you read this—as the price of peace and in return for withholding his bombing squadrons from London and Paris, that France and England turn over to him their entire navies. He may also demand that Britain cede to him her colonies in the Western Hemisphere. Successful in this, we might find him within striking distance of North America; hence the necessity for sane thinking, for quick, effective, and united action for preparedness.

The President told us that we were unprepared. If we are unprepared, as, in view of Hitler's successes, we seem to be, the present administration is responsible. The President, during 7 years, has been given all the money for which he asked—all of the authority which he said was necessary for the preservation of our Nation.

His failure to prepare for the present situation, knowledge of which was available to him through his special agents abroad, is water under the bridge or over the dam. Full realization of the extent of his incompetency is of value to us only as a guide for the future.

The President asked for $1,182,000,000 for national defense. That and any other sums for which he may ask will be given

him for that purpose. But money alone will not remedy the situation. Men—trained men—soldiers and pilots—are not obtained in a day or in a year. Battleships and planes cannot be bought at the "5 and 10"; nor can they be produced, except by skilled mechanics—competent, thoroughgoing executives.

Nor should it be forgotten that more than one war has been lost because of the unsound financial condition of a country. The past 7 years have added $20,000,000,000 to our national debt. Adequate national defense, which we must have, means oppressive taxation, overwhelming financial burdens, which must be endured patiently and uncomplainingly.

There is a limit to our resources. Sometimes we may have cake and ice cream, meat, bread and butter, and pie. Some people have been known to live on bread and butter—some live without the butter. We propose to spend $975,000,000 in 8 months for relief; $297,000,000 for parity payments and purchase of surplus commodities; other millions or billions for other purposes.

Airplanes, battleships, trucks, munitions of war, we must have. Would it not be wise for this Nation, as a nation, to quit spending for purposes which, however desirable or beneficial, are not absolutely necessary to the preservation of our Nation and to see to it that the money appropriated for that purpose all goes, without waste, corruption, or the granting of excess profits, for that purpose?

UNITY

The President pleads for unity. He said:

The Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned.

No truer statement was ever made; and to him as quarterback, calling the signals, every patriotic American, every Senator, every Congressman, will give his undivided support on any program for our national defense.

But the President is not the whole team. There is no reason why, unless he desires to follow in Hitler's footsteps, he should assume to carry the whole load—ignore the people and their representatives, the Congress. Nor is there any reason why he should obey signals called from the opposition team.

As the Dies committee has so thoroughly revealed, Hitler and Stalin have their emissaries, their agents, in this country. About that there is no longer any controversy. Communists have control of our merchant marine through the crews and the radiomen who are operating those ships. There are Communists in more than one department of the Government. They are the American "fifth column." Some are on the Federal pay roll. Let the President and the First Lady denounce these subversive groups and oust them from positions of influence in our Government.

In preparing for national defense, the country and the President need our industrialists—men who have operated and who know how to operate factories, to produce motor transportation, airplanes, cannon, munitions of war. These men can only be of value if the President gets rid of men who, like some in the employ of the National Labor Relations Board, are doing their utmost to strangle business.

Yes, we are all behind the President in this preparedness move; and the quickest, surest way to banish all political, partisan interference is for the President to announce frankly and quickly that he will not be a candidate for a third term.

Not long ago Dorothy Thompson made the suggestion that, under the circumstances, there should be no election in November next. We are not quite ready to give up our right to elect our rulers, and if Dorothy has become either so frightened by or so lost in admiration of what she is seeing in Europe that she no longer has faith in a republican form of government, where the people rule, she is no safe adviser for us to follow.

Let us proceed under our Constitution to select our representatives, our Chief Executive, as we have always selected them, for, in the past, to meet every emergency America has produced the man, and at no time in her history has she found but one man available for the job.

In the middle of the night, not so long ago, the President aroused the newspapermen to tell them that he had no desire to be a dictator. That act on his part proved that he realized that in this country there was a deep conviction that such was his purpose.

Now, with his political satellites insisting that he run for a third term; with a nationally known columnist suggesting that he be continued in office without an election; if he wants to allay all suspicion, if he wants to render unselfish, patriotic service in the greatest possible degree, let him follow the example of Washington, and say in unequivocal terms that he does not want, he will not seek, a third term; that his sole purpose is the preservation of our Nation.

Louisiana State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Governor Jones, of Louisiana, before the graduation class and cadet corps of Louisiana State University on May 21, 1940.

Governor Jones is my constituent. He is young, has courage and ability. I have every confidence his administration will be successful.

The speech is as follows:

It is with a feeling of gratitude to you for the splendid example of service that you have set by your 4 years' devotion to the task of preparing yourselves for our Nation's welfare, of rejoicing that I share with you the heritage of a great university's traditions, culture, and training, and of hope and belief that you are ready, willing, and able to play your part, be it large or small, in the solution of the multitude of problems that face a free people in this loftiest and mightiest democracy, that I appear before you today, knowing that I shall draw inspiration for my own task from any contact with so fine an aggregation of young Americans, and sincerely trusting that I may be able to convey a few thoughts that may justify my appearance.

I am privileged to be here today primarily because the commanding voice of a majority of the people of the State of Louisiana, made conscious of their rights and of their obligations to themselves and to you, the citizens of tomorrow, decreed that there should be an end to that shocking period of our State's history in which democracy was almost crushed beneath the dictators, and, by their votes, assigned to me the task of assisting in restoring the State to its former proud position as a Commonwealth of free men.

I have been appalled but inspired by the situation in which I have found myself—appalled by the chaos which has resulted from the willingness of public servants to plunder and despoil that which they are sworn to protect, but inspired by the readiness of thousands of citizens to devote themselves unselfishly and without hope of material reward to the rehabilitation of the State. To me has come the great honor of being the chief executive of my native State, a distinction which I deeply cherish, but it is with no feeling of personal importance that I have assumed the office. I feel rather that I am one of the agencies through which my fellow citizens are striving to find the way back to the principles of our forefathers, principles which have made and preserved us a Nation.

MIST DISPELLED

But it is not merely as your Governor that I am participating in these ceremonies. I look back constantly with pleasure and appreciation on the years that I spent as a member of the student body and cadet corps of the Louisiana State University and one of the great debts which I hope, through my service, to pay our State is that due it for having afforded me an opportunity of being taught and trained by the devoted, skilled, and earnest men who directed its destinies and presided over its classrooms.

The mist which for a while lay so heavily over our beloved school has been dispelled by the sincere efforts of the same type of leaders that made the institution possible, and I rejoice with you and the State in the realization that the whole world may once more see the academic splendor of an institution of higher

learning, directed by executives of unquestioned integrity which truly seeks to fulfill its declared purpose of preparing its students both to face life's battles and to be true American citizens.

And I am here today also because, being privileged like you to wear our country's uniform, symbolic of service, I desire, as a sort of big brother, to congratulate and greet you who have assumed the great responsibility and duty of being prepared to answer America's call, if necessary. Hating war and loving peace, nevertheless, I felt, when the World War ended, and still feel, that devotion to country should be something more than lip service. I applied for and received a commission in the Reserve Corps of which you are likewise to be a part, convinced that America owes it to herself to be prepared, not for aggression but for protection and the maintenance of her rights, and that, despite our avowed purpose, religiously adhered to, of attempting to live as friends with all nations, we may not, in the light of history, emphasized by the contemptible, incredible, and nefarious chapter, written during the last few months, predict what attitude other nations may take.

To envelop ourselves in a nebulous veil of security because of our own devotion to and belief in principles of international fairness, and because of our seeming remoteness from sources of danger is to render ourselves impotent and to subject ourselves to the ambition of those whom love of power and possession has made mad. That great American and lover of mankind, Benjamin Franklin, summarized the wastage, the mischief, and the misery caused by war in these words: "There never was a good war or a bad peace." But that paragon of common sense also saw the other side of the picture and is credited with having emphasized this piece of sound advice, imputed to an earlier philosopher: "Love your neighbors, yet pull not down your hedges."

STRIVE FOR PEACE

Strive for peace, my friends, but do not blind yourselves to facts or allow yourselves to be blinded by even the most ardent crusader, for even a crusader may be sincerely wrong. The will for peace did not prevent the swastika from supplanting the white cross of Denmark. The hatred of war could not turn back the Nazis from the lands of the liberty-loving Dutch. My prayer, then, is that you may never be called upon to know the horror of war; my hope is that should a call ever come you will be prepared.

I have, therefore, a threefold interest in you, as the Governor of the State of Louisiana, as an alumnus of the Louisiana State University from which you will soon graduate, and as a fellow member of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the United States, and because I have this interest in you and in the several thousand young men and women that compose the Louisiana State University student body, I have the right to talk frankly and freely to you and to them.

If belief that the United States of America is the greatest of nations and that it is a privilege to be one of its citizens, to enjoy its blessings, its freedom and its bounty, to be able to participate directly in the formation of the rules by which one is governed, to have one's vote counted in the selection of those by whom one is to be governed, and to be assured that there is recourse to the courts for the protection of one's rights is mere sentimentality, then I must plead guilty to being a rank sentimentalist, even if it should be claimed that sentimentality constitutes a vice.

But, my young friends, granting, as I do, to every man the right to voice his own opinion, and admitting that no government is perfect, since it must depend on the human element with its attendant frailties and tendency to err at times, I say to you that history has never presented a more magnificent and inspiring picture of a nation devoted to the welfare of its people, to the assurance of social and political security for them, to the development of happiness, to the perpetuation of peace, national and international, and to the evolution of a true brotherhood of man than that which bears the title "United States of America," a picture made possible, not by the work of one man but of countless thousands who have been willing to add their mite, or who have been equally willing to subordinate themselves to those more capable of adding the master strokes.

It is easy for the cynic to deride patriotism, to classify any sincere attempt to re-create and review the story of a nation's accomplishments as a mere resort of hokum, but I say to you, my compatriots, that it is wise for us to have flashed upon the screens of our minds a moving picture of America, her principles, her opportunities, and her greatness, which it is our duty to maintain.

PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING

Weaknesses there are, lapses from correct ideals have occurred, enactment of measures of which many have not approved has taken place, adoption of policies that have proved fallacious has been recorded, but America epitomizes free government, with the maximum blessings that flow from such a government, and each of us may well utter, not a pharisaical prayer, expressing gratitude because we are not like others, but a solemn prayer of thanksgiving that it has been vouchsafed to us to live in this land of freedom where each has a duty to perform for the common welfare and the corresponding privilege of benefiting from the efforts of others, and where each must live within the law, but where each may carve out a future for himself, unhampered by tyranny and oppression. It is a great land: Love it and serve it, my young friends.

And what a broad field for service there is. To bear arms in the event of a conflict is only a part of an American citizen's duty. Even above this, as I see it, is the willingness to strive steadily, consistently, unselfishly, and uninterruptedly to perpetuate the freedom which was so dearly acquired for themselves and posterity by our forefathers, who, neither supermen nor demigods, but plain, determined men, with human vices and virtues, were inspired to sacrifice themselves and their gods for the establishment of a free nation. The nation which was founded was not a perfect one, but through the years earnest, sincere men have striven assiduously to improve it.

A nation's laws must be changed to meet shifting conditions, and in every emergency that has arisen America has produced leaders who were able legitimately to solve her problems through orderly changes in the laws. I do not hold with those who would stifle public discussion of our Nation's affairs and who look upon every suggestion for improvement as a manifestation of communistic tendencies. I do warn you against those who have a sugar-coated panacea for every ill, or who advocate revolutionary schemes as an easy means toward the attainment of the millennium. America is a land of law and order: It must be kept as such.

AWAKENED IN TIME

But, my friends, do not ever allow America to drift into stagnation and darkness. A superabundance of good things often develops laziness of the body and of the spirit, a willingness to allow things to drift, and a desire to bask in the light of a fickle sun. Sometimes too late men are awakened to the fact that what seemed prosperity was merely a fleeting bounty, and that darkness follows the setting of the sun. Our own State suffered from such a condition as I have described. Lulled by the glib promises of men primarily interested in serving their own ends, furnished only a part of the loaf which their own labor and means had produced, while their self-styled benefactors, who labored not, reserved the remainder for their personal uses, led away from the basic precepts of honesty and fair dealing by the degree of opulence attained by the leaders who had betrayed their trust, too many of our citizens dwelt in this deceptive and enervating atmosphere of plenty. The awakening was rude, but fortunately it came in time and Louisiana today has thrown off the shackles of lethargy which she had permitted false leaders to rivet upon her, suffering, it is true, from the chains she wore, but working and striving to remedy the harm that had been done, with a determination to see that her betrayers pay the price they owe to society.

Such an orgy as our State unfortunately experienced must never happen again. Attention to public affairs, an analysis of the actions as well as the words of those who lie to please the voters, a direct participation in the solution of the social, economic, and political problems that constantly present themselves, and a refusal to be browbeaten by self-appointed leaders are demanded of you if you are to justify the privilege you enjoy of being American citizens. Don't let your State and Nation down.

No one has the power to hold up to you the magic mirror of the future, and no one in the light of history and common sense may truthfully say that each of you will have the sole power to create the reflection that will eventually appear therein, but we know that concerted action, earnest cooperation, devotion to the common welfare, attention to public problems, subordination of personal ambition and constant vigilance on the part of its people will help to perpetuate a nation and insure to a great extent the happiness of its people. I cannot and do not tell you that all of you will be leaders, but I do wish to impress upon you that each and every one of you will count in determining your future and that of our Nation. The attitude you are to take is largely of your choosing. On you rests the decision. Your records show that you have been ready to play your part. It is my belief that your State and your Nation may safely rely upon your expectations. In the name of the State of Louisiana and in my own name I congratulate you heartily upon your accomplishment, and thank you for this early manifestation of your realization of the obligations of citizenship.

Bart B. Howard, Editorial Writer of St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Awarded Pulitzer Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

SEVERAL EDITORIALS COMMENTING ON AWARD

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many outstanding contributors to the editorial pages of our metropolitan

newspapers but none superior to Mr. Bart B. Howard, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. Howard has just been recognized for distinguished editorial writing by being awarded the Pulitzer prize. The greater part of his 70 years has been devoted to newspaper work. Known throughout the country and appreciated by all who have been so fortunate as to have the privilege of reading his editorials, his friends by the hundreds have showered him with congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include several editorials commenting upon the award. They follow:

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald]

FAME—AND THE DAY'S WORK

The national fame of a Pulitzer prize comes to Bart B. Howard just as he approaches the beginning of his seventieth year. He was born May 13, 1871. And while this editorial writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has borne many important responsibilities and known many rich experiences in his long life, he has not been used to national acclaim. Now, that such notice has come to him, we imagine he will feel a certain satisfaction, but will smile somewhat skeptically, wondering how soon he may return to comparative obscurity.

For, nearing 70 and a newspaperman since youth, Bart Howard, we imagine, does not overestimate fame. It is pleasant to have this tardy recognition, to be sure, but it so easily might never have come. So, for how much does this happy chance really count?

It is his work itself that has mattered through the years to Bart Howard, and it is to his work that he will continue to look for his enduring and deepest satisfactions.

A sketch of this newspaperman's career, up to this hour of glory, reveals a life that might have ended its days in the limited recognition he had hitherto known and in the anonymity of the editorial writer.

You won't find Bart Howard in the latest Who's Who. He was not even the chief of the editorial page on which he worked.

Born in New England, he was grounded in the classics at Phillips Exeter Academy and Williams College. He still follows an Exeter professor's rule of memorizing a passage from a favorite author each day.

But Bart Howard is no withdrawn scholar. He played professional baseball—a left-handed second baseman—to earn enough money to enable him to start work as a cub reporter in Schenectady, N. Y., at $6 a week. He has been a sports writer, feature writer, columnist. His interest in the contemporary is keen and universal, as his work shows.

He was editor of two papers in Joplin, Mo. He was managing editor of a paper in Columbus, Ohio. It suspended publication. He held several jobs on the old St. Louis Republic. He wrote editorials for 3 years for the Daily Oklahoman in Oklahoma City. He returned 20 years ago to St. Louis, where he has since served on the editorial page of the Post-Dispatch.

A newspaperman's career. How many others have been in outline similar to it?

And now comes this high honor. A full half of the editorial page of his paper is given to reproduction of his 4 prize-winning editorials. Bart Howard's picture is seen in papers throughout the country, probably for the first time—maybe for the only time.

But, nice as it is, all this, we suspect, does not matter so very much to Bart Howard. It is still the work that counts. On the day of the announcement of his selection for the Pulitzer award, when his paper proudly reprinted his winning editorials, his picture, and a story of his life, there was still work to be done. There was another editorial page to be got out.

Bart Howard's fame is fine and fitting. But it is, after all, his work that matters, with or without the fame.

[From the Wayne County Record, Fairfield, Ill.]

EDITORIALS THAT SPARKLE

Bart Howard, editorial writer of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, won the annual Pulitzer award for the best newspaper editorial work. Day in and day out, the Post-Dispatch editorials truly sparkle.

Sometimes this writer thinks the Post-Dispatch editorial page is unkind, if not actually unfair, to the Democrats and their achievements and aims. Then editorials appear that make our Democratic heart proud indeed of our Bryan and Wilson teachings. So it must be, we can't help but conclude that Post-Dispatch editorials hew to the line, and it is only when a chip strikes us instead of a Republican that we do not think they are fairly written.

On other matters of public interest, on almost any subject you can name from serious international affairs to the monkeys in the St. Louis zoo, Post-Dispatch editorials contain help toward understanding, thoughtfulness, humor, kindliness, sometimes a club, but always the obvious thoughtfulness of intelligent men.

[From the Indianapolis News]

A DESERVED HONOR

As a rule, few things get stale so quickly as an editorial on international affairs. World events move at so terrifying a pace that one who writes today an analysis that will be usable tomorrow is taking chances. When one wrote a piece for the Ides of March 1939 that rang true when the Pulitzer-prize judges came to read it at the end of the year and even fits the conditions in May 1940, when the award is made, he deserves that honor, and more. The Pulitzer prize went this year to the author of such an editorial—Bart Howard, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

His article of March 17, 1939, Europe's Emperor, is the editorial of the day for May 1940. As Hitler invades Belgium and the Netherlands and as his partner, Mussolini, is said to be ready to strike in the Mediterranean, few words in Howard's dirge for the Czechs would have to be changed to bring it up to date.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette]

NO SURPRISE IN CHOICE

No alert American will be surprised that the award for distinguished editorial writing went to Bart Howard of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, that Edmund Duffy, of the Baltimore Sun, copped the prize for the best cartoon, or that the Pulitzer judges cited the graft exposure campaign of the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican as outstanding among journalistic crusades.

The Pulitzer prizes not only help transform deserving products of typewriter and pen into American institutions. The Pulitzer prizes are also institutions themselves, deserving and obtaining increasing amounts of public attention from year to year.

[From the Arkansas (Little Rock) Democrat]

AMONG THE COLOSSI

When Bart B. Howard, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch staff, was awarded the 1939 Pulitzer prize for distinguished editorial writing, one of the ablest editorial writers in the Nation finally was given the public recognition he has so long deserved.

Not that he has not been appreciated by readers of the Post-Dispatch, but, because editorial writers have their say anonymously, as individuals, they receive no public recognition. Nor do they ask it. Their award is in doing their daily chore without violation of their conscience. Bart Howard was so inspired.

So far as his ability as a writer is concerned, every editorial writer in the Nation who has read his editorials, has recognized that he has that which most of them envy—the ability, or you may call it genius, of being at all times "human." Whether Howard is writing about economic questions involving dollars or on the glories of the Ozarks, he makes his subject readable. A dogwood blossom is as appealing to Howard as an editorial subject as were the iniquities of the Pendergast gang in Kansas City.

If true tribute is to be paid to Bart Howard, he should be compared with such recognized colossi as William Allen White, who has received the public recognition which heretofore has not been given Mr. Howard. He has truly taken up the torch of the early Pulitzer tradition.

LITERATURE AS A DAILY STINT

(Walter M. Harrison, in Oklahoma City Times)

When Bart Howard was voted the Pulitzer award for consistently outstanding work as an editorial writer, I was just about as proud as if a member of our own staff had won the guerdon.

Howard is a graduate from the staff of the Daily Oklahoman; hence, it is fair to claim an interest in him, although he has been on the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for the last 20 years. It was a shock to me to realize that Bart is getting on toward the 70-year mark, but when I recall that he was touched with gray when he came down with us from Joplin, Mo., in 1918, is follows brutally that he is older now.

Those were the days of the black-out ball at the statehouse, Governor Robertson's $50,000,000 bond issue, the red war's flare, and the bitter Gore-Ferris campaign. Through tragedy and comedy, politics and piffle, Howard limned his way with an inspired pen that made the columns of the editorial page of the Daily Oklahoman glitter with a luster that lured him to larger fields. His move from Oklahoma City to St. Louis was his last one.

Generally, the Pulitzer award for editorial writing has gone to the author of one bell-ringing editorial. Howard often has had consideration in that field. This award is won for day-in-and-day-out delivery, for consistent excellence. Many anonymous scholars on the editorial side occasionally turn out an epic, but few type literature as a daily stint.

Howard has a marvelous versatility. A leader on Pendergast will sting like an adder and hit with a bludgeon today, and tomorrow that same mind will fashion a satirical whimsey on Dizzy Dean or sweet cornbread that makes the lay reader wish to know who wrote it.

The only signs of age in his work are elements of profound knowledge. His métier is as fresh and breezy on occasion as that of a sophomore. This prize is a grand gesture to a nobleman of the newspaper profession, and I think the Pulitzer board honored itself as much as Howard was honored in the selection.

[From the Denison (Tex.) Herald]

A NATIONAL REPUTATION

Bart Howard, who won the prize for distinguished editorial writing, is a member of the staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. His attacks upon graft in that city and in Kansas City have won him

a national reputation during the past year. And, of course, his editorials have brought the wrath of the politicians down upon his head.

The Pulitzer awards are not large, but they are given only in recognition of outstanding service rendered during the year. For this reason the Pulitzer awards are more coveted and more appreciated than many prizes that carry with them larger honorariums.

Who Is Playing Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a straightforward and significant editorial written by Mr. Fred C. Christopherson of that newspaper. That editorial was entitled "Who Is Playing Politics?", and I have secured consent of the House to include it as a part of these remarks. I commend it to the reading of every Member of the House and Senate.

Inasmuch as I was among those who hoped and believed that the President would use the occasion of his fireside speech last night to assure America that he had no intention of using the present European situation for partisan purposes in promoting a third term for himself, I have withheld reprinting this editorial until after the President's Sunday night radio speech. Unfortunately for the welfare of this country and the solidarity which should be manifest in our determination to develop an impregnable program of national defense, the President did more to confirm than he did to contradict his third-term aspirations in that speech.

His description of the "iffy" national defense—if we had it and if we had it paid for—which is presently America's quoted many interesting statistics about the equipment which we have "on hand or under order" but it left entirely unanswered the legitimate question which Democrats and Republicans alike are now pointedly asking about his own political ambitions. Americans, generally, want to prevent any invasion of one-man government from abroad and with equal unanimity they want to avoid any ascendancy of one-man government from within. The President's description of our existing national defense, in terms of its ability to offset the machines and methods of modern warfare, was very disheartening because as an editorial in today's issue of the Washington News says:

> He lumped weapons on hand with weapons under order, whereas there is a real difference between a loaded gun in your hand and a picture in the catalog. The Army and Navy usually have to wait a year or more to get deliveries on their orders.

His speech also failed to meet the major issues of the day head-on.

This is a time for national unity of purpose in defending the blessings of democracy in the United States. That there is unity of purpose in Congress to that end was demonstrated Friday when every Republican in the House joined with every Republican in the Senate in voting in favor of the new defense appropriations. The discord and disunity which seem likely to imperil rapid progress in modernizing our national defenses does not exist between the two major parties in the Senate and the House—it exists, rather, between those who would use a world crisis as a cloak to disguise a third-term drive and those who feel that now, as never before, America should be assured that the President will not permit personal ambitions to disrupt hallowed American traditions of self-government. The President alone can remove that cause for disunity and discord. He can do it in five words wherein he could say, "I will not run again." He could have done it in a third of the time he took explaining to Alf Landon why he was too busy to answer the question about his third-term intentions. The following editorial states the case clearly:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader]

WHO IS PLAYING POLITICS?

Something highly to be desired by those in office in Washington now is the development of a national psychology in which criticism of the President would be regarded as out of place.

Those who are interested in this objective are making constant pleas for national unity, for a coalition government, and the sidetracking of what they term politics.

Credit must be given to Alfred M. Landon, the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1936, for bringing this subject out into the open for dissection and analysis.

In a statement to reporters in Washington, following a luncheon with President Roosevelt at the White House, Landon said that Republican leaders could not at present enter into any coalition arrangement without making themselves a party to the third-term movement—a movement which he said was not compatible with the basic principles of a democracy.

Shortly thereafter a statement came from the White House. It said: "The President regrets that he has no time, just now, to give to the preparation of political statements. He is too busily engaged with problems of far greater importance."

The President's statement is vapid and evasive. In less time than it takes to light a cigarette, the President could say "Yes" or "No" to a third-term inquiry.

But, obviously, it doesn't serve his purposes, whatever they may be, to express himself on that point now. So he takes refuge in the dodge that he is too busy, and at the same time he seeks to create the impression that there is something impertinent and low about the presentation of the topic.

The President's reply to Landon was cheap. It was tawdry as well. It was, as a matter of fact, political in the worst sense. He is eager to push the minds of the people away from the third term and the national elections just now. Landon, however, believes that in this democratic Nation our elections are important and that the issues involved should be subjected to a frank discussion.

SENATOR TAFT'S UNANSWERED CHALLENGE

Mr. Speaker, because the following quotation from Senator BOB TAFT'S recent address in St. Louis, Mo., is in such close harmony with the sentiment expressed in the preceding editorial, I am citing it here for the further consideration of the Members of this House at this time. BOB TAFT on May 20 had this to say:

> The Republicans are accused of partisanship when they criticize the foreign policy of the President. If there could be any course more selfishly partisan than that which seeks to use a great world crisis to boost a third term, I don't know what it could be.

Members of the House, do you?

Dead Sea Apples

REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, many years ago as a reporter in Cleveland, Ohio, I attended a meeting of anarchists. Among the other things stated was this sentence uttered by a man named Gorsuch, "What this party wants, what we desire, is a land without law, without government, and without God." That sentence has stuck in my mind ever since in connection with this recrudescence of atheism as fathered and fostered by the successor to the anarchist party, the Communist Party.

In the audience that evening was a young woman. A few days ago she, a dumpy, fat old lady, died in Toronto, Ontario, an expatriate from her own country, a participant in many, many activities subversive to the United States Government. Having taken up her residence in Russia, she found that the utopia she had sought was simply Dead Sea apples in her hands. [Applause.]

That was Emma Goldman, for 20 years the chief anarchist of the United States, militant evangelist of the anarchs, with preachments that spawned a Berkman who shot Henry C. Frick; the woman who stirred the addled brain of

Czolgosz, assassin of President McKinley; the woman who finally went to prison and later landed in Russia only to discover that the beautiful Communist utopia of her dreams was a sordid, vicious, selfish world and a bitter disillusionment. When she saw the fingers of her Communist heroes dripping with the blood of thousands who had objected, she turned to longing for America and the little house on St. Joseph's Street in Rochester, N. Y., only to die in unmolested frustration.

She had been wrong in vision; she had seen only its distortions. The mirage had turned out to be an enveloping desert even as all persons today, seeking to overthrow this America, will find themselves at the end of the road, standing on the brink of the chasm of unrealized hope.

Keep America Out of Europe and Europe Out of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

RADIO SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OVER THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, SUNDAY, MAY 26, 1940

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Sunday evening, May 26:

It has been rumored around Washington for the past 2 days that President Roosevelt will, in his fireside chat tonight, renounce any ambitions he may have to seek a third term for himself, in the interest of the Nation and in order to remove politics from the national-defense program.

If these rumors are correct, it will be to the lasting credit of the President. He has an opportunity tonight such as few men have had in the history of our country to render a patriotic service to the Nation, by definitely disclaiming any ambitions to make this a one-man Government patterned after the Old World totalitarian systems.

This is no time for toying with the destiny of 130,000,000 Americans or with American traditions and democratic institutions.

I shall stress national defense tonight, as it is uppermost in the minds of the people, and defer presenting a detailed Republican peace program until June 22 over the N. B. C., although I will outline general principles.

The Congress of the United States, representing the will of the American people and confronted as they are by a world ablaze with war and destruction, is determined to appropriate every dollar necessary for adequate national defense, but not one dollar to send American soldiers to fight and die on foreign battlefields.

The Congress will within the next few days appropriate billions of dollars to defend our shores and make America invincible from any foreign attack. It is the will of Congress that these huge sums of the people's money should be for purposes of defense and not for aggression. The Congress should stay in session during the existing emergency.

The Republicans in Congress will stand as a unit for preparedness and peace, and for keeping America out of all foreign wars unless attacked.

There is something rotten about the state of our national defense. The Congress has appropriated $7,000,000,000 since 1933; what has happened to it? Judging from results, some of it must have gone down the proverbial rat hole.

President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, is largely responsible for the deplorable condition of our Army and its lack of modern weapons, for deficiencies that exist in our reserve supplies, and for the small number of trained air pilots in both the Army and the Navy. We should train 10,000 pilots immediately for both the Army and Navy Air Corps. It may take 2 years to equip and qualify them as combat pilots.

Just why President Roosevelt should be given credit for his belated efforts as Commander in Chief to provide adequate national defense is beyond human comprehension. He has failed with national defense as he has with our other vital problems of industry, employment, agriculture, and prosperity.

Instead of being commended, President Roosevelt should be condemned for failure to safeguard the interests of the Nation by providing proper equipment for our Army and air force.

I specifically exempt the President and the Congress from any blame as to the size or efficiency of our Navy. Many of our citizens, due to the vast amount of war propaganda, are in a state of jitters and fail to realize that we have the greatest and most powerful Navy in the world and intend to keep it so. I repeat, without fear of valid contradiction, that we already have as our first line of defense the best Navy in ships and personnel.

Any navy or combination of navies would have to be three times as powerful as ours to even come over to attack us, as modern navies lose 20 percent of their efficiency every thousand miles from their base. Today our Navy is six times as big as the German Navy and growing larger every day as German and English warships are sunk or destroyed. If the war continues, our Navy will soon be larger than the British and German Navies combined.

We are not next-door neighbors to Germany, like Denmark, Holland, Belgium, or France, but over 3,000 miles away, and no German airplane has been invented that could bomb our cities and get back to its base.

Fostered by the White House and the interventionists, a war hysteria is sweeping the United States, which is as insane as was the Salem witchcraft. How mad it is to instill fear in the hearts and minds of the American people about Germany attacking us, when it has practically no navy, nor could its airplanes bomb American cities. Germany is within 300 miles of London and 200 miles of Paris, yet is desperately trying to shorten this distance in order to use its air fleets effectively against British and French seaports and Paris and London.

While Europe is in the midst of a "blitzkrieg," we in America are in the midst of a "hysteria krieg," or war hysteria, aided and abetted by President Roosevelt and many well-known columnists and eastern newspapers, including the New York Times and Herald Tribune. The American people are nervous and jittery, and afraid of an invasion of the United States by some foreign foe, all because of the constant spread of inspired propaganda, hysteria, and warmongering by the interventionists who want us to police and quarantine the world with American blood and treasure.

Any American who dares to expose the false and vicious interventionist propaganda and hysteria, like Col. Charles Lindbergh, is denounced as being either pro-Nazi or as being un-American and part of a "fifth column."

Colonel Lindbergh rendered a great service to the American people when he said, "Let us stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion that has been running rife these last few days. * * * The only reason we are in danger of becoming involved in this war is because there are powerful elements in America who desire us to take part. They represent a small minority of the American people, but they control much of the machinery of influence and propaganda. They seize every opportunity to push us closer to the edge."

Never were truer words spoken. Every poll shows that 95 percent of the American people insist on staying out of foreign wars, but the 5 percent of interventionists are using every possible means to inflame the passions of our people, incite fear of invasion, and generally promote war hysteria in order to break down the will of our people for peace and against participation in foreign wars.

When Colonel Lindbergh publicly stated a year ago that the Soviet aviation was inefficient, and that the German airplanes were the best in the world, he was derided as being pro-Nazi. Everyone knows now that he knew what he was talking about, but his warning was not taken to heart.

Senator BYRNES assailed Lindbergh for daring to express his views. The pity of it is that there are not more Lindberghs to tell the truth to our people before we are eased into another foreign war. Who knows more about aviation, Lindbergh or his critics, including Senator BYRNES, of South Carolina?

The American people are entitled to hear from such aviation experts as Lindbergh. I believe in the fullest freedom of speech and that all phases of national defense and keeping out of war should be presented to the people over the radio. We are not yet a totalitarian state, and I hope we will never be.

The best assurance against a dictatorial government is to tell the people the truth, and, as Lincoln said, the country will be safe.

It is utterly un-American and undemocratic to impugn the motives or question the patriotism of American citizens such as Lindbergh with whom administration supporters may disagree. He proved he was right about German and Russian aviation, and he may be right as regards our own.

We want no Trojan horses of war in America, or that war is inevitable. The Trojan horses of communism and nazi-ism require investigation and constant vigilance, but they are as nothing to the dangers and menace of the Trojan horse of the internationalists and interventionists, who, by intrigue and secret diplomacy, would involve us in war.

We know about the Trojan horse of Woodrow Wilson. We should beware of the Trojan horse of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is a far more powerful and destructive horse than that of the Communists and Nazis. The modern American Trojan horse is a war horse in disguise. We are even now being jockeyed into the bloody shambles of war under the pretext of making the world safe for democracy, when even England has entered the ranks of dictatorial nations.

Why not try to establish air bases in Latin America, as suggested by Colonel Lindbergh, for a united defense of the American Continent? I go even further and urge the cancelation of the war debts owed to us by Great Britain and the payment of substantial sums of our idle gold to her in return for Bermuda, Nassau, Jamaica, and all her islands and possessions in the Caribbean Sea. They are of no particular advantage to her and would be useful to us as air and submarine bases for defense of our coasts.

These islands are off our shores and within our sphere of influence, and should belong to us. The sooner we take proper steps to bring this about the better it will be for Great Britain and ourselves. Neither Canada, the United States, nor Latin America would want these islands to fall into the hands of another European power.

We should likewise purchase Greenland from the Danes, Curacao from the Dutch, and Guadeloupe and Martinique from the French. I have urged the acquisition of all these islands and European possessions for 15 years in the Congress, and believe the time is propitious for favorable action.

I want to go on record for giving Secretary Ickes $1,000,000 to erect a tin smelter on our eastern seaboard in order to refine tin ore from Bolivia. The only smelters are in England and Holland, and they have a virtual monopoly which might be serious under war conditions. I also favor appropriating $1,000,000 to be turned over to Secretary of Agriculture Wallace to ascertain the best lands in Latin America to grow rubber for commercial use. We are now dependent on the East Indies for our rubber. Both of these proposals are in the interest of national defense, and would provide more jobs for American citizens.

As one who approved of the President's appeal to prevent the bombing of civilians and nonmilitary objectives, I can understand why so many Americans were horrified when he stated at a press conference this week that the Germans were "bombing some three to five million fleeing old men, women, and children" in northern France. The charge, coming from the President of the United States, if true, calls for the strongest kind of official protest to Germany and to all nations. The bombing of defenseless cities and the slaughter of women and children is a crime against humanity and civilization. But if the charge is false and made for propaganda purposes in order to add fuel to the flames of war hysteria, then he should be publicly rebuked as an interventionist and warmonger.

Let us always remember in these dark and trying times that if there is any country worth living in, it is the United States of America. We propose at all costs to maintain our democratic institutions and our constitutional form of government against both our enemies from within and from without. We must not tolerate or compromise with disloyalty or subversive activities anywhere within our own country.

The Congress should pass my bill prohibiting the arming, drilling, and uniforming of un-American groups, such as Communists, bundists, and curb the activities of the "fifth columns" by making America safe for Americans. "Fifth column" alien agitators, Communists, and Nazis should be deported immediately.

Let us stop bluffing and get on with our defense program to make America so powerful that no nation or combination of nations will dare to make war on us.

Theodore Roosevelt used to say "speak softly, but carry a big stick." Franklin D. Roosevelt bluffs and threatens but has carried only a twig or a splinter which has been no more effective than Chamberlain's umbrella.

The Republican Party must stand for preparedness, peace, and prosperity. We have had none of them under the New Deal. The Republican Party must adopt a peace or antiwar plank into its platform at the Philadelphia Convention next month. If the Republican Party will take the war issue to the people of keeping out of European and foreign wars and keeping Europe out of America it will sweep the Nation.

If, however, it compromises on American neutrality, intervention, and our traditional foreign policies of no entangling alliances, it will fail in its duty to present to the American people a clear-cut referendum on the greatest of all American issues—keeping out of foreign wars.

The President should remember that although the American people are 90 percent in favor of the Allies, they are 95 percent against having their sons plowed under on foreign battlefields. They know that our participation means the black-out of American liberties and our free institutions, the creation of a dictatorship as bad as the Nazis or Communists, and debts, taxes, and virtual bankruptcy.

Let us put an end to war hysteria and war talk and make America invincible from attack on land, sea, or air.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN M. VORYS OF OHIO

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the President in his fireside alibi last night tried to minimize the deficiencies in the defense which he has procured for our country with the billions voted for the purpose by listing arms on order as if they were on hand. He fails to explain away the deficiencies we in Congress have recently discovered. These deficiencies are pointed out in the speech of Representative JOHN M. VORYS, speaking before the second annual convention of the War Veterans' Republican Club of Ohio Saturday night, May 25, at Memorial Hall, Columbus, Ohio:

In this crucial time in world affairs our enemies are indifference, hysteria, and politics. Our slogan must be, "Wake up, America; keep your shirt on, America; put patriotism above partisanship."

The President is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and has sole responsibility under our Constitution for the conduct of foreign affairs. National defense and foreign affairs are highly technical subjects, involving much that is confidential and secret. The War, Navy, and State Departments are the only branches of our Government who can say to the people and to Congress, "We know but we won't tell; it's a state secret, a military secret." The President can conceal foreign or military information saying, "It's too secret—you might tell," or "It's too technical—you wouldn't understand."

To find out where we are going on foreign affairs and national defense, let's find out where we are and how we got there.

Both Hitler and Roosevelt came into power in 1933. Since then the President has controlled the Army, Navy, and State Departments. Every Budget request, every appropriation has been controlled by him and his party. We have spent seven billion eight hundred million for national defense, and the President has had two blank checks for relief and recovery of three billion three hundred million and four billion eight hundred million which were available for national defense. What have we gotten? We are told—

First. We have the best navy in the world.

Second. We have a reorganized, streamlined Army under a great Chief of Staff, General Marshall.

Third. We have the best bomb sight in the world.

Fourth. We have the best antiaircraft gun in the world.

Fifth. We have airplanes whose performance is the best in the world.

In 1937, the President made his speech about quarantining aggressors. In January 1939, he made his measure-short-of-war speech. In September 1939, when war came and he called a special session to deal with conditions created by the war, we received no message as to national-defense needs, although the military and naval affairs committees were idle for weeks during the neutrality debate. In January 1940, we received a national-defense budget which we had a right to assume was adequate. On May 16, 1940, we received the emergency national-defense message asking for a billion dollars for 50,000 planes and saying the situation had changed since September.

Upon reviewing our national defense, we find:

First. We were building destroyers that were top-heavy and our fleet must be remodeled to resist aerial warfare.

Second. We have about 500 up-to-date naval planes, only 192 less than a year old.

Third. We have 1,500 Army combat planes of which only 58 are said to be reliably up to date.

Fourth. We have 28 light and medium tanks—no heavy tanks. Both sides have lost more tanks than we have, in the last few days in a single raid.

Fifth. In antiaircraft guns we have fifteen 37-mm. and need immediately 1,423. We have no 90 mm. guns and need 317.

Sixth. In artillery we have no 105-mm. or 8-inch Howitzers and no 8-inch railway guns.

Seventh. We have no private powder plants in the United States and no factories to load shells.

Eighth. Our national debt is so high and our cash is so low that we cannot legally buy the arms that we need and additional taxes or debts will seriously affect our economy.

I feel we have a right to say to the President, "Why didn't you tell us about this before? In January? Last September?" We are told that it wouldn't have been popular to do so. What we need is leadership that will tell us what we need to know, not what we want to hear. After we have been told, the responsibility is ours. Until we have been told, the responsibility lies on him who has technical or secret information he refuses to divulge for fear it would be unpopular. The Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy has failed in his duty.

We now find that if we carry out the President's defense message, we won't have 50,000 planes but 1,400; that to build and operate 50,000 planes will cost possibly $7,000,000,000, and that we don't need 50,000 planes anyhow.

Teddy Roosevelt used to say, "Speak softly but carry a big stick." We find that Franklin D. Roosevelt's policy is, "Talk big and carry a switch."

What lies ahead of us? Many factors are uncertain and confused but certain things seem clear:

First. It will take us, not months but years, to build the national defense we need.

Second. We couldn't give effective military aid to the allies in the present crisis if we wanted to.

Third. We are in no immediate danger of invasion, no matter what happens in Europe.

Fourth. Our real national-defense problem is industrial and financial. Soldiers and politicians are not much good at organizing or running industry, but the President has so far refused to let industrial defense get out of the clutches of the New Deal.

Up to date the Navy Department has no head, its Secretary having resigned to run for Governor in New Jersey. Woodring, Secretary of War, is reported not on speaking terms with his assistant, Louis Johnson; is known in the New Deal and throughout the country as a "weak sister" or worse. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, during our years of frenzied finance, has been put in charge of airplane production. The President, from the air-mail cancelation down through the C. A. A. transfer and up to the publicity meeting last Monday, has shown a consistent desire for personal and political domination of our aircraft industry.

The New Deal has shown by its action in the past few days that by coalition they don't mean teamwork but single-party government. They consider criticism is treason and are determined to use national defense as a slogan to silence all New Deal criticism.

In this situation we should profit by the experience of France and England, two democracies which are tottering because the oppcsition remained silent too long while the Government pursued a fatally wrong course. If the opposition in France and England had spoken effectively before war came, they would not have been forced to change leadership during the war.

We have a subtle and difficult problem to contend with in combating the "fifth column." We must keep the F. B. I. and the Dies committee on the job. On the other hand, we must watch their activities unceasingly and we must beware of the activities of amateur and self-appointed spy hunters. Again we must avoid either indifference, hysteria, or politics. We want to suppress spies, Nazis and Communists, but we must be everlastingly careful to avoid saying that everyone who disagrees with us is a member of the "fifth column."

In a modern nation national defense is not merely a matter of appropriations, but a way of life, a form of organization of the country's resources. I think we can do this in America without sacrificing our form of government, but it will involve intelligence and patriotism and self-control and self-sacrifice. Already selfish swarms are descending on Washington, seeking jobs and contracts, peddling lands, materials, factories. We can't afford to do this in the good old-fashioned way that characterized the Civil War and the World War. We dare not let national defense become New Deal patronage. This time there must be no slackers and no profiteers. National defense should not be a New Deal proposal or a Republican issue, but an American achievement if we are to have peace.

Rules and Regulations of Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

REPORT BY THE COMMISSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the 29th day of February last the Federal Communications Commission issued certain revised rules and regulations governing television broadcast stations. Subsequently, on April 8, the Commission held hearings on the revised rules and regulations. The hearings have been completed. Today the Federal Communications Commission made its report as a result of the hearings on the revised rules and regulations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the Commission. The report is the unanimous report of the Commission.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Federal Communications Commission. In the Matter of Order No. 65, Setting Television Rules and Regulations for Further Hearing. Docket No. 5806. Report, May 23, 1940]

By the Commission:

On April 8, 1940, a hearing was begun by the Commission to obtain information relative to certain problems connected with television broadcasting which had arisen subsequent to the promulgation by the Commission on February 29, 1940, of its revised rules and regulations governing television broadcast stations. The issues which are at this time presented for Commission determination are those involved in that hearing. In the main they involve questions as to the wisdom (1) of selecting and setting at this time a single uniform system of standards for television transmitting equipment and (2) of continuing television broadcast licenses on an experimental as distinguished from a commercial basis. These issues can be adequately considered only against the broader background of the Commission's functions in relation to the development of television.

The Commission, in addition to being charged with the duty of licensing radio transmission stations, has the obligation to promote experimentation in radio, encourage its wider use and "regulate the kind of apparatus to be used" by sound and television stations. Those powers are set forth in section 303 of the Communications Act which provides:

"The Commission, from time to time as public interest requires, shall—

"Study new uses for radio, provide for experimental uses of frequencies, and generally encourage the larger and more effective use of radio in the public interest; * * *

"Regulate the kind of apparatus to be used with respect to its external effects and the purity and sharpness of the emissions from each station and from the apparatus therein; * * *.

"Make such regulations not inconsistent with law as it may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

No party to the proceeding has challenged the Commission's jurisdiction in this matter. On the contrary, Manton Davis, general counsel of the Radio Corporation of America, the chief protestant of the action of the Commission, conceded its jurisdiction by the following statement at the April hearing:

"Most certainly we do not challenge the jurisdiction of the Commission to fix any standards with respect to transmission of broadcasting, television, or any other transmission signals. Moreover, we do not challenge the jurisdiction of the Commission to make any investigations or to collect or correlate any facts that might be helpful to them in that endeavor."

From the duty to regulate the kind of apparatus to be used by broadcasting stations stems the duty to fix the transmission standards of such stations. Transmission standards may be simply defined as engineering rules governing the characteristics of the radio signal transmitted by the operation of radio apparatus. Such standards as a practical matter must require a fair degree of efficiency and assure to the public in basic outline a single uniform system of broadcasting which will enable every transmitting station to serve every receiver within its range.

In its regulation of television in the public interest the Commission, in the light of the evidence before it, has set as its goal unfettered technical development and engineering advance. In dealing with the problem of setting television-transmission standards the Commission has therefore sought to avoid action which would freeze the state of the art at an unsatisfactory level of performance. As a necessary corollary, it has sought to avoid action which might result in the freezing of standards by the industry itself. Hence, as evidence bearing on the issues at the hearing, the Commission has considered the effect which a widespread distribution to the public of television-receiving equipment currently available will have on the future improvement of television-transmitting systems.

PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTION WITH REGARD TO TELEVISION

The art of television has been under development for more than a decade. During this time the Commission has issued a number of licenses for experimental purposes looking toward the development of the science to the point where the Commission could be reasonably assured of television's readiness for a competitive public service upon a sound technical basis and upon a single uniform system.

Throughout this period the Commission has carefully observed and studied television's technical advancement and problems and has kept abreast of engineering developments in the field. On September 10, 1938, there was submitted for the Commission's consideration a proposed set of television-transmission engineering standards which had been adopted by the Radio Manufacturers' Association, a trade association of radio manufacturers.

On January 3, 1939, the Commission appointed a committee, consisting of Commissioners Craven, Brown, and Case, known as the Television Committee, which was charged with the duty of investigating and submitting recommendations with regard to the fixing of television broadcasting standards by the Commission and the disposition of a number of pending applications for television experimental licenses.

In order to secure information as to the nature of the proposed standards, and the effect of such standards upon the future development of television as a service in the interest of the public, the Television Committee met with representatives of the industry, visited various television laboratories, and conferred with several organizations concerned with the development of television from both the manufacturing and operating standpoint. The results of the committee's studies were embodied in a public report dated May 22, 1939, in which particular emphasis was laid upon the vital questions of public interest which were inherently connected with the Commission's duty to prescribe uniform transmission standards in the television broadcasting field. The bearing of the peculiar "lock and key" relationship between television transmitter and receiver upon the Commission's duty to set uniform transmission standards was sharply manifested in these words:

"However, a serious question of public interest would arise in the future if the Commission should specify external transmitter performance capabilities differing from the operating capabilities of receivers in the hands of the public. This is because of the re-

sultant possibility that the public's receivers would be incapable of receiving programs emanating from transmitters licensed by the Commission."

The committee's studies disclosed that technical advancement of the art had not progressed to the point where it would be in the public interest to adopt any transmission standards for television broadcasting. In the light of the demonstrated fluidity of the art and its current movement toward a higher level of efficiency, it was recognized that the acceptance of any fixed set of standards would entail the undesirable consequences of checking or retarding meritorious research. It was, therefore, the committee's recommendation that pending further studies upon the progress of television experimentation and research, no standards be adopted by the Commission.

On November 15, 1939, a second report submitted to the Commission by its television committee was made public. In this report the committee noted that certain progress had been achieved in television experimentation since the date of its previous report. It was felt by the committee that, although the television industry had not advanced beyond the experimental stage, it had arrived at the point where more rapid progress could be expected by the licensing of a class of station to render sponsored programs to the public on a limited basis. A revision of the Commission's rules to make this proposal effective was recommended. It was the conviction of Commissioners Craven, Brown, and Case, in making this recommendation, however, that the development of television was still in a rapid state of flux and the committee asserted that therefore—

"No interests should be permitted to raise public hopes falsely nor to encourage public investments where the state of scientific or economic development leaves any doubt that such hopes and expenditures are justified for the use of the public property in the radio spectrum."

On December 22, 1939, the entire Commission tentatively adopted the rules recommended in this second report of the television committee, with minor modifications, and on the same date all interested parties desiring to be heard with respect to these proposed rules were invited to participate in a public hearing on January 15, 1940, before the Commission.

Pursuant to the Commission's invitation leading concerns engaged in experimentation and research in the television field appeared and gave evidence upon the matters under investigation. Included among the parties who submitted evidence at this hearing were the Radio Corporation of America, a company engaged in the development, production, and sale of radio and television transmitting and receiving apparatus and the licensing of such production pursuant to its patents, and in conducting sound and television broadcasting through its wholly owned subsidiary, the National Broadcasting Co.; Philco Radio and Television Corporation, a company engaged in the development and production of radio and television receiving apparatus and in the operation of an experimental television broadcast station in Philadelphia, Pa.; Allen B. DuMont Laboratories, Inc., a company engaged in the development and production of television apparatus, and in television broadcasting; Farnsworth Television and Radio Corporation, a radio and television manufacturing organization; Zenith Radio Corporation, a manufacturer of radio and television apparatus; Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., and Don Lee Broadcasting system, broadcasting concerns in the radio and television fields; and numerous other manufacturers and broadcasters in the radio and television fields.

The January hearing extended over a period of 8 days. The voluminous evidence presented by the parties included an expression of the views of different members of the industry with respect to the Commission's proposed rules, and extensive testimony of the industry's leading television engineers concerning the technical status of the television art, and the desirability of the adoption of television-transmission standards by the Commission.

DIFFERENCES OF ENGINEERING OPINION WITHIN THE INDUSTRY

The hearing revealed a serious conflict of engineering opinion upon the question of standards among the representatives of various responsible elements in the industry engaged in important research and experimental work in the television field. Dissatisfaction with standards which had been submitted by the R. M. A. on September 10, 1938, was expressed by Zenith Radio Corporation, and also by the Allen B. DuMont Laboratories, and the Philco Radio and Television Corporation who were engaged in research on alternative proposals for which marked advantages were claimed. Defense of the R. M. A. standards was assumed chiefly by the Radio Corporation of America and the Farnsworth Television and Radio Corporation, who claimed superiorities for the R. M. A. system over other known alternatives. It is important to note that both DuMont and R. C. A. hold patents covering the proposals which they respectively supported.

In order to make clear the nature of the controversy within the industry a brief explanation of the basic television methods employed and of the terms used is necessary. A complete scene cannot be transmitted instantaneously by presently developed television methods. Therefore, it is necessary to transmit the picture by small successive elements, in a manner comparable to the eye reading the printed page of a book. This procedure of breaking the scene down is begun at the television camera by a process known as scanning. The picture at the receiver is made up of a single dot, caused by a stream of electrons, moving very quickly and continuously across the screen to form lines. The entire process is so rapid that the resultant mosaic is perceived as a complete picture because the eye retains or carries over the original impression caused by each position of the dot.

Increasing the number of elements and scanning lines in the television picture increases the detail and distinctness. The detail capability of the television system is therefore in part dependent upon the number of lines transmitted.

The "memory" of the human eye is, however, limited and therefore it is necessary to scan each scene completely in a fractional part of a second and in rapid repetition in order that the eye may perceive the series of individual pictures as a single, continuous, flickerless picture with continuous motion. The rate at which the complete scanning of a scene is accomplished is called the frame frequency, and means merely the number of times the complete scene is scanned per second. If the frame frequency is too low, the reproduced picture will have flicker and the motion will be jerky; if the number of lines is too small, the picture lacks clarity and detail. In general, it may be said that an increase in the number of lines can be made within a given band width of frequencies only by reducing the frame frequency.

Two of the important television problems outstanding are to develop (a) a better picture with more detail and greater clarity and (b) a larger picture. If the screen is enlarged with a given frame and line frequency, the quality of detail and clarity diminishes. An increase in the number of scanning lines is the only known method of satisfactorily accomplishing either of the desired ends. This could be most easily accomplished by increasing the band width of frequencies employed by each station. Each of such stations, however, already requires a large segment of the radio spectrum, a band of 6,000 kilocycles, which is 600 times the width of that necessary for a standard broadcast station. The number of radio frequencies being severely limited, it is regarded as essential to explore all possibilities of improving performance within the present 6,000 kilocycle band assigned. Since within any given channel an increase in the number of lines entails a lower frame frequency—fewer pictures per second—the problem of flicker and jerky motion is raised.

Considerable research has been carried on in recent years to accomplish a lowering of frame frequency without injury to the quality of the picture. Screens with "memory," or a chemically retentive quality, have been developed to a substantial but not to a satisfactory degree. Progress has been made, but no one yet claims the answer.

In the transmission of the picture units, it is essential that the receiver follow the scanning process at the transmitter so that the picture elements reproduced will have the same relative position. In order to keep the receiver locked to the transmitter, it is necessary for the transmitter to transmit keying or synchronizing radio signals in order to maintain the relationship of the transmitted picture units. These signals are known as synchronizing pulses and enable the receiver to be synchronized with the transmitter. In the development of television, a number of different pulses have been under study. It is the synchronizing pulse which is the foundation of the lock-and-key relationship between television transmitter and receiver.

The dispute brought into light at the January hearing centered mainly around proposals regarding frame frequencies, numbers of lines, and the character of the synchronizing pulse of transmission. A further difference of opinion involves polarization and is related to the type of antenna to be used.

Upon the question of frame and line frequencies, the R. M. A. proposal of a frequency of a fixed system of 30 frames per second and 441 lines per frame was attacked upon the grounds that it does not permit of sufficient picture detail, that pictures so produced are unsatisfactory for public use, that the development of larger pictures is precluded by such a standard, and that the scheme lacks flexibility. Alternate proposals suggested by the critics of this proposed standard involved (1) a flexible frame frequency range of from 15 frames to 30 frames and a range of between 441 lines and 800 lines per frame, and (2) a frequency of 24 frames per second with 500 lines or more per frame. Proponents of the R. M. A. proposals on this question characterized the foregoing alternatives as unsatisfactory for the reason that low-frame frequencies create the problem of flicker and smear in reproduction. It was admitted, however, that an increased number of lines produces more desirable picture detail but that an increase in the number of lines to as much as 625 lines necessarily requires reduction in the number of frames to 15 per second with its concomitant problem of flicker and smear. The admitted advantages of increased number of lines and testimony to the effect that further research was in progress toward the development of retentive screens designed to eliminate objectionable flicker and smear, indicated the desirability that the fixing of standards should await the results of such research.

Upon the question of synchronizing pulses DuMont contended that the RMA pulse would not permit automatic reception by receivers of increases or decreases in frame frequencies, which might be found desirable for varying types of programs. He urged as the fundamental essential of flexibility a synchronizing pulse having characteristics enabling automatic adjustment by receivers to various frame frequencies being transmitted. The evidence on this question indicated to the Commission that research directed towards the achievement of such flexibility should go forward.

Philco Radio and Television Corporation opposed the R. M. A. recommendation of horizontal polarization. Many advantages were claimed by Philco for the system of vertical polarization on which

research and experimentation were still being conducted. Enough was said in evidence to convince the Commission that further research upon the matter of polarization was necessary.

Although a divergence of engineering opinion existed with respect to the merits and demerits of the various systems in question, the members of the industry appearing before the Commission were in substantial unanimity on the need for the possibilities of improvement in these basic aspects of the television art.

REPORT OF FEBRUARY 29, 1940

On February 29, 1940, the Commission issued a report embodying its conclusions upon the problems raised during the January hearings. In making this report, the Commission adopted with few changes the rules which it had previously approved tentatively. Sponsored program service for one class of stations (Class II) on a limited basis was to begin on September 1, 1940.

The keynote of the Commission's report and the policy underlying the Commission's rules was that television broadcasting was still in an experimental stage and that, in view of evidence revealing a substantial possibility of significant improvements in the art, "research should not halt" and "scientific methods should not be frozen in the present state of the art." The Commission expressed the belief that the crystallization of standards at the current level of the art, by whatever means accomplished, would inevitably stifle research in basic phases of the art in which improvement appeared promising.

Recognizing the danger that research in television might be unduly retarded by immediate promotional activities for a single fixed system prior to the Commission's establishment of standards for this new art, the Commission's unanimous report of February 29, 1940, urged restraint in such activities in order to avoid consequences inimical to the public interest. The report stated:

"The issuance or acceptance of transmission standards by the Commission, especially in combination with the more extensive experimental program service which will in all probability develop under these rules, would have a tendency to stimulate activity on the part both of manufacturers and the public in the sale and purchase of receivers for home use. It is inescapable that this commercial activity inspired and then reinforced by the existence of Commission standards would cause an abatement of research. To a greater or less extent the art would tend to be frozen at that point. * * *

"The same considerations which demonstrate the unwisdom of the Commission's promulgating standards at this time dictate the undesirability of the industry itself attempting to impose such a code on all points. The Commission therefore recommends that no attempt be made by the industry or its members to issue standards in this field for the time being. In view of the possibilities for research, the objectives to be attained, and the dangers involved, it is the judgment of the Commission that the effects of such an industry agreement should be scrupulously avoided for the time being. Agreement upon standards is presently less important than the scientific development of the highest standards within reach of the industry's experts."

THE POSITION OF THE INDUSTRY ON SETTING STANDARDS

The objectives outlined in the February 29 report were a reflection of the almost unanimous opinion of the industry as expressed at the January hearing that standards should not be fixed if research was to go forward and the science developed in the public interest.

The Radio Corporation of America appeared to be in accord with these objectives as is demonstrated by the testimony of E. W. Engstrom, its chief engineering witness, and the statements of its counsel, F. W. Wozencraft. Engstrom testified as follows:

"I, as an engineer, am not recommending that standards be frozen in the term that I believe has been discussed at this hearing. I think that everyone should have an opportunity to work through the systems in which they are operating."

Wozencraft stated:

"I am advocating only that the Commission permit applicants to proceed experimentally, using certain standards which the Commission will permit the applicant to use. I think the Commission's position should be kept entirely flexible and I * * *. As far as R. C. A. is concerned, we don't ask that the standards be frozen or that the Commission approve the standards in a way which will make it more difficult for anyone else who has other standards at any time," and added:

"We have no desire to recommend to the Commission that everybody have to conform to the R. M. A. standards, or have to show that everybody who is operating under R. M. A. standards should have to change to another set of standards because a new applicant wants to use a new set of standards. * * * I don't see why an applicant should have to bear the burden and we do not suggest anything which makes it hard for anybody who thinks he can promote television and render service in that field and serve public interest * * *."

From the foregoing the Commission felt assured that no attempt would be made to freeze the standards by any means. The statements to the Commission, the record shows, were with the knowledge and approval of the R. C. A. president, David Sarnoff.

Yet, on February 29, a letter carefully drafted and reviewed by the Radio Corporation's officials, including its president, was signed by Engstrom and delivered to a meeting of the R. M. A. Subcommittee on Television Standards, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City. That letter stated:

"Since television transmission service and the sale of television receivers to the public have already begun on the basis of R. M. A. approved standards, proposals involving changes in transmission standards must necessarily be considered from the point of view of their superiority, if any, over existing standards. The proponents of changes in these approved standards must, of necessity, bear the burden of proof that such changes would effect a substantial improvement in the service to the public and that a change under the circumstances above referred to is warranted."

In April, Engstrom testified as to R. C. A.'s meaning in the use of the phrase "burden of proof" as follows:

"Chairman FLY. Well, tell me just what you mean by 'burden of proof'?

"The WITNESS. I mean by that, the kind of activity in the R. M. A. group where one man or one organization brings to that group the experience that he has in a particular line, it is usually up to him—and it always was up to us when we brought such information—to demonstrate to the other members that there was merit in his suggestion. That is what I mean.

"Chairman FLY. Yes. But, now, wait a minute. Now, wait a minute. The notion that one member would come in with such a single proposition, and then would take the burden of demonstrating to your satisfaction——

"The WITNESS. Not to mine, sir.

"Chairman FLY. Well, to the satisfaction of the association.

"The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

"Chairman FLY. Carries the implication that there is a status quo there, does it not?

"The WITNESS. That is correct, but there is an established procedure for changing any standard at any time.

"Chairman FLY. And, of course, there would be no need for changing any standard that was not, in effect, fixed?

"The WITNESS. Yes; that is right."

Meanwhile, on February 8, 1940, at a highly controversial meeting of the R. M. A. board of directors, Sarnoff had opposed a proposal by Philco that before any commercialization were undertaken, the R. M. A. standards should be reopened for consideration in the light of pending research and development on other alternatives. Sarnoff stated:

"If that is the point of view, I am sure the Radio Corporation does not belong around this table, and the quicker it resigns from membership and the quicker it gets out of the R. M. A. and runs its own business in the best way that it thinks it can run it, the greater freedom we shall all have to follow whatever course we wish to follow without any arguments or contentions or oppositions."

Following Sarnoff's announcement at this meeting of R. C. A.'s proposed commercial activities the following colloquy occurred between W. H. Grimditch of Philco and Sarnoff on the subject of the possible effect of such activities:

"Mr. GRIMDITCH. I am afraid if you would sell 25,000 sets in a year within a short time that would mean there would be $10,000,000 worth of obsolete apparatus in the hands of the public.

"Director SARNOFF. We live on obsolescence, don't we, in this industry? I think it is rather silly to argue about obsolete apparatus under those circumstances. * * * So far as we are concerned, there is no use discussing with us, inside or outside of the R. M. A., any program the purpose of which is to delay the commercialization of television."

R. C. A. did not carry out the threat to resign from the association, but at the meeting on February 29, when the Engstrom "burden of proof" letter was presented, Philco itself withdrew from the Television Standards Committee, announcing that the committee could serve no further purpose, since the widespread sale of equipment by R. C. A. would make consideration of any standards other than those of R. M. A. futile. At the same meeting all the members except R. C. A. and Farnsworth voted in favor of considering new proposals as against the suggestion that the R. M. A. standards be reaffirmed, but there is no record of any further action being taken on any new proposals.

The persistent determination of R. C. A. to move forward commercially is thus seen as independent of industry opinion and of the Commission's attitude on standards and commercialization. Announcement of R. C. A.'s plans had been made to the industry on February 8 and reiterated on February 29, both prior to the Commission's decision of the latter date. The determination was persisted in despite both industry opposition then and the Commission's decision later. The Commission's report was clear and no misunderstanding of it can be assumed. The record shows, moreover, that on the day following the announcement of the Commission's report, Bond Geddes, executive vice president of the R. M. A., addressed to Sarnoff and the other members of the R. M. A. a telegram reading in part as follows:

"Federal Communications Commission announced decision to permit limited commercial television operations September 1, authorizing advertising charges covering cost-sponsored programs. Commission did not fix standards but stated that television 'should not be frozen in the present state of the art.' "

FURTHER HEARING OF THE COMMISSION

Yet, on March 20, 1940, pursuant to R. C. A.'s earlier announced intentions to the industry, an intensive promotional campaign was launched by the company, the effect of which, if continued and successful, would, in the opinion of the Commission, tend toward the freezing of television broadcasting standards to the single system. Although regular program service by R. C. A.'s broadcasting subsidiary, N. B. C., was promoted and emphasized in extensive and varied public announcements, no mention was made of the experimental character of television broadcasting operations or of the

fact that only the N. B. C. station was on the air in New York City, that such station operated a program service irregularly for 2 or 3 hours per day but not on all days of the week, or that future stations employing alternative systems of transmission might not be received by the sets offered for sale.

Thomas F. Joyce, head of the R. C. A. sales department had testified as follows at the January hearing:

"Question. * * * You can't contemplate the type and character of a change that would make the set obsolete, and whether the cost incident to adjusting it would be greater or smaller is a question of degree, but it might be rendered obsolete, I assume.

"Answer. That is correct.

"Question. You further feel that the public should be told about this contingency?

"Answer. Yes; I do."

All of the foregoing factors are of concern to this Commission, not because of any question of fair-trade practices but because of the possible impact of R. C. A.'s whole course of conduct upon television broadcasting standards. It was apparent to the Commission that it was necessary to reinquire into the situation in order to ascertain whether the rules which it had adopted on February 29, 1940, were contributing toward a result contrary to their fundamental purpose of maintaining fluidity in the art in order to promote its advance and to avoid the premature crystallization of transmission standards, the result against which both the Commission and the industry had warned.

Indeed, action in the light of these facts was compelled by the congressional mandate under which the Commission serves. It would be a violation of its statutory obligations for the Commission to disregard any facts which might foreclose a proper exercise of its duty to fix transmission standards for a single uniform system of television broadcasting. Moreover, the Commission cannot ignore its duty to "encourage the larger and more effective use of radio" and close its eyes to activities impeding technical progress in the television art.

Accordingly, on March 22, 1940, the Commission scheduled a further hearing to begin April 8, to determine whether any revisions of the rules adopted on February 29 should be made or other action taken by the Commission, and whether the effective date for the beginning of limited commercial operations should be postponed.

The hearing was begun before the full Commission on April 8, 1940, and extended over a period of 5 days. The parties who appeared and submitted evidence at these hearings were, with few exceptions, the same as those who participated in the Commission's January hearing. Upon request of the parties, opportunity was given for the filing of briefs. Briefs were filed between May 1 and May 7, 1940, by Radio Pictures, Inc., a licensee of a television experimental station, R. C. A., Don Lee Broadcasting System, DuMont, Philco, Farnsworth, and Columbia Broadcasting System.

INDUSTRY VIEWS ON DANGERS INHERENT IN WIDESPREAD DISTRIBUTION OF EQUIPMENT

The position taken by R. C. A. in the R. M. A. meetings in February was not disclosed to the Commission until its April hearing. Up to that point it has been assumed by the Commission from the testimony given at the January hearing that the position of the entire industry, including R. C. A., was to avoid a freezing of standards at this time, whether this be accomplished by the Commission action or by the commercial activities of the industry itself. Nevertheless, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the "burden of proof" agreement which R. C. A. urged upon the association, combined with the reiteration of forcefully worded assertions of plans for sales promotion, the influence of those plans on the other manufacturers, and the promotional activities themselves, would have had the practical effect of crystallizing television transmission standards to the R. M. A. proposals and of causing a curtailment of research on other proposals. Indeed, recognizing that "certain companies presumably will proceed with receiver sales," W. R. G. Baker, director of the R. M. A. engineering department, remarked in a letter dated February 27, 1940, to Mr. A. S. Wells, president of the R. M. A., that "if enough sets are sold the standards may be formulated by reduction to practice."

This conclusion is regarded as inevitable by various other parties to the Commission's hearings. Philco has stated in its brief submitted after the second hearing:

"The Commission's power to fix transmission standards for television broadcasting is clear under section 303 (e) of the Communications Act. It is equally clear that if the Commission refrains from exercising this power and if commercialization (particularly the sale of receivers to the public) proceeds, transmission standards will be fixed by a portion of the industry. * * * The public outcry that would result from any later change in standards rendering receivers obsolete will effectively deprive the Commission of its statutory power."

According to the testimony of a Philco witness at the April hearing, the Commission's decision to permit limited commercialization and the announced plans of R. C. A. to engage in active sales of receivers caused it, after March 1, 1940, to abandon all of the research work upon which it was then engaged outside of the R. M. A. standards and to confine such research within those standards. As a result of these circumstances, its research staff was reduced to two-thirds of its former size, and its efforts were directed to the production of receivers.

The testimony of David B. Smith, of Philco, was as follows:

"Question. Beginning your account at that point, will you state the reasons for abandoning research in these fields other than vertical polarization?

"Answer. Well, when we received the Commission's order we, naturally, studied it. There were numerous conferences between our employees and our executives. We were pleased that the Commission seemed to agree with us that further improvement in the standards were necessary, but we were very much disappointed that they had, apparently, not understood or had not seen fit to take notice of our warning about commercialization. We felt that, while the Commission undoubtedly desired these improvements to be continued, there was a grave danger that the industry would go ahead with the commercialization that we anticipated that they would, and for that reason we felt that the standards we were considering, at least, could not be brought into the art, and, therefore, there was no point in trying to continue that line of research."

"The WITNESS. Our position, sir, was that in order to do research that would be definitely outside of the present standards, the only condition under which that could be done would be with, let's say, a reasonable hope that these improvements could be brought into the standards. As we stated in January, and we would like to repeat right now, that if the standards are actually frozen by the commercial activity of the industry, you cannot reasonably expect one to go ahead and do research outside of those standards."

Witnesses of other companies engaged in research outside of the R. M. A. standards testified that the same considerations would require a discontinuance or curtailment of such research if commercial activities continued on a wide scale.

DuMont Laboratories, Inc., for example, stated in its second brief that if commercial activities in the sale of receivers capable of receiving only 441 line-30 frame pictures continued, "it, too, would have been obliged to diminish or abandon its research program," and that "there would have been a burden upon any other manufacturer, including DuMont, to prove the superiority of existing and available tested transmission methods under most adverse circumstances."

U. A. Sanabria, an associate of Lee de Forest in American Television Laboratories, which is engaged in general television research and in particular upon a system of interlaced scanning designed to reduce flicker in pictures, testified that there would be no incentive for him to continue his researches in television if a large number of sets operating on present systems were distributed.

Dr. de Forest, long a leader in the radio field, who was unable to appear before the Commission at the second hearing, submitted a statement in writing on April 26, 1940, expressing the view that if commercial activities on the part of the industry continued, he had "no doubt that the present, indisputably half-baked 'standards' in television would soon be so effectively deep-rooted in the American television market that further evolution of this infant art would have been rendered economically and actually almost impossible."

It is obvious that the industry as a whole does not share the R. C. A. view of forging ahead regardless of the untested possibilities of improvement on the horizon. It further appears that the industry was not prepared to accept Sarnoff's premise of "We live on obsolescence" as a basis for justifying a heavy public investment at current levels of efficiency.

Indeed, these conclusions reached by a preponderant portion of the industry interested in television's further improvement are inevitable in view of the very nature of television and its operation.

In general, it may be said that television transmission will reach satisfactorily only sets designed to receive the number of lines and frames and the type of synchronizing pulse transmitted. Due to this lock and key relation of television transmitter and receiver, substantial changes in transmitters in respect to lines and frames, the retentive quality of screens, and synchronizing pulses, cannot be brought about after widespread distribution of receivers operating on a different combination of these factors. Thus widespread public distribution of sets of a system operating on present levels will undermine incentive for further advance in television broadcasting and the Commission will be confronted with the accomplished fact of frozen transmission standards.

It is this consideration that distinguishes the development of television from that of sound radio. At the time of the initial widespread distribution of sound radio receiving sets to the public, these sets were capable of receiving all types of radio transmission then being considered. General public use and improvement in radio transmission and reception could, therefore, go forward together without any substantial risk that the distribution of receiving sets would result in freezing transmission standards to the then levels. However, since television-receiving equipment adequate to receive transmission on one system would often be incapable or inadequate to receive transmission by another system, the widespread distribution of such receiving equipment would tend to cause the particular system of transmission to which it is geared to become a firmly rooted and immobile standard.

CONCLUSIONS

The rules adopted by the Commission on February 29, 1940, were intended to provide for a more rapid development of television by permitting programming experiments concurrently with necessary technical research leading to establishment of transmission standards by the Commission. Subsequent events, however, have demonstrated that commercial television broadcasting without the complete cooperation of the manufacturing industry is irreconcilable with the necessary objectives of further technical research and experimentation.

The positions of the different companies on this whole problem cannot be viewed with total disregard of the patent interests of

competing manufacturers which find expression in a desire to lock the scientific levels of the art down to a single uniform system based in whole or in part upon such patents. The functions of this Commission are not to be usurped and utilized as a means of monopolizing this important industry either through this or other devices.

It is essential to the program of television that there be not a mere semblance of competition, but that there be a genuine and healthy competition within an unfettered industry. The American system of broadcasting has been established by the Congress on a competitive basis. Television will be an important part of that system. Now, if ever, television is at the crossroad of monopoly or a healthy progressive competition. There can be no doubt as to the direction in which the Commission should, within its powers, attempt to guide it.

The fluid state of the television art and the desirability and need for further technical research before transmission standards are prescribed by the Commission were once again clearly manifested at the Commission's most recent hearing. Engineering opinion on many of the basic problems is still divided at this time. The industry now is no less anxious to continue further engineering improvements on basic aspects of the science than it was at the time of the Commission's earlier hearing. R. C. A.'s own engineering expert, for example, testified that his preference was for a system using 507 lines and 30 frames rather than the existing R. M A. standard of 441 lines and 30 frames. And, in fact, the very basic problem of what channel width or band of frequencies television shall employ must be regarded as a question not yet closed.

Contrary to the experience of other industries which have found that technical improvements were stimulated by large public use, in the television field a major portion of the industry takes the view that successful promotional activities at this time can act only as an anchor on experimental efforts to go forward. Premature crystallization of standards will, as has thus been pointedly illustrated to the Commission, remove the incentive for technical research toward higher levels of efficiency. If technical research having this goal is retarded or halted, the Commission's duty to fix transmission standards with due regard for considerations of public interest will have been, for all practical purposes, nullified.

It is, therefore, the conclusion of the Commission that in order to assure to the public a television system which is the product of comparative research on known possibilities standards of transmission should not now be set. It has further been decided that there should be no commercial broadcasting with its deterring effects upon experimentation until such time as the probabilities of basic research have been fairly explored. The Commission agrees with the industry that the earlier plan for arriving at commercial operations by an intermediate half step of partial commercialization to be taken next September cannot be relied upon to serve a useful purpose. The provisions in the rules for class II stations will be eliminated. As soon as the engineering opinion of the industry is prepared to approve any one of the competing systems of broadcasting as the standard system the Commission will consider the authorization of full commercialization. That a single uniform system of television broadcasting is essential—so far as basic standards are concerned—must also be amply clear. The public should not be inflicted with a hodgepodge of different television broadcasting and receiving systems.

It may be expected that industry opinion will insist upon such standards as will give definite assurance of satisfactory performance and of continuity of service for the public comparable to the continuity of service displayed in the past history of the radio industry. At the same time these basic standards—the standard gage they may be termed—should afford within their limits reasonable flexibility for future advances in the science of television broadcasting. With the view to encouraging research and experimentation on a wholly flexible basis, the Commission is prepared to authorize broader experimental operations by existing stations and by a number of additional stations.

Action will be taken promptly upon a number of pending applications for television experimental stations. These will be apportioned among various parts of the country with the view of forestalling any concentration of facilities in particular centers of population to the exclusion of the rest of the country. At the same time this will serve to provide further experimentation on the different systems on a comparative basis. Among the additional cities under consideration for such facilities are San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, Albany, Cincinnati, Boston, and others. Each station will be utilized for the predominant purpose of advancing the science of television broadcasting in its engineering aspects. The Commission invites other responsible individuals or companies who are prepared to carry on this work to apply for a license.

Certain basic policies in the licensing of these experimental operations will be followed. A substantial job of research must be done by each station. The channels available are strictly limited, and they must be utilized in the public interest. The radio spectrum is public domain—development in television must be undertaken and advanced in order that this domain be devoted to the best public use. There is no room for squatters and there can be no preemption in this field. Monopoly must be avoided. Free competition is to be promoted and preserved. Accordingly the Commission deems it to be in the best interests of the public that there be a strict limitation on the number of authorizations to any one licensee for television broadcast stations which as a part of the experimentation may take programs to the public. In addition, rules for the regulation of television stations engaged in chain broadcasting will be promulgated at an appropriate time.

No time limit can now be set for the adoption of standards. The progress of the industry itself will largely determine this matter. The Commission will continue its study and observation of television developments and plans to make a further inspection and survey in the early fall. Meanwhile the Commission stands ready to confer with the industry and to assist in working out any problems concerned with television broadcasting.

Revised rules designed to carry into effect the conclusions reached herein will be issued in the near future.

Farm Research in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 24), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. THEODORE G. BILBO, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "Farm Research in the South," published in the Industrial Expansion of the South, the special edition of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, of May 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 20, 1940]

FARM RESEARCH IN THE SOUTH—SENATOR BILBO DISCUSSES AGRICULTURE'S AID TO INDUSTRY IN THE REGION—KRAFT PAPER AND NEWSPRINT, STARCH, CELLULOSE, OILS, HEAD CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESEARCH

(By THEODORE G. BILBO, United States Senator from Mississippi and author of bill creating regional research laboratories)

Farm research, in the sense of chemical science applied to agricultural products, looms as a powerful influence in reshaping the destiny of the South. Call it what you will, organic chemistry or by its popular new name, farm chemurgy, it amounts to the same thing—chemistry at work in industry for the farmer. And it is my firm conviction that no other factor since Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin has contributed so much toward the dawn of a new day in our agricultural Southland.

There are manifold reasons why the South is destined to be a stronghold in agro-industrial development through medium of scientific ingenuity. We have the soil and the climate for an abundance of crops suitable for industrial uses. Moreover, a large portion of the millions of tons of farm wastage produced in the United States and adaptable for industrial uses occurs in the South.

As Nature's favored storehouse for inorganic materials, the South has an almost unlimited supply of the heavy chemicals essential to this development. It is estimated that for $5 invested in new chemurgic enterprises, one additional dollar is spent in the heavy chemicals industry for petroleum, gas, coal, iron, sulphur, phosphates, etc. The South is by far the Nation's major source of these materials.

We can offer plentiful labor; for the most part native-born Americans, efficient and relatively free from disrupting elements and costly labor troubles.

The South's unsurpassed water and rail transportation facilities and its adjacence to the markets of South and Central America are other fortunate factors in the industrial picture.

Of no small significance, too, is the fact of lower living costs and more healthful living conditions made possible by an equable southern climate.

NEW USES FOR COTTON

For too many years the South has leaned too heavily on King Cotton. Predominant dependence on a single cash crop, cotton, with its extreme fluctuations in price, has been the greatest handicap to southern progress. To eliminate that handicap by finding new uses for cotton and cottonseed as well as for other crops now grown or adaptable for growth in the South is therefore the objective of the farm research program.

Time was, not so many years ago, when we grew cotton merely for the fiber. The seed, except that portion kept for planting purposes, was the "step child" of the cotton plantation, regarded as a nuisance, and its disposition was the bane of the planter's existence. By gradual steps, through applied science, the once lowly cottonseed has undergone a Cinderella-like transition to become the richest seed in the world. The cottonseed industry now ranks second to cotton lint as the major cash crop in the cotton South.

Cottonseed oil mills now represent a leading industry, more than 500 in number, spread throughout the southern part of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The four principal by-products of cottonseed, which are oil, cake, or meal, hulls and linters, now furnish the basic materials for hundreds of the products of American industry. Chemistry has devised an astounding range of uses for by-products of the cottonseed. The oil is an important ingredient in American-made oleomargarine, a wholesome substitute for butter. Cellulose from hulls and linters is the base of multiple products of industry, including synthetic silk and smokeless gunpowder. The field of plastics is a large consumer of cottonseed derivatives. The broad use of cottonseed meal and hulls as feed for livestock and fertilizer for the soil is common knowledge.

SOME CHEMICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The layman is amazed when he contemplates the vast array of things created by modern chemistry. Silk hosiery (Nylon) and synthetic rubber from coal. Synthetic-silk fabric (rayon) from waste wood and other refuse of forest and field as well as from cotton linters. Lingo-cellulose plastics in many forms from pulpwood and plant fibers. Perfume, licorice, medicinals, and insecticides from pine stumps. Motor fuel from low-grade corn, sugarcane bagasse, cull potatoes, and miscellaneous waste crops. Acetic acid, methanol denaturant, and antifreeze from inferior hardwoods, cornstalks, and other trash. Masonite products from wood chips and pulpwood. Newsprint from southern slash pine, and kraft paper from pulpwood. Starch, flour, and glue from sweetpotatoes. These are but a few of a long list of the miracle products organic chemistry has given us. The list is long and growing ever longer, for almost daily we hear of another "white rabbit" pulled out of the farmer's hat by the chemist.

Institutional, private, and industrial laboratories over the country are spending multiplied millions of dollars annually in forwarding their research work. It was in recognition of the advance of the chemical age that the Congress of the United States passed a law in 1938 establishing four regional research laboratories devoted to the discovery of new and wider industrial uses and outlets for farm products. These laboratories, located in four strategic sections of the United States, will devote their full time to experiments with crops peculiar to the respective regions. The southern laboratory, at New Orleans, La., will treat largely on cotton, sweetpotatoes, and peanuts in the beginning. Two hundred scientists will be assigned to each laboratory.

As author of the bill creating these laboratories and a long-time advocate of more farm research, I am naturally expecting that great things will be accomplished for the benefit of American agricultural industry. The value of scientific achievement, as in any other realm, depends upon its practical application to sound business practices. For the purpose of practical illustration, I cannot think of better examples of what has been accomplished through farm chemurgy than are found in my home State.

THE CHEMURGIC CITY

Laurel, Miss., is known far and wide as "the 100 percent chemurgic city, where chemistry applied to waste products of the farm is working miracles." Interested visitors from all parts of the country journey there to see at first hand the accomplishments of agriculture linked with industry through chemical science. And yet, but for farm chemurgy, Laurel might well have joined the ranks of the "ghost towns" that followed in the wake of a decadent sawmill industry. This little city, whose present population is 23,000, was once a typical sawmill town. Men who lost their employment as the mills cut out have found new jobs in plants which utilize the former waste or semiwaste of forest and field. The famous Masonite plant is located there. Masonite fiberboard products are known and used in building trades throughout nearly the entire world. To help supply foreign demand, Masonite plants have lately been established in Rundviksverken, Sweden; Bolzano, Italy; and at Raymond Terrace, New South Wales, Australia. One is in process of installation at Gatineau, Quebec, Canada.

W. H. Mason, a man formerly associated with Thomas Edison, came to Laurel to conduct his experiments to cheat the trash-burners of nearby mills which were devouring hundreds of tons of wooden chips. His ingenius and patient experiments resulted in the discovery of a way to reduce that waste to fiber without destroying the lignins which nature employs to hold wood fibers together. He found he could make them into a strong, tough paper or into an efficient insulating board. One step led to another until the present Masonite processes were perfected.

Since wood refuse from sawmills is no longer available in sufficient quantity, the plant now uses pulpwood from south Mississippi forests (which formerly had little or no commercial value) for a hundred miles around, brought in by truck and rail to the extent of about 14,000 cords per month. For this raw material, the farmers receive an income totaling about $700,000. The plant employs over 1,700 people, and its present monthly pay roll is $152,000. Expenditures for gas and electricity, transportation, and miscellaneous expenses amount to approximately $725,000 annually. The grand total of money spent in Mississippi by the Masonite Corporation, inclusive of taxes, is $3,765,000 per annum, based on last year's operations. What this industry alone means to the community and the State is readily seen.

A somewhat similar plant is now in operation in the Mississippi Delta where the United States Gypsum Co. is converting the once worthless willow and cottonwood into wallboard and insulating material.

A NEW STARCH INDUSTRY

Unique, and hailed as an agricultural wonder, is the Laurel sweetpotato starch plant which converts the lowly sweetpotato into superior white starch—Aristocrat Sweetpotato Starch is the trade name. A pioneer in a fertile field, the starch plant stands out as a forerunner of a potential southern industry of gigantic proportions. This infant enterprise, just emerged from the experimental stage, purchased last year from nearby farmers an aggregate of 270,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes from which it extracted 2,800,000 pounds of starch. Potato flour, glue, and potato pulp stockfeed are among the valuable byproducts of starch processed at this plant—all having a bright industrial future.

Scientific experiments have been conducted under the purview of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, so that the factory serves as a research center as well as a commercial industry. Authorities on the subject say that it would require from 150 to perhaps 250 plants to supply the potential demand for sweetpotato starch. For the United States imports from foreign countries an annual total of more than 483,000,000 pounds of starch, according to 1937 figures from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Heretofore the sweetpotato had commercial value only as a food product. At least 20 percent of the potatoes produced do not meet the rigid standards of the markets, and this percentage of the sweetpotato crop therefore becomes "culls." The starch industry takes the potatoes "field run" and thereby has opened up an avenue for profitable usage of another farm waste or semiwaste.

In this great chemurgic drama even the pine stump, once regarded as an economic headache to the landowner and a blot upon the pastoral scene, has come into the industrial spotlight. Distillation plants at Laurel and at three or four other points in Mississippi are extracting commercial quantities of pine oil, turpentine, rosin, and miscellaneous disinfectants and medicinals from the old pine stump. Newest among the derivatives of pine stumpage are perfume and licorice. Distillation companies not only remove the stumps for the farmer but they pay the farmer for the stumps.

PULP AND PAPER

Until recent years paper manufacturers shook their collective heads at the suggestion of making paper from southern pine. It contained too much pitch, they said, and only northern white spruce would do for paper making. The idea of converting southern pine into white pulp for newsprint was held as just another daydream.

It remained for E. H. Mayo, superintendent of what is now the Kraft Paper Co., of Moss Point, Miss., to prove that kraft paper could be successfully and economically manufactured from southern slash pine. Since perfection of the kraft process more than 15 plants like the Moss Point mill have sprung up over various parts of the South. It is said that since 1935 the sum of $100,000,000 has been invested in southern pulp and paper mills.

And now, after long years of patient research, the crowning triumph has been realized. We have newsprint from Southern pine. This great epochal achievement is due to the genius and patience of the late Dr. Charles H. Herty, renowned chemist of Savannah, Ga., who conducted a 6-year research program in the utilization of fast-growing Southern pines. Just a few weeks ago the first Southern pine newsprint ever to be produced on commercial scale rolled from the $6,000,000 plant in Lufkin, Tex. With the opening of this plant a new frontier is crossed and a trail blazed for a new and highly promising southern industry. No group is more enthusiastic about this chemical conquest of nature than is the publishing trade. Statistics indicate that more than 4,000,000 tons of newsprint are consumed by the presses of the United States each year, and most of it is imported from other countries at exorbitant prices.

The South has a forest area well exceeding 200,000,000 acres. Junior forests are on the increase, and well-planned State and Federal programs are being executed for conservation and reforestation. Some of the wood utilization plants themselves sponsor conservation programs, as in the instance of the Masonite Corporation. With this safeguard, exploitation such as was experienced during the hey-day of the sawmills can be obviated. And this is yet another form of farm research contributing its share to southern progress.

TUNG OIL AND SOYBEANS

The oriental tung nut is among the newest of our industrial crops, having been introduced into this country from China. A subtropical plant, the tung tree is adaptable only to those areas having semi-tropical climate. The tung belt as now defined extends from Texas along the Gulf coast, through the extreme southern parts of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. For many years the United States has imported from 100,000,000 to 175,000,000 pounds of tung oil from China for use in the manufacture of high-grade paints, varnishes, and lacquers; for calking boats; for undercoating automobiles; and for other like purposes.

We now have something like 160,000 acres planted to tung, and acreage is increasing with each passing year. Two-thirds of the acreage is in Mississippi, where is found the largest single tung grove in the entire world—in Pearl River County. Although even the oldest groves are still young, commercial production of tung nuts thus far has justified the erection of five tung-oil crushing plants, one each in Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana, and two in Mississippi. As production increases, it is expected that paint factories will locate in the tung-producing areas to form

another link in the agro-industrial development of the South. Cut-over land not suitable for general farming has been used for most of the tung plantings, so that this new industry has gone far to utilize land that would otherwise be idle.

CANE SUGAR, PEANUTS

Another comparatively new oleaginous crop in southern territory is the soybean. Few other crops offer a wider field of industrial usages for the soybean oil is edible as well as valuable in manufacturing processes such as in the paint industry. An unestimated number of food products are made from this bean, and it is a valuable source of raw material for adhesives and plastics. Soybean production is rapidly making headway in most of the Southern States, and gives promise of becoming an important commercial industry. Aside from its other uses the soybean plant is valuable as hay for livestock as well as beneficial in soil conservation and soil-building practices.

Sugarcane is an old and familiar crop in Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Texas, Arkansas, and South Carolina—listed according to rank in production.

Louisiana is famous for its sugar industry. According to a recent public statement, as many as 200,000 persons in Louisiana earn their living from cane culture and in sugar-processing plants. We have always thought of cane in terms of food products mainly. But modern science reveals latent wealth in other byproducts derivable from cane. Sugarcane not suitable for edible purposes is found usable for making motor fuel. Cane bagasse is a recognized source of cellulose, and so on. Here is a crop which warrants and undoubtedly will receive greater industrial attention as the chemical age advances.

The peanut is another old southern crop with a bright industrial future. The South produces an annual average of more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of peanuts every year. Yet, aside from its popularity as an edible nut and in manufactured food products, very little has been done with it in an industrial way here where it grows most abundantly. Dr. George Carver, renowned colored scientist of Tuskegee, Ala., states that he has found more than 100 varied uses for the peanut. Other scientists also place high value on the meat, the oil, and even the shells of the peanut in industrial usages. Georgia is the big peanut State and itself produces an average annual crop of nearly 309,000,000 pounds, valued at $50,000,000. The Government's southern research laboratory will in the beginning give special attention to research with peanuts, as well as with cotton and sweetpotatoes.

So it is not at all visionary to anticipate that the humble peanut will make a proud name for itself in southern industry as time goes on.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

It would be most unfair not to mention the South's rapid strides in livestock production. In most of the Southern States both dairy cows and beef cattle have practically doubled in number during the past several years. It is certainly true of my State. The dairy industry in Mississippi has grown almost from "scratch" since 1925 to its present important status, with at least 18 creameries, 16 cheese plants, and 5 condensaries. Cash income from livestock and livestock products more than doubled between 1932 and 1939. Other Southern States have progressed in relatively high degree.

What scientific research has done to improve old methods and devise additional processes in the manufacture of dairy products forms an epic chapter, as witness our great American cheese industry.

As yet the South is concentrating on continued progress with livestock from the standpoint of more dairy-product plants, more packing houses, etc. But a frontier for tanneries, button factories, and other industries utilizing animal hides, hoofs, and horns cannot be overlooked as a fertile field for future industrial development.

One of the newest chemical phenomena has to do with milk. The skeptic might refuse to believe it, but it is true that two American chemists have recently patented a process for making artificial wool (casein fiber) from skim milk.

A southern commissioner of agriculture recently told me of an inquiry received from an eastern medicine manufacturer who wanted a list of slaughter houses in the State. His expressed purpose was to contact abattoirs with the view of purchasing large monthly supplies of certain vital organs of slaughtered farm animals.

This same agricultural official told also of a carbon manufacturer circularizing pecan-shelling plants in his quest for thousands of tons of pecan shells to be used in making carbon.

These are but additional revelations of how modern science seems to find a use for everything that formerly was utter waste.

To tell half the story of the South's forward march under the new regime of farm research would require volumes. I have merely touched upon a few of the high lights. Suffice it to say we have what it takes in natural resources and advantages, and we have the spirit of the new South. Our zeal for further development is not merely sectional. We are gratified to realize that more prosperity in the South means increased national prosperity.

Though we southerners deplore, perhaps resent, the prevailing implication that the South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, we welcome that other title frequently applied to us, America's last frontier. We find cause for optimism in the fact that we have frontiers to offer; that we are the Nation's prospect No. 1. It is pleasing to southern chivalry and southern pride to visualize the South at its witching hour, with new horizons to beckon new enterprise and new life.

If the learned Horace Greeley of "Go West, young man" fame were living now, he would surely counsel opportunity seekers to go South, where science, agriculture, and industry have joined hands to build a new industrial empire.

This is what farm research is contributing to southern industry.

Reorganization Plan No. V—Fifth Column and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 551, known as Reorganization Plan No. V, it is not possible to obtain sufficient time to discuss this matter in the Committee of the Whole. Therefore, under the privilege extended to me by the House, I desire to insert my remarks on the pending resolution and make certain observations which I think pertinent to the plan.

The President proposed by this resolution that the Bureau of Immigration be taken from the Department of Labor, under the jurisdiction of Miss Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and transfer it to the Department of Justice, and authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to exercise the powers therein set forth. This proposal has my wholehearted approval and support. I shall vote for it.

It is to be regretted that this suggestion was not made 7 years ago. The statement made by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives, that the suggestion of transferring this Bureau from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice comes from the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins, herself, comes as a complete surprise not only to me, but I am sure to a great many Members of the House of Representatives, because the record of the Department of Labor as conducted under the present Secretary, Miss Perkins, disproves any such suggestion.

There has been no agency of the Government during more than 7 years last past more responsible for subversive activities and "fifth column" organization in the United States than the Department of Labor and the attitude of the Secretary of Labor. If we have dangerous organizations in this country—and no one denies that we do have them—which have grown with alarming speed, it is due mainly to the unwillingness on the part of the Department of Labor to prosecute and deport known, convicted criminals, Communists, and other alien persons in this country. Government itself is to blame, if not for its acquiescence in, then for its indifference to, the activities, propaganda, and the subtle methods employed by Communists, Fascists, and Nazis groups known to be in this land. Let no American be deceived. When un-American groups are pampered and coddled by those high in the official life of our Government, the result of which is encouragement to such subversive groups, then may we be aware of the danger of the "fifth column" within our own gates.

Reorganization Plan No. V proposal comes at a very opportune time. It ought to be considered as a part of our national defense, and if it is so considered, it ought to be interpreted as a very frank confession that the Department of Labor has failed woefully in its duty to the American people in its failure of the proper enforcement of the law against the enemies of our Government within our own borders. I repeat, it is to be regretted that Government action was not taken 7 years ago. If it had been, I am of the opinion that the alarming conditions existing within our land as it relates to these un-American activities could not have been shown to exist by the Dies committee, which has been the only effort on the part of this Government to defend itself against its own enemies.

With nearly every other Member of Congress, I listened with intense interest to the fireside address of the President last night. He painted a rather reassuring picture of our national defense. But I believe he failed to take the American people into his confidence when he concealed from them the actual condition of our Army and Navy and air force by including in their numerical strength the units of equipment "on hand and on order." There is a vast difference between being "on hand" and "on order." It will be noticed that the President did not reveal how many were on hand and how many were on order. One of the widest breaches and the weakest link in our national defense is the stupendous and ever-increasing national debt of more than $45,000,000,000.

Let this administration propose that a tax be imposed at once to raise the necessary funds to pay for the increased cost for our national welfare. The American people will respond willingly and courageously to meet such a tax and pay for the equipment needed to defend our country and our people against any invasion. Our people are courageous and patriotic enough to willingly bear the burden themselves rather than to pass it on to our children and to generations yet unborn.

The President in his address expressed the hope that the present national demand for increased national defense would not affect some of the social legislation which has been enacted. I am sure that no Member of Congress would deliberately destroy that hope; but if such legislation is to be adhered to under national emergencies, then let the American people be prepared for an additional, and which may prove to be an insurmountable burden, in the increased cost which they must bear for national defense. It will mean less defense for the dollar.

If the American Nation desires to know how to build up its national defense, it might be well for us to inquire as a people how Hitler in the short space of 7 years built up one of the greatest war machines the world has ever seen. No one here will argue that he did it by employing people for 30 hours a week or 40 hours a week, but undoubtedly we will find that at every munitions factory in Germany they were perhaps employed double that time and were paid a wage based upon the defense of the country and the building of the war machine rather than the yardstick or measure of wages paid in peacetime.

One of the reasons for the apparent inadequate defense of both England and France was the attempt to provide that national defense on a short-hour week and giving aid to radical leaders who were more interested in their selfish ends than they were in the defense of their homeland.

The patriotism of our people should rise above any arbitrary wage scale now employed when the defense of the Nation is at stake. The destruction of our economic system and the increase of the national debt, which leads to bankruptcy and ruin, is as important a part of our national defense in preventing such a condition as the building of airplanes and the manufacture of rifles. Let America look well to its domestic problems if we would have adequate national defense.

It is a shocking record to know that in this country there are more than 36 national Communist youth movements, more than 122 national labor and racial Communist unions and clubs and over a hundred so-called Communist cultural chapters. The salute of them all is the raised fist and the emblem the red flag and the hammer and the sickle.

This sort of thing must be stopped—the membership of these "movements" is not American. It is alien. The objectives are not in the pursuit of freedom of speech and liberty of thought. They are deliberately malevolent and consciously directed to the end of the destruction of this Government.

There are over 300 Communist newspapers and magazines circulated in this country today, and millions of books and pamphlets of subversive nature are passing from hand to hand. Such is the disclosures of the Dies committee.

Rural Electrification Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. GARRETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say but a few words in praise of the Rural Electrification Administration, for this function of the Government has been of untold benefit to my State.

Back in 1935, before I came to Congress, I was a resident of a county that relied to a great extent on its rural income. I was well aware of the needs of the farmers, for I could know the conditions under which he was laboring. At that time the farm income was low and the farmers had little of the conveniences their urban neighbors received.

At that time—in 1935—only 2.3 percent of all Texas farms were receiving electrical power from central plants. This was much lower even than the national average, which was only 10 percent. We had little to brag about in those days, for most of the countries of Europe had as much or more than 50 percent of their farms equipped for electrical power. Germany had well over 90 percent of her farms electrified, and Sweden had an average of 50 percent. France had about 95 percent of all her farms connected to electrical power.

Japan, usually regarded as having a very low standard of living, had 91 percent of all her farms provided with electricity.

The United States, boasting the highest standard of living on earth, had only 10 percent of her farms connected with electricity, and Texas, the greatest State in the Union, had only 2.3 percent of her farms serviced with electricity.

American agriculture was awake to this need and had been asking Congress to remedy this need. I found that there was a determined group of men in Congress when I came to Washington who were working to provide the farmers with some means of obtaining this necessary power. To the best of my ability I supported and advocated every measure which sought to relieve this hindrance to American agriculture. One of the most highly prized letters I have is one from my good friend and colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, thanking me for my aid and support, mentioning specifically my aid in the passage of his amendment to the R. E. A. allotment of 1938, which, incidentally, increased the Texas portion for 1938 to $12,128,332.

Too, I was glad that this program could be worked out whereby the farmers could receive this aid without the moneys expended being lost to the Government. For you will know that the R. E. A. is operated on a no-subsidy, no-grant basis. The money is issued as a loan, paying slightly less than 3 percent, it being estimated that about 5 years of revenue regains the cost of construction.

Too, the farmers do not lose control of their cooperatives. The R. E. A. merely acts as banker and consultant for the farmers desiring electrical current. The control of the projects are in the hands of the farmers themselves acting through their democratic cooperatives with headquarters in their own communities.

Today Texas farms receiving electricity number 34,796, an increase of 172 percent since 1935. Farm lands in Texas that were not salable sold for $30 to $50 an acre after an R. E. A. project had been started. Farms that merely managed to pay taxes are now expanding their scope, and the farmer and his family are living more fully and more enjoyably.

In Texas the farm income has increased to $511,000,000. A great factor in this gain has been the aid the farmer has received from the use of electricity.

Too, this increase in the output of electrical current has also aided the power utilities in that they have sold more

power than ever before. Labor was employed in the construction of the lines and electrical appliance stores increased their sales when their market territory grew to encompass the rural districts. Statistics show that the income for Texas has gained from 1935 and is still rising.

Today I am happy that my district, the Seventeenth of Texas, can show a vast improvement over its status in 1935. At that time there was not one electrical cooperative in the entire district. Today, one-tenth of all the cooperatives in Texas are located in or serve the 12 counties that comprise the district. Almost 5,000 farms are either receiving or contemplate receiving electrical current through the R. E. A. cooperatives now in existence. The R. E. A. has become a vital part of the agricultural life of the farmers of my district.

Measured in dollars and cents, the R. E. A. is one of the greatest aids the Government has ever given the farmers—but measured in happiness and health for the farmer and his family, its greatness increases a hundredfold.

Economically, the farmer, using electricity, can increase his income by stepping up his activities. Working under more favorable conditions he can more than double his output. It is possible for him to conserve his labor and increase his productivity. The use of an electric dynamo makes many jobs possible.

Due to the supply of electricity, the farmer and his family can now enjoy the same modern conveniences to be had in the cities. Living conditions on the farm have progressed to a standard that the rural citizen never thought possible prior to 1935.

Health in the rural districts has received the benefits to be had from electrical facilities and our United States Health Department is enthusiastic over the gains made.

The farmers of my district, as evidenced from the many letters I have received, know the value of the R. E. A. and wish that it be continued until ultimately every farmer shall be able to subscribe to the service if he so desires.

And, so long as I shall remain in Congress, I shall support and vote for all legislation that will aid these farmers to achieve their desires.

Measured in the joy and aid to our farmers, the R. E. A. is indispensable.

Welfare and Safety of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY GOV. ARTHUR H. JAMES, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gov. Arthur H. James, of Pennsylvania, before the Republican State Central Committee, of Minnesota, on May 22, 1940:

It is with a sense of deep appreciation that I come here tonight as Governor of the largest Republican State to address a gathering of Republican men and women representing all parts of Minnesota.

Let me say at the outset that I am not going to talk politics beyond saying this: So far as I am concerned there will be neither a black-out nor a fadeout of the Republican Party so long as there is a threat that the blood of a single American boy will be shed in useless war.

Instead, I have a very simple message on issues that transcend the ambitions of men and of political parties—the welfare and safety of our Nation.

I have two suggestions for which I ask the most serious consideration of the men and women of America, in the full knowledge of all the dangers visible and hidden which beset this Nation.

These suggestions will in no way interfere with our progress in rearming America. That is a program which has been far too long delayed and into which we must plunge with the utmost speed and energy.

But Pennsylvania does not, and neither do the patriotic men of Minnesota—nor, for that matter, America—believe in building a war machine without brakes. We do not wish to lose the war against dictatorship getting ready for it.

We have available two brakes for the defense machine which we all concede is so badly needed. One is the American Constitution, and the other is the national Congress, composed of the elected representatives of all the men and women of all the States.

My suggestions tonight are, first, that the preparedness program of the National Government be immediately revised to include the American Constitution instead of discarding it, and, second, that the American people, directly and through their State governments, demand of Congress that it do not adjourn until America is rearmed and until the international crisis has abated.

For 7 years the New Deal has been attempting to bypass the Constitution. We all remember the various methods which have been tried: The Supreme Court packing bill, the reorganization bill, the senatorial purges, the use of relief funds to try to thwart the will of the people in elections, the setting up of bureaucracies at Washington subject to no restraint save that of the Executive who appointed them, the attacks on State's rights, and propaganda that the American Constitution was a relic of the "horse and buggy" days.

The New Deal has objected to the American Constitution for the very reason which should most compel the men and women of this Nation to preserve it. The new dealers have fought it because our founding fathers used that Constitution to put a fence around the powers of the President. If we are to have a Republic, if this is to continue to be a Government of, by, and for the people, those fences must stand—must stand, yes; and be strengthened.

Let it never be said that the American Constitution is a splendid peacetime document but unfitted for war. The Constitution was conceived during world conflict as grave as exists today. It was baptized in blood while Napoleon was ravaging Europe on a scale even greater than Hitler has yet achieved. The Constitution has demonstrated its worth in helping America win three major wars.

A free people, with their liberties guaranteed by such a Constitution and defended by their leaders, can always outfight an equal number of enslaved victims of dictatorship.

We do not need to speculate about what the new dealers would do to the American Constitution the moment either actual danger or war hysteria permits. They already have told us.

The New Deal mobilization bill provides for the immediate suspension of every constitutional provision guaranteeing the rights and liberties of the American people.

The day that mobilization bill becomes effective in its present form constitutional democracy stops in this Nation, and we will have a dictatorship. It will be a dictatorship with its emblem the Stars and Stripes, and not the swastika; but it will be a dictatorship as complete and as far out of the control of the American people as Nazi warlords have been beyond the control of the men and women of Germany.

We already have seen a 7-year skirmish in the battle for the preservation of the American Constitution. America's shock troops in that battle to defend the American way of living have been the National Congress. Backed by the unmistakable will of our Nation, Congress has well demonstrated the wisdom of our founding fathers in making the legislative branch of government coequal in authority with the executive.

In his message asking Congress for new funds for the purchase of fire apparatus to help protect us from the four-alarm fire raging in Europe, President Roosevelt paid tribute to the importance of Congress. He said: "The Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned."

But in the same breath he delivered the broadest sort of hint for the adjournment of Congress as soon as it has passed the appropriations he asked.

Don't forget one thing. No matter what promises are made, the cold fact still remains that once Congress adjourns no power on earth can call it back into session except the President himself. Think that over.

Ask your self this question: If Congress and the President constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned, is it wise or safe to send half the team back to sit on the bench while the greatest war game of our generation is being played?

I call upon Congress to remain in session. I call upon the people of the United States to demand that it resist both hints and pressure for adjournment and continue to occupy its front-line trench until all America is satisfied that we are protected alike from aggressors from without and borers from within.

I shall urge Pennsylvania's delegation to vote against adjournment. I suggest that Minnesota follow that example. Let all the governors in all the States, in the name of peace and security, do likewise. Let the friends and advisers of the President himself counsel him against pushing his suggestion for adjournment.

There is more involved here than merely keeping a bulldog in Uncle Sam's political front yard while we make a musket for his shoulder.

Congress has services it can render this Nation, during the next few months, which no other body can give, and which are of supreme importance to our national-defense program.

For one thing, Congress can protect the new dealers and the President himself from the further activities of the "fifth column" that has succeeded in so long delaying adequate defenses.

Thinking Americans can form only one conclusion as to why the New Deal, with limitless money and almost limitless power, has failed to keep Uncle Sam prepared to defend himself.

We have seen a national administration which for 7 years has been flirting with the Communists. Communism in all its forms has been a guest at the New Deal table, and it has needed no Dies committee to tell us that the reddest reds and the pinkest pinks have been and still are high in the New Deal counsels.

Can any of us doubt that it has been due to infiltration from a communistic "fifth column" that America's preparations to defend herself have been so long delayed?

Congress is in far better position than the President to weed out anti-American elements in our national administration and in our Diplomatic Service. Congress is the Nation's best defense against the "fifth column," which inescapably is at work in America. But Congress, once it adjourns, is powerless in this direction.

Remaining at Washington, Congress can control all the termites, including the third-termites, that army of New Deal fat cats who pray for Roosevelt's reelection on the sole grounds that it would keep them living 4 years longer in political clover at the public's expense.

The third-termites would hesitate not a moment to foment a war scare to try to protect their jobs and their political gravy. They would not hesitate to shame the American flag by using patriotism to mask their greed and ambition. They would not hesitate even to demand postponement of the conventions and of the Presidential election itself to postpone their day of reckoning.

Congress, by remaining in session, can protect the Nation and the President alike from such selfish and short-sighted advice. Believe me, brethren, he needs that protection.

There is a further consideration of which this Nation is scarcely yet aware.

The men and women of the United States are just beginning to awaken to the fact that the New Deal, as a body of political and economic theories, died last Thursday.

The new dealers have spent 7 years and $60,000,000,000 trying to make planned scarcity work. Nearly $60,000,000,000 have gone with the wind of boondoggling and leaf raking. They have been spent to buy votes instead of battleships. Planned scarcity as a policy is totally and obviously incompatible with a program of adequate military preparedness. The President himself, in the clearest terms, pronounced the death knell of planned scarcity in his appeal for rearmament.

The New Deal program of the last 7 years has given America thousands of rusted-out mills and factories which now must be replaced, thousands of plowed-under farms which now must be recultivated, millions of unskilled workmen who must now be trained, and a Mammoth Cave full of gold now becoming worthless. All that was done in the name of planned scarcity, and it must all be undone before America can be on a basis of self-protection.

The New Deal, as a going economic and political concern, went busted last Thursday. It needs a board of receivers to conserve its assets and reorganize it into something which will prevent its being a further liability in our national economy.

I know of no better receivership for the New Deal than the elected representatives of the American people, the legislative body designated by the Constitution for this very purpose—and I refer to the National Congress. Repealing and amending the Federal statutes to thaw out the frozen resources of this Nation and to make them available for national defense is a job which will keep Congress busy for months, and it is work which must be done promptly and well.

Only Congress is in position to see that the political misuse of relief appropriations, which has been a national scandal for years, is not duplicated in the administration of moneys made available for defense purposes.

America would forever hang her head in shame if history wrote on her pages that one cent of funds appropriated to a defense war chest followed relief moneys into a political war chest. That is a disgrace from which the United States must be protected, and Congress, by remaining in session, is in position to prevent it.

Another disgrace which America might suffer and which Congress can prevent is that the defense appropriations be used to line private pockets. War profiteers, whatever their connections, must not be allowed to bleed these funds. America's slogan can well be, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for profiteers."

Fifty thousand airplanes a year will require a system of airports on a scale far greater than the Nation has in sight. Mechanized armies, to be effective, will need military highways spreading from shore to shore in a network far beyond the capacity of anything now in existence. These again are fields in which the congressional half of the national-defense team can be of great service to the Chief Executive.

It is unfortunate that this emergency arises on the eve of the national conventions and the presidential election. There are undoubtedly many in the United States who believe it would have been proper for the President, in view of the crisis he outlined, to have taken the whole question completely out of politics by seizing the opportunity to renounce any third-term ambitions. One brief statement would clear the atmosphere. Unmistakably it is his move.

His failure to do so already is being construed in his own party as meaning that political considerations are not to be forgotten. Already certain third-termites are seeking to stampede the country into what they are pleased to call a "draft Roosevelt" movement.

Their conduct cannot fail to raise the question of whether this is defense mobilization or political mobilization.

Continued efforts by the third-termites to give this country the radio jitters, and thus obscure the vital issues, cannot fail in the long run to raise the disturbing question of the good faith of the national defense program as outlined to Congress.

If we use the safeguards available to us, we will not risk losing the fight against dictatorship getting ready for it. By that, of course, we will run no risks of being embroiled in war preparing to maintain peace. By that means, we can isolate the germ of desire for war, and give the first inoculation of that serum on the banks of the Potomac.

The New Deal slogan of 7 years, "Talk big and carry a pop gun," is now dead, and we are ready to return to the good old American doctrine of "Speak softly and carry a big stick." That is a slogan worth resuming not only for our national policy but also for our personal guidance as individuals in whom lodges the final authority of this Nation.

We, as a people, have a big stick we can use against enemies at home as well as abroad. That big stick consists of the individual and collective rights guaranteed us by our Constitution. Beware of any voice which urges you to lay down your big stick, whether he asks it in the name of preparedness or anything else.

We all concede that America needs rearming. Most of us demanded long ago that this country prepare to hold her own in the arena of nations.

A generation ago America organized an Army division for the first World War in which were men from Maine and men from California, men from Oregon and men from Florida, men from Pennsylvania and men from Minnesota, men from the North and South and East and West. Those men stood shoulder to shoulder in the ranks, and they battled side by side in what we then hoped was a war to end wars.

Recent events have demonstrated to us how completely that war failed to make the world safe for democracy. But disappointment over failure to achieve the end of permanent peace will never tarnish the gallantry of the soldiers who merged their racial and geographic differences in the famous Rainbow Division.

Tonight America is calling for another Rainbow Division. She needs 48 States that will stand shoulder to shoulder to make America safe for democracy. Far later than we should, we have awakened to our dangers from abroad. The next few months will tell whether we have awakened to our dangers from within.

Our first duty is to our own country. We must rearm America so that the Stars and Stripes and all they stand for will be forever safe.

Pennsylvania is proud to volunteer her services in this new Rainbow Division. As Governor of the Keystone State, I wholeheartedly pledge the full cooperation of our industrial Commonwealth of 10,000,000 people in a drive for proper and adequate defenses.

As I look into the faces before me tonight I know that Minnesota also stands ready to put her shoulder to the wheel. I know that Minnesota as always is ready to do her full share in protecting our flag.

But one final warning. Let us resolve not to permit that new Rainbow Division to be mustered under sealed orders. Let's find out where we are going.

I for one take no stock in the belief that we need to have war. I believe that rearmament, coupled with a policy of no more meddling, no more burning of Uncle Sam's fingers at the fires of Europe, will be the best possible guaranty of continued peace

Almost all the world is engaged in a gigantic dance of death, and I still think it will be possible for Uncle Sam to be a wallflower at that vast military ball.

I know America wants peace, and I for one am tired of hearing the new dealers brand every man who urges peace an isolationist.

But if war must come, I know of only one war worth fighting, and that is a war to preserve American liberty.

Let us reject any temptation to sacrifice that liberty in getting ready to defend it.

American patriots of whatever party can make no more important decision this summer and fall than to resolve to fight dictatorship and jingoism with ballots, lest one day in the future they have to fight that evil pair with bullets.

May God preserve our Nation. Give us courage in this hour of peril to see our duty and then to do it.

Grand River Dam District, Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE NORTHEAST OKLAHOMA ARSENAL ASSOCIATION, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF HON. MIKE SILVA, VINITA, OKLA.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

POSSIBILITIES OF THE GRAND RIVER DAM DISTRICT AS A LOCATION FOR A FEDERAL ARSENAL OR OTHER FORMS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ALLIED WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

FOREWORD

It is the purpose of this brief survey to point out some of the facts and figures which indicate that northeast Oklahoma, the Grand River dam district, is a logical location for industries important in the national-defense program. This material is not submitted for use in support of a campaign for any specific project, but it is intended as basic material upon which presentations for definite proposals may be developed. It has been prepared by the Northeast Oklahoma Arsenal Association in furthering the program set forth.

This report points out the geographical advantages of the Grand River Dam district, its widely diversified natural resources, its rich and varied fuel and power resources, its transportation facilities, its abundant supply of intelligent and readily adaptable labor, and its other attributes which merit the consideration of those whose responsibility it may be to determine the location of the Nation's defense facilities and industries.

The Northeast Oklahoma Arsenal Association was organized by local interests within the Grand River Dam district, and has gained widespread support for its purpose and program. Leaders in public life and private business over a much wider area than even the limits of the Grand River Dam area have pledged their support to this program in recognition of the potentialities of this region for national-defense developments.

The officers and directors of the Northeast Oklahoma Arsenal Association represent many communities and many business classifications. Individually and collectively they stand ready to work with those charged with the responsibility of selecting a location for a Federal arsenal or for other forms of industrial development allied with the national-defense facilities of this country.

NORTHEAST OKLAHOMA ARSENAL ASSOCIATION

It is the purpose of the Northeast Oklahoma Arsenal Association to exploit the advantages of the Grand River Dam area as the logical location for a Federal arsenal and other forms of industrial development as they are related to the program of national defense.

To build an organization of sufficient strength and interest that it will command respect both in this area and in its approaches to the State and Federal Governments.

Through the medium of a carefully prepared survey, followed up with a program of personal efforts and contacts, encourage the War Department, or some other agency of the Federal Government, to make an exhaustive survey of the Grand River Dam area to determine its advantages of location, resources, etc., with reference to national-defense developments.

Following these preliminary steps, to adopt as the first major objective of the organization the securing of the location of a new Federal arsenal for the Grand River Dam area.

To take as the second definite objective of the association the securing of the location of a Federal nitrate plant to be operated in connection with the Grand River Dam.

To exploit the possibilities of this area insofar as chemical industries are concerned, both as they are related to the national defense, but also as they relate to industrial chemicals, both present and anticipated.

To work in cooperation with other groups and agencies for the development of this entire area through the encouragement of industries which are related to the national-defense program and which may be developed as private enterprises.

NORTHEAST OKLAHOMA ARSENAL SURVEY

With the completion of the Grand River Dam early in 1940, northeast Oklahoma offers an ideal location for a Federal arsenal or industrial plants allied with the program of national defense. Located equal distance from Chicago and El Paso, Tex., and approximately half way from the east coast to the west coast, the Grand River Dam area is inaccessible from any exposed boundaries. It is midway between the Federal arsenals at Rock Island, Ill., and San Antonio, Tex. The location is ideal from the standpoint of raw materials, fuel resources, power, and labor supply. Climatic conditions, water resources, transportation, and industrial services are favorable. This brief survey will give brief factual information about this area and summarize some of its advantages.

Grand River Dam (Pensacola project): Grand River is a tributary of the Arkansas, its headwaters being in southern Kansas, and its never-ceasing flow being fed by the streams of the Ozarks. Above the site of the Grand River Dam, Grand River drains the run-off waters of 10,415 square miles, with a maximum annual run-off of 10,600,000 acre-feet, and with a maximum flood flow of 220,000 second-feet. The dam will impound 1,680,000 acre-feet and its spillway will have a maximum capacity of 525,000 second-feet. At elevation 745, the lake area will be 46,500 acres, the largest body of water within a radius of 200 miles.

In 1935 the Oklahoma State Legislature created the Grand River Dam Authority, comprising 14 counties of northeastern Oklahoma, a public corporation, and a State instrumentality created as a conservation and reclamation district. Bonds were issued to be repaid by the sale of electric power. This authority received an allocation of $20,000,000 loan and grant from the Public Works Administration.

The dam, scheduled for completion early in 1940, is 6,565 feet long, making it the longest multiple arch dam in the world. The length of continuous concrete is 5,680 feet, and of the multiple arch section 4,284 feet. The height of the buttresses in the river bed will be 150 feet, and the dam is 200 feet wide at the base. The powerhouse is immediately below the west end of the dam and is 285 feet long and 75 feet wide, providing space for four 20,000-horsepower units to be installed, and for two future ones of the same capacity. The power produced by four 16,000-kilovolt-ampere generators will be at a potential of 13,800 volts, and the annual power output will be 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours with the present installed capacity.

Two additional dams are anticipated in the complete Grand River project, and the ultimate estimated power output is 440,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

Grand River Dam area: The Grand River Dam district, located in the northeast corner of Oklahoma, surrounds the Pensacola Dam, now under construction on Grand River, and includes 14 counties as follows: Adair, Cherokee, Craig, Creek, Delaware, Mayes, Muskogee, Nowata, McIntosh, Okmulgee, Ottawa, Sequoyah, Tulsa, and Wagoner. This region is located in the foothills of the Ozark Plateau region. Because of the topography of the area, the Grand River is a stream of unusual flow in a valley of great beauty and with great potentialities for the service of man. The Grand River Dam area includes 9,669 square miles in northeast Oklahoma and has a population of 577,212.

History: The story of Oklahoma is different from that of any other State in the Union, and, of the entire State, the history of northeast Oklahoma is the most colorful. This was made the melting pot for Indian tribes not only of this region but also from east of the Mississippi River. The eastern Indians, known as the Five Civilized Tribes, established their own governments, and each tribe called itself a nation and had its own boundaries, laws, and officers. Military posts were conveniently located for the purpose of maintaining order, as well as being centers of contact between the Indians and the Federal Government; missions were established to provide a means of furthering Christianity, education, and culture among the Indians. This area became Indian Territory, and the western portion of the present State was Oklahoma Territory. The twin Territories were merged and Oklahoma became the 46th State of the Union November 16, 1907.

Natural resources: No region of the United States has a greater wealth of natural resources or a wider range of important mineral deposits than the Grand River Dam area. Although a young State, Oklahoma has ranked consistently in fourth place among the States from the standpoint of mineral production, and the reserves of this State are largely assembled in northeast Oklahoma. Coal is locked up in the hills around Grand River Dam, according to Government estimates, to the extent of more than 75,000,000,000 tons—enough to last, at the average rate of mining, for 25,000 years. This area has vast amounts of oil and natural gas, and it is at the center of the midcontinent region which has more than 70 percent of the Nation's reserves of these essential resources.

The most abundant metal is zinc. During several years one county in this region, Ottawa, produced more zinc than all the other States combined. Associated with zinc is lead. There are still vast amounts of zinc and lead unmined in Ottawa County. Among the other mineral deposits adjacent to the Grand River Dam are copper, iron, manganese, granite, limestone, marble, shale, cement, bentonite, glass sand, volcanic ash, tripoli, and novaculite.

It should be noted that the general area surrounding the Grand River Dam is extremely wealthy in natural resources. The annual production of minerals from Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas is in excess of $1,750,000,000, or more than 40 percent of the Nation's total production. These States lead in the production of coal, bauxite, molybdenum, gold, silver, lead, cement, stone, copper, and potassium salts. They also furnish vast amounts of asphalt, barite, chats, clay, feldspar, fluorspar, fuller's earth, graphite, gypsum, helium, mercury, oilstones, ores, pumice, salt, tantalum ore, titanium ore, uranium and vanadium ores.

Practically all of the minerals considered important in national-defense plans and produced in this country come from this eight-State region, and most of the other strategic materials not now produced in quantity in the United States are known to exist in this area.

Labor supply: With its population being over 98 percent native-born, a decided advantage exists in the Grand River Dam district over other areas where the standards of labor personnel are not so high. Skilled artisans are to be found in almost every line, and the possibility of labor shortage is almost out of the question because an almost unlimited supply of high-grade, intelligent, and readily adaptable labor may be drawn from the area. Most of the labor in this area is on an open-shop basis, with miscellaneous union labor working harmoniously, with resulting peace and friendship. The labor of this area is loyal to American ideals. The labor supply may be drawn from all of northeast Oklahoma, which had a population in 1930 of 1,087,174.

Industrial development of area: Although but 2 generations removed from the Indian settlement period northeast Oklahoma has made remarkable industrial progress, indicating the acceptance by private industry of the advantages of this area. According to the 1937 census of manufactures, northeast Oklahoma had 613 manufacturing establishments, giving employment to 16,088 wage earners. These concerns paid $16,684,273 annually in wages, $135,323,899 for materials, and had products valued at $195,225,155. In addition to the manufacturing activity, the area had, in 1935, 291 mining industries, which paid $5,440,930 in wages, and the value of their production being $18,183,504. Leading in manufacturing activity are petroleum refining, heavy-equipment manufacturing, lead and zinc smelting and refining, glass manufacturing, etc. Throughout the Grand River Dam area there is a wealth of available sites, with unlimited space for expansion.

Power resources: Northeast Oklahoma, with the completion of the Grand River Dam, will be favorably supplied with power at favorable rates. In addition to Grand River Dam power, the area has a number of municipal power plants and is served by the interconnected systems of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Oklahoma Power & Water Co., Oklahoma Utilities Co., and the Empire District Electric Co. Not including the Grand River Dam project, Oklahoma has electric power facilities with a total generating capacity of 331,334 kilowatts. There are 27 steam power plants with a capacity of 289,487 kilowatts, 67 internal-combustion plants, 4 combination plants, and 2 hydroelectric plants in addition to Grand River Dam. The network of connected interstate transmission lines assures an adequate supply of power to meet unforeseen demands.

Energy resources: It is doubtful if any area of the United States can equal northeastern Oklahoma in the amount and range of energy resources, including oil, natural gas, coal, and water power. The Grand River Dam is at the center of a reserve of 79,000,000,000 tons of coal. This region has long been a leader in petroleum production. Not only does this district produce approximately 100,000,000 barrels of oil per year, but it is at the heart of the Mid-Continent area, which accounts for more than 40 percent of the world's oil production. This area is also served by interconnected natural-gas systems, with many years' supply in sight. It is also at the center of the area which annually produces 70 percent of the Nation's natural gas. The water-power possibilities are indicated by the Pensacola project and other proposed developments on Grand River.

Water resources: All of northeast Oklahoma is networked with streams fed largely by springs in the foothills of the Ozark Mountains. The annual rainfall in this area is approximately 40 inches, and it is well distributed throughout the year. The ground-water situation is most favorable, and in many areas an abundance of water is available merely from the use of sand pumps. The Grand River Dam itself will impound 550,000,000,000 gallons of water.

Transportation facilities: Oklahoma, the youngest of the Southern States and the second largest, has extensive and well-distributed transportation systems, and this is especially true in northeast Oklahoma. The railroads of the State, operating a total mileage close to 7,000 miles, provide adequate passenger and freight service to all sections. Of the total mileage, all but a few miles are operated by 12 class I roads, which provide trunk lines from East to West and North to South. The total mileage of Oklahoma's State highway system is in excess of 8,000 miles, made up of approximately 3,300 miles of hard-surface roads, 3,700 miles of treated and untreated gravel roads, and only about 1,100 miles of dirt roads. A project is under way to make the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers navigable into the Grand River Dam area. When this is completed access can then be made for direct shipments to Gulf coast ports. The area is also well provided with main-line air-transport service, and airports throughout the area are generally in excellent condition.

Cities and towns: The population of the Grand River Dam area is well distributed. Cities and towns with a population of 2,500 or more in 1930 are: Bartlesville, 14,763; Bristow, 6,619; Claremore, 3,720; Commerce, 2,608; Drumright, 4,972; Henryetta, 7,694; Miami, 8,064; Muskogee, 32,026; Nowata, 3,531; Okmulgee, 17,097; Picher, 7,773; Sand Springs, 6,674; Sapulpa, 10,533; Tulsa, 141,258; Vinita, 4,263; Wagoner, 2,994.

Climate: The eastern part of Oklahoma is essentially agreeable for living and exceptional so far as agriculture is concerned. The annual average rainfall is about 40 inches, with 75 to 80 percent falling during the 210-day growing season between March 1 and October 31. Snow which averages only a few inches annually seldom lasts more than a few days. It is unnecessary for any lost time to be charged up in any industrial activity to extreme weather conditions. With short, mild winters the summers are correspondingly long with warm temperature, but the climate is dry and the nights are nearly always cool. The annual average temperature is 60.7° F., with the average maximum temperature being 72.2, and the average minimum 49.1.

Business in area: Northeast Oklahoma, comprising 33.6 percent of the State's land area, has 45.4 percent of its population and an annual buying income of $436,314,000, or 46.9 percent of the State total. This area has 165,242 registered automobiles, 133,338 electric light and power customers, and 83,369 farms. Because income is almost equally divided between agriculture, production of minerals, and manufacturing, business conditions in the area are unusually stable. Sharp fluctuations in business trends are seldom noticed. Employment figures, according to most recent information, are as follows: Manufacturing, 16,088; mining, 6,216; retail, 23,561; and wholesale, 4,700.

Agriculture: A diversified system of agriculture is practiced in this area, providing almost year-around farm production to be made available to business and industrial employees. Because of its central location and varied topography, this region produces most of the major crops of the United States with the single exception of citrus fruits. The total cash farm income in the State in 1937, amounting to $186,155,000, placed Oklahoma fourth among the Southern States and was an increase of $37,317,000 over the comparable figure of 1936. Of this total cash farm income, $89,168 was derived from crops and $82,322,000 from livestock and livestock products. This area and that adjacent to it produces large quantities of wheat, cotton, oats, corn, and fruits. Although Oklahoma often is considered as a prairie State, a considerable area of native forest land extends from the southern pine region of the southeast to the western boundaries of the State, where oak and some other types prevail. The number of trees indigenous to Oklahoma is 134.

Advantages for arsenal: The foregoing merely indicates the numerous advantages available in the Grand River Dam area for an arsenal and for industries related to the national-defense facilities. Each new development in the international situation reemphasizes the importance of locating this Nation's defense facilities away from the exposed coasts. In this regard northeast Oklahoma is superbly located, combining the advantages of a most central interior location with the fact that it is readily accessible from North, East, South, or West. Although this area is not far from the geographical center of the Nation and close by the population center, it is still far away from the major concentrations of population as well as the major industrial areas where an enemy might be expected to concentrate its first attacks. Furthermore, this district is centrally located in an area without any national-defense plants at this time, being almost exactly equal distance between the plants at Rock Island, Ill., and San Antonio, Tex.

This area is believed to have more of the natural resources needed for such a program than any other district so centrally located in the United States. Water is available of good quality and in abundance for any industrial undertaking. Climate is favorable and the labor supply is abundant. Electric energy is available at low rates, and with the completion of Grand River Dam there will be a surplus of electric energy in northeast Oklahoma. Zinc, a munitions necessity, is available in Ottawa County in one of the most important producing areas in the world. A portion of the products of this area is reduced within the area. This area also ranks high in lead production, and much of it is reduced nearby. Cotton for use in explosives and for other uses is available from the cotton fields of Oklahoma. Coal is available in abundance for the innumerable products made from it, including some of the more important explosives.

When the magic wand of chemistry is waved over bituminous coal the results are beyond comprehension. From this product, by low-pressure distillation, is developed gas, coke, and coal tar. From coal tar and gas therefrom many well-known products are derived. In addition to a large number of materials used in everyday life, two important explosives are derived from coal tar. One is picric acid, which has been used as an explosive since the Russo-Japanese War, and the other is nitric acid, a very important factor in the manufacturing of explosives.

Coal in northeast Oklahoma is a high-class bituminous coal, and is mined under ideal conditions, with very little impurities in the coal seam, very little methane gas present, and dust explosions unheard of in this region. Thoroughgoing analyses show that gas can be manufactured from this coal. It is also known that by coking this coal it will make a much more desirable domestic fuel.

In view of the outstanding advantages offered by this district, the Northeast Oklahoma Arsenal Association asks that an exhaustive Federal survey be ordered immediately to determine the importance of the Grand River Dam area to the national-defense program and pledges full cooperation of the entire area in such a study.

House Resolution 36

House resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of War to investigate the feasibility and practicability of establishing an arsenal and munition works, the same being convertible to the manufacture of commercial fertilizer, airplane factory, and training school for pilots and mechanics, all of which to serve the needs of the United States in peacetime and wartime

Whereas we are cognizant of the fact that there are several wars, declared and undeclared, now going on throughout the world; and

Whereas agricultural activities and the animal-husbandry industry are the two chief pursuits of livelihood in which the people of Oklahoma are now engaged; and

Whereas eastern Oklahoma is a part of the United States which is far removed from any coast and would prove less vulnerable to an attack than possibly any other area in the United States because of its natural terrain; and

Whereas eastern Oklahoma has all of the necessary materials for the manufacture and production of the many supplies that can be used in peacetime, and which production can be rapidly converted in wartime to the defense of our Nation, such as lead, zinc, iron ore, potash, manganese, cotton, petroleum, and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas all of the present arsenals and munition works now located in the United States, save and except one, are located in the close proximity of the oceans and of the Gulf of Mexico, and are vulnerable to foreign attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventeenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of War be memorialized to take cognizance of the possibilities of eastern Oklahoma in the proposed program of national defense, and to take the necessary steps to make the greatest possible use of such area in that program by investigating the feasibility and practicability of establishing commercial fertilizer plants, convertible munition works, arsenals, airplane factories, and training schools for pilots and mechanics; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to each Member of the House of Congress from the State of Oklahoma, and a copy to each Senator in the United States Senate from the State of Oklahoma, and a copy to the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of April 1939.

DON WELCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

How the Term "Fifth Column" Originated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following explanation of the origin of the term "fifth column":

A great deal of curiosity has been aroused recently by the repeated use of the expression "fifth column" in the press and over the radio. The way in which it has been used has served to give a good idea of its meaning, but very few have known how the term originated.

In checking back it is found that the expression "fifth column" started with General Emilio Mola during the recent civil war in Spain.

During that war General Mola was in command of the Nationalist troops which were marching against Madrid. When questioned about the disposition of his troops he is said to have replied:

> We have four columns on the march outside the city. In the city we have a fifth column.

By the words "in the city we have a fifth column" he meant that within the city he had people working and doing practically the same thing that the bunds and other similar organizations have done in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg, and as they are doing throughout the United States today.

Thus a new expression was born and added to modern languages. It has come to be associated with any subversive or treacherous undercover movements made within a country threatened with attack by an enemy.

The New Deal and the Third Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Howard H. Baker, attorney general of the thirteenth judicial circuit of Tennessee, at the Republican district convention of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, at Knoxville, on May 17, 1940:

It is a great pleasure to be chairman of this convention, a meeting of the best Republicans in America, the best citizens of the United States, the best people in the world. It is recognized by all authorities that the purest Anglo-Saxon blood in the present-day world flows through the veins of East Tennesseans. We are not patting ourselves on the back. I am merely stating facts.

You came here to select two delegates and two alternates to the national convention of our party on June 24 at Philadelphia, at which meeting we shall name and select the next President of the United States.

Our party had its inception at a time of grave national peril, and throughout its history, which is almost a history of our great Nation, it has directed the course of life of our forefathers and of ourselves with three exceptions, the administrations of Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is no time to point with pride nor view with alarm. It is no time to base our claims upon the past, glorious though it may be. We are happy in the thought that our party was born in travail; to have been born otherwise would have been an unnatural birth. We are proud of the history of our party, of its survival in 1864, and of its leadership throughout modern years.

The people of this Nation are familiar with this history, but they now are face to face with cold realities. They respect our history and tradition but they are far more concerned with the realities of today. And rightly so. What are the realities? Not a campaign between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. If so, there would be no real cause for alarm unless it be from the standpoint of the unappeasable appetite of the office seeker, and we have them in both parties. We have them even in our party, the party of Lincoln and his illustrious successors. Republicans for revenue only. We were taught by our Master, the Nazarene, that if we would see clearly, we should first cleanse our own eyes.

We do not face the Democratic Party, the party of Jefferson, of Andrew Jackson, or even of the idealist, Woodrow Wilson. We do not face the party of Senator Carter Glass or of Senator George, or of Vice President Garner, or of Cordell Hull, our own Tennessean, who would be a most formidable opponent but who doesn't have a Chinaman's chance (the Gallup poll to the contrary notwithstanding), and the reason he doesn't have a chance is that he is not acceptable to F. D. R. Mr. Hull has not yet called Mr. Roosevelt "Our Lincoln" and never will. So that eliminates him.

We face the New Deal, and by early fall the best of the Democratic Party as it exists today, that is, those Democrats who believe in their party's principles and who place America above piecounterism, will fold their tents and walk silently away. I predict that if the third termites nominate Mr. Roosevelt or an outright New Dealer, the Democratic Party will assemble shortly and nominate a Democratic candidate for President and will thus eliminate any possibility of a doubt of the election of the Republican nominee for Chief Executive of this great Nation.

It is my mature, sincere, and heartfelt belief that if our American system of government is to remain and endure, the New Deal must be eliminated in 1940. Unbridled debt will eat away the foundation of any nation, family, or individual, and we know that our national debt is now unbridled. Droves of mules are loose in the clover patch, and there is no mule herder, or if there is one his thoughts are upon other subjects.

The New Deal has attempted to stir up class hatred in a nation where there are no classes, no aristocracy except one based upon hard work and accomplishment, and it has partially succeeded, but the sound common sense of the American people has reas-

serted itself, and we again realize that such conflict is futile, that "a house divided against itself must fall," that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are still the cardinal aims of free men, that industry and frugality are still words to be prized, and that hard work is the secret of success.

We are faced with the towering menace of European war, now almost a world war, one which may cause the last one to dwarf into insignificance. It is a situation which may well cause the hearts of everyone—father, mother, son, and daughter—to be tremendously disturbed. Twice in our national history the thought of "don't swap horses in the middle of the stream" was used in political campaigns such as the one we may be approaching. The first time this expression was used it was true. The war had been waged for nearly 4 years; its outcome was doubtful; the issue was whether the War between the States should continue or cease.

It was a real issue. If Mr. Lincoln had been defeated, the Union would have been severed immediately. The other time was in 1916. Mr. Wilson was elected upon the issue that "He kept us out of war." The weeks were very short after Mr. Wilson's reelection and inauguration until we were very active participants in the war. The gathering war clouds will probably provide the chariot wheels for the third-term draft in 1940, but I believe that the American people have too much common sense and have their feet too solidly upon the ground to be deceived by such a feigned issue. I am not one of those who believe in "peace at any price" or complete isolation for the United States of America. The latter would be fine, but it is impossible. However, I do not believe in unnecessary bluffing on our part or going to war over a few barrels of oil or some tin; the New Deal has enough tin, anyway. There is no truer statement or thought than that they who play with fire will get burned. We should spend billions for defense and keep our hands out of European shenanigans and "protection" measures; and, to use the words of one of our present-day Republican statesmen, "Let's swap horses and stay on this side of the stream."

Some good has been accomplished by the New Deal and we must retain the things which are worth while. This is neither the time nor the place to recount them.

We must remove fear and hatred and give business a chance to reassert itself, but, above all, we must remove the New Deal. When that is done our problems will approach solution. We shall solve them by the concerted thought and action of all right-thinking Americans.

Save the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

PROGRAM OF INDIANA HOME OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith the 8-point program of the Indiana Home Owners' Association, Inc., of Fort Wayne, Ind., a growing and militant organization of more than 3,000 Hoosier home owners.

The commendable purpose of this fine association, which was organized a year ago, is to preserve our Christian democracy by saving the American home. It is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, and it has the support of many leading citizens of the community.

As part of its legislative program the Home Owners' Association is promoting the Mead-Barbour bill, S. 3447, which is now before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. This measure would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act by reducing the interest rate on H. O. L. C. loans, by abolishing certain deficiency judgments, and by providing a moratorium on foreclosures.

The officers and leaders of the association are: Henry J. Peters, president; Frank Bender, vice president; Chester W. Keen, secretary; Mrs. C. A. Menefee, assistant secretary; Dr. R. L. West, treasurer; Frank V. Kelly, chairman of the board of directors; and Herman C. Brandt, member of the board of directors.

After considerable study and investigation, based on practical experience with this pressing problem, the association has prepared the following eight-point program for the preservation of the American home. I recommend that it be given the serious and sympathetic consideration of this Congress:

It is our firm conviction that the Home Owners' Loan offices established throughout the various metropolitan centers in the United States are being maintained at excessive and unnecessary cost to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and that a reputable realtor who knows real estate and whose integrity is beyond question in each community would be better fitted not only to receive the collections but to handle the real estate which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has taken back than the Home Owners' Loan Organization now in existence.

It would have the added advantage of enabling those mortgagors who are in some difficulties with their mortgage to go to a local individual who has had years of experience in the real-estate business, and to present to him their problems, and with his help and suggestion, many of these homes which have been foreclosed could have been saved to home owners, and hundreds of thousands of dollars could have been saved to the United States Government and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation by efficient handling by someone with a background of experience and adequate knowledge of real-estate conditions in the various communities.

With this preface, we suggest the following changes be made:

1. That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation law or the regulations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, whichever may be required, be amended to enable those who are delinquent in their payments, and who have made good-faith effort to pay, possess good moral character and honesty, and are good moral risks, accompanied by a reasonable probability of acquiring a sufficient earning capacity to pay out their mortgages, may reamortize their loans at the reduced interest rate the same as those whose mortgages are current.

(a) By this this association does not mean that the man who has never paid, and who has never endeavored to pay, and who is a chiseler should be able to qualify under this reamortization plan.

2. Amend the law or regulations to provide that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, if it still possesses property which has been foreclosed, shall reconvey and accept a mortgage for the amount from those persons who are good moral risks and possess a reasonable probability of paying out their mortgages on the reamortization basis, to be determined by a home owners' debt committee as provided for hereinafter.

3. Place the handling of Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgages and collections in the hands of a reputable local real-estate agency in each metropolitan center with authority to trade or exchange properties now owned by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to those Home Owners' Loan mortgagors who are overhoused, and accept the higher priced property, in order that the Home Owners' Loan mortgagor may not lose his entire equity, on a basis which will assure to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation no greater loss than would be sustained in the handling of the cheaper property.

4. On foreclosures, eliminate appraisal fees, photographers' fees, and limit attorneys' fees to a fixed amount as a part of the cost of foreclosure, so that if the mortgagor is enabled to redeem his property he can redeem it without paying more than a reasonable fee for costs and expenses.

5. Require the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to take immediate steps with efficiency to implement the amendment for rewriting current mortgages at a lower rate of interest on the longer basis.

6. Provide that in event of foreclosure the Home Owners' Loan mortgagor may take advantage of the provisions of the Frazier-Lemke bill for farm mortgages by the same proceedings and under the same terms.

7. Provide for the creation of a home owners' debt committee in each county for the purpose of reviewing loans before foreclosure proceedings are instituted, and for the purpose of working with the mortgagor to enable him to manage his funds and budget his income so that reasonable payments may be made on his mortgage, and for the purpose of passing upon credit ratings, moral risks, and ability to pay, and the probability of income of those who seek to repurchase their properties which have been foreclosed, two members of the committee to be appointed in each community by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, two members by the Home Owners' Loan mortgagors, and a fifth member by the judge of the circuit court in the county where the committee is appointed.

8. If the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is placed on a basis of efficiency, properties and the mortgages managed by local real-estate agencies of reputable character, and excess baggage weeded out, enough savings can be effected to accomplish a further reduction in the interest rate on Home Owners' Loan mortgages.

Business Engaged in the Marketing and Distribution of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Should Not Be Classified as Chain Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS D. WINTER, OF KANSAS

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, a special Ways and Means Subcommittee has been considering H. R. 1, commonly known as the antichain-store bill, which is designated to protect local merchants against unfair trade tactics of the fast-growing chain-store monopoly. On May 10, 1940, I appeared before this subcommitte in opposition to an amendment to H. R. 1, which the subcommittee then had under consideration, which contemplated including places of business engaged in the distribution and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products in the category of chain stores and making such places of business subject to the tax provided in H. R. 1 against chain stores. My statement before the subcommittee was as follows:

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up very much of your time. I can agree with practically everything Mr. DISNEY has said, but not all of it.

The principal reason which has prompted my appearance here this morning is the apparent intention of the sponsor of H. R. 1, my learned colleague from the State of Texas, to include places of business engaged in the distribution and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products along with the other businesses to which he intends to apply the provisions of this bill.

At the outset of my discussion I would like to make it plain as to just what my interest is in this particular legislation. As you gentlemen know, I represent the Third Congressional District of Kansas. While Kansas is known throughout the country as one of the leading farm States, it also possesses great mineral resources and is one of the top-ranking crude-oil-producing States of the Nation. It might surprise you gentlemen to learn that the annual value of the petroleum produced in my State almost equals the total annual value of all its farm products.

In the production of this essential resource Kansas ranks sixth among the 23 States which produce oil. It is this fact, specifically, which is responsible for the interest of my constituents and myself in the attempt of the sponsor of H. R. 1 to include the production and distribution of petroleum products in the bill which is now under consideration by this committee.

The Third Congressional District of Kansas, which I represent, contains nine counties in the southeastern part of our State adjoining Oklahoma. This particular section of the State embraces a large portion of the State's oil-producing area and the returns from this activity, naturally, are of immeasurable economic benefit to the residents of that area.

But our interest does not cease with the production of the oil itself. In addition to operating their own oil wells the residents of my district also refine the crude oil which they produce into gasoline, lubricants, fuel oils, and other finished petroleum products for consumption. My district contains about one-third of the total capacity of all the refineries now in operation in the State and thousands of our citizens are gainfully engaged in the marketing of these products.

On the basis of the current yield of gasoline from crude oil it is estimated that the gasoline produced in the State of Kansas each year is sufficient to maintain 1,800,000 vehicles in operation for a whole year. Obviously, all of that volume of gasoline cannot be consumed within our State, for we only have 577,000 motor vehicles in the whole State. So it is clear that my constituents must depend upon distribution in other States if they are to make an adequate livelihood for themselves and their families.

They are not, moreover, in a position to undertake such distribution under their own financial resources. All of their available capital already is being utilized in the operation of their oil wells and their refineries. So, if they are to benefit from the sale of the finished products which they manufacture from the crude oil they produce, they must rely upon distribution facilities provided and maintained by others.

Wholly satisfactory results are now being experienced with the present system employed in the distribution and the marketing of these finished petroleum products. It seems only natural to me, therefore, that my constituents should be vitally interested in the uninterrupted continuance of the present efficient and economical distribution of their products to the country's consuming markets. It seems equally natural that they should be most loath to have legislation enacted which would cause a serious disruption in the present marketing structure.

In fact, many of them feel, and I believe with good reason, that if the provisions of H. R. 1 are made to apply to the oil industry that the marketing of petroleum products would be immediately plunged into chaos, and I think you gentlemen will agree with me that the marketing of petroleum products, and particularly gasoline, is in a peculiar situation. It is different than the marketing of food products or clothing that is being distributed by chain stores. There isn't any other way that petroleum can be marketed to the public successfully at the low economic price we are getting it for today.

In my district I don't know of any filling station that is not locally operated, and a great majority of them are locally owned, and I have gone into the thing very seriously with the representatives of the various companies, and the men operating these filling stations can buy or they can lease them.

I was very much interested in what Mr. DINGELL said about the 24-hour notice on contracts. That does not prevail in my State. Those contracts are signed for a definite period of time, and they use the gasoline of their particular company. But if a man owns his own station or a string of them, he buys whatever make of gasoline and lubricants he desires.

Mr. DINGELL. And I will say to you, so far as I am concerned, there is nothing to sustain that assertion except the word of the man who called me over the long-distance telephone.

Mr. WINTER. Well, I took that as your statement.

Mr. DINGELL. I have no reason to question the soundness or the veracity of what he told me, but it is not substantiated so far as the record is concerned.

Mr. WINTER. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that you made that statement, and since you made it, to say that that condition does not exist in Kansas.

Mr. DINGELL. You understand my position, I am not attempting to, or by the widest stretch of the imagination, planning on including any line of business under the provisions of the bill which rightfully would not belong there. On the other hand, my contention is if this is to be a chain-store bill, aimed and directed at chain stores, I want it to affect chain-filling stations or chain purveyors of liquor or chain-drug stores or chain-food stores or clothing stores or automobile supplies. Anything that is a chain must of necessity be included here, and any exclusions I naturally have my suspicions of. We had a witness here the other day who made a statement in favor of the bill. Then he evidently heard from his constituents and he came right back here and amended his attitude.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think in that case that witness overlooked an important part of his testimony. Those things happen to all of us

Mr. DINGELL. That may be true, but the fact of the matter is that he favored the bill, provided it excluded filling stations.

Mr. WINTER. I can agree with what the gentleman says to this point, with one exception, however, that is, to me, you have got to take into consideration the distribution of the particular article. If that distribution goes on under the class of what you are terming "chain stores" and the chain distribution of it, and it is detrimental to the people and the communities and the country as a whole which is producing that particular article, then I can agree with the gentleman, but I cannot for the life of me see how you can place the chain-store stamp upon the distribution of petroleum products in the manner and under the system we have developed here in America, and I will say this to the gentleman, that in my particular community—and that part of my State is producing a great deal of our oil and refining and making the gasoline—if this bill is enacted into law and it carries such a provision as this bringing filling stations under it, you would find everybody down there would be faced with the loss of their life savings and investment, and you would throw the whole distribution system into chaos.

Mr. DINGELL. I don't think we can go into the question there as to whether or not the bill is detrimental. That is beside the question before us.

Mr. WINTER. I will agree with you on that.

Mr. DINGELL. We have had more than 150 witnesses here who have said that the provisions of the bill are detrimental to the interests for which the witnesses spoke, but so far as the inclusion or the exclusion of any line of business is concerned, that question does not enter. It is a question of whether or not they qualify under the term "chain stores."

Mr. WINTER. I think it is a very important question for this committee to consider whether or not the enactment of any amendment to this bill or any other bill would be detrimental to an industry as a whole.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with you, and I am sure the committee will take such a thing into account. But I mean, so far as the inclusion or exclusion of any particular line of business——

Mr. WINTER. I am not talking about a particular business. If the gentleman will get my point—I mean an entire distribution system now in use in America insofar as the sale of petroleum products is concerned. That is the only point that I urge.

Mr. DINGELL. You understand my attitude?

Mr. WINTER. Certainly.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not unfriendly to the filling stations or to the producers of petroleum. We are an oil-producing State in Michigan.

Mr. WINTER. I am not unfriendly to H. R. 1 by any means. I don't mean that.

Mr. DINGELL. And my State produces the burners——

Mr. WINTER. I know it does.

Mr. DINGELL. Of the production that comes from your State.

Mr. WINTER. And we have lots of them in use in our State.

Mr. DINGELL. We have lots in common. I have no opposition to anything you might say, but I am interested in the question of fairness.

Mr. WINTER. I think this whole committee, so far as that is concerned, will be fair in whatever decision they arrive at in this matter, and I will say this to the gentleman, I do not contend that this present marketing system is perfect by any means. It has a lot of faults. But there is one thing I do know, and that is this: that it is functioning now with the very minimum of wasted effort and economic loss, and that seems to indicate it is just about as satisfactory a way of distributing the products of the petroleum industry as you can find.

Mr. DINGELL. I don't think there is any question about the efficiency and the cheapness at which the product is sold.

Mr. WINTER. And I don't think there is any question about the proposition of the number of people employed in it, and it seems most unwise to me and my constituents and the people who have a vast amount of investment in this to attempt any cure-all system so far as the system of distribution is concerned whereby we serve the public with the products we make from our crude oil and petroleum as we produce it and refine it.

As I say, I do not contend that the present marketing system is perfect. It may have some faults, but the fact that it now functions with the very minimum of wasted effort and economic loss seems to indicate that it is just about as satisfactory as it is possible to be. And it seems most unwise to attempt to install a new cure-all system which admittedly will effect radical changes in the whole set-up of marketing without any definite assurance or effective guarantee that there will be any resulting benefit to the consumer or to the producer and the refiner.

At this point it seems most desirable to place special emphasis upon one particular point. To us, in Kansas, the prosperity and welfare of the individuals who consume petroleum products, the individuals who refine these products, and the individuals who produce the crude oil from which they are manufactured, and the individuals satisfactorily and gainfully engaged in the marketing of these products under the present system, seem equally as important as the welfare of any small number of individuals in the marketing branch of the industry who are dissatisfied for one reason or another. As we understand our democratic Government, it is designed to foster and promote the greatest good for the greatest possible number and we, in Kansas, feel that the marketing system now in use in the petroleum industry is producing the greatest good for the greatest possible number at a minimum cost to the consumer.

And on behalf of my constituents, who are engaged as petroleum producers, refiners, and distributors of petroleum products, I most earnestly and sincerely protest the application of H. R. 1 to the production, distribution, and marketing of petroleum and its products.

So far as the bill generally is concerned, I am making a study of it, and I say to you frankly I am not prepared to make any statement on it at this time.

Mr. MCCORMACK. You are appearing here in one capacity.

Mr. WINTER. In one capacity; yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. There is just one question I want to ask you.

Mr. WINTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Assuming the provision you addressed the committee on should be included and the bill reported, what effect would it have on the State of Kansas from an economic and financial angle, and, in your opinion, upon every other State that produces petroleum?

Mr. WINTER. If this provision were in the bill?

Mr. MCCORMACK. If it was.

Mr. WINTER. I think it would wreck it. This is a business that is now employing hundreds of thousands of people, and we would have a great many more people on the unemployed roll.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I just wanted to get your opinion as to the result.

Mr. CROWTHER. I just want to say to the Congressman that in my opinion he has given us a very informing and enlightening statement, and I congratulate him.

Mr. WINTER. Thank you, gentlemen, for your time.

Amendment of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, published recently in the Washington Star:

WAGNER ACT VOTE TO MAKE HISTORY—STAND ON CHANGES SEEN TIED UP WITH MORALS OF DEMOCRACY

(By David Lawrence)

Within a few days the House will be asked to record itself on what may prove a historic vote because it is directly related to national unity and efficiency and production.

For several months, the House has had before it certain proposals to amend the National Labor Relations Act. These amendments do not in any way weaken collective bargaining or the rights of labor to organize, but they decidedly weaken the power of an arbitrary-minded tribunal to write into the law things that were never put there in the first instance by Congress. Likewise, the amendments seek to give employers—who, too, have civil rights and are supposed to be treated fairly, even though they are in the minority—a chance to conduct their labor relations without being harassed by misuse or abuse of the words of the statute.

The labor-union politicians, working in close cooperation with the National Labor Relations Board, have been conducting a lobby to persuade Members of the House to leave the law unchanged. Threats of reprisals at the polls are in the background of the controversy. Republicans and Democrats alike have been asked to vote against the amendments on the ground that the labor unions did not want changes

The position of the C. I. O. has been to oppose all amendments. The A. F. of L. started out with amendments of its own and thought it had administration support, but it turns out that the A. F. of L. has been left isolated. Lately there have been signs that the A. F. of L. leaders will return to the position they originally took, namely that a new labor board must be created.

BETTER RELATIONS NEEDED

The need for a more satisfactory relationship between management and labor than exists in America today is conceded on all sides. In England, it is admitted that because labor refused to cooperate voluntarily, measures of emergency had to be adopted by Parliament conscripting labor and capital. But in the end it is labor that has to surrender most. So in America, if voluntary cooperation breaks down and America is forced into the war some day, labor will bear the brunt of the struggle. Can America forestall such a development by setting up now a better relationship between management and labor? The House will have to answer that question and take full responsibility for the decision next week.

It is not a difficult controversy to appraise. When, after a searching investigation by a special House committee, abuses are revealed, it is certainly not constructive for the big powerful labor politicians to ignore the abuses and endeavor to whitewash completely those who have been guilty of wrongdoing and of openly violating the Federal statutes. Members of the Board have boldly confessed to violation of antilobbying laws, and yet have never been prosecuted.

PUBLIC MORALITY UNDER CLOUD

The spectacle of an administration which vigorously enforces the laws against employers and deliberately refrains from enforcing the statutes against its own employees when they violate Federal law is an example of the decay of democratic government and public morality. When political expediency supersedes honest enforcement of the law, the foundation of democracy itself is made insecure.

The campaign against amending the national labor relations law has in itself revealed that arbitrarily interpreted statutes can be kept in force if the political lobbies are strong enough. The administration by its position thus far has committed itself to the side of unqualified endorsement of the mismanagement by the Board. All the revelations of the Smith committee have been brushed to one side and administration leaders are fighting against amendments.

How can industry ever have confidence in any administration which so far forgets the rules of fair play in a democracy that when unfairness is clearly proved, no redress is obtainable? How much enthusiasm can industry put into the production machine when it feels that at Washington is a group of overzealous politicians interested primarily in their own ambitions and their own maintenance of political power?

VOTERS FINAL ARBITERS

The average citizen often asks himself what he can do about it. The coming vote in the House will give him much food for thought and a stimulus to action. Every vote for unqualified retention of the National Labor Relations Act, every vote made at the behest of pressure groups, can be repudiated at the polls by larger groups of the electorate who want to see a fair deal for employers as well as employees.

The question of what the Senate does about it is secondary. For the House must go on record first. If the House does not see the implications to national defense and efficient production in failure to correct the mistakes in the Wagner law, then America must look to the voters at the polls to express in unmistakable terms this autumn the national desire for fairness and voluntary cooperation in government. It's another episode in the era of selfishness that has made democracy so weak to cope with totalitarian states.

The Mexican Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News for May 25, 1940:

[From the New York Daily News of May 25, 1940]

THE MEXICAN MYSTERY

In this crisis, we feel that it is no time to pinprick our Government. And that is not our intention.

Nevertheless, we have long been puzzled by the present Government's policy toward Mexico—or lack of policy, maybe. Our bewilderment is renewed and refreshed by Hal Burton's series of articles on Mexico, now running in the News, and full of interesting and alarming material.

Soon after he was inaugurated in 1933, President Roosevelt announced the good-neighbor policy. It was to apply to all Latin America, which, of course, includes Mexico. About the same time, our Government began buying silver from all comers at inflated prices, the object being to give the western silver producers an economic boost and to help certain silver-standard countries, notably China.

In March 1938 the Mexican Government seized about $450,000,000 worth of oil properties in Mexico belonging to various American, British, and Dutch companies, and undertook to run those properties on its own.

Our State Department filed various protests, which were received with extreme politeness by the Mexican Government. But the story President Cardenas' press agents and newspapers told the Mexican people was that the United States Government approved the oil grabs. And the Mexican Supreme Court O. K.'d the oil grabs.

We went on buying Mexican silver at inflated prices, and are still doing so. That had and has the effect of staving off a complete financial break-down in Mexico—though Cardenas' government is having pretty tough going nevertheless.

Cardenas is selling the expropriated oil wherever he can find buyers or swappers; and those buyers and swappers were chiefly German and Italian before the war and are chiefly Japanese now.

In short, we are subsidizing with silver purchases a government which takes the property of Americans and sells or swaps it to governments which are less our friends than any other first-rank governments in the world.

"FIFTH COLUMN"

We've heard it asserted that this United States super-good neighborliness toward Mexico was at bottom a New Deal effort to pay off its political debt of the 1936 campaign to John L. Lewis, who contributed about $500,000 of his United Mine Workers' funds to the Democrats that year, and who is very friendly with Vincente Lombardo Toledano, Mexican labor leader. We have no reason to believe that there is anything in this charge, no way of verifying it. But it has been whispered about, nevertheless, and has apparently convinced some people.

Our soft-heartedness toward Mexico now begins to threaten to kick us in the face.

As Mr. Burton reports, the coming Mexican Presidential election has already fanned up a revolutionary situation in Mexico. Cardenas's candidate, Manuel Avila Camacho, and the conservative candidate, Juan Andreu Almazan, are making ready to contest the election with guns, whichever way it goes. The result may be a dangerous explosion to the south of us, at a time when Europe is exploding to the east of us and Asia to the west of us.

Even worse than that, to quote Mr. Burton:

"The 'fifth column' is closing ranks in Mexico, facing north toward the American border. Germany has 200 busy agents at work—more than in World War days, when Carranza maintained a dubious 'neutrality.'

"Russia, too, is busy behind the scenes. Native Communists and fellow travelers run many of her errands. Some of the anti-Franco refugees from Spain do the rest. Japan hovers on the side lines, distributing discreet largesse in the form of 'investments' that never will pan out."

That is the kind of country to which we go on being a good neighbor by buying its silver at uneconomic prices, then burying the silver at West Point, where it does us no good.

Mexico is already on the ragged edge of complete communism, its government having taken many a lesson from Leon Trotsky, its long-time honored guest. Nations unfriendly to us are already using Mexico for purposes best known to themselves. It is conceivable that Mexico may sometime be used as the jumping-off point for an invasion of the United States—or at least for some kind of violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

To repeat, we cannot understand why this Government goes on being such an extra-good neighbor to Mexico.

"Fifth Columnists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star on Saturday, May 25, 1940, which editorial follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1940]

"FIFTH COLUMNISTS"

The grim determination with which Great Britain is running down her "fifth columnists" is convincing evidence that the dictatorship realizes the seriousness of the peril across the channel.

Although democratic rights are in eclipse as police and Scotland Yard crack down on Fascists and Communists, these elements have no cause for complaint. They are merely victims of the very methods they would use if they should come to power—methods which they have been actively trying to establish in England.

It is one of the paradoxes of democracy that the guaranties of freedom of speech, assembly, and press are the shields behind which the foes of democracy conduct their vicious campaigns to destroy the system which permits them to exist.

If Britain has now, through the exigencies of the war, become a dictatorship, it is the most nearly perfect example of democracy in action, not only waging war efficiently against a highly mobilized opponent but jealously guarding its own future.

Not only Britain and France, but other nations not yet involved in this war are paying increased attention to those within their borders who would pave the way for an invader. Particularly is this true in Latin America, where the small republics have for years been the objects of Nazi lures and blandishments. Many of them have German and Italian minorities articulate in support of the lands from which they came.

Mexico especially has reason for apprehension at this moment as a hot election campaign approaches its climax in July. Mexico reports a suspiciously large influx of German tourists, augmenting the already substantial body of Nazis which have long used Mexico as a sphere in which to spread their ideology.

It is possible that subversive elements taking advantage of political upheaval, should that follow the election, might rise to power.

In such an event the United States could not remain a disinterested observer. We have too many potential "fifth columnists" ourselves to permit the rise on our border of a regime which would be more sympathetic with the cause of Nazi-fascism in Europe than is good for the Americas.

Coalition Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Ross:

WASHINGTON LETTER
(By Charles G. Ross)

CONCERNING THE NONSENSICAL TALK ABOUT THE NEED FOR A COALITION GOVERNMENT IN AMERICA—GOVERNOR LANDON MAKES A GOOD POINT IN OPPOSING THE IDEA

WASHINGTON, May 24.—The silliest talk to which our preparedness program has given birth is that we should have a coalition Government. If we had our backs to the wall, like England, the desperate necessities of the case would, of course, put us under that kind of government. There would be no alternative. And the Government in that event would be far more than a coalition government of

the sort that is being talked about; it would be a totalitarian government, like England's now.

But we haven't got our backs to the wall. We are not even in a war. What we are now undertaking to do is simply to spend money in sufficient sums and with sufficient expertness to insure our national safety if we do get into a war. This is a tremendously important effort; it is something that needs to be carried through with all dispatch; but it constitutes no crisis remotely warranting the hysterical cry that we abandon our traditional two-party system of government.

The preparedness program, overshadowing though it is at the moment and may be for a long time to come, is still but one of the concerns of the National Government. There are plenty of other grave concerns, and out of them grow issues that provide proper fighting material for the parties. To say that all these other issues should be put aside—which is to say, concretely, that the opposition party should be denied its right to do all it can at the polls to enforce its own view of these issues—is to say that democracy is unable to function even under a faint threat of bad weather; it is to urge a step toward the very form of government that is causing us, by its hateful aggressions, to pour out our billions for the defense of our democracy.

There could be no greater irony than for the United States at this time to adopt the methods of the dictators.

Conceivably, the time may come, as it has tragically come to England, when we shall have to do this. It is not here now, and to suggest that it is here is to do neither the cause of preparedness nor the cause of representative government any service. We fought the last war without going under a coalition; we can surely now, when at peace, do whatever is necessary to be done without going under a coalition.

This is not to say that the administration would not be well advised to set up a coordinating board of industrial leaders and experts to supervise the defense program. The members of such a board should be—to insure public confidence and the maximum of efficiency they necessarily would be—chosen with utter disregard to politics. What we face is not only a military problem; it is to a very large extent a purely industrial problem. There can be no question of the willingness of Republican industrialists as well as Democrats to cooperate with the President and the experts of the Army and Navy in the great nonpartisan effort represented by the program which is now going through Congress with the votes of Democrats and Republicans alike. As to national defense, politics is adjourned.

To this extent there is coalition—coalition that we like to think is inevitable whenever the country is faced with the threat of danger from the outside. The President could dramatize this unity we have achieved in a special field, he could make this unity count for efficiency and speed in the execution of the defense program by summoning to his aid the best qualified men in the country regardless of their attitude toward his domestic policies.

But a nonpartisan board, operating outside the Cabinet, with respect to an issue on which there is national unity, is a different thing altogether from a coalition government. A coalition government under present conditions would give us a Cabinet with a confusion of voices on all save the one issue of preparedness. Within the inner council of the Government would be men hostile to many of its purposes. The whole conception of the Cabinet as the official family of the President, selected by him because of their essential agreement with his views, would be violated. As for the outsiders drawn into the coalition, their influence with the country in opposition to the President would be weakened or destroyed. The point need not be labored: We need unified responsibility at the head of the Government; we need an alert oposition unhampered by ties with the Government.

Governor Landon made a good point in his statement of Wednesday when he said that "it is to be noted that even in the midst of actual war the Labor and Liberal Parties in England refused to enter the Cabinet until there had been substantial agreement on policies."

Coalition government in our system is justifiable only under the pressure of some transcendent issue on which there is substantial agreement between the parties and beside which the normal issues of the day shrivel into insignificance. To say that the present necessity of building up our armament has put us in this stage is to utter the rankest nonsense.

Grand Coulee Dam a Link in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SEATTLE STAR

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to have reprinted an article from the Seattle Star under date of May 20, 1940, written by Jay Franklin, one of the Nation's best-known columnists. This article deals with the unusual potentialities of Grand Coulee Dam in connection with national defense.

I have personally and as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations given much thought and consideration to the almost undreamed-of possibilities that exist in connection with the unlimited deposits of magnesite ore within a short distance of Grand Coulee. This article by Jay Franklin, in a direct, concise, and interesting manner, points out the possibilities which, in my opinion, will of itself justify the great work that the Government has been carrying on in the construction of Grand Coulee Dam.

The article follows:

GRAND COULEE DAM A LINK IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Behind the recent curious personnel upset in the Bureau of Mines lies an equally curious chapter in the dollar-scarred story of our national defense. It involves the projected use of cheap electric power from the great Coulee Dam in Washington to produce magnesium metal on a big scale for industrial and defense purposes.

Magnesium is one-third lighter than aluminum and stronger than steel. In addition it alloys easily with other metals, including manganese, and does not corrode. The Nazis are using magnesium extensively in their manufacture of military aircraft and air-bomb casings, thus stepping up fuel and load capacity and cruising radius enormously. It may well be considered the strategic metal of this and future wars.

The principal source of commercial magnesium today in this country is the Dow Chemical Co., which recovers the metal from brine deposits at Midland, Mich., and sells the product at about 28 cents a pound. Production has steadily increased from 500,000 pounds in 1928 to 5,000,000 pounds in 1938, while in 1939 the total of 11,000,000 pounds was produced.

At Chewelah, not many miles east of Grand Coulee, there are huge deposits of magnesium ore—estimated at 8,000,000,000 tons with a metallic content of around 20 percent magnesium. (The brine deposits contain about 1 percent magnesium but the process of recovery is different.)

For a number of years the School of Mines of the Washington State College at Pullman has been conducting research into electrolytic methods of refining magnesite ore. This research was undertaken by Dean A. E. Drucker, of the School of Mines. An effort was made to ascertain the German process which supports Goering's air-armada but there was nothing doing with the Nazis. Finally Dean Drucker succeeded in perfecting the laboratory process by which it is possible to refine Chewelah ore using Grand Coulee energy.

The basic calculations are convincing. Using Grand Coulee power at $17.50 per kilowatt year—or 2 mills per kilowatt-hour—it will be possible to produce an almost unlimited supply of magnesium airplane metal, etc., at 10 cents a pound, or about one-third of the present price for the limited supply of the metal. The economics of the operation are still more convincing. It will require 20,000 kilowatt-hours to produce a ton of metallic magnesium at a power-cost of 2 cents a pound. With a total projected power capacity of 2,700,000 horsepower or a capacity of 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, Coulee dam will be in a position to create a gigantic low-cost armaments industry safe from all conceivable air-raids or military capture behind the strong palisades of the Rockies and Cascade range.

The present plans for Grand Coulee call for the installation of two station service power units this fall and the completion of the first three major generators of 150,000 horsepower capacity apiece by the spring of 1942. Undoubtedly their installation could be speeded up materially on national emergency orders from Washington.

In the meantime, the current appropriation calls for the erection of a small pilot plant to produce magnesium metal at Grand Coulee. This plant would reduce the laboratory work at Pullman to industrial practice, under the joint auspices of the United States Bureau of Mines and the Washington State College School of Mines. Protracted delays on the part of the Bureau at Washington, D. C., are understood to have been the reason for the recent drastic shake-up in the Bureau of Mines.

Here, it is suggested, is a real test of the patriotism of private enterprise. The production of a vital war material can scarcely be deferred to the commercial convenience of a business corporation. If Dean Drucker's calculations are correct, the United States Government can produce unlimited quantities of magnesium at a cost which will put the Dow Chemical Co. at a tremendous disadvantage. During the next 2 or 3 years, the Dow people can make a killing in airplane manufacture—if they can overcome the vested interest of other metals, especially steel and aluminum, in the airplane and munitions industry. But if the United States is to prepare itself for the modern forms of warfare, the Government must clear away all congressional and bureaucratic opposition to the rapid development of Grand Coulee as an integral and essential part of our national defense. JAY FRANKLIN.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

THE SOUTHERN G-F CO., INC.,
Atlanta, Ga., May 23, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: I can appreciate the fact that you have so much on your mind that you hardly have time to read a letter from one of your constituents.

Being the son of a father who always voted a Republican ticket, and although I have always been a Republican, at the age of 50 I have about made up my mind to change. If Mr. Lindbergh and Mr. Landon are the mouthpieces of the Republicans, Heaven help the Republican Party.

As Senator BYRNES said last night, our good friend One Way Corrigan is just as well equipped to express himself on international affairs as Mr. Lindbergh. What background and what experience does Lindbergh have to jeopardize the future of this country by some misstatements he has made. What right has any man who runs around with a Hitler and Goering medal on his chest to tell us in this country what we should and should not do? Unfortunately this young man, in the eyes of many, is still an idol, but I believe the pedestal on which he has been placed has been shattered.

When it comes to ex-Governor Landon, to mix in politics or the future of the President, especially during this very serious period, is pathetic; and many people, like myself, old Republicans, are disgusted with the picture.

I am the father of a boy 21 years of age, and, of course, he will do his duty when called upon, but to avoid the necessity of being drawn in the maelstrom of bloody war, the only way to prevent it is to arm yourself to the hilt and keep the burglar out of your home I am not of the panicky type, neither are my friends, but I think everything within the power of this Government should be done to help England and France, as they are fighting our battles against the future expansion of avaricious Germany. Yet, if the Allies are defeated, we will have a real problem on our hands, not with Germany but with some of her very close bedfellows, such as Japan and Italy. Therefore, I urge you to do everything in your power to expedite the rearming of this country, which is in a deplorable condition, and, if necessary, tax the profits of every corporation, either large or small, to put this across.

I am sending you copies of this letter, and I wish you would please turn them over to some of the Republican leaders in Washington, who, I am sure, are just as loyal Americans as you and I but are being misled by the infantile mentality of some of our citizens with limited foresight and with the type of Republicans which brought about the downfall of the Republican Party.

Believe me, I am,
Very truly yours,

L. ARONSTAM, *President.*

Lindbergh Speaks Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, May 21, 1940:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 21, 1940]

LINDBERGH SPEAKS AGAIN

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh Sunday evening made the third radio speech on the war that he has made since the war began. We thought the speech contained a high percentage of common sense, at least in the passages devoted to the correct aviation defense policy for the United States.

All of Lindbergh's adventures in connection with this war have been interesting.

In 1936, while still a self-made exile in England, Lindbergh visited Berlin, and said at an Aero Club meeting that modern warfare might easily "destroy the very things we wish to protect"—a remark which didn't please Germany's airmen a little bit.

In 1938, after a tour of Russia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and France, Lindbergh was accused by the Russian Government press of having advised Neville Chamberlain's appeasement crowd in London that he thought the German air force could lick the British, French, Russian, and Czech air forces put together.

That Lindbergh had some such hunch was indicated when on May 17, 1939, he told the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee that in all types of planes except heavy bombers the German planes had the edge over the American.

When the war finally broke out last September, Lindbergh went on the air (September 15) with a bluntly worded plea for absolute United States isolation. A month later (October 13) he repeated that plea, and went further by remarking:

"Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power"—which started Canadians calling Lindbergh names as Russians, Germans, British, and French had done before.

THIS TALK OF INVASION

Well, the German air force, in Poland and Norway, and in the last 11 days on the western front, has borne out Lindbergh's long hunch that it was a most efficient air force. So we surmise that people will listen somewhat more attentively to Lindbergh's ideas from now on than they have done for some time past.

In Sunday night's speech, he put forth several ideas:

"The power of aviation has been greatly underrated in the past. Now, we must be careful not to overrate this power in the excitement of reaction * * *.

"Aviation is for us an asset. It adds to our national safety. With a firm and clear-cut policy, we can build an air defense for America that will stand above these shifting sands of war * * *.

"But * * * without a strong policy of defense, we will not even know what types of planes to build. The speed and range of our fighting planes must depend on the bases available for their use. If we are to defend the United States alone, then we must construct numerous air bases along the Mexican and Canadian borders. Such a plan would require large numbers of small bombers and pursuit planes, and eventually it would leave us as vulnerable to air attack as the nations of Europe are today.

"On the other hand, if we are to defend the entire Western Hemisphere, we need long-range bombers capable of attacking a hostile fleet a thousand miles or more at sea. * * *

"Let us not be confused by this talk of invasion by European aircraft. The air defense of America is as simple as the attack is difficult when the true facts are faced."

From this point Colonel Lindbergh went into a repetition of his previous pleas for absolute United States isolation from the eternal wars of Europe. This part of the speech was obviously pointed at the Roosevelt administration, which Lindbergh seems to suspect of interventionism.

That is a matter of opinion, and of evidence piled up from day to day—and it is a matter which may come to a show-down at the polls next November.

The practical part of Lindbergh's speech struck us as practical, indeed, and very reassuring in these days when some people's imaginations are already seeing the "blitzkrieg" bombers dealing death and destruction here.

We think Lindbergh would be a valuable man on any Government board of air-defense planning and strategy.

Refunding Taxes on Forced Patent Lands (H. R. 952)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the purpose and the history of H. R. 952, which the House passed yesterday by unanimous consent.

This bill, if now passed by the Senate and then signed by the President, will open the way to correct what the Secretary of the Interior has said was—

An unfortunate situation growing out of an erroneous interpretation by this Department of the provisions of the act of May 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 182)—Report on H. R. 6393, May 17, 1938.

That error, Mr. Speaker, was the issuing of patents between 1917 and 1920 to Indians in the violation of a trust period, the issuing of fee patents to trust Indians without their application or consent. When issued, the patents naturally were placed on record in the several counties and the lands were thereupon assessed and taxes collected or the lands were taken for nonpayment.

Within recent years, the Federal courts have consistently held that the issuing of these patents without the consent or application of the allottee was illegal and the courts have awarded judgments against the counties for the taxes collected.

The levy and collection of taxes was a duty imposed upon the local units of Government by statutory law and the bonds of their officers. The error was not their error. The error was the mistake of the United States Department of the Interior, as the Secretary agreed in the letter mentioned, in which he also said:

Clearly the local authorities were not at fault for taxing such land while patents in fee were outstanding.

The first legislative approach to a solution of this problem was the introduction in the Seventy-fourth Congress of bills to authorize the appropriation of $100,000 for an examination of the records in counties west of the Mississippi River to determine the status of each forced patent, to see whether the allottees had confirmed the patent by direct approval or by selling the land.

When I came to the Seventy-fifth Congress, I reintroduced the bill at the request of many unpaid Indians and many counties hard pressed to refund the taxes collected. I urged the matter before the Indian Affairs Committee and they reported the bill favorably. On the floor, however, it met the objection that the amount for the investigation was more than the refunding of the taxes should cost.

So I tried a different approach. I obtained a list of all the judgments issued against counties in my State of South Dakota and introduced a private relief bill (H. R. 6393, 75th Cong.) to reimburse them so that they could pay the judgments. That bill went to the general Claims Committee. In his report to that bill, the Secretary of the Interior, admitted the justice of the claims, but suggested that a bill should be drawn so as to permit refunding the taxes to Indians or counties in all States affected. I introduced such a bill (H. R. 10644) but it was then too late to get action in that session.

Consequently, I reintroduced the third bill as H. R. 952 at the opening of the Seventy-sixth Congress. The Committee on Indian Affairs gave a careful hearing and reported it favorably, following reports from the Department of the Interior, the General Accounting Office, and the Attorney General, from all of whom we asked for reports in order to meet possible objections on the floor of the House.

The Secretary of the Interior had said that—

The $75,000 authorized to be appropriated by the bill as amended would be sufficient to take care of all those cases in which judgments have been rendered and those now pending in the courts. It would also leave a balance to reimburse those Indians whose patents in fee may be canceled in future years.

As is well known, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] who is chairman of the committee on expenditures for executive departments, makes it a rule to object and strike from the consent calendar those bills dealing with Indian matters unless the bills are approved by the Attorney General. We discussed this matter with the Attorney General's office.

In a report dated May 9, 1939, the Attorney General suggested that no action be taken on the bill until the Supreme Court had heard and decided the case of the Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County, Kans. against United States. He stated, however:

The reimbursement proposed by H. R. 952 merely covers the amounts actually paid by the Indians as taxes and does not include interest thereon. If the Supreme Court should hold in the Jackson County case that the court below erred in awarding interest, the bill in its present form would appear to be unobjectionable.

Although the Department of the Interior suggested that this decision need not delay passage of the bill, objections were made to passing the bill in the 1939 sessions, pending the decision by the Supreme Court. On December 18, 1939, the Court, through Justice Frankfurter, handed down its decision holding that the Kansas court had erred in awarding interest, and saying in part:

Jackson County in all innocence acted in reliance on a fee patent given under the hand of the President of the United States. Even after Congress in 1927 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to cancel such a patent, it was not until 1935 that a cancelation was made. Here is a long unexcused delay in the assertion of a right for which Jackson County should not be penalized. By virtue of the most authoritative semblance of legitimacy under national law, the land of M-Ko-Quah-Wah a and the lands of other Indians had become a part of the economy of Jackson County. For 8 years after Congress had directed attention to the problem, those specifically entrusted with the intricacies of Indian law did not call Jackson County's action into question. Whatever may be her unfortunate duty to restore the taxes which she had every practical justification for collecting at the time, no claim of fairness calls upon her also to pay interest for the use of money which she could not have known was not properly hers. * * * We think as to interest here, the loss should remain where it has fallen.

On the basis of that decision, it was clear that H. R. 952 was properly drawn. By personal conference and letter, in January I placed the matter before the unofficial objectors on both sides of the aisle and before the gentleman from Missouri and others who had blocked passage of the bill, calling to their attention the fact that under this decision the bill was not objectionable to the Attorney General.

Before all of the objectors could be identified, however, and the facts explained, the bill had been put over from one consent calendar to another four times. On one occasion three objections to consideration were made and the bill was temporarily stricken from the calendar. I am glad to say, however, that those objectors subsequently withdrew their objections and the bill was restored to the calendar, and that March 18, with every objector satisfied, the bill was passed by unanimous consent.

I have made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, in order that the RECORD may show the history of the legislation, its intent and purpose, its essential equity, and to make clear why it was drawn in this form. With this background, I sincerely trust that it may now be approved in the Senate soon and then be approved by the President, in order that the next session of the Congress may consider appropriations under its authorization to do long delayed justice to Indians and counties concerned. (H. R. 952 was passed by the Senate May 28, 1940.)

Sixth Annual Joint Convention of the National Association of Postmasters, New York State Chapter, and the National Association of Postal Supervisors, New York State Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 23, 24, and 25, the Sixth Annual Joint Convention of the National Association of Postmasters, New

York State Chapter, and the National Association of Postal Supervisors, New York State Branch, was held in Buffalo, N. Y. Conventions of this type which bring together the men and women of the United States Postal Service in an exchange of ideas and a thorough discussion of their procedure and problems means much to the United States Postal Service. On Friday, May 24, a luncheon was held at which local businessmen were given the opportunity to question postal officials. This bringing together of business and governmental departments also is worth while. This convention was brought to a final conclusion by a banquet and dance at the Buffalo Consistory. It was my privilege and pleasure to be present at this climaxing event of the above-mentioned fine convention, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the address given that evening by United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD:

Coming here directly from Washington, I cannot avoid bringing with me some of the tense spirit that prevails in the Nation's Capital. These have been almost unprecedentedly busy legislative days since the outbreak of "total war" in Europe. Unhappily large-scale measures of national defense and necessary adjustments in existing statutes have been requested and are required in this present accelerated program of preparedness. And I am happy to report that the Senate passed the military and naval expansion program of the President by the votes of 74 to 0 and 76 to 0.

There is no hysteria in the legislative Chambers at the Capitol, but there is a grim realization that, like the advocates of representative government generally throughout the world, we are on the defensive today. There is a unanimous recognition that lip-service to the national defense is not enough—concrete, constructive, and, above all, speedy contributions to the armed protection of the Republic are required. All parties, all advocates, whether listed as pacifist, isolationist, preparedist, united to set an example worthy of emulation.

We have already, during the past few years, added materially to our defenses. Now we must continue that program at an accelerated rate.

Again, I say there is tension but not hysteria at Washington. If I brought you no other report, it would be this: The Nation is in good hands. The leadership of the United States in this day of emergency commands the universal confidence of all groups in our land. Our President enjoys the confidence of the great mass of our people—of the people not only within the confines of territorial United States but of all the Americas. From the southernmost tip of South America to the Arctic expanses in the northernmost area of this hemisphere there is confidence in the strength and the wisdom and the program of protection and self-defense of our national leadership. Yes; America is in capable hands, and no other single factor contributes more to our strength and unity and stability in this crisis.

As the President of the United States, leader of all our people, has emphasized repeatedly, and most particularly in his recent national-defense declaration, "Peace, not war" is the aim of this great brotherhood of the Americas. We are building for peace, we are building for unity, we are building for self-defense. We are in nowise interested in conquests, in aggression, or in any of the pursuits of force. We are, on the other hand, militantly dedicated to a policy of neighborliness.

Most of us listened to the President's national-defense message to the Congress. It was a serious message, dealing with the crisis of today. It was a vitally important and urgent message—one that could no longer be postponed in view of the holocaust abroad. The President emphasized that this is a day in which the weak, the unprepared, and the unwarlike nations of the world are having their illusions of peace, their dreams of neutrality shattered. He voiced a truth which is now evident to all of our peace-loving citizens. He said that aggression, invasion, and annihilation are the harvests reaped by unprepared, undefended, and disunited nations. It must not happen here.

The fate which overtook China, Austria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg bears out the accuracy of that assertion.

This does not mean that your legislators at Washington are convinced that the fate of the hapless republics which I have enumerated is the inevitable for the United States. But, it does mean that we must prepare for the unpredictable, the unannounced, and the unexpected. We are the last bulwark of freedom left in the world that is not engaged in a titanic struggle to preserve its way of life. There is not a capital in the whole of continental Europe that enjoys the peace that prevails at Washington. It is our responsibility to hold fast and firm to the blessings which we enjoy. As we insure our property, our homes, our communities by adequate police and fire protection, so, too, will we protect our shores from the invasion that precedes destruction with the best navy on earth.

There is no longer room for doubt that our progress along the pathway of peace requires vast additions to our military defenses. We are going immediately to work in providing those necessary weapons of defense. We have the wealth, the resources, and the industrial ability to produce the material requirements that are necessary for our adequate national protection.

But, I say to you that our most serious enemy will not be the tanks, deadly gases, the flame throwers, nor the airplane-bomber, nor any of the other terrifying implements of modern war. If we are made vulnerable to assault, it will be because we have failed to strengthen, to solidify, and to adequately provide the defenses of loyalty, of tolerance, of neighborliness, and of good will among our own people.

Here in America we must continue to educate ourselves in the strength and unity which comes from living side by side in peace and understanding. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that there are forces operating today, in this country, to arouse animosities among our people.

There are sworn enemies of our free system of Government at work in our midst. Let us abolish those subversive forces. Let us erase them from our land. Let us clean our body politic of corrosive elements which impede and thwart the processes of representative government. Let us be good neighbors in every sense of the word. In a nation of good neighbors we require unity, loyalty, and patriotic devotion.

The children of England, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, and other lands who settled this Nation, and who served in its wars, are devoted to its democratic ideals.

Regardless of racial ancestry, we must all stand shoulder to shoulder in a united aim to defend the principles of equal justice for both the big and the small, for the weak and the strong. We must not be pro-ally, pro-British, pro-German, or pro-anything but pro-American in this crisis.

If such is our faith, it follows that we must not assume the role of a complacent, self-satisfied citizen, lulled into the inertia of slumbering half interest.

We dare not leave the arena of human rights to the demagogue, to the subversive critic, or to the advocate of bigotry or intolerance, thinking him to be a harmless nuisance. Not if our eyes, ears, and minds are alert to the grim realities of today; not if we remember that democracy is not saved by law and by implements of war alone. But by those who will speak for it, live for it, and, if need be, defend it against attacks from within and from without.

Our security and our stability, as a representative government, requires effectiveness in national leadership and unity among all of our people. We must not turn our backs to the domestic problems which confront the Nation, nor must be blind ourselves to what could happen in the future at the hands of those who are unfriendly to our American way of life.

As I stated before, I am not warning against the inevitable but, rather, I am advocating that we be prepared in every manner against the unpredictable. We know not what lies ahead. There is uncertainty in the minds and hearts of all free people. That apprehension grows day by day as the ruthless march of totalitarian leadership continues. Our continent must be made safe from attack. Our people must be made secure in their homes.

As we build strong and invulnerable our military lines of defense, let us also be sure that we are not permitting any "Trojan horse" or "fifth columns" to develop under the advantages and liberties of our happy system.

We must say to our subversive critics that "if my Government means anything to me, it means that its philosophy is broad enough to protect every man in his right of political opinion, every man in his liberty of speech, and every man in his freedom of religious worship."

But we must insist that if our democracy is to work, then the springs of liberty must not be polluted with the poison of hate, covered with the slime of proscription, or drugged with the spirit of intolerance.

We may proudly declare that here in America we oppose regimentation; we respect our democratic heritage; and we reject prejudice and persecution as panaceas to be fed to hungry and desperate men.

I exhort you therefore to persevere with all your might and main in the defense of American institutions and in the defense of democracy as we know and enjoy it. Culture, religion, and civilization depend upon your perseverance.

You must join with all the fervor and enthusiasm of genuine patriots to forge new instruments and new methods to combat the blindness of the partisan, the passion of the jingoist, the vengeance of the bigot.

Through religion, education, logic, understanding, and fraternalism increased unity, loyalty, and neighborliness will be achieved.

Here we live in peace and brotherhood with all our neighbors. All races, creeds, and colors can find advantage and opportunity, equality and independence, dignity and happiness, within our shores. A preservation of those rights and privileges has been made possible under our free system of government. Political, social, and religious difficulties abroad should make us ever more deeply appreciative of the liberties that are ours to enjoy.

Let us say again and again that we believe in democracy. Let us repeat for all the world to hear that we believe in defending the right of man to follow the dictates of his own conscience. Let us, by action and accomplishment, demonstrate, with unmistakable emphasis, that we subscribe to a philosophy which permits and encourages freedom of rational personal and public independence in thought and action.

I ask you to live and breathe the genuine spirit of democracy. I ask you to typify, by work and deed, the embodiment of true American principles. I ask you never to forget that American democracy stands for the enthronement of law and equity, the preservation of free government, the right to individual liberty, the education of

the poor and unfortunate, the establishment of free institutions, the protection of life and property. I ask you to constantly sow the healthful seed of good loyal and patriotic citizenship. With diligence, with ample safeguards, and with a fundamental faith in our doctrine of representative government, we will be able to "nip in the bud" any sporadic fly-by-night movement which may arise to plague, to threaten, or to undermine our America.

The plea I make tonight is a plea for loyalty to the democratic system on the part of all of our people. I cannot too fervently appeal for solidification of internal loyalty which will strike to the very heart and banish from this fortunate land those who are unfriendly to the American way—those who came here with malice in their hearts or sabotage in their minds.

After all, this is our America. This is our way of life. This is all we have striven for, and fought for, and defended through a century and a half of a democratic development. We must say to the enemy of our system that we will never permit dissipation from within of the strength which upholds and supports the structure of our Republic.

Loyalty, devotion to principle, and a firmness of opposition to the enemies in our midst is the way to perpetuate, against all odds, the American way of life. To uphold and to support the leadership of the Nation, regardless of partisan considerations, is the order of the day. Loyalty to American principles, faith in the democratic system, supported by an invulnerable defense will keep America safe and will guarantee to our people the peaceful pursuit of happiness and opportunity which we, above all else, desire.

Eighteen Months' Operation of Wage and Hour Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY IRVING DILLIARD, OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article relative to the Wage and Hour Act written by Mr. Irving Dilliard, of the editorial staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, appearing in that paper under date of Sunday, May 12. The article follows:

UNITED STATES WAGE AND HOUR LAW: SURVEY OF 18 MONTHS OF OPERATION—WORKING WITH GOOD RESULTS, BUT NOT SO WELL AS IT MIGHT BE—DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ON BENEFITS AND DISADVANTAGES RANGE FROM "SWELL FOR ME AND MY FAMILY" TO "WORST OF DAMN-FOOL EXPERIMENTS"—BUT INVESTIGATION IN WASHINGTON AND IN SOUTH INDICATES NEW STATUTE IS ENTITLED TO SUPPORT, APPRECIATION, AND UNDERSTANDING

(By Irving Dilliard)

The Wage and Hour Act is working. It is not working as well as it might or as well as it should. But it is working.

The Wage and Hour Act has brought benefits to the country. It has not brought as many benefits as it is capable of and it has not yet helped nearly all those for whom it was intended. But it has significant social and economic gains to its credit.

On the basis of performance during the 18 months of its life, the law and its administrators are entitled to the support of employers, the appreciation of employees, and the sympathetic understanding of the public.

These are fair conclusions, in the writer's opinion, on the experience thus far with the National Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938—frequently referred to as the Magna Carta of marginal workers in America, certainly a legislative embodiment of the New Deal's humanitarian philosophy.

They are conclusions arrived at after a trip to Washington to talk with the law's administrators and Members of Congress who have been debating changes in it—and back through the South to inquire into the actual operation of the law in the section of the country which, so it was said by many of the law's opponents 2 years ago, would be seriously disadvantaged by application of minimum-wage and maximum-hours standards.

NOT EVERY ONE WILL AGREE; SHARP DISSENTERS IN SOUTH

They are not conclusions with which everyone will agree. The field trip through the South—the course traversed Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky—produced radically differing opinions:

"The best thing that ever happened to the South."

"It's swell for me and my family."

"A fine ideal being defeated by lax administration."

"I'm not as well off as before."

"The wrong way to do the right thing."

"It gives the decent employer protection against the chiseler."

"The worst of the damn-fool experiments of the Roosevelt crowd."

So the reactions run from one extreme to the other. But, taking them all together, shaking them up and settling them down, the three conclusions stand, this investigator is convinced. The Wage and Hour Act is working, it is doing good, and it is entitled to support.

This, of course, is not to say that the law is perfect, that changes are not needed, that the administration should not be improved. Changes are needed—and it is most unfortunate that the recent debate should have produced a parliamentary situation which virtually precludes perfecting amendments at the present session.

But thanks to the dog-in-the-manger strategy of the Representative from North Carolina's vegetable raising and canning coastal plain, the central issue became whether emasculatory amendments exempting some 2,000,000 agricultural canners and other processors of food products should be adopted. With this to the fore, the needed relaxation of the hours' provisions for workers paid well above or several times the minimum, and other desirable changes, went by the board, as the opposing sides loaded down each other's bills with amendments which neither side could accept.

And so the law stands. Its main provisions are simply enough stated. From October 24, 1938, to October 24, 1939, the least that an employer could legally pay a worker in an industry in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce was 25 cents an hour. And 44 hours was the maximum which the employer could legally work that employee without paying for overtime at the rate of time and a half.

SCHEDULE OF PERIODIC CHANGES, WAGE RISES WITH FEWER HOURS

Under the schedule of periodic changes which the law set up, the minimum-wage rate increased to 30 cents last October 24 and the workweek dropped to 42 hours. The minimum wage will rise to 40 cents an hour in 1945, but it may be increased above 30 cents before 1945 by industry committees working with the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division, as has already been done in several industries. Next October 24 the maximum workweek—again the workweek to be paid for at the employee's regular rate of pay—will be reduced to 40 hours.

As did the old N. R. A., some of whose other gains the Wage-Hour Act seeks to retain, the law prohibits outright child-labor products in interstate commerce.

The intention is that by the application of these standards workers will be protected from actual want through an irreducible though low minimum below which wages may not fall. It is intended at the same time to create additional opportunities for employment and to bring about a wider diffusion of mass buying power upon which industry itself is dependent.

The law casts its lot with no industry or section, other than by saying in effect that in the competition among communities for industries, substandard wages and excessively long hours of labor shall no longer be determining factors.

MORE THAN 100 INTERVIEWED IN WIDE RANGE OF INTERESTS

Such are the intentions. To find out how nearly they are being realized the writer talked to more than 100 persons about the operation of the law and its effects on industry, wage earners, and society in general. The variety of occupations and points of view represented is in itself interesting. Among the persons interviewed were:

Col. Philip B. Fleming, Wage-Hour Administrator; Maj. A. L. Fletcher, Assistant Administrator in charge of cooperation and inspection; Msgr. John A. Ryan, director of the social-action department of the National Catholic Welfare Council; Dr. Frank Porter Graham, president of the University of North Carolina; Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer; William Mitch, president, Alabama district, the United Mine Workers of America; Charles F. DeBardeleben, president of the Alabama Fuel & Iron Co.; Dr. Howard W. Odum, organizer of conferences and studies of southern social and economic problems; Miss Lucy Randolph Mason, C. I. O. public relations representative for the South; Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, Atlanta University sociologist and defender of Negro rights; Bernard Borah, southern director for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Those interviewed also included manufacturers and mill operators and representatives of banking, law, and newspaper publishing, who requested that their names not be identified with their views.

Among still others asked for their opinion were a high official in another administrative agency, a former important officer in the early days of the New Deal now in private law practice, chamber of commerce officers, wage earners, Pullman porters, and red caps. Red caps have lately been changed in several important terminals, including St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Washington, from a tip basis of pay to a regular weekly minimum wage of $12.60.

WHAT ARE THE COMPLAINTS? THEY ARE MANY AND VARIOUS

What are the complaints? They are numerous and they vary in nature with the outlook and interests of the complainer.

In western North Carolina a leading textile operator said that he and the manufacturers he knew had no objection to the establishment of minimum standards below which no one should have to live. His factory and the other factories with which he competed paid well above the minimum rates and did not work long hours. What he objected to was "the administration." He said that the Government worked "hand in glove" with labor

unions and looked on employers as "deadbeats and chiselers." His factory, he said, was not a "sweatshop" and he did not think Government representatives should treat it as if it were.

Another textile executive in the same North Carolina city said that the greatest difficulty was that an employer never could be sure that he was doing the right thing. He might ask an inspector. He might get an opinion from Washington. He might follow instructions to the letter and still be forced to defend himself against prosecution if some employee decided to bring suit against him for "failure to comply."

One industrialist said the inspectors are not content with confining themselves to pay roll and time books, but insist on seeing profit and loss statements and other confidential records. He said that they apparently have been instructed to keep their eyes open for other Federal and State law violation, so that they are not merely wage-hour law inspectors but snoopers into every corner of a business. This, he said, antagonized businessmen who should be treated so as to induce their cooperation.

"WE'RE HEADED STRAIGHT FOR HELL"

"Uncle Charlie" DeBardeleben, as Birmingham knows the president of the Alabama Fuel and Iron Co., placed no restrictions on quoting his views. "If this wage-hour nonsense and all the other monkey business of the New Deal keeps up, we're headed for hell straight as a martin to his gourd," he said, with obvious feeling

Complaining that the wage differentials between the North and the South were being wiped out, he said that the South had been "a bunch of ninnies" to be "taken in by the plotters and planners of the New Deal," whose purposes he said were "to break up industry, fritter away the taxpayers' money, and buy votes."

The suggestion that the wage-hour law might have increased the income of marginal workers and so enlarged the purchasing power brought an explosive denial that the law had had any good effects. The hour limitation had put the worker in chains, he said.

The issue, however, is larger than the wage-hour law in the eyes of the man who placed machine guns in concrete blockhouses to keep C. I. O. organizers from his coal mines. "It is time to look things squarely in the face," he said. "What took place in Norway can take place here. The C. I. O. has more Communist organizers in Alabama than there are in the Russian Government. This New Deal has been one damnable monumental mess."

OBJECTION TO DISCRETIONARY POWER

Another Birmingham industrialist objected to the discretionary powers of the Wage and Hour Administrator. He said it was wrong in principle that any bureau should make rules which could not be taken to the courts for review. He also declared his opposition to applying the maximum-hours provisions to salaried employees, many of whom, he said, were embarrassed and annoyed by the requirement of time-and-a-half to work beyond the legal maximum.

An outstanding newspaper executive said that application of hours provisions to professional workers, such as editorial writers, was creating a problem for employers who by no stretch of the imagination were proper subjects for minimum-wage legislation. Only the beginning office boys were paid less than the weekly minimum in his plant, he said, and yet the maximum-hours provisions appeared to apply to everyone in the building. He said he was heartily in favor of an irreducible minimum wage for workers in the poorly paid industries, and accordingly thought it unwise that energies which should be expended to extend the benefits of the law to them were being diverted into keeping track of the hours worked by salaried persons well above the minimum levels.

HOSIERY, TEXTILE, OTHER INDUSTRIES

In the hosiery, textile, millinery, shoe, knitted underwear, and knitted outerwear industries, for example, industry committees have already raised minimum wages above the 30-cent minimum now in force. Some critics of the law say that the administration has allowed itself to be used by organized labor for raising wages in certain industries, while thousands and thousands of workers, in serious need of the law's helping hand have not yet been reached by enforcement.

Organized labor finds fault with the law and its administration but the fault is of another kind. Here the complaints are that the law doesn't go far enough and that what there is of it isn't being rigidly enough enforced. Labor leaders say there is widespread evasion and describe in detail ruses and devices which they say employers practice for getting around the act.

One simple and common way of evading the law, they say, is to have the workers punch out at the time required for apparent compliance and then to allow them to go on working 2 to 5 more hours to increase their output and bring down their pay. Girls on piece work in some dress factories, for example, are told, according to this explanation, that they will be fired if their work does not come up to 30 cents an hour. They are not told to stay on and work, but the hints which the forelady passes along leads them to come back to their sewing tables after they have punched out for the day.

Many factories have short rest periods in the morning and afternoon, experience having shown that increased efficiency more than makes up for the time which goes into the rest interval. Piece workers who need extra time to produce enough work to equal the minimum wage frequently work through the rest period, the C. I. O. man said. It is also common, he said, for slower workers to cut their lunch time short in order to meet the requirements which the factory manager has let be known must be met as a condition to employment.

C. I. O. MAN CITES EVIDENCE

As evidence of a tendency of minimum-wage legislation, at least in its early stages, to level wages, a C. I. O. leader cited the case of a Virginia dress-shirt factory which posted a notice to the effect that those workers who had not been receiving the legal minimum would be raised and that those who had been getting more than the minimum would be reduced accordingly. This was a clear instance of violation. Experience, so the labor leader said, has taught chiseling employers not to be so bold as to post such notices on their bulletin boards which inspectors and labor representatives may see.

Another labor leader said that although enforcement of the law had meant restitution to many employees of wages illegally withheld from them, restitution in itself did not guarantee the worker's right to and use of the money. He told of a South Carolina print-cloth cotton-mill operator—South Carolina produces 95 percent of the country's print cloth—who, so he said, persuaded two young employees to take their $100 restitution checks to a nearby store, cash them, and turn the money back in at the mill office.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad probably provides the classic story of evasion. In order to avoid paying five track maintenance men the legal minimum wage, the railroad deducted from their wages for water pumps that did not pump, for sanitary facilities that did not exist, for ice in the drinking water used by the men while at work, for transportation on railroad motor cars from section headquarters to the place on the tracks where they were to work, for discarded ties used as fuel, and for quarters in abandoned cars. One man was assigned to quarters in and charged rent for a forsaken depot which was used by the railroad as a fertilizer storage warehouse.

UNITED STATES JUDGE MEEKINS' VIEW

Federal Judge Isaac M. Meekins, of North Carolina, who as a Raleigh newspaper reporter put it, "is not known as any great liberal," called these deductions exactly what they were—"devices" to avoid having to increase the wages of the section hands to the amount required by the law. In addition to awarding the employees a total of $1,079 in withheld wages, an equal amount of liquidated damages and attorneys' fees, Judge Meekins upheld the constitutionality of the law under the interstate-commerce clause.

Several labor leaders objected to what they called a tendency to compromise cases of violation. Their more or less uniform complaint was that after violation is found the Wage and Hour Division is "content" to obtain wage restitution when it should go on to prosecute.

One of those who protested against this kind of enforcement said that a shirt company in South Carolina had set aside a $1,000 fund as part of its operating plan. If it was caught it would make restitution to its workers out of the fund. If it escaped it would be so much ahead. Unless prosecutions become the order of the day for willful violators, an increasing number of chiselers, so this labor leader phrased it, would run the risk of being caught, confident that the penalty would be no more than restitution of withheld wages—no penalty at all.

WORKERS IN GREATEST NEED

Pointing out that the workers who stood in greatest need of minimum-wage protection were the unorganized workers in the lumber, furniture, textile, clothing, shirt, shoe, cottonseed oil, and fertilizer industries, one C. I. O. representative said that the law would probably prove of some assistance in the unionization of workers. Experience under the law would teach them, he said, that they were entitled to more than they were receiving and thus open their eyes to the fact that only through collective bargaining could they expect to improve their working condition to standards above mere subsistence.

In labor circles it was said repeatedly that the administration of the law, although well-intentioned, was not vigorous enough; that it needed field men under the administrators more zealous for enforcement than the administrators themselves. In more than one place there were reports of dissension in the local wage-hour office, with frequent changes in the staff and other signs that the organization was far from perfected.

LARGELY AN EDUCATIONAL JOB

Wage and Hour Division heads in the Department of Labor—where a Jo Davidson sculpture of "Mother" Jones, fiery leader of striking miners, greets the caller—know about all these complaints, all these shortcomings, about the inadequacy of the inspection, about evasion.

Col. Philip B. Fleming, the administrator, told the writer in a soft, mild voice with overtones of firmness, that the job of the Wage and Hour Division was still largely educational. An Army engineer in charge of river work at St. Paul at the time of his detail as administrator, he explained the slow work of extending the protections of a great social reform such as national minimum-wage legislation much as he might have described the construction of a great waterways project.

Obviously pleased with various court rulings sustaining the constitutionality of the law and especially with that of three judges of the New Orleans Court of Appeals, Colonel Fleming promised that greatly improved enforcement would come as more and more inspectors were trained and placed in the field. He said that there would be 800 inspectors by the end of June, and that this number would be increased as rapidly as possible toward a staff of 2,000, the number estimated as required to provide periodic check-up on the 250,000 employers of the 12,000,000 workers now under the law.

A "fairly large" number of complaints of violation had come from Missouri and Illinois, Colonel Fleming said, explaining, however,

that heaviest trouble was on the Atlantic seaboard. One of the best evidences of widespread support for the law in industry, he said, was the fact that a surprisingly large number of complaints against evasion came from complying businessmen who desired to have their competitors brought into line.

GREATLY SATISFYING WORK

It was a greatly satisfying work he was in, Colonel Fleming said—satisfying because of the obvious benefits the law was bringing to marginal workers for whom little or nothing has ever been done before. Employers of such labor are now making restitution of an accumulation of $6,000,000 in wages which were withheld until the Wage and Hour Division investigated complaints and obtained agreements for payment.

Only persons who read the letters which day laborers and mill hands and clerks and many other kinds of workers sit down and write to their Government could know how much a few cents more an hour and a reasonable working day means to them, Colonel Fleming said. Many persons appear to be living for the first time, he said.

Colonel Fleming had no apologies to make for the increase of minimum wages in certain industries through the industry committees. These committees are provided for by the law and while it is true, he said, that some of them have already raised industry wages to the 1945 minimum level, it has been done with approval of the industries concerned.

It is further true, the Administrator said, that some industries have reached the 1940 minimum before inspectors have reached many small factories in remoter places. But there was no reason, he said, why industries which were ready to make use of the industry committee system should wait on the enlargement of the inspection force and compliance by marginal producers. In any case, wage scales which anticipate the 1945 minimum in many factories will show backward employers why compliance with the present minimum is reasonable and proper.

ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

Assistant Administrator A. L. Fletcher, in charge of inspection and compliance, is no novice at labor-law enforcement. He was for many years an elected commissioner of labor in North Carolina, where he persuaded the legislature to pass some of the best labor legislation in the country. Even labor leaders who now say that he is not as vigorous an enforcer as he should be pay tribute to Major Fletcher's achievements in North Carolina.

His plan of enforcement for the country as a whole will be the same as in North Carolina, Major Fletcher said. "In North Carolina we kept everlasting at it. Every violator knew that we would get to him. Maybe not today, maybe not this week, or this month, but eventually. We intend to pursue exactly the same policy in the enforcement of the Wage and Hour Act. Whoever the violator may be, he can write it down in his little book that the Wage and Hour Division is going to get him eventually, and when that fact soaks in there just aren't going to be many violators."

Major Fletcher is the first to say that inspection is as yet inadequate. But there are reasons for that. One is the fact that the inspectors are being recruited under civil service—a much slower process than the overnight creation of a force through political selection. But if it is slower, it is also much better in that the inspectors are of higher quality and not beholden to political influence for their posts.

COMPLAINTS FROM THE FIELD

Although he makes allowance for the fact that employers are apt to become resentful when inspectors discover violations, Major Fletcher does not overlook complaints from the field about the inspection force. He tells the inspectors that, so far as the country at large is concerned, they are the Wage and Hour Division; that each inspector should be "exceedingly careful, exceedingly considerate, and exceedingly patient—all without being soft, vacillating, or uncertain."

Major Fletcher is not one of the southerners who think there should be two sets of living standards—one standard for the workers of the North and a lower standard for the workers of the South. He told the writer that if the South would study its pay rolls it would see that it had been strangling a big part of its potential market for its cotton textiles, cigarettes, and lumber. The South has been producing so cheaply that its producers have not been able to buy the products of their own hands, he said.

DR. GRAHAM AND PANEL

The writer found a vigorous exponent of this view in Dr. Frank Porter Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, who assembled a panel of his social scientists, including a labor-problems expert, so they might be questioned on the law's working and influence.

That meeting, in the handsome old president's house at historic Chapel Hill, produced these faculty observations: That the wage-hour law is an excellent thing for the South in the long run; that it has already improved purchasing power enough that many merchants who were opposed now favor the law; that the South must, in order to obtain its proper place in the Nation, set living standards equal to those in the North; that the North owes it to the South to make further adjustments in the matter of freight rates, provide Federal aid for education, and otherwise assist the South in return for its acceptance of the Wage and Hour Act.

At Atlanta University, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, former editor of The Crisis, and a young economist on his staff, agreed that effects of the law on the Negro could not be told with any certainty as yet. Some Negroes have had their wages increased, they said, but others doubtless have, after the customary lot of Negroes, lost their places to white workers as a result of the higher scales.

When told that several redcaps had complained to the writer that they were not as well off on the minimum wage, Dr. DuBois said that it would take experience to show whether they made more on tips than on a regular weekly wage, constant the year around. But in any case the change to regular payment was a decided benefit, he said, these familiar figures at the Nation's depots now being "recognized as laborers and not as the objects of casual philanthropy."

SIGNIFICANT SPECTACLE

Something which the writer saw as he traveled by plane from Atlanta to Birmingham impressed him more than anything else on the trip. This was the contour plowing on the clayey hills of Georgia. Looking down he saw literally hundreds of fields plowed in circular furrows, in ovals, in letter S's, around and around, like giant fingerprints on red and yellow impression paper.

A few springs ago not one of these fields would have been plowed in contours. Every farmer plowed in straight lines, up over the hill and down, up, over, and down. And when the rains came the valuable topsoil washed away to the rivers and the sea. But they are learning better. Scientific farming is coming. The ideas which have been developed and proved at the agricultural colleges and the experiment stations are catching on at the farms.

As the contour fields gave way to the green of pine forests—forests now being systematically replanted—these words seemed to sound themselves above the loud hum of the airplane motor:

"The South has broken with age-old practice to check the erosion of its soil. It is now turning to higher wages and better living conditions to halt the erosion of its people."

Puerto Rico, the United States, and Pan America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN AT THE PAN AMERICAN CLUB

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert the speech delivered by myself on last Friday, May 24, 1940, before the Y's Pan American Club, at Washington, D. C.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad that we have had tonight among us the former Governor of Puerto Rico, Maj. Gen. Blanton Winship. I thank him for the kind remarks he has just made about me in his opening speech. Also, on behalf of my people, I extend my gratitude to Governor Winship for the generous remarks he made about Puerto Rico and his good wishes for my people. I may add that Governor Winship was one of the most popular governors we have had in Puerto Rico, since the times of Ponce de León. He understood our people and did the utmost for our welfare and happiness, and we always will remember Governor Winship as one of the best and most beloved governors we have ever had.

I certainly appreciate deeply the kind invitation tendered me by Miss Isabelle Lynne to address tonight this distinguished gathering of the Pan American Club, and I feel myself very gratified among my fellow Puerto Ricans and among good friends of my beloved land on the Caribbean Sea.

First, I must say that I heartily feel myself at home in continental United States; we can say as do all Puerto Ricans coming here, who see in this great country of the United States our own country, and look to its glorious flag as our own flag, as we hope that Puerto Rico will be forever an inseparable part of the United States, having been taught for over 40 years to love and cherish American institutions of government, of democracy, and freedom, and hoping that in the near future a new star will shine in the blue field of the Old Glory, vouching to the Nation, to the world, and to history, that a new sister State, Puerto Rico, has been admitted in the sisterhood of free commonwealths of the United States of America.

Before going ahead, let me pay a word of tribute to my illustrious predecessor in the office of Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, the late honorable Santiago Iglesias, who fought a life struggle in Puerto Rico for the enlightening, the freedom, and welfare of my island, and who, a Spaniard by birth, was elected and reelected as Congressman from Puerto Rico, and who passed to his grave with the full love, respect, and veneration of my people. I should today dedicate a thought to Santiago Iglesias. He, a Spaniard, elected by the free will of the people of Puerto Rico to Congress,

is of special significance in this pan-American night. His election to represent Puerto Rico in the United States may have been, in the mysterious commands of destiny, a foreword that Puerto Rico, being Spanish in its historical stock, language, religion, culture and traditions, was very properly represented in the United States by a Spaniard to voice our people and help blend our Spanish civilization with the civilization of the mainland United States, bringing with us our racial stock, peculiar traits, and folklore into the whole of the diversified peoples that form this great Republic, and at the same time recalling our sister countries of the West Indies, of Mexico, of Central and South America, that, in the great pan-American ideal, Puerto Rico, as a part of the United States, is a token of lasting understanding, friendship, good will, peace, and unity among all the countries of the three Americas.

I am tempted to speak to you tonight only about the wonderful beauty of my island, which for me is the loveliest spot in the whole world. But I am afraid I would be considered simply as a business agent of tourism. Because my island, where a perpetual spring enlivens nature, with a constant blue sky smiling to our smooth rolling plains and low, beautiful hills always clad in bright evergreen, with numerous meandering rivers and rivulets of crystal water singing through the forests, with pretty birds and many, many flowers, with so many lovely retreats in the hills, and with a coast line of golden sand opening to many natural and splendid bathing-water pools, and everywhere the most picturesque landscape, and all inhabited with a people of ancestral politeness and the most kind sense of hospitality, a land gifted with beatiful women and gentlemanly manhood, and where in all places can be felt the breath of culture and modern progress, is certainly a place to go and live and stay.

But, Isabelle Lynn suggested to me to speak to you something about what the United States is trying to accomplish in Puerto Rico, what Puerto Rico wants from the United States, and why it is important for the two of them to work closely together.

In looking to the present picture of Puerto Rico, we have to recall that civilization got a foothold in Puerto Rico before any place in the mainland of the United States. Before the Pilgrim Fathers settled in New England; before the Dutch founded New York; before Roger Williams established a living place in Rhode Island; before William Penn stepped into the woods of Pennsylvania; before Capt. John Smith established an English settlement in Virginia; before the Spanish set foot and built a town in Florida; before LaSalle and Marquette set fcot on the banks of the Mississippi River; before any white settlement was established in what came to be the United States of America, for years before, already a civilized settlement was firmly established in Puerto Rico, the first Christian church in America was built, and the forefathers of the present Puerto Rican people, with the blessings of God, had laid the lasting foundations of our insular society.

When the United States flag was first hoisted over our public buildings, Puerto Rico had lived four long centuries of civilized and Christian life, we were a cultured people, aware of all the movements of history and all endeavors of enlightenment and progress, we had had men and women distinguished in literature, in arts and sciences, in statesmanship, and in our roll of fame we had soldiers, heroes, saints, and leaders of wisdom and character.

Now, a visitor going to our island, studying our local history, mixing with our people, seeing our landscape and our old churches, our old highways and bridges, forts, castles, and palaces, and wandering through sundry places full of history and legend, can witness that a people is established there, of the best civilized stock, aware of progress, and a people that deserves a place under the sun with all the opportunities, rights, and privileges of a free commonwealth.

Notwithstanding everything which I have so far said to you this night, looking now to the other side of the picture, Puerto Rico is far from being a paradise, it has not been a heaven of happiness to our people. Physical conditions of our country, nature, and history, have made us a poor and weak people. We certainly have over there much unemployment and real misery, with its social and economic problems, which I will discuss on some other occasion. Politically, Puerto Rico, as a whole, always has been a colony or possession depending on some power in the family of nations.

Puerto Rico is a small island, covering less than 3,600 square miles, overcrowded with a population of nearly 2,000,000 inhabitants, with 2,000,000 acres of land but out of which only about 800,000 acres is cultivable cropland, and so with less than one-half acre in the per capita distribution of land. We have practically no minerals, no petroleum, no supply of raw materials for manufacturing and trade. Our country is mainly agricultural, and has practically only one important stable industry, not mentioning several minor agricultural crops and minor industries which do not amount to much. We can say that only growing of sugarcane and the industry of sugar is the principal basis of our economic structure. With such a picture of our economy, and with the rate of overpopulation, we face a chronic problem of unemployment and distress. All the endeavors to provide food, shelter, health, education, high standards of living, and the advantages of welfare and happiness to all our people, meet the difficulties of our peculiar conditions.

As a fact and as a matter of justice, we should admit that the United States has accomplished a great task in Puerto Rico. The United States Government and American people have accomplished very much in its endeavors to help my people and to foster well-being and progress in Puerto Rico.

Since the United States troops occupied Puerto Rico during the Spanish-American War and the new American regime was established, Puerto Rico has taken great strides in progress of all sorts. The Puerto Rican people were encouraged by the incoming Americans, our people felt that they were living a new dawn of freedom and prosperity, and the Puerto Ricans welcomed the American flag and adapted themselves rapidly to the new way of life.

During the last 42 years Puerto Rico has certainly taken long strides to progress under the American flag. It would take a long time to go on making its encouraging story and accomplishments. But let me give a general picture with some facts and figures.

During these years under the United States, a great battle has been successfully waged against endemic tropical diseases that formerly decimated our population, and under excellent plans of public health these diseases have been practically subdued, and the present deaths have been reduced to a very low rate. The appropriations in our insular budget for public health 42 years ago were really insignificant, about $50,000. Now more than 10 percent of all our public revenue is spent in public health, amounting yearly to about $2,000,000.

In 1898 we had only 152 miles of public roads. Now we have about 2,000 miles of highways and public roads.

In 1898 we had only about 400 public schools scattered in few places, with a total school attendance of scarcely 27,000 pupils, and the appropriations for public education amounted to about $180,000. Now we have many thousands of public schools, more than 2,000 school buildings, beacons of light, in all the cities, towns, villages, wards, mountains, countrysides, with about 7,000 teachers, a school attendance of about 300,000, and the yearly appropriations for public education is about $7,000,000, with more than a third of all Government taxes and revenue devoted yearly to public education and learning.

Our trade 42 years ago ranged to a total of about $35,000,000. Now we had had, during the last years, an annual average of nearly $200,000,000.

Our present main crop, sugar, yielded a production of about 60,000 tons in 1898. In 1939 we yielded a production of 851,000 tons, but in 1934 we yielded a production of 1,100,000 tons, and without the restrictions of the Federal control program imposed on us we could yield a production of 1,300,000 tons or more. The value of sugar exportation in 1898 was less than $2,000,000. In 1939 it was over $53,000,000.

These facts and figures will give a bird's-eye view of the prosperity and progress of Puerto Rico during the last 42 years, while my people have been living and led by the hand and endeavors of the United States.

On the political side, we have another picture, which I will lay before you as briefly as possible.

As refers to personal guaranties and protection under the law, we can proudly say that in no other country of the world are there more guaranties and assurances to the citizens for the enjoyment of the rights of man than in Puerto Rico, under the American flag. The Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States, which is embodied in our Organic Act, is certainly a true Magna Carta of individual rights and a charter of human rights, enjoyed in Puerto Rico by all for the protection of all citizens.

About the status and political pledges and hopes of our people as a whole, the story is interesting.

At the opening of the Spanish-American War in 1898, which brought the island of Puerto Rico under the regime and flag of the United States, Puerto Rico enjoyed a charter of government recently granted by the Kingdom of Spain. Under that charter it was really provided for a home-rule shape of government for Puerto Ricans. It provided for a legislative assembly or chamber of representatives elected by the people of Puerto Rico. From among the members of the popular chamber a cabinet was appointed which swayed all administrative functions in the executive branch of our government, responsible to the people, by its elected chamber of representatives. Under said charter of home rule, Puerto Rico was free to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries, could protect our agriculture and industries levying protective tariffs, and had full powers to approve all legislation concerning local insular matters. And, furthermore, the charter provided that no law could be passed by the Spanish Congress or Cortes concerning Puerto Rico without the approval of our insular chamber of representatives. Said charter provided for 16 representatives and 3 senators elected by Puerto Ricans to the Spanish Congress at Madrid.

Nevertheless, as I have stated, Puerto Ricans welcomed the new regime and hailed its flag. Great encouragement and hopes were given us by the United States. The history and accomplishments of the United States, its shape of government, its institutions of freedom and democracy, the American way of life, the breath of prosperity, power, and liberty of the United States really filled our hearts with cherished hopes, and the Puerto Ricans, all the Puerto Ricans felt happy about the new day that was dawning.

The general that commanded the American Army that occupied Puerto Rico during the Spanish-American War in 1898 addressed the people of Puerto Rico as follows:

"In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom. * * * They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. * * * We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been

oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government."

During the negotiations of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States, when the Spanish peace representatives questioned the American peace commissioners about the future political status of the Puerto Ricans, the Americans said the following:

"As regards the status and civil rights of the native inhabitants, these were reserved to Congress, which would enact laws for the Government of Territories ceded to the United States, this being but a confirmation of the right of the sovereign power to leave to the new government the establishment of these important relations. The Congress of a nation which never enacted a law oppressive or detrimental to the rights of residents within its dominions and whose laws guarantee the greatest liberty compatible with the conservation of property, surely can be trusted not to depart from its well-established practice in dealing with the inhabitants of these islands."

The Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President McKinley, in his first report concerning Puerto Rico in 1899, made the following statement:

"The people of the ceded islands have acquired a moral right to be treated by the United States in accordance with the underlying principles of justice and freedom which we have declared in our Constitution and which are the essential safeguards of every individual against the powers of government; not because these provisions were enacted for them but because they are essential limitations inherent to the existence of the American Government."

Mention of Puerto Rico in messages to Congress from Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and other Presidents were gratifying to Puerto Rico as far as these messages praised the Puerto Ricans as a people endowed with intelligence and ability, with a grasp of principles of sound government and progress, and expressing that Puerto Rico was going ahead very well under the new flag.

All the messages and public papers of the Presidents of the United States concerning the Philippine Islands, from the recommendations of President McKinley to the Philippine Commission in 1898 through messages of the following Presidents to Woodrow Wilson, expressed or implied the policy of the United States leading for independence to the Philippines. But, on the contrary, as regards Puerto Rico, no declaration or remark have ever been made by any President of the United States or American Governor of Puerto Rico, not even by any official spokesman of the United States, that merely implied the remote idea that in the policy toward Puerto Rico the status of independence was contemplated. On the contrary, all public papers of Presidents of the United States and messages and remarks of American Governors of Puerto Rico have said openly or impliedly that the policy of United States is to keep Puerto Rico under the flag of the United States.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his first annual message to Congress, on December 2, 1913, in the part concerning Puerto Rico, stated as follows:

"These are all matters of vital domestic concern, and besides them, outside the charmed circle of our own national life in which our affections command us, as well as our consciences, there stand out our obligations toward our Territories oversea. Here we are trustees. Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, are ours, indeed, but not ours to do what we please with. Such Territories, once regarded as mere possessions, are no longer to be selfishly exploited; they are part of the domain of public conscience and of serviceable enlightened statesmanship. We must administer them for the people who live in them and with the same sense of responsibility to them as toward our own people in our domestic affairs. No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Puerto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice and interest and affection * * *."

Moreover, President Woodrow Wilson in his third annual message to Congress, delivered on December 7, 1915, stated as follows:

"There is another matter which seems to me to be very intimately associated with the question of national safety and preparation for defense. That is our policy toward the Philippines and the people of Puerto Rico. Our treatment of them and their attitude toward us are manifestly of the first consequence in the development of our duties in the world and in getting a free hand to perform those duties. We must be free from every unnecessary burden or embarrassment; and there is no better way to be clear of embarrassment than to fulfill our promises and promote the interests of those dependent on us to the utmost. Bills for the alteration and reform of the government of the Philippines and for rendering fuller political justice to the people of Puerto Rico were submitted to the Sixty-third Congress. They will be submitted also to you. I need not particularize their details. You are, most of you, already familiar with them. But I do recommend them to your early adoption with the sincere conviction that there are few measures you could adopt which would more serviceably clear the way for the great policies by which we wish to make good, now and always, our right to lead in enterprise of peace and good will and economic and political freedom."

Upon said recommendations of President Wilson, Congress granted us our present Organic Act in 1917.

Our present Organic Act, no doubt, is much better than the former, approved in 1900. It is more just. But it really does not satisfy the people of Puerto Rico today. The legislative assembly provided in our present Organic Act is elected wholly by our people, but its measures are subject to the practically absolute veto of the Governor. The provision granting to the people of Puerto Rico a degree of self-government, through its elective insular senate, to which body powers are given to advise and consent upon the appointments of the Governor, has not been in practice always a guaranty of the degree of self-government for Puerto Ricans, as certainly was the thought of President Wilson when he recommended Congress and requested more justice to Puerto Rico. This greater degree of self-government, which clearly was the intent of Congress when our present Organic Act was granted, has not all the assurances that we deserve. Any time any Governor, who is appointed at the pleasure of the President of the United States, may arbitrarily, or ill-advisedly, or due to any momentary misunderstanding, disregard the Organic Act, which is our insular constitution, and make of it a simple scrap of paper, and we in such case are practically helpless under the law, having to depend only upon the spirit of justice of the President of the United States, who may or may not give relief to any disregard of our organic law.

We want under the American flag another shape of government, which may train us in a form of real self-government that we deserve.

That is what we now aim politically, and that is what we are requesting from the United States, hoping that all Americans, with sense of fairness and justice, will help us to achieve, hoping to keep forever our ties with the United States, until the happy and glorious day comes when we may feel ourselves, with due pride, enjoying full citizenship of the United States, with equal duties and rights and privileges as all Americans in continental United States, when Puerto Rico may attain its entrance as an equal State in the sisterhood of this great federation of free commonwealths of the great Republic of the United States. Now, meanwhile, we hope that it may be granted to us at once a true democratic shape of government in Puerto Rico, where we could enjoy self-government, and by which form of government we could train ourselves for ultimate statehood.

Meanwhile, also, we are conscious, and deeply concerned, about the United States, its role in the Western Hemisphere as the elder brother of American Republics. Moreover, during the troubled times the world is now living, in the threshold of perhaps the greatest war struggle of mankind, when democracy is in jeopardy by the inrush of dicatorship, accompanied with tremendous ruthless war power which is a menace to democracy and civilization, we feel that Puerto Rico, aware of its duty, with the ties of racial origin, language, religion, and culture with the Latin-American countries, should stand most loyally by the United States. And I can assure that Puerto Rico, token of friendship and unity of Pan America, a watchdog near the entrance of the Panama Canal, now on the forward line of defense as a possible Gibraltar of America, can be relied upon as a spot where the flag of the United States is floating upon a loyal people, conscious of the destiny of United States as the safeguard and champion of democracy and freedom for all the three Americas and for all the world.

The National Defense and the War in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

LETTER FROM RT. REV. CAMERON J. DAVIS, BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Rt. Rev. Cameron J. Davis, bishop of western New York:

THE DIOCESE OF WESTERN NEW YORK,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 25, 1940.

The Honorable WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The annual convention of the Diocese of Western New York adopted the following statement and resolution and directed me to send you a copy of them:

"While in principle we deplore and condemn war, it is apparent that in the present crisis human freedom itself is at stake. The forces now making war on the European democracies have shown unmistakable and unremitting hostility to the moral values which are fundamental in Christianity and all other traditional forms of religion.

"We hold that it is our duty to let the whole world know where we stand. We call upon all fellow Christians to join us in giving assistance to those who are struggling at untold cost to uphold

those principles upon which Christian civilization and all that we hold most sacred depend: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That—

"1. We commend the action of our Government in protesting against the ruthless invasion of neutral nations and the barbarous acts of oppression committed against multitudes of innocent people.

"2. We join in requesting the Congress to make immediate and adequate provision for national defense.

"3. We request that Congress take immediately such action as will enable the democracies of Europe to obtain in this country such supplies of materials, including credits and advances of money as may be necessary for the successful defense of those values and ideals sacred to Christian nations."

With assurances of my sincere respect, I am,

Faithfully yours,

CAMERON J. DAVIS,
Bishop of Western New York.

Guarding the Destinies of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT JEWISH VETERANS' MEMORIAL EXERCISES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over the radio on Thursday evening, May 23, 1940, on the occasion of the Jewish veterans' memorial exercises held in Washington on that date.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, my fellow Americans, these are dark days in the course of world affairs—black chapters in the pages of history. Momentous, but we hope and pray not perilous, days for our own land and our own peoples. It is an hour when courage, faithful citizenship, strong patriotism, and trust in the Almighty need to be joined in the bosom of every man, every mother, and every child living in America.

These are qualities which have been splendidly exemplified by those to whom my remarks are especially directed—the Jewish war veterans of the United States, who are tonight gathered in their lodges and other meeting places throughout the Nation, in annual memorial services to those of their religious faith who laid down their lives for their country.

I esteem the opportunity of addressing simultaneously these many gatherings, these thousands of listeners, through the instrumentality of this modern magic which we know as radio broadcasting. It is a distinct privilege.

Some may inquire, why a Jewish or any racial organization of American war veterans? Nearly all the racial and religious groups have organized similar veterans' organizations. This does not mean that you or they are not satisfied and proud to be American veterans and belong to the Nation-wide veteran organizations—but it does indicate a desire to take justifiable pride in the contribution which the several racial groups have made to our military service in the American wars. It also serves the purpose of letting the general public know the loyalty and willingness of the children of those who were born in other lands and who are now American citizens, to make the supreme sacrifice of death for the preservation of our American institutions. Let it also be said, it should banish forever the whispering propaganda of those who would question the loyalty of our foreign-born citizens and their descendants or seek to deny them the full enjoyment of the civil and religious liberties guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution.

Let us consider in some detail the glorious record of our Jewish veterans for it attests the loyalty, the patriotism, and the bravery of those of Jewish ancestry first in the war for our independence and thereafter in every war in which the United States has ever engaged.

In these days when a billion dollars is voted by Congress for national defense in a few hours, the reference in the history of our Revolutionary War to an advance by a Jewish patriot of $300,000 to help finance the Continental Army under George Washington may appear as a small matter. But it was a huge sum of money in those days and of inestimable aid to the Revolutionary cause.

The rolls of our fighting forces in the War of 1812 and the Mexican War both contain the names of men and officers of Jewish blood.

At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 the Jewish population of this country was estimated at about 200,000. Some 8,000 Jews are believed to have served in the Union and Confederate Armies. The veterans' rolls of the Spanish War in 1898 tell a similar story.

The total number of Jews in the service during the World War is conservatively estimated at from 200,000 to 225,000, which constituted more than 4 percent of the armed forces of the United States, whereas proportionately the Jews in this country formed about 3 percent of the total population.

No less than 1,100 citations for valor awarded to men of Jewish faith are on record. The Congressional Medal of Honor, of which only 78 have been awarded to date, was conferred on 3 Jewish soldiers. The Distinguished Service Cross is worn by at least 150 American Jews, the French Medaille Militaire by 4 American Jews, and the Croix de Guerre by 174 Jews of the A. E. F.

There is scarcely a racial or religious group in all America that cannot point with justifiable pride to an equally glorious record of service and sacrifice.

On August 20 of last year I was honored by being invited to deliver the dedicatory address on the occasion of the unveiling of a monument presented by the Jewish people of Newport, R. I., to the city of Newport and dedicated to the American heritage of religious liberty. Two hundred and eighty-one years previous to the date of this dedication a small band of Jewish families, after a long and hazardous sail from Brazil and the West Indies, entered the harbor of Newport and became part of the community which the followers of Roger Williams had founded.

They were poor, weary, discouraged, and disheartened. They brought with them, however, the spiritual values of the religion of their fathers. It was the only influence that sustained them and gave them hope and courage. Realizing the priceless value of the ancient religion of their forebears, they immediately turned their thoughts to God. And recognizing the great fundamental duty that man owes to the Almighty, namely, worship, gratitude, praise, and prayer, they built on this spot the first synagogue erected in America. From that day to this, persecuted and exiled Jews have continued to find an asylum in every seaport that encircles the territory of the United States of America.

Tonight I am honored by being invited to join with you in honoring the memory of the thousands of Jewish youths who have given their lives for our country.

Such an occasion as this is in vain unless we draw new inspiration and new courage. The memory of our war dead heroes should fill our hearts with patriotism, our minds with high resolve—the resolve that the land of the free for which they fought and died shall remain free; that the democracy established in this land under the Constitution of the United States shall be preserved; and that, in the immortal words of Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." And on this solemn occasion, contemplating the service and sacrifice of your dead comrades, the high resolve also that, God willing, all Americans of whatever race and creed shall dwell in peace with one another. I know of no more appropriate sentiment for us to take away from these memorial exercises than the sentiment inscribed in one of the public buildings here in the city of Washington. It is a sentiment that applies both to nations and to men: "God made us neighbors, let justice make us friends."

If every American Protestant, American Catholic, and American Jew could live this sentiment, they would not only give manifestation of sincerity of their religious faith, but we would indeed all really live in the true spirit of Americanism.

Between Americans there are naturally differences of doctrine, but there is one point on which all may well agree: That the religious-minded people of this country should be as one in opposing the efforts of those who would make this Nation a Godless Nation; promote intolerance, array class or religious or racial groups against each other. Let not petty jealousies, distractions, Old World enmities, long-continued feuds, most of them of Old World origin, longer permit men to look upon religion as impractical and out of date, or infringe upon the birthright of every American to enjoy equality of opportunity, civil and religious liberty, and social and political justice.

My fellow citizens, reflection upon the results of the World War, the war to end wars, reveals the fallacy of the faith that the laurel wreath of peace is a permanent part of the victor's crown.

Every American, regardless of race, creed, or partisan affiliation, is wholeheartedly in favor of peace and in favor of everything that will promote peace—peace for our own country and, if possible, peace for the world.

Every American desires and seeks national security and national safety and is in favor of a course of action designed to achieve security and safety and to keep our country immune from attack by war-maddened foreign aggressors.

It is a tragic circumstance, but undoubtedly true, that treaties and compacts and international pledges and agreements as an insurance against war have been shown to be of no avail. They are being honored only in their breach.

Furthermore, thanks to the inventions of modern science, warfare today is infinitely more destructive and more cruel and more terrifying than ever before.

With respect to our national defenses we are proceeding with all possible speed to strengthen them at every point, in order so far as is within our power to safeguard our land and to preserve our freedom and our heritage.

We must be on our guard also to preserve our priceless heritage from the insidious forces of destruction within our own land—the question of the defense and security of the democratic institutions of our own beloved country. Let us be alert to detect false propaganda and false dogma from subversive elements and groups that are attempting to undermine and destroy our democratic institutions; indeed, to annihilate the freedom for which our forefathers fought and died.

It is difficult to recognize them, therefore they are harder to defeat. It will demand constant surveillance and careful reconnoitering to recognize the foe when you meet him, but if guided by basic American ideals and principles for which your comrades died, you cannot fail.

You living veterans who 20 years ago left the military service must not think that your battles are over. You must make yourselves the inspired leaders in all the great movements for advancement and progress of our beloved country.

We seek not to suppress the right of any man or woman to think and speak freely. That is their God-given right as American citizens. But we must exert our utmost influence in thought, speech, and action against the apostles of foreign philosophies, alien to American ideals, who would, if they had their way, topple our most precious institutions about us and erect on the ruins the superstructure of destructive communistic or totalitarian government.

Guarding the destinies of America against the perils that threaten it from abroad and the sinister enemies that would undermine it at home is more than ever a cause to which you and I may well dedicate ourselves.

Appropriations for the Military Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

TABLE PREPARED BY THE FINANCE BRANCH OF THE ARMY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing the appropriations for the Military Establishment, showing the approximate break-down into major functions, for the fiscal years 1925 to 1940, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations for the Military Establishment, showing approximate break-down into major functions, fiscal years 1925–40, inclusive

Fiscal year	Recurring charges and improvement of plant: Pay, rations, clothing, repairs, research and development, planning, construction, training, operations, maneuvers, schools, etc.		Augmentation, modernization, and replacement of arms and equipment: This includes new aircraft, spare engines, spare parts, bombs, new tanks, antiaircraft and antitank guns, semiautomatic rifles, trucks, tractors, field guns, machine guns, ammunition, etc.		Total appropriation, Military Establishment
	Entire Army (less Air Corps)	Air Corps	Entire Army (less Air Corps)	Air Corps	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1925	$208,280,000	$35,398,000	$7,623,000	$4,699,000	$256,000,000
1926	202,795,000	38,950,000	12,244,000	7,011,000	261,000,000
1927	202,102,000	37,167,000	21,673,000	8,058,000	269,000,000
1928	224,268,000	42,917,000	4,219,000	10,596,000	282,000,000
1929	234,121,000	45,473,000	17,594,000	13,812,000	311,000,000
1930	249,829,000	53,975,000	11,502,000	16,694,000	332,000,000
1931	254,397,000	60,525,000	14,089,000	17,989,000	347,000,000
1932	244,031,000	60,603,000	14,163,000	16,203,000	335,000,000
1933	238,003,000	47,217,000	6,617,000	12,163,000	304,000,000
1934 [1]	222,625,000	45,472,000	590,000	8,313,000	277,000,000
	[2] 53,150,000	[2] 18,050,000	[2] 18,000,000	[2] 7,500,000	[2] 96,700,000
1935	205,219,000	54,375,000	8,373,000	13,033,000	281,000,000
	[2] 6,300,000	[2] 2,100,000	[2] 500,000		[2] 8,900,000
1936	243,538,000	57,284,000	24,121,000	30,057,000	355,000,000
1937	[2] $13,950,000	[2] $4,650,000			[2] $18,600,000
	258,834,000	65,951,000	$19,538,000	$43,677,000	388,000,000
	[2] 23,700,000	[2] 7,900,000			[2] 31,600,000
1938	282,780,000	75,303,000	15,626,000	43,291,000	417,000,000
	[2] 37,950,000	[2] 12,650,000			[2] 50,600,000
1939	294,010,000	81,431,000	30,151,000	54,408,000	460,000,000
	[2] 94,425,000	[2] 31,475,000			[2] 125,900,000
1940	380,038,000	222,533,000	118,033,000	202,396,000	923,000,000
	[2] 29,250,000	[2] 9,750,000			[2] 39,000,000
Total	3,944,870,000	1,024,574,000	326,156,000	502,400,000	5,798,000,000
	[2] 258,725,000	[2] 86,575,000	[2] 18,500,000	[2] 7,500,000	[2] 371,300,000
Grand total	4,203,595,000	1,111,149,000	344,656,000	509,900,000	6,169,300,000

The grand total in—

Column 2 is 68.1 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 3 is 18.0 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 4 is 5.6 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 5 is 8.36 percent of the grand total in column 6.

100.0 percent.

[1] A total of approximately $36,500,000 was impounded and refunded in 1934. This was taken more or less proportionately from all activities.
[2] Allotments from Federal emergency funds.

Arms Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Times-Herald of this date under the heading "Hoover Urges Industrialist Leader as Czar to Direct Arms Program in United States Preparedness."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of May 28, 1940]

HOOVER URGES INDUSTRIALIST LEADER AS CZAR TO DIRECT ARMS PROGRAM IN UNITED STATES PREPAREDNESS—SPEED AND ECONOMY ADVISED BY EX-PRESIDENT IN ADDRESS TO NATION

NEW YORK, May 28.—Appointment of a preparedness czar to direct the vast expansion of the United States' war establishment was urged last night by former President Herbert Hoover. He spoke over the N. B. C. blue network.

Hoover specified a seven-point program for real preparedness:

1. Creation of a munitions administration in Washington.

URGES INDUSTRIALIST

2. That it should have a single-head administration with assistant heads for labor, agriculture, and industry.

3. The administrator should be an industrialist, and not a politician.

4. He should be authorized to appoint a nonpartisan advisory board representing the Army, Navy, labor, transportation, manufacturing.

5. The whole of the purchasing and manufacturing for the Army and Navy from private industry should be done by the administrator.

6. A research organization should be created to constantly improve these products.

7. All appropriations for such work should be made to the administrator's organization.

CITES SPEED, ECONOMY

"This is a form of organization that will get speed and economy," Hoover declared. "Urgency, speed, and economy are not bureaucratic virtues."

He cited three lessons which had been learned from the World War, the first being that procuring in sufficient volume of munitions must be separated from Army and Navy establishments, adding that this was a job for "management and labor," a job that "requires that thousands of factories be coordinated to do their part."

The second lesson, he said, was that such operations could not be "controlled by boards, councils, or conferences.

"The whole genius of the American people was demonstrated over 150 years that when we come to executive action, including the office of the President of the United States, we must have single-headed responsibility.

"It is just as foolish to set up a board to conduct munitions business as it would be to set up a board to conduct the Presidency of the United States.

"The third lesson taught by experience is that we must get these vast expenditures of money out of politics—get them out of sectional pressures and out of group pressures. * * * That is the only way we can prevent profiteering and eliminate waste and assure efficiency."

NO CAUSE FOR PANIC

Hoover advised the American people that "there is no occasion for panic," but "there is need for speed" in preparedness.

Describing the kind of preparedness he would like to see, the former President said:

"My own view is that we need, first, a strong navy. We need a skeletonized but more flexible army. We need large additions of skilled personnel in our reserves, air pilots, tank drivers, and gunners. And we need equally the organization of our industrial capacity to produce our weapons and supplies. It is in that organization where we are weakest.

"We do not want 50,000 planes put away in hangars. These planes would be obsolete in a year. I do not suppose that this is the President's proposal. In the face of constantly advancing science and invention it would be folly to have 50,000 airplanes in peacetime. It would require half a million men to look after them and to fly them. It would require more billions of dollars a year to support them.

"What we need is organization in Washington capable of bringing about a coordination in American industry that can produce 50,000 airplanes in a year if they were called to do it.

"If we could demonstrate that we could supply the Army and Navy with 4,000 planes during a single month, that would be ample notice to the world to keep off our grass. Likewise, we need an organized capacity to produce tanks and other arms."

Concerning the Roosevelt administration, Mr. Hoover said:

"Did we wish to engage in criticism we could point out that for years as officers responsible for national defense we had a Secretary of the Navy too ill to attend to his duties. Then he was replaced by a temporary appointment.

"NEED FOR CHANGE

"For 3 years the differences between the Assistant Secretary of War and his superior have been public knowledge. The recommendations of wise men for organization and coordination of industry have been rejected. It all proves the stark need of revolutionary change in method of organization for the future.

"What we are interested in now is not recrimination. What we want is to be prepared.

"The first step in preparedness must be made right in Washington. Our governmental machinery must be made capable of producing preparedness.

"In the 10 years prior to 1934, when the face of the world was turned toward peace, our expenditures for munitions and constructions was under $150,000,000 a year. Such organization as was necessary to make these purchases and bring about their manufacture could be carried out under the War and Navy Departments.

"We are confronted with a much larger and more complicated problem. The Congress is just passing an appropriation of three and a third billion, a large part of it to be used to manufacture planes, tanks, guns, and ships. That is a problem of gigantic industrial production. That requires another form of organization if we are not to fail again.

"President Roosevelt in his address last evening implied that previous administrations had been derelict in providing national defense. These statements have a partisan flavor. I could challenge the implications of Mr. Roosevelt's figures.

"For instance, despite the number of ships commissioned or not commissioned, the statistical abstract, published by Mr. Roosevelt's administration, shows we had available fighting ships to a total of about 1,100,000 tons when he took office, against about 1,350,000 tons today.

"Of far more importance, however, national defense is a relative thing. It is relative to the military menace in the rest of the world. No government has the right to impose unnecessary burdens on all those who toil.

"AMPLE WARNING

"The peaceful democratic government of Germany collapsed into dictatorship under Hitler 2 months after Mr. Roosevelt was elected. It was in Mr. Roosevelt's administration that Europe began to rumble with aggression and armament. The German Army grew to 2,500,000 men. Their Navy expanded.

"Great Britain, France, Russia, and Japan and all others at once expanded their expenditures 400 percent. The total of 60 nations increased expenditures from $4,000,000,000 in 1932 to $17,000,000,000 in 1938. The suggestion that we should have armed against menaces that had not been born seems overdone.

"During this last 5 years we have had warning time and again, publicly and privately. The Congress has increased appropriations year by year since 1934. It even permitted relief funds to be used for defense. We obviously have not gotten preparedness.

"Creation of such organization would be only the first step in meeting the task before us.

"Preparedness in a nation is not alone the ability to manufacture arms, or even the number of soldiers or warships or airplanes. It lies in the moral strength and the resolute will of the people. It also lies in economic strength and prosperity of a people.

"WEAKENED BY DEBT

"I do not wish to dwell upon the fact that today we have 10,000,000 unemployed, that we have 18,000,000 destitute people on relief; that one-third of our population is living at subnormal standards; that agriculture is kept afloat only by Government subsidy; that our national strength for defense has been weakened by the huge increase of our national debt and taxes in time of peace.

"Business and industry have been palsied with fear, hesitation, and lack of confidence. In consequence our industrial efficiency has even decreased in the last 8 years. That can be proven. A recent census of the machine tools in the United States showed that while only 52 percent were over 10 years old in 1932, there are 70 percent of them over 10 years old today. That means our industrial plant has slipped backward in its vital equipment.

"Today our call is for industrial production to defend the Nation. To get that we must have more than efficient Government organization. We must change the attitude of Government toward industry. If we are to be prepared for the supreme test of national defense, there must be regeneration of the springs of economic life in our people. We must restore confidence and thus employment. We truly need national unity for the most fundamental part of life and national defense.

"France is today paying in blood the penalty for a government of similar economic attitudes under the government of Premier Blum.

"We have no good reason to be discouraged or fearful. We have the largest resources in the world. We have the greatest mechanical genius. Our men are courageous and our women inspired in fortitude. The whole world knows the capacity of the United States in initiative, in execution, in creation, and performance.

"MUST BE PREPARED

"Once we convince the world that our capacities are organized, no nation will have any desire to establish bases on the Western Hemisphere or make any attack upon us now or any other time.

"Human liberty may need take refuge upon this continent. We must efficiently be prepared to defend it as the last hope of the world."

United States Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD AND THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of May 28, 1940, together with an article by John T. Flynn, published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of May 28, 1940, on the subject of the air power of the United States.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Times-Herald of May 28, 1940]

George Washington said: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they

actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."—From the Farewell Address.

UNITED STATES AIR POWER ONE-FOURTH THAT OF GERMANY—ARMY AND NAVY HAVE 4,489 PLANES, 70,000 MEN TO FLY THEM

(This is the last of a series of articles on the actual and potential strengths of the United States Military Establishments.)

The combined air fleets of the United States number 4,489 planes. Of these approximately 1,800 are in the Navy, and slightly more than 2,600 are in the Army Air Corps.

To man and maintain this air fleet the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have approximately 70,000 officers and enlisted men detailed to the air force.

FAR SURPASSED BY GERMANY

How this air force compares with that of the other great world powers is shown in the following table, based on the best estimates available to military observers. The table gives the number of planes and the number of men in world air forces.

Nation	Planes	Men
United States	4,489	70,000
Germany	15,000	300,000
Britain	7,000	245,000
Italy	5,000	120,000
France	4,000	85,000
Japan	3,500	40,000

The Army has 500 bombers, 430 combat planes, 170 observation planes, and 130 reconnaissance planes. The rest of its air fleet is in reserve and training planes. The Navy numbers 400 bombers, 350 combat planes, 140 observation planes, 100 reconnaissance planes, and the balance of its force is also in reserve and training planes.

The German air force is estimated to have 4,000 bombers. Russia is believed to have 1,500.

SALES TO ALLIES CUT STRENGTH

The Army Air Corps today would have near a strength of 5,500 fighting planes had its expansion program not been sidetracked to rush planes to France and Britain.

The current air-expansion program, authorized under the expanded defense program, would give the Nation an air force of 10,000 planes by July 1, 1941.

Although almost none of the Army's planes are last-minute models, they can be modernized with the addition of armor, bullet-sealed gasoline tanks, and like improvements.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 28, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, May 28.—The plight of the aviation industry now gives us a clue to one of the first difficulties into which war forces business.

There are orders—orders by the billions of dollars—waiting for the airplane factories. But they have not enough plants to handle them all. Therefore, before they can take these orders and cash in on them they will have to build more plant space.

But to do this they have to have money—sales of stock, or bonds, or vast loans from banks or somebody. But right there the fellow who buys the stock or bonds or lends the money asks himself a very pertinent question. Suppose I put all this money into this company and then, all of a sudden, the war stops. Then what?

All the orders of the Allies will be canceled, if they lose, and there will be no one to pay for them. As for America, the scare may be over, and the orders will stop or pause. Then there will be no need for this immense plant the company built.

That's what happened in the last war. Up in New England, Remington Arms and Winchester in Connecticut—and scores of other companies—went almost mad with the prosperity. New plants were built—building after building went up—millions went into them.

And then the war ended, the orders stopped, but there were the plants. And all the money that had gone into those plants was still buried in them. The profits had been great but not enough to pay for the cost of production plus the original investment.

We might as well face it as a war fact that private investment in war industries is going to be very difficult, and that if these industries are to be financed the Government will have to do it and make up its mind to face the losses if the loan is never made good.

I do not mean that the Government should own the factories. I mean it should make the necessary loans—only on essential war industries—and do so with the understanding that the loans shall be written off when the war or the war hysteria is over.

That will be doubly beneficial to the country. First of all, it will make it possible to limit the profits without endangering production. Second, and more important, it will help avoid what, unfortunately, seems inevitable when this war is over.

Private concerns with huge war machinery plants on their hands and with their own money in the plants, will be driven to find work, and the only work will be more war orders after the war is over. This will lead to propaganda for keeping up preparation, preparation against new and ever-present enemies.

If, when the war is over or the war effort at an end here, the Government should be in position to say, "No more orders; the need has passed. Now put away your excessive gun and plane plants, and do not worry because you haven't amortized your investment. The money is due to me and I am prepared to call it off."

This may sound foolish—but, as surely as we live, it is the course of wisdom.

Trojan Horsepower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, of the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., entitled "Trojan Horsepower."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

TROJAN HORSEPOWER

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It is getting to be worth your life, not to mention your liberty, to be seen in the company of a dachshund these days.

All of official Washington is on a hell-for-leather rodeo to round up the terrible Trojan horses, each of which, presumably, will be wearing a swastika brand on his right flank and carrying secret codes.

Isn't it about time to rein up for a bit and survey the terrain before we miss something?

Let's go back to last August. The war was not yet, and the negotiations were fast and devious. Who was it that pushed over the bar-room table and started all the shooting? The record shows that none other than long-whiskered Joe, from Moscow, did that job.

Stalin's compact with Hitler released the Nazi legions, and no amount of squirming or dodging by the Communists can lead close thinkers away from that original fact.

And the evidence has piled up steadily ever since that one of the elements of that deal was a sell-out of the Communist Party, United States of America, to Hitler as his half-witted tool here. The Nazis have never been able to build an organization in this country anything like so big or so wealthy or so well accepted among the googly-eyed respectables as have the "reds."

If we are going to round up the Trojan horses (and we had better), we had better begin at the beginning. And here's one for you to think over while you are thinking about where to begin.

This is a passage from page 281 of an authoritative new book entitled "Your Federal Civil Service," by James C. O'Brien, promotion officer, and Philip P. Marenberg, on the Board of Appeals and Review of the Civil Service Commission:

"Section 9 of the Hatch Act, which became law on August 2, 1939, provides that it shall be unlawful for the Government to employ any person who is a member of any political party or organization which teaches or advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States, and that any such person, if holding office, shall be immediately removed from his position through the medium of nonpayment of salary.

"Some persons believe that this provision in the Hatch Act, when read in conjunction with the Supreme Court's decision in the Strecker case, would seem to imply that a person who is presently a member of the Communist Party may not be eligible to hold a Government job, whether it be civil service or noncivil service.

"However, no authoritative decision has been made to date as to whether the Communist Party teaches or advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government."

They also state that the Civil Service Commission has no authority in any case to determine whether an applicant for a Government job is a Communist.

Think that over. Nowhere is there legal premise, according to these lawyers of the Government whose business it is to know, for

assuming that a Communist is dedicated to overthrow our constitutional form of government, or to find out whether he is a Communist in the first place.

As a matter of fact, the Communist Party of the United States of America has been sending through the mails in large quantities recently copies of its constitution and bylaws.

In the preamble of this document it is explicitly stated that the party "defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties."

You have to read carefully to find the gimmick, which is that the preamble also dedicates the Communists to "the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." Also, in article XI, the Communist Party of the United States of America announces its "affiliation" with the fraternal Communist parties of other lands through the Communist International.

Well, do you look at all this through the wrong end of a legalistic microscope, or do you look at the record?

What have the fraternal Communist parties done in Germany? In Italy? In Spain? In France? Did they, in those countries, advocate or attempt overthrow of the established governments? The record speaks.

Did the people of those countries act too late, too soon, or just right? In Italy, the Communists brought on Mussolini.

In Germany, they brought on Hitler. In Spain, they brought on Franco. In France, they shackled the people until now Death itself thunders at the gates of Paris.

And the "scientific principles" of socialism enunciated by those great humanitarian thinkers, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, have certainly done a pretty job in Russia.

There is evidence that the Communist Party, United States of America, has captured control of certain important labor unions in strategic war industries and is ready to call strikes whenever an order is placed in certain factories to make goods going to enemies of Hitler.

Do you approve of that? Is it in our national interest?

And yet, counsel to the Civil Service Commission find there is no bar in law as yet to Communists taking and holding employ in the Government of the United States.

Radio Forum Discussion on Munitions, Men, and Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN, OF VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proceedings of the national radio forum arranged by the Washington Star and broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. network on last evening, including an introduction by G. Gould Lincoln, political editor of the Washington Star, and an address by me on the subject of munitions, men, and morale.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY G. GOULD LINCOLN, POLITICAL EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON STAR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is our privilege to have as our guest in the National Radio Forum a distinguished Republican Member of the United States Senate, who will speak to us on the subject Munitions, Men, and Morale.

Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont, has achieved a reputation in the Senate for his clear-headed independence of thought and speech; he typifies the American tradition that party differences are buried in the face of National emergencies. Senator AUSTIN'S thought and speech on foreign affairs have never been guided by partisan considerations, and his views on the subject have won the respect of his colleagues.

As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, Senator AUSTIN has been in a position closely to observe the measures taken for our national defense, and I feel that all of us will profit by his appraisal of the situation as it is today.

It is my great pleasure now to present to you Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

In the beginning of the Seventy-sixth Congress industry was wholly unprepared to respond to the demands for national defense.

America was weak in the most vital organ of the Military Establishment, namely, production of munitions.

Assuming a large quantity of material on hand for the initial protective force, but an industrial establishment practically paralyzed, prudence and foresight required the rapid building up of the capacity to produce for future demands.

However, the assumption is incorrect, for we were woefully short of military material, defense fortifications, aircraft, antiaircraft guns, and ammunition.

Regardless of international tensions, there has been technical developments in the methods and means of warfare in recent years which dictated a change in American plans and preparations for defense.

As Secretary of War Woodring put it:

"Today the individual soldier is at the complete mercy of a modern military foe unless he is equipped and supported by a variety of highly developed weapons, for which, in turn, there has been provided an adequate supply of ammunition and reserves."

The Military Affairs Committees of both the Senate and House held hearings in January and February 1939 on a plan for adequate national defense, as outlined in a message of the President dated January 12, 1939.

Notwithstanding the vicissitudes of the contest between isolationists and realists, involving the question of providing airplanes for England, France, and the Netherlands, the act which carried into effect the recommendations of the President was approved April 3, 1939.

Within the brief period of 82 days a democracy had effectively reformed its policy regarding the means of protection of itself—continental and insular.

Development of production of airplanes, which is such an important item of modern defense, was immediately stimulated by contracts for delivery to the United States. But the chief cause of expansion of plant capacity was the export trade encouraged by our foreign policy.

This policy of exporting planes to belligerents accomplished several objectives:

Increase in the size and essential capacity of factories at the cost of the foreign governments, their capital, not ours, undertaking the risk of war-plant investment.

Reduction of a corresponding development in possible enemy nations.

Acquisition of new ideas discovered in the laboratory test of war itself.

Education in technique, through the requirements of customers engaged in warfare.

The ability to confound a possible enemy by shutting off the source of supply.

In all this program the theory of priority has been carefully studied and the right of the United States to place the American orders over foreign orders has been contractually preserved. All foreign orders are subject to the condition that they shall not interfere with our own procurement. Thus we have had nothing to lose and everything to gain by this wise policy of selling and exporting airplanes.

During the recess following the first session of this Congress and in September the present World War broke out. The President called Congress into extraordinary session and the Neutrality Act of 1939 was passed. It became a law on November 4, 1939.

This was the second chapter in the international record of this Congress.

"The Neutrality Act of 1939" is a misnomer, but it is the legal name of the act. It is not neutral. It might be characterized as quasi-neutral, but throughout the dramatic events which produced it I have always claimed that one of its chief objectives is national defense through aid of the democraries. I claimed, in the process of enacting this law, that we should do what we could short of becoming a belligerent to promote victory by the Allies.

In the course of debate in the extraordinary session I was asked by Senator Borah, whose distinguished memory we cherish:

"Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont stated that he was actuated by the belief that it was to the interest and security of the people of the United States that the Allies win. What does the Senator mean by 'win'?

* * * * * * *

"Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it means the stopping of the aggression of the totalitarian philosophy. It means the stopping, for the time being at least, of the military penetration of the Western Hemisphere. Does that answer the Senator's question?

* * * * * * *

"It makes little difference whether one uses the word 'win' or some other significant verb that indicates that our purpose is either to have an early—and the earlier the better—peace negotiated without further combat, which peace will be just, as nearly as human frailty will permit, or to stop for a time being, at least, the philosophical penetration of our country with ideas that tend to undermine our free institutions and are aimed insidiously at the Republic; or even to prevent the occurrence of incidents which might result in the occupation of Canada or the islands of the

Atlantic Ocean near our coast, as well as the occupation of Latin America by totalitarian states having visions of world empire and world grandeur."

Under that so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, the exportation of munitions has been further stimulated and the capacity of the American plant has been growing as a direct result of procurements by belligerents and at their expense.

I have no doubt that the products of our factories have gone to both sides, but the preponderant effect has been to furnish aid to the democracies. This belongs in my address to you tonight solely because it bears upon the subject of national defense.

Our present understanding of world events moves us to sacrifice and to action to protect our free institutions and opens a new chapter of endless possibilities in world politics.

We have seen in the case of the Netherlands that the steadfast desire for peace, an attitude of neutrality, and even its kindly provision of asylum for the former war lord of the German people did not save it from devastating aggression.

The list of countries overrun within the last 9 months also includes Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and France.

As has been pointed out in the President's address, our great territory of American States may be susceptible of attack from several angles through swift approach by air, which brings the problem of defense to the individual citizen in every community.

After hearing the testimony in the Military Affairs Committee in January and February of 1939, showing the penetration of Latin America by the dynamic foreign policy of national socialism, and upon consideration of other evidence, of the establishment of professorships in Latin American colleges, the placing of teachers of military science in their armies, of totalitarian officers specially trained in the language of the country they were sent to, of pilots and mechanics for their air lines—indeed, one whole air-line company of South America has a personnel 95 percent German—I became convinced that the final demands of the totalitarian powers could not be visualized; that there were no limits to them short of that expressed by Rauschning in The Revolution of Nihilism, thus:

"In particular, therefore, it is not correct to regard the new German foreign policy as simply the final form of the policy of the Pan-Germans. The foreign policy of the Third Reich goes beyond the most extreme limits any nation has consciously set itself in the past. It is supposed to be a 'peace policy of justice,' but: A new peace shall make Germany 'mistress of the globe,' a peace not hanging on the palm fronds of lachrymose pacifist womenfolk, but established by the victorious sword of a master race that takes over the world in the service of a higher civilization.' Such is the main political principle of national socialism as expressed by Rosenberg. Hitler's language is rather more general, but it conveys no less ambitious perspectives."

Rosenberg was once the National Socialist Party's supreme expert.

One does not have to exaggerate or yield to hysteria in making the decision of a prudent person that immediate superiority of power, spiritual and material, is indispensable to save the principles which constitute the American cosmos and to prevent further enslavement of the world to the doctrines of national socialism.

The evil spirit of world revolution put us on notice that civilization had slipped back to legendary pagan days of the Trojan horse.

Therefore we arm.

We arm mentally.

The general desire for peace following the first World War had such vogue that it deluded the democracies. Such effort as they made to perpetuate liberty was concentrated on other sanctions for peace than force. They relaxed. They took their ease. Their former victories gave a sense of security which now is seen to have been false. This includes the American Republic.

Like the Greeks of whom Virgil charged, "The unused weapon dies with rust," we Americans foolishly allowed the spiritual and physical means of national defense to die with rust.

The present deficiencies in the American establishments for protection are partly due to the assumption by the public that the record of recurrent wars—approximately every 30 years—could be ignored with safety; that the United States is isolated in effect by wide spaces of air and water, and that whatever happens over there cannot disturb our serenity or destroy our free institutions.

In such a condition of public opinion the Department charged with the duty of planning have been unable to accomplish, in the past 20 years, even the minimum objectives which they have continually urged.

During the 8 years that I have served in the Senate I have observed vigorous opposition to every appropriation for national defense by conscientious Americans within and without Congress.

Now, however, alarmed by the velocity of the spread of dynamic enemies of liberty over the countries of Asia and Europe, informed public opinion is aroused and energized to achieve, in the shortest practicable time, that preparedness which ought to prevent encroachment upon the Western Hemisphere, both continental and insular.

On national defense we are united. The strong harmony of our action taken last week is actuated more by the conviction that this is necessary for our own tranquillity than by the emotion excited by the abhorrence of the wrong involved in the inhuman and horrible slaughter of peaceful noncombatants and the ruthless and barbaric invasion of neutral countries.

We perceive the significance of the penetration of Latin America by totalitarian foreign policy and the phenomenon of the "fifth column."

Notwithstanding the imminence of a Presidential election, in which there is keen competition, Republicans and Democrats volunteer in a great unit to save our country. National defense and foreign relations are not a party issue. Their administration usually is an issue.

The former disagreements which cut across both party lines resolved the protagonists into groups called isolationists and realists, neutrals, and those called pro-Ally.

We now clearly see that our peace and safety, and the permanence of our Republic, depend upon stopping totalitarian conquests.

We are encouraged to adhere to the forms of government which have given us a higher degree of relative liberty, and a higher standard of civilization than elsewhere, by the vigor of our present unity of action and the competency with which this Republic proceeds to arm itself adequately. Without frenzy, without excitement, and with calculated planning, which had its genesis in many former blueprints made by the War and Navy Departments, we did, within the brief period of 7 days, vitalize the President's plan for adequate defense.

We are determined to preserve democracy.

We have its ability to act wisely and effectively without injurious loss of time, and without abandoning its structural safeguards. We will continue to do this.

The President's plan for defense is briefly described as follows:

1. It recognizes the effectiveness of providing the democracies which are in desperate combat all the aircraft for which they have applied or will probably require. Therefore the development of our capacity to produce will be increased above that attained with Allied capital.

2. It will rapidly increase the rate of production until our capacity equals 50,000 planes a year.

The Panama Canal will have an additional and separate set of locks for naval use.

Air bases will be located at strategic places accommodating mobile and quick defense of continental United States.

Coast defenses on both oceans and the Caribbean Sea will be improved.

Antiaircraft guns will be provided in character and number designed to be sufficient for the increased Army.

The Army will be increased to full capacity of its peacetime proportions.

When all elements of the National Guard and O. R. C. are included, it will aggregate over a million men.

In addition to this, I believe we should have an air-raid Reserve protecting the homes in every community throughout the country.

All arms, ammunition, equipment, transportation, housing, clothing, and other material required to round out a well-balanced and effective peacetime Army will be produced.

This basis, or skeleton, for a larger Army will be easily augmented, if necessary, in the future. Provision has been made for training of air pilots and ground personnel on a scale sufficiently progressive to correspond to the production of planes.

The President's plan for national defense comprehends the Western Hemisphere.

It is not given to us all to know the plans of the Executive Department in detail. We do know that the attitude indicated by the friendly neighbor policy harmonizes with our attitude toward Europe and Asia, even if it differs.

My considered opinion is that we should not make permanent alliances with Latin American countries, or with Canada, but I do think that we ought to make temporary alliances for the common defense and for intelligent coordinated planning. In deed, I believe this is an important element which ought to be in the President's plan.

The President's plan for national defense which Congress is unanimously providing involves the following results:

In all ways, short of our joining as a combatant, it will aid the democracies to stop Hitler, and bring the war to an end without subjugation of the democracies.

It will make us so competent to maintain our security that no belligerent would attack us, or commit other acts which are calculated to injure us severely or to threaten us with great harm.

It will create the moral and material superiority necessary to overcome an enemy.

It will increase our prestige and will fortify our position in any future negotiation between nations affecting any of our international relations.

We face bravely the internal hazards of a free government.

Without injustice or oppression we are building up resistance against them. The chief reliance of the Government, however, is on the devoted patriotism of its citizens, whose constant regard for law and order, maintains an atmosphere in which sabotage, sedition, and subversive acts, are difficult to conceal, and hard to carry out.

Remembering our many racial stocks, and cherishing the virtues of each of them separately and in assimilation here, we all hold Americanism the precious heritage to be transmitted to our children. For it we willingly and zealously sacrifice and strive.

Collectivism, the economy of the enemies of democracy, is at war with capitalism, the economy of America. Therefore an important measure of our defense is the maintenance of the soundness and solvency of our national economy.

The cost of our present obligations is great; but not so heavy as the cost of failure to spend now would later be. We ought to tighten our belts now and forthwith plan to meet the requirements.

Industry, mining, agriculture, commerce, the professions, labor, capital, and all other factors in the united effort should cheerfully cooperate to attain the maximum efficiency of our superb voluntary mobilization.

Out of the sorrow and anxiety of these dark days may rise a better America.

The demand for rapid production and for smoothly running service ought to produce the right solution of many of the complex issues that vex employer and employee, Government, and citizen.

The will to win should generate the will to do justice and to be unselfish on all sides.

My own efforts toward speeding up the national industrial plant and energizing and coordinating the superb resources of America, human and material, included the offer of legislation to enable the President to create a five-man board specially qualified to harmonize the relations between Government, employer, and employee, and stimulate quality and velocity of production.

While we temporarily lift the checks on power in this emergency we record our determination to preserve democratic liberty. Democratic liberty does not function with the speed of despotism under the impetuous will of fear-inspiring dictatorship, but is the will of the people revealed in measured and progressive steps toward their greater welfare and happiness as a whole.

Therefore our paramount object is to preserve the Republic.

While we subject our freedom to severe restriction for the common defense, we consecrate ourselves to the duty of keeping the lamp burning over our altars throughout these dark days.

The munitions, the men, and the morale which we enlist today shall be effective—

To keep the ambitious dictator from coming to plunder and seize the wealth of the Americas, for he shall know that he cannot get it, and

To maintain the permanence of republican forms of government against expansion of executive power and against invasion by the "fifth column."

Force may prevail against law temporarily, but we are determined that law, not force, shall ultimately be the arbiter of disagreements. For us the will of the people shall continue to be supreme.

United and prepared and animated by the virtuous purpose to save our country and its liberty, we shall become invincible.

Friends of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS AND ARTICLE BY MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this year there was an organization formed under the name of Friends of the Land, a nonpartisan, nonprofit society for conservation of soil, rain, and man. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of the officers of that organization, together with the trustees and sponsors, and also an article on the subject New Steps to Save the Land, by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, published in the Survey Graphic for April 1940.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIENDS OF THE LAND—A NONPARTISAN, NONPROFIT SOCIETY FOR CONSERVATION OF SOIL, RAIN, AND MAN

Morris Llewellyn Cooke, president.
Joshua Evans, Jr., treasurer.
Charles W. Collier, executive director.
Russell Lord, editor.

Vice presidents: Charles E. Holzer, first vice president; J. S. Apperson, New York; George A. Condra, Nebraska; J. N. Darling, Iowa; D. P. Fabrick, Montana; O. U. Habberstad, Minnesota; F. S. Hurd, Oklahoma; Aldo Leopold, Wisconsin; J. E. Noll, Missouri.

Trustees: J. J. Boatman, Iowa; Isaiah Bowman, Maryland; Bryce C. Browning, Ohio; James H. Causey, Colorado; Stuart Chase, Connecticut; George P. Clements, California; George M. Corlett, Colorado; Alma M. Davis, Arizona; Glenn E. Dill, Oklahoma; Vaughn Flannery, Maryland; J. Ross Hanahan, South Carolina; George H. Hecke, California; Miss Harlean James, District of Columbia; J. F. Jackson, Georgia; B. H. Kizer, Washington; Robert D. Lusk, South Dakota; E. B. MacNaughton, Oregon; V. C. Marshall, Texas; Wheeler McMillen, Pennsylvania; Will G. Metz, Wyoming; M. O. Ryan, North Dakota; J. Russell Smith, Pennsylvania; Robert J. Smith, Texas; Clifford H. Stone, Colorado; Huston Thompson, District of Columbia; Rexford G. Tugwell, New York; O. S. Warden, Montana; Victor Weybright, New York; T. Guy Woolford, Georgia; Robert Sterling Yard, District of Columbia.

Sponsors: Robert A. Allen, Nevada; C. L. Alsberg, California; C. W. Bailey, Tennessee; John H. Baker, New York; Charles A. Beard, Connecticut; Barry Bingham, Kentucky; Remsen D. Bird, California; U. B. Blalock, North Carolina; A. A. Brock, California; David K. E. Bruce, Virginia; Thomas D. Campbell, Montana; W. W. Campbell, Arkansas; Frederick P. Champ, Utah; George T. Cochran, Oregon; Mrs. Mabel C. Costigan, Colorado; Walter S. Cothran, Georgia; David Cushman Coyle, District of Columbia; Jonathan Daniels, North Carolina; J. C. Derieux, South Carolina; Robert L. Duffus, Connecticut; Paul M. Dunn, Utah; C. A. Dykstra, Wisconsin; J. J. Edwards, Washington; Albert Einstein, New Jersey; Edwin R. Embree, Illinois; Samuel S. Fels, Pennsylvania; John M. Fouts, Texas; P. H. Glatfelter, Pennsylvania; P. Hetherton, Washington; John E. Hill, Texas; T. C. Holy, Ohio; Gene A. Howe, Texas; Frank W. Hussey, Maine; Thomas Jesse Jones, New York; Paul Kellogg, New York; I. N. Knutson, Wisconsin, Grover Cleveland Ladner, Pennsylvania; Oliver La Farge, New York; Fiorello H. LaGuardia, New York; A. Frank Lever, South Carolina; David D. Long, Georgia; Edward Avery McIlhenny, Louisiana; Archibald MacLeish, District of Columbia; Otto T. Mallery, Pennsylvania; K. W. Marett, South Carolina; John C. Merriam, District of Columbia; A. B. Miller, California; Theodore Monke, North Dakota; Frank E. Mullen, New York; Miss Anne Mumford, California; Robert Cushman Murphy, New York; Richard Neuberger, Oregon; J. K. Newman, Pennsylvania; James G. Patton, Colorado; Donald Culross Peattie, California; Clarence Poe, North Carolina; Charles Redd, Utah; Robert Redfield, Illinois; Erle H. Reid, Wyoming; John H. Reisner, New York; Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., New York; H. M. Roseberry, Kentucky; W. Carson Ryan, New York; Carl O. Sauer, California; E. F. Scattergood, California; Paul B. Sears, Ohio; Markley Stevenson, Pennsylvania; Alfred Stieglitz, New York; Russell M. Story, California; Raymond Gram Swing, New York; G. C. Taylor, Louisiana; Wilbur K. Thomas, Pennsylvania; J. W. Turrentine, District of Columbia; Rupert B. Vance, North Carolina; Peter Vischer, New York; P. A. Waring, Pennsylvania; W. W. Waymack, Iowa; Kendall Weisiger, Georgia; William P. Wharton, Massachusetts; J. R. Wiggins, Minnesota; Robert E. Wood, Illinois; Carl M Yerrington, Montana; J. F. Zimmerman, New Mexico.

[From the Survey Graphic for April 1940]

NEW STEPS TO SAVE THE LAND

(By Morris Llewellyn Cooke)

"A good land; a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of the valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley, of vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of olive oil and honey: * * * Here thou shalt eat bread without scarceness; thou shalt not lack anything." Deuteronomy viii: 7-9.)

"The waters wear the stones; thou washest away the things that grow out of the dust of the earth; and thou destroyest the hope of man. * * * If my land cry against me, or that the furrows thereof likewise complain * * * let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockle instead of barley. The words of Job are ended." (The Book of Job.)

It is an old story, often repeated in the time of man. We have talked a lot about it in this country lately, and have come to realize that over vast areas we stand confronted with defaced landscapes, depleted water supplies, grave dislocations in the hydrologic cycle, and an all but catastrophic degradation of soil and man.

We have hurt our land. We have made much of it ugly in the plain implication that land laid to waste will not support that measure of individual freedom and those constantly higher standards of living which we as Americans have been led to expect.

Down our streams every year go enormous quantities of plant-food elements—nitrogen, phosphorus, and potash—that might have produced bread, meat, milk, and garments. This huge loss represents only part of the annual erosion bill. Erosion not only removes plant nutrients; it carries away at one disastrous stroke the available plant food, the material from which plant food is made, the micro-organisms that aid in the manufacture of available plant nutrients, the mineral matter that holds these organic and inorganic materials—the whole body of the soil.

Soil misuse makes people poor. Soil displacement is followed by human displacement. The first shock of displacement is felt in the open country. But soon, as yields and trade fall off, it is also felt in the towns.

Any land is all of one body. If one part is skinned, bared to the beat of the weather, wounded, not only the winds spread the trouble, dramatically, but the surface veins and arteries of the Nation, its streams and rivers, bear ill. Soiled water depletes soil,

exhausts underground and surface water supplies, raises flood levels, dispossesses shore and upland birds and animals from their accustomed haunts, chokes game fish, diminishes shore line sea food, clogs harbors, and stops with grit and boulders the purr of dynamos.

Eroded soil is soil in some part dead, devitalized. Soil debility soon repeated in nutritive deficiencies, spreads undernourishment. Evidence on this point is far from complete; but the trend of accumulating findings is unmistakable. If the soil does not have it in it, plants that grow there do not; nor do the animals that eat those plants; nor the people throughout a country who eat those plants and animals. Soil debility soon removes stiffening lime from the national backbone, lowers the beat and vigor of the national bloodstream, and leads to a devitalized society.

We, too, are all of one body. We all live on, or from, the soil.

No matter which political party gains ascendancy as the years go by, whether the swing be from middle left to far right, or to the farther left, whether we remain at peace or go to war again, this fact will remain: So long as we keep on scrubbing off, blowing off, killing off, our topsoil business and social conditions in this country will remain fundamentally unsound.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE ABOUT IT

Over the past 50 years we have slowly begun to do something toward reconciling the ways of man and nature. The national forests were first reserved to the Nation in 1890. In 1903 the Reclamation Service was created, and in 1904 the Forest Service started its work. The first great conservation drive in this country dates from 1905 in the administration of the first President Roosevelt. During the next 25 years the National Park Service and the Biological Survey came into action, and in the general field of agricultural education the land-grant colleges and extension services made great strides. All such advances have been accelerated, and others have been launched during the past decade. We have, as a nation, created and brought into action the Soil Conservation Service and the Civilian Conservation Corps. We have placed the public grazing lands under protective management, extended additional authorities to the Biological Survey and the Forest Service, and provided for control of floods by treatment of watershed lands. We have passed State laws providing for soil-conservation districts, have joined in new efforts of county land-use planning, from the ground up, and have instituted many other important developments.

While public programs have enabled us to begin to do something to conserve our land resources in a large, sensible, and connected way, they have fallen far short of all that needs to be done. We continue to lose ground at an ominous rate to the onrushing forces of soil and water wastage.

A NEW STEP

If our vital resources are to be saved, the conservation programs must be implemented by additional Federal and State legislation, by more adequate and sensible appropriations, and by measures which look on our land organically, as a living unit, and not as an aggregation of unrelated segments and problems. Even more essential will be the democratically achieved and greatly increased interest and support of all the people. All of us may need to make sacrifices, if we are to have national security. The efforts of Government officials alone will not suffice.

A new vehicle is needed through which friends of conservation can move and speak out together as never before and which will enlist all our citizens in a crusade to protect the land. To meet this need there has just been established a nonprofit society tentatively called Friends of the Land to support, increase, and to a greater degree unify, all efforts for the conservation of the soil, rain, and all the living products, especially man. This society is being organized by a representative group of citizens from all parts of the United States, meeting in Washington for the purpose, March 22–23, 1940.

Friends of the Land will at first work with friends of conservation, both lay and professional, here in this country, and later with like-minded people in other lands.

With the conservation idea advancing to a wider outlook and more practical techniques of research and husbandry, with conservation becoming, in effect, a working philosophy to reconcile the ways of man and nature—the time is right for such a society to grow and act.

The need is imminent. Much of the civilized world is at war again, sick at heart and weary. Even this far removed from the main centers of pressure on soil and humans, we feel, and shall continue to feel, the strain and tension. A wartime psychology fixes attention on devices of slaughter and destruction. It diverts human effort and ingenuity from studies and devices to perpetuate the source values of humankind.

Whether our principal personal interests be in soil, grass, trees, songbirds, game, flowers, livestock, landscape, or outdoor recreation; and whatever our occupation—farmer, banker, forester, agrostologist, journalist, anthropologist, ecologist, teacher, student, or what not—we can all work together for the good of the land.

To promote the conservation of land and water resources in America, Friends of the Land will place before the people of our country various issues and problems in this field. A monthly magazine, dealing humanly with problems and victories in all fields of conservation, here and abroad, will start publication, it is hoped, this summer.

The society will encourage new research and husbandry in land and water conservation by individuals, cooperative groups, and public agencies. It will recognize outstanding achievements by suitable citations or awards. Our educational institutions will be encouraged to include in their curricula, courses on the significance and technique of land and water conservation; and a search will be made for wider ways in which youth, especially unemployed youth, may participate in a moral equivalent of war to save our soils and waters.

All over the earth, land and water wastage threaten the stability of civilization. In China famine stalks on worn and deadened soil. The Sahara Desert rolls south more than one-half mile each year. Much of Africa is wasting away. Australia is threatened. Palestine is covered with geological skeletons of formerly productive lands. The soils of India bleed to death. And here, even here in this new country, as Secretary Wallace has said, "The war that needs most concern us is the war at our feet."

The energies of nations are now absorbed in world conflict. But it should still be possible to lay the groundwork for international cooperation in solving the great common problem of land and water wastage, a problem which, in the long view, transcends in importance most of those over which the world is now convulsed. Perhaps, in time, the destructive impulses of nations can be sublimated into a drive to conserve the resources on which the ultimate welfare of mankind depends.

To these ends friends of the land will explore possibilities of foreign collaboration and will encourage the establishment in foreign lands of private organizations for the furtherance of conservation. An international clearing house of conservation information will be maintained, and in general such things will be promoted as will lead to a world-wide acceptance of the concept that the earth is the mother of man, and when the people of any country forget that fact, they perish.

Rural Electrification Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN BEFORE THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION'S FIFTH ANNUAL STAFF CONFERENCE, IN THE AUDITORIUM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1940

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want every Member of this Congress and the people of this country to read the able speech, Rural Electrification Marches On, delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, who has done more toward making electricity available to the farmers of the Nation than any other man. The administration, the Congress, and the farmers of the country are deeply in his debt for the great fights he has made in their behalf. Under leave granted me, I include Mr. RANKIN's address to the Staff Conference of the R. E. A.:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, Secretary Wallace, ladies, and gentlemen, I first want to thank my distinguished friend, and your able administrator, Harry Slattery, for his complimentary introduction, and for his kind references to my services in the interest of rural electrification, as well as of cheap electricity for the American people generally.

I was delighted to hear the splendid address of our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture. I wish every farmer in America could have heard it. [Applause.]

We are on our way to a better day for the American farmer. I am going to speak plainly to you today. Since I owe my position to the 250,000 people back in the First District of Mississippi, and since they are the only ones who can call me to account, I have assumed the position of speaking what I feel on this subject of rural electrification in which they are so vitally interested. I am limited only by the rules of propriety, or the rules of the House of Representatives, and sometimes I am accused of violating both of them—in order to make myself heard, or understood. [Laughter.]

This R. E. A. program has gone so far now that it sells itself. It is self-spreading, just like measles, grasshoppers, or Johnson grass, or like Bermuda grass. Probably I ought to say like a religious wave. It just extends itself. Nothing can stop it or take it away from the farmers after they get it. It is real, permanent improvement.

I have some good news for you and for the farmers of the country this morning. We are going to get $100,000,000 for rural electrification for the coming year. [Applause.] We already have $40,000,000 provided for, and I have been working

for 2 months to try to get another $100,000,000. I have succeeded in getting a Budget recommendation for $60,000,000. I was called from the White House just a moment ago and given the glad tidings that this recommendation had been approved and is on its way to the House of Representatives. It now becomes my duty, and my pleasure, to get busy and get it approved by Congress.

This is the greatest program for the benefit of the American farmers and the American people generally this Nation has ever seen. I have been amazed to hear men call it "socialism." As a matter of fact, it is the greatest stimulus to individualism that has ever been instituted among the farmers of any nation. You take a man out on his farm, where he can have every convenience that modern science provides, where he can keep his children at home, close to the soil, under his own roof, and can entertain them in his own house, where they can romp and play in God's sunlight, and he will make individualists of them, real Americans who will take care of our country in the years to come. [Applause.]

If you will pardon me, I will give you a brief history of my activities in behalf of rural electrification. As you know, I was coauthor with Senator NORRIS of the bill creating the T. V. A., the greatest development of modern times. Nothing on earth compares with it, and it has done more for the American people than any other enterprise we have ever undertaken. Already the very example of the T. V. A. yardstick has forced reductions in light and power rates to the American people amounting to more than $600,000,000 a year.

A Congressman arose in the House the other day and said he lived in Cincinnati, where they had extremely cheap rates. Of course they have now. We have been threatening for 5 years to put a T. V. A. power line across the State of Ohio to supply T. V. A. power to the farmers of Ohio at T. V. A. rates; and for fear that might be done and that the people of Cincinnati might hook on, the power company serving Cincinnati reduced rates almost to T. V. A. levels. If we could get T. V. A. rates all over Ohio, it would save the light and power consumers of that State more than $47,000,000 a year. Someone said Birmingham, Ala., now has T. V. A. rates. Certainly, because we forced T. V. A. power into Tarrant City and Bessemer, adjacent to Birmingham, with the result that they had to bring their rates down to meet the competition.

They have called me the father of rural electrification in the House because I started the drive for the electrification of the farm homes of this country. I organized the first one of these cooperative power associations in my home county and then organized one in every other county in the district 2 years before the Rural Electrification Administration was created. Therefore I am a pioneer. I don't mean that I split all the rails in the South. My ancestors and their neighbors did that. I followed along and saw those old people plow up and down and across those prairies or up and down those hillsides in the hot sun, making a bare living and denied many of the conveniences and practically all of the luxuries of life. I saw the burdens of drudgery borne by the farm women of that section, and I determined I would see if I couldn't find something better for them, something to lighten their burdens. I found it—electricity—rural electrification—the greatest economic blessing our farmers have ever known. [Applause.]

When the T. V. A. was first created I went home and started a movement to get T. V. A. power for my district. The doubting Thomases said it was useless. I represent 10 counties in northeast Mississippi, and I served notice then that one of two things had to be done: The power companies either had to reduce their rates to the T. V. A. yardstick levels, or one of us had to get out of the district. They took me at my word, and have seen to it that I had opposition ever since. But I am still there, and today they do not own an insulator in the district. We have spread T. V. A. power throughout every one of those 10 counties. [Applause.]

If the people in the district I represent paid the same rates for their electricity they paid 7 years ago, their electric light and power bill for 1940 would cost them $2,000,000 more than they are going to pay for it. That is the value of 40,000 bales of cotton, an average of 4,000 bales to the county. I have the best electrified farming district in America. We have built approximately 2,000 miles of rural power lines in those 10 counties, and we are still on our way.

We are trying to reach every farmhouse with a rural power line that was reached with a draft in time of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. And we are not going to "bust" the Government doing it. Every dollar we are putting out on these rural lines, Mr. Secretary, will come back with interest and will bring with it compound interest in happiness, contentment, and relief from drudgery.

President Roosevelt and his administration have done more for the power consumers of America than all other Presidents and all other administrations combined. [Applause.]

I want to pay tribute to my distinguished friend and coworker, Senator NORRIS. He has done more for the power consumers of America than any other man who has ever sat in the Senate of the United States. [Applause.]

When I started out on this program in my own district we secured our funds through the T. V. A. That was before the R. E. A. was created. When the original R. E. A. Act was passed unfortunately there was not a majority on the House committee that handled it who were as liberal on this subject as Senator NORRIS and I are. They put a ceiling over us, or limited the amount that could be expended for rural electrification each year to $40,000,000. They thought they would hold us down to $40,000,000 a year, and that we couldn't find a way around it. But I was like the girl whose father willed her everything he had provided she would "never marry any man on earth." She went down into the Mammoth Cave and got married. She said she couldn't get around that promise but she could get under it. [Laughter.]

Well, we found a way around, or under, that limitation. With the approval of the President and the R. E. A. Administrator, I inserted an amendment into the relief bill, or spending bill, 2 years ago for an extra $100,000,000; and, as I said, we are going to get $60,000,000 additional this year.

I also wrote an amendment into the relief bill making R. E. A. projects eligible for W. P. A. assistance. It helps to reduce the cost of these rural lines to the cooperatives and enables them to reach more farmers—sometimes twice as many—without additional expense to the cooperative.

These cooperatives are paying out gradually. I have one in my district that paid out in 5 years. I know it is charged that these "co-ops" in the T. V. A. area are buying power below the cost of production. But that is not true They are paying the T. V. A. from 5 to 7 mills a kilowatt-hour for electric power wholesale that was being sold to a private power concern at Muscle Shoals during the Hoover administration at 1.56 mills a kilowatt-hour.

This outfit over on the Susquehanna River is selling power wholesale to the Philadelphia Electric Co. at 3.35 mills a kilowatt-hour, which is much cheaper than T. V. A. sells it to anyone. This concern here in Washington, the Potomac Electric Co., buys a good deal of its power wholesale for a little over 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. If private power companies can sell power for 2 or 3 or 4 mills a kilowatt-hour, how can they accuse the T. V. A. of selling it below cost when they charge from 5 to 7 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale? [At this point the lights went out in the auditorium.] I knew they would hear me. Mr. Secretary, we should put this building on an R. E. A. line. [Laughter.] [At this point the lights came back on in the auditorium.] Evidently they heard that too. [Renewed laughter.]

We have found that electricity can be generated with coal, gas, oil, or water power anywhere in the United States and laid down wholesale at rates at least as low as the preesnt T. V. A. wholesale rates—or even lower It could be supplied to every consumer in America at the T. V. A. yardstick rates without loss on legitimate investments.

Seven years ago 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity cost a consumer in a town or city in my district $2.50; 100 kilowatt-hours cost $8.60; and 1,000 kilowatt-hours cost $66.10. Today 25 kilowatt-hours cost 75 cents, while 100 kilowatt-hours cost $2.50, and 1,000 kilowatt-hours cost $8.90. It costs a farmer $9.90 for 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, but $1 of that goes to help pay for his line. We can do the same thing in every community in America. [Applause.]

Secretary Wallace has the right idea; the farmer's prosperity has to be built from the ground. I have no patience with the opinions some people have that the farmer is just out there to produce something for the rest of us to live on. Agriculture is a way of life. The farmer is the backbone of this Nation and he is entitled to every convenience that can be provided. [Applause.]

On the subject of investments, let me remind you that the greatest public power system in America is in Ontario, Canada. They have $400,000,000 invested in generation, transmission, and distribution systems, including the municipalities. They generate, transmit, and distribute one-twelfth as much power as private power companies generate and distribute in the United States. Therefore these power companies in this country ought to have twelve times that investment. What is 12 times $400,000,000? It is $4,800,000,000. Throw in enough to make even $5,000,000,000, and take that amount from the $13,000,000,000 the private power companies claim to have invested in this country and you will see that they have anywhere from $6,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 of water or inflated valuations in their capital structures. That is the reason they didn't want to deal with the R. E. A. They want to charge rates high enough to pay dividends on all that water. [Applause.]

Speaking of watered stock [the speaker took a drink of water] [laughter]—I understand the Republicans have a power magnate running for President. I hope they nominate him. I'll bet he can teach the farmers how to water the stock and shear the sheep. [Laughter.]

Before the T. V. A. and R. E. A. were created, a private power company had one rural power line in my county. On that line a farmer paid $4.50 for 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity that he now gets for 75 cents. That was going on all over the country where the farmers got any electricity at all. They called the overcharge a line charge. We have eliminated it at home and it should be eliminated all over the country.

The consumers in my town had only 19-percent saturation of electric refrigerators when the T. V. A. rates went into effect; 19 out of every 100 who had lights in their homes had electric refrigerators. Now 90 percent of them have electric refrigerators. It is about twice what it is in New York City or what it is in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, or the other great cities throughout the country. The

farmers on our lines have a higher percentage of saturation of electric refrigerators than they have in many of the principal cities throughout the country. Not only that, but they all have radios.

I remember when I first took up this fight on the floor of the House one distinguished Republican, who has since been retired, said to me, "Don't you know that if you built these lines out to these farmers' houses the first thing the farmer would do would be to buy a radio?" I said, "Certainly he would; if he didn't have sense enough to get a radio his wife would make him get one." He thought that was extravagance. He thought it was all right for the city man to have an automobile, a radio, and a refrigerator, but not a farmer. That is a fair sample of Republican sympathy for agriculture.

Sometime ago an old farmer down at home was walking down the street one morning when a young sprout walked up and slapped him on the back and said, "You came to town to get the news, did you?" He said, "Heck, no; I came to bring it. I got it before you woke up." [Laughter.] Farmers don't have to go to town now to get the news; they don't even have to read the local papers to be informed—or misinformed. They can get it over the radio. [Applause.]

I checked up to see what percentage of the people in my town had electric irons. Out of 1,720 domestic consumers they had 1,920 electric irons—many families had 2 or 3. I found that practically every farmer on the rural lines, or about 90 percent of them, had electric irons.

I found that the Electric Home and Farm Authority—another agency of this administration that is contributing so much to this program—had helped farmers to equip their homes with electric refrigerators, electric water pumps, electric churns, cream separators, feed grinders, and other necessary appliances. Some of them had milking machines, and many of them now have electric fences—just one small wire with a few volts of electricity. But does it work!

One of my farmer neighbors has a herd of Jersey cows. He sent off and got a young male. When this young bovine got about grown the farmer took him out and put him in a pasture with an electric fence around it. He acted just like a Republican Congressman or a Republican candidate for President, by totally ignoring rural electrification. [Laughter.] He came out with his head in the air, and walked into that fence, with such disastrous consequences as will come to those Congressmen and those candidates for President next November. [Applause.] He looked over at the green pastures beyond, and strolled into that fence. As soon as he touched it, he thought an earthquake had struck him. He stuck to it for about half a minute, trembled from head to foot, lashed his tail, licked out his tongue, and bawled, while the sparks flashed from his hoofs. When he finally got loose, he retreated hastily to the center of the field, and he has never been within 10 feet of that fence since. [Applause.]

I have been accused of official necromancy. In the words of Senator Carmack, they have accused me of welding the wooden handle to the pewter spoon [laughter], grafting the dead bough to the living trunk, mixing oil and water together placidly in the same bottle, and making boon companions of the spider and the fly, because I have succeeded in coordinating the R. E. A. and the W. P. A., and causing them to work in perfect harmony in the building of rural power lines. [Applause.]

There is one thing about it, they can't accuse me of using "fifth column" tactics. My efforts have been open and aboveboard, and I have even had the temerity to invite the opposition to join me. So many Congressmen are coming to me now and asking how it is done, that I am thinking of issuing a bulletin on the subject. If I do, it won't be written in braille, because it will be for Democrats, and those who have democratic leanings or democratic convictions, and who believe in rural electrification. They won't have to read it in the dark. [Applause.]

As I said, I wrote into the relief bill a provision that we could get W. P. A. help on these rural lines, and put the unemployed to work on them. It has worked like a charm. I want you to pass this information out to the farmers. If anyone undertakes to give you trouble under the Hatch Act for doing so, I will defend you and say that I sent them word by you, that you are representing me in taking this word to them. [Laughter.]

It was some time before I could get one of these projects worked up. I worried everybody to death, almost. I finally went to Hyde Park and got it ironed out. The power association put up the sponsor's fund, surveyed the proposed lines, and put them into a W. P. A. project. We thought it better for our people to be cutting poles, digging holes, and building these rural power lines than to be doing some other things to which some of them were assigned. As I said, it worked like a charm. The W. P. A. gave us the money for the labor. Therefore we cut those poles, peeled them, hauled them to the creosoting plant, and hauled them back, cut out the right-of-way, dug the holes, erected the poles, put on the cross arms, and stretched the wire. They gave us exemptions for the skilled labor necessary and allowed us $6 to $7 per month per man on materials, which enabled us to reduce the cost of these lines about 50 percent. That enabled us to reach more farmers. It enabled us to reach the isolated farmer—the one across the creek, the one beyond the pasture, over on the distant hillside, or around on the side road. We are trying to reach them all through this great program. And, believe me, the American people are behind us. [Applause.]

When these Old Guard Republicans or reactionary Democrats who are opposing us go home, take their flashlights, and start out to try to teach their farmers how to milk ducks [laughter], instead of helping them to get electricity to their homes, they are going to be by them like a good old time darky down at home was who got lost in a thunderstorm one night. He was trying to follow a path by the flash of the lightning. He was making poor headway and the storm was growing worse. He decided he had better pray. About the time the notion struck him the lightning hit a tree close by and shivered it to splinters. He dropped down on his knees and said, "O Lawd, I reckon you knows what you is doin'. I spec you knows mo' 'bout what's bes' in a storm like dis dan I does. But ef it means all de same to you, I'd be powerful glad ef you'd gimme less racket and mo' light." [Laughter and applause.]

We are today building cooperative cold-storage plants throughout the country, and we are going to continue to build them until we get one in every locality, so the farmer can live and eat the products from his own farm throughout the entire year. Millions of pounds of food are now being lost every year that could and should be saved. These cooperative cold-storage plants will do the work. I was out in Nebraska, speaking for my friend and coworker for the R. E. A. and the T. V. A., Senator GEORGE NORRIS, one of the best friends the farmers of this Nation ever had. [Applause.] I ate some fine Nebraska beef, but I found out that it came around through a packing house in Kansas City. They passed me some corn flakes. They were made from Nebraska corn but came from Battle Creek, Mich. With these cooperative cold-storage plants and these community processing plants we can eat our own meat, eggs, poultry, fruit, corn, fish, and vegetables the year round. If they keep raising the price of manufactured goods, farm women, with their electric sewing machines, can make their own clothes as well as clothes for the rest of the family.

I know there has been criticism of Secretary Wallace in some quarters because of his soil-conservation program, which I think is one of the greatest movements that has ever been instituted for the farmers of this Nation. We are saving our soil for future generations, we are building for a thousand years. Our people have nowhere else to go. Our backs are to the wall. We must build up or own country, our own section, our own communities, and our own homes and make them better and brighter places in which to live. [Applause.]

Whenever we electrify a community in my district I insist that they electrify the schoolhouse in that community, then set aside a room in that schoolhouse and equip it with electrical appliances. The dealers are usually willing to supply the appliances free of charge. It is good advertising for them. Then we teach the children how to operate those appliances. Above all things, we are teaching them to read the meter. The other fellow has been reading our meters too long. [Applause.] Now we have a meter that even a Republican Congressman or a Republican candidate for President can read. It just has one dial, where the old meter had four, and it costs about half what the old one did.

I am trying to leave as my monument cheap electricity in every farm home in the district I represent, and I hope to live to see it in every farm home in America. We are behind almost every country in the world in rural electrification. In France, England, Sweden, Norway, and Germany they have 90 percent of their farms electrified. Holland and Switzerland have 100 percent of their farms electrified. Even Japan has 90 percent of her farms electrified.

But we are on our way; no force on earth can stop us. Those candidates for Congress and for President who have not seen the light yet had better wake up and join the procession instead of listening to the siren songs of the opposition, and then have a rude awakening next November. [Applause.] Otherwise they will be like the old churchman who was led astray by some shrewd and unscrupulous fellows who wanted to use him to serve their own selfish ends back in the Volstead days. He was running for office, and they wanted to use him. They took him for a ride one night and coaxed him off the water wagon, first with a little spiked punch, then a little light wine, then a highball or two, and finally wound up with a heavy mixture of Alabama white mule and Pennsylvania applejack, followed by a chaser of Milwaukee home brew, which started him off "on flowery beds of ease" into what Grover Cleveland once called "innocuous desuetude."

He dreamt that he dwelt on an isle of cracked ice,
In the midst of a lake of champagne,
Where bloomed the mint juleps in meadows of green
And showers of lithia rain.

[Laughter and applause.]

He reclined on a sofa of lager beer foam,
With a pillow of froth for his head,
And the spray from a fountain of sparkling gin fizz
Descended like dew on his bed.

[Laughter.]

From far-away mountains of crystalline ice,
Came zephyrs refreshing and cool,
Wafting the incense of sweet muscatel
That sparkled in many a pool.

His senses were soothed by the amorous sound
Of a brooklet of pousse-cafe,
That rippled along over pebbles of snow
To a river of absinthe frappe.

[Renewed laughter.]

Ah, soothing the sound of that tinkling glass,
For the lake in his stomach was deep.
He dreamt that he lapped up a highball or two
And languidly floated to sleep.

And then he awoke, on a bed full of rocks,
With a bolster as hard as a brick,
With a wrench in his back, a rack in his head,
And a stomach detestably sick.

He had sand in his eyes, and grit in his mouth,
Where the taste of the night before clung,
And he felt a bath towel shoved down his throat,
Which he later found out was his tongue.

[Laughter.]

He searched for the thread of the evening before,
In the maze of his mystified brain,
From the depths of his soul there came the old vow,
"I'm on the wagon again!"

[Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Arthur Krock's Comments on Roosevelt's Fireside Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from this morning's New York Times:

[From the New York Times of May 28, 1940]

UNPREPAREDNESS IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MANY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—"I do not propose to, I could not, go into every detail," said the President on the radio last night, discussing the military uses to which have been put the $7,000,000,000 plus spent for national defense since he took office. Yet some of the details are very interesting and do not take much space.

Mr. Roosevelt said that in 1933 "the relative fighting power of the Navy had been greatly diminished by failure to replace ships and equipment which had become out of date." Yet in that year Hitler had just come to power in Germany; all the democracies were sleeping at the switch along with the United States; and our condition was not in the least unusual. It was the inevitable consequence of the Arms Limitation Conference in Washington in 1921, and the New York Times Index has no reference to any protest Mr. Roosevelt may have made at that time against the junking of the Navy. If he did not oppose the Hughes plan, as the files indicate he did not, he was a member of the vast majority.

The issue of this newspaper for December 27, 1921, contained many columns on the progress of Secretary Hughes' proposal. It contained also, on page 12, a letter from Mr. Roosevelt. But this was written as president of the National Navy Club, and its text was an appeal for support of this worthy organization; nothing about disarmament one way or another.

The details which the President did not give, and the reasons he failed to mention for neglect in preparedness from 1922 to 1933, make a proper supplement for his radio speech. That neglect, for which the responsibility was general, was once explained by former Representative Swagar Sherley of Kentucky in one of his wise and pithy epigrams. "Unpreparedness," he said, "is the price which a nation pays for democracy." This explanation thoroughly covers the subject up to the phase, after the President had been some time in office, when Hitler began his coups de main. Since then, critics assert, we should have spent more money on the Military Establishment, or gotten more for what we spent.

This is where the details, omitted by the President, become of value. The present equipment of the Army, in the categories mentioned by the President, is to be learned from official records if not from Mr. Roosevelt's speech.

He lumped together things ordered, in the process of construction, and completed. Thus, "Since 1933 we have actually purchased 5,640 airplanes for the Army," adding that those delivered 4, 5, 6, or 7 years ago have been worn out and scrapped. But a breakdown discloses that the Army now has only 2,422 planes, of which but 863 are combat types, and only several hundred of these modern.

"We now," said the President, "have more than 1,700 modern anti-aircraft guns of all types on hand or on order." We actually have in hand 163 of the 3-inch somewhat outmoded guns and precisely 1 modern defense weapon of this type.

"We have now on hand and on order," said the President, "more than 1,600 modern infantry mortars." Official sources report that the Army has "only a handful" of the 75-millimeter howitzers in its physical possession. The President added that we have "on hand and on order" 1,700 modern tanks and armored cars. There are on hand less than 100 light tanks. Mr. Roosevelt gave no figures as to scout cars and antitank guns. We have 500 of the former and 300 to 400 of the latter.

The figures as to Navy aircraft look rather better. "Today," said the President, "we have 2,892 on hand and on order." Of these, as he did not go on to report, 1,765 are in service now and 1,912 are expected to be in service in the next fiscal year. They will be divided in types as follows: Scouting, 851; transport, 120; fighting, 193; torpedo or bombing, 120; training, 270; and patrol bombing, 310. The remainder are miscellaneous.

These are some of the uses to which the $7,000,000,000 have been put since 1933, the total being exclusive of what is being currently provided to increase the national-defense establishment. They are the details available to any authorized and responsible interrogator, including Members of Congress. But there is a feeling in Congress that it should have a fuller and more complete break-down, which can be procured only by an inquiry. And there is a further feeling that some legislative observation should be maintained over the amounts to be spent in the future.

Few of those who express these sentiments, however, have overstepped the bounds of mild criticism. Considering the sums that have been spent, and that this is general election year, remarkable restraint has been observed. And there seems to be little doubt that, if the administration would support an inquiry and concurrent checking of future expenditures, a confidential status in any period of emergency would be accepted where confidence was obviously linked with national security. But a radio speech, particularly in such general terms, with such lack of detail and full of repetition of the blind phrase "on order," does not seem to the critics adequate in the circumstances.

The low mechanized state of the Army is especially disturbing to them in view of the sums expended and Gen. Hugh Johnson's repeated charge that the President years ago had $3,300,000,000 for this purpose and used none of it to that end.

Bermuda and Caribbean Isles Needed for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

STATEMENT BY MAKE EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee on the subject Bermuda and Caribbean Isles Needed for Defense:

"The position of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee in contending for the acquisition of Bermuda and the British and French West Indies by the United States is being more and more vindicated by events as well as by statements of outstanding public men," said a statement issued by the committee from its headquarters today at 425-426 Bond Building, Washington, D. C. The committee is headed by Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, as national chairman, with two Congressmen, SWEENEY, of Ohio, and RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, among the vice chairmen. Other vice chairmen include ex-Senator Smith W. Brookhart, of Iowa; Gov. E. P. Carville, of Nevada; and Gen. Smedley D. Butler.

"In his message to Congress on May 16," the statement continued, "President Roosevelt strongly emphasized America's increased proximity to Europe because of aviation and other changed technological and military conditions. This is in direct harmony with the position of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee which has from its inception pointed out the urgency of American ownership of Bermuda and the Caribbean islands as a matter of defense.

"In maintaining that these possessions should be acquired by the United States, we have been motivated by their defense usefulness as much as by the belief that their transfer would constitute a fair and a practical settlement of the old war debts which

have so long been a subject of controversy. Some, in their zeal for the Allied cause, have jumped to the erroneous conclusion that the demand for the islands was based upon a desire to help the Nazis, and that to press such a demand would be an act unfriendly to the Allied belligerents. This was, of course, absolutely incorrect, as the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee is concerned solely with the interests of the American people—certainly not with interfering in a ruthless and revolting war, which an overwhelming majority of Americans, from the Chief Executive down, have expressed a heartfelt desire to keep out of.

At an earlier stage of our activity there was a disappointing lack of interest in the proposed acquisition of Bermuda and the West Indian islands among some of our statesmen, while others, like Senators LUNDEEN and REYNOLDS and Congressmen RANDOLPH and SWEENEY, fought persistently to awaken the Nation to the imperative necessity of having all adjacent isles under the American flag. A quotation once reported—perhaps inaccurately—from a White House conference, characterized Senator REYNOLDS' advocacy of acquisition as "silly."

Today, however, the tide is turning. More than one distinguished American who was a short time ago apathetic to the proposal now recognizes its value. More than one prominent columnist is now featuring the wisdom of the suggestion in his writings.

Excerpts from the President's message to Congress coincide with our consistent viewpoint:

"More than ever the protection of the whole American Hemisphere against invasion or control or domination by non-American nations has the united support of the 21 American republics, including the United States. * * *

"If Bermuda fell into hostile hands, it is a matter of less than 3 hours for modern bombers to reach our shores.

"From a base in the outer West Indies, the coast of Florida could be reached in 200 minutes."

Frank C. Waldrop, in an able, full-page feature article in the Washington Times-Herald, recently remarked, "Right on the bosom of our most personal sea, the Caribbean, claws the war in real if unseen fury." His article was headed, "Why Debt-Dodging Europe Should Cede Caribbean Holdings to the U. S. A."

Timely references to the Caribbean situation have been made by such correspondents as Ernest K. Lindley, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in "Merry-Go-Round," Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, Ludwell Denny, and various others. The Nation itself is aroused to the vital necessity of facing what is assuredly "a condition, not a theory."

The Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee calls upon Congress to act promptly with regard to this critical and inescapable issue.

Make No Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address to the Republican State Convention assembled at Montpelier, Vt., May 24, 1940, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, neighbors, and friends, the close attention you have paid to, and the enthusiastic applause you have accorded the address of my friend, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, evidences your intense interest in and accord with the address he has made in his powerful and inimitable way.

I also noted your manifest appreciation of the forthright and sensible statements made so eloquently and forcefully by the Honorable Leonard Wing, the gentleman who is presiding in his usual effective manner, as chairman of this convention.

I might well commence and conclude my remarks by saying that I agree with the statements made by these two gentlemen who have heretofore addressed you; but you expect me to do more than this.

So let me say to you, neighbors and friends, that we should make no mistake. The job that confronts the Republican Party (and all Americans) is first to take care of America and American citizens, solve our domestic problems, keep out of the war in Europe, and keep the war in Europe out of America.

We should not be misled or misinformed nor should we be lulled into any false sense of security. Our goal, that of each and every individual, and particularly that of the Republican Party, is the preservation of the American way of life, of civil and religious liberty, and of economic freedom, than which nothing could be more worth while.

Our form of government and our scheme of society—and God knows they need improving—are yet so immeasurably superior as systems to anything in the world that no comparison need be made. Europe is not effete. It is medieval—held back by inertia when not held back by worse things.

During the thousand years that will be required for Europe to attain a real civilization wars will come, as wars have always come in the past.

The masses in Europe are driven as cattle. So long as this is true they will be driven periodically into wars and wars will be abroad there periodically for another thousand years or more.

We should have learned by bitter experience that we cannot go to Europe and control her destiny, even if we would, any more than we could have controlled the history which has produced this crisis.

True it is as Senator VANDENBERG says, "We cannot isolate ourselves in this foreshortened world." It must be our task to insulate ourselves to the last possible degree against this scourge.

The greater our resentment the greater must be our coolheaded restraint in official policy and action, because the greater must be our determination to stay out unless this war comes to the New World.

We must never surrender to the state of mind which resigns itself to the ultimate inevitability of our involvement. We must never forget that we have our hands full in saving democracy at home. We owe that, not only to America, but to the world.

I admit that I am committed by blood and sentiment to the proposition that we should render every aid short of going to war, to the democracies of Europe. Yet I am not in favor of rushing in where angels fear to tread, just to appear to be a good fellow, or of involving ourselves in the war by ill-considered sentimental acts, unjustified by either the propagandized situation of ourselves or of our friends.

There is nothing in the situation itself, or sufficiently new in the President's speech regarding our lack of preparedness to stampede the American people into ventures that may cost them and their posterity all the constitutional liberties and opportunities purchased by the blood of past generations of their fighting and far-seeing ancestors.

We agree with the President's speech in principle. We are not mollycoddles, nor do we lack intestinal fortitude. We have no conquered territory to surrender, we need no foreign territory; we will not squander either our human or material resources, except to defend ourselves against the world. This we will do always, and if and when it be necessary, as now, to make America safe for Americans, in America. That is our primary national obligation.

Our domestic and internal problems are our greatest concern. As we solve or fail to solve them, so shall we stand or fall. Our all-compelling obligation and first duty is to make America invulnerable against foes from without and enemies within our gates. Our duties abroad will to a considerable extent solve themselves as, if, and when this program is speeded to completion.

Secondary things will take second place if we make first things first.

The very perpetuity and security of our democratic institutions depend upon a logical, sensible, definite solution of America's difficult domestic problem, unemployment. It is paradoxical, as Representative WOODRUM of Virginia so eloquently stated the other day, that "In a great land of peace and plenty there is great want and suffering. In a land where there is a surplus of wheat there is no bread. In a land where there is a surplus of cotton, little children are naked. In a land of marvelous opportunities and much work to be done, men pound the highways seeking employment. I say to you, my fellow countrymen, that it is a sad commentary on our ability to make democracy work if we cannot coordinate these great influences." That is America's problem No. 1.

Unless and until we can solve it, you know as well as I do that there is no future for democracy, domestic or international, as we know it.

We have plenty of troubles at home. The "red herring" of internationalism dragged across the trail, should not distract our attention from nor let us lose the scent of tremendous difficulties to be overcome along the road we will have to follow at home in order to stay there.

There can be no difference of opinion among thinking people. Since the New Deal came into power it has spent more than $60,000,000,000. That is approximately enough to buy every manufacturing plant and every mine and every industry in the United States. In the hands of industry that amount of money would have provided and will provide enough jobs for more than the 9,500,000 unemployed. In the hands of Government it has created a centralized bureaucracy, a colossal debt and deficit that has absolutely prevented and stopped productive enterprise.

Think it over! There is no difference of opinion among people who think. We are of one mind and one heart in our anxiety that our country should climb out of the pit of depression into which it has been plunged.

We are of one mind and one heart in our desire to restore the activity of our industires so as to provide work for those who have been seeking it in vain. Seven years of useless experimentation

and wasteful spending of our money have convinced us that this recovery now can be achieved only by the election of a Republican administration in this coming campaign.

So much for business. Now let us look at another angle of the situation.

The destitute condition of the farmers of this country is due, in large measure, to the unfair procedure of the agricultural policy of the New Deal.

First, the New Deal went out and loaded farmers up with all the loans the farmers would carry and assured the farmer that better prices would prevail.

The ink had hardly had time to dry on his mortgage before the new dealers lowered the tariff through the reciprocal-trade treaties.

The new dealers then instituted the program of starting up new farmers subsidized by the administration to compete with farmers already on the farms. Many of them were taken from the relief rolls and set up in business against the regular farmer.

Then the new dealers started a program of controlling surpluses by buying surplus food to hold up agricultural prices. They spent $66,000,000 in 1 year to hold up agricultural prices, so they claim—turned around and imported as high as $868,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products that could and should have been raised on the farms of our country.

The New Deal program has put an invisible mortgage on every acre of cropland in America. The farmer may think his farm is paid for, and the records in the register of deed's office may show that there isn't any mortgage on record, but the invisible mortgage must be paid by the production of crops off this farm just as much as if it were in the county recorder's office.

A $1,000,000,000 increase in the public debt represents $2.90 in mortgage on every acre of cropland, if agriculture were to carry the whole load.

That's the story, in part. I agree wholeheartedly with the remark made by George Peek when he said in this connection, "We must replace theorists with realists, inconsistency with consistency, incompetency with ability, fiction with truth; and the time is now."

As my friend Wendell Willkie said some days ago in Pittsburgh: "On behalf of our own peace and security and our own spiritual values," of course "we should give to the democracies such assistance as we can, short of war. The British, French, Scandinavians, Dutch, and Belgians believe in the free enterprise system under democracy. That is what we believe. Whatever we can do to aid that faith without jeopardizing peace for our own land, that we should be willing to do." That's common sense.

Let me say to you, however, that our influence, our interests, and our future international relations rest on the foundation of a preparedness sufficient to protect and defend ourselves, internally and externally, against every foe, singly or in combination. That is the truth. That is what the American people should know. Knowing it, no sacrifice will be too great for them to make in order to insure its consummation.

Our internal domestic situation should give us great concern. I am no strategist. I am, however, convinced that by reason of our situation between the seas our continental security will not and cannot be seriously threatened by Europe or Asia, their air forces, their navies, or their armies, if—and only if—we command the seas.

"Sooner or later," as Colonel Lindbergh says, "we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power. Let us not be confused by this talk of invasion by European aircraft. The air defense of America is as simple as the attack is difficult when the true facts are faced."

Whether we like it or not, the day has come for us, the United States, to forego our dependence for our safety upon what the English Navy might and could do for us in an emergency, and for us to command the seas, for tomorrow there may be no British Navy. Our command and control of the seas is the rock on which rests the security of our national defense and, in fact, of civilization itself.

We must have a navy strong enough to protect our shores before an enemy can reach our shores from the sea. We must have an army and an air force adequately and numerically large enough and well enough equipped on shore to support and to maintain such policy as the Navy may adopt at any zero hour on any M day.

We should have learned that if we ever have to fight we should only fight to resist aggression or in defense. I am convinced that participation or intervention by us in the present holocaust by sending our manpower to Europe would accomplish nothing comparable to the consequent sacrifice in human lives, of our resources, and the possible loss of other things more precious that would be involved in such a participation.

Our defense needs may be briefly summarized, as they repeatedly have been, as follows:

"Our Army adequately equipped with modern weapons for air and land—that means just that and is all-inclusive—must be adequate to defend the bases from which our fleet and our aircraft operate. We must, in addition, have an air force capable of being concentrated on either coast, superior in number to the greatest number of carrier-borne and catapulted aircraft possessed by any naval power or conceivable combination of powers, and powerful enough to prevent an enemy from establishing in either ocean a base in this hemisphere while our fleet is engaging the enemy's fleet."

So I say no price is too high to pay, and no sacrifice too great to make, to insure that such a situation shall obtain at the earliest possible day, and from thence onward be maintained. Therein lies our salvation, the preservation of our ideals, and our hope for the future.

It is the business of the Republican Party to see to it that a government be installed in Washington which will make us so strong that no foreign foe will dare to molest us, which will see to it that ways are found to solve our domestic crises, and with a loyalty unmoved, unshaken, unseduced, unconquerable, and unafraid, we shall stand, a Nation united.

We Americans have made a new declaration of our independence. We have renewed our oath and our obligation to maintain and to defend it, against any and every attack always, from wherever or by whomsoever, it be assailed.

Let me also say to you that as I see it and believe, never again should a son of any American mother be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice in any land across the sea, or to fight for ideas and ideologies from which our forefathers had the brains, the courage, and the independence to separate themselves, so long ago,

Never again should an American soldier be called upon to lay down his life, to be planted beneath 2 feet of Flanders sod, or to be in those foreign fields marked by crosses, row on row, as a blood tribute to that greed for glory, gold, and glebe that is at the bottom of all the troubles of this war-worn world. Billions for defense. Not one red cent for tribute should be our slogan.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1940

Mr. BUCKLEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are today discussing problems of national defense. On Sunday evening I had the pleasure of hearing President Roosevelt review the present strength of our military forces and equipment; also, the plan to develop a program of defense to secure the safety of our Nation.

Many of us buy every edition of the newspapers these days, and spend much time listening to the radio commentators to get the news from Europe. And, what a low feeling one is left in when he hears of the attacks by the German war machine on courageous and helpless people. There come to view scenes of death, suffering, and destruction to countries who but a few years ago believed that they lived in comparative peace and safety. When we see photos and moving pictures of some of the newly created refugees plodding along roads, knowing not where the end is, we are too shocked to even gain the full significance of their plight.

We Americans believe in peace, and we are violently opposed to war; we are also opposed to sending our troops abroad to engage in foreign conflicts. As our President stated last Sunday, we are continuously offering prayers for peace for all mankind. Many of the other nations believed in peace and were opposed to war; but, alas, the monster that knows no ethics, religion, or anything of decency, rolls on to destroy their homes, their lives, and, most important of all, their spirit of freedom and religion. As in the past, I have called the roll of the victims, but there are some to be added today, since my statement to this House a month ago—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Holland, and Belgium. What has happened to these can and may happen to others. We will see to it that it will never happen to us. To the credit of America, our democracy, it must be said that in times of emergency we forget partisanship, sectionalism, and everything else in order to unite for the best interests of our country. There is little opposition to our President's plan to speed up the national defense. Those who are opposed are generally persons believing in the usual rank "isms" or those who term themselves isolationists, and point out that no one would dare attack us or that the oceans will protect us against such attacks.

Conditions change, and what would have seemed sufficient protection yesterday is not adequate today. Likewise, what we believe secure today would render us insecure tomorrow. Examples of this can readily be found in our municipalities. Some years ago many of our towns operated a fire department with a volunteer fire force. They did not have motorized equipment but used manpower to convey and operate the apparatus to the scene of the fire. The alarm system consisted sometimes of an iron hoop and hammer. That was adequate for that time. With the growth of the community, the taller structures, and the greater possibility of fire, these methods were abandoned in favor of the so-called modern and up-to-date fire departments, with a paid civil service trained force, motorized high-water pressure equipment, and electric fire-alarm systems. We also know that methods used in our police departments years ago have been discarded in favor of new and better safeguards for the life and property of our citizens.

With regard to our own defenses, although they may be better than at any time during peace in the past, we are going to improve them to meet present peace threats to the safety of our Nation. We will not disregard the fire alarm that has sounded across the seas, and we will not be caught napping. I note from a recent Nation-wide survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion (the so-called Gallup poll) that the public overwhelmingly approves of the defense program.

The American people regard with deep concern the attacks made upon small nations by the Nazi and Bolshevik Governments, and they know that the dictators of the world cannot be trusted, that they will continue to crush other nations, accompanied with the usual slaughter of helpless and innocent people. We are determined that it shall not happen here.

It is our duty to make America so strong on land, on sea, and in the air that no one on the face of the earth will entertain any idea of attacking us or challenging our beliefs in a democratic form of government. We believe in peace, and we will adopt this policy as an insurance to keep that peace. That our country should be adequately safeguarded by land, sea, and air defenses is a subject which should admit of no debate. Today our Navy is stronger than at any peacetime in history, our Army has a greater peacetime strength, our Air Corps is stronger than at any time in history. However, that is not sufficient. We should have the largest, best-trained, and best-equipped air force in the world. We should have on each coast a battle fleet second to none. Our land-defense equipment should be such that a successful attack would be beyond the realm of possibility.

Time after time I have vigorously condemned the alien philosophies of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. I knew that they were opposed to our democratic way of life. I knew that the Communists pitted class against class, seeking revolution and destruction of religion. I knew that nazi-ism pitted "superiority" of race against race and sought revolution and the destruction of religion. Fascism is just as bad. Today, after the revelations that were uncovered by the Dies committee and by other agencies of our Government, and the reports on the operations of the "fifth column" abroad, we now realize the danger of tolerating their further activities. In the preparation and carrying out of this defense program we cannot and we will not overlook this cancerous growth upon our body politic. We will allow them no latitude. They must be weeded out and done away with.

The United States will demonstrate to the world that a democracy can survive. To those of us living in this period of history, our mission is to preserve our heritage and all the fine qualities that make our civilization worth while. In this, industry, labor, government, and the public will work hand in hand with unison and harmony.

Many years ago a great American issued the following words:

> To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

Its author—George Washington.

National Defense and the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the national-defense program has now and will continue to have my full support. I think it is necessary at this time. It is too important, however, to be dealt with without the most careful consideration of its every angle.

Through all recorded human history there have occurred about once every 500 years great and profoundly important changes in the life of mankind upon this earth. If we begin with the year 1000 B. C. we find it marks the approximate date of the occupation of the Greek peninsula by the race that was to give us—about 500 years later—the greatest civilization the world had up to that time known. It was about 500 B. C. that the little city of Rome embarked upon her career of conquest that was to make her not only the mistress of the world from a military standpoint but the Eternal City in a much broader sense. Five hundred years later there took place the greatest of all events in the history of mankind—the birth of the Christ whose gospel was to prove the hope of all subsequent ages and whose brief life on earth was to become a spiritual power capable of destroying many evil institutions and of shaking empires to their foundation. In 500 A. D., approximately, the hammering of the northern barbarians finally broke the gates of Rome and the Dark Ages came over the whole of the western world. Almost exactly 500 years later we find the beginning of the Renaissance, the revival, and the call of Pope Urban for the First Crusade, which was, among other things, to set in motion a new set of forces of curiosity, change, and discovery that would one day give to all men in all parts of the world contacts of one kind or another with all other people on the planet. In 1492, only 8 years prior to 1500, Columbus made his historic voyage and discovered a new western world upon which the brightest hopes of mankind have ever since been fixed.

We now find ourselves approaching the dawn of the next 500-year period and if history teaches us anything it is this: That we should expect to find ourselves in the very midst of one of those periods when the ways of mankind are put to severe tests and when there is tension and trouble among the 2,000,000,000 human beings who have been cast by the Almighty upon this strange little speck in an oftentimes baffling universe.

It is hardly surprising then that we find ourselves in a distressed and tragic time when the peoples of the world are torn by conflict, afflicted by unspeakable acts of war and aggression, and when they seek one thing more than anything else, hope for a brighter tomorrow when there can be peace again.

What then are the things we as Americans can contribute to giving that hope to the peoples of the world?

The first, I believe, is a rediscovery of certain age-old truths which have in one form or another survived all the changes which I have just now so briefly sketched. I believe the greatest need of the world today is to deepen its religious life and to realize afresh that man does not live by bread alone. For if man needs hope more than anything else—and I believe he does—then he needs a hope that nothing can destroy—not war, nor dictatorship, nor death itself. The only such hope that there is is a religious hope. But we shall not be able to help restore and revive that hope merely by protecting the churches of our country against forces that oppose them. That we should certainly do, but far more than that is required. It is required that there be a new national spirit of consecration to what is right, a new willingness on the part of men to be misunderstood and

scorned—yes, and laughed at, if necessary—because they attempt to base their action on what they sincerely believe to be the will of God. It is required that there are some things worth working, living, and dying for yourself—as contrasted with sending other people out to die. And it is required that people who are not compelled to do so should in larger and larger numbers voluntarily identify themselves with the poor and the distressed of their nation first and of the world as well.

A CRISIS FOR FREEDOM

There is no use minimizing the stark realities of the present hour. The readiness with which the American people have responded to the proposal of the President for a vastly strengthened national defense is proof that the people understand that they must face those realities. There are two principles of life and government which face each other around the world today. The one is the principle of dictatorial might; the other is the principle of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Under the dictator principle human beings count for little—even whole small nations are apparently of small concern. Under that principle it is held that the common people are incapable of self-government or of responding to idealism; the only "progress" is achieved by ruthlessly compelling people to travel a road marked out for them by the "all-wise" and all-powerful ruling clique. Under the democratic principle people count, people are depended upon, and their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is the aim of their society and government. (The strange story of how and why it has come about that democratic peoples have been saddled with financial systems that throttle their enterprise and saddle them with unnecessary debt is too long to be injected here. Suffice it to say that there is no more affinity between democracy and the present financial system than there is between day and night, and that the heaviest burden democracy carries as it faces the opposing forces is that debt-money system.)

We are beginning to realize that freedom is a real thing, a precious thing, a thing dearly bought through centuries of effort, thought, and sacrifice. And a determination is growing in the American heart that, as long as they can by any means prevent it, the dictator principle shall not come upon the shores of this western world. We have been deeply moved and profoundly shaken. We are capable today of sacrifices which even a few short weeks ago we simply were not willing to make. Much good—and much that is not good—can come out of the state of mind in which the American people find themselves today. It is an hour for action. It is also an hour for careful consideration of what is right and best to do. It is an hour for consecration. And it is an hour when we may do great good or great harm to the future of our country and the world. Which of these it is to be will, in my judgment, depend not so much upon what we do as upon the spirit in which we do it.

And the first and most important thing is that we keep our heads, that we do not become panicky or excited, and that while we work for unity of purpose and objective we do not become intolerant of discussion as to the best means of achieving that objective.

THE MEANS OF DEFENSE

There is no longer any shadow of doubt that the national-defense program will be passed almost unanimously by an aroused Congress. Certainly, I shall support that program. But it will make all the difference in the world just how this program is carried forward.

First of all, it should be carried forward according to a plan—the best plan of national defense that the best brains in the country can devise. We have, I think, had not enough of this. I do not subscribe for a moment to the charge that "all the money spent in recent years on defense has been poured down a rat hole." I believe that money has, on the whole, been well spent. But I do know that this to too vital a time for us to fail—as Members of Congress—to insist on the very greatest efficiency and care being used in the expenditure of the defense funds we are providing. There should be no jealousy or friction within or between departments having to do with national defense. Such things can have no place from now on.

Second. This program of national defense must be carried forward on the basis of the principle of equality of sacrifice, which means sacrifice in proportion to the ability to make sacrifice. It is significant, I believe, that at least one eloquent House orator has suggested that we begin the sacrifice by making savings at the expense of the unemployed. He seems to have the idea that if people already undernourished are made still more undernourished it will strengthen their spirits and increase their stamina. Quite the contrary is, in my opinion, the truth. I believe this is no time to relax our efforts to solve the unemployment problem. Rather should we redouble our efforts. Neither is this a time to forget the problem of migratory labor, or of agriculture generally, or of the ill-housed, or of any other group. But there are those who will try to use this time to get us to forget these things. There are those who will try to urge in the name of national defense that at one and the same time we remove the measures protective of labor from the statute books and also relax all vigilance with regard to profiteering at the expense of the Nation. Patriotic businessmen will resent the implication that their loyalty has to be purchased. They will, I am convinced, be as ready as anyone to do their part if Congress does not play politics with this issue.

The truth is that any loyal American stands ready to "tighten his belt" if only he knows that all others are doing likewise.

TAXES

Third. Then, this program of national defense should be accompanied by a tax program that will really distribute the burden. I am not for letting favored groups go scot-free. But I am for distributing the burden in a fair and equitable manner. Income and inheritance taxes will have to be increased. The base will probably have to be broadened. Taxes on admitted luxuries can and should be increased. Loopholes, particularly the tax-exempt loopholes, should be plugged.

WAR EXCESS-PROFITS TAX MEASURE—H. R. 9513

And once again I am saying now, as I have been saying since the first day of the session, that a war excess-profits tax measure should be passed. A carefully prepared bill has been in—introduced by myself—since that first day. Its number is H. R. 9513. Tax experts tell me it would raise $500,000,000 at present levels of production—much more as the impact of the defense program is felt.

And action on these taxes should be taken now—before Congress adjourns, as soon as the appropriation bills have been disposed of. The country will respect us far more if we do not delay on this vital matter. Everyone knows we have got to pass tax legislation. Everyone knows we will do it next winter if we do not do it now. We are not going to fool a single person by waiting until after election.

NATIONAL CREDIT FOR DEFENSE

It is the practice of nations when facing national emergencies to call upon their people for sacrifice. But it has also been their practice to leave untouched by any sacrifice and, indeed, to handsomely reward the private creators of credit with higher and higher interest rates. Every national resource except the national credit is drawn upon by the Nation to meet its needs. The credit of any nation is based upon its production. It rests upon the capacity of the people to produce wealth and to make sacrifices. Yet we insist upon pawning our national credit to induce the banks to monetize it in the form of interest-bearing debt. The people as a whole make the sacrifices; the private banking system lends back to the people the use of their own credit. This is unreasonable and unjust.

We should proceed at once to buy the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks, which now operate as banks of issue though they are privately owned by the mem-

ber banks. And we should then provide either for the issue of United Staets currency or for the direct use of United States credit to pay the necessary expenses of national defense. With this must, of course, go a tax program of sufficient scope to prevent inflation and to provide for paying as we go for national defense.

In other words, new money or new national credit would be issued or created at a sufficient rate to pay for national defense. By means of the taxes levied the people will pay back to the Government this extension of their own credit. No debt need be contracted under these circumstances and no interest need be paid.

On January 22 I introduced a bill called the National Credit for Defense Act, which provides that this method of financing be used if by any tragic circumstance war should come upon us. That bill is now being redrafted so it will meet the present situation and the national-defense needs.

DO NOT SACRIFICE JUSTICE

I have spoken many times of sacrifice in this speech. But there is one thing that must not be sacrificed and that is elemental human decency and justice. There will be plenty of temptation to do so, plenty of opportunity to try to prove one's patriotism by making unfounded accusations against others with whom one does not agree. Aliens good and bad, aliens who are 100 percent loyal to this Nation as well as aliens whose real loyalty is still elsewhere, will, unless we are careful, all be dumped into one category and used as national whipping boys. Let us be careful lest honest criticism be condemned along with real obstructionist tactics. Let us be careful to distinguish between the person who with all his heart and conscience believes war is wrong and who, therefore, strives to the end for peace and the other individual who, for the benefit of foreign powers, tries to confuse the American defense effort in the name of "peace," but who really believes that force and force alone should be the principle of government. And above all, let him who has never done a small selfish thing that hurt or robbed his Nation for his own gain be the first to cast the stone.

I say these things not to minimize the importance of our detecting and dealing with any elements in this country whose allegiance is given to another nation or to a foreign dictator. I say them so we will, with great earnestness, avoid an unreasoning suspicion of every person who dissents from the dominant majority opinion. America's effort is to protect freedom and democracy. We must not destroy them in the process.

The job before the Dies committee, of which I am a member, is now of much greater importance than has heretofore been the case. That job now is one of doing everything possible to bring to light real "fifth column" agents in this country. The time has passed for the committee to spend its time on any but the most important people who are actually and actively working in the United States in the interest of foreign governments. The test from now on has got to be the test of where a man's loyalty lies. And it ought to be a matter of proof and not of inference, unless that inference can be checked and rechecked from a number of independent sources in every case. For whereas it may once have been true that a person accused before the committe was put in a difficult position, it is now true that such a person may well become an object of bitter hatred and deep suspicion. Already we have read of violence flaring up in various parts of the country—in one case against people distributing handbills. Whatever may be our opinion of the handbills, and however wrong may have been the things they said, there is one thing certain, and that is that the important "fifth column" agents are not out distributing handbills of any sort. Far more likely, they are occupying comfortable positions in the upper layers of our society.

There can be no question that the Communists have been working hand in glove with Nazi agents in Norway, France, many other nations, and in the United States. The Communists are probably a larger mass movement in the United States at present and it is easier to find out about them, but it should be remembered that their intrigue has been less successful than has the Nazi intrigue in every single country where the two have existed side by side. The Dies committee has done a pretty thorough job of exposing the extent and scope of communism in the United States, and I would not have the committee neglect this work. But it is clearly of the very utmost importance that an equally good job be done at the admittedly more difficult task of exposing the Fascist and the Nazi movements.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in his speech before the House yesterday, presented material on Nazi activities in this country that I hope and believe our committee will follow up with care. If even half of what he said is true, then he has pointed to persons of such power and influence that their exposure will be worth as much as the bringing to light of the activities of 1,000 unemployed radicals.

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

No one, I think, can view the present tragedy of Europe without seeking to find out just where the awful mistake was made after the last World War which caused another one to come so soon. I have never been a particularly enthusiastic advocate of the League of Nations. But I cannot help wondering whether it might not have been possible, by some such means, to have worked out a really just and equitable arrangement among the nations and to have avoided this holocaust. And I am certain that some way, somehow, we have got to find a vastly better answer than we have yet found to the problem of the relations between nations. At present, as I have said, I think we are doing right in building up the military defenses of our Nation. I am afraid there are forces at work in the world that understand nothing else. But if we stop and think we must realize how all the skill of science, all the ingenuity of man, is being turned to the refinement of means of destroying human life. The energies of men are turned more and more to the production of armaments. And while I would not fail to provide the defenses I think this country needs under present circumstances, I know my duty cannot and must not stop there.

The day will come because it must come (unless one believes that man's destiny on this earth is nothing more than self destruction) when the people of the world will realize that they have got to devise a way of peacefully living together on this earth. Some sort of world order—yes; some sort of world union—has got some day to come. It will present terrific problems, but not one of them will be half so great or half so terrible as the thing the people of Europe are facing today—the thing I hope and pray we can keep away from our western world.

We have got to think through this crisis and beyond it. Merely to meet it is not enough. We have got to keep alive that hope of a better world which for some strange but, I think, very significant reason mankind has never given up even in the darkest hours of history.

Yes; the principles of freedom and of concern for human life are worth preserving, worth sacrificing for. If America must stand as the refuge of democracy, we must make her strong to do that. But, even as we undertake this task, let us not forget that there are other kinds of strength than military strength that we shall need in the days that lie ahead.

For the strongest force in the world is not armed might. The strongest force in the world is the power and influence of a human spirit which is ready to make complete self-sacrifice. Enough people of that kind can stop a Hitler or any other force on earth. But it requires utter consecration.

Some day the world is going to learn this. Some day once again the power of the one Man who ever completely gave himself for humanity and to God will be given opportunity by men to work among them. It would be well for us to be ready for that day. For when it comes, all who have used implements of war for conquest will be afraid. They may rule for a few brief moments. But they can never really conquer, because they cannot conquer their own souls.

How Much Do We Want Liberty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY RABBI IRVING F. REICHERT, OF CONGREGATION EMANU-EL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by a distinguished constituent, Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, of Congregation Emanu-El, San Francisco, over the N. B. C. Blue Network, as follows:

It is not in the least surprising that the Fathers of the American Republic derived a great many of their ideas on government from the Hebrew Scriptures. They were, for the most part, deeply religious men. The Bible was the best-known book in their libraries. Their knowledge of the Old Testament was reflected, not only in the State papers and orations of the period, but in the principles of free government which they enunciated in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. For example, on the same day when the Declaration of Independence was signed, a distinguished committee consisting of Franklin, Adams, and Jefferson, which had been appointed to submit a design for a Great Seal of the United States, brought in its report. The report was accepted, and so on the first Great Seal of our Nation there appeared the picture of King Pharaoh and his cohorts drowning in the Red Sea, while on the bank, framed in a halo of glory, stood Moses and the newly emancipated Israelites. Around the rim of the Seal ran the legend, "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." And when those same founding fathers came to select the motto for the Liberty Bell, which has become one of the treasured symbols of our freedom, they chose as the most appropriate quotation a verse from the book of Leviticus: "Proclaim ye liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

These patriotic reminiscences are evoked by the circumstance that commencing on Monday night next and lasting for 7 days, the faithful of Israel will celebrate the Passover. Its theme is liberty. It commemorates with feast and story, with song and prayer, the release of the ancient Hebrews from Egyptian slavery. That first emancipation in recorded history proved to be one of the turning points in the destiny of mankind. When Moses, speaking in the name of the Eternal Spirit, demanded the release of the Hebrew slaves, saying, "Let my people go that they may serve me," he formulated for the first time the principle that human rights take precedence over property rights; that was a stupendous and a revolutionary declaration. Moreover, had the Israelites not been freed from Egyptian bondage, the Ten Commandments would never have been given; the Bible, including the New Testament as well as the Old, would never have been written; the Hebrews would have been absorbed into the population of Egypt, and Christianity and Mohammedanism would never have been born.

One need not be a believer in religion to appreciate the enormous significance of Moses in human history. Even a skeptic who dismisses the miraculous elements in the biblical account of the exodus as the romantic exaggeration of a pious scribe cannot thus legitimately deny the essential fact of the liberation from Egypt. For more than four centuries the Hebrews had been slaves. Anyone who has ever stood in the shadow of the pyramids or looked upon the massive ruins of the temple at Luxor can appreciate the fact that those ancient Hebrews were of considerable economic importance to their Egyptian masters. One can readily imagine the tremendous obstacles which Moses had to surmount before he could achieve the independence of his people—the resistance of their rulers, the servile timidity of his brethren, the jealousy of rival leaders, the bitter enmity of the privileged classes. Himself of royal status, he might have enjoyed the luxury of the idle rich and contemplated with serene detachment a system of human degradation of which he was the beneficiary. He chose instead to fill a more heroic role. He cared enough for liberty to make that choice.

We are living in one of those crucial periods in which the principle of human freedom must face anew the challenge of a cruel and truculent illiberalism. All the values of the human spirit which civilized men hold dear and honorable are threatened with extinction by a force more sinister and ruthless, more powerful and determined than any which our world has ever known. In one country after another the brutal fist of tyranny has brushed the heritage of humane and cultured living which is the finest flower of the free spirit of man. Every marvelous device which science has made available for the extension of human happiness and freedom is turned with savagery and staggering might into an instrument for the annihilation of those precious possessions. Mile by mile the frontiers of liberty are shrinking as the victorious hosts of destruction press their evil gains.

The number of free countries is growing smaller. Some have chosen dictatorship; others have had it forced upon them; still others, through the stern demands of military necessity, have been obliged to submit to it. Nor is there any neutral nation in the world today, howsoever far removed from the actual theater of war, whose liberties are not threatened. Tyranny is wearing many alluring disguises nowadays in her competition with the Goddess of Liberty. Her cheeks are rouged with false prosperity to trap the unwary with an appearance of health and her solicitation is often phrased in the plagiarized vocabulary of patriotism. Believe me, she is a dangerous courtesan and never more seductive than in a time when unemployment walks the streets in run-down shoes, and men are bewildered and desperate. Will we in America fall a prey to that snare? Despite the pressure of propaganda and the compulsion of a contracting economy, will we maintain and defend our democratic institutions? That is the crucial question which our generation must face and answer.

Now, a man does not have to be a prophet to realize that our answer to that question will depend on how much we want liberty. How highly do we value it? What price are we prepared to pay for it? The men and women who bequeathed it to us as the most precious quality of American life held it worthy of their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. They renounced some very delightful creature comforts and abdicated not a few attractive selfish privileges that the blessings of freedom might be more generally extended. How much do we want liberty?

In the first place, do we want liberty intelligently enough to recognize the proposition that government and economics are inseparable? Liberty is not to be had merely for the asking. It cannot be produced out of an empty political slogan the way a magician pulls a rabbit out of an empty hat. How much liberty does a man have when he is continually harassed by uncertainty and want? What meaning has freedom of opportunity when every door to gainful employment is closed?

The other day one of my friends, who is a thoughtful observer of the contemporary scene, put it this way: "90 percent of the American people," said he, "would readily exchange the Bill of Rights for economic security." Well, if my friend is right, we had best see to it that 90 percent, or even a substantial fraction of that number, are not driven by necessity to that desperate choice. Nevertheless, freedom to starve or freedom to register for relief is not the American conception of liberty—not by a long sea mile. To be sure, we have traveled a considerable distance during the last few difficult years along the road of enlightened social legislation, and the provisions we have made for unemployment relief, old-age pensions, minimum wages, and the like testify to a growing acceptance of the principle that government must be deeply concerned with the economic welfare of the people. And that, let me remind you, is no new theory in our national life. Jefferson championed it; Madison fought for it; Patrick Henry gave it all his celebrated eloquence. Our freedom is not menaced half so much by overpublicized Communists as it is by undernourished Americans. We need not fear hardworking Fascists nearly as much as Americans who have no work at all.

Write this down and think about it: The greatest menace to democracy is insecurity and want. If the millions of our unemployed and their dependents care enough about liberty to stand by and tighten their belts until we can work this problem out, we can preserve liberty in America. If government can make our boundless resources serve the greatest good of the greatest number, we can, within the framework of the existing order, retain our freedom. How much do we want liberty?

In the second place, do we care enough about liberty to subordinate our lesser loyalties for its preservation? Josiah Royce, in his Philosophy of Loyalty, reminds us of one of the most stirring episodes in English history. In 1642 there was a conflict between Charles I and the House of Commons. The King requested the surrender of those men who were most actively opposing him, but the House refused to give them up and reminded the King of its traditional prerogatives by which the House alone had jurisdiction over its members. Thereupon the King resolved to have his way by force. The next day, accompanied by an armed guard, he proceeded to the House and handed the presiding officer a list of the men he wished to arrest, with the curt demand, "Mr. Speaker, do you espy these persons in the House?" What followed made history. The speaker kneeled before his sovereign and, in calm, firm tones, replied, "Your Majesty, I am the speaker of this House, and being such, I have neither eyes to see nor ears to hear nor tongue to speak, save as this House may direct, and I most humbly beg Your Majesty's pardon if that is the only answer I can give to Your Majesty." Well, there you have a dramatic instance of a conflict in loyalties in which the lesser gave way to the greater. The speaker and the men sought by the King belonged, for all we know, to opposing political factions. It is quite likely that they had their differences and disagreements on many policies and issues, but when

the fundamentals of democratic government were challenged, they closed the ranks. The higher loyalty had the right-of-way.

Let no one listening in this afternoon suppose that he is outside the circle of this matter. Each one of us, in the words of Emerson, is a bundle of relations. Just see how we fragmentize our lives and mortgage out our loyalties—into political parties, fraternal organizations, trade unions, industrial associations, religious denominations—what an endless and varied multitude of affiliations lay imperious claims upon us. "This is the ax you must grind," they say, "remember that you are a Democrat," or "put republicanism first," or "the workers must stand firm," or "industry must have a clear field." What sort of clamor is this at a time when the pillars of the temple are trembling? Some years ago in California a quarterback gave the wrong signals, and the ball was run clear down the field to the opponent's goal for an enemy touchdown. There are too many quarterbacks out there calling the wrong signals—running the ball in the wrong direction. The forces that threaten republican government today are powerful and unscrupulous. It will take the best teamwork we can manage to beat them. Let us give America the right-of-way. This is a time to think and act not merely as Republicans and Democrats, labor leaders or captains of industry, workers or employers, Jews or Christians—but as Americans. How much do we want liberty?

To be sure, this does not mean that we must surrender our honest convictions or refuse to tolerate the opinions of those who differ with us. To do that would create the very tyranny we would destroy. That is exactly what has happened in Russia and Germany and Italy and that is why we say, "Thank God for America." Only as we keep America safe for differences can we keep it safe for freedom. Remember the words of Wendell Phillips: "If there is anything in the universe that can't stand discussion, let it crack." You may not like what that revolutionary radical is saying any more than I do, but so long as he has not put himself outside the protection of our laws, he has a right to speak. You have the right to differ. That is the American way. You may not approve of your neighbor's conduct any more than he approves of yours—that does not entitle you to tar and feather him and run him out of town. The Ku Kluxers and Vigilantes who make so brave a show behind their masks at night against the helpless victims of their cruelty have learned, it seems, much more from Hitler and Stalin than from Washington and Lincoln. They constitute by far a greater menace to America than all the Christian Fronts and bunds from coast to coast. Remember those immortal words of Lincoln: "Those who deny liberty to others do not deserve it for themselves, and under a just God, will not long enjoy it." How much tolerance do we want? Do we want it only for our own opinions, and not for the opinions of others? How much law and order do we want? Do we want it only for our own protection, and not for the protection of our neighbors? How much freedom do we want? Do we want it only for white men, and not for black and yellow? How much do we want liberty?

Finally this question leads directly to the heart of a world situation that touches intimately the life of each of us. Do we cherish liberty enough to refuse to risk its destruction in a war overseas? Make no mistake about this, my friends, the moment our Nation enters a foreign war, you can bid adieu to the Goddess of Liberty. Her statue in New York Harbor may not even be there to greet our soldiers coming home—if there are any left to come home. War demands dictatorship for its efficient waging. It demands the total resources—spiritual as well as material—of a nation. And in return it gives back corpses, blind and crippled sons and husbands, starvation, bankruptcy, unemployment, and dictatorship.

You blind men, fumbling with your broom-straws in the Veterans' Hospital that overlooks the Golden Gate, whose shimmering glory you can never know—you won the last war. You sharecroppers, scratching the dry crust of earth for crumbs to feed your wives and children—you won the last war. You bankers and brokers whose war profits built such costly tombs for your gassed and shattered sons—do you hear me? You won the last war. Thousands slain and hopelessly mangled; 200 billions of property destroyed; a National debt of 40 billions, 10 millions of unemployed—and who can count the cost in human suffering and the destruction of spiritual values? And we won the war.

A man does not have to be an isolationist, or even neutral in his heart to stand against American participation in this war. God grant that it may speedily end, and be succeeded by a just and lasting peace. To that end we can best contribute if we keep our sanity in a world gone mad. And we can keep our freedom too. If ever our own shores should be threatened by an invading foe, we shall know how to meet that challenge. But as we value liberty, we shall resist the siren voices that would lure us to its destruction. Have we so soon forgotten the surging tide of starved and angry voices in our city streets after the last war? Seeking democracy for the world, we barely saved it for ourselves. Next time we may not fare so well. The dice are loaded in that game. How much do we want liberty?

The Benefit of a Raised Price Level to the Farmer and Laborer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY CHARLES G. BINDERUP

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following radio address by our former colleague, Charles G. Binderup:

Good morning, my radio audience, and thank you for responding so splendidly to these broadcasts with your fine letters of encouragement. Before beginning my address today I would like to express profound appreciation to the owners and managers of this radio station. It is a privilege and pleasure to speak to you people, scattered out over the great Middle West of this Nation, in behalf of our Uncle Sam and to remind you of an honor debt you owe him. Have you forgotten when you or your folks came West, or across the water, as I did, in search of justice and freedom and a home? Your Uncle Sam gave you everything. Surely you have not forgotten. Then why don't you pay for these great blessings, now that he needs you? Can't you hear him pleading with you that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth"?

In these radio talks we are endeavoring to touch that magnetic spark of patriotism hidden away within the heart and soul of every American citizen. Without this awakening democracy cannot live, and with this awakening democracy cannot die. When we say "patriotism" we do not mean war, except, of course, in the case of an invasion of our own Nation. It is not our business to meddle with foreign affairs.

Just yesterday a letter came to the desk containing another one of the old, familiar Wall Street ghosts. To accommodate the writer, let us jerk off the white sheet and see the nothingness under the robe of this frightening apparition. He writes as follows:

"In your Constitutional Money magazine of April you speak about raising the price level of the farmers' products and at the same time raise the price level of the products of labor. What good will it do to raise the price level of farm products if you raise the price of labor and industrial products in the same proportion? Both the farmer and the laborer would have to pay more for what they have to buy. It wouldn't do one bit of good. Mr. Knox, former candidate for Vice President, spoke over the radio last night, giving the real plan as I see it, and that is to reduce the cost of what a farmer has to pay to a parity with the price of what he sells. I think Mr. Knox is 100 percent right." Our correspondent signed the letter "John Jacobs, Hastings, Nebr."

Friends, you heard about this ghost, this scarecrow, when you were children, didn't you? And since that time you have heard its weird cry echoed from Wall Street in an effort to weave a cobweb through the minds of the people so that reason couldn't enter in. The purpose of this ghost is to create an envy or hatred, a friction and strife between labor and the farmer, to keep our ranks divided so money monopoly could rule supreme and unquestioned. There is nothing new in this argument, Mr. Jacobs. It is a Wall Street ghost echoed by Knox. How destitute of a plan your Mr. Knox must be to suggest a thing so impossible to cure the economic ills of the farming class.

Your friend, Mr. Knox, says we must reduce the price of what the farmer has to pay. It is a well-established fact that on the average about 75 percent of what the farmer has to pay is made up of fixed charges, such as mortgages, taxes, rents, interest, freight rates, insurance, and hundreds of others. Now, Mr. Jacobs, how would your Mr. Knox reduce the principal of farm mortgages in the Nation, now totaling $7,000,000,000? The farmers have promised to pay this amount or surrender their farms and homes. And how is he going to reduce the interest rates written in black on white on these mortgages? How is Mr. Knox going to reduce freight rates when the Interstate Commerce Commission has within the last 4 years allowed the railroads to increase freight rates twice, and the law provides that they are entitled to a 6-percent profit regardless of how high the rates must be raised? How would he reduce taxes with millions of unemployed on W. P. A. or direct relief without a revolution? And how would he go about reducing the face value of the $225,000,000,000 in private debts the people are owing or the interest rates? How utterly impossible is his suggestion.

Mr. Jacobs, if you, or anyone else, refused to pay these debts or undertook to scale them down, the police would come in the power of the law and set your family and yourself out on the highway or street. If the police couldn't do it, they would call out the State militia. If they couldn't put you out and foreclose, taking your property to the last cent you owed, the Federal Army could be called to put you out. You wouldn't have the slightest recourse by law. You would find all the law on the other side. You wouldn't stand any more show than a snowball down in the hotter regions. How ridiculous of a supposedly intelligent man to make such a suggestion.

Instead, why not use the international bankers' method in reverse, just as was explained to you in our magazine, the Constitutional Money Advocate? Put back into circulation the money that the banking system took out in 1920, 1929, and 1937. Everyone knows if you put more money into circulation you can thereby raise the prices for labor and agriculture just as high as you want to. But remember a raised price level does not at all affect fixed charges. Fixed charges remain the same. If your annual fixed charges, such as interest, taxes, insurance, freight rates, rents, etc., equal $1,000, you are going to pay $1,000, no matter if the bankers do take enough money out of circulation to bring wheat and labor down to half, virtually doubling your fixed charges. This has become legally right by custom but is morally wrong. It is just as morally wrong as if those holding your note had raised the figures on your obligations to twice the amount for which it was contracted.

Suppose we reestablished the Coolidge price level of 1926. We all agreed at that time that this should be our standard and that prices must never go below that standard. This would make prices today approximately as follows: Wheat, $2; hogs, 14 cents; eggs, 35 cents; cream, 51 cents; corn, 81 cents; and common-labor wages, from $5 to $7 a day. We would just about double the laboring man's wages and the price the farmer gets for his products. You have virtually in this way accomplished just what you wanted to. They didn't have to cut your mortgages and interest, your taxes and freight rates, and all the other fixed charges in order to make it easier for you to pay.

Let us give you an example of just how you have benefited by a raised price level. Today you owe $8,000 mortgage on your farm and are paying 5-percent interest. You have just seen the party holding this mortgage, and you have tried to do as Mr. Knox suggested—reduce the price of what the farmer has to pay. Perhaps you suggested cutting the principal and interest in two, thereby reducing the mortgage from $8,000 to $4,000 and the interest from 5 to 2½ percent. Of course, he laughed at you, and likely said, "Pay what the mortgage stipulates or I will foreclose and put you off the farm." Or perhaps you have seen your landlord and wanted him to reduce the rent from the old-established rental of one-third to one-sixth and the pasture rent from $2 to $1 an acre. He very likely told you to pay as the lease set forth or get off the farm. You have seen tax collectors, and they said: "Why, a cut of your taxes is impossible. The records show your taxes are so much, and we can't cut it 1 cent." So on you go the rounds, encouraged by the impossible philosophy, as advanced by your Mr. Knox, to reduce what the farmer has to pay.

But suppose you use the plan as suggested in the April issue of our magazine, the Constitutional Money Advocate. This plan has been tried and found to work first class. It's the old international bankers' philosophy in reverse. It will work both ways—to the advantage of the international bankers one way, in that it will make money scarce, which makes the dollar dear and labor and the products of labor cheap, which is what the international banker wants, so his interest will buy more; and to the advantage of the people in the other way, in that it will make money plentiful, which makes the dollar cheap and labor and the products of labor high, which is what the people want, so they can pay their interest, taxes, and fixed charges. The international bankers, through the Federal Reserve Banking System, took out of circulation in 1920, $10,000,000,000; in 1929, $8,000,000,000; and in 1937, $3,000,000,000, bringing prices below the American standard of living by deflation. So let us do just as you would demand of an ordinary horse thief—bring it back, put the money back in circulation, and thereby advance prices to a decent standard of living, with a living wage to the farmer and the laborer. Put us back to the 1926 price level. It's just as easy to raise the price level as it is to lower it. Money monopoly lowered it, so let us raise it. Increase the money circulating in the veins and arteries of trade and commerce, as explained in the book, Uncle Sam's Hospital Chart, on page 101. Expand our money supply by paying old-age pensions of $50 a month and rehabilitating the farmer back on his farm until we have full production and full employment.

It is so important to remember, my friends, that fixed charges are not affected by the raising or lowering of the price level. They do not change, regardless of how much you increase or decrease wages and agricultural prices. If anything, fixed charges would be reduced slightly with prosperity. Everyone knows if the railroads run to full capacity, with the profits limited to 6 percent by law, transportation rates would come down. Everyone knows that with prosperity interest rates on new loans would come down, and it is equally certain that taxes would be cut in two by doubling rates and thus spreading or doubling the tax base on which to distribute the tax levy. Insurance should become cheaper for the reason that it reduces the moral risk, and a landlord is always striving to raise the rent when his investment does not pay out, so it should be easier to deal with your landlord.

Let us, with another example, illustrate the advantage of a raised price level to the farmer and laborer. Your wheat today is worth $1. Expand our money supply until it reaches the 1926 price level of $2. That means it would take only half as much wheat to pay the same mortgage. It means, in substance, that you did reduce your mortgage from $8,000 to $4,000 and your interest from 5 to 2½ percent by doubling the price of what you had to sell. And it's so easy for Uncle Sam to do this.

So you virtually did accomplish just what you asked the mortgage holder to do for you—cut the mortgage and the interest in two—but this time he cannot tell you to get off the farm. Think of the joke you pulled on the tax collector who told you there was no chance in the world to cut your taxes. You paid him every cent, but by doubling the price of what you had to sell it was the same as if you had cut your taxes in two. He didn't explain to you that it could be done in the old international bankers' way by adjusting the price level, by increasing the money supply. The railroad company laughed at you when you asked for a 50-percent reduction in freight rates, and said, "impossible," but you did get this reduction by raising the price level of labor and commodities, didn't you? And then there was the landlord who told you to pay as the lease stipulated or get off the farm. You just let him alone and by congressional control of the money supply of the Nation got your rent reduced from one-third to one-sixth of the crops, and pasture rent from $2 to $1, when measured by increased prices for your commodities. In your insurance and all the rest you did get a 50-percent reduction in what you had to pay, didn't you, because you received twice as much for what you had to sell?

Undoubtedly you belong to the National Grange or some farm organization—if you don't, you ought to—who have been working overtime for the cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer and here you got it by merely raising the price level, the only way it can ever be done. Every other plan is merely a piece of patchwork.

I hope I have impressed it upon your minds that fixed charges are not affected by a raised price level. They do not change by raising the price of commodities and labor. Suppose today the farmer gets 14 cents for eggs. These eggs, with fixed charges added, would retail on the market for 35 cents. If a laboring man in the city now gets 35 cents an hour for 8 hours, or $2.80 a day, he could buy with a day's wages just 8 dozen eggs, at 35 cents a dozen. Now suppose we double the price the farmer gets for his eggs. That would give the farmer 28 cents a dozen in place of 14 cents. The city laborer would then pay 35 cents plus the raise of 14 cents, or 49 cents a dozen for his eggs. But at the same time we have doubled the laborer's wages also, so he now gets $5.60 a day instead of $2.80. Then, for a day's wages he could buy over 11 dozen eggs, at the raised price of 49 cents, or over 3 dozen eggs more a day than with lower prices and lower wages. It would give the laboring man an additional purchasing power of over 27 percent. He could buy over one-fourth more from the farmer, and the farmer, getting 28 cents a dozen for eggs in place of 14 cents, could buy twice as much from industry. This is exactly the way a raised price level would affect us. Don't tell me this would not bring out a great prosperity, and prosperity can come in no other way. What did we do? We raised the price level and thereby created a purchasing and consuming power among the lower-income group, definitely and positively the only way you can bring back prosperity. When Congress gets through chasing up all the blind alleys in search of a plan to bring back prosperity, it is hoped by a process of elimination they will find this the only road to bring back our great Nation. Even Congressman DIES and his committee will have to join in the only plan and give up trying to effect a cure by treating the pimples on the body politic of old Uncle Sam in place of devoting their time to the diagnosis and the real case. Let me repeat, the reason why you can raise farm prices and the laboring man's wages in the same proportion, and at the same time derive a big benefit to both, is because 75 percent of the cost of living is made up of fixed charges which are not affected by this raise.

The Sherman antitrust law to hold prices of monopoly down, together with the congressional control of our money supply to hold prices up for the lower income group, would be common-sense government. What a victory it would be, Mr. Jacobs, for the people. And you left everyone happy. You would do much more. You would cut in two the $225,000,000,000 the people now owe in private debts, and you would have reduced Uncle Sam's debt from $45,000,000,000 to $22,500,000,000 and the interest from $1,100,000,000 to $550,000,000, all because we went back to the 1926 price level and doubled the price of labor and commodities. There would be great rejoicing and happiness and prosperity over the entire Nation—no, over the entire world, because we would have solved the problem of want in the midst of plenty, the problem of distribution. Every great nation that ever was, and is no more, died because the people failed to solve this problem. You would have choked to death with justice and righteousness all the Communists and "reds" and radicals and made a great citizen out of those who hate our Government because it had, without their knowledge or understanding, tolerated the contraction of our money supply that had doubled their debt and robbed them of their homes and farms, their jobs, and their constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But suppose, Mr. Jacobs, you had tried to follow the advice of Mr. Knox. Of course, you couldn't have done it without repudiating your obligations and disregarding your contracts. In fact, you couldn't have done it, if at all, without strikes and civil war or revolution. We tried it once when the people undertook to put into effect by force the moratorium on farm mortgages. Do you remember when they loaded the sheriff up, in many cases, and took him off the ground during a mortgage sale where the farmers' neighbors had agreed to bid in cows for a dollar and horses for $2, etc., to give back to the original owner? Do you remember when they put a rope around the neck of a Federal judge and dragged him off the bench, threatening to hang him for his decision that would not support the moratorium? My friend, that was revolution. If we followed the advice of your Mr. Knox, we would have a revolution before morning.

Answer to Editorial in Grand Rapids Press on Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the 22d day of May 1940 my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative FRANK E. HOOK, placed into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press under date of May 10, 1940. The editorial placed in the RECORD disagreed with a statement I had made on the floor of the House regarding the reciprocal-trade agreement and its application to the cherry growers of Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter dated May 23, 1940, addressed to Mr. B. G. Brown, editorial writer of the Grand Rapids Press, which is in answer to the editorial which appeared in the Press.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1940.

Mr. B. G. BROWN,
Editorial Writer, Grand Rapids Press, Grand Rapids, Mich.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 14, enclosing an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press with reference to my talk on the floor of the House on the wage-hour bill. I also received from another source your editorial of May 16, in which you state: "It may be wondered just where Congressman ENGEL obtained his information."

The Grand Rapids Press has been too kind to me, both in its news and editorial columns, for me to take any editorial as personal. I always welcome constructive criticism and know that no individual is always right. I never posed as an expert of any kind, and certainly not as a tariff expert.

Answering your question in your editorial of May 16 as to where I obtained my information, I wish to state that my sources of information were the Department of State and the Department of Commerce.

The statement in your editorial of May 16 from Mr. Harry C. Hawkins, Chief of the Division of Trade Agreements, Department of State, reads in part as follows: "Preliminary statistics show that only 11 pounds of maraschino cherries, valued at $4, were imported from Italy in 1939. The United States imports of cherries from Italy are almost entirely 'cherries sulphured or in brine,' the duty on which has not been altered in any trade agreement."

Your editorial further states that during the first 3 months of 1940 only 3,491 pounds of cherries came from France. It is my understanding that cherries "sulfured or in brine" are cherries that are shipped here for the maraschino trade. The Cherry Growers Packing Co., of Traverse City, Mich., in 1936 packed 28,000 barrels of cherries in brine, or approximately 7,000,000 pounds for the maraschino trade. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan during that same year packed 52,000 barrels of cherries in brine, or approximately 14,000,000 pounds for the maraschino trade, so sulfured cherries or cherries in brine coming over from Europe are in direct competition with Michigan, for cherries packed in brine and bottled are used for the maraschino trade.

I do not know where Mr. Hawkins gets his information that there was no reduction in duty on cherries sulfured or in brine in any trade agreement. I have before me a letter dated November 30, 1936, signed by the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State, who had charge of making the trade agreement to which we have been referring. This letter states that there was a tariff reduction of 20 percent in the ad valorem duty on sulfured or cherries in brine, and that the ad valorem duty reduction amounted to 2.2 cents on the No. 1 quality imported product and 1.5 cents on the No. 2 quality imported product, so either Francis B. Sayre, who made the French treaty, is wrong in saying there was a reduction, or Mr. Hawkins is wrong in saying there is not. I got my information from Mr. Sayre's letter. Mr. Young, in the editorial as quoted by you, contended that the reduction in the tariff was much less than 20 percent.

I have before me the letter above referred to by Mr. Sayre, which reads, in part, as follows: "On August 24, 1936, the average price on the New York market for sulfured, hand-pitted, imported cherries of No. 1 quality was 11 cents per pound, duty unpaid, or 22½ cents per pound, duty paid. The average price of No. 2 quality imported cherries was 7½ cents per pound, duty unpaid, or 18½ cents per pound, duty paid. On that date, therefore, the 20-percent reduction in the ad valorem duty amounted to 2.2 cents per pound on the No. 1 quality imported product and 1.5 cents per pound on the No. 2 quality, or less than 10 percent of the market value of both qualities."

The ad valorem duty is figured on the value of the cherry at port, duty unpaid, and naturally is not figured on the tax levied. The selling price, according to Mr. Sayre's letter, of No. 1 quality sulfured, hand-pitted, imported cherries or cherries in brine at New York was 11 cents a pound, duty unpaid. If this is true, then a 2.2-cent-a-pound reduction in the tariff would be a 20-percent reduction. If the No. 2 quality imported cherry referred to sold for 7½ cents a pound, duty unpaid, then a 1.5-cent-per-pound reduction would be a 20-percent reduction.

On June 4, 1936, I wrote a letter to Mr. Hull, protesting against the reduction made by the reciprocal-trade agreement. This letter was signed by every Republican Member of Congress from Michigan. In that letter, I used the following language: "Your Department further informs us that this reduction upon a basis of the 1934 importations represents a reduction of the tariff from 96 to 76 percent." Incidentally, the State Department never questioned that statement.

On May 25, 1936, Mr. George W. Bolling, of Traverse City, Mich., chairman of the Ninth District Democratic Congressional Committee, wrote Congressman George A. Sadowski, protesting against a cut in the tariff, pointing out that the present tariff on maraschino cherries in brine was to be cut 21 percent.

On June 25, Mr. C. L. Brody, executive secretary of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, wrote to the Michigan delegation in Congress that he was informed that a reduction of the tariff on cherries would be made, amounting to 20 percent. I do not know where Mr. Brody and Mr. Bolling obtained their information, but they must have received it from some authentic source.

Importation of cherries: I have before me a letter signed by Mr. Alexander V. Dye, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, dated April 15, 1938. Mr. Dye in this letter informed me that during the 6 months from July to December of 1937, and immediately following the treaty, a total of 1,023,854 pounds of cherries, sulfured or in brine, were imported from France, Italy, and Spain under the French reciprocal-trade agreement. Of this amount, 998,336 pounds were imported from Italy, 22,034 from Spain and only 3,472 from France.

In addition to these 1,023,854 pounds of cherries, sulfured or in brine, which were imported in 1937, there were imported during the same year 582,837 pounds of natural cherries and 57,598 pounds of maraschino cherries, candied, crystallized, and so forth, making a total of 1,664,289 pounds of cherries that came here in 1937 in competition with Michigan maraschino cherries. Incidentally, I called the Food Stuffs Division of the Department of Commerce yesterday and they informed me that these natural cherries were bottled up for the maraschino trade or were being used as maraschino cherries inside of chocolates, and so forth.

These figures are taken from a letter which Mr. Dye of the Department of Commerce wrote me on April 5, 1938, so apparently Mr. Dye and Mr. Young, both of the Department of Commerce, are getting their wires crossed. Mr. Young, in the figures given you, states that in 1937 the total importations rose to 57,000 pounds, of which 56,000 came from France. Apparently either Mr. Dye, whose figures I took, was wrong; or Mr. Young, whose figures you took, was wrong.

I called the Department of Commerce and asked for the figures again on May 15, 1940, and I have before me a letter dated May 16, 1940, signed by Mr. Young, in which he writes as follows: "In response to your telephone message of May 15, there are transmitted herewith pages from issues of Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States."

I have before me those pages which Mr. Young sent me. These figures are taken from the regular Commerce Reports for 1937. They show that Italy imported into the United States 149,348 pounds of cherries with pits and 861,824 pounds of cherries with pits removed, all sulfured and in brine, while France imported only 3,472 pounds with pits removed. This does not agree with Mr. Young's statement in your editorial.

The statement sent by Mr. Young in his letter to me further shows that in 1939 there were imported into this country from Italy 92,565 pounds of cherries with pits removed. In addition to

this there were imported from Yugoslavia, Canada, Argentina, Chile, Greece, and Italy 1,481,671 pounds of cherries in the natural state. There were also shipped into this country 35,303 pounds of maraschino and candied cherries, or a total of 1,516,974 pounds, of cherries that went into the maraschino trade.

I do not know whether there was any reduction in the tariff on cherries in the natural state, but the Department of Commerce informs me that these are coming in to be used in the maraschino trade. It also will be noted that while the tariff on cherries with pits removed is 9½ cents a pound, the tariff on natural cherries, according to the statement sent me by the Department of Commerce for 1938, was 1 cent a pound, or the equivalent of 13.1 percent ad valorem, as against 99.7 percent ad valorem tariff on pitted cherries.

I do not know whether or not cherries now imported as natural cherries under the lower tariff rate are replacing cherries without pits under a higher tariff, but I do know that they all go into the maraschino trade in competition with Michigan cherries.

I also note what you said regarding the importation of cherries for the first 3 months of 1940. I have before me a statement from Mr. Young. This statement shows that for the first 3 months of 1940 there were imported from France 3,491 pounds of maraschino or candied cherries, and France was also shipping in some 2,420 pounds of cherries in brine with pits removed. However, there were shipped in from Chile, Greece, Italy, and Yugoslavia during the same 3 months 487,116 pounds of cherries in the natural state, which the Food Stuffs Division of the Department of Commerce tells me go into the maraschino trade.

Cherries are, of course, a seasonal product. They are imported during certain months of the year. Whether the reduction of cherries sulfured or in brine during the first 3 months is due to the seasonal production, or whether those cherries are now imported for the same purpose in a natural state under a lower tariff rate, I do not know, but the facts are certainly not in accord with Mr. Young's or Mr. Hawkins' statement to you.

Competition: In your editorial, Mr. Young refers to the entire 1938 cherry crop as consisting of 278,000,000 pounds, of which approximately 36,000,000 pounds were produced as maraschino cherries. Of this 278,000,000 pounds, somewhere around 125,000,000 pounds, I believe, are sour cherries. The bulk of the cherry crop, both sweet and sour, goes into the canned trade. I can buy canned sour cherries now on the retail market for about 12 cents per No. 2 can.

Somewhere around 20,000,000 pounds of the maraschino cherries manufactured in this country are manufactured from sour cherries. If this maraschino-cherry production is in any way destroyed it would mean that these 20,000,000 pounds would be added to an already glutted cherry market that goes into canning. The imported cherries compete with these 20,000,000 pounds. In view of the fact that the value of these hand-pitted maraschino cherries lies largely in the labor of hand-pitting and preparing, and in view of the further fact that it costs us, according to information given us by the cherry growers, 5 cents a pound to hand-pit them here, whereas European countries are hand-pitting them with woman and child labor at a very small cost, you can see just what this competition means. Even a million or 2,000,000 pounds of imported maraschino cherries added to these 20,000,000 pounds helps to create the surplus, and it is the surplus that breaks the market. The competition of foreign imports must be compared with the maraschino trade and not with the canned trade, whether sweet or sour.

In his letter of November 30, 1936, Mr. Sayre informed me that the average price on the New York market for sulphured, hand-pitted, imported cherries of No. 1 quality was 11 cents per pound, duty unpaid, and that the average price of No. 2 quality imported cherries was 7½ cents a pound, duty unpaid. The cherry industry pays approximately 1 cent a pound for picking these cherries, plus 5 cents a pound for hand-pitting in addition to all the other costs such as barreling, storing, sorting, brine, freight charges, general overhead, etc. So you can readily see what will happen if the cherry grower is not given adequate tariff protection.

You can't plow cherry trees under. You can't stop growing cherries like you can wheat. These cherries keep growing unless you cut the trees. The grower does not know what price he is going to receive until after he has completed his cultivating, spraying, and all other costs of growing. He then has the cherries with the cost incurred, and he must keep selling them in competition with foreign trade and at a price which will give him a market as against the foreign market. In other words he has one of two choices. He can either take 1½ cents, 2 cents, or 3 cents a pound for his cherries delivered at the factory and with it a loss, or he can send them down to the New York market at a price which will keep the foreign product out, hoping that the next year's price will be better. If he lets them rot on the trees he loses the money he has spent in cultivating, spraying, and has no return on his investment. In either case he takes a loss.

The importation of cherries affects the price and holds the price down even though the importations may not be coming in in large quantities, because the grower knows he must supply that market at the price which the market will pay, even though that price is below his cost of production. If the grower should sell these cherries at the cost of production of 3½ cents to 5 cents a pound, add 1 cent for picking, 5 cents for hand-pitting, plus all the other costs of handling, barreling, freight charges, etc., his selling price would be in excess of the price at which imported cherries can be sold on the present New York market.

Perhaps I am unduly apprehensive, but I know that when the State Department makes a concession to a European country in a reciprocal-trade agreement, that country expects to make use of that reduction. They are not giving us something for nothing.

The European war and the war with Ethiopia, and the condition of the standing armies for the past 6 years in Europe have undoubtedly affected these imports. What will happen if peacetime is declared and the entire European manpower goes back to peacetime pursuits is rather alarming to me, I am perfectly frank to say. I am afraid that they will import cherries at any price to get back their 1929 market. There is no question in my mind but what that was their objective when they obtained a reduction in the cherry tariff.

In conclusion may I say this. I do not believe that you and I disagree on the reciprocal-trade agreement policy. The reciprocal-trade agreement policy was a Republican policy. If I am correct, William McKinley advocated it back in his day. I know that William Howard Taft as President made an agreement with Canada, which Canada refused to ratify. You and I both believe in reciprocal-trade agreements. We differ, however, with the method of the application of that policy.

I believe the American market should belong to the American farmer and to the American workingman, and neither should be traded off for the other. The fact that you argue that the cherry industry was not hurt induces me to believe that you agree with me that the State Department should not make reciprocal-trade agreements which injure either the farmer or industry. Where you and I differ is in our policy and not on what should be done, but upon what the effect of the policy is as administered by this administration. Is the farmer and is any part of our industry being injured?

May I say that the fact that we may have exported 5,000,000 pounds of cherries does not alter the matter, nor does it help the cherry grower if we turn right around and import from some other country another four or five million pounds. We should try to export all of our surplus that we can of this product, and should not import any to add to our surplus. Incidentally, the Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce states that there were only 303,309 pounds of cherries exported during the first 3 months of this year.

I have called Mr. Hawkins on the phone, giving him a copy of your last editorial and referring him to Mr. Sayre's and Mr. Young's letters, and have given him all the information I have. I have asked him to explain the situation. I am just as anxious to get at the facts as you are, and I shall await Mr. Hawkins' letter and answer with considerable interest.

Thanking you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on June 15, 1936, which letter was signed by the 11 Republican Congressmen from Michigan who were in the House on that date.

JUNE 15, 1936.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,

Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HULL: We have just been informed that under the trade agreement with France, the tariff on maraschino and candied cherries not in brine nor sulphur and not in their natural state was reduced from 9½ cents a pound plus 40 percent ad valorum to 9½ cents a pound plus 20 percent ad valorum. Your Department further informs us that this reduction upon a basis of the 1934 importations represents a reduction of the tariff from 96 percent to 76 percent. Under the most-favored-nation clause adopted by you in your reciprocal-trade agreements, this concession permits the importation of these cherries by any other nation including Italy, with the same reduction in tariff which is given France.

For your information, approximately 22,000,000 pounds of Italian cherries in addition to cherries from other countries were shipped into this country for the maraschino trade in 1929, and prior to the time this tariff was placed on the importation of this product. In 1934 after this tariff had been in operation approximately 4 years and industry had had an opportunity of operating, the importation of this product was reduced to approximately 700,000 pounds. The remainder of the maraschino-cherry trade was supplied by domestic cherry growers and manufacturers. In view of the fact that there has been a surplus of cherries in this country for several years past, this has been an important factor in keeping the cherry industry from being completely demoralized. The maraschino-cherry trade has absorbed from 10 to 15 percent of the total crop which has been a decisive factor in preventing a still greater surplus, and a complete break-down of prices.

The above tariff rate was based upon the difference in the cost of production in this country and in the European countries, represented mainly in the difference of the cost of labor. The French trade agreement permits the importation of the finished product which represents approximately 80 percent labor. The price the cherry grower receives for his cherries is ultimately determined by

the price the consumer pays for the finished product. All cherries in brine, either domestic or foreign, must ultimately meet this foreign competition as a finished product. A 20-percent reduction on cherries in brine which are worth about 10 cents a pound would have meant a reduction in the price of the finished product of approximately 2 cents a pound. We are informed that the candied or finished cherries sell for about 30 cents a pound, and therefore a 20-percent reduction would mean a reduction of 6 cents a pound. In view of the difference in the cost of labor in European countries and in this country, this reduction will throw open the door to the importation of manufactured cherries, will deprive the home grower of his market, and will add to the surplus crop of the United States in any year in which a normal crop is produced. All of these facts were presented to the fact-finding committee of the Tariff Commission a year ago.

We, the undersigned members of the Michigan delegation in Congress, protest against the reduction of the tariff on this product.

Yours truly,

Albert J. Engel, Geo. A. Dondero, Wm. W. Blackney, Carl E. Mapes, Roy O. Woodruff, Earl C. Michener, Clare E. Hoffman, Jesse P. Wolcott, Clarence J. McLeod, Verner Main, F. L. Crawford.

On June 22, 1936, I received an answer from Mr. Hull, acknowledging my letter of June 15, and stating that a full report would be made as soon as possible. On July 9, 1936, I received a reply from the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter into the RECORD.

JULY 9, 1936.

The Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: Secretary Hull has requested me to inform you that the Department has given careful and sympathetic consideration to the letter of June 15, 1936, signed by you and 10 other Congressmen, representing districts of the State of Michigan, with respect to the reduction from 9.5 cents and 40 percent ad valorem to 9.5 cents and 20 percent ad valorem in the import duty on maraschino, candied, and other prepared and preserved cherries under the trade agreement with France. I take pleasure in giving you the following information in regard to this matter.

With reference to your statement that the duty reduction affecting maraschino and candied cherries under the trade agreement with France constitutes an increase in foreign competition for all cherries in brine, it may be pointed out that maraschino and candied cherries are made of sweet cherries, almost exclusively of the Queen Anne variety, which is grown in commercial quantities on the west coast, but not in the East. East of the Rocky Mountains sour cherries are the dominant variety grown and are produced for kitchen and canning markets. The Michigan cherry industry is, as you doubtless know, mainly engaged in the growing of cherries of the latter variety, whose markets are not competitive with the special kinds of imported cherries on which the duty has been reduced.

According to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, in the year 1935 only 9 percent of the Michigan cherry crop was of sweet cherries, the bulk of 91 percent being sour cherries. Moreover, it is my understanding that the bulk of the relatively small crop of sweet cherries is sold in the fresh-fruit markets. In 1934 only 6 percent of the crop of your State was reported to be composed of sweet cherries.

Unfortunately, buyers in this and other fields sometimes endeavor to secure more favorable prices by the use of arguments which do not always bear analysis. I sincerely hope that the cherry growers of your State will not allow themselves to be misled during the coming season as to the true significance of the duty reduction.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS B. SAYRE,
Assistant Secretary.

On August 7, 1936, after consulting with the cherry growers of Traverse City and verifying the facts, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, a copy of which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD:

LAKE CITY, MICH., *August 7, 1936.*

Hon. FRANCIS B. SAYRE,
Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SAYRE: Your letter of recent date with respect to the reduction from 9.5 cents and 40 percent ad valorem to 9.5 cents and 20 percent ad valorem in the import duty on maraschino, candied, and other prepared and preserved cherries under the trade agreement with France received. Your letter reads in part as follows:

"With reference to your statement that the duty reduction affecting maraschino and candied cherries under the trade agreement with France constitutes an increase in foreign competition for all cherries in brine, it may be pointed out that maraschino and candied cherries are made of sweet cherries, almost exclusively of the Queen Anne variety, which is grown in commercial quantities on the west coast, but not in the East. East of the Rocky Mountains sour cherries are the dominant variety grown and are produced for kitchen and canning markets. The Michigan cherry industry is, as you doubtless know, mainly engaged in the growing of cherries of the latter variety, whose markets are not competitive with the special kinds of imported cherries on which the duty has been reduced."

This statement is absolutely in error. The Cherry Growers Packing Co. of Traverse City, Mich., alone are packing this year in excess of 28,000 barrels of Montmorency cherries in brine to go to the manufacturing trade for maraschino cherries. There is one other company in Traverse City which is packing 8,000 barrels. Approximately 50,000 barrels of Montmorency cherries are being packed in brine this year for the maraschino trade. Each barrel contains 250 pounds. This means that 9,000,000 pounds of Grand Traverse region cherries are being packed this year for the maraschino-cherry trade and approximately 12,500,000 pounds of New York and Michigan cherries are being packed for that trade this year. Let me remind you that Montmorency cherries are not sweet cherries but are sour cherries; that these 12,500,000 pounds of cherries used for the maraschino trade would otherwise go into the sour canning cherry trade and would add to the surplus, helping to break the price in a year with an average production or a surplus of this product.

This industry grew from nothing in 1929 up to this magnitude in a few short years. The outlook for future development was good until this treaty was signed. I am informed that Italy is now offering in the United States hand-pitted and barreled-in-brine cherries at a price of 5 cents per pound, exclusive of duty, which leaves nothing in it for the grower or the labor used in hand-pitting. The cost for hand-pitting alone is in excess of 5 cents a pound for that type of fruit.

Mr. A. J. Rogers, of Benzonia, Mich., representing the Michigan cherry growers, accompanied me to the fact-finding board of the Tariff Commission a year ago last winter, protesting against taking the tariff off on cherries. All of these facts were presented to that board, including the fact that the sour cherry is being used extensively for the maraschino trade. Now you profess an ignorance of the very facts contained in the records placed there by the representative of the cherry growers, who traveled 750 miles to testify at that hearing. This ignorance on the part of the Department of State is inexcusable. A continuation of this policy will mean ruin for the cherry industry because it can mean just one thing—the throwing of this tremendous amount of Montmorency cherries on the sour-cherry market, creating and increasing a surplus and lowering the price.

The statement was recently made by an official of this State, that "while you can plow under wheat, cotton, or corn, you cannot plow under cherry trees." I wish to again enter my emphatic protest against this action on the part of the State Department, which if continued will ultimately spell ruin for the cherry industry of my State and my district.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Despite the fact that Mr. Sayre wrote me within a few days that he would reply to my letter shortly, I did not receive an answer until November 30, 1936, or approximately 20 days after the November election was over. I ask unanimous consent to place that letter in the RECORD.

NOVEMBER 30, 1936.

The Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Lake City, Mich.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: Reference is made to your letter of August 7, 1936, and to the Department's acknowledgment thereof on August 14, relating to the reduction in the import duty on maraschino, candied, and other prepared and preserved cherries under the trade agreement with France.

A very careful study has been made of factors affecting the cherry industry, and the results thereof do not indicate that the domestic industry has been injured by the reduction in the duty on imported cherries from 9.5 cents and 40 percent ad valorem to 9.5 cents and 20 percent ad valorem.

On August 24, 1936, the average price on the New York market for sulphured, hand-pitted, imported cherries of No. 1 quality was 11 cents per pound, duty unpaid, or 22½ cents per pound, duty paid. The average price of No. 2 quality imported cherries was 7½ cents per pound, duty unpaid, or 18½ cents per pound, duty paid. On that date therefore the 20-percent reduction in the ad valorem duty amounted to 2 2 cents per pound on the No. 1 quality imported product and 1.5 cents per pound on the No. 2 quality, or less than 10 percent of the market value of both qualities. Even after the reduction in the duty, a total computed ad valorem duty of 105 percent on No. 1 quality and 147 percent on No. 2 quality was paid on imported cherries.

On the same date, August 24, the average price in the New York market for Michigan and New York sulphured, machine-pitted, sour cherries was about 9 cents per pound, while the sulphured, unpitted cherries sold for about 7 cents per pound. Including the newly reduced duty, therefore, the lowest quality of imported cherries sold for approximately double the price of the domestic sour cherries pitted by machine. Under such conditions, it does not seem possible that imported cherries can compete directly with the Michigan product.

I may also point out that the total imports of cherries from June 15, 1936 (the effective date of the agreement with France),

to the end of August (the latest date for which import data are available), amounted to only 5,329 pounds, valued at $1,045, including 3,720 pounds, valued at $668, which were imported from France. In view of the insignificant character of imports of preserved cherries since June 15, it would not appear that the reduction in the duty has had any effect upon the domestic industry.

I may assure you that your interest in this matter will be borne in mind. When additional and perhaps more significant data regarding imports of cherries become available, I shall write you again on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS B. SAYRE,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, somehow, the State Department has a total lack of understanding of the cherry question. I wish to emphasize again the fact that the cherry growers had sent witnesses down here 800 miles to Washington and 800 miles back, a total of 1,600 miles, to tell Mr. Hull, Mr. Sayre, and the Fact-Finding Board of the Tariff Commission just how maraschino cherries were being made out of sour cherries. The fact that Mr. Sayre, in his letter of July 9, 1936, stated that "maraschino and candied cherries are made of sweet cherries, almost exclusively of the Queen Anne variety" shows that neither nor Mr. Sayre nor Mr. Hull even read, much less took into consideration, the testimony that the cherry growers witnesses traveled 1,600 miles to give.

Regarding his last letter of November 30, 1936. I wish again to call attention to the fact that cherries grow on trees. They do not grow as an annual crop that can be plowed under. It takes time for trees to develop, and the full effect of a tariff reduction on cherries will not be felt until several years after the change has been made, because it takes that long for trees to grow. I wish to repeat what I said on the floor of the House on February 9, 1937:

Let me remind the Secretary of State that many times a comparatively small importation of a product added to a crop in this country is the straw that breaks the camel's back. It breaks the domestic price by adding to a surplus or creating a surplus when there is a normal crop.

I am not particularly opposed to reciprocal-trade agreements, but I am opposed to this method of making these agreements. I am opposed to sacrificing American industry in this way. I am opposed to trading Michigan cherries for southern cotton. It does not take a tariff expert to analyze these facts and come to the conclusion as to what will happen if this policy is persisted in by the Department of State. I maintain, above all, that the cherry growers of my district or any other industry have the right to know whether or not their product is threatened by an agreement before they are asked to come down here blindly to testify or defend themselves, not knowing whether they will be brought into court or not.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following national-defense address by the Honorable Herbert Hoover over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. on May 27, 1940:

I wish to talk to my countrymen tonight upon national defense. The increasing dangers in the world make it imperative that we be better prepared. But equally the time has come when the American people must insist that adequate organization be set up within the Government which will produce this defense. It must be an organization directed by men of outstanding experience in production management and labor unhampered by partisan politics.

Today we are onlookers at the most tremendous human tragedy of centuries. We are horrified at each gigantic scene. Scene after scene is so great and so terrible that even across 3,000 miles of ocean our people are filled with sympathy, with indigation, with hopes, and with fear. Our people are justly alarmed for our own safety. And some of them are more panicky than the people in Paris and London.

Whatever our feelings of outrage are, now is the time to keep cool. We need cool judgment if we are to make secure our own defense. The President has stated that a flight of hostile planes over Omaha, Des Moines, or New York could take place from enemy air bases in the Western Hempisphere. But before operating from a base in the Western Hemisphere an enemy must first capture that territory. Such an enemy must fortify that base. He must transport thousands of airplanes, hundreds of thousands of troops, thousands of machinists, with shops and vast stores of weapons and materials. And he must get all of that past the American fleet which is twice as strong as the combined fleets of Europe, omitting the British. That is a job that will take time even if it were possible. There is no occasion for panic. There is need for speed.

It can be argued that war makers from overseas have no reason or intention to attack the Western Hemisphere. Reasons can be advanced that this war cannot reach American shores. Whatever the outcome in Europe may be, or whatever the intentions of European war makers may be, that is not the problem I wish to discuss. What America must have is such defenses that no European nation will even think about crossing this 3,000 miles of ocean at all. We must make sure that no such dangerous thoughts will be generated in their minds. We want a sign of "Keep off the grass," with a fierce dog plainly in sight.

I was born and raised in that religious atmosphere which for 300 years has never varied in its extreme devotion to peace. Yet I know that peace comes in the modern world only to those nations which adequately prepared to defend themselves. The European Allies are now paying in blood and disaster for their failure to heed plain warnings. With adequate preparedness they might have escaped attack.

THE CAUSE FOR AMERICAN CONCERN

The anxiety and alarm which in recent days have gripped our people have not been all due to the rise of a new system of government in Europe which does not hesitate to overrun innocent neutrals. It is not all due to the new character of mechanized armies. It is not all due to the barbaric use of these weapons against peaceful people and against women and children. It is also due to alarm and shock over the disclosure of the inadequacy of our preparedness plans and our defense.

The Congress had hugely increased appropriations for national defense steadily for the past 5 years. The expenditures upon the Army and Navy have more than doubled from about five hundred and fifty million in 1934 to over one billion three hundred thousand this year. Now the Chief of Staff tells the Congress that we are not organized to wage modern war; that our arsenals are not equipped to produce the guns we should have; that it will take until June 1942 to obtain the necessary new rifles for our present force; that we are woefully behind in antitank guns, in antiaircraft guns, in coast defense, and in tanks.

Congress was told that we could only put 75,000 men into the field as a mobile force at the present time, and that these would not be fully equipped. Further, that it would take 18 months at least to equip our present Army and Reserves of 450,000 men. We are told we do not ever have sufficient clothing for this Army.

And the Chief of the Air Corps comes before the Congress and says that none of the Army's airplanes can be regarded as modern. Asked how many of our 2,700 military airplanes "can be modernized," the Air Corps Chief replied, "Offhand, I should say a half dozen." And perhaps most disheartening of all was his statement that the whole production of military airplanes, ever under the impulse of Allied orders, is only about 340 per month. And this contrasts with a sudden statement that we need 4,000 per month.

President Roosevelt in his address last evening implied that previous administrations had been derelict in providing national defense. These statements have a partisan flavor. I could challenge the implications of Mr. Roosevelt's figures. For instance, despite the number of ships commissioned or not commissioned, the Statistical Abstract, published by Mr. Roosevelt's administration, shows we had available fighting ships to a total of about 1,100,000 tons when he took office, against about 1,350,000 tons today.

Of far more importance, however, national defense is a relative thing. It is relative to the military menace in the rest of the world. No government has the right to impose unnecessary burdens on all those who toil.

For 14 years after the Great War and up to the end of the last administration the face of the civilized world has kept turned toward peace. All major nations were in agreement limiting their navies, and these agreements were being observed. Germany was limited by the Treaty of Versailles to 100,000 men and not much navy. Agreement to limit land armament among other nations was making progress. Methods for settlement of disputes by peaceful means was becoming stronger. During this time we in the United States spent about $700,000,000 a year on our Army and Navy. President Roosevelt considered the outlook throughout the world for peace and disarmament was so promising that he in 1934 himself reduced this rate of expenditure by about $100,000,000.

The peaceful democratic government of Germany collapsed into dictatorship under Hitler 2 months after Mr. Roosevelt was elected. It was in Mr. Roosevelt's administration that Europe began to rumble with aggression and armament. The German Army grew

to 2,500,000 men. Their navy expanded. Great Britain, France, Russia, and Japan, and all others at once expanded their expenditures 400 percent. The total of 60 nations increased expenditures from four billion in 1932 to seventeen billion in 1938. The suggestion that we should have armed against menaces that had not been born seems overdone.

During this last 5 years we have had warning time and again, publicly and privately. The Congress has increased appropriations year by year since 1934. It even permitted relief funds to be used for defense. We obviously have not gotten preparedness.

Did we wish to engage in criticism we could point out that for years as officers responsible for national defense we had a Secretary of the Navy too ill to attend to his duties. Then he was replaced by a temporary appointment. For 3 years the differences between the Assistant Secretary of War and his superior have been public knowledge. The recommendations of wise men for organization and coordination of industry have been rejected. It all proves the stark need of revolutionary change in method of organization for the future.

What we are interested in now is not recrimination. What we want is to be prepared.

The first step in adequate preparedness must be made right in Washington. Our governmental machinery must be made capable of producing preparedness.

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

In the 10 years prior to 1934, when the face of the world was turned toward peace, our expenditure for munitions and constructions was under one hundred and fifty million a year. Such organization as was necessary to make these purchases and bring about their manufacture could be carried out under the War and Navy Departments. We are confronted with a much larger and more complicated problem. The Congress is just passing an appropriation of three and a third billion, a large part of it to be used to manufacture planes, tanks, guns, and ships. That is a problem of gigantic industrial production. That requires another form of organization if we are not to fail again.

WHAT SORT OF PREPAREDNESS DO WE WANT?

Before that organization is created we must answer the question as to what kind of preparedness we want. My own view is that we need first a strong navy. We need a skeletonized but more flexible army. We need large additions of skilled personnel in our reserves, air pilots, tank drivers, and gunners. And we need equally the organization of our industrial capacity to produce our weapons and supplies. It is in that organization where we are weakest. We do not want 50,000 planes put away in hangars. These planes would be obsolete in a year. I do not suppose that this is the President's proposal. In the face of constantly advancing science and invention it would be folly to have 50,000 airplanes in peacetime. It would require half a million men to look after them and to fly them. It would require more billions of dollars a year to support them.

What we need is organization in Washington capable of bringing about a coordination in American industry that can produce 50,000 airplanes in a year if they were called to do it. If we could demonstrate that we could supply the Army and Navy with 4,000 planes during a single month, that would be ample notice to the world to keep off our grass. Likewise we need an organized capacity to produce tanks and other arms.

We need much larger research to constantly improve these machines.

The test of preparedness is not to be found in words or blueprints. The test is the capacity and the ability of our factories to turn out quickly and effectively—guns, airplanes, tanks, and whatever we require. And the proof to these things lies in an adequate organization in the Government that will permit these things to be produced by industry.

The magnitude of this problem of producing 4,000 airplanes a month contrasts vividly with the present capacity of 340 military planes a month.

WHAT SORT OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION MUST WE HAVE?

In the last 25 years the governments of the world have been confronted, as never before in history, with the problem of creating governmental organizations capable of making their national preparedness function. During that time it has been my duty to observe and to deal with these organizations on the economic side in a score of governments. I have seen their successes and their failures. During the last war I was constantly in contact with the governmental organizations behind the lines in France and Germany and Great Britain. I saw these organizations emerge from national muddling by politicians. I saw them develop into extremely efficient agencies under the leadership of competent men. At one time I examined these organizations at the request of President Wilson. Later on I sat in our American War Council and participated in organizing this country's industrial resources when we entered the Great War. While in the White House I had part in preparing plans for organization against a time of emergency for defense of our country.

This experience of the whole world leads to certain definite and specific conclusions as to organization of preparedness in industry when governments are under strain.

First and foremost: This is a business requiring expert knowledge of manufacturing, industry, labor, and transportation and agriculture. The lesson of the whole of the last World War and every step in the present war is that the procurement of munitions in any large volume must be separated from the Army and Navy Establishments. It must be done by an organization separate and independent of either Department. It is an industrial job—a manufacturing job, a mass-production job—for management and labor. It requires that thousands of factories be coordinated to do their part.

The profession of our soldiers and sailors is to make war. They are not trained as production and financial executives. And neither are the politicians nor bureaucrats. This is a job for businessmen and labor.

Nor is it a job that can be done any better by political coalitions. This is no question of political unity. It is a question of hard-headed practical business organization in which for the security of the Nation there is no politics at all.

The second lesson learned over and over again out of all these recent years is that such operations cannot be controlled by boards or councils or conferences.

They must be controlled by a singlehanded, trusted, and experienced man. Every nation in Europe in the last war started in to organize industrial production of war materials through boards. And after muddling for months and the sacrifice of the lives of hundreds of thousands of men and the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars every government fighting in that war finally created a munitions department, headed by a single man. When we entered the Great War we failed to profit by that experience. We set up the War Industries Board in an advisory capacity to the Army and Navy. It was supposed to coordinate the activities of those departments with industry. It occupied itself largely with futile debates. We lost precious months by the fuddling of this Board. After these months of muddling we came to a tardy realization that the experience of the nations might be worth while, and we made one man, Mr. Bernard Baruch, responsible. And then the industrial machine began to hum and munitions to arrive.

The efficient production of goods involves the same problems and techniques, whether they are produced for private or public consumption, whether they are for war or for peace.

The whole genius of the American people has demonstrated over 150 years that when we come to executive action, including the office of the President of the United States, we must have single-headed responsibility. It is just as foolish to set up a board to conduct munitions business as it would be to set up a board to conduct the Presidency of the United States.

Centralization of executive responsibility for the production of munitions does not require clothing any man with autocratic powers. This form of organization can and should be based upon organized cooperation. The American people have the highest sense of cooperation of any nation in the world. We proved that in the last war. We shall prove it again if the Government organizes in such a way as to instill confidence in the people.

The third lesson taught by experience is that we must get these vast expenditures of money out of politics—get them out of sectional pressures and out of group pressures. We must get them focused into one place where the whole Nation can look at it and watch the spending. That is the only way we can prevent profiteering. It is the only way we can eliminate waste and assure efficiency. We must not blind ourselves to the sectional pulling and logrolling that goes on in our country. We know too well the use that can be made politically of favors to localities and to individuals in the expenditure of such large sums of money.

It is a sorry thing that the American people have to learn these lessons over and over again every time necessity knocks at our doors.

Therefore what are the essentials of this organization if we want real preparedness? It requires:

1. That a munitions administration be created in Washington.
2. That it should have a single-headed administrator with assistant heads for labor, agriculture, and industry.
3. That administrator should be an industrialist and not a politician.
4. That he should have authority to appoint a nonpartisan advisory board representing the Army, Navy, labor, transportation, manufacturing, and agriculture.
5. That the whole of the purchasing and manufacturing for the Army and Navy from private industry should be done by this administrator. The business of the Army and Navy is to state what they want. It is for the munitions administrator to deliver it.
6. That a research organization should be created to constantly improve these products.
7. That all appropriations for such work should be made to this organization.

This is a form of organization that will get speed and economy. Urgency, speed, and economy are not bureaucratic virtues.

REGENERATION OF OUR NATIONAL STRENGTH

Creation of such organization would be only the first step in meeting the task before us.

Preparedness in a nation is not alone the ability to manufacture arms, or even the number of soldiers or warships or airplanes. It lies in the moral strength and the resolute will of the people. It also lies in economic strength and prosperity of a people. I do not wish to dwell upon the fact that today we have 10,000,000 unemployed; that we have 18,000,000 destitute people on relief; that

one-third of our population is living at subnormal standards; that agriculture is kept afloat only by Government subsidy; that our national strength for defense has been weakened by the huge increase of our national debt and taxes in time of peace.

Business and industry have been palsied with fear, hesitation, and lack of confidence. In consequence our industrial efficiency has even decreased in the last 8 years. That can be proven. A recent census of the machine tools in the United States showed that while only 52 percent were over 10 years old in 1932, there are 70 percent of them over 10 years old today. That means our industrial plant has slipped backward in its vital equipment.

Today our call is for industrial production to defend the Nation. To get that we must have more than efficient Government organization. We must change the attitude of government toward industry. If we are to be prepared for the supreme test of national defense there must be regeneration of the springs of economic life in our people. We must restore confidence and thus employment. We truly need national unity for this most fundamental part of life and national defense.

France is today paying in blood the penalty for a government of similar economic attitudes under the government of Premier Blum.

We have no good reason to be discouraged or fearful. We have the largest resources in the world. We have the greatest mechanical genius. Our men are courageous and our women inspired in fortitude. The whole world knows the capacity of the United States in initiative, in execution, in creation, and performance. Once we convince the world that our capacities are organized no nation will have any desire to establish bases on the Western Hemisphere or make any attack upon us now or any other time.

Human liberty may need take refuge upon this continent. We must efficiently be prepared to defend it as the last hope of the world.

Who Are the Friends of Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, all too often a few self-appointed spokesmen describe themselves as the friends of labor and charge all who oppose their ideas with being labor-baiters, enemies of labor.

It might be of interest to those self-appointed egotists, those holier-than-thou critics, some of whom would be highly indignant were they accused of assuming the role of champions of labor for political or financial purposes, to know the result of a recent poll on the question as to which of a certain named group had been helpful to labor.

To that end I here quote an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 28, 1940:

POLL OF WORKERS CALLS FORD BEST FRIEND OF LABOR—"FORTUNE" SURVEY REPORTS MANUFACTURER LEADS BOTH GREEN AND LEWIS

According to a national poll of organized and unorganized workers, the results of which will appear in the June issue of Fortune magazine, nearly three-quarters of American labor believe that Henry Ford has been more helpful to labor than has John L. Lewis or William Green.

Of those polled, members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, of independent unions, and of no unions, 44.6 percent believed that John L. Lewis, president of the C. I. O., was harmful to labor, and 18.2 percent believed that William Green, president of the A. F. of L., was harmful to labor. Only 12.3 percent believed that Henry Ford was harmful to labor.

In answer to the question, "Which of these people do you feel have been on the whole helpful to labor and which harmful?" 73.6 percent believed that Henry Ford was helpful to labor, 49.7 percent believed that William Green was helpful, and only 32.6 percent voted favorably on Mr. Lewis.

The list that followed the question included the names of others prominent in labor questions. Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, who was voted by 51.8 percent to be helpful to labor, received the second largest favorable vote. However, 42.6 percent of the poll voted "Don't know" on Senator WAGNER.

Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party, received the fewest helpful votes, only 4.2 percent.

The isolated vote of members of the C. I. O., which organization has been at war with Henry Ford, showed that 51.5 percent of the members believed Henry Ford helpful to labor.

On the question of which of the two leaders of the labor factions was the more to blame for the present conflict between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., 39.4 percent accused Mr. Lewis, 21.6 percent accused both leaders, 11 percent believed Mr. Green more at fault, 3.8 percent believed neither to be at fault, and 24.2 percent voted "Don't know."

Another question in the poll dealt with the attitude of labor on the question of the fairness of employers and revealed that in three particulars the majority of those answering the poll believed that more than half the employers were fair on hours, working conditions, and wages.

In answer to the question, "Do you regard picketing as a good or bad method of protest?" 55.5 percent of the votes rejected picketing.

National Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON J. W. DITTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable J. W. DITTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., station KYW, Philadelphia, Pa., on Saturday, May 25, 1940.

In my well-considered judgment the address is a masterpiece of statesmanship; that is easy to say yet not difficult to justify, if you read it.

This speech was carefully and logically thought out. It bears evidence of Americanism, rather than partisanship.

It is one of the best and most far-sighted speeches delivered in days, or recently. It deserves and should have the careful consideration of all those who care more for this country than they do for the temporary benefits which may accrue to them by virtue of any partisan political affiliation.

The truth is brought home to all of us in unmistakable terms and in unequivocal language that the situation in which these beloved United States of ours, and that means our country, exists by reason of no fault save that of the derelictions of duty, and the continued unjustified experimentations of the present administration, superinduced by its selfish desire, at our expense, to perpetuate itself. This cannot be successfully contradicted or controverted.

Never before, in my opinion, has the situation been more truthfully portrayed, nor has the attention of the people or of the American public been more directly attracted to the exact situation that obtains than in this eloquent, logical, and sensible address:

Ten days ago the President addressed a joint session of the Congress. It was a dramatic appearance. Nothing was left undone to impress upon the Senate and the House the seriousness of the occasion. Not only the Congress but the country was anxious for assurance as the news of the terrible tragedy in Europe became the more disquieting day by day.

You probably heard the President's message on the air that afternoon, or, you may have heard it as it was rebroadcast several times during the evening. He pictured vividly the dangers that modern methods of warfare entail. Our danger was made very real as a mile-by-mile and hour-by-hour imaginary invasion of the country was outlined. Even the cities most distant from the seacoast were included in the possibilities of an invader's attack. An impression of immediate danger was created, and with that impression there came a doubt of our own safety and security at this time. It has become increasingly evident day by day that the unfortunate impression which the President's address made upon thousands of our people was one of fear that an attack by a foreign aggressor was imminent. I believe, and I think you believe, that this fear must be dispelled if we are to think clearly and plan wisely in the days before us, and that the first duty of

national leadership in times such as these is the compelling challenge to a real courage.

The President has asked for an appropriation of more than a billion dollars to strengthen the defenses of the Nation. With scarcely a dissenting voice that request will be granted. The swift progress of the forces of a dictatorship cannot be ignored. Our defenses must be adequate in the light of present world conditions, and whatever funds are needed must be provided.

A unity of purpose seems assured by the Congress. Partisanship will play no part in the effort to solve the gigantic task with which we are confronted. But the magnitude of the proposals, the far-reaching consequences of their enactment, the ultimate effects on the general welfare of all our people and the forces which they may set in motion, invite the careful examination and the critical analysis which our two-party system of government has always provided. Only as such examination and analysis is encouraged can we hope to avoid the inevitable mistakes of arbitrary decisions.

In his message to the Congress the President asked that we appropriate immediately "a large sum of money to procure essential equipment of all kinds for a larger and thoroughly rounded-out Army, to replace all old Army and Navy equipment with the latest type of equipment, to increase production facilities." The message implied that all this was to be accomplished with the additional funds requested. There was no suggestion that the billion-dollar expenditure was only a beginning. Nor was there any suggestion as to how this preparedness program would be carried out, nor as to how the bill for the undertaking was to be paid.

The appropriation requested by the President will be made. It will finance a start in a broad program of expansion and the modernization of equipment for national defense. It will, however, be only an approach to the problem—not its solution. It seems to me that it is vitally important that the Congress consider factually and calmly the actual condition of our armed power and what changing world conditions now imperatively demand. It should help put into high gear the national industrial machine which during the last 7 years has had so little to encourage its expansion and which is indispensable if an efficient and expeditious development of our defense program is to be secured.

As the President suggested, "The Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned." And I say to you tonight, if that team is to perform, if that team is to play the serious game expected of it, the Congress should not adjourn until it has had the fullest opportunity to inquire into the whole program, to ascertain the purposes and the plans, and to determine the means to be used for the payment of that which will be necessary to give the country a sense of absolute security.

I believe, and I think you believe, that team has a real responsibility today. It has a duty, not only to appropriate the necessary funds for defense, but it has an equally solemn duty to decide upon the means by which those funds are to be secured. The two go hand in hand. They are one problem. To magnify the one and ignore the other is neither convincing nor courageous. Deficits do not make good defenses, and to pile one debt upon another at this time will inevitably mean that the very defenses so sorely needed will be weakened. Appropriations are almost always popular, but a storm of protest usually is aroused—yes, I might say almost a universal protest is aroused when tax measures are presented which are intended to raise the revenue for the appropriations which have been made. But as unpopular as a tax measure may be, I believe it to be the duty of the present administration to introduce legislation of this kind at once.

No sooner had the President completed his message than legislative machinery was set in motion by the majority party to carry out the proposals for expansion and modernization. Hearings got under way in both the Senate and the House of Representatives by the regular committees to provide both the authorization and the appropriations contemplated by the President's proposal. Every expedition was afforded to speed the enactment of the necessary legislation, but up to the present time no proposal whatever has been made by the Democratic majority which would give either the Congress or the country a hint as to how the bill is to be paid.

Nor should it be forgotten that while the President in his message to the Congress on January 3 of this year asked it "to levy additional taxes to meet the emergency spending for national defense," his request apparently has not been pressed, for no action has been taken. If that suggestion was timely last January, as it was, then certainly the enlarged program makes such action imperative at this time. And yet, every indication points to an adjournment of the Congress as a part of the administration's plans without the presentation of any proposal whatever of the methods that are to be taken to finance the new defense program. If the Congress and the President as a team owe a duty, as I believe they do, to make the Nation invulnerable against the attack of any aggressor, that same team, the Congress and the President playing together, owe an immediate duty to study seriously, consider carefully, and enact courageously those measures which will help to make the expanded military machine an effective instrument.

One statement made by the President in his message of a little more than a week ago bears repetition tonight, when he said, "The clear fact is that the American people must recast their thinking about national protection." I believe that to be true—we must recast our thinking about national protection. That protection includes not only the Army and the Navy but the whole economic and industrial life of the Nation. National defense means more than money and men and munitions. No defense can be stronger than the economic foundations which support it or the morale of the people who sustain it.

We must recast the thinking that has found no cause for alarm in the fact that our spending for the last seven years has been far in excess of our receipts; that our national outgo year by year has been greater than our national income; that a philosophy of spending ourselves into prosperity has been advocated by those in charge of our Government; that the warning which has been repeatedly sounded of the dangers of a loose fiscal policy has been ignored, all of which brings us today, in this hour of real need, face to face with the grim reality that profligacy provides little strength in the time of a national emergency.

We must recast the thinking that conceives widespread unemployment to be a necessary and permanent part of our way of life; that insists our industrial machine can no longer turn unless the hand of Government is at the throttle; that fails to recognize the danger of continued tinkering with economic forces; that kills the spirit of adventure by destroying the hope of conquering new frontiers, and that leaves the dynamic energy of men and machines and money standing idle in what should be the thriving market places of the Nation.

We must recast the thinking that has urged a philosophy of scarcity as a solution of our economic ills; that suggests the widespread curtailment of crops as a means of acquiring agricultural wealth; that paralyzes the industrial productive capacity of the Nation by the arbitrary decisions of administrative agencies; that penalizes the right of a man to a reasonable profit for his investments of time and talents and abilities, and that holds the vast resources of our national wealth within the confines of a series of social and economic experiments.

We must recast the thinking that places a premium on paternalism; that urges the benefactions of government as the measure of its effectiveness; that approves bounties as a bartering means for ballots, and that encourages a spirit of dependency among large groups of our people.

Above all else, we must at this time recast the thinking that countenances any encroachment, direct or indirect, on our free institutions; that winks at treason as an essential element of tolerance; that accepts any emergency as an excuse for relaxing established limitations, and that lends its approval to an evasion of constitutional restraints.

The need today is a prompt recasting of much of the thinking that has been indulged in since 1933 and that has formed the basis of national policies during that time. An abrupt about face is needed along many lines. Billions spent for modernizing our machines of war will be wasted unless our thinking is set straight—unless some of the homely virtues are again woven into the fabric of our national life. They are just as essential to our security as weapons of warfare. Without them our rearmament will be in vain. Honesty, thrift, industry must be made a part of the defense plans of the Nation. A unity of purpose must be built on mutual understanding and mutual helpfulness among all our people. It must be bound together by cords of cherished traditions—love of liberty and a will to be free. It must find its life and its inspiration in the great moral forces which from day to day prove our faith in a living God and which challenge our courage to work out the destiny which He has in store for us. To this unity of purpose we Republicans, not as party men but as Americans, pledge our honor and our devotion.

Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co., appellant, against Homer M. Adkins as collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 804. October term, 1939. *The Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co., appellant, v. Homer M. Adkins, as collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas.* Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas. May 20, 1940]

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.

The labor provisions of the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 991) were held unconstitutional by this Court in *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238). The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72) was thereupon enacted. It eliminated those provisions of the earlier act and made other substantive and structural changes.[1] The basic problem here involved is the constitutionality of the 1937 act.

That act provides for the regulation of the sale and distribution of bituminous coal by the National Bituminous Coal Commission[2] with the cooperation of the bituminous-coal industry. Its aim is the stabilization of the industry primarily through price fixing and the elimination of unfair competition. It is provided in section 4 that the coal producers, accepting membership, shall be organized under the Bituminous Coal Code. Some 20 district boards of code members are provided for, which are to operate as an aid to the Commission but subject to its pervasive surveillance and authority. The statute specifies in detail the methods of their organization and operation, the scope of their functions, and the jurisdiction of the Commission over them. The Commission is empowered to fix minimum prices for code members in accordance with stated standards. Under section 4, II (a), each board shall "on its own motion or when directed by the Commission" propose minimum prices pursuant to prescribed statutory standards. These may be approved, disapproved, or modified by the Commission as the basis for the coordination of minimum prices. Somewhat comparable machinery is provided for such coordination of minimum prices "in common consuming market areas upon a fair competitive basis," section 4, II (b), and for establishment of rules and regulations incidental to the sale and distribution of coal by code members, section 4, II (a). The Commission is also given power by section 4, II (c), to establish maximum prices for code members pursuant to standards prescribed therein. The sale, delivery, or offer for sale of coal below the minimum or above the maximum prices established by the Commission is made a violation of the code, section 4, II (e). So are numerous practices, specified in section 4, II (i), as unfair methods of competition. And contracts for the sale of coal at prices below the prescribed minimum or above the maximum are invalid and unenforceable, section 4, II (e). The Commission may, after hearing, revoke the code membership of any coal producer for willful violation of the code or of any regulation made thereunder, section 5 (b).

Section 3 (a) imposes an excise tax of 1 cent per ton of 2,000 pounds upon the sale or other disposition by the producer of bituminous coal produced in the United States.[3] Section 3 (b) imposes an additional 19½-percent tax (based on sale price or in certain cases on fair market value) on sales of bituminous coal by producers "which would be subject to the application of the conditions and provisions of the code provided for in section 4, or of the provisions of section 4–A."[4] Producers who are members of the code are exempt from that tax. As we shall see, the interpretation of section 3 (b) is a subject of controversy. But if, as the Government contends, the 19½-percent tax is applicable to sales by nonmembers, there are strong inducements for joining the code.

Machinery is provided in section 4–A for obtaining exemptions. A producer who believes that any commerce in coal is not, or may not be made, subject to the provisions of section 4 may file an application for exemption with the Commission. Subject to qualifications not material here, the filing of such application "in good faith" exempts the applicant from any "obligation, duty, or liability" imposed by section 4 pending action by the Commission on the application. The Commission shall grant the application or, after notice and opportunity for hearing shall deny or otherwise dispose of it. An applicant aggrieved by such denial or other disposition may obtain a review of the order in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or in the court of appeals in the circuit where he resides or has his principal place of business (sec. 6 (b)). The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, are conclusive.

Appellant is lessee of coal lands in Arkansas and is engaged in the business of mining and shipping coal. It has not subscribed to or accepted the provisions of the bituminous coal code provided for in section 4 of the act. In August 1937 it filed an application for exemption on the grounds that its coal was not bituminous coal as defined in section 17 (b) of the act.[5] The Commission held a public hearing on that application in October 1937.[6] Appellant appeared, introduced evidence, and was heard on oral argument before the Commission.[7] In August 1938 the Commission handed down an opinion with findings of fact and conclusions of law and entered an order denying appellant's application for exemption on the grounds that its coal was bituminous within the meaning of section 17 (b). Appellant obtained a review of this order in the circuit court of appeals. That court held that the Commission had jurisdiction to determine the status of coal claimed to be exempt, and that the Commission's decision was based on substantial evidence. It accordingly affirmed the order (*Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co.* v. *National Bituminous Coal Commission*, 105 F. (2d) 559). We denied certiorari (308 U. S. 604).

In May 1938, while the above proceeding was pending before the Commission, appellee demanded that appellant pay the taxes, penalties, and interest accruing under section 3 (b) of the act for the period ending February 1938; and filed a notice of tax lien against appellant's property. Thereupon appellant filed its complaint in this suit to enjoin the collection of the tax. A three-judge court was convened, which issued a temporary injunction.[8] Apparently no further action was taken in this case until after the decision of the circuit court of appeals in *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co.* v. *National Bituminous Coal Commission*, supra, when appellee filed a supplemental answer stating that the decision in that case was res judicata as to the status of appellant's coal under the act and that the district court had no jurisdiction over that subject matter. The court below denied appellant's motion to strike that portion of the answer (31 F. Supp. 125). The case was tried. The court held the act to be constitutional and dismissed the bill on the merits.[9] The case is here on appeal (50 Stat. 752; 28 U. S. C. A., sec. 380 (a)).

I. Appellant argues that it is not subject to the 19½-percent tax imposed by section 3 (b) because that section does not apply to producers who are not members of the code. Its argument rests on the construction of section 3 (b) and section 4. As we have seen, the former places the 19½-percent tax on the sale or other disposition of coal "which would be subject to the application of the conditions and provisions of the code provided for in section 4, or of the provisions of section 4–A." Section 4 provides that the "provisions of such code shall apply only to such code members." Appellant therefore contends that the tax is not applicable to its coal, since the coal produced by a noncode producer such as appellant is not subject to the provisions of the code.

But if the 19½-percent tax is not applicable to noncode members, it is not applicable to anyone, since section 3 (b) exempts code members from that tax. That construction would read the 19½-percent tax out of the act. The essential sanction of the act would then disappear and its effectiveness would be seriously impaired. That alternative will not be taken where a construction is possible which will preserve the vitality of the act and the utility of the language in question. See *Armstrong Paint & Varnish Works* v. *Nu-Enamel Corporation* (305 U. S. 315, 333) and cases cited. Only a highly strained construction of section 3 (b) would lead to the conclusion that noncode members are exempt from the 19½-percent tax. It seems that Congress made a deliberate choice of words when it said that the tax applied to the sale or other disposition of coal which "would be" subject to section 4 and section

---

[1] H. Rept. No. 294, 75th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2–3.

[2] Though we refer throughout to the Commission, it should be noted that its functions have been administered since July 1, 1939, by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior. Reorganization Plan No. II, sec. 4 (a) and (b), submitted by the President to the Congress May 6, 1939. Public Resolution No. 20, 76th Cong., 1st sess., ch. 193, approved June 7, 1939.

[3] These provisions are now found in sec. 3520 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 430). The 1-cent tax was apparently designed to cover the administrative costs of the act. See H. Rept. No. 294, supra, note 1, pp. 2–3, recommending a one-half-percent tax, which in conference was changed to 1 cent per ton. H. Rept. No. 578, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 5.

[4] Sec. 4, as we have seen, governs the constitution and operation of the code. Sec. 4–A provides, inter alia, that the Commission shall subject coal in intrastate commerce to the provisions of sec. 4 if it finds after hearing that transactions in that coal "cause any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference, or prejudice as between persons and localities in such commerce on the one hand and interstate coal on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against interstate commerce in coal, or in any manner directly affect interstate commerce in coal."

[5] Sec. 17 (b) provides: "The term 'bituminous coal' includes all bituminous, semibituminous, and subbituminous coal and shall exclude lignite, which is defined as a lignitic coal having calorific value in British thermal units of less than 7,600 per pound and having a natural moisture content in place in the mine of 30 percent or more."

[6] This hearing was not restricted to appellant's application. Other producers in the same field intervened.

[7] The liberal notice and opportunity to be heard afforded appellant are illustrated by the following: In January 1938 the report of the examiner was served on appellant. In May 1938 a proposed report of the Commission was issued giving appellant 30 days to file exceptions and briefs and in that event to apply for oral argument. Appellant filed exceptions and asked for oral argument. Notice of oral argument was issued and oral argument was had. Thereafter the Commission issued its order denying the application.

[8] It granted, however, a permanent injunction against collection of taxes prior to December 4, 1939, the date on which this Court denied a petition for rehearing on the petition for certiorari (308 U. S. 638). Appellee has not appealed from that part of the decree. The Court also granted a stay with respect to collection of taxes accruing after December 4, 1939, pending final disposition of this appeal.

4–A. Section 4 is made expressly applicable "only to matters and transactions in or directly affecting interstate commerce in bituminous coal." Hence it seems plain that the tax was intended to apply only to those sales by noncode members which "would be" subject to regulation under section 4. Appellant's coal plainly falls in that class, since practically its entire output is sold to purchasers outside the State of Arkansas. To sustain appellant's position, we would not only have to substitute "is" for "would be"; we would have to override the express congressional plan to make the 19½-percent tax "in aid of the regulation of interstate commerce" in bituminous coal.[9] That would be not only to rewrite section 3 (b) but to remake the whole statutory scheme. Obviously such a task is not for the courts.

II. Appellant challenges the constitutionality of the act on the grounds that the 19½-percent tax is not a tax but a penalty, that Congress lacks the power to fix minimum prices for bituminous coal sold in interstate commerce, that there has been an invalid delegation of legislative and judicial power, and that the division of bituminous coal into code and noncode classes is improper.

Clearly this tax is not designed merely for revenue purposes. In purpose and effect it is primarily a sanction to enforce the regulatory provisions of the act. But that does not mean that the statute is invalid and the tax unenforceable. Congress may impose penalties in aid of the exercise of any of its enumerated powers. The power of taxation granted to Congress by the Constitution may be utilized as a sanction for the exercise of another power which is granted it. (*Head Money Cases*, 112 U. S. 580, 596. And see *Sonzinsky* v. *United States*, 300 U. S. 506.) It is so utilized here.

The regulatory provisions are clearly within the power of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution. These provisions are applicable only to sales or transactions in or directly or intimately affecting interstate commerce. The fixing of prices, the proscription of unfair trade practices, the establishment of marketing rules respecting such sales of bituminous coal, constitute regulations within the competence of Congress under the commerce clause. As stated by Mr. Justice Cardozo in his dissent in *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, supra, p. 326, "To regulate the price for such transactions is to regulate commerce itself, and not alone its antecedent conditions or its ultimate consequences." (See *Tagg Bros. & Moorhead* v. *United States*, 280 U. S. 420.) What is true of prices is true of the attachment of other conditions to the flow of a commodity in interstate channels (*Mulford* v. *Smith*, 307 U. S. 38, and cases cited). Since this power, when it exists, is complete in itself (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1, 196), there can be no question but that the provisions of this act are an exertion of the paramount Federal power over interstate commerce. (See *United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc.*, 307 U. S. 533.)

Nor does the act violate the fifth amendment. Price control is one of the means available to the States (*Nebbia* v. *New York*, 291 U. S. 502) and to the Congress (*United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc.*, supra) in their respective domains (*Baldwin* v. *G. A. F. Seelig, Inc.*, 294 U. S. 511) for the protection and promotion of the welfare of the economy. But appellant claims that this act is not an appropriate exercise of the congressional power. It urges that the nature and use of bituminous coal in nowise endanger the health and morals of the populace; that no question of conservation is involved; that the ills of the industry are attributable to overproduction; that the increase of prices will cause a further loss of markets and add to the afflictions which beset the industry; and that the consuming public will be deprived of the wholesome restriction of the antitrust laws. Those matters, however, relate to questions of policy, to the wisdom of the legislation, and to the appropriateness of the remedy chosen—matters which are not our concern. If we endeavored to appraise them we would be trespassing on the legislative domain. And if we undertook to narrow the scope of Federal intervention in this field, as suggested by appellant, we would be blind to at least 30 years of history. For a generation there have been various manifestations of incessant demand for Federal intervention in the coal industry.[10] The investigations preceding the 1935 and 1937 acts are replete with an exposition of the conditions which have beset that industry.[11] Official [12] and private [13] records give eloquent testimony to the statement of Mr. Justice Cardozo in the Carter case (p. 330) that free competition had been "degraded into anarchy" in the bituminous-coal industry. Overproduction and savage, competitive warfare wasted the industry. Labor and capital alike were the victims. Financial distress among operators and acute poverty among miners prevailed even during periods of general prosperity. This history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in blood as well as in ink.

It was the judgment of Congress that price fixing and the elimination of unfair competitive practices were appropriate methods for prevention of the financial ruin, low wages, poor working conditions, strikes, and disruption of the channels of trade which followed in the wake of the demoralized price structures in this industry. If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic conditions which have prevailed in it do not justify legislation, it is difficult to imagine what would. To invalidate this act we would have to deny the existence of power on the part of Congress under the commerce clause to deal directly and specifically with those forces which in its judgment should not be permitted to dislocate an important segment of our economy and to disrupt and burden interstate channels of trade. That step could not be taken without plain disregard to the Constitution. There are limits on the powers of the States to act as respects these interstate industries (*Baldwin* v. *G. A. F. Sellig, Inc.*, supra). If the industry acting on its own had endeavored to stabilize the markets through price-fixing agreements, it would have run afoul of the Sherman Act (*United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.*, 309 U. S. —). But that does not mean that there is a no-man's land between the State and Federal domains. Certainly what Congress has forbidden by the Sherman Act it can modify. It may do so by placing the machinery of price fixing in the hands of public agencies. It may single out for separate treatment, as it has done on various occasions,[14] a particular industry and thereby remove the penalties of the Sherman Act as respects it. Congress under the commerce clause is not impotent to deal with what it may consider to be dire consequences of laissez-faire. It is not powerless to take steps in mitigation of what in its judgment are abuses of cutthroat competition. And it is not limited in its choice between unrestrained self-regulation on the one hand and rigid prohibitions on the other. The commerce clause empowers it to undertake stabilization of an interstate industry through a process of price fixing which safeguards the public interest by placing price control in the hands of its administrative representative (*United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc.*, supra). That was the choice which Congress made here. There is nothing in the Carter case which stands in the way. The majority of the Court in that case did not pass on the price-fixing features of the earlier act. The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cardozo in separate minority opinions expressed the view that the price-fixing features of the earlier act were constitutional. We rest on their conclusions for sustaining the present act.

Nor does the act contain an invalid delegation of legislative power. Under section 4, II (c) the Commission may fix maximum prices when in the public interest it deems it necessary in order to protect the consumer against unreasonably high prices. These maximum prices must be fixed at a uniform increase above minimum prices so that in the aggregate they will yield a reasonable return above the weighted average total cost of the district. And no maximum price shall be established for any mine which will not yield a fair return on the fair value of the property. The minimum prices to be fixed must conform to the following standards: The weighted average cost for each minimum price area must be computed, the elements of cost being defined; a classification of the various sizes and grades of coal shall be made which reflects as nearly as possible the relative market value of the various kinds, qualities, and sizes of coal, which is just and equitable as between producers within the district and which has due regard to the interests of the consuming public; and coordinated minimum prices shall be established for such coal (a) which reflect as nearly as possible, the relative market values at points of delivery taking into account specifically enumerated factors, (b) which preserve, as nearly as may be existing, fair competitive opportunities, (c) which are just and equitable as between the districts, and (d) which, consistently with the process of coordination, yield a return to each area approximating its weighted average cost per ton.

The problem of fixing reasonable prices for bituminous coal cannot be differentiated legally from the task of fixing rates under the Interstate Commerce Act (41 Stat. 484; 49 U. S. C. A., sec. 15) and the Packers and Stockyards Act (42 Stat. 166; 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 211). The latter provide the standard of "just and reasonable" to guide the administrative body in the rate-making process. The validity of that standard (*Tagg Bros. & Moorhead* v. *United States*, supra), the appropriateness of the criterion of the "public interest" in various contexts (*New York Central Securities Corporation* v. *United States*, 287 U. S. 12, 24; *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation, Inc.*, 272 U. S. 1; *Avent* v. *United States*, 266 U. S. 127), the legality of the standard of "unreasonable obstruction" to navigation (*Union Bridge Co.* v. *United States*, 204 U. S. 364) all make it clear that there is a valid delegation of authority in this case. The standards

[9] H. Rept. No. 294, supra, note 1, states concerning this tax (p. 4): "Under subsection (b) a tax of 19½ percent is applied to coal which would be subject to the provisions in section 4 or the provisions of section 4A. Producers who are code members are exempt from this tax. This tax is intended to be in aid of the regulation of interstate commerce in coal provided for in sections 4 and 4A."

[10] National Resources Committee, Energy Resources and National Policy (1939), pp. 41–123, 338–346, 405–423.

[11] Hearings on H. R. 8479, 74th Cong., 1st sess.

[12] National Resources Committee, Energy Resources and National Policy, supra note 10; H. Rept. No. 1800, 74th Cong., 1st sess., covering the 1935 act; S. Rept. No. 252, H. Rept. No. 294, 75th Cong., 1st sess., covering the 1937 act; *Appalachian Coals, Inc.*, v. *United States* (288 U. S. 344); Third Annual Report Under the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (1940), pp. 4–5.

[13] Hamilton & Wright, the Case of Bituminous Coal (1926); Report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the National Coal Association, October 1934, pp. 9–11, 96–97.

[14] See *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.*, supra, p. —.

which Congress has provided here far exceed in specificity others which have been sustained. Certainly in the hands of experts the criteria which Congress has supplied are wholly adequate for carrying out the general policy and purpose of the act. To require more would be to insist on a degree of exactitude which not only lacks legal necessity but which does not comport with the requirements of the administrative process. Delegation by Congress has long been recognized as necessary in order that the exertion of legislative power does not become a futility (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U. S. 1, 15, and cases cited). But the effectiveness of both the legislative and administrative processes would become endangered if Congress were under the constitutional compulsion of filling in the details beyond the liberal prescription here. Then the burdens of minutiae would be apt to clog the administration of the law and deprive the agency of that flexibility and dispatch which are its salient virtues. For these reasons we hold that the standards with which Congress has supplied the Commission are plainly valid (*United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc.*, supra).

Nor has Congress delegated its legislative authority to the industry. The members of the code function subordinately to the Commission. It, not the code authorities, determines the prices, and it has authority and surveillance over the activities of these authorities. Since lawmaking is not entrusted to the industry, this statutory scheme is unquestionably valid (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra, and cases cited).

But appellant maintains that the delegation of authority to the Commission to determine what coal is subject to the act is unlawful because of uncertainty in the statutory definition of bituminous coal. Section 17 (b) defines the term "bituminous coal" as follows:

"The term 'bituminous coal' includes all bituminous, semibituminous, and subbituminous coal and shall exclude lignite, which is defined as a lignitic coal having calorific value in British thermal units of less than 7,600 per pound and having a natural moisture content in place in the mine of 30 percent or more."

As in the case of the term "interurban" electric railway in the Railway Labor Act (*Shields* v. *Utah Idaho Central Railroad Co.*, 305 U. S. 177), we think the definition of bituminous coal is wholly adequate as a standard for administrative action. The fact that it is not a chemist's or an engineer's definition is not fatal. The definition is not devoid of meaning. We are unable to say that it cannot be applied so as to delineate the areas in which Congress intended to make this system of control effective. The fact that many instances may occur where its application may be difficult is merely to emphasize the nature of the administrative problem and the reason for the grant of latitude by the Congress. The difficulty or impossibility of drawing a statutory line is one of the reasons for supplying merely a statutory guide (Cf. *Piedmont & Northern Railway Co.* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission*, 286 U. S. 299, 312). That guide is sufficiently precise for an intelligent determination of the ultimate questions of fact by experts.

Nor is there an invalid delegation of judicial power. To hold that there was would be to turn back the clock on at least a half century of administrative law. The question of whether or not appellant should be subjected to the regulatory provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act was one which the Congress could decide in the exercise of its powers under the commerce clause. In lieu of making that decision itself, it could bring to its aid the services of an administrative agency. And it could delegate to that agency the determination of the question of fact whether a particular coal producer fell within the act (*Shields* v. *Utah Idaho Central Railroad Co.*, supra, p. 180). The fact that such determination involved an interpretation of the term "bituminous coal" is of no more significance here than was the fact that in the Shields case a decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission of what constituted an "interurban" electric railway was necessary for the ultimate finding as to the applicability of the Railway Labor Act to carriers. That problem involves no more than the adequacy of the standard governing the exercise of the delegated authority. Furthermore, on this phase of the case, appellant has received all the judicial review to which it is entitled. As we have seen, it obtained a review under section 6 (b) of the Commission's denial of its application for exemption. The functions of the courts cease when it is ascertained that the findings of the Commission meet the statutory test (*Rochester Telephone Corporation* v. *United States*, 307 U. S. 125, 146).

Appellant contends that the statutory classification of coal into code and noncode classes and the application of the 19½-percent tax to the latter are improper under the fifth amendment. Its objection is not premised on lack of due process. Nor could it be in view of the elaborate machinery and procedure for the act's enforcement which the Congress has provided. Rather appellant's objection is founded on its claim of discrimination. But the fifth amendment, unlike the fourteenth, has no equal-protection clause (*Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, 301 U. S. 548, 584, and cases cited). And there is "no requirement of uniformity in connection with the commerce power" (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra, p. 14). The lack of similarity in treatment of the two classes of coal is an integral and essential feature of this act. As we have said, it is through that device that Congress sought to obtain an effective sanction for the act's enforcement. Coercion is the very essence of any penalty exacted for failure of submission. "It is of the essence of the plenary power conferred" by the commerce clause "that Congress may exercise its discretion in the use of the power" (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra, p. 14). A part of that discretion is the selection of the sanction for the law's enforcement. Discrimination constitutionally may be the price of noncompliance. "Inquiry into the hidden motives which may move Congress to exercise a power constitutionally conferred upon it is beyond the competency of courts" (*Sonzinsky* v. *United States*, supra, pp. 513–514; and see *Mulford* v. *Smith*, supra, p. 48).

III. Appellant contends here, as it did below, that Sunhine Anthracite Coal Co. against National Bituminous Coal Commission, supra, is not determinative of the present issues since that case did not involve the assessment of taxes and since the Commission had no authority to determine the status of appellant's coal.

These contentions are untenable. In the first place, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is merely the agency to collect taxes levied under the act; he is not the administrative agent whom Congress has designated to determine what coal is exempt from the 19½-percent tax. That function is entrusted to the Commission. By the terms of section 4–A it is the Commission which determines whether an application for exemption should be granted or denied. By the provisions of section 3 (b) it is the Commission which certifies to the Commissioner those who are code members and consequently exempt from the 19½-percent tax. Hence the Commission determines the scope of the provisions of the act and their applicability to various producers. The Commissioner is given no administrative functions whatsoever except tax collection. In the second place, the underlying issue in each of these two suits is the same. In *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co.* v. *National Bituminous Coal Commission*, supra, the question was whether or not appellant's coal was "bituminous" within the meaning of section 17 (b). When that issue was decided adversely to appellant, liability for the 19½-percent tax followed unless appellant joined the code, in which event it would be entitled to a certificate from the Commission evidencing its tax exemption. In the present suit, appellant is seeking to raise the identical issue, since its purpose is to enjoin collection of the selfsame tax.

The result is clear. Where the issues in separate suits are the same, the fact that the parties are not precisely identical is not necessarily fatal. As stated in *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *Schendel* (270 U. S. 611, 620), "Identity of parties is not a mere matter of form, but of substance. Parties nominally the same may be, in legal effect, different, * * * and parties nominally different may be, in legal effect, the same." A judgment is res judicata in a second action upon the same claim between the same parties or those in privity with them (*Cromwell* v. *County of Sac*, 94 U. S. 351). There is privity between officers of the same government, so that a judgment in a suit between a party and a representative of the United States is res judicata in relitigation of the same issue between that party and another officer of the Government. See *Tait* v. *Western Maryland Railway Co.* (289 U. S. 620). The crucial point is whether or not in the earlier litigation the representative of the United States had authority to represent its interests in a final adjudication of the issue in controversy. Cf. *Gunter* v. *Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.* (200 U. S. 273, 284–289). Cases holding that a judgment in a suit against a collector for unlawful exaction is not a bar to a subsequent suit by or against the Commissioner or the United States (*Sage* v. *United States*, 250 U. S. 33; *Bankers Pocahontas Coal Co.* v. *Burnet*, 287 U. S. 308) are not in point, since the suit against the collector is "personal and its incidents, such as the nature of the defenses open and the allowance of interest, are different" (*Sage* v. *United States*, supra, p. 37).

But here the authority of the Commission is clear. There can be no question that it was authorized to make the determination of the status of appellant's coal under the act. It represented the United States in that determination, and the delegation of that power to the Commission was valid, as we have said. That suit therefore bound the United States as well as the appellant. Where a suit binds the United States, it binds its subordinate officials (*Tait* v. *Western Maryland Railway Co.*, supra). The suggestion that the doctrine of res judicata does not apply unless the court rendering the judgment had jurisdiction of the cause is sufficiently answered by *Stoll* v. *Gottlieb* (305 U. S. 165) and *Treinies* v. *Sunshine Mining Co.* (308 U. S. 66). As held in those cases, in general the principles of res judicata apply to questions of jurisdiction as well as to other matters—whether it be jurisdiction of the subject matter or of the parties. Accordingly the lower court correctly held that it had no jurisdiction to determine whether appellant's coal was "bituminous" as defined in the act. Furthermore, where, as here, Congress has created a special administrative procedure for the determination of the status of persons or companies under a regulatory act and has prescribed a procedure which meets all requirements of due process, that remedy is exclusive. (See *Anniston Manufacturing Co.* v. *Davis*, 301 U. S. 337.)

The decree below subjected appellant to payment of taxes accrued or assessed against it under section 3 (b) after December 4, 1939. To relieve against payment of taxes until final termination of the litigation would be to put a premium on dilatory tactics in a situation where under the authority of *Currin* v. *Wallace*, *Mulford* v. *Smith*, and *United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc.*, supra, the subject of the act was clearly one over which the jurisdiction of Congress was complete.

Affirmed.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the act under review is beyond any power granted to Congress and that the judgment below should be reversed.

Champoeg—Oregon's Shrine to Civil Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

HISTORICAL SKETCH AND ADDRESS BY LESLIE M. SCOTT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Champoeg, situated on the banks of the Willamette River in Oregon, is a place of great historic interest. History records that on May 2, 1843, the Oregon pioneers, in a meeting at Champoeg, voted to create a provisional government and on July 5 subsequently adopted laws and inducted officers into office.

Champoeg should be dedicated and maintained by our Government as a shrine to the establishment of civil government and the ultimate preservation of the Pacific shores to the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following short history of Champoeg, written by Mr. Leslie M. Scott, the well-known historian of early Oregon history, together with an address delivered by him July 5, 1937, at Oregon's anniversary at Champoeg, be included in my remarks.

The history and address follow:

CHAMPOEG MEMORANDA—ORGANIZATION OF THE OREGON PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT IN 1843

(By Leslie M. Scott)

Champoeg was a principal center of travel, trade, and assemblage in 1842–43. The Hudson's Bay Company erected a warehouse there in 1842. It was a river landing, a market, where French Prairie met the Willamette River and connected by boat with Fort Vancouver, and by pack trail leading south. It was also a river crossing for the west-side trail. In the vicinity was an Indian village, and later the French-Canadian Campement du Sable, that is, "camp of sand" or "gravel." A village of white people sprang up there (about 1845), and was swept away by flood (December 7, 1861). French Prairie was the place of the earliest agricultural settlement of the Willamette Valley, named for French-Canadians, the first settlers.

Champoeg is an Indian name meaning "place of the root."[1] The prefix occurs in other names such as Chehalem, Yamhill (Cham-il), Chemeketa, Chemawa.

Champoeg was the scene of the principal and largest meetings of the settlers, in the formation of the Oregon provisional government, on May 2 and July 5, 1843, when the settlers elected officers and adopted laws.

Earlier meetings of settlers, to propose a government, took place elsewhere in 1841,[2] at which sessions the settlers arranged the administration of the Ewing Young estate under a probate judge and elected various inactive officers. The probate followed the laws of New York, but the settlers adopted no laws for the civil and criminal government of the colony. This movement for a government lapsed chiefly on account of the objections of Lt. Charles Wilkes, of the American Navy, then inspecting Oregon for the United States Government, and the apathy and opposition of American and British settlers, and the lack of a code of laws.[3]

At Champoeg a large meeting of settlers took place September 23, 1842, to receive Dr. Elijah White, who came from Washington as an executive officer of the United States, sub-Indian agent, and was greeted with commendatory resolutions of the welcoming population.[4]

The meetings elsewhere than at Champoeg in 1843 were attended by a small number of settlers and were preliminary to the decisive meetings at Champoeg on May 2 and July 5, 1843; at the Methodist Institute near Salem (February 2, 1843); at the house of Joseph Gervais, French Prairie (March 6, 1843), to consider protective measures against predatory animals, first and second "wolf meetings"; at Oregon City (March 17, 1843), organization committee of the second "wolf meeting," "to take into consideration the propriety of taking measures for civil and military protection of this colony," and to issue the call for the Champoeg meeting of May 2, 1843.[5] The main objective was the legalization of land titles.

The provisional government, formed at Champoeg May 2 and July 5, 1843, was the first effective and permanent popular government on the Pacific coast. Several ineffectual efforts to institute government in Oregon had preceded. The laws were taken from the ordinance of 1787 for the Northwest Territory and the statutes of Iowa, and adopted July 5, 1843.[6] Officers were elected May 2 and July 5, 1843.

The official record plainly says that the first vote at Champoeg May 2, 1843, on the question of organization was "no" by a close decision, and that the last vote was "yes" by a "great" majority. Between the first and the last votes on this question there were confusion and long delay, with pullings and haulings and conflict. In this interval Joe Meek called for a divide, says Historian William H. Gray, who was present, and the result was a majority of two in a rival line-up of the factions.[7] Historian Robert Newell, who was also present, does not mention Meek's call, but says the division or line-up showed a majority of five.[8] The final majority, says Recorder Le Breton, who made the motion for the vote, seconded by Gray, was "great." Between the first and the last votes the British Canadians mostly departed. Le Breton's records say that "most of the dissenters withdrew."[9] F. X. Matthieu, who was present, gives the Gray version of two majority.[10]

The influx of American traders, missionaries, and settlers in the decade preceding the Champoeg events of 1843 made rivalry with the British Hudson's Bay Co., which had long monopolized and governed the Oregon country, now known as the Pacific Northwest. The Americans wished the Government of the United States extended over the Oregon country, or a temporary form of government established "until such time as the United States of America extend their jurisdiction over us," as they declared at Champoeg in 1843 in the preamble to the laws then adopted.

The British considered such assumption of political authority an invasion of their rights secured by the existing treaty of joint occupancy between the United States and Great Britain, and viewed with concern and reticent opposition the American political movements.

The proceedings at Champoeg in 1843 echoed this rivalry, and the French-Canadian opposition was a British protest. The controversy ended in 1846 when the United States by treaty gained possession of the Oregon country north to the present British Columbia boundary.

In the 2-month interval between May 2 and July 5, 1843, the movement to create the provisional government gained favor. Many apathetic Methodist missionaries who were absent from the first assemblage, attended the second. Many others who opposed the Government at the first assemblage, raised no objections at the second. The purpose of legalizing land claims drew the several groups together, and the second assemblage, larger than the first, was virtually unanimous in its acts.

The provisional government, enlarged and strengthened in 1844 and 1845, and succeeded in 1849 by a territorial government of the United States, and in 1859 by the State of Oregon, instituted laws and policies which continued into the territorial and State periods of Oregon.

The Oregon country, the Pacific Northwest, was completely in possession and control of the British and their Hudson's Bay Co., fur traders for 21 years, 1813–34; and, partly thereafter for 12 years until 1846. In the 12 years, American missionaries and settlers composed a rival group which had growing numbers and influence, especially in the Willamette Valley, and which finally took the lead in forming the privisional government of 1843.

The territorial claims of the United States began with the discovery of the Columbia River in 1792 by Robert Gray, of Boston, and were strengthened by Lewis and Clark, the explorers, in 1804–06; by the Astor fur traders, in 1811–13, and by American missionaries and settlers after 1834. The British fur traders began their control in 1813, after the failure of the Astor enterprise. British subjects were under the rule of the Hudson's Bay Co., and the laws of Canada; American citizens, while legally free from that authority, were subject to it through the British domination of the Indians and mastery of supplies and trade.

The provisional government, created at Champoeg chiefly by American settlers and dominated by them, took control of Oregon

[1] Cham, "place"; poeg, "root," used for food.

[2] At Ewing Young's funeral, February 17, near Newberg, at the Lee Mission February 18, near Wheatland, and at St. Paul, June 1, 1841.

[3] Wilkes, Exploring Expedition, IV, 352; Sir George Simpson's letter to Hudson's Bay Co. governor in London, November 25, 1841, Oregon Historical Society archives; Hastings, Emigrant's Guide, 61; Thornton, Oregon and California, II, 31, and various other sources.

[4] White, Ten Years in Oregon, 168–170.

[5] Grover, Oregon Archives, 11; Bancroft, History of Oregon, I, 301; Clark, History of Willamette Valley, 281; Hines, Oregon, Its History, 423; Carey, History of Oregon, 378; R. C. Clark, Oregon Historical Quarterly, XIII, 147.

[6] Carey, History of Oregon, 381, 383.

[7] Gray, History of Oregon, 279.

[8] Oregon Herald, December 9, 1866; Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXX, 234.

[9] Brown, Political History, 97; Grover, Oregon Archives, 14; Gray, History of Oregon, 280.

[10] Oregon Historical Quarterly, XI, 21.

in 1843 south of the Columbia River, and 2 years later, in 1845, north of that river. While some Americans sought to establish United States sovereignty, and their influence made the laws and policies in 1843 unfair to British interests, the later settlers who arrived in 1843–44, made the regime of the provisional government just and tolerant for all classes, and united them all in support of the government; their purpose being, as Jesse Applegate, distinguished American pioneer, said, "to secure peace and order in the country until the United States took it under protection" (letter, October 29, 1865, Oregon Historical Society archives). Again said Applegate:

"Both the Methodist Mission and the Hudson's Bay Co. ceased to be political powers, either to be courted or feared in the colony (1845), and to the close of its existence (1849) the provisional government of Oregon attained all the ends of good government." [11]

A historian of Oregon (R. C. Clark) says of the provisional government:

"It will ever be one of the bright places in Oregon history to find that in spite of antagonism, jealousies, and mutual distrust, a spirit of conciliation and compromise prevailed to bring together all the residents of Oregon Territory, British and American citizens, with the French-Canadians, people of diverse religions and unlike temperaments, into a peaceful union for the purpose of maintaining a government having for its object the protection of life and property." [12]

The scenes at Champoeg May 2 and July 5, 1843, are told by many witnesses and writers of history: F. X. Matthieu, Robert Newell, William H. Gray, George W. Le Breton, Gustavus Hines, who were contemporary with the events; Peter H. Burnett, pioneer of 1843; Lansford W. Hastings, of 1842; and J. Quinn Thornton, of 1846, who were later writers; Mrs. F. F. Victor,[13] Elwood Evans, J. H. Brown, F. V. Holman, M. P. Deady, Harvey W. Scott, C. B. Moores, Charles H. Carey, Dr. R. C. Clark.

The assumption of American control of Oregon, in 1843–45, together with the rapid influx of American settlers in these years and the growing power of the provisional government, contributed to convince the British in 1846, after nearly 30 years of diplomatic delay, that their interests would be best conserved by the immediate adjustment of the Oregon Territory dispute at the forty-ninth parallel. Accordingly, the boundary treaty was negotiated in London in May and June 1846, ratified by the United States June 15, 1846, and by Great Britain July 17, 1846, and proclaimed by President Polk August 5, 1846. In 1845 the Hudson's Bay Co. changed from previous aloofness and opposition to alliance with the provisional government, as Chief Factor John McLoughlin explained in correspondence with his superiors—

"both for the security of the company's property and the peaceable maintenance of its rights. * * * We had to guard against the designs of many desperate and reckless characters * * * the outcasts of society who have sought a refuge in the wilds of Oregon. * * * They were to resort to the acts of skulking incendiary. * * * We had no security for the recovery of our debts." [14]

William Strong, American pioneer of 1850, jurist, Supreme Court of Oregon Territory:

"Oregon owes by far the most of its prosperity and rapid progress to the early formation of the provisional government, the wise laws which were enacted and the inflexible justice with which they were administered." [15]

F. V. Holman, historian:

"This government conducted itself as though it had real sovereignty * * * derived its powers from the consent of the governed * * * was just and fair to all peoples and properties * * * was regarded by Congress as competent." [16]

George H. Williams, pioneer of 1853; jurist, Supreme Court of Oregon Territory, 1855:

"The provisional government was a government de facto * * * and a government de jure. * * * Such a power is inherent in the inhabitants of any country, isolated and separated as Oregon was * * *." [17]

Matthew P. Deady, pioneer of 1849; jurist, United States District Court, Oregon, 1867:

"The people were living under an independent government established by themselves (1843–49). They were an autonomous community in the full sense of the term, engaged in agriculture, trade, commerce * * * made war and concluded peace by their own authority." [18]

Whether the beginnings of the provisional government of 1843 were made in 1838 or 1841; whether the vote in 1843 at Champoeg showed a majority for the government of two or five, or large or great; whether Joseph L. Meek bespoke the American spirit in calling for a count or divide; whether two or six or more French-Canadians voted for the government, are questions secondary to the main issue. That issue is the actual organization, which took place May 2 and July 5, 1843, at Champoeg.

This chain of events shows a train of destiny which probably would have brought about the creation of government after the migrations of 1843, 1844, and 1845 (5,400 Americans). But this probability does not detract from the significance of the events of 1843. The settlers at Champoeg deserve remembrance for their foresight, initiative, courage; their regard for law and the rights of life, liberty, property. The State of Oregon is builded upon the organization of the provisional government effected in 1843 at Champoeg.

Each of the two large assemblages at Champoeg in 1843, May 2 and July 5, was attended by more settlers than before had met together in Oregon; each appears more significant of growing events than any meeting held prior; each fixes historical attention on Champoeg as the apparent birthplace of the Oregon provisional government. If the scene of May 2 be omitted and that of July 5 be studied singly, the latter takes additional importance. Controversies of majority, divide, names, "representation, (which critics raise as to May 2), do not apply to July 5. Properly those controversies seem not relevant to the issue of May 2, when the settlers declared for organization of the provisional government, in rivalry with British-Canadian opponents, elected officers and chose a legislative committee to draft the laws which in the assemblage of July 5 they adopted.

Considered together the two assemblages in 1843, each supplementing and reinforcing the other, present convincing proofs to this observer, and to many others, that the provisional government of Oregon and the sequential Territorial and State governments of Oregon sprang from events of 1843 at Champoeg.

The State of Oregon owns and maintains a park of 106 acres at Champoeg, designated by acts of the legislature as Provisional Government Park. The legislature appropriates funds biennially for maintenance. Public-spirited citizens erected a stone monument there in 1901. An act of the legislature in 1913, appropriating funds for purchase of additional land, cites in the preamble that the meeting of settlers at Champoeg May 2, 1843, was "an event of historical importance, one of the most noted in the annals of pioneer history of Oregon * * * one of the important events which secured to the United States a large extent of territory known as the Oregon Country"; that "this event should be commemorated and held in grateful remembrance by all the people of the State of Oregon." [19]

In 1927 the legislature appropriated $5,000 for a frame building to shelter anniversary meetings from inclement weather, and in the preamble of the act declared: "Through the efforts of the pioneers there assembled, the Oregon country became a part of the United States," and "it is important that this action on the part of our pioneers should be remembered and properly celebrated." [20]

Until the year 1935 the park was administered by the State board of control, consisting of the Governor, secretary of state, and state treasurer; since 1935 the duty has been performed by a special commission of five members, Milton A. Miller, chairman.

OREGON'S ANNIVERSARY AT CHAMPOEG—ADDRESS DELIVERED AT CHAMPOEG, JULY 4, 1937, BY LESLIE M. SCOTT

We are proud to meet here again in this heart of early Oregon; proud of our institutional beginnings which sprang from this spot; proud of our pioneers who here, in 1843, founded the provisional government and called to future generations with these stirring words of the preamble of their laws:

"We, the people of the Oregon Territory, for the purpose of mutual protection, and to secure peace and prosperity among ourselves, agree to adopt the following laws and regulations until such time as the United States of America extend their jurisdiction over us."

Our pioneers voiced these words here at Champoeg on the next day after Independence Day, 94 years ago. Two months before, on May 2, 1843, they voted here to create the provisional government, and here assembled again on July 5 to adopt laws and induct officers into office.

On the previous day, July 4, here at Champoeg they observed the Fourth of July, "glorious in the recollection of every American as the birthday of liberty." We quote the orator of the day, Rev. Gustavus Hines, who next day served as chairman of the convention. His narrative continues:

"Nearly all the Americans in the country and many of the French-Canadians and English assembled to listen to the oration and enjoy a public dinner. The festivities of the day were enjoyed in the true spirit of liberty. As there were no houses to entertain the people during the night, they nearly all camped upon the ground, and the morning of the 5th found them prepared to enter upon the important business that was to come before them, and which resulted

---

[11] Bancroft, History of Oregon, I, 480.
[12] Clark, History of Willamette Valley, 305.
[13] Author of Bancroft's History of Oregon.
[14] Letter, November 20, 1845, to Hudson's Bay Co. governor in London, Oregon Historical Society archives.
[15] Transactions, Oregon Pioneer Association, 1878, 28.
[16] Oregon Historical Society Quarterly, XIII, 137.
[17] I, Oregon Reports, 178, Baldro against Tolmie.
[18] I, Oregon Reports, 391; Carey, History of Oregon, 408.
[19] Laws of Oregon, 1913, 243.
[20] Laws of Oregon, 1917, 742.

in giving to the Oregonians a tangible form of government" (Hines, Oregon, Its History, 425).

It was the most stirring day that Oregon had ever known.

The records do not tell the number of persons who were then present, but as there were 200 adult American men and 122 adult French-Canadian and English men in the Willamette Valley (authorities vary), it may be fair to estimate those who attended at 200, who were a larger audience than at the May 2 meeting when Joe Meek made the dramatic call: "Who's for a divide? All for the report of the committee and an organization follow me."

It is a latter-day fashion to throw doubts upon the provisional government, as to its time and place of origin and its value, and to wrangle over such inconsequential disputes as the following: Whether the majority vote cast for creation of the government at Champoeg was two votes or five votes or large or great; whether the Canadians who joined the American side numbered 2 or 6 or a larger number; whether some 40 Americans, who were recorded as voting, fitly represented the resident American male adult population; whether Joe Meek called for a divide; whether the provisional government instituted in 1843 with laws was more vital than the ineffectual government set up in 1841 without laws, or than the futile one attempted in 1838; whether the certainty that a strong government would have been instituted in 1844 or 1845 by the later pioneers, reduces the government of 1843 to insignificance.

These questions are inconsequential; the real fact is that the organization of the provisional government took place at Champoeg May 2, and July 5, 1843, after numerous ineffectual attempts made prior.

These questions raise quarrels and wrangles true to the old Oregon habit of factionalism, which long has been the pest of Oregon harmony and progress, and several times lately has defeated projects for the erection of a Federal memorial to the provisional government at Champoeg. Recently these wrangles caused the advisory board of the national parks historical sites committee to say:

"Champoeg has no national significance, and whatever importance is attached to the meeting there in 1843, which gave birth to a provisional government, is merely local."

Authentic history amply attests that the settlers instituted the provisional government here at Champoeg in 1843 at two large mass meetings, which had more members than any previous meetings in Oregon; and that the provisional government for 6 years thereafter was the vital power of law and order in Oregon, and finally merged with the government of Oregon Territory in 1849, and with that of the State of Oregon in 1859, having made a memorable record of security, progress, and prosperity with national as well as local significance, the first effective and permanent popular government on the Pacific Coast.

An ancient fable of Aesop may be in point: A lion and a goat fell to quarreling and fighting as to which of them should first drink at the spring. Ceasing from strife for a moment, they beheld in the sky, hovering over them, a flock of vultures. Whereupon they made up their quarrel, agreeing that it was far better for them to become friends than to furnish food for the vultures.

In 1843–45 the Americans, British, and French-Canadians made up their quarrels and became friends in the provisional government. It would seem that their example and also that of the fable could well be followed by us of the later day.

The settlers at Champoeg deserve our remembrance for their foresight, initiative, courage; their regard for law and for the rights of life, liberty, and property.

Our beloved State of Oregon is builded upon the organization of the provisional government in 1843 at Champoeg.

On this Independence Day we pay honor to the pioneers whose energy and courage led them to this then distant land and inspired them to set up here at Champoeg an independent republic which lives in the State of Oregon, in the hearts of our people, in the spirit of our institutions.

We welcome you all to this Champoeg shrine of Oregon's beginnings.

BOOKS ON CHAMPOEG

Available histories narrating events of the provisional government in 1843 are as follows:

Bancroft, History of Oregon, I, 303 and following.
Brown, Political History of Oregon, 93–104.
Burnett, Recollections of an Old Pioneer, 168–174.
Carey, History of Oregon, 378–380.
Clark, History of the Willamette Valley, 276–305.
Clarke, Pioneer Days of Oregon History, II, 658–672.
Evans, History of Pacific Northwest, I, 238–241.
Gray, History of Oregon, 279 and following.
Himes and Lang, History of the Willamette Valley, 253–255.
Gustavus Hines, Oregon, Its History, 423–437.
H. K. Hines, History of Oregon, 141 and following.
Oregon Historical Quarterly, I, 91–95, F. X. Matthieu; II, 95–118, Harvey W. Scott; XIII, 89, 139, Frederick V. Holman; XXVII, 389–396, C. B. Moores; XXX, 207–217, Leslie M. Scott.
Schafer, History of the Pacific Northwest, 160–163.
Scott, History of the Oregon Country, I, 3 and following.
Thornton, Oregon and California, II, 25–34.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

LETTERS FROM LEWIS J. MURPHY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from Lewis J. Murphy, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans:

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 21, 1940.

To all Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

DEAR SIRS: I am attaching hereto copy of a letter to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and copy of a letter of instruction issued by the undersigned as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War to our national service department of the D. A. V.

In view of the fact that the enclosures will show that new legislation is necessary to extend the benefits discussed therein to the disabled World War veterans rated under the provisions of the 1925 rating schedule and Public, No. 141, and in view of the fact that we believe these benefits are very timely and necessary, and that proper legislative action should be taken during this session of Congress to provide for them, I deem it expedient to bring this matter to the Members of Congress for your information and guidance.

By way of explanation, a difficulty has materialized in the last few years which amounted to a problem in securing ratings of permanent and total disability for many men with service-connected disabilities. In order that you may better understand the percentage reductions in the service letter of April 2, 1940, the procedure before its issue required that the disabled veteran have one disability standing alone rated at least 60 percent disabling with others combined to make a total rating of 80 percent before the veteran could be rated totally and permanently disabled, and under the system of combining disabilities each succeeding disability had a tendency to cut down the percent of each succeeding disability. If the veteran had just one disability, then it had to be rated at least 70 percent of itself before he could be rated totally and permanently disabled under the rating schedules. A movement was launched to lower these percentage requirements and to take into consideration the advancing age of the World War veteran. Examples of cases were shown where the aggregate combined disabilities would total 150 percent to 175 percent or 200 percent and still a man could not be rated totally and permanently disabled because he had no one disability which first rated at least 60 percent of itself. After representations were made on this matter, the service letter of April 2 reduced these percentage requirements somewhat but not to the level which has been requested. You may compare the reductions by referring to the attached letter of instructions wherein they are contained.

Our problem is to fairly and fully compensate the service-connected disabled veteran for the actual loss which he sustained. Rating schedules are only a means of arriving at that end result, and they must reflect the change of economic and social conditions that has been brought about in the past 20 years with a glutted labor market, advancing age and the fact that age has increased the degree of disability when employment is considered, coupled with the fact that our Government is attempting to guarantee every group of our citizens some measure of social security.

The Disabled American Veterans are enthusiastically in favor of the reduced requirements granted under the service letter of April 2, but the great majority of service-connected cases are rated under Public, No. 141, and the 1925 rating schedule to which the service letter of April 2 does not apply and for which new legislation is required.

I am presenting this matter to the Members of Congress to obtain your favorable support, requesting at the same time your favorable support for the amendment to House bill 8930 which has recently passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate in order to extend these liberalizing benefits to the service-connected disabled veteran and which are so urgently needed at this time.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS J. MURPHY,
National Commander.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 21, 1940.

MR. THOMAS KIRBY,
Director, National Service Department, D. A. V. of W. W., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
MR. THOMAS KEHOE,
Assistant Director, National Service Department, D. A. V. of W. W., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Letter of Instruction.

(Attention: All D. A. V. National Service Officers.)

1. Without reciting the preliminary efforts and events that led up to the release of a service letter signed by Gen. Frank T. Hines on April 2, 1940, on the subject of total disability ratings under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the 1933 rating schedule, it seems necessary to analyze and review the effects of that service letter as it presently stands and applies to the service-connected disabled veterans.

2. Those of us who had sponsored the principles involved now find that the letter of April 2 is not nearly as advantageous from a practical standpoint, as it sounds. It provided in part as follows:

"Total disability ratings under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the 1933 rating schedule may be assigned without regard to the specific provisions of the rating schedule, except as outlined herein, when the disabled person is, in the judgment of the rating agency, unable to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation as a result of his disabilities: *Provided*, That, if there is only one disability, this disability shall be ratable at 60 percent or more, and that, if there are two or more disabilities, there shall be at least one disability ratable at 40 percent or more, and sufficient additional disability to bring the combined rating to 70 percent or more."

3. I am informed that our field-service officers are confronted with great difficulty right now in explaining to those veterans who are rated under the 1925 rating schedule, in excess of the required percentages, as cut down and reestablished under this service letter of April 2, why they are not entitled to permanent total ratings on the basis of unemployability. Likewise, your commander has been besieged with similar inquiries concerning the nature and extent of that service letter.

4. When this situation came to my attention, I took the matter up with Director Thomas Kirby, and he has advised me that during the recent hearings before the World War Veterans Committee in Congress, that it was definitely acknowledged that the 1925 rating schedule was "frozen" by Public, No. 141, which was passed following the Economy Act, and that the Veterans' Administration now has no power to amend the 1925 schedule, and that it can only be amended by new legislation.

5. The schedule amendments under the new service letter of April 2 applies only to the 1933 rating schedule, and the great majority of all service-connected-compensation cases are drawing benefits under the 1925 schedule and would not be benefited by the reduced requirements now made available by the regulation of April 2.

6. In addition, the language of the service letter of April 2 expressly restricts the application of the age factor to non-service-disability cases and is in part as follows:

"For the purpose of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part III, only, the above specified 60 percent, 40 percent, and 70 percent percentage requirements may be reduced by 10 percent on the attainment of age 60; and by an additional 10 percent on the attainment of age 65; and there shall be no percentage requirements for total disability ratings in the cases of unemployable veterans who have attained the age of 70. The attainment of age 70 will not of itself warrant rating as permanently and totally disabled; in addition thereto disability sufficient to produce unemployability will be required."

7. The D. A. V. is principally concerned with the service-connected disabled group; all other groups being incidental to any action we might sponsor for the service-connected group. The D. A. V. at the Boston national convention adopted in our legislative program, the principle of age being a factor in increasing service-connected disability compensation. There does not seem to be any sound ground or logical reason why the age factor should not be applied to service-connected disability cases falling under the 1933 schedule for rating purposes, the same as is provided in the service letter of April 2 for non-service-disability cases. In other words, there appears no valid reason why the Government should be more lenient with non-service-connected cases than with service-connected cases. It seems reasonable that age and the age factor is just as applicable to those comrades of ours who secured their disabilities on the front lines or in active service when it affects their employment and renders them totally unemployable. There is no contention that age itself is a disability, but that it is a factor in increasing the degree of disability as it affects the ability to follow a gainful occupation.

8. It is true that the Veterans' Administration, in the service letter of April 2, in concurring in the age factor, has applied it to the nonservice total disability group, intending, as is reported, to spread the benefits over a larger group. The position of the D. A. V. has always been, and must continue to be, that the service-connected disabled veterans be taken care of prior to the granting of any general benefits to those whose disabilities have not been proven to be of service origin, and we cannot agree to the plan of spreading benefits over a larger group of nonservice disability, especially when the principle upon which they propose to base the spread of benefits is entirely applicable to the service-connected group, and this group is omitted and prevented from sharing in such benefits. Therefore, the following analysis and discussion of the principles involved, and recommendations are made concerning the service-connected disabled group.

9. In considering the service letter of April 2, 1940, and reviewing its advantages and disadvantages, it appears there are certain provisions within that letter that require further legislation because of its failure to apply to the service-connected group under Public, No. 141. The service letter states:

"Provided that, if there is only one disability, this disability shall be ratable at 60 percent or more, and that, if there are two or more disabilities, there shall be at least one disability ratable at 40 percent or more, and sufficient additional disability to bring the combined rating to 70 percent or more."

If a large group of service-connected disabled veterans who are now rated under the 1925 rating schedule are not to be discriminated against, the foregoing quoted provision should be placed into statutory enactment.

10. There are disadvantages to the service-connected group under Public, No. 2 which should be eliminated. In the phraseology—

"Total disability ratings, under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the 1933 rating schedule, may be assigned without regard to the specific provisions of the rating schedule, except as outlined herein, when the disabled person is, in the judgment of the rating agency, unable to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation as a result of his disabilities"—

It appears that the word "may" which is used in the above-quoted portion of the letter is not sufficiently positive in its action and practical application. It is my recommendation that the word be changed to "shall" which leaves no interpretation on the part of any rating agency as to the intent of the language.

11. From the viewpoint of the service-connected disabled veteran, the proviso in numeral paragraph 1 of the said service letter needs correction as the language would bar benefits, apparently intended to be given, in some cases. This proviso reads as follows:

"Total disability ratings, when the above conditions are met, may be granted for deafness, the organic loss of speech, for the amputation or loss of use of either hand or of either lower extremity above the knee (as to these amputations and losses of use, when followed by continuous unemployability after incurrence)."

It is the phraseology within the parentheses that is causing the confusion and the bar to benefits in some cases. For example, if a person had an amputation or a loss of use of extremity during service and has at any time since that date followed a gainful occupation, even though he is unable to follow a gainful occupation at this time, the language contained in the parentheses above would bar him, and we believe this is a distinct discrimination against the service-connected case. Whereas, in contrast, if a person were injured in an accident of any kind subsequent to military service and has now suffered the anatomical loss of the hand or lower extremity above the knee, or has suffered the loss of organic speech or deafness, the language above in parentheses would benefit such non-service-disability cases. Therefore, the provision reacts detrimentally to the best interest of the service-connected cases on the whole. I would recommend the elimination in toto of the wording as contained in the parentheses:

"(As to these amputations and losses of use, when followed by continuous unemployability after incurrence.)"

12. It is observed that the age factor has been carefully considered for the non-service-connected cases only, whereas the age factor as applied to service-connected cases should also receive the same consideration, especially in view of the fact that as the age increases so does the disability increase in ratio to the age. A person over 40 years of age today is seriously handicapped in the entire employment field with being forced to compete with the younger person. If this is true with the able-bodied man over 40 years, then it is more than true with a disabled person over 40 who finds it utterly impossible to compete with a person of sound body and mind in following a gainful occupation. In most every community today, after the lapse of 20 years, the fact that a service-connected disabled veteran has a disability has become to a large extent a public knowledge. To a great extent he has become a marked man, and if he does not already have a job, it is almost impossible for him to secure one because of both his age and known disability. No one wants to hire him—even our own Government. It seems to me that we should not ask private industry or our Government to hire the man who is so disabled by reason of both age and disability that he cannot fully perform the duties that might be expected of him, or that an able-bodied man could better discharge.

That, on the contrary, we should keep in mind the very first principles of disability compensation which was in the beginning and is now, to fully compensate a man for the actual loss which he has sustained and now exists. We know of hundreds of our service-connected compensation cases that today are inadequately compensated, and because they are drawing compensation in some amount, they are thereby barred from receiving any benefits of social security which our Government is now extending to every

other group of American citizens. Surely the service-connected disabled veteran is entitled to be socially secure the same as the non-service-disability veteran, especially when that principle of social security should be superimposed upon the disability which he suffered in the service of his country. Surely the children of the service-connected disabled veteran are entitled to receive an education and the opportunities of life the same as the opportunities afforded those who did not serve their country. This can only be accomplished by the recommendations set forth herein. For this reason, the age factor must be considered from the service-connected point of view, whereas the Veterans' Administration has used this for the purpose of pension only, i. e.:

"Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part III, only, the above-specified 60-percent, 40-percent, and 70-percent percentage requirements may be reduced by 10 percent on the attainment of age 60; and by an additional 10 percent on the attainment of age 65; and there shall be no percentage of requirements for total-disability ratings in the cases of unemployable veterans who have attained the age of 70. The attainment of age 70 will not of itself warrant rating as permanently and totally disabled; in addition thereto disability sufficient to produce unemployability will be required."

13. In view of the above reasons, setting out the viewpoint of the service-connected disabled veteran, the age factor must be brought into the service-connected cases under both Public, Nos. 141 and 142, and the same reductions in percentage disabilities because of the age factor as contained in said service letter, should be made applicable to all service-connected cases. The expense to the Government would be small because of the relatively small number of service-connected cases to which these provisions would apply.

14. In numerical paragraph 4 of said service letter we find the construction of the language is such that it bars from total ratings those cases suffering from psychoneurotic and psychogenic disabilities when they do not have other conditions of organic basis involved either directly or indirectly with their nervous conditions. It is felt that this is distinctly detrimental to that unfortunate class of veterans who are either just or unjustly labeled a mental defective, a psychopathic inferior, or suffering from constitutional psychopathic state with psychotic episodes. We find that many of these cases are unjustly labeled, due to the fact that many of our neuropsychiatrists do not, as General Hines stated during the Boston convention, use "horse sense" in arriving at their diagnosis. They are entirely too prone to label a veteran psychogenic without having delved sufficiently into the history of the case, especially the childhood history, which must show, in accordance with the teachings of neuropsychiatry, a definite retarded mental condition during the formative stages of childhood, and further, in a great number of cases, especially by their failure to delve into the history of war neurosis and the predisposing causes arising out of military service that form the basis of such war neurosis (as authority see Medical Diseases of the War, by Arthur F. Hurst, M. A., M. D., F. R. C. P.). It is conceded that such diagnosis as mental deficiency, inferiority, and psychopathic state cannot be acquired. Therefore, without the early history concerning a mental retarded condition during childhood, as mentioned above, it is not fair to label any person with such diagnosis. We have not considered properly the effect that the war would have had on those cases which may not have been as strong mentally as those enjoying good health mentally at the time of acceptance in service. In other words, this type of case would be more prone to break down than a normal person. We must arrive at the logical conclusion that these unfortunate mental and psychoneurotic cases should be awarded total ratings where it is definitely shown that they cannot obtain gainful employment, and that the functional or constitutional neurosis involved is the material and controlling factor in the case. Again, it is the end result that we are interested in and must be interested in by providing to these unfortunate service-connected disabled veterans some social security to which they are entitled by virtue of their unemployability.

15. For the above and foregoing reasons, it is believed that a specific bill incorporating the advantages of the service letter of April 2 and discarding the disadvantages of that letter should be incorporated into statutory enactment for those cases coming under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Public, No. 141, Seventy-fourth Congress. A proper bill, couched in simple language which would be impossible of misconstruction by those charged with the administration of it in the Veterans' Administration, is attached hereto, which, in my opinion, if enacted into law, would accomplish our purpose.

16. To recapitulate our objections which are fourfold as follows, viz:

1. This service letter fails to apply to Public, No. 141, and the 1925 rating schedule.

2. The age factor is not considered or extended as to the service-connected groups of disabled veterans.

3. It eliminated from application those nerve cases without underlying or superimposing organic disabilities.

4. It fails to permit total ratings for certain cases within the service-connected group who have suffered an anatomical loss or loss of hearing or speech.

17. Further, in view of the foregoing and after careful consideration, I am of the opinion that an emergency has been created and now exists with reference to the legislative and regulatory benefits which the service-connected disabled veterans are entitled to receive by the omissions related above, and that in order to secure the prompt and effective remedies and consideration that are necessary at this time, it becomes the duty of your national commander to act promptly under the authority extended in article 7, section 7, paragraph 2 of our national bylaws, which are as follows:

"The director of national service is director and supervisor of legislation, rehabilitation, and employment, and other service activities of the national organization, subject to the instructions of the national commander, national executive committee, and national convention."

Pursuant to the authority above recited and and as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, I hereby instruct, order, and direct Thomas Kirby, director, national service department, and all others under his direction in said department, to forthwith carry out the following instructions:

1. To immediately register with Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, our disagreement with the provisions of the service letter of April 2, 1940, for failing to make proper provision for the service-connected disabled veteran as herein related before. Further, to present to said Administrator the viewpoint of our organization as the representative of the service-connected disabled veterans that the inequalities created in the said service letter as against the service-connected disabled veterans should and must be corrected at the earliest moment.

2. To prepare and present to the Finance Committee of the United States Senate a bill as mentioned above, of which copy is attached, or a proper amendment to H. R. 8930 now pending before said committee, after having been passed by the House of Representatives, and which would amend said bill by incorporating thereunder the substance of said service letter of April 2, 1940, making it applicable uniformly to both the 1925 rating schedule under Public, No. 141, and the 1933 rating schedule under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and being so written as to eliminate the objectional features hereinabove recited.

3. To present such evidence before such Senate committee or House committee as is necessary to establish the case of the service-connected veteran and to call as witnesses before said committee expert field service officers of our own organization from the field, and experts outside of our own organization to testify.

4. That the incorporation of these rating principles and rules into legislation by Congress be given the immediate and primary consideration of the national service department, of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and the director thereof shall make due report of his progress and accomplishments to the national commander from time to time which in turn will be referred to the members of the national executive committee by the national commander.

5. The matter of legislation as set forth in these instructions shall be handled by Thomas Kirby, director, and the matter of policy as set forth in these instructions shall be handled by Thomas Kehoe, assistant director, and they shall coordinate their various activities and cooperate to the extent of achieving the objectives set forth in this letter of instructions.

LEWIS J. MURPHY,
National Commander.

A bill to provide liberalized benefits for disabled veterans of the World War and modifications of certain provisions already pertaining to benefits granted under Public, No. 141, and Public, No. 2

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of Public, No. 141, and Public, No. 2, and the 1925 and 1933 rating schedules pertaining to these provisions be modified by the following enactments covering the benefits of the World War disabled.

Total disability ratings under Public, No. 141, and Public, No. 2, and both the 1925 and 1933 rating schedules may be assigned without regard to the specific provisions of the rating schedules mentioned when the following requirements have been met:

(a) When the disabled person is shown by evidence unable to follow a substantially gainful occupation as the result of his service-connected disabilities and their complications: *Provided*, That there is one disability which shall be rated, under either the 1925 or 1933 rating schedule at 60 percent or more and that if there are two or more disabilities, there shall be at least one disability ratable at 40 percent or more (under either the 1925 or 1933 rating schedule) and sufficient additional disability to bring the combined rating to 70 percent or more (under either the 1925 or 1933 rating schedule).

(b) Total ratings, when the above conditions are met, shall be granted for deafness, organic loss of speech, for the amputation or loss of use of either hand or of either lower extremity above the knee as single disabilities, or his other organic disabilities.

(c) The above specified 60 percent, 40 percent, and 70 percent requirements shall be reduced by 10 percent on the attainment of the age of 60; and by an additional 10 percent on the attainment of age 65; and there shall be no percentage requirement for total-disability ratings in the case of unemployable veterans who have attained the age of 70. Nothing contained in this paragraph will prevent a total-disability rating for such disability or disabilities, and/or combinations of disabilities, including loss of use of two extremities, loss of sight of both eyes, being helpless or bedridden and other disabilities, as are now, and have been assigned under previous regulations and acts pertaining to Public, No. 141, and Public, No. 2, specific ratings of 100 percent for the severity in question.

When total disability under this paragraph is under consideration, the claimant will be required to submit a sworn statement in affidavit form covering his employment or unemployment over a period of at least 1 year prior to his application for these benefits, or at least 1 year prior to rating action covering benefits if application has not been made.

II. A disabled person of the World War, meeting the regulatory and schedular requirements for a 100 percent rating, is entitled to a total disability rating, regardless of employment. Other cases which do not meet the requirements of this act, or the regulatory and schedular requirements under previous acts and rulings pertaining to Public, No. 141, and/or Public, No. 2, but which, in the opinion of the rating agency of the Veterans' Administration, represent a total disability on the average basis—that is, whose employment represents highly exceptional effort or ability to overcome the handicap of disability—are entitled to consideration on Veterans' Administration R. and P. R. 1142 and should be submitted to the proper authority under the Veterans' Administration for consideration as outlined. All reasonable doubt shall be resolved in favor of the claimant in all matters pertaining to benefits under the World War enactments under Public, No. 141, and Public, No. 2, both as to this act and other acts in the past.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 21, 1940.

Gen. FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HINES: I am writing to express to you on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War objections to certain inequalities that appear to us to exist under the service letter of April 2, 1940, promulgated by you on the subject of total disability ratings under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the 1933 rating schedule.

These inequalities appear to amount to discriminations against those cases with service-connected disability, who by reason of unemployability would be eligible to share in the benefits made available under said service letter as distinguished from those benefits given to beneficiaries with non-service-connected disabilities.

For the sake of brevity and because of lack of time, instead of discussing these objections and their importance directly in this letter, I am attaching hereto a typewritten copy of a letter of instruction which I have issued to the national service department of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and which contains an analysis with argument as to why we believe certain inequalities in the service letter should be corrected in order to prevent discrimination against the service-connected disabled group.

I appreciate that for some time past the leaders of some veteran groups have been crying on the shoulders of everybody with a plea for additional benefits to those non-service-connected cases who are totally disabled by reason of unemployability. I fear it is for that reason that in this instance the service-connected disabled veterans have been forgotten. Nevertheless, the fact remains that many men in the service-connected group today are faced with unemployability and principally by reason of his service-connected disability. Many of these service-connected cases have been surveyed out of industry as industrially dead, and in many cases paid off under industrial insurance policies as permanently and totally disabled. They have become marked men in their local communities, and they cannot get even emergency relief for themselves and their families because they draw compensation. They cannot get on W. P. A. in most communities because they draw compensation—but, the compensation which they draw is inadequate to support themselves and their families, and to give their children an education.

For 20 years now, it has been admitted on all sides by the Government and by all veteran groups that the first duty of our Government was to the service-connected disabled veterans.

Therefore, I must register vigorously the opposition of the members of our organization to the inequalities in the service letter of April 2, 1940, which directly discriminates against the service-connected disabled veteran. If unemployability is to be made the basis for extending benefits, then the age factor surely affects the service-connected disabled veteran in like manner as it does the non-service-disability case, and for that reason the question of age should not be confused with the disability having arisen in service. The service-connected disabled veteran is getting older every year also, and under our present economic and social system the age factor is bringing about the unemployability of the service-connected disabled veteran to the same extent and degree as it does the non-service-disability case. The present inadequacy of the rating schedule to cover the case of the service-connected disabled veteran who is unemployable exists to the same extent that it does for the non-service-disability case.

On behalf of the service-connected disabled veterans I request that you reconsider the principles involved in this situation with a view of eliminating the discriminations outlined against the service-connected group in the service letter of April 2, 1940.

Your careful and kind consideration will be appreciated to this request.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS J. MURPHY,
National Commander.

The Ballot—Bulwark Against Concentration of Economic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL, H. R. 7534

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the testimony of Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS in support of the anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 7534, before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on May 18, 1940. Because of the monopolization of economic power by a relatively small number of individuals, Senator THOMAS said, it is essential that political power be distributed as widely as possible if we are to maintain our republican form of government. Senator THOMAS in his testimony made the very important point that it is within the power of Congress, it is the duty of Congress, to take such steps as will effect the widest possible distribution of political power. One such step is the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.

The testimony of Senator THOMAS follows:

In these days of world crisis we cannot but watch events abroad and wonder what they mean to the United States. Not only the fact but the principles of democracy are under fire over there.

It is, therefore, vital at this time to talk about poll taxes—more vital today than ever before. The abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections is essential in the strengthening and defense of democracy in our own land.

THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

With concentration of wealth goes great political power. In order that our republican form of government may continue undiminished it is essential that political power be distributed widely so that the interests of all groups in the population can be adequately represented. To this end the rights of suffrage must be available to all our citizens. In a period when so many of our common needs are met by the Government—when the average man looks to Government for the education of his children, for protection on the job, for security in his old age—more than ever before it is important that this average man should have a voice in selecting those who represent him so that through the democratic process the greatest opportunity and security should be retained by him.

The testimony which you have thus far heard with respect to the poll tax as a requirement for voting in eight Southern States has shown widespread disfranchisement of poor farmers, croppers, industrial workers, women, and Negroes. It has shown the small vote by which Representatives to Congress are elected in these States in comparison with the votes on the basis of which their colleagues from non-poll-tax States hold office. It has shown the "rotten boroughs" within States, which are maintained by vote of the Representatives from such districts.

VOTING IS PART OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The United States did not start its career with universal suffrage, even manhood suffrage. Only the frontier State of Vermont, among the Thirteen Original States, had no property qualifications for voting. It was the common presumption that only those who had enough stability and enough stake in the community to be property holders merited the vote.

In the 150 years since the Constitution was adopted, two things have happened to change the situation. The principles of political democracy have become part of the American way of life and at the same time concentrated economic power has challenged the effectiveness of democratic methods.

In 1800, when he was a candidate for the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson declared himself in favor of a general suffrage. His stated reasons were the same as those which prompt this bill. "I believe," he wrote, "we may lessen the danger of buying and selling votes by making the number of voters too great for any means of purchase." Faith in the good sense and integrity of the common man, upon which political democracy must rest, grew under the leadership of Jefferson and his followers and of Andrew Jackson and his, and was reflected in the revision one by one of the old State constitutions and the substitution of manhood for restricted suffrage. By the end of the 1830's only

a few remnants of restriction on manhood suffrage remained—apart, of course, from the slave population—but it took nearly 100 years more for women to be included within the concept of responsible democracy. The poll tax, however, introduced as a substitute for property qualifications in order to broaden the franchise, hung on in several States, and was available to be used as a means of again restricting the vote when certain forces gained the upper hand in the new South. Although the specific poll-tax legislation now under fire came in only at the turn of this century and is a southern institution, the issue is far older and more widespread in our national life. The southern State of North Carolina abolished its poll tax as a voting requirement more than a decade before the northern State of Pennsylvania. The present fight against the poll tax is a southern fight only because these are the last States where this particular obstacle seriously limits suffrage. The effort today to extend the right to participate politically is less an effort in a single section to regain lost liberties than it is a part of the continuing national effort, of which the original Constitution was one step, to secure effective democracy on this continent.

BALLOT INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT

At the time that the Constitution was adopted, the ballot was less of a necessity than it is today. For most people, voting had little to do with the important things which preoccupied them—with the daily business of earning a living. In a country of small farmers, small traders, and small artisans, individuals enjoyed basic freedoms which they could largely protect without using the Government. The population was small and the country vast. There was employment and educational and religious opportunity for all. The result was a Nation with great physical and spiritual energy.

But now our people have increased in number and spread over the entire continent. The physical resources have many more demands on them. Jobs are scarce and there is no free land to take up. On the farms, tired soil and tired men are backed up because our economy does not use them. Our people are beginning to know what it means to live with despair day in and day out, year after year, as a result of the flowing into the hands of a relatively few persons the ownership and control of our means of making a living.

In eight States the poll tax serves to limit the right of the ballot to those few who can afford to pay for it. Ironically, these are the poorest States in the Union. Clearly where the cash income of the average family is only a few hundred dollars a year, many hundreds of thousands of citizens find themselves denied this basic right, under our republican form of government, of voting for those who are to represent them.

ECONOMIC CONTROL IS CONCENTRATED

The need for effective democracy is far greater today than it was 150 years ago. The growth of concentrated power in the economic sphere has greatly enhanced the importance of widespread suffrage and a truly democratic political regime.

The giant corporation has come to dominate an increasing proportion of our national economic life. The Temporary National Economic Committee reports that 1 percent of the corporations today own 52 percent of the assets of all corporations. Of all corporations, less than 5 percent own 87 percent of all the assets of all of them.

Nor is it true that the common people share in the profits of these large-scale enterprises. In 1929, a year of prosperity, three-tenths of 1 percent of the population got 78 percent of the dividends. This is the same as one person getting 78 cents of the dividend dollar while 299 persons must share the remaining 22 cents among them.

The effect of the concentration of wealth is further reflected in the distribution of national income. The National Resources Committee showed that in 1935–36, 47 percent of all American families and single individuals living alone had incomes of less than $1,000 for the year; and at the other end of the ladder a little less than 1½ percent of the Nation's families received incomes which in dollars and cents was the equivalent of the total income of the 47 percent at the bottom.

In 1939 one large insurance company, owning 7,000 farm, worth about $78,000,000, was the biggest farmer in the United States, and received the largest A. A. A. check—over $257,000. And in that same year the number of farmers who were operating as tenants was put at 42 percent of all farmers.

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace is continually pointing out that a dangerously large percentage of the Nation's farm people are forced to live far below the decency level. Their numbers are increasing daily. Mr. Wallace recently estimated that there are about 8,500,000 farm persons trying to struggle along on an average income of about $2 each week.

All this exists while the family of a single large manufacturer was able to contribute $65,000 to the campaign fund of a certain political party in 1936.

No clearer statement of the implications of this wide variation in economic power can be made than that stated by President Roosevelt in 1936: "The first truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself."

STATESMANSHIP NEEDED

Three generations ago Daniel Webster said: "The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable if the tendency of the laws were to create a rapid accumulation of property in a few hands and to render the great mass of population dependent and penniless. In such a case the popular power must break in upon the rights of property or else the influence of property must limit and control the exercise of popular power."

He prophesied that in such a situation statesmanship would be really tested. And it is being tested—our statesmanship, gentlemen, here and now.

DISTRIBUTION OF POLITICAL POWER ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRACY

It is history today that the industrial revolution has brought with it the accumulation of ownership and the monopolization of economic power by a relatively small number of individuals. An oligarchy might well become the expression of such a group in the field of government.

In view of this situation, the time has now come when the widest possible distribution of political power is essential to the maintenance of a republican form of government. It is now necessary that our Government be thoroughly democratic if its republican form is to be maintained.

Since the Constitution of the United States grants to the Congress all power to enact legislation necessary to maintain a republican form of government in each of the States, it is within the power of Congress, and it is a duty of Congress, to take such steps as will effect the widest possible distribution of political power. One such step is the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. This is a minimum necessity.

The Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Mr. Henry R. Luce over WJZ and a coast-to-coast network on May 22, 1940:

After 30 days in Europe—in Italy, France, England, Holland, Belgium—I returned by clipper Monday. In those days came the conquest of Norway, one of the most brilliant campaigns in the history of war, followed by a cabinet crisis in London as spectacular as any in the three centuries of the English Parliament. Holland, a country famous throughout the world for being honest, solvent, peace-loving, and superneutral, was partly destroyed and wholly conquered in less than 100 hours. Hundreds of good Dutch burghers, men, women, and children, whom I passed on the crowded streets of Amsterdam less than 2 weeks ago, are dead today. Belgium, with an army three times as big as the Army of the United States and whose defenses were considered infinitely stronger than in 1914, was overrun in 10 days. And as I left Europe the people of America were already seeing the specter of the subjugation of Great Britain and France by Adolf Hitler.

I have not been invited by N. B. C., however, to give you one more version of events concerning which you are already well informed. But I am grateful for this opportunity to talk to you as one citizen to another. I speak out of a profound conviction that our America is now confronted by a greater challenge to its survival as a land of liberty than any it has had to face in 80 years.

When I sailed for Europe the American people were not willing to face the challenge. I believe they are willing to face it now.

What precisely is this challenge? The fundamental truth is very simple. Let us not be distracted by if's and but's. The truth, fully attested by every competent observer of world events I know, is simply this: That the American way of life is bitterly opposed by mighty and ruthless military nations. And the fundamental truth is, further, that nothing will stop those mighty and ruthless military nations—not money nor cajolery nor friendship—nothing but superior force.

The events of the last few weeks have shocked the American people. But these events were not things which happened by accident. They were not events like earthquake or famine or plague or fire. These were acts of men—long and carefully planned. They were planned with cunning and efficiency and implacable purpose. The grim outline of these events had been foreseen—and still the force and fury of their actual occurrence were indeed stupefying. These events were an inevitable climax of the history of the last few years. But they are only one climax. Greater climaxes, of good or evil, are yet to come, and soon. The final defeat of Great Britain and France would be another climax the immensity of which even now defies the imagination. Hoping with all my heart that this catastrophe may not occur, I cannot believe it will. But if Great Britain and France fall, we know that we and we only among the great

powers are left to defend the democratic faith throughout the world. And if Great Britain and France succeed by a miracle of heroism in beating off the enemy, we know that Great Britain and France, weakened with loss of blood and treasure, will need our ungrudging cooperation in order to restore in half the world a peace of justice and humanity. We may never fight side by side, comrades in arms of France and Britain, but we know now that, fundamentally, their struggle is our struggle.

The frame of mind of the American people has changed amazingly in the last few weeks. I am amazed to find an attitude almost amounting to one of intense alarm. Now if the alarm is like the alarm on an alarm clock, reminding us what time of day is it, then that's fine. But there is no occasion for the kind of alarm that gives way to panic.

What is the actual situation? The actual situation is this. Certain stupefying events have happened in Europe. And we realize we have to take action. What we have to do I would summarize under two heads. First we have to arm ourselves. We have to prepare ourselves to meet force with force—to meet force with superior force. That is a colossal job. The second thing we have to do is to make up our minds what we are willing to fight for. That for us as for all free peoples is an even harder job.

The job of arming America physically is a job which we all agree cannot be delayed—to which I would add the following points:

First, armaments are expensive—the most terribly expensive things in the world. They are a sheer and appalling economic waste. That means that all of us are going to be a lot poorer than we otherwise might have been. But we will not cry about that. Along with all other democracies, we will take our full share of the blame for not having done our share toward creating a better world and for not having erected stronger bulwarks against monstrous aggression.

Secondly, the arming of America must in itself be the first practical test of our ability to act as a united people. For many years we have been anything but a united people. We have been a very expensively divided nation. The arming of America must be our first great act of national unity.

Thirdly, the arming of America must get fully under way now, under the leadership of our President. Franklin Roosevelt is in many respects a very great leader. But he has his faults. Who hasn't? There are two faults—two of the defects of his virtues perhaps—which we want him to guard against now. One fault is his tolerance of incompetent people. A very nice fault—but one we cannot afford just now. The other fault is his intolerance of extremely able people who don't happen to agree with him. We all know that during the last few years Franklin Roosevelt hasn't got on at all well with most of our ablest industrialists. It may have been their fault or it may have been his. Never mind. Today we need the services of the ablest industrialists in America for the most efficient arming of America.

There is no need for a coalition government. But the job of arming America must be removed from politics and should be handled by the nonpartisan military services and by a really nonpartisan War Industries Board, under the leadership of our President, and with broad grants of power and money from Congress.

Fourthly, let us constantly remember that appropriations are not armaments. Adolf Hitler is not afraid of big dollar signs in the newspapers. Hitler will only be afraid of actual airplanes, actual tanks, actual guns, and actual pilots and actual gunners. Hitler knows right now just how many actual airplanes, tanks, guns, pilots, and gunners we have—and he'll keep on knowing every step of the way. During some possible lull in the European scene you may lose interest in the arming of America, but Hitler won't. The price of military domination is eternal vigilance—and it is also the price of liberty.

Finally, let us face frankly the handicaps of democracies in their inevitable contests with autocracies. Autocracies foster above all else the will to fight, even the love of fighting—what is called the martial spirit. And, except on rare occasions, democracies just do not foster the will to fight. That is a very great military handicap. Billions and billions of dollars' worth of airplanes and tanks and guns aren't worth the trouble of dumping them into the sea, unless—unless there are men who have the will and the courage and the daring to use them. For many young men and women, who have grown up in a period of great revulsion against war, this is a very unpleasant truth. I am afraid it is the truth, nevertheless. For 7 long years Hitler and all his storm-trooping henchmen have been sneering at us democrats because, they say, we are soft and effeminate and self-indulgent and greedy for comfort and pleasure. There is, I fear, only too much truth in that sneering indictment.

But, of course, democracies have fought wars and they have won wars—otherwise they wouldn't exist today in this very imperfect world. Good democrats, good peace-loving democrats, have fought with supreme courage and skill. For what do they fight?

This question brings us to the second thing which we, the American people, have to do. We have to make up our minds what we are willing to fight for.

Our Government has the constitutional duty of deciding exactly where and when and how the United States shall fight. But our Government cannot and will not decide what we, the people, are willing to fight for. Only when our Government knows what we, the people, are willing to fight for—only then can our Government face the world with an intelligent and resolute policy.

In the end the great decision has to be made in the heart and in the private conscience of each and every American citizen. It is a responsibility which is personally yours and personally mine. You cannot escape it. I cannot escape it. It is the greatest responsibility which will ever come to us as citizens of the America we love. I have made my decision as to what I am prepared to fight for with everything I have and am, and as one citizen to another I will tell you as best I can how I have decided.

In doing so I should like to feel that I am talking to Americans who deeply love their country. There are millions of Americans who would give up their lives in battle for America. I hope they will never be put to that test of ultimate devotion. There are millions of Americans who will gladly give up their fortunes and all their prospects of personal success whenever that sacrifice is needed for the survival of American democracy. I hope America will not become an impoverished nation, but only those who are quite calmly willing to face privation—only they can dare to face the challenge which confronts us now.

And to all these I give as my personal answer that what I am willing to fight for is, of course, America, but not America as a geologic mass, not for its mountains and plains and rivers, greatly though I love them and much though they have concerned me. The America I want to fight for is the America you too love best, the America of freedom and justice, the America which has stood throughout the world for the hope of progress in the democratic way of life and for faith in the ultimate brotherhood of man. America belongs to us, the lucky 130,000,000 people who are living here today. But America does not belong entirely to us. A little of America belongs to every man and woman everywhere who has had faith in democracy and hope in a world of peace and justice. We, the living, who control the destiny of America today, are the heirs of a great inheritance from men who lived and from men who died to make men free. What they meant by America is what I would wish to mean by America. And for that America I am willing to fight. And I am the more willing to fight because if I know anything I know that that America, the America we love, has small chance of surviving the tyranny and chaos which everywhere advances unless those who love America make it plain that they are willing and ready to fight.

If something like this is the answer which will be given in the coming weeks and months by the American people, then I for one am completely willing to trust our leaders, whoever they may be at any time, in the White House, in the State Department, and in Congress to decide exactly where and when and how the American people shall take their stand at Armageddon.

Proposed Study of Ways and Means To Reduce Governmental Costs and Increase Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution which seeks to meet the urgent financial needs of our Nation. It is self-explanatory. The times demand that we take a forthright stand and face squarely the critical situation that confronts us. Only by doing so can we hope to achieve our pressing needs.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent resolution providing for a study by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate to determine ways and means to put our financial house in order and to meet adequate national defense costs

Whereas our country faces a grave situation in that world conditions are such as to require substantial improvement of our national defense; and

Whereas our internal economy is in an unhealthy condition; and

Whereas our monetary and financial structure is also seriously diseased; and

Whereas appropriations are now exceeding the legal debt limit of $45,000,000,000; and

Whereas healthy economy, sound money, and finances are basic to the needed improvement in our defense arm; and

Whereas these conditions make it imperative that drastic economies in Government cost be promptly instituted and additional taxes levied to meet the added defense cost; in short, that our financial house be put in order; and

Whereas this demands a willingness on the part of every American citizen to sacrifice sufficiently to fully meet the situation that confronts us; and

Whereas the full confidence of the people in the Government is necessary to cause them to be willing to make this sacrifice; and

Whereas that confidence will not be forthcoming unless the Government itself is disposed to lead the way: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate jointly are hereby authorized and directed to study methods and provide ways and means to—

First, abolish all Government expenditures and all political jobs that are not vital to the life of our Nation, and reduce Government salaries commensurate with the sacrifice demanded of the people in general; and

Second, levy sufficient taxes to bring the Budget in complete balance within the next year or two; and be it further

Resolved, That said committees shall report this recommendation to their respective Houses before adjournment of the present session, accompanied by proper legislation to effectuate the same.

Roosevelt Criticized for Defense Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the following news article by David Lawrence criticizes President Roosevelt for defense blunders. Where was our "ear-to-the-cables" President when Germany was rearming? Why did not he give some of his knowledge—if he had it—of Germany's advances in armaments to the people of this country? Did someone hear Roosevelt say he would keep the Congress and the country informed of serious developments?

Is it fair for Roosevelt to say to the country in his so-called fireside chat that we have on hand and on order 1,700 tanks, when, as a matter of fact, there are only 10 light tanks and 18 medium-sized tanks on hand? Anything on order or in the blueprint stage cannot be used in the battlefields. The President grouped combat cars and tanks together. This, too, is deceptive, because combat cars are transportation vehicles and only slightly armored, while tanks are actually heavily armored offensive weapons.

Some of the American people are beginning to think the defense crisis originates in the White House.

SITUATION IN UNITED STATES HELD CRITICAL—ADMINISTRATION IS CASTIGATED FOR DEFENSE BLUNDERS

(By David Lawrence)

The "home front"—namely, the situation in the United States—is more critical than the average man knows. Mistakes and blunders of immediate consequence to America's national security are being made. Weeks or months hence, when it is too late to remedy them, alibis will be heard and scapegoats created.

Outside of Washington is a Nation ready to cooperate. The rank and file of labor is loyal, unselfish, eager to aid national defense. The rank and file of business and industry is in the same mood.

The big battle in Washington today is not whether America can be saved, but whether the New Deal can be saved. This is but a realistic way to describe the contest between the members of the administration who want to retain control over every phase of defense preparations and the businessmen of the country, mostly anti-New Deal, who want to see reforms sidetracked wherever the national defense requires it.

In between are the Army and Navy. Under the rules of military discipline, these officers are muzzled.

SENSE OF SECURITY PROPAGANDA

Efforts to get at the truth through congressional investigation are choked off by the New Deal majorities in both Houses of Congress. The whole machinery of Government propaganda is turned on to give the people a sense of security when there is no security.

What are the facts about America's defenses? We have a pitifully small air defense, hardly any antiaircraft guns, hardly any tanks, a small standing Army, and a Navy that is too little for the job that may have to be done to defend America in the next 18 months.

Almost the entire American fleet is at present in the Pacific Ocean. There it will remain frozen in and around Hawaii, watching for a Japanese "blitzkrieg" in the Pacific aimed at the Dutch East Indies or the Philippines or even Hawaii. Certainly the fleet cannot get back into the Atlantic quickly if the Panama Canal isn't defended. Our defenses in the Canal Zone area are inadequate.

The Nazis have strong "fifth column" units in Brazil and the northern part of South America. If Italy enters the war, it means Portugal and Spain will be enveloped within Nazi rule and then the Cape Verde Islands—nearest to South America—will be a short hop for Italian air forces. Northern coasts of South America have bases which the United States cannot now defend without more aircraft and a more aggressive policy.

THE BRITISH FLEET

If England should be invaded and defeated, the most important piece of defense strategy the United States could effect would be to keep the British fleet afloat. Presumably the British fleet would become part of the Canadian Government.

In the face of this gloomy future, what is the policy of the United States? The militarists in Japan are working hand in glove with the Nazis. There is a substantial element in Japan which would welcome a friendly working arrangement with the United States. Peace in China can be brought about by American diplomacy. It is an essential part of our defense strategy. Friendship with Japan would release America's fleet for use in the Atlantic. Battleships cannot be built overnight.

The biggest requirement, however, on the home front is to get faster production for aircraft and mechanized weapons. This is a job for industry and labor. It can be accomplished only if the class warfare engendered by New Deal reform laws is stopped at once. The President can stop it. But he cannot be effective until he restores fair play inside his own administration.

EXAMPLE CITED

This very week, under orders from the White House, the administration leaders in Congress are working tooth and nail to prevent the ousting of Labor Board members already demonstrated to be unfit to hold public office.

The President's latest "coordinating" plan whereby experts from business, communications, finance, etc., are being brought to Washington is, therefore, doomed to failure for a simple reason. It's because business and industry know the scheme is mere window dressing. It is a dramatic effort to cover up the real crisis, but the real reason why "coordination" will not work is because the coordinators will have no authority or power. The White House has already announced that these outsiders will be merely "advisers." They will be able to issue no orders. They will have no authority to decide things.

Precisely such a plan known as the Council of National Defense was under way in the early part of the Wilson administration's experience after the World War began. It was a tragic failure because the advisers had to try to teach Cabinet officers the rudiments of industrial production. The new scheme will fail much quicker this time because the present Cabinet is incompetent and it is through the present Cabinet that the war machine is supposed to function.

Either American businessmen can be trusted to decide what ought to be done to accelerate production or they ought to be brushed aside and the new dealers put in charge of factories and management.

President Roosevelt may be thinking that he cannot be reelected if he puts industry in the saddle insofar as war preparations are concerned, if he listens to the earnest pleas of high Navy and Army officers for relaxation of certain laws that hamstring industry today. But the President would stand a far better chance of reelection if he renounced ambition and did not concern himself with political maneuvers. And until politics is swept from the Washington scene and the fresh air of genuine patriotism begins to guide decisions, America will drift along while her Government fiddles in the midst of the biggest challenge democracy has ever faced, involving the biggest potential threat that has ever come to the United States of America. When will the people wake up to the crisis in Washington?

Air Mail Pick-Up Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ANDREW EDMISTON, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me yesterday:

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss informally the future of the air mail pick-up service.

For the past year, as you know, the Post Office Department has been conducting this service under an experimental basis through West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Ohio. Several of the towns in my district were on the West Virginia route which extended between Pittsburgh and Huntington, W. Va. This route covered 30 communities in southern Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and the southwestern part of Ohio. A second route which extended between Pittsburgh and Philadelphia covered 31 communities in Pennsylvania and 1 in Delaware.

Service on the West Virginia route was terminated on May 11 and on the Pennsylvania route on May 13 due to the expiration of the air-mail contract held by the operating company which was the All-American Aviation of Delaware.

Last December this company filed with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, pursuant to the Civil Aeronautics Act, an application for a certification of public convenience and necessity which would have placed the experimental service on a permanent basis. This application also proposed to extend the air pick-up service into 125 additional communities in the same general territory making 227 in all that would receive the service.

This number included 132 communities in Pennsylvania, 36 in West Virginia, 25 in Ohio, 17 in New Jersey, 10 in western New York, 2 in Kentucky, and 5 in Delaware. The application also sought the right to carry express and passengers in addition to air mail.

As I understand it, the plans of the company included the establishment of passenger service on a flag-stop basis. In other words, landings will be made at station points where suitable airports are available for the accommodation of passengers, but when none are available, the pick-up service will be used for the collection and delivery of mail and express.

Hearings on this application were completed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority early in March and the final date for filing briefs under the Authority procedure was April 1. At that time it became apparent that the Authority did not have sufficient time in which to act on this application before the expiration of the air-mail contracts on the experimental routes which threatened a lapse in the service on these routes.

In an effort to avoid a lapse in the service conducted under the experimental act, the Post Office Department on April 10 advertised for new bids for the routes and in the meantime the situation had been thoroughly canvassed with the Civil Aeronautics Authority and it was found that the Authority apparently was without power to prevent a suspension of the service before a determination of the application for a certificate of public convenience.

The bids under the readvertisement of the Post Office Department were to have been open on May 10 but on that day the Postmaster General canceled the advertisement. He announced the reason for his action was because the air pick-up service, having proved a success, was no longer an experiment, and, therefore, it had passed beyond the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General. He also announced at this time that the Department was sending a report to Congress on the merits of both the air pick-up service and the autogiro service between the Philadelphia roof top and the Camden airport, which was established under the same experimental act.

This report of the Post Office Department was submitted on May 14, from which I quote the following pertinent paragraph:

"Both the pick-up service and autogiro service have proved to be very reliable and satisfactory, and the percentage of performance is such that it is believed by the Post Office Department that this type of service need not be considered any longer as in the experimental stage. It is the recommendation of the Post Office Department that permanent service of this type be established by the Civil Aeronautics Authority by means of certificates of convenience and necessity, as provided for in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938."

Under the heading "General Summary" the Postmaster General, in this report, stated:

"The experiments conducted by the Post Office Department in compliance with the wishes of Congress, as expressed in H. R. 7448 appear to have demonstrated conclusively that both the pick-up and the rotary-wing services can provide improved air-mail service, and it is recommended that such types of service be authorized by Congress on such routes as are granted certificates of public convenience and necessity by the Civil Aeronautics Authority."

The rest of the report is devoted to a review of the operations of both the pick-up service and the autogiro service, and conducts high praise of both.

For example the report says that in one place from a safety standpoint, the performance record of the air pick-up service is perhaps without a precedent for a new type of operation.

The air pick-up service was very popular in my district, and I received many protests over the suspension of the service.

After the action of the Post Office Department in canceling the new bids, it became apparent that the only hope for the immediate restoration of the service lay in getting a favorable decision by the Civil Aeronautics Authority on the pending application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity. However, new complications have suddenly appeared in this matter with the issuance of the examiner's report on this application which recommended its dismissal for want of jurisdiction.

In this report the examiner stated: "It is clear that services established under the provisions of this act (referring to the Experimental Act) remain in an experimental status until such time as Congress determines that such services are useful and essential and passes further legislation establishing them on a permanent basis."

The examiner's opinion, of course, is not final. He may be overruled by the Authority, which may hold that the air pick-up service has now assumed the same status as any other air carrier and as such comes within its jurisdictional powers. From what examination I have been able to make, I think that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has this power already.

However, it is a controversial point, and in the interest of facilitating the reestablishment of the service it has been generally agreed an informal discussion with Members of Congress, the Post Office Department, and the Civil Aeronautics Authority that perhaps it would be best to remove all doubt about the matter through an act by Congress clearing up this ambiguity.

Several methods of doing this were discussed, and finally the matter was taken up with Representative LEA, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House. I understand that Congressman LEA made a very careful survey of the situation and came to the opinion that the best way of clarifying the matter was through the repeal of the Experimental Air Mail Act. A bill to accomplish this purpose was introduced in the House this afternoon by Mr. LEA. I am informed that the bill will have the support of both the Post Office Department and the C. A. A., which are just as anxious as we are to clear up the matter.

I think that with the support of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee we can get favorable action on this bill in the House, despite the short time remaining before adjournment. I understand that a companion bill will be introduced in the Senate tomorrow, and I am sure that under the circumstances it also will be possible to pass it over there.

This meeting has been called to acquaint the Members of Congress through whose States and districts the experimental routes operated and the proposed routes will run to enlist their support in the movement to eliminate the technical obstacle that threatens the whole plan for the restoration and extension of the service.

My interest in this matter is inspired solely by the desires of my district for direct air-mail service, to which I believe it is entitled. However, I agree wth the Post Office Department that All-American Aviation, Inc., has done a splendid job in operating the service and in demonstrating the feasibility of the pick-up idea.

I think that the whole purpose of the experimental act was that if the pick-up service, or the autogiro service, or any other experimental service that was set up under it proved a success, it was to be continued on some permanent basis. In this case success has received a penalty instead of a reward, and I think that something should be done to remedy this extraordinary situation.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson published in today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 28, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

NEW YORK.—The President is right when he suggests that some people didn't raise hell earlier about our defenselessness because they didn't realize what was going on. It is true that he "did not share those illusions." But he is very subtle in seeming to find any support in the terrible events of the last few days for his policy of our sticking our necks into that mess. The existing battle situation completely liquidates his interventionist leanings by proving plainly that we had no business there and couldn't have done any good by doing one thing more than we have done.

This brings up the vital question of our defenselessness. Those who didn't realize the danger abroad may be excused for going to sleep on it. But how can the President be excused? With full information, he went to sleep on preparedness.

His comparison of the money spent on defense during his 7 years with the preceding 7 years is purely political and unfair. In the 7 years before Roosevelt there was no menace from Germany and no need for vast preparation. There were treaty limitations on naval increases. The Allies held Germany helpless.

Hitler came with Roosevelt and began the 7 years of rearmament and preparation of the vast force with which he is destroying Europe. The Allies could have stopped him any time up to 1936.

They neglected to act. Mr. Roosevelt also went to sleep. This column constantly called attention to this situation, beginning with its very first issue early in 1935.

It is no alibi to refer to the amount of money spent on defense. It plainly was not enough, and it wasn't spent to the best advantage. It was not "wasted" or "poured down a rat hole." But it provides no excuse to minimize our woeful lack of landward preparation to kick at critics who insist on the truth. The naval job has been well done in part, but the job in aviation, Army, and provision of strategic bases is woefully inadequate.

Pollyanna statements made by the President and over the air on the same night by other officials do not agree with expert testimony before congressional committees. Lumping our equipment as "on hand" or "on order" is meaningless and misleading.

All these things are bygones. Our job is to correct these blunders. But we can't correct them without recognizing them. These attempts to gloss them over are of themselves a danger and a continuing blunder.

The President is right in saying that, for unified defense, we must avoid hatreds. He has produced them in mass. Even in his fireside chat he warned against war "millionaires," promised continued handouts, and at least seemed to say that in this period of sacrifice and extreme effort by everybody none will be demanded from labor. And yet prices are to remain low regardless of increased costs and no control. Perhaps it was a gesture toward "unity" that no new taxes were suggested and financial aid was promised to industry. People who pay taxes are far more realistic. They are demanding increases. No truly American industry seeks profits due to war. No truly American worker is unwilling to do his part.

Nothing in the fireside chat suggests the stern, tough administration that this situation requires. To any veteran of our greatest American defensive effort, it cannot fail to bring goose-pimples of apprehension. It did not face or truly tell the facts. It promised speed and efficiency and offered no convincing plan for getting them. It reeks with a kind of timid fumbling that has carried England and France to the brink of destruction. It was a third-term political document rather than a formula for immediate and effective defense.

Reconstruction in Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

SPEECH BY THE FINNISH FOREIGN MINISTER AND PROGRAM OF THE NEW FINNISH GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the turmoil abroad, with millions of men engaged in a death struggle, we might well pause to take spiritual courage from the example set by the courageous Finns in their fight—now a fight of peace instead of war. Their problems are the problems that all Europe will have to face once the mantle of peace descends upon the war-torn battlefields.

The courage and fortitude evident in the speech to the Finnish nation of Foreign Minister Vaino Tanner, of Finland, on March 13, when the hostilities between Russia and Finland ceased, deserves to be recorded in the pages of our history.

Under leave granted me, I desire to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the speech of Mr. Tanner, together with a statement of the Finnish Government, issued March 27, 1940, on the program of the Republic of Finland in the work of reconstruction following the war.

SPEECH BY FOREIGN MINISTER TANNER

Finland has been engaged in war for three and a half months. Finland was drawn into war through no fault of her own. Territorial demands were presented to her, and she was prepared to satisfy these demands to a reasonable extent. This notwithstanding the negotiations broke down. Finland trusted, however, in the agreements concluded with her neighbor and in the desire for peace repeatedly proclaimed by this neighbor, and did not believe war would break out. Nevertheless, war did break out, and the country was compelled to defend herself.

Right from the beginning it was evident that the struggle would be an unequal one. As we had not been able to believe that we were on the threshold of war, we had not furnished ourselves sufficiently with war material with which we would have been capable of resisting an invasion for a long period. There was a direct lack of many decisive instruments of war. Still less had we even thought of seeking in our support guaranties or promises from other states. After the outbreak of the war it has been possible to some extent to reinforce our equipment. Similarly we have received financial support and humanitarian aid.

The battle has been stern. Defending ourselves against a superior enemy, our Army has been compelled to exert itself to the utmost. It has, nevertheless, brilliantly fulfilled its task. Our defense has exceeded all expectations. Our task was generally believed to be hopeless, but that did not prove to be the case. The command of our Army was equal to the demands placed on it, and our rank and file have done good work. They have behaved—I will not say as heroes, for that would be too everyday a word, but as men. Because of this, our Army has several fine victories to its credit. It has inflicted heavy losses on the attacking enemy. Only on the main front have we retired a little. On other fronts we have been able either to hurl back the enemy or at least check his advance.

The home front, too, has stood well all the terrorism which the total war waged on us brought with it. Despite the almost daily aerial bombardments the spirit of the home front has remained magnificently confident and a model efficiency has been maintained in work.

All our efforts meanwhile have been hampered by one great deficiency. We are a small nation and can set against the enemy only a fraction of the forces which have been set rolling against us. Because of this the same men have had to remain under fire the whole time, and even the pluckiest troops gradually become weary. Gaps, too, are always caused in the ranks in war. Thus we were in sore need of reinforcements. But these have not been forthcoming. A number of volunteers have hastened to our aid, but their number, compared with the assistance needed, has been very small. And it is only during the past few weeks that these too were ready to take their place in the fighting line.

We have continued to send out appeals for help for the overcoming of this deficiency. Our neighbors, the Scandinavian States, for whom it would have been easiest for geographical reasons to send troops to our aid, have not regarded themselves as being in a position to do so. The attitude of neutrality adopted by them has prevented them from doing so. Numerous inquiries and appeals in these quarters led to no result. A negative answer in this respect was even made public, with great harm to the military position of this country.

The western Allies, after hesitating for some time in the beginning, have announced their willingness to send to this country a fully equipped expeditionary force if this country so requests. This promise has been frequently repeated during the past weeks. On the latest occasion, a couple of days ago, the Prime Ministers of both countries, Chamberlain and Daladier, have given public assurances that their respective nations are ready, immediately on a request to that effect by Finland, to stand by our side in the struggle with the aggressor.

Our military command has carefully studied this scheme for our assistance. Its details have been exhaustively discussed. It has been found to be effective in every respect. Yet it contains one weak point. How are these reinforcements to reach this country? The geographical situation of Finland places difficulties in the way. So long as the Baltic Sea is closed, the sea route is out of the question. The route to Petsamo is long and difficult, and is further held by the enemy. The only possible route lies across the Scandinavian countries, through Norway and Sweden.

On Finland's part, the Governments of these two countries have been approached on several occasions with a request for permission for Allied auxiliary forces to pass through their territory. A similar request has been made by the Governments of the Allies. This permission, however, has been strictly refused on behalf of both the countries concerned. In this case, too, the obstacle was the attitude of neutrality adopted by them. This firm refusal has placed an obstacle that appears to be insurmountable in the way of assistance by the Allies.

Thus our country has been left to settle its relations with our powerful opponent alone. We had no wish voluntarily to surrender our territories and rights. Contrary to certain earlier examples, we ventured to oppose demands of this character. When our country was attacked, we proceeded to defend ourselves determinedly. We have shown the path which small nations must take in the face of demands by dictator states. It has not been our fault that the democratic states have either been unwilling or unable to help us in this unequal struggle. All that can be said against us is that as a nation we are too small. In spite of the great success of our defense we cannot alone carry this struggle to a victorious end. As no help is forthcoming, the outcome of the struggle is plain. Should the war continue, this country might be conquered and its population placed in a hopeless position.

When this eventuality became plain, we began to explore the possibilities of peace. Feelers to that effect have been sent out for some time. For some weeks already the Government has been in contact with the Government of the Soviet Union. These contacts finally led to the departure of delegates of the Finnish Government for Moscow on March 6, to open direct negotiations with the Soviet Government. Meanwhile, however, hostilities have proceeded as intensely as ever. It is probably a unique phenomenon that the delegates of a state proceed in the midst of a fiercely raging war to an enemy capital to negotiate without a previous armistice. The Soviet Government, however, was not desirous of agreeing to an armistice before peace had been concluded.

During the negotiations held during the past few days in Moscow the delegates of the Soviet Union have presented their terms for peace. These terms are unexpectedly severe compared with what the enemy has so far succeeded in achieving by war. They also greatly exceed the demands presented by the Soviet Government last autumn in the name of the increased security of Leningrad. Our delegates have attempted during the negotiations to secure an alleviation of these terms, but in vain.

In spite of the severity of the terms the government has regarded assent to them as being in the national interest. As we have no hope of securing better terms by continuing the war, it has been preferred to agree to the present terms rather than continue a hopeless war. Finland having consented, the treaty of peace was signed last night, and at the same time it was agreed that hostilities should cease today.

The details of the peace treaty are not known to us at the present moment. They will not be revealed to us until our delegates return from their journey. Our eastern frontier, however, will run approximately where it was fixed at the peace of Uusikaupunki in 1721. Cape Hanko will be ceded. Similarly our territory on the Rybachi Peninsula in Petsamo. On the other hand, no political demands have been presented to us. The Soviet Union does not intend to interfere in either our domestic or our foreign policy. That would indeed have been a demand which we could not have accepted. Further, the right of this country to self-determination remains inviolable. The Kuusinen government, to which the future fate of this country was to be entrusted according to the scheme drawn up to the beginning of the war, has been thrust aside.

As will appear from these preliminary reports couched in general terms, the peace imposes a heavy burden on this country. Only with great hesitation has the government consented to it. The decision was all the more difficult to reach in that no one could foresee what the near future would bring. In this case it will become evident only at a later stage, as is the case with all great political decisions, whether the decision was right or wrong. The government, meanwhile, has had to shoulder the responsibility. In the government's opinion the wisest course was to conclude peace while our resistance was still unbroken.

Peace has thus returned to this country. But what a peace! Henceforward the nation will continue its existence in a state of mutilation. Its old frontiers have been altered. Areas of vital importance have to be surrendered, including important industrial and agricultural areas. The population of the ceded areas will have to seek new dwelling places. Our future possibilities for defense are weakened. Nevertheless, in the government's opinion peace was better than to go on with an uncertain war.

With the restoration of peace we shall return to a more normal existence in the measure in which the proceeding war between the great powers allows. In this connection new and great tasks in abundance will be imposed on us. We must begin to remedy the wounds struck by war. A new work of construction must be begun. New dwelling places must be found for the inhabitants of the areas to be ceded, and a livelihood assured to them. The destruction wrought in the country must be repaired by our joint efforts.

In all this, I am convinced we shall succeed. The Finnish people are hard working and resistant. They have shown this in war, but the same qualities appear with even greater clarity in works of peace. Our country has been devastated before this during the course of its history. Its population has once been reduced by nearly a half. Even from such depths we have ascended again. Finland will become a vigorous nation and her people prosper as before. We have land in abundance. Our opportunities for fruitful work are boundless. And our Army is still whole. It can keep watch that our peace will not be disturbed in the future.

One thing, however, is essential. The unanimity which the war brought us we shall, it is to be hoped, preserve. It was created by outside pressure. So long as European affairs are in their present state of confusion, the danger of new complications is constantly present. Because of this we must continue to hold together, united and therefore strong. It would indeed be easily comprehensible if opinion among us were to be divided in regard to the decision now made, so many are the arguments that can be brought against it. Such differences of opinion, however, should not be allowed to disturb the united front achieved by us. We shall certainly need it during the days of peace now beginning as much as we needed it during the war. We must forget the past and look to the future.

If we succeed in this, it will be a promise of regeneration for Finland after the blow we have endured.

THE PROGRAM OF THE NEW FINNISH GOVERNMENT

MARCH 27, 1940.

At the first session of the new Government Prime Minister Ryti presented the following program:

The new Government regards as its most important task the speedy inauguration of a comprehensive work of national reconstruction and the creation of the conditions for its successful realization.

Our foreign policy must be a policy of peace and neutrality; it must aim at creating and maintaining friendly and confidential relations with all nations, and thus at consolidating our international position and guaranteeing and promoting the work of reconstruction.

Our defense must be planned and built up with a view to the new conditions and the experience gained.

About one-eighth of our population have been deprived of their homes and livelihood. They must be settled as useful, productive citizens within our new frontiers. This calls for initiative, courage, and patience from the citizens concerned and great sympathy and a national sense of responsibility from all those in a position to offer them work and a roof over their heads or to help and support them in other ways with a view to providing them with a new start in life.

But it also calls for speedy and effective measures by the governmental authorities. For the part of the evacuees who are accustomed to the practice of agriculture and wish to devote themselves also in future to the cultivation of the soil suitable land must be arranged, so far as is possible, all ready for the approaching summer, and the first essential buildings provided for their new homes. The professional skill and experience of others we must seek to direct into the service of the national economy in such employment and such fields of labor where they can best profit their country. In the case of those who, owing either to the war or the peace treaty, have lost their property, or an appreciable part of it, these losses, if no other compensation is forthcoming, must be jointly borne to the extent of our capacity. To make this possible, those whose property has been largely preserved must submit to a once-for-all sacrifice in accordance with the decision which will be made in due order in this matter.

A nation compelled in the long run to live on and consume only as much as it is capable of producing, and to build or make other capital investments only to the extent of its savings.

We have lost a good tenth of our arable land and our industrial capacity. We have further lost important raw-material areas and considerable sources of power. The loss of Karelia has deprived us of about 17 percent of our railways, badly mutilated our network roads, and disorganized our inland water-transport routes, now that the mouth of the Saimaa Canal and Viipuri Bay are no longer within our frontiers. The loss of important harbors will place difficulties in the way of our overseas trade. In addition the war has been a great burden on the state finances, and the stability of our currency is imperiled.

We must set boldly to work in order that we might within our new borders regain all that we have lost, and even increase in all fields our useful production beyond what we have earlier been able to achieve. In spite of the reduced arable area, we must produce more food than before by intensified cultivation methods and by adding to the area under cultivation. The care of our forests must be made more effective. Our industrial output must be expanded and extended to new fields. To provide more power for industrial use we shall have to harness rapids that have hitherto remained untouched. Especially must we speedily begin to exploit our ore and mineral resources. Our railway, road, and water transport systems and our harbors must be built up and developed to meet the new situation. Our foreign trade, in particular our export trade, must speedily be revived. A sane balance must be restored in our public economy and the stable purchasing power of our currency secured.

These gigantic tasks call for gigantic efforts by the Finnish people. They demand of each of us that we work more than before; that we abstain from much that we have previously been able to permit ourselves, and to sacrifice for the common good more than before. We can speed up and facilitate our work of reconstruction with the aid of foreign loans, and we have the right to expect the help of our friends in this respect. But even though this hope were to fail us, we must embark boldly and with confidence on the reconstruction of our country, and in that work success is sure to crown our efforts.

Another New Deal Spending Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TOLEDO BLADE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have had 7 years of unscrupulous generosity with the taxpayers' money under the New Deal policies, which is strikingly presented in an editorial of the Toledo Blade. Under leave to extend, I am including it as a part of my brief remarks.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of April 27, 1940]

ANOTHER NEW DEAL SPENDING SPREE TO INFLUENCE THE ELECTION

There is perhaps no more discredited cure for depression than government spending of the New Deal variety. For more than 7 years this panacea has been fed to our ailing economy; at no time has it produced more than temporary results, leaving the disease as bad as before, or worse, and the bill for the treatment larger than ever.

Experience, it has been said, is the best teacher. Seven years of failure to achieve recovery by means of billion-dollar spending programs should be sufficient evidence to convince even the most stubborn supporters of such a course that it is vain.

Yet the Roosevelt administration is going right ahead in its blind devotion to this futile, dangerous remedy. The biggest spending program in which the New Deal has yet indulged is about to get under way. It is not being heralded with the fanfare and bright promises which have preceded earlier sprees of this kind. But the fact remains that, in the 6 months beginning July 1, this year, our Government will spend some $5,000,000,000, more than we have ever spent in an equal peacetime period before, even during the New Deal.

This sum—about twenty-eight millions every day for 6 months—is so staggeringly large that its significance is difficult to picture. Some idea of its size may be gained from the fact that it is considerably more per day than Great Britain is spending to fight the war.

To waste present funds and mortgage future revenue in this manner is sufficiently reprehensible. But the sinister motive which underlies this rise in Government expenditures at such a time is even more to be deplored.

For the third time the New Deal is faced with an important national election. And for the third time the rate of Government spending is to be materially increased for the months of the campaign. The spend-tax-elect technique swings into use again.

The matter can hardly be dismissed as mere coincidence; the New Deal may truthfully say, "We planned it this way." But 1936 and 1938 were merely the beginning. This year the spending is to be more open-handed than ever. The new dealers are desperate and they will "buy" the election if possible.

Nearly one-third of our people now profit from this money the Government is handing out. Thus does the New Deal bureaucracy seek to perpetuate itself in office. It is this to which Mr. Wendell Willkie referred when he said recently that the New Deal had a vested interest in the depression. For recovery would end this ability to keep such a great number of voters under a kind of obligation for favors received.

But even those who have for the moment benefited from the New Deal spending spree will honestly admit, if they face the situation squarely, that the game of deficit financing cannot continue forever.

By election day it will be nearly 8 years since Mr. Roosevelt and his clique of new dealers began experimenting to achieve recovery and restore employment. Not only have they failed, but they have raised the national debt practically to its legal limit of $45,000,000,000.

We must not fool ourselves into believing that this so-called pleasure trip of the new dealers can continue forever. A day of reckoning must come. When it will be is difficult to say, but it cannot be far off. No one can spend $2 for every dollar he takes in without going bankrupt eventually.

Mr. Roosevelt is doubtless confident that he can meet the situation simply by piling on more taxes. But the people will not always have the money to pay the ever-increasing demands of the Government.

The future of our country is in serious danger unless some change takes place in Washington soon. If you are an American, if you want our form of government to continue, then you should forget politics in the face of our serious economic condition. It can only be corrected by putting some sensible and experienced men in charge of the administration before it is too late.

The Art Project at Gardena High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY OLIVE HENSEL LEONARD, LIBRARIAN, GARDENA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the fertile Gardena Valley, midway between the Great Los Angeles Harbor and the metropolitan Los Angeles area, lies the little city of Gardena. Within this city, housed in spacious buildings mostly constructed with P. W. A. assistance, is one of the several high schools of the Los Angeles city high-school district.

Gardena High School has a student body of about 1,500 students and a faculty of some 50 members. This school lies almost in the geographical center of the Seventeenth California Congressional District. It is not only the geographical center of the Seventeenth District but the art center of southern California. As one who has been a member of the faculty of this institution for the past 10 years and is even now on leave of absence from this institution, I am naturally enthusiastic about its accomplishments. In the belief that other schools should emulate Gardena High School, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Olive Hensel Leonard, librarian of that institution. Mrs. Leonard, along with former Principal John Henry Whitely and the vice principal, Miss LaVeta Crump, and other faculty members, has been tireless in her efforts to put over the project which means so much to the school, the community, and southern California:

THE ART PROJECT AT GARDENA HIGH SCHOOL, GARDENA, CALIF.

(By Olive Hensel Leonard, librarian, Gardena High School)

Gardena High School takes inventory on her art project after 21 years of senior class purchases of western canvases, 13 of which have been associated with purchase prize exhibits. The project shows very satisfactory results, or shall we say trends? The school now owns 53 canvases painted by outstanding artists.

During these 21 years we who have watched the experiment have seen a country town of small cultural attainments and contacts become art minded. Several hundred of our citizens pay hard cash for membership in the Gardena Art Association every year, and every civic and fraternal organization in the town is back of the project 100 percent. Our people throng the galleries throughout the annual exhibit of pictures and bring their friends from outlying towns. We have found it a unifying civic project, one in which there is great joy and no conflict.

Another aspect of the project, more satisfying than any other, is the interest and pleasure many of our students take in the canvases.

Incoming seventh-graders look with awe upon the collection at first and gradually select their favorite pictures. Year after year they familiarize themselves with the different subjects, artists, and techniques, and by the time they are seniors it is truly remarkable what clearness of judgment and uncanny discrimination they have in valuing a painting. The contacts they have with artists, too, is most valuable, and social training of the long and frequent contact with the public as hosts and hostesses during the 2 weeks of the art exhibit is a splendid training.

The gallery is now assuming prestige among the picture collections of the West. Stanford University borrowed the entire exhibit to hang in her beautiful art gallery for 4 months last year and the Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles featured a part of the collection in their rich, spacious clubrooms during February and March 1940.

This year, as usual, a dinner and reception initiated the formal opening of the purchase prize exhibit. Four hundred and fifty guests enjoyed the tasty dinner, seasoned by witty speeches and repartee by the large number of southern California artists who always attend the opening dinner.

Gardena High School is satisfied that there are so many cultural, social, and civic advantages in a school and community project of this kind that it is well worth all the time, money, and energy that it takes to put it over.

Fifty Thousand Civilian Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times for May 25:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of May 25, 1940]

FIFTY THOUSAND CIVILIAN PILOTS

President Roosevelt's plan to train 50,000 civilian pilots during the fiscal year which starts July 1 is an ambitious one. But it is by no means too ambitious. Just such a difficult, far-reaching program is needed as a challenge to public patriotism and resourcefulness.

Clearly the success of this particular defense enterprise will be determined largely by the American people themselves. Their enthusiasm will set the pace for training activity and enrollment of students. If the people support the movement aggressively, this country can speedily launch the greatest air preparedness drive the world has seen.

Skeptical readers may wonder whether public sentiment will surge strongly in favor of a training program which will send thousands of young men into the realm of the air.

The answer to this skepticism is that the American people are thoroughly air-minded in dealing with the problem of national defense. They were convinced long before their military leaders were that air power would become the decisive military factor which it is now conceded to be.

Back in the early 1930's every poll of public opinion revealed overwhelming majorities favoring great expansion of the Army and Navy air forces. Before Hitler put in motion the vast aerial rearmament drive which has given Germany quantity leadership in the air, the average American was registering his emphatic belief that his country's military aviation ought to be made the most powerful on earth.

While the admirals and generals were stressing the limitations of air fighters, the people were saying, in every test of their opinions, that aerial warfare possesses tremendous potentialities and that the Nation's armada of the skies should be expanded.

These facts are in the record. There is no need to worry about the public reaction to the President's civilian air-training plan. The people were ready for it in 1935. They are more than ready for it now.

Membership of Hon. William D. Byron Upon Committee on Military Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, has for one of its members the gentleman from the Sixth District of Maryland, the Honorable WILLIAM D. BYRON. Today I would like to report to the House this his selection by the Ways and Means Committee has proven to be a wise one. WILLIAM D. BYRON has made good as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee.

As you well know, a great many Congressmen are selected for this committee who have large military establishments in their districts and can best serve their constituents as a member of it. This is as it should be and applies to Members of both political parties.

However, as you all know, the selection of the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman BYRON, was made with consideration for his background and experience which admirably qualified him for the important post on the committee.

He was the son of a distinguished officer of the Army, the late Col. Joseph C. Byron, in whose honor the post of the Spanish-American War veterans in Washington County, Md., is named. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BYRON] himself served his country in the World War. The particular service that he saw, first as a pilot in the flying corps and then as an officer instructing others in tactics and in aerial gunnery, I believe enhances his value to the country at this time when the angry flames of war are surging through Europe and Asia.

The importance of maintaining the security of American peace through a program of military preparedness for national defense has become a problem of the National Government of grave concern, and the work of the Military Affairs Committee of this Congress has become of first-rank importance. In such critical times I am glad to have his advice and counsel in the committee.

He has shown marked ability and thorough understanding of the many perplexing problems of our country's defenses. I am glad to say that he has at all times manifested deep concern as to our military objectives and has been courteous and cooperative.

He enjoys the confidence of all the members. Although representing a district which is close to Washington and which by its proximity necessarily keeps him especially active in behalf of his constituents, so far as I can recall he has rarely missed a meeting of the committee during his time of service on it.

It is my desire and hope that he shall, in these crucial and trying times, remain a member of this strategically important committee of the House of Representatives. In his experience so far he has demonstrated his ability for this particular work.

An Open Letter to His Majesty, George VI, King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India, Buckingham Palace, London, England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

LETTER FROM J. FRANK WEBBER, NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE MAKE EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to King George VI, of Great Britain, from Mr. J. Frank Webber, national field representative of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee. It is my opinion that the sentiments expressed by Mr. Webber in his communication to the reigning monarch of Great Britain are the sentiments of every red-blooded American.

AN OPEN LETTER TO HIS MAJESTY GEORGE VI, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND AND OF THE BRITISH DOMINIONS BEYOND THE SEAS, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, EMPEROR OF INDIA, BUCKINGHAM PALACE, LONDON, ENGLAND

MAKE EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1940.

YOUR MAJESTY: Your Majesty's insistent invitation to take part in the latest garden party in Flanders has been received and duly noted. We regret, Your Majesty, that we are unable to attend this affair because the cakes and ale the last time turned out to be at our expense—notwithstanding England's promise to repay, and we are still paying for it—with interest.

In plain Americanese, Your Majesty, we call it getting stuck with the check.

As Your Majesty probably noticed, Your Majesty's visit here nearly a year ago to the day, which strangly enough preceded the present war by less than 90 days, properly overwhelmed us, whipped up quite a little enthusiasm for the empire. As we had only been expecting Your Majesty or Your Majesty's Governor of the Bank of England officially for 20 years, Your Majesty's social visit took us by surprise. Tell me, Your Majesty, when a king comes begging, does he bring a tin cup or one of gold with the royal crest?

In fact, the last redcoats to visit the Capital were greeted with a hail of lead. That was in 1814. If we had suspected that Your Majesty's presence here merely foreshadowed the events of September and subsequent attempts to involve us in another costly European war—on us—the reception which Your Majesty received might have hearkened back to the bitter days of a century and a quarter ago when royal lobster-backs made a bonfire of the Presidential Mansion and Capitol. Of course, Your Majesty did not have incendiary ideas, beyond inviting us to a war—as usual, at our expense—and this was advanced by repeal of the arms embargo just for the sake of Auld Lang Syne.

Evidently, it is easier for Your Majesty to forget the war debt of approximately five and one-half billion dollars than our supposed Anglophilia. How repugnant Hitler's plan of taking over some of the Union Jack must seem. The idea of conquest is abhorrent to Your Majesty. But, by the same token, it is remarkable how righteous imperialism can become with the passing of time. Now, the great proportion of the world's real estate worth owning is held by the British. Even the German colonies taken in the last war. Your Majesty should have realized that when the time became propitious, the Reich would first politely request and—failing in that—start out to recover them the same way you did—by diplomatic and military "blitzkriegs."

But hold on to them you British will, even if it costs France her last man and the United States her last jackass. The British Empire must be like the acres in Heaven—sacred, inviolate, and unscorched.

Of course, this is just small talk, the point remains, Your Majesty, it looks like the sand is fast running down the glass and Your Majesty's last blue chip is down. Naturally, Your Majesty

needs more cash because it takes a lot of money to wage a war, and when Your Majesty is up to his royal ears in debt, the scratch has to be raised somewhere. Most people have to put something in the hock shop to raise ready cash. Empires are no different. This is just a suggestion. Why not cede Bermuda and the West Indies to the United States? They would make a nice down payment on the old bill. And it's a cinch that if things keep going the way they are, Your Majesty won't have anything left to cede. Can't you imagine British Honduras, Bermuda, and Jamaica under the swastika? Not pleasant to contemplate, is it? Particularly, not for us. And when it comes right down to the question of national defense—we need 'em.

The day preceding Your Majesty's latest invitation, Sir George Paish suggested giving us an island or two in the West Indies, but undoubtedly he had in mind a few pelican rookeries. After placing these "gems" under the glass, they don't seem to have the proper depth and brilliance upon which to make a substantial loan—let alone settling the score for the last time. We would like to have a more imposing offer—say, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and a couple of the others we really need for our own national defense. Suppose they all do raise a lot of valuable commodities. What good are they to Your Majesty if these commodities lie at the bottom of the ocean?

From time to time, we will probably be hearing further from Your Majesty regarding this little matter of sending men and millions to stem the advancing tide of grey-clad troopers. We believe the last time it was to save "civilization." This time it is to save "democracy." It couldn't possibly be like the bitter medicine sugar-coated—to save the British Empire?

We're afraid, Your Majesty, that we will have to paraphrase General Pershing's historical remark before the tomb of the great French patriot—"Lafayette, we are here"—and, by golly, that's where we're staying.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed) J. FRANK WEBBER,
National Field Representative, Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is growing extremely conscious minded on strengthening of our national defense, but national defense interests should not be wholly armament minded. In times of war, a nation's strength is largely dependent upon resources of raw materials for industry and its food resources for man and beast. We are blessed with an abundance of food but are dependent upon the rest of the world for many raw materials needed in industry, principal of which is rubber.

We can produce and are producing rubber in a small way today in California from the guayule plant, which is native of Texas and Mexico. Experiments have proven its adaptability to most of the southwest part of the United States.

The guayule plant is a shrub and grown from seed in seed beds its first year, then set out in rows the following year as seedlings, much as we set out cabbage plants. Cultivated as a row crop, at 4 years it produces up to 1,800 pounds of raw rubber per acre. Rubber is about 23 cents a pound. A 4-year-old field is about 2 feet tall and bushy, somewhat similar to privet hedge. Its roots are spreading and penetrate below ordinary plow levels. In harvesting, a sharp-edged but heavy steel-bar drawknife drawn by a tractor cuts the roots about 8 or 10 inches below the ground surface.

Present tropical rubber is "milked" daily from trees, while guayule rubber is produced in one process—that of grinding the entire plant in a pebble grinder under water, while the rubber itself floats to the top. An acre of guayule produces about the same amount as tree rubber and has the advantage of being available at all times as the needs may be. The guayule plant may be left to grow for 10 years, when it will produce about 3,500 pounds per acre, or it may be let to grow for 30 years, gradually increasing in rubber content.

There are 6,000 acres of cultivated guayule growing in the Salinas Valley of California now, and already 200,000,000 pounds of guayule rubber have been produced in California and Mexico.

As has already been demonstrated, we can produce our own rubber in our country and not be dependent upon war-torn foreign countries for such a great essential.

It appears to me that this should be one of the first steps toward national defense. We now depend upon the East Indies for most of our rubber, and we all know of the precarious position we are in for a dependable supply of rubber from that source, should war spread to include the East Indies. Less than a month ago rubber was 18 cents a pound, and in less than 2 weeks rose to 23 cents a pound.

Why not be prepared by having our own source of rubber supply, while at the same time protecting the American automobile owner against exorbitant automobile-tire costs, and at the same time providing work for millions of men in industry and giving the American market to the American farmer?

Conglomeration, Inc.; A. Hitler, President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY W. H. McWILLIAMS

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in this anxious hour, when people everywhere are profoundly disturbed by events transpiring in Europe and when dismay at the prospects of a quick German victory over France and England has led many people to the conclusion that we must ourselves be almost immediately involved in that terrible war, we should not give way to our fears nor permit our energies to be dissipated by hasty, ill-considered action nor our aims and purposes to be thwarted by premature and hence inefficient attempts to accomplish them. If there ever was a time that demanded stout hearts, calm minds, and level heads, it is now; and it is heartening to know that here and there, through the newspapers of our land, journalists and columnists are trying to call us back to the realities of the situation and to calm our minds by putting present events in proper perspective and to achieve thereby the most efficient action possible in the rearming of the Nation.

Eastern Ohio has had for a number of years a columnist whose sage but homely and sometimes witty comments on current events has both delighted and instructed his readers. Recently, in the issue of Monday May 20, 1940, of the Daily Times, of Martins Ferry, Ohio, this columnist, who writes under the pen name of Hi Waters, but who is in real life Mr. W. H. McWilliams, of St. Clairsville, Ohio, has made a real contribution to the return to mental stability and calm determination that is so essential at this time. Following is the article to which I refer:

[From the Daily Times, Martins Ferry (Ohio), May 20, 1940]

CONGLOMERATION, INC., A. HITLER, PRES.—BUT ADOLF DOESN'T WANT UNCLE SAM

(Editor's note: The following article was written by W. H. (Hi Waters) McWilliams, noted Belmont County columnist and propounder of homely philosophy. The article was prepared for Mr. McWilliams' regular Views from the Bench column and we, thinking the thought expressed might be good for troubled minds in troublesome times, asked Mr. McWilliams' consent to publish it here.)

Europe's line-fence dispute, involvin' some half billion neighbors, seems enterin' its final stages.

The dispute, the thirty-second which has occurred in modern European history, was started back in the days when men in iron armor, not men in German field green, Poilu blue, English brown, or Italian drab, argued, parried, and thrust for the right to bargain for a ton of wheat, a load of coal, a tank of oil, or even a cartload of wooden fagots.

Almost with the regularity of the moon's change, the "line fence of Europe" was tore up, reset, and new post holes of frontier lines dug in the blood-soaked soil of that turbulent country.

And all for what?

That this people, that people, this ruler, that ruler, might live, grow rich, survive, or perish.

At each new outburst a new board of directors were selected to run the country and to supervise the trade between this neighbor and that neighbor, and to supervise the division of the profits, the losses, and gross receipts squeezed from the reddened land and from the hearts of the people.

And each outburst, from the first to the thirty-second, the quarrel appeared the worst, appeared more violent than the last. Each new outburst brought men of the hour to bloom awhile—then wilt. Until finally, as war's vengeance or peace's tribulations took their toll, they dissolved amid their own oblivion.

EACH ONE WAS GREAT

There was Alexander the Great, who "wept because he had no more worlds to conquer"; there was Genghis Khan, the Terrible; there was Caesar himself; there were the Franks, the Huns, the Northmen, the Normans, the Saxons, the cunning Spaniards, and the greatest of them all, Napoleon Bonaparte, the Little Corporal from the Isle of the Blue Mediterranean.

Conquerors, all!

Each brought a crisis to the land beyond the Atlantic—each brought themselves honors, defeats, victories, problems, fears, and heartaches. Each, in turn, passed away.

The world, in spite of them, rolled onward.

Twenty years ago the greatest line-fence dispute of them all, lit, burned, flickered out. It was the Kaiser, then, who wanted more trade, more money, more wheat, more oil, more coal—more power.

A Bismarck before him sought, and gained for a while, those ends. Then he, too, flickered and went out.

Napoleon achieved much, gained much. Land after land, country after country, nation after nation, fell to his might. He was the greatest landlord of history—almost as great as was Caesar, before him, or of Alexander the Great, or of Genghis Khan—but like them, Napoleon tottered and fell.

WHY ALL THE FUSS?

The reason for history's meanderings?

It's simple. They were great in war—but small in peace!

It's easy to conquer a people—it's impossible to keep them conquered. It's easy to bite off too big a chunk—it's impossible to digest it.

Adolf Hitler is smart. He may take a lesson from the past. He may work with his defeated enemies instead of working against them. He may, with his 100,000,000 people, try and keep order with his 500,000,000 "subjects" instead of keeping order against them.

But he's got a tough job.

Tougher than even Napoleon; tougher than even Alexander; tougher than even Genghis Khan. Napoleon had even more people under his thumb and he lasted just 10 years!

Do you think Adolf Hitler, smart guy as he is, would want to take on 130,000,000 more people 3,000 miles away from his home base, and try to keep them in a good humor—try to keep feuds, disputes, riots, revolutions, plots and counterplots, from happening, knowing that all the great conquerors in the past couldn't keep order with a space half the size of the United States and convert a subjected people that they had ground beneath the heel of their military might?

Do you think Adolf Hitler or any other conqueror of Europe—smart as they must be to win over there—would be dumb enough to attempt to get twice the headache by acquiring us over here?

Not a chance!

GIVE HIM POWER

Give Adolf Hitler today all of Europe; give him a destroyed England, a ruined France, a mutilated Italy, a blasted Belgium, a conquered Norway, a raped Poland, a wrecked Balkan—and it would take him a thousand years—a thousand vain, troubled, hopeless years to hold what he won.

Give Adolf Hitler all of that, and time will reveal again what history has revealed in the past—that no conqueror, from the days of eternity's dawn to the present time, has ever kept peace in his family of defeated people within the borders of a blood-soaked Europe.

The wings of victory—if they fly that way—will hand Adolf Hitler an elephant, and say, "Here, carry this!" Would he want for two elephants to carry?

Adolf Hitler, victorious even beyond his wildest dream, wouldn't want—besides—an America with 130,000,000 fighting wildcats to help his ultimate overthrow.

He would want, I predict, a stable America to carry on the trade in a normal way when peace settles—for a while—over war-torn Europe; he would want a stable country on this side of the troubled territory as a pillar on which to tie a disrupted world economic condition; he would want a stable America to remain stable and a foundation—far from the theater of war—where the product of his conquered lands might be consumed.

No, from a standpoint of danger of attack, your country and mine is safe from Adolf Hitler. Adolf Hitler doesn't want us, because Adolf Hitler couldn't digest us if he had us! Victorious in war, as he might be in Europe, Adolf Hitler will have all he can handle for the next quarter century—even if he's successful in peace.

DO WE WANT TO GET IN?

America is not in danger of Adolf Hitler, unless America decides that Adolf Hitler should not conquer Europe. That's another question.

It would be easy for America to become embroiled in the war; easy if we decide that the "corner post of frontier No. 745" is not where it should be; easy if America decides that the "line fence between Ignatz Giesgenszzi's garden and Georges Tiercourt's farm, and John Bull's pasture" shouldn't be moved.

It would be easy for America to get in the war, if we want in.

Why should we get in the war? * * * They don't want us—we don't want them.

Personally, I am in favor of the present "board of directors" over there in Europe's "conglomeration, incorporated." I wouldn't want to see a new board of directors voted in, headed by Adolf Hitler. I think President of the Board A. Hitler is pretty much of a crook, a thief, and a thug.

But we've got all we want to handle over here, and more, too, it looks like. We've got a little "board" trouble ourselves, without messin' up in somebody else's headaches. Why do it?

We tried that once. Remember?

Did that end the line-fence disputes in Europe? Nope; and 10, 15, or 20 years from now they'll be stagin' their thirty-third major war of modern history over there * * * the thirty-third line-fence dispute of modern times.

LET'S GET READY

But should we prepare? Should we get ready in case? Should we be on guard? Should we put up our guard and stand ready for any possibility, however remote * * * stand guard against enemies within as well as without * * * stand guard with the defense that's ours to defend with?

Sure; that's smart business.

If it takes a billion or two billion, let's spend it. We can harm no one by bein' prepared. I don't think we'll ever need to be prepared to that extent, but if we do need to be we are. We'd better be prepared and not need to be, than not be prepared and need to be.

But danger of attack from Adolf Hitler?

Silly.

If we get in this war, it will be because we wanted in it—wanted in it just like we did in 1918; however good we thought the excuse might have been. Now, we know it wasn't good enough then * * * a similar one oughtn't to be good enough now.

Sure, Mr. Roosevelt, I think you should go ahead and use the billion for defense, mebby you might have to use another billion to bring the defense up to par * * * best be on the safe side.

But don't kid us, Mr. Roosevelt.

Adolf Hitler's legions don't want us. He wouldn't take us served with cream. He couldn't digest 130,000,000 Americans and he knows it.

He'll have enough of a bellyache over there digestin' 500,000,000 people even considerin' he gets 'em.

Let's keep our shirts on * * * and our guns cocked, and you, Mr. President, please don't try to scare the hell out of us.

Are We Men or Mice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by my predecessor, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill:

ARE WE MEN OR MICE?

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

The big push appears to be on to frighten us into war. As in 1917, the hysteria is in high, and in high places. Every acre of the Western Hemisphere is in danger. And so forth.

Are we men or mice? Are we going to be scared into another World War?

This column is for Western Hemisphere defense and for whatever sea and air forces are necessary—with a good factor of safety. Let us not twiddle our thumbs, as England and France have done, and then expect us to liquidate their folly.

But before we get yellow around the gills, let us take counsel of our courage and of the facts of modern war. Hitler has done an

astonishing job so far against nations which were asleep at the switch. But Germans are still nothing but men less than 6 feet tall. They are neither gods nor magicians. Their guns are still made of steel and their planes still burn gas. Let's not get fooled on some elemental facts. Blood and iron are formidable, but blood without iron is nothing.

Modern wars are fought with metals and mineral fuels. Political boundaries may shift but mineral depcsits do not. This, and the facts following come from the Mineral Map of Europe, just off the press, compiled by Theron Wasson, one of the leading geologists of the world.

By a supreme effort, by 5 years of guns without butter, Germany has made an impressive showing—so far. But she is not ready to jump the Atlantic.

The facts are that Germany is deficient in nearly every natural resource necessary to sustain a long war. She can make planes, but not petroleum. Of the three most important resources—iron, coal, and petroleum—she has a surplus only of coal. Her iron ore is so low grade that in other countries mines like hers would not even be worked. For iron she must now depend chiefly on Sweden. She had two routes to Swedish iron. One by salt water from Narvik. That is now cut off and is not likely to be reopened. The other is the Gulf of Bothnia, which is blocked by ice in all but a few months of the year.

Germany is deficient in iron, petroleum, aluminum, copper, lead, manganese, antimony, magnesite, pyrite, asbestos, mercury, mica, lumber, leather, cotton, rubber, gold. She is not only deficient, but in some, like rubber and cotton, she has none whatever.

And besides metal for her guns she needs food for her soldiers and civilians.

Before we turn yellow let us compare Germany and the United States with respect to petroleum—an absolutely indispensable necessity for gasoline, without which bombers are grounded, and for fuel oil, without which submarines are anchored.

Greater Germany, which now includes Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, produces 5,609,000 barrels of petroleum annually. She is short 47,620,000 barrels. That is, she has to get from outside Germany 9 barrels out of every 10 that she has to have. (And, of course, in war her consumption increases terrifically.) Where is she to get these vital 9 barrels either to carry on protracted war in Europe or to fly across the Atlantic?

Rumania and Russia are her only sources of supply now available. Suppose she got the entire surplus of these countries. Add them together. The United States produces 11 times as much as the total. And our gasoline and fuel oil is on our side of the Atlantic and her supply is on the other side of the Atlantic.

The United States produces 61 percent of the petroleum of the entire world. And there is more in Mexico and South America. The result is that if Hitler got his hands on every oil well in Europe, Africa, and Asia, we in the Western Hemisphere would still have—on our side of two oceans—twice as much war fuel as Hitler on the other side of those oceans.

And, Mr. Ickes to the contrary notwithstanding, our known petroleum reserves are now greater than at any time in history. Besides we have the finest industrial plant and transportation system in the world to get our petroleum into the gas tanks of our bombers and fighters.

Facts versus fright is so important that I shall discuss it further in my next piece. If we are men and not mice, no combination of dictators need scare us into war. But they should scare us into being prepared for war.

Why the Present Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL OF COMMERCE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, when the present reciprocal trade agreement program was launched the world was in a very dissimilar mood than that which prevails at the moment. Certainly we cannot claim, and justify that claim by accomplishments visible, that the program has added one bit to world peace. Since the very inception of the program, the whole world has moved rapidly towards war, towards further trade restrictions, towards a dissimilar economy to that advocated in the trade-agreement approach. Restricting our approach to the Western Hemisphere alone we cannot claim solidly very much accomplishment for the program.

Now, as we face a recasting of economic, industrial, and agricultural relations between the countries constituting the family of nations in the Western Hemisphere it certainly appears that from a defense program alone we shall have to recast our trade-agreement approach. The signing of the Inter-American Bank Convention by our State Department, the defense program which is now being launched by Congress, and the pressure which we shall be forced to exert on the Latin American countries to the south of us will all contribute to our reexamining the entire trade-agreement philosophy. We may now face a situation where the most-favored-nation clause will have to be entirely abandoned and where we shall have to think primarily in terms of a direct relationship between the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. Under permission granted by the House, I now submit the editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce:

OPPOSITION TO SILVER LEGISLATION

Despite the fact that not a single persuasive argument has yet been advanced for retaining the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 on the statute books, cessation of purchases of foreign silver by the United States Treasury appears to be as far away as ever. The Senate has passed the Townsend bill to halt the buying of silver abroad, it is true, but the House Ways and Means Committee proposes to kill this measure for all practical purposes by taking the stand that it is a tax bill, and as such should have been originated in the House. It seems quite doubtful that a new bill originating in the House will be passed at this session.

The chief reason advanced for continuing the purchases of silver is the desire to maintain American exports. It is claimed that the United States may hurt its exports if the Treasury stops buying silver abroad, however useless this metal may be. This contention would be just as valid if it were asserted that the Treasury should buy trainloads or shiploads of gravel from some foreign country at an artificially high price, in order to give that country buying power for our goods.

In point of fact, the desire of the administration to continue the silver-purchase program reflects its failure to evolve an effective foreign policy with regard to Latin America. The good-neighbor policy, well-intentioned though it was, failed to bring about that close economic and political collaboration between the United States and Latin American countries which was desired. Fearing to antagonize Mexico, despite the cavalier treatment accorded by that country to a number of American interests, the administration has fought for a continuation of the silver-purchase program, which benefits Mexico far more than any other country. It has vague fears that to do otherwise might cause Mexico to draw closer to authoritarian regimes abroad.

The United States should cooperate wholeheartedly with Latin-American countries especially now when defense of the hemisphere is a practical issue. Sound relations will not be promoted, however, by favoring nations which trample on American interests and discouraging those which are ready to cooperate on a reasonable basis with us. A firmer attitude toward Mexico, for example, and a friendlier policy toward Argentina, which has sought in vain to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with the United States, would be far more likely to promote sound pan-American relations.

Let's Adjourn Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which, in my opinion, should be placed in the hands of all new dealers who, during the debates of the past few days, have been exhorting the Congress to adjourn politics. As stated in the last paragraph of this editorial, it is quite apparent to all who have listened to the arguments of the

New Deal that it is only the other fellow's politics that the new dealers want to adjourn.

The Tribune editorial follows:

LET'S ADJOURN POLITICS

General Hysteria is riding off in all directions in Washington and New York. His radio commentator and columnist lieutenants are shrilling nonsense about coalition cabinets and postponing the election. The new dealers are cleverly exploiting the panic in western Europe in the hope of instilling similar panic on this side of the Atlantic. They are raising the cry that in this crisis, which in its domestic aspects is largely of their manufacture, the Nation must adjourn politics.

All right, let's adjourn politics.

Let's adjourn the political manipulation of the National Labor Relations Board.

Let's adjourn the use of W. P. A. funds and the ruthless intimidation of W. P. A. workers to elect Democratic politicians to office.

Let's adjourn Henry Wallace's political juggling of agricultural subsidies to buy farm votes.

Let's adjourn the political use of the Walsh-Healey bill to bludgeon manufacturers supplying the Government into letting the lady fellow traveler in the Labor Department fix their wage rates.

Let's adjourn the political fixing of hours of labor under the wage-hour bill, which is hamstringing efforts to expand industrial production essential to our own and the Allies' defense.

Let's adjourn Secretary Morgenthau's and Mr. Eccles' political manipulation of the money market to divert funds into the administration's deficit financing.

Let's adjourn the punitive tax schedules that have prevented industrial expansion in order to perpetuate unemployment as a vested interest of the New Deal politicians.

Let's adjourn the political waste of the Nation's substance on T. V. A., Grand Coulee, Passamaquoddy, and all the other ventures into state socialism and screwball engineering and economics.

Let's adjourn the political fixing of prices under the Guffey Act, which is loading millions of dollars of additional costs on industry and home owners in order to repay another installment of the Roosevelt campaign-fund debt to John L. Lewis.

Let's adjourn "Donald Duck" Ickes and the rest of the verbal tarantulas who have spent the last 7 years fanning class hatred in America.

Let's adjourn the political use of Federal funds by State political machines by enacting the Hatch bill, which the Roosevelt administration has succeeded in killing in Congress.

Let's adjourn progress toward a Nazi legal system by passing the Walter bill to give proper court review of the rulings of New Deal administrative tyrants.

Above all, let's adjourn the scaremongering that is trying to convince the Nation that the United States is in danger of invasion day after tomorrow, the sole purpose of which is to make plausible the cry of "Let's adjourn politics."

All this isn't the kind of politics that the new dealers want adjourned. President Roosevelt has said that there will be no relaxing of what he misrepresents as his social reforms. Secretary Morgenthau has told the plane manufacturers that private industry will get the first chance to build 50,000 planes, adding in effect that the Government is going to keep right on beating them over the head while they try.

It is only the other fellow's politics that the new dealers want to adjourn.

What the Press Thinks of the Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, last August I found myself placed on a committee of the House headed by the gentleman from Virginia, Representative HOWARD WORTH SMITH, to which had been assigned the task of investigating the activities of the National Labor Relations Board.

Committee activities attracted a great deal of attention. News stories went out every day. There was a great deal of editorial comment. It would be interesting, I thought, to make a measure of the national newspaper editorial approval and disapproval of the activities of the National Labor Relations Board. So a Government clipping service—which unquestionably is unbiased—was requested to send to each member of the five-man committee all editorial comments on the hearings without regard to opinion, for or against. I then concluded to analyze these comments and report on them to the House, hopeful that they thus would serve a more extended and useful purpose.

My study of the first 1,000 clippings, which preceded the filing of the Smith committee report, is contained herein. It shows condemnation of the Board by the press of the Nation to be practically unanimous. From coast to coast, from Canada to the Gulf, there is but one single paper, as far as my search revealed, that had a word to say in defense of the National Labor Relations Board. And the support of this paper is a doubtful recommendation to the Board or to the course it has pursued.

That paper is the Daily Worker, of New York, house organ of the Communist Party in the United States, voice of Earl Browder, recently convicted of fraudulently securing passports, and stanch defender of Joseph Stalin, spearhead of the bloody invasion of Finland.

Here is the way in which I proceeded in studying these editorials. I divided them as to geographical sections and States beginning with New England. Taking the editorials as they came, I quote verbatim the central thought or conclusion which each contained. Thus I give each only the space that seemed necessary to portray the gist of it. Examples follow:

The Worcester Telegram:

Remembering the large percentage of flubdub and hokum elicited by many congressional probers, it is really remarkable that the Smith committee has hewn to the line so steadily and effectively. From members and officials of the Board it has drawn some illuminating, and in some instances, damaging, admissions. Since its establishment it has been a question in many minds whether the Labor Board was not transcending its powers and departing upon occasion from the intent of the Wagner Act. Already the question has been answered in the affirmative. And it has been answered in the affirmative not by dubious characters but by persons of the greatest authority on the subject—members and officials of the Board itself.

The Boston Christian Science Monitor:

If the ballot box is to supersede the rough-and-tumble in deciding American labor issues, as contemplated in the Wagner Act, there must be a considerable tutelage in the democratic process as applied to the workshop in elections held by the National Labor Relations Board. * * * At present the principal method seems to be through a choice between rival unions. * * * Some of these campaigns have become quite expensive in outlays * * * for the paraphernalia of political campaigns. It is not inconceivable that a kind of Corrupt Practices Act, like that which limits congressional campaign expenditures, may be necessary to supplement the Wagner Act.

The Boston Transcript:

It is obvious that some changes should be made to permit employers to discuss labor matters with their employees. At the same time care must be exercised lest by word of mouth a reactionary employer, hostile to unions, is able to coerce and intimidate his workers. * * * The act should be amended or reinterpreted so that the Board, in determining the proper bargaining unit, does not have the power to upset labor relations in single plants where harmony prevails. The job of Congress is to preserve the principle of collective bargaining and to eliminate the excesses of both labor and capital.

The Boston Post:

The chief objection to the administration (of the Wagner Act) is that these young examiners have at all times acted as prosecutors, judges, and juries. Any semblance of legal procedure has been disregarded. One member of the three-man Board is clearly so biased against employers that he was proved to have instigated a strike in a large concern for the purpose of bringing the case before the Board. The Board itself has been extremely repugnant to suggestions that less stiff attitude in administration would be desirable. No doubt the administration of the Wagner Act is much more objectionable than the law.

From one end of New York State to the other, home of the author of the act creating the Board, has come unmeasured condemnation.

Utica Observer-Dispatch:

Enough testimony has been heard by the House committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board to show how far the Wagner Act, which the Board administers, has come from its avowed object of promoting harmony in industry. Not only has it created new friction between employers and employees but it has greatly aggravated the quarrel between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.

New York Sun:

One of the worst defects in the Wagner Act * * * is the absence of any restraint on labor unions to prevent them from applying pressure to employers and to workers not on their membership rolls.

Buffalo Courier Express:

If it is true that the House committee investigating the Labor Relations Board is already convinced that the Wagner Act is due for some national major amendments, that may be taken as proof of a returning common sense.

New York Herald Tribune:

The Board has in shameless disregard even of the Wagner Act's intentions thrown its weight to labor against the employer and to one faction of labor against the other * * * We can ask ourselves whether this agency as at present set up, torn with internal dissention, the sport of labor politics and seething with its own, can further serve any useful purpose.

Wall Street Journal:

Enough has already appeared to emphasize again the vital importance of personal qualifications in those administrative boards which have so increased in numbers during recent years and have been endowed with such great authority over their fellow citizens. The Labor Board has, from the beginning included men lacking in the qualities essential to those entrusted with quasi-judicial functions, together with others. That is no reflection on them. It is simply to say that one who is by nature a zealous advocate is not by nature qualified for administrative work, though he may be immensely useful to society in other capacities.

Brooklyn Eagle:

Democratic leaders * * * will shortly present * * * definite suggestions for modifying and amending the National Labor Relations Act. * * * Republicans, popular rolls, large sections of labor, most employers, and now Democrats are for the change. * * * There is no longer much doubt that an intrinsically sound law has been made ridiculous in its administration.

Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

Dr. Leiserson (Board member) believes that law should permit the Board to promote industrial peace and that its administration should be fair as between employers and employees, and as between different groups of employees. All of which seems like a pretty sensible and fair attitude It is to be regretted that Dr. Leiserson is in a minority position on the Board. But the President, if he is wise, will not delay too long in correcting that situation.

Buffalo News:

In the airing of the clashing views and administrative discords Congress and the public are certain to realize that administrative weaknesses stem from fundamental weaknesses in the law itself. Many cases have proved the need for reform of the Labor Relations Act as well as the agency by which it is administered. In particular, the law should be amended to place equal responsibility on labor and the employer for maintaining fair labor practice in the collective-bargaining relationship. At present the law is weighted against the employer. It will be a task of the committee to make recommendations looking toward a stronger and fairer law, in the interest of labor, the employer, and the public.

The Troy Record:

The disclosures of N. L. R. B. terrorism have come out of the Board and records. William M. Leiserson, a veteran of railway mediation, who has a Nation-wide reputation as a sincere and intelligent friend of labor, was promptly confirmed by the Senate. And it is largely because of his appointment that the public is getting a sight at the N. L. R. B.'s dirty linen that the congressional committee is hanging on the line. It justifies the demand that Congress either repeal the Wagner Act and start afresh or alter it so radically that not a vestige of power to terrorize American industry and labor will remain with it.

New York Herald Tribune:

Given the one-sided provisions defining unfair labor practices and the virtually unrestricted power of the Board to designate the bargaining unit, and it was a foregone conclusion that not justice, but Mr. John L. Lewis, would govern the law's application, at least so long as he had the ear of the White House. Meanwhile, the obvious remedy is no more change in the Board's personnel, however desirable, but a thoroughgoing revision of the act to protect the employer as well as labor from coercion and intimidation and deprive the Board of its arbitrary authority to dictate the pattern of unionism. The country's industrial relations have suffered long enough from bureaucratic favoritism.

New York Times:

It would probably be necessary to go back to the days of national prohibition to find another law which has been the subject of such bitter and continuous controversy as the National Labor Relations Act. * * * The Board has made a tactical mistake and probably exceeded its authority in the matter of deciding according to its own judgment what form of labor unit is best for the purposes of collective bargaining. It has been guilty of irregularity in its procedure in the consolidation of cases. In many instances there has been mismanagement and "bungling." * * * What is needed primarily at the present time is not an investigation of the competence or the impartiality of the Labor Board or even a report on desirable amendments of the law itself. It is nothing less than a study of the whole problem of labor relations (in which the N. L. R. B. is only a single factor) and the drafting of a comprehensive program. * * * The committee has a rare opportunity to use its investigation as a basis for framing a constructive and balanced program in the broad interest of good labor relations and industrial recovery.

The Daily Worker:

It becomes clearer every day that the Smith committee itself is a part of a huge plot against the American labor movement and its struggle for better conditions, and for a position of independent strength * * * A combination of the Smith committee and the administration is a powerful one, and spells danger to the labor movement.

Passing from New York to the District of Columbia, where there are four daily papers, all inclined toward nonpartisanship, I found them all tending to denounce the Board. Here they are:

The Washington Post:

William M. Leiserson has gone a long way toward shattering confidence in the National Labor Relations Board, of which he is a member. When due allowance is made for Mr. Leiserson's candid and outspoken manner, his testimony before the House investigating committee leaves the N. L. R. B. in a very serious predicament.

Washington News:

Our own opinion, of course, is that the Labor Board has made a bad record which was only partly redeemed by its grudging retreat under fire when it modified its own rules, and by the appointment of the temperate and able William M. Leiserson to the Board. We believe that power to misinterpret the law should have been taken away from the Board by amendments clarifying the Labor Act, and that the administration of the regular labor committees of Congress made a great mistake in restricting and delaying amendments. If, now, the special investigation should result in emasculating amendments, those friends of the law who stalled off action through the recent session of Congress can blame themselves.

The Washington Star:

The practices of some of the Board's officials and employees which have been brought to light are more than sufficient to demonstrate the need of this inquiry. * * * The committee already has shown that change in personnel will be necessary if the Board is ever to function satisfactorily as the quasi-judicial agency it is intended to be. * * * Obviously, the recommendations which the Smith committee will make after completing its hearings will have a profound effect on the future economic welfare of the country.

The Washington Times-Herald:

The N. L. R. B. is finding out how it feels to be on the griddle. In times past governmental investigators and governmental inquiring committees, including those of Congress, have taken all kinds of liberty with unlimited authority to put people in bad lights. Injustice has resulted with national consequences. It must give Mr. J. P. Morgan a little pleasure to see the boys squirm these days under the same kind of lash that has been laid across his own back by the familiar Simon Legrees of Capitol Hill.

Turning westward into my native Ohio, I found the attitude of the press was sane and sound, but nowhere did I find a defender of the Board. Here are some of the expressed opinions:

The Cleveland News:

It is to the credit of the Smith congressional committee that it has discovered an enormous number of young women lawyers working for the National Labor Relations Board in obscure offices in Washington, abstracting cases and making a considerable number of legal decisions for the Board. These inexperienced young women, the testimony shows, are all determining matters on which a large part of the Wagner Act enforcement and interpretation, and many thousands of dollars for industries, depends. The country does not generally know that so many women are at work in this important Government department. Before it closes, the Smith committee should inquire further into the sources of their selections.

The Dayton News:

Out of the congressional investigation now under way of the operation of the Wagner Act has come a conclusion of wide acceptance. The testimony of Member Leiserson of the Labor Relations Board went far to establish the fact that the trouble with the law has been in its administration rather than with the law itself. The law attempted to establish a simple and now little-disputed rule. It intended merely to insure the worker the right, now little opposed, to organize for collective bargaining. * * * The clear purpose is to get the subject out of the approaching

melee of politics. It is more than likely that neither political party will be averse to this. You cannot stay in politics today and stand out against collective bargaining.

The Toledo Blade:

At last it looks as though Congress will hear from the country on the matter of what is wrong with labor relations as handled by the Wagner Act. From this may be mined the information that Congress should have on this weighty question.

The Cleveland Press:

Our own opinion, of course, is that the Labor Board has made a bad record.

The Cincinnati Enquirer:

What the latest findings of the House investigating committee indicate is the imperative need for revision of the Wagner Act, along with revision of the personnel of the Board.

The Cincinnati Times-Star:

The National Labor Relations Board has done plenty of things that no administrative body in a republic has a right to do. It has built up one large group of labor unions as against another. It has sought to put "fear" into the hearts of employers. In various plants it has shattered harmonious relations between employers and employees. It has rendered decisions based on its own prejudices or presuppositions, unsupported by trustworthy evidence. It has even ordered mills to pay back wages to workers whom State courts had jailed for physical violence and sabotage. In a word, it has sketched the main lines of a national picture which shows baffled and hamstrung employers, and workmen striking not only at their bosses but against each other.

The Akron Beacon-Journal:

What the House committee must do is to determine whether this weighting of the scales in labor's favor has not gone on long enough, and just how to go about changing the law so the weight will be shifted back sufficiently close to the center.

The Canton Repository:

Investigation must not ignore the thing behind the Board and behind the act which it administers. Fact is, the Board itself is inconsequential, being merely the front of an administrative policy that has been placed in question both by popular opinion and congressional action. If the House committee performs properly responsibility will be placed where it belongs—not on the administrators of a law that seems to mean what an administrative agency says it means, but on those whose principles members of the Board are interested in upholding.

Further west the feeling against the Board seemed to intensify. In Illinois it was exceedingly bitter. Here are a few examples:

The Chicago Journal of Commerce:

The proposal of the Congress of Industrial Organizations that the Wagner Act be amended to provide criminal penalties (for employers only) is an excellent clinical example of pressure groups psychology. To persons who have followed the enforcement of Government policy under this legislation it will be significant that when the C. I. O. cries aloud for change it seeks an alteration that would make the act more one-sided than ever.

The Chicago Tribune:

When Mr. Madden and the Smiths endeavored to turn American industry over to Mr. Lewis they did no more than Madam Perkins, Mr. Farley, and particularly Mr. Murphy when he was Governor of Michigan. The New Deal nearly succeeded in this by promoting a civil war in industrial cities and allowing the revolutionary vanguard to defy the courts, fight the police, and take over properties they needed as bases of operation. When Mr. SMITH of Virginia has completed the work of his committee's investigation and has laid the reports before Congress it may then become much safer for the plain Mr. Smiths to go to Washington and get out again still with their personal possessions in their pockets.

The Chicago Times:

A House committee in Washington is investigating the Labor Board and the workings of the Wagner Act. Characteristically the report started out with a list of those present. It named the three members. * * * And following 22 attorneys in all. We were prepared to expect legal complications and technicalities. * * * But when it takes 22 lawyers to hold up the legal end of the affair, we bow in awe.

The Rockford Star:

There have been many boards and commissions set up by Congress with lavish authority to police our economy. They have in most cases been given the sanction of the courts in their general activity, even though the courts have from time to time made mild protest against assumptions of authority. The Smith committee is simply taking one of these boards apart to find out what happens when authority is delegated in lavish degree. Its findings in some instances are almost incredible. The effect of these hearings will be immediately felt in Wagner Act revisions, it seems certain; beyond that they will be felt in a greater niggardliness on the part of Congress to pay out to any commission so much rope.

The Province Journal-Transcript:

Revelations that Nathan Witt, Secretary of the National Labor Relations Board, wrote a memorandum to Charles Fahy, general counsel of the Board, in which—9 days before any complaint was made—he advised C. I. O. officials and attorneys how to proceed to create a case against the Inland Steel Corporation, is justification enough for general public demand for complete change in personnel of the Board and its servants, if not for repeal or modification of the Wagner law under which the Board operates. The memorandum Witt wrote clearly indicates not merely that his sympathies were actively against the company and for the C. I. O., but that he even went so far as to tell attorneys for the union that, if they did thus and so, they would be putting the company in a position where, unless company executives were exceedingly shrewd, a complaint could be made to the Board. * * * When a Government official takes sides in a labor controversy, even before the controversy has developed to the point where it can be adjudged by proper authority, the whole system of American fair play is in jeopardy.

The feeling lessened not at all in the great open spaces of the West. Here are examples from papers in that section.

The Kansas City Kansan:

The country is not satisfied with its labor-relations situation. The ranks of organized labor divided. Damaging strikes have occurred. There are all sorts of charges and countercharges hurled by employees and employers at each other and at the Government. And all this follows a long-debated and highly tainted National Labor Relations Act which comes labeled as enlightened legislation, the kind which should spare employers, employees, and the public from all this difficulty. Something is wrong. Some say the law ought to be changed. Some blame the members of the National Labor Relations Board. The country isn't out of the economic woods yet. It needs the path to be made just as smooth and well-marked as possible.

The Topeka Capital:

This [labor] law was not intended to be fair. It was not intended to promote collective bargaining which originally was announced to be its purpose. The very word bargaining infers that there are two sides and that they stand on an equality, each entitled to the same rights as the other. When one is strong enough to dictate to the other and compel it to submit to certain conditions, that is not a bargain; it is tyranny. Laws that are unfair to either the employees or the employers will eventually work to the detriment of both. Instead of helping the cause of organized labor as was expected, the Wagner Act has greatly injured it, by creating public sentiment against it.

Salt Lake City Tribune:

The Board has made tactical mistakes, exceeded its authority, played favorites, and defeated objects of the act, according to evidence before the congressional committee now investigating its records.

Spokane Spokesman-Review:

The National Labor Relations Board, long under suspicion of bias, and therefore unfit to act in a semijudicial capacity, is shown by the congressional inquiry, which has barely started its investigation, to have been not merely partial, but militantly partisan in industrial disputes.

It may be that the maximum of indignation against was reached in San Diego, the point farthest to the continental Southwest. Observe the following:

The San Diego Union:

Judging from what has been revealed in the first peek behind the scenes of the National Labor Relations Board, it is about time the lid was taken off that organization and the whole country given a glimpse of what has been going on. Any organization holding the authority this Board holds over millions of workers and employers should have its every act carefully scrutinized. It is hoped that it (the investigation) will bring out into the open all the reasons why this new arm of government has taken upon itself dictatorial powers over the lifeblood of the Nation—labor and commerce Unless and until this important agency of the New Deal's program is cleaned up and subjected to the glare of publicity, there cannot help but be grave suspicion of the motives behind those who direct it.

The Oakland Tribune:

From business and labor have come concrete suggestions for the improvement of an act which may be said to be admittedly faulty even by those who oppose amendment, when they declare it can be made to work fairly by a change in the administering board. What is needed is a law free from possible abuse or exploitation by any board which, at the moment, may be in office.

The San Francisco Chronicle:

Revision, however, will not be easy. Taking only the labor movement into consideration, Mr. Green, of the A. F. of L. wants changes that will stop the pro-C. I. O. prejudice he claims has

dominated the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Lewis, of the C. I. O., wants changes that will freeze the ground gained into the law and prevent any change or prejudice in the Board from adversely affecting his organization. What change can be made that will reconcile such opposed motives is difficult to envision. It is the hard task that Mr. Roosevelt faces unless the Wagner Act is to be a 1940 battleground for politics as it has been for labor and industry.

The Fresno Bee:

The National Labor Relations Board has been its own worst enemy. Starting with the thesis that the employer is never right, the Board seldom took the judicial attitude toward cases brought before it. In fact, it often went out of its way to carry out the policy by methods that were detestable. Peculiarly enough the Board's attitude has won for it neither appreciation nor esteem from labor. Both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. are demanding drastic changes in the law, each charging the Board has shown marked favoritism to the other.

The Los Angeles Times:

The Board has now decided, in a case involving the Waumbec Mills, Inc., of Manchester, N. H., that if an employer rejects applicants for work, he may be required not only to put such applicants on the pay roll but pay them back wages from the time of their application, notwithstanding that they have never before been employed by him. You guessed it—it was a C. I. O. union they belonged to. The Labor Board holds that discrimination against the two men might tend to discourage union affiliation on the part of other workers and hence is an unfair labor practice.

Democratic Texas is no less indicative than Northern States that are habitually Republican. Note the following:

San Antonio Express:

The appellate court reversals of National Labor Relations Board orders occur almost weekly—revealing evidence—first, bias, improper procedure or even misrepresentation to benefit favorite plaintiffs, notably the Congress of Industrial Organizations unions; second, Federal court reviews have shown that the Board repeatedly has ignored its constitutional right to work; third, it has furthered compulsory unionism by denying rights to nonunion workers and small independent labor organizations. It has substituted surmise and guess for proof, condoned violence, and denied defending employers a fair voice in Board hearings.

Beaumont Enterprise:

If the National Labor Relations Board is done for, it will cause few regrets. The Board has antagonized both of the labor factions, is unsatisfactory in its personnel and its operations to business, and has created in the public mind grave doubts as to its wisdom and fairness.

Dallas News:

Conspicuous in the studies of the operation of the Board and its representatives has been the free and easy acceptance of evidence and testimony without due regard to its authenticity. Congress in granting wide powers in hearings to the Board may have considered a just criticism that courts govern testimony on too technical grounds. The National Labor Relations Board has swung as far in the other direction. Rules to tighten admission of testimony should lie somewhere between the two evil extremes.

Wichita Falls Record News:

One would have to search the records of Government activities with diligence to find a department or bureau with as sorry a record as that of the National Labor Relations Board. American industry, both large and small, is at the mercy of the Board. So is labor. Its acts can leave an influence upon the Nation's prosperity and well-being far above those of any other bureau or board. Instead of exercising this power in a judicial manner, testimony so far presented shows that the Board or its agents frequently treated cases before it purely on a political basis. Apparently there has been small effort to bring impartiality into its proceedings, particularly in the early history of the Board, there appear to have been persecutions of those opposed to the political concepts of Board representatives.

Note that Oklahoma's attitude toward the Board is anything but complimentary:

Tulsa World:

Friends of the Wagner Labor Relations Act face this situation: Unyielding support of the National Labor Relations Board as now constituted and insistence upon vindication of all its acts so far will certainly result in discrediting the law and possibly in substantial repeal. Apparently the Board is not even a quasi-judicial body but is more a dummy or front for somebody or other. There are allegations of uniform favoritism for the C. I. O. and this Wagner Act is not going to function rightly until suspicion is removed.

Tulsa Tribune:

Every day evidence is piling up in the congressional investigation of the Board, the worst possible enemy of the Wagner Act. It is outspokenly biased in favor of the employee. It has not been a fact-finding body. It has set out to prove the employer wrong in every case.

Coming up through the deep South the comment of the Democratic press is little less complimentary. Note the following:

New Orleans Times-Picayune:

There are many who believe the Board is rather to be blamed than the law for the developments which have provoked Nation-wide criticism and protests even from the grand divisions of organized labor.

Asheville (N. C.) Citizen:

The administration which the National Labor Relations Board has given to the Wagner Act has been of the type to invite and to justify criticism. In its zeal to safeguard the rights of the employees, it has been unjust to the employers in all too many cases. If this prejudiced administration of the Wagner Act is not ended public sentiment will harden so completely against the act itself that Congress will be compelled to alter the law.

Charlotte Observer:

The law which this Board has been attempting to administer is itself unsound in a number of essential respects, and then, on top of this, has come a Board that has been obviously one-sided, prejudiced, and unfair in its construction of the law and its application as well.

Macon Telegraph:

It is a familiar fact that the Wagner Act makes no provision whatever for the Labor Relations Board to serve as a mediator in labor disputes. It does act under authority of law as prosecutor, judge, jury, but, significantly enough, it is given no authority to function in a conciliatory capacity. And yet, in one instance after another, when trapped by the investigating committee in matter that did not concern them, and always in the interest of John Lewis' C. I. O., the alibi of these Board agents has been they were trying to "mediate."

Memphis Commercial Appeal:

Not even the Labor Board itself can claim it has a good name, for it is patently the most unpopular of all the New Deal agencies. Designed to reduce labor controversies, it has multiplied them. Supposed to create better feeling, it has become the target of acid criticism from all concerned with its operations, including employers and both wings of organized labor.

The surprising thing about all of this is the unanimity of the condemnation of the National Labor Relations Board. There are, doubtless, papers in some of the States that are not communistic that defend it. If I had searched through additional hundreds of them I might have found such defenses. But certain it is that condemnation is practically unanimous. Those of us who are new in Congress are inclined to assume that those issues that continue to be controversial have groups of antagonists arraigned against each other, that they meet on some hypothetical political battleground and fight it out as might two football teams. But here we have a political bone of contention in which practically all members of all parties are on one side. It is hard for those of us who are novices where there is any disagreement. If Democrats and Republicans, workers and employers, C. I. O.'s and A. F. of L.'s, all agree that the National Labor Relations Act and Board is illy conceived and improperly officered, manned, and operated, why not remedy the situation forthwith? If there are lessons that have been learned from the vast and tragic experience through which we have passed, why not collect those small nuggets as the slight salvage obtainable and go on from there? But why waste further time in pulling and hauling back and forth other issues in which agreement is already unanimous?

Secretary of Labor Perkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CAROLINE O'DAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Labor needs no defense from me. Her record during these turbulent years speaks for itself.

We have voted to remove the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to the Department of Justice and, personally, I am in entire accord with the transfer. The proposal is not a new one. The Bureau never properly belonged under Labor and Secretary Perkins, herself, is known to favor the change.

But I am unwilling to permit this proposal to go through with the charges that Secretary Perkins has mishandled the Bureau unanswered. Such is not the case. As head of the Department under which the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization operated, Secretary Perkins has directed it both humanely and well. In contrast to certain former Secretaries, whose interpretation of the law was often harsh and unreasonable, she has been willing to concede that the alien, an American in the making, was also an individual, each with his or her own personal problem. That we, as Members of Congress, have also realized this is evinced by the many private bills introduced to help individuals whose cases fell outside the law or just over the border. Did we believe that all aliens, those who had by mischance or otherwise fallen afoul of our laws, were criminals there would be no private bills before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

When the transfer is effected I hope to see these individual cases decided by an impartial committee composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Labor, and Justice. Such a committee would insure the strangers within our gates the justice and mercy that we, in our introduction of our private bills, have endeavored to obtain for them.

Since I have been given leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to Secretary Perkins as the efficient and capable public official she has been for many years of her life. As head of the New York State Labor Department for 13 years she did a job that commanded the admiration and respect of wage earners, employers, and the general public.

As Secretary of Labor of the United States she has done a thorough, conscientious, and admirable job in the interest of the men and women of this Nation who work for their living.

The United States Department of Labor is now more efficient and better administered than it ever has been since it was established by the Congress in 1913. Secretary Perkins has overhauled the Department with the view of making it more effective for carrying out the underlying purpose as expressed in the basic act—to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. Procedures have been simplified, duplication of effort and responsibilities has been eliminated, bureaus having different functions but utilizing the same material for their information have learned the art of having one common pool for statistical and economic information. Inspection and investigation services also have been pooled so that no duplication of effort or waste of motion takes place. Business management has been centralized, and all this has been planned for the purpose of getting the best and most complete results on the small amount of money spent, but functional organization and approaches have been maintained.

Secretary Perkins was chairman of the President's Committee on Economic Security which made the recommendations upon which the Congress based the Social Security Act, one of the most far-reaching beneficial statutes enacted in the history of the United States.

Among the programs designed primarily to benefit the wage earners, but also in the public interest to promote the general well-being of this generation and those to come, which have emanated out of the Department of Labor since Secretary Perkins took office in 1933 are the following:

First. An immediate recommendation early in 1933 that there be some quick relief in the way of Federal appropriations to assist the States and localities in meeting the primary relief needs of the people who were then unemployed and had been unemployed for a long time in the emergency of general depression.

Second. A program of straight public works. The recommendation for it and the justification for it and the basic figures and information came out of the Labor Department. The conception of finding special work for those who could not be absorbed on straight public works also sprang from a meeting of labor leaders, Government officers, and others in the Department of Labor early in 1933.

Third. The Wagner-Peyser Act, which established well-equipped, free public employment offices, also came from recommendations of the Department as a method of taking care of the effective placement of persons looking for work where there was work to be had, so reducing the loss and waste of poor placement of the job hunting.

Fourth. The labor sections of the N. I. R. A. were contributed by the Department and its advisors in an effort to offer employment opportunities and labor protection in private industry.

Fifth. The Public Contracts Act, which required not over 40 hours and a fair minimum pay on Government contracts in manufacturing. This act sprang out of the recommendations of the Department, advised by a conference committee of State labor department officials and labor leaders.

Sixth. The Wage and Hour Act, which was the first effort to establish on a Federal basis a floor to wages and a ceiling to hours. This grew directly out of the recommendations of this Department, advised again by a conference of State labor department officials and labor representatives following the abandonment of N. I. R. A.

Seventh. Unemployment compensation, which is an adjustment for the loss of wages due to the accident of unemployment. Again this had its origin in the studies and recommendations of the Labor Department and its advisory committees.

Eighth. Contributory old-age insurance for the future and Federal assistance to the States for providing old-age assistance to aged needy persons. These programs were adopted partly to enable the elderly to leave the labor market and so offer more employment to persons at the peak load of their responsibilities.

Ninth. Limitation on the employment of young persons under 16 years in the N. I. R. A. Act and later in the Public Contracts Act and Wage and Hour Act. These provisions were aimed partly at keeping the immature workers out of the labor market and so offering more jobs to those in middle life.

Tenth. The C. C. C. as a form of constructive educational employment for young persons also had its inception in the Department of Labor.

This is a record that needs no defense. It represents an accomplishment of which any public official may well be proud.

Freedom and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the address which was delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives before the Republican State convention at Montpelier, Vt., May 24, 1940, and broadcast on a coast-to-coast network.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, when your able and genial Representative in the House, CHARLIE PLUMLEY, extended to me the invitation to address this convention I was delighted to accept.

It is an honor, a pleasure, and an inspiration to address this Republican convention in this great State, distinguished as the only one which has, in every Presidential election, been loyal to the Republican Party ever since the day Vermont's electoral vote was cast for Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin in 1860.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the stalwart idealism, the devotion to liberty, independence, and good government which kept Vermont in the Republican column all these years will keep her there this year.

Your State motto has in these strange days a deep meaning for this entire Nation. That motto on your State seal is "Freedom and unity." Those words might well be adopted as the Republican slogan for this campaign, "Freedom and unity."

I want to take those words as a text for a few minutes and point out why they have such a deep and fateful meaning for the people of this Nation in these times.

The world is divided by wars and national hatreds; schisms, bitter and deep, exist between different classes and sections even within the nations themselves.

We are all watching the future with grave anxiety and heavy hearts. We can and we must have recourse to a strong faith in an all-wise and all-powerful Providence; we must have that high courage of Stark and the Green Mountain Boys at Bennington; that courage which sustained the Allens, Jacob Bayley, Bradley, Chipman, Clark, Chittenden, and the other brave and sturdy pioneers who, through their energy, vision, and courage, helped establish the great, enlightened Nation that is today the United States of America.

While we watch with heavy hearts the merciless, ruthless conflicts in Europe, we must be vigilant that our own domestic problems do not literally become Trojan horses. We must be alert to the danger of unemployment; of increases in our already stupendous national debt; of continuing deficits; of agricultural distress, oppressive taxes; of discouraged and disheartened business; of oppressed individual initiative. We must prevent these problems becoming sprouting beds, as it were, of discouragement, of a distrust and disgust of constitutional government, which might aid propagandists in their efforts to overthrow our constitutional government in this Nation.

"Freedom and unity!" Three words holding more of the hopes of the American people than, perhaps, any other three words in the English language. Three words representing the dreams and ideals for which our forefathers fought, bled, worked, sacrificed, and saved.

"Freedom and unity!" Was there ever a time since the Stars and Stripes became the symbol of this free Nation when there was so great a need for unity to preserve our freedom as there is in this dark hour, when the philosophy of ruthless force seems to be sweeping over such a great part of the civilized world?

Many grim problems confront us. It will be only through the unity possible because of our common love of freedom that we will be able to solve these problems and keep the torch of liberty burning for the rest of the world.

There have been many disquieting disclosures in the last few weeks about the national defense. The Republicans in the Congress have stood solidly for both the principle and the practice of a national defense adequate to protect this Nation and the Monroe Doctrine against aggression by any nation or any combination of nations.

A most important part of that national defense is the financial solvency of our Government. Grave, indeed, is the situation which confronts us. You have seen the public debt mount, year by year, until it has reached a figure which no citizen, in 1932, even dreamed would ever be approached. We have had deficit after deficit; taxes have mounted until they have become almost confiscatory.

When we entered the first World War in April 1917 our national debt was $1,100,000,000. In the 18 months of our participation we spent more than $35,000,000,000. To meet those expenditures we raised about ten billions through taxation. We borrowed the remainder, and came out of the war with a national debt of twenty-six billions.

Compare that to our present situation. We have piled up a huge national debt. If we should be drawn into a war of first magnitude we should have to start with a debt of at least 45 billions, probably more, and then finance the effort on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land.

No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ if we were drawn into war; but all of us can visualize the danger to our institutions if we were forced to inflation, confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such measures, it might well be that we actually would fail in our defense.

To deny that a healthy economic condition is vitally important to our Nation's defense would be absurd. Our ability to mobilize and maintain the resources of the country in a major effort depends fundamentally upon the strength of our national economy.

We should very closely examine and consider changes which may be necessary in the fundamental plan of our national defense. We must not mislead the people into thinking something has been accomplished merely because Congress rushes through another appropriation. The whole future is too uncertain, too many problems confront us, for any such action as that. The American people must be made aware of the fact that the whole plan, the whole fundamental idea of our defense, upon which we have relied, may have to be altered.

It is entirely possible our system of national defense, based on the assumption that our interests and our national security will never be threatened on more than one of the two oceans at the same time, and never by a naval power as strong as ourselves, may have to be completely changed to meet the possibility of a very strong threat to our security in both oceans at the same time.

Now, there is another kind of defense we must also prepare. You have watched a political bureaucracy—the greatest and most expensive political bureaucracy ever created in this Nation—grow up under the present administration at Washington; you have seen it send its tentacles into every corner of this Nation; you have seen it in its very processes of sapping the substance of the citizens through taxation, and of using that substance—public funds—for the purpose of further entrenching itself in power.

Bureaucracy is not a new invention of the present administration. It is not an innovation in government. From time immemorial the liberties and privileges of individuals have been restricted or destroyed by bureaucracy.

History shows certain well-defined facts concerning bureaucracies. They invariably followed a pattern. Although a benevolent despot sufficiently wise might, theoretically, establish the finest form of government for the people, three difficulties always confronted the people in such a despotism: The first was to find a despot who would remain benevolent after he attained absolute power; the second was to find a benevolent despot wise enough to be intelligently benevolent; and the third was to find administrators with the benevolence and the vision of the despot to carry out his will without abusing or imposing upon the people under them.

Age-long experience with bureaucrats taught men that, without fail, powerful bureaucracies always became corrupt, dictatorial, arrogant, and stupid. Regardless of what motives might be animating the ruler, the bureaucrats became so numerous the despot could not keep his eye on each one of them personally. Abuses crept in; the possession and exercise of power changed the natures of men; greed and pride blinded them; and the people suffered in consequence.

In the United States in later years, our great political bureaucracy has behaved exactly according to the historic pattern.

This trend toward bureaucracy, Mr. Chairman, is inexpressibly more dangerous than the people realize. Look back to 1904, when the total number of employees in the Government service—all employees—in Washington and over the United States, exclusive of the military forces—was 301,000. In 1913 the number was 443,605. The World War came on, and the number grew by 1918 to 917,760. After the war it dropped again in 1923 to 515,772, and in 1930 was 580,494; and then, with the advent of the New Deal administration, it began to grow by leaps and bounds, and rose from 563,487 in 1933 to 945,826 in 1940.

The safety of the United States, the financial well-being of this Nation, and the security of the people's liberties, all demand that we reverse this trend toward an ever-increasing bureaucracy and more complex government and get back to a more simplified form of government, fewer tax eaters on the pay rolls, and more returns per dollar of salaries and expenses in government.

"Freedom and unity." If we are going to maintain political freedom in this country, we must maintain unity in the Republican Party after the convention at Philadelphia in June has decided who the candidates shall be. We must, every man and woman of us, put our shoulders to the wheel and work together with every ounce of energy we can summon to turn out of office this great New Deal bureaucracy which has plunged this Nation into debt to such a dreadful degree.

The campaign this year, my fellow Republicans, is not a campaign in which the Republican Party is merely seeking to recapture public office. It is a campaign to save this Nation from financial insolvency. It is a campaign to save this Nation from certain bankruptcy, which faces us if we continue along the road we are traveling now. It is a campaign to reestablish firmly the foundations of free constitutional government in this Nation.

Common sense and common logic tell us we cannot successfully defend, maintain, and perpetuate liberty, freedom, enlightenment, constitutional government, and American ideals by abandoning every tenet of liberty, freedom, enlightenment, and constitutional government at the first assault upon them.

The only way under God's blue sky we can successfully maintain freedom and Americanism in this country is to refuse to abandon under any circumstances the principles and the tenets of freedom and Americanism.

This Nation has come to a critical hour. The problems which confront us, the dangers which beset us, the temptations which surround us, all require that if we are to continue to be a free, constitutional Republic we must stand united as a people, above all sectionalism, all partisanship, all class suspicions, and hatreds. The motto of the dictator is "Divide and Rule." In country after country we have seen long-constituted governments swept away by those who, through their crafty and treacherous ways and means, divided and took over the rule of the government and the people.

We all realize, of course, that conditions of modern warfare necessitate absolute mobilization of entire populations. Such

would be the case in our own country if we became involved in a war. The very first act we would be required to perform in this free country of ours in event we were in a crisis due to the imminence of war would be to submit to the mobilization program which the administration has ready. That would mean—and mark you well what I am saying—that would mean the abolition of freedom and the extinction of personal liberty in the United States; the setting aside of constitutional government; and the absolute regimentation and mobilization of every man, woman and child in this Nation. When, if ever, we would return to free government would be highly problematical.

I said a while ago that we could not protect and maintain the liberties and the privileges and the freedom of Americanism by abandoning at the first crack of a gun, so to speak, all the principles and tenets of Americanism. Let me say to you that this is no time for this Nation to allow emotional surges to supplant logical thinking. We must face conditions as they are, realistically and rationally. There is nothing about world conditions today, and there is nothing about our domestic condition today that demands or requires or justifies any abandonment of our traditional two-party system of government. In times of stress like these there is always the tendency to cry down any criticisms. Let me say to you, my fellow citizens, that the surest and quickest way to mistakes and failure is to silence and penalize constructive criticism.

There is not one single reason why we Republicans should lower our voices, limit our words, or silence our protests against the extravagance, the waste, and the mistakes that have been made in the last 7 years. There is no reason why we should not urge that the Republican Party be given control of the House of Representatives and of the White House. I want to say to you that the record of broken promises, the record of contradictions, and the record of failures in the last 7½ years constitute the best argument today that the conduct of our national defense and the future affairs of this country should be turned back to Republican hands.

The great danger to this country is that we will become infected with a hysterical fear that in some way some great and invincible enemy is crashing at our doors or approaching our shores.

I want to recall to you what I think was the most profound statement of truth Franklin D. Roosevelt ever made in his life, and that was when he declared that "the thing we have most to fear is fear itself." I say to you and to this Nation today that in this hour the thing we have most to fear is fear itself—synthetic fear—manufactured to sway us against our better judgment and our reason.

Let us not forget that our course must be a peaceful one because any other course must be paid for, not alone in dollars but in the blood of our youth and the wordless agony of the hearts of the fathers and mothers of America.

So, then, let us go forward to next November conscious that we have done our duty as a minority party in criticizing fearlessly and constructively that which we felt merited criticism, and which we still believe merits criticism. Let us have the courage to continue to criticize constructively—not merely from a partisan standpoint but constructively—whatever deserves constructive criticism. Le us not be afraid to help put the brakes on emotionalism. Let us not be afraid to raise our voices and exercise our energies in keeping common sense and logic in control in America.

Let's keep on being Americans in the American way.

Field Mass, Arlington Cemetery, May 26, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

SERMON BY BISHOP JOHN F. O'HARA, C. S. C.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Bishop John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., at the field mass at Arlington Cemetery on Sunday, May 26, 1940:

"Cleave ye unto the Lord, your God, as you have done unto this day; and then the Lord God will take away before your eyes nations that are great and very strong, and no man shall be able to resist you * * * because the Lord, your God, Himself, will fight for you, as He hath promised. This only take care of with all diligence, that you love the Lord your God" (Joshua xxii: 8–11).

We have gathered here today in justice to honor the gallant dead, who have died that we might live, and in charity to beg of God a merciful judgment on all who shed their blood for their fellow men. We meet in peace to thank God for sparing us from war; we unite in common petition that by divine mercy brotherly love may be restored to all the children of God.

We meet on ground hallowed as the last earthly resting place of men who have offered themselves for the supreme sacrifice; and the form of our prayer is the sublime sacrifice of the mass, in which we offer to the Heavenly Father the divine victim who is the supreme exemplar of self-immolation.

Men who believe in God and in eternity have little difficulty in accepting the fact that there are things worse than war. If God is our Creator, and our last end, the greatest evil is whatever keeps us from God. If Heaven is our only true home, and death is the door through which we pass to that home, then death is a blessing—a blessing to all who are prepared to pass through that door. It is in this sense that the Holy Ghost spoke through the mouth of the wise man: "The souls of the just are in the hands of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them."

"In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, and their departure was taken for misery, and their going away from us for utter destruction; but they are at peace. And though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality" (Wisdom iii: 1–4).

Short of spiritual destruction, but grave in their temporal consequences, there are other evils worse than war. The dignity of the human person finds expression in temporal as well as spiritual ends, and liberty to attain worthy temporal ends is a right with which God has endowed our souls. Three such rights are enumerated in our Declaration of Independence; the rights to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. Other correlative rights are protected by our Constitution, and particularly by those amendments which we style "the Bill of Rights." These are rights given us by the natural law and defined by our charter of government, and we recognize the duty of our duly constituted authorities to defend these rights even by recourse to arms when all other means of defense prove fruitless.

Every civilized nation recognizes, in some form or other, the necessity of placing before its own people and before the world at large a just cause for any war in which it may engage. Every nation feels impelled to show, by white books or other documented apologies, that the impelling motives to war imply greater evils than war itself. In the emotional fever which accompanies the state of war it is difficult, often impossible, to pass impartial judgment on conflicting claims. It sometimes happens that centuries pass before there is anything like unanimous agreement on the morality of a particular war. We must leave to God the judgment of those who provoke unjust war, and we must in all charity restrain the temptation to judge harshly those who have borne arms under an unjust aggressor, for they may easily have been deceived in the heat of passion.

Here today, surrounded by the earthly remains of men who offered themselves in the supreme act of charity, here by the grave of a man whose identity is known only to God, but who gave his life in the belief that he was saving civilization from something worse than war, here in the shadow of the cross and the flag, symbols of our devotion to God and to country; here we may judge more calmly, we may plan dispassionately, and pray without rancor for the peace which the world cannot give. And in our prayers and our plans for the future of America let us have before our eyes and in our hearts the warning that Joshua gave to the people of Israel, "But if you will embrace the errors of these nations that dwell among you, and make marriages with them, and join friendships: Know ye for a certainty that the Lord your God will not destroy them before your face, but they shall be a pit and a snare in your way, and a stumbling block at your side, and stakes in your eyes, till he take you away and destroy you from off this excellent land, which he hath given you" (Joshua xxiii: 12–13).

I am afraid that in the heat of passion we have forgotten this prophecy and all that it implies. God warned the people of Israel that if they would embrace the errors of the nations about them, He would not destroy those nations, but would allow them to remain as a pit and a stumbling block in their path. The history of the world bears out this prophecy. Look down through the years, not only through the history of the people of Israel, but through all the history of Christendom, and you will find that nation after nation, after a conquest of its enemies, fell victim to new vices that it learned from the vanquished foe.

What error shall we avoid? Every error. Every false philosophy of life. And the all-pervading false philosophy of life that has thrown Europe into chaos today is the philosophy of materialism. It is the philosophy of those who place all paradise here on earth. It is the philosophy of those who see only the material want of the moment, which they would satisfy to the detriment of the immortal soul. It is the philosophy of those who are depriving our Nation of millions of babies each year, while the purchasing power of the farmer is destroyed because there are not enough mouths to feed. It is the philosophy of those who would educate children in all that affects their physical and economic well-being, but deprive them of all knowledge of God and of eternal life. It is the philosophy of all who exclude God from human calculations.

This false philosophy was not in the minds of our forefathers when they founded this country; it is not the mind of our State and National Governments today. But it is a "fifth column" philosophy that has affected American life to a dangerous extent, and we cannot ignore its existence.

Here in the green hills of this noble State of Virginia, on soil hallowed by the blood of brothers in blue and gray, who died for principles which they saw as right, it seems not inappropriate to recall that in the darkest days of that tragic War between the States, the Government of the Confederate States of America thought it proper to send a high commissioner to the court of His Holiness Pope Pius IX to plead the morality of the cause of the Confederacy. The commissioner chosen was Bishop Patrick M. Lynch, of Charleston, S. C. His commission was signed by the Honorable Jefferson M. Davis, President of the Confederate States of America. His letter of instructions from the Honorable J. P. Benjamin, Secretary of State, has been preserved to us. It is a beautiful document, and I hope I may be pardoned if I quote from it somewhat at length.

After complimenting Bishop Lynch on the high appreciation of his character and ability which President Davis has shown by entrusting him with a mission so delicate and important, Secretary Benjamin goes on to say:

"The recent correspondence between the President and His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff Pius IX, of which a copy accompanies these instructions, was, as you will perceive, not political in its nature, but it exhibited in a striking manner the very benevolent character of His Holiness, his earnest desire for the restoration of peace on this continent, and his readiness to do whatever can be properly done by him as head of the Catholic Church to promote so desirable a result. The spontaneous action of His Holiness in addressing an exhortation to this effect to two of the highest dignitaries of the church, North and South, elicted from the President the expression of the feelings excited not only in him, but among all the people of the Confederacy, by so striking a manifestation of Christian charity and benevolence.

"It has seemed proper to the President that in further testimonial of the cordial sentiments entertained toward the Sovereign Pontiff and of respect for his character and eminent position, a Commissioner should be sent to reside near the court of the Vatican for inaugurating such political relations as may be suitable under the circumstances in which the Confederacy is placed. He knows no person to whom this duty could be entrusted that would probably be received by His Holiness with greater satisfaction than yourself. It is scarcely necessary to explain that by a policy as unprecedented as we believe it to be unjust the great powers of Europe have hitherto declined to recognize the unimpeachable title of this Government to admission into the family of nations; nor would there be any utility in entering into discussion of the reasons by which this denial of our rights is justified in the opinion of those powers. It must suffice to say that we can under no circumstances admit in our relation with foreign governments, either expressly or by any implication, however remote, that the Confederacy stands on any footing other than that of perfect equality with all other nations, and especially with the enemies who are now waging a war of invasion for the subversion of its right and independence.

"While maintaining this position, however, we would be scarcely justified in expecting that the cabinet of the Vatican should assume the responsibility of being the first to recognize our independence and thus to cast a seeming censure on the Great Powers which control the general policy of Europe on this question. To make a formal demand for our recognition by His Holiness would therefore seem to be ungracious and inconsistent with the friendly feelings which prompt this mission. The President is consequently unwilling to instruct you to pursue any course which would compel His Holiness, however well disposed, to decline acquiescing in our claim, in order to avoid injuriously affecting his relations with other powers. The honor and interest of our own country is, however, paramount to all other considerations.

"It will be your delicate task to keep in view the great advantage which would accrue to our cause by the formal recognition of this Government by the Sovereign Pontiff, and the establishment with him of the usual diplomatic intercourse. If an occasion be presented which in your judgment offers a reasonable prospect of the successful issue of such a step, the President expects that you will not fail to avail yourself of the opportunity. If, on the contrary, you become satisfied that the result would be unfavorable, you will content yourself with the maintenance of those informal relations which are usual in the case of a government not yet formally recognized. It is rather to the indirect than the direct effects of your misison that we are disposed to look for fruitful results. Combining, as you will, the advantages of eminent ecclesiastical and political position; located, as you will be, in the center from which radiates the influence of the Holy See; brought, as you must necessarily be, into immediate contact with not only those who control the policy of the states of the church, but with the trusted representatives of all the Catholic powers of Europe—opportunities will be afforded for enlightening opinions and molding impressions of which the President is confident you will avail yourself with signal benefit to the cause of our country. The errors prevalent in Europe in regard to this people and the struggle in which they are engaged, the unfounded prejudices and false impressions which have been industriously created and fostered by our enemies constitute weapons against which we are more helpless than against invading armies."

Thus far the letter of Secretary Benjamin. Its further comments you may read, if you will, in the published Messages and Papers of the Confederacy. The scars of that conflict have healed, and brothers of both North and South are united in bonds of esteem and affection to work out a common destiny in fear and love of God. For myself, I like to think that the beginning of that harmonious spirit of cooperation began at Gettysburg in the afternoon of July 2, 1863, when Father William Corby, then chaplain of the Irish Brigade, and later president of the University of Notre Dame, gave general absolution to all the men before going into the charge of the peach orchard. It is probably the first time that this happened in the United States of America.

Major General Mulholland described the scene as follows:

"Father Corby stood on a large rock in front of the brigade. Addressing the men, he explained what he was about to do, saying that each one could receive the benefit of the absolution by making a sincere act of contrition and firmly resolving to embrace the first opportunity of confessing his sins, urging them to do their duty, and reminding them of the high and sacred nature of their trust as soldiers and the noble object for which they fought. * * * The brigade was standing at 'Order arms.' As he closed his address, every man, Catholic and non-Catholic, fell on his knees with his head bowed down. Then, stretching his right hand toward the brigade, Father Corby pronounced the words of the absolution:

"'* * * ego absolvo vos, a peccatis vestris, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritui Sancti, Amen.'"

In describing this ceremony years later, Father Corby stated that the general absolution was intended for all, not only for the Irish Brigade, but for all, North or South, who were susceptible of it, who were about to appear before their Judge. Then he added: "Let us hope that many thousands of souls, purified by hardships, fasting, prayer, and blood met a favorable sentence on the ever memorable battlefield of Gettysburg."

We must be as charitable today. We must leave judgment to God—judgment, that is, of all save ourselves. Our hearts must be pure, our hearts clean, for these men who lie here bequeathed our Nation to men of pure hearts, and to men of clean hands.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. MOUTOUX

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a short article appearing in the Knoxville News Sentinel of Sunday, May 26, written by its Washington staff representative, John T. Moutoux, who is a capable and well-qualified reporter and columnist:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News Sentinel of May 26, 1940]

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT F. D. R. DEFENSE WORK; CAN G. O. P. CRITICIZE?

(By John T. Moutoux)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Certainly the frightful news from Europe this week demonstrated the need of a first-class air force in modern war, or for defense.

Immediately Americans ask: Do we have such an air force? If not, why not?

Last week I showed in this column how more than 2 years ago President Roosevelt asked Congress to authorize a naval expansion program, and how his request was ridiculed by such Republicans as Senator VANDENBERG, who referred to it as "a super, super Navy," and by the late J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee, who asked the need for this "super, gigantic Navy."

This week I want to refresh our memories on another phase of our defense program—strengthening our air force. Let us see what the President did about it, and how some of the Republican leaders in Congress reacted to his request.

IN A SPECIAL MESSAGE

On January 12, 1939, President Roosevelt sent a special message to Congress. I wish there were room here to print the whole message, because it shows with what remarkable foresight the President anticipated the situation now confronting us and the world. But I will cite excerpts, as follows:

"In my annual message to this Congress I have spoken at some length of the changing world conditions outside the American Hemisphere which makes it imperative that we should take immediate steps for the protection of our liberties. * * *

"Careful examination of the most imperative present needs leads me to recommend the appropriation at this session of Congress, with as great speed as possible, of approximately $525,000,000. * * *

"The survey indicates that of this sum approximately $450,000,000 should be allocated for new needs of the Army, $65,000,000 for new needs of the Navy, and $10,000,000 for training of civilian air pilots. * * *

"In the case of the Army, information from other nations leads us to believe that there must be a complete revision of our estimates for aircraft. * * *

"Military aviation is increasing today at an unprecedented and alarming rate. Increased range, increased speed, increased capacity of airplanes abroad have changed our requirements for defense aviation."

The President suggested that the bulk of the fund recommended be used for the purchase of new planes for the Army and the Navy and that the balance, some $110,000,000, be used for the purchase of "critical items" of equipment, including tanks, antitank guns, antiaircraft artillery.

The President said he considered his recommendations "a minimum program for the necessities of defense," and he closed by asking "quick action on this emergency program."

WHAT MR. FISH SAID

Let us see what Mr. HAMILTON FISH, ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, thought of the President's request. He expressed his views over the Mutual Broadcasting System on January 19, 1939, exactly a week after the President had sent his message to Congress. I can quote only excerpts.

Mr. FISH began:

"What I intend to say this evening may not be approved or appreciated by New Deal warmongers, hysterical internationalists, war profiteers, superpatriots, and Communists, who are all hellbent on arming the United States to the teeth for the purpose of acting as a policeman for the entire world.

"The contention that this country is in danger of foreign attack is sheer political bunk. It aims to deceive the people into supporting a huge armament program in the guise of national defense, which in reality is nothing but a smoke screen to obscure the depression and economic failures of the New Deal."

Although a number of Republicans are now criticizing the President for wasting and squandering millions of dollars on W. P. A. and other relief agencies instead of using the money to build up our national defense, some of the Administration's critics did not feel that way about it even a year ago. Mr. FISH, for example.

"I feel strongly," he said, "that in the midst of a depression with 12,000,000 unemployed, it is not sound policy or logical to cut down relief for our destitute on the one hand and spend billions for superarmaments and destructive purposes on the other * * *."

Later in his speech Representative FISH said: "I challenge President Roosevelt to tell the American people what nation or nations has the faintest idea or capacity to attack or invade the United States. * * *

"The President asks for 8,500 airplanes. Against whom are they to be used? * * *"

NOT A MAJORITY

Mr. FISH, it should be added, did not represent a majority of the Republicans in the House. As a matter of fact, the Republicans in the House held a caucus just before a bill was brought to the House embodying the recommendations of the President. At that caucus a majority agreed on a statement which set out their views—the official views of the Republicans in the House.

That statement, presented to the House by Representative JAMES WADSWORTH, of New York, expressed concurrence in all parts of the program recommended by the President except the rate at which the air force was to be built up. The President had recommended that the Army air force be built up to 6,000 planes as rapidly as possible. The Republicans thought it would be better to spread out the plane-building program over 3 to 4 years. They gave two reasons for their position—the planes would be less likely to become obsolete, and the "financial strain" would be lessened.

The last paragraph of that Republican report is especially interesting at this time, in view of the charges now being made by many Republicans that the President neglected this country's national defense. (For instance, Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the finance committee of the Republican National Committee, said in New York this week that the President had left this country as unprepared against invasion as Finland or Norway.)

This is the concluding paragraph of the Republican caucus' report: "In any event, with an Army Air Corps at a maximum strength of 5,500, with additional Army personnel trained for its operation, coupled with a naval air force approximating 3,000 planes, we believe the air defense of our country will be adequate."

TWO DAYS' DEBATE

After 2 days of debate the Republican amendment to limit the number of new planes to 1,000 a year was defeated 136 to 183. The RECORD does not show a recorded vote, but it is fair to assume that the 136 who voted for the amendment were largely Republicans.

Later that same day the bill was passed by an overwhelming majority.

HOW VOTE WENT

When the bill reached the Senate it was opposed by the isolationists—Nye and Borah among the Republicans and Clark of Missouri among the Democrats. There were others, of course, but the trio just named led the fight which consumed almost 2 weeks.

Much of the time was consumed assailing the President for permitting the sale of American planes to the French. In fact, the discovery that a French mission was in this country buying American planes created quite a scandal for a while. I imagine that most people in this country now wish that the French had started buying American planes a whole lot earlier—and had bought more of them. And I doubt if there are many in this country who would now attack the President for permitting sale of the planes to the French.

The President's foreign policy also came in for heavy attack, the charge being that the President wanted to police the world.

However, when the vote came only eight voted against the bill. Not even all of the isolationists voted against it.

And so the President's program for expanding the country's air force got under way. The President started it; the Democrats, or most of them, backed him; and a majority of the Republicans went along.

NOTE.—Despite Mr. FISH's attack on the President's air force expansion program, the New York Republican on Monday of this week said on the floor of the House:

"Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the country have been acclaiming President Roosevelt for his appeal for additional funds for national defense, particularly as applied to our Army. The President has been in office for 7 years, and the European war had been going on for 9 months before the Commander in Chief discovered the deplorable conditions of the Army for purposes of defense. Instead of praising the President, he should be condemned for permitting this condition to develop."

Army Promotion System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON AND ROBERT S. ALLEN

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely article from the Washington Merry-Go-Round by Messrs. Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, appearing in today's Times-Herald:

Real secret of the Army's stagnation is the promotion system. It is based entirely upon the time when a man walked into a recruiting office during the last war, or graduated from West Point. The whole basis for promotion is length of service.

An officer may be the most brilliant youngster in the Army, or the laziest. It makes no difference. He keeps his rank until a sufficient number ahead of him die off. Then he is promoted.

The effect of this on Army morale is devastating. There is no premium on efficiency. There is no impetus for outstanding ability. Every officer knows that if he keeps reasonably sober, is not absent without leave, keeps his company accounts straight, and lives long enough, a certain number of years will see him promoted. If he works harder he will not be promoted faster. If he tries to work out new plans for mechanization and motorization it will not hasten his advancement one iota. He merely has to wait.

It is this system of promotion by inertia that has contributed so materially to the present somnolent state of our military defense. And building a billion-dollar edifice of national defense upon the faulty foundation of personnel inefficiency is like throwing good money after bad.

The Army has some superb officers—in fact, some of the finest in the world—and if given free rein they could build up a real national defense. But they are bogged down and sapped by the system that surrounds them.

What the United States Army needs is a surgical personnel operation, not the mollycoddle bill in Congress, which merely retires colonels who have reached the age of 60.

Reply to Former President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address

delivered by The Assistant Secretary of War, Hon. Louis Johnson, on May 28, 1940, in reply to former President Hoover.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to report tonight to the American people on the status of our American defense plans which are of such vital importance in this crucial period of world affairs. I have two purposes in mind: First, to give an honest summary of the military situation as it now exists; second, to clear up some of the misconceptions that may have arisen as a result of former President Herbert Hoover's radio talk on national defense last night.

We realize that this is no time for party bickering or partisan considerations. In Boston in November 1938, in launching the President's armament program, I said, "There are two things, in my opinion, that transcend party politics—the first is foreign affairs; and the second, national defense." From the very first President Roosevelt and the War and Navy Departments have directed their energies to lifting the grave problem of defense above political or partisan considerations. It is not our pupose to say that any party or any individual is responsible for any shortcomings that may exist in the defense program. The sole object is to bring a united Nation behind the Government's plan to provide adequately for any emergency that may arise. First, however, I think it is fair to clear up the record on Mr. Hoover's speech. The former President was originally scheduled to speak over this national network early Sunday night. After it was announced that President Roosevelt was to address the Nation later that night Mr. Hoover's talk was postponed. Obviously, this was done in order that he might have an opportunity to reply to President Roosevelt, although the Chief Executive in no sense intended his talk to the people to be a partisan effort.

Mr. Hoover's speech was a reply to the President. The New York Times of today carried a report on page 19, the headlines of which said:

"Hoover Denounces Arms Board Plan * * * Single Expert Must Control Munitions Making, He Says in Reply to Roosevelt." On the next page, the Times printed a speech by a prominent candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination. He demanded that we immediately establish a nonpartisan national defense board to plan and direct our program of rearmament.

From these conflicting advices, the need for coordination between the Republican spokesmen seems much greater than is the need for any coordination of the defense activities of the Government. These, I assure you, are proceeding along lines as planned and coordination in the defense program is proceeding on a most efficient basis.

We are facing today a definite challenge to our security. National defense is at the crossroads. It is heading in the right direction. The road is long and the going may be rough. We must travel it at the maximum speed compatible with safety and efficiency and we must see to it that it remains true to the course of adequate preparedness. We must assure ourselves that at the end we will find an America ready to meet any military crisis; an America so well prepared on land, on sea, and in the air that no prudent enemy will be tempted to attack us, and that no reckless foe will be in a position to defeat us.

Our work is cut out for us. We must mobilize our thoughts and our energies behind the President's national-defense program. It is nonpartisan in its nature and has the overwhelming support of the political leaders and the rank and file of both parties. It is practical and capable of achievement.

If we had launched such a program in the fall of 1938, immediately after the so-called Munich appeasement, which forebode the world situation of today, its objectives would have been nearer to realization at this time. Unfortunately, however, most Americans at that time were not awake to the dangers to us that lay dormant in the volatile European situation. They were annoyed at the disturbance of international peace in Europe, but they were not aroused to its possible repercussions.

For instance, whenever the President tried to call the attention of America to the impending catastrophe overseas, cries of "alarmist" and "warmonger" greeted his remarks in the press and on the radio. When he called a conference of influential leaders to the White House to give them the benefit of the information he had gained from experts, some in the group intimated that they had more reliable information that pointed otherwise. When he talked of quarantine, there were some who blatantly charged that the President was leading us to war.

When it was patent to every student of military science that the war in Europe threatened the very foundations of Great Britain and France, our former President, Herbert Hoover, tried to allay the fears of America by assuring us that they could not possibly lose. I quote from an interview given by Mr. Hoover to Mr. Roy W. Howard, editor of the New York World-Telegram on October 3, 1939:

"The war is only a month old. But the major factors are already emerging. The British and French can, and will, control the seven seas despite submarines and airplanes, and can sit there until their enemies are exhausted. By their sea power the Allies can protect England and all the outlying possessions of both empires from invasion. Their manpower can defend France unless they blunder into taking wild adventures in military offensives and exhaust their manpower. Aerial warfare may be destructive, but that works both ways and, so far as all experience goes, is not conclusive of any war."

I continue to quote Mr. Hoover:

"If one surveys the whole front—sea, land, air, and economic resources—I am convinced the Allies can defend their empires. The end may be victory for them. At worst, it might be stalemate. I do not see any possibility that it can be defeat."

Tonight, this analysis of the situation seems curiously unreal in the light of news from abroad that the King of Belgium has capitulated.

Nowhere in this interview did Mr. Hoover urge national defense. On the contrary, its very tone and spirit encouraged Americans to feel that we were not concerned with the war overseas.

On October 20, 1939, Mr. Hoover made a speech in which he vigorously defended his neutrality plan, calling for prohibition on the sale of offensive weapons to the warring nations, including the sale of bombing planes, their ammunition, and submarines. He said only defensive weapons and not offensive weapons should be sold to the belligerents. This was another unreal and perhaps tragic misconception of the war in Europe. Moreover, the distinction between offensive and defensive weapons is so tenuous that no military man would have dared draw such fine lines.

National defense has always been a cardinal principle in the Democratic program; the basic law of self-preservation as laid down by society since time immemorial and as emphasized by our Constitution, we have made every effort to obey.

From 1922 to 1933 many of our citizens naively believed that if only we would disarm the rest of the world would follow. They honestly thought that if only we gave up our Army and our Navy, international peace would prove inevitable.

Well, the United States did disarm. Our Army was skeletonized. Our Navy was reduced to a level within the reason of other nations. The rest of the world, however, merely gave lip service to our impracticable idealism and continued to build up their armed forces. In the terms of the solemn treaty that they had signed, they found loopholes which enabled them to defeat its clearly defined purposes.

Our responsible leaders knew, or should have known, that our idealistic gesture of disarmament was proving itself unilateral, yet they did nothing to awaken America to its dangers. They offered no concrete program to strengthen our national defense. Far worse, they kept right on reducing our Army and weakening our Navy, and pointing with pride to their saving of a few pennies here and there. At the direct order of President Hoover the Marine Corps became but a shadow of defense. Saving, indeed, at the expense of national insurance.

Consider for a moment to what a low state of readiness our Army and Navy had been reduced by March 4, 1933, when President Roosevelt came into office.

Our Navy, in 1922 the mistress of the seas, had been scuttled. While other nations that had signed the Washington Treaty of that year for the limitation of naval armaments complied only to the extent of tearing up blue prints, we junked, scrapped, and actually sank men-of-war. As a gesture toward international peace, our Government in one fell swoop destroyed three-quarter million tons of ships that had cost us more than $150,000,000; and, as if that were not enough of a sacrifice, this country gave up another 175,000 tons in 1930 as a result of the London Treaty. We had the right, under our treaty promises, to keep up our Navy on a 5–5–3 ratio, but we did not do that.

On land and in the air we fared even worse. With the armistice began the unilateral disarmament of our Army. Our American Expeditionary Forces, the strongest military machine that has probably ever been assembled in the history of men, we proceeded methodically to break up. Our overseas veterans we immediately brought home. Our soldiers we quickly demobilized. Our reserves of munitions we practically gave away to our Allies. Our standing Army we continually reduced until it became but a shadow of its former self. Instead of a force of several million, most of them ready for battle, we were left, by 1933, with a few loyal legions of Regulars numbering less than 125,000, hardly strong enough to perform routine interior guard duty; and these, in turn, were scattered all over the United States and our foreign possessions. Joint or large-scale maneuvers were impractical and hardly possible.

Furthermore our soldiers trained with arms that were outmoded. They used equipment that, if not obsolete, at least was obsolescent. While foreign armies were motorizing and mechanizing we stuck to the horse and the mule. We had planes which as models were perhaps the best in the world, but in such small quantities that in an emergency their influence could hardly be felt. Our troops lived in dilapidated wartime barracks. Our officers were housed in converted warehouses and reconditioned stables.

True to its fine traditions, however, our Army never lost its spirit, but what a strain our wealthy American Government had placed upon the shoulders of these loyal defenders of our country.

The state of civilian readiness for cooperation with the Army in industrial mobilization showed similar deficiencies. The Army had a plan, and basically it was a good plan, but, so far as the American public was concerned, it was little known and less understood. In criticizing it misguided pacifists and mischievous malefactors were conjuring up a picture of a monstrous military leviathan bent on swallowing up the traditional capitalistic system of America. Nothing could have been further from the truth, but very little was done to correct that false impression.

Then came the election of 1932. The Democratic Party was returned to power. At once the picture changed. First, President

Roosevelt showed his confidence in our armed forces by giving them a remarkable opportunity to prove the value of their services to the American people not only as a factor in war but as a useful asset in peace. He assigned the Army to the job of assembling, transporting, organizing, and equipping the young men of the Civilian Conservation Corps, hundreds of thousands in number—and what a job it did.

No single service of our armed forces in time of peace has done more to enhance the prestige of the Army, and the Navy, too, for it also helped, than the mobilization of the Civilian Conservation Corps in its early days. Our officers, while being trained, proved themselves not only highly efficient but deeply sympathetic, kindly, and understanding.

The President next turned to the Navy. With its problems, he was especially familiar. During the World War he had served it faithfully and honorably. He had realized that unilateral disarmament had failed and set out to awaken America to its needs on the sea. Results immediately followed.

Under his leadership, Congress, in 1934, provided for the building of a Navy up to the limits established by the Washington Conference and the London Treaty, and every succeeding session of Congress has taken further steps toward the strengthening and the improvement of our sea forces. We are building a Navy that should prove second to none and fully capable of protecting our interests on the sea in the present storm-tossed world.

Under President Roosevelt, our Army gained a new lease on life. It began to modernize, to motorize, and to mechanize. We added officers and enlisted men. We strengthened our National Guard. We trained more Reserve officers. We added R. O. T. C. units. We laid the foundations for an air corps that can defend this continent against attack. We built modern barracks. We arranged large-scale maneuvers. In short, we gave moral and material support to the Army and brought it up to a high state of efficiency.

With industry, relations have improved immeasurably since 1933. Never before in the history of our country has there been a keener appreciation of the respective roles in time of an emergency of our armed forces and of industry.

The American businessman knows now quite clearly that there is no intent nor desire on the part of the Army to interfere in the slightest degree with his enterprise at any time during peace or war. He, the Army, and the Navy understand each other and trust each other. That spirit of cooperation that has been nurtured in the last few years may save us days, weeks, and perhaps months in time of emergency, and, what is even more important, the lives of many of our citizens.

Time and again, in the past 3 years, I have had occasion to discuss with the President of the United States the contributions of American industry to our national-defense program. When I told him of my plan to acknowledge these contributions at a national industrial preparedness dinner in New York on April 5, 1939, he enthusiastically applauded and urged me in these words to convey his message to those at the dinner:

"That's fine," he said. "Add these words for me. In the revival of the spirit of national defense, industry is playing a leading and vital role. I am conscious of its loyalty. I appreciate its cooperative efforts. Its patriotic services I commend as an example of good and useful citizenship."

Industry accepted the President's statement in that very spirit. Industry has cooperated in every way. Industry will achieve for us our armament program in the typical American way.

The program for the cooperation with industry in an emergency has been worked out by our armed forces with the cooperation of management and labor. It is described in a pamphlet known as the Industrialization Mobilization Plan, Revision of 1939. It calls for the effective and equitable utilization of industrial resources in time of war. Perhaps Mr. Hoover had this plan in mind when he advocated an individual administrator, or perhaps it is a mere coincidence that he made such a proposal.

But, mark you, we are not at war. There is no need for setting up any machinery to manage our armament program when we have well-established agencies competent to do the job. We are arming in accordance with our well-established principle of peace. Our armament program industry can well absorb without drastic or revolutionary changes.

America has achieved many improvements to national defense under the leadership of President Roosevelt. I do not intend to imply that our problems are solved and that we are prepared to meet any crisis.

I now return to what I said at Boston: "There are two things, in my opinion, that transcend party politics; the first is foreign affairs and the second national defense," and, for my part, I hope partisanship in national defense is at an end.

It is time to quit talking politics. There is work ahead. The air has been cleared. Let us get down to business and get our defenses in shape. The Roosevelt administration will carry out our national-defense program free from politics and partisanship and only in the interests of national security. We will take every worth-while suggestion from every responsible person which will help toward the realization of this objective. We have one supreme goal—the safety of the United States and the security of the American people, which united we shall achieve in the minimum of time.

The Government's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I made last night on "The Government's Responsibility."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A modern Samson is bent on wrecking the temple of civilization. If he succeeds, it will wreck him as it did the biblical destroyer. At such a time our domestic problems fade and our eyes are upon the deadly struggles across the seas.

There are almost 2,000,000,000 people in the world. Over one and one-half billion of them are at war. We are the only important ccuntry in the world that is not at war, on the brink of war, or just emerging from it. Can we avoid being engulfed? I know it is the steadfast purpose of the President and the Congress to prevent it.

I speak to you tonight from the standpoint of one whose mind has been changed by the march of events. I have not heretofore been entirely favorable to large military appropriations. I think that my views were the views of many millions of our people. The change has not come easily or swiftly. I am not an extremist on the subject. I do not believe it is likely, even if the German ruler is finally successful in defeating France and England, that he will turn to America. It is often said here that the Atlantic Ocean is not as wide as it once was. This, of course, in point of time is true, but it is still much wider than the Rhine or the English Channel. It still is and for many years will be a tremendous barrier, a protection to our America.

The German ruler has not yet conquered England and France. He may never do so. But should he do so, the sheer physical exhaustion of his armies, of his people, the exhaustion of his resources, I think it reasonable to say, would make it difficult for even his mind to contemplate the successful invasion of this country. It must be remembered that we are a nation of 130,000,000 people. There are doubtless traitors in our midst. There would doubtless be alien activity here in the event of war, but I believe that democracy, the best government yet devised by the mind of man, has so satisfied the mass of our people that any subversive group that would try to rise and injure us would not last long.

It must be remembered that a greedy-eyed conquerer who looks our way would see the Nation with the greatest industrial power in the world. If he can build powerful tanks, we can build better ones. If he can pile up munitions by the thousand tons, we can pile them up by the 10,000 tons. This Nation, to a greater extent than any other nation of size, is a self-contained economic unit. I say I am sure that these considerations and others that will occur to you would cause him to pause. Invasion of the United States without nearby bases and without a navy much stronger than any that could now be brought together would be required to give even some credence, some hope of success to a successful, dominant nation across the Atlantic or Pacific. These are all considerations that would appeal to a reasonably minded European ruler.

But I want to reason tonight particularly with those who feel that perhaps we are going too far and too fast in the new effort to arm ourselves. Expressed in the language of the sporting world, in my judgment, the chances are a 100 to 1 against invasion or attack. But, my fellow Americans, we cannot take that remote chance. Many of us had thought that civilization had advanced to the point where the international good will that we have been endeavoring to build up influenced the people and rulers of the world, but the events of the last 9 months have driven from my mind the last vestige of that hope. If the United States escapes invasion, it will not be because the German conquerer does not want to invade us. It will be because he does not dare invade us. In other words, it is not our good will, not our reputation for fair dealing, not our let alone and let live policy, but our brute force, our tremendous power that will deter the sinister military leaders of modern Germany.

Therefore, as one who thinks and has thought, as I believe the majority of Americans have, I give the reasons why and how I and many others here have arrived at the conclusion that we must arm ourselves to the point of impregnability. I do this because I believe my mental processes and those of the average American are the same. Therefore, I support the President's program.

There has been much said in the public press and over the radio about the present condition of the defenses of the United States. In my judgment, there has been gross exaggeration of our alleged deficiency. There has been gross underestimation of our defensive power. It is commonly charged that during the past 10 years we have expended $7,000,000,000 on defense, and the question is asked, Why has this not prepared us? A recent newspaper article which, judging by my mail, has had large circulation, in effect charges that this $7,000,000,000 has been spent and has done no good. It has been so stated in recent radio speeches. I cannot take the time tonight to give you the whole picture. I can speak briefly of our first line of defense—the Navy.

Out of this $7,000,000,000, approximately four and one-half billion has been expended for the Navy. If those who make these wild charges had made any investigation whatsoever they would have discovered that approximately three billion of this four and one-half billion was the regular maintenance and upkeep money—wages, coal, fuel oil, etc.—appropriated in part each year for the regular expense of the Navy. One and one-half billion, in round figures, was for new construction. During the 10-year period just closed this money has been used for the purpose of increasing the number and power of our ships.

We have added a grand total of 138 ships to our Navy consisting of 4 aircraft carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 9 light cruisers, 73 destroyers, 32 submarines, and 2 gunboats. In addition thereto, 7 auxiliary naval vessels, repair ships, etc., and in further addition thereto, two 35,000-ton battleships which will be completed and commissioned next month. In addition to this, there are 8 battleships under construction, including two 45,000-ton ships, 1 aircraft carrier, 6 light cruisers, 24 destroyers, 13 submarines, 12 auxiliary vessels, and others sufficient to make a grand total under construction of 77.

According to the latest figures available, the United States has a total of 369 ships in its Navy with 77 building. Great Britain has 328 with 81 building, France has 176 with 65 building, Italy has 315 with 55 building, Japan 254 with 22 building. The German Navy is weak. We have more battleships than any other nation in the world. We have more heavy cruisers than any nation in the world. We have more destroyers than any nation in the world. Let us not reach the conclusion either that our money has been wasted or that we are weak in sea power.

Our weakness is in air power. We have many airships but are behind other powerful nations. Here the airplane was developed. It is probably fortunate that we did not build up a great fleet, because modern warfare has demonstrated that new armor, great speed, greater safety, such, for example, as the rubber self-sealing fuel tanks, has made the plane we would have built yesterday obsolete. We can now build with the experience of the present to aid us. This program is the one that we now embark on under the leadership of a great President with the support of all our people. I favor the immediate airplane-construction program. It is now our greater weakness. Shortly we will match any nation in the world. Our peculiar genius, our technical ability, our industrial machine that can turn out 3,000,000 cars per year, is surely well adapted to turn out 50,000 planes. Here is where we must, with all speed consistent with efficiency, devote our time and money. That is just what we now propose to do.

Our Army is small but efficient. The recent appropriations made will provide adequate air power and will greatly increase the personnel and efficiency of our Army.

The one real danger that I can see to our country is not an enemy attack from an exhausted Germany, if successful in the present struggle. It is more likely to be penetration through their nefarious methods in some of the nations in the Western Hemisphere. For this we have precious time. But this is not the only defense. The trade policy of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull with our neighbors to the south and our neighbors to the north—the good-neighbor policy—now stands out in full relief as one of our best defenses. We must continue to cultivate friendship with the Central and South American republics and with Canada to the north, not only because it is right to do so, not only because in the end the good-neighbor policy will improve our trade, but because the Americas can then present an impregnable front to military power or the sinister "fifth column" of which we now hear so much.

There is no hysteria in Washington. There will be no wasteful, careless, planless construction of war defenses. Based on our knowledge of the new weapons now being used in the World War with the advice and counsel of our industrial leaders, with the knowledge that we have a reasonable amount of time, our defense program will go forward and I would give what assurance one Senator can that if the remote chance is taken and a victorious Hitler should attempt to take us, America will be ready. The Government is meeting its responsibility.

One of the most difficult tasks of my legislative career is to vote to spend these large sums for armaments. We Americans could not bring ourselves to believe that this terrible destruction of human life, of property, and of the morale of civilization could come. I confidently believe that it will not come to our shores. There are so many needs for which this armament money could be spent—education, housing, clearance of slums, peaceful industrial development, relief—all are far more appealing to me and I would be far happier to expend these billions upon them, but a war-mad man with the most tremendous destructive power that modern industry has so far constructed is loose, bent upon tearing down this civilization of ours. I cannot believe that it will eventually succeed. This is a time that discourages men's souls. As we view the smoke and flame and carnage of war, as we see the pictures of dead women and children, as we hear the story of refugees machine-gunned to death, we indeed feel that civilization has failed. But we must have hope. We do have hope.

If the history of warfare, carnage, and conquerors teaches anything, it is this: Rulers may come and go, but peoples live on. Austria, Poland, the Czechs, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium are now overrun. It will not long be so. A victor with gun in hand cannot forever hold a people in subjection. The upsurge of civilization may seem stifled. It will not be so for long. One who fights religion and morality, the church, and the human conscience is lost when he chooses these foemen. Let him remember: He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword. Let him recall the story of the human scourges of the past—the great conqueror of the nineteenth century died a military prisoner on a lonely rock in the South Atlantic. The Roman conqueror was assassinated by his friends. Neither built an impregnable empire on the wreckage of conquered states. Have we reason to believe that fate will be less kind to modern civilization?

We are determined that we shall not suffer as have others. God has given us the power to resist. We will use it. So, my fellow countrymen, I bring you from the Capital this message: Your America will be ready. Your Government is accepting its responsibility.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY AND LETTERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most able address delivered by our Postmaster General, Hon. James A. Farley, in my home city of Asheville, N. C., on last Monday, May 27, at the annual convention of the North Carolina Chapter, National Association of Postmasters.

I further ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. J. R. Teague, president of the North Carolina Chapter, National Association of Postmasters, by my distinguished colleague, Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, under date of May 23, and likewise a telegram by me under date of May 27 to President Teague, which letter and telegram make mention of Postmaster General Farley's visit to our home State of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the address and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 23, 1940.

Mr. J. R. TEAGUE,
Henderson, N. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Thank you for your letter.

It is not likely that I will be able to attend the convention, which I very greatly regret. Let me send you a message of greeting to all present and assurances of my good wishes, and let me also say a word for Postmaster General Farley.

Eight years ago Mr. Farley was little known to our people. In these 8 years he has become one of the best known men in the United States, and he has been put to every test. It seems to me that he has stood those tests in an amazing way. He has grown greater in the estimation of our people day by day. He has come out of every trial a bigger man, and I question whether he has ever met any American citizen without making the impression upon him of being a man of high character, great good will, and of the highest degree of personal poise. He was once classified as a politician and a political manager. It is usually difficult to outgrow this classification, but Mr. Farley has outgrown it. He is a great figure in our land in whom everyone has confidence.

If you will read this to the convention, or have the introductory speaker to read it when he presents Mr. Farley, I shall feel highly honored.

With all good wishes,
Very truly yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY.

May 27, 1940.

Hon. JACK TEAGUE,
President, North Carolina Postmasters' Association,
Vanderbilt Hotel, Asheville, N. C.

I shall greatly appreciate your expressing to those in attendance upon your convention today my sincere and genuine regrets that I shall not be able to be with you and associates when our Postmaster General, Hon. James Farley, will address you, because nothing would provide me with greater pleasure than being with you all today. Particularly am I sincerely regretful that on account of urgent governmental matters requiring my attention in Senate at noon today I shall not be able to fulfill my earnest desire as per previous plans to introduce Postmaster General Farley, which invitation was so kindly extended by you. May I say that our Postmaster General is unquestionably one of the finest characters I have ever known. At all times he radiates the expression of friendship toward his fellow man and of all the years I have known him I have never heard him say an unkind word about anyone regardless of who they are. That I believe is one of the highest tributes that could be paid to any human being. His tolerance, his benevolence, his Americanism, are such as might serve as standard by which American people could well be guided in view of his sterling qualities. His unselfish attitude in all respects and his untiring efforts for upbuilding and development of our beloved America. Regards.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

It is a pleasure to be here today with the North Carolina chapter of the National Association of Postmasters. North Carolina is a great State. In business, industry, and agriculture it is foremost among the progressive States of the Union. I congratulate you most heartily on the progress you have made and the eminence you have attained in the Postal Service of the Nation.

The unanimous selection of your distinguished associate, Paul Younts, the able and representative postmaster of Charlotte, as the president of the National Association of Postmasters, is not only a great tribute to his sterling qualities of character and leadership, but it is also an honor of which you and every cititzen of North Carolina may well be proud.

I am sure you will be interested to know that the Postal Service is continuing to show marked increases in business. Each month shows more revenue and more mail volume than the corresponding month in the previous year, and I feel that the revenues of the Postal Establishment this year will set another all-time high amounting to at least $755,000,000. You know, and I know, that when business is good in the post office, business is good everywhere. It is an accepted fact that the postal revenues are an accurate barometer of the Nation's business.

The post office is the outstanding example of a business organization in Government. It is the No. 1 agency of the Federal establishment affecting directly the life of every individual in the Nation. Its representatives are found performing their daily tasks in every city, town, and hamlet. Their daily rounds carry them over all of the city streets, all of the important highways, and many of the unimportant highways in the rural areas. Its benefits and facilities are made available to rich and poor alike. Its officials and employees are trained to function efficiently under all conditions at all times. It is a public utility so large that the average citizen finds it difficult to visualize its far-flung organization and operation, and has simply come to accept the well-known fact that if he writes a letter or prepares a parcel and places the necessary postage on it, and deposits it in the nearest mail box, he can do so with full confidence that it will reach the addressee quickly and in good order.

Obviously, there is no reason for the public to be concerned about the operation of the Postal Service. It is and should always be carried on with such certainty and efficiency that public concern and discussion are unnecessary. But to you and to me who are directly connected with the management of its affairs it becomes a duty to give careful thought every hour of the day to its successful operation and to service improvements. That is the principal reason why you maintain this splendid organization of postmasters, and that is why I am always happy to attend meetings of this kind.

The organization of the Post Office Department in its headquarters at Washington is well set up. In each of the bureaus there are men and women who have devoted their lives to the Service, who are intensely interested in their work, and who have followed this business as a career, and who can be counted upon to safeguard its reputation. During my service as Postmaster General I have taken advantage of every opportunity to improve this organization. I have surrounded myself with men in the policy-determining positions in whom you have every confidence. I have backed up these men by selecting administrative officials with long experience in the field services. I am happy to say that we have the finest headquarters staff in the Post Office Department that it is possible to bring together for the effective operation of this vitally important business. We have gone further than that.

We have given more attention and more careful consideration to the selection of postmasters, with the result that we have men and women in those positions who are devoting their best efforts to adequately serving the people in their communities. We have fostered legislation which does away with the short term for postmasters, granting them appointments for indefinite periods during good behavior, which unquestionably will result in better service and better morale of postal employees.

We have approved and have urged Congress to pass legislation liberalizing the hours of labor and the working conditions of the employees generally. I am quite sure that we are the largest business organization in the world that guarantees life tenure to such a great majority of its employees with a guaranteed income and with the assurance to the employees that their hours of service will be regulated on a reasonable basis that leaves them ample time for recreation and rest. We shall continue to give first consideration to the matter of service to the public, and second only to that we shall be alert and take advantage of every opportunity to provide better working conditions for the employees.

Of course, we must always keep in mind our obligation to the taxpayers, for I know it must be obvious to you that whatever money we spend over and above the actual revenues of the service must be taken from the general funds of the Treasury, which means the pockets of the taxpayers of the Nation.

I am definitely of the opinion that the post office renders the character of service that should enable it, under wise and careful management, to pay its own way; and as you know, in all but 1 year of full operation under my administration as Postmaster General, the Department has more than paid its way from that part of its operations which it renders to the public for hire. This is a fine record, and I am indeed grateful to each and every one of you who are connected with the Postal Service for this fine spirit of cooperation which has made this possible. With the continued increase in mail volume it is, of course, necessary to increase our expenditures, but I am quite sure that the efficiency of the organization is improving with this increase in business to the extent that we can confidently expect even better results in the future. I have no doubt of this.

Since I have been Postmaster General I have had an opportunity to associate with and observe postmasters and postal employees. I am pleased to say that the personnel of this Department for loyalty, industry, and efficiency is not excelled by any other group in America. I know that the people of this Nation appreciate the fine work you are doing, and that is another reason why I take advantage of these opportunities to attend your meetings, so that I can tell you about these things and thank you for your wholehearted cooperation. Postmasters are doing good work and postal employees are doing a fine job because they are good people, carefully selected, and happy in their jobs.

We have somewhat rigid disciplinary policies in the post office. If it were otherwise such a large organization could not be so well timed and so serviceable to the people. We avoid, however, any harsh or unfriendly attitude toward our own people or to the public. We have a friendly organization that is eager to serve. I am sure that the postmasters of the State of North Carolina understand and appreciate the importance of their positions and that they will do their part in maintaining the high standards set for them by the Department. If this is to be accomplished, however, no one can assume a self-satisfied air and take it for granted that everything is all right. On the contrary, eternal vigilance is required if we are to maintain efficiency and service, which is so important. We dare not relax in the matter of supervision even for a day.

In the headquarters at Washington we formulate policies, make regulations, and from the executive standpoint manage the affairs of the entire postal establishment, but you folks in the field, who are facing the everyday problems, are the ones who actually make and maintain the Department's record for service. Some of you may at times feel that possibly your part is not of great importance; but let me assure you that the postmaster or employee in the smallest post office, or the person in the most exalted position in the service, is important in his place, and without his sincere cooperation and vigilance the efficiency of the whole organization would be impaired.

You know that while millions of pieces of mail matter are deposited in the post offices in the principal cities of the Nation every day, much of it so deposited is intended for delivery in the smaller communities and on the rural routes. The large post offices would not be so large if they handled only local business. Likewise, the small post offices would not be so successful if their activities were limited to local communities. You must keep before you always the fact that the Postal Service of the United States is an efficient organization because it is made up of thousands of small organizations and units maintained within the system itself. You should be proud of the part you play in this great business, and you may be assured that I personally appreciate everything you do to make it function so smoothly.

It is most encouraging to find so many postmasters in attendance at this meeting. By coming here you show that you have more than a passing interest in your job; that you are anxious and willing to join with others associated in the same business for the exchange of ideas that will help you in the solution of your local problems. This establishment has been in existence for a long, long time, and I doubt that any condition could or would develop in any section of North Carolina that has not existed before in some other section of the State.

Therefore, when you come to these annual meetings you are almost sure to find help in the solution of your local difficulties either by general discussion in the meeting itself or by private discussion with fellow postmasters, post-office inspectors, or the officials of the Department. Aside from that it gives you an oppor-

tunity to know your fellow workers, to cultivate friendships which are lasting, and to have a better understanding of the people with whom you interchange mails and contact in the transaction of other postal business. Where there is a general understanding among men and women there is good will, success, and happiness.

These meetings also give me and the staff of the Department an opportunity of meeting you and securing from you first hand your viewpoint on the things we are doing in Washington. This is very helpful to us. I greatly appreciate this opportunity and look forward to these meetings with genuine pleasure. May I again congratulate you on this fine State chapter of the National Association of Postmasters and wish you wide and continued success.

Senator McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLES FROM NEW YORK TIMES AND LIFE MAGAZINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times written by Richard L. Neuberger, a well-known editor of Portland, Oreg., reviewing the political situation in the Northwest. Mr. Neuberger's article includes the information that our beloved minority leader is exceedingly popular in his home State, and that the vote of the State of Oregon in the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia will be cast for their senior Senator for President.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the same time another article from Portland, Oreg., as printed in the magazine Life, commenting in a complimentary way on the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] as a Presidential possibility.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

MCNARY'S CHANCES STIR OREGON HOPES—BACKERS CONTEND HE COULD WIN FARM AND LIBERAL VOTES AWAY FROM NEW DEALERS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND, OREG., May 4.—In Virginia, on the far off Atlantic seaboard, students at Washington and Lee University held a mock national political convention last week and nominated Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, as the Republican Party's candidate for President. This news from the other side of the continent has been accepted in the Pacific Northwest as a happy omen.

Republicans here resolutely maintain that Mr. MCNARY, who is the minority leader in the United States Senate, has a real chance to be the standard bearer of his party. Supporters of Senator MCNARY are describing him as a Republican who is progressive but not unsound, the Portland Oregonian, one of the foremost Republican newspapers in the West, presented him this week as "a veteran of the Senate who is liberal and has the respect of his colleagues."

The chief argument put forward by the adherents of Senator MCNARY is that he could lasso farm, labor, and liberal votes now regarded as safely corralled by the new dealers. Although at the start of this session of Congress he was unanimously reelected spokesman for his party, Mr. MCNARY sometimes breaks with the regular Republicans to back administration proposals.

ON PREFERENTIAL BALLOT

Senator MCNARY's name will be on the Oregon preferential ballot at this State's primary election, May 17. He is expected to get an overwhelming endorsement from the voters, although the Oregon Voter, a journal of business and finance, has been urging a write-in campaign for Thomas E. Dewey.

In his home State, Senator MCNARY enjoys a standing which his sponsors contend could be his nationally as well. Party conservatives, with only a few exceptions, support him. So do the insurgent Republicans who advocate public ownership of electric power and similar proposals closely akin to the New Deal. The American Federation of Labor in Oregon has long been friendly to Mr. MCNARY and his crusade for the Umatilla Dam was praised this week by the Oregon Commonwealth Federation, which is affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The strategy of Senator MCNARY enthusiasts is based on hopes of a deadlock at the convention between the two dominant candidates, Mr. Dewey and Senator Taft. They believe the hour for the Oregon aspirant will strike if this develops.

[From Life]

M'NARY'S CHANCES

PORTLAND, OREG.—Republicans in the Pacific Northwest are beginning to maintain that the strongest possible candidate the party could select is Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, minority leader in the United States Senate. This claim gathers emphasis with passing weeks. It is based on the belief that the G. O. P. must get the farm vote to win the election.

As MCNARY's backers see it, the Republicans will make decisive gains in the industrial East regardless of whom they nominate. The election will be decided in the Corn Belt and the Far West. Who among the Republicans would have as good a chance in these areas as MCNARY?

So far as his congressional voting record is concerned, MCNARY is sitting pretty. He has opposed the New Deal on such fundamentals as the court-packing bill, Government reorganization, and scandals in relief. On the other hand, he has gone along with virtually the whole social-welfare program and has excelled Mr. Roosevelt in a desire to aid the farmers.

When Senator TAFT, in February, proposed to slice $5,000,000 off the appropriation for the T. V. A., MCNARY resisted. This gives him the friendliness or beneficent neutrality of Senator GEORGE NORRIS and other public-power boosters. At the same time MCNARY, as Republican floor leader, has the solid backing of the G. O. P. regulars.

Early in 1936 the late Senator Jim Couzens, multimillionaire Progressive Republican from Michigan, wanted MCNARY to run for the Presidency. He offered to put up $100,000 to start the campaign. MCNARY scribbled something on the back of a Senate restaurant menu and slid it across the table to Couzens:

"The Presidential bee is a deadly bug,
I've seen it work on others.
O, Lord, protect me from its hug
And let it sting my brothers."

Now MCNARY has changed his mind slightly. His name is entered on the Oregon primary ballot for the Presidential referendum May 17. He will have the delegates from his home State and the backing or sympathy of the delegates from neighboring Western States, such as Idaho, Washington, and Montana. His friends think that at the show-down he will emerge as the one G. O. P. candidate capable of cinching the rural vote and victory.

The President's Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM NEWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham (Ala.) News of May 27, 1940, entitled "The President's Talk."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of May 27, 1940]

THE PRESIDENT'S TALK

President Roosevelt was never more earnest in a "fireside talk" to the Nation than he was last night. Seldom, if ever, it seems to us, has he been more effective.

It was a characteristically frank talk that Mr. Roosevelt made to the American people. One can hardly imagine how it would be possible for the Nation's leader, in a time of the gravest trouble abroad and of great concern at home, to speak more plainly and more frankly about the matters which he discussed.

This speech was sorely needed. Various individuals and various groups, since the President's defense message to Congress, have been engaging in sniping attacks on the administration's policies. Many rash and ill-considered comments have been made by men in political life and by others, including some newspaper writers who have been chronic critics of the New Deal. Many things have been said, apparently through sheer ignorance, that are demonstrably untrue.

President Roosevelt forcefully demonstrated the untruthfulness of some of these statements in his talk last night. Calmly and without any show of anger or personal resentment, but with a profound feeling of concern, Mr. Roosevelt took due notice of the criticism—usually either petty or altogether unfounded—of the defense measures which have been followed by the United States in the last 7 years and of the expanded program which the President now proposes.

By citing the figures on the greatly increased Army and Navy expenditures during his administration over the previous 7 years, and the concrete results already achieved in terms of additional warships, planes and productive capacity for planes and increased Army and Navy personnel, President Roosevelt showed up the misrepresentations of those who have been picturing our defenses as weak and implying that the Roosevelt administration has been negligent on this score. The President's speech should silence that sort of talk.

Well did Mr. Roosevelt say, "Let us have done with both fears and illusions." While we urgently require stronger defenses in view of the situation abroad, we need not have undue fears concerning the strength of our defenses now; nor should we have any illusions concerning the possible danger to our national security which time may bring, if the Allies are defeated, and the consequent necessity for increasing our arms heavily.

We must be on guard, too, as Mr. Roosevelt warned, against all kinds of subversive activities, including not only "fifth columns" and Trojan horses, but also the undermining propaganda and dissension which he branded "undiluted poison."

Gallup Poll on War Sentiment in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE GALLUP

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. George Gallup in which he advises that war sentiment in the United States has risen but slightly since Germany's invasion of Holland and Belgium. In other words, it appears that the American people are determined to stay clear of the European War insofar as our sending soldiers abroad is concerned.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—WAR SENTIMENT IN UNITED STATES RISES SINCE NAZI INVASION BUT REMAINS 13 TO 1 AGAINST ENTRY

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 28.—Sentiment for going to war with Germany has increased since the Nazi invasion of Holland and Belgium May 9, but the increase has been less than 4 percent. A Nation-wide survey just completed finds the country still more than 13 to 1 against American entrance into the conflict.

For many months studies by the American Institute of Public Opinion have found two basic aims governing the attitude of the American people toward the war—first, to do everything possible to aid the Allies; but, second, to stay out of the war. The events of recent weeks have caused increased sentiment for helping the Allies by every means "short of war," but there has been little change in the other basic attitude—to keep out of the fighting.

TREND OF SENTIMENT

The trend of sentiment on going to war with Germany has been as follows:

"Do you think the United States should declare war on Germany and send our Army and Navy abroad to fight?"

	Percent	
	Yes	No
When war started (September 1939)	6.0	94.0
October	5.0	95.0
December	3.5	96.5
After invasion of Norway (April 1940)	3.7	96.3
Today (since invasion of Holland, Belgium, and France)	7.0	93.0

It is interesting to note the relation between events in the war and the trend of sentiment. Some observers thought the Nazi invasion of Norway, with its bombing of open towns, would profoundly affect America's attitude of aloofness. Actually, according to the survey, there was little change.

The dramatic and world-shaking invasion of Holland and Belgium a week later brought a net increase of about 3 percent in war sentiment. But it is clear that, for the present, at least, no war fever of any appreciable size has been generated. What will happen to American sentiment if the Nazis unleash a furious bombing assault against England, or threaten Canada, remains to be seen.

UNITED STATES NOT APATHETIC

The comparative absence of warlike sentiment does not mean, however, that the Nation looks with indifference on what is transpiring abroad.

Public-opinion surveys have consistently shown that national sympathy is overwhelmingly with the British and French, and that feeling against Hitler and the Nazi regime has been mounting since the invasion of Austria in 1938. When war broke out last autumn a survey found the voters in favor of lifting the American arms embargo in order to help England and France.

In a more recent survey a large majority said they would prefer to vote for a candidate who promised the Allies all the help they need short of going to war than to vote for a candidate who promised no more help than is now being given. A small majority likewise favor sending warplanes to the Allies on credit if they cannot pay cash.

Adjournment of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which I believe to be timely. I hope it is not too late. It is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 24 entitled "Let's Adjourn Politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 24, 1940]

LET'S ADJOURN POLITICS

General Hysteria is riding off in all directions in Washington and New York. His radio commentator and columnist lieutenants are shrilling nonsense about coalition Cabinets and postponing the election. The new dealers are cleverly exploiting the panic in western Europe in the hope of instilling similar panic on this side of the Atlantic. They are raising the cry that in this crisis (which in its domestic aspects is largely of their manufacture) the Nation must adjourn politics.

All right; let's adjourn politics.

Let's adjourn the political manipulation of the National Labor Relations Board.

Let's adjourn the use of W. P. A. funds and the ruthless intimidation of W. P. A. workers to elect Democratic politicians to office.

Let's adjourn Henry Wallace's political juggling of agricultural subsidies to buy farm votes.

Let's adjourn the political use of the Walsh-Healey bill to bludgeon manufacturers supplying the Government into letting the lady fellow traveler in the Labor Department fix their wage rates.

Let's adjourn the political fixing of hours of labor under the wage-hour bill, which is hamstringing efforts to expand industrial production essential to our own and the Allies' defense.

Let's adjourn Secretary Morgenthau's and Mr. Eccles' political manipulation of the money market to divert funds into the administration's deficit financing.

Let's adjourn the punitive tax schedules that have prevented industrial expansion in order to perpetuate unemployment as a vested interest of the New Deal politicians.

Let's adjourn the political waste of the Nation's substance on T. V. A., Grand Coulee, Passamaquoddy, and all the other ventures into state socialism and screwball engineering and economics.

Let's adjourn the political fixing of prices under the Guffey Act, which is loading millions of dollars of additional costs on industry and home owners in order to repay another installment of the Roosevelt campaign fund debt to John L. Lewis.

Let's adjourn Donald Duck Ickes and the rest of the verbal tarantulas who have spent the last 7 years fanning class hatred in America.

Let's adjourn the political use of Federal funds by State political machines by enacting the Hatch bill, which the Roosevelt administration has succeeded in killing in Congress.

Let's adjourn progress toward a Nazi legal system by passing the Walter bill to give proper court review of the rulings of New Deal administrative tyrants.

Above all, let's adjourn the scaremongering that is trying to convince the Nation that the United States is in danger of invasion

day after tomorrow, the sole purpose of which is to make plausible the cry of "Let's adjourn politics."

All this isn't the kind of politics that the new dealers want adjourned. President Roosevelt has said that there will be no relaxing of what he misrepresents as his social reforms. Secretary Morgenthau has told the plane manufacturers that private industry will get the first chance to build 50,000 planes, adding in effect that the Government is going to keep right on beating them over the head while they try.

It is only the other fellow's politics that the new dealers want to adjourn.

Educational Orders Essential to War Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

MEMORANDA FROM WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the war-preparedness program, I want to point out the need for an enlarged program of research and development and industrial mobilization. I have repeatedly said that no country will attack America with its 130,000,000 people, with its tremendous natural resources, its unequaled industrial power, if America is prepared.

Educational orders, in my judgment, is a vital and absolutely necessary part of any program of industrial mobilization. It is only through educational orders, in my judgment, that we can mobilize the tremendous industrial power in this country. By industrial power I mean not only the mobilization of our industrial physical power, but I mean the mobilization of the mental power of the industrial giants who have made this Nation the greatest industrial Nation in the world.

On June 21, 1939, when this House had under discussion the War Department appropriation bill, I used the following language:

Everyone concedes that Germany has attained her present air and military power by using to the limit the industrial power within Germany. The War Department program providing for educational orders under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Johnson, was intended to mobilize and make available in case of emergency the tremendous industrial power in this country.

To me, the mobilization of the industrial power in case of emergency is the most important part of the program of the President. The plan calls for tools and dies and jigs to manufacture war material in quantities required during wartime. Because of the inability to manufacture such material in quantity required, we were compelled to use the Enfield rifle and the 75- and 155-millimeter cannon and to disregard our Springfield rifle and our 3- and 6-inch cannon.

Only by industrial mobilization and educational orders can we hope, in case of war, to manufacture and supply an army of any size with the arms and ammunition required in wartime. Again, to me, this is the most important part of the entire program. If this bill is passed we will find not only that we are not putting our idle airplane factories at work and that a few large factories are going to get fat contracts, but we will learn that the committee in this bill has cut the educational orders more than 50 percent. The excuse of the committee was that the appropriation for this item was for 2 years, and they allowed for 1 year only. The entire construction program covers a period of 2 years, including the airplane construction. This is the only item in the bill which was cut 50 percent.

I submit that if it is wise and good legislation to appropriate at this time money for a 2-year program on airplanes and other materials, then it is also wise to appropriate for 2 years on the educational-orders program. As a matter of fact, unless the War Department can be assured of a second-year appropriation they are going to be seriously handicapped in carrying out this educational orders program.

The committee this year again cut the educational orders down from $16,000,000 to $2,000,000. The Senate restored the full amount. I sincerely hope that the conference committee, of which I am a member, and the House will adopt the Senate amendment.

The educational-orders program is under the supervision of the Honorable Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War. I recently requested Mr. Johnson to send one of his best men to my office that I might go over the matter with him and verify the facts which I have. This he did.

The three branches of the War Department that require educational orders are the office of the Chief of Ordnance, the office of the Chief Signal Officer, and the office of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service.

The Chief of Ordnance was instructed to furnish me with a statement showing the amount of the production program for 1940 and 1941 and the number of different facilities or factories that would supply their needs for those 2 years; also a statement showing what the ordnance procurement program would require during the first year of hostilities to supply an initial force of 1,000,000 men. The office of the Chief Signal Officer and the office of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service were instructed to furnish me with similar information. This information was furnished me through the Assistant Secretary of War at my request, and I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, May 22, 1940.

Memorandum for: Office of the Assistant Secretary of War.
(Attention Colonel Kimball.)

Subject: Statement of educational order funds.

1. The 1940 production program of the Ordnance Department is approximately $150,000,000.

2. It is estimated that the total funds which will be available to the Ordnance Department for production orders in 1941 will be $250,000,000.

3. In placing orders with industry in 1940 there were only 19 different facilities which received contracts amounting to $500,000 and over.

4. It is estimated that in 1941 there will not be to exceed 50 facilities receiving education through production contracts exceeding in price $500,000.

5. Production orders are considered the best education possible. However, the 1941 funds, mainly $250,000,000, are relatively insignificant compared with the planned war program involving approximately three and one-half billion dollars in the first year of a war.

6. An ordnance war-procurement program will involve approximately 1,000 facilities with contracts averaging $3,500,000 each.

7. Because of the business risk involved in producing specialized ordnance equipment for which there is no commercial parallel, relatively few facilities are in a position to take on Government work in peacetime. Consequently, there will be a great many repeaters getting 1941 contracts which also produced under the 1940 program.

For the Chief of Ordnance:

A. B. QUINTON, Jr.,
Lieutenant Colonel, Ordnance Department, Assistant.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,
Washington, May 22, 1940.

Memorandum for: Col. H. K. Rutherford.

Subject: Justification of the Signal Corps educational orders program for the fiscal year 1941.

In compliance with instructions received from your office the following is offered in an effort to justify the Signal Corps educational orders program that has been submitted for the fiscal year 1941.

1. Under existing law educational orders provide the only means whereby the Signal Corps can use selection in placing production orders.

(a) Examination of past records shows conclusively that a few manufacturers, and continuously the same ones, are the successful bidders securing current orders, resulting in only a few having been employed in the manufacture of Signal Corps items.

(b) The examination of records shows that quite often some of the strongest, as well as most reputable firms, from the standpoint of national defense, either do not bid, due to the fact that these manufacturers find it more profitable to produce goods at a higher margin, or if they do bid, are not the low bidders. This results in a condition in which some of the most desirable manufacturers are not familiar with manufacturing Signal Corps items.

2. Only through educational orders are manufacturers required to furnish production analyses, which include sources of contributory items, raw materials, related data, and disclose bottlenecks.

(a) When normal production is completed and the goods received, the account is closed. No information is furnished of any bottleneck with regard to shortage of labor, inadequate machinery, contributory items, and raw materials unless something unusual is

presented; whereas educational orders are subject to critical analysis with respect to every phase of production.

(b) Bottlenecks in production and in the flow of raw materials have been disclosed by the educational orders program in connection with telephone EE–8 and wire 110–B. Such disclosure will be of inestimable value in a national emergency.

3. Only through the use of educational orders can a relatively large production rate be assured.

(a) Studies of results of the educational-orders program in the Signal Corps show that under educational orders for telephone, a daily productive capacity of 1,000 telephones a day will be assured, in contradistinction to the production rate of 200 per day as demonstrated from productive orders in the past.

4. Only by the use of educational orders can a full utilization of the large production capabilities of the United States be realized.

(a) Requirements based on the 1940 mobilization plan, which it is believed may be insignificant in the event of a national emergency, require the maximum effort in scheduling the manufacturer to produce items for the production of which he has had no experience.

(1) It is confidently believed that 6 to 8 months could be saved in connection with tooling up and learning how to manufacture, and arranging for the uninterrupted flow of raw materials. The most convincing example of this can be found in aircraft radio. Aircraft-radio production based on 5,500 planes is, on the face of it, not significant compared to a proposed 50,000-plane air force. But, based on even 5,500, and with the knowledge that there are only 6 or 7 aircraft manufacturers, the Signal Corps has made plans predicated on the hope that through the educational-orders program, certain reputable radio manufacturers could be educated in manufacturing specific sets that have been manufactured by these aircraft producers, but in quantities far short of the productive capacity of those now visible.

(b) A large number of radio sets now being made are done so at the comparative pace of hand production. Radio manufacturing plants could be utilized for accelerated production of components in a development that must, of necessity, come in an emergency.

(c) Even though there has been a reluctance to freeze design of aircraft radio equipment in order that the latest developments could be incorporated, yet it is now imperative that the best possible design be frozen and efforts be concentrated on securing quantity production. The educational order makes this possible. The design that has been frozen can be the subject of an educational order with midwestern radio manufacturers, thus relieving the aircraft radio manufacturer who has been a quasi designer, developer, and custom producer so that these facilities could be kept for utilization in an effort to keep step with the latest development resulting from lessons learned from this strangest of all warfare.

5. The indiscriminate placing of production orders under existing law and without coordination runs the risk of upsetting all procurement planning work that has been undertaken in the past 20 years.

(a) Facilities have been allocated, schedules placed, and arrangements made that can be activated only through the educational orders program, or allocation and negotiation.

(b) The placing of production orders under existing law not only disregards, but actually threatens to upset, all existing planning arrangements, violating the lessons that should have been learned from America's experience in the past war, and heedless of the teaching of the Industrial College, and the policy that has been enunciated by the Planning Branch, and so ably sponsored by The Assistant Secretary of War.

For the Chief Signal Officer:

CLYDE L. EASTMAN,
Colonel, Signal Corps, Executive.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE CHIEF, CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1940.

Memorandum for Lt. Col. A. R. Kimball, Office of The Assistant Secretary of War.

1. Pursuant to your telephonic request, the following explanation of the need for educational orders appropriations in addition to contemplated production appropriations for the fiscal year 1941 is submitted:

2. Many of the items for which production appropriations have been requested are not duplicated in the educational order program. Some of these, such as steel containers and gas-mask repair kits, can be made by industry without appreciable preliminary education, while in the case of items such as the standard service gas mask the education of industry has been completed as far as the assembly of this item is concerned. On the other hand, it should be noted that a large percentage of contemplated production for the next fiscal year will be accomplished at Edgewood Arsenal, owing to the immediate need for these items and to the fact that industry is not now prepared to undertake their manufacture. Thus the problem of making up the supply deficiency during the fiscal year 1941 will be solved to the extent permitted by appropriations, but no provision would thereby be made for educating industry to produce these items in the vast quantities desired in a national emergency. For many important chemical-warfare supply items, the maximum production at Edgewood Arsenal represents a minute fraction of that required in wartime.

3. The question of the procurement of component parts for gas-mask assembly and other vital items is not as yet satisfactorily solved for the wartime requirements. Industry can produce these items at normal peacetime production rates and can probably also meet the augmented production rates under the present emergency by tool-room methods. If faced with the problem, however, of supplying these component parts at a rate demanded by the assembly plants on a wartime production basis, the present manufacturers would fall down completely in the absence of an educational-order program.

4. Considering specifically the items recommended by the Chemical Warfare Service for inclusion in the educational order program for the fiscal year 1941, the following remarks are submitted:

a. Non-coconut-activated charcoal manufacture: Two educational order contracts for this item have already been awarded. Two educational orders have been recommended for the coming fiscal year. A total of eight such orders will be ultimately required before maximum wartime requirements can be guaranteed.

b. Whetlerite manufacture: The situation as discussed above in regard to non-coconut-activated charcoal applies equally to whetlerite manufacture, as this represents an additional step in the manufacture of an efficient gas absorbent. In this case a total of six plants to be educated have been recommended, inasmuch as the capacity of the unit set-up is smaller than that of the corresponding charcoal. A total of 24 educated plants will ultimately be required to meet maximum wartime requirements.

c. Noncombatant gas-mask assembly plant: These orders are for the purpose of establishing a model plant for the manufacture of noncombatant gas masks, so that other manufacturers can convert their factories along these lines to the production of this item. There should be at least one such model plant in each principal industrial area throughout the country. An award for one such assembly plant is being recommended for the present fiscal year, and the program contemplates two additional plants for the fiscal year 1941. Obviously it would never be possible to build in advance plants for noncombatant gas masks with anywhere near the proper capacity to meet the demand in time of war.

d. CC2 Manufacture: There is no industry which can produce this chemical at the present time. One company is now working on an educational order in order to become educated in the manufacture of this important chemical. Two educational orders for this item for the fiscal year 1941 are recommended but a total of at least eight educated plants will be ultimately required. For the next fiscal year, however, all production will have to be accomplished at Edgewood Arsenal.

e. Impregnite S3: This material has never been manufactured in industry. Due to its noncommercial character its production will have to remain limited to Edgewood Arsenal until industry has been educated in the process of making it. The exact capacity of one unit set up has not as yet been determined, but a minimum of four or five plants will ultimately be required.

f. Soda-lime manufacture: This chemical is a constituent for gas-mask canisters and represents one of the outstanding bottle necks with respect to the procurement of component parts for gas-mask assembly. This soda lime is made by laboratory methods by several chemical concerns, but there is only one facility in the country which can make it on a production basis and this company uses antiquated processes and rather obsolete equipment. This is one of the few items not produced at Edgewood Arsenal, and, therefore, an educational order to develop additional sources is essential. The exact capacity of one-unit set-up has not as yet been determined, but a minimum of four or five educated plants will ultimately be required.

g. Filter manufacture: The gas-mask filter is another outstanding bottle neck in the procurement of component parts for gas-mask assembly. It has never been manufactured at Edgewood Arsenal and there is only one firm in the country which can manufacture it at the present time. This firm uses modern methods and makes a highly satisfactory product, but it is located in a highly vulnerable position in New England and if anything happened to the plant, the entire gas-mask program would be put out of action. The process is a secret one and can be taught to other manufacturers only by means of an educational order. There should be ultimately at least four educated plants to meet wartime requirements.

For the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service:

P. X. ENGLISH,
Lieutenant Colonel, Chemical Warfare Service, Executive.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the 1940 production program of the Ordnance Department is approximately $150,000,000; that there were only 19 different factories or facilities which received contracts amounting to $500,000 or more. It is further interesting to note that the Ordnance Department production orders for 1941 will amount to $250,000,000 and that these production contracts will be given to approximately 50 facilities or factories, with contracts of approximately $500,000 each.

The statement further shows that an ordnance war program for the first year of a war to supply 1,000,000 men in the field will require approximately three and a half bil-

lion dollars and 1,000 facilities or factories with contracts averaging three and a half million dollars each.

It is pointed out that the contracts each year have been going to repeaters; that is, a great many of the factories which produced under the 1940 program will produce under the 1941 program. The same thing is true with regard to signal equipment and chemical-warfare equipment.

Small industry has no chance against the large industry in this program as it is now conducted, although some of the finest industrial brains are in small factories.

Any program of industrial mobilization should include the following:

First. An inventory should be taken of all the factories in the United States capable of producing equipment needed by the Army and Navy, the amount of the floor space, the facilities on hand, and the amount and kind of equipment each factory can produce. Part of this work has already been done by the Army.

Second. We should determine exactly the amount and cost of equipment we will need as nearly as possible during the first year in case of war to equip and supply 1,000,000 men.

Third. We should determine how many factories and which factories are able to and can produce each type of equipment.

Fourth. We should have tools, dies, and jigs made with which to produce the equipment necessary for equipping an army of 1,000,000 men. If we have the tools, dies, and jigs, we will have saved from 3 to 5 months and not be dependent upon taking these workers from ordinary production.

Fifth. We should have enough educational orders in these factories to train sufficient men so that on short notice we can go into production of the required material and equipment.

To do this, we must have adequate money for these educational orders. Without it, 950 of the thousand factories required to produce ordnance which they will be asked to produce will have no one who knows how to produce it. It will require from 3 to 5 months to make the tools, dies, and jigs before they can even teach men how to produce them.

The things that are true of the Ordnance Department are also true with regard to signal equipment and chemical warfare equipment. I believe it is imperative that an adequate educational order program should be carried on if we are to mobilize our industrial power in case of war.

I might point out that the furnishing of semiautomatic rifles is typical of our needs. We have the Savage Arms Co., the Winchester Arms Co., the Remington Arms Co., and a number of other large companies. Thus far, only one company, the Winchester, has been accepting contracts and is equipped to produce this rifle. It is obvious that in case of war we would find ourselves unable to manufacture these guns fast enough. Our men would be compelled to use the old Springfield instead of the Garand, which has two and a half times the fire power of the Springfield. The same is true with regard to artillery, antiaircraft, antitank guns, and other equipment.

The Lindbergh Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY W. D. ARCHIE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Willard D. Archie, editor of the Evening Sentinel, Shenandoah, Iowa, which appeared last week in the column he writes for his paper. Knowing Mr. Archie as I do and having implicit faith in his ability to judge men and events in their true perspective, I want to say that I am in complete accord with his views and that I consider Colonel Lindbergh's speech of May 19 a quieting and reassuring voice that is appreciated by the people of this Nation, a nation made jittery for a time by the speech of our Chief Executive to the joint session of Congress on May 16.

[From the Shenandoah (Iowa) Evening Sentinel]

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA

(By W. D. Archie)

Mr. Lindbergh here I come. It is generally tough to argue against Pot Pourri, and as a rule we agree, but this time I can't help feeling his new dealism is mixed with a brilliantly written defense of the Government defense program. Further, I thought Pot Pourri did not hear all the speech.

The background of Mr. Lindbergh's speech was the one made by the President in asking for 50,000 airplanes and a billion-odd dollars for defense. This was a war speech. It was so timed, and so given, as to arouse our people into thinking we must enter this war to save our country. It was not a speech made to defend our shores from attack. It was a speech delivered to make us think our chance of safety was to send planes—and probably men—to France to help stop Hitler on foreign soil.

Lindbergh was answering this speech. He was trying to calm our people—and what burns them to a crisp in Washington is the fact that he accomplished his purpose.

Lindbergh did not object to the defense program. Call Lindbergh by the name of Churchill and Roosevelt by the name of Chamberlain in the fable by Pot Pourri. When Lindbergh was appointed a special ambassador by the Allies to check German war readiness he came back with a report they were far ahead in airplanes and manufacturing plants. He told them the kinds of planes, the methods of production, and a complete, black story. No one believed him. He was ridiculed for taking a decoration while getting this information.

Later he checked this country's air reserves and air forces. He made another black report, which was lost in the shuffle. Lindbergh is one man that did foresee what was liable to come. His warnings, like the warning of air officers in our own Army and those of Arthur Brisbane, were discarded both by you and myself and by the Commander in Chief of our defense forces, President Roosevelt.

The former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, now President of the United States, was interested only in building up the Navy, a commendable procedure in the light of future events, but only a part of what is needed.

Not one thing in Lindbergh's speech could be said to object to a defense program. Perhaps he is against it, but he didn't say so. In fact, he commended the President's defense program.

He did say we will gain nothing by mixing in this war. He did say we will again be condemned by victor and vanquished alike when it is over. He did say we had better attend to our own affairs and not mix into the power struggle in Europe. He sees little for us to gain in this war.

Lindbergh, since gaining renown as a world flyer, is not, as Senator BYRNES stated yesterday, just an aviator. He has had access to every court and capital of the world. He has continually lived, dined, talked, and investigated defense and combat preparations of many nations of the world. He has served the English and French Governments, as well as our own. He has had a rare opportunity to gain valuable information on world affairs in the past 13 years and has taken advantage of it.

He has been a world ambassador rather than a lucky aviator. If the Allies had believed him 2 years ago, they would not be in such desperate need for airplanes as they are today. If they had believed him, they might have further postponed the war until they had factories working.

On Hand and On Order—What the United States Army Has and Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, in President Roosevelt's "fireside chat" last Sunday night he unfairly made a comparison between our military strength 7 years prior to the New Deal and the last 7 years of his administration. We know that before Roosevelt came into power the Republican administrations had attempted to pursue a course leading to peace and disarmament.

The war during Wilson's Democratic administration had sapped the economic strength of our country. In 1920, the American people by an overwhelming majority had turned the Democrats out of office because they wanted peace and economic recovery. During the twenties business went ahead under the leadership of Republican administrations. It was not necessary to arm to the teeth. In fact, people were led to believe by Wilson that we had waged a "war to end wars" and had "made the world safe for democracy." But along came 1933, and almost at the same time that Roosevelt came into office Hitler came into power in Germany. England and France permitted Germany to rearm.

Roosevelt took no steps to prevent German rearmament because it is not the intention of the American people to rule and regulate the other nations of the world. But Roosevelt, through superior sources of information which he claims to have at his command, must have been advised of the strength of Germany's war machine. Roosevelt must have known of our own military strength; yet no sound American defense preparations were suggested, nor was the Congress informed, nor were the people of the United States advised by Roosevelt of the military might and productive capacity of foreign powers.

So when the President attempts to excuse our lack of proper defenses, by comparing the military equipment "on hand and on order" in his administration with what we actually had on hand during the preceding 7 years of the Republican administrations, he is making a specious comparison.

Look at the following table and draw your own conclusions:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1940]

WHAT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WANTS

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The actual strength of the United States Army in weapons, ammunition, and other major items of equipment, as of May 1, 1940, and the quantities it expects to have upon completion of the current emergency defense program are shown in the following official War Department tabulation submitted to the Senate appropriations subcommittee for use during consideration of the Army appropriation bill:

	On hand	Completion figure
ANTIAIRCRAFT		
3-inch guns	448	500
90-mm. (approximately 3⅝ inches) guns	None	317
37-mm. (approximately 1½ inches) guns, antiaircraft	15	1,423
.50 caliber machine guns	1,014	1,683
Directors	168	273
Height finders	142	276
Sound locators	194	801
SMALL ARMS		
Semiautomatic rifles (standard infantry equipment)	38,000	240,559
37-mm. antitank guns	228	1,388
60-mm. mortars	3	3,756
81-mm. mortars	183	853
.50 caliber machine guns (pack)	83	962
FIELD ARTILLERY MATÉRIEL		
75-mm. guns modernized (light artillery standard)	141	1,432
75-mm. howitzer (field and pack)	99	319
105-mm. howitzer	None	120
155-mm. guns, long range (heavy artillery)	4	96
8-inch howitzer	None	120
COMBAT VEHICLES		
Scout cars	485	1,346
Combat cars	114	208
Tanks:		
Light M2A4	10	734
Medium M2	18	194
TRACTORS AND SPECIAL ORDNANCE VEHICLES		
Tractors:		
Light	93	120
Medium	261	550
Heavy	65	777
Trucks:		
Small arms repair	79	146
Instrument repair		53
RAILWAY ARTILLERY		
8-inch railway gun and carriage	None	24
AMMUNITION		
Ammunition bomb:		
500-pound	11,928	34,924
1,000-pound	4,336	14,511
Caliber .30 automatic pistol	17,268,000	73,920,000
Caliber .50 ball	25,220,000	53,117,000
37-mm. tank and antitank	75,000	1,205,000
37-mm. antiaircraft guns	46,000	2,624,000
81-mm. mortars	43,000	373,000
75-mm. howitzer, high explosive	142,000	382,500
155-mm. howitzer, high explosive	925,000	1,131,000
8-inch howitzer, high explosive	None	29,000
ENGINEER CORPS		
Pontoon bridge, 10-ton	1	32
Pontoon equipage, 23-ton	1	8
Water-purification unit	4	45
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile	285	1,028
CHEMICAL WARFARE		
Gas masks	407,696	1,297,000
QUARTERMASTER CORPS		
Wool uniform cloth, yards	None	5,500,000
Field ranges	5,000	667,000
SIGNAL CORPS		
Radio set:		
SCR 161	390	1,849
SCR 171	26	401
SCR 194	809	2,138
Wire (field wire) (miles)	16,800	65,491
Field telephones (miles)	15,800	47,602
Detector sets	None	182

Awake America

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, what we need in this country is a single Department of National Defense with a separate Department of Air Force, Navy, and Army.

The truth of the above statement is daily becoming more convincing as we explore the adequacy of our national defense in the light of present world conditions.

On January 10, 1940, it was my privilege to introduce House Joint Resolution 417 which is designed to create a National Defense Commission for the purpose of surveying our national-defense needs and resources. This resolution is not the result of any new-fangled idea but is supported by competent military authorities.

Outstanding among the many champions for such a survey of our national-defense needs and resources and the creation of a Department of National Defense, was the late Gen. William Mitchell, who in 1929 made the following prophetic utterance:

> The coming of air power has made a greater difference in war than anything in history. Armies are mere holders of land. During the war armies only moved back and forth for 60 miles and killed hundred of thousands. That isn't war—war is getting at the vital centers of the enemy, where they live, their food, their communications. Air power can go straight to them now—3,000 miles away—and destroy.
>
> What we need in this country is a single department of national defense, with a separate department for air force, navy, and army. Until we have that we cannot protect ourselves. No rules or regulations or treaties can do away with the necessity of protecting ourselves. If we don't protect ourselves, no one else will.

House Joint Resolution 417 is the vehicle necessary to translate Billy Mitchell's words into action at a time when we are preparing to explore every angle of our national defense and spend billions of dollars in strengthening our military position among all nations.

Deportation of Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. J. WILL TAYLOR, LATE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM TENNESSEE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the late Representative J. Will Taylor, made on the floor of the House on November 3, 1939:

Mr. Speaker, for more than 16 years Congress has sought a solution for the economic and social problems of our country which are the direct outgrowth of inadequate legislation dealing with immigration. In the past 3 years there have been several attempts to correct some of the evils which are daily growing more apparent.

On June 10, 1937, this body, by voice vote, passed H. R. 6391, the Dies bill, for the deportation of criminal aliens. This bill never came to a vote in the Senate, but it helped to focus the attention of the people on our alien problem. This bill also drew the fire of some of the alien groups in our country, and by the fall of 1937 there had been set up in New York City an organization known as the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, with headquarters at 100 Fifth Avenue. This committee, claiming to represent 155 organizations, with a membership estimated at 1,055,000 persons, has been particularly active since that time. Among their affiliated organizations were the Communist Party, New York State Committee, International Workers Order, American League for Peace and Democracy, Friends of the Soviet Union, International Labor Defense, National Maritime Union, Workers Alliance of Greater New York, and many other groups identified with the foreign "ism" movements in the United States. The only thing American about this committee was its name, but by January 1938 it was boasting of its victories in 1937. In his report for the year, Dwight C. Morgan, secretary, said:

"We have won some victories with the forces we have been able to mobilize. We have been able to gain at least temporary refuge in the United States for Max Meister, a stowaway from Germany, who was held for exclusion at Ellis Island. We have been able, through Congressman CELLER, to stay the deportation of Hans Goepel, another anti-Nazi refugee. We were able the other day to remove from Ellis Island, Paul List, who was wounded in Spain, and now faces deportation to Germany."

Now, I have mentioned this Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born to call attention to the fact that the foreign-born and aliens in our midst, over 4,000,000 in number, are being organized for a united fight against any change in our immigration laws that will, so far as they are concerned, work any hardships upon them. And by these hardships I include fingerprinting and other means of registering, which I believe we will ultimately have to adopt in dealing with this alien problem.

HOW MANY ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES?

In the 120 years from 1820 to 1939, inclusive, 38,219,687 persons have emigrated to the United States. Of this number, as late as 1930, according to the census, there were 6,234,613 persons who owed their allegiance to another flag, living under the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

Today, according to the most conservative compilations, we still have 4,091,159 unnaturalized aliens in this country competing with our own citizens and those who have become citizens through the process of naturalization, for jobs, for business, and, in many instances, for both public and private charity.

After 10 years of the world's greatest depression, this is a situation which cannot be lightly laughed aside. And the immigrants continue to pour in on almost every ship that arrives at an American port, but we know them now not as immigrants but as refugees. "Refugee" is an easy word that softens our hearts and lowers our guard. In fact, in the recent shaping of events it seems that these European refugees are of more concern to the New Deal than are the 10,000,000 of American refugees who have been walking the streets of our cities in vain for years seeking the economic security that was promised to them back in 1933 by President Roosevelt. But the American people are not to be deceived by this "refugee" bunk. This is just another scheme to bring additional thousands here who are not wanted in Europe. On October 24 last the Swedish-American liner *Drottningholm* arrived at New York with 579 passengers, of whom 279 were Americans. Among the aliens aboard were 93 Germans, mostly Jewish refugees. One was Daniel Sternberg, who conducted the symphony orchestra at Tiflis, Russia. Perhaps Mr. Sternberg will find Americans most receptive to his symphonies, but if I had my choice he would play them elsewhere.

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

Of the 82,998 quota immigrants admitted to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, the racial composition is as follows:

Hebrews	43,450
Italians	6,708
Germans	5,524
English	5,076
Irish	2,968
Scotch	1,968
Scandinavians	1,563
French	2,214
All others	13,525

Are these figures self-explanatory? Do they reveal a situation to our satisfaction?

Mr. Speaker, in 1929 a sincere effort was made to regulate our future immigration when President Hoover, by proclamation, put into effect the quota system. The total annual quota set for all nations was 153,774. These quotas were set according to a formula based upon previous immigration, and the national origin of the immigrants prior to 1920. Under the formula the quotas established for the countries of principal origin were as follows:

Great Britain and North Ireland	65,721
Germany	27,370
Irish Free State	17,853
Poland	6,524
Italy	5,802
Norway (2,377) and Sweden (3,314)	5,691
Netherlands	3,153
France	3,086
Czechoslovakia	2,874
Soviet Union (Russia)	2,712
Switzerland	1,707
Belgium	1,304
Denmark	1,181

The quotas for all other nations are below 1,000.

In studying the immigration records for the fiscal year 1939, one cannot help noticing the apparent disregard of all quota provisions on the part of the enforcement agencies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, when we find that 30,096 Hebrews have been admitted from Germany during the past year, a number which alone exceeds the national quota by 2,726.

DEPORTATIONS FOR 1939

While 82,998 immigrant aliens entered the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, our deportations for the year were the lowest of any in the last 10-year period.

Our deportation record, by years, is as follows:

1930	16,631
1931	18,142
1932	19,426
1933	19,865
1934	8,879
1935	8,319
1936	9,195
1937	8,829
1938	9,275
1939	8,202

Of the aliens deported in 1939, over 20 percent, or 1,638, were criminals; 1,056 had been previously deported; and 3,080 had entered this country without valid passports. Can we afford to allow the condition here revealed to remain unchallenged?

WHOM WE DEPORTED

Of the aliens deported in the 5-year period from 1934 to 1938, inclusive, 3,216 were English, 2,598 Italian, 2,463 French, 1,770 Irish, 1,383 Scotch, 1,483 German, 998 Chinese, 850 Scandinavian, 740 Greek, 510 Hebrew, and 28,486 people of other nationalities.

CONTRACT LABOR IMMIGRANTS

Under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917, employers may file petitions to be allowed to import alien workmen into this country.

In 1938 petitions to the number of 1,581, involving 2,515 aliens, were filed by prospective employers. Favorable action was taken on 736 petitions, involving 880 laborers.

During the fiscal year 1939 favorable action was taken on 772 petitions, affecting approximately 800 additional workers.

Can anyone logically assume that these alien workmen were a necessity in our country at a time when more than 10,000,000 of our own people were unemployed?

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

To further illuminate this interesting subject, I now refer to Press Release No. 19, Department of State, dated January 19, 1939, entitled "Immigration Quotas, Vital Statistics" for the year ending June 30, 1938. From this official press release I glean the information that of the 45,712 quota immigration visas issued by American consular officers abroad for that year, but 52 visas were issued to

persons listed as farmers coming to the United States. There were 29 from France, 19 from the Netherlands, and 2 each from Germany and Hungary. So the people who are coming here are not coming to farm but to crowd up in our cities and to compete with our own business, professional, and laboring men.

This situation, Mr. Speaker, would not be serious but for the fact that these aliens frequently are unable to keep up with the swift tempo of American life and easily fall into the habits of their native lands. They crowd into tenements and become dissatisfied with their new-found promised land. Then it is but a step until, in many instances, they fall victims to one or another subversive movement which holds out to them social and economic objectives attainable only through bloodshed and violence. Many of these disillusioned victims have already told their stories before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities in the United States. I wish that every citizen could secure and read a complete set of the committee hearings. It would be well worth the price if the Office of Education could supply a complete set to every school in the Nation, so that the children and their parents might learn exactly what the foreign "ism" elements in this country are doing to wreck our Government and destroy our liberties.

THIRTY THOUSAND ALIENS ON RELIEF—THOUSANDS MORE IN INSTITUTIONS AND PRISONS

Mr. Speaker, through the courageous action of Congress last year, more than 30,000 aliens were removed from the rolls of the Works Progress Administration early this year, effecting a saving of over $1,800,000 a month, which was promptly made available for the relief of our own citizens, many of whom had long been denied the opportunity of public-works employment theretofore extended to the discharged aliens. This was the logical and American way to deal with a most distasteful situation. The taxpayers of the Nation have too long been assuming burdens which normally should have been borne by others.

But there is another burden thrust upon us by the foreign-born and the aliens which we cannot escape. That is the burden of caring for the mentally defective, the insane, and the criminal-alien element. Quite recently the chamber of commerce of the State of New York has made a study of this phase of the immigration problem. In their publication Conquest by Immigration are found many interesting statistics. From them I have compiled the following tables showing the foreign-born inmates of mental and corrective institutions in the several States, and another list showing the alien-born prison population of certain States:

Foreign born and aliens reported in institutions for mental defectives for 1938

Alabama	18
Arkansas	22
California	6,847
Colorado	756
Delaware	163
Idaho	94
Illinois	6,056
Indiana	525
Iowa	251
Kansas	271
Kentucky	25
Louisiana	33
Maryland	404
Massachusetts	1,596
Michigan	5,121
Minnesota	2,577
Mississippi	7
Nebraska	77
Nevada	20
New Jersey	2,043
New Mexico	8
New York	4,562
North Carolina	24
North Dakota	236
Ohio	1,328
Oklahoma	62
Oregon	353
Pennsylvania	824
Rhode Island	946
South Dakota	348
Tennessee	30
Texas	183
Virginia	14
Washington	784
West Virginia	92
Wisconsin	143
Wyoming	148

Foreign-born and aliens reported in penal institutions for 1938

California	851
Colorado	63
Connecticut	39
Delaware	124
Idaho	21
Illinois	196
Indiana	9
Iowa	40
Kansas	26
Maryland	99
Massachusetts	599
Michigan	686
Minnesota	12
Missouri	4
Nebraska	59
New York	946
Ohio	404
Washington	259
Wisconsin	69

THE FRIENDLY BORDERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, our country has long been known for its hospitality to the stranger who comes here for business or pleasure. We have, in fact, been the good neighbor to all countries, particularly to Canada and Mexico.

The records for 1938 of the Immigration and Naturalization Service show 52,993,989 individual entries into the ports of entry along our borders, including each individual crossing of the border by any United States citizen or traveling alien. Of this total, 14,230,131 were alien entries from Canada and 14,421,370 alien entries from Mexico.

Besides the alien entries there were 15,740,505 citizen entries from Canada and 8,601,983 from Mexico.

To check against this horde of visitors is one of the duties of the Immigration Border Patrol. In 1938 the border patrol apprehended 13,655 law violators, 112 of whom were smugglers of aliens, 12,851 illegal entrants were seized, as were 692 persons wanted for other law violations. How many got by the border patrols will never be known, but it is safe to assume that the number runs well into the thousands, for once an alien is across the border and in the hands of friends the possibility of being apprehended and deported is remote.

The border patrol as an organization is small but efficient. Its complement of 850 officers and men cannot be expected to perform the impossible feat of adequately patrolling thousands of miles of our border, day and night. To keep the aliens out we must have additional laws with teeth in them to help.

MISUSE OF PASSPORTS

The simplicity with which persons can enter or leave our country is aptly illustrated in the case of Grover Bergdoll, the draft dodger. From his own story told on the witness stand in his recent trial before a military court at Governors Island, N. Y., we learn that Bergdoll, tiring of life in Germany, made two successful trips back to the home of his mother in Philadelphia, entering the United States each time by way of Canada under an assumed name. All of which took place when Bergdoll was a fugitive from the United States authorities, and his photographs and fingerprints had been broadcast and posted throughout the Nation. There were undoubtedly many "Bergdolls" who crossed our borders in the last few years. But what I cannot help wondering is how many men more dangerous to America than Bergdoll have sneaked into the United States or gone to some foreign countries and back as Communist Earl Browder and Communist Fred E. Beal did on phony American passports prepared for them by friends who knew the ropes and strings to pull in New York to get them.

We need some additional safeguards also to prevent the fraudulent issuance of passports. While I have cited these two instances of the misuse of passports on the part of American citizens, from facts developed in the testimony before the Dies committee investigating un-American activities, it is generally conceded that there are in several of the European capitals well-organized passport rings who specialize in the business of providing fake passports for secret agents of the Communist International to all countries, including ours.

MANY ALIEN SEAMEN JUMP SHIPS AT UNITED STATES PORTS

Mr. Speaker, another source of frequent trouble to our Immigration and Naturalization Service arises from the horde of foreign seamen entering our ports. Many of them, it is known, ship on boats sailing for America, with the intent and purpose of jumping ship when they get here. In the fiscal year 1938 alien seamen paid off and discharged in the United States ports numbered 21,875. In addition to this number there were 1,577 seamen who were removed to hospitals in this country, and 2,841 seamen deserted their ships. Thus, 26,293 alien seamen were dumped in the lap of America. They either had to find jobs on American or foreign ships or haunt our water fronts in search of relief or work.

During the year, 24,539 of these seamen reshipped to foreign ports, but 1,754 alien seamen remained in this country at the end of the fiscal year, unaccounted for. From testimony before the Dies committee it is easy to understand just how many of these alien seamen may possibly have engaged in activities of a subversive nature. Many also possibly have been utilized in carrying on the intensive espionage maintained in this country by Communist and Nazi and Fascist groups in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, if we hope to preserve our free democracy as was handed down to us by an illustrious ancestry; if we mean to perpetuate our liberty, we must immediately take steps to rid our land of these enemy aliens who are busily engaged in spreading the doctrines of hate and discontent, and who are boring from within, with a view to the final overthrow of our Government. It may require some painful surgery to remove this suppurating cancer, but as one Member of this body, I am willing and anxious to support any necessary legislation to accomplish the operation.

These disciples of foreign ideologies continually complain about our form of government. They want to change it to conform to the Nazi form the Fascist form, or the Communist form. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they do not like our form of government, in the

name of God, why do they not get out and go back whence they came. [Applause.]

I regret to say that in my judgment the one thing that has increased the audacity and improved the opportunities of these foreign emissaries to ply their nefarious programs has been the attitude of our national administration during the past 6 years. There has been a well-defined tendency on the part of our public officials to coddle these Reds and "parlor pinks." Along with hundreds of thousands of Americans, I was utterly amazed a few days ago when the President in one of his press conferences characterized as "sordid business" the action of the Dies committee in exposing Government employees who are either Communists or "fellow travelers." This rebuke by our Chief Executive of a congressional committee endeavoring to perform a patriotic service was indeed a melancholy commentary.

All praise to this committee for its courage, its independence, and its determination to stamp out this malignant curse to Americanism regardless of any influence that may be exerted from whatever source.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest menace to this country today does not come from abroad. Our greatest danger lies in the activities of these subversive influences, and the sooner we suppress them the better for our country—the last pure democracy on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Slum Clearance and Low-Rent Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

DECLARATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following declaration of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor urging Congress to approve S. 591, which provides for continuation of the slum clearance and low-rent housing program of the U. S. H. A., adopted at the quarterly meeting held in Washington, D. C., on May 20, 1940:

The future of the slum-clearance and low-rent housing program of the U. S. H. A., vitally important to labor, depends on the approval of S. 591 by the House of Representatives before adjournment.

Labor's concern in the future of this progam is intensified by current developments. In the present world-wide crisis the permanent security of America lies in action directed toward domestic betterment. The U. S. H. A. program goes straight to the heart of our most urgent economic problem. The splendid beginning made by the United States Housing Authority toward meeting the workers' need for decent homes has proved this program to be one of the most effective defense weapons of our national welfare. To discard this tested weapon now is to surrender a strategic line of defense of economic security of our people.

In view of conditions in the building industry it is essential that Congress act at this session to prevent a sharp decline in employment in the construction and related industries. The U. S. H. A. is a double-barreled employment program. The present program is providing 512,000 building-trades jobs on project sites in 200 communities. These jobs account for $225,000,000 in wages which go into the pay envelopes of building workers. In addition, employment of 760,000 workers in related building-materials industries is provided by the U. S. H. A. program. Stoppage of the program will wipe out these jobs and cut off the source of buying power derived from these wages. Unless S. 591 is approved by Congress this loss of employment and buying power to labor will come at the crucial time when the crushing burden of unemployment has become unbearable to millions of American workers who are entitled to the opportunity of earning a decent living through their own efforts.

The cost of this program is modest. The U. S. H. A. from its inception has had a consistent record of progress in the reduction of the costs and of the annual contributions needed to rehouse slum dwellers. Labor has cooperated in achieving these low costs by entering into agreements which assure that, after construction has started on a project, work will not be interrupted by jurisdictional or wage disputes.

War abroad is already creating new conditions in our economy, most important of which is the siphoning of wage earners into communities dominated by specialized production. The national defense program will also involve a rapid increase in specialized industrial facilities and their shift to the central cities of the Nation. These developments will create emergency housing situations which must be remedied. Good housing must be provided for the workers who will flock to these industrial centers.

The experience of the U. S. H. A. in the construction of workers' housing will enable it to provide such industrial housing with extreme speed and with thorough knowledge of each local problem. The U. S. H. A., with its Nation-wide network of contacts with local housing needs and with its staff trained and experienced in dealing with local housing problems, is the only agency equipped to plan and administer such a program.

If properly planned, this emergency housing will not be a total economic loss at the conclusion of the emergency, but will become a permanent asset available to low-income families in the future. Termination of the U. S. H. A. program at this time would not only aggravate the already acute shortage of low-rent housing but also deprive us of the tested machinery, in full working order, well fitted to deal efficiently with the emergency we are facing.

The American Federation of Labor, as the original champion of this legislation, has resolved that this program must be continued and expanded to meet the growing needs for reemployment and for rehousing.

Status of Rural Electrification Program in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

TABLE COMPILED BY THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to set out the following brief statement of rural electrification activities in Oregon, as compiled by the Rural Electrification Administration. The statement follows:

Status of rural-electrification program in Oregon

Borrower	Amount	As allotted		May 15, 1940, counties
		Miles	Members	
2, Lane: Blachly-Lane County Cooperative Electric Association, Blachly.	$139,000	97	446	Lane.
4, Lincoln: Benton-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corvallis.	265,000	217	701	Lincoln, Polk, Benton, Lane.
5, Clatsop: Nehalem Valley Cooperative Electric Association, Jewell.	89,000	65	367	Clatsop.
14, Umatilla: Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association, Hermiston.	258,000	240	665	Umatilla, Morrow.
16, Malheur: Malheur Electric Cooperative Association, Vale.	148,000	115	347	Malheur.
17, Douglas: West Douglas Power Cooperative, Roseburg.	132,000	110	376	Douglas.
19, Jordan Valley: Jordan Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Jordan Valley.	30,000	4	81	Malheur.
21, Coos: Coos Electric Cooperative Inc., Coquille.	119,500	99	357	Coos.
Total	1,180,500	947	3,280	

50.7 percent of the farms in Oregon, as of June 30, 1939, are still without central-station service.

Common Sense on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, psychologists tell us that an earthquake is perhaps the most terrifying of all human experiences. This is thought to be true because in all other calamities people can at least keep their feet firmly planted on the firm ground. Consequently, in any period of mental earthquake, if we can find something solid and dependable on which to firmly plant our mental feet, our fears are reduced and we tend to become calm and reassured.

During the past few weeks the people of the United States have been feeling violent repercussions of the mental earthquake that has hit the people of western Europe. Our thought world has been crowded with fears, mental-conditioning propaganda, charges and countercharges, dire predictions, and hysterical prophecies. We know not what or whom to believe. At a time such as this I am happy to be able to present excerpts from a remarkably authoritative publication which could well become the thought pattern for every loyal American in these trying times. In my humble opinion, there is little else worth saying on the general situation.

The publication referred to is Senate Report No. 1615, prepared and printed by order of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, May 15, 1940. I herewith submit pertinent excerpts from its contents:

The views on national defense recorded in this report which the committee considered in arriving at its conclusions and recommendations do not represent the views of any one person or group of persons. They represent composite opinions derived from one or more of the following sources. Statements made by our best-informed citizens who have studied this problem, prior reports made by the committee to the Senate and data presented to the committee during the past 5 or 6 years by the most responsible naval officers and naval experts in America, including such prominent officers as Admirals Stark and Leahy, Chief and former Chief of Naval Operations; Admirals King and Cook, former Chiefs of the Bureau of Aeronautics; Admiral Laning, former President of the Naval War College; Admiral Taussig; and an outstanding national defense expert, Maj. George Fielding Eliot.

INSULAR POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

From the military point of view the United States must be considered as an insular nation. We are separated from potential enemies on the east and west by broad and deep oceans. On our northern and southern borders are nations which have been friendly heretofore. Across these land frontiers could come no armies of sufficient strength to menace our security. Our situation is not similar to that of the British at the present time. Prior to the advent of air power the British Isles were insular countries. This complete insularity is now compromised in the military sense in that they are subject to damaging attack by aircraft based on the continent.

The armies of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To be a menace they must be transported across the sea in ships. Airplanes based on the continents of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To threaten seriously our continental security they must be conveyed across the sea and operated from bases in or near this hemisphere.

The armed forces of no foreign nation or group of nations can seriously threaten our continental security if we make sure that we command the seas which separate us from all potential enemies.

WITH ADEQUATE SEA AND AIR POWER THE UNITED STATES CANNOT BE DEFEATED

From the evidence available it appears that if we build and maintain an adequate navy, provide ourselves with adequate air power, and a comparatively small, but well-trained and highly efficient army, we cannot be defeated. If our fleet, supplemented by our air forces, is able to exercise control of our essential sea and air communications, our Nation is secure.

An adequate Navy, capable of meeting and defeating an enemy's navy at sea, is the only sure way that war can be kept at a safe distance from our coasts and the only sure way to bring a war to a close.

FUNCTIONS OF AVIATION

Aircraft, without the assistance of surface vessels, have not yet demonstrated that they can deny an enemy control of the sea.

Land aircraft alone, even were they able to present an inconceivably—and impossibly—impregnable defense, would still be only defending. This can never defeat an enemy.

Nothing would be more conducive to aggression on the part of an unscrupulous and reasonably intelligent enemy outside this hemisphere than the knowledge that he could wage war upon this country while exposed only to the negligible injury of the passive defense to which we would be committed by primary reliance on land aircraft. However, everyone is convinced of the very great importance of aircraft in our scheme of national defense. No force, ashore or afloat, can afford under any circumstances to be without ample aircraft support.

AIRCRAFT VERSUS THE BATTLESHIP

There is no recent evidence to show that battleships or other surface craft are obsolete as a result of increased efficiency of bombing from aircraft. The manner of employment of naval vessels undoubtedly has been affected by the comparatively new form of attack from the air and the armament, armor, and protection of ships has been and must continue to be adapted to resist damage as far as practicable.

AMERICA AND THE WAR IN EUROPE

We are doing now practically everything possible to bolster Allied sea and air power, and we are stepping up American production of aircraft and shipping them to the Allies. Some naval experts are of the opinion that due to the superiority of the Allies in surface craft it would not materially change the chances of an Allied victory if we did send out the fleet to operate in European waters.

We are not prepared to participate in the European war, as we do not possess the necessary weapons to make our efforts effective.

American soldiers should never again be landed upon a foreign continent, except to defend the naval or air bases from which it may be necessary for our fleet and our air forces to operate. Can anyone see how we could possibly accomplish anything worth the sacrifices of human lives, of resources, and possible loss of our free institutions, that will be demanded of us by our participation? We should certainly profit by the experience of the last World War and avoid becoming too greatly involved in European affairs.

If we are to remain at peace we must avoid becoming interested financially in the outcome of the European war, and our industries must not become too greatly compromised by foreign war orders.

Some naval experts point out that the view that we ought to fight now when we would have allies rather than take the chance of having to fight victorious totalitarian states flushed with victory at a later date is based upon an incorrect evaluation of actual military facts and military history.

It is an axiom of military strategy that military power can always be exercised more efficiently and to much greater effect within a reasonable radius of action than it can by fighting thousands of miles away.

THE COST OF WAR TO OUR LIBERTIES

If we allow ourselves to become engaged in the war in Europe as we did in the last war one thing is certain, the whole energies of our people, of necessity, will be ordered, regimented, and directed by a single authority. Everything—manpower, industrial power, wealth, production, transportation, liberty itself—will be at the service of the Government.

Why should we go to war to defend freedom if we must begin by destroying it with our own hands? We need not do this. The cold, hard military fact is this: Our Navy, if adequate, supplemented by a highly efficient Army and air force, will be so effective that few nations, not excluding victorious totalitarian nations, will challenge its power; and if any does we shall be the deliverer and not the recipient of the terrible hammer strokes of war.

AMERICA AND THE FAR EAST

Japan is an insular nation * * *. She is therefore vulnerable to attack from the sea. She can be rendered impotent and can be defeated by naval forces without military conquest. She cannot direct a serious attack against us if we maintain our defenses on an adequate basis.

At the present time the United States Navy alone could not undertake a war in Far Eastern waters * * *. To insure victory in this undertaking it will be necessary not only to maintain the 5–3 ratio, but to increase our fleet perhaps as much as 100 percent.

A war fought across the breadth of so vast an ocean as the Pacific is fraught with very great difficulties. The cost to us of such a war would be so great that we must, by every means in our power, avoid the necessity of having to undertake it.

The all-important fact in the Pacific, so far as Americans are concerned, is this: We need not fear aggression or any vital harm from this direction so long as we maintain our fleet in the Pacific at not less than the 5–3 ratio with the Japanese fleet, and maintain adequate naval and air bases from which our fleet can operate effectively.

DEFENSE OF AMERICA

If we realize that the important causes of war are in human minds and emotions, that force cannot change materially human nature, give up the illusion that American armed forces can bring permanent peace to a warring world and confine our military objectives to the defense of this country, we shall find that our problem of national defense becomes relatively simple. An impregnable defense for America will be costly, but infinitely less costly in the long run than engaging in another futile attempt to "save the world for democracy."

WHY NOT FACE THE FACTS?

Why not face the fact that we have not provided ourselves with the necessary instruments of war to assist the Allies or the necessary bases to make our air forces and our Navy effective on foreign continents or in foreign waters and that our prior efforts to build up our defenses were not undertaken with these objectives in view?

Why not face the basic military and economic fact that it is not within our power or means to create Military or Naval Establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere? Why not face the fact that American armed forces cannot force permanent peace on a

warring world, but that we can maintain peace in our own part of the world?

In doing this we need not shut ourselves off from contacts with other nations, but we can and should command the seas and airways which are the medium of those contacts.

In the words of Washington:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Why not take adavantage of our pecular situation, develop the sources of raw materials available in this hemisphere, and construct the instrumentalities of war which will enable us to pursue our way in peace, free from the horrors of invasion, the perils of bombs from the sky above us, the burdens of supporting vast armies, and the perils to our liberties which any involvement in war would bring?

Mr. Speaker, here we have in this remarkable document the calm reassuring words of our best authorities. Here we have the sane reasons behind the slogan that I continue to recommend:

Let us keep America out of war, and let us keep war out of America.

Flood-Control Protection Part of Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, realizing that flood control is one of the principal needs of the people of my district, I have endeavored since coming to Congress to do everything within my power to bring about an adequate program of flood control, which is of such vital importance to our Nation.

The public knows the enormous loss of life and property from floods. The Nation has been sold on flood protection. It is my belief that there is no more satisfactory work than flood-control improvements. The investment of our Federal Government toward protecting civilization in flood control will result in real economy. It is a wise investment, from which we will receive value from the money spent. Important work remains to be done, especially on the Johnstown Channel, and I trust, for the interest of national defense, that the completion of this project will go forward without delay.

People in my congressional district who have in recent years been under great stress because of the danger of floods know just what it would mean to many of the large factories in and around Johnstown, Pa., should a flood of major proportion occur before the completion of the present project. We know what an important part some of the factories in Johnstown played during the World War in supplying our Government with steel that was necessary to help us win that war. Should a flood of major proportion occur, these factories would be put out of commisison for a long time. If our factories in strategic parts of the country were to be flooded, our military plans would necessarily be greatly hampered.

It is estimated that an additional $1,597,800 will be needed to complete the project in Johnstown. Of course, not all of this will be needed during the next fiscal year, which begins July 1, as the Army engineers believe that the flood-control project in Johnstown cannot be completed until the following fiscal year even though funds were available.

I hope that a sufficient portion of our national-defense appropriations will be set aside for the completion of flood-control projects throughout our Nation.

Origins of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

LETTER FROM HAROLD W. HANCOCK

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to note that all Americans have not been swept off their feet by the hysteria that had its origin in the White House a week or two ago. Fortunately, the brainstorm is subsiding and a sound understanding of foreign affairs is replacing the fear and mystification that gripped millions of our people a few days ago. At this point I desire to present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

ORIGINS OF THE WAR

To the EDITOR OF THE POST.

SIR: The danger that we have feared so much is now here—that the United States may be led into the war. And this danger is brought on by the hysterical reaction of those pledged to keep us out. And why are they hysterical? Because the Allies are having some reverses.

But were not these reverses a possibility in September 1939 when the President pledged to keep us out? He did not say "as long as the Allies are winning."

Why are "we" so interested in the Allies? If Italy joins them, will we love her too? Will we then regard Mussolini as a good fellow who seeks to "reestablish international law and order"—to use Secretary Hull's moralizing words?

Are England and France fighting against domination of the other countries of Europe? Then why did they arm Hitler, knowing that his stated program—Mein Kampf—included conquest of other countries? The answer is clear to all who are not blinded by propaganda: They armed and connived with Hitler because his main aim was the destruction of Soviet Russia.

But Soviet Russia foiled this long-prepared plan by building an army three times the size of Hitler's. That is why Hitler decided, on August 24, 1939, not to attack Soviet Russia. And that is why, 1 week later, England and France declared war on Hitler. He had become their enemy overnight by changing his plan. They now knew that anything further that Hitler took would not be used against Soviet Russia but sooner or later against themselves and their interests.

England and France are therefore not fighting German fascism. If they can reduce Germany's strength to a point where Germany will not be threatening England's Empire, the present war will come to a close.

We should have no part of this struggle between the rival rulers of Europe. If Soviet Russia, near the conflict and in constant danger from both belligerents, can stay neutral, the United States, in a different hemisphere, certainly can. By building her defenses, as Soviet Russia has done, the United States can make herself even more impregnable than Soviet Russia.

HAROLD W. HANCOCK.

MOUNT RAINIER, MD., *May 21.*

A Problem President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt for the past 7 years has been stirring up class hatred, arraying group against group, and now when overwhelmed with

debt and faced with unpreparedness to meet the problems arising out of the foreign war, he piously pleads for unity of action and teamwork. However, he still continues to be petulant, critical, and political-minded toward those from whom he now desires teamwork.

The Republican Party rallied to the support of President Wilson in the World War, and the party will show the same spirit of cooperation now, regardless of whatever action President Roosevelt may take, but it would come with far better grace from the President to dismiss his political-mindedness and play the game like a man.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under date of today entitled "A Problem President," which points out that the President is still playing up to his radical friends by appointing them to positions of trust in the preparedness program, while using two great industrialists merely as "window dressing." No one can dispute the fine character and ability of William S. Knudsen and of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., but why sacrifice these men for window dressing when their talents should be available, unhampered by New Deal politicians?

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 29, 1940]

A PROBLEM PRESIDENT

Signs are multiplying that the country is becoming more and more impatient toward its problem President. His fireside chat displayed not only a political petulance that ill became the moment, but also a complete blind spot toward the one essential fact in the preparedness effort. Calling for cooperation and support, he himself refused to cooperate with anybody or support any plan that would enlist the industrial forces of America in the race to make the Nation able to defend itself.

The contrast with the two able Republican speeches delivered the next night was complete. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Dewey covered different ground, but their goal was the same. As Mr. Dewey pointedly said at Dallas, the President "expects to keep the political control of a machinery for increasing production of defense materials and to use industrialists for window dressing." The President promptly came through with the window dressing yesterday, inviting an assorted group of industrialists, New Deal radicals, and a consumer representative from North Carolina to come to Washington and advise the administration.

No one in the country is better qualified than Mr. Hoover to comprehend the problem facing the country and plan its solution. The fundamental of the situation was admirably stated by him in his broadcast when he said:

"The lesson of the whole of the last World War and every step in the present war is that the procurement of munitions in any large volume must be separated from the Army and Navy Establishment. It must be done by an organization separate and independent of either department. It is an industrial job—a manufacturing job, a mass-production job for management and labor. It requires that thousands of factories be coordinated to do their part."

These are not mere generalities to Mr. Hoover. He worked and lived through the last war in the closest touch with the men who organized the Allied supply systems. He is himself a trained engineer and an experienced industrialist. His application of his principles to the problem of the air was especially cogent. We do not want 50,000 planes to put away in hangars, he remarked. In the face of constantly advancing science it would be folly to have 50,000 planes in peacetime. He assumed that the President really did not want such a result. What the Nation really needed he defined as follows:

"What we need is organization in Washington capable of bringing about a coordination in American industry that can produce 50,000 airplanes in a year if they were called to do it. If we could demonstrate that we could supply the Army and Navy with 4,000 planes during a single month that would be ample notice to the world to keep off our grass. Likewise, we need an organized capacity to produce tanks and other arms."

There is nothing secret about these fundamental facts of preparedness. Mr. Dewey and Mr. Hoover stated them with unusual clarity. But the whole country knows what American industry and mass production are, and it knows how to apply them to the defense problem. Only Mr. Roosevelt knows differently. He insists upon retaining personal charge of the job himself, and instead of turning the actual direction over to great industrialists he leaves it to his Secretary of the Treasury, who knows nothing whatever about industry; to a Secretary of War and an Assistant Secretary of War who are not on speaking terms with each other; and to a Secretary of the Navy who is about to resign to run for political office.

The right course is so obvious that it takes all of Mr. Roosevelt's ingenuity to ignore it. But he is unmistakably standing fast on his dictatorial, political resolve. He refuses to end his own private war with American industry even to prepare the Nation to defend itself in a period of great emergency.

The Problems of Unemployment and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of life on this earth down to our present-day complex existence, man has looked for security. No matter what work we do, what profession we follow, what menial tasks we perform, we dream about a day when we can retire in ease and comfort, to live as we wish to live, and do what we feel like doing. But for practically all of us the day of retirement never comes. Depressions wipe out our savings, financial upheavals and wars disrupt the lives of nations, and sickness and death very often take away the earnings of a family. Although there are many causes which lead to economic distress, the worst of all is unemployment.

The American who is out of work lives idly by, day after day wondering what tomorrow will bring. Here in America the unemployed citizen has seen the Government try ill-conceived devices to create employment. But up to the present time these various schemes of "made" work have only pacified the American people for the time being and have shirked the real problem. No temporary relief will satisfy the needs of the head of a family who must look at the years before him, develop his position in life, feed, clothe, and educate his children. We cannot appease the hunger for security with scraps of relief which are inadequate and which stamp the individual with inferiority as one living on Government generosity. There is no reason for such embarrassing charity, no excuse for Government hand-outs at the expense of taxpayers who themselves are burdened with debt and finding it more difficult each day to meet their tax problems.

Unemployment steals from our youth their right to make a living, to secure a good education, to establish homes of their own, to improve their condition in life. The man who trudges the streets going from factory to factory looking for work faces an endurance test forced upon him by unemployment. How much longer can he last, looking and waiting for the job which he should have. The father, mother, and children in so many American homes are staring at present want and future insecurity. What a pitiful picture they make as we look at them with their hopes turned to despair through the loss of work and the resultant loss of courage to carry on in life.

It seems to me, the Government has a special duty to alleviate distressing conditions. This duty is imposed upon those who govern, by religious precepts, with which all of us are endowed as a guide to good and wholesome living. If we forget these fundamental rules of life, we might as well give up all hope of advancing civilization. If legislators fulfill the obligation resting upon them and their Government to recognize the needs of their people, and strive with all the energy they can command to satisfy those needs we should then get equality, justice, and fair treatment for all.

It has been variously estimated that our unemployed number between ten and twelve million; which means that about 1 out of every 5 persons in our employable population is without a job. We know that many individuals are dependent upon these jobless workers, and if we include these dependents, we find that we have a total of about 25,000,000 persons who are the victims of unemployment. This number is greater than all the individuals living in the 10 largest cities in the United States. In fact, our army of unemployed and their dependents are more than the entire population of the United States in 1850.

Now, why do we have so much unemployment? Various speakers have varying ideas about what causes unemployment. Some say it is due to the machine age; others say the capitalistic system is responsible. During recent years we have had a prolonged depression, which some economists say is the result of the stagnation of the capital markets. It is said that taxation policies have tended to drive investors to high-grade tax-exempt securities; that regulation has raised the cost and increased the risk of capital flotations; that persistence of large deficit spending has undermined confidence in public credit; that development of a maze of Government lending agencies has narrowed such private investment channels as remain; that uneasiness over the future of private investment is accentuating the fear of an ultimate break-down of public credit, accompanied by price and wage inflation. Some say that the New Deal has created so many business deterrents that an individual cannot now go into business for himself without hiring an accountant and consulting a lawyer. But, whatever the reasons for unemployment, the legislators should study this problem continuously, and if one group does nothing to solve the problem the voters should put them out of office and elect others who have the courage and energy to do something about it.

We should strive to give security to the people in this country so they will be protected against unemployment and against the rigors of that period in life when men no longer are considered active enough to fit in with our mechanized system in industry. Of course, I realize that to try to give true security to all of the people in this country is almost as difficult or as illusory as a search for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Even when we do devise a method of paying pensions to aged people, we might be confronted with a war or some other major catastrophe which would destroy our retirement plans. But we can at least do our best to bring some degree of comfort and security to the old people who have retired from gainful occupation.

Now let us look at the so-called Social Security Act which is in effect today. The title of the act, "Social Security," is a slogan or a catch phrase which has led many persons in distress to believe that, at last, here was legislation which was going to help them. But how fooled they were. Those unemployed who really needed the benefits of social-security payments were not helped at all. Only those in industry who had a job and had less need for old-age benefits were covered under the act. Millions of other workers, agricultural and domestic, were left outside. We might call this a deceptive law because it does not give the people the security which they think they are getting. It has been stated that the average old-age benefit payment under the act will be $19 a month. This certainly is a small sum and no one can live decently on such a small allowance. It has been charged that the records of the Social Security department were in such bad shape that men now growing old and counting on social security to make their old age comfortable may one day find themselves unable to prove their claims to old-age benefits. Many of those who pay taxes will get nothing in return. A great percentage of those paying social-security taxes will get less than is given free by the State to old people. Those who will receive benefit payments over the next few years will in some instances get an amount of money running into many hundreds of dollars, although their tax payments have been slight. Those who have stopped making contributions and are now receiving their small benefit payments, will be chiseling, so to speak, on the moneys placed in the so-called social-security reserves by those who are now paying the social-security tax. Any plan that offers to pay so much more than it collects is unsound, and any plan that is managed by those who please only a select few is certain to have faults. We should have equitable taxation for security payments in this country.

Is there any reason why the Government should pay more to one individual when he reaches the retirement age, than to another, when the former individual has not deposited enough to meet even one-twentieth of his payments? Is there any sense in requiring the youth of today to make social-security payments only to find when they are old that there will be no funds available for them? Under existing procedure the pay-roll taxes are used for the operating expenses of the Government. No cash and no revenue-producing assets are being set aside with the tax money; only Government bonds or I O U's are placed in the reserve fund. So you can see, as future benefit payments must be made, those payments have to be met by further taxation in the years to come. The Brookings Institution recommended that the old-age annuities should be framed on a pay-as-you-go basis, rather than by collecting a huge reserve. They stated also that the rates for old-age annuities should be temporarily reduced and that the contingent reserves should be invested in outstanding Government bonds at current rates; and that the Treasury should separate its operations from those of the social-security administration. It seems to me that there is much sense in the report made by a group of House Members who have considered the problem of social security. They stated that the annuity system should be on a pay-as-you-go basis and they criticized the present social-security laws, which take such a great amount of money in pay-roll taxes from the people in this country. They urged that pensions be paid to all American citizens over 60 years of age who are retired from industry and they suggested that there should be no difference in the amounts paid to persons in the various States. I can see where there might be some discussion about the fact that most of the people living in the South do not require as much money for living expenses as do the people in the North. Then, too, there is the problem of adjusting benefit payments from time to time as the cost of living goes up or down. The House committee suggested that the revenue should come from a broad general tax as well as from taxes designed to reduce the volume of idle funds. The size of the pension is to be determined by prorating the money derived among all who are to receive the annuity. The House committee claimed that such a system would avoid the complicated bookkeeping now required of the Social Security Board and the employers in the country; that it would do away with pay-roll taxes; and that no particular class would be favored but that it would include all of our citizens.

Certainly Congress must study the problem of unemployment and old-age annuities in order that the people of this country will in the near future be assured of some semblance of security in their old age. Many of the subversive activities prevalent in the country today, are present only because the people are dissatisfied with conditions and will follow cheap orators who promise everything but deliver nothing. Business should be encouraged; restrictions which hamper and bind private enterprise must be removed. In considering the cost of any old-age-benefit program, we might compare it with the cost of the last World War. It has been stated that, figuring World War cost at $250,000,000,000, we could have taken that staggering sum, built homes at $2,500 each, equipped with $1,000 worth of furniture, built on $500 lots and given such a home to not only every family in the United States, but also to every family in England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, and Australia. To every 40,000 people in those countries could have been given a $2,000,000 library, a $3,000,000 hospital, and a $10,000,000 university; the balance properly invested could have paid annual salaries of $1,000 each to 125,000 teachers and 125,000 nurses. Such a vast sum of money could have been used to make over the entire world and rid it of so much misery and suffering.

Oh what worries, fears, and heartaches we could eliminate by assisting the people in this country to get work and security in their old age. There can be no more heroic achievement for any nation than to solve the problem of unemployment and give to every citizen in the twilight of life true security.

The First Inter-American Conference on Indian Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL BY JOHN COLLIER, COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, PUBLISHED IN JUNE (1940) ISSUE OF "INDIANS AT WORK"

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, some time ago there was held in Mexico an Inter-American Congress on Indian Life, participated in by persons interested in Indian affairs. The United States was represented at that congress; the head of its delegation was Mr. John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Mr. Collier has prepared a statement. I ask unanimous consent that his statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST INTER-AMERICAN CONGRESS ON INDIAN LIFE

Patzcuaro: Nearly 400 years ago, Spanish cruelties practiced upon the Indians of the State of Michoacan had whipped the populace into long-lasting guerrilla warfare. No white man could venture unguarded out of the towns. There came on foot, and alone, over the big mountains from Mexico City, a priest, aged 60 years. He was Don Vasco de Qurioga. This man in his old age produced one of the most moving chapters of Indian history. He drew the Indians together into numerous community establishments called hospitales. Within an outer wall they lived and did their craft work, and they tilled the adjacent fields. All of them worked, but none worked more than 6 hours a day. The leisure time was organized and used creatively. The many hospitales specialized in varied types of crafts. There went forward an exquisite blending of the pre-Columbian and the Christian institutions. All around the surpassingly beautiful lake, on whose shores Patzcuaro is built, and back into the purple mountains, these Indian communes were both the local self-government and the industry of the countryside.

But in Spain, and from Mexico City outward, there went ahead the parceling of the country into the hands of captains and favorites. The tyrannous hacienda system was being thrust across Indian life. Don Vasco in his old age was called back to Mexico City and he died amid the gathering fatality which very soon thereafter overwhelmed the communes.

There only remain, now, the villages with their many arts and crafts, and there remains the original monastery and the surrounding wall of the first of the communes, and within the wall there grow olive trees 400 years old, of fabulous dimensions.

The bones of Don Vasco repose in the beautiful provincial museum which the town of Patzcuaro maintains, and which is a model for regional museums everywhere.

To each of the assembled delegates President Cardenas presented a book, The Rules and Ordinances for the Government of the Hospitales. The ancient printer's type is reproduced with exactness, and a moving introduction is supplied by Mauricio Magdaleno.

This was the environment of the First Inter-American Congress on Indian Life, and the tradition of Don Vasco surrounded the deliberations. Many countries were present; from a number of the countries opposing domestic elements were brought together; scientists, administrators, and diplomats were all at the meeting; and Indians from countries as wide apart as the United States, Peru, Bolivia, Panama, and Mexico. A high degree of tension prevailed, and it grew in intensity from the opening of the congress by President Cardenas to its termination by the President's representative, Dr. Beteta, at the end of 10 days. What was most impressive and important was this fact—that though strongly contending philosophies and political situations were involved throughout the sessions, there was "give and take" in every critical matter, and all of the important actions, when finally taken, were unanimous.

The subject matter: Four sections continued throughout the 10-day meeting—social-economic, legislative, educational, biological. A subsection dealt with arts and crafts. The Indians held their own summarizing and interpreting sessions and participated in all of the sections and in the plenary meetings. A set of the prepared papers is before me as I write. They total 1,100 extra-length pages. The Acta Final, reporting only the resolutions and actions taken, is 58 single-spaced pages. This Acta Final, in English, will soon be available. From time to time, in Indians at Work, some of the resolutions which were adopted will be reproduced. Here I give one or two of them:

"That the nations of the Americas shall adopt and intensify the policy of offering the amplest opportunity for the display of the capacities of their Indian groups, to the end that the Indian cultures shall not die but shall endure to enrich the culture of each nation and the culture of the world and contribute to the energies of the nations."

Another unanimous recommendation:

"1. That each government shall establish an agency or an office with the object of concentrating attention upon problems of the Indians and of focusing upon Indian need in effective manner the services of the governments for the shaping of Indian welfare and the defense of the Indian.

"2. That such Indian agencies or offices should not monopolize the administration of Indian services but should operate to focus upon the problems of the Indian all the resources of the governments as well as all local resources.

"3. That the offices of Indian affairs should work with the Indians through indirect methods, utilizing the Indian groups as their media, or otherwise developing or utilizing cooperative organizations for the mutual aid and mutual defense of the Indians."

Among the general resolutions, the most important single one dealt with land. It was debated through many sessions and was adopted unanimously. It read:

"Whereas, it is the duty of this Congress to seek to influence the nations having Indian populations, to the end that their political and social policies shall favor the Indian race and shall aid in the integration of the races within each country,

"Therefore, we recommend to the nations joined in this Congress that where there exists an overconcentration of the ownership or control of land, the respective governments shall take appropriate measures, in accordance with equity and justice, to correct whatever abuses of overconcentration may exist; and we recommend that they adopt methods appropriate to their own situations to help the Indian populations in building up their economic life, providing them with needed land, water, credit, and technical facilities."

Generalized from the record, it can be said that the Congress found and announced many elements of Indian power, Indian need, and Indian problems which, with minor local differences, hold good for all of the Indian countries. The beginnings of a real hemisphere Indian policy were laid down. And be it noted that no resolutions were perfunctorily adopted. Always they were presented and argued within the sections and then were reconsidered at a plenary session; and the participants were diplomats, administrators, scientists, and Indians. The final voting, of course, was by countries.

The permanent organizations. Two organizations were set up by the Congress, each looking toward a permanent and uninterrupted activity. One was the Continuing Commission of the Congress, which for its chairman has Dr. Louis Chavez Orozco, the President of the Congress, and for its secretary, Dr. Moises Saenz, the general secretary of the Congress. The representative from the United States is Dr. Sophie D. Aberle. This continuing commission is charged with the procuring of the next congress, with the publication of the proceedings, and with various tasks of unfinished business of the first congress.

The other permanent organization is a momentous one. The Congress created, on a provisional basis, the permanent Hemisphere Institute of the Indian, the provisional headquarters being Mexico City. Though its existence is as yet provisional, the institute is empowered at once to become active in the diffusion of data and the stimulation, coordination, or conduct of research. The main immediate task of the institute is to prepare and negotiate the conventions or documents of affiliation, to be enacted by the participating countries. The president of the institute is Dr. Orozco and its director is Dr. Saenz. The provisional governing board is constituted of technicians or administrators from the United States, Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, Bolivia, and Brazil. These members, for purposes of meetings, may be represented by alternates, chosen by the governing board itself upon recommendation of the embassies and ministries at Mexico City. The representation from the United States fell to myself, and my alternate is Pierre deL. Boal, the counselor of our Embassy in Mexico. The constitution of the institute provides for branch offices in the countries desiring them, and for the creation of technical consultative groups within and between the participating countries.

This report is indeed an abbreviated one. Members of our own delegation (Presidential appointees, and members of the coordinating committee) participated in all of the sections and all of the plenary sessions. A heavy burden was inconspicuously carried by many of them. Through the entire congress, wise and potent aid was given by Mr. Boal, the counselor of the American Embassy, and at a critical moment in the organization of the institute, decisive help was given by Ambassador Daniels. Within the Mexican group, from President Cardenas down the line, there was manifested truly a spirit of statesmanship—of disinterested but impassioned concern for the Indian cause throughout the hemisphere, joined with a chivalrous considerateness for the special situations existing in some of the other countries.

Our Indian delegates, named by the Secretary of the Interior, represented the Papagos, the Jicarilla, and San Carlos Apaches, Isleta Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Taos Pueblo, the Hopi tribes, the Flatheads and the Osages; and none did better work than they.

The next meeting of the congress, 2 years hence, upon the invitation of Peru, was set for Cuzco, high in the Andes, the capital of the ancient Inca empire.

"Blitzkrieg" That Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TOWANDA (PA.) DAILY REVIEW

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal drive to put President Roosevelt in the White House for a third term by use of war hysteria and coalition has fallen flat. The people of this country are not so gullible as the new dealers thought. After 7 years of broken promises they have begun to think things out for themselves and are beginning to take with a grain of salt the suggestions of the President. The Towanda Daily Review, Towanda, Pa., hits the nail on the head in the following editorial:

[From the Towanda (Pa.) Daily Review]

"BLITZKRIEG" THAT FAILED

The most heartening sign that democracy in the United States has lost none of its virility despite events abroad and the "blitzkrieg" engineered by the new dealers to sink the Republican Party into a "ja" adjunct to the third-term drive is the complete collapse of the proposal to erect a "coalition" government for the "emergency," the "emergency" this time to last, presumably, until Mr. Roosevelt had been safely ensconced in his White House seat for another 4 years.

The Republican National Convention will be held in Philadelphia in less than a month, and the campaign will be one of the most torrid in the history of the Nation. That is as it should be.

If the record of the present administration, including the President's admission that the country is defenseless in the wake of record peacetime expenditures for armament—coupled with the papsucker drive to continue Mr. Roosevelt in office forever—do not constitute valid grounds for a sizzling campaign, this is, indeed, no longer a republic, and what is there left to fight for?

Politics has been injected into the Nation's defense program by the President himself, and if he doesn't find it savory he can only find consolation in the knowledge that he outsmarted himself at last. Calling in Republican leaders to discuss the weather may have seemed clever to him at the time, but Alf Landon, a country boy from Kansas, turned the "blitzkrieg" into reverse when he emerged from a free meal at the White House to call upon the President to patriotically curb his ambitions in the interest of the Nation.

There will be an election come November, and those responsible for the sly suggestion that it should be called off are not worthy to be termed Americans.

Gallup Poll Shows 93 Percent of the American People Are Against America's Entrance Into the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE GALLUP

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. George Gallup on the war sentiment in the United States compiled after a Nation-wide survey:

THE GALLUP POLL—WAR SENTIMENT IN UNITED STATES RISES SINCE NAZI INVASION BUT REMAINS 13 TO 1 AGAINST ENTRY

(By Dr. George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 28.—Sentiment for going to war with Germany has increased since the Nazi invasion of Holland and Belgium May 9, but the increase has been less than 4 percent. A Nation-wide survey just completed finds the country still more than 13 to 1 against American entrance into the conflict.

For many months studies by the American Institute of Public Opinion have found two basic aims governing the attitude of the American people toward the war—first, to do everything possible to aid the Allies, but, second, to stay out of the war. The events of recent weeks have caused increased sentiment for helping the Allies by every means "short of war," but there has been little change in the other basic attitude—to keep out of the fighting.

TREND OF SENTIMENT

The trend of sentiment on going to war with Germany has been as follows:

"Do you think the United States should declare war on Germany and send our Army and Navy abroad to fight?"

	Percent	
	Yes	No
When war started (September 1939)	6.0	94.0
October	5.0	95.0
December	3.5	96.5
After invasion of Norway (April 1940)	3.7	96.3
Today (since invasion of Holland, Belgium, and France)	7.0	93.0

It is interesting to note the relation between events in the war and the trend of sentiment. Some observers thought the Nazi invasion of Norway with its bombing of open towns would profoundly affect America's attitude of aloofness. Actually, according to the survey, there was little change.

The dramatic and world-shaking invasion of Holland and Belgium a week later brought a net increase of about 3 percent in war sentiment. But it is clear that, for the present at least, no war fever of any appreciable size has been generated. What will happen to American sentiment if the Nazis unleash a furious bombing assault against England, or threaten Canada, remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Gallup poll, as far as participation in the war is concerned, is correct, and that it reflected with a like percentage in the Congress of the United States.

Social Offensive or Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SANDAGER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Providence Journal of Tuesday, May 28, 1940, entitled "Social Offensive or Defense?" which comments pointedly upon the President's fireside chat of Sunday night. The editorial follows:

[From the Providence Journal of May 28, 1940]

SOCIAL OFFENSIVE OR DEFENSE?

The President's fireside chat had the virtue of letting us know in unmistakable language that not one concession would be made in New Deal policy to the program of gearing our industrial production to the needs of national defense.

In other words, Mr. Roosevelt told the Nation that we can have our cake and eat it, too.

Many people may have felt reassured by what Mr. Roosevelt told them we already have in the way of armament. As a matter of fact, that was the most political part of his whole chat. If he had told them, not what we have in the number of guns "on hand and on order," as he repeatedly put it, but what was the protective value of what we have in relation to the continent that we have to protect, the story would have sounded altogether different.

Except for the Navy, the value of which is dependent upon the future of the British fleet and the position of the Japanese fleet, Mr. Roosevelt should have told the people that we have not enough land armament or air armament even to count against a first-class power, let alone such unprecedented and terrifying mechanized force as Hitler has produced.

We submit that the purpose of his putting the statement as he did had a strong odor of bidding for votes.

Neither what we have "on hand or on order," or even are likely to put on order, can solve the problem, but only the capacity to produce through organization, management, and freedom of action for industry in the emergency as the emergency demands.

This, says Mr. Roosevelt, he will not let industry have for fear of injury to the New Deal social offensive.

We believe that Mr. Roosevelt is making the same terrible error of Britain and France, which is costing them heartsickening losses in lives, blood, and treasure and may yet cost them their liberties. This error could have been avoided if their leaders had had courage and truth in their hearts.

We should be compounding the error, believing as we do, if we did not raise the warning while there is still time that the consequences will be inexorably the same—inadequate, insufficient, and botched preparedness against the most ferociously efficient monster that the world has ever suffered under.

The Nazi menace is, obviously, primarily the power of industrial production concentrated upon weapons of mechanized warfare.

The only possible answer to it for the United States is industrial production of armaments.

Eighty million Germans for 7 years have literally slaved for this fiendish production. Lack of natural resources—particularly petroleum—may still defeat them, but so far as the production of armaments is concerned, the Nazis have overwhelmed both Britain and France, though both democracies, with enormous industrial capacity, have themselves concentrated upon armament production desperately, since Munich and before.

If Germany wins she will instantly have ended her lack of natural resources. Swedish steel, petroleum, rubber, every resource needed for war will be hers in abundance. Her military power will be this prodigious industrial production, which was greater than that of Britain and France, plus access to all needed resources.

Germany is on the channel ports now because for 7 years the nation was turned into a forge and arsenal for war purposes, with sweat and sacrifice exacted of her people without parallel in history. The loot of droning empires that failed to read the handwriting on the wall has been promised them for their work.

The awe-inspiring might of Germany cannot be matched and outstripped under a leadership that in the same 7 years spent approximately $60,000,000,000 and failed to lift our industrial production, with the exception of 1 month, to the level of 1929. Consider that Germany, the "have-not" nation, from 1929 to 1937 practically doubled her national income for industry and commerce, and that, on the other hand, the United States in the same period in the same field failed to reach the national income of 1929.

Yet this is the leadership to which has been entrusted the administrative and executive power to do the job that has been so lamentably bungled—increasing the production of the United States. As the President told the Nation, the men to be called from the industrial world are to be advisers, nothing more. They will have no authority to act; they will not have the power of decision; they will have their judgments subordinated to officials who got their training in the vast complexities of the modern industrial machine as gentlemen farmers and social workers.

The shade of Woodrow Wilson, who came to the hard fact that production was the responsibility of men who knew how to produce, could warn the President of a mistake that may be fatal. Mr. Wilson tried the course Mr. Roosevelt has adopted and failed with it utterly. He then substituted a War Industries Board with real executive power. This, Mr. Roosevelt refuses point blank to do. He cannot trust industrial executives with executive authority. It is temperamentally repugnant to him.

With the emergency crying out for production, more production, maximum production, the President offers the Nation a social program, the same program that has tied American industry, like a recumbent Gulliver, with the ligatures of restraint and restriction. Because industry was forced by laws and regulation to live on a day-to-day and hand-to-mouth basis, unemployment remains high, obsolescence has not been adequately surmounted, replacement has been cautious instead of bold, and machinery has moved with a limp.

If the leaders in Washington will not face up to the fact, the Nation must: That the men and methods that have left us in a weakened industrial condition must go, and men and methods that will function efficiently and without waste in rearming the United States must take their place.

We, too, need Churchills, Reynauds, and Weygands.

We need a leader who will tell the workers that for the emergency the deadening hand of coddling legislation must be lifted for the strengthening of national defense. And he will be understood and respected by the workers for so telling them, because they know that their enemy today is Hitlerism and its evil genius which immediately enchains labor.

We need a leader who will oust, instead of continuing in power, the present National Labor Relations Board, which has received the openly declared vote of no confidence by industry, one of the two major labor unions, and public opinion. Its disruptive effect upon industry is already evident and it will deepen unless a more responsible and fair membership is selected to handle and adjust the delicate balances of employer and employed.

We need a leader who will bring to government in this emergency the experience, practicality, and skill that proved indispensable in enabling industry to weather depression.

We need a leader who can accomplish the mighty task of making secure our national defense without imposing too great a strain upon the entire economic structure, who has the confidence of the industrial world, which must do the job, and who has the common sense and reasonableness to achieve the necessary adjustments without social disturbances.

We do not believe that Franklin D. Roosevelt, his Cabinet, his inner circle of advisers have the capacity, in view of their record, to handle the emergency. We do not believe that their methods can do the job.

Importations of Canadian Oats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the distressingly low prices of American farm products, it is disturbing to note from the market page of the Chicago Tribune of May 28 that Canadian oats are adding further to the losses of our farmers. It does seem something should be done to protect us against depreciated currencies and foreign surpluses dumped upon our already overburdened agriculture.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 28, 1940]

CANADIAN OATS BROUGHT IN TO FILL CONTRACTS

The first Canadian oats received in Chicago since 1934 were being unloaded yesterday at the Northwestern Elevator, East One hundred and twenty-second Street and Torrence Avenue, for Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis grain dealer.

Carrying 378,000 bushels of No. 2 and No. 3 white oats, the steamer *Riverton* docked at the elevator Saturday. The grain was shipped here from Fort William, Ontario.

Wyman W. Fitzgerald, vessel broker and grain trader, said the oats were brought in to help cover May contracts in the grain outstanding at the close of trading May 22.

According to Fitzgerald there were 669,000 bushels of May oats contracts outstanding last week and the cash grain supply was far short of the amount needed.

Canadian oats have been underselling American oats in New England by 2 to 4 cents a bushel for several months.

Depreciation of the Canadian dollar in terms of United States currency, heavy supplies of superior Canadian oats, and a less than normal supply of domestic oats have been factors contributing to increased imports, according to cash grain dealers.

Lincolniana in the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

ADDRESS OF MR. DAVID C. MEARNS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, April 15, 1940, was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the death of President Abraham Lincoln. On that day the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia gathered at the Hay-Adams House in the Nation's Capital where Mr. David C. Mearns, superintendent of the reading room of the Library of Congress, delivered an instructive address on the Lincolniana in the Library of Congress. Believing that Members of Congress and other students of our Nation's history will be interested in reading Mr. Mearns' description of the mementos in the Library of Congress relative to our first martyred President, I submit herewith his address in full.

LINCOLNIANA IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The London Times for April 27, 1865, carried the news of an American tragedy. A great man had been murdered. Among those who read the account was "a very little lady," who was then residing

on the north shore of the Isle of Wight. Writing on that day to a "most beloved uncle" in Belgium, she declared:

"These American news are most dreadful and awful! One never heard of such a thing! I only hope it will not be catching elsewhere."

She was a very sad little lady. Osborne House, where she was staying, had been built from designs drawn by her husband, now 3 years dead, and he himself had superintended its construction. On the broad acres that surrounded it he had run a model farm. The flag tower, the clock tower, the furniture, paintings, statuary, gardens, the very sea air were filled with memories of him. And so it was but natural that her sympathies should go out to another widow. But it was at the prompting of Prof. Goldwin Smith, her good friend and "a great democrat," who urged that "it would do more good than anything else" that 2 days later she took up her pen and with a firm hand wrote:

"DEAR MADAM: Though a stranger to you, I cannot remain silent when so terrible a calamity has fallen upon you and your country, and must personally express my deep and heartfelt sympathy with you under the shocking circumstances of your present dreadful misfortune.

"No one can better appreciate than I can, who am myself utterly broken-hearted by the loss of my own beloved husband, who was the light of my life—my stay, my all—what your sufferings must be; and I earnestly pray that you may be supported by Him to whom alone the sorely stricken can look for comfort in this hour of heavy affliction.

"With the renewed expression of my true sympathy, I remain, dear madam, your sincere friend,

"VICTORIA REG.[INA]."

A month later that letter was acknowledged.

"MADAM [wrote the other lady]: I have received the letter which Your Majesty has had the kindness to write, and am deeply grateful for its expressions of tender sympathy, coming as they do from a heart which, from its own sorrow, can appreciate the intense grief I now endure. Accept, madam, the assurance of my heartfelt thanks, and believe me in the deepest sorrow, Your Majesty's sincere and grateful friend,

"MARY LINCOLN."

Today is the anniversary of that terrible calamity which befell our country 75 years ago, and it has seemed to me appropriate to begin an account of the Lincoln collections in the Library of Congress with a quotation from Queen Victoria's letter, the original of which is enshrined in them.

Just when the formation of those collections was initiated it is difficult to determine. Perhaps they began with the publication of the Lincoln-Douglas debates; but certainly by the time of Mr. Lincoln's inauguration they had begun to take shape, and the records of our borrowers' accounts show that President Lincoln himself sent to the Library of Congress for copies of the campaign biographies written by D. V. G. Bartlett and William Dean Howells.

However, the credit for having assembled the first considerable collection of Lincolniana must go to Andrew Boyd, a publisher of directories in Albany, N. Y., who, in 1870, issued "A memorial Lincoln bibliography: * * * comprising a collection in the possession of the compiler * * *." In his preface to that publication Mr. Boyd wrote: "It is without doubt the largest Lincoln collection extant."

Speaking before the Bibliographical Society of America in 1908 on Lincoln collections and Lincoln bibliography (proceedings and papers, vol. 3, p. 54), so eminent an authority as Daniel Fish, remarked that "Andrew Boyd had ceased from his labors (in 1900), but his collection was intact in the hands of Maj. William H. Lambert, of Philadelphia, to whom all Lincoln devotees bow as the chief of their tribe." Later on, in the same address, Mr. Fish said of Major Lambert: "As before indicated, he early acquired the collection of Andrew Boyd, the basis of the Hart-Boyd bibliography of 1870, upon which ample foundation he has erected the tallest of the literary monuments to Lincoln."

Again, Albert H. Griffith, in an article published in the Wisconsin Magazine of History, volume 15, No. 2, December 1931, entitled "Lincoln Literature, Lincoln Collections, and Lincoln Collectors," made the unqualified statement that the Boyd collection had been sold to William H. Lambert. In a biographical sketch which appeared in the auction catalog of his library it is declared that Lambert "bought Boyd's collection on Lincoln," and that "Boyd's collection was one of the earliest formed, and this will explain how Major Lambert had so many items that other collectors could not find. He got them early * * *." Benjamin Oakleaf, in a note to the subscribers to his Lincoln Bibliography, declared that "Henry E. Huntington, of San Gabriel, Calif., purchased a large portion of the [Lambert] collection, including all of the rare items. These are installed in the library at San Gabriel (sic), known as the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery."

Thus it may be seen that it is the general belief among Lincoln collectors and bibliographers that the Boyd collection was acquired intact by Lambert and subsequently came, in part at least, into the possession of the Huntington Library.

Behold I shall show you a mystery. Several years ago, in response to an inquiry, I investigated the history of the Boyd collection and, grubbing among old files and dusty records, I was able to assemble the following evidence:

First, that in the Library of Congress Journal [of Disbursement], volume 1, page 220, is the following entry:

"November 3, 1873. Fund for increase of the Library, 1873, to amount paid Andrew Boyd, $1,000."

Second, that in the letter book of the Librarian of Congress, January 10, 1871, to February 20, 1874, page 645, is a letter to the Honorable T. O. Howe, chairman of the Joint Library Committee, also dated November 3, 1873, which reads:

"SIR: I have the honor to enclose for your signature, if approved, the following bills:

L. Martin, fund for improving building, Botanical Garden	$642.40
W. D. Wyvill, fund for improving building, Botanical Garden	23.10
Andrew Boyd, fund for increase of the Library	1,000.00

"P. S.—The owner of the Lincoln collection, after long debate, concluded to accept the offer authorized by you and Mr. Allison last March. We get the whole collection, except such books and pamphlets as are already in the Library, [amounting to] only about 200 articles.

"(Signed) A. R. SPOFFORD."

Third, that there is in the General Accounting Office the account of Andrew Boyd against the Library of Congress. This account reads as follows:

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *March 18, 1873.*

Library of Congress, bought of Andrew Boyd, the Boyd collection of Lincolniana, comprising about 1,500 books and pamphlets, medals, handbills, etc., tokens, etc., to amount of $1,000, as agreed. Received payment.

ANDREW BOYD.

WASHINGTON, *November 3, 1873.*

Fourth, that we have a copy of Andrew Boyd's Memorial Lincoln Bibliography, checked and annotated by Mr. Spofford, then Librarian of Congress, which was used both as an accessions and a finding list. I believe that the items checked represent the purchases, and that the items marked with a "D" are those duplicates which were rejected. After an entry on page 33 is a penciled note: "Mr. Boyd will send two copies"; and on page 133 is another: "A. B. will send this copy." Moreover, we have discovered that the books themselves were marked to agree with their location in the bibliography. For example, a memorial address on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln, delivered at Concord, N. H., June 1, 1865, by Hon. James W. Patterson at the request of the State authorities, is marked at the top of the front cover "66.7," and it appears in the bibliography on page 66 as item No. 7.

Thus we have, I believe, incontrovertible evidence that the Library of Congress secured all of the magnificent Boyd collection in 1873 with the exception of about 200 duplicates. Of course, there may very well have been duplicates in the Boyd collection which were not enumerated in the bibliography, and these may have represented the nuclei of the collection subsequently sold to Major Lambert.

I don't know.

In any event the Government has been collecting Lincolniana for lo, these many years. On the 11th day of April 1916 the children of John Hay, Mr. Lincoln's secretary, presented to the Library of Congress the manuscript of the Second Inaugural Address, and two copies, in the President's holograph of that address delivered at Gettysburg, Pa., on November 19, 1863, consisting of the original, one sheet of which had evidently been written at the White House and the other in Gettysburg, as well as a fair copy, or draft, written sometime before its delivery.

On the same day the daughter of Mr. Lincoln's other secretary, Col. John G. Nicolay, added to our collections that very characteristic Lincoln paper, the Memorandum of August 23, 1864, in which he stated that it seemed probable he would lose the coming election, in which event he would cooperate with the President-elect to save the Union. This memorandum he sealed at the time, and each member of the Cabinet, at his request, endorsed it without knowing its contents. After the election the seal was broken and the memorandum was read aloud to the Cabinet.

In 1923 President Lincoln's papers, which had been on deposit since 1919, were presented to the Library by his son, the Honorable Robert Todd Lincoln, with the stipulation that they should not be opened until 21 years after his death. Mr. Robert Lincoln died July 26, 1926, and so 7 summers must pass before that correspondence will become available for public examination. These are, however, the papers used by Mr. Nicolay and Mr. Hay in preparing their Life of Abraham Lincoln, and having been examined by such competent writers may be presumed to contain little unpublished material calculated to change estimates of men or manners.

In 1927 Mrs. Robert Todd Lincoln added to the collections the letter of condolence from Queen Victoria, a more formal but sympathetic letter from the Empress Eugénie, written, in French, from the Tuileries, on the 28th of April 1865; and a letter referring to personal associations with President Lincoln, from Louis Philippe d'Orleans, the Comte de Paris.

A year later Mrs. Lincoln added to her previous gifts three precious mementos of her great father-in-law, his family Bible, the Bible on which he took the oath of office at his first inauguration, and a gold medal presented to the President's widow shortly after his assassination as a touching tribute from 40,000 French citizens.

The youthful romance of Lincoln has found new expression in the Library of Congress in the very copy of Samuel Kirkham's English Grammar, which Lincoln mastered and then gave to his sweetheart, Ann Rutledge. Through the efforts of Miss Jane E. Hamand, of Schaller, Iowa, the volume was secured from the

surviving Rutledges and given a permanent abiding place in our collections in 1932.

Mary Lincoln Isham, the President's granddaughter, in 1937, added to the Government's treasure by the gift of important memorabilia, including a number of books from Mr. Lincoln's private library.

I have mentioned Kirkham's Grammar. In Lincoln's youth, the mathematical textbook in use in southern Indiana was Pike's Arithmetic. Too poor to buy a copy, the frontier boy indulged his passion for self-improvement by borrowing one and transcribing portions of it for his own use. The sheets so copied were then sewed together in a home-made book. On two of the pages he copied the tables and exercises in linear, land, and dry measure, and in a less serious moment scrawled the doggerel lines:

"Abraham Lincoln, his hand and pen;
He will be good, but God knows when."

These pages were presented to William H. Herndon, Lincoln's law partner and biographer, by Lincoln's stepmother in the fall of 1865. They are a part of the Herndon-Weik collection, now in the possession of G. A. Baker & Co., of New York City, and it may be of interest to remark that there is now pending in Congress a joint resolution to purchase that collection for preservation in the Library of Congress. The preamble contains the following statements: (1) That "Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, was one of the greatest Presidents of our Republic, whose name will live forever in the hearts of the people"; (2) that "all papers, objects, and effects of Abraham Lincoln which are connected with his exemplary life are, and always will be, cherished by the people of the United States"; and (3) that "it is the desire of the American people and the uniform policy of the Congress of the United States to preserve for posterity all papers, objects, and effects of Abraham Lincoln."

In connection with Queen Victoria's letter, I referred to Prof. Goldwin Smith as the only begetter of it. He himself contributed an article on The Death of President Lincoln, published in Macmillan's Magazine (London) for June 1865, in which he said:

"The small country lawyer of Illinois has died lamented by the nations, and all that is most august in the world has paid its tribute to his grave. What is more, the best men among his own people feel that America has gained one more ideal character, the most precious and inspiring of national possessions. If it be so, the second of the two ideal characters bears a close resemblance to the first. The glory of Lincoln, like that of Washington, has nothing in it dazzling or grandiose; it is the quiet halo which rests around the upright, self-devoted, unwavering, and unwearying performance of the hardest public duty. But its quiet light will shine steadily when many a meteor that has flamed in history has been turned, by the judgment of a sounder morality, to darkness. * * * It has been said that in the work of those whom the world calls great there are always two elements—one produced by their just discernment of their times, which is almost always lasting, the other more individual, and more connected with personal schemes and aspirations, which is apt to pass away. Guizot, in a well-known passage, has illustrated this remark in the case of Charlemagne. No man's work ever had in it more of the first element, and less of the second, than that of Lincoln. No man's work, therefore, by this rule, ought to be more lasting."

Professor Smith's prognosis has been proved correct. No man's work has been (or will be) more lasting than Mr. Lincoln's; because that is so, the Government must continue to collect and preserve the records of his life, and the Angles and the Bartons and the Beveridges and the Townsends and the Sandburgs must continue to interpret it to each generation in terms of its own experience. And as for the records, themselves, they must, I believe, somehow feel at home, for when Congressman Lincoln came to Washington, he lived in the fourth of a row of houses known as Carroll Row, which stood on the site of the present Library of Congress.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MOLINE (ILL.) DISPATCH

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Moline Dispatch of May 22 on the subject of national defense.

[From the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of May 22, 1940]

REPUBLICANS AND DEFENSE CRISIS

We've been hearing defeatist talk among Republicans since the Nazis barged into the lowlands and threatened Paris and British soil. It is assumed by some that there isn't any use any longer in keeping up a campaign for Republican principles; that they might as well cancel the convention and let the election go by default. It's a one-man show from now until the end of the European crisis, according to some. One writer even suggests that the next 4 years are bound to bring a lot of trouble regardless of the party in power, and that the Republicans might as well let the Democrats have that trouble.

In the first place, we object to the supposition that Adolf Hitler's antics can interfere in the affairs of the American Government. Why we should have a New Deal Democrat administration every time Germany overflows into neighboring countries is a question that can be answered only by an appeal to emotion, and emotion is a dangerous thing. To assume that Mr. Roosevelt is the only man who can keep the country out of war, build up the Nation's defenses, and participate, if participation is necessary, in a peace conference, is to ignore the record Mr. Roosevelt has established thus far.

Turning the picture the other way, we present the thought that this is a very trying and dark time for the Democratic Party. We would imagine that the Democrats of the old-line type would be glad to get out of the emergency the best way they can and let the Republicans inherit the trouble the New Deal has left as a heritage.

There are millions now alive who remember acutely the theory that Woodrow Wilson was going to keep us out of war. He was reelected on that promise, and he couldn't keep us out of war. Our entry into the World War was justified, but the scandalous inefficiency of the service of supply, the horrible unpreparedness that sent untrained men into battle, and the ridiculous waste of funds that accompanied the war are reflected in the present low estate of business caused by the secondary post-war depression. Wilson laid the ground work and the G. O. P. got the blame.

We would assume today that the Democratic Party should retreat into whatever shell it has at the bare mention of war. For let this be understood: If the United States Government becomes involved in this war without full justification, the Democratic Party will bear the nickname of the war party. If we add to our already unjustifiable national debt purely to preserve the balance of power overseas, the Democratic Party will earn a reputation as a wrecker of treasuries. If we pass on another load of billions to be paid by generations still to be born, the Democratic Party will be classed as an oppressor of children.

The American people go into war wholeheartedly and support it with every nerve, muscle, and brain cell; but after the war they ask questions. They asked questions after the last war, and unreasoningly blamed the munitions makers and British propaganda. Today we are able to detect propaganda, and the industrialists who would make the munitions are on record as wanting nothing to do with war, except in defense.

There are a few third-term fans who actually would welcome war, or a threat of war, as a vehicle for their political aspirations. They are not old-line Democrats, but radicals who don't care what happens to the party after the war, and fondly imagine that a debt is a good thing. After all, we would owe it to ourselves, you know.

Wouldn't you suppose that traditional Democrats would be glad to let the Republicans inherit an empty Treasury and a defense problem, plus millions of unemployed and disorganized business?

Who says the Republicans couldn't organize national defense—and conduct a war—if need be?

The Herndon Collection of Lincolniana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what American, regardless of political affiliation, does not revere the name of Abraham Lincoln? His lowly beginning, his unfailing kindliness, his patience, his simplicity, his humility, and his humor all are embedded in the hearts of the school children of this and other lands. His courageous struggle against adversity, his successful championship of the oppressed, his firm leadership in a serious national crisis, and his martyrdom to the cause of liberty and union have made him America's great contribution to the ages. In his day he was the foremost defender of that system of government which we call democracy—a system now imperiled in so many parts of the world by ruthless suppression of the God-given rights of individuals.

Lincoln was not an unyielding devotee to partisan politics. Early in his career he was a Democrat. An admirer of Henry Clay, he studied and absorbed the writings and public utterances of that distinguished statesman. His views changed, and he became an ardent and enthusiastic Whig. Suppression of Negro slavery and preservation of the Union of States, however, were to him principles that were above party affiliation and he left the Whig Party to cast his lot and devote his energies with the newly formed Republican Party. He became their first President. Today Democrats and Republicans alike acclaim him one of our greatest Americans.

Lincoln was given to the Nation by Illinois. There he spent his early manhood. There he became a young storekeeper, surveyor, soldier, lawyer, and legislator. There he contended in the debates with the "Little Giant," Stephen A. Douglas, for a seat in the United States Senate—a struggle that he lost as though destined for greater work. We never tire reading of his remarkable career as chronicled by Nicolay and Hay, Barton, Beveridge, Hertz, Sandburg, and others of his numerous biographers. His life, his accomplishments, and his death all have made a deep and lasting impression upon our minds. We in the Nation's Capital are constantly reminded of them by the proximity of the great Lincoln Memorial erected by our Government; by Ford's Theater, the scene of the tragedy that saddened the world; and by the Peterson House across the street where his weary body found eternal rest and his noble character became the inspiration of the ages.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Illinois it has been my privilege in the past to address this House concerning the life and distinguished career of this great man, who, nearly 100 years ago, served my State as a Member of this body. I address you again today to enlist your support of House Joint Resolution 507, a bill which contemplates the purchase, for a permanent place in the Library of Congress, of the William H. Herndon collection of the early writings of the Great Emancipator, most of which are in his own handwriting. The collection is now under examination by the Chief of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

It is fitting and proper and in accordance with national policy that these documents be placed with the other priceless collections now in that Library, where they may be enjoyed by all. From a small beginning, the Library of Congress has become the greatest in the world. It originated practically with 6,000 volumes from the private collection of Thomas Jefferson. During the latter part of the last century and the early years of this, under Ainsworth R. Spofford, then Librarian, its growth was phenomenal. During his administration the main building was erected opposite the Capitol. Later, under Librarian Herbert Putnam, another magnificent building was erected to accommodate the 5,400,000 books and periodicals necessary to be preserved. In these two buildings are housed many of the most important collections of Americana, including the writings of some of our most famous statesmen. Last year Congress appropriated $55,000 for the purchase of the papers of Charles C. Pinckney, who played such an important part in our early diplomacy and was author of the phrase "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." During the administration of President Hoover, Congress appropriated $1,500,000 for the purchase of books printed during the fifteenth century, among which was the celebrated Gutenberg Bible.

Let me give you a brief history of the Herndon collection.

For 16 years prior to Lincoln's election to the Presidency William H. Herndon was his law partner. He was 9 years younger than Lincoln, and was likewise a native of Kentucky. His family had moved to Illinois in 1820, and in 1825 settled in Springfield. An admirer of Lincoln from his first acquaintance with him, he joyfully accepted in 1844 an invitation to become his partner and thereafter worked loyally at his side in the practice of law and in the furtherance of his political ambitions. When Lincoln left Springfield for Washington to assume the office of President, his last request to his law partner was to keep intact the old sign, "Lincoln and Herndon," until his return. As we know, he did return, but only to sleep the sleep that knows no awakening.

Prior to Lincoln's death and for several years thereafter Herndon took unto himself the task of collecting accurate and detailed information concerning the life of the Great Emancipator. He traveled in Kentucky and Indiana accumulating reminiscences of Lincoln's boyhood days from people who were still living and who could speak of him at first hand. He interviewed the members of his family including his stepmother, Sarah Lincoln; his stepsister, Matilda Moore; and Dennis and John Hanks. He talked to judges before whom Lincoln had pleaded cases, lawyers with whom he had been associated in lawsuits, and lawyers who had opposed him. He exhausted the recollections of politicians, storekeepers, and tradesmen. He even corresponded with and personally interviewed girls whom Lincoln had courted. Whenever he attained a lead that somebody somewhere had intimate knowledge of some hitherto unknown fact concerning Lincoln's life, he followed it up persistently and untiringly. With this mass of material and data based on his researches, Herndon planned to write an elaborate biography. He permitted Joseph H. Barrett, Isaac N. Arnold, and Ward H. Lamon to examine his collection but they made slight use of it in the biographies they subsequently brought forth. When he had reached the age of 71, he engaged a young man named Jesse W. Weik to help prepare the work we now know as Herndon's Lincoln, The True Story of a Great Life, published in 1889. Herndon's own manuscript was largely rewritten by Weik and then extensively edited and cut down. A great portion of the valuable material which he had obtained through his exhaustive research was deleted or entirely omitted from the published product. The late Senator Albert J. Beveridge and Ida M. Tarbell, two subsequent Lincoln biographers, are said to have had a limited view of the Herndon collection which to some extent bears the aspect of an unworked literary mine. In 1938, the late Dr. Emanuel Hertz, of New York City, noted Lincoln authority, published The Hidden Lincoln, a work which is rich in hitherto unknown facts and incidents in the life of the emancipator which he obtained from a study of the Herndon collection.

The history of these papers since their use by Herndon and Weik is interesting. Weik inherited them from Herndon and retained them until his death. Thereafter his estate sold them to a firm of autograph dealers in New York for a large sum. This firm planned to sell them piecemeal. It was realized that the manuscripts of Lincoln in his own handwriting were especially valuable and that many of them would bring $1,000 or more each. However, the owners were urged by specialists and public-spirited citizens not to dispose of the papers and documents in that way but to keep them intact so that they might be used as a whole for biographical and patriotic purposes. For several years a wealthy individual is said to have expressed a desire to purchase the collection with the intention of presenting it to the Nation. Recently the owners have withdrawn the option which this individual held and are now willing to sell the collection for deposit in the Library of Congress for a figure said by leading experts to be quite reasonable and less than could be realized if sold piece by piece.

Herndon was an abolitionist. That his opinions on the slavery issue influenced Lincoln to any great extent may be overestimated. Certain it is that he was in close touch with Theodore Parker, Charles Sumner, William H. Seward, Wendell Phillips, Horace Greeley, William Lloyd Garrison, and other prominent abolitionists and undoubtedly he called to his distinguished partner's attention many of their writings and utterances relative to that subject that otherwise would have escaped him. The Herndon collection contains one of Parker's books—a book Lincoln is said to have carried in his pocket and which contains the germ of many of his anti-slavery arguments, even to the extent of almost literal

use of some of Parker's phrases. Throughout Lincoln's political reverses from 1848 to 1858, Herndon's faith in the ability of his friend and in his firm attitude relative to the extension of slavery and the preservation of the Union, never wavered.

To keep him informed on the current developments of the antislavery movement, he compiled a scrapbook containing a mass of information which his partner utilized in his speeches. Then Lincoln compiled one himself, and this is one of the choice gems of the collection. It is a small book, perhaps less than an inch in thickness, 4 inches wide, and 5 or 6 inches long, neatly pasted together, and designed to be carried conveniently in his pocket. In it are some 200 items, including newspaper clippings, quotations, and tables of statistics. It contained the ammunition he thought would be useful in his battle with Douglas in 1858—his campaign textbook, to which he could refer instantly for the facts that would pierce the argument of his able opponent. It brings us very near to the actualities of the momentous encounter on open platforms under the trees of Illinois. As we feel the little brown volume and thumb through its pages, which Abraham Lincoln himself so carefully put together, we realize that we are in intimate touch with one of the great moments of history, when the fate of freedom or slavery, union or disunion, was to be decided. It is quite probable that this memento of the Lincoln-Douglas debates has never been examined with sufficient care to exactly determine the part it played. As a sacred relic of American history, it should be in the Library of Congress, where all may see it, study it, and perhaps glean from its yellow pages some of the thoughts that were Lincoln's when he faced the "Little Giant" in the momentous days of 1858.

In the Herndon collection there are also precious mementos of Lincoln's boyhood. His mother passed away when he was 9 years of age. His father, not long afterward, married Sarah Bush Johnston, the widow of Daniel Johnston, of Elizabethtown, Ky. She became an important and abiding influence in young Abraham's future life and lived for several years after the tragedy that took him away. It was she who told the now familiar story of his ciphering on boards and then shaving them off with a knife in preparation for fresh efforts. It may be that she had a premonition of the future greatness of her stepson. She materially assisted him in his unrelenting quest for knowledge and her deep affection for him never waned. Her pride in him was so keen that she carefully preserved some of his earliest efforts at writing. One of these comprised two pages of homemade arithmetic, which she kept until the last and then turned it over to Herndon. It is the first of his literary efforts of which we have any record and was written when he was about 9 years of age. It is valuable, not only because it bears the earliest signature of Lincoln known to exist but because it proves him to have been a real boy, with all of a boy's natural humor. In the lower left-hand corner of the first page of this early arithmetic lesson he penned the following verse:

> Abraham Lincoln, his hand and pen,
> He will be good, but God knows when.

Surely this treasure should be permanently displayed in the Library of Congress.

Among the priceless manuscripts of the Herndon collection are 750 legal papers in Lincoln's own handwriting covering his entire legal career, which began in 1836. We find in them a multitude of causes pro and con concerning the affairs of the people of his county and State. They show first the youthful and then the matured lawyer employed in diversified legal actions. On some of the earlier of these cases his sense of humor is quite as prevalent as are the argumentative facts and legal conclusions. Among these papers is the famous case wherein he represented the Illinois Central Railroad and for his services claimed a fee of $5,000. Payment was refused, and he was obliged to sue for it. Here we find the testimony of the witnesses as to his skillful handling of the cause of his client and the justice of the bill. Suffice to say he recovered the amount in full.

Many original autographed letters augment the value of the collection. A large number refer to the political maneuverings of the 1850's. There is a letter of Herndon written March 24, 1858, in which he sets forth the information he was able to glean on his tour through the Eastern States regarding Lincoln's Presidential prospects for 1860. There are numerous letters from Mrs. Mary Todd Lincoln and Robert T. Lincoln and about 300 from Herndon to Weik concerning a vast amount of information to be used in the biography they had in mind. There are 15 manuscripts concerning Lincoln, containing about 175 pages and 35,000 words. These constituted Herndon's original labors in writing the biography. There is an 8-page interview by Herndon with Lincoln's stepmother, Sarah Bush Lincoln, and other records of conversations with Matilda Moore, his youngest stepsister. There are records of conferences with a number of Lincoln's boyhood friends, and one with Mentor Graham, who was his teacher and had so much to do with stimulating his thirst for education. Here also are several letters of Horace White, who as a newspaper reporter covered the Lincoln-Douglas debates for the Chicago Tribune.

Perhaps we can better understand the real Lincoln if we read a few sentences from one of the letters contained in this collection. It was written by the man who was President Lincoln's private secretary during the trying years of 1861–65. This man—John Hay—later to become Secretary of State under President Theodore Roosevelt, was the father-in-law of our distinguished colleague Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York. It is intensely interesting, because Secretary Hay was in the White House with President Lincoln during the Civil War years and was probably more closely and intimately associated with him during that crucial period than any other person. Here is what he says:

> Lincoln used to go to bed ordinarily from 10 to 11 o'clock, unless he happened to be kept up by important news, in which case he would frequently remain at the War Department until 1 or 2. He rose early. When he lived in the country at Soldiers' Home he would be up and dressed, eat his breakfast (which was extremely frugal—an egg, a piece of toast, coffee, etc.), and ride into Washington, all before 8 o'clock. In the winter at the White House he was not quite so early. He did not sleep very well but spent a good while in bed. Tad usually slept with him. He would lie around the office until he fell asleep, and Lincoln would shoulder him and take him off to bed. He pretended to begin business at 10 o'clock in the morning, but in reality the anterooms and halls were full before that hour—people anxious to get the first ax ground. He was extremely unmethodical; it was a 4-year struggle on Nicolay's part and mine to get him to adopt some systematic rules. He would break through every regulation as fast as it was made. Anything that kept the people themselves away from him he disapproved—although they nearly annoyed the life out of him by unreasonable complaints and requests. * * *
>
> He was very abstemious—ate less than anyone I know. Drank nothing but water—not from principle, but because he did not like wine or spirits. Once in rather dark days early in the war, a temperance committee came to him and said the reason we did not win was because our Army drank so much whisky as to bring down the curse of the Lord upon them. He said drily that it was rather unfair on the part of the aforesaid curse, as the other side drank more and worse whisky than ours did. * * * I believe Lincoln is well understood by the people. Miss Nancy Bancroft and the rest of that patent-leather kid-glove set knows no more of him than an owl does of a comet. * * * I consider Lincoln's republicanism incarnate—with all its faults and all its virtues. As in spite of some rudenesses, republicanism is the sole hope of a sick world, so Lincoln with all his foibles is the greatest character since Christ.

Mr. Speaker, briefly I have endeavored to describe some of the gems contained in the great Herndon Collection of Lincolniana. Our Government should not permit it to be disintegrated. It is an authentic record of a part of our Nation's history. It belongs in the Capital City and should be given an honored site in the greatest library in the world.

President Roosevelt Desires Dictatorship and War for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

LETTER FROM MR. AMOS PINCHOT

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

MAY 20, 1940.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that an effort is being made to break down, presumably with your consent, the anti-third-term tradition—that is to say, the tradition that no man shall be allowed to exercise the powers of the Presidency for more than 8 consecutive years—I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter.

For, occupied as you have been, and indeed overtaxed, by the duties and responsibilities of your office, it is possible that you have not taken time to consider the probable effect of the third-term drive, not primarily on yourself or your party, but on the country and the character and direction of American political thought. For, in the last analysis, it is the people's thinking that will shape the country's future.

Abraham Lincoln, in a little-quoted passage in his first inaugural, said:

"The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people * * *," who have "wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their hands at very short intervals."

And perhaps he would have spoken more strongly had he known that in the next three-quarters of a century the President's authority would be so enlarged—by statutes, by job and money patronage, and by an overgrown Federal bureaucracy, extending its control to State and city politics in every section—that today any man who has served two terms in the White House and wants a third can override opposition and make himself his party's candidate.

Mr. President, if you renominate yourself, for that is what it amounts to, your party will have to fight, in the coming campaign, on three vital and essentially related issues. They are vital and they are related, because they raise the question: What are the proper limits of the authority of the President of the United States?

These issues will be (a) the immense powers you have already gained, and the far greater powers you tried to secure in 1937 and 1938, through a series of bills which, if passed, would have given you the full authority of a dictator; (b) your attitude toward America's involvement in the war; and (c) your desire to break down the anti-third-term tradition, and become the first American to remain in the White House for 12 years in a row.

I am not a Democrat. And I am not writing this letter out of any wish to see your administration avoid errors that might insure its defeat next fall. On the contrary, I believe it has been in too long and become too strong. And, though it did many needed and beneficial things in your first term, your second term has tragically failed as an instrument of recovery, progress, and reemployment. It has left unsolved every serious national problem. And it is evident that a change is required.

But, what seems to stand out as clear and important in the situation, is this. Any party that goes before the people in a Nation-wide effort to convince them that the President should be armed with the sort of powers that were provided in the bills referred to, will be doing a major disservice. For, it will be defending a legislative program which, had it not been defeated, would have assured a puppet Congress, a puppet Court, a puppet press, and a Government-controlled economic system, to be steered, allowed to go ahead, or hauled back, like a toy boat sailing in a pond at the end of a string.

Later on I will raise the question whether this country should or should not enter the European war. Obviously it is a question on which everyone is entitled to his own opinion. But, at this point, it may be said that, in your handling of foreign relations, you have gone far toward laying down the proposition that you, instead of Congress, should have authority to make the choice between war and peace. More than that, while you have frequently declared your preference for peace, in a more or less perfunctory manner, you have followed up such declarations by making almost every argument that might justify our entry into the war.

No political party in this democracy can afford to defend the doctrine that the President shall decide the issue of war and peace, any more than any party can go to the people on the proposition involved in your third-term drive, namely, that your presence in the White House is indefinitely indispensable. And, Mr. President, if the Democratic Party does defend these propositions—and it will have to if you are its candidate—it will be turning American thinking away from democracy, away from peace, and away from the basic ideas of life and government that have nourished and sustained our commonwealth for a century and a half.

I

YOUR 1937–38 BILLS

Space forbids a discussion of the expansion of Presidential authority which you have actually accomplished from 1933 to the spring of 1937. This was the period in which a subservient Congress, in the name of emergency, gave you practically every power you asked for over agriculture, industry, business, foreign relations, taxation, and the spending of the public funds. And the results are sufficiently evidenced by the country's present condition.

But I would like to refer, at some length, to the powers which were embodied in the White House bills proposed by yourself and your advisors, and defeated in 1937 and 1938. For in these measures we have an authentic, unchallengeable record of your intentions on the subject of concentrating power in the President's hands. Consequently, in order to make clear, in brief form, the purpose and meaning of these measures, I have gathered together some of their more significant provisions and have redrafted and condensed them into a single measure, using simple and untechnical language.

And here I would like to emphasize the fact that there is no provision or even implication in this condensed measure, which, for convenience, we will call the Presidential powers bill, that is not found in the bills they are condensed from. And I may add that, if you will show me any provision in my bill which, in substance, is not found in your bills, I will be glad to send you my check for $1,000 to be donated to any charity you may select.

"A bill to authorize the President to enlarge the powers of the Presidency in peace and war; to control Congress; regulate industry; censor the press and radio; guide constitutional decisions of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes

'TITLE I. REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

"SECTION 1. The President is hereby authorized (a) to change the name and functions of the office of President, or (b) to abolish that office and set up another in its place.

"SEC. 2. The President is authorized (a) to change the name and functions of the executive departments, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and all other agencies and offices in the executive branch of the Government, or (b) to abolish them.

"SEC. 3. The President is authorized to nullify and prevent the enforcement of laws passed by Congress by abolishing any or all agencies set up by Congress to enforce its laws.

"TITLE II. CONTROL OF INDUSTRY

"SECTION 1. The President, acting through a board of five persons, appointed by and responsible to himself, is authorized to establish a standard minimum wage not to exceed $1,200 a year, except as hereinafter provided, and a workweek of whatever hours the Board may decide to be fair.

"SEC. 2. (a) The President's Board may at any time set aside the standard wage and fair workweek established in accordance with section 1 for any industry, class of industries, or individual concern, and fix whatever wages and hours it may see fit.

"(b) The President's Board may thereafter change hours and wages as often as it may see fit.

"(c) The President's Board may require any employer to establish, in addition to fair wages and hours, whatever other labor conditions it may see fit.

"SEC. 3. The President's Board may cancel agreements between employers and employees arrived at through collective bargaining if and when it decides that the facilities for collective bargaining are ineffective.

"SEC. 4. Violation of any provision of this section shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed $500, or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both. Each employment of a person in violation of this title shall be considered a separate offense. (Example: A publisher or broadcaster employing 1,000 persons in violation of this act would be punishable by a fine not to exceed $500,000, or imprisonment not to exceed 500 years, or both.)

"TITLE III. CONTROL OF THE PRESS AND RADIO

"SECTION 1. The provisions in title II, giving the President authority to change wages, hours, and other labor conditions, at discretion, shall apply to the newspaper and radio industries, to the end that the President shall be empowered to discriminate against or discipline any newspaper or broadcasting company whose policies do not coincide with those of his administration.

"SEC. 2. Anyone who publishes and transports across State lines, or through the mails, any material known by such publisher to be false, shall, upon conviction, be barred from the use of the mails for 6 months, and shall be fined not less than $1,000, and imprisoned for not more than 2 years.

"SEC. 3. The question whether such material was false, and whether the publisher knew it to be so, shall be decided by an appropriate authority.

"TITLE IV. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"Section 1. The President, acting through the Secretary of Labor, is hereby authorized to blacklist, at his discretion, and render ineligible for Government contracts for a period of 3 years, any contractor whom the National Labor Relations Board shall report (but need not prove) to have engaged in an unfair labor practice.

"TITLE V. WAR POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

"Section 1. Upon a declaration of war by the United States against any nation, large or small, the President is hereby authorized:

"(a) to fix, by proclamation, and to adjust, and readjust, at any time, upward or downward, at his discretion, the maximum price at which any article, or product, or any property, or right or interest in property may be bought, sold, leased, or contracted for, whether such articles, products, property, etc., shall relate to war or not.

"(b) to fix, by proclamation, and to adjust and readjust, upward or downward, at discretion, the maximum wage, compensation, or contract price of all labor and services, whether such labor and services shall relate to war or not.

"SEC. 2. By virtue of the authority granted to the President in the foregoing section, to fix and change at will, and without limit, the maximum prices and compensations for articles, products, and services (which includes the price of newspapers, periodicals, print paper, etc., and the compensation for advertising, entertainment, and other services) the President is empowered to censor the publishing and broadcasting industries and, if need be, to make unprofitable any newspaper or broadcasting company which refuses to follow the instructions of the White House.

"TITLE VI. REORGANIZATION OF THE SUPREME COURT

"Whereas certain provisions of this or other acts of Congress, enlarging the President's powers over Congress, business, agriculture, and other phases of American life, might be held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to add to that Court six new Justices of his own choosing."

I repeat that, incredible as it may seem, each and every power in the foregoing bill is taken from actual bills sponsored by yourself or your advisers in the period referred to. And the fact that they did not shock the country, even more than was the case, was mainly due to two circumstances. In the first place, the bills were introduced at intervals so that their force and meaning was never fully grasped by the people. In the second place, they were radically altered by congressional committees before they were given publicity.

For example, the power, provided in the condensed bill, to change the name and functions of the Presidency, or abolish that office and set up another in its place, is found in the typewritten White House draft of the reorganization bill, dated February 16, 1937, in titles I and V, and also in the revised draft of February 22, but not in the drafts debated on the floor of Congress. Both of the original drafts were made after consultation with you by men chosen and paid by you for the purpose.

Likewise, the highly coercive power to change and rechange, without limitation, wages, hours, and other labor conditions in the publishing, broadcasting, and other industries, was given you in the original Black-Connery bill, introduced by Senator Hugo L. Black, now Supreme Court Justice, on May 24, 1937. And the same is true of the other powers granted you in the condensed bill. Talk about economic royalists. These bills would have established an economic, plus a political, royalism such as was never before contemplated in a free country.

Also, it should be noted that the bulk of these bills made their appearance under misleading declarations of purpose. The Court-packing bill was offered to the country as a more or less routine measure designed to lighten the labors of Federal justices. The Black-Connery bill, which would have set up an executive dictatorship over capital and labor, was introduced as a mere wage and hour measure. As I remember, you referred to it as a bill "to put a few dollars in a poor devil's pay envelope at the end of the week."

The reorganization bill sailed under the colors of an efficiency measure, and was preceded by a message from the White House stating categorically that it would not increase the President's power, while the war-powers bill was printed under the reassuring caption, "A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war, and to equalize the burdens of war, and thus provide for the national defense and promote peace."

Mr. President, your lost battalion of bills was a political and economic monstrosity. It was a reduction to legislative form of a dream of unrestrained Executive ambition, a dream which, unfortunately, was more than a dream, and which still persists, as shown by the unceasing efforts of your administration to strip Congress of its constitutional functions and vest in the Executive more and more power over the economic and political organization of the country. It is evident that, had these bills been enacted, they would have put this country on the path not of creeping socialism but of galloping collectivism and dictatorship. And it seems equally evident that they were drafted by men who, having lost interest in the American way of doing things, were going on the principle that the only good democracy is dead democracy, and that the Constitution is a fine thing to praise but a better thing to maim or destroy.

II

FOREIGN RELATIONS

So much for the issue that would be raised, should you seek a third term, by your program of 1937 and 1938, and your continuing desire to acquire authority at the expense of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. Now let us turn, for a moment to foreign relations. For here, again, it would seem that no party would be justified in asking the American electorate to accept certain propositions which you have laid down.

In the opinion of many experts of good standing, the worst thing that could happen to England and France would be for the United States to become physically involved in the war. For this would necessarily divert our natural and industrial resources from the Allies. Our entry would mean that our productive energy would be required to strengthen our sadly lacking and obsolete Military Establishment. The job of suddenly putting this country on a war footing would be an enormous one. The Allies do not need man power. They need all the planes and various other kinds of equipment we can furnish, and more.

Unfortunately, though the New Deal has seen the European war coming since 1937, it has been as impractical and inefficient in military matters as in the matter of recovery. It has spent seven billions. It has talked a great deal about modernizing our system of defense, just as it has talked about balancing the Budget, restoring employment and farm incomes, and carrying on a large housing program. But it has done exceedingly little. And now, at the end of 7 years, with war sweeping the world, we have no army to speak of, a very small air force, inadequate coast defenses, practically no antiaircraft guns, and a paralyzing public debt, which will make adequate military preparations possible only at the cost of a serious sacrifice in the standard of living.

For 7 years, under your leadership and that of the "brain trust," your administration has been carrying on an economic war against depression. And the results have not been gratifying. For there has been little coordination or effective administration, less foresight and consistent planning, and no steady application of horse sense. And the question arises, Under the same kind of leadership, could a military war be effectively waged? No, Mr. President; if we want to help the Allies—and 9 Americans out of 10 do—common sense demands that this country shall stay at peace; that it shall keep its shirt on and not be rushed across the ocean into ill-considered adventures in Europe or Asia, where we cannot fight effectively in any case.

And yet you have moved steadily to a position far beyond that authorized by Congress and approved by the American people, namely, that of aiding the Allies by making our industrial output available to them. Indeed, your administration has advanced to a point where, with one foot in the war and the other in the air, it should be comparatively easy for it to throw this country irrevocably into the conflict.

A little over a year ago your personal representative in Paris made an address in the presence of high French officials, which, if less than a promise, was more than a hint that America would fight for France, should war occur. Less than 2 months later, you yourself publicly recorded your belief that, in case of war, America's "physical involvement" would become a "virtual certainty."

In the recently published American "white paper," which must be taken as authorized, since you have publicly recommended it, and it was compiled with the help of at least one member of your official family, and with access to official files—it is stated that, in conversations with the Attorney General and the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, you have taken the stand that, while you will not send an expeditionary force across the ocean, you might be willing to send our Navy and air forces.

A week ago, in your speech before the eighth American Scientific Congress, you again expressed an intention to keep the country at peace. Nevertheless, almost in the same breath, you all but declared war on Germany. And dramatically, in an appeal to fear, you restated the arguments for armed intervention. Last Monday, Secretary Hull, in an address of mysterious meaning, before the American Society of International Law, seemed to say but did not quite say, that we ought to intervene in an effort "to keep alive in the world the principle of order under law."

What do such statements mean, Mr. President? Why this mystery? Why this facility in never quite saying it? I have been convinced for a long time that you sincerely believe that this country ought to enter the war, and that, if you are reelected, you will move rapidly in that direction. But, in any case, your statements indicate a misconception of the scope and functions of the Presidency and, one may add, an overlooking of the fact that the decision between war and peace must, under our Constitution, be made not by yourself but by Congress, in the light of future circumstances, if and when the occasion arises.

In short, your position seems prematurely taken and more prematurely spoken, and inconsistent with your expressed resolve to prevent a black-out of peace. And, what is more, it comes near to laying down the proposition that when the people elect a President they give in advance to a single individual a mandate to commit 130,000,000 people to war, and all that war means.

Again, an analysis of the utterances of various administration leaders—Secretary Ickes, Senator PITTMAN, Under Secretary Welles, etc.—since the third-term drive began in 1937, reveals an intemperate and inflammatory quality better suited to create interna-

tional friction and hatred and a war psychology in our country, than to keep America in such a relation to Europe that, conceivably, it might act as a mediator to bring the present unspeakable disaster to a close.

One does not question the sincerity of these and others among your advisers. In fact, it is their sincerity that makes them dangerous. But it is possible that their judgment may have been influenced by the consideration that, only through an expectancy of war, or war itself, can the feeling against the third term be overcome, and they themselves be assured the opportunity to continue their usefulness to the country in an official capacity.

Nothing can exceed the horror with which public opinion in the United States regards the savage and inhuman course of Adolf Hitler and his government. Yet, what is to be gained by continually shaking one's fist at him across the Atlantic Ocean, or by the endless stream of threats and invective that flows eastward out of Washington? Certainly it has had no tendency either to help the Allies, or to check or embarrass Hitler. In Germany it has probably strengthened Hitler's hold on his people. In America it has undoubtedly excited the public, clouded its judgment, and increased the likelihood of our being drawn into war.

Despite the so-called American liberals who have found pleasure and profit in running down the United States, we have a great country. On the whole, it is a generous and enlightened country, and a tolerant one. It has made mistakes, and will make others, plenty of them. But, in the long account, it has developed a higher degree of freedom and opportunity than has been found in other nations. And this should not be sacrificed in a rash and barren excursion into a war which would help no one, a war for which we are unprepared, a war that might destroy millions of our young people and, at the same time, tear down what we have built in seven generations of effort.

The American people, Mr. President, have done a good deal for themselves in a hundred and fifty years, which, after all, is but a tick of time in the world's history. Likewise, they have done a good deal for humanity. And the possibilities of the future are larger and finer than the accomplishments of the past. And of one thing they may be certain in this time of uncertainty. They should continue on the path of peace and democracy which they have followed, faithfully in the main, and kneel at their own and no other altars.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

Debt Chickens Come Home to Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOUSTON (TEX.) POST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Post under date of May 16, 1940:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post of May 16, 1940]

DEBT CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST AS DEFENSE PROGRAM PLANNED

President Roosevelt, in discussing the huge armament and preparedness program which soon will be presented to Congress, said the method of financing defense activities is "a minor detail." The important thing, he contended, is to start the wheels turning, in order that the United States may be made impregnable to attack.

The President's refusal to worry about where money is coming from is nothing new. His confidence that money can be obtained merely by passing an appropriation bill was very much in evidence when the money was needed for purposes much less laudable and less essential to the country's well-being than adequate machinery of defense.

The Chief Executive always has considered revenue-raising a very minor detail. Only in devising bigger and better spending programs has he shown any capacity for detailed planning or any real enthusiasm.

As a result, the United States enters this critical period in world affairs, when international outlaws are on the prowl, with guns in their hands, with a Federal debt approaching $45,000,000,000, the legal limit, and with sorely inadequate machinery of national defense. Confronted with the necessity of spending billions for guns, airplanes, and other military equipment, Congress must levy new taxes or raise the debt limit and adopt a policy of piling more indebtedness on an already staggering total.

Chickens, it is said, always come home to roost. The vast program of concentrated spending which has flooded the country with leaf-raking projects, with boondoggling undertakings and with a variety of programs which left no visible mark except red-ink entries on Treasury statements, are coming home now to roost on the White House door. The President's desire to dismiss financial aspects of the defense problem as "minor details" does not eliminate a very real and very serious problem.

For years the Post has been pointing to the dangers of excessive spending. We have contended that while borrowing may be justified to meet an emergency, that no government can continue to spend twice as much as it takes in without eventually bumping into a real financial crisis.

Since the European war started, we have pointed out that big armies and navies, huge fleets of airplanes, and vast stores of guns and munitions are not enough to assure adequate national defense, but that one of the most important weapons is a sound internal economy. We have contended that the Government's ability to borrow large sums from its citizens in time of war is vital to security, and that our borrowing ability is limited by the size of the public debt.

There is no doubt the Government can borrow enough money to finance necessary defense appropriations, or that taxes can be levied to foot the bill. But there can be no doubt that if war comes to this country, despite everything we can do to keep out, we would enter such a war so deeply in debt that the country might be drained dry economically in financing the struggle.

At this time, we can see very clearly the danger of an official attitude at Washington that spending is much more important than such a "minor detail" as raising the money to be spent. We can see just how much more intelligent it would have been if we had spent billions on defense instead of leaf-raking projects, polo fields, and boondoggling in those happy-go-lucky days when we thought we could get rid of a depression by spending money we didn't have on things we didn't need.

Does the Record Qualify Roosevelt To Play the Role of Moses?—An Estimate From the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

LETTER FROM A CITIZEN OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the letter that I include herewith under leave given me to extend my remarks comes from a citizen of the Northwest, from South Dakota, in comment on an address delivered before a gathering of citizens in my State by the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. KARL MUNDT.

It is a plea for real leadership for America shared by countless thousands of our people, who are becoming frightened at the stumbling, fumbling type exhibited by the Roosevelt administration during the past 7 years.

The writer seeks no rhetorical effect. His style is colorful and gripping, but only because he makes his points, one by one, with surgical directness and incisiveness. Whether we all agree with what he says or not, let the letter speak for itself and let its conclusions be tested by the persuasion of the writer's presentation.

It is as follows:

MAY 22, 1940.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Presumably the long-hoped-for emergency which will justify Roosevelt in suppressing his own ardent desires for retirement and compel him to offer himself as a sacrifice for the good of his country has now arrived. Judging from the intemperate hysteria which seems now to afflict new dealers and Republicans alike, one might suppose that all we had to do was to make an enormous appropriation and preparedness would be an accomplished fact. Of course, we all believe in preparedness. We all believe in not only adequate but the greatest preparedness. But in taking sensible steps to prepare we should not forget the cause of our unpreparedness.

I have read with considerable care Roosevelt's speech to the Congress, in which for the first time he definitely puts himself forward as the Moses who is to lead the American people out of the wilderness of military helplessness. He should not be permitted to get away with it. Viewed in the light of the past 7 years' happenings, judged by the actual record which he himself has made, I consider his speech to Congress the most devastating indictment of his own administration that has been delivered by any man—Democrat, Republican, or Communist. Now is the time, before Congress adjourns, that public acclaim should be made of Roosevelt's contribution to our present state of helplessness.

(1) Under 7 years of his administration and with the full play of his dictatorial powers, eight billions were squandered for military purposes. Eight billions on the debit side, and for our military preparedness on the credit side we have twenty-seven hundred obsolete and worthless airplanes; artillery that is outranged by the artillery of the smallest European nations; a navy like the ghost the colored gentleman saw, "jest drappin' behind, jest drappin' behind"; an army in the throes of a heated controversy over the choice of rifles. Does this record qualify Roosevelt to play the role of Moses?

(2) Great as was the contribution of Roosevelt, through neglect and dumbness, in the creation of our wretched condition of unpreparedness, still greater was his contribution, through his persistent and vindictive attacks upon the industrial interests of the Nation. Today it requires the United States twice as long at four times the cost to build a battleship as it does Japan. The National Labor Relations Act and its infamous administration by its still more infamous Labor Board makes it impossible for us under existing conditions to compete with foreign nations in all of the essential requirements of preparedness. The excessive burden of taxation and the inquisitorial and vicious regulations with which he has burdened and handicapped all business activities, and the persistent substitution of governmental and bureaucratic conduct of industrial affairs constitute one of his greatest contributions to our present condition of unpreparedness. He now finds himself in the position to be not the beneficiary but the victim of his insolent, egotistic, and bombastic policy when, in referring to the business interests, he said: "I am their master." On top of all this he has plunged the Nation so heavily in debt that the time soon must come when it can no longer stand the strain, even though that strain be created in a patriotic effort to defend and protect our Nation. If he is to pose as the American Moses, he should be compelled to garb himself in swaddling raiment and hide himself in the bulrushes.

(3) Ignorant of, or unimpressed by, our state of unpreparedness, he must make that condition more serious by his bombastic threats against other nations with whom we were at peace, as witness his Chicago bridge speech, where he advocated quarantining the totalitarian aggressive nations, and still later his perfervid outburst that if any foreign nation dare attempt the invasion of Canada we would not permit it. Sentiments well enough in their place, if robbed of the obvious boastfulness with which our own helpless state clothed them.

(4) Great stress he lays in his recent speech to Congress, which no doubt he thinks will become historic, upon the existence in this country of the so-called "fifth column." In short, the numbers of Communists, Nazis, and other foreign elements who are either actual or potential spies and saboteurs. Common decency should have shamed him from making any reference to these. Aside from the fact that for his own political preference he has arrayed class against class and has overemphasized the importance of ne'er-do-wells, moochers, and profligates, as against the thrifty and energetic, one of his first acts, when his pants were hardly warm in the Presidential seat, was to recognize the Russian Bolshevik Government. Even as late as a year ago, he sent a telegram of felicitations to the bloody Russian Government upon the anniversary of its existence. He should be now compelled to face the humiliating fact that he did all in his power to prevent the continuation of the activities of the Dies committee. For the first time in the history of any important congressional committee, the Department of Justice and all other departments and bureaus, agencies and individual sycophants refused to lend assistance to the Dies committee, and it is a well-known fact that only the force of an outraged public opinion prevented him from eliminating an appropriation for the continuance of that committee.

(5) No doubt you are wondering why I am writing you at such length as to matters on which you are as well informed as I am. It is because I recently read KARL MUNDT's address to the Republican women in New York, from which I concluded that his views on present conditions are quite similar to my own, and I felt justified in adding my views to them in the hope that thereby, in a small way, I might be able to warn you of the impending disaster to our own country and to suggest that now is the time, when Congress is in session, if opportunity offers, to let the public know of this danger. It is the obvious danger of Roosevelt's reelection, the inevitable result of which is the destruction of the present form of American government. This fear is not academic, as is shown by the hysteria which has prompted Dorothy Thompson, in her syndicated articles, and certain so-called political leaders to go so far as to suggest that the Republicans abandon their convention and that all Americans get behind the reelection of Roosevelt. In the face of Roosevelt's demonstrated incompetence to handle successfully our domestic economic problems and his muddling of our foreign relations, he is the last prominent American citizen who should be considered for the task at hand. And apropos of this pseudo-patriotic appeal to forget all domestic controversies, let me remind you of what happened shortly after the November election in 1932, when President Hoover, burdened with the tremendous depression then overwhelming the Nation, harassed by a hostile Congress, made his appeal to President-elect Roosevelt to confer with him as to ways and means to be adopted to remedy the situation, and Roosevelt's conceited, insolent brutal, and would-be witty reply was "this is your baby, not mine." All right, this is Roosevelt's baby, so let him adjust his own diapers.

Reciprocity for Kansas Consumers and Livestock Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON, OF KANSAS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech on Reciprocity for Kansas Consumers and Livestock Producers:

Our favorite American breakfast drinks—coffee, cocoa, and tea—come from foreign countries. We obtain them by trading with other nations. While you were drinking your breakfast cup this morning you probably did not think about its connection with foreign trade. But without foreign trade—that is, without exporting some product of the United States in exchange for the imported coffee, cocoa, or tea—you could not have enjoyed the beverage. We sell some of our surplus products to other parts of the world to pay for our coffee, cocoa, tea, and many other items which we consider daily necessities.

Now, Kansas farmers produce more wheat, more meat, and more of other farm products than the people in Kansas towns can consume. So the surplus of these products is traded—either with other States or with foreign countries—for things not produced in Kansas but which Kansas people want. The breakfast drinks I referred to are among those things. So are rubber for the tires of Kansas farm cars and trucks, silk for the stockings of Kansas women, and hundreds of other things that are used in the daily life of a Kansas family, either in town or on the farm.

This trading means that our standards of living in Kansas are raised, and so are the standards of people in other States and in other countries. We are able to enjoy these additional goods for only one reason—the fact that it is possible to exchange our own surpluses for the surpluses of other States and countries.

We are all in favor of selling more of our own products, but attempts are frequently made to cause Americans to fear imports; foreign goods, and even goods produced in other States, are made to seem bad in some intangible way. Secretary Wallace has alluded to fear of agricultural products from abroad as a "farm import devil." This "devil" is supposed to be completely equipped with tail, horns, and a pitchfork. During campaign years this "farm import devil" takes on enormous dimensions, his tail is lengthened, his horns enlarged, and his pitchfork sharpened. Kansas farmers have heard a lot about the "farm import devil," and most of what they have heard is not true. Surely such agricultural imports as coffee, cocoa, tea, rubber, silk, and bananas, not produced by any farmer in the United States, could hardly be called bad.

The coffee, tea, and cocoa, to which I have referred, are not isolated illustrations of so-called agricultural imports. Coffee, it happens, was the second largest item imported into the United States in 1939 among either agricultural or nonagricultural imports. We brought in $140,000,000 worth of coffee in 1939. As a matter of fact, some of the largest industries in the United States are absolutely dependent upon imports of so-called agricultural products. For example, the United States has the largest rubber-manufacturing industry in the world, and every pound of crude rubber it uses is classed as an agricultural import. Crude rubber was the biggest item in all our imports of all types in 1939—$178,000,000 worth of it. The United States also has the largest silk-manufacturing industry in the world, and every pound of its material comes in as an agricultural import.

Neither Kansas farmers nor farmers anywhere else in the United States can produce rubber or coffee or tea or silk or any of dozens of other products, and the imports of products which are not produced at all in the United States make up more than half of all our so-called agricultural imports.

Kansas farmers certainly need not be frightened at a cup of imported coffee or an automobile tire made of imported rubber. And Kansas farmers could not have these things if they and others in the United States did not trade their surplus wheat and meat and other products with the countries that produce the things we import.

A lot of other things, of which we produce certain quantities in this country, are just as essential to our well-being as are silk and rubber and our favorite drinks. But we do not, for one reason or another, produce enough of them to supply to all the people who want them at a price that these people can afford to pay. And, unfortunately, on many of the things the people of Kansas need there are excessive American tariffs which do not permit these things to come into the United States in sufficient quantity to meet consumer requirements at reasonable prices. In retaliation, foreign countries raised their barriers against the products which we desired to export. Thus by 1932 the foreign trade of the United States had reached an impasse.

In order to overcome the harmful effects of these barriers on American producers, American labor, and American consumers, our Government, in 1934, inaugurated the reciprocal trade agreements program to reduce excessive barriers to trade. This is a cooperative program under which foreign countries reduce their artificial trade barriers on our exportable surpluses they need while we reduce some of our excessive tariffs on their exportable surpluses of different things we need. This program is a careful and scientific plan for reviving our foreign trade, and, on the whole, considering the great difficulties to be overcome, it has worked well. Under it the United States has obtained many concessions from foreign countries and has granted concessions of its own in return for those obtained.

Many farmers in Kansas and in other States have not been fully and correctly informed about reductions in duty under trade agreements, particularly with respect to the livestock industry. Stockmen have repeatedly been made the victims of partisan misrepresentation and misstatement of facts about the trade program and its results.

They have been told, for instance, that as a result of reductions in United States tariffs through the trade agreements, this country has been flooded with imports of beef and cattle that have deprived the American cattleman of a large share of his domestic market and lowered the prices that he has received. That is not true.

Opponents of the trade agreements, when talking about cattle imports and trade agreements, never mention the fact that duty reductions apply only to certain classes of cattle, and only to limited numbers in those classes. They do not mention the fact that less than half the beef cattle imported into the United States in 1939 came in under trade-agreement tariff reductions, whereas more than half paid the duties imposed in the Tariff Act of 1930. These opponents say nothing about the fact that in 1939, as compared with 1938, imports of cattle on which no duty reductions have been granted increased by a greater number than did imports of cattle on which the duty has been reduced, and that American feed is used to condition these cattle for market. They never tell the livestock producers that the rates of duty have not been reduced on any kind of beef, including canned beef, in any trade agreement.

But the real test of the trade-agreements program as it affects livestock producers lies in the price and income the cattlemen have been receiving. In 1933, the year before the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, the United States average price received by farmers for beef cattle was $3.75 a hundred pounds; in 1939 it was $7.03, after 5 years under trade agreements.

In 1933 the farm cash income from the sale of cattle and calves for the United States as a whole was $599,485,000; in 1939 it was $1,274,714,000, considerably more than double the pre-trade-agreement figure and the highest since 1929, the last full year before the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was passed. The income of Kansas cattlemen from the sale of cattle and calves was $45,698,000 in 1933 and $80,886,000 in 1939.

This increase of $35,000,000 cash income certainly constituted a great benefit and not an injury to Kansas cattlemen. In fact the figures show that the domestic market—practically the only market for beef from Kansas and other beef-producing States—has been materially assisted and benefited by the industrial and business activity to which the trade-agreements program has contributed. Even though domestic cattle or beef are not exported in significant quantities, livestock producers are in better condition when industrial activity is accelerated by thriving export and import trade.

Kansas hog growers, whose marketing conditions are entirely different from those of cattle raisers, have been directly benefited by trade agreements through which market opportunities for their products in foreign countries have been improved. In normal times a comparatively large part of our pork products is exported. Since the droughts of 1934 and 1936 production of pork and lard in the United States has been increasing, and so have the exports of these products. United States exports of hog products, including lard, in 1939 were valued at $43,925,143, a gain of $5,000,000 over the 1938 figure and of $13,000,000 over the 1936 figure. The opportunity to market these surplus hog products in foreign countries helps to support the price that every corn-hog farmer in the United States receives for his hogs.

All the trade-agreement countries, except Brazil and Turkey, have made tariff or other trade concessions on exports of various United States hog products, and approximately nine-tenths of the country's exports of these products go to trade-agreement countries.

Great Britain, normally the largest foreign market for United States pork and lard, removed entirely its 10-percent tariff on United States lard and expanded its import quotas for other pork products. Cuba, in recent years the second largest foreign market for United States lard, reduced its tariff from over 9 cents a pound to about 1½ cents a pound, and also removed its consumption tax. In 1939 Cuba purchased more than 55,000,000 pounds of United States lard, as compared with 14,000,000 pounds in the year ended June 30, 1934, or prior to the agreement.

It is true, of course, that the outbreak of war in Europe has for the time being suspended or offset many of the advantages gained through the trade-agreements program for exports of United States meat products. Defense measures taken by foreign countries have led to strict control and limitation of their purchases of certain American agricultural products. At the same time, however, their increased purchases of many products of American industry have tended to sustain employment and buying power among United States workers and thus to support the domestic market for meat products. Furthermore, if it had not been for our trade agreements with countries now at war, matters would have been worse as far as exports of farm products to them are concerned.

In conclusion, I go back to my original point that foreign trade ministers daily to the needs and convenience of every American citizen. Every day many widely separated parts of the world contribute to our comforts and well-being. In the approaching campaign, don't listen to the partisan apostles of fear who may tell you to look under your bed every night for some form of "import devil" resulting from trade agreements. Tell them that our prosperity depends upon an exchange of goods with other countries. Under normal international trade conditions, to which it is hoped the world will be able to return when hostilities cease, few American industries have more to gain, both directly and indirectly, from the trade-agreements program than has the livestock industry.

God Bless America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, our biggest and most important job is to keep America out of war. I fervently believe that we should never again soak Europe's soil with American blood. Our main objective is peace, but we must lose no time in strengthening our national defense. It is important that we should realize the extreme and immediate peril of our Republic. We must be ready to give our services and our lives to maintain our American liberties in case we are invaded. Our American people are ready and willing to spend billions for defense, but not one cent for aggression.

This administration has made many mistakes in preparing for our national defense, according to the testimony of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff and Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of Air Corps, before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations. Regardless of this fact, now is the time to rectify these mistakes and to present a united front. There is a definite need for expert and nonpartisan administration of the national-defense program. Under such a set-up, it would be possible to eliminate bureaucratic delays and uncertainties. Our people are demanding action—not petty political bickering. It is my hope that future generations may be able to turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find that there were many Members of Congress who were willing to cooperate in any national emergency without seeking political advantages. Now is the time for members of all parties to put their country first. It is our duty as representatives of the people to remain in session until our preparedness and safety is assured.

Our political parties must accept the responsibility of maintaining our Constitution in form and spirit. That great document required the Congress, and not the President, to determine whether war should be declared; that Congress, and not the President, should impose taxes; that Congress, and not the President, should regulate the value of our currency. These important functions should be discharged by the Congress which broadly represents the people of the country.

Lest we forget, I wish to refer you to article 4, section 4 of the Constitution:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

Our American policy must be maintained for the best interests of the American people and against all "isms" which seek to destroy us. We must prevent the growth or spread of influence of any organization which seeks to undermine our form of government. It is our business to look after America and see that no foreign country attempts to destroy by propaganda, sabotage, or force the kind of a government which we

have chosen ourselves. We owe a duty to millions of Americans who have so nobly stood by America, her ideals and institutions, through these difficult years.

The laws we now have on our statute books must be enforced. The earnest effort of all groups of people in the United States will be required if we are to preserve the constitutional liberties which our people have gained through the years of struggle.

With foreign "isms" rampant throughout our land, their infection spreading to high places within our Government, starting a decay from within, we would do well to rededicate ourselves to our country, to our homes, and our God with the inspiration of Lincoln's words when he said:

Many free countries have lost their liberty, and ours may lose hers; but if she shall, be it my proudest plume not that I was the last to desert, but that I never deserted her.

The Strongest Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ELKHART (IND.) TRUTH

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of May 27:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of May 27, 1940]

THE STRONGEST DEFENSE

The platform just adopted by the Republicans of Indiana voices the hope of the American people when it says the United States should stay out of any foreign war.

The platform is also right in saying:

"It is our obligation to preserve peace. We must so order our own affairs as to give the world at large a visible, a tangible, demonstration of how a great civilization can be preserved without intolerance, bigotry, class conflict, persecution of minorities or militaristic fanaticism."

To this end, the State platform declares, "we favor the strongest defense required to make our shores secure against any conceivable attack by any foreign power or coalition of powers."

And it is still right in lamenting "our present state of unpreparedness" and in laying the responsibility for that condition to "a shameful waste of defense appropriations."

For while it is true that President Roosevelt saw the war coming when others failed to see it, it is also true that he failed to act in accordance with his prescience.

Instead of using the huge sums obtained by heavy taxation for securing our safety, he allowed many of them to be spent on projects of little worth. Instead of making our farflung outposts secure, he promoted leaf-raking, boondoggling, and social experimentation.

Responsibility for America's sudden awakening to the fact that its defenses, though they may be better than they were, are still far less than they should be, cannot be sidestepped by the administration that has been in power for nearly 8 years, has had unprecedented sums to spend during that time, and has spent a great part of them wastefully.

As Mark Sullivan points out, the Republicans have opposed the administration's tendency toward intervening abroad, but on arming for defense have always been willing to go as far as Roosevelt was. On national defense, as distinguished from the policy of meddling in the war, the administration's political opposition and the people as a whole have supported it completely.

They will still go along with the President on many of the objectives voiced in his fireside talk of yesterday. Loyal, united support of a comprehensive defense plan the President may expect from the country.

But he must also expect the country to remember that he guided it into its present condition—with a heavier national debt and larger peacetime expenditures than ever before, with as many unemployed as ever, with the heavy hand of oppression laid on industry, with bureaucracy entrenched in Washington and theorists and political figureheads in vital governmental posts.

He must expect his opposition to keep reminding the country of these facts, not as a disloyal or destructive attack, but as a constructive means of making certain that the mistakes of the tragic past shall be corrected as speedily as possible, and that similar errors are avoided in the uncertain future.

A Strike by Employers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many people have wondered what would happen if employers went on strike. At least some employers can afford to strike, notably Ford, and there are a few others, who, if their factories were closed permanently, still would not suffer.

C. I. O. for some time has been continuously assailing Ford. If Ford tired of their persecution and closed his plants, would Lewis or Thomas or any of the other labor organizers, who are living in luxury on their cut out of the worker's check, give a Ford worker a job?

If union racketeers force employers out of business, as they have done in altogether too many instances, then what?

Under the Wagner law, if the employer discharges an employee because of union activities, he is required to reemploy him and pay him for lost time. What a nice thing it would be for the workers, if, losing their jobs through strikes and the closing of a factory, John Lewis and some of the other big shots in the labor organizations, or the union itself, was forced to pay the striker for all lost wages.

That others are thinking of a strike by employers is evident from an editorial by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., which is as follows:

WHAT A STRIKE!

A strike is really an act of rebellion, a declaration of war by the strikers against those they believe to be unfair. To study the history of industrial strikes is to learn that the real promoters of them are not the actual participants but the big-headed, unmindful, selfish, and unscrupulous employers. With them any working conditions are good enough as long as they reap a financial harvest even though they themselves would not accept these conditions were they the workers. Business with them is merely a racket—a means to an end. The racketeer employer is more responsible for our chaotic industrial situation than even the racketeer laborite. He created the condition for this vulture to prey upon.

Fortunately, the racketeer employer is far in the minority. Nevertheless, the actions of the racketeers have played a major role in bringing persecution to the honest employers.

This being a Nation of opportunity we naturally have opportunists willing to take advantage of this sad situation for the purpose of promulgating their selfish objectives. They do not hesitate in disseminating propaganda blaming all industrialists for abuses practised only by the racketeer class. The propaganda mongers leave no stone unturned in persecuting employers to gain their end. Strikes are being "pulled" on both classes of employers, many of them absolutely unjustified and, in some instances, financed by racketeer employers, with the natural result of destitution to workers and persecution to employers.

I often wonder what the breaking point of tolerance is with our legitimate industrialists who have conscientiously done much to improve the American way of life without domination from politicians who have enacted laws handicapping industry, and without the help of racketeer laborites, unscrupulous industrialists or nit-wit idealists. I wonder what men like Alfred Sloan, Henry Ford, Walter Chrysler, H. W. Prentis, Jr., J. Howard Pew, Col. Charles E. Speaks, Walter J. Kohler, S. Bayard Colgate, Owen D. Young, and others of equal importance, but too numerous to mention here, are really thinking these days. I admire their great tolerance because if they lacked this virtue many of them could use a most dangerous weapon of retaliation.

Men of this type, who have legitimately acquired enough wealth to live on the rest of their lives without ever having a business worry, could close their plants and "pull" a close-up strike. So it is not hard to understand that their activity in the business world is not merely for the accumulation of the almighty dollar, as some would make you believe. Their main interest must be for the betterment of their fellowmen.

Persecution is the underlying force which causes humans to strike. It may be well to remember that captains of industry are only humans, and if continually persecuted, even they may strike. And what a strike!

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,

Editor, Railroad Workers Journal, Official Organ of Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.

Memorial Day—the Obligations of the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALVA B. ADAMS, OF COLORADO

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last night the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] delivered a very interesting address, which was broadcast, on the subject Memorial Day—the Obligations of the Living. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial Day is set aside each year to be devoted to appropriate commemoration of those who have fallen in battles waged for their country. Originally instituted to honor those who fell in the War between the States, it has been properly broadened to include the heroes of all the wars to establish and maintain our country, its independence, its rights, and its institutions.

Thoughtlessly we have come to regard Decoration Day mainly as a holiday, a day set apart for amusement and recreation, but when we pause to give thought as to its purpose and significance we become conscious that it should receive a more fitting observance.

Can we not give a few hours each year to thoughts and ceremonies in honor of those who gave their lives for us?

The young men who lie in the graves we so little remember marched forth into the fire and hazard of battle to secure and safeguard the rights, privileges, and benefits which we today enjoy.

We are accustomed to accept the blessings of a free constitutional Government as a matter of course. We complacently use our freedom under the protecting arm of a great Government as if we by our own efforts had gained it. We forget that thousands of men gave their lives and other thousands of men and women suffered and sacrificed to establish and maintain our free institutions. How seldom have any of us really returned thanks and expressed appreciation or gratitude to those to whom we owe so much.

We may write and speak and think freely. We may worship God as we please. We are free from unlawful searches and seizures. We enjoy freedom of elections through which we select those who are to rule over us, and fix conditions and limitations to their authority. We are secure in our legitimate property rights and in the making and carrying out of plans for our lives. The only taxes we pay are imposed by those whom we have elected and clothed with the power.

These great privileges, among others, far from being a matter of course, were never enjoyed by any nation until 150 years ago.

We wear no gas masks to work. We fear no enemy on land, water, or from the air. We can sleep soundly without fear of shells or bombs. No siren warns us of raiders in the sky.

Are these fortunate and happy conditions of our own making? They are not. Ought we not bow and bare our heads in grateful memory and reverent homage to those brave men who gave their lives that we might have these great privileges? They are gifts from the dead, not conquests by the living.

We properly set aside certain days to commemorate individual men whose deeds have justly placed their names high upon the rolls of the great. Most of these men received honor and distinction during their lifetime in recognition by their fellow citizens of their services and accomplishments.

This day is to commemorate no single man, but the thousands whose names are not written on the scroll of fame; who gave their all without recognition or reward, and who served as devotedly as those whose names are sung and whose deeds are acclaimed.

Our debt to them is great. Let us pause in the comfortable and secure round of our daily activities at least a few hours in the year to acknowledge it. Let us not only acknowledge our debt but let us try to pay it. There is one way in which we can at least make some small payment on this great debt. These men gave their lives for our Nation and the principles upon which it was founded. And forget not, the lives of these men were as dear to them as are our lives to us. If these dead could tell us what reward, what payment, they would wish of us they would with one accord say: "Continue the fight in peace or war for the cause for which we gave our lives." Surely this we must be willing to do.

Let us, therefore, both for ourselves and in memory of them, pledge ourselves to the preservation of our institutions in their essential purity and integrity. Nor may we safely sit smugly and complacently at our fireside imagining that there is no danger.

Free governments have been overthrown in many lands in recent days and are threatened in others. Today the principles of democracy are not only repudiated but derided in the lands of the dictators. Today the ability of democracies to maintain themselves against the ruthless might of dictatorship is being tested in the crucible of war.

We have learned that peace-loving, industrious, God-fearing nations in which rulers are the choice and representatives of a free people are not safe so long as there exists a powerful people dominated by might, where leaders are animated by greed for power and territory. With ruthless power on the land, in the air, and under the sea, free governments have been invaded and destroyed. Peoples who yesterday were busy at their peace-time pursuits, on their farms, in factories, enjoying the comforts of happy homes, with ill-will toward none, with no ambition to gratify through the suffering of others, are pitiful refugees and wanderers driven from ruined cities and desolated homes. While other thousands are maimed and murdered without regard to age or sex by aggressors whom they have not wronged.

While it is men who do the dastardly deeds we so abhor, the men are but the implementation of wicked ideals. It is the ideal which inspires their evil deeds. False and wicked ideals may spread like the plague from centers of infection. Let us not sit too comfortably and merely feel sorrow for those across the water. Greed for power may not stop at the water's edge on the eastern shore of the Atlantic. Dangerous and destructive thoughts can span tne ocean in an instant. They need not wait for ships. They ride the electric waves of the air.

As the earthquake destroys the peaceful valley and its cities without warning, so may our seeming security of today be turned to confusion and disaster tomorrow.

Not only may our institutions be destroyed by invading enemies or by the spread of pernicious doctrine from abroad, but within our own land there may be engendered evils and destructive forces such as will bring chaos and disaster upon us.

Among the dangers which might engulf our institutions in ruin would be the prevalence of the idea that while the principles upon which our Government was constructed may have been sound in the early days of our country, they are no longer applicable, and may be disregarded with safety, if not with advantage. Details of the Government, functions or powers of constituent elements of the Government may and should change to meet new problems as they arise, but the purpose of our institutions should ever be faithfully preserved and promoted. Changes in form or structure should be to carry out, not to subvert or alter, these fundamental purposes.

Our heroes died to establish and maintain institutions where justice among free men was the great objective. They made the supreme sacrifice for the perpetuity of a government the object of which was the freedom and welfare of the citizen, not its own power and greatness.

With the increasing complexity of our civilization the problem of preserving the freedom of the citizen is of increasing difficulty. This does not absolve us from our obligations to the honored dead whom we commemorate.

We cannot with clear conscience fail them. The blessings of sound government which the sacrifices of other men have provided for us we must in all good faith and justice pass on unimpaired to those who follow us.

It would be little less than cowardly for us to provide comfort and safety for ourselves at the cost of ruin and destruction to those who are to come after us. As good citizens and true men we cannot rob the future for our own benefit. Rather let us try to pass on a government better for our having lived.

Men are the bravest of living things. The courage with which millions of men in wartime face death and destruction has been demonstrated in many conflicts present and past. Men do not hesitate or falter when ordered to face an enemy's fire. However, those who would willingly sacrifice their life for their country in time of war sometimes hesitate or even refuse to make some minor sacrifice of personal or political advantage to protect their country against a peacetime evil or danger which may be as threatening to the future of their country as an armed enemy in time of war.

Our Nation may be destroyed as thoroughly in times of peace by subversive doctrine, by abandonment of its fundamental principles, by surrender or usurpation of the rights and privileges of the citizens, by an economy which denies to men their political freedom, or by a vicious and wasteful fiscal system which destroys national credit and individual initiative, as by successful invasion of ruthless enemies in time of war.

It is easier to defend against alien enemies than against the slowly creeping paralysis of insidious doctrines and the gradual surrender by a careless or weakening citizenship of its rights to usurping agencies and authorities. Against the armed enemy every citizen eagerly rushes forward to do his part in defense of his country. The attack upon our institutions by insidious and subversive doctrines and practices goes forward imperceptibly, or at least at such a slow rate as not to arouse the citizen from his fancied security. Often this peacetime undermining of our civic structure comes in such pleasing disguise as to lead many to give it welcome and encouragement.

We are apt to forget that history teaches that democracies are not eternal and that as many have fallen victim to internal decay and disasters as from external enemies.

Therefore, in paying our debt to the heroes in whose honor Memorial Day is dedicated, let us be as vigilant in protecting our country against the forces of decay and dissolution within our country as against foreign foes, and let us not forget that while the attack by enemies from abroad is only at long intervals, the internal forces which make for the destruction of our institutions are ever at work.

All we need to protect our country from its internal dangers is that our citizens be inspired in peacetime with the same spirit of loyalty, service, and sacrifice which animates them in wartime—that there be no distinction between wartime patriotism and peacetime patriotism.

Democracy is only for those who appreciate it, who deserve it, and who are not only willing to fight for it but able to defend and maintain it against all enemies at home or abroad. Let us resolve that no matter what the cost, we will deserve it, we will protect it, and we will pass it on without impairment to those who are to follow us.

Tomorrow let us take time to recall in grateful appreciation the services and sacrifices of those who have made possible for us the blessings of the free institutions which we enjoy.

Let us make of Decoration Day a dedication day.

National Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on May 29, 1940, on the subject of national preparedness.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, as you sit quietly in your homes tonight, thousands of men are dying and suffering on the battlefields of France and Belgium. It is impossible for us to realize at this distance how horrible modern war really is. We read of it in the papers. We are deeply shocked and grieved. Still it isn't real to us, because we can't believe that such things can actually happen in a civilized world. We pray for the escape of the British and French armies in northern France, abandoned by their ally. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the British Nation, threatened today by ruthless attack on a land which has not been invaded for nearly a thousand years.

Our people are vitally concerned that we shall not find ourselves in similar danger in a world ruled by brute force. On Monday night President Roosevelt discussed the present condition of our preparedness. Tuesday night former President Hoover analyzed the problem. Last night he was answered by Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War.

We are not engaged in war today, and I believe there is every reason to hope that we will not be. I see no reason for a German attack even in the unfortunate event of a German victory. But we cannot close our eyes to the possibility or neglect our defense as did the English. We cannot take a chance. We want no Munich on this side of the Atlantic. Certainly an attack is much less likely if we are completely prepared to meet it. And so there is no disagreement on the necessity for preparedness. There is no disposition to skimp either on the part of Congress or the people of the United States.

But there are substantial differences of opinion as to how preparedness had best be accomplished. It is said that this is a time to avoid politics. If by that is meant that there should be no selfish partisanship, there can be general agreement. In fact, the same advice may well be given in peaceful times. But if it is meant that there shall be no criticism of the President or his administration, then I emphatically disagree. It is not only the right but the duty of those interested in public affairs to discuss freely the fundamental policies necessary for adequate preparedness. If there had been more active criticism in France and England, they might be in better condition today. The objection to a coalition Cabinet is that the minority members must surrender their power publicly to criticize and discuss. Every newspaper editor and every columnist in the country is discussing the question of preparedness and criticizing the present condition. Certainly there is no reason why the Republicans should not do the same without being accused of partisanship.

It has even been suggested that the election be suspended on the assumption that the President is the only one who can carry on a preparedness program at the present time. This certainly is a denial of the very possibility of democracy. The argument is in effect that because the crisis is great, because a war exists in Europe, the people are incompetent at such a time to decide who should be President. If democratic government is sound at all, that is the very time when the people should be best able to decide. George Washington refused a third term in 1796, when world conditions were anything but satisfactory and Napoleon was threatening the conquest of Europe. Domestic affairs were in such a turmoil that many doubted the power of the new Nation to continue, but an election was held in 1796. In 1812 an election was held in the midst of war. In 1864 the administration was bitterly attacked by Democrats and Copperheads, and Grant's defeat at Cold Harbor was not encouraging for the North. But I don't remember that Abraham Lincoln ever suggested that the election of 1864 be postponed. A Presidential election under such circumstances may be conducted in a more solemn and less sensational manner, but that very fact should make it more satisfactory and more likely to reach a correct conclusion There is certainly nothing in the record of the present administration to justify an argument that it is peculiarly equipped to defend the United States.

I wish to discuss, therefore, the whole nature of a program for national preparedness. We have seen what Germany has done. Since Hitler became dictator in January 1933 he has in 7 years built the nation into a great war machine. He has subjected to that end all other purposes in life. The people have given up their freedom, they have reduced their standard of living, and they have staked all on their success. There are men in this country who feel that we must follow that example, that we must give arbitrary power to the President to tell every citizen what he shall do in manufacture, in commerce, in agriculture; to draft manpower and capital; to fix all wages and prices.

On the other hand, the speech of the President on Monday night indicated his view that we need make no change in our life or our economy or our Government policies; that we can have our cake and eat it, too; that preparedness is merely a matter of closing our eyes and appropriating vast sums of money. That position is just as unsound and even more dangerously misleading than the other extreme.

I believe very strongly that we can develop an effective preparedness organization within the form and spirit of democratic government. I believe that democratic government, properly administered, can be as efficient as any autocratic government. I believe we can accomplish as much by cooperation of the people as by regimentation of the people. We can retain both freedom and democracy. But, on the other hand, we can't hope to have everything in the world at one time. We can't have battleships and still go on adding dams and parks and post offices. We can continue to strive against unequal distribution of opportunity, but we can't have all the frills that have looked so tempting during the past 5 years. We can't permit political pressure to take large sums of money out of the Government Treasury for special groups which we ought to spend for preparedness. We can't plunge on toward national bankruptcy and go on fooling ourselves that we can get something for nothing.

In recent years we have averaged Government deficits between three and four billion dollars a year. We have been spending far more than our people have paid or have been willing to pay. That policy has resulted in a steady increase in the public debt until, according to Senator HARRISON yesterday, the debt limit of $45,000,000,000 will be reached in January 1941. Taxes absorb 20 percent of the income of all the people, and peacetime government takes 15 percent of the average workman's income through direct and indirect taxes. Government expenses have been built up in the city, State, and Nation until on a peacetime basis they would absorb 25 percent of the people's income if met by taxes. We have borrowed on the theory that we were in the midst of an emergency. Now we find that far from being in an emergency, we have been living in comparatively peaceful and untroubled times, and should have paid our way as we went.

Now we face a necessary increase in expenditures for defense, an increase which may easily amount to $2,000,000,000 a year, and may go on for many years to come. We see clearly that we have been fooling ourselves and we will fool ourselves more unless our income soon equals our expenses. That means today both a cutting of unnecessary Government expense and a substantial increase in taxation. Yesterday Senator HARRISON proposed to increase the debt limit by $3,000,000,000 and levy a tax of $600,000,000 a year, supposed to pay off this additional indebtedness in 5 years. If that is the only change in fiscal policy proposed, then it is ridiculous to think that this new indebtedness will be paid off for many years, for we will face in 1942 another deficit of three or four billion dollars.

The administration is willing to proceed with the tax now on the theory that the people will accept such a tax at this time because of the need of national defense. They ought to accept the tax, but they ought also to realize that the real cause of additional taxes is the tremendous deficit for ordinary peacetime expenditures plus the colossal size of the existing debt. Obviously we are not increasing the debt limit from forty-five to forty-eight billion dollars, and borrowing $3,000,000,000, just to pay a supplemental defense expense of $1,000,000,000. If our budget had been balanced since 1936, as it should have been, we could well afford to borrow for a year or two for extraordinary defense construction. But now there is no alternative except taxes and more taxes, in fact I believe a complete revision of our whole tax system. Any other course will lead to national bankruptcy, a break-down of the whole economic system on which our industry and prosperity are based.

But the President takes no interest in fiscal matters. Only last week he told the press that he did not care whether Congress raised the debt limit or levied a tax—all he was interested in was getting the money to spend. His record shows his complete incompetence to deal with financial policy. He subscribes to the

idea that the debt is unimportant because we owe it to ourselves. Of course, if you are going to wipe out the debt by confiscation, by abandoning democratic government and adopting a socialist state, then the debt is unimportant. But national bankruptcy is fatal either to a successful defense or to the continuance of the American way of life and the American system of free enterprise. Our people today are convinced that we can spend an adequate amount for defense and still retain a system of free enterprise, but it can only be done if we pay our way as we go.

There is not the slightest indication that the President intends to cut any Government expenses. He is still demanding an increase in W. P. A. appropriations from $1,000,000,000 to the equivalent of a billion and a half. We have just been asked to authorize another half billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation for agricultural loans. The President has not opposed the large increases made by Congress for farm subsidies. Not one cent is to be taken off any of the appropriations of any Government department for the year beginning the first of next July. There is no recognition of the fact that preparedness is a deadly serious business, which can only be accomplished by sacrifice; by changing the whole character of our peacetime establishment; by returning to the sound fiscal principles followed by every previous administration, Republican or Democratic.

We come to the question of the Army and Navy. The money actually appropriated has not been thrown away. The Army and Navy are well organized and competent. But certainly today, in a serious crisis, we find ourselves weak in many of the most important necessities for modern defense. While our Navy is twice as big as those of Germany and Italy combined, progress in the building of new ships has been very slow. If the ships under construction were now completed, there would be little fear of attack by any foreign nation. The mechanization of the Army has hardly begun. Our supply of airplanes is small, and the present capacity for producing airplanes is about 3,600 a year when the President talks of 50,000.

The President portrayed the situation as so serious in his recent address to Congress that the people at once asked why he had let such a condition develop. He felt called upon to go on the radio Sunday night and reassure the people that our Army and Navy were the best in the world, or at least would be when everything under order had been delivered. Unfortunately, orders take a long time to fill.

Last night Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, tried to put the blame on the Republicans, who went out of office more than 7 years ago. He blamed them for the naval disarmament treaties, which met with the general approval of the Democratic Party and were negotiated by Democrats as well as Republicans. He blamed them because the Army and Navy were small in 1933. He overlooks the fact that the question of armament is entirely relative to those of other nations, and that in 1933 all armaments were small because of the naval-disarmament treaties and the prospect of other disarmament treaties. He overlooks the fact that the Democratic platform of 1932 advocated a survey of the Army and Navy, so that the people in time of peace might not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually. He overlooks the fact that President Roosevelt, in accordance with that platform, reduced the expenditure for Army and Navy during his first year. He overlooks the fact that Hitler came into power in Germany in January 1933, after the first election of President Roosevelt. Up to that time the German Army had been limited by the Treaty of Versailles to 100,000. The present administration saw the repudiation of the Treaty of Versailles, and the increase of that Army to 4,000,000 men with thousands of the most modern airplanes. The increase of the Japanese Navy, which is the only one comparable to ours, did not begin to take place until after 1933. No; if blame is to be attached to the present condition of our defense, it can only rest on the administration of President Roosevelt.

I notice that Assistant Secretary Johnson sneered at former President Hoover because he recently advocated a distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, and attempted to discredit his criticism of the preparedness program by suggesting that this distinction between offensive and defensive arms was "so tenuous that no military man would have dared draw such fine lines." It does not promote national unity or preparedness to have The Assistant Secretary of War sneer at the serious criticism of a former President of the United States. Furthermore, it happens that President Roosevelt would be subject to the same sneer. For President Roosevelt, on May 16, 1933, in a letter to 60 nations of the world, said:

"If all nations will agree wholly to eliminate from possession and use the weapons which make possible a successful attack, defenses automatically will become impregnable, and the frontiers and independence of every nation will become secure. The ultimate objective of the disarmament conference must be the complete elimination of all offensive weapons. The immediate objective is a substantial reduction of some of these weapons and the elimination of many others." As late as 1937, Mr. Roosevelt claimed that the distinction was his own idea. He said: "For the first time in this appeal to the nations, emphasis was placed on two fundamentals of the reduction of armaments: First, that weapons of offensive warfare should be gradually eliminated. * * * The reasons behind these proposals are even stronger 4 years later than they were in 1933."

It is not possible yet to analyze fully the reasons for our present deficiency in defense, but some of them are apparent. The present administration has been primarily interested in spending money for internal improvements and for many different phases of the New Deal. When the first emergency blank check for $3,300,000,000 was voted by Congress in 1933, it was proposed that $2,000,000,000 be spent for mechanization of the Army. The President rejected the proposal, and turned it over to P. W. A. for any kind of public works, which gave little more employment than mechanization of the Army would have done. Billions have been spent for purposes having a much closer relation to domestic politics than has national defense. New Deal spending has been the first love of the administration.

There has been an obvious lack of coordination between the different departments of the Government. Secretary Swanson was ill for many months. Secretary Edison was not appointed for a long time after he died, and now is running for Governor of New Jersey. The Secretary of War and The Assistant Secretary of War are not on speaking terms. Aggressive secretaries would have secured better consideration for the defense programs. Construction work in the Navy apparently has been very slow, much slower for instance than the Japanese work on their new battleships. It has been partly due to unnecessary New Deal restrictions, so numerous and hampering that many businessmen will not take a Government contract except as a matter of duty. Although 6,000 airplanes were authorized over a year ago, the actual delivery of airplanes, Army and Navy and foreign, has averaged less than 300 a month up to April 1, and two-thirds of these have gone abroad. No plans appear to have been made for the development of airplane capacity anything like the capacity of Germany.

The New Deal administration has been characterized by a deliberate hostility to industry, the very industry upon which we should rely to provide defense supplies in quantity production. In spite of occasional motions toward appeasement, that hostility to industry still exists, and shows itself in opposition to every move toward amendment of New Deal legislation. Last September President Roosevelt appointed a War Resources Board of leading industrialists to consider a proper organization of industry for defense. War had already begun in Europe. In less than 2 months, apparently on the demand of the New Dealers within the Government, the Board was dismissed. Nevertheless, it prepared a report which is said to criticize Army and Navy procurement methods and recommend a separate agency to handle industrial mobilization. The report has been completely suppressed. The administration apparently is afraid to publish it on account of criticisms contained in it.

It is reasonable to conclude that the present deficiency in the most vital essentials of defense is due to the neglect of that subject by the present administration in its intense interest in the domestic policies of spending, regulation, and politics.

What should the program be today? There should certainly be a much more definite plan than there is at the present time. The President's recent request for appropriations seems to have been hastily thrown together. It includes a demand for blank-check appropriations, the exact purpose of which the President himself has not clearly defined. Today it is reported that the President will seek from $600,000,000 to a billion dollars of additional funds, which apparently he thought unnecessary a week ago. If that is true, it shows that the first program was hastily thrown together without thinking anything through. There is no agreement on the fundamental question as to just what area we are going to defend. There is no adequate financial plan. There is no plan to mobolize industry.

Yesterday the Reconstruction Finance Corporation submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate an extraordinary amendment to existing law. It is proposed that the R. F. C. be authorized to create a Government corporation with any powers the R. F. C. may consider necessary, and then loan unlimited amounts to that corporation for plant construction, equipment, and working capital. Under this authority the Government could go into any business, manufacturing, commerce, or agriculture, for any business would have some relation to national defense. This amendment was quietly proposed without even revealing its real purpose, and is likely to be forced through the Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow morning. It was drafted by Mr. Thomas Corcoran, counsel for the R. F. C. It shows a determination on the part of the administration to extend New Deal principles into preparedness with the same disregard for private industry which has heretofore existed in peacetime. If there is an industrial program, it ought to be presented to Congress. If there are some kinds of war equipment which the Government can manufacture better than private industry, then let us authorize the Government to do that particular thing. But if the proposed act is passed, Congress might as well go home and let the Reconstruction Finance Corporation borrow all the money it wants, and run the Government without appropriation. This was the plan last year of the original spend-lend bill.

It is vitally important that Congress create a joint committee to study the entire problem, to request definite plans from the President, and to recommend the legislation necessary to carry out the plan. On such a committee would be Republicans and Democrats. There would be little difficulty in obtaining an agreement on what is essential. It is not a party matter. If the President desires unity, that seems to me the best way to obtain it, without demanding a coalition cabinet in which Republicans must subordinate their views on fundamental domestic principles essential to the future welfare of the Nation.

In the second place, there should be an agency with a single director to head up the procurement of military and naval supplies,

similar to the secretary of munitions, who was a vital necessity in every European cabinet during the war, similar to the position which Mr. Baruch held in this country. The President has just appointed an advisory board, a step to which no one can take exception. But he has made it clear that its function is entirely advisory. It has nothing to do with the giving of orders or the purchase of material. Furthermore, if we can judge from the present administration's past record with advisory boards, the President is not likely to pay much attention to its advice, particularly if it conflicts with the views of more intimate advisers. For administration purposes a board, particularly in an emergency, is of little value. As General Goethals once said, "A board is long, narrow, and wooden."

Apparently the mobilization of industry is in the hands of Harry Hopkins and Secretary Morgenthau, unless it is now to be handed over to the R. F. C. While each of these gentlemen is able in his own peculiar field, I doubt if either would be selected as experienced in the organization of industry for war. Modern war is a war of machinery. Its success depends as much on industry as it does on men, guns, and ships. Surely it is a job which ought to be given to the most competent and experienced man in the whole field of industry.

In the third place, I believe there should be a determined effort to reduce the regulation of business in order that it may develop more rapidly and efficiently, in order that it may renovate its plant, in order that it may put more men to work and create the wealth necessary to support our tremendous expenditures under a system of free enterprise. I have advocated this entirely apart from the war. Now it is even more necessary. I feel very strongly that New Deal legislation has in nearly every case gone far beyond the actual abuse which it seeks to cure. It is not necessary to subject whole industries to detailed regulation simply because there are one or two crooks in the industry. Legislation has been inspired by the belief of the New Dealers that the solution of every problem is complete Government control, and it can and must be modified. We had an example this week in the La Follette civil-liberties bill. As finally passed by the Senate, it will meet the evils of industrial espionage and strike-breaking agencies at which it was aimed. But the Senate eliminated a vast amount of incidental restrictions which would have deprived employers of the right to find out whether their men were Communists or "fifth columnists" and subjected them to all kinds of bureaucratic restrictions and regulation, particularly with relations to Government contracts. The same thing can be done with many other New Deal laws now hampering industry at every step. We can stimulate prosperity, put men back to work, and develop a prosperous country, able to bear the tremendous weight of national defense. But we haven't been able to do it through planned economy in time of peace, and we can't do it any better in time of war.

If the American people want a national administration which has shown any ability to carry out an effective program of national defense, there is no possible argument for the present administration. It has failed to develop an Army and Navy with essential modern weapons. It has shown its complete incapacity in the field of finance. It has shown its unwillingness to abate by one jot or one tittle its hostility to industry, or its adherence to all the bureaucratic activities of the New Deal. It is proposing to destroy any possible unity in the United States by insisting on a third term, in violation of all the traditions and principles of the American Republic.

Local Politics: Menace to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. PAUL W. SHAFER OF MICHIGAN

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. SHAFER, which appeared in the May 1940 issue of the American Mercury.

[From the American Mercury of May 1940]

LOCAL POLITICS: MENACE TO DEFENSE

(By PAUL W. SHAFER, M. C., member of the Military Affairs Committee)

The United States is building up an admirable defense—for protection against Indian uprisings and for the satisfaction of assorted local pressure groups. We have no scientifically planned defense program in realistic relation to possible needs in a tempestuous world. Our program, so far as it can be thus dignified, is one of pouring out billions of dollars at haphazard, on the wishful theory that when an emergency arises these billions may, by some happy chance, have been aimed in the right direction. Effective defense has been frustrated for generations by extravagance and blundering.

We have scores of Army posts that are not only useless but would be a positive detriment in the event of a war. We are building, and have in recent months built, naval ships that cannot be sent on a mission in rough waters, because they would be blown over by a heavy breeze. We are handicapping the development of our air forces by split authority and by constant bickering between the services. Somewhere someone in the Government may have a comprehensive and cohesive plan for a sound defense program, based upon analysis of what we must defend and against whom. But if such a program exists, it has been carefully concealed from Congress.

In this article I want to limit myself largely to one aspect of the costly and dangerous situation, the aspect of politics, pork and patronage as barriers to intelligent national-defense expenditure. It used to be said that the tariff was a local issue because every locality wanted protection for its own products and free trade for the products of other localities. The same is true of our national defense. If there is one problem which should be solved in a thoroughly national spirit, this is it. Yet both the Army and Navy have become local issues in the most pork-barrelish style.

Recently a congressional committee, representing the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, made a 25,000-mile tour by air to inspect and study the Army's equipment. I returned from that trip deeply concerned for the fate of this Nation, if ever it has to make a real defense of its borders. Along with this concern, I brought back frightening requests for the improvement and extension of posts which we visited. These requests reached the astonishing total of billions of dollars. If granted, they would provide swimming pools, post exchanges, athletic fields, and other embellishments for an army of at least 5,000,000 men.

Some of these requests were made in formal compilations by commanding officers of the various forts. The greater number, however, were proffered by chambers of commerce, real estate dealers, and other earnest citizens apparently convinced that the way to protect America's coasts is to spend millions to boost trade in their particular areas. It is amazing how many spots in this country have the perfect climate and surroundings for an Army post, and are also, by a fortunate coincidence, perfectly located from a strategic and tactical standpoint. Any chamber of commerce, anywhere in the country, can show you just such a site.

We now have approximately 125 Army camps and posts scattered throughout the country. Any real defense program would cut them to a score or less and would build up and operate that score to meet the real urgencies of real military situations. Most of our camps and forts originated in the distant past, to make available small bodies of troops to keep the Indians in subjugation. They are unrelated to modern needs. But attempts to do away with any of them meet with frenzied opposition by those whose local interest would be affected. By way of exemplification I offer the Fort Moultrie incident:

On returning from our tour, I mentioned that in Fort Moultrie there were defensive guns which had not been fired for years, that they could not be fired because the explosive force would destroy summer cottages and shacks nearby, and that among these cottages was one built by the mayor directly in front of a gun. I was merely citing Fort Moultrie as an instance of a general situation. You would have thought Fort Sumter had been fired on again. The Carolina papers hit the ceiling and the Carolina Representatives were driven frantic with appeals from their folks to save Fort Moultrie. No doubt it was unadulterated patriotism that whipped up the storm.

As another example of waste that results directly from local domination of our defense expenditures, and the lack of correlation that follows, I point to the spring Army maneuvers scheduled in the vicinity of Fort Benning, Ga. The War Department decided that because of world conditions our military force should indulge in large-scale maneuvers this year. (Incidentally, last year's maneuvers, held in the North, proved to be a total failure.) When plans for this spring's activities were prepared, they called for an expenditure of $18,000,000. A break-down of the figures revealed that $9,000,000, or half the total, would be spent for transporting troops to the tactical area. In other words, we spend many millions to bring troops from the Indian outposts to an area which might really be in danger in the event of an invasion. Our scheme of defense, it would seem, does not aim to prevent invasion, but rather accepts the invasion as a fact and aims to protect the interior from the invader's advance.

I wonder how many are familiar with Fort Huachuca. It is a post in Arizona which, according to the Bisbee Chamber of Commerce, "is strategically located for the defense of the Mexican-American border." The good merchants of Bisbee, through their chamber of commerce, provided the committee with an elaborate pamphlet containing 33 photographs of the fort and an analysis of its needs. All of the latter were identified as "immediate needs." They would involve expenditures of nearly $4,000,000, for everything from new barrack buildings to a new well. In presenting the pamphlet, the chamber expressed hopes "that you will file this as future reference when appropriations for the Army are being considered. * * * We can truly say that the Army in this State performs a distinct service."

The Cheyenne (Wyo.) Chamber, to cite another example, stands four-square for the development of Fort Francis E. Warren. The Cheyenne pamphlet presented to us says:

"The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce emphatically believes that Fort Francis E. Warren should be the headquarters and station for a streamlined division and have prepared the following résumé of the advantage of Fort Francis E. Warren as a location for the headquarters of this division. * * * We believe that Cheyenne's recreation, climatic, transportation, and educational facilities make Fort Warren, which adjoins Cheyenne, a very desirable place for officers and men to reside and to educate and rear their family."

The chamber asked for a modest $3,000,000.

Then we have "Marvelous Marin, Inc.," which is a county chamber of commerce at San Rafael, Calif. "Marvelous Marin" informed the committee that its needs would be met if the Federal Government would build a new route to the Golden Gate Bridge, would establish a submarine base at Richardson Bay, and would locate a dry dock at Point San Pedro. It was joined by other civic organizations of the area in arguing that the Nation's defense would be enhanced by making the Golden Gate Bridge toll-free, with Uncle Sam assuming the responsibility for meeting bonds and interest.

Down the Potomac River from Washington the Army is maintaining detachments at forts which were obsolete before the Civil War and which by no stretch of the imagination could figure in the defense of this country. Some of the guns still in place could not possibly be fired, and no ammunition is now being made that would fit them. The same is true in other sections of the country. The chambers of commerce, and sometimes the commanding officers of posts, felt that maintenance of the particular fort or camp was justified by the fact that in its precincts was the hallowed tomb of some national or local hero. We should, of course, show proper reverence for our heroic dead, but we will add countless numbers to those dead unless we follow a sane defense program, unimpaired by local political interests and the bickerings of rival Army and Navy groups.

These are just random instances of demands for the embellishment of the existing camps and forts, and for the establishment of new ones. They illustrate the pressures operating against a defense program based on genuine needs and unencumbered by considerations of politics.

II

Local interference in what should be a nationally conceived and nationally executed program is, of course, only one of the hindrances encountered by those seeking to work out a planned program. There is also, as an important factor, the historical circumstance that the Army and Navy, instead of working cooperatively, are mutually antagonistic. One will brook no interference from the other in what it considers its special domain. Let me cite a particular instance. One of the stops on our inspection tour was at San Diego, Calif. The party was traveling in three Army planes. The Navy landing field was in excellent condition. The Army field nearby is under construction and at the time we approached was largely under water, making a landing in the big planes extremely hazardous. Yet this congressional committee, trying to find out what is wrong with national defense, was not permitted to land in the safe naval field, but was forced to risk a landing in the dangerous Army field.

No one has estimated how much has been wasted by the refusal of the two services to use property jointly when such joint use would be feasible and practical. We remember the occasion during the World War when the Army got around to equipping its fighting forces only to find that the Navy had cornered the market on a large number of necessary supplies.

That the lesson of that incident has not been learned is evidenced by a recent incident at Tampa, Fla., where the Army is constructing the Southeastern Air Base. The Navy acquired a parcel of land while the Army was negotiating the purchase of the same site. The Navy wanted the property for a quarantine station, while the Army had contracted for part of it as an air base. A quarantine station would have ruined the availability of the entire site. Lengthy and expensive negotiations were necessary before the rival claims of the Army and Navy were settled.

Duplication of facilities exists right in the National Capital; we have Army and Navy air fields adjoining, each refusing to have anything to do with the other. The situation is further complicated in Washington by the fact that Congress is now spending $5,000,000 to build a landing field across the river from the Army and Navy airports for the accommodation of civilian flyers. I have serious doubts whether we need three separate and distinct fields.

The Navy muddle on defense plans is as serious as that of the Army. Anyone in doubt that the pork-barrel figures in the sea and shore program of the Navy can have his doubts resolved by trying to abolish a naval station, no matter how obsolete. The operation of unwisely located naval stations is wasting millions of dollars every year. There are annual drives to lure the fleet into particular waters, not in order that it may be better trained or better based, but in order that the port city may thrive for a time. Here again Washington figures in the picture. Many years ago, when ships were all of comparatively shallow draft and when the Potomac River meant something in the way of shipping, the Washington Navy Yard was constructed. Today scarcely any ship larger than a rowboat can navigate the Potomac, but the navy yard remains. Virtually landlocked, it is being utilized as a naval gun factory; the guns made there have to be transported by rail or on barges before they can be built into the ships—another heavy and useless expense.

These facts, and a mountain of additional facts present a true indictment of our present haphazard system and emphasize the need for the formation of a sound and effective program of national defense. The studies which I have made have convinced me that America can save millions of dollars every year, and at the same time obtain greater protection, if we divorce the national defense from politics and pork-barrel influences.

Kings Canyon National Park Now a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the long-drawn-out legislative contest which culminated this year in the enactment of my bill to create and establish the Kings Canyon National Park in central California no organization rendered greater assistance in the achievement of the victory than did the Sierra Club, an organization of disinterested citizens who have banded themselves together to preserve the glories and the wilderness characteristics of the high Sierra-Nevada Mountains.

As the author of the enabling legislation, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief article from the April 1940 issue of the official bulletin of this most worthy organization which is entitled "Kings Canyon National Park Now a Reality." As it is indicated at the end thereof, this very interesting essay is from the able pen of Mr. William E. Colby, who, at the moment, is serving as secretary of the Sierra Club.

The unanimous consent of the entire membership having been indicated, the article which has been referred to follows:

[From the Sierra Club Bulletin of May 1940]

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK NOW A REALITY

The signing by the President of the bill creating the Kings Canyon National Park is a cause for great rejoicing. It ends a battle of many years. There was very early thought of making a great national park out of this general region, but it was John Muir who gave the idea real vitality. He had visited the area in his early wanderings in the Sierra. With that uncanny sense which made him our foremost wilderness savior, he recognized its outstanding character and advocated that it be included in a national park as early as 1890. He repeated this recommendation many times during his lifetime.

The Sierra Club has consistently urged the creation of this park. In 1906 it prepared a detailed report on the region. (Sierra Club Bulletin, vol. VI, pp. 115–127, January 1907.) When Stephen T. Mather became Director of the National Park Service, one of his major objectives was to secure the passage of a bill in Congress which would accomplish this. With the able assistance of Congressman Arthur J. Elston, also one of our members, a bill was on several occasions brought to a point where it seemed highly probable that it would be passed. But on each occasion some last-minute obstacle would arise which blocked it for that particular session. Then came opposition from the city of Los Angeles, which made water and power filings on all of the major streams in the area and spent thousands of dollars in surveys. Approval of these filings was refused by the Federal Water Power Commission, which held that the San Joaquin Valley irrigationists had first claim on any such rights. With the gauntlet taken up by these irrigationists the situation looked hopeless. Secretary of the Interior Ickes had other ideas, however, and decided to urge upon Congress the creation of this great park, which his friend Stephen Mather had so actively fought for during his lifetime. The Secretary personally met with and satisfied the irrigationists that their problems could best be solved in other ways, and also promised to urge upon Congress the building of the Pine Flat Reservoir to take care of their needs. Congressman B. W. GEARHART, from Fresno County, was enlisted to introduce the measure. Too much credit cannot be paid him for his fearless advocacy of the bill in the face of powerful local opposition and unsuccessful attempts

similar to the secretary of munitions, who was a vital necessity in every European cabinet during the war, similar to the position which Mr. Baruch held in this country. The President has just appointed an advisory board, a step to which no one can take exception. But he has made it clear that its function is entirely advisory. It has nothing to do with the giving of orders or the purchase of material. Furthermore, if we can judge from the present administration's past record with advisory boards, the President is not likely to pay much attention to its advice, particularly if it conflicts with the views of more intimate advisers. For administration purposes a board, particularly in an emergency, is of little value. As General Goethals once said, "A board is long, narrow, and wooden."

Apparently the mobilization of industry is in the hands of Harry Hopkins and Secretary Morgenthau, unless it is now to be handed over to the R. F. C. While each of these gentlemen is able in his own peculiar field, I doubt if either would be selected as experienced in the organization of industry for war. Modern war is a war of machinery. Its success depends as much on industry as it does on men, guns, and ships. Surely it is a job which ought to be given to the most competent and experienced man in the whole field of industry.

In the third place, I believe there should be a determined effort to reduce the regulation of business in order that it may develop more rapidly and efficiently, in order that it may renovate its plant, in order that it may put more men to work and create the wealth necessary to support our tremendous expenditures under a system of free enterprise. I have advocated this entirely apart from the war. Now it is even more necessary. I feel very strongly that New Deal legislation has in nearly every case gone far beyond the actual abuse which it seeks to cure. It is not necessary to subject whole industries to detailed regulation simply because there are one or two crooks in the industry. Legislation has been inspired by the belief of the New Dealers that the solution of every problem is complete Government control, and it can and must be modified. We had an example this week in the La Follette civil-liberties bill. As finally passed by the Senate, it will meet the evils of industrial espionage and strike-breaking agencies at which it was aimed. But the Senate eliminated a vast amount of incidental restrictions which would have deprived employers of the right to find out whether their men were Communists or "fifth columnists" and subjected them to all kinds of bureaucratic restrictions and regulation, particularly with relations to Government contracts. The same thing can be done with many other New Deal laws now hampering industry at every step. We can stimulate prosperity, put men back to work, and develop a prosperous country, able to bear the tremendous weight of national defense. But we haven't been able to do it through planned economy in time of peace, and we can't do it any better in time of war.

If the American people want a national administration which has shown any ability to carry out an effective program of national defense, there is no possible argument for the present administration. It has failed to develop an Army and Navy with essential modern weapons. It has shown its complete incapacity in the field of finance. It has shown its unwillingness to abate by one jot or one tittle its hostility to industry, or its adherence to all the bureaucratic activities of the New Deal. It is proposing to destroy any possible unity in the United States by insisting on a third term, in violation of all the traditions and principles of the American Republic.

Local Politics: Menace to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. PAUL W. SHAFER OF MICHIGAN

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. SHAFER, which appeared in the May 1940 issue of the American Mercury.

[From the American Mercury of May 1940]

LOCAL POLITICS: MENACE TO DEFENSE

(By PAUL W. SHAFER, M. C., member of the Military Affairs Committee)

The United States is building up an admirable defense—for protection against Indian uprisings and for the satisfaction of assorted local pressure groups. We have no scientifically planned defense program in realistic relation to possible needs in a tempestuous world. Our program, so far as it can be thus dignified, is one of pouring out billions of dollars at haphazard, on the wishful theory that when an emergency arises these billions may, by some happy chance, have been aimed in the right direction. Effective defense has been frustrated for generations by extravagance and blundering.

We have scores of Army posts that are not only useless but would be a positive detriment in the event of a war. We are building, and have in recent months built, naval ships that cannot be sent on a mission in rough waters, because they would be blown over by a heavy breeze. We are handicapping the development of our air forces by split authority and by constant bickering between the services. Somewhere someone in the Government may have a comprehensive and cohesive plan for a sound defense program, based upon analysis of what we must defend and against whom. But if such a program exists, it has been carefully concealed from Congress.

In this article I want to limit myself largely to one aspect of the costly and dangerous situation, the aspect of politics, pork and patronage as barriers to intelligent national-defense expenditure. It used to be said that the tariff was a local issue because every locality wanted protection for its own products and free trade for the products of other localities. The same is true of our national defense. If there is one problem which should be solved in a thoroughly national spirit, this is it. Yet both the Army and Navy have become local issues in the most pork-barrelish style.

Recently a congressional committee, representing the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, made a 25,000-mile tour by air to inspect and study the Army's equipment. I returned from that trip deeply concerned for the fate of this Nation, if ever it has to make a real defense of its borders. Along with this concern, I brought back frightening requests for the improvement and extension of posts which we visited. These requests reached the astonishing total of billions of dollars. If granted, they would provide swimming pools, post exchanges, athletic fields, and other embellishments for an army of at least 5,000,000 men.

Some of these requests were made in formal compilations by commanding officers of the various forts. The greater number, however, were proffered by chambers of commerce, real estate dealers, and other earnest citizens apparently convinced that the way to protect America's coasts is to spend millions to boost trade in their particular areas. It is amazing how many spots in this country have the perfect climate and surroundings for an Army post, and are also, by a fortunate coincidence, perfectly located from a strategic and tactical standpoint. Any chamber of commerce, anywhere in the country, can show you just such a site.

We now have approximately 125 Army camps and posts scattered throughout the country. Any real defense program would cut them to a score or less and would build up and operate that score to meet the real urgencies of real military situations. Most of our camps and forts originated in the distant past, to make available small bodies of troops to keep the Indians in subjugation. They are unrelated to modern needs. But attempts to do away with any of them meet with frenzied opposition by those whose local interest would be affected. By way of exemplification I offer the Fort Moultrie incident:

On returning from our tour, I mentioned that in Fort Moultrie there were defensive guns which had not been fired for years, that they could not be fired because the explosive force would destroy summer cottages and shacks nearby, and that among these cottages was one built by the mayor directly in front of a gun. I was merely citing Fort Moultrie as an instance of a general situation. You would have thought Fort Sumter had been fired on again. The Carolina papers hit the ceiling and the Carolina Representatives were driven frantic with appeals from their folks to save Fort Moultrie. No doubt it was unadulterated patriotism that whipped up the storm.

As another example of waste that results directly from local domination of our defense expenditures, and the lack of correlation that follows, I point to the spring Army maneuvers scheduled in the vicinity of Fort Benning, Ga. The War Department decided that because of world conditions our military force should indulge in large-scale maneuvers this year. (Incidentally, last year's maneuvers, held in the North, proved to be a total failure.) When plans for this spring's activities were prepared, they called for an expenditure of $18,000,000. A break-down of the figures revealed that $9,000,000, or half the total, would be spent for transporting troops to the tactical area. In other words, we spend many millions to bring troops from the Indian outposts to an area which might really be in danger in the event of an invasion. Our scheme of defense, it would seem, does not aim to prevent invasion, but rather accepts the invasion as a fact and aims to protect the interior from the invader's advance.

I wonder how many are familiar with Fort Huachuca. It is a post in Arizona which, according to the Bisbee Chamber of Commerce, "is strategically located for the defense of the Mexican-American border." The good merchants of Bisbee, through their chamber of commerce, provided the committee with an elaborate pamphlet containing 33 photographs of the fort and an analysis of its needs. All of the latter were identified as "immediate needs." They would involve expenditures of nearly $4,000,000, for everything from new barrack buildings to a new well. In presenting the pamphlet, the chamber expressed hopes "that you will file this as future reference when appropriations for the Army are being considered. * * * We can truly say that the Army in this State performs a distinct service."

The Cheyenne (Wyo.) Chamber, to cite another example, stands four-square for the development of Fort Francis E. Warren. The Cheyenne pamphlet presented to us says:

"The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce emphatically believes that Fort Francis E. Warren should be the headquarters and station for a streamlined division and have prepared the following résumé of the advantage of Fort Francis E. Warren as a location for the headquarters of this division. * * * We believe that Cheyenne's recreation, climatic, transportation, and educational facilities make Fort Warren, which adjoins Cheyenne, a very desirable place for officers and men to reside and to educate and rear their family."

The chamber asked for a modest $3,000,000.

Then we have "Marvelous Marin, Inc.," which is a county chamber of commerce at San Rafael, Calif. "Marvelous Marin" informed the committee that its needs would be met if the Federal Government would build a new route to the Golden Gate Bridge, would establish a submarine base at Richardson Bay, and would locate a dry dock at Point San Pedro. It was joined by other civic organizations of the area in arguing that the Nation's defense would be enhanced by making the Golden Gate Bridge toll-free, with Uncle Sam assuming the responsibility for meeting bonds and interest.

Down the Potomac River from Washington the Army is maintaining detachments at forts which were obsolete before the Civil War and which by no stretch of the imagination could figure in the defense of this country. Some of the guns still in place could not possibly be fired, and no ammunition is now being made that would fit them. The same is true in other sections of the country. The chambers of commerce, and sometimes the commanding officers of posts, felt that maintenance of the particular fort or camp was justified by the fact that in its precincts was the hallowed tomb of some national or local hero. We should, of course, show proper reverence for our heroic dead, but we will add countless numbers to those dead unless we follow a sane defense program, unimpaired by local political interests and the bickerings of rival Army and Navy groups.

These are just random instances of demands for the embellishment of the existing camps and forts, and for the establishment of new ones. They illustrate the pressures operating against a defense program based on genuine needs and unencumbered by considerations of politics.

II

Local interference in what should be a nationally conceived and nationally executed program is, of course, only one of the hindrances encountered by those seeking to work out a planned program. There is also, as an important factor, the historical circumstance that the Army and Navy, instead of working cooperatively, are mutually antagonistic. One will brook no interference from the other in what it considers its special domain. Let me cite a particular instance. One of the stops on our inspection tour was at San Diego, Calif. The party was traveling in three Army planes. The Navy landing field was in excellent condition. The Army field nearby is under construction and at the time we approached was largely under water, making a landing in the big planes extremely hazardous. Yet this congressional committee, trying to find out what is wrong with national defense, was not permitted to land in the safe naval field, but was forced to risk a landing in the dangerous Army field.

No one has estimated how much has been wasted by the refusal of the two services to use property jointly when such joint use would be feasible and practical. We remember the occasion during the World War when the Army got around to equipping its fighting forces only to find that the Navy had cornered the market on a large number of necessary supplies.

That the lesson of that incident has not been learned is evidenced by a recent incident at Tampa, Fla., where the Army is constructing the Southeastern Air Base. The Navy acquired a parcel of land while the Army was negotiating the purchase of the same site. The Navy wanted the property for a quarantine station, while the Army had contracted for part of it as an air base. A quarantine station would have ruined the availability of the entire site. Lengthy and expensive negotiations were necessary before the rival claims of the Army and Navy were settled.

Duplication of facilities exists right in the National Capital; we have Army and Navy air fields adjoining, each refusing to have anything to do with the other. The situation is further complicated in Washington by the fact that Congress is now spending $5,000,000 to build a landing field across the river from the Army and Navy airports for the accommodation of civilian flyers. I have serious doubts whether we need three separate and distinct fields.

The Navy muddle on defense plans is as serious as that of the Army. Anyone in doubt that the pork-barrel figures in the sea and shore program of the Navy can have his doubts resolved by trying to abolish a naval station, no matter how obsolete. The operation of unwisely located naval stations is wasting millions of dollars every year. There are annual drives to lure the fleet into particular waters, not in order that it may be better trained or better based, but in order that the port city may thrive for a time. Here again Washington figures in the picture. Many years ago, when ships were all of comparatively shallow draft and when the Potomac River meant something in the way of shipping, the Washington Navy Yard was constructed. Today scarcely any ship larger than a rowboat can navigate the Potomac, but the navy yard remains. Virtually landlocked, it is being utilized as a naval gun factory; the guns made there have to be transported by rail or on barges before they can be built into the ships—another heavy and useless expense.

These facts, and a mountain of additional facts present a true indictment of our present haphazard system and emphasize the need for the formation of a sound and effective program of national defense. The studies which I have made have convinced me that America can save millions of dollars every year, and at the same time obtain greater protection, if we divorce the national defense from politics and pork-barrel influences.

Kings Canyon National Park Now a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the long-drawn-out legislative contest which culminated this year in the enactment of my bill to create and establish the Kings Canyon National Park in central California no organization rendered greater assistance in the achievement of the victory than did the Sierra Club, an organization of disinterested citizens who have banded themselves together to preserve the glories and the wilderness characteristics of the high Sierra-Nevada Mountains.

As the author of the enabling legislation, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief article from the April 1940 issue of the official bulletin of this most worthy organization which is entitled "Kings Canyon National Park Now a Reality." As it is indicated at the end thereof, this very interesting essay is from the able pen of Mr. William E. Colby, who, at the moment, is serving as secretary of the Sierra Club.

The unanimous consent of the entire membership having been indicated, the article which has been referred to follows:

[From the Sierra Club Bulletin of May 1940]

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK NOW A REALITY

The signing by the President of the bill creating the Kings Canyon National Park is a cause for great rejoicing. It ends a battle of many years. There was very early thought of making a great national park out of this general region, but it was John Muir who gave the idea real vitality. He had visited the area in his early wanderings in the Sierra. With that uncanny sense which made him our foremost wilderness savior, he recognized its outstanding character and advocated that it be included in a national park as early as 1890. He repeated this recommendation many times during his lifetime.

The Sierra Club has consistently urged the creation of this park. In 1906 it prepared a detailed report on the region. (Sierra Club Bulletin, vol. VI, pp. 115–127, January 1907.) When Stephen T. Mather became Director of the National Park Service, one of his major objectives was to secure the passage of a bill in Congress which would accomplish this. With the able assistance of Congressman Arthur J. Elston, also one of our members, a bill was on several occasions brought to a point where it seemed highly probable that it would be passed. But on each occasion some last-minute obstacle would arise which blocked it for that particular session. Then came opposition from the city of Los Angeles, which made water and power filings on all of the major streams in the area and spent thousands of dollars in surveys. Approval of these filings was refused by the Federal Water Power Commission, which held that the San Joaquin Valley irrigationists had first claim on any such rights. With the gauntlet taken up by these irrigationists the situation looked hopeless. Secretary of the Interior Ickes had other ideas, however, and decided to urge upon Congress the creation of this great park, which his friend Stephen Mather had so actively fought for during his lifetime. The Secretary personally met with and satisfied the irrigationists that their problems could best be solved in other ways, and also promised to urge upon Congress the building of the Pine Flat Reservoir to take care of their needs. Congressman B. W. GEARHART, from Fresno County, was enlisted to introduce the measure. Too much credit cannot be paid him for his fearless advocacy of the bill in the face of powerful local opposition and unsuccessful attempts

to discredit his motives. It is doubtful if any one thing has been done in a long while which in the long run will redound to the greater advantage of Fresno County than calling the attention of the entire country to the scenic marvels included for permanent preservation in this outstanding park.

THE SIERRA CLUB'S PART

The board of directors of the Sierra Club, recognizing that the time was ripe, put the whole force of the club behind the project, and called on its members and kindred organizations to assist. Thousands of finely illustrated pamphlets descriptive of the region were printed (not "hundreds of thousands," as a hostile Congressman charged on the floor of the House when the bill was called up for debate) giving the reasons for creating the park and answering objections. The Sierra Club can justly be proud of the part it played as the rallying point of the western clubs and other advocates of the measure. The club's prestige is enhanced immensely by the outcome. Great credit is due the American Planning and Civic Association and to Horace Albright, its president and former Director of the National Park Service, and to Miss Harlean James, resourceful and vigilant secretary of the Association; also to the emergency conservation committee and Mrs. C. N. Edge, its chairman; to Mrs. Linnie Marsh Wolfe, of the John Muir Association; and to Mrs. Edmund C. Brown. They gave most effective aid at critical times. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to single out and name other organizations and individuals who should receive credit, for their name is legion. Our own members responded nobly on the many occasions when S O S calls were sent out. Mrs. Wolfe wrote from Washington, D. C.: "I have been told that final passage was precipitated by the flood of letters and telegrams that deluged the Senators. They appealed to KEY PITTMAN to withdraw his opposition and let the bill go through."

There is one member of the club who deserves special mention. In 1924, when the Sierra Club party was returning from its summer outing in Glacier National Park, Dr. George C. Thompson came to me as chairman of a committee to raise a fund testimonial to the successful management of the trip, and asked for suggestions as to what should be done with such contributions. I told him that no greater good could be accomplished than to create a fund to draw on for the "sinews of war" necessary to carry on a campaign to bring about the creation of a national park embracing the Kings River area. My suggestion was adopted, and approximately $1,800 was raised in this manner. It was placed in a savings account, and, with accumulated interest, amounted to approximately $2,100 when this latest movement to create the park started. It is certain that, without this fund to draw on, the work of the Club would have been seriously handicapped, for it is doubtful if the directors would have felt justified in authorizing such a large expenditure from the treasury. As a result the regular funds of the club were drawn on for only a comparatively few dollars, and the club now owns the very fine color film of this new park region, taken last summer by David Brower and Richard Leonard, the cost being paid out of this special fund.

NEW PROBLEMS TO SOLVE

The National Park Service will be confronted with some very serious problems in administering the new park area. The recently completed road into the South Fork Canyon will attract a flood of visitors, and criticism is bound to follow because it has not been possible to prepare adequate accommodations. Cedar Grove and other areas within the reservoir site excluded from the new park are now under Forest Service jurisdiction, and the road does not now extend into the park at any point. This is bound to cause confusion because of divided jurisdiction. However, we are certain that those of our members who visit the canyon this year, whether with the annual outing party or separately, will cooperate with Park and Forest representatives in every possible way to lighten their difficult tasks. It will take months and even years to iron out all the problems. We have good news in the fact that Dr. Harold C. Bryant, formerly of the University of California, and in charge of the National Park Nature Guide Service, has been selected to take over the superintendent's duties during the transition period, which will require careful and tactful handling.

Of course, we all regret the exclusion of Tehipite Valley and the Cedar Grove part of the South Fork Canyon from the new park, but the situation is far from hopeless. The creation of the great surrounding park will do more than anything else possibly could to convince the public of the desirability of eventually adding these areas. They are outstanding in impressiveness and scenic majesty, and when the thousands who visit this area recognize this fact, even local sentiment will realize that their greatest value lies in perpetual preservation as a part of the great park to which they naturally belong. The studied and mature reports of the Army and reclamation services indicate that the asserted need for these reservoir sites can be satisfactorily supplied elsewhere in the Kings River watershed.

We wish to thank personally all the good friends of the club who responded so generously to our repeated calls for aid during the progress of this legislation, and I know that they will all share with us the realization that a good fight for the right has been won—that John Muir, in spirit at least, is rejoicing that the great work which he started is being carried on so effectively by the organization which meant so much to him during his lifetime.

WM. E. COLBY,
Secretary of the Sierra Club.

Political Shadow Boxing and Judicial Juggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it may be good policy in some instances to keep the left hand from knowing what the right hand is doing.

Large appropriations do not overnight bring adequate national defense, nor does one rule for industry and another for labor tend to create the coordination which is necessary if a nation is to arm.

The President will do well to read, consider, and then profit by the experience of other nations which have met disaster.

From the Chicago Tribune of yesterday let me quote:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 29, 1940]

BLUM, MACDONALD, AND THE NEW DEAL

The grave news from Europe ought to give pause to those who have been trying to rush this country, unprepared as it is, into the war. The day's budget of domestic news ought to serve further to dampen the ardor of the war hawks. It is all too clear that this country is in the Blum-MacDonald period.

The same papers which reported the surrender of King Leopold told of the United States Supreme Court decision in the Apex Hosiery case. A manufacturing company had been the victim of a particularly inexcusable and violent sit-down strike. The company had sued under the Sherman law for triple damages, alleging an illegal conspiracy on the part of the union to interfere with the flow of interstate commerce. The company had won in the lower court, but the verdict was reversed in the Supreme Court on the ground that, though the offense was grave, it did not fall within the terms of the Sherman Act.

Chief Justice Hughes and two of his associates dissented. It is not necessary at this point to discuss the opposing views of the law; the point which needs to be stressed is that the company saw only a slim chance, if any, of obtaining justice under the State laws of Pennsylvania and has now discovered that the Federal Code offers no protection whatsoever against violent and conscienceless interruptions of industrial production.

Just as in France under Blum, and in Britain under MacDonald, our Federal Government is all sail and no anchor. Our recent legislation has all been directed at establishing the right to disrupt the economy of the country and lessen its productivity. Unions are encouraged to prevent the training of young men in the more intricate trades. Hours of labor even in the armament industries are narrowly restricted. The Federal Government has disrupted the coal industry and the power industry and encouraged revolutionaries to organize the basic metal trades and the motor factories.

The objection is not to unionization but to the encouragement of violent and subversive unionization. Mr. Roosevelt has opened the door of industry to the "fifth column," just as Blum and MacDonald did in their countries, and has taken no steps to impose restraint and regard for the common danger and common welfare upon those he has raised to power. The Federal Government has assumed jurisdiction over the milk industry, but under Mr. Roosevelt does nothing to maintain the milk supply of Chicago. His Supreme Court has said that virtually all industrial labor is subject to Federal regulation, but his laws are all directed against the employer, whose chief desire is to make and sell more goods; none of the laws discourage interruptions of production by men of violence acting under the guise of labor leaders.

The latest of the New Deal laws is the La Follette bill which, even with its amendments, is still vicious legislation. It forbids the employer to take any effective steps to combat a strike, no matter how unjustified the strike may be, no matter how unpopular it may be with the rank and file of the employees, and no matter what forms of terrorism are employed by the pickets. Here is another evidence that the New Deal is determined to make it as easy as possible for the Communist "fifth column" to disrupt industry.

It is this same Government which is edging an unprepared Nation toward war.

Behind the Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., the night of March 20, 1940:

I am extremely grateful to Miss McAfee for two reasons: First, for inviting me here, and second, for asking me to discuss a subject with which I am fairly familiar. The second reason is important because after many years of experience in appearing before the public I have arrived at the solemn conclusion that a college student body is a very exacting audience. The remark is not intended as a criticism. On the contrary, it is a compliment.

College students are the busiest folks I know and when they set aside an evening to listen to a speaker they expect to be compensated by hearing something that is worth while or at least new. A youthful audience is also an alert audience, and the speaker who might be careless about his facts has small chance of having his errors passed unnoticed.

I am also pleased to be here for a very personal reason. Usually when I attempt a public appearance there is no member of the Farley family in attendance and if the talk happens to be broadcast, the family radio is silent as the tomb. I assume that attendance here tonight is compulsory for one member of the family so that Betty will be compelled to hear me out, no matter how painful the ordeal may be.

The subject of this talk is Behind the Ballots, and the purpose is to reveal something about the business end of electing a President of the United States. By the business end, I mean the work of directing the complicated party machinery by means of which a candidate's claim for the office is put before the public.

The Constitution did not make provision for political parties. Yet they have come into being and continued to flourish until today the part they play in the election machinery could be performed in no other way.

We are fortunate in this country in having the two-party system, by which I mean that the vast majority of voters adhere to one or the other of the two major parties. There are several minor political parties, of course, but very rarely do they command enough support to wield the balance of power or change the outcome of an election. If there were a dozen or more parties, appealing to the electorate on sectional or class issues, the election of a President by majority vote would be impossible. And majority rule is the lifeblood of a democracy.

Democracy is the finest system of government yet devised by man, but it is not self-operating. It has been tried in a number of foreign countries with tragic consequences because the people were not sufficiently disciplined in its use. The reason democracy works so well in this country is due to the fact that the people have been educated to the wise use of the popular referendum.

They have learned the greatest lesson that democracy has to offer—and that is the lesson of tolerance. By tolerance I mean the disposition to respect the opinions of other groups, no matter how distasteful they may be, and a sincere willingness to abide by the decision of the majority. We have witnessed many hotly contested elections in this country in recent years, but when the ballots were counted the losers yielded gracefully and accepted the fact that the will of the majority should prevail until the next national election. There has been no post-election violence and no hint that such tactics should be employed.

I have digressed briefly to show the function of political parties in the election system. Next in order is a consideration of the practical methods employed in the task of trying to elect a President. I shall talk about the Democratic Party because I know more about it, although the Republican Party is organized in essentially the same manner.

The Democratic National Committee is composed of 2 members, 1 man and 1 woman, from each of the 48 States, and also 2 each from the Territories and insular possessions. The committee is a continuing body in that it functions between elections and maintains national headquarters at all times. However, the peak of the work is concentrated in the few months intervening between the nomination of candidates and the election in November. We are approaching that period now.

Party headquarters are peaceful and quiet under normal conditions, but the atmosphere is soon changed when the actual electioneering gets under way. The excitement of political campaigning is intense and all save a few hardened veterans usually become its victims. While much of the daily labor is little more than drudgery, the morale is kept at a high level by this eager interest of the workers in the election outcome.

The ordinary routine of the committee can be carried on by relatively few employees, but during the campaign activities are expanded at a breathless rate. Whole new divisions must be set up, organized, and made to function in the short space of a few weeks. Each division head has a vital part of the election machinery to watch over. There is a labor division, an agricultural division, a businessmen's division, a speakers' bureau, a women's division, a veterans' division, a foreign-language division, and many others.

I failed to mention the finance division, although without this important arm of committee activity a campaign would be impossible. The cost of running a national campaign under present-day conditions runs into millions of dollars, and you can imagine the heavy duty which lies upon those responsible for coaxing such an amount of cash into the party treasury. It may be of interest for you to know that the Democratic National Committee expended $1,876,000 in the 1932 campaign and $3,866,000 in the 1936 campaign. A finance director is usually appointed, with several assistants, and a local finance director in each State. The gentleman selected for the task must be a genius in his line; he must bring in sufficient funds to meet a huge weekly pay roll with only a minimum amount of time in which to make an appeal.

The women's division should be particularly interesting to a Wellesley audience. Based upon our experience in national elections, it has been made a permanent part of the committee organization instead of a temporary campaign device. The decision to make this a permanent division was not arrived at simply as a gesture of gallantry to our feminine coworkers. It was founded on a common-sense realization of the ever-growing influence wielded by women in the field of politics.

When the nineteenth amendment, or suffrage amendment, went into effect, it was said by those who disapproved that the size of the electorate would be doubled without improving the quality. These same critics complained that women had no interest in public questions and would simply vote as the men folks voted. For a few years it may have been true that the influence of women voters was negligible. That is decidedly not true today. They are exercising the right of suffrage on a broad scale, and their views are having a wholesome effect on the kind and character of public issues.

I am happy to give testimony to the fact that women are excellent political workers, and in some respects they are more efficient than the men. They have an intense interest which never lags, and they have less inclination to shirk the small tasks, upon the performance of which so much depends.

The Democratic Party was fortunate to have as the head of its women's division for several years, including the important election year of 1936, Miss Mary W. Dewson, a graduate of Wellesley College. Those misguided individuals who still think that women are ignorant about politics apparently never had the pleasure of knowing Miss Dewson. In all my experience in public life, I never met a person who had a finer talent for political organization and administration than Molly, as she was known to her associates. She had the ability to direct other people with a minimum of effort and she knew how to bring forth the best efforts of her subordinates while at the same time maintaining their respect and good will. She never allowed trifles to pile up and obstruct her view of the goal ahead. This is a high art in politics, and Miss Dewson's grasp of the fundamentals made her a truly great political commander.

Her concern in politics went beyond the mere winning of elections. For many years, before becoming actively associated with a political organization, she devoted her energies to the improvement of social and economic conditions among the lower income class groups. She had sincerity of conviction, and it was this sincerity that enhanced her ability to influence the opinions of others.

The publicity division of the national committee might be described, in military terms, as the ammunition supply base for the rest of the Army. It has the primary duty of providing facts, figures, and arguments to confound the political enemy. It must exploit the attractive qualities of the party candidates and reveal the weak points of those on the other side. The publicity division has many and far-flung activities. In addition to supplying the usual campaign material such as pamphlets, posters, and other types of literature, it must make the fullest use of the new means of propaganda which have been developed in comparatively recent years. I refer to the moving picture, the newsreel, and the radio.

Development of the radio to its present high state of efficiency brought a new factor into political campaigning. While everyone realizes the importance of broadcasting in influencing votes, I doubt if anyone yet has been able to gage its exact significance. It is interesting to note that since the ownership of radio receiving sets became almost universal in this country, there has not been a close Presidential election. This may mean that the voters disregard other appeals and simply reach a verdict by listening to the opposing candidates. Or it may mean something entirely different. In any event, it is easy to understand why the major political parties allocate as much money as they can possibly spare for radio broadcasting.

Having reviewed the work of a few divisions, a question might arise as to the duties of the national chairman. The idea may be gathered that all he has to do is to sit back and watch the others

work. However, the position is not quite as simple as that. First, there is the duty of coordinating the various divisions, of making certain that their activities do not overlap, or, worse still, contradict each other. If a letter of instruction goes out under the signature of the chairman or someone else, a copy must be seen by each of the division chiefs. Otherwise, without that precaution, the workers in the field might be puzzling over very contradictory letters of advice.

The chairman of the national committee must be at his desk from 9 o'clock in the morning until midnight from the opening of the campaign until its close. Much of this time is consumed in directing the work of the various divisions and in replying to letters which number many hundreds daily. He must also be prepared to exchange views with prominent party leaders who arrive at headquarters in a constant stream. These are Governors, Senators, and other individuals of eminence in their own States who have a right to expect a personal chat with the chairman. Very often information is obtained in these personal interviews that can be gotten in no other way.

But the first duty of the national chairman is to act as a field marshal for the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. He should be able at all times to tell how the battle is progressing. He should have a correct estimate of his own resources and a fair understanding of the enemy weaknesses. The arithmetic of elections, after all, is comparatively simple. There are 531 votes in the electoral college, apportioned on the basis of State populations. The goal is to win a majority of 266, and a smart commanding general should know where he proposes to get them. A map with State lines sharply drawn, and State electoral votes marked in bold type, is always a conspicuous exhibit at national headquarters. In fact, every individual with a keen interest in election outcomes should have such a map.

Before a campaign is long under way, it is usually possible to determine the doubtful States, or those States whose electoral vote will determine the election. Perhaps you have heard the expression that as New York goes, so goes the Nation. Note I didn't say as Maine goes, so goes the Nation. The reason for New York's importance is relatively simple. Because of its large population, the State has 47 electoral votes, or between 8 and 9 percent of the total vote. A swing of that margin has been enough to win more than one Presidential election. Illinois and Ohio are 2 other pivotal States for the same reason.

The task is to find the States where sentiment is close and to concentrate campaign activities in those areas. A campaign manager who wasted his efforts on States already won might find himself very much embarrassed on election day. How is it possible to gage the drift of sentiment in advance of the actual balloting? In other words, before people vote, how do you know how they are going to vote?

The straw vote, or sampling method, as it is called, has become a favorite preelection sport in recent years. Americans are fond of guessing games and there is nothing quite so fascinating as the pleasure of anticipating the results of a Presidential election. It must be conceded that these straw votes frequently hit the mark with surprising accuracy. On the other hand, they often miss by a wide margin, as did the unfortunate Literary Digest poll in 1936.

The straw-vote method is used sparingly by those directly engaged in political management. The time-honored custom is to depend upon the knowledge and judgment of the vast army of local workers who have become familiar with the voting habits of their neighbors through years of experience. There is at headquarters a list of every Democratic county chairman and woman vice chairman in the United States, numbering several thousands, and in addition the names of national committee members, State chairmen, Governors, legislators, and other active party workers. They comprise the field forces. They are canvassed regularly for their views and they are urged to report at once any shift in sentiment which may come to their attention. This system calls for a large volume of correspondence, to say nothing of the labor involved in sifting and analyzing the reports. But the final result is worth the effort because the method provides an invaluable index of public opinion.

During the 1936 campaign, we had a special list of about 2,500 key workers, mostly in the pivotal States, who were instructed to report at regular intervals. This group was composed of individuals whose judgment had been tested and found dependable in predicting the results of previous elections.

The accuracy of this private survey was remarkable. The June reports disclosed that the Republican candidates were finding popular favor. A couple of months later, in September, interest in the Republican ticket had slumped considerably, and the public was mainly concerned about President Roosevelt's proposed speaking tour, which had not then gotten under way. By late October the reports disclosed a groundswell of sentiment in favor of the Democratic ticket. The final check was made by telephone a few days before election. From headquarters in New York we called literally hundreds of these key workers, who reported that the tide was mounting and not receding. Upon the basis of this information I made a preelection forecast that President Roosevelt would carry 46 of the 48 States, despite the dire warnings of many earnest individuals at headquarters who felt that it was too absurd to be taken seriously by the public.

I refer to this forecast merely to demonstrate the insight possessed by skilled political observers in detecting the tides of public opinion in their home areas. The one thing needed at headquarters is an ability to distinguish between those men and women who know what is taking place and those who are being carried away by their enthusiasm. That, too, is a matter of experience. It is an odd fact that many public men who are excellent vote getters themselves are unable to gage the trend of opinion when they are not candidates for election.

Although a campaign lasts only a few months, the emotional strain often makes it seem much longer. As a rule, the workers are cheerful and optimistic, they are devoted to the candidates, and they feel confident that victory will perch on the party banner. The atmosphere is bright and happy, despite the burden of long hours and hard work. Then comes a depression period. Nearly everyone is enveloped in gloom. The cause seems hopeless and the workers go about looking anxious and woe-begone. This happens in practically every campaign, and it takes swift measures by seasoned veterans to bring about a change of attitude. The spirit of defeat is too contagious to gamble on its spreading. The mood passes quickly and it is difficult to explain why it came or why it went.

Another trying task for those directing campaign activities is to restrain the enthusiasm of overzealous workers. It is a common happening for individuals inexperienced in politics to suggest issuing statements or engaging in other activities that might do the cause more harm than good. One error frequently made is to assail the opposition candidates too viciously. The public has a keen sense of fair play, and an intemperate attack, founded upon ill temper instead of fact, is apt to have a dangerous reaction.

The exercise of patience is needed to handle the volunteer advisers who arrive at headquarters to tell just how the campaign should be conducted. The hardest person in the world to discourage is the individual who thinks he knows all about political management even without practical experience. I must confess that men are more often the offenders in this respect than women. A sense of humor is the only defense for the ridiculous suggestions that pour in from the beginning of a campaign until it closes.

In these remarks I have covered in a general way the mechanics of political management during the period of a national campaign. There has been no mention of men or issues, although these are the vital, living forces that make politics attractive. There have been many dynamic, forceful public figures in our country who have held a wide following for upward of 25 years. This enthusiasm for outstanding leaders has been one of the biggest factors in bringing people into politics and keeping them there.

I suppose many of you would have preferred having me talk about what is going to happen in 1940 rather than what did happen in past elections. I have some well-defined views on that subject. However, politics has taught me one more very valuable lesson, and that is that there is a time to talk and a time to maintain a discreet silence. And this is one of the latter times. So I am going to close by thanking you most sincerely for your courteous attention to my remarks.

Fifty-Year Fight for Kings Canyon National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT MAGAZINE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of my bill for the creation of the Kings Canyon National Park in California culminated in victory a legislative fight which had its beginning in 1881 when Senator John F. Miller, of California, introduced the first bill to accomplish this end so devoutly wished for through all of the intervening years by all true nature lovers and mountain conservationists.

As incomprehensive as it is strange, the disinterested efforts of naturalists and mountain lovers to confer national-park status upon this unprotected area has met with unyielding opposition down through the years from partisans of other administrative agencies and would-be exploiters of the public domain. Because of the nature of this opposition, the length to which they were prepared to go, and did go, in their endeavors to block this most worthy legislative move, the final enactment of the legislation will ever be to me an incident in my legislative career which I will recall with gratitude to those who assisted me throughout the long-drawn-out legislative contest.

It is with pardonable pride that I ask the consent of the membership of this body that an article entitled "Fifty-Year Fight for Kings Canyon National Park Won," which appeared

in the January–March 1940 issue of Planning and Civic Comment magazine be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article, though short, contains much that will be of historical value in the days to come.

The unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives being indicated, the article which has been referred to follows:

[From Planning and Civic Comment, January–March 1940]

FIFTY-YEAR FIGHT FOR KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK WON

When on March 4, 1940, President Roosevelt signed the Gearhart bill to create the Kings Canyon National Park, almost the last step was taken to preserve in the national park system an adequate section of the southern Sierra. John Muir, the first proponent, has been dead for more than a quarter of a century. The list of those who have worked hard to protect the Kings Canyon country from commercial uses contains many names of distinguished citizens. John Muir, Col. George W. Stewart, Robert Underwood Johnson, Dr. Charles Sargent, and Stephen T. Mather did not live to see their dreams realized. But William E. Colby, Dr. J. Horace McFarland, Frederick Law Olmsted, and Horace M. Albright, who labored for many years; and more recently, President Roosevelt; Secretary Ickes; Arno B. Cammerer, Director of the National Park Service; Frank Kittredge, director of region IV of the Park Service; Dr. Joel H. Hildebrand, president of the Sierra Club; Mrs. Linnie Marsh Wolfe, secretary of the John Muir Association; and scores of public-spirited citizens and civic organizations of California have lived to enjoy the results of their hard-won victory. Mention of those who contributed to the final result should not omit Col. William B. Greeley, who, when he was Chief Forester, appeared before a committee of Congress to support the inclusion in the Sequoia National Park of Mount Whitney, the Kern Kaweah, and Kings Canyons as proposed in the twenties; the late F. A. Silcox, who, as Chief of the United States Forest Service, appeared before the House Committee on Public Lands to support the Gearhart bill, which has now passed Congress; and John C. Page, who, as Commissioner of Reclamation, appeared before the same committee to testify that the area was not needed for reclamation projects.

This is an opportune time to recall the piecemeal steps which have led to the conservation of the area now included in the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. In 1875 John Muir made his first trip to the Kings country and the big trees. In 1879 Col. George W. Stewart began to interest himself in saving the Sequoias from commercial exploitation. In 1881 Senator John F. Miller, of California, introduced a bill into Congress to make a national park of the "whole west flank of the Sierra Nevada from Tehipite to a point southwest of Porterville, from the high foothills eastward to the summit of the range." But the bill was never reported from committee because of the objections of local residents. The lumbermen looked with longing eyes on the big trees, not knowing history would demonstrate that most of the fallen giants were wasted economically.

In 1885 the Secretary of the Interior suspended 18 townships of mountain land from entry, including all or part of the Sequoia groves on public lands in Fresno and Tulare Counties. In 1889, following a meeting in Visalia, boundaries were proposed which included the entire forest region from Yosemite (State) Park to some point in Kern County. About that time the pressure on the Secretary of the Interior to rescind the withdrawals from entry became so heavy that Colonel Stewart and his associates investigated the history of Yellowstone National Park. In a letter from Colonel Stewart to Col. John R. White, dated June 8, 1929, Colonel Stewart stated: "We desired to have a large park embracing Mount Whitney, the Kings and Kern Rivers, and the big-tree areas, but because of the strength of the opposition the little band of conservationists confined their efforts to saving the big trees, then in immediate danger." In his letter Colonel Stewart commented: "The river canyons we thought could be added if we once had a park in existence. We didn't think then the enlargement of the park would be so long deferred."

Due to the combined efforts of John Muir, the California Academy of Sciences, and the little group in Fresno, the acts of 1890 created Sequoia National Park and General Grant National Park, the latter badly shot with private holdings, some of which have never been acquired by the Federal Government.

In November of 1891, following the creation of the all-to-inadequate Sequoia and General Grant National Parks, John Muir, at the request of Robert Underwood Johnson, then editor of Century magazine, published the remarkable illustrated article on "a rival of Yosemite, the canyon of the South Fork of the Kings River, Calif.," which was reproduced in summary in the January–March 1939 Planning and Civic Comment.

In 1892 the Sierra Club was organized by John Muir, William E. Colby, Warren Olney, Sr., Dr. Willis Linn Jepson, and Dr. Joseph LeConte, all names closely linked with worthy conservation and scenic preservation movements in California. From that date on the Sierra Club has consistently fostered all efforts to make of the Yosemite country and the southern Sierra fine national parks.

From 1916 to 1926 there was a bill pending before each session of Congress to enlarge the Sequoia to include the Kings and Kern Canyons and Mount Whitney. In 1926 the Kern, Kaweah, and Mount Whitney areas were added to the park, and this, together with private lands purchased, gave the park custody of 27 groves containing thousands of big trees.

But the Kings Canyon country was still outside the park. For some years it was subject to overgrazing by cattle in summer. But the United States Forest Service, recognizing its superior recreational value, has, in recent years, steadily reduced the number of cattle and sheep.

In 1939 Congressman BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of California, introduced a bill to establish the John Muir-Kings Canyon National Park, to include the famous Evolution Basin, the headwaters of the South Fork of the San Joaquin and of the Middle and South Forks of the Kings River, with 81 miles of the John Muir Trail, incorporating General Grant National Park, and authorizing the purchase of 5,762 acres of privately owned land, including a 4,000-acre tract of fine redwoods on Redwood Mountain.

In spite of the fact that the United States Forest Service joined with the National Park Service to advocate the transfer of the area outlined from the Sequoia National Forest to the new national park, the local commercial opposition to the Gearhart bill has been intense, and more than one lobbyist was sent to Washington to block its passage. However, the House passed the bill on July 18, 1939, and the Senate concluded congressional action on February 19, 1940. With the President's signature on March 4, this great new national park takes its place in the system.

But there yet remains one other step. The lower part of the canyon of the South Fork of the Kings River, which Muir described in his Century article nearly 50 years ago, still lies outside the park—likewise, a proposed reservoir site in the Tehipite Valley. A recent report of the Bureau of Reclamation to Congress recommends the Pine Flat Dam for combined irrigation, flood control, and power, and for future development a large power project on the North Fork of the Kings River. Both of these sites lie entirely out of the new park. The effect of these recommendations should be to release the canyon of the South Fork of the Kings and the Tehipite Valley for incorporation in the national park—to complete the conservation efforts of public-spirited citizens begun over 60 years ago.

The gratitude of the entire country should go to those intrepid conservationists in California, led by the Sierra Club and the John Muir Association, who cooperated with Congressmen Gearhart and DeRouen, Senators Adams and Barkley, Secretary Ickes, the National Park Service, and the United States Forest Service to bring about this long-delayed act of justice and sound land-use distribution.

Members of the American Planning and Civic Association who have done their part to bring about this consummation may feel that they have been in good company and have participated in a conservation event which will take its place in the history of the Nation.

Brewing Industry Willing To Do Its Share Toward Raising Additional Revenue in Emergency—Brewery Executive Expresses Views on Proposed Increase in Tax on Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM ANHEUSER-BUSCH, INC.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis, the city I have the honor, in part, to represent, produces more beer than any city in the United States. The largest brewery in the country, Anheuser-Busch, Inc., is located there.

The products of breweries today are burdened with larger taxes than ever in the history of the industry. Despite this, the officers of these corporations want to do their share in this emergency that requires the passage of a bill raising additional taxes. I have a lengthy telegram this morning from Mr. Adolphus Busch III, the president of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., in which he expresses the sentiments of himself and associates. Mr. Busch promises cooperation, but at the same time he points out careful consideration should be given to factors which he enumerates in his message. I have presented the message to the Committee on Ways and Means for the information and consideration of its members. I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and therefore, under permission granted, include the telegram as part of my remarks. The telegram follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 29, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I have released the following statement to the press:

"The preparedness program proposed by the President transcends all other considerations. We stand ready to bear our fair share of any taxes imposed to meet this emergency.

"New taxation, however, should be equitably apportioned so as not to unduly burden any particular industry and thereby adversely affect the welfare of workers now gainfully employed. To reduce the volume and consumption of beer and create unemployment would defeat the purpose of the tax program and considerably lessen the need for agricultural and other products required by the breweries of the country.

"The brewing industry has experienced many discouraging and profitless years. Only within the past few years has it become rehabilitated. It is therefore to be hoped that the $1 per barrel additional tax recommended by the President will not be exceeded, in order not to discourage the sale and consumption of beer, thus reducing instead of increasing the revenue from this source.

"This is a grave emergency in which we all want to help to the fullest extent of our ability."

After 13 years of prohibition the beer industry was reborn in midst of a depression, and because of need for revenue on part of Federal, State, and local taxing authorities it was a natural object of taxation, resulting in the high beer taxes that now exist.

In view of this particular tax history, we feel that best economic judgment suggests consideration of several factors.

No doubt Congress will give careful thought to possible effect of proposed tax increase on quantity consumed and risk of reducing total revenue expected.

Much information is available indicating that higher Federal tax on beer would not necessarily assure greater total revenue. Since repeal several States increased their taxes on beer and suffered loss in total revenue. One State reduced its tax and enjoyed increased revenue from that source. Prior to prohibition there were no State taxes. Today all States have substantial taxes and license fees on beer.

In past 2 years total national beer sales declined noticeably, according to records of Treasury Department.

If it is decided to increase Federal beer tax, we sincerely hope it will provide additional funds expected from this commodity and that tax will be for duration of emergency only. Practical operation of law should be closely watched to ascertain whether it accomplishes its purpose. We sincerely hope it will.

You may care to pass these suggestions to appropriate committee and remind them brewing industry today is taxed by Federal Government alone in excess of quarter-billion dollars annually. In the short period of 7 years since relegalization the industry has invested many millions in construction and plant rehabilitations, and is paying its workers considerably above average industrial wage. Our company alone invested $18,000,000 in plant replacements and improvements, affording vast employment to all industrial crafts.

You and your colleagues recognize we have always cheerfully borne our share of tax burdens—Federal, State, and any and all others imposed. Our country now faced with grave emergency, toward which we want to contribute to maximum our ability. We alone contributed to Federal Government in excise tax last year the sum of $11,500,000. We now want to go along with any program found advisable to safeguard welfare of our country and its citizens.

But we do ask and hope that our industry will not be singled out and discriminated against. There is every willingness and desire on our part to do our representative share. All we expect is fair and equitable treatment, and if the President's recommendation of $1 a barrel additional tax is adopted, you will find us doing our part.

This message is intended to be helpful and to call attention to certain economic aspects as they appear to us as members of the industry.

Please feel free to call upon us for any data you think will be of value.

ANHEUSER-BUSCH, INC.,
ADOLPHUS BUSCH 3D, *President*.

The Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT CANNON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press]

TORPEDOING THE SUGAR ACT

Typical of the absurdities involved in Government control of sugar marketing in this country is an amendment to the 1937 Sugar Act now on its way through Congress.

One of the objectives of that law was elimination of child labor in the beet fields, which had become a national scandal. This was to be accomplished by withholding benefit payments from producers who employed children.

Passed by the Senate and approved by the Agriculture Committee of the House is an amendment which would subject any producer's benefits merely to a deduction of $10 for each day he employed a child instead of losing the whole benefit. If this isn't intended to let down the bars against the employment of child labor, what can be its purpose?

Florida cane growers are not affected, because they have never employed children. Their only interest arises from the fact that adoption of this amendment again demonstrates the ease with which Louisiana and beet-sugar interests are able to manipulate sugar legislation to suit themselves.

So many absurdities, injustices, jealousies, and ironies are bound up in the sugar-control program that it can never be anything but a bone of contention. This very fact may be working to the advantage of Florida's sugar industry, in the opinion of the Fort Myers News-Press.

With other producing areas, certain refineries, and financial interests fighting among themselves over quotas, benefits, and other special favors, it is possible they may not be able to agree on a new law or even on an extension of the old one.

Either result would be a break for Florida. With all controls removed, thousands of acres of rich everglades land could be put to work producing sugar for the American market. This would mean cheaper sugar for the American housewife and untrammeled development of the continental area that is best suited to supply it.

The Role of Reclamation in the National Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 30, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN C. PAGE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 last the Honorable John C. Page, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, delivered a strikingly interesting address before the section on agriculture and conservation of the Eighth American Scientific Congress, in Washington, D. C. Because of the highly informative nature of Mr. Page's important pronouncement, I believe that he is entitled to and should have a far wider audience than the attentive group that gathered about him on the occasion to which I have just made reference.

I therefore ask the consent of the membership that the text of his address may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings.

The unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives being indicated, Mr. Page's address follows:

This morning I bring you greetings from the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, who has asked that I give you the following message:

"The first European immigrants came to these shores in search of political and religious liberty. They could have had no idea of the vast and varied natural resources that they and their descendants were to enjoy. Following them, waves of people from all parts of Europe came for economic opportunities which were made possible by the richness of our soil, the power and abundance of our waters, and the great stores of wealth that were locked up in forests and earth and rocks awaiting development.

"Ours is a hemisphere of ample resources. We must keep it so by intelligent conservation. We have wasted in the past and abused our heritage, but I think that we are coming out of that now.

"We have the opportunity to keep this hemisphere a place of plenty. In other lands, we see the unhappy contrast of desperate nations fighting fiercely for the very things with which we are blessed in abundance. Cities are falling, destruction is on the march, nations ruthlessly are being wiped out simply because of the drive to get resources which are ours on every hand.

"Our supreme task is to preserve peace by maintaining plenty in our own lands. The world will need the strength we can give if we do so. It is a destiny which will demand patience, self-control, and farsighted wisdom. I hope that we will have the qualities necessary for the undertaking."

This word from Secretary Ickes outlines the scope of our problem and presents a real challenge to all of us in these American countries.

The biggest job faced by conservationists in the United States, as in any new country which feels the strength of its youth, has been to combat the habit of thinking in terms of limitless resources.

Those who came to settle our section of this continent were so overwhelmed by the extent of its forests, its arable lands, its mineral deposits, its wildlife and marine resources, and its opportunities for abundant life that it was easy for them to gain the belief that, do what they would, opulent America would forever feed her people with a silver spoon.

The attitude of the pioneers toward the new homeland still is strong among us. We have seen the hardwood forests dwindle to scattered woodlots; the wildlife needlessly slaughtered. We have discovered and exhausted oil fields, dug and abandoned mines, used up or wasted mineral deposits. We know that once productive farm lands now are useless, that old fields are gullied, and that the top soil is gone from vast acreages. We are aware that floods have been made more numerous and destructive through mishandling of watersheds, and that sweet water has been poisoned by industrial and city wastes.

We have been and are aware of these things, but as yet they have not made forceful enough impressions to cause us to turn completely away from the methods of the pioneers. As a nation, we still pick our way along the Indian traces in our thinking about our resources. We still half believe what our reason tells us is no longer true, that there is a haven for the profligate; that if one forest is destroyed, another will be found; that if farms are rendered useless, there will always be enough land; that new oil fields will continue to be discovered, regardless of how many are drained.

Great leaders have sounded warnings, as did Thomas Jefferson, about conservation needs. Only comparatively recently, however, has the cry of conservation begun to turn back the tide of blind optimism.

I am not pessimistic, and I know of no sincere conservationist who is pessimistic with respect to the future of America. While we have wasted much of our natural wealth through destructive, greedy, and careless use, we still have plenty left for this and future generations if only we are intelligent and conservative in its use.

With the establishment under President Theodore Roosevelt nearly 40 years ago of two important conservation agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Forest Service, conservation began effectively to displace exploitation, and the public good was raised as the primary objective in our treatment of two important natural resources. From these beginnings the forward movement has been extended along a broad national front of conservation which has received its greatest impetus under the leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. During these recent years the Grazing Service has been established to restore and maintain the usefulness of about 150,000,000 acres of unappropriated public lands, the Soil Conservation Service to halt wasteful use of farm lands, the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide useful employment of thousands of young men in furthering the whole array of conservation programs. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been created and new coal and oil legislation enacted. The conservation work of the Bureau of Mines has been increased, and the National Park Service has enlarged its recreational areas by adding to the number of its national parks and monuments. The Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey have had their activities greatly expanded and the Bureau of Reclamation has started new construction to make useful 2,500,000 acres of desert land by its program on water conservation in the West.

In any discussion of the present state of development of our activities it is necessary that the word "conservation" be defined. Perhaps the best definition is that given by Secretary Ickes, a leading conservationist and the administrator of most of the programs in the conservation field. Secretary Ickes said, "Conservation means the prudent use of our natural resources without waste or needless destruction and having in mind always that, so far as not inconsistent with our own needs, they should be preserved for the use and enjoyment of future generations."

As Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is my privilege to engage in one of the most important of the activities under the Federal Government's conservation program.

It is not understood generally that approximately one-third of the land area of the United States, more than 700,000,000 acres, is arid or semiarid. Rainfall over this vast area in western United States shades downward from 20 inches, and little of the moisture which is received there comes during the growing season for crops. Much of this land is desert. Parts of it are in the borderland, where in some years wheat can be produced and in other years even this crop fails because of drought. The great western mountain ranges generally receive more than 20 inches of moisture. It falls as snow in winter and is the reserve irrigation supply. It runs off in freshets or floods when warm weather comes. Most of the western streams flow intermittently, or periodically swell to great flood heights and periodically dwindle to mere tricklets. Without irrigation no cultivated agriculture is safe throughout this tremendous region. Except for diversions to serve comparatively small areas, irrigation itself is unsafe for the most part unless storage reservoirs can be provided to catch the spring floods and hold their waters for summer and fall use.

Irrigation in the West antedates the written history of the region. Indians practiced irrigation in advance of the coming of the white man The Spanish missionaries introduced improved methods, and earliest settlements by the citizens of the United States within the region were founded upon irrigation.

At the present time there are irrigated about 20,000,000 acres in this dry section. This land has been watered and developed by individual initiative, cooperative enterprise, the efforts of the States, and the Federal reclamation program. As irrigation has progressed, the engineering works essential to the development of water supplies for new areas have become progressively more complex and costly. In the past 20 years the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has been responsible for virtually all of the new irrigation developments. This Bureau is the principal agency in the field of water conservation and desert land improvement in the United States.

The Bureau of Reclamation is charged with the responsibility of making investigations of water supplies and land resources in the planning of projects. Beneficiaries of the projects, who are the settlers on the irrigated land, and the power consumers if hydroelectric development is included, are required to pay back to the United States the costs of the projects. With respect to costs allocated to irrigation, however, no interest is charged. This concession is made in recognition of its national benefits. Otherwise repayments are with interest.

A review of our western expansion shows Federal reclamation to be the most carefully planned step taken in providing for the growth of the United States across the North American Continent. At the outset of westward expansion, the public lands were regarded by the Federal Government simply as a source of revenue. Later, under the homestead laws, a part of the humid, rich Mississippi Valley was used in addition as a means of furthering a settlement and development plan. The land was divided into 160-acre tracts, the amount assumed to be adequate to single-family operation. This policy of encouraging a farmer to own his home and farm and to develop only so much land as he and his family could work, is fundamental even in later irrigation development. The homestead plan worked well enough in the humid region of the Mississippi Valley, but it was not altered when western settlement reached the semiarid Great Plains, where 160 acres were insufficient to support a family. Some of the most critical present-day problems of soil conservation and land use can be traced directly to the failure to recognize initially the differences between land which receives 30 inches or more of rainfall and land which receives only 20 inches or less.

In the decades before 1902 when the Federal reclamation policy was adopted, several attempts were made, by modifying homestead laws, to meet the new problems introduced by expansion of settlement into the arid and semiarid West. The land hungry, however, came too fast for temporizing measures. Some land which should not have been plowed was plowed, and over-grazing of the vast public range areas was not recognized immediately as a destructive force. It soon became apparent that in most western areas, irrigation alone would provide the necessary security for a cultivated agricultural production.

Irrigation had been introduced by private, corporate, and cooperative enterprise in the areas which were patently arid at early dates. Irrigation was sponsored by the Federal Government as well, a tacit recognition of the fact that in arid and semiarid regions policies which had been applicable in humid areas would not bring the desired results. For 30 years, however, although the new and applicable irrigation policy had been adopted, the old policy of encouraging settlement through offering homesteads remained in force beside it. It was not until 1934 that the Taylor Grazing Act was enacted withdrawing public lands from entry, and establishing a program under which the remaining public lands could be protected and rehabilitated. Had the break between the old and the new policies more nearly coincided with the advance of settlement across the 20-inch rainfall line, much could have been prevented that now conservation programs must correct.

A review of conservation activities relating to the land shows that most of them are corrective. The Federal reclamation program is an important exception. It is a planned method of establishing conservation controls on water and land in advance of their use and development.

Let me turn for a moment to the scope of this program.

Since 1902, through the operation of the Federal policy, nearly 53,000 new farms have been created in the deserts of the West, and 258 new cities and towns have grown up among them. Nearly 1,000,000 people live in areas served by Federal reservoirs and canals. One hundred and sixty dams and 48 powerhouses have been built. More than one-fifth of the money expended in these developments already has been returned directly to the Federal Treasury through payments by water and power users. Each year the lands of the Federal projects produce crops valued at more than $100,000,000. The influence on our economy of this great crop value is spread and swelled by processing, transportation, and marketing services, and by its exchange for manufactured products which employ labor from coast to coast.

At this time there is in progress a construction program which within a comparatively few years will conserve additional water to irrigate 2,500,000 acres which still are desert. When fully developed, this land will provide homes for 850,000 people, many of whom otherwise might not have an opportunity to gain security and a decent living standard.

These reclamation projects are pioneering areas. To make successful homes in them, settlers must have the same brand of industry, determination, and fortitude in the face of hardships, for which we honor our forefathers. It is greatly to the credit of the settlers that they have not tarnished a great tradition, but have built communities and modern towns that are worthy.

Looking now to the future, let us inquire as to what the limits of this activity may be. First, let it be clearly understood that hundreds of millions of acres in the West can never be irrigated and farmed. The water supply in the rivers is the limiting factor, for the most part, for along most of the streams, or near them,

are to be found tracts of dry but otherwise good soils in extent far greater than can be served. Some do not understand this, failing to perceive that where there is insufficient rain to make crops grow naturally there will also be insufficient water in the rivers to make them grow over all the area even though all the streams should be utilized in irrigation. Let us ask them to what extent the water supply of the West limits prospective irrigation development.

At present about 20,000,000 acres are irrigated. That is about 3 percent of the land in the arid and semiarid States. Projects now under construction will water about 2,500,000 acres more. When they are completed there will be left approximately 20,000,000 acres which might be irrigated with engineering works we can visualize today. That would make a total of 42,500,000 acres irrigable, by present standards of judging their quality, out of 700,000,000 acres of land, or about 6 percent of the total. The available water then would be largely utilized.

This doesn't seem like a large future. It serves to emphasize the need for carefully planned irrigation developments to conserve the water, choose prudently from among the lands, and make these resources serve best ourselves and our children.

Nevertheless, a future which holds the possibility through conservation of developing 22,500,000 acres of irrigated land is promising. The West now supports upward of 12,500,000 people with 20,000,000 acres irrigated. There is no reason to believe that its population could not be doubled comfortably through the irrigation of 20,000,000 more. We see here, then, the elbow room of America, our place for expansion, for creating new opportunities and new markets, a place to expend a part of our great energies in productive labor, building solidly for the future.

On Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

[From the Washington Post]

ON FREE SPEECH

(By Mark Sullivan)

A PRIVILEGE ABUSED

I listened to President Roosevelt's fireside chat about national defense, especially what he said about the enemy within our gates, the Trojan horse, the "fifth column"—that such must not be allowed in America. I listened to that and felt assured.

Then, next morning, I went through the mail on my desk. I found some announcements from the Communist Party, publicity hand-outs. I read that the Communist Party is about to hold its national convention, this week. I quote and condense:

"The Communist Party's national convention will be held in New York City May 30 to June 2. The probable Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees, Earl Browder and James W. Ford, nationally prominent Negro leader, will deliver their acceptance speeches Sunday, June 2. The speeches will be heard over coast-to-coast hook-ups of the Mutual Broadcasting System and National Broadcasting Co. from 1:30 to 2 p. m., eastern daylight saving time. The Columbia Broadcasting System will interview Earl Browder over a national hook-up from 8 to 8:15 p. m."

So on one Sunday night, Mr. Roosevelt on the radio, saying there must be no Trojan horse in America; on the next Sunday night, the Communist Party and Mr. Browder on the radio.

The party sends out voluminous advance publicity. Obligingly, for the benefit of newspapers, the publicity hand-outs include advance suggestions of what the party platform will contain. Some of it is attack upon Mr. Roosevelt. Up to a year or so ago they used to praise Mr. Roosevelt. Since he showed sympathy for the Allies, and especially since he favored Finland, the Communists revile him. I quote and condense:

"The granting of war credits to Finland revealed the war course of the administration. Repudiate the militarization and armaments program. * * * The imperialist role of the Roosevelt administration. * * * The Roosevelt administration, supported by decisive sections of monopoly capital, is endeavoring to create 'national unity' * * * which aims to tie the American people to the war chariot of the economic royalists * * *."

Most of the platform prospectus is the usual Communist thing. I quote and condense:

"The Communist Party of the United States stands stronger and more united around the banner of Marxism-Leninism. * * * It is necessary to heighten the Bolshevik vigilance of the party. * * * We must develop to the maximum the international working-class solidarity of the American workers with the workers of the glorious land of socialism, the Soviet Union. * * * The present situation demands of the Communists that they act in the way Lenin taught; in the way taught now by the great, wise leader of the working people, Stalin."

That, ladies and gentlemen is what you will hear when you turn on your radio next Sunday afternoon and evening. You can't escape it. It will be on all major chains. The broadcasts, says the Communist announcement, "were granted by the three major chains in response to our request for free time."

The radio people say, truly, that it is not up to them to keep the Communist convention off the air. They have a policy of giving time for speeches of candidates of all political parties, major and minor. They say, accurately, that the Communists have legal standing as a political party.

But could not the radio people change their rules just a trifle? Could they not say, "We will give time to all candidates for President, except such as are now under sentence to jail?" That would bar Mr. Browder. Or could they say, "We will give time to all Presidential candidates except convicted liars and perjurers"? Or the radio people could bar the whole Communist Party by making their rule read: "We will give time to all political parties except such as are affiliated with a foreign government."

But it isn't really up to the radio companies. It is up to the Government. Whether the Federal Government, or the State government of New York, or the city government, I do not know. Except that there is a responsibility on Mr. Roosevelt. He cannot afford to let America go through the experience of hearing what he said against "fifth columns"—and then, within a week, hearing Mr. Browder and the Communist Party on the radio.

The right of free speech? That is for Americans and American institutions. It is not for foreign governments and their agents and affiliates. From the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States I quote article II: "The emblem of the party shall be the crossed hammer and sickle * * * with a circular inscription having at the top 'Communist Party of the United States of America.' And in the lower part 'Affiliate to the Communist International.'" And article V: "All members of the party shall pay an assessment * * * for an international solidarity fund. This money shall be used * * * exclusively to aid our brother Communist parties in other countries * * *."

Our obligation of free speeech to Communists is a matter, not merely of our Constitution or our Bill of Rights, but of international relations with Russia. America can properly give to the American affiliates of the Communist Party exactly that degree of free speech which Russia would give to a Russian affiliate of our Democratic or Republican Party. And all the free speech they would get in Russia would be enough to say, "God help me," as they face the firing squad.

I am not sure the Russians would permit that much. I doubt if they would permit the word "God."

Extension of the Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor for May 21, 1940:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 21, 1940]

RAMSPECK BILL ENDORSED AT CENTRAL CONFERENCE

CHICAGO.—Civil-service officials from more than 15 Central States meeting here recently were practically unanimous in favoring the Ramspeck bill, now pending in Congress, which would give President Roosevelt authority to transfer more than 250,000 Federal employees to civil-service status.

The civil-service officials were from both State and city agencies in the Central States, meeting in the annual central regional conference of the Civil Service Assembly. Though entirely a nonpolitical organization, the officials aiming always to improve all of the various phases of the merit system, members see in the Ramspeck bill an indirect means of stimulating interest, extension, and improvement of civil service in State and local governments.

To some observers who believe that the bill will mean the "freezing in" of many New Deal special appointees in the alphabetical agencies, for the bill extends to every Federal job in the country outside of the Work Projects Administration, G. Lyle Belsley, executive director of the Civil Service Assembly of the

United States and Canada, explained that in his opinion the present incumbents would have to pass tests given by the Civil Service Commission and that only those qualified would be given their status.

DEVELOPMENT NOT NEW

"The Ramspeck bill constitutes the only practical way to extend civil-service provisions in the Federal Government," Mr. Belsley said in an interview. "Both Democratic and Republican Presidents have used the Executive-order device for extending the merit system in the Federal service. It is not a new development.

The difficulty, as Mr. Belsley sees it, is that Congress itself has specifically exempted thousands of positions from classified civil service. The Ramspeck bill, he emphasized, will merely authorize the President to bring these positions within the classified list so that they can be filled on the basis of merit.

"History shows," he further stated, "that the extension of the provisions of the Civil Service Act to an ever-increasing number of Federal workers has come largely as a result of action taken by the Presidents through Executive orders."

The 3-day session of the Civil Service Commission in Chicago was in the nature of a laboratory working conference in which officials exchanged views on how to test and give ratings to applicants for jobs, how to classify jobs according to the duties performed so that a man doing twice as much work as another, for instance, could also be receiving twice as much pay, how to give training to men and women while employed so they can qualify for something better farther up the scale of civil-service classification.

COOPERATION STRESSED

"More cooperation" was the theme song in one session when George C. Benson, of the unemployment-compensation commission in Michigan, urged a closer working together of civil-service commissions not only on different levels of government but also those operating in the same localities.

Panic, Then War—F. D. R.'s Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD OF MAY 30, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the American people are being excited and inflamed by Roosevelt's policies. The many letters I receive from my constituents all indicate the fear they have that Roosevelt is leading this country to war. They fear that the President wants 50,000 planes, not for defense but for the European battlegrounds. They fear that it will be a reckless waste of money to build 50,000 planes without having pilots to fly them. Of course, they think that we should have the productive capacity to turn out thousands of planes, and that industry should be geared up for any eventuality. But they believe with all their hearts America should stay out of the European war. It looks as if panic, then war, is Franklin D. Roosevelt's policy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news article:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 30, 1940]

PANIC, THEN WAR, F. D. R.'S POLICY, SAYS AL WILLIAMS—FORUM HEARS FLYER HINT 50,000 PLANES WOULD GO TO ALLIES

(By Eugene Warner)

Stating "the spirit of Billy Mitchell is at my shoulder as I speak," Maj. Al Williams, famous flyer, joined Colonel Lindbergh last night in decrying the President's foreign policy, saying flatly that "panic first, then war," was Roosevelt's policy.

In a sensational speech at the National Aviation Forum banquet in the Willard, Williams said America was in no danger of invasion by air or sea, that the President's speeches have been "panic creating," and strongly intimated the President's plan for 50,000 ships was not actually for home defense, but to hand over to the Allies.

FARLEY NO ALARMIST

Another prominent speaker, Postmaster General James A. Farley, told the delegates that this country must improve its defenses to "keep America safe for Americans."

Farley emphasized that he could not be regarded as an alarmist, and added:

"You, too, are not afraid. But you are sane and sensible. You know, as I know, that now more than in a long period of history, national weakness invites attack."

The Postmaster General emphasized that Americans "do not intend to be made the victims of any invader."

CHARGES BUNGLING

Scoffing at sea power in the light of events in Europe, Williams said the United States was following the same "bungling mistakes" of British politicians in still placing its hopes in the Navy.

He demanded that, contrary to the President's announced plans, the proposed new air armada be severed completely from Army and Navy control and be made a separate unit, free of their domination. He termed the President's plans in this respect the "foolish British policy," and said Germany's great gains in aviation were traceable to their air arms having unhampered freedom.

CITES WAR ABROAD

"To support my argument against President Roosevelt's wild flight schedule for a foreign air invasion of the United States, I offer," he said, "a single incontrovertible fact:

"With all their air power the Germans could not attack and subdue England from air bases 300 miles to 500 miles distant. Instead they seized air bases on the north coasts of Holland, Belgium, and France—20 to 100 miles distant.

"PANIC FIRST, THEN WAR

"Each and every stage in Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic itinerary for the air invasion of America," he went on, "would have to be conquered first and air bases established.

"The President must know this—but apparently the pattern is, panic first and then war.

"Assume Germany wins and takes over British war power. Then what? Would the Germans be fools enough to send warships against us, using the same ships that had failed the British? Nonsense; the United States is in no immediate danger of air invasion or any other kind of invasion."

SEES PLANES FOR EUROPE

Speaking of the President's demand for haste, he stated:

"I fear the President wants airplanes in great numbers right now—to toss into this war. If he wants thousands of planes as soon as he can get them, without waiting to build our air force first, then production of planes for Europe is his goal, not the defense of America.

"Not one penny for any such system as recommended by the President for buying airplanes. Not one penny until we are sure of a three-department national defense—Army, Navy, and Air. It is the only means by which we can attain the security we deserve, and for peace, instead of panic, in the minds of Americans."

Williams advocated a new Department for Air be established immediately with its own Secretary in the Cabinet, and that a Supreme Council of Defense be set up with the President at its head and members drawn from the House and Senate.

Major Williams' speech at last night's banquet at the Willard followed an address by Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, which closed the 3-day forum held at the Department of Commerce auditorium.

Mayor LaGuardia told the session:

"We should know definitely what is before us," and said it was of paramount importance to have a definite plan before lunging into a vast air-expansion program.

He advocated immediate granting of far-reaching power to the President and Secretary of War to clear away red tape, pointing out that under the present set-up a batch of 201 bombers ordered in March of 1939 would not be completely delivered until September 1941.

Why Mislead the People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in his so-called fireside chat, on last Sunday evening, evidently attempting to justify the expenditure of the $7,000,000,000 which have been appropriated for our national defense during the period of his administration made statements to the effect that we had certain munitions of war "on hand and on order." There is a vast difference between the two. With the $7,000,000,000 we should have an abundance of war materials and supplies on hand, because the money has been expended. The munitions of war, which are "on order," will have to be paid for as and when delivered. It is truly a very sad commentary we have to face when the Executive head of our

Nation makes a fireside chat over the radio, taking the people into his confidence, and then by very adroit methods in his statements attempts to leave the impression that we have military supplies and munitions in vast quantities. Yet, they are not "on hand." They are not available now for use. They may be "on order" for delivery at a future date—but when? The record shows that we have on hand only 28 light and medium tanks. When we read that Germany employed more than 3,000 tanks in one engagement in the present war in Europe, we really wonder what the administration has done with the $7,000,000,000 which were appropriated for national defense in this country.

And, too, when the President speaks, as he did in his fireside chat, taking the people into his confidence, and at the same time attempting to leave the impression that we have much war material on hand for our defense of our Nation—when in truth and in fact a very large part of that material is just ordered and not completed, and not paid for in large part—that is very misleading. The people want to know the facts, and they especially expect their Chief Executive to give them the facts about our national defense. This is our country—it is not the country of any one man or group of men, and it is not the country of any political party. The people are vitally interested in their country and in their Government. They want to know the facts about their national defense. They want our national defense to be strong and adequate, they expect that every dollar appropriated for national defense shall be used for that specific purpose and that they will receive one dollar in value for every dollar which is spent. Our people want to protect our country, our people and our institutions, and they do not want their money frittered away by any group of incompetent Army or Navy officials or heads of Government departments. They expect the careful methods of business to be employed in every governmental agency; they expect, as they have a right to expect, that their servants will use care and good judgment in our national-defense program and in its expansion, and that they will conserve the money of the people in every instance. The people do not want another outlay of $7,000,000,000, or of any sum of money, without the full value therefor "on hand."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., on Tuesday, May 28, which editorial follows:

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of May 28, 1940]

HE WAS NOT CONVINCING

During his radio talk on Sunday night, President Roosevelt may have impressed some persons while discussing the equipment of our Army when he gave figures as "on hand and on order."

The joker was in that expression, "on hand and on order." A glance through the appended tabulation will show you how many vital items are "completion figure" or "on order," that is, to be made and delivered in the future, rather than "on hand."

This tabulation is of May 1, 1940. It was provided by the War Department for the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for use while considering the Army appropriation bill.

Item	On hand	Completion figure
ANTIAIRCRAFT		
3-inch guns	448	500
90-mm. (approximately 3⅝ inches) guns	None	317
37-mm. (approximately 1½ inches) guns	15	1,423
.50-caliber machine guns	1,014	1,683
Directors	168	273
Height finders	142	276
Sound locators	194	801
SMALL ARMS		
Semiautomatic rifles	38,000	240,559
37-mm. antitank guns	228	1,388
60-mm. mortars	3	3,756
81-mm. mortars	183	853
.50-caliber machine guns (pack)	83	962
FIELD-ARTILLERY MATERIAL		
75-mm. guns, modernized	141	1,432
75-mm. howitzer (field and pack)	90	319
105-mm. howitzer	None	120
155-mm. guns, long-range (heavy artillery)	4	96
8-inch howitzer	None	120
COMBAT VEHICLES		
Scout cars	485	1,346
Combat cars	114	208
Tanks:		
Light M2A4	10	734
Medium M2	18	194
TRACTORS AND SPECIAL ORDNANCE VEHICLES		
Tractors:		
Light	93	120
Medium	261	550
Heavy	65	777
Trucks:		
Small-arms repair	79	146
Instrument repair		53
RAILWAY ARTILLERY		
8-inch railway gun and carriage	None	24
AMMUNITION		
Ammunition bomb:		
500-pound	11,928	34,924
1,000-pound	4,336	14,511
Caliber .30 automatic pistol	17,268,000	73,920,000
Caliber .50 ball	25,220,000	53,117,000
37-mm. tank and antitank	75,000	1,205,000
37-mm. antiaircraft guns	46,000	2,624,000
81-mm. mortars	43,000	373,000
75-m. howitzer, high explosive	142,000	382,500
155-mm. howitzer, high explosive	925,000	1,131,000
8-inch howitzer, high explosive	None	29,000
ENGINEER CORPS		
Ponton bridge, 10-ton	1	32
Ponton equipage, 23-ton	1	8
Water-purification unit	4	45
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile	285	1,028
CHEMICAL WARFARE		
Gas masks	407,696	1,297,000
QUARTERMASTER CORPS		
Wool uniform cloth, yards	None	5,500,000
Field ranges	5,000	667,000
SIGNAL CORPS		
Radio set SCR 161	390	1,849
Radio set SCR 171	26	401
Radio set SCR 194	809	2,138
Wire (field wire) (miles)	16,800	65,491
Field telephones (miles)	15,800	47,602
Detector sets	None	182

In the light of these official figures from his own War Department head, the impressive figures mentioned by Roosevelt in his radio address become singularly unimpressive. There is too little on hand, too much on order.

The future—that future which Hitler seems to control so much by his assumption of the initiative—counts too largely as to whether or not we will be prepared if and when Hitler attacks us.

What a deadly gamble we are in now—thanks to the failure of President Roosevelt to bend every effort in the years now past to have the military power of the United States constantly increasing commensurate with the steady growth of the military power of Hitler—to have it on hand instead of on order.

For Peace and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today we again honor our dead who gave their lives for our Nation and peace. Much has happened in this twentieth century to awaken our people to the thought of what is ahead, how long it can last, and what will be the ultimate end. Today we find the whole world menaced with wars as terrifying and as devastating as any the world has ever known. We are witnessing unspeakable persecutions and purges and whole lands of people are facing annihilation and servitude. Twenty-two years ago we thought that peace had finally come to a long-troubled world forever, and now again we are witnessing the countries across the sea in their deathly battle. The immediate aspects of this immense subject of peace in the world are the questions relat-

ing to what our Government and our people ought to do, and what they ought to refrain from doing under these circumstances, in order to insure against our involvement in the war in Europe and also safeguard our security with some thought to the American people collectively, and to do anything we can that is consistent with our neutrality laws for peace in the whole world.

No one can tell what the final consequences shall be for these warring nations or what effect the wars shall have on the rest of the world and humanity. We do know that if the war is long continued the result will be devastating beyond comprehension and repair.

Our objectives are to keep the United States out of war upon any other continent, to maintain peace at any cost, and to keep our Nation free from any foreign aggressor.

During the past 7 years we have seen civilization crumble, freedom become enchained, and the lust for power become dominant. The events of the past year have made the issue confronting mankind unmistakably clear. The ultimate conflict of our day is a struggle between democracy and dictatorship, between enlightenment and humanity on one hand and darkness and despair on the other.

The dictatorships are one united menace to the civilized world. The American people, neutral though they should be and are in political action, cannot and will not be neutral or silent in thought. They stand arrayed against aggression, eager to uphold the sacred obligations of preserving humanity and freedom. The majority of our people are strong in their opposition to our country making any move that is liable to expose us to conflict. Our people do not want war, and they shall not have it as long as we can stand and think as one people, the American people. A gratifying element in our favor is the resistance of our people to propaganda. Much of this propaganda originates in our own country, through people with selfish money interests for personal gain. Other comes from well-meaning but misguided people, who let their sympathies warp their usual good judgment. Much also comes from the European countries, who figure that our participation in their wars would be to their advantage. Our people are determined to treat the present war in Europe objectively. They are refusing to become bewildered, confused, and misled by the devices and opportunities of those who wish to see this country participate in war. Our people are wary of foreign entanglements and insistent upon a real neutrality, and their sentiment shall reflect on the Congress of the United States and with all high Government officials.

Everyone, regardless of party, is of the opinion that America's main objective is to keep away from foreign entanglements. Everyone is in complete accord on that matter, but we cannot altogether turn our backs on our sympathies for the victims of warring nations, and our hate for tyranny, lust, and abhorrence of the dictatorships that have ground the peace-loving people into the earth of their country; but we must realize that not our hearts but our common sense shall be our guide.

I rejoice in every action that our Government has taken recently in behalf of mediation and peace. Nothing can be gained for the welfare of mankind through war which cannot be better and more permanently achieved through peace. America is enlisted in the cause for world peace. If we were at war, many great sacrifices would be demanded of us, but we are at peace and we should be willing to make sacrifices necessary to win peacefully what war can never bring.

I am for spending billions for national defense and preparedness, not as a prelude to war, not for weapons, not for aggression, but as an insurance against invasion by any belligerent nation, and a protection against sending any of our American boys to Europe. By being prepared to defend ourselves against a menace that overshadows and threatens the world it will not be necessary to sacrifice a single life, nor will we suffer the fate of the people of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France, all peace-loving and valiant citizens whose courage alone was insufficient to safeguard and protect them against aggression.

We also come to the question of doing our honest best for the furtherance of peace, and on that question we will all agree that the last 25 years has showed us that our participation in any entanglement cannot promote peace or save democracy. From the great World War of 1914–18 came communism, fascism, nazi-ism; elsewhere in the world and in our country, too, also came a post-war period of social and political stagnation which finally resulted in the financial panic of 1929 and that long-drawn-out period of depression more severe and prolonged than we have ever before experienced.

Let us band together in driving out the inner forces in our country that want us to sacrifice our freedom and liberty. "Isms" have no place in this land—the land that has been built by Americans, for Americans, and shall ever be the shining beacon of democracy and liberty in the world.

Our young men shall be the instruments through which science shall develop for the good of mankind. Never again shall they be used for the experimentation in the development of instruments of war.

We must follow a prudent and sensible course. We all desire world peace. We have shown evidence of that since the close of the last war. The President left no stone unturned to prevent the outbreak of war in Europe, and he has made it clear that our Government stands ready to assist in a just and enduring peace.

Our fathers have built our country well and have established therein the blessings of free society and a productive economic system. It is our noble task to defend what has been reserved for us and to go forward and keep building for those who are to follow.

Let us pray each day for the restoration of peace throughout the world. Let us pray for a thorough and everlasting peace. American Democracy is our heritage; we are proud of its freedom, its rights, its sovereignty. These precious rights shall be preserved and we shall not become the subjects of dictators.

Let us thank God that we are Americans!

Appropriations for Military Purposes, 1925–40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *May 27, 1940.*

There has been much discussion in recent weeks of the appropriations of moneys to the War Department for its military activities. In order to afford you a factual and long-range picture of those national-defense allotments, I enclose a tabulation of appropriations for military purposes—as distinct from those for the War Department's nonmilitary civil activities—covering a period of 16 fiscal years, 1925 to 1940, both inclusive.

You will note that during that 16-year period the amounts appropriated for the military activities of the Army totaled $6,169,300,000, including $371,300,000 from Federal emergency funds. That total includes not only allotments for the Regular Army, but for the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the citizens' military training camps, and other military activities.

Of that total of $6,169,300,000 it should be noted that 86.1 percent—that is, $5,314,774,000—were allotted for what are termed recurring charges and improvement of plant. Those items include pay, rations, clothing, repairs, research and development, planning, construction, training, operations, maneuvers, schools, and similar activities. Left for expenditure by the War Department, after those charges, were a bare $854,526,000 for augmentation, modernization, and replacement of arms and equipment, including new aircraft, spare engines, spare parts, bombs, new tanks, antiaircraft and antitank guns, semiautomatic rifles, trucks, tractors, field guns, machine guns, ammunition, and similar matériel.

It should be noted that of this $854,526,000, $509,900,000 went to the Army Air Corps, a comparatively new, but nonetheless vital, branch of the land forces. In other words, of the total of somewhat over six billions appropriated for the military activities of the War Department over a period of 16 years, only $344,626,000, a bare 5.6 percent, were available for the augmentation, modernization, and replacement of arms and equipment for the ground elements of the Army of the United States. In view of these facts it is rather remarkable to me that we have been able to maintain any mobile ground army at all, especially when it is considered that the useful life of much military equipment, such as tanks and heavy motor vehicles, barely exceeds 5 years.

You will note from the break-down that an average of only $21,000,000 per year has been allotted for the modernization, motorization, mechanization, and equipment of the Army's ground forces.

It is my hope that the enclosed tabulation will serve to clear up some of the prevailing misconceptions on the military expenditures by the War Department during the past decade and a half.

Total military appropriations, 1925–40, inclusive	$6,169,300,000
Total spent on fixed charges; food, clothing, housing, training, etc	5,314,774,000
	854,526,000
Total spent on Air Corps	509,900,000
Total left, spent on arms and equipment for ground forces	344,626,000

16 years) $344,626,000 ($21,000,000
32

24
16

8

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

Appropriations for the Military Establishment, showing approximate break-down into major functions, fiscal years 1925 to 1940, inclusive

Fiscal year	Recurring charges and improvement of plant: Pay, rations, clothing, repairs, research and developments, planning, construction, training, operations, maneuvers, schools, etc.		Augmentation, modernization, and replacement of arms and equipment: This includes new aircraft, spare engines, spare parts, bombs, new tanks, antiaircraft and antitank guns, semiautomatic rifles, trucks, tractors, field guns, machine guns, ammunition, etc.		Total appropriation, Military Establishment
	Entire Army (less Air Corps)	Air Corps	Entire Army (less Air Corps)	Air Corps	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1925	$208,280,000	$35,398,000	$7,623,000	$4,699,000	$256,000,000
1926	202,795,000	38,950,000	12,244,000	7,011,000	261,000,000
1927	202,102,000	37,167,000	21,673,000	8,058,000	269,000,000
1928	224,268,000	42,917,000	4,219,000	10,596,000	282,000,000
1929	234,121,000	45,473,000	17,594,000	13,812,000	311,000,000
1930	249,829,000	53,975,000	11,502,000	16,694,000	332,000,000
1931	254,397,000	60,525,000	14,089,000	17,989,000	347,000,000
1932	244,031,000	60,603,000	14,163,000	16,203,000	335,000,000
1933	238,003,000	47,217,000	6,617,000	12,163,000	304,000,000
1934 [1]	222,625,000	45,472,000	590,000	8,313,000	277,000,000
	[2] 53,150,000	[2] 18,050,000	[2] 18,000,000	[2] 7,500,000	[2] 96,700,000
1935	205,219,000	54,375,000	8,373,000	13,033,000	281,000,000
	[2] 6,300,000	[2] 2,100,000	[2] 500,000		[2] 8,900,000
1936	[illegible]	57,284,000	24,121,000	30,057,000	355,000,000
	[2] 13,950,000	[1] 4,650,000			[2] 18,600,000
1937	258,834,000	65,951,000	19,[illegible],000	43,677,000	388,000,000
	[2] 23,700,000	[2] 7,900,000			[2] 31,600,000
1938	282,780,000	75,303,000	15,626,000	43,291,000	417,000,000
	[2] 37,950,000	[2] 12,650,000			[2] 50,600,000
1939	294,010,000	81,431,000	30,151,000	54,408,000	460,000,000
	[2] 94,425,000	[2] 31,475,000			[2] 125,900,000
1940	380,038,000	222,533,000	118,033,000	202,396,000	923,000,000
	[2] 29,250,000	[2] 9,750,000			[2] 39,000,000
Total	3,944,870,000	1,024,574,000	326,156,000	502,400,000	5,798,000,000
	[2] 258,725,000	86,575,000	[2] 18,500,000	[2] 7,500,000	371,300,000
Grand total	4,203,595,000	1,111,149,000	344,656,000	509,900,000	6,169,300,000

The grand total in—
Column 2 is 68.1 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 3 is 18.0 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 4 is 5.6 percent of the grand total in column 6.
Column 5 is 8.3 percent of the grand total in column 6.

100.0 percent.

[1] A total of approximately $36,500,000 was impounded and refunded in 1934. This was taken more or less proportionately from all activities.
[2] Allotments from Federal emergency funds.

Military Training for C. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ELKINS (W. VA.) INTER-MOUNTAIN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain for May 25, 1940:

[From the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain of May 25, 1940]

MILITARY TRAINING FOR C. C. C.

A bill which would provide 8 hours of training in military tactics and drill each week for members of the Civilian Conservation Corps was introduced in Congress yesterday by Representative RANDOLPH.

This proposal is not new, but it is especially important at a time when the Nation is embarking on a broad rearmament program which must provide trained manpower as well as machines for waging warfare. Lack of trained enlisted reserves is one of our admitted weaknesses and in our opinion such training for members of the corps would be good for the Nation and good for the boys themselves.

Youths enrolled in the C. C. C. in many instances would be called to service in case of war, regardless of their economic status. In or out of the corps they would be of military age. Called into the Nation's Military Establishment they would find previous training valuable indeed.

There are some who have contended that such training would be in effect discrimination against poor boys, which, of course, is plain nonsense. If war should come rich and poor alike will be called to the colors. In the case of poor boys who would have had military training in the C. C. C., they would have a distinct advantage over their wealthy cousins. They would soon become the corporals and sergeants in the new army.

Yes, by all means, give the youths enrolled in the C. C. C. military training.

Proceedings on the Occasion of Conferring Degree on Hon. James A. Farley by Oglethorpe University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESSES BY DR. WILLIAM STATES JACOBS, DR. THORNWELL JACOBS, AND HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, recently Oglethorpe University bestowed upon the Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The Postmaster General was presented for the degree by Dr. William States Jacobs, of Houston, Tex. The degree was bestowed by Dr. Thornwell Jacobs, president of the university.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Dr. William States Jacobs and Dr. Thornwell Jacobs at the baccalaureate exercises, Atlanta, Ga., May 26, 1940.

Mr. President, I also ask that the able, practical, and interesting address of the Honorable James A. Farley, on the occasion stated, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. WILLIAM STATES JACOBS, OF HOUSTON, TEX., IN PRESENTING JAMES A. FARLEY, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF OGLETHORPE UNIVERSITY

Mr. President, gentlemen of the Board of Trustees of Oglethorpe University, on this auspicious occasion I present for your dis-

criminating favor a great American citizen whom the people of this Nation have placed in a class by himself in the galaxy of American political statesmen.

It is like sending "Owls to Oxford" to extol the virtues of Postmaster General James A. Farley.

By reason of his role of tribune of the people, he has put himself beyond the reach of the carping critics of politics.

By his adherence to the party of the people he has discarded all armor but the shield of faith, the breastplate of righteousness, and the sandals of peace.

By his choice of a chief he has displayed a comprehension of statecraft that has laid the foundations for an unparalleled career of success in the field of American politics.

By his sympathy he has found favor with the meek who will ultimately inherit the earth.

By his deep study of American life he has become the political seer of his time.

By his radiant blushes—the complexion of virtue—he has left no question as to the sincerity and rectitude of his purposes.

By his masterly leadership he has twice carried the trailing banner of democracy to glorious triumph; and I venture to say that in the fullness of time the American people will crown him with the honor that he has so generously sought for another.

By his clean, high-minded nobility of character and conduct he has raised the profession of politics to a height that has left his competitors on the lowland of despair.

By his matchless smile he has made many a Republican's wife vote the Democratic ticket.

For a decade in American politics he has done the work, while the honors have gone to others; and all he has gathered for reward is the privilege of reading the post cards and the dead letters.

A list of his business activities reads like a business directory of a great metropolis. He has been the president of about everything but the United States of America—and I have it from reliable authoritative sources that he might not be averse to that—though I am not at liberty to divulge anything on this subject.

If I might be permitted a word of personal privilege, I would confess that my only objection to the third term is that it would delay my opportunity to vote for him.

He is an ex-member of everything in New York State, except the penitentiary and the asylum, and I am not informed as to his purposes regarding these.

Universities and colleges have conferred honorary degrees upon him. I do not know how many; but I am confident that he will not stop until he has a safe majority of them. He already has as many alphabetical ensignia as the New Deal, and one wonders whether he got the idea from F. D. R., or whether the New Deal got the idea from him.

It is thought that these degrees have been conferred in the effort to get him to divulge the sources and substance of his matchless political wisdom; but when we remember that he chose a political career early in life, and when we remember his rare ability to know more than he tells, we are forced to the conclusion that the crypt of civilization that bulges from his noble brow is sealed until he chooses to open it.

In fact, it is said that his academic career was cut short by the circumstance that, though he knew all the answers to the questions, that the professors asked, he was not willing to divulge them, not even the source of his knowledge.

There are many reasons why Postmaster General Farley should receive the distinguished honor of a degree of doctor of laws conferred by this great university.

The first is because all America loves Jim Farley, and we want him to have anything that he wishes—from a white elephant to a white house.

He is a man of many moods. In one of them, he is the big, jolly Jim Farley. In another he is like the sphinx in Egypt's sands. In another he is a mighty genius for order and organization. In another he is a political seer, easily ranking with the major prophets. In another he is the spark plug of democracy. In still another he is to the Republicans a flaming "blitzkreig," scattering ruin and desolation over the land. While to us Democrats he is like a great, tall angel standing in the sunlight.

In the name of the countless millions of American citizens I present for the honor of the degree of doctor of laws, one who has taught us the law of divine rectitude in the difficult field of American politics; who has taught us the law of loving kindness in the field of religion; who has taught us the law of brotherly love in the field of human relations; who has taught us equal rights to all in the field of social justice; who has taught us the law of liberty in the great battlefield of American statesmanship.

I affirm that he is a worthy successor to others who have stood in this distinguished presence—such as Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States—who stood here and received the honorary degree of doctor of laws. And of Franklin Delano Roosevelt—who stood here 8 years ago and received the honorary degree of doctor of laws, and was subsequently made President of the United States.

And now, Mr. President, I present for that honor the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the National Democratic Executive Committee, Postmaster General of the United States, a member of the President's Cabinet, statesman, Christian, and friend—a normal man to an abnormal degree—and may history repeat itself.

President Thornwell Jacobs, at the baccalaureate exercises of Oglethorpe University, used the following citation in bestowing the degree of doctor of laws upon James Aloysius Farley:

"The degree of doctor of laws upon James Aloysius Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, genius in the world of friendship and human kindness, optimistic and constructive political leader in a dark and desperate hour. Presented by Dr. William States Jacobs."

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Whatever the outcome of this war, one thing is certain: The world in which we live after the firing has ceased will be a new kind of world. Old methods will change. New tasks will confront us all. To the members of this graduating class, the challenge of that new world presents itself. To you, then, as citizens of a new world, I offer, as is the custom, a text: "Take ye heed to yourselves."

When we are young, the things that surround us seem to be permanent and indestructible. What we see immediately around us is, to us, the world. We see our parents, and we cannot believe that they will ever grow old or pass from our sight. We see our home, and we cannot believe that it will ever change. We see our friends, and cannot believe that they will ever leave us or grow away from us or forget the fine relationships we share. I know this, because that is the way it was with me when I was young. I dreamed of going away, of course, as all boys do—of going away to big cities, to big work. But whenever I tried to make these visions definite, the big city was only an enlargement of the town in which I lived. The work was only an enlargement of the work I was doing. The world that I knew was my own community. It did not seem possible that it could change, or that the world into which I might go could be different, that it would have different problems or would present unexpected tasks. So, in a sense, the young truly live with the past and with the present. They only dream of the future.

With the passing of years comes the realization of how much of the world that surrounds us changes. As we grow older we become more and more conscious of the temporary character of most things that we know. But the curious thing about it all is that the more we grow conscious of change, the more we seek for the changeless, the permanent, the secure.

This is the greatest paradox of life—that in the midst of change, fully aware that change is inevitable, we human beings eternally long for the things that do not change.

No doubt the students here conceive of this university which they love as changeless and everlasting. But it will change. It will grow. It will offer wider and wider opportunities for the youth of the future, and in the process of growth many of its characteristics may change. Early in the last century brave and far-seeing men established it. The young men who graduated in those days believed, too, in the permanence of the things they knew. It was their college home—to remember, to revisit, and to love. But, as you know, the desolation of war came and left its trail of destruction. Of the old institution, nothing that was physical and material remained. It vanished. It vanished just as so many of its graduates vanished, with the flower of our country, before the terrible fury of war.

Looking back now, we know that a university is not alone a material thing. It is a thing of the spirit. It lives through every crisis, on and on into the future. The spirit of Oglethorpe lived on beyond its physical destruction. This magnificent institution rose from the ashes, larger, more beautiful, and more capable of human service. It rose again and here it is.

So the history of this university teaches us a great lesson—the lesson of the permanence of things of the spirit despite the passing of material things. And as we plunge into the world of building and of destruction, of creating and undoing and re-creating, we must learn to distinguish between those things that are permanent and those things that are temporary. In this dark hour we must ask ourselves: What is it we must cherish, beyond all things, in the world of the spirit and of the mind?

One of these, most assuredly, is popular government—the right of the people to govern themselves, to choose those who temporarily administer the government. This country has developed and has embodied in our Constitution the great idea of representative government. We have learned, after many vicissitudes, many desperate differences of opinion, how to protect the rights of local and State governments, while we are, at the same time, developing our prestige as a nation.

We have learned how to be 1 Commonwealth and 48 Commonwealths at the same time. We have learned how we can and should protect the rights of the States to choose their own officials, administer their own laws, send men of their own choice to Congress, be represented as they want to be represented, and have their special problems presented in the National Legislature.

Representative government affords protection to minorities. It recognizes that complete and utter control by the majority leads to the end of popular government. We protect religious and political minorities not always because we agree with them, but because we know that unless they are protected, nothing is protected. We permit a fellow citizen to speak his mind not because we agree with what he says, but because we know that if we prevent him from speaking his mind, our right, our freedom will ultimately be destroyed.

We separate the powers between Nation and State and within Nation and State. We recognize the distinction between executive,

legislative, and judicial powers. These principles, established by the makers of the Constitution, conceived by great men out of the experience of centuries, are part of the eternal heritage of America. We must guard these principles, preserve them, and apply them in our day-to-day dealings with the problems of government.

And while I am speaking of the separation of functions in a democracy let me add that here in America, beyond any nation in the world, we have observed the essential need for the separation of the church and state. We can never go far astray if we remember that, in the last analysis, certain constitutional protections are rooted in the doctrines that Christ taught while He was on earth. He taught us that the individual has definite obligations to God and also to his country. In the course of long experience we have learned the importance of the distinction. We have learned the everyday pertinence of Christ's injunction: Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

A distinction exists, and properly exists, between the institutions of religion and the institutions of free government. Yet the spirit that a free government should represent is rooted in that deep religious feeling that is common to us all. It is rooted in the idea that we are, each of us, our brother's keeper; that a government must represent the human aspirations of the people or it cannot survive; that government must help the afflicted, lift up those who have fallen, protect those who are weak, give support to those who need it, and, above all, develop the spirit of brotherhood among all classes and conditions of people. A free government must be the government of all the people, and not of a few. It must serve them, be responsible to them, and seek always to move in the spirit of justice.

In the world that is lying before us, full of trials and problems the like of which we have never faced before, we must maintain the ideals and the leadership of the United States. That job will grow harder as the years pass. America is strong. But it must grow stronger to cope with the problems of the New World. With bitter warfare shaking the foundations of the world, the hope of mankind must be found in the West.

It is not to speak in the spirit of selfishness to say that we must, as Columbus did, keep our eyes on the promise of the western world. Nowhere has that been more beautifully expressed than in one of the poems of a genius whom Oglethorpe gave to the world. Sidney Lanier told how the great spirit of Columbus held firm to his purpose as, day after day, discouragement shook his officers and the crew. Constantly they begged Columbus to turn back. They told him that, if he persisted, all would be lost; that the world into which they were heading was dangerous, trackless, empty of all except terror. The one answer that Columbus gave, as Lanier puts it for us, was, "Our help is in the west."

Those words may well be the sentiment of a stricken world when the storm of war is past. When that moment comes America must be strong, must be able to take up her burdens.

I like to think today of what that great American, Woodrow Wilson, said on a similar occasion. Wilson once lived in this State. There was, as I understand it, a special bond of sympathy between the institution of which he was the head—Princeton University—and your own Oglethorpe. I believe they were dedicated to the same religious ideals. Speaking before a graduating class in his last baccalaureate address at Princeton, Woodrow Wilson gave the youth of that day a message that is full of meaning today.

"There is a sense," he said, "* * * in which the spirit of truth, of knowledge, of hope, of revelation, dwells in a place like this. * * * It has made some things certain for you, permanently and beyond conjecture. * * * There must be very few of you, if there be any, who have failed to get a definite undoubting grasp of some things that have here become certitudes for you. * * * Mere comradeships and pleasures cannot have satisfied you.

"You must have been fed upon something and been nourished. * * * You are certain * * * that there are definite comprehensible practices, immutable principles of government, and of right conduct in the dealing of men with one another. * * * You cannot be uncertain how it is that men come by happiness or failure; you are sure that there is such a thing as justice and a noble force in men who are righteous and love the truth; you perceive that some governments are free, some tyrannous and cruel, that there is a way of freedom and of peace and a way of certitude and strife in the affairs of men, and that it is all a rewarding study of human life in its realities, in its actual habit as it lives—that you have looked in the face of life, very noble, very tragical, full at once of pathos and of hope."

It is hardly necessary to add to this message of Woodrow Wilson, but I hope I may be permitted to make just one last suggestion to the members of this graduating class.

You are to be cititzens of a new world. Whatever the outcome of these trials abroad, you, as citizens of that world, must offer the strong fiber of your hope and the vast confidence that belongs to Americans. The most tragic of all losses from this war will be the loss of youth, of the able and hopeful and strong young men who will be left dead on the field of battle. Their loss is a loss not to their country alone, but to the whole world. And that loss puts upon the youth of this country greater and more exacting responsibilities.

And so, go out into the world, make yourselves felt, be worthy citizens of the New World Face the truth, however unpleasant, and tell the truth, however difficult. If you would have loyalty from others, be loyal to others yourself. Carry your responsibilities as Americans must. Hold fast to the old spirit in the midst of changing times. Learn to distinguish between the things that are permanent and the things that are temporary. The burden is your burden. The responsibility is your responsibility. "Take ye heed to yourselves."

Real Air Power for the Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by Maj. Al Williams last night at the National Aviation Forum.

February 28, 1919, I introduced a bill in the United States House of Representatives calling for a separate department for our Air Service. This was H. R. 16195, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR SERVICE

Since that early day many bills calling for a Department of Defense, with separate Bureaus of Air, War, and Navy, have been placed before Congress by numerous authors and in varied forms. I am proud to have pioneered this legislation which must some day become the law of the land. In my endeavors I had the hearty support of Gen. William Mitchell, famous World War aviator. Now we have the endorsement of the daring and able Al Williams, airman known to all American aviation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of America, of all ages, good evening. I have been invited to speak to you on the subject of air power and the national defense of the United States. Let us devote a moment to calm, reasoned thinking—worthy of Americans who believe in themselves, in the destiny of this Nation, and in our determination to preserve this Nation free from the hysteria and conflagrations which today are devastating many portions of the world beyond our boundaries. Let us refrain, therefore, from following the all-too-prevalent practice of making the gestures for putting out a fire by pouring gasoline on the flames. With wide-open eyes and cool minds, let us survey the situation.

MEDDLED IN INTERNATIONAL POWER POLITICS

I am speaking to you as an ordinary American citizen who wants nothing from his Government except peace, stability, and a sense of security—and who is deeply worried because for 5 years this administration has persistently meddled in international power politics and, at the same time, failed to provide an adequate national defense system for the country.

And, above all, I am speaking tonight because I believe that it is the sheerest folly to paint a vision of adequate defense until we have, as the first essential, a separate and independent air force which can plan, develop, and operate real American air power without interference and restraint from the Army and Navy.

This recital is not for the purpose of recrimination, but is directly in line with the old-fashioned American practice of looking backward to see where we have been—in order to appreciate where we are—and where we are going.

KNIGHT ERRANT OF THE HUMAN RACE

This country is not the Knight Errant of the human race. The blood of America belongs to America—to no man or group of men—and it must not be shed or mortgaged again in foreign wars, nor on foreign battlefields. That blood is for the defense of America—to the last drop. Defense of America—her safety, the peace of her people, and the ideals for which she stands—can never sanely be construed as waging a war on the battlefronts of Europe, nor in Asia's zone of influence. As a Knight Errant of the human race, some men would have the United States pose before the world, while the knight's armor, his sword, and his shield are made of tin and of obsolescent design.

According to military experts, about 18 months of emergency effort would be required to equip and train an American Army competent in size and power to rate consideration as a first-class fighting force. Woefully deficient in antiaircraft guns of all calibers, strategic reserves, mechanized and motorized equipment, and lacking even the cloth to make uniforms for an army—that, fellow Americans, is the status of the battle efficiency of the United States Army.

BATTLESHIPS ARE NOT FIT TO MEET NEW WEAPON OF AIR POWER

The Secretary of the Navy, himself, has admitted that our battleships are not fit to meet this new weapon of air power. After 20 years to watch the development of foreign air power—as it worked to a position of dominance in Europe's skies—the Navy now reports to us, in this crisis, that it must remodel. No; to be safe, the Navy wants to scrap all our present battleships and build a new fleet.

General Arnold, of the United States Army Air Corps, says our planes are obsolete. I am speaking primarily as an airman, and it has been my privilege to study intimately the air power of the several European nations now at war. Over a period of years I have acquired first-hand knowledge of their principles, organization, administration, policy, and air tactics. I have flown some of the foreign fighting planes whose performances are tossing war-college textbooks and the tactics of sea power and land power into the scrap heap. And in confirmation of General Arnold's appraisal, I say that there is not one squadron of American Army or Navy planes capable of meeting the performances of the British Spitfires or the German Messerschmitts and Heinkels. In the face of this disgraceful accounting our politicians are following the death march of the British admirals in preventing the full development of real American air power by opposing the creation of a unified, separate air force. Our aircraft production has been muddled through this administration's persistent dumping of everything to the Allies.

THROTTLING THE DEVELOPMENT OF BRITISH AIR POWER

The British people first lost control of the administrators of their Government, and they in turn lost control of the army and navy blocs. These naval and military blocs dominating England's rearmament period—from 1936 to the outbreak of this war—went overboard in buying battleships and the wrong kind of war tools, and in throttling the development of British air power. The British Navy could only see the necessity for defending the air over the water around England. The British Army could only visualize the defense of the air over England. Edward, Prince of Wales, upon ascending to the throne, told England that her first line of defense was no longer the British Navy but the Royal Air Force.

We are confronted by coiners of dangerous international phrases, coined in subversion of the safety and peace of America.

Congress alone can save us, and we alone—we ordinary Americans—can save Congress by telling these representatives of ours that we are determined to mend and put our own house in order; that we are demanding the formulation of a coordinated national-defense system—competently organized, administered, and adequately equipped to protect this country—and above all, a unified air force, free from Army and Navy domination.

THE GALLANT SPIRIT OF GENERAL BILLY MITCHELL

The complete answer, as I see it, is (and I can almost feel the gallant spirit of General Billy Mitchell at my shoulder as I say these words): The United States must have a separate air force under a three-way Department of National Defense—Army, Navy, and Air. The development of true American air power must no longer be left in the jealous hands of the land Army and the sea Navy and politicians. To do so is to court the present plight of England, and eventual disaster. Remember these words—because words of similar import were spoken by the airmen of England time and again to the politicians of England, but these politicians all wanted more billions for warships. They got the billions and England got the warships—instead of the air power she needs today to defend herself against the air power invader. Of course, the President tells you we need more warships—and some air power dominated by warship people. The President's information came to him second-hand. My information as to what air power could and would do was acquired first-hand—and much of it from the cockpits of foreign war planes. And that cockpit experience was shared by none of his advisors.

NEW WINGED WAR MACHINERY

Of course, the President cannot see the new winged war machinery if he depends upon advisors who are blinded with warships, and blinded as was Prime Ministers Baldwin, Chamberlain, and Churchill. Loose-thinking men tell you of the wartime weaknesses in a democracy, compared to the dictatorships. That is falsehood. The weakness of England in air power at this moment was not created in wartime. It was created in peacetime by political lobbies refusing to permit the nation to prepare for the future. Democracy is not on trial—it is these weak leaders of democracy who are on trial. What has the form of government got to do with selecting the right or the wrong kind of war tools? Absolutely nothing—and the excuse is a red herring to cover political falsehood.

The American first line of national or hemispheric defense is to be found in American air power—not in warships, and not in the two tiny air services which act as messenger boys for the Army and Navy. Such messenger boys, under competent management abroad, have developed the capacity of destroying their one-time masters. We must now—and God knows the reason is clear—merge our two air services into a separate department and permit the airmen of America to work out the destiny of real power in the air for the protection of this country.

FAILURE OF BRITISH SEA POWER

The failure of British sea power—the greatest sea power in the world—to cut the line of German sea communications through the Skagerrak because of German air power was the death knell of sea power as any nation's first line of defense. This, with the complete dominance of air power over the present battle fronts of Europe, gives conclusive evidence that no army on the land and no fleet on the sea can move with safety within the range of air power unless control of the air over the combat zone is first established. These factual lessons must be incorporated immediately in our own national defense, and this is no time for half measures nor compromise.

A DEPARTMENTAL SYSTEM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR

We must have a departmental system of national defense—Army, Navy, and air—the civilian leaders of each to be members of the President's Cabinet. We need a supreme council of defense, headed by the Executive, with members of this council drawn from the Senate and from the House of Representatives. Under such a system the United States would revert to the American way of doing business, with the President and Congress jointly formulating the foreign policy—peace or war—the supreme council of defense interpreting that policy and the joint board of secretaries of the Army, Navy, and air applying that interpretation. These things can and must be done—now.

Under the system of a separate air force, the main striking power of America in the air will be coordinated under a single command.

Air power dominates the European War and spells the difference between victory and defeat. None but the politically blind could fail to see this. None but the blind could refuse to recognize that air power already has relegated land and sea power to secondary positions in this war. None but those who will not see could refuse the prime lesson of this war: the need for airpower, built and administered as an independent arm of national defense, comparable to the Army and Navy.

AIRPLANES TO TOSS INTO THIS WAR

The President knows all this—but I fear that the President wants airplanes in great numbers right now—to toss into this war. If he wants thousands of planes as soon as he can get them—and without waiting to build an air force first—then production of planes for Europe is his goal—not the defense of America.

A Congressional Committee should be formed immediately by Congress to carry out the constitutional responsibilities of formulating a modernized national-defense policy by providing a three-way plan for Army-Navy-Air Departments.

We have time to do this, and now is the time.

OCEANS ARE STILL VITAL FACTORS

Oceans and extended lines of communication are still vital factors in modern warfare. President Roosevelt's panicky flight schedule for the air invasion of America is ridiculous, worthy of Hollywood and certainly not of the White House. Four hours from Greenland to Newfoundland, 5 hours to Nova Scotia, and then 6 hours to New England. As an airline commercial schedule those figures might be sustained, but given to us as the flight schedule of an air invasion of America, they are deceiving and panic-creating for ordinary people who the President knows are not able to interpret them.

Such figures, creating panic and terror, are expected to induce peace-loving Americans to plunge into this conflict now, in the belief that they would be forestalling some future disaster.

FANTASTIC ITINERARY FOR AIR INVASION

To support my argument against President Roosevelt's wild flight schedule for a foreign air invasion of the United States, I offer a single incontrovertible reason. With all their air power, the Germans could not attack and subdue England from air bases 300 to 500 miles distant. Instead, they seized air bases on the north coasts of Holland, Belgium, and France—20 to 100 miles from the coast of England. Each and every stage of Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic itinerary for the air invasion of America would have to be conquered for the establishment of major air bases for the enemy attempting the job. The President must know this—but apparently the pattern is panic first, and then war.

Assume that Germany wins and takes over British seapower. Then what? Would the Germans be fools enough to send warships against us and our air power (if we had air power), using the same ships that had failed for the British against German airpower? Nonsense! The United States is in no immediate danger of air invasion, or any other kind of military or naval invasion.

NONSENSE AND BASELESS PANIC

We, therefore, have time—time to provide a competent air defense—but no more time for nonsense and baseless panic, no more time for shipping aircraft to the Allies by men who are more interested in helping the Allies in licking Germany than in saving the United States.

With real air power we could treat any invader of our shores or the shores of any of the Americas to a series of Skagerraks and Norways. If they (whoever they might be) should attack Central or South America, what would our defense be? If the attack is by air, will we invite disaster and defend the Monroe Doctrine with warships? That would be folly, after what we have seen happen in Europe. Is it not sensible that our defense of the entire Western Hemisphere should be attempted with an overwhelming air power that America can and must build—an air power that will strike and return home in far less time than warships would require to reach a distant scene of action. Air power has a most dominant place as an independent factor in the hemisphere defense as well as in the national defense of America.

LACK OF VISION IS COSTING ENGLAND THE WAR

British sea-navy admirals and land-army generals resisted the full development of British air power, and their lack of vision is

costing England the war and killing thousands of men. Plans and time build air power—not money. All the $18,000,000,000 of gold in Kentucky cannot produce one expert airman or one additional plane for America tomorrow morning. The air is an atmospheric ocean. Its machinery and navigation are complicated, and mastery of them is no matter for part-time careers. We are safe against air invasion now. Who dares say how long this immunity will last? Shall we, therefore, wait until that immunity is actually dissolved before we organize to provide full experts and competent machinery—both of which are only possible under another department of national defense?

AIR POWER BEAT THEM TO THE PUNCH

When the Allies contemplated opening up Norway as a new theater of war with preponderant sea power, air power beat them to the punch. When the Allies pressured Italy with sea power, land power, and some air power, the Italian counterthreat of real air power stymied the Allies.

No matter where we look, air power holds the trump cards. This is a fact, not a theory.

The United States can build American air power only by entrusting its development to specialists and freeing those specialists from service and party politics. From the lessons of this war, sea power never will be used again by sane commanders within the range of shore-based aircraft. And under a three-department system of defense, our strategy should be shaped to fit this startlingly clear picture.

If England loses this war, there will be but two sizable sea fleets left in the world, ours and that of the Japanese. The Germans never will get the British Fleet. That sea fleet will be destroyed in the English Channel attempting to prevent air invasion of England or it will be distributed to the several British Dominions, where it will be beyond the range of major aircraft concentrations.

OUR FIRST NEED DEVELOPMENT OF REAL AMERICAN POWER

But let us never lose sight of our first need, namely, the development of real American air power, for which airplanes are the last thing to be provided. A national air-defense policy must come first—to lay down the principles of our needs, which, in every event, must encompass a separate and unified air force. From there on we will need research—aeronautical research—to find out what kind of airplanes and engines must be built. We will need a flight-training program under air-force direction to fit the selected ships and the tactics necessitated by these ships. Then—and only then—comes the mass-production program, to provide ways and means for building air-power machinery in great quantities. These are the three timing gears of air power: (1) Research, (2) pilot training, and (3) production. Let one of them falter and air power becomes air confusion.

AIR-POWER LESSONS IN THIS WAR

I, for one, resent the warning that "the American people must recast their thinking about national protection." I maintain that it is the President who must recast his thinking about national protection. We see air-power lessons in this war, but we can do nothing about incorporating these lessons into our national-defense system. That is the President's job and the job of Congress. The President is Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this Nation. He knew Germany was building 600 planes a month in 1938—and he did not then warn America to do likewise. His recent hope—publicly interpreted as a recommendation—for 50,000 airplanes has only confused the minds of laymen and experts alike. "Ship for ship," he claims for our Navy, "ours are equal to or better than those of any foreign power."

Again I say, Then what? Are our ships better able to stand up to air attack than the warships of England? Certainly not. The Secretary of the Navy himself admits that they are not. Those 50,000 airplanes—certainly we can't pay for them out of the last emergency request to Congress. Those 50,000 planes would cost between eight and ten billion dollars, and if we started to build 50,000 airplanes right now what kind would we build? Our research facilities are puny when compared to those of Germany, and that is the starting point to air power—research.

FIFTY THOUSAND PLANES—WHO WOULD HANDLE THEM?

But even if we had 50,000 airplanes, who would handle them, and who would handle the half-million men necessary to fly and service them? The Army or Navy certainly couldn't do that job since they evidently are unable to handle their own problems now.

It is a blinding flash of the obvious that we need an entirely new department of national defense to handle the air power of the proportions now under discussion. If we had a competent air department today, and had only 10 airplanes in each category, superior or even comparable to the warplanes of Europe, we then would be 10,000 times better off than we are right now. At least, we would have our homework done and we would be ready to move toward acquiring real American air power. Then—only then—would we be in position to talk in terms of mass production.

FIRST—PROVIDING AN AMERICAN AIR FORCE

But of what avail is logic or reason? The Allies don't want our Army or Navy. They want our airplanes—to make good their neglect to see the light we are trying to make Mr. Roosevelt see—now, and they want those planes right now, and Mr. Roosevelt wants to give them airplanes right now—without first providing an American air-force organization for the permanent air defense of America.

The airplanes are for Europe. Additional proof of this is to be found in the recommendation of Senator PEPPER (who has been close to the administration) to turn our present United States Army Air Corps' planes now in active service, over to the Allies.

We have been inarticulate too long; it is time for the real blood of America to take stock of these men who are running our Government, and to demand that they free themselves from bureaucratic prejudices and taboos, and heed the lessons of dominant air power which are being so cruelly taught in Europe today.

KEEPING AMERICA OUT OF WAR

Stand up, America. Stand on your feet, and make known your demands for actually keeping America out of war and building a modernized, efficient national-defense system, which will cause any potential foreign aggressor to shudder at the prospect of attacking the United States. For this, all our resources and our blood. I am speaking directly and forcibly because I saw British politicians throttle and mismanage the development of air power and bring England to her present crisis—short on airpower.

THE RETURN OF THE LOCUSTS

Not one penny for any such system as recommended by the President for buying airplanes—since this system is typical of the years eaten by the locusts. And not one penny until we are sure that with a three-department national defense—Army, Navy, and air—the return of the locusts will be prevented. Real American air power is possible only under such a system, and it is the only means by which our so-called "mystic security" can be converted into the actual security we deserve for the safety of America, and for peace, instead of panic, in the minds of Americans.

Preparedness and Partisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TIMES

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Times of May 28, 1940, entitled "Preparedness and Partisanship."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of May 28, 1940]

PREPAREDNESS AND PARTISANSHIP

President Roosevelt's "fireside chat" Sunday night was in effect an accounting to the Nation of his administration's stewardship of our national-defense forces. To all but the most partisan the accounting was satisfactory. Our military and naval strength is still far from what it should be. But we've come a long way in the right direction since 1933.

Since President Roosevelt took office, here is what has been done for our national safety:

The Army has been increased from 122,000 men and officers to approximately 240,000.

The Navy personnel has been increased from 79,000 men and officers to 145,000.

The Navy has commissioned or laid down 215 new warships, including actually now in use 12 cruisers, 63 destroyers, 26 submarines, 3 aircraft carriers, 2 gunboats, 7 auxiliaries, and a number of smaller craft.

Naval aircraft have been increased from 1,127 to 2,892 in use or ordered.

Army aircraft actually purchased since 1933 number 5,640.

Antiaircraft guns on hand or ordered have increased from 355 to more than 1,700. Infantry mortars have increased from 24 to 1,600, tanks from 48 to 1,700 either in use or being constructed.

Those figures and the others cited by the President answer those who have prattled about the waste of billions in national-defense funds. Far from having nothing to show for our money, we have the strongest peacetime Army and Navy in history—inadequate though they may be.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT MIGHT HAVE SAID

Mr. Roosevelt did not make the political capital of these facts which he could have had he been inclined to adopt the tactics used by his bitterest critics. He did not point out that it was under three successive Republican administrations that our Military Establishment was allowed to decline to the point of a national disgrace. He did not mention that it was a Republican administration which sank our newest and finest warships, and Republicans who allowed the rest of the Navy to slump far below the point of safety.

Nor did the President mention that it was the omniscience of a Republican, the late Senator Borah, which was responsible for our failure to amend the Neutrality Act a year ago. Earlier amendment might have postponed the outbreak of war. Surely the Allies could have been better prepared.

The talk was that of the leader of a united American people. In the care with which he abstained from reproaching those guilty of irresponsible criticism of his leadership, there was a devastating reply to their misrepresentations.

For those who accuse Mr. Roosevelt of seeking to destroy private industry the reply was adequate: "We are calling on men now engaged in private industry to help us in carrying out this program. * * * Private industry will have the responsibility of providing the best, speediest, and most efficient mass production of which it is capable."

In those same words was the answer to such malcontents as Gen. Hugh Johnson who have been uttering shrill cries of anguish over the administration's failure to secure the aid of practical industrialists.

THE HOME FRONT STILL COMES FIRST

To those who have called the President a warmonger, have accused him of seeking to drag us into the European conflict, the lie was given by Mr. Roosevelt's declaration of continued devotion to the domestic social objectives of his administration. No President seeking to lead the Nation into war would be concerned over maintenance of the wage-hour law, the protection of organized labor, social security, housing, and the conservation of natural resources.

Mr. Roosevelt's attitude Sunday night, as it has been ever since "total war" broke out abroad, was in striking contrast to that of his political enemies. He has had every opportunity to take political advantage of the emergency. Yet he has so carefully refrained from so doing that his opponents have been driven to impute to him those things which he might have done had he chosen to.

Because the President might have dealt a blow to Republican opposition by forming a coalition Cabinet, his enemies have accused him of attempting to do it, although he invited no Republican to join the Cabinet. Because he could use the emergency to cinch his renomination for a third term, they have accused him of doing so, although he has maintained precisely the attitude he has kept for the past 2 years. Because their party almost ruined our national defense, and pooh-poohed every warning of the President, the Republicans seek to blame him for our unpreparedness.

In contrast to the President's behavior, that of his die-hard critics has been a shabby spectacle. Neither their own cause nor the Nation's is being served by such tactics.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk Walter Lippmann's column, published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "For the Immediate Defense of American Interests," the most striking paragraph of which seems to me to be the following:

How many more technically scrupulous neutrals must be destroyed before we understand that we are living in a time when security does not depend upon the favor of others but solely and absolutely upon the power to resist aggression?

I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 30, 1940]

FOR THE IMMEDIATE DEFENSE OF AMERICAN INTERESTS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Nation must not be misled into thinking that its task is to prepare itself to defend its vital interests at some unknown time in the future when we have managed to organize the capacity to produce 4,000 planes a month. Time is not our ally. We lost that ally of ours, namely the time which democracies need in order to muddle through, when we refused to lift a finger to prevent the war and when later we allowed ourselves to be bound hand and foot in a stiff and stupid neutrality. Whether all the people of the United States have as yet realized it or not, America has already suffered a tremendous defeat. It is a defeat which can be redressed. But it can be redressed only by enormous courage, unflinching sacrifice, and the utmost lucidity and wisdom in our leaders.

The vital interests of America have to be defended now—in the next days and weeks—and by the means now at our disposal. Let no one throw up his hands. They can be defended. But first of all the air must be cleared of the panic which has paralyzed us for 2 years—a panic born of ignorance of the strategic position in the world, and then assiduously nurtured by native demagogs and foreign agents. I mean the panic about sending our boys to Europe. This panic is now and always has been absolutely groundless because, every other consideration apart, it has always been impossible in this war for us to raise, train, and equip a great army and convoy it to Europe. But the unreal fear that we might have to do this impossible thing has totally blinded the mass of the American people to the things that they have the greatest reason to fear. And it has inhibited them from doing the necessary and effective things to protect themselves.

There is no time left for the muddleheadedness which prevents us from seeing that American vital interests have to be defended now and with the means now at our disposal. This can be done if the back-seat drivers who have got us to the edge of the precipice will quit screaming hysterically and will behave like men.

The means at our disposal are the immense potential resources of this hemisphere. But these resources will count no more than the immense potential resources of the British and French Empires, or the immense potential resources of Russia, or of China, unless we demonstrate at once that we mean to organize these resources and that we know how. No one is going to be in the slightest degree impressed by blue prints, promises, and boasts, neither the Allies, who will be measuring their capacity to resist, nor the coalition of their enemies, who will be measuring their capacity to exploit totally the victory which they think is in sight. For we must understand at once that there are degrees of resistance and conquest; that the degree of resistance and conquest is a matter of the utmost consequence to America; and that the task of defending the vital interests of the American hemisphere consists in acting now to prevent a total catastrophe in Europe and Asia—while we insure ourselves as best we can against the worst that can happen.

The only decisive means of action immediately at our disposal consists of the very genuine respect which every nation has for our potential power. Nobody in Europe respects our present military power. Nobody, to be quite candid with ourselves, now respects our capacity or our will to make ourselves formidable; for universally it is believed that our public men are intellectually lazy and uninformed and on the whole not very public-spirited, and that as a people we have been softened and corrupted by sentimentality and materialism. Yet in order to defend our vital interests we need above all other things to make ourselves respected. But this cannot be done by appropriations and committees. We are dealing with governments and peoples who will not be deceived by the gestures which still deceive us. They have made all those gestures themselves, and they know, better than our people know as yet, what they are worth.

What they will be watching, and the only thing which will impress them in the great showdown which is impending, is whether or not we have learned the lessons of Europe and are prepared to apply them, or whether we have to make all the mistakes all over again all by ourselves. Only we shall be deceived, and no one else, by a defense program which is still conceived and planned in accordance with the fatal errors of the Chamberlain Tories and of the British Labor Party.

What are these errors? The first is that the defense program is not based upon the principle of universal service, and it will therefore, be obstructed at every turn by private interests and by interminable negotiations designed to persuade men to do their patriotic duty. The second error is that the defense program is still being presented to the people by the politicians in both parties as a side show rather than as the main business of our lives, or worse still, as a kind of miraculous device for restoring normal prosperity or instituting peacetime reforms and benefits. With this misconception rampant the defense program will not get the priority it must have over all other considerations nor will it get out of us all anything like the hard work and full devotion which it requires. The third error is that the central organization for leading the Nation in this undertaking is still, as Mr. Hoover demonstrated so brilliantly this week, in the primitive and amateurish stage of hydra-headed negotiating and consulting committees rather than of responsible commanders equipped with all necessary legal powers.

We shall neither make ourselves strong eventually, nor make ourselves respected immediately in the crisis which is at hand, unless we can pass promptly and without lost motion through this fumbling period, which has brought such tragedy to all the other democracies. The crucial question, to put it plainly, is whether—before there is irreparable disaster all about us—we can prove that we shall not make the fatal errors of the others, and that, therefore, our immense potential power must command immediate respect. This can be done only by committing ourselves to the principle of universal service, to the principle of the total dedication of our resources, and to the principle that a nation can be armed only by leadership and authority.

No doubt it will take the country and, still more, the politicians, a little time to get over the shock of the proposal and to accommodate themselves to the novelty of universal service and of total dedication. But the third error can be corrected at once. The Advisory National Defense Commission appointed by the President is on the whole excellently chosen. In the appointments which matter primarily, Messrs. Stettinius, Knudsen, Hillman, Budd, and Davis will rightly have the confidence of the country and of the interests they must work with.

But it is not clear how far they are advisers and how far they are executives, and if they are wise, they will, I suggest, take up as their very first problem this question of how the whole program is to be administered and where authority and responsibility are to be centered. To do this they should not only read Mr. Hoover's speech, which is the wisest and most useful utterance since the crisis broke, but they should invoke his help, because he understands the problem better than any member of the commission. They should invoke his help in drafting an advisory report on how to supersede the very commission of which they are members in order to establish a genuine Munitions Administration.

They will come to this later. All experience proves it. So as practical men they should waste no time in going through useless motions, and by taking this line they will demonstrate to the knowing here and abroad that the Americans know what they are doing. That demonstration now will be worth more than 5,000 airplanes a year hence.

Not even if we adopt all these measures—universal service, the dedication of our resources, and the organizing of effective authority—we shall still not have done all the things it is possible and necessary for us to do in order to prevent the disaster from becoming a catastrophe. If we can get over the illusion that we can defend our security in this hemisphere by the rabbit's device of trying to stay very still in the hope of not being noticed—by doing what is called "not meddling"—there are substantial things we can do which will, regardless of the outcome, be immensely worth doing.

We should appropriate a very large sum of money to feed the ravaged people of western Europe, and we should suspend any legal impediments to the delivery of supplies. We should do it first of all because we ought not go to the day of judgment with it on our conscience that we sat around with a surplus of food while the most highly civilized peoples in the world were allowed to perish. We should do it because their continuing resistance now is worth more to us than any arms we can make now. We should do it because we shall need friends in this world, and we shall have none nor deserve them, if we are too cold-hearted and too timid to go on so obvious and so necessary an errand of mercy.

We should also carry out to the full the pledge given by the President in his message to Congress, not only giving the Allies first call upon anything we can produce but we should go beyond it, by making available to the Allies any weapons we possess which are not immediately indispensable to preserve law and order within the inner zone of our strategic defenses. They have financed and built for us whatever expanded facilities we have for the production of planes and munitions. We are immeasurably in their debt for this service, and as a matter of self-respect and of national prudence we should let them have from our stocks everything that is not clearly indispensable. For they have provided us with the facilities for replacing anything that we let them have.

By doing this we shall not be one bit more "involved" than we are. For the powers that we have to deal with will, if they can, do exactly the things they wish to do whether we have or whether we have not been technically neutral. How many more technically scrupulous neutrals must be destroyed before we understand that we are living in a time when security does not depend upon the favor of others but solely and absolutely upon the power to resist aggression?

There are many other things that we shall need to do. But they lie in the realm of diplomacy, of a far-reaching and discerning diplomacy both in Asia and in Europe. We shall very soon be forced to undertake that diplomacy. But that diplomacy cannot be made effective until the United States of America again commands the respect of the world.

Editorial Comment on West Virginia Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 28), 1940

COMMENTS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a few newspaper comments about the West Virginia primary election.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSH HOLT should be well pleased with the good showing he made in the recent primary election, and we are very proud to note that so many West Virginians have given their support to one who has fought for what he has deemed as right regardless of where the political ax would fall.

As United States Senator he has a fine record. He is able, independent, and honest. He bows his head to no boss or ruler. He thinks for himself. His views of national questions are sound. He is opposed to waste, extravagance, and bureaucracy. He stands for traditional American ideals and ideas. He is opposed to dictatorship in every form.

Senator HOLT'S vote was a tribute to a young man who dared to tell the truth; even on those who belong to his own party.

Defeated is RUSH DEW HOLT, but even the boy Senator who rode into the national spotlight 6 years ago as the protege of a liberal Democratic Party and soon after became a "lone wolf" in Congress, went down in a manner that approached being glorious. Without organization, he gave his two opponents a race, to the amazement of many. RUSH HOLT will be through as a Senator next January, but who dares say he will be retired from public spotlight? As a senatorial dissenter he's been a burr under the saddle, yet his vote in the primary proves that there are many who agree with him. Perhaps all concerned in the party are glad that the campaign lacked in bitterness toward him.

SENATOR RUSH HOLT MADE GREAT RACE

One of the outstanding features of last Tuesday's Democratic primary was the showing made by Senator RUSH D. HOLT in his campaign for renomination.

Opposed by two powerful political machines in his own party without any organized backing, bearing his own campaign expenses, and even introducing himself at the few political meetings which he addressed, Senator HOLT polled approximately 80,000 votes (more than 80,000).

Senator RUSH HOLT was defeated, but he won. He won the admiration of all clear-thinking people of West Virginia for his campaign, a campaign that bought no votes, a campaign that did not force a single citizen to cast a vote for him because of fear. His supporters were those who believed in him and his independence.

Charles Brooks Smith commented:

"Then the visiting reporter made the last dutiful call. None too keen for it, he postponed making it as long as he could. Young Senator RUSH DEW HOLT was "at home" to him. There was no crape on the door. HOLT bounced up from his chair to greet the visitor. There was that grin and that felicitous glib. There was no dejection, no Gloomy Gus here. The scribe felt surprise. He could not throttle letting loose a sigh of relief. After that things were just about what they always were before the primary.

"HOLT was, in truth, a dissenter, because he would not and could not be a 'rubber stamp.' In a machine-ridden Washington and West Virginia, refusal to be a 'rubber stamp' is risking political death. Some get away with it, like the nine Senators who went through the fiery furnace of the 'purge,' but the rule has been that most of them were involuntarily liquidated.

"A story projected from the A. P. bureau at Charleston said that there were no tear-wet eyes among the hotdiggitydogs of the New Deal in Washington because of Senator HOLT'S defeat. It made a good guess. The story went on to relate that this feeling toward the West Virginian stemmed from his opposition to such administration propositions and pets as ——.

"Its plan to put the judiciary system under political control of the executive branch by enactment of Congress; its various measures socializing and centralizing Government on a collectivist foundation; condoning the politicalization of W. P. A., facilitating it playing politics with human misery, etc. For his oppositions to such radical and scandalous things as these, HOLT was punished by his party at the primary on May 14. The irony in his defeat is that his party in Washington—in the Senate in particular—vindicated him in a majority, if not all, these things. It did it most emphatically in the Court-packing proposal and the W. P. A. scandal and outrage perpetrated on decent and honest Government. Obviously, this was the reason why Editor Smith wrote: 'Perhaps all concerned in the party are glad that the campaign lacked in bitterness toward him.'

"A study of the returns, county by county, shows the class and quality of the Democrats who contributed to the amazing large sum total received by HOLT. It was supplied by that high grade of electoral personnel which, taken from both parties and combined, can no longer muster a majority at the polls in West Virginia. The need exists more than ever for young men of idealism, courage, sincerity, and ability, such as HOLT possesses in full measure, but the situation isn't inviting and certainly not encouraging. It would be expecting too much of sacrifice from the young to sacrifice all they have to offer, which is inherent within themselves, at the threshold of career.

"West Virginia isn't going the way they want to go. And so it has come to pass—definitely—that the future isn't bright for the RUSH DEW HOLT type of young West Virginians—either sex. The nontype—what will happen to them? What has always happened: They will bare their rump to the branding iron and then be turned into the herd."

The National Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM FAIRMONT (MINN.) DAILY SENTINEL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, at the recent gathering of the delegates of the American Red Cross a distinguished editor and citizen of Minnesota visited the National Capital for the first time. I refer to Maj. Arthur E. Nelson, editor of the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn.

Major Nelson served as an officer in the War with Spain as well as in the World War. His father served with Grant and Sherman. His impressions of the National Capital and its history awakened patriotic thoughts of our heritage and the sacrifices made to preserve it. He wrote an editorial concerning the subject that I consider worthy and fitting to be printed in the RECORD on this national Memorial Day. I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel]

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

(By Arthur M. Nelson)

I have been to Washington.

I have visited the Nation's great patriotic shrines.

I have walked along Pennsylvania Avenue.

It has been a long time between generations of Nelsons traversing that historic thoroughfare. Dad beat me to it by just three-quarters of a century

It was in May 1865 that the Union armies of Grant and Sherman united in the grand review at Washington.

Sherman's gaunt regiments arrived direct from their battles and campaigns of 9 months incident to the Atlanta campaign, the march to the sea, the advance on Joe Johnson's heels through the Carolinas

For 2 days the two great armies paraded in celebration of victory for the Union, a fitting and historic climax of their years of service before being mustered out. Dad was a sergeant of Company E, Fifty-fifth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and he'd told me a lot about that review. I wondered if ever I'd walk where he marched. It's been a long time but at last it happened.

The patriotic shrines visited, and all good Americans should at least hope to one day see them, were, in the order visited, Gettysburg, Arlington, the Unknown Soldier's Tomb, Mount Vernon, Washington's Monument, the Lincoln Memorial.

I felt urgent need to stand at these shrines. I needed a new baptism in devotion to our democracy; not just an ordinary sprinkling, at least a triple immersion. As yet I can't feel entirely certain that it "took."

The Gettysburg field looked just about as I expected. In the old days when wars were fought by hand I spent many sessions at military schools studying and discussing the Gettysburg maps and campaigns. It was a standard text. So it all seemed familiar. In the study of military maps one is supposed to actually visualize features of the terrain, its elevations, depressions, and so forth. So the geography of the place and general details of the 3 days' struggle were something like reviewing a lesson previously studied. And I had known and talked with many men who fought at Gettysburg. The names of two of them—W. R. Livingston and Henry H. Runyan—are inscribed on the Pennsylvania monument which is one of the hundreds on the field.

As battles are fought now, Gettysburg was a puny affair, but of tremendous import. There armies of brave men sacrificed life for principles, and the perpetuity of this Nation was determined.

The battle lines were approximately 6 miles long. The opposing armies formed on ridges running north and south, separated by about a mile of open ground. The entire operations were in an area of only about 25 square miles. All is readily visualized from any one of several towers erected on the field.

Compare that with the battle fronts of a hundred miles and more in the World War, with the gigantic clashes of arms now occurring in Europe.

The shrine at Gettysburg is not where Reynolds fell, where Pickett charged, where the one Minnesota regiment present suffered annihilation to gain a few minutes of precious time at a crucial period. It is not the spot in the cemetery with its thousands of known and unknown dead where Lincoln spoke.

On Oak Hill, an eminence to the north overlooking the battlefield is the giant pillar holding aloft the eternal light, dedicated to peace, justice, liberty, that "these dead may not have died in vain." It is at this point that one senses most deeply the patriotic significance of it all.

At Arlington, verdure and blossoms profuse and magnificent in the warm sunshine of spring in Virginia, one walks where rest thousands of the Nation's defenders. There, side by side, are the graves of many who in life held the highest military rank, winning their fame and glory by the service and sacrifice of private soldiers resting nearby in graves marked "unknown."

Most of the victims of the Maine are interred in their separate plot at Arlington, its central monument a section of the main mast of the sunken ship. One stands there and reflects that but for the rage and demand for revenge that swept the Nation when the Maine was sunk at Habana 42 years ago last February, we would not have engaged in that war, and the writer hereof would not be a pensioner.

He is indeed callous clay who is not mightily moved by Arlington's hallowed surroundings.

I failed to grasp the full significance and majesty of the unknown soldier's tomb. I think this was because of the distracting crowd, many of its members indifferent, gabbing, laughing, romping about. I felt that I had been robbed. Within the crypt may be resting one with whom I had shared common experiences—a comrade. The reaction was, "Oh, the pity and uselessness of it all! Must it be again?"

Mount Vernon was indescribably lovely in the gorgeous Virginia springtime.

The place is largely a restoration, and there must be many changes from the Mount Vernon of Washington's time. The old mansion is, of course, authentic, a fine picture of the aristocratic living place of a wealthy Virginia planter of the period 1750 to 1800.

There is awe and reverence as one stands at the somewhat modern brick mausoleum at the foot of the garden where, fully open to public gaze, are marble coffins containing the remains of the Father of his Country and his wife Martha. But here again solemnity is destroyed by the milling crowd. A guide told us that there are at this time of year ten to fifteen thousand visitors daily at Mount Vernon. There seemed fully that number when we were there. Mount Vernon smacks of commercialism. You pay as you enter.

Washington Monument is more of a curiosity than anything else. There is nothing particularly impressive about it except that it is the highest structure man has ever created by laying one stone on top of another.

The Monument is hollow. Lots of people who live in Washington don't know that. We talked with a public man who has lived there nearly 20 years but has never visited the Monument, though it is the most obvious thing in the city. He sees it every day. Everyone in the city does.

They started to build the Monument in 1848; didn't get it done until 1884. The ran out of money from time to time. One can tell where one appropriation left off and another succeeded. The workmanship is different.

To see the Monument you must walk up its 900 steps. Very few do. They go up in the elevator. As you walk you can see and read the 179 memorial stones set into the walls by various States, countries, lodges, and societies. They, of course, all face inside of the wall.

Masonic lodges predominate among these memorial stones, though the Odd Fellows are a good second. There are several stones placed by the Sons of Temperance, Good Templars, and other foes of alcohol of former days. One reads such inscriptions as "The safety of the Nation depends on the sobriety of its citizens." There is nothing to counteract this sort of propaganda. United Brewers should get busy.

Well up toward the top there is a slab of pipestone carrying the inscription "Minn.," nothing more. Wonder who put it there.

The stairs are not circular but lead from one landing to another. It takes a middle-aged, overweight person about an hour and a half to make the ascent. The interior is electrically lighted. There are no windows or peepholes to shoot through until you get to the top.

Before leaving Washington, we took up with Congress some improvements we think should be made at the Monument. For instance, all the way up and down there are no sanitary facilities, no place to sit down to rest and refresh one's self.

One, of course, never forgets the view from the Monument's top, but you can get one that's better from an airplane.

I visited the lighted Lincoln Memorial after 10 at night, with Senator SHIPSTEAD. Aside from the guard, always on duty, we were the only persons there at that hour.

Never before had I sensed the artistry of great sculpture, had I known that chiseled marble can be made to speak. A feeling of reverence and awe beyond the power of expression sweeps over one. The colossal figure actually speaks and one feels himself in the presence of the living spirit of Abraham Lincoln. The Lincoln Memorial proclaims, does not merely typify, the great idealism of American democracy. In its portals one experiences a "new birth of freedom," feels kindled anew within himself "renewed devotion" to that great Nation of which he is an infinitesimal part.

Traveling Expenses of Federal Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have written regarding traveling expenses of Federal officials.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: I realize that the news from Europe is taking most of the attention of the people but I thought the citizens would be interested in news from this country.

Do you know that the traveling expense of the Federal officials for this year amounts to $80,416,401? Do you know that the amount spent for travel in the last 10 years was $540,190,337?

An interesting sidelight on travel cost was made public by a committee of the House of Representatives a few days ago. Howard Hunter, No. 2 man of the W. P. A. in the United States, does his traveling at interesting times. The testimony of the House shows that Mr. Hunter found it convenient to travel to Louisville, Ky. (where the Kentucky Derby is held) just at the time of the Derby in 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 with the Federal Government paying his expenses. Furthermore, it shows that Mr. Hunter found it convenient to be in New Orleans during the period when the famous Sugar Bowl football classic was being held in that city in 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939. Furthermore, it shows that official business took him to Miami, Fla., during the time of the running of the famous horse race known as the Flamingo Stakes (February 24, 1940).

Mr. Hunter's travel expense came from the W. P. A. money; money appropriated to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

These amounts may be small in comparison with the total expenditures but if all of these small items are added together, they make quite a sum. You pay for them whether they be small or large, pay for them in everything you spend.

You have seen the slogan, Travel and See America. Many Government officials have used their positions to accept that advice.

Sincerely,

RUSH D. HOLT.

Selected Weeklies Commend Oklahoma Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE SELECTED WEEKLIES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I am pleased to include herewith a resolution recently passed unanimously by the Selected Weeklies of Oklahoma which have been adjudged the outstanding weekly newspapers of the State. The names of the selected weeklies in question are as follows: Buffalo Journal, Cherokee Republican, Carnegie Herald, Cleveland American, Cordell Beacon, Drumright Journal, Duncan Eagle, Durant News, El Reno American, Enid Events, Fairview Republican, Frederick Press, Guthrie State Register, Kiowa County Star-Review Hobart, Kingfisher Times, Purcell Register, Walters Herald, Watonga Republican, Wayonka Enterprise, Weatherford News, Woodward Journal, and the Yukon Sun.

Permit me to add, Mr. Speaker, that the sentiment expressed in the following resolution is in keeping with that of a resolution passed this week by a unanimous vote of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and placed in the RECORD by the chairman of our delegation, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT.

The resolution adopted by the selected weeklies of Oklahoma is as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, the selected weeklies of Oklahoma, this 26th day of May, in convention at Kingfisher, Okla., go on record as recognizing the seriousness of the international situation of today and the grave problem facing the United States, feel that our representatives in National Congress can best serve the interests of their State and Nation by remaining on duty at their posts in Washington, D C.; and further recognizing that many of them face opposition for renomination and election, and by remaining on duty in Washington may be jeopardizing their political futures, we feel that they should be accorded special consideration in the forthcoming election; and we do therefore pledge our support and commendation to all those who are making the sacrifice; be it further

Resolved, That in view of the Government's plans for the establishment of aerial training bases all over the Nation in the expansion program of its aerial armament, that we recommend and urge that the remount station at Fort Reno be converted into such an air base, due to its excellence of topographical, climatic, geographical, and every other factor desirable in a great aerial training station.

Air Power the Key to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

INTERVIEW OF ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS AND REMARKS OF HON. ELMER THOMAS, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview by Judson C. Welliver with the commander of our naval forces of the United States during the World War, Admiral William S. Sims, concerning air power as the key to national defense, and remarks in the Senate by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma.

May I summarize the Sims interview as follows:

In another war, the best thing to do with our battleships would be to send them as far as possible up the Mississippi River, out of harm's way, and send out submarines and aircraft to do our fighting.

1. Something like a revolution in warfare is even now (1927) taking place.

2. Even before 1914, an influential school of naval thought had questioned the usefulness of the battleship. In England, Admiral Scott had become leader among those who regarded the battleship as obsolete.

3. Admiral Sims' article places emphasis on submarine, airplane, and airplane carrier.

4. In the Washington Conference of 1921-22, efforts were made to outlaw the submarine (by England), but this failed. Other powers, regarding the submarine as their best defense, would not consent.

5. Battleship is no longer an asset. Submarine and airplane have clipped the wings of sea power. Even a minor power could confront a blockading fleet with such a force of submarines and aircraft as would make maintenance of a blockade utterly impossible.

6. There is no defense against aircraft except aircraft and antiaircraft guns. Antiaircraft guns on board rolling ships would have much difficulty in hitting aircraft.

7. The development of the submarine has ended the possibility of any power in the future rating as mistress of the sea.

8. The nations will never agree on abolishing the submarine, and because it is here to stay the whole art of naval war has been remade.

9. With the disadvantage of having two ocean fronts to protect, the United States is compensated by the possession of vast oil resources on either front.

10. Our great population, resources, wealth, and industrial capacity constitute the surest guaranty of peace for a long time to come, provided we pursue wise policies of social and economic justice.

11. A separate department of aviation.

How much aircraft should we have for defense? The first thing to consider is not the enemy's number of battleships and cruisers,

but their force of air power. Find out how many planes their carriers will carry. Then we will need a force of airplanes sufficient to smother the enemy's planes. The enemy might possess thousands of airplanes, but we would be confronted only with such number as they could bring, with their equipment of carriers, to our coast.

12. A combination of powers might present a large superiority in battleships and cruisers. But to attack us they would have to move to our shores, and these vessels can carry only about enough oil for the round trip from Europe. In order to remain here and conduct a campaign they would have to bring colliers with fuel and have an advance base near our coast. So our means of defense against them would be principally mines and our submarines and aircraft, to pick off the colliers and other auxiliaries.

13. A bomb from a plane which falls in the water near the vessel sinks to a certain depth and explodes, like a depth charge, against the unprotected part of the ship below the water line. It is even more deadly than if it had fallen on deck.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLUTION IN NAVAL WAR ENDS REIGN OF THE BATTLESHIP—SCEPTER PASSES TO SUBMARINE AND AIRCRAFT, DECLARES ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS, AMERICAN NAVAL COMMANDER IN EUROPE IN WORLD WAR—NEW AND DEADLY INSTRUMENTS WILL RULE SEAS HEREAFTER—NAVAL BLOCKADE IS A THING OF THE PAST—ENTIRE ART OF NAVAL WAR HAS BEEN REMADE—UNITED STATES HAS ADVANTAGES NONE CAN MATCH—STARTLING REVELATIONS BY ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS, LEADING NAVAL AUTHORITY

In view of the assurance that a conference on reduction of naval armaments will be held this year, the opinions of America's foremost naval authority are timely. They are given in the following interview by Judson C. Welliver with Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, retired, commander of the American naval forces in Europe during the World War:

"In another war, the best thing to do with our battleships would be to send them as far as possible up the Mississippi River, out of harm's way, and send our submarines and aircraft to do our fighting."

Thus Admiral Sims summarized his view of the battleship. He made the startling suggestion quite casually, as later he did others equally revolutionary. He was seated in the library of his Newport home, whence he looks out philosophically upon the turbulent processes of things naval during this epoch of rapid change.

Admiral Sims continues in retirement the zealous student and original thinker on all problems of naval organization and sea power. For upon him has descended the mantle fashioned and first worn by Admiral Mahan, whose studies in sea power and world power gave a new understanding of these things.

When the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan meet at Geneva the coming summer to discuss further limiting naval armaments, the whole question of maritime power will enter a new phase. Something like a revolution is even now taking place.

Even before 1914 an influential school of naval thought had questioned the usefulness of the battleship. In England Admiral Scott had become leader among those who regarded the battleship as obsolete. Their views were urged with much earnestness and were combatted with corresponding fervor.

The Washington Conference on Naval Armaments, in 1921 and 1922, resulted in agreement of America, Britain, Japan, France, and Italy to limit battleship construction and fix a ratio of maximum strength in this unit. Efforts to outlaw the submarine failed, though strongly supported by Britain. Other powers, regarding the submarine as their best defense, would not consent. The conference, however, limited future men-of-war to 10,000 tons and 8-inch guns.

BATTLESHIP NEAR ITS END?

Though the Washington agreements were limited to 10 years, there is general belief they will be indefinitely extended and perhaps at last applied to smaller fighting craft. Will the battleship and battle cruiser become obsolete? Will the cruiser fleets ultimately be definitely restricted in numbers? Will the submarine the bombing hydroplane, the airplane carrier, and the destroyer presently become the controlling elements of naval power?

No American is better fitted by training, experience, and public confidence to judge future developments than William Sowden Sims, commander of American naval forces in Europe during the World War, and long head of the Navy War College. Discovered by President Roosevelt as a young officer of vigor and ideas, he was made inspector of target practice and naval aide. Ever since then, he has been close to all naval conflicts, whether in the forum or on the sea. President Wilson's choice of him for the European command met with universal approval.

SEA POWER'S WINGS CLIPPED

"The battleship was once the backbone of the fleet," declared Admiral Sims; "it is so no longer. The submarine and airplane have clipped the wings of sea power. Not merely have new instruments been devised, but the whole strategy of the seas has been changed. The naval blockade, by which the superior power closed the ports of the inferior and cut it off from communications, is of the past. Even a minor power could confront the blockading fleet with such a force of submarines and aircraft as would make maintenance of a blockade utterly impossible.

"The battleship is no longer an asset. If we can imagine a gun being invented to shoot a 3,000-pound projectile 20 miles from the deck of the fastest ship, and to make a substantial proportion of hits, that will suggest a parallel to what has happened to the battleship. There is no defense against aircraft except aircraft and anti-aircraft guns, and the latter have the greatest difficulty hitting a mark in the air. Even on the western front during the war guns placed on the solid earth are credited with requiring 65,000 shots to one hit against aircraft. And guns carried on the deck of a rolling ship would do still worse. As to the submarine, there is no answer. They are building now of 3,000 tons, carrying oil to circuit the world without refueling. They are safe, seaworthy, and habitable.

"At the Washington Conference, Britain sought to outlaw the submarine. If that had been done, her superiority in fighting craft and naval bases would have assured continuance of her naval supremacy. But the other nations would not agree. For them the submarine and airplane are the sure and comparatively inexpensive instruments of defense. The development of the submarine has ended the possibility of any power in future rating as mistress of the sea.

"ALMOST NO ATROCITIES

"Opponents of the submarine emphasize U-boat atrocities. But there were almost no atrocities. It was charged that submarines fired on boats filled with the people from vessels that had been sunk. In fact, there was only one solitary case of that sort. The U-boat commanders were of a high class. They frequently gave tow to the boatloads of survivors, helping them to rescue. In some cases when they had sunk vessels off the Irish coast and left their crews in boats, the submarines signaled Queenstown the location.

"Submarines operating in mid-Atlantic would capture a merchantman, put a prize crew on board, and use her as a base. As other vessels were sunk their people would be transferred to this base ship, which would be held until it was filled with their people. Then the submarine commander would turn the base ship over to its own crew with orders to beat it to the nearest port. The nations will never agree on abolishing the submarine, and because it is here to stay, the whole art of naval war has been remade."

AMERICA'S BIG ADVANTAGE

Admiral Sims' attention was called to the fact that the battleships *New York*, *Wyoming*, and *Utah*, the last three coal-burning battleships of our Navy, have been ordered converted into oil burners. With their conversion the entire line of battle of the American Navy will be composed of oil burners, while the British Fleet will still include five coal-burning battleships.

"The naval strategy of another war," said the admiral, "will be greatly concerned with assuring ample and continuous supplies of petroleum and its products because it is essential as fuel not only for surface craft, but even more so for submarines and aircraft. England, having no significant oil supplies at home, must keep open the routes to the Near East, the Middle East, the Straits Settlements, because from these she must get her oil. The United States would be concerned about communications with Mexico and the Caribbean countries and to keep the Panama Canal open for movement of oil between the east and west coasts. But the problem is not so urgent with us, because of our huge supplies of oil within our own borders. For a naval campaign in the Atlantic, the fighting craft, whether on the surface, in the air, or under the sea, would be supplied with oil from the eastern and midcontinent fields. If the war be in the Pacific, the California fields would assure ample supplies. With the disadvantage of having two ocean fronts to protect, the United States is compensated by the possession of vast oil resources on either front. Over 70 percent of the world's petroleum production is in the United States, and the industry has seen its greatest expansion in the years since oil began to be used as maritime fuel.

VITAL NEED OF OIL

"Naval people know that Britain has established great stores of oil at her bases all over the world; Japan likewise has accumulated vast reserves of this munition. All navies are now on the oil-burning basis, because oil requires less space, can be more conveniently stored aboard ship, produces 50 or 60 percent more power per ton, and requires a considerably smaller crew. No other naval power possesses its own oil as does the United States; yet so important is oil that there were times during the war when English commanders were under orders not to proceed at more than one-half or three-quarters speed, except when confronting the enemy, in order to conserve oil."

Asked if the American Government had established any great oil stores as insurance against war exigencies, Admiral Sims replied that he was not informed, aside from the well-known fact that large reserves had been set up in the Hawaiian Islands. "But, having resources and production of oil available on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts," he added, "that is not so necessary in our case."

END OF NAVAL ERA

Conversion of the last three American battleships to oil burning was, in Admiral Sims' view, an interesting incident, but not a vitally important one. Yet it marks the end of an era in the Navy's history. That era was introduced in 1815, when Robert Fulton built for the Government the first steam-driven warship. She was called the *Fulton*, and though of only 38 tons was described as a "fire-eating monster." For a century thereafter coal produced the Navy's steam power; then in 1914 came the battleship *Nevada*, one of the first of our oil burners. Since then oil has become the standard fuel in all navies.

"The fact that the Allies had the great oil resources of the United States to draw on is now recognized as one of the important factors in giving them victory, said Admiral Sims. "But in general the war's demonstration of the industrial and financial capacity of the United States forced a revision of all calculations regarding the seats of power in this world. Our immediate adoption of universal service, the prompt registration of 10,000,000 men under the Universal Service Act, the proof of our unparalleled ability to produce the necessaries of life and of war, the transport of 2,000,000 troops to France in circumstances which the enemy had believed made such a movement impossible, the demonstration of our enormous financial capacity—all these things compelled a sweeping recasting of all calculations about locations and alinements of power. Our great population, resources, wealth, and industrial capacity constitute the surest guaranty of peace for a long future, provided we pursue wise policies. Having no reason for aggression, our Naval Establishment should be adapted to assure the best defense.

AN AIRCRAFT FORMULA

"For instance, as to our requirements of aircraft. Suppose we confront an alliance of 2 powers against which we must defend ourselves. The first thing to be considered is not their combined number of battleships and cruisers, but their force of airplane carriers. Assume that the 2 powers together have 6 carriers with a capacity of 50 planes each. Then we must be prepared to deal with 300 airplanes along our coast, for the modern airplane carrier is considerably faster than a battleship and has a cruising radius of 6,000 or 7,000 miles. So we will need a force of airplanes sufficient to smother the enemy's 300. The enemy might possess thousands of airplanes, but we would be confronted only with such number as he could bring, with his equipment of carriers, to our coast.

"A combination of powers might present a large superiority in battleships and cruisers. But to attack us they would have to steam to our shores, and these vessels can carry only about enough oil for the round-up from Europe. In order to remain here and conduct a campaign they would have to bring colliers with fuel and have an advance base near our coast, and so our problem of defense against them would be principally with our submarines and aircraft, to pick off and sink the colliers and other auxiliaries. On the basis of experience and demonstrations that would be no difficult task, for the big planes can carry a bomb of from 2,000 to 4,000 pounds. Dropped on the deck of any fighting ship or in the water within a short distance on either side, one bomb would finish her, and the proportion of hits in such operations is so high that the fleet would have no chance. It is not commonly understood how big a target a battleship presents to a bomber. If the ship be 600 feet long and 100 feet beam, then a great bomb that strikes her, or within 50 feet on either side, will be fatal; its target represents an area 600 by 200 feet. The bomb which falls in the water near the vessel sinks to a certain depth and explodes, like a depth charge, against the unprotected part of the ship, below the water line. It is even more deadly than if it had fallen on deck.

MODEL NAVY OF FUTURE

"The Navy of the future should be particularly strong in aircraft carriers. We have one, the *Langley*, completed; an experimental craft of only 15 knots. The *Saratoga* and *Lexington*, which are nearing completion, will carry 75 planes each and make about 30 knots an hour against perhaps 23 for a battleship. With such a speed a carrier's program is to keep out of range of the battleships and cruisers and send her aircraft out to bomb them.

"Instead of building more cruisers of 10,000 tons, which are permitted under the Washington Conference agreement, sound naval practice would be to construct aircraft carriers. The battleships and cruisers, with their steaming radius of about 6,000 miles, are not to be compared to submarines, with four times that radius. It must be remembered that normally the submarine steams on the surface, going below only when there are reasons for concealment.

THE MODERN SUBMARINE

"The big, new submarines can do around 100 miles under water at 7 or 8 knots. On the surface they use oil for power; under the surface, electricity from storage batteries. A submarine can lay mines anywhere, even across the widest ocean. If it be suggested that the chance of sinking shipping with mines is rather remote, my reply is that at the height of the submarine campaign the British Admiralty was using 600 vessels constantly as mine sweepers to keep clear the approaches to harbors of the British Isles. That many vessels were lost to other services for which they would have been enormously useful."

Discussion turned to the forthcoming armament conference recommended by our Government, and the admiral observed that, of course, the nation which initiates such a conference assumes serious responsibilities because the success or failure of the conference at once becomes partly a political question. In order to secure results that will make the conference a success, the country concerned is liable to have to trade off some of its own interests. "For example," he said, "at the Washington Conference, in order to get Japan to accept the 5–5–3 ratio, the United States agreed not further to fortify any of its bases west of the Hawaiian Islands. This hamstrings us in the Pacific and means that in case of war the Japanese would immediately seize the Philippines and Guam, and in an effort to retake them we would be handicapped by having no naval base in all the 4,000 miles between Hawaii and the Philippines. The compact not to fortify Guam was a mistake, but was forced upon us because Japan demanded a quid pro quo for accepting the 5–5–3 ratio."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1940, pp. 563–564]

BATTLESHIPS ARE NOT OF MUCH BENEFIT IN MODERN WARFARE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is my conviction that battleships are not of much benefit in modern warfare. I think they are only targets for the enemy air forces. I read a squib in a newspaper the other day, or heard it stated, that if a few more of Great Britain's capital ships were sunk, in the event the King desired to inspect his fleet he might have to put on a diving suit.

It is proposed to expend multiplied millions in building battleships. I voted for some of those bills. When I cast my vote I was not satisfied that I was casting a sound vote. I am not satisfied now that I cast sound votes in voting multiplied millions of dollars with which to build battleships.

* * * * * * *

I am advised that a bomb falling near a battleship is more destructive than if the bomb hits the battleship. The ships being sunk today are not being sunk by direct hits, as a rule; they are sunk by torpedoes, and there is no torpedo boat that can shoot a torpedo through the water in such a way as to pierce a battleship and sink it. The damage is not done by the piercing quality of the torpedo; it is done by the explosion of the torpedo. At the end of the torpedo there is a fuze so that when the torpedo hits the battleship it explodes and the concussion, away from the battleship, blows the battleship in two, or blows it in, and destroys it.

IF THE AIR FORCES COULD FIND THE BATTLESHIPS THEY WOULD NOT LAST ANY TIME

As to the relative merits of battleships and the air force, and artillery and infantry, that is another matter about which I am not prepared to give any expert advice. I have my conviction. I do not think battleships are worth very much in present warfare. I am advised unofficially that the greatest English battleship is hid; it cannot be found. If it is hid, of what use is it? It is the greatest ship in the world. If it is hid, it is serving no useful purpose. If that be true, it is my opinion that if we should build up a great navy in the United States and war should come, and some naval power should attack the United States, the safest place in the world would be on one of our battleships. The chances are that the battleships, unless we had a preponderance of power, would be somewhere away up the Mississippi River where they would be perfectly safe. They would have to be in some such place, because if the air forces could find the battleships, they would not last any time. If what our committee saw in San Francisco can be done anywhere in America, a battleship would have no chance whatever.

The battleship today has no chance against the modern bombers with their bombs. The only chance of security is for the same nation that has the battleships to have more bombing planes and more pursuit planes and more of other kinds of planes than the enemy has, so that if a plane attempts to attack our battleships, we can send our planes to meet the enemy planes, and if an enemy squadron makes an attack, we can send a squadron to meet the enemy squadron, and fight it out in the air.

Training Men To Do Skilled Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein articles contained in numerous newspapers showing the necessity for training men to do skilled mechanical work:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record of May 7, 1940]

SKILLED WORKERS AND SCHOOLS

If Wilkes-Barre's school system is to be geared closely to community needs it is likely that renewed attention will have to be given, at a time not far off, to the question of vocational training. Wyoming Valley has been acquiring new industrial plants and already notice has come from several sources that the task of finding skilled workers to man them is becoming more difficult. In view of widespread unemployment, which is still a plague in Wyoming Valley, this may seem strange. But the long period of dullness has made for few apprentices during the last decade and if the hoped-for industrial expansion spreads to this community, as it showns signs of doing, the scarcity of qualified workers will manifest itself acutely and operate against getting additional new plants.

How far the schools could supply the lack through vocational training is debatable, but there is no question that young men with such schooling will be more acceptable for jobs and further training

than those without such a background. The problem which is presenting itself should be examined with a view to determining what the schools can do to contribute to its solution.

[From the Washington Post of May 18, 1940]

LABOR AND DEFENSE

The best-laid plans for national defense, backed by ample funds for financing them, still depend for their execution upon the availability of an adequate labor force. With millions of men unemployed it is a paradoxial fact that the recruitment of a working force capable of turning out modern implements of warfare on a tremendously expanded scale will, nevertheless, be extremely difficult.

Ironical though it seems, the prolonged and widespread depression has already led to labor shortages in many industries requiring the services of skilled men. That is because the depression discouraged the training of apprentices and forced a disproportionately large number of applicants for skilled work into the unskilled labor market. In face of this lingering situation our industrialists are today suddenly confronted by the challenge of a huge defense program.

It has to be remembered that wherever the shortage of skilled labor is acute unfinished work will pile up and precious time, as well as money, will be lost. In short, the industries engaged in work for the defense program not only require a great deal of skilled labor, but that labor must have diversified training to prevent industrial bottle necks from developing.

It is apparent, therefore, that a great deal of time and money will have to be devoted to preliminary training programs in preparation for the plant expansion required to satisfy our defense needs. President Roosevelt has admitted that necessity, and suggested the possibility of broader training programs under Government direction. But the main responsibility will have to be assumed by industrial leaders familiar with the problems presented and equipped with facilities for instructing novices. It is encouraging that this problem of manpower is already the subject of earnest discussion among industrial experts representing manufacturing companies.

Concerns engaged in the production of aircraft have already been slowed up by the lag in production of aircraft engines, and handicapped by a shortage of trained flight crews. To reach the contemplated yearly airplane output of 50,000 units would, therefore, necessitate much more than a quadrupling of existing productive capacity.

Under the circumstances, it looks as if labor shortage may well prove the major obstacle to speedy attainment of the goals set by the defense program. That will certainly be the case unless extensive and varied training programs are launched with a minimum of delay.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of May 13, 1940]

WORKERS MUST BE TRAINED IF UNITED STATES IS TO BE PREPARED

America faces the task of getting its industrial machinery geared to a preparedness basis. It is more than a problem of material resources alone; it involves our human resources. For there probably is not now in the country sufficient trained manpower to operate our industrial plant at full speed—this despite the fact that there are some 9,000,000 or more persons able and eager to work who cannot find employment.

At our present rate of industrial operations local labor shortages are being reported with increasing frequency from various parts of the country. New or expanding industries, such as plastics, rayon, lithographing, say they cannot find enough trained workers to meet their needs. Thousands of jobs are open for persons possessing occupational skills or basic training—even in some of the long-established industries.

At Hartford, Conn., the State trade school has been operating on a multiple-shift basis during the last 5 months in an effort to meet the demand of local industry for machinists and machine operators. A night course, running from 10 p. m. to 6:30 a. m., offers 5 weeks of basic training. Graduates are qualified for employment at the end of 5 weeks of basic training but they are expected to learn details of their work on the job. While there is no pretense that finished machinists can be turned out with 5 weeks of training, the utility of short courses is demonstrated by reports from Cleveland that employers are hiring men out of trade schools there before they have completed regular machinists' courses.

Vocational schools are being kept busy supplying the need for workers in the fast-expanding aviation industry. From Buffalo it is reported that every graduate of the aviation mechanics' course offered in the public schools since 1934 is now employed in the local or nearby aviation industry or is working in related enterprises. Hundreds of applicants have been turned away from this course in recent years because of inadequate facilities for their training.

In Michigan, where the vocational education program is well advanced, a short course for resort employees was conducted for the first time last year. The school system lacked facilities so resort managers permitted the use of their structures for the course. It is being repeated this year in preparation for the vacation season.

In Pennsylvania a reemployment campaign found there were about 20,000 jobs that could be filled if trained workers were available. It discovered 300 classifications in which there are shortages of employables.

One factor which complicates the employment picture is the fact that many workers who have been unemployed for long periods have lost touch with their trades and are not familiar with new developments. This explains why some employers may complain they cannot find trained machinists while a local machinists' union declares hundreds of its members are out of work. Retraining programs are being started in many localities to "freshen up" older workers. A recent survey in a large city recently showed there were nearly four times as many workers in a going industry who had reached or were about to reach the retirement age as there were workers at the learning age to replace them.

Efforts now are being made nationally, through cooperation with local public-school officials, to plan and execute vocational education programs to meet actual needs. Each program is worked out locally by the school system with the help of advisory committees composed of representatives of labor, industry, and other interested groups. These committees undertake to determine the present and prospective needs for workers in the various fields in the locality and gear the training program to meet these needs. Vocational guidance is given to individual students through the schools.

The number of men available from a military-defense standpoint, or the industrial machinery that is available, depends upon training and not mere population. We have a vast reservoir of material resources and we likewise have a great reservoir of manpower. But sheer statistics do not provide adequate defenses nor preparation for a war's needs. Our physical strength has deteriorated from disuse just as has much of our industrial machine. We need seriously a practical training program for our jobless, whether it is in the interest of preparedness or just in anticipation of prosperous peacetime employment.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 16, 1940]

ROOSEVELT'S PLANE PROGRAM WOULD EXPAND UNITED STATES FACTORIES

WASHINGTON, May 16.—Spokesmen for airplane manufacturers said here today that President Roosevelt's request for an annual production of 50,000 military and naval planes would mean a great deal of plant expansion and far more extensive use of subcontracts than at present.

Present annual production, as the President said, is something over 6,000 planes. By the end of 1940 the output will be stepped up to between 12,000 and 15,000 units.

Any such expansion program as the President now proposes, representatives of the industry said, would mean the freezing of production to a few types of aircraft, as has been done in Germany, elimination of practically all further experimentation, and letting out of many more contracts for airplane parts than at present.

Bottleneck of the problem of stepping up production, they said, is chiefly in the engine industry, where there has been a limited number of skilled machine-tool mechanics available.

SCHEDULE EXPECTATIONS

The industry spokesmen said they doubted if any great expansion in production schedules could bring results much before the end of the year.

In normal times, in 1936 and 1937, the aviation industry was producing only about 1,000 military planes a year. The Army today possesses a total of only about 2,800.

Today, 14 companies, working an average of 2 shifts, are engaged in producing combatant equipment for the United States and foreign Governments. Included are Bell Aircraft, Boeing, Brewster, Consolidated, Curtiss, Douglas, Grumman, Lockheed, Northrop, North American, Glenn L. Martin, and Republic.

Active producers of warcraft engines are Allison, Pratt & Whitney, Wright, Ranger, Vought-Sikorsky, and Vultee.

Plans for plane production expansion also bring up the problem of pilot training. "There is no use having capacity to produce 40,000 or 50,000 airplanes a year if we are not to have the men to fly them," Senator Sherman Minton (D) of Indiana, remarked in the Senate.

TOTAL PILOTS

It is estimated that if the United States today called up all reserve pilots, including the 10,000 being trained for civil flying under Civil Aeronautics Authority college courses, the total would not be more than 25,000.

Under the Army training schedule, expanded last June, approximately 396 new applicants are entering the Army flying schools every 6 weeks now, but on March 31, the total strength of the Air Corps was 2,037 officers and 995 reserves.

The C. A. A. is training 9,072 student aviators in the Nation's colleges and 760 in noncollege courses. Another 1,442 have already won their C. A. A. certificates.

It is estimated that there are not more than 3,500 enlisted mechanics available at the present time.

President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress today, made it clear that he would spend a large portion of the $100,000,000 he asked of Congress to put in his own hands, for the training of additional aviation personnel.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of May 16, 1940]

ORGANIZED DRIVE TO TRAIN APPRENTICES SEEN AS NEED—INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE REPORT TO PRESIDENT ON SKILLED WORKERS STRESSES TIGHT MARKET—SURVEY NOW UNDER WAY TO DETERMINE FUTURE REQUIREMENTS

WASHINGTON, May 15.—An emergency calling for mobilization of the skilled manpower of the country at this time would find

methods and facilities for training such workers inadequate, President Roosevelt has been told by labor and business leaders, it was learned today, although assured that despite a relatively tight labor market, plants devoted to immediate employee wants filled.

A report from the Interdepartmental Committee on Apprentice Training is understood to have just gone to the President for his consideration in connection with the emergency defense program which he will tomorrow transmit to Congress.

While details of this report are being withheld from publication at this time, it is believed that it stresses the need for apprentice training on an organized basis. Such program already is in operation in several airplane fuselage and engine plants, and it is understood that the recommendation is made in the report that all such plants, and others that might be engaged in war implements production to do the same thing.

It is stressed that the problem of obtaining skilled workers in a sufficient number to meet emergency needs cannot be solved in 6 months, nor yet a year, but if the period of disaster that has been created abroad is going to be extended for 3 years, as forecast by British Ambassador Lord Lothian, much progress can be made within that time to safeguard our own industrial interests.

A survey is now under way by Government agencies of workers in skilled occupations to determine future requirements and reach conclusions as to how to meet the need. Seriousness of the possibilities that an emergency would find the country short-handed in essential industries is being stressed by many officials who have faced the opposition of organized labor to workers expansion programs, and lack of interest on the part of many industrialists to bothering with large numbers of learners.

It is insisted that a good showing can be made for vast apprentice training for the airplane and machine-tool industries without making a census, but it is in other lines, where the need is less obvious, that statistical data will be found desirable in the presentation of the actual employment situation.

Meanwhile James W. Young, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, reported today that a census of labor in key industries of the United Kingdom is being undertaken in connection with the planning of production and effective distribution of available labor. The result of the census will not be made public. Allocation of raw materials to the key industries is also being studied with a view to integrating production, Mr. Young revealed.

The only alternative to apprentice training is dilution of labor—the simplification of jobs so that one man would have but one portion assigned to him, where, if properly trained, he could complete a whole operation. That has been resorted to in Great Britain despite opposition of organized labor there, and prevailed in the United States during the first World War and found very unsatisfactory.

It was related today that then hundreds of airplane motors were made that could not raise airplanes from the ground because tolerances were so great as to create mechanical monstrosities. Expansion of the airplane-motor industry to 35,000 units per annum, as contemplated, may present some difficulties, which, however, will start with the tool and die industry upon which engine manufacturers have to rely for equipment.

NO ABSOLUTE SHORTAGE

While this is not an easy labor market, it does not seem to present a situation where there is an absolute shortage that would place a limitation on present production. There is certainly not a large number of skilled metal-trades workers unemployed, and the doubling of plant operations would present real difficulties, but over a period of time enough workers could be recruited, largely by shifts from other lines, to meet needs.

For instance, there are unemployed garage mechanics, railroad shopmen, locomotive engineers, and other craftsmen who could be retrained for new duties in relatively short periods of time, labor officials said today. From their ranks also there could be recruited men for further training for the operation of tanks, it not being possible to take the average youth and put him inside such a moving fortress and expect him to be able to operate and repair it in time of need—that takes a mechanic trained in his work.

In Government reports it is emphasized that in time of peace it is desirable to train men as skilled workers for they cannot be matriculated in a couple of months, equipped to do a real mechanical job. The turning out of efficient tool and die workers takes upward of 2 years, and that is true of many lines of endeavor.

Boeing, Lockheed, Pratt & Whitney, and Sperry Gyroscope are pointed to as companies that are looking ahead to the training of men for the airplane industry, having put into effect, under supervision of a joint management-labor committee, a system of training for young men on a 4-year basis. Interest of the engine companies is in mechanics, while those of the fuselage builders would be in such trades as sheet-metal workers and four or five other crafts that they employ.

LABOR IS COOPERATING

Organized labor has maintained all along that it could not tolerate a system of wholesale training of skilled workers, but in the present situation labor leaders appear to be working most harmoniously with management and Government representatives in providing training for the future. A joint committee determines what number of additions to the trained force are needed and that, according to Government officials, is tending to solve a troublesome part of the labor problem.

It was indicated that the President, in asking an emergency defense appropriation at this time, will seek also authorization to enter into arrangements for production that will not begin until the fiscal year 1941. Such a program would better enable industries to size up their labor and materials requirements and materially cut down the lag between acceptance of and delivery under a Government contract.

[From the Philadelphia Ledger of May 11, 1940]

SKILLED LABOR NEEDED HERE

Philadelphia industry is suffering an acute shortage of skilled labor as industrial leaders push through extensive apprenticeship programs to train younger men for the day when aged hands will no longer be able to bear the brunt of increasing demands.

Particularly scarce in this area, plant executives report, are die and tool makers, large lathe and plane operators, template makers, draftsmen, grinders, and gage checkers. To meet present and future demands for workers, virtually every large industry here already has installed 3- and 4-year courses of practice-study.

ARSENAL NEEDS MEN

Probably the hardest hit locally is the Frankford Arsenal, which has sent out appeal after appeal for skilled mechanics and machinists. Facing a situation where it must compete with private industry to secure its labor—and private industry is jealously guarding what it has—the arsenal has jobs abegging at $6.80 per day and $2,200 per year.

With unemployment at its present level, it necessarily follows that there is no dearth of workers in the less skilled class and news of such shortages invariably brings forth an army of unemployed whose only claim to experience is that the applicants once hammered a nail or ground an automobile valve.

KEEP EYES OPEN

Several large industries, such as Westinghouse and SKF, who foresaw the trend, report that at present they have not felt the pinch although even they have their eyes open for the unemployed skilled man.

"We can't just pick them off the shelf," declared J. G. Morgan, manager of industrial relations at the Lester branch of Westinghouse. "Our products require a maximum of accuracy and we are training our own men for ourselves."

An SKF official, recently returned from a trip through the New England plants of his company, declared that everywhere plants "are crying for skilled mechanics and machinists." He said his company now has the largest class of apprentices in its history.

Refund to Railroad Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7986, the purpose of which is to make it possible for the railroad boys in Kentucky, Louisiana, Alabama, California, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Jersey to get refund on certain moneys paid by them into the State unemployment commission of their respective States.

It seems that these States passed laws creating a State unemployment commission, as did the other 41 States, but the 7 States named collected from the employer and the employee according to the provisions of their State laws. In regard to the railways, the other 41 States collected from the employer only. On July 1, 1939, the Railroad Retirement Board took over all railroad employees' compensation and requested that all State funds be turned over to it, which, as I see it, is wholly unfair to the railroad employees of these 7 States, where both employer and employee paid into the fund, by compelling them to pay from their salaries into a fund which they must share equally with the employees of 41 other States. In the State of Kentucky there are approximately 40,000 railroad employees, who paid into this fund $1,038,000, or an average of around $25 per employee. It seems to me that my railroad boys are being penalized to the tune of about $25 per employee for living in the State of Kentucky. I know the membership of this House will agree with me that the Congress had no such intentions when the Railroad Retirement Act was passed, and that it still has no such intentions. I have the firm conviction that the Congress will right this wrong, and I am appealing to you to help pass, this session, legislation toward this end.

Since the introduction of my bill, I have been striving to get the committee to take some action; not a week has passed that I have not, on two or three occasions, urged and pleaded for action. I was able to get a subcommittee appointed and a hearing by the subcommittee at which it was agreed that, since several had introduced bills after the introduction of my bill, someone from the Railroad Retirement Board, the author of the bill, which was apparently sponsored by the Board, and myself get together and work out an agreeable bill to all of us. I have called time after time and seem to find no interest except what I show myself, and all the while these boys are doing without their money that should never have been taken from them.

I have run into some of the oddest arguments in my efforts to do something about this I have ever listened to. One person told me he thought it would set a bad precedent; that if this were done it would be used as an argument for other refunds. This is about as flat an argument as I have ever heard. That is like your saying to John, when he asks you for that $5 you have of his, "Yes, John, I have your $5 and could give it to you, but if I do I have $5 that belongs to George and he will want his, too, so I cannot afford to let you have yours." Another argument is that not more than 60 percent of them will ever ask for it. That is downright ridiculous. Imagine any man, let him be a railroad man or any other, not going after $25 that is due him when he knows that money is waiting for him. And, granting that some of them would be reluctant to ask for it, is that any reason why those who do ask should not have it if it is due them? These arguments are mighty flimsy when you look at them, but the worst one and the most ridiculous one of all was made by the person who said that these men were just a bunch of roughnecks and spendthrifts, and that it would not do them any good if they got it. The very nature of the work they do requires them to be strong and robust and in good physical condition at all times. Twenty-three years of my life have been spent in a county where one of the greatest, if not the greatest, railroad yards in the world is located, and my daily contact with the railroad men has long ago convinced me, as it would you if you came in contact with them, that no better or finer group of men ever placed foot on God's good earth. I have seen them, when a neighbor was in distress, pass a hat during their 30-minute lunch hour and, I dare say, get a bigger donation than could be gotten under the same circumstances out of a similar sized body anywhere, not even excluding this body. And their wives, I say to you, I have never lived by a more wholesome, neighborly, Christianlike people than the fine womanhood found in the homes of these men.

I am for the railroad boys, I believe in them, and I love them, because I know that under those greasy overalls there beats a heart that is just as pure as yours or mine. For the sake of justice, for the sake of equality, I ask each of you to assist in getting this refund for these men.

David Lawrence Criticizes Roosevelt for Playing Politics With National Defense

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, ever since President Roosevelt's fireside speech last Sunday night many Americans have been wondering about the exact status of a national-defense system described by its Commander in Chief as "being on hand or on order." David Lawrence, in the following article, sheds some needed light on the reasons for the President's unusual speech:

(By David Lawrence)

Uneasy over events abroad, the entire Washington situation is crystallizing rapidly into one of great concern lest America be caught napping in the swiftly developing maelstrom of world war entanglements.

President Roosevelt is on the defensive politically. Far from being an asset, the newly created emergency has already become a liability to the administration. The Republican Party will shortly ask the American people to change the national administration on the grounds of incompetence, just as the British turned out Prime Minister Chamberlain.

The particular grievance which is shaping up as the basis for an intense battle in the Presidential campaign is the unpreparedness of America at perhaps the gravest crisis that has come in a century in world affairs.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech last Sunday night alienated supporters rather than helped him. This is because when a President sees fit to discuss defense details and combines in his statement airplanes available and those on order so that the public cannot tell the difference, it is a sign that political considerations are guiding national policy rather than frank presentations of weaknesses.

CANDOR NEEDED FOR CONFIDENCE

Most people will go along with the administration when it ceases to play politics and indulge in adroit maneuvers based on the theory that peacetime methods will be sufficient to meet criticism. The truth is action and candor alone will bring confidence.

The latest step—the appointment of a seven-man council of defense in an advisory capacity—can only bring from American businessmen sighs of regret and poignant disappointment that the administration in Washington doesn't know its selections are recognized as window dressing. To put captains of industry into the defense council without giving them any authority to act and at the same time to put in that same defense council the very men who have been baiting business for the last several years is not to create or build confidence among the industrial men of the country. The President has made a grievous mistake.

The factories and their managements will cooperate to the utmost—their patriotism will take care of that—but industry cannot be sanguine about reaching the goal—efficient production. It may well be asked why it is that Germany—a bankrupt nation with a meager supply of gold—can build the biggest defense system the world has ever known. The reason is that the Nazis didn't use gold or money, but labor. A nation can get along without money if it can get enforced labor.

NO HOPE IN BLAME

In France the defense mechanism fell down because the left wing broke up armament production with laws providing a 40-hour week while German workers toiled 60 or more hours a week. America cannot build an adequate defense unless some of the left-wing legislation now on the statute books is modified so as to accelerate production in the defense industries. The President refuses to accept that view. He may prefer to take responsibility for a failure of America to get enough airplanes for defense, but it may be too late some day to fix responsibility on any one man, just as it is today in France and Britain. Nobody today can repair the mistakes made 2 and 3 years ago by an incompetent administration in Britain and France.

In America where criticism is unrestricted, the people may not wish to give the Roosevelt administration any more opportunities to bungle the defense program. They may demand an instant change in tactics or else there may be a change at the polls. In many respects it is a fortunate coincidence that a presidential campaign is at hand because the people will have a chance to vote on whether the defense record of the present administration should be upheld or repudiated at the polls.

G. O. P. CONGRESS MAY WATCH

Also, whether or not the President is reelected may become a question distinct from the necessity of electing a Republican majority in both Houses, because evidently the members of the President's own party are too subservient to his wishes to take care of the national security of the people of the United States by assuring efficient production. When the President says there is no emergency which requires modification of existing labor laws, he is committing America to an effort to build up its defense not only at high labor costs but on a basis that cannot possibly give America the planes, the tanks, the battleships, and the weapons of war needed at the earliest possible moment to protect the United States against any or all attacks.

Public opinion is something powerful enough to affect a President in times of crisis, especially when it manifests itself plainly. The trouble is that the facts have been camouflaged or glossed over. The people do not know how inadequate are our national defenses to meet the kind of emergencies that may arise. They are willing, however, to let bygones be bygones and forget the past if there is any sign that the new policies will assure the attainment of the desired result. It is because the administration prefers to play politics with national defense and refuses to open up the governmental power to all classes that business and industry will find itself pervaded with a sense of disappointment where there should be eagerness and enthusiasm and a high morale.

Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have discussed Russian relations in an article in Liberty magazine this week. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Liberty of June 8, 1940]

SHALL WE BREAK WITH RUSSIA?

(By Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG)

It is about time the smug, complacent American attitude—the "it can't happen here" state of mind—gave way to vigilance and vigor in dealing with the problem of communistic treachery inside the United States.

That problem is no longer academic. It calls for elementary precaution, as would the protection of our homes against bacteria that mean death.

Upon treachery the technique of aggression is largely built. We know that now. We saw in Norway precisely how it works. It capitalizes treason, and glories in doing so. In Norway it happened to be Mr. Hitler's agents "who stole the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in." Mr. Stalin's technique, as the United States has already experienced it, is no different except, for the time being, in degree.

Norway can do nothing about it now. But it is not too late for the United States to do something about its own kindred jeopardy.

We want no vipers in our bosom. Yet we have them, and we know that their supreme purpose is to strike against us with fatal poison if and when Moscow signals. There may not be many of them—relatively. But there weren't many traitors in Norway, relatively, either.

In the United States the chief symbol of treachery is the notorious broken contract between Commissar Litvinoff and President Roosevelt. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—better known as Bolshevik Russia—has repeatedly and conclusively violated the terms of its agreement with the Government of the United States under which we "recognized" Moscow in 1933. It is continuously engaged, directly or indirectly, in a conspiracy to undermine the Government of the United States and ultimately to overthrow it by force. It not only believes in "world revolution" as an abstract objective; it is constantly attempting to promote this objective inside the United States.

This is not merely a matter of opinion. It is a conclusion of fact which is sustained by the official records of the Government of the United States. It is my opinion that we are guilty of complete folly if we suffer in silence and in acquiescence this violation of our rights.

I am not talking about going to war with Russia or about anything of the kind. I am proposing no desertion of the code of neutrality, to which I hope this country is permanently committed. I am talking about the fact that our diplomatic relations with Russia are based on a contract. We extended "official recognition" to Moscow on the basis of the specific pledges contained in the Litvinoff-Roosevelt correspondence of 1933. The pledges have been violated. The contract has been broken. Therefore there is no further justification for the relationship which was established, and which has been contingent upon the integrity of these pledges and the fulfillment of this contract. We should revert to the basis of relationship which existed prior to 1933.

If we are willing indefinitely to condone this breach, Moscow will get a wrong idea about its immunities under the American flag. On the other hand, plain talk and conclusive action now in respect to this matter which is wholly within our own jurisdiction and control and wholly within our obvious right may save a peck of trouble day after tomorrow.

The United States is the one and only republic in the New World which still maintains diplomatic relations with the Soviets. North America, Central America, and South America are a unit upon this score—with the single exception of our own country. If there were nothing else to awaken us (and there is plenty), we should be put upon notice by this unanimous anti-Russian attitude of united Pan America that we need to have a powerful reason for officially fraternizing with the Bolsheviks. There is no such reason. On the contrary, powerful reason runs the other way and recommends that we harmonize our attitude with that of our good neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. The distinction of being the only Bolshevik bedfellow in the New World must be as distasteful as it is lonely.

Of course it is none of our business what kind of government the Soviets have inside their own territory. They can be as communistic and as ruthless there as they please. But, by the same token, it is none of Russia's business what kind of government we have inside our own United States. We have no right to interfere in their internal affairs. They have no right to interfere in ours. That is what this question is all about.

When the Soviets took charge of Russia in President Wilson's time, we realized the impropriety and the hazard of having any official relationship with the heart and center of an ambitious world revolution. Secretary of State Colby, under President Wilson, declined to recognize Moscow in one of the most powerful state papers ever written. The Harding administration took the same view. Secretary of State (now Chief Justice) Hughes said: "There is conclusive evidence that those in control of Moscow have not given up their original purpose of destroying existing governments whenever they can do so throughout the world." President Coolidge next declined recognition on similar grounds. Then came the Hoover regime, and still the same consistent attitude, to which Secretary of State Kellogg gave expression.

Then came President Roosevelt and 1933 and the New Deal. Whatever it proved to be for us, it certainly did prove to be a new deal for the Hammer and the Sickle. President Roosevelt concluded to end this long-time breach. But he knew that he was dealing with treachery, so he sought to tie its hands. Commissar Litvinov came over and agreed to everything the President asked. They exchanged a series of international love letters, all dated November 16, 1933. Russia signed up to compose her debts to us.

Still more important—and fundamental to everything else—Russia agreed also to quit all relationships with internal revolution inside the United States or with any agencies over there or over here which should be engaged in "any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States * * * and in particular any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States."

On the strength of these unctuous assurances—despite the probability that they were not worth the paper they were written on—the President recognized the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We opened our gates, we extended our hospitalities to the agents of communism. Then things began to happen.

It did not take long to demonstrate that the leopard had not changed its spots; that the undependable Russia of yesterday was still the undependable Russia of today; that we were the victims of an atrociously bad bargain.

First, the debt negotiations promptly broke down. Russia owed us what is now $395,000,000. There were some desultory conversations on the subject—a sort of shadow-box pretense at preliminary good faith. But on January 31, 1935, the State Department issued an official statement which concluded: "In view of the present attitude of the Soviet Government we feel that we cannot encourage the hope that any agreement is now possible."

It never was possible. It never has been. There never has been any sort of agreement. Soviet Russia is just as much of a defaulter as she was on the pious day when she agreed to quit being one. Thus came the first disillusionment. But that was relatively inconsequential, because there were plenty of other defaulters. Six months later, however, we came to grips with the things that really count.

Our ordinarily placid State Department wrote Moscow that the Seventh All World Congress of the Communist Internationale—plotting its world revolution here as elsewhere—was guilty of "flagrant violation of the pledge given by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on November 16, 1933, with respect to noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States." It said the Government of the United States "would be lacking in candor if it failed to state frankly that it anticipates the most serious consequences if the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is unwilling or unable to take appropriate measures to prevent further acting in disregard of the solemn pledge."

Russia rather contemptuously dismissed the protest as meaning nothing. She had what she wanted. She declined to admit guilt or to do anything about correcting the intolerable situation. But the State Department simply wrote another note convicting Moscow of "a clean-cut disregard and disavowal of the pledge by the Soviet Government." Incidentally, when Secretary of State Hull responded in January 1940, to my Senate resolution asking for this official record, he said that we had an "irrefutable case" against Moscow in 1935. Irrefutable! But nothing happened. We swallowed the offense charged, and carried on in our injured innocence. The offense charged was a participation in an effort internally to overthrow the Government of the United States by force.

In 1936 Rear Admiral Taussig, testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, said: "Members of the Third Internationale are very active in the United States in furtherance of their plan for world revolution, which includes the overthrow of our present form of government." I felt that this exhibit, coming as it did from a high officer of our own Government, carried with it an

authenticity which could not be ignored. So I called this testimony to the attention of our State Department. Nothing happened.

Now we come down to 1940. A committee of the House of Representatives to investigate un-American propaganda activities officially reported on January 3:

"Hundreds of pages of testimony have established the fact that the Communist Party of the United States can make no more than a superficial claim that it is a political party in the sense in which the American people understand those words. It is, on the contrary, a constituent member of the Communist Internationale and is its agent in the United States. The Communist Internationale in turn is completely dominated by the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. The committee feels that a careful examination of the facts justifies the assertion that the Communist Party of the United States is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party. The committee is forced to conclude that in practice the Communist Party is actually functioning as a border patrol on American shores for a foreign power—the Soviet Union. Since the Communist Party of the United States has the avowed purpose of drastically changing the form of government of the United States, it is the opinion of the committee that the party's activities constitute a violation of the treaty of recognition entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of the U. S. S. R. in 1933."

The record stands clear. There can be no denial of these cumulative implications. Communism in the United States is not a "political party." There can be no question that the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreements upon which Soviet recognition was based are worth no more than were the nonaggression pacts which were supposed to protect Poland and Finland. They are completely worthless. The Soviets long since abrogated the agreement under which we maintain diplomatic relationship. We alone still respect it. We do so at our peril. We thus invite internal subversion which is at war with every American conception. We not only invite this subversion; we actually license it. In the contemporary language of the State Department, this is "irrefutable."

It is not enough to say in reply that we are not afraid of what communism can do to us. That begs the question. One rotten apple in a barrel has been known ultimately to contaminate all the rest. But whether Russia can achieve the destructive purposes of communism within the United States is beside the point. The point is that the effort has been and still is continuous in spite of a direct and specific pledge to the contrary. The point is that Moscow has long since completely reversed the relationships with us which were presumed to have been established in 1933. We should face this fact and sever a relationship which has become a ghastly challenge to international good faith.

It is not enough to argue that, despite all this treachery, we had better maintain our diplomatic outposts in Russia for the sake of keeping ourselves more intimately informed regarding the trend of this menace. (We found recently that our outposts were not worth very much when we were trying to find out what had happened to our ship *City of Flint*.) For every outpost we maintain over there, they will maintain a dozen over here, because we are relatively only children in the arts of intrigue and infiltration. The privilege of maintaining our listening posts over there is as nothing compared with their privilege of maintaining subversive depots over here.

But the thing of paramount importance is the principle involved. We are victims of a broken contract—a contract which this administration deemed to be necessary as a prerequisite to diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The contract involves the internal sanctity of American institutions. This is a domestic problem. It relates to our own Government and to our own institutions and our own order of things inside our own United States. It has nothing to do with our external neutrality or with our detached status in respect to world affairs. It has nothing to do with peace or war. It is simply a case of quietly demonstrating that Uncle Sam is not the gullible chump which Moscow seems to think he is. It is past time for the United States to tell the world that we are not running a polyglot boarding house in which the vistors can foul our hospitality and get away with it.

Our Moscow Embassy should come home. Moscow's Embassy should go home.

Memorial Day Program for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, like a lighthouse in a dark and stormy sea, in a land full of leaners on the Public Treasury, it may be refreshing to learn that there are oases in this New Deal desert where rugged individualism still lives, where Americans refuse to believe that our frontiers are gone and our full growth attained. Archbold, in Fulton County, Ohio, proves that "Little America," applied to that region in northwestern Ohio, deserves that honored appellation. From the Toledo Blade of May 29 I shall append the story of a heroic American town.

TOWN THAT REFUSES W. P. A. FUNDS WHIPS DEPRESSION—NEW HOMES AND BUSINESS ADDITIONS DOT VILLAGE THAT HAS NO BONDED DEBT; WILL BUILD NEW LIBRARY

ARCHBOLD, OHIO, May 29.—Archbold, which has no relief problem, has never accepted any W. P. A. assistance, and has no bonded indebtedness, is writing a new chapter in whipping Old Man Depression with a business and building boom that is envied by scores of other communities.

While remaining clear of debt, the village has accumulated a surplus of $7,500 in its water-plant fund and residents and former residents have subscribed nearly $2,000 for the site of a new public library for which Mrs. Helen McLaughlin, of Hollywood, Calif., a former resident here has donated $15,000.

Meanwhile, business firms and individuals have been prospering building new homes and enlarging business establishments. Predictions are made that, with homes under construction or contemplated this year, 45 new homes will have been erected here during the last few years.

FOUR MILLION-DOLLAR BUSINESS

Many improvements are under way at the Lugbill Bros. livestock auction yards, just outside Archbold, where 70 employees work regularly and $4,000,000 worth of business was enjoyed in 1939.

The firm is erecting a 26 by 90 brick and concrete addition to house additional cooling units and to provide more space for the processing of meats. A 10-inch well also is being drilled to provide a greater water supply for the packing plant and the new homes in the addition where the company helps employees to erect new homes.

Across the highway from the Lugbill Brothers' thriving business enterprise, three new business buildings are under construction. Riegsecker Brothers are completing a lumber sales room, 50 by 100; Earl Luty is erecting a garage, 26 by 100, and the third structure will house Nofziger's Dairy Store.

FACTORY SPACE DOUBLED

In Archbold proper, the Sauder Woodworking Co. is completing an addition that will double its floor space and enable the firm to increase its force. The company manufactures church furniture and reported that 3 months were required for it to complete one large contract.

The Archbold Ladder Co., the town's largest employer, reports 80 workers are employed steadily in the manufacture of ladders and other pine wood products.

The community is inhabited largely by Mennonites. The village proper had 1,168 inhabitants in 1930 and expects a count of 1,300 or more in the 1940 census.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this points the way out of our present difficulties—the old American way of private business and public thrift. These frugal, religious, industrious men and women of my district have never left the old, time tested American way of life. They know there is no substitute for sound practices either in public or private business.

May the myriads of crystal-gazers, starry-eyed do-gooders, and dreamy magis of the New Deal—the armies of Federal employees that are bedeviling and confusing American business, American labor, and American farmers, and citizens generally—be quickly disbanded, their mistakes liquidated, and this beloved land of ours put back in its natural and normal orbit to justify and glorify this Government of laws administered by men. There are undeveloped, undiscovered Acres of Diamonds throughout the length and breadth of America. Let us survey them, develop them, and use them for the betterment of our people; and roll back this fog of defeatism and frustration that has enveloped this land. We have a covenant with the honored dead from Lexington to Argonne Woods and Flanders fields that this Government of laws shall not be forfeit to one of men; that we move forward to new horizons for the boys and girls of America, steadfast in their faith in God and native land. Let no man sell his country short. Here she stands, still the envy of all the world.

"Fifth Column" Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we Americans must take no chances with our Nation's destiny. We must fully recognize the necessity of taking further steps immediately to divest and rid America of all subversive elements and groups. We must segregate and weed out from the population of America all "fifth column" groups and those individuals not true to our principles and precepts of government. Certainly, America must acknowledge the fact that those who advocate the overthrow of our Government have no claim to the protection of this Government; to advocate the displacement of democracy in this country with another form of government should forfeit all privileges and immunities of those who so contemptuously identify themselves.

On both occasions since becoming a Member of Congress I have enthusiastically supported and voted for the Dies committee; I favor appropriating additional funds now or when needed to enlarge the scope of the work of the committee. I have supported and voted for every other measure coming before the House in the duration of my tenure to stamp out subversive elements and activities. I shall not deviate from this stand in the future.

No man coming into this country about whose allegiance to the principles of this Government there is a question should be permitted to freely roam and remain. This country is no place for those to come or to remain whose purpose it is to extoll the virtues of the dictatorships. This country is not the place in which to win their converts.

It is said George Washington, the night before the battle of Trenton, fearing someone might try to betray him and the cause for which he was fighting, said, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." We are in a period in our Nation's history when true Americans, those on whom we can fully rely and wholly depend, must be on guard everywhere in our Nation all the time. Well may we afford to examine the governmental allegiance of those who urge us not to prepare and then express their admiration for the dictators and dictatorships.

For a period of more than 150 years the people of America have given themselves a Government under which prosperity and progress have thrived and over which God has watched and will reign. To perpetuate this Government and Nation is the duty of each of us. With those who are really true to our form of government alertly on guard night and day, our posterity will not be disappointed, for a Government giving freedom and opportunity will be handed down.

Recently I received a telegram from one of the several splendid American Legion posts in my district. I fully concur in the statements expressed in the telegram which I herewith include:

KILGORE, TEX., *May 28, 1940.*

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH:

When an individual or any group of individuals advocates the overthrow of our American form of government they forfeit their right to its protection. We strongly urge you to use your influence to have Congress pass suitable legislation at once to deal with all forms of subversive influence in these United States.

ROBERT LEE CRIM POST 280, THE AMERICAN LEGION.

George Washington in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly amazing to reread the messages of our first President and find how germane they are to the problems of the day. Certainly his thoughts on preparedness, our merchant marine, Trojan Horses, and our industrial mobilization are sufficient prototypes of today's needs to warrant a reprinting of cogent extracts.

His first annual message says volumes, for it stresses the primary need—preparedness—but it goes beyond that and asks for a "uniform and well-digested plan." It then anticipates the need for industrial mobilization by asking for the promotion of "such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies."

Scholars and students have written volumes on critical and raw materials, educational orders, and the benefits of autarchy but the rarest of combinations, the superb warrior and brilliant administrator sets the stage for their thoughts a century and a half before in his eighth annual address. There he stresses the need of a powerful navy to protect our external commerce, and he points out that sincere neutrality is not enough. It must be fortified with a "naval force organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression."

Then, in the greatest of administrations in the Farewell Address, he says, "If we remain one people," which means a united nation, destitute of "fifth columns," our course will be clear.

GEORGE WASHINGTON—FIRST ANNUAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 8, 1790

Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention, that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies.

ADDRESS TO THE SENATE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 11, 1790

We are persuaded that one of the most effectual means of perserving peace is to be prepared for war, and our attention shall be directed to the objects of common defense and to the adoption of such plans as shall appear the most likely to prevent our dependence on other countries for essential supplies.

SECOND ANNUAL ADDRESS, DECEMBER 8, 1790

The disturbed situation of Europe, and particularly the critical posture of the great maritime powers, whilst it ought to make us the more thankful for the general peace and security enjoyed by the United States, reminds us at the same time of the circumspection with which it becomes us to preserve these blessings. It requires also that we should not overlook the tendency of a war, and even of preparations for a war, among the nations most concerned in active commerce with this country to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting its valuable productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by which encouragements to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms, which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both of these great objects.

ADDRESS OF THE SENATE TO GEORGE WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 10, 1790

The critical posture of the European powers will engage a due portion of our attention, and we shall be ready to adopt any measures which a prudent circumspection may suggest for the preservation of the blessing of peace.

FIFTH INAUGURAL ADDRESS, DECEMBER 3, 1793

There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the repuation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

EIGHTH ANNUAL ADDRESS, DECEMBER 7, 1796

To an active external commerce the protection of a naval force is indispensable. This is manifest with regard to wars in which a state is itself a party. But besides this, it is in our own experience that the most sincere neutrality is not a sufficient guard against the depredations of nations at war. To secure a respect to a neutral flag requires a naval force organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression. This may even prevent the necessity of going to war by discouraging belligerent powers from committing such violations of the rights of the neutral party as may, first or last, leave no other option.

The considerations invite the United States to look at the means, and to set about the gradual creation of a Navy. The increasing progress of their navigation promises them to no distant period of the requisite supply of seamen, and their means in other respects favor the undertaking. It is an encouragement, likewise, that their particular situation will give weight and influence to a moderate naval force in their hands. Will it not, then, be advisable to begin without delay to provide and lay up the materials for the building and equipping of ships of war, and to proceed in the work by degrees, in proportion as our resources shall render it practicable without inconvenience, so that a future war of Europe may not find our commerce in the same unprotected state in which it was found by the present.

FAREWELL ADDRESS, SEPTEMBER 17, 1796

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocations; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

The Significance of the Centenary of Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. J. BEN ROBINSON, DEAN OF THE DENTAL SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, at the convention of the American Dental Association held in Baltimore from May 18 to the 20th, the association celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first institution for the formal teaching of dental science and the dental art, and I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a speech delivered on that occasion by Dr. J. Ben Robinson, dean of the Dental School of the University of Maryland, which is located in the Third Congressional District of Maryland, which I have the honor to represent.

The address is as follows:

Today the profession of dentistry pauses to observe suitably the founding of the first institution for the formal teaching of dental science and the dental art. Any attempt to emphasize the importance of the first dental college without due regard for the movements that preceded it, and other important developments coincident with its beginning, would not present a true picture; nor would the effort to establish the date 1840 as the beginning of dentistry conform to the facts of history.

No lasting institution is the work of a moment. Preparation is essential and as effective as immediate achievement. The inception and growth of institutions depend not on one individual but on many who make their contributions to the main theme without leaving a record of their services; when the time is ripe those of vision and creative resourcefulness marshal the accumulated materials of progress and organize the essentials into concrete, usable form. To the man of vision and creative ability go the rewards, the distinction, and the honor for achievement. As a consequence, celebrations such as this are too frequently designed to do honor to individuals and institutions rather than to principles which individuals and institutions represent.

Dentistry assumed the rank of a profession with the founding in 1840 of periodic dental literature, of formal dental education and of dental organization, the results of the immediate creative resourcefulness of two great American dentists. But the founding of the Journal, the College, and the Society cannot be regarded as the beginning of dentistry. It is true that the effective services of early American dentists resulted in the establishment of the basic elements that distinguished dentistry as a profession. But mere creative effort would have been barren without the aid of a science that had developed as a consequence of long years of earnest investigation and an art of practice that had been gradually perfected through the centuries. The pioneers who are today honored as the founders of professional dentistry did not create but rather adjusted an existing art and science to the then present needs of society and by interpreting dentistry in terms of greater usefulness established a permanent profession that has taken its place among the many indispensable institutions upon which modern civilization depends.

A rudimentary dental art and an incipient dental science existed among all ancient civilizations. From a humble beginning dentistry grew in strength and usefulness, showing at all points in history a strong tendency toward autonomy. Actually the seed for a distinct specialty of medical service was sown in ancient times; it germinated during the era which included the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries; it sprang forth under the benevolent influence of Pierre Fauchard; was cultivated by American dentists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; and blossomed in all its usefulness in 1840. The beginning of professional dentistry 100 years ago was the consummation of many centuries of preparation.

The purpose of this celebration is to point to the past, to consider the present, and to arouse inspiration for the future. The centenary committee has worked diligently to create a picture that will give proper weight to these various viewpoints. It has taken as its theme the beginnings of the three fundamental factors of professional integrity: The Baltimore College of Dental Surgery, the American Journal of Dental Science, and the American Society of Dental Surgeons, which collectively are regarded as the tripod upon which professional dentistry rests. These organizations appeared in 1840 as the effective tools of professional service and progress. They ushered in a new era of cooperation and of scientific approach, as contrasted with ages of individual toil and uncorrelated effort applied toward the ultimate achievement of an ideal.

In the program prepared for you suitable recognition has been accorded dentistry's heroes, and plans have been made for receiving hospitably members of the dental profession who have been inspired to return to dentistry's birthplace. Hayden and Harris are canonized as immortals because they gave coherence, stability, and purpose to the dissociated elements of a profession and for these services we attempt to honor them. Baltimore is the Mecca for dentists of the world because it was here that Harris and Hayden did their great work and it is here that the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery is located, the only one of the three original institutions founded by Hayden and Harris that still carries on.

Other features of the celebration are designed to show the status of the profession as it now exists. They reveal the character of dentistry after a century of intelligent enterprise engaged in by numberless contributors whose zealous devotion has brought to a high degree of perfection the infant institutions of 100 years ago.

This is neither the time nor place for detailed reference to the progress made by dentistry in the hundred years. To do so would abuse your patience. But it is not too much to allude generally to certain notable advances made in connection with the growth of the 3 institutions founded 100 years ago.

Periodical dental literature that began in a modest way under professional auspices has made tremendous gains. The American Journal of Dental Science had a brief but brilliant career. At the end of 20 years commercial houses, through advantages they were able to employ, preempted the field, and dental literature was made the agent of commercialism rather than the servant of the profession. In the course of time there was an awakening to the evils of commercial domination, and under the benevolent influence and the strength of dental organization literature was restored to its rightful sponsorship. Today professionally directed periodical literature is serving the educational needs of the profession through more than 100 professionally controlled dental journals. Every phase of professional activity and of public interest is adequately provided for in the facilities these numerous journals afford.

Organization has contributed to the profession a certain strength and character predicted by those who designed the first Society. The American Society of Dental Surgeons had a precarious career and came to an untimely end. But the seed was sown and from its experience sprang more representative and more practical bodies. Today, in addition to the great American Dental Association with a membership of more than three-fourths of the dentists in the United States, there are active dental societies in all States and possessions, all Government services; and a host of special organizations spread throughout the length and breadth of the country. These have been pointed to service for securing legislation for the protection of the public and for the preservation of high standards of practice; for stimulating interest in continuous education of the dentist; and for providing recurrent opportunities for limited postgraduate study. They have also supported capably formal dental education, and have given substantial grants for the promotion of dental research.

The Baltimore College of Dental Surgery, the third leg of the tripod, or the first leg if you will, is the only one of the three original dental institutions founded 100 years ago that still exists. Dental education began under proprietary influences. This pioneer system of education was not confined to dentistry but was with few exceptions, the order in all the professions of that period. Proprietary education served the educational needs of many phases of society for many years. This system in the early days served a good purpose, giving form to dental education through an important period of its growth. But the proprietary system had its weaknesses.

Because of the technological nature of the dental art, dental education was peculiarly vulnerable to commercial aggression. Early in its history commercial influences were as conspicuous as they were damaging, with the consequence that educational standards not only failed to make progress but actually stood still. The advent of the university dental school served to a degree to check commercial influences. The dental educational council, projected in 1910, accelerated the trend toward better educational standards; in 1926 the report of the Carnegie Foundation on dental education in the United States and Canada was a most important factor in placing dental education on a sound footing. Today we can say with reasonable accuracy and security that dental education in America is permanently and almost completely under university authority and that it is meeting capably its educational responsibilities to the profession and to society.

The future toward which we look so hopefully is not one of doubt and uncertainty. Dental science and art are dynamic, and we may look to the future with confidence for a continuation of progress even to a greater degree. Dentistry will receive from society and from the university a support and an encouragement in proportion to its proved worth as this may be established in the opinion of those upon whom claims are made for assistance. Dentistry is no longer an experiment; it has proved itself; it will continue to grow in public esteem and usefulness in proportion to the earnestness and care with which we pursue the course laid down by our forbears. We look to the past with admiration, to the present with determination, and to the future with hope.

McMillan Scorns Hitler, Asks Solid Backing of Defense Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an unusually well-prepared and thoughtful article written by the Honorable T. H. McMillan, commissioner of education of the city of Chattanooga, which appeared in the Chattanooga News-Free Press on Sunday, May 26. The analysis made in this article is well worth serious consideration. It is one of the best discussions of some of the problems presently presented that I have read. Mr. McMillan is a capable student of international affairs and has given the effects of a possible Hitler victory discerning study.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of May 26, 1940]

IF GERMANY WINS!

(By T. H. McMillan)

Should Germany, along with its totalitarian doctrines and Hitlerian principles, achieve victory on the fields of northern France, what would happen to the United States? Modern transportation and communication have so annihilated space and time that it is inconceivable for us to remain untouched. We cannot live apart from the rest of the world. What affects one affects all.

The German arms might be so exhausted that no immediate conflict would occur, but there would be immediate consequences. Already, and before the Reich has crushed the Allies, we are feeling these first results, fearing and dreading the plunge toward militarism, wondering about "fifth columns," increasing armament, watching the stock market drop, organizing to prevent spying and sabotage, while our papers flame with the triumphal boasts of Nazi leaders and the lightning accomplishment of Nazi legions.

Hitler's actual conquest of France and England would still further lower the pall of doubt and fear over the liberal governments of the world. Millions are now shaken in faith, and doubt the practical value of democracy. Tens of millions are wondering if democracy is not outmoded by the startling industrial and military efficiency of the Nazi idea. Our confidence in government by the people is being weakened, and all our thinking is being colored now by the stupendous effectiveness of a government by one man.

ENGLAND TO BE DESTROYED

If Germany wins, England will be destroyed. Two generations of Germans have been so saturated with hate that they believe the land of Shakespeare, Milton, Tennyson, Florence Nightingale, John Wesley, Gen. William Booth, and Cardinal Newman should be utterly crushed. A German peace will be merciless, for there is no place for mercy or generosity in Mein Kampf. Poland will disappear, as will Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and all nations who have resisted "Der Fuehrer," whom to oppose is crime and unpardonable offense.

America is next in line. The envy that coveted England's wealth and position cannot be satisfied. Envy is never content with gains but, like fire, expands with consumption. Envy is a disease, incurable, ever unsatisfied.

It is not possible for a great liberal nation to exist peacefully with a Nazi power. The very existence of a democracy is a condemnation of its opposite.

It is, therefore, inconceivable that the world could contain two national philosophies as differing in detail and as antagonistic in principle. The American idea is based upon truth, law, justice, and a maximum of liberty for the individual. The Teutonic philosophy is based upon deception of friend and foe, will of the leader, elimination of legal processes to the promotion of efficiency, and the absolute subordination of every right to the whim of the dictator. In Nazi reasoning there is no law or justice, only the desire of the head. Caprice becomes law. Sympathy, mercy, love, are sacrificed to obtain ultimate efficiency. Life, motherhood, honor, loyalty, religion, and all unselfish emotions are eliminated to achieve the ultimate in effectiveness. All human nature is pressed into the narrow mold of military aims.

BACK TO DARK AGES

Nazi doctrine is not new. It is the same barbarism exemplified by the brutal natures of the Dark Age conquerors. It is a reversion, not a revision; a descent, not an elevation. The cave man held might was right, stole because he had opportunity, and killed out of jealous rage. His neighbor could not deal honorably with him because he had no honor, no respect for truth. Nor has Hitler. The spirit of barbarism and nazi-ism are thus one and the same, but the Nazis are armed with modern inventions, organized to the *n*th degree, and equipped to handle death and terror with equal nicety.

Faced by the necessity of living with such a national, America has but two roads. One is the road to isolation in the hope that by living apart we may perhaps live peaceably with the barbarian. But neutrality did not protect Holland, Denmark, Norway, although no one can imagine more harmless neighbors. As early as last autumn informed columnists here and abroad seemed agreed that sooner or later the United States must meet totalitarian philosophy head-on, probably in Japanese form. Certainly any isolation, however magnified, would have to be utterly self-sufficient and would be extremely difficult to maintain. Many think it impossible.

The second choice is that of armed preparation for the inevitable clash. This course will be a terrible shock to our senses, for it involves a change in the entire habits and complete outlook of every individual. It involves a gigantic redirection of national effort, an adjustment of all social energies, as we attempt a rapid militarization of our resources. Adequate armies for defense and offense must be formed, along with air legions, mechanized units, organization for chemical warfare, ordnance, fortification of coasts and cities, reshaping of our aims and objectives, and fitting all our interests to the molds of Mars.

TO CHANGE LIFE IN UNITED STATES

One can fight efficiency only with efficiency. Our easy ways and liberal traditions would have to be surrendered in the emergency. Our hours of work would have to be lengthened, our nonessentials eliminated, our luxuries banned, our leisure utilized in production, and all our strength and wealth would have to be transformed into national protection.

Taxes would jump. In England they consume 25 percent of the national income now, while Germany is demanding an even higher percentage. Much of the money now turned toward highways, education, and all kinds of internal improvements would be redirected toward fighting planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and the endless devices of death and destruction.

SCHOOLS TO TRAIN FOR WAR

The schools and colleges, which have tried to prepare young people for life, would have to reverse their procedure and prepare for military action. Every course of study would have to be revised toward war objectives while discarding our ideologies of peace and peacetime industry. Germany has closed half her halls of learning. To kill the enemy is the object of war, and every peaceful ambition has been subordinated to this single brutal objective.

The freedom of the press would go. So would the right to speak one's thoughts and ideas. These are the main characteristics of democracy, but they are high-priced luxuries when one is forced to bend every thought and every effort toward military success alone. To compete with the Nazi machine we would probably be forced to adopt most of the Nazi methods and practices. The Nazis take the child from the cradle and teach tiny nature to admire the grim aspects of conflict. To achieve equal military power, we might have to use the same process and indoctrinate the next generation with ferocity and craft in destruction.

ALL FREEDOM WOULD GO

Our minorities may well shudder at the dismal prospect. To meet totalitarian efficiency, we would be compelled to achieve complete harmony of political, religious, and industrial factors. Even sincere objection has no place in militarism. Our political privileges and freedom would have to be forgotten in the urgency of desperate strife. Our Government approves full separation of the church and state, but there is small room for the churches and their creeds of love and toleration when heads are bent toward war. Our churches would have to forego their present freedom of expression that the juggernaut might roll on. Heretofore religion has exalted the supremacy of conscience. There is little place for conscience in a nation in desperate endeavor and concentrated toward military excellence. Labor, too, would be forced to forego its wage scales, privileges, hours, and regulations. There is no privilege for labor in Germany. Only the will of Hitler. Only by matching his methods of production could we turn out the planes, the bombs, the tanks, the engines and machinery of total war. Capital would be conscripted, for it, too, becomes a slave of the militaristic state.

BLOOD-PURGING TO COME

To compete with Germany and its present leaders it is conceivable that an opponent might have to adopt even the most objectionable methods of the Reich—the concentration camp, breach of treaties, brutal suppression of dissenters, blood-purging, frightfulness, and wanton destruction. The terrible part of the situation is than to defeat the brutality of nazi-ism one is forced to practice the same despicable methods, to stoop to conduct outlawed by decency and international law. England and France are in straits today largely because they refused to emulate Hitler's disregard of right and law.

This picture faces America if Germany wins; and only by facing this prospect can democracy hope to place its millions on a competitive basis with the Nazi machine. Our transformation might be effected thoroughly, but after our war with nazi-ism was won we would face as difficult a task again—to turn our energies to peace again. There lies a terrible danger. Lives dedicated to war can never be reclaimed. Liberties once lost are difficult to regain. This is part of the price of militarism.

HITLER MUST BE BEATEN

America must revolt from such a future. It is contrary to the best in the American ideal. We do not want to kill. We do not want war. We want to till the fields, construct, invent, overcome disease, develop justice and order, create wealth, and solve the social problems of crime, poverty, unemployment, and social equality. But if Hitler wins, God help America, or any nation worthy of envy and unprotected by might. Hitler and his totalitarian allies have made international law obsolete; they have reestablished the savagery of the stone age. They have set up anew the tenets of tyranny and absolutism. Only by the utter defeat of such principles can the theory of democracy be restored. Only by such defeat can mankind again begin to study the fundamental problems of existence under self-rule.

This is the stake of the war. Meanwhile, the wastage goes on. Each day 10,000 young lives ebb downward into the sod of France, some to set up the Nazi ideal, some to preserve the ideal of liberty, justice, and equality. In America we shudder, but our determination becomes firmer. Our millions are being gradually drawn to a holy resolution—a renewal of the vow that "government of the people, for the people, by the people shall not perish from the earth."

Danger to the American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. SLATTERY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Herald-American of May 24, 1940, by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor, entitled "American System May Be Crumbling; Happy, Carefree Days Near End."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Herald-American of May 24, 1940]

AMERICAN SYSTEM MAY BE CRUMBLING; HAPPY, CAREFREE DAYS NEAR END

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, Financial Editor)

The American system may be crumbling.

If it is, the disaster is occurring not in Washington, not in the United States, but on the battlefields of Europe.

As we have said before, if Hitler is victorious it is impossible to vision the future with any clarity. But of this we may be sure: The happy days of moderate expenditures for Army, Navy, and air force will be over.

For 8 years the German Nation has turned every surplus ounce of its energy toward building a mighty war machine. Its purpose from the start has been clear—conquest.

OPEN AND BRAZEN

So open and brazen has been the boast of the Nazi regime that the Germans are a superior race which must rule the world that other nations and other peoples looked upon it as too fantastic to be deserving of a busy world's attention.

The stories of Chamberlain and Nevile Henderson as written by themselves disclose a woeful, unbelievable ignorance of what was taking place in Nazi Germany. The United States only now is beginning to understand the significance to itself of the Hitler philosophy.

Hitler has declared that he can create revolution in the United States and take the country from within, just as he has boasted that he was willing to sign any treaty and break it the next day if it was to his purpose.

SAT IDLY BY

Hitler said that he would destroy the British Empire, and the British sat idly by allowing him to build the planes with which to fulfill his boast, permitting him to play at war in Spain at the expense of the Spaniards for the invaluable experience to be used when the real struggle came.

Is there any more reason why the United States should take Hitler lightly than there was for Britain and France?

Brazil, Hitler has declared, is the Germany of South America. Mexico is a rich plum awaiting German exploitation. The United States is a fat, wealthy, futile nation, rotten because of its lack of race purity, decaying from within because of its belief in democratic capitalism.

ARM TO SURVIVE

The United States today begins to realize that should Hitler be victorious it must arm to the teeth if it is to survive.

Already we are girding for the production of 50,000 fighting airplanes and increased armaments of all types. The cost of this great defense program—needed only if the philosophy of might makes right, of conquest, of treachery, prevails—must fall on the backs of the American people.

No; we cannot see the future. But a Hitler victory in Europe will mean that Americans, too, must sacrifice butter for cannon.

American businessmen will find that the danger to the American system lies not with the Government elected by an overwhelming vote of the American people but with the "fifth column."

NERO FIDDLING

Great Britain eagerly, almost unanimously, has given dictatorial powers to its Government in a desperate effort to avoid destruction. If the United States wishes to avoid a similar terrifying experience it would do well to cast aside today, before the emergency arises, selfish partisanship, greedy reaching for personal advantage.

There are a few American business leaders today who remind us of Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

The world is afire. Totalitarianism threatens to engulf this Nation. Yet these businessmen go up and down the country, like

schoolboys, storming against the annoyances, the irritations, of the most liberal political-economic-social system existing anywhere on earth today.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA, MAY 30, 1919, AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, General Isaac B. Sherwood, of Ohio, placed the remarks delivered by myself on Memorial Day, May 30, 1919, at the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 16, 1919, volume 58, parts 1–9, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, pages 8915, 8916, and 8917.

I stand today where I stood then. I have no need to change or take any word back. America first—absolute neutrality in the quarrels of Europe and the old world—is still my slogan and will be to the very end.

This distinguished general served 18 years in the United States House of Representatives. He was the last Grand Army of the Republic man in Congress. It was exactly 52 years from the first day of his congressional service, which began on March 4, 1873, and ended on March 3, 1925. He was a great patriot and brave soldier. He entered the Civil War as a private and came out a general. At Nashville he was left for dead on the bloody field. He fought in 44 battles of that civil conflict.

This was the last memorial service in the old amphitheater. Next year the exercises were held in the new and present amphitheater, and Gen. John J. Pershing was the first speaker there. The first speaker in the old amphitheater was General, Representative, and President James A. Garfield, of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent to have this extension of remarks by Representative Sherwood printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LUNDEEN. When the Athenean orator of old ascended the rostrum to address the Assembly of Athens, he first offered up a prayer to the immortal gods that no unworthy word might escape his lips. Today I am speaking straight from the shoulder and right out of my heart. What I say I say in all earnestness. It is perhaps my last word here, and I pray that no word unworthy of America and her mighty history may escape my lips.

In Independence Hall you will find two world maps. One, in black, shows a world at the close of the eighteenth century dominated by monarchs. Our first Thirteen States were then the only large territory governed by the people. Another map shows the spread of popular government at the beginning of the twentieth century. That map is almost white. The power and influence of our Republic gained steadily during more than a century, and during that century America remained in splendid isolation. Aloof from Europe, apart from all entangling alliances, America grew to greatness.

Washington, Patrick Henry, and Jefferson—these were our guiding stars. Under their leadership America challenged the world's greatest empire on the field of battle. We see them again, minuteman and continental, hurrying from forest, field, and farm. Husband and wife and children sobbing their farewells. The signal lights! The midnight warnings! The drums and the fifes! Then, carrying their long-barreled rifles with powder horns slung, with scanty provisions, they hurried forward. Over the hills and through the valleys they rallied around a new national standard. Then Putnam left his plow. Then Allen thundered his demands and John Paul Jones sailed the seven seas.

At last there rose a majestic figure, one destined to command the first Americans. From Quebec to Yorktown and the Carolinas the inspired word of Washington fired every American heart. They dared at Trenton; they died at Saratoga; they suffered cold and hunger at Valley Forge. They won immortality and a nation's liberty at Yorktown.

We are met together today as Americans. [Applause.] Party politics has no place here. Personal ambition is laid aside. We know only America and her glorious dead. [Applause.] Foreigners and all foreign intrigue aside, internationalism forgotten, we stand at the graves of those who made and preserved us a nation.

In national solitude we grew to greatness, our trade circled the globe. We preserved our independence. Other nations formed alliances; we stood free. Other lands joined in European intrigue; we stood apart. Our trade relations were never jeopardized by our political independence. In fact, we drew close to the friendship of all.

Providence placed us here to work out our great experiment in government, unfettered and unbound. We drew inspiration from our solitude. We builded a haven for the oppressed.

As it is with the individual, so it is with a nation. Christ walked alone the shores of Galilee. Mohammed in silence and solitude developed a new religion. Moses left the multitude and returned with the Ten Commandments. Dante alone, Demosthenes in solitude, Newton with nature, Linné with his flowers—these and other giant minds drew their inspiration far from the surging crowd. So pilgrim and pioneer, adrift from Europe and her seething politics, became the sturdy minuteman and continental, willing to suffer the agony of Valley Forge that America might never again be European.

Patriotism is love of country. It is not the love of some nebulous nothing. It cannot be turned into international channels. Concord and Lexington, Saratoga and Yorktown, Gettysburg and Appomattox, the precious blood of our hero dead, these, my friends, these purchased and preserved an independence never to be surrendered while an American still lives. [Cheers and applause.]

Many years ago, on the plains of South Dakota, a little burial party wended its way to an open grave. The fife and drum were playing, and strong men in blue, wearing medals of honor, fired three volleys. A bugler sounded taps, and then we turned away, but a small flag was left flying over that grave. It was my first knowledge of the Grand Army of the Republic. That day impressed itself strongly upon my mind.

And then came the glory of songs of that Grand Army, sung in our public schools, among these the Battle Hymn of the Republic, and a song written by an American private in time of war, while tenting at night on the old camp ground. It is well that this is so. The children of today will not forget these great songs of patriotism.

Noble women of every State, banded to help our heroes, veterans, daughters and sons of veterans of every war, upon you devolves the teaching of true patriotism, practical patriotism. We must be ever diligent in that duty; we must hand on untarnished these great orders dedicated to our common country.

Memorial Day! Oh, memories, glorious memories! It was the 2d day of July 1863. Gray uniforms filled the woods beyond and swarmed up the opposing slopes; batteries opened. The roar of artillery shook the ground. Cannon replied to cannon. And then the gray mass moved. Forward they swept into the open, down the slopes, and across the fields of grain. Now they charge with the rebel yell, bayonet to bayonet. The first line of blue goes down before them. On they come unchecked. Hancock rides up where the thin blue line of one shattered regiment holds the Union center. "What regiment is this," asks the general. "The First Minnesota," answers Colonel Colville. "Charge the enemy," orders General Hancock. Forward against the whole army rushes that lone regiment. They go down almost to a man before overwhelming numbers. But the charge is checked. Before they can resume fresh Union regiments fill the gap and roll back the enemy in flight. The day is won at Gettysburg. [Applause.] It was the high tide of the rebellion. From there it ebbed to final defeat at Appomattox. Memories, glorious memories! Mere lads many of you, yet men on the battlefield. Fighting on for 4 long years. You marched with Sherman to the sea, you scaled Lookout Mountain, you stood with Thomas at Chickamauga. In the trenches at Vicksburg, at Iuka and Corinth, Antietam, Shiloh, and the Wilderness, Cold Harbor, and Petersburg. In the cold and in the heat, in sunshine and shower, amid the hell of war, wounded and hungry, you never wavered, but on and on until the sword compelled surrender.

You were the backbone of the Nation. When you marched, the Nation moved forward. When you halted, our hearts hesitated. When you swept over hostile barriers, the Nation triumphed. [Applause.]

Men of the Grand Army, a Nation owes its life to you; the fathers builded, but you saved the structure. Others founded, but you placed the capstone. With iron will and courage sublime you marched on to victory. You were then, you are now, the Grand Army of the Republic. [Applause.] Your last battalions are now silhouetted against the evening sky. Veterans of the Grand Army, the people of America salute you. Death shall not destroy nor time dim the luster of your fame.

Sacred story tells us that Elijah gave his mantle to his followers, and they became inspired to do great deeds. May the mantle which you bore so nobly through so many desperate conflicts rest upon all who seek to emulate your example.

Bronze and granite will recite the story. History will record your names. But in our living hearts we will carry forever the memory and love of those who fought for liberty and union.

As the Nation honors and cares for the veterans of the Civil War, so we will honor and care for the veterans of the Spanish-American War [applause] and the veterans of the World War. I see my comrades of the War with Spain around me. The Nation will not forget the men who remembered the *Maine*. [Applause.]

The best way to honor the dead is to care for the living. [Applause.] Were the fallen to speak now, they would ask for their living comrades that larger liberty in industrial affairs which will make true democracy a happy reality of their daily lives. Were they to speak now they would ask for them economic liberty, the last and greatest of the rights of man.

The veterans of the World War want no desert grant or swamp privilege. [Applause.] They ask equal opportunity to develop our millions of idle acres of fertile lands. They want no crumbs of charity. [Applause.] Our boys, if given a fair chance, will win that confidence and independence which marks a sturdy race. Pomp and parade, receptions, and the cheers of the multitude, these pall upon men who faced death on the field or prepared themselves in spirit for that ordeal—men who now face the stern realities of the great industrial struggle. Glory is not a satisfactory substitute for bread. [Applause.]

How tenderly we handle the rent and riddled battle flags, splintered staff, and war-worn colors borne by the veterans of all our wars. You lay up the battered hulks of naval victory as proud mementos of their services, while at your very door stand the men who carried those flags and manned those ships, not less tattered and torn by service and splintered by hostile bullets.

The veterans of the World War met death in new and dreadful forms. A thousand death-dropping planes hummed and wheeled above them. The roar of giant guns, the rain of bursting shells, storms of choking poison gas, ceaseless war by day and attack by night, until the drum fire of death pitted the earth as would a new disease. Before that rain of shells forests disappeared, cities melted into dust, and through it all a roar and rumble as of a million bolts striking incessantly upon their line. In such a fire was the temper of their courage tried. Thus again America met the test of war. They turned the tide [cheers and applause], our boys; and let no beaten foe or jealous nation question that. [Applause.]

The broken frames of a wrecked humanity now say to you by their service and by their scars that as they cared for you in times of danger and peril you shall now do justice by them. Today our soldiers and sailors return from camp and battlefield to seek a livelihood. They did not shirk at Chateau-Thierry nor hesitate in the Argonne. They sailed the seas undaunted; they added new luster to American arms. We will not forget. [Applause.] The American people will remember the dead and care for the living. They took their lives in their hands and went forth to battle. You applauded; you promised; you sent them forth to battle for American rights upon the sea.

Men and women of America, it is for us to say that no soldier who fought our battle shall suffer from the cold hand of neglect [applause] nor from the cruel injustice bred of forgetfulness. Those who profited unduly from the war must now yield up the gold they coined out of patriotism. The burden of the poor is more than they can bear. Let the burden fall on the shoulders best able to bear it. It cannot be otherwise. They are entitled to a full fair share of their native land, good land [applause], not deserts or swamps; and while we pour our billions into the laps of foreigners, let us invest a billion or two for our American lads [cheers and applause], our bravest and best.

By the solemn act of the Government these men were called to follow the flag across thousands of miles of death-infested ocean into foreign lands. They upheld the honor of our country. [Applause.] Upon them were placed the burdens, hazards, and losses of a world war. Only by the act of the Government can they be restored to their rightful place in the community.

Memorial Day brings to mind all that our soldiers did for us. We take increased devotion from the ideals for which they died and recount the principles upon which they founded our Government.

Fellow citizens, I will read from our great chart of liberty laid down in the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. Hear the voice of the fathers: "We, the people of the United States." Evidently the fathers intended "a government of Americans, by Americans, for Americans." "In order to form a more perfect union," "establish a confederation and perpetual union." No wonder you fought to save that Union. "To establish justice, to promote the general welfare, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The militia shall only be used "to execute the laws of the Union, to suppress insurrection, and repel invasion." No Army appropriation can be made for more than 2 years. Our forefathers sought to escape the fearful burdens of foreign wars. They left Europe to escape that burden, to escape unjust taxation, conscription, large standing armies, and all oppression.

It is provided that no title of nobility shall be granted by the United States. Those who wish to observe the spirit of this clause should refrain from humiliating themselves and their fellow citizens by accepting titles bestowed by fickle royalty. It is further provided that no officer of the United States can accept any emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign state without due consent of Congress. Our Presidents are held in check by the provision requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senate to ratify all treaties. A majority of the Senate must confirm Presidential appointments to office.

The founders of the Republic were friends of progress. Within 10 years after the adoption of the Constitution no less than 11 new and vitally important amendments were added. These amendments guaranteed freedom of speech and of the press; they provided that there shall be no law respecting the establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof.

The right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition their Government for a redress of grievances shall not be abridged. The people of the United States were made secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. No warrants must issue except upon probable cause, and no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Speedy and public trials are provided by impartial juries, with the right to the assistance of counsel. Excessive bail must not be required nor unusual punishments inflicted. The people retain all power not granted by the Constitution. Thus the American citizen took the lead in human progress. [Applause.]

The first framework of the United States Government, the Articles of Confederation of 1777, provided a "perpetual union," so at the very forefront of our history as a Nation was laid down the principle of "the Union forever," a principle which the boys in blue in '61 so gallantly kept alive. [Applause.]

A strong and independent Congress was provided. In these days, when men cry down Congress, we may well remember that the first Government of the United States was Congress—aye, a Congress of one house of delegates. It was 10 years later that the executive and judiciary branches were added. It was Congress which declared our independence, adopted the Articles of Confederation and perpetual union, fought the War of the Revolution to a victorious end, and concluded a permanent peace.

Independence is the cornerstone of our national existence and the inspiration of our national life. The Declaration of Independence absolved us from all allegiance to the British Crown and dissolved all political connection between the United States and the state of Great Britain. Our Government was not a charter granted by some higher power; it was a declaration of the preexisting, inherent, inalienable rights of man, to secure which rights governments are instituted among men.

On yonder hill stands the Capitol of the United States, and over there the Executive Mansion. Let them look up to Arlington for their inspiration. Here on the hillsides of Virginia are resting the men who made America.

When passion and prejudice grow furious, when party spirit grows narrow, and all the evils of political strife disturb the true compass of our national greatness, let them look well to Arlington for their certain course. Oh, my fellow citizens, they did not die in vain while we fare hither to recount their ideals and the principles for which they fought. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, it is time to complete our monuments to American heroes. Here stands the marble amphitheater unused. When Memorial Day, 1920, is here let it stand out a finished gem upon the hills. Over there Grant's unfinished statue is almost forgotten. His comrades demand its early completion. [Applause.] Lincoln's Memorial, the Memorial Bridge to Arlington, the preservation of the Mall planned by Washington, these, my friends, may well enter our thoughts today. To Washington the pilgrimage of Americans is constantly streaming, and here America must be at her best. We are proud of our Capitol, proud of the White House, proud of the city itself, but prouder still are we when mention is made of the men who made America. [Applause.] They rise above field and farm and factory as the true example of American greatness.

Arlington, the Nation's shrine. Here meet the people of every State, here lie buried men from every walk of life, of equal rank in death as they stood equal before the law in life.

Boys in blue and rebel gray, men of the Revolutionary days, and men of the *Maine*, private and general, white and black, but all Americans. Here shines the sun of forgiveness through the tears of the mourners and a Grand Army president opens the gate to Dixie land. Thirty thousand men now bivouac on these hills. No bugle call arouses, no drum beat calls to battle; only the rustle of the leaves in the wind and the voice of a child calling to the forest bird. We linger a little while and go away. This is our shrine. Here God inspires, patriotism flames anew, and here men highly resolve that liberty shall not die. As the trees and the grass of the hills entice the else forgetful rain to earth, so will Arlington forever bring to our people a practical patriotism.

And while we stand here today in beautiful, wonderful Arlington, American soldiers, sailors, and marines, a million of them, decorate the graves of the fallen legion across the sea.

A hundred thousand American graves in foreign lands. Brave lads who never flinched. An arrogant aristocracy and a mighty militarism went down before their irresistible armed rush. Many of these lads lie buried in central cemeteries decorated and cared for today, but what of the lad who died in his trench, the next explosion burying him forever. The missing brave whose American heart is forever stilled over there. The wind moans his requiem, and dewdrops are the tears. The friendly sun clothes his resting place with grasses green and covers him over with beautiful wild flowers. Nature does not forget the dead. A hundred thousand men—American dead. It is enough. Our living lads over there now demand their places in homeland [applause], motherland, God's own country. [Applause.] They are weary of Europe and Asia. The war is over and they want to come home. For them no mandatory nonsense, either foreign entanglements and new-made graves in Africa, Asia, or Europe. They are Americans, and they want to live and die in America, to stand on their own home ground. [Applause.]

In republican France, in imperial England, in bonnie Scotland, Wales, and the Emerald Isle, yes, in Germany, and Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, in the drifting snows of Russia, in Siberia, and in the depths of the deep there sleep our brave.

God lights the stars, He made the blue, and the white light of distant suns, and all the radiant red of morning is His handiwork, and so we wove and intertwined all these and made our flag the banner of the brave and flung it sun-kissed and wind-tossed into God's free air, the one flag, the great flag all else beside.

Our country, we are proud of your glory. No slave, all freemen, and every man a sovereign citizen. We read the same Declaration of Independence, the same Articles of Confederation, the same Constitution, and the rule of the ballot is supreme. Men rise and fall on the tides of fortune, but the ship of state sails on through every storm. God has been good to America. Let us be humble lest we forget.

Comrades and fellow citizens, today we pause to honor our hero dead. They died to make us independent, to give us sovereignty, to preserve our Union, to plant our banner where all men might see and here take courage anew. Look about you and behold a sea of flags. Arlington is not forgotten; Arlington will never be forgotten. [Applause.]

Let no traitor lower our flag [applause], let no supergovernment be imposed upon us, let none question our sovereignty or seek to set aside our liberty and our independence.

They did not die in vain. Our people are true Americans, believing in the American Nation, in its everlasting and eternal independence. We will not suffer foreigners to lord it over us, neither shall those among us whose hearts are still in Europe be our leaders. We still remember our hero dead, we remember the fight they fought and for what they fought. We shall not forget. Let us follow in their steps. [Applause.]

Newark Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey:

An assembly concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States and the War Department of the United States to investigate the conditions at Newark Airport, Newark, N. J., and the feasibility of this airport being placed under Government control as an integral part of the United States national-defense program

Whereas the President of the United States has requested that Congress make available a large emergency appropriation for the purpose of expanding the national defenses of the United States; and

Whereas Newark Airport, Newark, N. J., a municipally owned airfield, is one of the largest airfields in the country and is in the center of the metropolitan district of the East; and

Whereas the Newark, N. J., municipal authorities have announced the proposed closing of the control tower at Newark Airport due to failure of commercial air lines to adequately compensate the city of Newark; and

Whereas the closing of this control tower means practically the cessation of commercial aviation at this large airfield and the eventual decay of the field; and

Whereas it is the belief of the citizens of New Jersey that this airfield should be an integral part of the air-defense program for the New York and New Jersey metropolitan area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States and the War Department of the United States be urged to investigate immediately the conditions at Newark Airport and the feasibility of this airport being placed under Government control as an integral part of the expansion program of national defense now under consideration, and that the city of Newark be adequately compensated for the transfer of the airfield and its facilities to the United States Government; and

2. That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member therein representing the State of New Jersey, and to the Secretary of War.

A Timely Word of Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT NEWS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News:

UNITED STATES PAPERS PLEASE COPY

We hope the newspapers of the country will advise their readers of Detroit's "Hire Detroiters" campaign and of its purpose. In doing so they will perform a humanitarian service and at the same time help to avert avoidable economic waste.

Detroit is not inhospitable. But in view of widespread publicity given the city's probably important role in the defense program, its government has had to take what steps it can to forestall the hardships that might come from a rush of workers here for the "war boom."

The fact is that Detroit is unlikely to experience any labor demand as a result of defense contracts which its own unemployed citizens will not amply supply.

Mayor Jeffries and the council, therefore, are asking industrial employers to "hire Detroiters." Employers cooperating in the campaign will require job applicants to produce Detroit election registration cards as proof of residence.

Workers in other places may be spared sore disappointment and financial loss if made aware that these steps are being taken.

Maj. Fielding Eliot Endorses a Department of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to a survey of our national-defense policies as outlined in my resolution, House Joint Resolution 417. The intent of my resolution will determine the following pertinent facts:

First. The area we as a Nation are expected to defend.

Second. The cost of adequately protecting such area.

Third. The adequacy of our present national-defense system.

The demand for a survey of our national-defense policies has been widely acclaimed in business, industrial, and military circles. Chief among the exponents of this timely resolution is Maj. George Fielding Eliot, one of America's outstanding military analysts, who declared in a letter to me dated March 22, 1940:

I am in sympathy with the majority of the objectives set forth in paragraph 2 of House Joint Resolution 417, and feel very strongly that a thorough study of the whole national-defense structure at this time is imperative.

Major Eliot's voice blends with the chorus of distinguished Americans who are likewise qualified to speak on this issue so vital to the welfare of the American people.

Kings Canyon National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

ARTICLE WRITTEN BY THE EMINENT NATURALIST, THE LATE JOHN MUIR, FOR THE CENTURY MAGAZINE IN 1891

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, with the enactment of my bill for the establishment of the Kings Canyon National Park in central California, national park status was conferred upon one of the most beautiful scenic areas in the world. This great scenic region and recreational center is bound to become in time as famous as any similar mountain playground on earth.

Today the outstanding scenic qualities of this area are fully acknowledged. In the light of the bitter legislative contest which resulted in the creation of this newest park, it will be interesting to note what John Muir, the late eminent and dearly beloved naturalist, had to say concerning the unmatched marvels of this section of the high Sierras in an article which he wrote for Century magazine 49 years ago. Because everything that he said then is as true today as it was when he recorded his thoughts, I ask the consent of the membership of this body that this article from his pen be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The unanimous consent of the membership having been indicated, the article referred to follows:

A RIVAL OF THE YOSEMITE—THE CANYON OF THE SOUTH FORK OF KINGS RIVER, CALIF.

In the vast Sierra wilderness far to the southward of the famous Yosemite Valley, there is a yet grander valley of the same kind. It is situated on the south fork of Kings River, above the most extensive groves and forests of the giant sequoia, and beneath the shadows of the highest mountains in the range, where the canyons are deepest and the snow-laden peaks are crowded most closely together. It is called the Big Kings River Canyon, or Kings River Yosemite, and is reached by way of Visalia, the nearest point on the Southern Pacific Railroad, from which the distance is about 45 miles, or by the Kearsarge Pass from the east side of the range. It is about 10 miles long, half a mile wide, and the stupendous rocks of purplish gray granite that form the walls are from 2,500 to 5,000 feet in height, while the depth of the valley below the general surface of the mountain mass from which it has been carved is considerably more than a mile. Thus it appears that this new Yosemite is longer and deeper, and lies embedded in grander mountains than the well-known Yosemite of the Merced. Their general characters, however, are wonderfully alike, and they bear the same relationship to the fountains of the ancient glaciers above them.

As to waterfalls, those of the new valley are far less striking in general views, although the volume of falling water is nearly twice as great and comes from higher sources. The descent of the Kings River streams is mostly made in the form of cascades, which are outspread in flat plume-like sheets on smooth slopes, or are squeezed in narrow-throated gorges, boiling, seething, in deep swirling pools, pouring from linn to linn, and breaking into ragged, tossing masses of spray and foam in boulder-choked canyons—making marvelous mixtures with the downpouring sunbeams, displaying a thousand forms and colors, and giving forth a great variety of wild mountain melody, which, rolling from side to side against the echoing cliffs, is at length all combined into one smooth, massy, sea-like roar.

The bottom of the valley is about 5,000 feet above the sea, and its level or gently sloping surface is diversified with flowery meadows and groves and open sunny flats, through the midst of which the crystal river, ever changing, ever beautiful, makes its way; now gliding softly with scarce a ripple over beds of brown pebbles, now rushing and leaping in wild exultation across avalanche rock dams or terminal moraines, swaying from side to side, beaten with sunshine, or embowered with leaning pines and firs, alders, willows, and tall balsam poplars, which with the bushes and grass at their feet make charming banks. Gnarled snags and stumps here and there reach out from the banks, making cover for trout which seem to have caught their color from rainbow spray, though hiding mostly in shadows, where the current swirls slowly and protecting sedges and willows dip their leaves.

From this long, flowery, forested, well-watered park the walls rise abruptly in plain precipices or richly sculptured masses partly separated by side canyons, displaying wonderful wealth and variety of architectural forms, which are as wonderful in beauty of color and fineness of finish as in colossal height and mass. The so-called war of the elements has done them no harm. There is no unsightly defacement as yet; deep in the sky, inviting the onset of storms through unnumbered centuries, they still stand firm and seemingly as fresh and unworn as new-born flowers.

From the brink of the walls on either side the ground still rises in a series of ice-carved ridges and basins, superbly forested and adorned with many small lakes and meadows, where deer and bear find grateful homes; while from the head of the valley mountains other mountains rise beyond in glorious array, every one of them shining with rock crystals and snow, and with a network of streams that sing their way down from lake to lake through a labyrinth of ice-burnished canyons. The area of the basins drained by the streams entering the valley is about 450 square miles, and the elevation of the rim of the general basin is from 9,000 to upward of 14,000 feet above the sea; while the general basin of the Merced Yosemite has an area of 250 square miles, and its elevation is much lower.

When from some commanding summit we view the mighty wilderness about this central valley, and, after tracing its tributary streams, note how every converging canyon shows in its sculpture, moraines and shining surfaces that it was once the channel of a glacier—contemplating this dark period of grinding ice, it would seem that here was a center of storm and stress to which no life would come. But it is just where the ancient glaciers bore down on the mountain flank with crushing and destructive and most concentrated energy that the most impressive displays of divine beauty are offered to our admiration. Even now the snow falls every winter about the valley to a depth of 10 to 20 feet, and the booming of avalanches is a common sound. Nevertheless the frailest flowers, blue and gold and purple, bloom on the brows of the great canyon rocks, and on the frosty peaks, up to a height of 13,000 feet, as well as in sheltered hollows and on level meadows and lake borders and banks of streams.

At the head of the valley the river forks, the heavier branch turning northward, and on this branch there is another Yosemite, called from its flowery beauty Paradise Valley; and the name might well be applied to the main canyon, for notwithstanding its tremendous rockiness, it is an Eden of plant beauty from end to end.

THE TRIP TO THE VALLEY

Setting out from Visalia, from the base of the first grand mountain plateau we can see the outstanding pines and sequoias 4,000 feet above us, and we now ascend rapidly, sweeping from ravine to ravine around the brows of subordinate ridges. The vegetation shows signs of a cooler climate; the golden flowered Fremontia, manzanita, ceanothus, and other bushes show miles of bloom; while great beds of blue and purple bells brighten the open spaces, the whole forming a floral apron of fine texture and pattern, let down from the verge of the forest in graceful, flowing folds. We have now reached an elevation of 6,000 feet. Down through the shadows we make our way for a mile or two in one of the upper ravines of Mill Creek. Climbing a steep mile from the mill we enter General Grant National Park of Big Trees, a square mile in extent, where a few of the giants are now being preserved amid the industrious destruction by ax, saw, and blasting powder going on around them.

We now descend to Bearskin Meadow, a sheet of purple-topped grasses enameled with violets, gilias, larkspurs, potentillas, ivesias, and columbine; parnassia and sedges in the wet places, and majestic trees crowding forward in proud array to form a curving border, while Little Boulder Creek, a stream 20 feet wide, goes humming and swirling merrily through the middle of it.

The next place with a name in the wilderness is Tornado Meadow. Here the sequoia giants stand close about us, towering above the firs and sugar pines. Then follows another climb of a thousand feet, after which we descend into the magnificent forest basin of Big Boulder Creek. Crossing this boisterous stream as best we may, up again we go 1,200 feet through glorious woods, and on a few miles to the emerald Horse Corral and Summit Meadows, a short distance beyond which the highest point on the trail is reached at Grand Lookout, 8,300 feet above the sea. Here at length we gain a general view of the great canyon of King's River lying far below, and of the vast mountain region in the sky on either side of it, and along the summit of the range. Here, too, we see the forest in broad, dark swaths still sweeping onward undaunted, climbing the further mountain slopes to a height of 11,000 feet. But King Sequoia comes not thus far. The grove nearest the valley is on one of the eastern branches of Boulder Creek, 5 miles from the lower end.

CHIEF FEATURES OF THE CANYON

Going down into the valley we make a descent of 3,500 feet, over the south shoulder, by a careless crinkled trail which seems well-nigh endless. It offers, however, many fine points of view of the huge granite trough, and the river, and the sublime rocks of the walls plunging down and planting their feet on the shady level floor.

At the foot of the valley we find ourselves in a smooth, spacious park, planted with stately groves of sugar pine, yellow pine, silver fir, incense cedar, and Kellogg oak. The floor is scarcely ruffled with underbrush, but myriads of small flowers spread a thin purple and yellow veil over the brown needles and burrs beneath the groves, and the gray ground of the open sunny spaces. The walls lean well back and support a fine growth of trees, especially on the south side, interrupted here and there by sheer masses 1,000 to 1,500 feet high, which are thrust forward out of the long slopes like dormer windows. Three miles up the valley on the south side we come to the Roaring Falls and Cascades. * * * On the east side of the fall the Cathedral Rocks spring aloft with imposing majesty. * * *

Next to the Cathedral Rocks is the group called the Seven Gables, massive and solid at the base, but elaborately sculptured along the top and a considerable distance down the front into pointed gothic arches, the highest of which is about 3,000 feet above the valley. Beyond the Gable group, and separated slightly from it by the beautiful Avalanche Canyon and Cascades, stands the bold and majestic mass of the Grand Sentinel, 3,300 feet high, with a split vertical front presented to the valley, as sheer, and nearly as extensive, as the front of the Yosemite Half Dome.

Projecting out into the valley from the base of this sheer front is the Lower Sentinel, 2,400 feet high; and on either side, the West and East Sentinels, about the same height, forming altogether the boldest and most massively sculptured group in the valley. Then follow in close succession the Sentinel Cascade, a lace-like strip of water 2,000 feet long; the South Tower, 2,500 feet high; the Bear Cascade, longer and broader than that of the Sentinel; Cave Dome, 3,200 feet high; the Sphinx, 4,000 feet; and the Leaning Dome, 3,500. The Sphinx, terminating in a curious sphinxlike figure, is the highest rock on the south wall, and one of the most remarkable in the Sierra; while the whole series from Cathedral Rocks to the Leaning Dome at the head of the valley is the highest, most elaborately sculptured, and the most beautiful series of rocks of the same extent that I have yet seen in any yosemite in the range.

Turning our attention now to the north wall, near the foot of the valley a grand and impressive rock presents itself, which with others of like structure and style of architecture is called the Palisades. Measured from the immediate brink of the vertical portion of the front, it is about 2,000 feet high, and is gashed from top to base by vertical planes, making it look like a mass of huge slabs set on edge. * * *

The next notable group that catches the eye in going up the valley is the Hermit Towers, and next to these the Three Hermits, forming together an exceedingly picturesque series of complicated structure, slightly separated by the steep and narrow Hermit Canyon.

East of the Hermits a stream about the size of Yosemite Creek enters the valley, forming the Booming Cascades. It draws its sources from the southern slopes of Mount Hutchings and Mount Kellogg, 11,000 and 12,000 feet high, and on the divide between the Middle and South Forks of the King's River.

Above the Booming Cascades and opposite the Grand Sentinel stands the North Dome, 3,450 feet high. Above the dome the ridge still rises in a finely drawn curve until it reaches its culminating point in the pyramid, a lofty symmetrical rock nearly 6,000 feet above the floor of the valley.

A short distance east of the dome is Lion Rock, a very striking mass as seen from a favorable standpoint, but lower than the main rocks of the wall, being only about 2,000 feet high. Beyond the Lion and opposite the East Sentinel a stream called Copper Creek comes chanting down into the valley. It takes its rise in a cluster of beautiful lakes that lie on the top of the divide between the South and Middle Forks of the Kings River, to the east of Mount Kellogg. The broad, spacious basin it drains abounds in beautiful groves of spruce and silver fir and small meadows and gardens, where the bear and deer love to feed, but (sic) it has been badly trampled by flocks of sheep.

From Copper Creek to the head of the valley the precipitous portion of the north wall is comparatively low. The most notable features are the North Tower, a square, boldly sculptured, outstanding mass 2,000 feet in height, and the dome arches, heavily glaciated and offering telling sections of domed and folded structure. At the head of the valley, in a position corresponding to that of the Half Dome in Yosemite, looms the great Glacier Monument, the broadest, loftiest, and most sublimely beautiful of all these wonderful rocks. It is upward of a mile in height and has five ornamental summits and an indescribable variety of sculptured forms projecting or countersunk on its majestic front, all balanced and combined into one symmetrical mountain mass.

THE VALLEY FLOOR

The bottom of the valley is covered by heavy deposits of moraine material, mostly outspread in comparatively smooth and level beds, though four well-characterized terminal moraines may still be traced stretching across from wall to wall, dividing the valley into sections.

With the exception of a small meadow on the river bank, a mile or more of the lower end of the valley is occupied by delightful groves, and is called "Deer Park." Between Deer Park and the Roaring Fall lies the Manzanita Orchard, consisting of a remarkably even and extensive growth of manzanita bushes scarcely interrupted by other bushes or by trees.

The largest meadow in the valley lies at the foot of Grand Sentinel. It is noted for its fine growth of sweet-brier rose, the foliage of which as well as the flower is deliciously fragrant, especially in the morning when the sun warms the dew. At the foot of South Tower, near the Bear Cascades, there is a notable garden of Mariposa tulips.

On the north side of the Valley the spaces that bear names are Bee Pasture, Gilia Garden, and Purple Flat, all lavishly flowery, each with its own characteristic plants, though mostly they are the same as those of the south side of the river, variously developed and combined; while aloft on a thousand niches, benches, and recesses of the walls are charming rock ferns, such as adiantum, pellaea, cheilanthes, allosurus, and brilliant rugs and fringes of the alpine phlox, Menzies penstemon, bryanthus, Cassiope, Alpine primula, and many other small floral mountaineers.

PARADISE CANYON

Ascending the Paradise Canyon we find still grander scenery, at least for the first 10 miles. * * * The walls of the canyon on either side rise to a height of from 3,000 to 5,000 feet in majestic forms, hardly inferior in any respect to those of the main valley. The most striking of these on the west wall is the Helmet, 4,000 feet in height; and on the east side, after the monument, Paradise Peak.

FROM YOSEMITE TO KINGS RIVER ALONG THE SIERRA

One of my visits to the great canyon was undertaken from the old Yosemite along the Sierra. We followed the old trail to Wawona and the Mariposa sequoias, then plunged into the trackless wilderness. We traced the Chiquita San Joaquin to its head, then crossed the canyon of the North Fork of the San Joaquin below the Yosemite of this branch, and made our way southward across the Middle and South Forks of the San Joaquin to a point on the divide between the South Fork of the San Joaquin and the North Fork of the Kings River, 10,000 feet above the sea. Pushing on with difficulty over the divide, we entered the upper valley of the North Fork of the Kings River, and traced its course through many smooth glacier-meadows, and past many a beautiful cluster of granite domes, developed and burnished by the ancient glaciers. Below this dome region the canyon closed, and we were compelled to grope our way along its forest-clad brink until we discovered a promising side canyon, which led us down into the North Fork, Yosemite, past a massive projecting rock like El Capitan. We at length made a way out of this little Yosemite by a rude trail that we built up a gorge of the south wall, and on to the crest of the divide between the North and Middle Forks of the river. Here we gained telling views of the region about the head of the Middle Fork of Kings River, vast mountains along the axis of the range, seemingly unapproachable, a broad map of domes and huge ridge-waves and canyons extending to the summits far to the west of us in glorious harmony. Tracing the divide through magnificent forests we at length forded the main Kings River, passed through the sequoia groves, and entered the great Yosemite on the 9th of October, after a light storm had freshened the colors.

DESTRUCTIVE TENDENCIES

At first sight it would seem that these mighty granite temples could be injured but little by anything that man may do. But it is surprising to find how much our impressions in such cases depend upon the delicate bloom of the scenery, which, in all the more accessible places, is so easily rubbed off. I saw the King's River Valley in its midsummer glory 16 years ago, when it was wild, and when the divine balanced beauty of the trees and flowers seemed to be reflected and doubled by all the onlooking rocks and streams as though they were mirrors, while they in turn were mirrored in every garden and grove. In that year (1875) I saw the following ominous notice on a tree in the King's River, Yosemite:

"We, the undersigned, claim this valley for the purpose of raising stock.

MR. THOMAS,
MR. RICHARDS,
HARVEY & CO."

and I feared that the vegetation would soon perish. This spring (1891) I made my fourth visit to the valley, to see what damage had been done, and to inspect the forests. I left San Francisco on the 28th of May, accompanied by Mr. Robinson, the artist. At the new King's River Mills we found that the sequoia giants, as well as the pines and firs, were being ruthlessly turned into lumber. Sixteen years ago I saw five mills on or near the sequoia belt, all of which were cutting more or less of "big tree" lumber. Now, as I am told, the number of mills along the belt in the basins of the King's, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers is doubled, and the capacity more than doubled. As if fearing restriction of some kind, particular attention is being devoted to the destruction of the sequoia groves owned by the mill companies, with the view to get them made into lumber and money before steps can be taken to save them. It seems incredible that Government should have abandoned so much of the forest cover of the mountains to destruction. As well sell the rain clouds, and the snow, and the rivers to be cut up and carried away if that were possible. Surely it is high time that something be done to stop the extension of the present barbarous indiscriminating method of harvesting the lumber crop.

THE TEHIPITEE VALLEY

By ascending the valley of Copper Creek and crossing the divide you will find a middle fork tributary that conducts by an easy

grade down into the head of the grand Middle Fork Canyon, through which you may pass in time of low water, crossing the river from time to time, where sheer headlands are brushed by the current, leaving no space for a passage. After a long, rough scramble, you will be delighted when you emerge from the narrow bounds of the great canyon into the spacious and enchantingly beautiful Tehipitee. It is about 3 miles long, half a mile wide, and the walls are from 2,500 to nearly 4,000 feet in height. The floor of the valley is remarkably level, and the river flows with a gentle, stately current. Nearly half of the floor is meadowland, the rest sandy flat planted with the same kind of trees and flowers as the same kind of soil bears in the great canyon, forming groves and gardens, the whole enclosed by majestic granite walls, which in height and beauty and variety of architecture are not surpassed in any Yosemite of the range. Several small cascades coming from a great height sing and shine among the intricate architecture of the south wall, one of which when seen in front seems to be a nearly continuous fall about 2,000 feet high. But the grand fall of the valley is on the north side. This is the Tehipitee Fall, about 1,800 feet high. The upper portion is broken up into short falls and magnificent cascade dashes, but the last plunge is made over a sheer precipice about 400 feet in height into a beautiful pool.

To the eastward of the Tehipitee Fall stands Tehipitee Dome, 2,500 feet high, a gigantic round-topped tower, slender as compared with its height, and sublimely simple and massive in structure. It is not set upon, but against, the general masonry of the wall, standing well forward, and rising free from the open sunny floor of the valley, attached to the general mass of the wall rocks only at the back. This is one of the most striking and wonderful rocks in the Sierra. (See plate VIII.)

THE NEED OF ANOTHER GREAT NATIONAL PARK

I fancy the time is not distant when this wonderful region will be opened to the world. * * * Some of the sequoia groves were last year included in the national reservations of Sequoia and General Grant Parks. But all of this wonderful King's River region, together with the Kaweah and Tule sequoias, should be comprehended in one grand national park. This region contains no mines of consequence, it is too high and too rocky for agriculture, and even the lumber industry need suffer no unreasonable restriction. Let our lawgivers then make haste before it is too late to set apart this surpassingly glorious region for the recreation and well-being of humanity, and all the world will rise up and call them blessed.

JOHN MUIR.

Permissive Military Training for the C. C. C.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced a bill in this Congress to permit enrollees in the C. C. C. camps to be given military training of 6 hours per week. Under the provisions of my bill it is not required that all C. C. C. enrollees take military training, but the bill only permits those enrollees who desire such training to take it under the supervision and instruction of Army officers. I would not favor compulsory military training in the C. C. C. at this time. But for the past 4 or 5 years I have been urging that C. C. C. enrollees be permitted to avail themselves of this opportunity which I have long since been definitely convinced a vast majority of the enrollees very much desire. During the past few years I have visited more than 50 C. C. C. camps in some 15 States. I have been accorded the opportunity of not only talking publicly to the enrollees but also of discussing this matter of military training with hundreds of enrollees privately. I find that at least 95 percent or more are desirous of having this training. Many of the enrollees have expressed the opinion that in failing and refusing to give them the opportunity to receive this training this Government is not giving them a square deal. I have asked the chairman of the Committee on Labor for a hearing on my bill and am very hopeful of being accorded the privilege of appearing in support of this proposed legislation. I have also discussed the matters with others very high in authority and feel that this administration now looks with favor on my proposal to permit C. C. C. enrollees to receive this valuable training.

PROCEEDINGS

HELD IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

AT THE

UNVEILING OF THE PAINTING

DEPICTING THE SCENE AT THE

SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940, at 3 o'clock p. m.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

HON. JOHN N. GARNER, *Vice President of the United States*

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, *Speaker of the House of Representatives*

HON. DAVID LYNN, *Architect of the Capitol*

PROGRAM

Concert, 2:30 to 3 p. m.—Selections by UNITED STATES NAVY BAND
LT. CHARLES BENTER, *Leader*

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, *Speaker of the House of Representatives, Presiding*

Invocation—REV. ZeBARNEY T. PHILLIPS, D. D.
Chaplain of the Senate of the United States

Presentation of the Painting—HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Unveiling of the Painting—GRAHAM T. SMALLWOOD, *Sons of the American Revolution*; MISS MILDRED C. SHERMAN, *Daughters of the American Revolution*

The Star Spangled Banner—UNITED STATES NAVY BAND

Address—HON. KENT E. KELLER
House of Representatives

Address—HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
United States Senate

Address—HON. ULYSSES S. GUYER
House of Representatives

Acceptance of the Painting—HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
United States Senate

Introduction of the Artist—HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

March of the Constitution—UNITED STATES NAVY BAND

Benediction—REV. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, D. D.
Chaplain of the House of Representatives

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, Ruler and Guide of the destinies of nations, we commend unto Thee our blessed America, that Thou wilt ever keep her close unto Thyself, for out of her, dear Lord, Thou hast constructed a great and efficacious instrument for good in the world. Thou has placed us in the gateways of the earth; Thou hast mingled our blood from uncorrupted springs; Thou has touched us with the inspiration of human hearts, which is the great law, the great watchword of our Constitution.

Thou didst promise of old, dear Lord, that Thou wouldst make a new covenant with Thy people, saying, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Remember, O Lord, this Thy covenant of old. May we reinvoke it on this

blessed occasion when an inspired people rededicates itself unto Thee and Thy service.

We commit unto Thy gracious keeping the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Congress, the judiciary, and all the departments of the Government of this our great land. O, give us wisdom and discretion; keep us pure, calm, and steadfast, and grant to us the strength to live an upright and a godly life. Bless Him who hast given us the benefit of Thy inspiration upon His work, for Thou, O God, didst bring forth at the creation of the earth shouts of joy from the children of the Most High; Thou, O Christ, was born in a manger tapestried with angelic forms and with the heavenly antiphon of peace on earth and goodwill to men resounding down the corridors of time. And so we ask Thy blessing upon this service of dedication in the nation's shrine of this masterpiece of beauty and historical import.

Grant that now we may undertake only that which shall promote the way of peace. Bless those nations that are at war; strengthen the patience of men; guide their instincts into holy and constructive living. And may our Nation, dear Lord, be the means of bringing back not only to rationality and reasonableness but also unto the highest, most righteous peace all the nations of the earth. Forgive our sins, our negligences, and our ignorances, and help us to go forth to all the world in Thy name and through the spirit of Him who taught us when we pray to say:

Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed by Thy name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom and the power, and the glory, forever and ever.

Amen.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As chairman of the Commission authorized by the resolution of Congress to provide for a painting depicting the signing of our Federal Constitution, and in accordance with a concurrent resolution adopted by both bodies providing for the unveiling and acceptance of the painting, I now call this convocation to order. The Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Z©Barney T. Phillips, will offer prayer.

In a few moments there will be disclosed for your observation and, I feel confident, for your hearty approval and admiration, a reproduction on canvas of possibly the most significant event in the political and governmental history of our Republic.

It has often occurred to me in looking over the other great historic paintings which adorn this rotunda and this Capitol that it is a rather singular thing, if, indeed, not a grievous omission, that up until this hour no provision has been made for the perpetuation in enduring form of that scene of such transcendant importance to our people, as well as to the people of the world.

It was the concluding episode of the determined purpose of our ancestors who participated in the struggle for our independence to write into one document their conception of the structure of a righteous and enduring form of government for a free people. With the addition of the first 10 amendments, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, there was established our fundamental law, upon which there has been builded not only the oldest but likewise the most powerful democracy on the face of the earth.

Possibly after a lapse of 150 years after the signing of this Constitution, no more appropriate time than this could have been selected for the dedication of a perpetual memorial to those men of genius and high resolve and profound philosophy who made possible our great experiment in human freedom. And such observation is based upon the fact that today we are confronted with the menace of diabolical doctrines and powers which threaten to destroy the very foundations of democratic institutions everywhere on the face of the earth.

In a moment as we look upon the faces of those great men, the signers of the Constitution, let us as a united people highly resolve that no sacrifice will be too great, no hardship too burdensome upon the part of this generation, to preserve for our posterity and for the world the priceless heritage they bequeathed, in perpetuity, to their descendants.

Let us swear by the memory of the founders that if constitutional and representative government shall succumb in all other parts of the world, it shall and will be preserved inviolate in the Western Hemisphere. God give us the spirit and the strength to secure that supreme objective. [Applause.]

The Commission authorized by resolution of Congress to provide for a painting depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States having fulfilled its duties pursuant to that resolution, this painting will now be unveiled by Mr. Graham T. Smallwood, representing the Sons of the American Revolution, and Miss Mildred C. Sherman, representing the Daughters of the American Revolution.

During the unveiling of the painting, the United States Navy Band played the Star-Spangled Banner.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The President of the United States was, of course, invited to attend the ceremonies but found it impossible under the pressure of his other public duties at this time to attend. I now have the privilege of reading to this audience the letter addressed to me as chairman of the Commission by the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 28, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Chairman of the Commission to Provide a Painting of the Signing of the Constitution, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We should all be immeasurably happier could this ceremony take place in another kind of world—in a tranquil world where men and nations alike were free to seek out peacefully their individual destinies.

But, tragically, the condition of the world is vastly different. Beyond the seas, the way of life so brilliantly outlined in the document that we salute today is under attack by force of arms unprecedented in human history.

And so I believe that I express the sentiments of every thoughtful and loyal member of this democracy when I say that the present occasion is one far less for rejoicing than for sober resolve: resolve that neither by moral unfitness nor neglect of our physical defense shall we permit the lamp of freedom to be extinguished in this land.

It was truly a momentous scene whose reproduction is to be unveiled in the Capitol. It marked the culmination of a prodigious, unparalleled, and amazingly successful effort to express in a charter of government the eternal spirit of a just and humane society. God grant that the day is not far distant when that spirit will be free to assert itself in the councils of all mankind.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I take pleasure in presenting the Honorable KENT E. KELLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, and chairman of the House Committee on the Library.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, painting on wood and stone is known to be some thousands of years old, where fully protected. But there appears to be a feeling that pictures done on canvas are comparatively short-lived; that they soon fade and disappear. But the facts are that paintings on canvas are to a very high degree permanent if properly protected. There are a number of paintings on canvas now nearing 700 years of age, awaiting installation in the National Gallery of Art.

They are as fresh and colorful as the day they left the painters' hands. There is every evidence that these paintings will show but little, if any change at the end of another 700 years. The same will be true of this great canvas before us today.

It contains not only the finest and truest portraits of these men—the Signers of the Constitution—now in existence—all drawn to life size, perspective considered. These colors are as permanent in their nature as those in the pictures referred to awaiting installation in the National Gallery of Art.

When twenty centuries shall have rolled away, and when American millions have passed by and viewed their ancestors in that great act, these characters—these clothes—these men in the habiliments of their time will be as fresh and clear as they are before us here today.

House Joint Resolution No. 224 was introduced by Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST, Representative in Congress, on March 22, 1939. This resolution authorized the painting of the "Signing of the Constitution." It was reported by the Committee on the Library on March 25, Report No. 315. It was passed by the House of Representatives on April 3, by the Senate on April 17, and approved by the President on April 20, 1939.

The public resolution provided for a Commission, consisting of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, to select the painter to execute this work.

On May 19, 1939, this Commission selected Mr. Howard Chandler Christy to paint the "Signing of the Constitution of the United States." The price agreed upon was not to exceed $30,000, and that amount was agreed to between the Commission and Mr. Christy. The painting was to be approximately 20 by 30 feet in size.

About 5 years ago, Mr. Christy had begun an extensive study of this subject, the Signing of the Constitution, and 3 years ago had finished a small painting containing portraits of all of the signers. This painting was about 5 by 7 feet. It was exhibited on the floor and corridors of both the House and the Senate. It showed, to say the least of it, the intimate study which Mr. Christy had made of this subject of the Signing of the Constitution.

This first picture, contained in the upper part, an allegorically expressed idea—the spirit of the Constitution in relation to the people it was to serve. The figures representing this allegory, however, were entirely rejected by the Commission when they instructed Mr. Christy in the form which the painting was to take. He was instructed to follow strictly the historical facts in painting this picture, and this instruction he followed to the letter.

The artist sought and studied all available portraits and descriptions of the signers of the Constitution as the basis of his work. He found acceptable and authentic portraits of 36 of them which left only 2 of the signers of whom no authentic portrait was available. They were Jaco Broom, of Delaware, and Thomas Fitzsimons, of Pennsylvania. The figures of these 2 are painted in with their backs to the observer.

The painting, therefore, contains the portraits of George Washington, president of the convention and delegate from Virginia; John Langdon and Nicholas Gilman, of New Hampshire; Nathaniel Gorham and Rufus King, of Massachusetts; William Samuel Johnson and Roger Sherman, of Connecticut; Alexander Hamilton, of New York; Wil. Livingston, David Brearley, William Patterson, and Janathan Dayton, of New Jersey; B. Franklin, Robt. Morris, Thos. Fitzsimons, James Wilson, Thomas Mifflin, Geo. Clymer, Jared Ingersoll, and Gouv. Morris, of Pennsylvania; George Read, John Dickinson, Jaco Broom, Gunning Bedford, Jr., and Richard Basset, of Delaware; James McHenry, Daniel Carroll, and Dan Jenifer of St. Thomas, from Maryland; John Blair and James Madison, Jr., of Virginia; William Blount, Hu. Williamson, and Richard Dobbs Spaight, of North Carolina; J. Rutledge, Charles Pinckney, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and Pierce Butler, of South Carolina; William Few and Abraham Baldwin, of Georgia; and William Jackson, the secretary, with the two exceptions noted.

But to Howard Chandler Christy, this is not alone a work of art. It is the expression of a patriotism older than the Republic, of a family background from colonial days. It is a work of love and appreciation of his country, an expression of a subconscious recollection of the many battlefields on which his family contested for the establishment and maintenance of this Republic.

Mr. Christy was not only enabled to gather many portraits of most of these characters, which enabled him to paint the best possible portraits, but in many instances he located the original clothing which many of the delegates to this constitutional convention actually wore during that period. This painting shows that clothing with great precision and truth on the canvas.

Where the portrait did not indicate the size and physical characteristics of the man, Mr. Christy carried on an investigation along that line, which not only gave very complete data as to the actual clothing which these men wore, but the physical size and form of these signers of the Constitution.

This is notably the case in relation to George Washington and Benjamin Franklin.

The most comprehensive picture of any man is obtained from what the man, himself, said and did. For instance, George Washington was a man of great height and strength, trained by military service, athletic, a great wrestler, as shown by the historical fact that he was made an Indian chief because he could throw in a match any Indian wrestler between Virginia and the Ohio River. He was a splendid horseman, in the saddle much of the time; consequently there was little opportunity for him to develop any width of waist line.

At the age of 55, at the time of the signing of the Constitution, he stood over 6 feet 3 inches and weighed 190 pounds.

In color, his hair was red, eyes blue. He wore no wig, but his hair was powdered according to the fashion of the time. His clothing was rich but simple. In the painting they are exact copies of the original, including his shoes and knee buckles and watch fob, which can be seen in the Smithsonian Museum.

These known facts, together with the wonderful mask of Washington by Houdon (now carefully preserved at the Mount Vernon Museum) gave the artist an infallible physical portrait of the man as he was. Many people, seeing this portrait as it was being painted, have remarked, "That is Washington as I have always thought him to be."

Among other things, one common fallacy has been corrected. Many portraits of Washington, showing him with a quite full stomach, are in existence. When one considers his way of life and examines his clothing, such portraiture is clearly incorrect. So, upon investigation it was found that often another model posed for Washington's body. In one case Gouverneur Morris is known to have posed for the figure in a very important work, wherefore the large and untrue waistline.

The same painstaking research was made in relation to Franklin. Two years ago, the Metropolitan Museum of the city of New York held an exhibition of everything pertaining to Franklin. Portraits for which he posed personally, objects of furniture and clothing, and especially the plum-colored brocade costume with the finest lace embroidered waistcoat which he wore while in France, gave a good idea of his stature.

But the most comprehensive and descriptive material dealing with Franklin was what he, himself, had to say. Because of his direct simplicity, possessing that glorious singing quality of truth, bestowed by God on the day of his birth, Franklin wrote in a way that revealed his own glory.

He possessed a deep appreciation for creative art. He also possessed one of the greatest minds in all the history of mankind. It is said that Benjamin Franklin and Leonardo da Vinci were the greatest creative and artistic minds the world has ever known. No doubt, because of his great appreciation for creative art, he posed more than most others of his time for artists.

At the time of the signing, Franklin was 82 years old, a philosopher, inventor, humorist, wit, statesman, and so you see him in this picture—not a wrinkle put in—not a wrinkle left out. The face of any 82-year-old man, as he was—the first time it has been so painted. This characterization is a great achievement.

For the portrait of Hamilton, some 30 reproductions or paintings, busts, and bas reliefs were used, taking the best from each painting an entirely new portrait truer than any then in existence is the result. The best portraits of him are those by Trumbull in front and three-quarter views, but a profile was required for this place. He was 30 years old at

the time of the signing, and is here depicted in black satin with cut silver buttons, white silk stockings, powdered hair, and very handsome and animated as he really was.

Madison, who was 36 years of age, is represented by the fine portrait by Stuart.

For Gouverneur Morris, several portraits were consulted. He had lost a leg in an accident and is usually depicted wearing a peg leg. But since a peg leg had nothing historically to do with the signing, and since he stands back of Hamilton, this leg was not permitted to show.

Each character here represented was taken up and studied carefully, in order to get the best portraits possible. Inasmuch as the deputies knew that the signing was to take place, they considering it a state occasion, dressed up. Here they are, with their very best clothes and powdered wigs or hair, as the case might be.

Many studies were made in the chamber in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, where the signing took place. The light at the time of day and the time of year fell in just this way upon the men and the furnishings.

The original desk and inkwell, the famous "Sunrise" chair mentioned by Franklin, many of the chairs used by the delegates, the chandelier still in its place; the flags, the original Stars and Stripes, a famous dragoon regiment from Maryland and a New Hampshire regiment have their banners there. The curtains of green with gold facing, the cloths which covered the delegates' tables, the rose-colored silk rug, and other drapings are just as they were then, true in color and design.

The books on the floor near Franklin are three of Thomas Jefferson's finest, now of great value. The open Bible on the side table by Robert Morris is also of that period. All of these are at present in the Library of Congress.

Smithsonian Institution has the drum shown on the back wall.

The pen, or quill, with which Spaight is signing, came from the boyhood home of Patrick Henry.

Through the window can be seen the old Horse and Coach Tavern which was there at that time, and which the delegates frequently visited. The season of the year is indicated in the well-known row of walnut trees.

It is well here, perhaps, to make a suggestion of the origin and use of painting in the recording of great events of men, to indicate at least relatively the position this great painting is to hold in that great art of color, form, and action.

Of all of the arts—painting, sculpture, and architecture—painting is probably the newest. But it has already played a tremendous part in the giving of expression to the achievements of the periods in which the great paintings were made, just as this great painting is the ultimate of the works of this character at the present day.

How old is art? And what is the importance of it? Every one has noticed children in their attempts to make pictures of the things they see. It is, in fact, a universal aspiration of the human mind. The proof of this is very clearly and certainly illustrated by the fact that in what we consider the childhood of the human race at least 15,000 years ago, a great unknown artist of the Magdalenian epoch painted vividly a bison in the caverns of Altamira, Spain. The drawing is accurate, firm, and spirited. The pose and expression is proud and terrible. The coloring is still finely preserved and altogether appropriate.

Many other spirited sketches of men and animals of that remote period and even earlier have been found at far separated localities of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Thus far America, though it has lately yielded to the search of the archeologist artifacts in stone and pottery dating from 15,000 years or more ago, presents no examples of the high artistic skill until near the time of Christ. But then there comes to light in Mexico and Central America a talent in carving in stone not inferior to the finest examples of carving in any age or clime. Moreover, immense architectural triumphs, as original and majestic as those of Egypt or Mesopotamia, astonish us.

But in the Egypt of 5,000 to 3,000 years ago, not only architecture but painting and the craft of the jeweler were of the highest order and permanence. Specimens of Egyptian jewelry from the tombs of her kings and mighty men are now preserved in the museum at Cairo which would grace the most exacting of today. Mural paintings of the judgment scenes, where the souls of the kings are weighed in the presence of the gods, are now to be seen in the rock tombs near Thebes, impressive in their solemnity and as fresh in their colors as if laid on but yesterday.

In all countries, in all ages since man arrived at a fair standard of culture, great historical scenes and notable triumphs have been recorded by the chisel of the sculptor, and the pencil and brush of the artist. Thus the dead yet speak from times far antedating the printed book.

How should we know, for instance, of the personal appearance of the apostles had not the eastern and Latin churches preserved, since the earliest centuries of the Christian era, minute direction for their portrayal? Their figures, always the same, are found in the illuminations of the earliest manuscripts, and on the walls of the Byzantine and Greek churches from the earliest times. To cite but two examples, St. Peter appears as a man of about 60 years, rather full in stature, with bald head except for curling, light-gray hair at the back, a short broad beard, majestic expression, and rather wide nostrils. St. Paul is smaller, less erect, somewhat younger, nearly bald, a somewhat longer beard of darker gray, small quick eyes, and a very determined and clever expression. Both apostles wear the seamless garment. Authoritative commands as to the delineation of the apostles, according to ancient usage, come down from the second council of Nicaea of the year 787.

The permanency of painting as a spirited record of human achievement is remarkable. In the galleries of Europe, in our own choice National Gallery of Art, soon to be opened, and in the priceless collections of connoisseurs, there are preserved canvases already 6 centuries old, which represent the acme of human genius. When war, with its brutal devastations, invades the calm precincts where these priceless gems are kept, great cost and pains are always taken, if possible, to hide them away beyond the reach of armies. We may hope that such loving ministrations will succeed in preserving the masterpieces of great artists like Raphael, Titian, and many others for the many centuries to come.

There is, nevertheless, a great value in works of painting less distinguished than these. Time lends historical importance to the portraits of national figures, and the gatherings which took place on notable occasions. How could we spare the portraits of popes and doges, emperors and kings, whose acts have changed the world? What would make up for the destruction of our paintings of the appearance of Christopher Marlowe, Milton, Luther, and others who have shaped human thought? Would great monuments in stone satisfactorily replace for us the portraits of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, or Lincoln?

And who is not moved to emulation by the painter's depicting of great moments in human history? Washington crossing the Delaware, or suffering with his army at Valley Forge; the Declaration of Independence; Jackson at New Orleans; Paul Jones "just begun to fight"; Decatur in the harbor at Tripoli; Lee and Grant, so strikingly in contrast to present barbarism, as they met at Appomattox.

There are at least four great moments in that history which is our heritage which richly deserve to be set high before our memories. I allude to the wresting from King John of the Magna Carta at Runnymede in 1215; the compact of the Pilgrim Fathers at Provincetown Harbor in 1620; the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776; and the adoption of the Constitution in 1788. These are the bulwarks of liberty. Threatened on every hand, now is the time when the inspiration of these great moments should thrill us all to sacrifice all else for liberty.

We do not minimize the value of the teaching found in books, millions of which fill the great Library of Congress. We are proud of the provision so adequately and ingeniously worked out by The National Archives for preserving not only written documents of historical value but even the voice—

the manner—the actual appearance of the great leaders in the settings where they spoke on subjects during the present period.

But these great repositories, necessary as they are, are not entirely adequate to the memory of the great men, great peoples, and great occasions. We may well call on architecture, on sculpture, and on painting to elevate our minds and acts to noble pitches as we contemplate those greatest deeds and characters which most deserve our emulation.

The record of the bison on the wall of the cave shows that through their art we know the genius of men, although they otherwise may be long forgotten.

So may it be with this painting in the centuries yet to come. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now have the great pleasure of presenting United States Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the ceremony which we here perform commemorates the erection of one of the great beacons of civilization. For the people of the New World it stands almost exactly midway in their history. We have lived 150 years approximately in the light of that beacon. They, our great forefathers, lived 150 years before they were able to erect it. Here on this continent a people distressed economically and under the great fear of anarchy politically looked up to that beacon in hope, but with some misgivings. From the New World its beams were cast across the sea to the Old World, where mankind was also looking for light to take it out of the darkness which had been created by the tyranny of an entirely different principle of government than this great Constitution represented. Heaven ordained that the world should have the benefit of the most remarkable collection of great men, that is as it seems to us, the most remarkable gathering of great men the world has ever found assembled with one common objective. Yet their leader, Washington, was so modest that, in a letter to Bushrod Washington, evidently written about 2 months after the signing of the Constitution, he said among other things:

> I do not think we are more inspired, have more wisdom, or possess more virtue, than those who will come after us.

I wish I could believe that that had the element of prophecy in it, for I think today the world needs the guidance not only of a benevolent Creator but also of men who possess wisdom and virtue adequate to solve the grave problems with which the world is confronted today.

They not only established a government by their Constitution, they founded a philosophy, a philosophy that was the product of the ages. So far as our forefathers are concerned, what they put upon paper and subscribed on that eventful day, September 17, 1787, represented the evolution of 150 years of difficult political experience. They sought a fixed law to live by because they had suffered under the laxity, uncertainty, and evil of a fundamental law that was subject to fluctuation and change with the changing emotions of the monarch. From divine right of kings to moral responsibility of man they progressed. From absolute power they revolted and evolved the philosophy of limited and divided power.

As I looked at this picture first I imagined Hamilton inquiring of Franklin there, "What do you think we have created here?" And Franklin replying in effect, "A republic, if the people are competent to keep it such." [Applause.]

The thought is amplified in the following, which I have taken from The Constitution and Its Framers, by Coleman, a brief paragraph quoting Franklin:

> In these sentiments I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered; and I believe further that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall have become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other.

How wise do those words prove to be as we witness the mortality of republics in the Old World. Thank God for the fact that this Republic has lived a longer life in years than any other form of government ever lived in all the history of the world, and that it still promises to endure so long as the people of America are worthy of this form of government. [Applause.] For the maintenance of it, I take a quotation from Hamilton. What he is saying there to Franklin we can only conjecture, but we know that the thought reflected by his countenance as he leans toward Franklin is well expressed in the following:

> The Constitution is the compact made between the society at large and each individual. The society, therefore, cannot, without breach of faith and injustice, refuse to any individual a single advantage which he derives under that compact, no more than one man can refuse to perform his agreement with another. If the community have good reasons for abrogating the old compact and establishing a new one, it undoubtedly has a right to do it; but until the compact is dissolved with the same solemnity and certainty with which it was made the society, as well as individuals, are bound by it.

There is another figure in that remarkably beautiful memorial of this great event that appeals especially to me. It walked right out of the ensemble toward me, in effect, when I first looked at that painting. It is the figure, the countenance, and the stern eyes of Gouverneur Morris. There he stands, right in front of that window. He is No. 5 on your diagram. Of course, I would be interested in Gouverneur Morris. He meant so much not only to the United States of America as a great founding father, but he meant a great deal to the State from which I come and which I love—Vermont. I am yielding to the temptation to take your time long enough to quote from Gouverneur Morris on Vermont. It is a little bit whimsical, but it recognizes the remarkable perception of Gouverneur Morris. He was writing to his Governor—Governor Clinton—in 1778 in the midst of that contest for independence and recognition which Vermont made when she was striving so hard to be admitted into the Union. He said:

> I find clearly from the very best authority that without nice management we shall certainly lose the State of Vermont. * * * 'Tis absurd to reason against the feelings of mankind. Neither is it much to the purpose whether our claim is right; for if it be, the most which can be said for us is that we have right without remedy. What are their claims? Occupancy, settlement, cultivation, and the Book of Genesis. What their plea? Their mountains, their arms, their courage, their alliance. Against all this what can we produce? Why, forsooth, a decision of the king in council and a clause in the confederacy. How slender a foundation. But how are we to act? To give them up? No. We must go to the mountain if the mountain won't come to us. * * * It is under heaven the great thing needful to us, and though I laugh whenever Vermont is named, yet I could almost use the poetical occasion and say " 'tis laughter swelled with bursting sighs."

Now, it was this same statesman who recognized the fundamental disagreements that had characterized the making of the Constitution and who feared that many of the delegates would refuse to give their individual consent to the Constitution; therefore, in order that the action of the convention would appear to be unanimous, Gouverneur Morris devised the following formula:

> Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the 17th of September. In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names.

Thus he escaped putting any delegate personally upon the record, and we well remember that only 39 of the 42 delegates signed the Constitution and that at least 65 persons had been appointed as delegates to the convention. So that this great beacon of civilization was really erected by a moderate-sized convention.

I think that posterity as well as ourselves owes a great obligation of thanks to Howard Chandler Christy. He must indeed be a prince of personality to be able to put upon canvas figures and countenances so noble, so expressive as these which stand before us in this wonderful work of art. [Applause.] He comes to us not only with a great gift of beauty, but with a message of vital importance which he never could have transmitted through those eyes and lineaments there on canvas had he not been animated by a sentiment of deep devotion to his country. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now have the pleasure of presenting the Honorable ULYSSES S. GUYER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Speaker BANKHEAD, Mr. Christy, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: Literature and art are the mirrors that reflect a nation's life, the stream on whose bosom is etched the spiritual and intellectual life of a people. Since the Great War of 1914 there has been an evident decadence of the fine arts. However, there are notable exceptions. Mr. Borglum's giant sculptures at Mount Rushmore rival the massive grandeur of ancient Egypt, and now Howard Chandler Christy's historical painting commemorating the signing of the Constitution has no rival on this continent. Next to the signers of that document, I envy the man who painted that incomparable canvas.

After 150 years we at last have an adequate memorial celebrating the grandeur of the Constitution and our devotion to that powerful group of constructive statesmen who made it possible.

Someone said that there had been no painting since the war in 1914 which, by its beauty or thought had caught the gaze of the public eye. That no longer may be said, for here is a canvas that captures the imagination for its beauty as well as for its great historical significance.

I shall always consider it one of the rarest privileges of my life that I was permitted to observe this artist-patriot paint himself into immortality on this canvas. I saw it grow into a living thing pregnant with patriotic meaning and eloquent with the epic of the most historic drama ever enacted on the Western Hemisphere. Who can adequately estimate the value of the influence of this painting as generation after generation of American youth gaze upon this patriotic vision knowing, as they must, that whatever security of life, liberty, and property they possess depends upon what those wise statesmen wrote on those four precious pieces of parchment over there in the Library of Congress.

During that long sultry summer of 1787 those consecrated patriots struggled with the age-old problems of human liberty until, on the 17th day of September, they were ready to write their names into immortality by signing what was soon to become the Constitution of the United States. When these strong men, who will for centuries look from this canvas, gave us a government of law and not of men, they placed themselves among the immortals; and, judged by what they wrought, they were the greatest and wisest group of statesmen that ever surrounded the council tables of any nation in all the tide of time. Their work was performed in that classic Hall at Philadelphia which the artist has so faithfully portrayed.

And what giant actors played their roles on that consecrated stage. With what exquisite skill has the painter forever fixed upon this canvas the images of these Titans who so wisely wrought the fabric of our Nation's faith. Never did artist more realistically catch the spirit of the moving drama, the living motion, and the stately dignity of a superlatively great occasion to be transmitted to the vision of generations yet unborn that they, too, may look upon and know the breed of men who laid our foundations strong and deep.

There sits Franklin with the wisdom of the ages looking from his tired, age-dimmed eyes. Franklin, for whom, Mirabeau declared, "the worlds of science and philosophy contended." Close by his side is Alexander Hamilton, the first martyr of the Republic; Hamilton, a living dynamo of nervous energy, with his face aflame with the fire of creative and constructive genius; Hamilton, the only human being that Washington ever deigned to lean upon. And in the background sits quiet, unobtrusive James Madison, the personification of modesty and reticence and the impersonation of intellectual capacity; Madison, the "Father of the Constitution." Sitting over there to the right is Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolution, who was the victim of our first depression; Morris, who made his country rich but who was visited by Washington in a debtor's cell. Above Morris is James Wilson, superb lawyer whom Washington appointed as the first Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Then, towering above all and dominating all is not only the daring leader of armies but also the master of men, the incomparable hero of the Republic, George Washington.

Now we dedicate it to the future, full of hopes and fears, at a time which may well mark an epoch in the history of mankind, at a time when we need the inspiration of these engineers of destiny to guide our steps and chart our way.

Here let it rest as a symbol of the spirit of the Constitution which they wrote, of equality under law, of a government of the people, in which the rights and privileges of the humblest citizen is guarded with sleepless vigilance and girded about with jealous care. That was what these master builders hoped to secure through the Constitution, and this canvas is a symbol of the triumph of their dreams.

Here let it rest while this Government which they founded remains to bless this Western Hemisphere. Here let it rest as long as stands this stately Capitol splendor-domed. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now have the pleasure of presenting the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, who will accept the painting on behalf of the Congress of the United States, Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it now becomes my duty and privilege to accept, on behalf of the Congress, this painting about which we have been so eloquently told this afternoon. Before I officially accept it I want to make one or two very brief comments with respect to its significance and the circumstances under which the Constitution was written.

It is always an interesting form of speculation to try to fathom what might have happened in the world if something else had happened that did not. I realize how fruitless that speculation is, yet it is not entirely inapropos to call attention to the fact that the writing of the Constitution of the United States was in some respects an accidental occurrence. The Revolutionary War had been fought. The treaty of peace had been signed in 1783, recognizing the independence of the Original Thirteen Colonies. No effort was made to form what the Constitution in its preamble terms "a more perfect union" for 4 long years following the signing of the treaty of peace terminating the Revolutionary War. During those 4 years the Original Thirteen Colonies, or States, which had been united in their effort to establish freedom began to fall apart, to become dissevered, because of jealousy and local provincial interests; and in those days no less than in other days the local politician began to get in his work to create prejudice in the community against the general interests and the general welfare.

The State of New York, through her legislature, enacted a statute forbidding the importation of firewood into New York from Connecticut, in order to compel the people of New York to burn their own wood, and to keep out competition from Connecticut. Similar legislation was enacted forbidding the importation of garden truck, cabbages, potatoes, and onions, from Maryland and Virginia, in order to protect the producers of cabbages, potatoes, and onions in New York from the competition of importations from Maryland and Virginia.

The State of Maryland and the State of Virginia came almost to blows over the dispute, involving the navigation of the Potomac River between the two States. In order to make an effort to settle this controversy between Maryland and Virginia, a conference was held in Annapolis, 30 or 40 miles from this Capital. Out of that little conference to settle the dispute between Virginia and Maryland over the navigation of the Potomac River grew the Convention later in Philadelphia which wrote the Constitution of the United States, because the Thirteen Colonies, or States, in that 4 years of separation and disunion and jealousy of local interests, had come to recognize that there must be somewhere within America a centralized government with power to enforce its decrees for the general welfare of all the people.

As a result of this little conference at Annapolis the Convention met in Philadelphia. They did not meet to write

a constitution. There was not one of the 65 delegates who were chosen from the Thirteen Colonies, or one of the 42 who attended, who was commissioned by his State to write a constitution of the United States. They were sent there to amend the Articles of Confederation, under which they had lived for 4 years.

I mention this because I suppose those of us who are legalistically minded would say that the delegates to that Convention in the performance of their duty were guilty of ultra vires; in other words, they went beyond their delegated authority in writing a Constitution of the United States. They wrote it. They submitted it to the 13 States, with the provision that if 9 of them should ratify it a new Nation should be born in the western world—and how narrowly did the 9 escape giving their ratification!

When the convention met in Richmond, Va., to decide whether Virginia would ratify this new Constitution of a new Nation, George Washington was not a delegate. Patrick Henry was, and, although he had uttered those immortal words repeated by every schoolboy, "Give me liberty or give me death"—words which had inspired every Continental soldier who had fought under Washington—when the convention met in Richmond to decide upon ratification or rejection of the Constitution, Patrick Henry made the fight of his life against ratification, on the ground that if this Constitution were ratified, and the Nation were organized under it, people who had fought for 7 years to gain their liberties would thereby lose them in the creation of a centralized government.

It is also of importance to suggest that if Virginia had rejected it, in all probability, the Constitution would not have been ratified. Out of the total attendance of 65 in the convention in Richmond, the Constitution was ratified by a majority of 9, and when Virginia ratified the Constitution the required 9 ratifications were had. Thus, a new Nation under this new ordination was set up in the Western Hemisphere.

It is also of importance to note the fact that, although Patrick Henry, in his sincerity of heart and his effort to visualize the future of this country, predicted that a nation organized under this Constitution would lose the liberties of the people, I rejoice in the knowledge that for 150 years we have lived under it and we are still free; we still enjoy as much liberty as is possible in view of the complexity of our lives and the interdependence of all our people on one another for the solution of their great problem.

One hundred and fifty years is not long in the history of the world. H. G. Wells, in his Outline of History, says the world is 250,000,000 years old. I read a book not long ago in which the author said that the world was created 4,897 years ago at 9:30 o'clock in the morning. [Laughter.] No matter which or whether either of these historians be correct, 150 years is only a small speck on the firmament of God's eternity compared to the age of the world, yet in that 150 years we have grown from 3,000,000 people fringing the Atlantic seaboard, until today we are 130,000,000. We have grown from 13 weak and jealous little disjointed Colonies to 48 great States, more firmly united today than we have ever been before. [Applause.] We have grown from a pauper Nation, without standing or credit in the financial realms of the world, until today we are the richest Nation in all the world. We have grown from the weakest to the strongest. Under our influence more republics have been set up in the self-governing world than have been created in all the ages of man's history by all other influences combined. We have grown in power from the weakest and most insignificant until today we are the most powerful. Under that Constitution whose signing is depicted in this marvelous painting we have accomplished these things, and under that Constitution we will preserve our power and our strength; we will preserve it from all corroding influences and undermining forces from within; we will preserve it from any brutal juggernaut that may threaten it from without; and we will do it without surrendering our liberties and our conceptions of popular government. [Applause.]

In the Sistine Chapel yonder in the Vatican at Rome, there is a beautiful fresco above that chapel painted by an immortal man who had never before wielded a brush, Michelangelo. Michelangelo was older than Raphael, but Michelangelo was a sculptor. He was no less inspired because his tools were the chisel and hammer than was Raphael whose tools were the brush and the paint board. And when the Pope of Rome desired to have a great painting to adorn the Sistine Chapel, he asked Raphael to recommend a painter. It is a strange comment upon human nature to note the fact that Raphael, knowing that Michelangelo was not a painter, but jealous of him because of his greater reputation and notoriety, recommended to the Pope that he secure the services of Michelangelo to paint the painting in the Sistine Chapel.

When the Pope approached Michelangelo, he protested he was not a painter, that he was a sculptor, that he had never painted a painting, that he had chiseled out of cold marble the human form divine and the countenance of man, but he had never put upon canvas of any sort a painting. The Pope went back to Raphael and reported what Michelangelo had said. Raphael insisted, and finally, after much persuasion, Michelangelo said to the Pope:

> I will agree to paint this picture if you will allow me to remain within the Sistine Chapel undisturbed until I have finished it.

The agreement was entered into. For 3 years—36 months—Michaelangelo locked himself within the Sistine Chapel. His food three times a day for 3 years was brought to him by servants. He slept in the chapel. And at the end of 3 years he emerged, having accomplished that great painting in the Sistine Chapel because of his withdrawal into seclusion and the inspiration that was surrounding his soul, and in that divine atmosphere, communing no doubt with Almighty God, he produced this wonderful painting—this man who had never before painted a picture.

I am bound to conclude that in reproducing this wonderful canvas here, the man who has done it to some extent withdrew himself from the world. I do not know what the religious affiliations of Mr. Christy may be. I do not care what they may be. I know that he is a patriot, for no man less than a superb patriot could have visualized the scene in Philadelphia which this painting depicts. [Applause.] In its production not only did he commune with the spirits of our forefathers, but I am persuaded to believe that he communed with the spirit of Almighty God, to bring here this immortal painting, not only that we may look upon it, but that our children and our children's children for a thousand years to come may look upon it, and receive from it an inspiration that will cheer them on, and give them courage to fight for the things which it represents, and which our Nation represents.

It is in this spirit that I, as the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, not only accept this painting on behalf of Congress, but express my pride in being able to accept it, not only on behalf of Congress, but on behalf of the American people, as a symbol of liberty, of equality, and of justice, and I accept it on behalf of all the liberty-loving people of mankind and all those who are depressed, oppressed, and distressed in this hour because of a lack of that liberty. [Applause.]

I congratulate Mr. Christy, and I believe I speak the sentiments not only of this assemblage here, but of all those who will gaze upon this canvas in the years to come, when I express our gratitude and our affection because he has given to us this symbol of creative genius, this symbol of a patriotic surge in the hearts of all true Americans, this symbol of unity of purpose throughout the future. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Now that you have had an opportunity to observe that great scene, I am certain you will agree that our Commission made no mistake in selecting the artist who has produced it.

A real American whose ancestors were contemporaries of the signers; this man, out of his great artistic skill, with infinite patience and superb patriotic fervor and consecration, has wrought on canvas an inspiring reproduction of a historic scene very precious to all our people. Future generations will view with pride and satisfaction the handiwork of its

creator—the gentleman I now have the honor to present, Mr. Howard Chandler Christy. [Applause.]

Mr. Christy rose.

The United States Navy Band played March of the Constitution.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, pronounced the benediction:

The Lord bless thee and keep thee; the Lord make His face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon thee and give thee peace, both now and evermore. Amen.

Economic Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY MR. DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association, at Mineral Wells, Tex., May 21, 1940, on the subject, The Restoration of Economic Equality Among the Regions of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Equality of opportunity is the cornerstone of the American way of life: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal"; these are among the most resounding cadences of American speech. This foundation of our political ethics also underlies the American conception of economic justice. No man has a right to demand more than an equal chance; no one may justly be given less. And what is true of individuals is likewise true of regions. No region of the United States has a right to special privileges or immunities; the Nation may not in equity deny any region and its people less than equality of opportunity.

The people of the South and the institutions of the South have not enjoyed and do not today enjoy the blessings of equality of opportunity. This denial of equal opportunity for southern economic development is the most significant single fact in contemporary American life. Such a restriction upon the forward movement of millions of American citizens cannot become a permanent part of our national life without the gravest injury to our national sense of fairness and the impairment and ultimate exhaustion of our resources.

Here is perhaps the great issue of your generation and mine. For the kind of country we shall be 25 years hence will depend largely upon what happens to the South in the coming years. No nation, not even one as wealthy in resources as America, can indefinitely endure the economic suffocation of one-fifth of its people.

The restoration of equality of opportunity for the South will not be at the expense of equality for other regions; it is not a case of taking from Peter to pay Paul. To increase the standard of living and income in one region of our Nation does not require that another region be robbed of an equivalent income. Our common end is to find ways and means of increasing the level of income for the Nation as a whole. Under a wise administration of business and of Government an increase of income to one region stimulates economic opportunity everywhere. We have recently been reminded "that if the per capita income of each southerner were raised from its present $285 to the national average of $485, the Nation would have captured a new market half again as big as the entire export trade, and would be richer by billions."[1]

It is well known that the income of the people of the South is the lowest in the Nation and far below the national average; it is shockingly less than that of some regions. Why should this be true? Why should the per capita income in the State of Alabama, for example, or Louisiana, or Arkansas, or Mississippi be drastically less than that in Pennsylvania, say, or Illinois, or Connecticut?

If this were a naturally poor region, if little would grow in the fields of the South, if scanty rains doomed our crops or bitter winters destroyed vegetation, if we had no minerals in our hills and no timber would grow on our slopes—then we might resign ourselves and say that Nature herself had doomed us to a low income and there was no help for it. But Nature has been generous with the South in the two elements that can produce wealth—natural resources and capable human energies. What we call value, what we call income, results when human beings apply their labor and skill to the raw materials of Nature, whether they be products of the soil, of the forest, or minerals. The southern regions have raw materials in abundance; natural resources which compare at least on an equality with those of any other region of the country—some of the finest forests in the Nation, fortunate climate, ample rainwall, a wealth of minerals of every kind. And in human resources the South is equally endowed, with a population capable of transforming these natural resources into income.

WHY THERE IS LOW INCOME IN A RICH REGION

The answer to this puzzle of low income in a region that is a potential economic garden spot is not far to seek. That answer is steadily becoming understood at every crossroads and every fork of the creek throughout the South. The answer is found in two related facts:

First, that natural resources contribute to the wealth and income of a people only to the extent that those natural assets are transformed by manufacturing processes into a more valuable form of goods; and, second, that in the South we are still predominantly a producer of raw materials rather than a producer of the more valuable, hence greater income producing, manufactured commodities.

The fundamental readjustment we in the South must accomplish is to change our way of making a living from an almost complete reliance on production of raw materials. We must thoroughly learn the lesson that as a producer of raw materials we are draining our natural resources in return for inadequate compensation; but that if we can process and finish a greater proportion of those raw materials and receive the greater compensation which those manufactured articles will bring to us, then our income will rise to a more satisfactory level. It is a simple proposition, and it is coming to be better and better known, but we must keep hammering away at it untiringly.

A few specific illustrations will be helpful to clarify this point. Pulpwood is a raw material on which little labor has been expended. The farmer who cuts that pulpwood and hauls it to town gets $4 a ton. Thus, for that farmer to buy an $800 automobile, he would have to cut and haul about 200 tons of pulpwood. But when the pulpwood has been processed into wood pulp, it is worth five times as much as the farmer received for the wood, or $20 a ton, and it would require only 40 tons to purchase the automobile. When the pulp has been further processed into kraft paper, it reaches a value of $65 a ton. In other words, the raw material, timber cut from the land, has been multiplied about 16 times. Finally when the pulp has been manufactured into paper bags, it has a value of $150, has multiplied nearly 38 times in value from the farmer's truck, and it now requires only 5 tons for the purchase of a 2-ton automobile.

Another illustration starting this time with an article of greater value in the raw form would be cotton selling on the farm at 8¾ cents per pound. To purchase a $700 tractor requires the cultivation, picking, and hauling of 8,000 pounds of cotton. Converted into cotton yarn at 30 cents a pound, 2,300 pounds of yarn would be required for the tractor. If manufactured into broadcloth worth 44 cents a pound, 1,600 pounds of broadcloth would buy the tractor. Finally, if the broadcloth is cut and sewed into shirts worth $2 a pound, 350 pounds of shirts purchase the tractor.

The economic disadvantage of exchanging semifinished products for finished goods might be illustrated by another example. Consider that for a ton of bulk petroleum asphalt, which is one of the important semifinished products of the Southwest, at the refinery you could buy 65 electric light bulbs (at wholesale), but when this asphalt is sold as a ton of rolled roofing it has increased 23 times in value and could be exchanged for 1,500 of these same light bulbs.

The limited extent of manufacturing and processing in the South is revealed by figures published by the Bureau of the Census, which show that the value added by manufacturing to raw materials in the 13 Southern States is only 12 percent of the total for the Nation despite the fact that the South has 28 percent of the Nation's population. With 16 percent of the wage earners in the country the South receives less than 11 percent of the wages. This indicates a large number of unskilled wage earners, even in the relatively meager percentage of those employed in industry. The value of products manufactured in the South is only 14 percent of the total national value of production. Two industries in the South, refining of petroleum in the Southwest and manufacture of cigarettes in North Carolina, account for 22.6 percent of the total value of southern production. In only 2 of the 16 groups into which the Census Bureau has classified industry does the South's value of production indicate that it supplies the remainder of the Nation with goods in excess of its proportionate share, if based on population percentage—in other words, a share greater than 28 percent.

Some specific examples of the extent of the processing and manufacturing in the South will show why there is an imperative need for manufacturing of highly finished goods. There seems to be a popular misconception that the textile industry has moved en masse to the southeastern portion of the United States. The fact is that the textile industries which have moved South are only those which produce products requiring relatively little skilled labor.

The 10 Southeastern States accounted for only 22½ percent of the total value of products listed in group 2 of the 1937 Census of Manufactures entitled "Textiles and Their Products." This group has 93 subclassifications. In 31 of these subclassifications

[1] The U. S. A., Fortune, February 1940, p. 146.

there is no production at all in the Southeast. Eleven of the subclassifications account for 87.3 percent of the total value of all southeastern textile products. The remaining 50 subclassifications account for 12.7 percent of the value of the southeastern textile products. Of the higher classified textile goods listed, the Southeast is particularly deficient in production. As an example, only 11 percent of the men's shirts, 7 percent of the house dresses, uniforms, aprons, etc., and 0.6 percent of the dresses other than house dresses are produced in the Southeast.

Although the Southeast produced 41 percent of the total virgin aluminum in the United States in 1939, none of the higher-priced aluminum products, such as cooking utensils, airplane parts, automobile engine heads, and pistons, are produced in that area. Although in 1937 the Southeast produced 25 percent of the wood pulp in the United States, it furnished only 10 percent of the paper. Lumber is one of the principal commodities produced from the Southeast's vast forest resources, but only 17 percent of the furniture of the United States is produced in the Southeast.

Many more specific illustrations could be furnished, but the above will serve to indicate the opportunity for industrial expansion in the South.

Here then is the nub of our southern economic problem: How specifically, concretely, practically, may we substantially increase the amount of manufacturing of the raw materials which abound in this region, and thereby provide added value and added income for the people of the South? My answer I can state in two words: "Economic equality." Remove the economic inequalities and man-made disadvantages which burden the South, and in less than a decade the income of the South will be substantially raised from its present level, a level which we all know does not permit an American standard of living for millions of our people. Restore economic equality to the South and you strengthen the defenses of democracy in every other region and area of the United States. Restore economic equality to the people of the South and you create a volume of purchasing power which will stimulate business activity in every part of the United States, and particularly in those great centers of industry which lie north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. Restore economic equality and thereby release the pent-up energies of the South and you will not only create a more vigorous southern region but there will be more clocks bought from Waterbury, Conn., more harvesting machinery from Chicago, more insurance policies from Worcester, Mass., more automobiles from Detroit, Mich., more radios from New York. As one of our southern editors, Mr. Peter Molyneaux, has put it:

"* * * there is no region on the face of the earth where there is greater opportunity for the creation of new markets for manufactured goods by increasing the purchasing power and raising the level of life of the mass of the people, white and black, than is presented today in the cotton South."

It ought to be frankly recognized, of course, that if most of the new wealth added by the processing of raw materials is drained out of the area, if it is not retained and reasonably distributed in the hands of the people of the area, the benefits of manufacturing in the South will, in the long run, be slight. How such a result can be avoided is a subject that requires more extensive discussion than we have time for today. Suffice it to say that unless and until we find a way to increase our income, the problem of retaining it will never arise.

TWO BARRIERS TO EQUALITY OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

I have said that economic inequality is the essential cause of the South's present situation. What causes these inequalities and handicaps? The causes are several; I shall have time today only to discuss two, and to my mind the principal ones.

The first is the inadequacy of the industrial research in the southern region. Only with the aid of technical research are the opportunities for investment in local and industrial processing of raw materials uncovered. New industry comes out of the laboratory. The deficiency in industrial research is not a result of law, but of the force of economic circumstances; it can be removed by public and private effort. The second is a discriminatory structure of freight rates, imposing upon the efforts of the South to engage in the processing of raw materials a marketing handicap too great to be borne. This inequality, unlike that relating to industrial research, is removable, upon an appropriate state of law and facts, by public authority.

Both of these inequalities have been the subject of the program of action of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I should like to tell you what the T. V. A. has done about them. As I discuss the two activities of the T. V. A. relating to industrial research and discriminatory freight rates, you will observe that there is no substantial difference in economic status between the Southwest and the Southeast, between the area in which the T. V. A. functions and that portion of the South that lies west of the Mississippi River. On the contrary, there is an intimate community of interests. The fact is that all the interior regions of the United States are to a large extent "in the same boat" in their efforts to maintain and improve their standard of income.

I. RESTORING EQUALITY THROUGH INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

The United States has great industrial research facilities, perhaps the best and most extensive in the world. Out of these great laboratories have come the ideas on which modern industry has been created and has grown to its present proportions. The South, however, does not have a reasonable share of the Nation's industrial research facilities. Only about 7 percent of the number of private industrial research laboratories with 4½ percent of the research personnel in the country are in the South.[2] This is undoubtedly one of the important reasons why the South, with 28 percent of the Nation's population, has only about 14 percent of the total value of manufacturing production.

Industrial research efforts center in and are financed by areas other than the South. It is natural that their efforts should be directed toward the solution of the problems of those nonsouthern areas and interests. This explains the fact that little industrial research effort has been devoted to the raw-material resources of the South, with a few exceptions, such as research on petroleum products. This is also why, when adequate research is done in the South, such as development of a single new use for its great timber resources, that of manufacture of newsprint recently started commercially at Lufkin, Tex., it is so unusual as to attract national attention.

The South suffers from the fact that most technical research is supported by existing industry. It follows, with existing industry excessively concentrated elsewhere, that private technical research in the South is limited and inadequate.

Moreover, only fairly large companies, as a rule, can afford the costs of modern technical research. This is an important handicap when we are trying to find ways and means to enable small manufacturing plants to operate successfully, or new plants to start up, in the small towns and communities.

For these reasons, the existing technical research structure of the Nation is not well adapted to supplying needed ideas for home-grown, small-scale local industry, the product of local initiative, local brains, and local capital. As a result, the tendency to concentration of industrial activity is accelerated, small local industry suffers, and economic opportunity is narrowed.

Here, then, is the connection between industrial research and the production of new income in the various localities of our country. Such income can come about only as resources and energies in raw material producing areas, such as the South and West, are more fully and profitably utilized than at present.

Research by private industry in the South, although inadequate to the resources and needs of the area, has nevertheless produced valuable and promising results. One which will occur to you newspaper publishers at once is the achievement I have already mentioned, in which you have participated, that of the Southland Paper Mills, Inc., in producing newsprint paper from southern pine at the new town of Herty near Lufkin, Tex. This is an example of how research has laid the foundations for a new southern industry. The well-known work of Dr. Herty's laboratory at Savannah, Ga., first proved to the satisfaction of investors that southern pine trees were suitable for newsprint. Public research by the United States Forest Products Laboratory has contributed to this development by adapting the semibleached sulfate pulp process for use with southern pine, a method followed at the Lufkin plant. Research by the private paper company to carry these laboratory and pilot plant results into actual commercial operation should also be credited with an important part in this outstanding achievement. A significant feature is that virtually all the leaders of the commercialization of this research development, beginning with Dr. Herty, have been southerners.

Another striking example of the value of research is the development of a new method of making cigarette paper, and the recent establishment in North Carolina of the first American mill to make cigarette paper on a commercial scale. Heretofore the immense quantities needed for making our cigarettes have been imported from France, where linen rags are used as the base, whereas the North Carolina plant uses the flax fiber directly. The Champagne Paper Corporation of New York is reported to have spent 5 years in research, at a cost of some $500,000, developing varieties of flax which have a fiber suitable for making the paper and which also yield plenty of seed, so that the crop would be a profitable one for farmers to grow. Machinery was also developed for preparing the flax fiber for paper making. As a result the new mill is now in operation, employing about 800 persons, and is reported to be capable of supplying a third of the needs of domestic cigarette manufacturers.

But research by private industry alone is not enough. There are a number of reasons why this is true. For one thing, there are products which are badly needed and which fit into the resources of the area, but where the prospects of an early profit appear insufficient to justify research by private enterprise. But the most important reason is the one which I have already cited, namely, that for the most part industrial research on new processes is supported by existing industry located in other regions. It seems clear to me, therefore, that private industrial research must be supplemented on an extensive scale by public research, research carried on in the public institutions of the South and carried on as much as possible in cooperation with southern business and commercial interests.

HOW T. V. A. HAS CONTRIBUTED TO EXPANSION OF INDUSTRIAL PROCESSING RESEARCH

T. V. A.'s program has been based on this conviction that supplementary public research is essential to the restoration of regional equality and strengthening of the whole Nation. What the T. V. A. has done in the field of industrial research over a period of some 6 years is now beginning to bear fruit. The chief

[2] Thirteen States: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

characteristic of T. V. A.'s work in this field has been a deliberate, conscious effort to find those technical processes that will help meet the needs for industrial and business opportunities in the South, based upon the resources of the region, and which will help farmers to find new sources of income to relieve the burden on their soil. In almost every instance T. V. A. research has been carried on with the closest cooperation with existing southern institutions, chiefly educational institutions, but in some instances business groups. I shall cite some specific examples of this work.

At the University of Tennessee is an engineering experiment station which has a $70,000 experimental plant with the latest chemical laboratory equipment devoted to finding new commercial outlets for products of the cotton plant. The story of how this experimental plant came into being and of what it has done and is doing should be of interest wherever cotton is grown.

All the talk about declining markets for cotton has related to cotton fiber. This emphasis has served to obscure the fact that there is in the South an industry based on other products of the cotton plant—oil, meal, meal cake, hulls, and linters. In a recent year close to 500 mills turned out some $200,000,000 worth of these products.

The first work of this engineering experiment station with later cooperation from the T. V. A. and others and with the support of the industry was to investigate the cottonseed-cooking process to determine whether established methods could be improved. The project appeared to present unique possibilities for constructive research, because no fundamental improvements in basic operating procedure had been evolved in over 50 years. This proved to be the case. A new type of pressure cooker was developed which could be used in a conventional cottonseed-oil mill. Results are a higher yield and quality of oil and of the meal and cake byproducts. The cooker is particularly valuable to the typical small mill without much skilled help, because it automatically facilitates processing efficiency.

Already the three major United States manufacturers of cotton-oil mill equipment are making this new type of cooker under an arrangement whereby income from licenses will go to finance further research. A public non-profit corporation handles the licensing and commercialization of this equipment.

Two cooker installations have been made in Texas, one in Oklahoma, three in Georgia, one in Arkansas, two in Mississippi, and one in Tennessee. In a number of cases operators have said they paid for the new equipment out of the extra profits of their first year's operations. Many other cottonseed-processing operations, products, and byproducts are presumably susceptible to improvement by research methods. Public research agencies including the T. V. A. are undertaking these further investigations.

T. V. A.'s technical efforts in the field of mineral resources furnish an important illustration. About 75 different minerals have been identified and located in the Tennessee Valley region by public and private investigations. Where profits were fairly predictable, private enterprise has already financed developments. But except for a few of the most valuable minerals, such as coal, iron, copper, feldspar, and zinc, there has been little research to determine the economic processing of ores which in their crude state offer little possibility for commercial exploitation.

The deposits of clay, called kaolin, in North Carolina, for example, have been known since Colonial days. They have been worked sporadically for the past 50 years, but no process was ever developed for refining the clay so that it could be used for high-grade white ware. For fine china, English kaolins were imported. The North Carolina industry languished. As a result of commercial research, in a T. V. A. laboratory at Norris, Tenn., carried on cooperatively with representatives of the ceramics industry, several American ceramic plants are using North Carolina kaolins. The war, of course, has accelerated the shift from imported materials. Last year 16,000 tons of kaolins refined by this new process were produced near Spruce Pine. Production this year will be doubled, and experts predict that, as a result of the Government's research assistance, this private enterprise will grow to four or five times its previous size. Concurrently, experiments in electric firing of kaolin were carried on in the same laboratory, and test ware was successfully produced. The work in electric firing operations, which may mean a whole new field of industrial possibilities as well as greatly increased use of electricity, is now being continued under the direction of technicians of the Bureau of Mines. Other local minerals—magnesium, talc, scrap mica, vermiculite—all these are under investigation. For each one of them our technicians appear to have discovered uses and methods of processing which will offer new opportunities for economic expansion.

A year and a half ago farmers around Cleveland, Tenn., brought truck after truck of strawberries from their farms to a building on the outskirts of the town. Here the berries were put into a machine of an entirely new kind, designed by T. V. A. industrial engineers. Six minutes after each batch of the berries was put into the freezing machine they were taken out, each berry frozen into a solid red marble. The frozen berries, 88,000 pounds of them, were then put into a refrigerated truck and hauled to a specially designed barge, also refrigerated to about zero temperature. This barge, loaded with these and other fruits frozen at the plant, then set off down the Tennessee River, the Ohio, and up the Mississippi to St. Louis, where the product, contracted for months before, was turned over to the purchasers at premium prices to test market acceptance. Weeks, or even months, later, when the berries were used, it was reported that they retained the taste and shape of fresh strawberries. This quick-freezing process is a great advance over existing methods. The same invention has been adapted with excellent results to the quick freezing of other fruits, to most vegetables, and to meats and poultry.

As soon as patent licensing arrangements are worked out, the equipment will be manufactured by private concerns and put on the market. Practical businessmen believe it will open new opportunities for local, decentralized industry. Even more significant is the effect of such a technical development upon the conservation of the soil and the income of farmers. Some of the crops frozen, like peas, are legumes which enrich the soil in which they grow. The matted roots of strawberry plants help prevent erosion. Frozen products bring adequate and stable prices, which tend to raise farm income. As they get more income from fewer acres, farmers keep the plow off the steeper lands that wash badly and sow them to sod crops. Here is a beneficent cycle under way: Science and engineering skill applied to technical problems of local industry and also helping the private business of farming.

The T. V. A. is cooperating in a number of other projects, the mention of which may be of interest. For example, at the agricultural experiment station in Mississippi a research worker is developing a cheap process for extracting protein directly from cottonseed. Excellent plastics are one type of product which has been made experimentally from this protein, and tests are under way to carry the process out on a larger scale and determine costs. It appears that a commercially feasible process may well ensue.

At Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, under the direction of the famous Dr. G. W. Carver, Negro research workers have long been at work in the field of industrial research, and recently the T. V. A. has been cooperating with this institution in a project, one of many under way at the institute, on the production of very cheap farm paints, from clays mixed locally with waste automobile oil which has been specially treated.

In the State Engineering Experiment Station at the Georgia School of Technology, promising results have been obtained in finding ways of making new fabrics from flax fiber on cotton-spinning machinery. This project has required the designing of new equipment for processing fiber flax. This development is paralleled by necessary growing and yield studies in the agricultural experiment station, without which the industrial demand for the flax fiber could not be successfully met. The T. V. A. is participating in this project.

T. V. A. IN PARTNERSHIP WITH OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

I have mentioned some of the public industrial-research activities which the T. V. A. has sponsored or in which it has participated. I want to make it clear that this program is not carried on by the T. V. A. alone, but in intimate partnership with the public technical institutions of the region and with the cooperation of business and farm groups. In some cases important projects were well under way and the T. V. A. was a junior partner. In other cases the initiative came from the T. V. A. which enabled some existing engineering college or agricultural experiment station to extend its program and make a contribution toward determining new opportunities for regional industry.

A considerable number of such activities are going on in the public-research institutions of the South. I am not familiar with all of them by any means, but there has recently come to my attention a publication of the Texas industrial research council of the University of Texas, which I am sure would interest those of you who have not already seen it. It indicates that at the University of Texas, as is true in a number of other institutions, research efforts directed toward removing the South's industrial handicaps are under way. Every one of these activities needs your encouragement. Most of us are little concerned, as a matter of dogma, with whether industrial research emanates from a private laboratory, a public laboratory, or is the joint product of private and public research. What hard-headed, realistic men in the South are interested in, it is my observation, is that this work shall go forward with redoubled effort on every front, so that the day may soon come when the South will no longer be predominantly a raw-materials producer, but may enjoy its fair share of the increased wealth and income which comes from the processing of its natural resources.

II. RESTORING EQUALITY BY REMOVAL OF INTERREGIONAL FREIGHT-RATE BARRIERS

Even if the handicap of inadequate industrial research should be overcome or mitigated, the South's road to balanced development is blocked by a second major obstruction. That barrier is a system of freight rates which deprive the South and other interior regions of an opportunity to develop their natural resources on a footing of equality with the Northeast. The timeliness of this issue is manifested by the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission only a few months ago, for the first time in its long and notable history, ordered a comprehensive investigation of the interterritorial rates of the United States in a single proceeding—the so-called class-rate investigation. That timeliness is also demonstrated by the fact that both Houses of Congress have just denominated interregional rate discrimination as a form of illegal rate making.

On a visit to Austin a few weeks ago I was asked how it happened that the Tennessee Valley Authority, usually thought of as a water-control and power project, should have taken an active part in the railroad-freight problems of the Nation. That is a fair and natural question, and I shall try to answer it.

The problem of transportation economics as it affected the development of the Tennessee Valley region was one of the very first general policy questions considered by the T. V. A. Board of Directors. When the T. V. A. was barely 2 months old, at a meeting on August 9,

1933, the Directors, in the midst of the tremendous pressure of setting up a large organization, took time to discuss this question. The Board thereupon delegated to me initial responsibility for exploring the problem. I was aware, of course, that transportation charges are often a controlling consideration in the development of the business and farming possibilities of any community or region, but the specific facts of the situation were not available, either for the T. V. A. region or any other. The first job, as I saw it, was to get those facts. T. V. A. was fortunate in finding a technician to undertake this pioneering fact-finding investigation—Mr. J. Haden Alldredge, a native and resident of Alabama, an authority on transportation economics, who has recently been elevated to the Interstate Commerce Commission. In March 1936 Mr. Alldredge and his staff had completed their factual investigation.

The Board studied this report carefully, took outside counsel on it, and on May 27, 1937, transmitted it, as the law provides, to the President of the United States. The President, on June 7, 1937, sent the report, described as "The Interterritorial Freight Rate Problem of the United States," to the Congress, and it was ordered printed. This T. V. A. report has since been widely circulated and studied.

Since much of the current interest and discussion in this field was initiated by this Presidential report, I should like to indicate some of its conclusions:

First. The freight-rate structure of the United States is on a regional rather than a national basis. This regionalization of freight rates has the effect of erecting "Chinese walls" within the United States, which, in the words of Chairman Eastman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, "discourage unity of national action."

Second. We gave it as our opinion (I quote from the report) that "discriminatory or preferential rate unduly favoring some regions or territories as against others will surely operate to lower the future living standards of the American people * * *" since manufacturing and processing in disadvantaged areas outside the industrialized Northeast is "hampered, discouraged, and retarded despite the fact that certain areas in these (interior) regions possess, with the single exception of proximity to markets, all the economic factors necessary for a considerable industrial growth."

Third. Inequities and inequalities do in fact exist in the regional freight-rate structures of the United States. A considerable portion of the report is devoted to a statement of the facts supporting this conclusion.

HOW FREIGHT-RATE STRUCTURE DISCOURAGES PROCESSING IN THE SOUTH

These facts, the plain, simple, and unquestioned facts of unequal regional opportunity, stand as our most eloquent spokesman in the effort to establish the basic fairness of a national freight-rate structure. And because the facts in the T. V. A. report tell the story so much better than any amount of argumentation, let me recite some illustrative material. I shall append to the text of these remarks and file with the officers of your association certain maps and charts which will serve to state these facts in graphic form.

Freight-rate discussions are usually carried on in a jargon so technical that the average businessman feels the subject is hopelessly complex and beyond his understanding. But the essentials, stripped of jargon, are not complex and are readily understood. It is only necessary to remember that the United States, for freight-rate purposes, is divided into five major geographical divisions. The Southern States lie in two divisions known as southwestern and southern. The region in which manufacturing today is chiefly concentrated, the area north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, is known as official territory.

EXAMPLES OF REGIONAL INEQUALITY IN FREIGHT RATES

The rates on southern raw materials shipped into this concentration area of manufacturing in the Northeast are, generally speaking, about the same, distance considered, as the rates on shipment of the same raw materials within the southern region, and this has long been the case. Bear this in mind: There is no barrier to the movement out of the South of raw, unfinished products. As a matter of fact, the interterritorial freight-rate structure has long encouraged this draining out of our unprocessed raw materials. But observe what happens to regional equality when southern industry seeks to transport those same materials after they have been processed in the South. Rates on sulfur are about the same, whether the product is shipped into the so-called official territory or shipped from point to point within the South. But, when sulfur has, through manufacturing, become agricultural insecticides, a far more valuable product, the rate from southern territory to official territory is 70 percent higher for an identical distance than is the rate within official territory.

Rates on raw cotton from the South into the official territory are about equal to the level of rates within the latter territory, but when raw cotton is manufactured into fabric the southern rates are 10 percent above the official territory level. When these fabrics are further manufactured into oilcloth, the rates from the South to the North are 54 percent higher than within the official territory. The rates on crude sulfur from the Southwest into the official territory are 13 percent lower than the official-territory level. The rates on sulfuric acid, however, are 15 percent higher than the official-territory level, but the rates from the Southwest to official territory on agricultural insecticides made from sulfur are 70-percent higher than the official-territory level.

These are a few examples of many that might be of interest.

These denials of equal opportunity can be expressed in yet another way. A businessman in Peoria, Ill., let us suppose, asks for prices on an article shipped under first-class rating. There are, let us say, five sources of production, each at a distance of 930 miles from Peoria. The producer from Trenton, N. J., in official territory (north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi River) can quote a price based on a rate of $1.74 per 100 pounds; the Canadian producer in Montreal, Quebec, must figure in $0.20 more on his bid, for his rate of $1.94 per hundred pounds is 11 percent higher. Contrast with that the southeastern producer at Valdosta, Ga., who must figure $0.70 more freight in his bid, for his rate of $2.44 is 40 percent higher than the Trenton producer. Now a producer at Colorado Springs, Colo., in western trunk-line territory, must contend with a $0.93 differential against him, for his rate of $2.67 is 53 percent higher than the Trenton producer. But then we look at the Houston, Tex., producer located in the Southwest, and for the same transportation service on the same article over the same distance he is paying $0.99 more in freight rate for every hundred pounds he ships to Peoria, for his rate of $2.73 is 57 percent higher than his Trenton competitor. It is rather startling to note that the Canadian shipper can send his goods to Peoria cheaper than any producer of the United States, at an equal distance, except one who is located in the Northeast.

Another illustration, based this time on commodity rates, tells the same story. Paints, stains, and varnishes are produced in both Chattanooga, Tenn., and in Pittsburgh, Pa. For the Chattanooga producer to ship 443 miles to Muncie, Ind., a rate of 66 cents per 100 pounds is charged. The Pittsburgh firm can ship an identical distance to Danville, Ill., for 41 cents, an inequality against the southern processor of 61 percent. Likewise, metal alloys are produced in Sand Springs, Okla., and Philadelphia, Pa. To move the metal alloys from Sand Springs to Indianapolis, Ind., a rate of 79 cents per hundred pounds is charged for 671 miles. Philadelphia to Fort Wayne, Ind., is the same distance, but the rate is 50 cents per 100 pounds. The difference in the two rates is 29 cents, or 58 percent higher for the Oklahoma producer.

For my part, I have such confidence in the American sense of fairness that I believe such facts as these, once they are understood, will bring down the "Chinese walls" within our economic system.

What can be done, as a practical matter, to restore equality of opportunity to the interior regions? We must bear in mind that even though the fact has now at least been established beyond dispute that the interior regions are at a marked disadvantage, and though evil consequences to those regions and to the Nation flow therefrom, it does not necessarily follow as a matter of law that such freight rates are illegal and must be changed. That is a question for the Interstate Commerce Commission to decide upon the basis of evidence submitted to it. The Interstate Commerce Commission is a quasi-judicial body. Its decisions must be, and are, based not upon general economic principles or public policy, but squarely upon the facts presented to it and the acts of Congress that govern it. The issue of the legality of these regional disadvantages the Commission itself will decide. When that decision is made, the country can rest assured that it will be made on the merits and by an able administrative tribunal.

The decision of legality is for the Commission, but the facts of inequity and inequality are plain; nor can there be any longer any question as to the economic consequences which flow from such lack of equality of economic opportunity between regions of the United States. The only question left open is the one which the Commission, under the class-rate investigation, will decide—the legality of the continuation of such conditions.

CORRECTION OF FREIGHT-RATE INEQUALITY WOULD BENEFIT ENTIRE NATION

The restoration of equality of opportunity by a correction of this situation would, in my opinion, not only be beneficial to the South and the West, would not only tend to conserve natural resources, raise purchasing power in the South, give southern businessmen an opportunity to show the skill and resourcefulness they have, but would be a great regenerative force for the Nation. These "Chinese walls" of freight rates between sections of our common country have a depressing and sterilizing effect on the whole Nation. It is sound economics and sound public policy to remove every barrier to a free flow of commerce within the United States.

The T. V. A. Board of Directors a few days ago instituted another study which we feel will throw further light on this crucial issue. This report, like its predecessor, will be made to the President of the United States. We are now seeking to discover the consequences, in practical terms, of interterritorial freight-rate inequality upon the economic development in the interior regions, particularly the Southeast and the Southwest.

Industrial possibilities in the processing and marketing of the South's raw materials will be studied, and the effect of such regional inequality upon potential sources of new southern income will be spelled out. I believe this report will also contribute to a better comprehension of the factors that make for national well-being. In the preparation of this report our staff will consult and cooperate with other interested and qualified agencies in various parts of the country.

The class-rate investigation order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, issued on July 29, 1939, is epoch-making. The Commission has set aside funds for research into costs and other factors and has given every indication that this investigation will become one of the high points in the work of this supreme economic court of the United States. To those of us who live in the South the importance of this investigation can hardly be exaggerated. It will stand as one of the landmarks of history, taking its place

with us with such dramatic events as the invention of the cotton gin, and for the West with the first transcontinental railroad.

THE CLASS-RATE INVESTIGATION SHOULD NOT BE ABANDONED

There are those in the South who do not share these views. There are influential men in the South who are publicly and privately urging that the Interstate Commerce Commission abandon the class-rate investigation before a single fact has been educed. I do not desire to reflect in any way upon the sincerity or motives of these men. But with their point of view I differ and differ sharply.

It should be borne in mind in discussing the points in opposition to the Interstate Commerce Commission's inquiry that existing rates on raw materials or heavy semifinished products, known as commodity rates, are admittedly favorable to the South; that the investigation does not directly concern these rates; that the products which form a large percentage of the existing southern shipments, perhaps 50 percent, are the bulky, low-valued products; that in the maintenance of rates on these products southern shippers have the greatest stake; and that class-rate traffic moving at higher rate levels in the South is a relatively small percentage of the total volume of traffic because there is at present little high-grade manufacturing in the South.

Three principal points have been made in opposition to any general revision of rate levels which might result from the investigation announced by the I. C. C.

First, it is said that any lowering of rates on high-grade manufactured products, such as might result from the I. C. C.'s investigation, would necessarily result in raising many of the present low rates on existing traffic. To state this argument for an abandonment of the I. C. C.'s investigation is virtually to answer it. The South is no longer content to try to maintain itself on the meager compensation of a colony, as the mere producer and exporter of raw materials and low-grade goods. Nor is there any tangible evidence that the present level of heavy commodity rates will in fact be changed, if the rates on high-grade manufactured articles should be changed. In any event, this much is clear: Unless the inequalities in rates on high-grade, processed articles are removed, the future economic status of the South is unlikely to surpass its present status. We must never forget that we are concerned not only with present shippers and their rates, but about the future, about future business enterprise, future jobs, income; development tomorrow and a decade hence.

The second argument against the Commission's investigation is that any downward revision of the present rates on high-grade goods would adversely affect the railroads. Again this argument rests on the fallacy previously mentioned—that a continuation of the present state of affairs is satisfactory. A reduction in rates on high-grade goods would, if the I. C. C. should find such reduction warranted by the facts, afford equality of opportunity in the interior regions for the manufacture of high-grade goods. This would in turn create new traffic and new revenues for the railroads. Few who are familiar with the situation doubt that this new revenue would more than compensate for any reductions in rates to make this type of enterprise possible. In any case, it is not conceivable that the I. C. C. would sanction or establish any rate structure which would fail to consider the need of the railroads for revenue.

The third principal argument made against the class-rate inquiry is that if there are rates on particular articles that are inequitable, complaint may be made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and those particular inequities corrected without a broad-scale inquiry into all rates. Those who urge the abandonment of the class-rate investigation point to the so-called Southern Governors' case before the I. C. C. as an illustration of the virtues of this method. This procedure is hopelessly slow and prohibitive in expense for the needs of southern commerce. The Southern Governors' case sought adjustment on 18 commodities, and after 3 years' effort and the expenditure of $75,000 reductions were granted on 11 of these 18. But there are literally hundreds of commodities in which the South's present and future businessmen and wage earners are interested, and even the 3 years required for the few commodities in the Governors' case is not a fair test. The southern coke case, for example, consumed 11 years before it was concluded. Such piecemeal, expensive, and protracted procedures greatly discourage the rise of smaller manufacturing concerns which hold so much hope for the future of the interior regions.

The newspaper publishers of the South represent a substantial business enterprise and a vital factor in community and regional leadership. Furthermore, you have perhaps more contact with the business leadership of the South than any other single group of men. The issues we have been discussing here today are peculiarly within the province of businessmen. Economic development is a subject that is constantly in the minds of live and creative men of business; the businessman's way of thinking, his familiarity with the compelling force of costs and competitive conditions, his insistence in his business on facts rather than mere opinions or generalities, give him a natural place of leadership in the working out of this issue. It would be a deep satisfaction to those of us in the T. V. A. who have tried to contribute to the facts and public discussion of regional inequalities if members of this group and businessmen generally through the South would more and more participate actively in clearing the road of these barriers to the fullest development of the South and the Nation.

American Foreign Relations Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. J. F. ZIMMERMAN TO NEW MEXICO BANKERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on May 16 Dr. J. F. Zimmerman, president of the University of New Mexico, delivered a very interesting address on the subject American Foreign Relations Today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two great difficulties confront us in discussing foreign relations. First, the great secrecy which has always surrounded foreign affairs. After the last war Woodrow Wilson wanted "open covenants openly arrived at," and efforts in that direction were made but without great success. Diplomacy is still a somewhat secret process in all countries—witness Welles' visit to Europe recently and, upon his return, not one word was given either to Congress or the public. Although the realm of foreign affairs controls the very lives of all citizens, it seems that it remains a mystery, difficult, and almost impossible to subject to any great degree of democratic control. Money, trade, international finance, military affairs, diplomatic negotiations, are all poorly understood by the rank and file, who consequently leave them to a few national leaders.

There is also another difficulty in discussing foreign affairs, namely, the danger that emotion and prejudice will predominate over intelligence and reason. Raymond Fosdick, in 1938, spoke of the "retreat from reason" in foreign relations. The description is appropriate, and the sad part of it is that it was applicable in 1838; and, if secrecy in foreign relations continues, still will be applicable in the year 2038.

Recognizing these two difficulties, I shall proceed to the discussion of American foreign relations today. Our country has had a long tradition of national isolation, broken occasionally, it is true. We might say that until 1917 conditions were favorable to a large degree of isolation; at any rate, that policy was considered basic to that time. The corollary of isolation was the doctrine of nonintervention in the affairs of other nations, coupled with the rather fixed notion of no entangling alliances with other nations, and more particularly with the European group. Even our Monroe Doctrine was, basically, a reciprocal nonintervention policy—we were not to bother with Europe's system of balance of power and war, and they were to stay out of our peculiar spheres of interest.

As a matter of fact, our foreign policy grew logically out of the fundamental differences between Old World and New World conditions. European powers have struggled for mastery for centuries, while on this continent the United States has maintained unchallenged supremacy. The smaller States of the Western Hemisphere have, at times, feared the imperialistic tendencies of Uncle Sam, but they have never yet sought to unite and create a balance of power against the United States.

In this fact lies the explanation of the tradition of the Americas as peace-loving peoples, while that of Europe is regarded as a warlike tradition. It is a matter of geographical and historical background rather than one of ethical and spiritual ideals. With no vital problems of natural frontiers, of ethnic minorities, of lost provinces, or of population pressures, our continent until recently has very easily pursued a peaceful path. Confronted by all of these dangers all of the time, Europe has pursued its course of international struggle and war.

Hence out of historic and geographic conditions arose our American diplomacy outlined by authorities somewhat as follows: Political isolation, nonintervention, neutrality, the Monroe Doctrine, the open door, and arbitration. This diplomacy attained its highest world achievements, perhaps, in the field of neutrality, and in the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, which provided for the peaceful settlement of international disputes by mediation, by international commissions of inquiry, and through the establishment of the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague.

The first great step toward involvement in world affairs outside this continent began, strangely enough, in the acquiring of the Philippines. Our desire to help Cuba was not accompanied by careful thought of the final outcome, and we suddenly found that with the Philippines in our possession we had to take joint action with the powers of Europe in dealing with affairs of the Pacific and the Far East, though we still did not wish to take joint action on matters related directly to Europe. Then under

Theodore Roosevelt we participated in 1906 in the Algeciras conference, which was not of great international import since it only sought to settle the claims of Germany and France in Morocco. In the end, however, the settlement reached, favorable as it was to France, affected directly the balance of power in Europe.

Of course, our greatest departure from the policy of isolation and nonintervention was our participation in the World War of 1917, following the traditional counsel of Wilson in 1914: "To remain neutral not only in act but also in thought." Very gradually, under idealistic impulses bordering on religious fervor, we entered unconditionally into that struggle to "make the world safe for democracy" with all of our available resources, financial and military. Losing sight of more practical diplomacy in our high idealism, we did not require from our Allies before we entered that war any pledge that a victorious peace would result in the embodiment of those high principles for which we fought in the European order which was to follow. We may still argue academically as to the wisdom of going into that war, but our colossal blunder in not attaching vital conditions to our entrance is, I consider, undebatable. If we ever enter again into another European war, we should at least in advance of going in demand such agreements as to peace terms as will, as far as possible, avoid the mistakes and disappointments of 1919 and succeeding years.

As one views the situation since 1919, our attitude on the question of isolation or participation in European and world affairs is not easily explained. In general, the reaction following the World War was in the direction of withdrawal from participation in European political affairs. I regard it as unnecessary before this group to review the various phases of our participation in Europe's economic affairs. More recently, in the face of threatened war in Europe we tried to adopt a more safe and cautious policy of neutrality in the hope of staying out of the war.

We seemed to want to go back to the more normal and historical policy of staying out of the world affairs by modifying and correcting many phases of our policy adopted in the earlier years of the twentieth century. This trend has been especially notable since 1930. For example, we have definitely abandoned the former imperialism in Latin America and substituted the good-neighbor policy. We have also moved toward withdrawal from the Philippines and the far eastern obligations which these islands place upon us. Finally, we sought to remove some of the economic causes of unfriendliness between nations by means of reciprocal-trade agreements with countries in all parts of the world.

On the other hand, the trend toward greater participation in European affairs must not be overlooked. First of all we are confronted with the fact that as the present European struggle approached we witnessed, and as the war proceeds we are witnessing, the unprecedented verbal commitment of our President and the State Department to the interests of one group of European belligerents. Contrast this position with the words of Wilson in 1914 to the effect that we must even be neutral in thought, and we see at once the vital trend toward involvement in European affairs insofar as President Roosevelt and the State Department are concerned—in 1914 neutrality in act and thought, in 1939–40, legal neutrality which admittedly assists Britain and France, and verbal neutrality not at all.

President Roosevelt as early as 1938 spoke publicly of the desirability of quarantining certain powers, and more recently again in public utterances makes no effort to conceal his hopes for the success of one belligerent over the other. From the former tradition of neutrality, isolation, and nonintervention, we would seem to be rapidly approaching its complete contradiction, namely, one of direct participation and partial, if not total, intervention in the war in Europe. This at least as far as the President and the State Department are concerned, and there are indications that point to its approval by public opinion, if not as yet by the Congress.

It should perhaps be pointed out here that the desire to play an important role in European affairs has not always been foreign to our Government, and especially to some of our Presidents. Jefferson, it will be remembered, took up arms against the Barbary States. He determined while President to cease paying tribute to the pirates in that area, and upon the refusal of the European powers to join him in dealing unitedly with the pirates, sent a squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean and succeeded in bringing the Bey of Tripoli to terms. This may be regarded as an historical forerunner of Wilson's armed intervention in Europe in 1917. From time to time during our history also it appears quite obvious that some of our Presidents and Secretaries of State have moved close to the border line of intervention through the desire to have their names connected with some great master stroke in world diplomacy. Moved by visions of the grandeur of the United States as a great world power with superior moral virtue, some have been prone to give gratuitous advice at times to the other nations of the world. At times also these idealistic, and yet somewhat imperialistic, outbursts have been unaccompanied by careful consideration of America's long-time interests, and a thorough grasp of the most strategic factors affecting America's relation to world affairs.

In the present instance one does not question the sincere convictions of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull. As in 1917, a real wrong is being done in Europe, and they are morally indignant against that wrong. Our country began with similar indignation in 1917, and a little later, to save the small nations and democracy, we went to war. And in that war for high ideals we shared in the use of conscription, poison gas, blockades which starved millions, and in a treaty vengeful, selfish, and cruel. All this to help small nations and save the world for democracy. But when all was over, the world was less safe for democracy than it had been for generations, and the small nations are not now in a very enviable position.

I believe it was in large part the high hope of some form of collective security through the League of Nations which would guarantee peace to Europe and mankind which led Wilson to decide in favor of war. Certainly no low motive would have impelled that great man to send American youth to the then Western Front.

It would appear that public opinion in our country is now about 100 percent opposed to Hitler's methods of blitzkrieg, oppression and cruelty, combined with Machiavellian diplomacy, in his war on small nations, and the soundness of this opinion cannot be questioned. From every moral consideration our sympathies are, and should be, with the small countries of Europe and with their defenders, the British and French Allies.

It may indeed be that since the first World War, our fate as a nation has been inextricably linked with that of the democracies of Western Europe, and that after almost a century and a half of struggle to live apart from the European system, we find it necessary now to be united again with those European bonds which we, after great struggle, severed in 1776 and the years immediately following.

If this does become America's future policy in foreign affairs, then it seems to me that we can scarcely look forward to a future in which we can escape Europe's gigantic struggles for power, or expect to keep the American continent free from future involvement in those struggles. Furthermore, it would appear that such a course will jeopardize any opportunity we might have following this war to exert our influence in Europe for the future collective security and peace of all nations. On the other hand, our country may rightly decide that to help defeat Germany now is a greater service to mankind and of greater value and interest to us than anything else which the future may hold in store for us.

Unable as I am to chart the course of our immediate future, I do wish to make here one observation as to our past. It seems tragic indeed that America decided after the last war that she could not help in the proposed plans for cooperative and constructive world peace.

I am troubled also when I consider that our country, which was largely responsible for the Court at The Hague, would not even become a member of the World Court at Geneva following the last World War.

Are we to hope that a brighter future will result from this war of "law against anarchy," of "democracies against dictatorships," than followed the other war to "make the world safe for democracy"?

Chamberlain, who stated the war aim for the Allies, said that it was to defeat Hitlerism, "that aggressive, bullying mentality which seeks continually to dominate other peoples by force, which finds a brutal satisfaction in the persecution and torture of inoffensive citizens, and in the name of the interests of the state justifies repudiation of its own pledged word." He also thus defined the peace aim, "A new Europe—not in the sense of redrawing the map according to the ideas of the victors, but a Europe in which the nations will approach their difficulties with good will and mutual tolerance." He referred also to his desire to make the necessary boundary adjustments in a conference between equals. The trouble is, however, that after the war there will not likely be equality between victor and vanquished, and more than likely there will exist neither good will nor mutual tolerance.

Hitler's peace terms for Europe as a whole contain the expressed wish "That the leading nations of this continent one day come together to draw up a statute that will insure them all a sense of security." But we fear that after the war what would bring a sense of security to one side would not seem like security to the other.

As I've said before, if we could remain at peace we might be able to do something looking toward the future peace and stability of Europe and of the world, and if we should decide to go to war, the greatest possible thought surely should be given to those fundamental principles upon which we would expect peace to be based and those principles formulated into a definite prewar agreement with our allies.

It goes without saying also that before going into this war our leaders should consider most carefully our present state of military preparations in the light of all recent developments in wholesale mechanized warfare on land, on sea, and in the air, calculating in every detail the possible contribution we can make to such a gigantic enterprise, and they should consider also most carefully the future of defense plans for our country and for this continent. These problems which relate to the vital strategy of war and preparations for future defense are of such a technical nature that I can only raise them as questions without offering suggestions as to their possible answers.

Frankly, I face this difficulty that while I am inclined to believe that the days of isolation and nonintervention have passed, or are rapidly passing for our country, nevertheless I have not as yet brought myself to the conviction that this is the time for international intervention on the scale that may be found necessary if we enter the war. It is quite possible, and even probable, that my difficulty arises out of lack of information. I am not aided in my thinking by promises that our boys need not go, that our resources will supply all the needs of our Allies, because I know that this

statement does not square with the history of the years from 1914–17. Would that all the people of our country knew that history. It is difficult also for me to construe as sound information the slogans such as "A world half slave and half free," "Quarantine the aggressor," "Law and anarchy," "Our frontiers are on the Rhine," etc., or the highly dubious though sensational prophecy that every inch of earth and every human being on the earth are in danger of being controlled by one leader of one nation of the earth. Such prophecies are surely not intended for citizens possessing mature minds.

It may well be, however, that our leaders have decided that these are the only available methods of inducing our people to do what they feel we must soon do. On such a basis such methods may be justified, and yet more frankness and more information would seem to be the better way to instruct our citizens as to their duty.

In spite of our almost unanimous sentiment against Hitler and of our genuine sympathy for the Allies, I question whether the majority of our people are yet in favor of going to war. Nevertheless, with our woeful lack of knowledge of the diplomacy of our Government and the strong language coming from our leaders almost every day, looking in the direction of war, emotion, and prejudice, I fear, will not be long in making difficult any further intelligent and reasonable consideration of the subject.

In conclusion, and by way of summary, I suggest:

(1) That traditional isolation is no longer sound as a permanent policy;

(2) That for 20 years now American participation in all steps looking toward collective security and peace would have been good policy and will be good policy after this war;

(3) That peace at any price never has been and never can be a tenet of sound American diplomacy;

(4) That unwise and untimely military intervention is dangerous, very dangerous in this highly militarized world;

(5) That before entering into war we give most careful thought to and plans for our future defense, deciding in advance just what we are going to defend. We need to know if we must defend continental United States, or the Western Hemisphere, or 300 or 600 miles into the oceans around this hemisphere, or the British Isles and France, or the far-flung empires of these two countries, or Hawaii and the Philippines, or the entire Far East. Our preparation for defense should be determined by what we plan to defend;

(6) That before entering into war we obtain more assurance than we now have that we are well prepared with bombproof ships, with adequate air force, with enough antiaircraft guns, with an adequate army adequately equipped, and finally with thorough coordination of all branches of our service;

(7) That before we enter into war we formulate definitely our peace aims, that these be incorporated into a signed agreement with our allies and made known to the other nations of the world.

Before we forego our present neutrality to take a more active part in the present European conflict, we should as a nation carefully define our reasons for entering the war. This should be done in no sentimental fashion but in a coldly realistic manner. No war should be entered lightly, but only for the gravest and most compelling reasons.

Our decision to go in or stay out of the war should be based solely on considerations of national interest. The last World War cost our own Nation $200,000,000,000, directly and indirectly, and we are not through paying for it yet.

What alternative use could we have made, for instance, of the money that 4 years of war cost this world? Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has made an inventory of what we could do for mankind if we had that money today. We could buy 5-acre plots of land at $100 an acre, build homes upon the land costing $2,500, furnish them for $1,000, and give such a home scot-free to every family resident—in 1935—in Russia, Italy, France, Belgium, Germany, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, England, Australia, Canada, and the United States. Every city of approximately 20,000 people in those countries could have a $2,000,000 hospital, a $3,000,000 library, and a $10,000,000 university. With part of the balance invested at 5 percent, we could pay salaries of a thousand dollars apiece to 125,000 teachers and 125,000 nurses, and then we would have enough money left to buy up every penny's worth of property in Belgium and in Germany. Think of the social benefits the world has sacrificed to pursue a war which brought us all only a depression and more war.

To enter this war and see it through would probably cost us more than the last one. The toll in human lives would be infinitely greater, in all probability, due to the increase in effectiveness of modern armaments. The social and political consequences might result in the destruction of the traditional American way of life and the substitution of a native Fascism with all that would mean.

These considerations, which I am only briefly noting, make it incumbent on each of us to keep our head, to think soberly of the stakes involved, and to keep our hearts under control of our heads. However unfortunate a German victory might prove to England and France, and however much our sympathy goes out to them, our first duty is to ourselves. By keeping democracy alive and strong here in America, we will undoubtedly serve not only ourselves but the future of the world best.

We are living in the midst of a war age, in all the turmoil of its chaotic and destructive forces. America has been built by brave men, but also by men who had great vision. We should not become so engrossed, as children of this war age, as not to try to envision world conditions as they will be in the future. After this maddening time of war and bloodshed, there must be leaders of nations who can see the needs of a world which will, even though weary and wasted, still want truth and justice and love and peace. I hope America will produce such far-visioned leaders. We may be facing unprecedented provocations, the easy road may be to war, but in the long view of American diplomacy and America's obligation to itself and to the world, war might prove not to be the best road.

Development of Trade and Commercial Relationships With Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few pertinent editorials dealing with the development of trade and commercial relationships between the United States and the Republic of Brazil.

The most important step taken in recent years to promote a better understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Brazil is that embraced in a plan of two-way publicity outlined by Hon. Edward C. Johnston, vice president of the well-known Western Newspaper Union.

Returning from a trip to South America, Mr. Johnston wrote an editorial article for the Boletin Linotipico, issued for South America by the Mergenthaler Linotype Co. The article, reproduced herewith, excited comment from all parts of the country. Newspapers in the United States encouraged the viewpoint of Mr. Johnston, and pledged support. Brazilian newspapers followed suit, and today the plan seems headed for fruition, and no doubt will contribute in an important way to the promotion of a better understanding between Brazil and the United States, and also promote the dissemination of constructive news about the United States in Brazil and about Brazil in the United States.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal]

EYES TO THE SOUTHWARD

With Europe at war, Uncle Sam's face has been turned to the South instead of the East.

That is to say, that the people of the United States have been thinking more and more in terms of South America and less in terms of Europe.

Consequently, new impetus has been added to improving pan-American relations, and on this side of the Gulf we have been realizing just how close are the interests of the North and South American peoples.

But just how much do we know, even now, of South American affairs? Do we really understand their culture, their economics, their politics, their industry? Is the good neighbor idea, at the present time, much more than a friendly impulse, a sincere hope? It may be suspected that it is not, and that it is to the task of making the good neighbor policy a practical, realistic instrument of mutual welfare that we are under a real obligation to dedicate ourselves.

In the current issue of Boletim Linotipico, the Portuguese edition of the Linotype News, Edward C. Johnston, vice president of Western Newspaper Union, really gets to the heart of the "good neighbor" impulse and points the way to a practical implementation of the pan American ideal.

After noting the fact that the press of the United States is rapidly becoming conscious of a marked increase in things Latin American, and especially Brazilian, Mr. Johnston says:

"There is a fair flow of spot news by cable and radio in both directions—north and south. But this much is certain: In the columns of our newspapers and yours there is a dearth—almost a total absence—of authentic, background feature articles, appropriately illustrated, which constructively interpret to the readers the fundamental institutions, cultural and material, of our respective countries. Along this line the surface has scarcely been scratched. But a two-way channel is needed.

"Recently, representative Brazilian and North American publishers with whom I have discussed the subject expressed a keen

desire to collaborate in a reciprocal exchange of factual, authentic background feature material. Such an exchange as proposed would make this material available on a mutual and nonprofit basis to the publisher groups in our respective countries.

"Would not the cumulative effect of such a reciprocal program contribute most effectively to that cultural exchange and to the development of that mutual understanding which is so necessary between good neighbors?"

Mr. Johnston's idea is obviously sound. Cooperation between the United States and great South American republics must be based on deep mutual understanding of each other's culture, economics, politics, problems and methods in every field. And genuine understanding can be based only on accurate and complete information. An exchange of such information would be not only beneficial but is also absolutely essential.

[Editorial by Edward C. Johnston in Boletin Linotipico]

The press in the United States is rapidly growing conscious of a marked increase of reader interest in all things Latin American. Moreover, this reader interest in Latin America flows from a natural and proper desire on the part of our people to get better acquainted with their neighbors to the south.

It was my good fortune while in Central and South America recently to meet and renew personal friendships with many of your representative publishers. And without exception they told me of the great interest on the part of their readers in things North American. Apparently the same urge to get better acquainted with their neighbor to the north is held in common. Clearly, I think, publishers must now recognize their responsibility to furnish these interested readers the information they seek.

There is the familiar anecdote about Charles Lamb, who said, "I dislike that man." "But," came the reply, "you do not know him," and Lamb answered, "Of course I don't know him. If I did, I could not dislike him."

Someone has said, "We are apt to suspect those we do not know."

Publishers in the United States generally agree with their colleagues in Latin American countries that there should be a mutual effort to disseminate knowledge of each other's civilization. We need to share each other's knowledge of our history, our cultures, our fundamental institutions, our significant and historic personalities.

As I flew down the east coast of South America to Buenos Aires and up the west coast to Mexico City in the airplanes of that great developer of better relations "Panair," the speed achieved in travel shocked me. It forced the realization of how much smaller the world now seems. Literally the world has shrunk. Ideas which peoples of one country have held about peoples of another country, however distant, must now be adjusted at a much faster tempo, not leisurely and over decades. Never before has mass thinking altered so quickly, reacted with such speed to current events and stimuli.

Admittedly, radio is an effective medium for quick dissemination of "spot news" bulletins and for various kinds of entertainment, but the printed word is still the best medium for appeal to man's reasoning powers and in forming his convictions.

Increasingly, I am glad to say, the schools and universities in the United States are making available courses of study in the Spanish language and literature. Our own national heritage from Hispanic culture is realized and greatly appreciated.

This enthusiasm for educating ourselves more about the other Americas is not solely to achieve the satisfaction of greater knowledge. It flows from the urge of the individual citizen to contribute as best he can to making a better world through a progressive realization of the ideals that good neighbors among nations must have in common.

There is a fair flow of "spot news" by cable and radio in both directions—north and south. But this much is certain: In the columns of our newspapers—and, if I may say so, also in yours—there is a dearth—almost a total absence of authentic background feature articles, appropriately illustrated, which constructively interpret to our readers and to yours the fundamental institutions, cultural and material, of our respective countries. Along this line the surface has scarcely been scratched.

But a two-way channel is needed.

Recently representative Latin American and North American publishers with whom I have discussed the subject expressed a keen desire to collaborate in a reciprocal exchange of factual, authentic background feature material. Such an exchange as proposed would make this material available on a mutual and nonprofit basis to the publisher groups in our respective countries.

Would not the cumulative effect of such a reciprocal program contribute most effectively to that cultural exchange and to the development of that mutual understanding which is so necessary between good neighbors? I believe you will agree it would do so. Publisher groups are now carefully examining this proposal. Your comments and suggestions will be most welcome.

EDWARD C. JOHNSTON,
Vice President, Western Newspaper Union.

FOR A BETTER UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES—THE WORK OF EDWARD C. JOHNSTON AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

[Translation from the Portuguese of an editorial article published by A Gazeta, Sao Paulo, Brazil, March 18, 1940]

Intelligent and beneficial is the program which Edward C. Johnston, vice president of Western Newspaper Union and one of the most actively interested North American newspapermen, is sponsoring in favor of a better understanding between his and our country.

Good friendship and good neighborliness can surely never become tangible realities so long as our peoples continue to ignore each other and the work of their necessary approximation is limited to only one of its aspects—commercial intercourse; that is to say, so long as the ties of commercial interest are not supplemented by mutual understanding and comprehension and culturally we continue to live so far apart from each other as if we were not living on the same continent and were not coexisting in the same historical epoch.

Having visited our country frequently, Edward C. Johnston is well acquainted with us. Recently, since he reached again the North American soil, he has not lost an opportunity to show to us that spontaneous and sincere sympathy, having become, as it were, the "friend No. 1 of Brazil in the United States," so much has he done to make us known among his countrymen and so disinterestedly has he placed at the disposal of the Pan American crusade his influence in the political and journalistic circles of his country.

Even recently Mr. Johnston published in the Portuguese edition of the Boletim Linotipico an illuminating article on this important subject, which was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States at the suggestion of Senator LEWIS SCHWELLENBACH, of Washington State. Among many favorable editorial comments in the United States of America, the Jacksonville Journal, a very popular and important publication of Florida and southern Georgia, commented editorially on it at length. In his article Johnston brings the matter to a focus with rare success. He views it from a new angle in which idealism does not exclude but explains the aim, and the path to follow is traced with precision and clarity. The author is not satisfied with speeches, official declarations of cooperation, or with mere tourist excursions. In his opinion, the results will not be wholly satisfactory unless and until we learn to know each other better in greater knowledge and realization of our culture, our progress, our customs, our fundamental institutions, our way of life, and of significant characteristics of our existence. "It is with great pleasure," says he, "that I observe the colleges and universities of the United States offer increasingly more courses in the Portuguese language and in Lusitano-Brazilian literature. We in the United States recognize the values of that part of our national inheritance derived from the cultures of the Iberian Peninsula. This enthusiasm of ours to learn more about things Brazilian and of the other countries of the Americas is not solely inspired by a desire to widen our knowledge. It is rather prompted by the desire of all of us to better relations in this hemisphere by a realization of the common ideals of truly good neighbors. There is now a fair exchange of spot-news items by telegraph and radio, but there is an obvious lack of articles with authentic background and proper illustrations in the columns of our respective newspapers which would explain to the readers in a constructive manner the basic institutions of our two countries. In this direction the surface is scarcely scratched.

As is seen, the writer attributes to the press the most important and the greatest role in the work of bringing the peoples of our two countries together, suggesting a systematic exchange of background feature material between the Brazilian and North American editors. "Would not the cumulative effect of such a program," asks he, "contribute greatly to that cultural exchange and to the development of that mutual comprehension so indispensable between good neighbors?" And he answers, "I think that it would."

We also think that it would; and on that point we are in full agreement with the ideas of our colleague and with that of the editorial commentator of the Jacksonville Journal, being positive, as is the latter, that "genuine understanding can be based only on accurate and complete information," and also that in this case such background information is not alone beneficial but "absolutely essential." For that reason, the program of Edward C. Johnston should meet among us the widest echo and deserve the highest support.

Among the many who have visited us—politicians, journalists, businessmen—he was the first one to view the matter thus from its inception, and also the first one to look at it through a superior prism and to place it on a higher plane, without thereby committing the error of dissociating it from its other aspects.

BRAZILIAN VIEWS ON AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING

[Translated from O Observador-Economico e Financeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil]

The North American commercial missions which have visited us recently have aroused interest in Brazil and throughout the United States, where the necessity for greater approaches with our country in the economic field is making itself felt from day to day, which movement is gaining new and valuable adherents. The situation created for the international commerce by the present European conflict is certainly contributing to the formation of that state of mind, which can only result in our mutual benefit provided we know how to profit thereby. On the Pacific coast, for instance, there is a great scarcity of articles which we are already producing. If we would organize our forces efficiently, we could produce and sell our exportable output to our Yankee friends under mutually advantageous conditions. Rubber, manganese, fibers, and vegetable oils figure in the first place on the list of possible increased sales, and alone in these items we shall have an immense field of action.

However, it must not be lost sight of that the commercial interchange is only one of the aspects of that work of approach, which is incomplete, inefficient, and to a certain extent counteractive if at

the same time care is not being taken to seize this occasion for strengthening the ties of mutual understanding between our two great continental nations, a task in which cultural comprehension is vital. On the contrary, so much depends on contingencies, on mere circumstances, thus resting on highly fragile bases to resist unforeseen vicissitudes. Nobody understands better the problem in its entirety than the vice president of Western Newspaper Union, an organization which serves with feature material approximately 13,000 North American newspapers. It has thus the possibility of sounding the national public opinion and to know by actual and direct contact the very opinion of the public on many diversified matters.

The articles written on that subject by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Edward C. Johnston, and which we had the opportunity to read in issues of Jacksonville Journal and in the Boletim Linotipico, and other journals, and which were reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States on motion of Hon. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, United States Senator from the State of Washington, views the matter under a new light and suggests practical measures, worthy to be put into practice by all concerned. For Mr. Edward C. Johnston the fundamental principle is that the peoples of our two countries should learn to know each other better in the first place, and to do this not merely through statistics of their commercial turnover or through the study of their economic opportunities, but before all, through their achievements in the field of social and moral progress and cultural history and background. "It is vital," says he, "we should have a more intimate knowledge of the history, of the culture, of the fundamental institutions, and of the historic personalities of our respective countries. All of us," continues he, "are inclined to distrust peoples whom we do not know well."

We Brazilians, in our turn, have no reason to react any differently. It is therefore necessary to do all in our power that both peoples learn to know each other, and knowing each other better, we shall esteem each other the more and be disposed to make an effort at mutual collaborating and fraternal cooperation on the basis of the policy of true friendship and good neighborliness enunciated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Johnston starts from the principle—and in that respect he is obviously correct—that true friendship and mutual understanding by the masses of our peoples are essential elements in developing commercial and economic relations, but neither the one nor the other is possible without reciprocal and disinterested comprehension; that is to say, unprejudiced and not dominated by immediate material gains. He is convinced that newspaper men and educators can probably do more for continental solidarity and for Pan-Americanism than businessmen.

"It is with great pleasure," says he, "that I observe that United States colleges and universities are now giving more and more courses in Portuguese and Spanish languages and in Lusitano-Brazilian literature. We recognize more and more the true values of our own national inheritance derived from the cultures of the Iberian peninsula. Our interest in things Brazilian and Latin American in general, is however, inspired not solely by the mere desire to widen our knowledge. It is rather motivated by the desire of all of us to better this world by a realization of the common ideals of truly good neighbors." That which up to now has been done in that direction, seems to him insufficient and inadequate. "There has been a certain exchange of spot news items by radio and by cable in both directions, north and south, but there is no doubt that in the columns of our newspapers as well as in yours there is a lack of feature articles having authentic background, which interpret in a constructive manner to the readers the fundamental and significant institutions of our countries." For that reason his suggestion of an organized and systematic exchange between North American and Brazilian newspapers of articles, authentic background features properly illustrated, all that kind of material tending to give to the readers here as well as there a clear and concrete idea of the past and of the present of these friendly countries. It does not involve, as Johnston clearly points out, any difficult undertaking; there is no doubt about that. Neither does it deal with a vague idea, without appreciable practical results. "There has never been any period of time as is ours," emphasizes he, "in which mass thinking has undergone so many and rapid changes with respect to current events. Preconceptions formed in one country about another may now be corrected with the greatest speed, and not with the slowness of bygone times."

Why then do we not avail ourselves of that rich experience for the benefit of making the effective approaches? Do not allege its needlessness or its slight importance—the contrary is exactly the case. Let us not be satisfied with official speeches made from time to time, nor with the restricted activity of our official publicity offices in the United States. In commenting on the articles of Edward C. Johnston, for instance, the editor of the Jacksonville Journal made a confession which by itself is sufficient to open our eyes and to call our attention to a reality: "How much do we know, even now, of Latin-American affairs?" asks this editor sincerely and earnestly. And he continues: "Do we really understand their cultural backgrounds, their economics, their politics, their industries? Is the good neighbor idea at the present time much more than a friendly impulse, a sincere hope?"

And as for us, if we will make an examination of our own conscience with the same frankness with which that editor made the examination of his, we likewise cannot escape the sad revelation that of the United States we know hardly anything more than is shown to us by the films of Hollywood, or by the might of their industry and of their finances. Their so intense social and spiritual life is completely strange to us.

Has the time not arrived to end this mutual ignorance and to strive earnestly to know each other better? Consequently, is right not on the side of Edward C. Johnston?

Communists and Nazis on Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in today's Washington News there is an article headed "Communists and Nazis Concentrated on Border." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and, in connection with it, I call attention to a bill which I introduced yesterday, Senate bill 4071, which provides for the establishment of a series of observation stations along the Mexican border. A similar bill was introduced in the other House by Representative SNYDER some days ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Friday, May 31, 1940]

COMMUNISTS AND NAZIS CONCENTRATED ON BORDER

EL PASO, May 31.—Communists, working hand in hand with Nazi agents, are distributed all along the northern border of Mexico, according to Gen. Juan Anreu Almazan, Mexican presidential candidate, who will be in Juarez June 9.

"People of Mexico know that the enemy they have to guard against is an outrageous band of foreign invaders who have come here lately to prepare—to make Mexico the center of agitation aimed against the United States and all of Latin America," he charges in a statement released by Manuel Reachi, a member of the Almazan campaign committee.

FACTIONS ARE NEIGHBORS

Influx of German and Russian elements into Mexico is tremendous, according to Señor Reachi. He said Communists and Nazis are working together throughout the country. In Mexico, he said, their leaders live together in the San Angel section.

German money, he said, is publishing the Mexico City magazine El Timon. Russian money is behind El Popular, Toledano's labor daily, he charges.

Mexico has a large German population, particularly in the coffee area of Chiapes, the tobacco districts of Vera Cruz and in the commercial centers of Mexico City and Monterey, he said. Señor Reachi said he has found the Germans almost entirely pro-Nazi and ardent supporters of Hitler.

Señor Reachi predicted that General Almazan will win the election by such a heavy majority that only the defeated candidates will be interested in starting a revolution to cover defeat. In any event, he said, there is no fear of any widespread revolutionary uprising. The Mexican Army, he said, is no longer a political machine since the days of Alvaro Obregon. He thinks it will not split over politics.

General Almazan, according to Señor Reachi, favors settlement of the oil controversy according to international law.

He quoted General Almazan as saying that if Mexican workers would display the same discipline and efficiency as the northern American workers, they could be paid the same wages and given the same working conditions.

WANTS FOREIGN CAPITAL

General Almazan had previously announced that he favors encouragement of foreign capital in exploitation of Mexico's resources. He also advocates a military alliance among American nations.

General Almazan favors continuation of the division of land among small holders, but he advocates previous payment for the land expropriated and he advocates that individual title be given to the farmers instead of to the Communal Ejido (community farms).

Attitude of Labor Toward National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS AND THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles clipped from today's Washington newspapers. One is from the Washington Daily News and sets forth the patriotic attitude of British labor, which now has a realization of the dependence of the national safety upon its patriotic cooperation with governmental policies.

The other article records the uncooperative action of some American workmen on American warships now under construction in this country.

The safety of our country today depends as much upon the patriotic cooperation of labor and capital to serve the national needs of our Government as it does on the Army and Navy and the brave men in the uniform of our country. I am as much opposed to the racketeers against honest labor and their subversive tactics as I am to profiteering in wartime industry.

My hope is that by publishing these two newspaper clippings the contrast between the present attitude of the British and some American workmen may be noted by all those concerned, and that the lesson which the contrast teaches may be learned now, and not after it is too late to serve a useful purpose. May we all now go forward together unselfishly in a unified resolve to serve and save the American people and their constitutional government, which should be the aim and purpose of all American patriots.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 31, 1940]

BRITISH LABOR UNITED, DETERMINED TO WIN WAR

(By William Philip Simms)

LONDON, May 31.—British labor, convinced that this is a people's war, is determined to defeat Germany at all costs. This, I can state on the best authority, is the position of trades-unionists and workers in general.

In the last few days I have found opportunity to talk with many leaders and members of the Labor Party and of labor unions. They were unanimous in their expressions concerning the war and its ultimate outcome, and even more resolute to win than they were during the first World War. The reason, I think, is that they regard it as "our war."

Today I talked with a group of unionists, Socialists, and Laborites. They thoroughly agreed with each other, and what they said agreed with what others had told me previously. The gist of it was this:

"This is not the Tories' war. It is labor's war—a people's war. It has been our war ever since Hitler rose to power.

"The whole Hitlerian concept is opposed to what British workers believe in. Hitler's concept is that the people exist for the government. Ours is that the government should be of, by, and for the people. Abraham Lincoln might well be the patron saint of British labor, for his brand of democracy runs strong in our ideals of statecraft.

"So Britain can't lose this war. Wars made by mere governments are easily lost, but a war backed by an entire free people can end only in victory, especially when behind those people are such economic resources as the British commonwealth of nations commands.

"The fact that British labor has voluntarily given up benefits which it took us a hundred years to win proves how much in earnest we are. We are working unlimited hours, 7 days a week, and doing it gladly.

"Capital is giving up all its war profits and labor is pulling its full share of the load without thought of increased pay. We refuse to take advantage of the situation to force higher wages or win advantages, even where these are long overdue.

"We refuse to do anything that might in any degree imperil the cause for which the Allies are fighting—for that cause is really ours.

"There are no racketeer leaders in British labor. We do not say that to reflect upon the American labor movement, which we know is inspired by ideals as high as ours. But apparently the rank-and-file of American labor has not been able to keep some unworthy men who are not really workers from gaining power in their movement. It is fortunate for us that this has not happened here, for confidence in our leaders is one great factor in enabling British workers to get unanimously behind the war effort.

"In Prime Minister Churchill and Ernest Bevin, the Minister of Labor and National Service, this country has two very big men. Both are realists. Both know what defeat would mean to the plain people. Both are bulldogs of determination, and the whole Nation stands back of them.

"British labor thoroughly understands the position of the United States. We don't want America to come into the war. We don't need American manpower. But we do need American planes and materials in vast quantity, and we do want America's moral support.

"British labor hopes that American labor will answer our appeal."

[From the Washington Star of May 31, 1940]

WARSHIP CONSTRUCTION TIE-UP IS THREATENED BY STRIKE OF 6,000—FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING WORKERS DEMAND WAGE INCREASE

KEARNEY, N. J., May 31.—A wage-increase strike of 6,000 union workmen at the Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. threatened today to halt construction of four United States warships, important cogs in the national-defense program.

The strikers, members of Local 16, Industrial Union of Maritime and Shipworkers of America (C. I. O.), began a peaceful picket of the plant at midnight despite the urgings of union leaders to delay action pending further negotiations.

At the deadline hour, a crowd of 3,500 persons was congregated about the yard gates and 300 men began marching in a picket line. They carried no signs. Seventy-two guards and 35 maintenance men received union permission to work their regular shifts.

INSTRUCTIONS IGNORED

John Dempsey, national vice president of the local, said he told his men to reconsider their action because of the Navy ships under construction. An overwhelming majority voted to strike, however, he added.

No statement was immediately forthcoming from the management, but Dempsey said the company had agreed to close the plant today and meet with union delegates for further negotiation.

A 10-cent an hour wage increase and an annual week's vacation with pay were asked by the strikers whose contract expired Wednesday night. Dempsey said the union had rejected a company offer of a 2½ to 4 cents an hour increase. The present scale of pay ranges from 62½ cents to $1 an hour, it was stated.

LEADERS TO SUPPORT ACTION

Dempsey, who said he was joined in opposing the strike by John Green, national president, and William J. Carney, regional director of the C. I. O., asserted leaders would support the men despite their independent action.

Under construction at the yards are two destroyers and two cruisers. Two other destroyers were slid into wet basins recently.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on national defense by Richard L. Stokes, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 19, 1940]

NATIONAL DEFENSE: UNITED STATES ARMY, PAPER PLANS AND THE ACTUALITIES—FOR LACK OF SUPPLIES ONLY 75,000 MEN WOULD BE QUICKLY AVAILABLE—THEORETICAL M-DAY FORCE OF 450,000 IS $76,000,000 SHORT OF HAVING THE MEANS OF WAGING WAR—$240,000,000 SHY FOR OUTFITTING PROTECTIVE MOBILIZATION PLAN ARMY

(By Richard L. Stokes, a staff correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The ancient world was conquered and ruled for six centuries by means of the Roman legion, a unit of

heavy infantry, rigidly disciplined and highly trained, with a combination then resistless of flexibility and striking force. Poland's collapse, England's headlong debacle in Norway and the German drive into Holland, Belgium, and France suggest that the third Reich may have fashioned a modern equivalent from howitzer, machine gun, combat car, and airplane. This is the mechanized division, an instrument wielding a mobility and fire-power hitherto unknown to man. Of such divisions Hitler's army possesses at least 12. Their personnel of 150,000 or more represents the last word in skill, equipment, and morale.

By contrast the United States can muster today exactly a single mechanized unit. This is nothing so impressive as a division, but merely the third part of one—namely, a brigade. Its two regiments of former cavalry consist of 2,865 officers and men. They are supplied with 183 Springfields, 60 automatic rifles, 2,658 pistols, 1,186 machine and submachine guns, 12 mortars, 16 howitzers, 240 wheeled trucks, 40 half-trucks, 46 passenger cars, 112 tanks, 120 armored and scout cars, 7 planes, 160 motorcycles, and 2 ambulances. There are plans on paper for expanding the unit to 2 brigades.

AIR SPEED AND DEADLINESS WORKING AGAINST ISOLATION

In the opinion of Army authorities, the chance is growing that the Americas may sooner or later be put to their military defense against invasion. The armor of geographic isolation, once invincible, is thought to be disintegrating rapidly before the range, speed, and deadliness of the air arm.

Owing to Japan's secret construction of capital ships, the American Navy, it is said, may no longer constitute even a one-ocean fleet. Latin America, to whose defense against invasion we are committed by the Monroe Doctrine, and the United States itself, are regarded as acutely vulnerable to the Trojan horse. Allied loss of the war, in this view, might plausibly enough bring the American Hemisphere face to face with a coalition of Germany, Italy, Japan, and perhaps Russia—all of them fiercely predatory and murderously hostile to the democratic idea.

With such arguments in mind, as well as the penalties of unpreparedness which have shrieked almost daily from European news dispatches during the last 8 months, a factual survey of the Military Establishment of the United States may be welcomed as timely and valuable. For present purposes the Navy is left out of account. The report is based on conversations with responsible Army officers and members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, upon testimony of Army leaders before the House Appropriations Committee, and upon standard reference books such as Maj. R. Ernest Dupuy's World in Arms. Certain high lights of the situation leap to the eye.

The total trained and partly trained military manpower of the United States is estimated at 607,000. Corresponding figures for some other countries are given thus: Holland, 380,000; Switzerland, 450,000; Australasia, 687,000; Turkey, 700,000; Belgium, 790,000; Rumania, 1,208,000; and Yugoslavia, 1,380,000.

Because of lack of equipment, only 75,000 of these 607,000 men could be placed in the field tomorrow with a fair chance of coping with the latest developments of military warfare. It is the dream of Army chieftains to be able to call up at the declaration of hostilities an initial force of 450,000 men, fully trained and armed; and to have at hand, stored in arsenals, complete equipment for an additional 550,000 who would be recruited by enlistment within 90 days afterward under the so-called Protective Mobilization Plan.

HALF OF THE INITIAL FORCE WOULD REQUIRE MORE TRAINING

The proposed initial force is still $76,000,000 short of the full equipment, according to Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. Half of it would be composed of National Guard units, which are calculated to require on an average from 2 to 3 months of intensive training to equal Regular Army standards. For outfitting the Protective Mobilization Plan Army, General Marshall declares, no less than $240,000,000 is lacking. The procurement of this material is regarded as having such vital urgency that he pleaded it should take precedence over increases of personnel, however sorely needed.

Outside of aviation, which in effect is being subsidized by Great Britain and France, the United States has virtually no munitions industry. Thence arises a time-lag of 15 months to 2½ years between the voting of a congressional appropriation and its translation into actual deliveries. In many cases the Army is only now receiving equipment authorized during the fiscal year 1938–39.

A case in point is the Garand semiautomatic rifle, which Army experts, in the face of criticism, still hold to be the most effective weapon of the kind in the world. It was standardized for production in 1936. Not until 3 years later, in May 1939, did funds become available through a congressional appropriation for 169,789 rifles. Today 40,000 have been delivered, including 10,000 for the National Guard. At the current pace of production the remaining 129,789 will not be ready till June 1942. Even then the supply will be 70,700 short of mobilization day requirements. Actual tests have proved that automatic rifles are twice as effective as machine guns against strafing aircraft.

BASIC FIELD ARTILLERY PIECE WAS GOOD GUN BACK IN 1897

The basic weapon of American field artillery is the French 75-millimeter gun, which was a revolutionary innovation in 1897. Last year 141 pieces were modernized to permit higher elevation and motor traction and to increase their traverse from 6° to 87°. About 600 others, out of a total quota of 1,439, are being brought up to date. Even in the French Army this flat-trajectory gun has been supplanted to a considerable degree by the 105 howitzer, which fires a larger shell and can search out entrenched targets. In their rearmament program the Germans adopted the 105 howitzer as major field weapon. Of such howitzers the United States Army has a few test pieces and 60 are being manufactured. It should be explained that American theory is based on open warfare and fast action against tanks rather than entrenchments.

In the field of motorization, the Regular Army's peace quota is 28,850 trucks and cars of a commercial type. About 15,000 of these were ordered last October. Deliveries started in January and will be completed this month. In addition, the Army began in 1939 a 5-year program at a rate of $2,800,000 annually, for the replacement of worn-out vehicles purchased in 1935 or earlier with P. W. A. funds. Even so, in case of hostilities the Army would still have to resort in part to the "shuttle" system, under which 1 battalion of a regiment is transported to the front while the other 2 wait their turn.

All of the artillery in the National Guard is motorized, but in June 1941 it will have on hand less than 14,000 vehicles out of a peace requirement of 44,000. There is a 5-year program in the National Guard also for the replacement of ancient motors, at a rate of $1,731,570 annually. According to General Marshall, "National Guard divisions are now tied immobile to the ground. They cannot maneuver as divisions. They cannot take the field as such, and yet they are a part of the initial protective force which must be able to move in an emergency."

FIXED COAST DEFENSES

Under the head of fixed coast defenses the United States possesses 62 forts in 19 harbors. In time of peace these are mostly in the custody of skeleton crews of caretakers. At the outset of war, in addition to some Regular Army forces, they would be taken over by 14 regiments of the National Guard. Some of the equipment dates from the Spanish-American War, and most of it is confined to 6-inch cannon. On the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific shores together there are perhaps 4 or 5 batteries of 16-inch guns.

By way of mobile coast defense, the Army is equipped with a very few 12-inch railway mortars and 8- and 14-inch railway cannon. There are no military highways or railroads, but plans exist for adapting commercial roads and rails to Army use. Our coast defenses as a whole are described as undermanned, understaffed, and underequipped. For their modernization, the War Department is asking $95,000,000—a process which would require between 3 and 5 years.

The Nation's total equipment of combat cars amounts to something like 350 tanks, with orders for 328 more, which are to be completed late in 1941. Of the tanks at hand 112 are concentrated in the solitary mechanized brigade. All are of light and medium weight, ranging from 9 to 17 tons. Excepting one or two for experimental purposes, we have no heavy tanks, for which the Army sees little prospect of use. Mobilization day requirements are put at 925 light and medium tanks. The Regular Army has 5 battalions and the National Guard 18 companies of tank troops.

ANTITANK MACHINE GUNS

Outside field artillery, the chief weapon available for resistance to enemy tanks is the .50 caliber machine gun. This is to be replaced with a more powerful arm, the 37-millimeter antitank gun. Of the latter 1,556 are needed. Funds are at hand for 744, leaving a shortage of 812.

While Germany is known to be producing at least 2,300 planes a month, the United States is not expected until next September to reach a capacity of 800 a month for all purposes—Army, Navy, foreign, and commercial. At present the Army has 2,800 planes in commission, including training and cargo ships. All of them are already obsolete, to the extent that they have no armor, antileak tanks, or 37-millimeter guns firing explosive shells. The Army's current program calls for 5,500 planes by June 30, 1942.

In Europe bombing has been practiced at heights of from 18,000 to 25,000 feet. The American Army has 174 antiaircraft guns, which, in Mayor LaGuardia's expressive phrase, "are not enough to defend Coney Island." These are mostly 3-inch guns, which are not regarded as effective against targets more than 18,000 feet above. For defense against bombers at higher altitudes the great cities would have to rely on combat planes and aircraft warning service. Technical apparatus for the latter has only recently been perfected, and $12,000,000 is asked for putting it in production. The Department's future expenditures on antiaircraft armament are based on a new 90-millimeter gun, which means a caliber of 3½ inches and an effective range of 25,000 feet.

16 ANTIAIRCRAFT REGIMENTS

There are 16 antiaircraft regiments, 6 in the Regular Army and 10 in the National Guard. Gaps in equipment are reflected by the current Budget's demand for $13,851,950 with which to purchase guns, fire-control instruments, searchlights, and sound locaters. This sum, it is represented, would equip 22 regiments completely and 15 others with the exception of searchlights and sound locaters. In all the country there is not a single adequate antiaircraft firing range. Practice is held mostly over coastal waters, where targets can approach only by sea and the element of surprise is eliminated. Pleas are before Congress for $294,000 with which to acquire a site of 25 square miles in the Mojave Desert.

With the hope of achieving economies and hastening production by 4 to 12 months, the Army in April 1939 sought to institute a program of educational orders under which 10,000 plants were to

be trained and equipped with machine units that could be expanded into mass production of about 1,200 essential commodities Congress authorized an expenditure of $34,500,000 during the fiscal years 1939, 1940, and 1941, and in addition $2,000,000 during each of the 4 fiscal years succeeding 1941.

Last year there was available about $15,000,000, including $2,000,000 diverted from other purposes, such as pay rolls of officers and men. With these funds the Army was able to cover 73 items. Its current budget of $14,250,000 for educational orders was cut to $2,000,000 in the House of Representatives. Unless the appropriation is restored by the Senate, it is predicted that during the next 12 months only six or eight factories can be "educated."

MINIMUM SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

The Army has estimated that for minimum requirements of safety in case of war the country should have on hand a two-year stock of 14 strategic materials which depend mostly on sources outside the continental United States, and of 15 critical materials which are obtainable only in part from domestic sources. The cost of fulfilling the program was placed at $200,000,000. In June 1939, Congress authorized an expenditure of $100,000,000.

So little actual money was forthcoming that the department last year junked the entire program of critical materials, including vanadium, optical glass, toluol, phenol, asbestos, cork, hides, platinum, iodine and wool. It also threw out of the window six strategic materials—antimony, coconut shell char for gas masks, mercury, mica, nickel, and silk. Rubber was turned over to a cotton-barter arrangement with Great Britain. Purchases were limited to chromium, ferrograde manganese, manila fiber, quartz crystal, quinine, tin, and tungsten. It is calculated that the nation's reserve of manganese is now sufficient for 1 year of normal peacetime needs, but that its stocks of rubber and tin are adequate for only 2 or 3 months of peace requirements.

227,000 IN REGULAR ARMY

Including 54,000 men in overseas garrisons and 31,000 in "housekeeping" or service commands, the Regular Army today has a strength of 227,000, with 1 cavalry and 5 infantry divisions. The personnel of the National Guard is about 234,000, grouped for the most part in 4 cavalry and 18 infantry divisions. Thus the suggested initial force of 450,000 on mobilization day would absorb both Regular Army and National Guard. According to Maj. Gen. John F. Williams, of Columbia, Mo., Chief of the National Guard Bureau, each guardsman at present receives the equivalent of 3 months' training a year, but the annual turnover among enlisted men is 40 percent.

The protective mobilization plan force of 1,000,000 men would include Regular Army and National Guard, plus 200,000 men who have had some training in the National Guard and 30,000 discharged soldiers of the Regular Army who form the Regular Army Reserve. The Officers' Reserve Corps and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps would be drawn upon for commissioned officers, and the Citizens' Military Training Camps for both commissioned and noncommissioned officers. Under best conditions, at least 300,000 of this force would consist of raw recruits. For its maximum effort, the War Department contemplates an Army of 4,000,000, to be raised under selective service. For this there exist 171,000 Reserve officers, but neither trained men nor equipment.

PUERTO RICO AND ALASKA

Under modern aviation conditions, Puerto Rico has become the vital Atlantic outpost of the Panama Canal. The island's military garrison consists of 5,000 men, chiefly two infantry regiments. The Canal's defenses include 4 infantry regiments of the Regular Army, 2 mobile antiaircraft regiments and other units to a total of 20,000 men. The zone has 2 permanent airfields, but only 2 or 3 of the 15 emergency landing fields considered essential to its air protection. Because the 3 double sets of locks are placed side by side, the Canal could be put out of action at 1 bombing by a few saboteurs. If an appropriation now pending is voted, and if work begins this summer, a proposed separate system of locks may be completed by 1946.

Hawaii, the pivot of national defense in the Pacific, is held by approximately 23,000 troops, including 1 infantry division of the Regular Army, 1 mobile antiaircraft regiment, and two infantry regiments of local National Guards. Regular Army units stationed in the Philippines consist of 1 cavalry regiment and 1 infantry division of reduced strength, a total of about 4,000 men. There are 6,000 Philippine Scouts, or native troops. A Philippines Commonwealth army of 30,000 is in progress of organization.

Alaska is known to Army men as "the Achilles heel of the United States," and the Aleutian Islands are described as "another Norway." On Kodiak Island the Navy is constructing a reconnaissance air base, and at Fairbanks the Army Air Corps has cleared 500 acres, at a cost of $300,000, to serve as a testing ground for cold-weather operations. Army leaders hold that an adequate military base at Anchorage would prevent other powers from seizing bases in Alaska, and defend the United States against attack from Asia along the Great Circle. Congress has just authorized $112,000,000 of "pork" under the guise of a rivers and harbors bill, but the House struck from the Military Establishment appropriation an item of $12,734,060 for starting construction of the Anchorage base.

APPROPRIATIONS

Since 1932 congressional appropriations for the War Department have totaled $4,215,807,426. The estimate for 1940–41 is $851,473,245, making a total for the 10-year period of $5,067,280,671. The point is made that a large part of the 1939 and 1940 appropriations have not arrived in the form of orders, and that the current Budget represents a per capita charge of only $6.54 a year for military defense.

In other countries the ratio of national income devoted to defense is declared to be as follows: Japan, 30 percent; Great Britain, 40 percent; France, 50 percent; and Germany, 60 percent. But the United States, it is affirmed, with the richest country in the world to safeguard and wide commitments to protect the rights of others, spent last year on Army and Navy together only 2 percent of its income.

Relation of Flood Control Project at Hartford, Conn., to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD TIMES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Times of Hartford, Conn., on Wednesday, May 29.

This editorial clearly deals with a most important item on the subject of national defense, and I hope that, through the RECORD, it may be brought to the attention of Members of Congress. It definitely points out how a flood-control project at Hartford, Conn., presents a serious need in the matter of protecting our airplane industry and other industries in Connecticut.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times of May 29, 1940]

DIKES, ETC., AND AIRPLANE ENGINES

The plea that Federal appropriation for the local Connecticut River dike extensions be granted hardly would need go further under present circumstances than to point out that airplane engines for the Army and Navy are not produced by factories which are closed because high waters keep employees from reaching them.

That, in the present urgency to speed the national defense, is all the argument that really needs to be offered for restoration of the items stricken from the flood-control bill.

In both 1936 and 1938 floods the United Aircraft plant was obliged to close, not because the buildings themselves were reached by floodwaters, but because highways were made impassable, and especially the single bridge over the Connecticut River which connects Hartford and East Hartford.

Precisely the same thing would be true today if this area were visited by a flood of the 1936 or 1938 proportions. If the Congress is really serious about speeding defense preparations it will give heed to this situation and some other matters related thereto.

The Hartford and East Hartford dike projects are not of the pork-barrel variety. They are vitally needed. They could be amply justified at any time, when it is considered that the 1936 flood caused damage estimated at $20,000,000 in Hartford. That justification is multiplied a hundredfold when the possibilities of war and the need of preparing against it are considered.

Without the dike extensions provided in the legislation offered by Senator MALONEY the system now partly constructed will not be complete. The extensions are needed, not only to make certain that floods will not close the United Aircraft plant, but they also are needed to assure that power supply will be uninterrupted and to complete the protection of Brainard Field. Hartford's airport already is headquarters for National Guard aviation. In the event of war, it unquestionably would become a center of military flying activities, and perhaps of naval, too, since it borders the river.

In passing, in view of the clamor for protection against possible invasion, the Federal Government might well take keen interest also in the pending proposal for an additional runway at Brainard Field, at present without provision for landings into the frequently prevailing southwest wind. Commercial planes more than merely occasionally are obliged to omit Hartford landings due to this lack. In time of war that might be tragic. If the country really is preparing for defense, the runway should be installed promptly. The second bridge over the Connecticut might also be hastened.

As to the dike extensions, let it be said that the need does not in any sense support the argument for removing the airplane-engine

industry into the Middle West or making extensions of it there. Too many other factors enter into that situation to make mere need of flood control a reason for removal or for nonexpansion here.

The local airplane-engine industry is not merely under the roofs of the United Aircraft Corporation. It is scattered over scores of plants all over New England, whose assistance is utilized because of the particular nature of their products or the especial skills which they command. At a recent aeronautical meeting in Hartford representatives of 60 or more such concerns, all essential suppliers of United Aircraft, were seated at a single table. The local airplane-engine industry includes these plants as well as a particular corporation. It could hardly be moved to another part of the country without taking also these other industries, unless manufacture were to be dislocated, delayed, and complicated rather than speeded, to say nothing of the loss of access to skilled labor. If much of this seems to have little to do with dikes, it is nevertheless important to consider in improving the national defense.

Civilian Conservation Corps in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY GUY D. McKINNEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Guy D. McKinney, Assistant to the Director, Civilian Conservation Corps, regarding the Civilian Conservation Corps in New York State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Civilian Conservation Corps program has now been in operation in the State of New York for a little more than 7 years. Over this period about 200,000 New York young men and war veterans have lived and worked for varying periods of time in the wholesome outdoor atmosphere of the C. C. C. camps. Under the competent supervision of Federal and State conservation authorities, these men have enormously advanced conservation programs in New York State and substantially aided many western States in putting their conservation houses in order.

The number of camps operating in New York has ranged from 129 in 1935 to 56, the number now being maintained. The number of men enrolled from the State has fluctuated according to the size of the Corps, as well as the demand for outdoor jobs by New York youth. At the present time the C. C. C. is able to give healthful employment to virtually every eligible New York young man between the ages of 17 and 23 who applies for C. C. C. enrollment and who is fitted for camp life. All told, some 18,500 New York men are now in the Corps, the majority of them in camps located within the State.

In the 7 years that the Corps has been operating, New York men have sent in excess of $36,000,000 home to their parents and dependents. This sum represents the aggregate of the $22 a month allotment checks which each C. C. C. youngster with dependents allots home each month. The young men and war veterans are paid $30 a month, $8 of which is kept by the enrollee for his personal expenses. In return for working 8 hours a day, 5 days a week in the field, each enrollee receives not only the $30 cash allowance for himself and dependents, but also shelter, food, clothing, medical attention, education and training, and work experience.

On the average, the young men who have enrolled from New York State have gained from 7 to 11 pounds during the first 6 months that they spent in the woods or on farms. The outdoor life, the camp routine and discipline, and the good food served have conditioned the enrollees physically, and greatly improved their health. It has taught them safety and sanitation rules. They have learned how to take care of themselves. Should any of these boys ever join the Army or Navy in event of an emergency, they will have a head start over youths who have not received such training.

The work which the youths and war veterans have done is of great importance to every citizen of the State. Working with the State conservation commission, they have planted new forests, protected existing forests and parks from fire and disease and insects, worked on flood-control projects, and developed new recreational facilities. In the Western States, New York young men have aided in protecting and conserving the Nation's timber supply. They have worked on reclamation, wildlife, grazing control, erosion control, and many other kinds of projects. Many of these boys, away from home for the first time, have enjoyed invaluable opportunities to see other sections of the country.

Among important work activities in New York State by enrollees working under State and Federal forest and conservation officials, has been the reforestation program being carried out on submarginal farm lands newly acquired by the State, and the protection and improvement of the State's splendid existing forested areas.

The forest camps operate under the direction of the United States Department of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, in cooperation with the State conservation department. Soil-erosion camps, which have been doing an important job combating soil losses on valuable agricultural land, operate under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service. At the present time 27 camps are located on State-owned forest areas, 5 on privately-owned timber lands, and 6 on soil-erosion-control projects. The Department of the Interior supervises the work of 15 camps in State parks, 2 in national parks, and 1 attached to the Bureau of Biological Survey.

The reforestation program has resulted in the planting of a total of more than 154,000,000 trees, mostly in the central and western parts of the State. During the past year new acquisitions of land requiring reforestation brought the total area contracted for by the State to more than 450,000 acres. The C. C. C. camps also engaged in surveys connected with the acquisition program, thereby effecting large saving to the State.

In addition to the actual tree-planting job, C. C. C. enrollees spent 30,820 man-days of labor on the production of the necessary tree seedlings in forest-tree nurseries. C. C. C. boys engaged in all phases of the nursery program, including the collection of some 60,000 pounds of hardwood seeds from which to grow seedlings.

In order to improve the future value of large stands of timber, C. C. C. enrollees under the direction of forest technicians have covered 42,755 acres on timber stand improvement work, which consists principally of thinning operations designed to better the growing conditions of valuable trees.

The C. C. C. has greatly advanced the development of recreational resources within the two State forest preserves in the Adirondacks and Catskills. Work of this nature has been highlighted by the improvement of fishing in scores of trout streams. Fishing rights on more than 400 miles of such streams have been acquired or are under long-time lease by the State on privately owned lands. On these, and also on streams in State-owned forest areas, C. C. C. camps have carried out a large-scale project of stream improvement. Deflectors, rock cribs, and other streambed structures and improvements have been applied to stretches where needed, and trees and other vegetation planted. Work of this type aids the propagation and increase of game-fish populations. There has been a noticeable improvement of good fishing reported by sportsmen in areas where this work has been carried on. C. C. C. enrolees have aided in the production of fish stock for "planting" in these streams by constructing more than 100 new fish-rearing ponds.

Outdoor recreation in general in the Adirondack and Catskills Forest Preserves has been greatly facilitated by the work of the Corps. Since 1933 C. C. C. enrollees have developed scores of new camp sites and miles of foot trails and simple shelters for hikers and winter-sport enthusiasts. Ten camps continued recreational work in the forest preserve during 1939, and in six of these camps recreational work was the major part of their work programs. No timber stand improvement cutting is done in these forest preserves and no cutting of trees at all except where absolutely necessary in clearing rights-of-way for foot and truck trails.

Since the beginning of the C. C. C. program enrollees in New York have engaged in actual forest-fire fighting to the extent of 43,700 man-days. In the reforestation areas and on the forest preserve work included the construction of truck trails, fire lines, and water holes. A total of 462 miles of truck trails has aided transportation for fire-control forces; nearly 200 additional miles of telephone lines and newly erected fire lookout towers have also aided the fire-detection and communication systems.

Another contribution of New York's forest-conservation program has been the protection of the woodlands from tree-destroying insects and diseases. Since 1933, C. C. C. crews have covered a total of 3,000,000 acres on control measures aimed against insect pests in the extreme eastern part of the State, principally gypsy moths. The egg clusters of this insect are scouted for and destroyed. Work against tree diseases, covering about 1,000,000 acres, has largely been directed against white-pine blister rust. The spread of blister rust, which annually destroys much valuable timber throughout the Nation as well as in New York, is controlled by the eradiction of plants of the genus ribes, which act as the "alternate host" to spread the disease.

The camps operating under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service have developed areas to demonstate practical methods of soil saving. Work of the camps has reduced the destruction of good agricultural soil through the construction of check dams and the planting of gully banks with trees, shubs, and grasses, and the construction of terracing.

In addition to the camps located in forest and soil-conservation areas, 17 C. C. C. camps are working in New York park areas at

the present time. At various times since the C. C. C. was organized, the corps has worked on 52 park areas of the State.

Its work is credited with advancing the conservation and recreational features of the park system by many years. Enrollees have provided more trails, beaches, picnic groves, cabins, and shelters and even a complete new park for the recreational needs of the Empire State's residents and visitors.

The new park is Margaret Lewis Norrie State Park, a 320-acre reservation on the eastern shore of the Hudson River, 9 miles north of Poughkeepsie. Here enrollees have constructed overnight cabins, which can be used by vacationists cruising on the river, an entrance road to the park, bridges, and numerous recreational facilities.

One of the most interesting projects in the State has been the establishment of a fine arboretum at Cornell University at Ithaca.

In Gilbert Lake State Park, enrollees have handled projects designed to encourage wildlife and have developed a number of duck ponds. This is probably the wildest and most natural park area in the central New York region.

In Clarence Fahnestock Memorial State Park, enrollees constructed a concrete core wall dam to impound water to form Lake Canopus, a body of about 100 acres. In Palisades Interstate Park, enrollees have also provided recreational lakes, and have constructed roads, truck trails, have graded fine slopes, and provided water-supply facilities.

Working from a base camp, enrollees have developed picnic and tent camp facilities, trails, cabins, parking grounds, and similar improvements in many of the reservations of the Thousand Islands region. In 1898 New York acquired 11 camp sites in this region for the use of the public. These areas situated on Lake Ontario and along the St. Lawrence River from Sacketts Harbor to Chippewa Bay are valuable State park property today.

Since establishment of the base camp, enrollees have completed topographic surveys of all parks in this region. At Cedar Point, Grass Point, and Kring Point State Parks, bathing facilities have been put in first-class condition.

At Grass Point, by way of experiment, several hundred yards of sand were dumped on the ice during the winter, and when the ice went out in the spring the sand spread itself evenly on the river bottom, making an excellent bathing beach.

Some of the parks in the region are being provided with bathhouses and latrines, sewage, water supply, and light systems, parking areas, gravel roads and trails, stone sea walls, entrance portals, trailer sites, tent platforms, table and bench combinations, and fireplaces. The picnicking and camp areas in all of them are being subjected to general clean-up operations, and many trees and shrubs are being planted.

The stone used in the buildings is quarried, cut, and laid by the boys of the Civilian Conservation Corps, who are also responsible for the carpentry and plumbing.

Green Lakes State Park, near Syracuse, has been provided with enlarged and improved recreational facilities including overnight cabins, picnic areas, foot trails, and park roads. A handsome recreational building has been constructed here by C. C. C. labor under joint supervision of the Central New York State Park Commission and the National Park Service.

In Allegany State Park, enrollees have constructed a modern camping center, including facilities for automobile trailers. Electric power, water, and sanitation systems and equipment for preparing meals are provided at each trailer site. Also in this park, enrollees carried on an interesting animal census in an effort to record the species and abundance of wild mammals in this huge recreation-conservation area and to determine methods favorable to their future increase. Bears, deer, raccoons, Canadian porcupines, mink, beavers, and other mammals and many varieties of birds abound in the 65,000 acres of this park. Enrollees have established a system of nature trails in the area to enable visitors to observe these native animals and also to study the plant life of the region.

At Selkirk Shores State Park on Lake Ontario, near Pulaski, enrollees have developed camp areas, enlarged picnic grounds, and installed water, power, and telephone lines. They have constructed sea walls to prevent erosion.

In three parks of New York's great Finger Lakes network—Fillmore Glen State Park, Fair Haven Beach State Park, and Cayuga Lake State Park—enrollees have provided extensive picnic areas, trailside shelters, and vacation cabins, and have transplanted thousands of trees and shrubs in extensive landscape projects. Construction of a nature trail along a wall of the deep gorge hewn through limestone and shale by the waters of Fillmore Creek was one of the projects in Fillmore Glen State Park, an area named for Millard Fillmore, thirteenth President of the United States, whose cabin birthplace is nearby. This trail includes many steps cut in solid stone. Beach improvements were made at Fair Haven, and a new contact station has been completed at Cayuga.

There has been a great increase of attendance at Letchworth State Park since enrollees extending the picnic-area system, erected cabins and fireplaces, and built roads and trails in the area. Much erosion control has also been carried on here.

At Hamlin Beach State Park, beach and shore-line development and protection have been the main work jobs of enrollees and include the building of jetties to prevent the periodic shifting of sand along the beach due to currents and storms. They have also provided picnic areas, tennis courts, baseball fields, and informal playgrounds.

Restoration of trails, damaged by floods, in the famous scenic gorge of Watkins Glen State Park consumed many man-days and enrollees have devoted time to developing camping, picnicking, boating, and swimming aids.

At Lake Taghkanic State Park overnight cabins have been constructed and a tent-camping area provided.

Saratoga National Historical Park project and West Point are the only two Federal areas in New York on which the Civilian Conservation Corps has worked under National Park Service supervision since the beginning of its program.

The camp at West Point was established April 1, 1935. To date the enrollees have built a community house, a mess hall, 4 picnic shelters, and 30 picnic table and bench combinations, besides developing 23 acres of public campground. They have restored the old Marine battery and razed 5 undesirable structures; made 6,000 feet of gravel walks, and nearly 16 miles of trails. Thirty acres of nursery areas have been developed for raising trees and shrubs, and 28,660 trees and shrubs have been moved and planted around new buildings and in recreational areas. Work has also been done in tree surgery, insect-pest control, dead-tree clearance for fire-hazard reduction, and various other projects. Enrollees worked both on the reservation and Constitution Island.

The camp at Saratoga National Historical Park project has been established little more than 6 months. Work plans call for topographical surveys, razing of houses and barns, removal of fences, obliteration of an existing 15-acre picnic area when plans for a new one are completed, landscaping of 250 acres, construction of 5 miles of roads, telephone and power lines, and water-supply system, development of a nursery, work in tree preservation, and exotic-plant eradication; and work in road maintenance, traffic count, and fire presuppression.

Saratoga Historical Park was authorized for establishment in June 1938. It will bring into the Federal park system the site of one of the most decisive military engagements in American history, the turning point of the American Revolution. The nucleus of the new area will be a 1,429-acre section of Saratoga Battlefield. Here, on October 17, 1777, General Burgoyne surrendered his entire army of more than 5,000 men to General Gates. Thus the British plan of cutting the American rebellion in two, by controlling the Champlain-Hudson line, met defeat, and this crucial blow brought France to the American side.

A Clear Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SALIDA (COLO.) DAILY MAIL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by John M. O'Connell, appearing on May 21 in the Salida (Colo.) Daily Mail. While I do not concur in all of the conclusions reached by this very able writer, I am deeply impressed by his clear logic.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salida (Colo.) Daily Mail of May 21, 1940]

A CLEAR ISSUE

The air is filled with talk about isolation, intervention, and neutrality. The Nation is in a state of hysteria. Calmer heads are warning us to keep our shirts on, but war propaganda is insiduous and powerful. We hear that "This is not our war," that "It is our turn next," that "We cannot stay out," that "We must go in at once," that "We must give aid to the Allies short of war," that "We are weak and can be invaded by air, land, or sea," that "We have nothing to fear."

Now is the time to be calm and to make a careful survey of the situation. We think the case can be stated in one proposition expressed in two forms:

First. Either the Allies are fighting for the peace and liberty of the United States, or they are not.

Secondly. The defeat of the Allies will make it impossible for the United States to live at peace with the dictators, or it will not.

If the Allies are fighting for the peace and liberty of the United States, and if their defeat will make it impossible for us to have peace, what are we waiting for? Evidently in that case it is our

duty to pitch into the war in Europe with all our moral, economic, and military strength. If it is our war we belong over there and the quicker the better. Why trifle with measures "just short of war," why get into it half way, or stick our big toe into it? Why not take the plunge and have it over with?

If the Allies are fighting our war, fighting for our peace and security and we fail them, we are a nation of ingrates, slackers, cowards. If they are fighting for us and we do no more than lend them our money and furnish them with airplanes and guns for their young men to use against the enemy, while our own young men, from behind their mothers' skirts, watch the brave British and French die, what kind of a nation are we?

But if the Allies are not fighting for the peace and liberty of the United States and if their defeat will not mean war for us against the dictators, what are we stewing about? Why should we send our young men forth to fight in a cause that is not ours? Why should we stick our nose into a neighboring fight that is no concern of ours? Why should we endanger our own form of government by engaging in a war that neither side will win, because even if they win they lose. Why should we immediately invite ourselves to be regimented and placed under a dictator, the plans for which were drawn several years ago, if this war does not affect us? Why should we gamble with the blood of our young men in a cause that is not our own?

So stands the proposition. If now we inquire into the underlying facts of the war, we shall find that it is the same old war that has been going on in Europe for at least 2,000 years. It is a continuation of the World War into which we were duped. It is a war for commercial supremacy in Europe and nothing else. It is not a war of honor, a war for liberty, or a war for security. It is a war for commercial power.

We know now that the World War was not fought to make the world safe for democracy. We see now how Turkey and Russia are lined up with their old enemies of the World War, and Italy is leaning that way. We see how Japan has veered from the side of "democracies" to the side of Germany. Are they still fighting for democracy? Were they fighting for democracy in the World War?

Only yesterday we read that Great Britain is trying to win the wicked Stalin to its side again, willing to forgive the invasion of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland. This talk of war for honor and war against dictators and war for democracy and the like, just don't add up.

In a world so full of nations that line up in war according to their own advantage, why should we be continually looking for a chance to get in and fight for democracy, honor, and other high principles?

Common sense tells us our duty is to obey George Washington's advice and keep away from that eternal fighting and intrigue in Europe. Keep our own home fires burning, guard this Nation with the biggest Navy, biggest airfleet and an efficient Army, and mind our own business. That's the prudent course.

If Germany wins the war, A. Hitler will rule the roost in Europe. If the United States gets into the war, win or lose, a Hitler will rule America. Our form of government will melt in the war. Our hope for the United States as a democracy is to stay out—away out.

England financed Hitler, furnished him with war supplies even while he was crushing Austria and Czechoslovakia. And now we are supposed to finance England in its war with Hitler. Barnum was right. The American people love to be fooled—but not that badly, we hope.

Mr. Farmer, Examine Both Sides of Public Questions During a Campaign Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE V. PARSONS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2972, an article, inserted by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman MASON, Republican, entitled "Pertinent Thoughts Bearing on the Campaign Issue of 1940." This was a typical Republican attack on the trade-agreements program. It was just a run-of-the-mine Republican statement. There was nothing unusual in the fact that it contained inaccuracies, misstatements of fact, and false inferences. For example my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON] condemned Secretary Hull's program by saying:

It virtually amounts to free trade.

Opponents of the trade-agreements program who can find no legitimate criticism against it fall back to the hackneyed criticism that it is virtually free trade. Apparently the author of this statement does not know that under the Trade Agreements Act the President is limited in all changes in duty to 50 percent of the Hawley-Smoot rates, and that is far from free trade.

The following figures clearly show how erroneous was the statement, "It virtually amounts to free trade":

Ad valorem equivalent on dutiable imports

	Percent
Average rate for Fordney-McCumber Act	38.5
Rate for 1938	39.3
Rate for 1939 (preliminary)	36.4

If the rates of duty under trade agreements are virtually free trade, the Fordney-McCumber Act, according to the above average figure, which was slightly lower than the rate for 1938, must have been a free-trade Republican tariff act.

Those who have opposed any reductions in duties also claim that since more than 60 percent of the imports into the United States enter free of duty, the United States is on a low-tariff basis and, therefore, there is no necessity to reduce duties in order to increase foreign trade. The embargo or prohibitory rates are, of course, diluted in this average figure. The obvious fallacy in the whole contention is that if the rates of duty are high enough for a complete embargo on all dutiable items, everything imported must enter free of duty, then we might point with pride to our liberal trade policy because 100 percent of our imports would enter free. Would that make us a free-trade nation? Even on this fallacious basis the following comparative figures show that the "virtually free trade" talk by opponents of foreign trade is not substantiated by facts.

Percent of imports entered free

Average under Fordney-McCumber Act	63.8
Hawley-Smoot Act, 1933	63.1
Trade agreements, 1939	61.4

With a smaller percent of the imports entering free of duty in 1939 than for the average of the Fordney-McCumber Act, what is there to this "virtually free-trade" talk under trade agreements?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] called attention to the fact that he had seen manufactured articles labeled "Made in Germany," "Made in Japan," or "Argentine beef" on the shelves in American stores. There was the inference that these products had gotten there by reduced duties through trade agreements. Now if he had been even superficially informed with respect to trade agreements, he would have known that there are no agreements with the indicated countries. As a matter of fact, Germany is positively penalized and prevented from receiving any benefit whatever from reduced duties. That implication was just 100 percent wrong.

According to the Tariff Commission about 3 percent of Japan's exports to the United States enter at lower rates of duty as a result of the most-favored-nation treatment which has not yet been modified with Japan. No duty reduction has been made on Argentine beef or any other kind of beef. The negotiations with Argentina were terminated more than 6 months ago. So this effort to prejudice farmers against trade agreements must fall flat on these three false counts. Farmers are so much better informed than my friend [Mr. MASON] that in an ordinary court proceeding he would be disqualified as a witness; his evidence would be incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial.

Under the caption, "Failure after 7 years," an unsuccessful attempt, by manipulating certain average figures, the old game of "diluting the mix" was made to compare conditions under the old deal and under the New Deal.

The following comparative figures indicate what has happened to American farmers during 7 years of the New Deal:

	1932	1939
Farm cash income from marketings	$4,682,000,000	$7,711,000,000
Average farm price for all commodities, index (1909-14=100)	65	93
Average prices received by farmers for—		
Wheat (cents per bushel)	38.80	63.60
Corn (cents per bushel)	28.10	47.60
Beef cattle (dollars per 100 pounds)	4.25	7.03
Hogs (dollars per 100 pounds)	3.34	6.23
Butterfat (cents per pound)	17.90	23.90
Wool (cents per pound)	8.60	22.30
Cotton (cents per pound)	5.82	8.66
Tobacco (cents per pound)	9.30	13.60

A further diluted calculation of 5-year averages in an attempt to show imports and exports of agricultural products in an unfavorable light was cooked up by the gentleman. In reply to such statistical maneuvering, the following figures show (a) that American farmers were taken out of the foreign market from 1929 to 1932 to the tune of more than a billion dollars annually, and (b) that there was much greater competition for American farmers by foreign countries in so-called competitive agricultural imports during those new-era days:

Agricultural exports:	
1929	$1,693,000,000
1932	662,000,000
Annual loss in agricultural exports under Hawley-Smoot Act	1,031,000,000
Imports of competitive agricultural products:	
1929	1,017,000,000
1939	526,000,000
American farmers better off under the last year of trade agreements by	491,000,000

The following tables are evidence of the losses to the State of Illinois under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act and benefits under trade agreements:

Condition of agriculture in Illinois under the Hawley-Smoot tariff period and the trade-agreements period

Commodity	Illinois farmers' cash farm income received during 3 years under—		Gain to Illinois farmers, 1936-38
	Hawley-Smoot period, 1931-33 [1]	Trade agreements, period, 1936-38 [1]	
Cattle and calves	$131,563,000	$243,121,000	$111,558,000
Hogs	189,835,000	318,899,000	129,064,000
Sheep and lambs	11,737,000	18,308,000	6,571,000
Corn	133,865,000	287,368,000	153,503,000
Wheat	41,576,000	88,555,000	46,979,000
Oats	26,268,000	34,782,000	8,514,000
Barley and rye	2,054,000	3,076,000	1,022,000

[1] Since the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act became effective in June 1930, the year 1930 has been omitted. Although the Trade Agreements Act was authorized on June 12, 1934, only 4 agreements had been negotiated by the end of 1935.

NOTE.—Figures do not include Government payments.
Source: Data published by the Department of Agriculture.

Decrease in typical Illinois industries under the Hawley-Smoot tariff period

Industry	Decrease from 1929 to 1933, Hawley-Smoot tariff period		
	Wage earners	Wages	Value of production
Total, all industries	271,221	$621,459,000	$3,779,917,000
Electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies	43,205	81,059,000	379,045,000
Furniture	13,712	24,499,000	101,753,000
Meat packing	5,914	15,812,000	450,713,000
Printing and publishing—book, music, and job	10,687	24,694,000	95,868,000
Steel-works and rolling-mill products	13,411	37,611,000	178,607,000

Increase in typical Illinois industries under the trade-agreements program

Industries	Increase from 1935 to 1937,[1] trade-agreements program		
	Wage earners	Wages	Value of production
Total, all industries	142,896	$301,405,000	$1,561,183,000
Electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies	15,203	26,409,000	120,148,000
Furniture	4,484	7,710,000	29,571,000
Meat packing	795	6,049,000	89,658,000
Printing and publishing—book, music, and job	4,914	8,933,000	22,966,000
Steel-works and rolling-mill products	16,639	31,684,000	124,691,000

[1] Latest Census of Manufactures data published in 1937.

Where the Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUTTE (MONT.) STANDARD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Butte (Mont.) Standard, of May 18, 1940:

[From the Standard, Butte, Mont., of May 18, 1940]

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

For the first time since the founding of this Nation its living standard is slipping, economists say.

Previously, for more than 160 years, living conditions of the people of this country have been on the upgrade.

Looking at some figures dug up by economists we believe we see the reason. In 1929 the per capita income was $668 and per capita retail sales were $404. The per capita income for 1939 was $519 while the per capita retail sales was $283.

By comparison the people in 1929 spent much more for retail goods than they did in 1939. Where did the remainder of this income go? The obvious answer is that it went for taxes. The tax on the average earned dollar today is between 25 and 30 cents; in 1929 the tax on the average earned dollar was around 12 or 15 cents.

Storing of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, an act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials was approved August 11, 1939, and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MARTIN, was adopted and became a part of the law. The Martin amendment has the effect of requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate 300,000 bales of Government agency cotton in New England.

The Martin amendment should not have been adopted, and the Commodity Credit Corporation should not now be required to reconcentrate such a large quantity of cotton in New England. I have, therefore, introduced a bill the purpose of which is to repeal the Martin amendment and to

provide a fair and just plan and policy for the reconcentration of cotton which is pledged to or owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is not the purpose of the bill I have introduced to require the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate cotton. I am very definitely in favor of cotton being stored in interior warehouses in communities where it is produced so that farmers and local merchants will not be deprived of exercising their rights in the selling and buying of the cotton in the event it is offered for sale. I am likewise thoroughly convinced that if and when it becomes necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate cotton which is owned by or pledged to the Corporation, the cotton should not be reconcentrated in large quantities in warehouses located in port cities but rather should be reconcentrated in domestic consuming centers so that it might be readily available for sale to our manufacturers. I am, of course, in favor of farmers being able to store their cotton at the lowest possible rate.

Even a casual examination of the record indicates that the Commodity Credit Corporation has favored the large warehouses in port cities and has discriminated against small domestic interior warehouses located in areas in which a large portion of our cotton is processed. Too much cotton is now reconcentrated in the ports and not enough is reconcentrated in domestic consuming centers. During the crop year 1938–39, North Carolina mills consumed and processed 1,789,458 bales and during the first 6 months of the crop year 1939–40, North Carolina mills, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, have consumed and processed 1,069,000 bales. With North Carolina processing in excess of 2,000,000 bales per year, the startling fact remains that the Commodity Credit Corporation has reconcentrated only approximately 900 bales of Government loan cotton in North Carolina during the last 12 months—not enough cotton to run the cotton mills of North Carolina for even 1 day. On the other hand, the Commodity Credit Corporation has reconcentrated cotton in Pacific, Gulf, and South Atlantic ports to such an extent that there are now stored in ports 1,820,517 bales against exports last year of 3,400,000 bales. In other words, North Carolina processed approximately one-half of the number of bales exported last season. It will be observed that there is enough Government reconcentrated cotton stored in ports to take care of the entire export trade for approximately 6 months as against less than 1 day's supply of Government reconcentrated cotton for North Carolina mills stored in North Carolina warehouses. This is the situation, notwithstanding the fact that there are warehouses in North Carolina that are offering not only competitive rates, but in some instances the lowest rates in the entire country, that is, 8 cents per bale per month for compressed cotton and these warehouses are Federal bonded warehouses and have reconcentration and free reshipping privileges.

According to a complaint filed on the 16th day of April 1940, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said act, some of the warehouses with which the Commodity Credit Corporation has stored large quantities of Government agency cotton are accused of engaging in an understanding and agreement, combination, or conspiracy among themselves to restrict, restrain, and suppress competition in the compressing and storing of cotton and of many other acts and practices to the prejudices of the public.

So we face the situation of having one governmental agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation, dealing on a large scale in the matter of the storage of cotton with the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. and many other respondents named in the complaint filed on the 16th day of April 1940, while another agency of the Government, the Federal Trade Commission, in its complaint, is accusing the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and other respondents therein named of the worst type of racketeering and of a conspiracy in restraint of competition.

I, of course, do not know whether or not the Federal Trade Commission will be able to substantiate the charges preferred in the complaint, but at least the charges are of such a character as to warrant, justify, and require an inquiry and investigation by the Commodity Credit Corporation into the acts and conduct of the accused warehouses with which the Corporation is continuing to transact business on a large scale.

The complaint filed on April 16, 1940, is as follows:

[Before Federal Trade Commission. In the matter of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., a corporation; Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Mississippi Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Tensas Parish Gin Co., a corporation; Madison Parish Gin Co., Inc.; R. L. Taylor, individually and as chairman of the board of directors of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Binford Hester, individually and as president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; E. F. Wade, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Winston E. Chealrs, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; W. Dennis Brown, an individual; and Fred Schneider, an individual. Docket No. 4090]

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., a corporation; Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Mississippi Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Tensas Parish Gin Co., a corporation; Madison Parish Gin Co., Inc.; R. L. Taylor, individually and as chairman of the board of directors of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Binford Hester, individually and as president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; E. F. Wade, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Winston E. Chealrs, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; W. Dennis Brown, an individual; and Fred Schneider, an individual, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of the said act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest hereby issues its complaint in that respect as follows:

Paragraph 1: The respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal office and place of business located at 81 Monroe Avenue, in the city of Memphis, within the State of Tennessee. Said respondent is engaged in the business of compressing and storing cotton and in the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties for use in compressing cotton in connection therewith. In the conduct of its said business, respondent, either directly or indirectly through the respondent, R. L. Taylor, the chairman of its board of directors, owns and operates a large number, to wit, 80 compress plants located in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas. Said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., through the means of subsidiary corporations, owned or controlled by said respondent directly or indirectly through the respondent, R. L. Taylor, is also engaged in the business of ginning cotton in the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

Said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., causes the cotton compressed by it and the jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold by it and affixed to the said bales of cotton which it has compressed, to be transported from the States in which the respective compress plants are located to the purchasers thereof located at various points in the several States of the United States other than the State of the origin of such shipments and in foreign countries. There has been, and now is, a course of interstate and foreign commerce in said jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties between said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and the purchasers of said products located throughout the several States of the United States and in foreign countries.

At all times mentioned herein, said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., has been in competition with other corporations, partnerships, and individuals likewise engaged in the compressing and storing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties used in conection therewith in interstate and foreign commerce.

Paragraph 2: Respondent, Valley Gin Co., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Missouri with its principal office and place of business located at Blytheville within the State of Arkansas.

Respondent, Mississippi Valley Gin Co., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Mississippi with its principal office and place of business located in the city of Jackson, within the State of Mississippi.

Respondent, Tensas Parish Gin Co., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana with its principal office and place of business located at Newellton, within the State of Louisiana.

Respondent, Madison Parish Gin Co., Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana, with

its principal office and place of business located at Tallulah within said State of Louisiana.

All of the respondents described in this paragraph are engaged in the ginning of cotton and the operation of cotton gins, and in addition thereto, the respondent, Valley Gin Co., is engaged in the financing of cotton gins and the issuing of cotton-production loans. All of the respondents described in this paragraph are owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., either directly or indirectly through the respondent, R. L. Taylor.

Paragraph 3: Respondent, R. L. Taylor, is an individual and maintains his principal office and place of business at 81 Monroe Avenue in the city of Memphis within the State of Tennessee. Said respondent is chairman of the board of directors of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

Respondent, Binford Hester, is an individual and maintains his principal office and place of business at 81 Monroe Avenue in the city of Memphis within the State of Tennessee. Said respondent is president of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

Respondent E. F. Wade is an individual residing in the city of Little Rock within the State of Arkansas. Said respondent is vice president of the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

Respondent Winston E. Cheairs, is an individual and maintains his principal office and place of business at 81 Monroe Avenue in the city of Memphis within the State of Tennessee. Said respondent is vice president of the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

Respondent, W. Dennis Brown, is an individual engaged in the banking business and residing in the city of Lake Providence within the State of Louisiana.

Respondent, Fred Schneider, is an individual and resides in the city of Lake Providence within the State of Louisiana.

Paragraph 4: In the course of the production and marketing of cotton from the planter to the ultimate user thereof, cotton is, after it is picked, first transported to a cotton gin to be ginned. At the gin the seed is separated from the cotton and the cotton is loosely packed into bales and wrapped with jute or burlap bagging held in place by means of steel bands or ties. Thereafter the loose bales of cotton are transported to a compress plant for the purpose of compressing into tightly packed bales of smaller size and for the purpose of adding additional bagging and ties or bands to said bales. The compressing of cotton and the adding thereto of additional bagging and ties is a necessary step in the transporting in interstate commerce of cotton from the planter to the ultimate user thereof.

Paragraph 5: Said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and said respondent, R. L. Taylor, acting in cooperation with each other and through and in cooperation with the other respondents herein named, for more than 4 years last past, and particularly since February 27, 1936, have entered into and carried out and continued and are now engaged in an understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy among themselves and with and through the other respondents herein named, to restrict, restrain, and suppress competition in the compressing and storing of cotton and in the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection with the compressing of cotton, and to create and maintain a monopoly in the compressing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith, in the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

Paragraph 6: Pursuant to said understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy, and in furtherance thereof, the said respondents have done and performed and still do and perform the following acts and things:

(1) Respondents, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. and R. L. Taylor, have caused to be erected and have operated, and do now operate cotton gins, charging fees for ginning which are below the prevailing fees of competitors in the same territory and are below the actual cost of operation, for the purpose of and with the effect of driving competitors out of business, and of securing the cotton so ginned for respondents' various compress plants, and to enable respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., at its compress plants to sell the jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection with the compressing of said cotton;

(2) Have attempted to induce and have induced customers of competitive compress plants to transfer their cotton to the compress plants of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., by means of rebates in the form of drayage allowances granted to said customers;

(3) Have, at cotton gins owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., directly or indirectly through respondent, R. L. Taylor, refused to transfer or forward cotton ginned at said gins to compress plants other than compress plants owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.;

(4) Have transferred from cotton gins owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., directly or indirectly through respondent, R. L. Taylor, cotton which has been ginned to compress plants owned by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., without regard to, and against the direction and orders of the owners of said cotton;

(5) Have sought to obtain control of competing compress plants through the purchase from its stockholders of their holdings in the corporations operating said plants for the purpose of driving said competitive compress plants out of business;

(6) Have, through the individual respondents, Binford Hester, E. F. Wade, and Winston E. Cheairs, all of whom are officers of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and through the individual respondents, W. Dennis Brown and Fred Schneider, all acting as agents of said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., attempted to acquire the stock of competing compress plants by means of threats and statements made to the owners of such stock in competing compress plants to the effect that the stock of said competitive compress plants which are generally owned by cotton growers and independent gin operators, will decline in value and be made worthless as a result of the activities of the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in erecting competitive gins and ginning cotton at figures below cost of operation, or free of charge, if such a course shall prove necessary to secure the cotton, and by the allowance of drayage and other rebates. By means of said threats and statements the respondents have caused great concern, anxiety, mental stress, and worry to stockholders in said competitive compress plants and have caused cotton ginners and cotton growers to send their cotton to the compress plants of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. for the purpose of compressing, and having added thereto bagging and ties as hereinbefore described, rather than to competitive compress plants in which said ginners and independent cotton growers are stockholders.

(7) Have made threats to owners of cotton gins that they would erect cotton gins and gin cotton below cost or free of charge in competition with said independent cotton gins unless the owners thereof shipped the cotton so ginned by them to compress plants owned by the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in preference to competing compress plants.

(8) Have, by threats to erect cotton gins and operate the same below cost or free of charge, caused the owners of cotton gins who were also stockholders in compress plants owned by competitors of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. to ship the cotton ginned by said gins and owned or controlled by the ginners to compress plants of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in preference to compress plants in which ginners were financially interested.

Paragraph 7: The individual respondents, R. L. Taylor, Binford Hester, E. P. Wade, and Winston E. Cheairs, are now and have been officers of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and as such officers have been in charge of the activities of the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and have participated in the activities hereinbefore set out in paragraph 6. The individual respondents, W. Dennis Brown and Fred Schneider, while not officers of the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., have also participated in the activities hereinbefore set out in paragraph 6 and for that purpose have served as agents of respondents, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. and R. L. Taylor.

Paragraph 8: The result of the acts and practices of the said respondents herein named as hereinbefore set out in paragraphs 6 and 7 has been, and now is, to substantially lessen, restrict, restrain, and suppress competition in the ginning, compressing, and storing of cotton and in the interstate sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith throughout the several Southern States of the United States and in foreign countries, and empowers the said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., to dominate the compressing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith and to increase the prices charged for compressing cotton and for jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith, above the prices which would prevail under normal, natural, and open competition, and also is to tend to create a monopoly in said respondent, Federal Compress & Warhouse Co., in the compressing of cotton and in the interstate sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith.

Paragraph 9. The acts and practices of the respondents as herein alleged are all to the prejudice of the public and have a dangerous tendency to and have actually hindered and prevented competition in the compressing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith in commerce within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and have placed in respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., the power to control prices to be charged for the ginning, compressing, and storing of cotton, and for jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith; have created in the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., a monopoly in the compressing of cotton and in the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith, in such commerce, and unreasonably restrained the ginning and compressing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties used in connection with the compressing of cotton, and constitute unfair methods of competition in commerce within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Wherefore, the premises considered, the Federal Trade Commission, on this 16th day of April, A. D. 1940, issues its complaint against said respondents.

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given you, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., a corporation; Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Mississippi Valley Gin Co., a corporation; Tensas Parish Gin Co., a corporation; Madison Parish Gin Co., Inc.; R. L. Taylor, individually and as chairman of the board of directors of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Binford Hester, individually and as president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; E. F. Wade, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; Winston E. Cheairs, individually and as vice president of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.; W. Dennis Brown, an individual; and Fred Schneider, an individual, respondents herein, that the 24th day of May, A. D. 1940, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, is hereby fixed as the time, and the offices of the Federal Trade Commission in the city of Washington, D. C., as the place, when, and where a hearing will be had on the charges set forth in this complaint, at which time and place you will have the right, under said act, to appear and show cause why an order should not be entered by said Commission requiring you to cease and desist from the violations of the law charged in the complaint.

You are notified and required, on or before the twentieth day after service upon you of this complaint, to file with the Commission an answer to the complaint. If answer is filed and if your appearance at the place and on the date above stated be not required, due notice to that effect will be given you. The rules of practice adopted by the Commission with respect to answers or failure to appear or answer (rule XII) provide as follows:

"In case of desire to contest the proceeding the respondent shall, within 20 days from the service of the complaint, file with the Commission an answer to the complaint. Such answer shall contain a concise statement of the facts which constitute the ground of defense. Respondent shall specifically admit or deny or explain each of the facts alleged in the complaint, unless respondent is without knowledge, in which case respondent shall so state.

* * * * * * *

"Failure of the respondent to file answer within the time above provided and failure to appear at the time and place fixed for hearing shall be deemed to authorize the Commission, without further notice to respondent, to proceed in regular course on the charges set forth in the complaint.

"If respondent desires to waive hearing on the allegations of fact set forth in the complaint and not to contest the facts, the answer may consist of a statement that respondent admits all the material allegations of fact charged in the complaint to be true. Respondent by such answer shall be deemed to have waived a hearing on the allegations of fact set forth in said complaint and to have authorized the Commission, without further evidence, or other intervening procedure, to find such facts to be true, and if in the judgment of the Commission such facts admitted constitute a violation of law or laws as charged in the complaint, to make and serve findings as to the facts and an order to cease and desist from such violations. Upon application in writing made contemporaneously with the filing of such answer, the respondent, in the discretion of the Commission, may be heard on brief, in oral argument, or both, solely on the question as to whether the facts so admitted constitute the violation or violations of law charged in the complaint."

In witness whereof the Federal Trade Commission has caused this, its complaint, to be signed by its Secretary, and its official seal to be hereto affixed, at Washington, D. C., this 16th day of April, A. D. 1940.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] OTIS B. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I also desire to call attention to the following news article which appeared in a Cotton Trade Journal dated June 17, 1939, and to the headline on the article Federal Trade Stocks Swell a Million Bales in Last Year.

FEDERAL COMPRESS STOCKS SWELL A MILLION BALES IN LAST YEAR—R. L. TAYLOR REPORTS EARNINGS EQUAL TO LAST SEASON; PLANT IMPROVEMENTS COST $1,000,000

MEMPHIS.—Stockholders of the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. Tuesday were told by R. L. Taylor, chairman of the board of directors, that the season ended May 31 had been a very satisfactory one and stock of cotton on hand was 2,624,139, or practically a million more than at corresponding date of 1938. Of the amount, 2,487,177 bales were loan cotton, leaving only 136,362 bales of "free."

Earnings for the year were reported about the same as for previous season, Mr. Taylor explaining that in order to take care of increased demands for storage it had been necessary to spend over $1,000,000 for improvements and expansion, large part of which was in building fire walls and practically doubling capacity of many plants. With acquisition of three of its smaller competitors and erection of new plants in Sikeston, Mo.; Hughes, Wynne, and Lepanto, Ark., now under construction or to be started shortly, the new season will start with bonded warehouse capacity of 4,250,000 bales.

High density compress machines have been installed recently at Tiptonville, Tenn., and England, Ark., and many other improvements made to meet growing requirements of the past futures season. Mr. Taylor said the physical condition of the company property was better than ever before.

In the financial statement presented cash on hand was reported at $536,632.98, comparing with $353,245.38 1 year previous. Real estate was carried at $1,326,403.65 against $1,310,685.74, with buildings, machinery, and equipment at $21,587,239.16 against $20,810,814. Total assets were given at $24,433,997.39, against $23,286,564.54.

On the liabilities side capital stock was unchanged at $12,500,000, while bills payable were $1,500,000, comparing with $650,000 a year ago, due to the program of expansion. Reserve for depreciation was increased to $9,608,991.88 from $9,261,094.20, while surplus dropped to $779,697.48 from $872,947.97.

During the year regular dividends of 40 cents a quarter were paid. An inquiry from one of the stockholders as to accruals elicited a reply that nothing definite could be said about such, although funds would begin to come from the Commodity Credit Corporation in August and even though a little borrowing from banks might be necessary there would be enough to pay off all loans and leave plenty for stockholders ultimately, figured by some present at several millions of dollars.

No changes were made in the board of directors or in list of officers at the board meeting which followed.

UNION COMPRESS MEETING

At the annual meeting of stockholders of the Union Compress & Warehouse Co. held yesterday routine reports were made and officers and directors chosen. Only two changes were made, K. D. Wells, of Vicksburg, made vice president to succeed Ernest Rice, and George Franklin, of Rayville, La., added to the board.

Officers are: Douglass W. Brooks, president; K. D. Wells, vice president; W. H. Willey, secretary; Norris Blackburn, treasurer and general manager; directors, A. M. Crawford, K. D. Wells, D. W. Brooks, George G. Harvey, Eric Hirsch, J. J. Marks, E. Rice, W. H. Willey, and George Franklin.

On February 20, 1940, I wrote Secretary Wallace the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1940.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For more than a year I have been trying to prevail upon the Commodity Credit Corporation to change its policy with regard to the storage of Government-loan cotton. I would like very much to have the benefit of an expression of your views with regard to the situation.

I am advised that during the entire life of the Commodity Credit Corporation only 6,900 bales of cotton pledged to or owned by the corporation have been shipped into North Carolina for storage. I understand that during the last 12 months only approximately 900 bales of Government-loan cotton have been shipped into North Carolina, 700 bales were shipped in from South Carolina, and 200 bales from Virginia. During the crop year 1938–39, North Carolina mills consumed and processed 1,789,458 bales, and during the first 6 months of the crop year 1939–40 North Carolina mills, according to my information, have consumed and processed 1,069,000 bales. It will be seen from these figures that the cotton reconcentration in North Carolina is not sufficient to operate North Carolina mills for even 1 day. Government-loan cotton, and I mean by Government-loan cotton, cotton which is pledged to or owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, has been reconcentrated in Pacific, Gulf, and South Atlantic ports to such an extent that there are now stored in ports 1,820,517 bales, against exports last year of 3,400,000 bales. In other words, North Carolina processed approximately one-half of the number of bales exported last season. It will be observed that there is enough Government reconcentrated cotton stored in ports to take care of the entire export trade for a period of approximately 6 months, as against less than 1 day's supply of Government-reconcentrated cotton for North Carolina mills, stored in North Carolina warehouses. I know that there are warehouses in North Carolina that are offering not only competitive rates but in some instances the lowest rates in the entire country; that is, 8 cents per bale per month for compressed cotton. These warehouses are Federal bonded warehouses and have reconcentration and free reshipping privileges.

It seems to me that whenever it becomes necessary to reconcentrate cotton which is pledged to or owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation the cotton should be reconcentrated near the domestic consuming centers so that in no case shall the ratio of the total amount of Government agency reconcentration cotton stored in the ports of the Continental United States to the amount of cotton exported to foreign countries exceed the ratio of the amount of Government agency reconcentration cotton stored in the cotton-consuming States to the total amount of cotton consumed by those States. Especially is this true in view of the passage of S. 2697 at the last regular session of Congress, which clearly indicates that Congress looks with disfavor upon excessive reconcentration of Government agency cotton in ports and by the adoption of the Martin

amendment looks with favor upon the reconcentration of cotton near domestic consuming centers.

In keeping with the wishes of Congress as expressed in the passage of S. 2697, I hope that you will give consideration to a change in the policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation which has had the effect of taking cotton away from domestic consuming centers and shipping it to ports.

Notwithstanding the passage of S. 2697, the Commodity Credit Corporation has reconcentrated 300,000 bales of Government agency cotton in ports since August 1, 1939.

I have discussed this matter on numerous occasions with all of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I am convinced that the situation will not be changed or remedied unless there is some change in policy, or unless an act of Congress is passed directing a change in the reconcentration program.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

Mr. Speaker, several members of the North Carolina delegation have from time to time conferred with officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation and finally, on March 6, with Secretary Wallace with reference to the reconcentration policies of the Corporation.

So that Members of Congress from Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia may see just how the policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation is affecting the mills and manufacturers in their States, I submit the following table:

Cotton: Production, imports, and consumption in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, last season, ending Aug. 1, 1939

[Bales, exclusive of linters]

	Georgia	South Carolina	North Carolina	Virginia
Production	855,721	649,132	390,416	11,083
Imports	491,790	722,877	1,399,042	127,240
Consumption	1,347,511	1,372,009	1,789,458	139,323

Total consumprion of all northern and New England mills, 975,908 bales.

From the above figures it can be seen that North Carolina last season had to import approximately 1,400,000 bales from Mississippi and States west of the Mississippi River. Also the consumption in North Carolina alone is approximately twice the amount consumed in all of the Northern and New England States.

Unless something is done by Congress at the present session, Commodity Credit Corporation is to reconcentrate in the Northern and New England States at an early date 300,000 bales. While the Commodity Credit Corporation has shipped into North Carolina less than 1,000 bales.

The situation is almost as bad in many other States.

I am also submitting the following letter received from an assistant general railway freight agent, which indicates that it will cost Carolina mills approximately $3 a bale more to purchase cotton reconcentrated at ports than cotton reconcentrated in close proximity to the mills:

SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY,
Raleigh, N. C., March 20, 1940.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to our attention that you are interested in knowing the freight rate on cotton in carload lots of 50,000 pounds from Muskogee, Okla., to Greensboro, N. C., first when shipped to Houston, Tex., for transit and also when shipped to Carthage, N. C., for transit and then reshipped to Greensboro, N. C., as a final destination.

The through rate from Muskogee, Okla., to Greensboro, N. C., will not apply via Houston, Tex., and shipments handled via Houston are subject to a combination rate of 59 cents to Houston and 80 cents from Houston to Greensboro or a total rate of $1.39 per 100 pounds. These rates are published in Agent Peel's Southwestern Lines Tariff 208-F, I. C. C. 3202.

On the other hand the rate from Muskogee, Okla., to Greensboro, N. C., and Carthage, N. C., is 77 cents, applying to both destinations the same, authority the same tariff.

This through rate to Greensboro will apply via Carthage, N. C., subject to a backhaul charge of 2¾ cents per 100 pounds as published in Seaboard Railway I. C. C. A-7980, Cotton Transit Tariff, item 60 and rule 18 thereof. This makes a total charge of 79¾ cents against $1.39 via Houston. In cases where the cotton is reshipped from Carthage, N. C., within 90 days there is no transit charge. If cotton is held more than ninety days there is a transit charge of 2¾ cents per 100 pounds, authority rule 7 of SAL I. C. C. A-7980.

Trusting this is the information desired,

Yours very truly,

G. C. POOLE,
Assistant General Freight Agent.

Can It Happen Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

ADDRESS BY DAVE BECK

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dave Beck, international representative of the Teamsters' Union, given over radio station KOL in Seattle and broadcast over all stations of the Mutual System in Washington State on May 16, 1940. It was given under the sponsorship of the subversive activities committee of the State department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Good evening, the news from Europe and Asia tonight should convince us in America that we can no longer sit in our house by the side of the road and let the rest of the world roll by.

If we do, an aerial bomb may bring our house cracking down around our ears. The world won't roll by. It will roll over us.

For centuries Americans have lived in a Garden of Eden. We have fancied ourselves secure behind the broad expanse of the oceans that guard our coasts.

Tonight that security is gone. We have seen the development of airplanes that vie with the speed of sound and of submarines which are almost battleships and can glide unseen to our shores beneath the water we think protects us.

Modern military science has all but evaporated the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. They are little more than the moats of a medieval castle.

We are no longer safe from foreign aggression. Yet we lull ourselves into security every time the tide comes in. Some day that tide may bring in a fleet of foreign transports, and a hostile army will be on our shores.

Impossible, some people may say.

These same people said a few years ago, however, that another war was impossible. They watched with unbelieving eyes when Japan invaded China and when Italy slaughtered the Ethiopians and seized Albania. They were still in a daze when Soviet Russia trampled prostrate Poland and seized Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and brutally assaulted Finland.

And, finally, when Germany climaxed her conquest of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria with her unprovoked invasion of Scandinavia and the low countries, the whole civilized world gasped with horror.

Yet some people shrug their shoulders at the sight of Norway, Holland, and Belgium bleeding under the Prussian boot.

They say it cannot happen here.

Well, let's look at the facts and see who, or what, is to stop it.

In the first place, we have a one-ocean navy, which means that our Navy cannot defend both our coasts at the same time.

Up to now we have relied on the British fleet. But the British fleet has troubles of its own. It cannot help us now.

So, the protection of our shorelines rests solely on our own Navy, and the latest reports of the experts cast some doubt as to whether our Navy today is a match for the Japanese.

In other words, it is questionable whether we could stop the Japanese in the Pacific, even though we massed our sea power and left the Atlantic coast completely unprotected.

And if we lost in the Pacific both coasts would be at the mercy of an invader. Certainly our Army couldn't stop anybody. It isn't large enough, and it can't move fast enough.

We have only one mechanized division to defend 6,000 miles of coast line, not to mention two unfortified boundaries between Mexico and Canada.

That means that only one division of the United States Army can move faster than a man can walk. Our Army would be wandering around like the lost tribes of Israel if we ever needed it in a hurry

This is because Congress has played politics with the Army. Every Congressman wants a piece of it in his district, and so we find it

scattered across the country in obsolete posts, just as it was in the days when it protected the pony express.

Our air force is totally inadequate to maintain an effective patrol of our borders, to say nothing of fighting off an enemy air fleet. And in the entire 48 States we have only enough antiaircraft guns to guard the city of New York.

Who is to stop it from happening here?

We are a ripe peach, ready to be plucked, when the dictators of the world get through plucking the smaller peaches closer at hand.

The invasion of Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland should have brought us to our senses. People didn't think it could happen there, either.

Those were peaceful little countries, minding their own business and trying to keep out of the politics and quarrels of Europe.

Yet overnight they became the victims of the greatest and most ruthless military machine the world has ever seen. The Nazi legions, unleashed by the madman Hitler, are overrunning Europe.

Will they stop there?

We know that 100 of Hitler's pilots are now flying commercial airplanes in South America. They know every foot of the terrain. They know where and how to drop a bomb in a sudden effort to blast the Panama Canal and put the United States Navy in cold storage.

Italian flyers are operating in South America, too, under the personal direction of Mussolini's son, who boasted of the fun he had in Ethiopia shooting down helpless natives from his war plane.

Italy is the ally of Germany. The Roman army marches again when Hitler says the word.

Also linked with Germany is the bloody dictatorship of Russia, the nation which really brought this war upon us by her treachery in conspiring with Hitler as he hesitated on the Polish frontier.

If Russia had not encouraged Germany at that time, the world might still be at peace. But Stalin craves bloodshed.

These three great militaristic dictatorships, with the possible aid of Japan, are now bent on dividing the world between them. They have armies of millions of men, air fleets of tens of thousands of planes, and they have perfected the technique of dropping troops from the clouds on a sleeping nation at peace with the world.

Let's not kid ourselves. It can happen here, and I think it will happen here, if the democracies lose to the dictatorships. And that is exactly what this war is, a struggle between democracy and dictatorship.

We are a democracy. That is why I, as a labor representative, am so deeply concerned with the trend of world affairs. I do not want to see the democratic processes of government wiped out. I do not want to see labor enslaved, as it is today, in Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan.

Even if the dictatorships should have no hostile intentions toward us, what would happen to the American standard of living, based on the American wage scale, if the dictators should win?

Does anybody think for a minute that we could continue to pay labor our present wage scales in this country and compete with slave labor elsewhere throughout the world?

And does anybody think that if the dictators win Canada would remain free? Or Mexico? Why, even today the Nazis and the Communists are taking over Mexico. They are boring into that government and into its industries and labor unions so effectively that some morning we may wake up and find an enemy power south of the Rio Grande.

At the same time in this country the Nazis and the Communists are using the same tactics they are using in Mexico and which they used with such tragic results in Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

They are boring into strategic positions in the aircraft factories, in transportation, and in communications. Need I point out to you the havoc they could create for us in an hour of peril?

And only last week, officials of the Communist Party met in California and demanded that we cease at once all preparations for American defense.

What colossal effrontery. The Communists, who plunged one continent into chaos, are now insisting that this Nation do nothing to save itself from a similar fate.

The Communist agents are entrenching themselves in industry to see that we proceed very slowly, if we proceed at all.

These things, happening in the United States, are the same things that preceded the invasion of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Denmark. Why should they be happening here, now, if nobody has any designs upon us?

Why are the Communists and the Nazis so anxious to get jobs in airplane plants and navy yards where they can sabotage our national defense?

Why are they striving for key positions in our communication systems? Why are they trying to control labor unions, and organize peace societies to persuade us not to be ready to defend ourselves? How much longer will we permit these spies to plot against us?

These questions concern me, as they should concern you, and as they do concern every student of international affairs and every man who saw service in the last war.

For that reason, I appreciate the invitation of the Subversive Activities Committee of the State Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make this broadcast under their sponsorship.

As a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars myself, and as a comrade of many of its members in the American Expeditionary Forces in 1918, I understand, as they understood, the perils that lie in unpreparedness.

The United States is an idealistic Nation. It never foresees the danger of war, until war is upon us. We have always paid a terrific price in human life for that weakness.

Do you realize that in the last war some men were sent into the front lines so poorly trained that they pulled the pin on a hand grenade and then stopped to read the instructions.

It is nothing less than murder to send such raw recruits into battle. Yet, if war should strike us, as it has struck a dozen other peaceful, idealistic nations, we would have to defend ourselves with raw recruits, untrained and virtually unarmed.

Some people ask why anybody should invade us? Why should anybody invade poor little Finland? Or Norway, Denmark, or Holland?

It is because the mad lust for conquest is ruling the world as the dictators of Europe and Asia combine to slaughter and conquer.

Had Britain and France, together with the Scandinavian countries and other free peoples of Europe, recognized early enough the dangers that confronted them, they would not now be faced with the imminent danger of the extinction of democracy and their free governments.

It is a realization of what has already happened that is causing the ablest minds of our country to ponder whether or not our future peace and security would best be preserved by joining the democracies in their fight for their lives.

There is a division of opinion on that question, but there can be no disagreement among anyone who loves this country that we must be prepared to defend ourselves from attack.

Personally, I am opposed to war.

But I do not intend to be an ostrich about it. We have too many ostriches in the United States who cover their heads so that they will not see what they do not want to see.

And so America finds herself in the midst of a world aflame, with nothing but a bucket brigade to fight the fire if it sweeps our way on a sudden shift of the wind.

This country must make some momentous decisions very shortly.

It is a part of the world that is plunging into an abyss. If democracy falls elsewhere in the world, it falls here. If the dictators can repudiate God, as they have repudiated Him in every land that has fallen under their blight, America will fall before the resistless wave of materialism and imperialism.

This is a war between two philosophies of government that can not be reconciled. It is a war to impress the tyranny of totalitarian government on every free nation.

It is a war to determine whether nations have the right to govern themselves, to develop their culture, solve their economic problems, and keep their church spires high in the sunlight as a beacon toward a better manner of life.

The democracies of Europe are fighting this war as our spiritual allies. But that may not be enough! We should be prepared to furnish them with munitions and supplies—and the ships to carry them in—if necessary, to roll back the red tide of atheism and anarchy.

We cannot, under any consideration, either spiritual or material, permit the democracies to lose this war. We must be ready to fight, as our forefathers fought, for a system of government where the minds and consciences of men are free. We must be ready to defend the processes of democratic government under which men may think, and speak their thoughts.

We must be ready to see that governments "of the people, by the people, for the people" do not perish from the earth.

Good night.

Panama Canal Zone Locks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1939, I voted against recommitment of H. R. 5129, a bill authorizing and providing for the construction of additional locks in the Panama Canal Zone for the purpose of adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping.

I was convinced at that time of the necessity for additional facilities in the Panama Canal Zone to care for the passage of our new and improved naval vessels in time of war and for increasing commercial needs. During the recess last year I visited the Panama Canal en route from California to the east coast. The commanding general and the Governor of the Canal Zone extended many courtesies

to me, including a close and intimate view of the fortifications, locks, and general make-up of our responsibility in the Canal Zone. After this opportunity I was more convinced than ever of the necessity for the construction of these locks. No ships of other nations, whether ships of war or commerce, may use these additional facilities unless we permit them, but under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty we are compelled to keep the present Canal facilities open for any ships which may care to use them.

Yesterday, May 30, when the appropriation for this improvement was approved, was Memorial Day. After addressing community exercises commemorating the day in Towson and Taneytown, Md., under the sponsorship of my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, I hoped to return to Washington in time to make this statement during the actual debate yesterday. This not being possible prompts a statement today.

Our national-defense program will be helped very materially by this work being expeditiously performed. The President of the United States, the Army, and the Navy all say the additional locks are necessary and should be constructed immediately. I am glad the House saw fit to approve this appropriation yesterday thereby supporting the view I took last year.

West Point Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. J. BUELL SNYDER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1940, IN THE ASSEMBLY HALL AT WEST POINT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to pay an official visit to West Point Military Academy on Friday, May 17, 1940, in company with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ALBERT ENGEL], a member of my subcommittee on Army appropriations. I wish that every Congressman could have been with us at West Point that day. Brig. Gen. Jay L. Benedict, Superintendent of West Point, and his staff showed us all of the activities at West Point and I am sure that you would say as we say that it is truly a great patriotic nation-building institution, building young men to help guide and direct the activities of the generation in which they will live.

Perhaps the greatest inspiration I ever had or ever expect to have was when the 1,760 cadets massed, shoulder to shoulder, in close formation in the assembly hall and with faces upturned toward where I was standing on the announcement balcony, stood as if they were statues, while I had the pleasure of delivering the following brief address:

General Benedict, gentlemen of the Corps of Cadets, at no time in history has your profession occupied a more conspicuous place; at no time in history has it been more apparent that the security of nations depends upon the intelligence, the ingenuity, the loyalty, the will and courage of its military leaders; at no time in the history of America has there been greater cause for gratification and pride in this great military institution of learning, from the graduates of which we always have been able to find in time of peril leaders of unsurpassed ability. I am confident that among this splendid group of embryo officers there are several Lees and Grants and Pershings in the making.

God forbid that there may come a time to prove that assertion, but it is comforting to the Nation to know that the leadership of the proper caliber is at hand if and when needed.

You men are alive to what is transpiring in Europe today. Probably the greatest military machine in the history of the world, directed by the most ruthless leadership, has been crushing with all the weapons of modern ingenuity, the smaller countries which border it or lie rather close by, and is now at grips on a vast scale with our former allies.

The duration of this latest phase is problematical. The ultimate outcome means much to America. It means much to each of you, both as future officers of our Army and in a civil sense—your homes, your loved ones, your freedom, your democratic form of Government. Should German arms triumph, there may come a challenge to America in many conceivable ways, and it is your duty, and my duty, and the duty of every loyal and patriotic American to pay heed to that menace and to prepare ourselves to resist it.

Adequate preparation is the best guarantor of freedom to conduct our own Government in our own way, and to rid this hemisphere of unwanted intrusion. I can assure you that the present administration at Washington is and has been pursuing, since 1934, a policy of better defense preparation because it feels that such a course is the only one which has promise of enduring peace. The President's fine message to the Congress on yesterday, to which it was my privilege as a Member of Congress to listen, was inspired solely by his desire and purpose to make it possible for us to pursue our own way, and that way is the uplifting and elevating course of peace.

You have a very large share in this policy. Readiness to ward off intruders means not alone the possession of adequate matériel, but a reasonable number of highly trained officers and men, the former to be alert, courageous, and thoroughly versed in the ways of modern warfare. By the past records of those who have preceded you, I am confident that we shall not find any of you wanting. I am very proud of you. May the Divine Spirit ever abide in you.

"Fifth Column" Jitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND (VA.) TIMES-DISPATCH AND REPLY BY HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch and my reply thereto:

"FIFTH COLUMN" JITTERS

Every effort should be made, by constitutional means, to reduce to an absolute minimum the activities of spies and saboteurs in the United States, but there are mounting signs that some of those in responsible positions are ready for another witch hunt, such as we staged nearly 25 years ago.

Representative DIES, who has done some good work in rooting out subversive elements, but who has gone off half-cocked altogether too many times, appealed to the House on Friday in an hour-long speech for action against the American "fifth column." No doubt some sort of stricter enforcement of existing legislation is called for, and possibly new enactments are needed, in view of what has happened in Norway, Holland, and Belgium, but it is to be hoped that someone with a more balanced viewpoint than Representative DIES will lead the movement.

And as alarming as anything that has been said recently is the utterance of Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Alexandria, sponsor of a dangerous antialien bill which passed the House last year, and is now pending in the Senate. Asked on the floor Thursday whether a certain provision of the measure violates constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and the press, Mr. SMITH replied: "I don't think so. If it does, we ought to change the Constitution."

Why? Does Mr. SMITH think that our Bill of Rights ought to be tampered with at a time when it is probably more important than it has ever been in our history? It is just this sort of doctrine which must be resisted at all costs in such critical days as these. There is plenty of warrant under the Constitution for dealing with members of the so-called "fifth column" (a phrase which originated in the recent Spanish civil war and refers to the enemy spies inside a city or a country who are ready to sell it out to an enemy). For Heaven's sake don't let's get ourselves into such a jittery state of mind that we are ready to scrap parts of George Mason's immortal document which has been incorporated in Virginia's and the Nation's Constitution for more than a century and a half.

No one could be more anxious than this newspaper to round up all criminal and traitorous elements and to keep them under lock and key where they can't damage the country. But we should be careful not to go to extremes or to swallow fantastic yarns, such as were circulated during the last war about many innocent people who happened to have German names. In other words, we should deal justly with all who are under suspicion. Any other course brings us into altogether too great similarity to the totalitarians themselves.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1940.

Mr. VIRGINIUS DABNEY,
Editor, Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.

SIR: The despicable deception perpetrated upon the readers of the Times-Dispatch by the editorial in your paper of May 19, entitled "'Fifth Column' Jitters" impels me, in the interest of accurate information to the public in these times of peril, to take notice of statements that in normal times I would ignore.

In your attack upon me, you characterize me as "sponsor of a dangerous antialien bill which passed the House last year." For the information of your readers, it should be known that the bill passed the House by a vote of 272 to 48. Its provisions, briefly, are as follows:

1. It prohibits subversive efforts to effect the loyalty and discipline of the United States Army (this provision was drafted and endorsed by the United States Navy Department, and endorsed by the War Department);

2. It makes it unlawful for persons to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence;

3. It orders the mandatory deportation of aliens who unlawfully assist in smuggling other aliens into the country, of aliens who violate the narcotic laws of any State, of aliens who are machine-gun gangsters, and convicted criminals;

4. It requires the fingerprinting and registration of all aliens in the United States and of all aliens who may hereafter be admitted;

5. It excludes from admission to the United States aliens who are anarchists or who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force.

Your readers will agree with me that it is a dangerous antialien bill, but dangerous only to the subversive "fifth column" movement which has assisted in the destruction of so many European governments in recent weeks, and which apparently you seek to protect through your vaunted advocacy of the constitutional right of freedom of speech and of the press.

In your attack upon me, you further state that, when asked if a certain provision of the foregoing bill violated the guarantee of freedom of speech and the press, I replied, "I do not think so. If it does, we ought to change the Constitution." You carefully refrain from advising your readers what the certain provision referred to was. The question propounded to me was whether the provisions prohibiting any person from advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence violated the right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, and I replied then as I would reply now, that, if it did, the Constitution ought to be amended. Of course, such a provision violates no right of freedom of speech or of the press. The Bill of Rights and the Constitution were never designed to protect treason.

This bill passed the House on the 29th day of July 1939, before the present war started, and it will be heartening to your readers to realize that, notwithstanding the carping criticism of some self-styled liberals, their Congress had the foresight, by a vote of 272 to 48, to pass such a bill, even before the emergency arose, and that every member of the Virginia delegation in Congress supported the bill.

For the further information of your readers, my so-called dangercus antialien bill was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate on yesterday without a dissenting vote.

People in responsible positions in Washington, devoting their energies to preparing to meet the emergency that has come upon us, have little time at present to meet flank attacks from those who should be giving us their wholehearted support in this hour of the country's peril, and I take notice of your publication only for the purpose of letting your readers be informed of the facts, which you should have given them, if you saw fit at all to notice my feeble efforts.

I trust that your belief in the constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and of the press will lead you to accede to my request that this, my answer, be published in full and given as prominent a place in your paper as that given your unwarranted attack upon me.

Very truly yours.

HOWARD W. SMITH.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although the question of continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years has been settled, we are still being called upon to witness the spectacle of members of the opposition—the Republican Party—indulging in a torrent of statistical fallacies, bolstered by half truths.

If one were inclined to be charitable, he would characterize this onslaught as based on abysmal ignorance. But since the facts are so easily obtainable, one has to conclude that our friends are relying entirely on deliberate misstatement.

For the past few years there has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from time to time, statistical tables purporting to show that trade agreements have increased the importation of agricultural products to the ruination of American farmers. Many of these tables are unquestionably deliberate attempts to mislead the public, because of the inference that shifts in trade have been caused by some governmental action.

RECOVERY REFLECTED IN INCREASED FOREIGN TRADE

An illustration of this type of statement was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1940, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], involving a selected list of increases in imports of some agricultural products for 1939 in comparison with 1938, with the categorical statement that trade agreements were responsible. If he were entirely fair, he would have to admit that these tables really show nothing about the effects of trade agreements. Anybody who professes to know anything about economic conditions in the United States must realize that the considerable business recovery in 1939 over 1938 was emphatically reflected in increases in our foreign trade.

What actually has been the effect of increased imports of agricultural products which we hear so much about? On this point Secretary Wallace, in his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee, in answer to charges of increased imports resulting from trade agreements said:

> It should only be necessary to point out that in all of the more important cases of increased imports, such as wheat from Canada, corn from Argentina, wool from Australia, and hides from Argentina there had been no change whatever in the tariff rates established in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, to dispel the myth that trade agreements were responsible for the temporary rise in imports during the middle thirties.
>
> Imports into the United States of agricultural products similar in kind to those produced in this country were smaller in the most recent fiscal year, 1938–39, than in the first year of the trade-agreements program, 1934–35, and were less than half their average annual value during the entire decade of the twenties.

With regard to the effects of the imports of agricultural products on domestic agriculture, Secretary Wallace, whose department has carefully studied, and is best qualified to judge this matter, said:

> It is also a fact that some reductions have been made through trade agreements in the duties on agricultural products. But I do not know of a single case where such duty reductions have seriously inconvenienced American agricultural industry. As a matter of fact, in cases where a damaging influx of agricultural products might take place as a result of duty reductions meticulous care has been taken to see that safeguards were introduced to prevent such an influx.

FARMERS' CASH INCOME INCREASED

The persons who make for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD such statements about trade agreements and imports are invariably careful to avoid mentioning the really significant fact about agriculture in the United States since the inauguration of the trade-agreements program—I mean the fact that American farmers' cash income from the marketing of their products was $7,711,000,000 in 1939, a gain of $2,433,000,000, or 46 percent, over their cash income in 1933, the last full year under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act.

Not only do the authors of such statements ignore, and what is worse, conceal pertinent and conclusive evidence, but they also resort to trickery, juggling, evasion, and direct misrepresentation in the very statistics which they quote, even when the figures as such are correct. Such tactics are not used in presenting an opposition viewpoint honestly held and truthfully supported.

CITES PRODUCTS NOT AFFECTED BY TRADE AGREEMENTS

Preceding the table which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] placed in the RECORD was the following statement:

"The New Deal reciprocal-trade program was responsible."

That is a very definite statement, though fallacious, of cause and effect. The gentleman's facts did not support his statement.

For examples, the items and groups of items which the gentleman from Ohio listed after making the statement quoted above included the following, which have not been involved in any trade agreement, and, therefore, no trade agreement could have been "responsible" for the increased importations.

Item	Tariff status	Item	Tariff status
Canned beef	No change in rate of duty.	Chick-peas	No change in rate of duty.
Hides and skins	do	Canned tomatoes	Do.
Casein	do	Unmanufactured wool	Do.
Wheat	do	Unmanufactured cotton	Do.
Wheat flour	do	Flaxseed	Do.

Furthermore, the rates of duty have not been decreased on sago, tapioca, arrowroot, which are one the free list, or on barley-malt.

The above-mentioned items account for more than half of the total value of imports listed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] on March 29.

Moreover, the item, meat products, includes canned beef which is also given separately, so this is a duplication and inflates the total number and value.

More than half of the imports of both cattle and cheese, shown in the table of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], entered under the Hawley-Smoot rates of duty, and so trade agreements could not have been responsible for all the increases. Such "padding" by opponents does not really make a better case against trade agreements even if we assumed that the imports are bad per se.

Imports of white or Irish potatoes are limited by quotas. The figures consist largely of seed potatoes imported for the benefit of American farmers.

The duty reduction on canned peas was limited to the high-price bracket, and thus the import data of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] overstates the effects of trade agreements on this item.

FIGURES INFLATED AND FACTS IGNORED

When the table is examined in the light of facts, it appears that opponents inflate both their statistics and items by from 50 to 75 percent in an attempt to make an adverse case against the trade agreements. Which calls for the time honored observation: "Figures don't lie, but liars can figure."

The list of items not only included products which have not been involved in tariff concessions granted by the United States, but also includes the large farm exports such as cotton, wheat, apples, tobacco, and others produced in great surpluses in the United States. One of the purposes and results of the trade-agreements program has been to obtain concessions in foreign countries so that these may be exported. And the program is succeeding.

I have noticed that it is a common practice for opponents of trade agreements to give these highly misleading lists of imports, although the figures themselves may be correct, and then attempt to make one of the departments responsible. In this particular instance the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, presumably of the Department of Commerce, was given as the source of Mr. Jones' information. I am sure that the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics of any Government department could not have been the source of the statement that the trade agreements were responsible for the increase in imports shown in that table. It is no doubt true that some reduced duties have encouraged larger imports into the United States. But these imports did not compete, but merely supplemented the domestic production of the articles.

The farmers of Ohio, or of any other State, will surely not be taken in by such ridiculous, partisan tabulations as that placed in the RECORD for March 29, 1940. A spirit of candor and fairness ought to suggest a proper clarification of the RECORD in this instance, and if it is not made every farmer constituent of the gentleman from Ohio ought to be informed as to how little their Representative knows about trade agreements, how poorly qualified he is to talk about them, and how ready he is to distort and misuse facts which have a direct and important bearing on the economic welfare of farmers in his own district and in the entire United States.

The truth is mighty and will prevail, but do not expect to get it from a Republican when he talks tariff. The tariff, that is the Republican conception of tariff, was, I venture to say, conceived in iniquity, fostered in corruption, and maintains whatever vigor it has today because statisticians are able, by trick and device, to make the worst appear the better.

Farm Tenancy Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, below is the table showing the number of farms bought by the Farm Security Administration through appropriations under the Bankhead-Jones bill.

If this money could be used to help the people that have distressed loans, much greater benefits could be attained than there has been by using these funds to purchase farms for new owners These funds could be used to keep the farmers of the Dust Bowl from going to the Rose Bowl and could be used in behalf of the real farm people already on the land. These loans are made for 40 years at 3 percent, when the average farmer must pay 3½ to 4 percent and pay taxes to help subsidize his competitor at a lower rate of interest for a longer period of time. This is unfair to the farmers on their farms, and is one of the cross-purpose schemes of the New Deal. Eighty-five thousand farms have been foreclosed by the New Deal, and 85,000 homes and means of making a living have been denied these rural families. At the same time their city cousins have had millions appropriated for city housing with $4,800 to $5,600 homes on which they did not pay down one cent. Why take 85,000 farm homes away from our rural people and spend millions for city housing that is subsidized by the Federal Treasury to the amount of $28,000,000 a year? This does not make sense nor is it human justice.

Farm-tenancy loans: Expenditures by States and by fiscal years

States and Territories	1938	1939	Total
Alabama	$131,471	$1,339,415	$1,470,886
Arizona	12,266	18,815	31,081
Arkansas	19,458	946,826	966,284
California	44,790	240,610	285,400
Colorado	17,588	162,784	180,372
Connecticut		7,195	7,195
Delaware		15,650	15,650
Florida	15,950	97,886	113,836
Georgia	155,082	1,373,862	1,528,944
Idaho	28,925	61,686	90,611
Illinois	225,295	735,322	960,617
Indiana	145,657	377,362	523,019
Iowa	309,015	834,492	1,143,507
Kansas	60,122	470,972	531,094
Kentucky	31,000	826,525	857,525
Louisiana		539,462	539,462
Maine		18,360	18,360
Maryland		67,965	67,965
Massachusetts		12,065	12,065
Michigan		364,806	364,806

Farm-tenancy loans: Expenditures by States and by fiscal years— Continued

States and Territories	1938	1939	Total
Michican		$364,806	$364,806
Minnesota	$54,980	656,569	711,549
Mississippi	24,680	956,000	980,680
Missouri	314,412	744,735	1,059,147
Montana		43,885	43,885
Nebraska	111,413	505,784	617,197
Nevada	1,525	5,525	7,050
New Hampshire		3,649	3,649
New Jersey		89,701	89,701
New Mexico	14,170	64,046	78,216
New York		74,669	74,669
North Carolina	72,286	859,065	931,351
North Dakota	32,775	195,860	228,635
Ohio	167,804	546,417	714,221
Oklahoma	356,329	1,028,405	1,384,734
Oregon	37,130	95,145	132,275
Pennsylvania		119,873	119,873
Rhode Island		4,447	4,447
South Carolina	67,838	795,009	862,847
South Dakota	34,650	161,090	195,740
Tennessee	53,805	970,233	1,024,038
Texas	662,716	2,401,663	3,064,379
Utah	12,600	18,650	31,250
Vermont		8,800	8,800
Virginia	46,276	467,893	514,169
Washington	32,366	95,117	127,483
West Virginia	5,080	198,100	203,180
Wisconsin	8,500	302,345	310,845
Wyoming		44,500	44,500
Hawaii	21,925	132,909	154,834
Puerto Rico		79,165	79,165
Virgin Islands			
Total	3,329,879	20,181,309	23,511,188

It Was Supposed He Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

STATEMENT FROM THE LEAD (S. DAK.) DAILY CALL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pointed statement from the Lead (S. Dak.) Daily Call:

[From the Lead (S Dak.) Daily Call of May 25, 1940]

HYSTERICAL NONSENSE

(By Stanley Wood)

For 7 years now President Roosevelt has had practically complete control of our Government at Washington. He has had a rubber-stamp Congress and about 1,000,000 Government employees to carry out his policies, the chief one of which has been to spend the taxpayers' money. This has gone on long enough and to such an extent that it has come to be known as a personal government under a spendthrift administration. Nothing has stood in Roosevelt's way to carry out his policies. Almost totalitarian authority has been his along with blank checks for billions of dollars.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy he has known what our military and naval weakness or strength was during all this period.

For 7 years he has known whether or not we were prepared to defend ourselves against attack.

Moreover, he has frequently asserted that he and his own State Department knew more about what was going on in other parts of the world than anyone else in this country, and no one disputed him except the late Senator Borah. Because of inside information he took the position that we should aid the British and French Allies in "measures short of war," with the result that he earned the bitter dislike of Hitler and was called a warmonger by the German press.

Most of us were and are for him in his "short of war" attitude against Germany or any other aggressor nation. But we believed that in taking this position, along with the appropriations of $7,000,000,000 for national defense, that our country had a sufficiently strong Military and Naval Establishment to have justified it.

This belief was fully justified because few heads of nations are foolish enough to adopt a foreign policy unless they are able to back it up at least to the extent of defending one's self successfully if the other nation resents such a policy and decides to fight over it.

That was the general situation until 2 weeks ago, when Mr. Roosevelt suddenly appeared before Congress with his startling message that we were wide open to attack and were without facilities to defend ourselves. The imminent danger of a quick German victory over the Allies and its grave consequences to ourselves under such circumstances resulted in a Nation-wide shock and, in some cases, even of hysteria. The most typical example of the emotional hysteria in some quarters was the proposal to call off the Presidential election this fall and, of all people, reelect Mr. Roosevelt. Another was to immediately effect a coalition Government.

We all agree on the urgent necessity for immediate and thorough preparedness which we mistakenly thought we already had. To say the least, Mr. Roosevelt is rather tardy in informing us about this supremely important item. We had thought from what he has been telling us for 7 years that the big danger to our security in this country was to be found in business and industry, to whom, it now seems, we must now turn for salvation and protection against assaults from foreign despots. Well, time is up for today, but it would seem that recent developments make it more apparent than ever that Mr. Roosevelt should not be renominated, and most certainly not be reelected.

The New Order, and Civic Slackers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

ADDRESSES BY HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, OF VERMONT

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses, The New Order, and Civic Slackers, delivered by the gentleman from Vermont, Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, before the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs at Old Point Comfort, Va., on May 1, 1940:

A NEW ORDER

Madam President, and ladies of the federation, if I do not seem to be overawed by this breakfast assemblage of the daughters of the F. F. V.'s, you may attribute my complaisance to the fact that it is no unusual occurrence for me to be eating breakfast with the daughters of Virginia. Both of my sons married Virginia girls. I expect I am distantly related to at least a third of you, along the branches of the Ashby, the Brown, the Nelson, Shackelford, Wingfield, Warren, Cox, Frost, and other family trees.

I am not unappreciative of the honor you do me in inviting me to address you. I realize also the responsibility which attaches thereto. I have selected as a topic for this breakfast talk, "A New Order," and for a few minutes would like to direct your attention to a few matters and things which it seems to me deserve the considered attention of everybody. Let us look to the work the times reveal.

In the United States it has been taken for granted that since the founders of the American Republic placed a Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution, the liberties of American citizens are forever secure. However, wherever we look, outside of America as well as in America, the inalienable rights of man are being more and more regulated and restricted, and nearly all the activities of life are being regimented and circumscribed. Everywhere the nations are beginning to set limits to freedom of action, and many are setting up the authority of the state as supreme in all things, both religious and civil.

A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our precious heritage of liberty.

In these times, when human rights are treated as pawns on the chessboard by human governments, when every activity of life is regulated, restricted, and regimented, irrespective of constitutional guaranties to the contrary, it becomes doubly incumbent upon the citizenry to familiarize themselves with the principles and the struggle which in the beginning brought about the establishment of democracy and human rights.

Our only safety lies in knowing and understanding these fundamental principles, and in defending them at any cost. The inalienable rights of man, whether they be social, political, or economic, must be respected and preserved, no matter what the cost in inconvenience or hardships. And no monetary consideration of mere expediency, no consideration of personal advantage, of utility, race, color, or creed, should ever be permitted to interfere either temporarily or permanently with the supremacy of the soul and the conscience, or with the inviolability of the heritage of inalienable rights, which reside inherently in every human being.

We hear a good deal these days about the new order. May it not be true that it is not so much a new order of a world which con-

fronts us as a new disorder; a disruption of earlier conditions; a confusion of methods and chaos of schemes? Certain it is that civilization, as Matthew Arnold said of his time, is wandering between two worlds—one dead, the other powerless to be born. Sir William Osler, one of England's foremost scientists, said in 1919: "There must be a different civilization or there will be no civilization at all." There are many who agree with him. Certain it is that we all agree that with a civilization which stands in a position of immense advantage as compared with all those of the past, the responsibility for its future rests on the American people in a greater degree than on any other, because it has at its command all the resources, material and spiritual, from which our civilization and all proceeds.

I am not one of those who thinks this world is such an awful bad place in which to live, or that civilization is going to the dogs. We need not be unnecessarily alarmed at all of the changes we see. True it is that all change is not progress, but all progress is a change. The world is full of optimists who expect it to outlast all its troubles; full of men and women to whom a recognition of the difficulties to be encountered is a challenge to their ability to overcome them.

The progress which has been made in all lines of endeavor during the last 50 years is simply wonderful, but with this advancement have come problems of commensurate importance and ponderousness which must be met and solved.

The World War shook things to their very foundations, but after all, the eternal verities were not disturbed, the essential things of life remain, and the fundamentals are fast bedded in the rock on which civilization rests.

It is truly a wonderful age in which we live; the possibilities it affords every rational human being for enjoyment and accomplishment are simply countless in number, stupendously staggering in character and almost beyond our ability to comprehend. We find fault, however, with little things; are too narrow-minded; live too much in the past or the present. Build for ourselves and a near tomorrow, not for others and a far future, forgetting, as so truly stated by the poet, James R. Lowell.

"The future works out great men's destinies,
The present is enough for common souls,
Who never looking forward are indeed
Mere clay, wherein the footprints of their age
Are petrified forever."

To get an idea of whither we are possibly tending, it may be worth while to look for a moment at the history of civilizations of the past, the most glorious of which was that of ancient Greece. Historians attribute its collapse to the change or substitution of population, the decay of marriage and family life, exile and colonization, and almost perpetual warfare, Greek against Greek, and the final exportation of the Greeks on a great scale by their Roman conquerors as slaves, doing the clerical and professional work of the Roman Empire.

Rome lasted longer. It was established on a broader foundation and drew into its service the best energies and talents of all the peoples of Europe. Some of its emperors were made out of common soldiers from remote provinces, and some slaves became secretaries of state. The best talents of the civilized world followed the roads, all of which led toward Rome. Then marriage became unfashionable, children were regarded as a burden; pleasure, luxury, and production of elegant verse became the principal occupations of selected classes. Finally, The Mistress of the World reached her climax and the chaos of the early Middle Ages followed.

Then Spain became great, but its career, though wonderful and brilliant, was of short duration. Expelling the Moors and the Jews, the maintenance of a vast colonial empire, the life of luxury and other elements combined to start Spain along the line which the others had followed, and its power and glory declined.

Then France and England took up the struggle; and last of all Germany has made her bid for world domination.

This is a wonderful age in which we live. To be an American citizen is the greatest blessing which any of us can enjoy. To have a part in changing the course of history is the greatest opportunity with which any man or woman of any day or generation can be confronted. The responsibility rests upon each and everyone of us, and it is well to take thought of our situation and to endeavor to devise some way in which, by the proper discharge of our duty, we may guarantee to posterity the transmission of our civilization and that most priceless heritage, a democratic government.

CIVIC SLACKERS

Madam President, let me say positively and definitely, in order to relieve your minds, that this is to be no partisan political speech. Just an old-fashioned undiluted American Jeffersonian Democratic talk by a Republican Representative of that State which made possible the election of Jefferson as President.

Not so many of you knew that did you? And some of you do not believe it now. Well all you have to do is to take time out when you get home to study your history and you will find that in the Aaron Burr-Thomas Jefferson Presidential contest the election was thrown into the House of Representatives. You will also find that the vote of Matthew Lyons, Representative from Vermont, broke the tie and elected Jefferson.

There is a lot of other interesting early history that ties the two States together very closely. Apparently my boys knew all about it, as I have heretofore suggested today.

As I said, I do not intend to make a political speech here today, partisan or otherwise, but I have been asked to talk about the youth problem. So at the outset let me reiterate the statement I have made again and again, namely: That the best thing we can do for youth is to undertake to get back to real American thrift and economy in living—to get away from the idea that the Government owes us a living. We must get rid of the idea that youth and its elders too prevalently have today, that this is a good Government to live in because it is a good one "to live on and off from."

Time past seems nothing; time to come always seems long. So indulge not in vain regrets for the past, in vainer resolves for the future; act, act in the present.

How beautiful is youth! How bright it gleams
With its illusions, aspirations, dreams!
Book of beginnings, story without end,
Each maid a heroine, and each man a friend . . .
All possibilities are in its hands,
No danger daunts it, and no foe withstands;
In its sublime audacity of faith,
"Be thou removed!" it to the mountain saith,
And, with ambitious feet, secure and proud,
Ascends the ladder leaning on the cloud!

Today, in the midst of the greatest revolution the world has ever seen, there is only one unpardonable sin: Indifference. And there is another sin, almost as unpardonable as the first, and that is ignorance.

Before the throne of coming events it will avail you nothing to explain, "Well, I did not understand," or "So many things had happened I just could not keep interested." For you shall go down into the limbo of those who do not deserve to survive: "Who had ears to hear, yet heard not; and eyes to see, yet saw not."

In the olden days before the machine became an iron man Friday, people obeyed the law, "Work or starve." Today the slogan is, "Think or perish."

I might as well admit, first as last, that I have no patience with those who are living in the past and to and of themselves and their generation. What old fossils they are to permit themselves to think that the best has been, when everybody knows that the best is yet to be. They live in a past gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were, not realizing that the tender grace of a day that is gone will never come back to them, or that the past is dead and has no resurrection. They forget that the earth with its scarred face is a symbol of the past.

I say to them and in their interest, that beyond the East is the sunrise, and beyond the West is the sea. There is a realm where the rainbow never fades, where the stars are spread before us like islands that slumber in an ocean, while things and beings that pass before us like shadows will stay in our presence forever.

Youth is the stream of the new, washing against the rocks of the habitual and the old. It floods in a continual current of enthusiasms, of joy in existence, of hope, of fine expectation, of sharp awareness of evil and injustice, of headlong ambition to reap harvests that seem possible.

Youth is the idealist. It sees what may be builded out of what is. It is the impetuous engineer, knocking at the gates of thought, clamoring to be let in. It is progress, change, alteration, eternal striving ahead, and if it is inclined to trail off the discussion sometimes into poppycock, it has still, the seeds of vitality. It is that part of life which is irrepressible growth.

Age is the halfway house, where experience fructifies into caution. The aloe has bloomed but the fruit may be mellowing. Age has met disillusion and knows the garb of that foeman. It has pushed possibilities to the limit and feels ready to cry "halt," that it may consolidate its winning. Crabbed only when defeat has embittered it, or when fear has driven out generosity and implanted greed, it represents the realities which to youth are still touched with haze.

Age, nevertheless, is no practical realist when it deadens its ears to the news which the new generation has to tell it. To set oneself against the idealist merely because of a constitutional hatred for change is to prophesy one's own defeat. Hatred for change is not a qualification of the practical realist.

"Age is opportunity no less
Than youth itself, though in another dress,
And as the evening twilight fades away
The sky is filled with stars, invisible by day."

Change is everywhere. It is born into the world with our progeny. Every babe in the cradle is a potential revolution, the end of one epoch, and the beginning of another.

"Youth will be served; the gods we reared
In faith upon our altar stone
Now keep their vigil unrevered
In dusty corners, all unknown.
New idols rise at new demands
Above our crumblin' overthrow,
They pick and choose with ruthless hands—
As we did in the long ago.

"Youth will be served; we live to see
Our dearest deeds another's boast,
A butt for laughtered ribaldry
The dreams for which we suffered most.
They see no print of bleeding feet,
The heights we won on footsteps slow
They mount, unwitting of defeat—
As we did in the long ago.

"Youth must be served; one harvest's gain
The seed from which new harvest springs,
The fuller yield of golden grain
From our forgotten harrowings.
Their hands shall turn fresh furrow soil,
The bread we eat, they too shall know—
May they find gods to sweeten toil—
As we did, in the long ago."

Our form of government and our scheme of society, and God knows they need improving, are yet so immeasurably superior as systems to anything on this side of the world that no comparison need be made. Europe is not effete; it is mediaeval, much of it uncivilized, held back by inertia, when not held back by worse things.

During the thousand years that will be required for Europe to attain a real civilization, wars will come as wars have always come in the past. The masses in Europe are driven as cattle. So long as this is true they will be driven periodically into wars and wars will be abroad here periodically for another thousand years or more.

It is not for merely doctrinal reasons or for the satisfaction found in successfully defending a position, that we are concerned for the spread of democracy, nor merely because democracy is the only scheme of organization yet wrought out that keeps the door of opportunity open and invites all men to their fullest development. We are interested, because, disguise it as we may, and postpone the acknowledgment of the fact as long as we will, the human family will eventually have to admit that under no other system can the world be made an even reasonably safe place in which to live.

It is only autocracies, especially military autocracies, must be softened down by peace, which softening process has never been successful or destroyed by war; there is no alternative. An aggressive military autocracy either reduces the rest of the world to vassalage, overruns the whole world, or drenches it in blood, or has to be overcome. Think that over.

So upon those of us who comprehend just the beginnings of all that democracy stands for and may mean rests the responsibility of bringing our neighbors to a realizing sense of the blessings that are theirs and an appreciation of the fact that there are commensurate responsibilities for each one to assume.

The truth is we count our blessings too lightly, underestimate the value of our citizenship, and take too much for granted.

St. Paul said he was a citizen of no mean country. The Romans challenged the world with the slogan, "I am a Roman." What, then, should be the attitude and the state of mind of every American when he takes time to consider the vastness of the domains, the type and multitudes of peoples, and the wealth of all kinds, over which fly the Stars and Stripes of his country today? To no man or woman in the long history of mankind, and the story of world conquest in the rise and fall of nations, has it ever meant so much as it now means to you and me to be able to say, "This is my own, my native land."

But what have I done, what have you done—or are we doing—to deserve this priceless patrimony? American institutions presuppose not only general honesty, intelligence, and fidelity in the people but their constant and direct application to public affairs. Our system of government rests upon all the people, not upon a part of them. The citizen who is self-sufficient, a civic slacker, who shirks his duty in time of stress, not only evades and avoids his duty and his share of the burden but loads more on the shoulders of his fellows, whom he has betrayed. Talk is cheap; words at best are poor yardsticks. Men are measured by what they do. What they say all too often exposes them to the ridicule they seek to avoid, although they deserve it.

Our safety lies not in the name democracy—you might call it anything else—or in the form republican, it could be remodeled. Our safety lies not in these or all of them but in ourselves—in you and me and our fellowmen. This brings the responsibility right home to each one of us. That is just where it belongs and in the last analysis the responsibility for the fate of this Nation rests on the doorstep of every single citizen.

Isn't it about time for us to give ourselves a little going over? What kind of a citizen are you, anyway? Have you earned and do you deserve half the blessings you now enjoy?

Now, be as honest with yourself as you would wish others to be with you. What are you doing to conserve all that is good and to dispose of all that is evil and bad in your Government, to the end that these United States may be an increasingly better land in which to live—and in order "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," as your forefathers undertook to do?

What are we, the people, doing about all these things? That means me—it means you. Take it home and think it over. This is your Government; you helped to "make the world safe for democracy" and bragged some about it 'til the boys came home. Now the question is, Will democracy save itself? The responsibility is yours, and you cannot dodge it or shirk it.

The greatest problem of the day and generation in which you and I live, the greatest question that confronts this country today, or has confronted it for some time, perhaps since the 1860's, is the question before which all others shrink into insignificance—What shall we do with the indifferent citizen? or, to put it another way, What will the indifferent citizen do to the Republic? America has settled some tremendous questions, but as she settles this one, right or wrong, so shall the future of the American Republic be determined.

Are you, then, an indifferent citizen? Are you reaching out for all the blessings and comforts that can come to you through your citizenship, while you sit back disinclined to make any effort or sacrifice that discommodes your personal convenience; too lazy and too selfish, too shortsighted even, to be interested in saving yourself? Think it over!

War is awful! It is bad enough; but I would prefer to see this country of mine plunged into a righteous war, stripped of all its power, wealth, and glory in a fight in defense of principle and to maintain liberty, justice, and equality among men, rather than to see it sink out of sight and into innocuous desuetude, and see it go the way of the nations of the long dead past, through, and because of the spinelessness, indifference, and supineness of its citizens. One way there is honor—the other dishonor, which covers and buries us with disgrace!

If I have made you make this a personal matter and have given you something to ponder, whether you agree with me or not, then my message has reached its mark, and I am content.

In conclusion, let me say to you that "The fate of civilization has always hung in the balance. There are certain ideals of civilization which cannot be destroyed. Throughout the ages we have fought and striven onward and upward to establish and to maintain justice, mercy, and liberty, and we will ever fight to maintain them."

Industry Girds for Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BUCYRUS (OHIO) TELEGRAPH-FORUM

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bucyrus Telegraph-Forum, of Bucyrus, Ohio:

INDUSTRY GIRDS FOR BATTLE

In true American spirit American industry is beginning to fight back at the forces which for 8 years have been making unreasonable and unconstitutional demands in a fashion bordering too closely to totalitarian policies. Meeting recently in Columbus under the sponsorship of the Ohio Manufacturers' Association and the National Manufacturing Association, Ohio's industrial leaders, including several who attended from Bucyrus, joined in a national movement to protect industry's resources and industry's rights against any further governmental attack.

Keynote of the meeting was a demand for an about-face move on the part of the Government so that confidence might once again be restored. This is a fair demand. Industry is to be congratulated for its exhibition of patience and patriotic loyalty over a period of 8 years during which it reluctantly remained on the receiving end of governmental interference and took and obeyed orders from political bosses who know nothing about industry's aims or its problems.

It is industry's right to protect its own interests, and when industry protects its interests it protects, too, the interests of practically all American workingmen and every one of its large and small communities. When an attack is made upon freedom of the press, the newspapers of the Nation rise up in revolt. When an attack is made upon freedom of religion, the pulpit does likewise, and when free speech is attacked every red-blooded American is ready to fight. It is not selfishness for each one of these enterprises to fight for its own rights nor is it selfishness for industry to do the same.

Just as the American Constitution is the foundation of all of our lives, industry in one way or another is the foundation of their promotion. There is not a business, a profession, or any other enterprise in America that does not depend entirely upon industry. One industry can make a city; one can destroy a city. All this was recognized for generations in Washington until the

Roosevelt new dealers took over and attempted to substitute industrial knowledge and experience with untried and obviously foolish theories. Men who had made successes of their lives were branded as "economic royalists." This communistic rot was preached in so-called fireside chats, and at every opportunity. The purpose was to poison the workingman's mind against the man who was providing him with a job, his family with a home, and modern luxuries.

The people were told that the industrial system, in effect, was "all wet" and that the Government would soon correct the many "ills" that had existed and had been trampling the "forgotten man." So far the new dealers have failed to correct the ills, have failed to provide employment as promised—except at the cost of taxpayers—and have failed to show that there was anything wrong with the industrial system in the first place. One law after another was passed. Some of them were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. In the meantime, industry did not know where it stood. One branch of government said one thing; the other branch another. All the while industry sat back and took the rap. Naturally, it did not advance, and naturally it did not expand in the face of ignorance from one day to the next what new tax would be levied against it to pay for silly theories.

Now industry is beginning to fire back. The time is ripe, for the average worker must know that behind him there must be capital and investment. In the railroad industry alone there is today invested $26,000 for each railroad employee; $9,000 is behind each automobile worker; $11,500 behind each steel worker; and $47,000 is backing up each electric-utility employee. These figures were cited at a Rotary district convention at Lima recently by Bennett Chapple, assistant to the president of the American Rolling Mill Co. Remove these investments and no American worker would be secure in his job. Nor would any American industry, for each industry employing 150 men means the support of 1,000 persons in a community, a plant investment of $100,000, a pay roll of $200,000, sales and service stations for at least 200 automobiles; a dozen retail stores, a 10-room schoolhouse, opportunity for at least a dozen professional men, $60,000 a year for railroads serving that community, a $300,000 agricultural market, a taxation valuation of around a million dollars, an annual expenditure in trade of a million dollars, and the numerous civic improvements necessary for the health, convenience, and protection of the 150 men and their families. This is what the "economic royalists" are giving to American communities. It is time that America awaken to the true facts and compare them with Government waste and foolishness.

America's Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from the Fifth District, Minnesota, Representative OSCAR YOUNGDAHL, over radio station WJSV and the Columbia Broadcasting System, May 30, 1940:

AMERICA'S DEFENSES

Twenty-two years ago today this Nation was engaged in a great war, a war to "make the world safe for democracy," a war to end all wars.

Today we pause to pay tribute to those brave men who died for that noble ideal, while Europe's battlefield bears testimony to the futility of that resolve.

No nation ever entered a conflict with higher idealism, with more unselfish purpose or more noble motives than did the United States in 1917. We had no desire for imperial domination, no lust of ambition, no pride of power and might. Our sole desire was to give to the world the same right to live in freedom, in peace and happiness which we held as a heritage from our forefathers.

Our heritage had been won in the snows of Valley Forge, guaranteed at the "Bloody Angle" of Gettysburg. It was our heritage, our unchangeable right because thousands of brave men to whom we pay tribute today had died that we might live as free citizens of a liberty-loving democracy.

It is fitting that America today should pay tribute to her sons and daughters who have died in defense of her heritage of freedom. But today as we honor those sacrifices, we should at the same time make an accounting of that stewardship. We should search out our own duties and ask of ourselves what we are doing to carry on those ideals for which they died.

Our tears and our flowers are tributes of our love and devotion, but they are not sufficient. It is only by doing our own part to live up to and carry on the ideals for which they died that America today can pay tribute to her honored dead.

The world is again torn by wars, wars more terrible and more destructive of human life and property than anything that has ever been known to man. The powers of ruthless aggression and tyranny again are marching forward. Freedom and peace are trampled under the heel of totalitarianism and power. What then is America's part in this new world crisis?

Should we again send forth our sons to fight to make the world safe for democracy? Should we again cast our ideals with Europe's ambitions?

On this 1940 Memorial Day I say to that that America's place is in America. America's duty is not making the world safe for democracy. America's duty is to save democracy for the world. America's task is not the destruction of nazi-ism nor fascism nor communism in other parts of the world. America's destiny is the preservation of Americanism in America.

Close as Europe's wars have touched many of our lives, hate as we must the ruthless aggression of totalitarianism, I can see no reason for another A. E. F.

If totalitarianism, dictatorships, and the rule of might are to perish it will not be because America or any other nation has overthrown them at the point of a bayonet or a machine gun. It will be because the people themselves, guided and inspired by the example of freedom-loving America, living in peace and happiness, has caused them to throw off the shackles of dictation and assume for themselves the rights of self-government, of liberty, and right.

But it is not sufficient that we should only hold aloft the burning torch of liberty. We must be prepared to defend our American way of life against any conceivable enemy.

No nation comprising, as does the United States, but 6 percent of the earth's land surface and containing but 7 percent of the earth's population, enjoys the standards of living, the luxuries, and the glories of America without being coveted by forces of greed and ambition.

No nation whose people use 32 percent of the world's railroad mileage, 58 percent of the world's telephones, 36 percent of the world's developed waterpower, and ride in 76 percent of the world's automobiles could prevent covetous eyes from seeing its wonders.

No nation which produces with its 7 percent of the world's population, 60 percent of the world's petroleum, 48 percent of its copper, 47 percent of its steel, 58 percent of its corn, 56 percent of its cotton, 33 percent of its coal, and which has amassed more than 45 percent of the world's total wealth, can prevent dictators and aggressors from looking with longing eyes at those resources.

America then must be prepared to defend not only our ideals but our possessions, not only the rights but the fruits of freedom and individual liberty.

Congress now is engaged in appropriating $1,182,000,000 as a special fund for rebuilding our national defenses. Some of that already has been appropriated, more has been authorized. This huge sum is in addition to seven billions we have spent in the last 7 years on our Army, Navy, and air forces, the largest peacetime appropriations for defense in our history.

True we are told that our present armed forces are the best—the best equipped and the best trained—in all our peacetime history. Such assurance is not particularly reassuring. Our peacetime Army has never been anything but a skeleton organization. Assurance that it is the best it has ever been is not sufficient; it still is not big enough, sufficiently well equipped, nor trained for the defensive tactics this war in Europe has shown us as vital to any defense.

I know that Congress is united on the necessity of immediate adequate national defense. Congress is working as a unit toward the end that America must be prepared to successfully resist any conceivable attempt to invade our shores.

Determined as America is, however, to see our defenses in order, we should go about this business with calmness and deliberation, with both feet planted squarely on the ground and with a united demand that for every dollar of American money spent for defense, we get a dollar's worth of defenses. There is no need for the hysteria, for the near panic into which this country has been thrown the last 2 weeks.

Neither is there any need for a disruption or a discontinuance of the regular functions of our democratic system of government nor our traditions of long standing. Defense of democracy can never be adequately rebuilt by adopting the methods of dictatorships. Defense of democracy must be achieved through the regular functioning of democratic methods.

America is not totally unprepared. We have in our Navy 303 warships, of which 15 are battleships. They are manned by 155,000 officers and enlisted men plus 25,000 officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps. Another 61,000 officers and men comprise the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

Our Army consists of some 227,000 enlisted men and 14,000 officers, of whom some 2,300 are airplane pilots. Close to 5,000 of the enlisted personnel are on air force duty, some of them are pilots.

The Air Corps has on hand at the present time 2,665 first-line planes.

The National Guard comprises another 251,000 officers and men, but this branch may be expanded by the Presidential order at any time to 400,000 officers and men.

In equipment some of our naval vessels are obsolete, others need remodeling and modernizing. We do not have sufficient tanks or antitank guns. Our antiaircraft equipment is inadequate and our air force needs not only more planes of the latest type but many more trained pilots.

Around this nucleus America must build a defense force adequate to protect us from any possible enemy. If the appropriation bills now before Congress will give us that adequate defense, then well and good. If more funds are required, then Congress should provide them. America must be prepared for any eventuality.

But let us not follow any false illusions. Adequate national defense is not going to be attained by the passage of some bills by Congress and the ordering of more airplanes and more guns and more explosives.

Adequate national defense is going to be had only by the sacrifice of each of us, of every man and every woman in every walk of life, by industry and by labor, by farmer and mechanic, by teacher and pupil.

Adequate national defense can only be achieved if we stamp out and forget those class hatreds and intolerances which we have seen engendered and augmented in recent years.

America cannot be defended by pitting labor against capital, rich against poor, the followers of one sect or one faction against those of another. America can be defended only when we all realize that we are all Americans, working, living, and sacrificing for the same high ideal, when we all pull together for the common ideals of all.

Armament costs money. One giant, long-distance bomber alone costs in the neighborhood of $350,000. A great battleship costs millions. Unless America is willing to sacrifice or to go without other things to pay for it, we will have no adequate national defense.

Today our national debt is dangerously close to, if not beyond, the legal limit of $45,000,000,000. We can provide great defense forces in one of two ways. We can tax ourselves to pay for them, or we can raise our debt limit and pass on the job of paying for our defense to our children and our children's children.

The delusion of an endless source of borrowed money which the Government may tap without regard to its repayment is as dangerous to this country's safety as a lack of guns or warships or airplanes. Financial bankruptcy is no less a danger to our democracy than is invasion.

In my opinion, Congress should immediately take up consideration of a new tax measure to pay for our defense program. Along with this new tax measure should come strict economy in Government expenditures.

America needs billions for national defense. Let some of these billions come through a reduction in luxuries and unnecessary expenses of government itself.

National defense means duty and work and sacrifice for every American citizen.

And now may I mention another phase of our defense which in my opinion is just as important as a strong force on land or sea or air? I refer to a defense against those "fifth column" and Trojan-horse tactics which are already among us, preaching and teaching the overthrow of our Government and the substitution of some alien "ism" for the American way of life.

Events in Europe the last few weeks have shown us the utter futility of great defense forces if a defense against those enemies within the country is neglected. Small nation after small nation in Europe has been delivered over into the hands of a foreign enemy by traitors and spies within their own midst.

Only those who will not see or think can believe that similar forces are not organized and at work in America. These alien agitators and propagandists are a more real and immediate danger to our democracy than any foreign invader.

It is just as important that Congress pass strict laws and regulations to curb and curtail the activities of these satellites of alien "isms" as the rebuilding of our armed forces.

I am a firm believer in the right of free speech, but I am no believer in the license of free treason. America has no place for any "ism" but Americanism. Let those among us who do not like our way of life, whose hearts do not thrill at the sight of the Stars and Stripes, who are not ready and willing to subscribe to and sacrifice for our ideals—I say let's send them back to dictatorships and the communes they love. We need and want none of them. Liberty is not license and freedom does not guarantee right of abuse.

America today needs a great spiritual revival. We need to rekindle our militant belief in the fundamentals upon which our Government was founded. We need to again rededicate ourselves to our ideals, to reaffirm our faith in God and his teachings. We need pride in the things for which we stand.

As this Memorial Day draws to a close America could make no better resolve than to carry on the ideals for which these loved ones gave their lives; to willingly and eagerly make any sacrifice necessary that America and her heritage shall not perish; to keep America a bright light of freedom and happiness shining as a beacon to all the world that in America peace and democracy and freedom shall live forevermore.

Enforcement of the Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

LETTERS AND ENCLOSURES FROM THE SECRETARY OF LABOR AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and enclosure received by me from the Secretary of Labor, together with an editorial from this morning's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of May 31, 1940]

MISS PERKINS HITS BACK

In an open letter addressed to Representative TABER, Secretary of Labor Perkins answers his charge that she has "steadily and steadfastly failed and refused to enforce the immigration law and continuously admitted and kept here those who were not entitled to stay."

As the agitation over the Bridges case revealed, certain Members of Congress have very little regard for the rights of aliens under our laws. Their irritation is directed against the Secretary of Labor because she has consistently emphasized those rights and called attention to the dangers of dealing arbitrarily and hastily with alien groups. The stress thus laid upon fair dealing and humane treatment on the part of the authorities does not imply ineffective enforcement of the laws, as some Congressmen too hastily conclude.

In her able reply Secretary Perkins is not content with a categorical denial of Congressman TABER's charges. She notes the steps that have been taken under her administration of the immigration laws to prevent illegal entry and speed deportation of aliens illegally in the country.

It is certainly desirable to have these innovations called to public attention. Perhaps the Secretary of Labor has been too modest in failing to publicize her achievements and too tolerant of unfair criticism.

The reason for her customary silence in face of attack—so markedly in contrast to the explosive tactics of certain members of the Cabinet—is revealed in the letter to Mr. TABER. So long as her personal competency alone is challenged, Miss Perkins explains, she does not believe it in the interest of the public "to raise personal objections to the free expression of opinion, however unfavorable."

But unsubstantiated charges of deliberate failure to enforce laws, for whose administration the Secretary of Labor is responsible, are not merely personal attacks. They concern not only the head of the Department, but all the major officials and minor Government employees who help to administer the immigration law.

In reminding Mr. TABER that his attack was made under a rule of immunity, the Secretary of Labor makes a suggestion which should be heeded. It is that their protected status implies for Congressmen a self-imposed obligation to avoid misrepresentation in bringing accusations which reflect upon the character or competence of administrative officers who cannot speak for themselves.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 31, 1940.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: This is to acknowledge your letter of May 27, requesting information in connection with the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization Service since 1933.

I know of no better way to furnish you with the facts concerning its administration than to forward you a copy of a letter I wrote on May 27 to Congressman TABER in reply to statements made by him.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

MAY 27, 1940.

The Honorable JOHN TABER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: I have just had called to my attention your speech in the House today with regard to the reorganization order transferring the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Department of Justice. You are quoted as having said:

"We are going to vote for this reorganization plan because the President has not the patriotism nor the courage to remove the Secretary of Labor, a notorious incompetent, and one who for the last 7 years has steadily and steadfastly failed and refused to enforce the

immigration law, and continuously admitted and kept here those who were not entitled to stay."

I have no objection to your expressing your opinion about my competency. That is a matter of personal judgment and you are unquestionably entitled to yours. I feel, however, that I must raise objection to that part of your statement which professes to be a statement of fact, namely, "That I have for the last 7 years steadily and steadfastly refused to enforce the immigration law and admitted and kept here persons not entitled to stay." This statement is not true, nor is it a mere expression of opinion.

The immigration law has been enforced faithfully and effectively during the last 7 years. For the first 4 of these 7 years the Immigration Service was in charge of the Commissioner, Col. Daniel J. MacCormack, an officer in the United States Army with a long record of effectiveness, efficiency, and patriotism. I appointed him for these reasons and directed him to enforce the law fairly and faithfully. We were confronted on the threshold of our duties with not only certain undesirable situations of administration which had been denounced by the Wickersham committee, appointed by President Hoover, but by clear evidence of corruption in certain offices. It was our duty to correct these things and we did so. We directed our attention not only at the deportation of aliens not legally entitled to remain in the country, but also took vigorous steps to prevent the illegal entrance of aliens, including the smuggling of aliens, falsification of immigration documents, fraudulent activities in naturalization proceedings, all of which were found to be going on under the administration of the law.

We have reorganized and expanded the border patrol, one of the most effective branches of the service, for the prevention of illegal entry. We completely motorized the service with radio-call system and provided for the modern supervision in training of that service. We developed a system of education and training for naturalization, which is practical and aims to enable the courts to make proper selection of those who are attached to the principles of the Constitution and so eligible for citizenship. These policies have been continued under Commissioner J. Lawrence Houghteling.

I also appointed a committee of experts, external to the department (Dimock, Hart, and McIntyre) to study the problems of immigration. On the basis of their report a reorganization in the interests of making the service still more effective and of giving to the people in the field a better knowledge of the law and the Court decisions is being set up. A classification survey of positions in the immigration and naturalization field service has been completed in the interests of greater efficiency, following the recommendations of the committee.

The changes made, at times misrepresented by some, were designed to improve the system. They have cleared up irregularities and dishonest situations, and have accomplished many of the reforms badly needed and recommended in the report of President Hoover's Wickersham committee in 1931.

Every person admitted, temporarily or otherwise, to the United States during my administration of the immigration law has been admitted in accordance with the laws as enacted by the Congress of the United States. These admissions for brief periods as temporary visitors have been under proper safeguards. In a number of deportation cases involving no subversive or criminal charges, but which would have meant separation of families and the abandonment of American citizens, I have deferred making effective final deportation orders while legislation giving relief in these cases was pending in Congress. These cases have been reported to the Immigration Committees of Congress which were considering them in connection with private bills, and with proposals for general remedial legislation.

Throughout my administration the immigration law has been enforced energetically, fairly, and humanely under my direction.

I have been in public office for many years. I have a reputation for service to the public and for faithfulness in discharge of public duty, and for placing the public interest above any other, which I am sure you will admit I should and must defend in fairness to those who have placed their confidence in me, as well as to myself. I have tolerated many expressions of opinions adverse to me personally in my administration of this Department, believing that it was not in the interest of the public to raise personal objections to the free expression of opinion, however unfavorable. Some of the expressions led to statements on the floor of the House and to impeachment proceedings. These charges finally culminated in an investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary, resulting in a finding of lack of any evidence to evade responsibility to enforce the law, or of failing or neglecting or refusing to enforce the law against any alien.

Your statement of today, however, I feel I should not accept without protest. Since it was offered as fact, sir, I believe that it is in the interests of justice not only to me but to the 4,000 men and women of the Immigration Service who have faithfully carried out the law, since they cannot speak for themselves, that this letter be made public.

I know that many things are said in the heat of political controversy which one does not wish to stand by, and I am sure you will understand that I bear you no personal animosity, but wish to correct the record. I realize that these statements were made under a rule of immunity which Members of Congress have, and for that reason I am sure you will be the first to wish to correct anything that is misleading therein.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Congress Should Not Adjourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a radio address which I delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network from Washington, D. C., May 30, 1940, entitled "Congress Should Not Adjourn." The address is as follows:

My fellow citizens, although far removed from war-torn Europe, here in the Nation's Capital the very air seems charged with the grim tragedy of war. The dogs of war are unleashed and in their devastating wake the Four Horsemen are riding again over the fair lands of Europe, leaving behind them only death, desolation, and despair. The greatest crisis the world has faced in the memory of men confronts it today. We are living from hour to hour. No one can forecast what the next hour may bring forth. It is a time for clear thinking, sound judgment, and resolute determination to save America. It is no time for war hysteria or propaganda or appeals from self-serving special interests. The Congress should embrace this task with grim resolve to do the job of defending America without being swayed from its course, with a single purpose to keep America at peace and save our democracy.

Fortunately, America is at peace with all the world. With your help, my countrymen, God willing, the Congress will resolutely strive on to keep America at peace. We have no design upon the territory or possessions of any nation. We cannot black-out, however, the caldron of war burning in Europe. We cannot but look to our own defenses and be apprehensive of our own safety and protection against invasion or attack from any quarter. The law of self-preservation compels this course.

The Congress of the United States is deeply aroused. It was clearing its desks for an early adjournment the first weeks in June, when the smoldering flames of war loosed its fury, threatening to encompass the whole of Europe if not the world.

A national election is in the offing. All Members of the House of Representatives and many of the Senate have contests for reelection. Ordinarily the Congress would adjourn in early summer to permit its Members to participate in the elections. In normal times the Congress should adjourn under such circumstances so that partisan politics may not enter or shape legislative action. The peril and portentous implications of the European war, however, have completely changed the entire program.

We here in the Congress must not underestimate the momentous issues that press for solution in this crisis. In our hearts we are fervently praying that this war may not be visited upon America. We want to remain aloof. We want to keep America free. We do not want freedom to perish from the earth. We want to preserve unsullied the fundamental doctrines underlying this great democracy. For over 150 years our forbears have wrought and sacrificed that constitutional democratic government might be vouchsafed to every American. The decisions we make and the action we take here in the Congress in these momentous days may determine the fate of democracy in America and the course our country shall follow in the years that are ahead. Well may we ponder in this fateful hour: What is the duty of the Congress in such an emergency? Should it adjourn pursuant to the usual practice, ignoring that the world is on fire, or should it remain at its post of duty, meeting and solving these momentous issues, until this crisis confronting us shall have passed? No promptings of partisanship, no considerations of personal interest, no exigencies of political welfare should enter into our deliberations in determining this issue. The defense and preservation of our Nation supersedes all else.

There is no room here for partisanship. The political fortunes of any man or any party are unimportant when our Nation's safety is at stake. In this supreme hour of trial in our Nation's life we are neither Republicans nor Democrats, but only Americans. This does not, however, mean the surrender of one jot or tittle of party loyalty or obligation. The success of the American party system of government depends upon party fealty. In it there is no place for coalition. It ill becomes either political party or its leaders in this hour of our Nation's peril to attempt to achieve partisan party success by seeking to acquire or maintain party control through the exigencies of this grave national emergency. Either party seeking through this issue to form "fifth columns" or Trojan horses in the ranks and forces of the other at this critical time deserves defeat, and the condemnation of all loyal Americans. There is no room for Benedict Arnolds here, and no place for parachutes to land.

In considering our course let us remember that the Constitution of the United States lodges in the Congress authority to raise and

support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the Government, and regulation of the land and naval forces, to provide for organizing the Army and disciplining the militia, to levy taxes and to appropriate money and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution these powers. In the Congress, and in the Congress alone, is vested the power of legislation with respect to these underlying provisions for our national defense. The Congress cannot sign a blank check to the President, adjourn and go home without shirking its responsibility.

The days of the rubber-stamp Congress are over. The Congress makes the laws, the Executive enforces them. Only in dictatorships and totalitarian states do the legislative bodies surrender their functions to the executive and quit in times of peace. America is not at war. The Congress is determined America shall keep out of war.

To provide for the defense of our Nation and to avoid being entangled in European conflicts, and to remove the operations of American enterprise and American nationals from the scenes of war, so far as possible, the Congress has enacted certain laws. The President, through authority vested in him by the Congress, has established fixed zones in belligerent territory in which American ships and nationals are forbidden to enter. We have given up many of our rights as neutrals to engage in foreign commerce, to use the high seas for our ships engaged in lawful trade, and to permit our citizens freely to go into foreign countries with whom we are at peace. We have voluntarily surrendered these cherished rights, sanctioned by international law, that we may not become embroiled. In times past we have gone to war to preserve them. Through the fierce progress of this modern mechanized war, the theater of conflict is changing from hour to hour. New belligerents are being drawn in. New factors are entering, requiring additional laws; new decisions and immediate action by our own country to meet the emergencies and to keep ourselves from entanglement. Since the invasion of the lowlands in the last few weeks the Congress has passed legislation changing some of our peacetime laws, lodging additional power in the Executive, providing for the increase and equipment of our land, naval, and air forces, and partially establishing a program that will, when completed, strengthen our national defenses in order to repel any assaults upon our country and our possessions.

National defense means more than guarding our frontiers from foreign foes. We must not overlook those who would undermine the foundations of our liberties by boring from within. Let there be no place in America for "fifth columns," Trojan horses, or parachutists. With public safety at stake, it is time to act. We must know who are with us and who are against us. The Congress is now enacting laws to effectively deal with enemies within our borders.

With the threat of total war in Europe, we find that we are woefully deficient in the essentials for national defense. We lack mechanized and motorized Army equipment, guns, munitions, and airplanes, bombing and pursuit planes, heavy tanks, antiaircraft guns, coast defenses, and trained personnel, both for land, sea, and air. Furthermore, we are not only deficient in these facilities so necessary to defend ourselves successfully in modern war, but, more important, we do not have the factories, tools, machinery, and equipment to manufacture them, and we do not have the skilled workmen and technicians to staff the factories when built.

We have been sleeping at the switch. We have fiddled while Europe armed. It is true we have spent billions for national defense in the last 7 years, but an inventory discloses that only a very small percentage of these funds was devoted to the purpose of acquiring mechanized and motorized equipment, munitions, strategic and critical matériel, and aircraft essential for modern warfare.

The Congress cannot overnight enact the necessary legislation to provide adequately for solving these many problems. We cannot appropriate the necessary money, wave a wand, and go home and rest in assurance we have saved America. The machinery of America is geared for peacetime activities. Our laws respecting social security, wages and hours, employment, and industrial enterprise are formulated for peacetime operations. Many of these laws must be modified or suspended to provide this superwar machine without further delay, which is necessary to protect America against the onslaughts of modern mechanized warfare. Only the Congress can provide the changes necessary. In the changes necessary to provide a war economy we must guard jealously the rights and social progress of the common people we have perfected through the years. Any surrender of these hard-earned, protecting, individual rights, in speeding up a defense program, must be conditioned on their recapture when the emergency ends.

It is at once apparent that the Congress should continue in session to provide the essential legislation which will permit this project of national defense to go forward unhampered, with the utmost dispatch and with the greatest efficiency, to the end that it may be consummated at the very earliest moment.

Our first line of defense is a sound fiscal policy. We entered World War No. 1 practically free of debt. The money cost of the World War on June 30, 1934, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, was $41,765,000,000. Today we are confronted with a national debt of $45,000,000,000. Our expenditures, not including those made necessary by this emergency for national defense, exceed our income by over $4,000,000,000 for the ensuing fiscal year. We have continued to build up an annual deficit for over 8 years, with no end in sight. We have some 10,000,000 unemployed. The President, in his message to the Congress, made no mention as to what should be done to finance this immense additional war bill which he recommended in the sum of $1,182,000,000 in appropriations and authorizations. The Congress should not adjourn without finding a solution to this financial problem. Additional funds cannot be borrowed unless the debt limitation is raised, which requires an act of Congress. Our immense gold hoard, constituting three-fourths of the monetary gold of the world, in the main is obligated and is not available for this purpose. Our tax revenues are several billions below that required for normal operations. We cannot provide adequate national defense without paying the costs. The Congress must finance the armament program. It is a duty the Congress cannot shirk. This Congress should not throw it into the lap of the incoming Congress. It should remain in session until the job is done and the war crisis over.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

In addition to the questions of national defense, to which I have referred, requiring the attention of the Congress at this time, there are many domestic problems which the Seventy-sixth Congress has failed to solve. Among others are the farm problem, unemployment, necessary amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, wage and hour amendments, transportation bill, the Hatch bill, tax measures, old-age security, and various other problems of great import, upon which the welfare and security of our Nation depend. We cannot hope to restore confidence to America; to start the wheels of industry turning again; to provide jobs on private pay rolls for the millions of unemployed; to take care of the 5,000,000 youth of the country who have never, under our present economy, had an opportunity for employment, unless the Congress formulates and enacts legislation to provide solutions for these problems.

It seems imperative that the Congress should not adjourn at this time; it should stay on the job and do the work for which it was elected; the Members should forego any personal considerations and cooperate together to accomplish these results. We should zealously guard against any incident that may plunge this country into war. We must stay out.

In all ages the costs of liberty have been great. Our own, which we now cherish, was purchased by our American forebears with suffering, sacrifice, and life itself. America's march for freedom down the long road from Valley Forge to Flanders Field in 1918 has left a record of heroic endeavor and sacrifice in meeting the price of liberty, unsurpassed in the annals of time. We of this generation, possessors of this priceless legacy of freedom, purchased at such a cost, can do no less than to do our utmost to preserve it at all hazards. We cannot keep back the black scourge of war from our shores unless we, too, pay the price. The huge armaments necessary to maintain our peace will mean heavy sacrifices from us all, which I am sure we all will willingly make without stint. No needed costs can be too great to preserve our freedom and keep America out of war.

Mother's Day Peace Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

STATEMENT BY MOTHER'S DAY PEACE COMMITTEE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement presented to me by the Mother's Day Peace Committee of Washington, D. C., which I am having reprinted at the request of the mothers who signed such petition.

MOTHER'S DAY PEACE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1940.

To Our Senators and Representatives in the Seventy-sixth Congress.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: As Mother's Day, 1940, draws near, we mothers of Washington, D. C., have been thinking of the kind of gifts we would like to have. You have it in your power to give us the greatest gift any mother could want—the assurance that her children may live in peace and security.

American mothers have managed to produce good citizens for their country in spite of having had, for a good many years, to bring their children up in conditions of insecurity and poverty—many of them without sufficient nourishment, clothing, or education.

Today, however, mothers face the possibility of war. We remember the sacrifices which mothers made during the last war—sacrifices made in the name of democracy and a better world—and made in vain. Nevertheless, we hear the same arguments being used to convince us that our country should take sides in the present European conflict. And we say, "No," Messrs. Congressmen. We have not struggled and worked all our lives to make useful men and

women of our children in order to have them killed off in a useless war.

We want our children to remain here, to be able to get a good education, to get jobs, to live in decent homes, to maintain their health, so that they may contribute to the building of a happy, prosperous nation. That is the way we will fight for democracy and a better world.

We ask you to give assurance not only to us, but to the thousands of mothers in your own districts who go to the polls this fall, that neither now nor at any time in the future will you help to involve this country in the European war. Pass no legislation which would allow loans or credits to the belligerents; pass no legislation which would allow any of our sons—whether they be in the Army, the Navy, or the air force—to be sent into war.

Instead, pass legislation which will give them jobs, educational opportunities, better health, and housing, and will protect the civil liberties guaranteed by our Constitution, that they may continue to be a credit to us and to the Nation.

The Challenge of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

AN ADDRESS BY DR. HAROLD M. DORR, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Harold M. Dorr, assistant professor of political science, University of Michigan, at the Oakland County Citizenship Day Celebration, May 19, 1940, entitled "The Challenge of American Citizenship":

I am happy and deeply honored to have been invited to participate in this, our first greeting to our young voters. I am happy that the acceptance of citizen responsibilities must no longer be taken for granted. I am happy that the people of Michigan and Oakland County are among the first to pay the honor which is your due. And I am happy that this acknowledgment comes with marching feet and playing bands—with ritual pomp and ceremony—the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. On May 10, 1940, Adolf Hitler, in sending his armed forces against a defenseless land, declared—I quote:

"The hour has come. These actions will determine the fate of the German Nation for a thousand years."

I adopt these words from a creed which I denounce. I adopt them as a challenge—as a battle cry for democracy. For you, too, "the hour has come." Today you repledge your loyalties to the perpetuation of a free people and to the support of a form of government dedicated to the cause of peace.

These ceremonies in recognition of your new status and your acceptance of new responsibilities insures the future of America against the aggression of all "isms." Let us thank God that there yet is, in a war-mad world, a country where we may assemble—free men under a flag dedicated to peace.

America is a rich country. Our fields are fertile, our hills and mountains are well stocked with iron and coal, our people are resourceful. America is beyond doubt the most powerful and the richest nation in the world. Yet, I submit to you that our most priceless possession is our youth—our young men and women, those of you who now dedicate yourselves to the democratic ways of life. Yes; let me warn you. The coal must be mined, the iron must be forged, the fields must be cultivated before the resources can be turned to the use and to the happiness of man.

So it is with you today. You, too, must undergo processing and tempering before you can, to the utmost of your abilities, discharge the responsibilities you now assume. You must become familiar with the political processes and with the forms of government. You must school yourselves in the field of practical politics; you must seek public office and public employment; you must join with others of like mind and discuss problems and policies; you must demonstrate judgment and balance; you must be ever alert to strike at graft and corruption. But above all, you must have faith—faith in the democratic ideal and faith in the American way of life. This, I submit, is the first challenge of American citizenship.

The implications of this challenge are so exacting that it may be well for us to turn for a moment from the general to the particular. You may well ask: What, specifically, are my responsibilities as an American citizen? How can I, as an individual, acquire the necessary training and experience? How may I demonstrate political judgment and social intelligence?

I may enumerate some of these responsibilities under two heads—civic and political.

We do not live in a regimented state. Our political order endows the individual with great freedom in thought and action. Within this area of freedom we have developed social institutions for the purposes of human associations. Best known among these social institutions are the family, the community, the church, and our social clubs and organizations. In this area our associations are entirely voluntary. No obligations are imposed by law. Yet every failure by these voluntary associations—every break-down within our social institutions—invites the intrusion of the law, and to that extent constitutes a threat to our liberties and to the democratic way of life.

Thus, I charge you: Do not neglect your civic responsibilities; become an active partner in the management of the affairs of your family, your church, your club, and your community; join with your friends and act now to insure your community against the dangers of regimentation and the loss of individual freedom.

Your political responsibilities as an active citizen are equally important. Some of these I would enumerate:

1. You must become familiar with local, State, and national problems.
2. You must face issues with courage and conviction.
3. You must affiliate with the party of your choice.
4. You must register and encourage others to register.
5. You must participate in the nomination of candidates.
6. You must vote in all elections—no issue is too trifling, no office too lowly to challenge your attention.
7. You must insist upon reforms which strengthen democracy.
8. You must stand against influences which threaten it.
9. You must support your public institutions.
10. You must insist upon honesty in Government at every level and in every act.
11. You must insist upon value for your tax dollar.
12. You must insist upon honesty and efficiency in public employment.
13. You must protect your public servants against reprisals—political, racial, and religious in character.
14. You must not refuse service in public office, on election boards, or on juries.
15. You must, in your spare time, serve as an errand boy to democracy.

Citizenship is a public trust and a public office. We would not choose to place that trust in incompetent and untrained hands. We charge you, at this time, to increase your competence and to intensify your training.

Training for citizenship is a matter of self-development rather than a process of instruction. For the benefit of those of you who desire to undertake intensive training I would suggest:

1. That you continue your education, read reliable newspapers and magazines, make use of your libraries and your radios, take advantage of extension and adult education courses.
2. Train yourself to think clearly and avoid prejudices.
3. Overcome the fear of your own convictions.
4. Learn to express your ideas and to speak in public.
5. Become active in the affairs of your church, lodge, club, and trade organization.
6. Get acquainted with people with experience and influence.
7. Affiliate with a party.
8. Join youth organizations.
9. Attend school and council meetings.
10. Visit your courts and your public institutions.
11. Attend all meetings of your party caucus.
12. Circulate petitions and debate issues.
13. Round up voters in support of your candidates and propositions.
14. Try your hand at political organizations.
15. Run for public office.

If you as young voters honestly desire to develop your talents and increase your capacities for political leadership, opportunities are not wanting. Democracy is a living, growing thing. It provides its own training school and testing grounds. The selection of leadership is inherent in its processes. Far pastures appear green and youth is impatient. You look to the Halls of Congress, the Supreme Court, and the White House. I charge you to examine the ladders whereby the incumbents of high office have climbed—slowly, painfully, rung by rung. Local government has been described as the cradle of American democracy. I submit to you that the units of local government provide the experiences and the training out of which Senators, judges, and Presidents are born.

The dictators of Europe laugh and sneer at democracy and the democratic processes. Writers and speakers in our own land cry out that democracy is on trial. I would submit to you today that democracy is established. It is not on trial. But those of you who would continue the democratic way of life are on trial. You are about to become the defenders of democracy. The functions of that office are exacting. Achievements and success lie yet ahead.

Thus we honor you today, not because of your accomplishments, but because of your promise and your opportunities. We honor you because you have expressed a desire to accept the responsibilities of active citizenship. We honor you because of our expectations. We shall expect you to govern wisely and to obey the mandates of your Government. We shall expect you to create authority and to respect that authority. We shall expect you to

remain free and to honor freedom. This, I submit, is the second challenge of American citizenship.

I have named youth as our most priceless possession. I would now present our most cherished heritage. We of the older generation now invite you to accept joint responsibility in a trust we in turn shared with our fathers. American democracy rests upon a foundation of civil liberties. These rights, I submit, we hold only in trust to be handed on to the unborn generations of American citizens. Among these are the rights to free speech, a free press, and a free conscience; there is the right to assemble freely and to discuss openly our common problems. I would submit also the right to a free public education and the right to choose freely our public servants. I would name, further, the right of the individual to be free in his person and property from the interferences of an arbitrary or meddling government.

These rights constitute the spirit of American Government. These rights are the property of no one man; they are the exclusive possession of no generation. They assume the vastness of time and the limitlessness of space. We, of our generation, received these rights in trust—and, today we share that trust with you. Your citizenship challenges you to defend and to preserve these rights.

Our final charge to you today—the most striking challenge of your citizenship—is that you in accepting these obligations will so conduct yourselves that we who are passing from the scene may be assured that Lincoln did not speak in vain, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." May God bless you and your America.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention and the attention of my colleagues to the following article taken from the column of Mr. Edward Ryan of the May 30th issue of the Washington Post:

SIX HUNDRED AT F. S. A. TO LOSE JOBS IN FUND CUT

About 600 employees of the Farm Security Administration would go out of their jobs under the House-approved relief appropriation for the agency's farm rehabilitation program, officials estimated.

The pay-roll cuts, it was said, would be made in Washington and in the field, but it has not yet been decided how the division would be made between these two groups.

The agency asked the Budget Bureau to approve a $161,000,000 fund for the rehabilitation work, same as the current year. The Bureau cut the estimate to $123,000,000 and the House approved $115,000,000.

Secretary Wallace was reported yesterday to have told the Senate Appropriations Committee, that the impact of war was already hitting hardest the farmers in the lowest-income group which is covered by the F. S. A. rehabilitation program.

Wallace, it was understood, desired the rehabilitation work as a first line of defense for thousands of needy farm families suffering from economic dislocations of the war.

His report to the committee said that farmers who had lost their foothold on the land were becoming hopeless, and fertile ground for social ills which disrupted Europe, and warned that unless they could be helped toward security, their intolerable conditions may prove a threat to democracy.

Here is just one more example of two viewpoints which always seem to be presented at any time a constructive kind of legislation is advanced:

First, you will note how the new dealers try to infer that anyone who votes for a measure which will reduce the number of Federal employees is in the class of the inconsiderate and unholy.

Second, that Mr. Wallace has given the people to understand that the "fifth column" is going to be on the farms of our country unless everyone subscribes to the inefficient, unsound, and unfair program of the Agricultural Department. Mr. Wallace better get the "fifth columnists" out of his own Department, before he starts worrying about them on the farms of this country. I think that it is high time that someone tells Mr. Wallace that the vast majority of the people of this country are becoming aware of the New Deal schemes and that he is not making as much of a political issue out of some of his maneuvers as he thinks he is.

In the first place, if the money which has been appropriated to the Farm Security Administration had been, or would be, used for the rehabilitation of real farmers there would be some sense to it. Instead of doing this the Farm Security Administration first spends millions of dollars in buying up farms for people who have never owned farms before, paying up to $650 an acre for them. The purchaser is not required to make a down payment of a single cent. He gets this money for 40 years at 3 percent interest. At the same time the New Deal has foreclosed 85,000 farms of persons who are already on their farms and are trying to hang onto their homes and their means of making a living.

Mr. Wallace's presence recently at St. Paul indicates that he evidently wants to make a political issue out of this farm foreclosure program. The facts are that the New Deal has had complete control of this situation for 7 years. Mr. Morgenthau went out in 1933 and organized the set-up, and now at the end of the 7 years it seems that they want to shove this over into someone else's lap and blame them for the fact that their whole farm-credit machinery has bogged down. This whole program was a brain child of the Harvard Law and it is just one more of the New Deal chickens that is coming home to roost.

The other fact which is very evident is that, with all this discussion of the social ills, the migration from the Dust Bowl to the Rose Bowl could be easily halted if these millions of dollars that have been appropriated had been used to keep people who were in distress on the farms on which they were living. Instead of such a program the Department of Agriculture has followed one of waste and extravagance and has spent millions of dollars in overhead with nothing to show for their enormous expenditures. These intolerable conditions can very easily be eliminated by simply using the money which is being appropriated for the purposes for which it is appropriated. The time has come when someone should use a little common sense. The so-called Farm Security Administration may be security to a few hand-picked individuals, but up to this time these funds have been used for the further insecurity of the people who are the real farm people and who own and operate their own farms.

This article shows how far Secretary Wallace will go in trying to picture an emergency, which, in fact, is nothing more or less than playing with the misery of the poor. They may bark at the rich but they surely eat off the poor by squandering money which Congress appropriates for the welfare of the poor people of our country.

German Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have heard considerable discussion recently on the subject of the effectiveness of the present German war machine. I am one of those who believe that the Germans started their rearmament program long before Hitler's rise to power. The following article, taken from Economics of the Patent System, by Vaughn, is of particular interest at this time:

About 1920 the War Department made an investigation of patents obtained by German citizens and assigned to Frederick Krupp, of Germany. On May 20, 1921, the War Department authorized the publication of the following:

"The Secretary of War has caused an investigation to be made of the patents and applications for patents recently announced as having been obtained by German citizens and assigned to Frederick

Krupp. The investigation disclosed a rather striking circumstance, in view of the conditions which Germany is supposed to observe as to disarmament and the manufacture of war materials under our treaty obligations.

"Of the 228 patents and applications for patents assigned to Krupps, 26 were found to relate to artillery fire-control devices; 18 to electric-control apparatus; 9 to fuses and projectiles; 6 to gas engines and appurtenances; 17 to guns and their appurtenances; 3 to processes for production of metals; 10 to naval fire-control devices; 3 to projectiles and machines for handling same; 14 to railroad artillery; and the balance to varied uses, most of which might well relate to military use.

"Incident to making this investigation it was noted that a large number of patents and applications for patents had been assigned to numerous other German companies, and a casual examination indicates that a considerable number relate to airplanes and their accessories, chemicals, dyes, radio apparatus, and naval equipment."

The article above goes a long way toward proving that the German nation was obviously engaged in preparing for the present war while other nations throughout the world were attempting to settle their differences peacefully and scrapping their offensive weapons.

The President and the President To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Senator CLAUDE PEPPER at the convention of Young Democrats, Raleigh, N. C., April 29, 1940.

My fellow young Democrats and fellow Americans, as the representative of a State just learning how to be liberal, I am glad to be in the oldest liberal State in the South.

Nine long months ago we young Democrats met in Pittsburgh. That convention was notable because the spirit of North Carolina dominated. For the first time the new liberal forces of youth in this country swept a national convention from start to finish.

We said at that time that the Pittsburgh convention of the young Democrats was of great significance, because it was a mirror of the Democratic convention this July.

We are all sure now that we were right.

When we met on those hot summer evenings many things troubled us in our hearts. We were troubled by the arguments of many honest reactionaries within our own party, who we thought did not appreciate that a sword of Damocles hung over our heads. We were troubled by the sight of men who played the adventurous game of politics for personal power, and made the welfare, even the lives of our fellow citizens, pawns in the game. We were troubled by the intuition, if not the consciousness, that we sat on a powder keg; that our own economic forces were barely stable and yet ran the risk of the tremendous impact of half the world at war at any moment. In this state of affairs we felt the impelling necessity for unity among ourselves—steadfast and earnest unity of purpose—unity of action. We felt that in those serious moments those who held the rank, let alone claimed the name of statesmen, should think first of the interests of the people before they thought of themselves or their class.

We were closer to the truth than even we knew. We thought we could see the sky darkening over Europe. We could not know that we were meeting 3 weeks before the declaration of the second World War.

For 8 months now that war has been fought. By some blessed chance it has not yet broken out in all of its terrible force. But each day brings sadder news of an enlarging and intensified conflict, and each day we know that the task of keeping America at peace grows harder.

Those sentiments which we felt at Pittsburgh are now doubly true. If it were dangerous then to our country's welfare to indulge in petty, personal politics, it is doubly, aye, triply, dangerous now. If it were destructive then to shake the confidence of the people in a leader who was their only hope, now to do so is disastrous. If we were heavy hearted then because of those who were blind and could not see or worse, those who were blind because they wouldn't see, we are doubly sad if there are any such men now to raise their voices and claim the right to lead.

If we were intolerant then of men who jockeyed for the power of the White House, who boasted that they could step into the Presidency and carry on the amazingly skillful and intricate job that the President is doing, we must be doubly intolerant now, when we realize what that job means to youth and to youth's future world.

When we were at Pittsburgh, the conservatives of our party—the men who were telling us to let them save the country and the world by doing nothing for either—these conservatives told us that our country was tired; that we had been going at too fast a pace, that what we needed to do to have national unity was not to work together but to sleep together.

These old prophets of an old order, who claimed to possess all wisdom, told us that we might as well bury the carcass of the New Deal, because the body was dead. They told us that there was nothing else for Government to do; that there were no challenging problems which required assault by the whole Nation. They told us that there was no upheaval in our own economy threatened; that there was no real danger that people would seriously protest against poverty, against undernourishment, against pellagra, against seeing their children die twice as fast as they would if they were better off; against seeing their inheritance of the right to work being perpetually denied them.

These deceived and deceiving prophets of repudiated doctrines were telling us that there wasn't anything to this argument about machines having disordered the old ways of the world, the ways that men knew and understood; that it wasn't so that there were strange new forces, material and mental, loose in the earth; that we were foolish alarmists who talked about trying to put our house in order against a war which might engulf civilization, because, said they, there wasn't going to be any war—at least, there wasn't going to be any war if Roosevelt did not cause it.

These arguments weren't very convincing to us young Democrats at Pittsburgh, because we young Democrats had not been out of personal touch with real people in this country as long as some men have who have spent a lifetime in Washington, where they have lived well and been honored. And because we young Democrats knew that the real alarmists, the real false alarmists, were those who tried to frighten the people of their country by telling them that all was lost if they did not immediately go back again to the days when they lost all or nearly all. We knew that their gloomy prophecies about most other things were no more true about Roosevelt having destroyed business, even big business in America. For we read the newspapers and we read the headlines which told the same story that the financial page of the New York Times yesterday told, under the headline "250 corporations raise profits 50 percent."

We read magazines which tell the same story that the Wall Street Journal told a little bit ago, in saying that the profits of the first thousand representative corporations as compiled by the National City Bank, showed earnings in 1937 of 8 percent on net worth as compared to 6.6 percent in 1927 when enterprise was as free as the eagle, and 9 percent in 1929.

We knew that Roosevelt had been the best friend business, even big business, ever had in the White House, because we knew that the only way that big business can live is for little business to thrive, and Roosevelt was the first President in 20 years upon whose retina little business has been able to register an image.

We Young Democrats at Pittsburgh did not take these doleful prophets of gloom very seriously when they talked about debt ruining our future, because we were just curious enough to look into that dirge of debt a little bit. And when we did we were pretty well satisfied, for we found that our generation owed altogether two and one-quarter billion dollars less than we owed altogether in 1932, and we were realistic enough not to be deceived by thinking that we really owed less if the Federal Government owed less but our cities and districts and counties and States and private corporations owed more.

And when we heard these statesmen singing a song about as cheerful as The Prisoners' Song about balancing the Budget, we Young Democrats were just impertinent enough to ask, "Whose budget are you talking about balancing?"

We are interested in balancing our generation's budget. All that is ahead is our inheritance—it is the estate that posterity has left us, and what we are interested in is the condition of that estate. Have we an honest trustee? Has it been well administered, so that its corpus has been preserved, or has it been neglected while the trustee thought only of his commissions?

We Young Democrats have not been very long out of school, and we still read some of these books that these college professors write, and some of these papers that men who spend their lives in these laboratories write, and we even read some of these magazines that tell us something about the marvels of our age, and we know that things aren't like they used to be. We know that a long time ago, about all a nation needed to get along was wood and wind and water, and then a little later, about our grandfather's and even our father's time, about all they needed was coal and iron and mechanical power, but we know now that the world isn't that simple any longer. We have actually been in chemistry laboratories occasionally, and we know that now it takes all kinds of things from all parts of the world to keep us going—all kinds of materials and all kinds of energies.

And we know that our world now is not as large as the Atlantic seaboard was in Washington's time, or as France was in Napoleon's time.

And we know that peculiar things have happened in what we call our economic life, because we know, for example, that in North Carolina the number of spindles needed to turn out a given quantity

of goods is very much less than a few years ago, and the number of men it takes to turn out a given quantity of goods is very much smaller than were required just a little while ago. So it is easy for us to see that that means that two great pyramids have already grown up in our economic life. One of them is the pyramid of unused money, and the other is the pyramid of unused men. We know that that situation cannot be solved by just doing nothing.

We have seen democracy lost because it just did nothing about that sort of thing. We have seen people trade their liberty for jobs, trade their independence for security, even from dictatorship. We have seen men who dreamed of getting a chance to live under a democracy, who fought to be able to be a part of a democracy, scorn it and think it was a shibboleth because it did not govern when it had a sacred duty to govern.

We do not mean to be disrespectful of our old leaders, but we are not blind and we know they not only did not do anything about these things, but they did not even see these things; or if they saw them, they did not care enough to do very much about them.

But we do know, thank God, about Franklin D. Roosevelt. We do know that he sees these things that we see, and that he has been doing something about them, even against the doleful prophets who speak for the dead.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, we know, has saved our inheritance for us. He did not let our estate, handed down to us by the blood of our forbears, the kind of forbears who shed their blood at Kings Mountain, the kind of forbears who gave us the declaration of Mecklenburg, collapse and fall to pieces. He has lightened our debt. He has conserved our resources when they were being squandered by an irresponsible trustee. He has made us healthier. He has thrown a lot of the rotten apples out of the barrel of our national life, and gently enough, but nevertheless realistically, he has kicked in the pants a lot of fellows who were snooping around trying to steal most of the good apples that were left in the barrel.

And it gives us no little satisfaction to know that he is the one fellow that even dictators don't kick around very much.

Roosevelt suits us Young Democrats, just as he suits the older Democrats like your fine Governor here, who has just issued a statement approving Roosevelt. Roosevelt suits us as he suits the people of America, because he has got what we like. He knows what it is all about. He is a real man. He's got guts, and he's got a heart in him, as we say down here in the South, as big as a mule. He, like George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, and Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, is one of these men who came from the upper classes to be the champion of the lower, which, without irreverence, suggests something like the example of the Master.

Most of us, being practical fellows, like Roosevelt because he has made democracy work. He has actually made it feed and clothe and shelter people. He has made it the instrument to better the conditions of all the people. Literally, he has made democracy the agency to achieve all those fine things recited in the preamble of our Constitution, "To form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

We see the other major nations of the world at war and we know that we are at peace.

We see young men in other nations of the world under arms. We follow the pursuits of peace. We see other nations spending their substance in war, while we employ our resources to raise the standards of living of our people. We see liberty gone in most of the rest of the world, while we enjoy it here as a matter of course.

We see freedom of the press, of speech, of worship, of assembly, of thinking gone from other peoples, while we make freedom a footmat for abuse.

We see youth in other parts of the world hopeless, while we here are more hopeful of the future of our country than we have ever been.

Roosevelt is that hope.

At Pittsburgh we demanded a third term for Roosevelt's ideas. Now young Democrats and all Democrats of America and all Americans who love the democratic way demand a third term for Roosevelt.

We will not give up Roosevelt until these new rights—"the right to a job, the right to security in times of private employment and in old age, the right to a decent home, the right to an education, the right to bargain collectively with the boss, the right to enough to eat, the right to adequate pay, the right to sell the products of the farmer's toil at a fair price, the right to security of savings, the right to security of home and family, the right to a fair share of the Nation's resources and to protection against their exploitation"—until these new freedoms, until these new deals to the American people are secure, until they are accepted and in the bedrock of our life.

These new principles are stones in the edifice of a new life for our generation bearing Franklin D. Roosevelt's own craftsman's mark, and we will not give up Roosevelt until they are laid in the mortar of permanence and inviolability.

We know that these new rights have not been given to us. They have been dearly bought with sacrifice, with brave, courageous effort, and with money.

The Chinese Ambassador recently said that China had traded space for time. As Mrs. Roosevelt said, "We have traded money for time." Time for our economic structure to be modified according to modern technological demands. Time for our economy to be adjusted to the mastery of the machine. Time for our people to learn new skills and to make physical and mental adaptations to this strange new world. Time for the democratic process to assimilate the modern method. Time for the world to regain its sanity. Time for the mad dogs of dictator imperialism to be leashed. Time for men to learn the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We have invested that money in our faith in humanity, in our hope that man will live to keep his rendezvous with destiny. By it we are saving America. We believe in our hearts we are helping to save God's world.

We see leaders in the old world, we hear would-be leaders in our world telling the people not to trade money for time and what time brings. We see what happened to nations that took the counsel of those leaders and who, like Midas of old, lost all their gold because they were too greedy for more. Our minds and our hearts tell us that the same tragedy would befall those who would follow the modern pied pipers.

Who would have back that money and have war; who would have back that money and have revolution; who would have back that money and have economic chaos, mental and spiritual demoralization?

The people of America know an inspired leader when they see him. They know the difference between a fakir and a President in the White House. They know how to judge men and with a rare intuition they sense men whom they can trust and follow with consummate devotion.

Only Lincoln, a new dealer ahead of his time, led America through a darker hour than has Roosevelt. The people trust him now as they trust no other public man in America. They will follow him now as they will follow no other American. They will unite behind him as they will behind no other leader. He is their rendezvous with destiny, and they are determined to keep him.

It is usual to hear these days a mournful song of confidence. One is not in good standing in the business world, I imagine, unless he frequents the wailing wall at which his comrades wail for "confidence." They have not succeeded in restoring the people's confidence in the leadership of big business because its record does not deserve the people's confidence. But there is a need for confidence. It is the confidence of business that it will have customers. It is the confidence of the people that they will be able to buy. It is the confidence of the people in their leader. It is the confidence of the people in their democracy. It is the confidence of the people in their country.

There are yet dark days ahead—days maybe darker than any we have heretofore seen. We may have to go down to the valley of the shadow of death. The way down may be a long road, and the way up longer still. We will need to grasp a firm hand. We will need to hear a strong voice. We will need a light to follow. I believe in my heart that if the people of America, the masses of America, felt that they had to go through a great ordeal, either in domestic or foreign affairs, they would rather have Franklin D. Roosevelt their leader than any man born of woman who lives and whom they know today. That kind of confidence is what gives us national solidarity—gives us strength for the future.

Those who fear a third term have short memories. They forget that Senator Fess, a scholarly Republican, demanded that Coolidge be drafted while able Senator Pepper (Republican and no kin), of Pennsylvania, said that the third-term objection had become nebulous. That Congressman Snell, Republican leader of the House and permanent chairman of the 1932 and 1936 Republican Conventions, said "everybody wants Coolidge." Even "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton" hoped Coolidge would consent to run if the convention were deadlocked That rather conservative figure, Herbert Hoover, the rather honorable and respected Chief Justice of the United States, Charles E. Hughes, that rather substantial businessman, Henry Ford, that rather respected businessman, Odgen L. Mills, they were all among the "draft Coolidge for a third term" clan. Secretary Ickes, at the National Editors' dinner a week ago, reminded Glenn Frank, "brain truster" of the Republican National Committee and who now views Roosevelt with alarm, that both of them eloquently supported Theodore Roosevelt for a third term.

Able Senator TAFT, who aspires to follow his father in the White House, must have forgotten that his father wanted Theodore Roosevelt to run for a third term, and himself finally took an only term so as to give Theodore Roosevelt a third term, vicariously or by proxy.

We who have read our history relatively recently learned that George Washington for 8 years was the Commander in Chief of the Armies in our struggling cause. Then he was the moral leader who bridged the gap and between the end of the Revolution and the establishment of the Constitution. And then for 8 years more he was the President of his new country. Thomas Jefferson, too, for many more than 8 years was President, actually or by proxy. Andrew Jackson for more than 8 years was President personally or through Van Buren.

There are some streams which are more than 8 years wide.

There have been three great crises, I would say, in American history: Washington winning our Nation, Lincoln saving our Union, Roosevelt saving our country. What would people have said about Lincoln having a third term if his second term had ended with Appomattox? We here, in the South, you and I, whose grandfathers and grandmothers, or maybe whose fathers and mothers,

went through the crucible of reconstruction, we know that if he could have been spared to do it, Lincoln would have done the job of restoration.

Roosevelt is no candidate for office. There are no more honors in America to heap upon him, no more homage could they give him if he lived forever as President than the people have given him in the dark hours of their trial. But Roosevelt is the people's candidate for 4 more years in the White House—until we can see through the clouds. In this great world crisis they trust Roosevelt to guide us the best way that mortal man can guide us. They know that he knows more about the sad evolution of events that have led to this day than any other man who might take his place. They know that not ambition, but duty, would keep him in the White House if the people called, because he is not a man who shirks duty.

Involved in the choice we make is the essential principle of democracy—the right of the people to choose their own leader; the right of the people to go the new way, the way they want to go in life and in government; the right of the people to plan their own future the democratic way, and particularly the right of young men and women to preserve their inheritance.

Tonight as I look into the faces of the young men and women my mind turns principally to contemplate America's future. To me what I see is America unlimited. It is not a dying America—it is a living America. But what makes it a growing America is not its fast-diminishing resources but the vision and the planning and the courage of its people—its new-minded men and women.

My mind turns back to what you and I would have seen if we had lived in 1860 and had looked at the little country of Sweden, already densely populated, on the other side of the water, and at this great United States of America, sprawling across a continent. The areas beyond the Mississippi, those fertile fields, those rich resources, were not yet touched. Those broad rivers ran on, unchecked by dams and turbines. Their backs were yet unburdened with the loads of trade or travel. Would anyone have said in 1860 that between that day and this, Swedish manufacturing would have grown more rapidly than ours? And yet such is the astonishing fact.

When we look inside of that remarkable country we find that what has made it grow has not been its natural resources but its people, and how they have planned and lived by cooperation.

As Dr. Kreps recently said at the Temporary National Economic Committee, "They have had a 'reserve works' system—a W. P. A., if you like—since 1866, based on a national resources survey made in 1752. They have about the lowest tariff in the world. They initiated a national power system under a water-power administration in 1909 (with scores of municipal and cooperative distributing plants (T. V. A.)). A governmental power network gridirons the whole nation, with rural electrification covering 60 percent of the farms (as opposed to less than 20 percent here). They have had a managed currency since 1920 and frankly scoff at the gold standard. The state is a partner in the largest iron mines in the country—those now of such importance to Germany.

"Tobacco profits are used to finance old-age pensions, which they have had for decades, together with unemployment insurance and other forms of social security. The state owns the trunk-line railways, the telegraph and telephone systems, and most of the forests. They have had the basic elements of the A. A. A. since 1928. Their system of state liquor control compares favorbly with that of any country in the world.

"Their governmental aerotransport company has not had a fatal accident in 12 years. They have had full collective bargaining for decades and since 1909, when Hjalmar Branting came into power (by the way, to settle a general strike which the King refused to stamp out by violence or bloodshed), Sweden has been governed most of the time by its L. O.—Landsorganisetionen—with the slogan 'The same possibilities for living securely within the fatherland for all those who inhabit it.' They have had a consumer cooperative movement that successfully and aggressively attacked and reduced the prices of manufactured goods. In spite of all these obstacles Swedish manufacturing grew faster than that in the United States.

"Those who consider Sweden a special case should look at developments in Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, or any other industrialized country, including Great Britain. Even in that tight little island the increase in real wages from 1840 to 1900 was just as rapid as in the United States."

If this little country shall be able to stand off the dictator it shall be through the strength it has developed in three-quarters of a century of intelligent cooperation through government. With the example of what these countries with vision have been able to do with their scant material, is there any American who does not thrill over the prospects of what we might do if we really save America and really make America what our forefathers dreamed.

Ahead of us lies a vista that challenges the scope of imagination—a future that grasps the fancy and sends the blood racing through the veins of a proud and understanding citizenry. The long road is winding toward the top of the mountain. If we but hold our course, husband our resources for the final climb, spend ourselves in our fidelity to our leader and to our cause, there shall soon burst upon our vision the great valley on the other side.

I conclude my remarks with the words uttered by your own senior Senator, Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia in 1936. True then, and truer now, a tribute in unsurpassed eloquence to the man who is the democratic way for America in the world—these sentiments, the sentiments of North Carolina in 1936, I know are the sentiments of North Carolina now:

"Mr. Chairman, gratefully North Carolina seconds the nomination of the candidate without a rival before this convention, without peer in the public service or the hearts of the American people, their voice and their idol, the President and the President to be.

"We hail him as the political redeemer of the American Republic; the vindicator of the rights of the voiceless millions; the restorer of the national faith, and the national unity in that faith; the preserver of democracy and the free institutions in our land when they were failing throughout the earth; the man who proved himself the man for America in her darkest hour; the man by every test for her millions as they emerge from the pit and the night once again, thanks to his mighty leadership, and proceed to regain the way to their happy destiny.

"We love him for his manifest sympathy with the people he serves and leads; for his inspired statecraft in grappling with problems and overcoming difficulties and perplexities that threatened to engulf our Nation, and we love him for the enemies he has made.

"We greet their challenge with a cheer. We welcome the hour when we may run before him to meet them hand to hand in his behalf, as he has met them day by day for 3 great years.

"We are confident in the triumph of our cause, assured in the power of its righteousness, inspired by his matchless example, and honored by the knowledge that we have the privilege of sharing with him the highest patriotism and the noblest service in doing what in our power lies to reelect as President, Franklin Roosevelt."

The Kings Canyon National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES OF MARCH 24, 1940

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of my bill for the creation of the Kings Canyon National Park has created widespread favorable comment throughout the Nation, some of which I have heretofore extended and other of which I will hereafter offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Among the interesting articles which have appeared is one which was contained in the March 24th issue of the New York Times, an article which the editors of that great newspaper entitled, "New Park for West."

Because of the accuracy of the factual statements and its excellence in descriptive matter, I ask the consent of the membership of this body that this article be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceeding. I am sure that it will be of historical value in the days to come.

The unanimous consent of the membership being indicated, the article referred to follows:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1940]

NEW PARK FOR WEST—KINGS CANYON, NEAR YOSEMITE AND SEQUOIA IN CALIFORNIA, RUGGED AND SPECTACULAR

When President Roosevelt recently signed the bill H. R. 3794, outdoor-living and outdoor-loving Californians found themselves in possession of a new national park, comprising 454,000 acres of the rugged Kings River area in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and including the present General Grant National Park.

The region included in the new park consists of towering mountains, breath-taking canyons, sapphire-blue lakes and flowered alpine meadows in the gorges of the Kings River. The area lies along the crest of the Sierra Nevada between Sequoia National Park and Yosemite National Park. It is part of the country described by John Muir as the "shining mountains" because of the sparkle of the rocks, the brilliance of the perpetual snows, the shininess of the glaciers, and the brightness of the sun.

Muir, California's beloved naturalist, first proposed in 1891 that this part of the "snowy sawtooth Sierra" be made a national park. Since then the National Park Service, the Sierra Club, other organizations and individuals in California have waged a hard battle for the new park.

PEAKS, CANYONS, LAKES

From the tourist standpoint, this "Alps of America" offers an immense new national playground. The glaciated mountain scenery of the Kings River gorges is unsurpassed. In the park are 40 peaks more than 11,000 feet high and 10 more than 14,000 feet high. Just south is Mount Whitney, 14,468 feet, the highest point

in the United States. The canyons are spangled with nearly 600 lakes.

No purchase land is necessary in the creation of this new national park. It will be carved from the Sierra and the Sequoia National Forests. The administration will merely change from the United States Forest Service to the National Park Service. Boundaries of the new park will be drawn so as to give full protection to the irrigation needs of the San Joaquin ranchers. Future dam sites at Cedar Grove, Tehipite, and Pine Flat will be placed outside the park boundary.

A GREAT WILDERNESS

Plans are to make the new region America's greatest wilderness park. During the past century the wilderness found in California by Jedediah Smith, Kit Carson, General Fremont, and other early explorers has been rapidly vanishing so that today only 600,000 acres of undeveloped mountain area lie more than 10 miles from a road. Dougherty Meadows, within the new park, are said to be the farthest spot in California from a highway.

With this in mind, the National Park Service is planning to make the park a paradise for the hiker and the horseman.

To most Californians the Kings River is a single stream flowing placidly through the fields and farms of the San Joaquin Valley Actually it is formed by the junction of three splendid tributaries—the North, Middle, and South Forks—which have their source among the enormous snow fields and glaciers of the high Sierra.

The park encompasses the watersheds of the South and Middle Forks of the Kings River. Its dominant features are two enormous canyons, similar geologically to those of Yosemite Valley, yet distinctive and unspoiled. These spectacular gorges cut deeply through the body of the Sierra and lead back to the crest of the range through great glacier-sculptured uplands.

A HIGH WALL OF STONE

The summit peaks combine to form a 12,000- to 14,000-foot wall of fantastic stone bearing the white splendor of perpetual snow. To the west of this escarpment lie the expansive alpine shoulders of the range—intricate ridges and divides, hanging valleys, spacious timber-line plateaus. This whole western area is jeweled with myriads of lakes, streams, meadows, and gardens of alpine flowers. To the east is a sudden, breath-taking drop of more than 8,000 feet to the arid Owens Valley and the interminable sea of desert ranges stretching toward the Nevada border.

The Kings River gorges have been compared with the canyons of Yosemite Valley. Both were carved from granite and limestone eons ago by great glaciers. But the gorges of the Kings River possess a personality of their own. Having fewer rock features such as Yosemite's El Capitan and Half Dome, nevertheless the canyon walls contain a magnificent assemblage of carvings even higher and more rugged than those of Yosemite. Outstanding among the rock temples is Tehipite Dome in the Middle Fork—towering above the canyon 3,700 feet, or 100 feet higher than El Capitan.

NEW ROAD TO PARK

A new highway constructed by the State and dedicated last summer provides an entrance way to the park, but only to the South Fork Canyon of the Kings River. The road enters the park but does not cut through it. Only a few square miles in the park will be touched by road. It is the park primeval for those who love their mountains unmotorized, and many vacationists who prefer "roughing it" on hiking and pack trips are expected to explore its miles of unspoiled wilderness.

The road begins at General Grant National Park. It winds around mountain peaks, runs through a 60-year-old forest which has grown up during the last century, plunges into the South Fork through rugged mountain slopes and emerges alongside the rocky, foaming Kings River. Towering on one side are huge limestone mountains, rising thousands of feet in reds, greens, and yellows. Across the gorge on the other side are tree-crowned pinnacles and spires which create the effect of a great silvery cloud hovering on the precipice. The canyon finally widens out into a great bowl at Cedar Grove.

In spite of the luxurious Awahanee Hotel in Yosemite and the new $1,250,000 Timberline Lodge recently built by the United States Forest Service on the slopes of Mount Hood, the National Park Service has pledged that accommodations in the new park will be kept as simple as possible. An unpretentious inn or lodge will be constructed suitable for the person of modest means.

Good hiking and bridle trails will be built to all parts of the new park. Thus the great primitive region may be protected for all time to come and saved for those who would visit it on foot or on horseback. It has been planned to make living in the new park as inexpensive as at a Y. M. C. A. or Boy Scout camp.

Says Frank A. Kittredge, regional director of the National Park Service: "We believe that there is a tremendous future ahead for a wilderness park, such as is in the Kings Canyon country. There is everything there which the hiker could hope to find.

"We feel that there are only comparatively few people who can afford to hire a pack outfit and only a few people who know enough about pack animals to pack in on their own responsibility. There are, however, thousands upon thousands of young men and women, as well as those of mature age, who would like nothing better than to be able to hike leisurely through the park, carrying only their sleeping bags and food for 2 or 3 days. The construction of proper trails and shelters in case of storms and the placement of foodstuffs will be one of the greatest steps forward in the use and enjoyment of this and other great inspirational national parks."

As in other national parks, hunting will not be permitted. Figures show, however, that only 5 percent of all deer bagged in the Sierra and Sequoi National Forests last year came from the area included within the park boundary.

A Bill To Create Division of Aviation Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

STATEMENT EXPLAINING PURPOSES OF PROPOSED ACT

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the bill, H. R. 9974, and wish to include in the RECORD the following explanation of the bill:

The proposed act would establish within the Office of Education of the United States a division of aviation education to conduct research, make studies and investigations with respect to means and methods of promoting and carrying on aviation education, to furnish information and assistance to organizations and schools seeking to promote education, and to cooperate with educational institutions in providing plans and materials for instruction in aeronautics and all its branches.

The division of aviation education would also be empowered to assemble, compile, and maintain for reference and proper distribution records and statistical and other data pertaining to aviation education, opportunities in the field of aviation, and availability of training in aviaton, prepare and distribute material for extension courses, and undertake other functions incident to the promotion of aviation education.

The proposed act would create a committee of 15 members, representing all branches and all functions of aviation and aeronautics, to confer and advise with the director of the division of aviation education on plans and methods of promoting aviation education.

This committee would be made up of representatives of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, Air Transport Association, private flying, soaring, the United States Army Air Corps, the United States Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, the United States Weather Bureau, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Civil Aeronautics Authority, National Aeronautic Association, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, the Airline Pilots Association, and model aircraft work.

The bill proposes an appropriation of only $35,000 for the organization and operation of this office for the fiscal year of 1941.

Events of the past few months, at home and abroad, have proven beyond doubt the necessity for a comprehensive and coordinated program of aviation education in the United States.

Progress in aviation in the United States has been remarkable, when we consider that its progress has been without assistance or inspiration of any coordinating agency and that the only limited aid or encouragement to the field of aviation has been that extended by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Army, and the Navy.

With other sections of the world producing pilots, and trained youth in various branches of aviation, in much larger numbers than have been produced in the United States, it is apparent that some action, sponsored, planned, and directed by a responsible agency, should be undertaken to encourage, aid, and facilitate aviation education in the United States.

Since it naturally becomes an educational function, then it follows that it should be so treated.

The bill that I have introduced in the House seeks to stimulate and rationalize aviation education by bringing together representatives of all branches of aviation voluntarily, under the supervision of the Office of Education of the United States, to plan and stimulate a broad program of training.

This bill makes no effort to force upon any one any program of aviation education which they do not wish. Neither does this bill propose to force aviation education into any schools, public or private. We merely propose that the committee created and given official status by the proposed act, and representing all branches of aviation insofar as is possible, shall prepare and propose an extensive program which any organization, school, or individual interested in any way in aviation education or development might participate under the official aid and guidance of the Commissioner of Education.

The bill seeks further to make available to any organization, school, or individual such data and information as may have been assembled and prepared from studies and research conducted by the Division of Education, on approval of the Commissioner of Education, as may be helpful in furthering and advancing aviation education throughout the Nation.

My bill proposes to make this information, or so much of it as the Commissioner may authorize, available to private schools, as well as public schools, for the reason that these private schools have been carrying the load of aviation education unassisted since the teaching of aviation as a science or study was first undertaken, and, for the further reason that the private schools may be expected in the future to continue to share a very important part of the aviation-education program.

For the sake of public benefit and public safety it appears that such information and data as may result from the research and studies of the Division of Aviation Education should be made available, insofar as that is possible, to private schools and responsible private individuals, as well as to public schools and other agencies of the Government.

Plan for Economic Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the press this morning an article by Dorothy Thompson, noted publicist and commentator, which deserves thoughtful and sober study by every Member of this body.

THE WORLD GERMANICA—PLAN FOR ECONOMIC RULE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Germans have a clear plan of what they intend to do in case of victory. I believe that I know the essential details of that plan. I have heard it from a sufficient number of important Germans and persons closely in touch with important Germans to credit its authenticity, the more so as previous information regarding military strategy which emanated from the same sources has been completely confirmed by the events.

Germany's plan is to make a customs union of Europe, with complete financial and economic control centered in Berlin. This will create at once the largest free-trade area and the largest planned economy in the world. In western Europe alone—Russia is another chapter—there will be an economic unity of 400,000,000 persons, skilled, civilized, white men, with a high standard of living. To these will be added the resources of the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian Empires. These will be pooled, in the name of Europa Germanica.

The Germans count upon political power following economic power, and not vice versa. Territorial changes do not concern them, because there will be no France or England, except as language groups. Little immediate concern is felt regarding political organizations. The Belgian King will remain on his throne, and may be rewarded with the throne of Holland. Mussolini will remain on his balcony and Victor Emanuel on his throne; other governments will be set up, but no nation will have the control of its own financial or economic system or of its customs.

The nazification of all countries will be accomplished by economic pressure. In all countries contacts have been established long ago with sympathetic businessmen and industrialists, and those who have been openly hostile will be punished by boycott. The German occupation armies will fraternize with the Allied soldiers and persuade them that the great social revolution has occurred.

As far as the United States is concerned, the planners of the World Germanica laugh off the idea of any armed invasion. They say that it will be completely unnecessary to take military action against the United States in order to force it to play ball with this system. They point out that there will be no other foreign market for the raw materials and agricultural products of the United States, since these can hardly be sold in the Western Hemisphere.

Here, as in every other country, they have established relations with numerous industries and commercial organizations, to whom they will offer advantages in cooperation with Germany. Certain conditions will have to be met. No orders will be taken from or given to firms headed by personalities unfavorably regarded by the Nazis. No advertising contracts will be placed with newspapers directed by or publishing the work of pro-Ally or anti-Nazi editors or writers.

(This is exactly the way in which they have already swung into line the press of southeastern Europe.)

The immense gold reserve of the United States will be, obviously, worthless. The international currency will be a managed currency, the German mark, and all external trade will be based upon barter. This new world-wide complex will want raw materials, and will pay for them in manufactured goods. The United States will become an economic colony, for its economic independence will be lost. There will be immense demands upon the Southern and Middle Western States for cotton, wheat, etc., and upon the mineral wealth of this country, which they will take at high prices measured in terms of manufactured articles. The German planners predict a stampede of the South to collaborate with this system. This stampede will be fostered and directed by their agents.

South America will be conquered by business agents, not by guns. The plantation owners will be asked by the Germans whether they want to sell their meat, cotton, and raw materials to Germany in exchange for machinery, industrial material, automobiles, etc., or whether they want to be boycotted. Inasmuch as the chief market of South America is Europe—and obviously the United States cannot take these products, which compete with our own—they count on the complete break-down of the Western Hemisphere policy. "America," they say, "will be reduced to attempting to conquer all the arts of economic persuasion at our command. We shall be the peacemakers, and they the war makers." The economic penetration has already been established in all South American countries and in Mexico, and will be accompanied by political ultimatums and propaganda activities.

Germany will be the industrial and financial dynamo at the center of all this, with special privileges. Reference is made to the American Civil War, to the conquest of the industrial North over the agricultural South. France will be kept to agriculture and the manufacture of quality goods. She can still make dresses and women's handbags.

London is to cease to be a financial center, but will be the chief commercial center, under Nazi domination. When it is possible to find pro-Nazis of French, British, or other nationality, they will be put into power in their own countries. Otherwise, German governors will be put in. In any case, all political activities will be quietly watched by the Gestapo.

To accomplish all this it is necessary to complete a total war against Britain and France. Original plans were to drive through to the Channel ports and offer a separate peace to France. The progress of the German Armies, however, now leads the German generals to the belief that they can deal a knockout blow to both London and Paris.

The former is to be accomplished by the invasion of Britain at a time when her very meager army is decimated. The Nazis intend to blast a channel or channels across the Channel—corridors across the corridor--probably from Antwerp or Calais. They will sweep mines from a fairly narrow channel with speedboats and submarines and heavily mine both sides of it, transporting troops under the cross-channel fire of heavy guns of a size and range not yet used in this war.

Nazi troops now concentrated in Norway will be used for the invasion, simultaneously, of Scotland. Invasion will be by giant submarines, boats, and planes.

Assault troops will be landed at the same time at half a dozen points along the coast. The Nazis have speedboats which can carry 200 men and can cross several times a night.

They consider London the easiest city in the world to invade once the troops have landed. The roads approaching it are undefended, many major highways and numerous small roads converge upon it and are connected with cross roads through which

several units can approach at the same time and retain communication with one another.

All operations will be accompanied by terrific air attacks.

The British Isles will be held as hostage for the empire and the fleet. It is contemplated that the fleet will be scuttled or will go to Canada. "But no new stand can be made in Egypt or in Canada or elsewhere in the empire or among the commonwealths because we shall have the British Isles at our mercy, with the entire population. We will destroy the ports and cut them off from food. They can either sign on our terms or be systematically ausgerotted and starved."

The Nazis believe in the system of hostages. They now admit that they tried it first with the Jews to see whether world Jewry would buy out its coreligionists. They thus demonstrated that the humanitarian impulses of the world are one of their own most useful weapons.

Russia will not be invaded. "We have no interest in the political system. Stalin will work with us. We are only interested in the organization of the Russian transport system in increasing the production of the oil wells and exploiting minerals. Russia is full of our engineers and more of them will be welcome. The Russian system is all right, but it needs Nazi discipline and German technical skill to exploit it. Slavs cannot organize."

They do not believe that the proletarian workers in any country will seriously oppose them—even if they could. They argue that the tendency in all democracies demonstrates that workers only want to eat and have work, and care nothing for national matters or for individual liberty. What remnants are left of the pre-Hitlerian epoch myths will be terrorized out of the workers by the Gestapo. "And," they add, "there is nothing that capitalists will not do, if profitable. Democracies have taught their people, workers or corporation chiefs, to believe only in money.

And, finally, only the master race, the Germans, will be allowed to bear arms. If, however, the United States wants to concur, all armaments can be radically reduced.

The Pinnacle of Lunacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM ELLERY SEDGWICK, ESQUIRE, AND REPLY OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BEVERLY, MASS., *May 30, 1940.*

Hon. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM:

The foreign policies you have confidently and no doubt conscientiously supported for 20 years have now brought us to the brink of disaster. Will you now push us over? In time the public always learns the truth, and just when the victory of sane domestic policies seems certain at the polls the conviction that under isolationists' leadership world democracy is in deadly peril stands fatally in the path of Republican victory.

ELLERY SEDGWICK.

MAY 30, 1940.

Mr. ELLERY SEDGWICK,

14 Walnut Street, Boston, Mass.:

Yours. We have not been neutral but in recent years constantly intervening in the political affairs of other nations, with certain disaster ahead for ourselves. What you term isolationism I term noninterventionism. No country can be half in war and half out of war. It is patently disloyal to the American people to involve them in war, and that is what the present policies are doing. War means the setting up of a dictatorship, the abolition of free economy, the imposition of censorship and espionage; in short, the establishment of a totalitarian government here to fight totalitarian governments elsewhere. This would be the pinnacle of lunacy for a country which believes in liberty and freedom and can maintain its neutrality and preserve its integrity. Our highest duty is to keep democracy alive here. I do not see that we have a duty to endeavor with fire and sword to maintain our form of government everywhere in the world. It is a fight lost before begun.

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

The United States and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE MONTANA SCHOOL OF MINES

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address made by me at the commencement exercises at the Montana School of Mines at Butte, Mont., on Friday evening, May 31, 1940, upon the subject of the United States and the War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Ayers, President Thomson, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, and students, may I express my deep appreciation of the honor you have conferred upon me and the genuine pleasure that I experience in making the commencement address to this justly celebrated mining college. I would much prefer to speak to you who live in this great mining center on matters of interest and encouragement with regard to mining. Metals are the most essential substances on earth. The evolution of civilization has followed the discovery, mining, and beneficiation of metals. Wars are won today with metals. We of the intermountain country with its vast mineral resources will contribute our part to the defense of our country. It has been deemed advisable, however, that as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, I should address you with regard to the United States and the European war. I approach this subject cautiously as no sympathizer with the cause of Great Britain and France will prophesy its end or but conjecture as to its possible serious effect upon the United States and the rest of the world.

During the last 3 weeks we have witnessed the "blitzkrieg". We had heard this word repeated many times, and in general we understood its definition. And yet may I say that not even the President, who has watched the course of events most carefully during 7 years and is peculiarly qualified to analyze its course, could have imagined the rapid kaleidoscope of death and destruction that has taken place in 3 weeks. Without notice, on the early morning of May 10, while the peaceful people of the Netherlands were wrapped in sleep, Hitler's vast fleet of airplanes bore down upon the air fields, the homes, and the public buildings of Holland. Parachute soldiers by the thousands jumped from airplanes, landed at strategic points, and opened up their streams of death and destruction with machine guns. This was a new and strange movement in war, and no one was prepared to meet it. As daylight came amid death and destruction, terrified people saw great lines of steel monsters moving at incredible speed, belching shot and shell and fire. Tanks were used during the World War, but these incredible instruments of death were new. In a brief time the lives of 100,000 people of the Netherlands were destroyed, and countless men, women, and children wounded and wracked to the point of death. Tanks and armored cars followed by a horde of infantry swept across Holland laying waste as they went. Holland's gallant army of 500,000 men was dispersed and their efforts were made futile.

Over into Belgium flew the flock of planes, attacking the gallant Belgian Army from above with bombs and machine guns, while the tanks with their instruments of destruction shot down and crushed everything in their way. Another great army similarly equipped went through Luxemburg without resistance, the "fifth column" having prepared the way. Into France pushed and pounded these monsters of steel and destruction, while the airplanes rained death upon the mobilizing French Army. And these forces proceeded with but little opposition until they were within 60 miles of Paris. And then this great German mechanized army whirled to the right, driving everything before it, and occupied vital portions of the French coast across the channel from England.

The Netherlands had an excellent army, though small in comparison with that of the Germans. The Belgian forces were well organized, and felt safe for a time at least behind their fortifications. The French Army, of which there is no superior in the world, had made long preparations for defense against a German attack upon its northern border. It is not surprising, however, that these

great armies should have been pushed back. A fanatical genius for 7 long years has lived but for the day he could conquer Great Britain and France and the intervening neutral countries. He has organized a government in which he is supreme ruler. He has subordinated the individual to the state. He has enthused his subjects with the spirit of revenge and the promise of domination of the world. He ruthlessly removed every obstacle to his ambitions and his plans. Christianity was banned, and churches were disorganized. Social, cultural, and political societies were destroyed. Labor organizations were dissolved, and the laborer was compelled to work on such terms as Hitler might dictate. And then his system of rigid training of his officers and his soldiers was instituted and maintained under absolute discipline. He called into the service of the Government every inventor, ever scientist, and every genius. All were working to one end—the creation of an invincible instrument of destruction and conquest. These inventors and scientists created powerful new instruments of war.

It seems strange that the governments of Europe did not become aware of the extraordinary preparations for conquest that Hitler was making and take steps to defend their countries. The fact remains, however, that they did not provide adequate protection to defend against Hitler's overpowering attack. The French generals in 1935, when Hitler marched into the Rhineland, urged that he be driven out. It is reported, and with some authority, that the British Government objected on the grounds that they were not prepared for war. That was in 1935. From that time on Hitler steadily advanced in his plans of conquest. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium were subjugated.

Again, strange as it may seem, Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain, while charging that Hitler had deceived him at the time of the surrender of the Sudetenland, apparently after that still had trust in his protestations. There were some of us who denounced Hitler 14 months ago and urged that it was possible for him either individually or in cooperation with other totalitarian powers to dominate Europe and Asia, and that it was our duty to prepare to defend against that which might come after. It is true that it was only a supposition and there was little reason for those in the United States to give credence to such assertions. But we were far away from the conspiracies that Hitler was preparing against the world. Great Britain and France were very close. The same excuse does not exist as to them.

We may dream as to what might have been, but it is our duty today to face the facts as they affect the welfare of the United States today. The conquest of Hitler was once far away; it is nearer now. We have witnessed the tremendous effect of airplanes. We must realize that it is possible for Hitler to bomb and destroy our cities, munitions plants, and factories. It is hardly practicable, but it is possible. Of course, he could not conquer this country with airships alone. And, if such an attempt were made to bomb and destroy, we realize now that we have no adequate defense against such an attack. We know now that the only adequate defense against an attack by airships is by airships. Our air fleet is insignificant. We realize now that we have only sufficient antiaircraft guns to defend the city of New York. Our Army consists of only 75,000 men that can be fully equipped at this time. Ten millions of men equipped are in the standing armies of Europe. Without regard to what the result of this war may be, Hitler today dominates not only Germany, but Denmark, Holland, Poland, Belgium, and Czechoslovakia with their millions of people, their natural resources, their shipyards, munition works, and manufacturing plants. These people, their resources, and their manufacturing plants are absolutely at Hitler's command. These people will be required to work in operating those shipyards, munition plants, and factories under such conditions as Hitler may command. And how about the vast manpower and resources of the outlying possessions of the countries he has conquered? They are his also to do with as he pleases. Must we not realize the tremendous power that Hitler possesses, irrespective of whether he conquers Great Britain and France or whether a peace is negotiated?

The only thing that could relieve the United States from the present threat is the defeat of Hitler. At present that does not appear probable. As I said before, Hitler with his accumulated power would be a threat to the United States even if peace were made today, but how much more desperate it would be if Hitler should conquer Great Britain and France and acquire possession of their navies. We would then have a fleet on the Atlantic far superior to our whole fleet, and we'd have a fleet on the Pacific almost equal to the power of our fleet. Let us say that such an occurrence is hardly probable, but still we must admit that it is possible. It is the duty of statesmen in a government representing the people not to take chances on possibilities. I doubt if Hitler even in alliance with other governments would attempt to attack the United States directly in the near future. That is not necessary. Every action of his government has indicated that Hitler longs for the great natural resources of South America. His subjects have gained great power in that continent already, and his "fifth column" has long been active. We would have to determine when his control in southern South America endangered portions of South America nearer to the Panama Canal and our own shores. In self-defense and by reason of our admiration and friendship for the states of South and Central America, and Mexico, we are compelled to aid them against any conquests either from the outside or from the inside. This will be a tremendous burden upon the people of the United States.

And yet if we spent all we have, it would be a cheap price to pay for our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our independence, and our liberty. We will never live under a dictator's heel, deprived of the right to participate in our Government, deprived of the right of the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and our right to worship our God as we see fit.

The situation may be complicated and made more serious by the entry of Italy into the war on the side of Hitler. The King of Italy and his subjects are Christian people who despise the atheism of Hitler. They are opposed to Italy's entering this war. The Pope knows Hitler. He knows he is an atheist. He knows that he has been the most bitter enemy of Christianity in all the world. He knows his unlimited ambition and that he would not hesitate to impose his will upon Italy. Mussolini is looking out for the physical welfare of Italy. Italy was deceived in the last war by the Allies. Mussolini knows that Italy needs colonies possessed of raw resources. These things Italy desperately needs. And, therefore, he may lead Italy into war. That will not increase our hazard very much. I do not believe he has any desire to follow Hitler around the world in his mad career of conquest. Italy would not relish such an undertaking and besides Italy requires her fleet to protect Italy and her possessions on the Mediterranean. Italy will never join in an attack upon the United States either directly or indirectly.

This confused situation in the world is hard to understand even by those who have followed and studied its course. There is a serious situation now facing the United States and our people must trust in their President and their representatives. There is no division in sentiment as to the necessary defense preparations among the loyal citizens of our country. The representatives of our citizens in the House of Representatives and in the Senate realize, as well as does the President, the dangerous situation in which we suddenly find ourselves and the necessity for speedy preparations for defense. This is perfectly illustrated by the fact that every Member of the United States Senate voted for the Army and Navy Appropriations Acts. And remember that these appropriations are the largest ever made by a Congress of the United States in peacetime. Again our people realize now that preparation cannot be made in a month or a year. The capacity of our airship plants must be quadrupled. This will take a long time. It takes two and a half to three years to build a battleship. There must be no politics in our country as affects the great emergency facing us.

We are not preparing with relation to the present war. There would not be time to send soldiers to take part in the present war even if we desired to do so, but the President and the Congress have no such desire or intention.

Great men have ever believed that they were greater than other great men. Even those who have made failures of government are unconscious of it and are convinced in their own minds that they could conduct preparations for defense and even war, if necessary, better than the Chief Executive of the United States, selected twice by an overwhelming vote by our citizens as their leader and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy under our Constitution. These statesmen propose that the conduct of defense preparations and the expenditure of the money appropriated by Congress shall be made by a committee of distinguished businessmen. Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States conducted the most remarkable mobilization of an army of four millions of men more rapidly and more successfully than was ever recorded in history. He mobilized the resources of the United States both economically and industrially. He brought into the services of the Government dollar-a-year men, consisting of the greatest economists, monetary experts, and captains of industry. At the head of the War Industries Board he placed Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, recognized then and now as one of the greatest monetary and industrial experts. Woodrow Wilson's administration of the war and the preparations for war were a glorious tribute to our constitutional form of government. Our country is fortunate indeed that it has in the White House today as its Chief Executive a man who served through the World War as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and who has studied and understands preparation for war and the conduct of war. They are fortunate indeed in having as their Chief Executive a man of action, which quality is required more today than probably any other characteristic in a leader. Let it not be understood that I am attempting to convey the impression that President Roosevelt is the only man that could successfully conduct our Government as Chief Executive. I am simply urging that our people follow the leadership of their constituted authorities. The President has already taken steps, as did Woodrow Wilson, to create a great War Industries Board. He has placed at the head of that Board two of the greatest business executives in the United States. And may I call attention to the fact for the purpose of disclosing that there will be no politics in our preparation for defense that both of these distinguished gentlemen are affiliated with the Republican Party.

We must each and all of us realize that this is our country, that this is our Government, and that the responsibility for its defense falls equally upon each and all of us. Whatever sacrifices must be made we will meet equally and unselfishly. We intend to say to

the world and prove to the world that we love our Constitution and our institutions; that we love our independence and our liberty; that we love the Bill of Rights with its guaranties of freedom of assemblage, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to worship our God as we see fit; and that we will give what we possess, and our lives if necessary, to prevent forever the destruction of these things that we love.

We Have Had Enough of Discord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY WENDELL L. WILLKIE AT AKRON, OHIO

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in these chaotic times it is important that widest circulation be given to the carefully considered views of able and patriotic citizens.

By common consent Wendell L. Willkie has rapidly assumed a position of leadership in thought in this country. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an able and patriotic address delivered by Mr. Willkie before the American Legion Post in Akron, Ohio, on May 28, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have come together here to celebrate our faith in America and to give expression to our patriotism.

Often in gatherings such as this we can most fittingly express our emotions with fine words. We can refresh our minds with new images and derive new strength and resolution from the phrases of patriotic orators.

But today, I fear, our situation is such that fine words and phrases are powerless to celebrate our love for the United States. Today, as sometimes in the past, we are faced with grave decisions involving the destiny of our country. Not what we say here, but how we decide to act, will be written in history. We are faced with the necessity for action.

Twenty-six years ago Germany marched into Belgium. The Kaiser's troops laid waste to peaceful towns, crushed a feeble army, forced their way into France, and were at last stopped in the Battle of the Marne, only 30 miles from Paris. Three years later it seemed to us in America that democracy, our way of life, was in peril. We declared war on German imperialism. We organized the greatest military expedition in history. And we did save the democratic world from destruction.

Today that catastrophe in Belgium is repeating itself on a more gigantic scale. Holland was vanquished in 5 days. Belgium, with an army three times as big as the active force of the United States, was overwhelmed in 10 days. Germany is now striking at Paris and London and democracy is again threatened.

We here in the United States look on, aghast and bewildered. The thoughts that cross our minds are so appalling that few of us dare to speak out. The decisions that we must make are so critical and far-reaching that we scarcely dare to make them. It is a time to try our souls.

EXPERIENCE OF 1917 IS RECALLED

But of all people in the United States, we who are gathered here tonight, together with our living comrades, are most qualified to speak. We know what war is, not from books and not from theory, but in terms of work and danger, sweat and blood.

It fell to us in 1917 to drop our jobs, to submit to discipline, to peel potatoes, to learn the manual of arms, to study ballistics. It fell to us to do a lot of dirty work. It fell to some of us to go over there and get ourselves shot at. And it fell to some of those whom we had grown to love as dearly as our own folks to stay over there under the white crosses and stately monuments.

What is our attitude toward this war? We who decided the last one must answer that question clearly and fearlessly.

First of all, we don't want to get into any war if we can possibly help it. When we turned in our rifles and put our uniforms away in camphor, 22 years ago, we hoped that we had seen the end of war in our lifetime, and for many lifetimes to come.

We were disillusioned about the glories of war and the flag-waving. We felt that we had done a job and we wanted that job to stick. We must not lose our heads now. We must start with the fact that we don't want to go to war, and don't want our sons to go, either.

But while we have been living here in peace, trying to do our peacetime jobs, something has happened in Europe which we could not control. A man has arisen whose thirst for conquest and lust for blood surpass almost any in human history. This man has spent the last 7 years organizing a great nation with one unified aim—to fight, to conquer, and to kill.

To this end he has destroyed representative government, flouted the church, depraved the youth of his country, conscripted labor and built the most terrifying war machine ever devised. While we in America, and our sister democracies in Europe, were trying to make better lives for ourselves, this man was harnessing the energies and ingenuity of 80,000,000 people to his own warlike purposes. And as a result he has gone a great way toward destroying European civilization.

HATE AND FEAR OF HITLER CITED

We don't like this man Adolf Hitler. He isn't our kind of a man. His ideals of war and bloodshed don't fit with our ideals of peace and commerce. The fruits of his labor are hate and death. The fruits of ours are happiness and life. He shall not enter here.

But it isn't only that we hate him. We must also fear him. Let us admit the fact. A direct attack by Hitler on this continent may be highly unlikely—and I believe it is unlikely—but as men who have seen something of war, you and I know that a doughboy trying to stand up against those fast-moving, armored, mechanized troops would have no chance.

We had some mechanization in our war. There were some tanks and airplanes and a few armored cars. And we know how helpless an exposed infantry column may be in the face of those weapons. But in this war those weapons are vastly multiplied, both in numbers and effectiveness. They sweep men down before them like rats. And they have revolutionized the tactics of warfare.

I am not being an alarmist. I am stating a fact. And to this fact there can be only one answer. However firm our resolution may be to stay out of this war, and however remote the chances may be that Germany or some other aggressor will attack our shores, we must set about the business of building a defense for ourselves immediately and without stint.

We cannot leave our shores and our cities exposed to an invader who has so far not hesitated to destroy anything that happened to cross his path. We cannot risk sending our boys against him as poorly equipped as the British and French boys who are defending their countries today. We do not want war. But we cannot have slaughter and destruction.

Let us, then, look at this problem of defense. What do we mean when we say that we must defend ourselves?

There are three separate considerations, and concerning each of them we must be forthright and clear.

The first consideration is that of assistance to the Allies. We can dismiss as entirely academic any thought of going over there to save them from the present emergency. We have no troops to send, and if we had the troops we should lack the equipment.

ALLIES CALLED OUR FIRST DEFENSE

Nevertheless it is clear that England and France constitute our first line of defense against Hitler. If anybody is going to stop Hitler from further aggression, they are the ones who will do it. Just putting the matter in the most selfish light, if Britain and France lick Hitler now, we may be saved billions of dollars, billions of tons of armaments, billions of hours of wasted effort and unfruitful work. Just on the most selfish basis, it is enormously to our advantage to have them win.

It must, therefore, be to our advantage to help them in every way we can, short of declaring war. Our Government has been slow in getting this help to them. One reason for this is that we are industrially unprepared. But another is that no one seems quite clear as to what we should do.

Let us be practical about this. If I were in need and you wanted to help me, what would be your first act? Would you sit down and think up ideas of your own? Or would you ask me in what way you could help me most? Now perhaps through the ordinary channels of diplomacy our Government has asked the Allies this question. But if it has, we, the people, haven't heard about it, and we certainly don't know the answer.

We assume that the Allies want planes, but maybe they also want butter. We don't know whether it would really help them much to repeal the Johnson Act, or whether it would help them to give up some of our own military secrets.

So, I should like to make this proposition. I should like to ask Secretary Hull to ask the democracies, publicly and openly in the name of the American people, what help, short of troops, the American people can give.

If the Allies respond with a request, then we can debate that request on its merits. We can debate it nonpartisanly and nonpolitically as a unified people. Even if we find that we cannot grant it, our public inquiry will have helped Allied morale, will have helped a little to check Hitler.

The second department of national defense is that of our own Military Establishment. Some people seem to think that the present administration ought to be able to pull a big army and a big air force out of its hat. But we must be fair. America has never wanted a big standing army.

NEEDS FOR DEFENSE ARE OUTLINED

Militarism is uncongenial to our way of life. If the administration had sought to build up our Army step by step with those of Europe we should have bitterly opposed it. It is altogether natural and proper that we should confront the present emergency with a small army, a moderate air force, and I believe, a strong navy.

But although we wanted a small army, we did not want an incompetent one. We did not want an army so poorly equipped that, no matter what their bravery, our boys would be run over by a really well-equipped army of comparable size. But this is just what we've got.

On the basis of its present plans, the Army needs 241,000 semiautomatic rifles, which have replaced the old Springfields of our day. As of May 1, 1940, it had on hand only 38,000 of these rifles. The Springfield Arsenal is turning them out at the rate of only 200 per day, which means that the 105,000 now on order will not be produced until September 1941.

An additional 65,000 ordered from the Winchester Arms Co. will not be ready until June 1942. Thus we cannot hope for an adequate peacetime supply of this most elementary weapon for another year and a half.

Maybe it is all right for the politicians to assume that an order for a rifle is the same thing as a rifle. But a doughboy has never been known to make that mistake.

The Army very conservatively estimates that we need 1,400 modernized 75's. But we only have 141 of the modern version of these indispensable guns. We need about 3,800 60-millimeter mortars, but we only have 3.

Our tank equipment is almost ludicrous. We have no modern heavy tanks. The Army wants 700 modern light tanks and only has 10 on hand. It wants 200 modern medium tanks and only has 18 on hand. As for ammunition, the Army needs 74,000,000 rounds for .30-caliber automatic pistols but has on hand only 17,000,000 rounds.

It needs 2,600,000 rounds for the 37-millimeter antiaircraft guns and has only 46,000. It has only about half enough ammunition for the existing 75s. And it needs 1,300,000 gas masks and has only 400,000.

OUR AVIATION TECHNOLOGY HAILED

In aviation technology this country leads the world. Nevertheless, the expansion of this vital industry has been so slow that we have failed to supply our own needs, let alone help the democracies on any significant scale. Our air force is smaller than that of any major European power and a great part of it is more than 2 years old. According to the most optimistic estimates, we are now producing barely 400 planes a month, almost all of them for the Allies.

The vital importance of this arm to the boys on the ground was emphasized in the recent maneuvers of the Third Army in Louisiana. Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, commanding the Blue forces, said that out of 34 missions which he had requested of the Air Corps, only 2 were fulfilled. He made certain recommendations for correcting that weakness. But if such a record had been turned in during actual combat, it could not have been corrected by recommendation. Our boys would have paid for it with their lives.

Surely the administration is not presenting the facts fairly when it tells us that we have a well-equipped, modern Army. Nor, for that matter, has it given us any realistic idea of what a well-equipped Army and a big air force will cost. In spite of our present unpreparedness, our defense expenditures have been enormous.

In the 10 years since 1930 we have spent about $6,600,000,000 on defense. If it has cost that much to get ourselves poorly equipped, how much will it cost to get ourselves really modernized? It is a staggering thought. It means that in addition to the biggest national debt in our history, and on top of big annual deficits, we must carry a huge new burden, the size of which the politicians do not dare to estimate.

A recognition of the size of this burden leads to the third category of national defense, that which can be called industrial defense. By industrial defense I mean our ability to make the equipment that our Army, Navy, and air force so vitally need.

Ours is not a war economy like Hitler's. It is a peacetime economy. Our factories are equipped to produce what you and I want to consume. In order to produce the necessities of war, they must be converted or partially adapted to specialized products for which there is no civilian market.

This is a gigantic task. It requires minute knowledge of each industry. It requires almost infinite planning. It requires intelligent coordination. And above all, it requires that all elements in our society, government, industry, finance, labor, and even the consumer and the taxpayer, work together harmoniously.

Plainly, all defense rests upon industrial defense, without which we cannot produce the equipment that we need. But the keystone of industrial defense is national unity.

National unity is something that money cannot buy. No billions of deficit, no tens of billions of debt, can purchase it.

National unity is something that cannot be conjured up with words. No charmed phrases on the radio can create it.

For 8 years now, by the expenditure of vast sums of money, and by the coining of magic phrases, we have torn this country asunder. A government intent upon raising its own power to the *n*th degreen has pitted the people against business, labor against industry, State against State, pressure group against pressure group.

Our Government has sought power and won it by sowing discord among the people and the people's enterprises. It has spread among the people a great fear of business, and it has spread among businessmen a great fear of the people. The result is industrial and economic demoralization and 10,000,000 unemployed.

This is the heart of the crisis that we are facing today.

We, the people of this country, who own, operate, and work in the 10,000,000 enterprises that the new dealers dismiss as "business," cannot tolerate this discord. We are faced with a crisis perhaps as grave as any in our history. And we say to the new dealers and the troublemakers in Washington:

We believe in ourselves, the American people. We believe in our own ingenuity, our own energies, and our own sense of fairness.

We believe in our American liberties; in our American laws; in our American traditions of free enterprise.

We believe in our industries, which have revolutionized the world and provided us with the widest horizon that any people has ever had.

We believe in our workers, their skill and craftsmanship, their love of a full day's work, their desire for a full opportunity to get ahead.

We believe in our young men and women, their desire to learn, their desire to take their places beside us at the controls of industry, their desire for a new future.

And we believe, finally, that these elements in our society, and all other elements in our society, desire to work together, to build a still greater Nation than the one we have now.

Therefore, we say to the new dealers and the troublemakers: Let us work together. We have had enough of discord.

Let us bring together the industrial brains of this country, and the labor of this country, and the young men and women of this country, and everyone who belongs to this country and lives in it.

And let us take our vast resources out of the earth and transport them to our factories; and let us assign each factory a job for the defense of this Nation; and let us gear these jobs one to the other, so that each will fit, so that there will be a minimum of waste, and so that our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force may be adequately equipped as quickly as possible.

This we recognize as a difficult job. But it is a job that we all want to do. It is a job that we can do, if we work together.

And so we say to you: Bring us together.

Launching of Battleship U. S. S. "Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by me at Philadelphia, Pa., on Saturday, June 1, at the launching of the battleship U. S. S. *Washington,* be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here today to witness the launching of a mighty battleship, the U. S. S. *Washington,* the first one of its class to be added to our fleet in nearly 20 years.

In the name of the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt; the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Charles Edison; and in my own name I extend heartiest congratulations to Rear Admiral A. E. Watson, commandant of this, the fourth naval district, and to the officers and men of the Navy who, by their devotion to the service of their country, their diligence, their skill, and their engineering genius, have made possible this great achievement. I extend congratulations also to the civilian personnel who, with just pride and real enthusiasm, have participated in the building of this battleship.

The construction of a battleship is a tremendous undertaking. The keel of this vessel was laid on June 14, 1938; it will probably be completed in December 1941, and it is estimated to cost approximately $80,000,000.

Battleships, as you know, are named for the several States, but it is singularly appropriate at this hour that this ship, named for the State of Washington, bears also the name of the father and defender of our country.

George Washington was a lover of peace and therefore a firm believer in national defense. It was he who said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." This means that if we really seek and earnestly desire peace we must be stronger than those who seek war.

It is perhaps an anomaly and a contradiction to speak of peace on an occasion like this, when we are launching a battleship. The very purpose for which a ship like this has been built would seem to bespeak militancy and those things which we associate with war. But in the real and American sense this is a superficial view. The policy of preparedness underlying the increases in our Navy, as is evidenced by the launching of this vessel, hides a deep and more

significant meaning. We must understand that meaning to appreciate the real purpose for which we have sought to increase our naval forces. Our Navy is for defense, not for aggression. It is for peace, not war.

We are a peace-loving people. Following the example of those who founded the democratic institutions under which we now live and who charted our first foreign policies, we have sought in our international relations to avoid those alliances, those entanglements with foreign nations which lead to war. We have made some real sacrifices in the name of peace. It is not inappropriate to mention one of them today, namely, the scrapping of 30 naval vessels, including battleships and cruisers which cost approximately $285,000,000, following the Naval Armament Limitations Treaty in 1922.

When we look about and consider the present-day world in which we live, the death struggle for power on one hand and for national existence on the other, the need for providing and maintaining an army, navy, and air force that can adequately protect us against foreign aggression is imperative, an obligation of the most vital and compelling importance if we are to seek safety and security for our Nation.

The American people are determined at all costs to prepare for any eventuality that may follow the European war. We do not seek war. We have no imperialistic designs. We are concerned only with self-protection. Every loyal American insists that our land and our people be not left to the mercy of a foreign aggressor or a combination of foreign powers who might see fit, attracted by our great resources and the wealth within our boundaries, to launch an attack upon us.

This event today is a memorable one in our history. It is the beginning of a renaissance in naval preparedness that will not cease until we have a naval fleet of such size, efficiency, and power that no prospective enemy or group of enemies dare assail us.

Some misunderstandings exist with respect to the present strength of our Navy. The American people should know and fully appreciate the tremendous progress that has been made since we awakened from the "sleeping sickness" that affected us during the years of the naval armament limitation treaties, from 1922 to 1937. In an honest attempt to comply with the spirit of the limitation treaties we permitted our Navy to reach an inferior position. Other nations pursued an opposite course and greatly expanded their naval-construction programs. With the termination of these treaties in December 1936 came an awakening as to the weakness of our position and the need of a large increase in our own naval program.

Since 1933 we have built and added to our fleet a total of 104 combatant ships, including 3 aircraft carriers, 2 heavy cruisers, 9 light cruisers, 62 destroyers, 26 submarines, and 2 gunboats, and, in addition, 7 auxiliary vessels.

We have now under construction 56 combatant ships, which includes the battleship we are launching today and 1 to be launched at New York on June 13, the U. S. S. *North Carolina*.

Our Navy in November 1933 had an aggregate tonnage of a little more than 1,000,000 tons, one-third of which was in the over-age or obsolete category. Our new Navy, which means ships now afloat plus the ones now under construction and plus those which Congress has authorized and which we are going to construct with all possible speed, when completed will have an aggregate tonnage of nearly two and one-fourth million tons and will comprise a balanced Navy of approximately 522 vessels. All new weapons of warfare have had their effect on naval strategy, tactics, and on naval construction. In the case of aircraft, as in the case of weapons such as the torpedo, submarine, and high-powered guns, the threat of attack has been anticipated by the inclusion in naval vessels, from destroyer to battleship, of appropriate counterweapons and powers of resistance. Increased power and effectiveness of antiaircraft batteries, increased speed and maneuvering ability, increased thickness of deck armor, and greater compartmentation, are all characteristics employed to resist air attack.

Air power, in a restricted area, comparatively close to its home bases, has become increasingly effective against ships and shipping within ready range of these bases. In considering this aspect of the war in Europe, we must realize that the British Navy has been forced to operate under the worst possible conditions. It is, of necessity, operating in restricted areas and is subjected at all times to the hazards of shore-based aircraft and small as well as large submarines. Naval forces are always at a disadvantage in operating against land forces.

Due to the limited range of aircraft, our self-sufficiency in food, and our geographical location, the United States is not confronted with a similar situation. Our home ports and shipping centers are not only farther from tenable air bases but they cover a wider area and are available in two oceans.

Manifestly all naval powers have been giving serious consideration to the effectiveness and relative security (ability to remain effective) of naval ships against all threats, including attacks from the air. It is significant that all are continuing their naval building programs. Even admitting the practicability of accurate bombing in the face of determined resistance of air forces and antiaircraft weapons, the heavy bomb, with its restricted ability to penetrate armor plate, is certainly less potent than the heavy shell. That these views are held by all of the principal naval powers, including the belligerents in the present war, is indicated by the recent completion and continued building of battleships, as follows:

1. Germany recently completed two and has four under construction.
2. Italy likewise has recently completed two and has two building.
3. Japan, while not having completed any recently, we have positive information that she is building four battleships, but it is believed that she actually has eight or more under construction.
4. Great Britain has nine battleships building.
5. France has recently completed two and has four under construction.
6. United States has completed one today, another will be completed on June 13, and we have six under construction.

Some have questioned the vulnerability of battleships to attack from the air and as to whether, in the light of present-day offensive power of aircraft, battleships have ceased to be of a military value commensurate with their enormous cost.

The fact still remains that the battleship ever has been and, as far as can be foreseen, ever will be the supreme embodiment of sea power. The battleship is the least vulnerable of any vessel against air or any other form of attack. It is the most formidable and hardest hitting. It is a fortress at sea. It is capable of withstanding maximum punishment from guns, torpedoes, mines, and bombs. No fleet can afford to lack them if they are a component part of an enemy's fleet. As a reserve in power and as a rallying point for all other types of warship, the battleship is yet the backbone of sea power. Under no circumstances should the United States abandon its battleships until every country in the world has done likewise.

It is British preponderance of naval power that has gained control of seaborne trade and denied this trade to Germany. It is Germany's preponderance of air power which threatens Allied and neutral trade in comparatively restricted zones near German bases. Neither of these facts points to the obsolescence of surface men-of-war or the superiority of air power. They merely point to the restricted effectiveness of unbalanced military or naval forces.

In considering at this time the question of air power versus sea power, the following must be kept in mind:

(a) Our situation is entirely different from that of the British.

(b) Germany's air power from the very beginning of the war has been greatly superior to British air power.

(c) For a period of about 8 months, British sea power has held a greatly superior air force in check, and without this sea power Britain today would probably be another Poland.

Our program for expanding and strengthening our national defenses at every point and by every means is planned to give full recognition of the prime importance of aircraft and its important place in military and naval establishments. No force ashore or afloat can afford under any circumstances to be without ample aircraft support. We are proceeding on that basis.

But there is not a particle of evidence to support the theory that aircraft alone can supply the primary defense needs of our country. Indeed, we can be very positive that such is not the case.

As to the comparative value from our national-defense standpoint of battleships and aircraft, the answer is that each complements the other and both are indispensable.

An adequate navy, capable of meeting and defeating an enemy's navy at sea, is the only sure way that war can be kept at a safe distance from our coasts and the only sure way to bring the war to a close.

We live in a dynamic, not a static world. Undoubtedly the facts will change. More powerful explosives may be developed, more efficient fuels may become available, which will increase many times the effective radius of action of aircraft, submarines, and surface craft, or other more effective weapons of war may be invented.

If the basic facts change, we must reorient ourselves to new situations, reevaluate the facts, and readjust our Military Establishments to meet these new conditions.

I know of no more appropriate message to give to the American people on this historic occasion than to urge them to a reawakening of the spirit of the founders of our Nation. Let us dedicate ourselves, as they did, to the preservation of the truths and political principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence. After proclaiming to the world the great inalienable truths which are the foundation of our freedom, the bedrock of our democratic institutions, and the reservoir from which our greatness and prosperity has sprung, each of the 56 patriots signed his name to that immortal document. The last sentence, immediately preceding the signatures, is inspiring and indicative of the spirit of supreme sacrifice which justified their struggle for independence. I quote: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In the present world crisis, with gloom and despair encircling us, with uncertainty as to the future, let every American, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, pledge his honor, his fortune, and his life to the building up of the defenses of our country, to the end that we may be impregnable against invasion and thereby preserve our lives, our homes, and our priceless free institutions.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered over the Columbia network on June 1 by Mr. Henry R. Luce, editor of Time and Life magazines, on the international situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, was this the speech made by Mr. Luce which was really advocating that we get into the war?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not so construe the speech of Mr. Luce although it speaks for itself.

Mr. WHEELER. I read the speech, and if it was not a speech which practically advocated that we get into the war, I do not know what it was. But I have not any objection to it going into the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent has already been given.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

The address is as follows:

I want to talk about what we can do to meet the crisis and to overcome it.

The gigantic conflict now raging threatens our national existence in any particular you may wish to name. If you are one who loves America, then there is nothing that you like or are interested in which is not already gravely threatened by this struggle. For example, if you like our standard of living—not as high as it should be, but by far the highest in the world—then that standard of living is gravely threatened. If you are interested in free enterprise, then that is threatened. If you are interested in labor unions, then they are threatened. If you are interested in art and culture, they are threatened. If you are interested in the institutions of self-government, in the right to vote, in trial by jury, in the free press, then all these and more are threatened. And if you are interested in the right to worship God in your own way, then that most definitely is threatened. I do not say the Christian religion can perish. By all the promises we hold most dear, it cannot. But the Christian church can be driven from the face of the earth back into the catacombs.

Now we, the American people, do not choose to surrender our lives to circumstance. We choose to act. Accordingly we must give to our leaders of both parties some rough blueprint of the will and the purpose that is in our hearts, for we have at last a common purpose; for we intend, before many years are passed, we intend to have peace, real peace, in a world of peace.

Here, then, it seems to me, is what we can tell the leaders of a united Nation in broad outline, but in plain English:

First, we are profoundly willing to strive with all our might and main to make our democracy work better. We know we must go to work, and work harder. It is no longer a question of finding jobs for the unemployed. We urgently need today the full-time services of every able-bodied man and every able-bodied woman in our land. In the next few months America must and will go back to work.

And, secondly, we know we have to prepare to fight. Yes, we'll not go on wrapping words in cotton and muffling unpleasant sounds by sticking our fingers in our ears. We won't be fooled by the sound of words like "defense" and "safety." The kind of armament we have ordered, the kind our Senate voted for 74 to 0—that kind of armament isn't anything at all like the pearl-handled pistol our maiden aunt might keep under her pillow. We don't expect to buy a war machine out of a show window and hire a chauffeur to run it. We, all of us—brothers and sons and fathers—we are ready to get ready to fight. If you are anything like me, you will hate every inch of the way of armament, every inch of the way until at last we can throw the whole wasteful murderous mess of tanks and guns and bombers into the bottom of the sea. Or most of them anyway. It will be a long, long road. You will hate it to the end—and you will not falter.

But thirdly, the problem which is troubling most of us most is how to help the Allies right now in their back-to-the-wall struggle against Nazi conquest.

Before we can answer that question we have to face frankly what may happen. Suppose Hitler wins—this summer. If Hitler wins, the United States of America will have to make some arrangements for living indefinitely in the same world with Adolf Hitler. Now, it's going to make all the difference how we deal with him. Faced with a triumphant Germany, we are going to hear a lot of plausible talk about how maybe Hitler isn't so bad after all—about how he is going to settle down and paint pictures and be a perfectly sweet benefactor of mankind. Or the words may be different, but that will be the tune. If we deal with the third Reich on a basis of appeasement of any kind, it will follow as sure as night follows day that we will pay for it in blood and tears—in the bloody end of all our democracy. We must deal with Hitler as with an enemy—an enemy of peace—our peace. If Hitler wins, nothing must stop us for one moment from arming ourselves up to the limit. And as we arm and as we deal intelligently and firmly with Hitler, so will we be able to bring comfort and healing to millions of defeated men and women. These men and women will not be defeated in their spirit, and their children will not grow up defeated if we acquit ourselves without fear and without reproach.

Now, secondly, suppose Hitler is not able to bring Great Britain and France to their knees—to his knees—this summer. Then the Allies are likely to win. But how soon they will win and how great their chances are of averting world-wide chaos—that will depend upon how much help we give and how fast we give it. We would give a good deal today for a chance to stop Hitler without going to war ourselves. If we could buy an Allied victory in 1 year for $5,000,000,000 we would be the luckiest people in the world. So, let's make our politicians understand that we don't want to "miss the bus," we want to give the Allies unlimited aid as fast as possible.

But what about now—what about now, this tragic, desperate moment? There is something we can do immediately and do it better now than ever again. We, 130,000,000 American democrats, can stand up and speak our mind. We can strip off our false cloak of neutrality and announce to the world—to the brown men and the black men and the yellow men and to all the white men of the world—that we stand now and so long as any of us shall live we shall continue to stand for democracy, for international law, for the sanctity of treaties, for freedom, for the individual rights of man, for the faith of our fathers. We can make it plain that therefore we, as a nation, one and indissoluble, deeply wish that Hitler's attack may be beaten off, that we, as a nation will continue to refuse to recognize the Nazi domination of free peoples, that we as a nation will continue to oppose, by whatever means seem to us best, the consequences of Nazi victory.

Other proposals have been made. Senator PEPPER. has proposed that the President be authorized to sell to the Allies some of our Army planes to be replaced at any time by planes the Allies have on order here. I favor this proposal. And it might make a difference now. But I am ready, and I think the American people are ready, to be done with little gestures, little hints of how we stand. I think we are ready to speak out plain to tell the world how we honestly feel.

In my opinion, it is vitally important for us to do this now for our own sakes.

It is apparent that we cannot help others with arms—if we ourselves are not armed. It is even truer that we cannot help others spiritually except as our own spiritual house is in order. The American spirit has recently not been in good order. We can now go a long ways toward regaining our spiritual integrity, as God-fearing Democrats, if we stand up and speak our mind now.

How do we do this? We do it by calling upon each of our political leaders to declare himself now on behalf of himself and on behalf of us all. Let every political leader, high and low, speaking for himself and for us, state flatly in his own way (1) that he deeply wishes the defeat of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany; (2) that he will never vote to recognize the Nazi domination of once-free peoples; (3) that he will never in any way give aid and comfort to the Third Reich; (4) that he will continue to oppose by every wise and practical means the consequences of Nazi victory.

Fully realizing his great responsibility, let us, nevertheless, call upon Franklin Roosevelt to make such a statement. It may not be news how he feels. But it will be news that the American people, whom he serves, now want him to say it plain. And, believe me, that news will be like a gospel of hope from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand.

And let us call upon Herbert Hoover, of California, first private citizen of the world—let us call upon him to say it, too. It may be no news that he feels that way, either—but news, great news, that his fellow countrymen want him to say it.

And we will call upon Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, and upon his friend and predecessor as Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, of New York, both of whom, against the terrific weight of apathy and ignorance, have fought with all their hearts and minds to stem the oncoming tide of international lawbreakers. We will call upon KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, far-seeing chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and upon Senate leaders ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, and CHARLES MCNARY, of Oregon, the furthest west of freedom. And we will call upon the most active of our Presidential

candidates—upon Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana, and Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, and Wendell Willkie, of Indiana. And you and I, wherever we are, will call upon every candidate for office in the place where we live—we will call upon them to stand up and speak their minds.

Mr. Hoover once said to me there have not been many times in history, but there have been a few times, when declarations have changed the course of history. This can be one of the times. Rising above all partisanship, let all our first citizens fashion the words which mean faithful comradeship with all men everywhere who work and fight and pray for peace and freedom.

Are we or are we not in favor of freedom and democracy? Will we or will we not compromise with the lawbreakers of the world? Those are the simple questions we need to answer now as a united Nation. We can reserve to ourselves freedom of action—to take only such steps in defense of our principles as may seem to us from time to time to be wise and effective. But by standing up and speaking our minds now, we will keep alive hope in the hearts of the defeated and bring new courage to those who press on to battle.

For ours can yet be an epoch of great hope and human progress. The trouble we see about us is not the end of the world. It is only the end—nearly the end—of much folly and miscalculation and stupidity. I know that there are young people listening to me who are quietly resolved to build a better world when their time for leadership comes. And to them I say, you will have your chance and you will succeed if you do not falter now. As for those of us who are older, we are totally unwilling to leave behind us, as the record of our generation, the world as it now is. And to all of my generation I say we, too, will have our chance—our chance to redeem the folly and stupidity of which we all were a part. We, too, will have our chance to leave behind us a world better than we found it. And we will not falter now.

Communist Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the pen of Mr. Mark Sullivan, newspaper columnist, under the date line Washington, May 29, entitled "Communists Go on Air Sunday, Week After Roosevelt Warning."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 30, 1940]

COMMUNISTS GO ON AIR SUNDAY, WEEK AFTER ROOSEVELT WARNING—MARK SULLIVAN CITES PRESIDENT'S PROHIBITION ON TROJAN HORSE IN CRITICIZING RADIO FOR LETTING BROWDER SPEAK—ASKS, WOULD RUSSIA PERMIT IT?

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—I listened to President Roosevelt's fireside chat about national defense, especially what he said about the enemy within our gates, the Trojan horse, the "fifth column"—that such must not be allowed in America. I listened to that and felt assured.

Then, next morning, I went through the mail on my desk. I found some announcements from the Communist Party, publicity hand-outs, read that the Communist Party is about to hold its national convention this week. I quote and condense:

"The Communist Party's national convention will be held in New York City May 30 to June 2. The probable Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees, Earl Browder and James W. Ford, nationally prominent Negro leader, will deliver their acceptance speeches Sunday, June 2. The speeches will be heard over coast-to-coast hookups of the Mutual Broadcasting System and National Broadcasting Co., from 1:30 to 2 p. m., eastern daylight saving time. The Columbia Broadcasting System will interview Earl Browder over a national hook-up from 8 to 8:15 p. m."

ROOSEVELT, THEN BROWDER

So—on one Sunday night Mr. Roosevelt on the radio, saying there must be no Trojan horse in America. On the next Sunday night the Communist Party and Mr. Browder on the radio!

The party sends out voluminous advance publicity. Obligingly, for the benefit of newspapers, the publicity hand-outs include advance suggestions of what the party platform will contain. Some of it is attack upon Mr. Roosevelt. Up to a year or so ago they used to praise Mr. Roosevelt. Since he showed sympathy for the Allies, and especially since he favored Finland, the Communists revile him. I quote and condense:

"The granting of war credits to Finland revealed the war course of the administration. Repudiate the militarization and armaments program. * * * The imperialist role of the Roosevelt administration. * * * The Roosevelt administration, supported by decisive sections of monopoly capital, is endeavoring to create 'national unity' * * * which aims to tie the American people to the war chariot of the economic royalists."

Most of the platform prospectus is the usual Communist thing. I quote and condense:

"The Communist Party of the United States stands stronger and more united around the banner of Marxism-Leninism. * * * It is necessary to heighten the Bolshevik vigilance of the party * * * We must develop to the maximum the international working-class solidarity of the American workers with the workers of the glorious land of socialism, the Soviet Union. * * * The present situation demands of the Communists that they act in the way Lenin taught: in the way taught now by the great, wise leader of the working people, Stalin."

That ladies and gentlemen, is what you will hear when you turn on your radio next Sunday afternoon and evening. You can't escape it—it will be on all major chains. The broadcasts, says the Communist announcement, "were granted by the three major chains in response to our request for free time."

The radio people say, truly, that it is not up to them to keep the Communist convention off the air. They have a policy of giving time for speeches of candidates of all political parties, major and minor. They say, accurately, that the Communists have legal standing as a political party.

But could not the radio people change their rules just a trifle? Could they not say "we will give time to all candidates for President, except such as are now under sentence to jail?" That would bar Mr. Browder. Or could they say "we will give time to all Presidential candidates except convicted liars and perjurers?" Or the radio people could bar the whole Communist Party by making their rule read: "We will give time to all political parties except such as are affiliated with a foreign government."

But it isn't really up to the radio companies. It is up to the Government. Whether the Federal Government or the State government of New York or the city government, I do not know. Except that there is a responsibility on Mr. Roosevelt. He cannot afford to let America go through the experience of hearing what he said against "fifth columns," and then within a week hearing Mr. Browder and the Communist Party on the radio.

The right of free speech? That is for Americans and American institutions. It is not for foreign governments and their agents and affiliates. From the "constitution of the Communist Party of the United States" I quote article II:

"The emblem of the party shall be the crossed hammer and sickle * * * with a circular inscription having at the top 'Communist Party of the U. S. A.' And in the lower part 'Affiliate to the Communist International.'" And article V: "All members of the party shall pay an assessment * * * for an international solidarity fund. This money shall be used * * * exclusively to aid our brother Communist parties in other countries."

CURB LIKE RUSSIA'S URGED

Our obligation of free speech to Communists is a matter not merely of our Constitution or our Bill of Rights, but of international relations with Russia. America can properly give to the American affiliate of the Communist Party exactly that degree of free speech which Russia would give to a Russian affiliate of our Democratic or Republican Party. And all the free speech they would get in Russia would be enough to say, "God help me," as they face the firing squad.

I am not sure the Russians would permit that much. I doubt if they would permit the word "God."

Our Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SHEBOYGAN PRESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of May 22, 1940, entitled "Our Postal Service." It is a fine statement of the Post Office Department's splendid service to the American people under its able head Hon. James A. Farley. I take great pleasure in having it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sheboygan Press of May 22, 1940]

OUR POSTAL SERVICE

Postmaster General James A. Farley on his recent trip to Wisconsin, where he addressed the Wisconsin Postmasters Association, brought home to every one of these Government agents the importance of community service and how the Postal Department had risen to new heights in this respect.

He told of the efforts put forth by the Department in the matter of collecting applications of veterans for the bonus and the delivery of the bonds and the payment by check to the boys who desired to surrender them. Then he touched upon the social-security set-up, the increased amount of work it caused, and the efficiency that the Department showed.

All of these were activities new in the Postal Department, and yet this great network that reaches every section of the country and foreign lands was equal to the task. He told of the Rural Delivery Service and how communities have been brought in closer relationship, and he gave full credit to the men and women who comprise the Service.

In that whole address was not a word about the man at the head, the Postmaster General, who has put into the Department the last word in efficiency, who requires every postal employee to give the best that he possesses. The Postal Department of this country has never had a man at its head who could measure up to General Farley. Neither has it had a man who was so sympathetic to the administration, and that is why the Department has been such a success. It has been taken out of the red despite the fact that the Department is a clearing house for so many new activities.

Jim Farley has coordinated and brought the Service to the highest point in its career, but in his desire to give credit to the men and women in the ranks he seldom refers to himself. Every postmaster who attended the convention in Milwaukee was proud of the fact that he is serving under such a leader.

In the Wrong Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., under the heading "In the wrong spirit."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

IN THE WRONG SPIRIT

Appearing in the Brookings Register this week is an editorial written by a student about to be graduated from high school.

The high-school editor discusses the days that are to come for those who are about to step out of the high-school classrooms and the possible influences of the war. Outlining this subject, he writes:

"We're not afraid of death after life; it's death before life that we are struggling against. We don't want to bow to the gods of war at the commencement of our lives, to die before we've lived.

"We want life, liberty, and the right to pursue happiness. We want baking powder instead of gunpowder. We want home and unscarred landscapes. We demand the right to paint, to sing, or write. Why must we, the potential Rembrandts and Bernhardts, never satisfy our desire?

"This isn't just the cry of one small class of graduating seniors, it's the cry of one big class all over the world.

"When we walk out the front door of the high school we'll be thinking of our new diplomas, in the future tense, and we'll be proud we've got them.

"But for what?"

With these observations, the editor of the Argus-Leader is wholly in accord.

But they are incomplete. The student outlines what he is demanding from the world and presents not a word in explanation of what he proposes to give the world to justify the claims he is advancing.

Life, liberty, and the right to pursue happiness are privileges that must be created and maintained. They must be deserved and warranted. For their establishment and retention, sacrifices must be made.

Too many citizens today, however, appraise these privileges as something for which they need give nothing in return. They seem to regard the Government as a beneficial agent from which they can draw support instead of something which they must support.

Many high school and college graduates begin early in life to demand that they be given this or that instead of commencing their careers with an offer of service.

We suggest that they reverse their sentiments, thinking first of what they have to offer instead of what they want to demand.

The United States of America is a democracy. It is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Whenever these basic principles are frustrated, the people are to blame. If they listen to inept leaders and if they are induced to barter their fundamental privileges for a political favor, then they must assume the responsibility for whatever the future has in store.

National Home Defense Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 29 I introduced a bill (H. R. 9944) to establish a National Home Defense Force by permitting the voluntary enlistment in such force of all veterans, and enrollees, and former enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps for instruction in military tactics and the use of weapons of defense for use insofar as practicable in the maintenance of fortifications, equipment, stations, posts, and construction in conjunction with the armed forces.

It will be observed that this bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator BRIDGES, a very distinguished Member of that body.

The Bridges-Anderson bill provides that this enlistment shall be voluntary only and that the use of this force is limited to the United States and the Western Hemisphere. We do not seek to force military training upon the C. C. C. but leave it entirely upon a voluntary basis.

In the Civilian Conservation Corps are thousands of young men who will be called upon to serve in the armed forces if we are required to defend our Nation. By giving them the opportunity of basic military training, we will be helping them to protect themselves and their Nation. The more training a man has the better will be his chances if called to the colors.

A few days after the Bridges-Anderson bill was introduced a similar measure known as the Byrnes bill, which apparently has the blessings of the administration, was offered in the Senate. But before this body takes action on either bill I urgently suggest that you compare the two measures. In order to facilitate your comparison of the two bills, I am concluding this statement with a brief comparative outline of these measures:

COMPARISON OF BRIDGES AND ANDERSON BILL WITH HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 544 (BYRNES)

Bridges and Anderson bill	*Byrnes resolution*
C. C. C. and others in national home-defense force cannot be sent out of Western Hemisphere.	C. C. C. can be sent anywhere in the world.
Are to be trained and instructed in the use of arms and other weapons so that force can defend itself if attacked.	Can be armed and placed on firing line but — cannot be trained in use of weapons.
Voluntary service in force and only with parental consent if under 21 years of age.	Voluntary for 6 months or less—then compulsory.
NUMBER	
No limit. Could provide for over 1,000,000 men in 90 days.	Limited to 300,000.
CONTROL	
Officered by veteran qualified by War Department and appointed by War Department.	Indicated by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Control by Sidney Hillman, C. I. O.

COMPARISON OF BRIDGES AND ANDERSON BILL WITH HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 544 (BYRNES)—continued

DRAFT, 22–36

Bridges and Anderson bill—Con.	*Byrnes resolution*—Continued
Seventeen to twenty-one and over 36 years. Will not interfere with draft ages.	Sixteen to twenty-four years. Will reach into draft ages (22–24) and will thereby force married men to serve in Army if and when draft occurs.

INDUSTRY

Will not interfere or disrupt business or hinder industry as this bill will serve to eliminate the need of conscription by providing a supplementary force to Army and Navy of a million or more trained men.	Will cause disruption of both business and industry by interfering with draft age 22–24, and will interfere with formation of national home-defense force by precluding the use by said force if present. C. C. C. camps (over 1,500) necessary to the speedy formation of the national home-defense force.

RELIEF

Will aid relief by taking over enrollees from C. C. C. (volunteer) as rapidly as enrolled at rate of 92 percent.	Will restrict relief aid to dependents of 300,000 enrollees.

ECONOMY

Is a means of providing $1 of home defense for every $1 expended.	Is unsound economically and will result in forcing the expenditure of unnecessary millions of dollars.

RESULT

Will enable the United States to have a well-disciplined force which can immediately protect military objectives and industry from the danger of sabotage. Will be a well-trained complement to Army and Navy. Is nonpartisan.	Will hinder preparedness and may bring about early conscription. Will be of little value to Army and Navy as C. C. C. will not be trained and properly disciplined. Is political.

Indiana Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, according to United States Commerce Department figures, in Indiana, on April 1, 1930, the value of farms—lands and buildings—was $1,415,542,192, but declined in value under this administration by January 1, 1935, to $1,040,238,254, a decrease of $375,303,938.

Also, in the Seventh District of Indiana, our farm values have declined from $135,848,000 in 1930 to $97,983,000 in 1935, a decrease of $37,855,000.

Farm values decline under New Deal

[U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

County	Value of farms		Average value per acre	
	1930	1935	1930	1935
Clay	$9,927,425	$8,263,193	$54.82	$40.90
Daviess	14,997,717	10,605,170	61.88	42.88
Gibson	14,277,014	9,523,522	60.22	36.66
Greene	12,549,878	8,977,804	45.41	30.34
Johnson	18,874,968	13,491,217	101.12	70.41
Knox	20,501,604	14,782,408	70.36	49.92
Martin	3,759,051	3,265,393	24.54	18.58
Monroe	8,439,383	6,225,467	43.96	29.93
Morgan	12,916,694	9,666,768	60.62	41.95
Owen	5,903,035	4,030,440	30.91	20.78
Sullivan	13,702,104	9,152,369	58.35	36.35
Total	135,848,873	97,983,751		

SEVENTH DISTRICT, INDIANA, FARMERS

Agriculture in southern Indiana is a big business. We now have a capital investment of almost $98,000,000. Eighty-five percent of the total land area in the Seventh District is in farm land.

We have over 26,400 separate farms, with a farm population of more than 114,000 persons. We supply the Nation each year with 15,744,000 bushels of corn, 27,829,000 gallons of milk, 8,666,000 dozens of eggs, 4,632,000 bushels of wheat, 3,183,000 chickens, and 1,273,000 pounds of butter.

Other important crops are oats, hay, soybeans, fruits, and vegetables. We produce over $1,000,000 worth of fruits and vegetables each year.

Knox County leads the district in the production of corn, hogs, wheat, oats, apples, and chickens.

Johnson County leads in the production of milk and sheep. It also has the highest yield per acre of corn and wheat.

Sullivan County leads in the production of butter and wool, and is second in the production of eggs, chickens, and sheep.

Greene County leads in the production of eggs, and is second in the production of oats, butter, and vegetables.

Gibson County leads in the production of hay, potatoes, and soybeans. It is second in the production of wheat and corn.

Daviess County ranks first in the production of cattle, second in potatoes, and is third in the production of oats, milk, eggs, and butter.

Monroe County leads in the production of vegetables.

Morgan County is second in the production of milk and apples.

Clay County ranks well up the list in milk, butter, and chicken production.

Martin County, our smallest in population, ranks fourth in potato production. It also ranks high in other vegetables and egg production.

Owen County, our second smallest county, stands well on the list in the production of sheep, wool, and chickens.

Indiana farm products

[U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Counties	Milk	Butter	Wool	Eggs	Chickens
	Gallons	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Dozen*	
Clay	2,832,857	117,784	24,736	707,383	296,147
Daviess	2,929,597	142,216	27,278	994,730	352,485
Gibson	2,412,011	130,918	29,382	650,405	335,132
Greene	2,781,500	152,755	43,230	1,052,776	348,316
Johnson	3,902,306	58,806	43,583	509,123	269,567
Knox	2,710,613	129,746	39,027	842,377	410,154
Martin	1,322,195	82,431	10,559	731,636	123,568
Monroe	1,957,922	125,116	13,835	565,467	177,622
Morgan	2,939,128	105,521	30,438	869,342	298,977
Owen	1,341,481	73,691	33,449	709,404	202,148
Sullivan	2,700,036	154,383	47,559	1,033,932	368,940
Total	27,829,646	1,273,367	343,076	8,666,575	3,183,064

Counties	Cattle	Sheep	Hogs	Vegetables	Apples
					Bushels
Clay	14,265	3,909	18,465	$52,483	15,134
Daviess	20,980	4,664	28,420	42,697	15,794
Gibson	16,606	5,330	41,930	31,357	5,190
Greene	18,744	8,334	20,949	59,527	7,281
Johnson	20,241	10,883	47,968	35,555	11,665
Knox	18,680	2,726	52,084	22,833	163,126
Martin	10,461	3,241	8,960	47,034	5,998
Monroe	11,854	3,538	7,624	68,133	2,381
Morgan	16,634	8,027	28,528	56,710	65,807
Owen	11,046	8,112	11,949	34,977	5,112
Sullivan	16,571	10,037	25,953	41,471	1,340
Total	176,082	68,801	292,830	492,777	298,828

Counties	Wheat	Oats	Hay	Corn	Soybeans
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Tons*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Clay	402,108	54,583	20,750	1,257,911	3,635
Daviess	459,890	110,961	27,346	1,623,568	36,683
Gibson	733,297	60,764	30,551	2,025,971	97,609
Greene	319,513	120,225	26,361	1,388,394	47,573
Johnson	570,884	59,147	25,639	1,821,287	11,662
Knox	1,112,969	137,662	29,918	2,379,090	63,712
Martin	80,073	26,014	13,317	579,947	4,375
Monroe	55,889	39,327	16,502	588,889	1,554
Morgan	295,698	84,512	23,395	1,648,738	10,461
Owen	90,166	21,878	14,710	732,950	760
Sullivan	502,210	56,464	21,491	1,687,557	22,559
Total	4,632,697	771,537	249,980	15,744,302	300,644

Indiana farm products—Continued

Counties	Land area	Farm land	Farms	1935 value per acre	Average size farm
	Acres	*Acres*			*Acres*
Clay	231,040	202,036	2,510	$40.90	80.5
Daviess	277,120	249,197	2,661	42.56	93.6
Gibson	311,040	259,754	2,422	36.66	107.2
Greene	347,520	295,933	3,251	30.34	91
Johnson	206,080	191,610	1,994	70.41	96.1
Knox	326,400	296,115	2,436	49.92	121.6
Martin	216,960	175,710	1,464	18.58	120
Monroe	266,240	207,977	2,444	29.93	85.1
Morgan	259,840	230,455	2,343	41.95	98.4
Owen	251,520	193,971	1,719	20.78	112.8
Sullivan	294,400	251,790	3,212	36.35	78.4
Total	2,988,160	2,554,548	26,456	[1] 38.03	[1] 98.6

[1] Average.

Seventh District information, Indiana

[Office of Government Reports, 1939]

Counties	Persons on farm 1936	1930 dwellings	1936 autos	1938 radios	1937 unemployed
Clay	10,553	6,900	5,507	6,530	1,339
Daviess	11,895	6,100	4,472	5,860	1,056
Gibson	10,882	7,400	6,038	7,070	941
Greene	13,186	8,100	6,029	7,660	1,490
Johnson	8,685	5,800	5,884	5,520	776
Knox	12,270	10,800	8,621	10,500	1,628
Martin	6,803	2,400	1,613	2,180	478
Monroe	11,068	8,500	6,799	8,800	1,803
Morgan	9,343	5,200	4,024	4,930	590
Owen	6,928	3,000	2,364	2,830	392
Sullivan	12,673	7,300	5,515	6,870	1,524
Total	114,286	71,500	56,866	68,750	12,017

These reports are very valuable to me as a Congressman, because they give exactly the important agricultural activities in our district. It enables me to better represent my constituents in legislation or Government policies beneficial to their interests.

In trying to solve the farm problem the Republican agricultural fact-finding committee, of which I am a member, has been going direct to the dirt farmers of America for their advice and counsel. Especially am I grateful for the suggestions and the cooperation which has been given me by the farmers and their organizations in the Seventh District.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses

	Congresses
Alabama (entered Union 1819):	
Felix G. McConnell	28th.
William R. Smith	33d.
Joseph Wheeler	47th, 49th, 51st through 53d.
Ariosto A. Wiley	59th.
S. Hubert Dent, jr.	61st through 66th.
Lister Hill	68th through 75th.
John J. Sparkman	75th, 76th.
Arizona (entered Union 1912):	
Marcus A. Smith (Territorial Delegate)	55th.
Lewis W. Douglas	71st.
Arkansas (entered Union 1836):	
Archibald Yell	29th.
Ben Cravens	61st.
California (entered Union 1850):	
J. A. McDougall	33d.
James W. Denver	34th.
William S. Rosecrans	48th.
William W. Bowers	52d, 53d.
Julius Kahn	59th through 68th.
Florence P. Kahn	70th through 72d.
Samuel L. Collins	74th.
John M. Costello	74th through 76th.
Connecticut (entered Union 1788):	
Thomas H. Seymour	28th.
Francis W. Kellogg	38th.
Henry C. Deming	39th.
Joseph R. Hawley	43d.
John A. Tilson	61st, 62d, 64th, 65th.
James P. Glynn	69th, 70th.
Edward W. Goss	71st through 73d.
J. Joseph Smith	74th through 76th.
Delaware (entered Union 1787):	
James Williams	45th.
Florida (entered Union 1845):	
J. Mark Wilcox	74th, 75th.
Georgia (entered Union 1788):	
Edward F. Tatnall	18th, 19th.
John Floyd	20th.
John Coffee	23d, 24th.
Thomas Glascock	24th, 25th.
William C. Dawson	27th.
Duncan L. Clinch	28th.
Hugh A. Haralson	28th through 30th.
Pierce M. B. Young	43d.
Philip Cook	44th.
William E. Smith	46th.
John C. Nicholls	48th.
Dudley M. Hughes	62d.
William S. Howard	63d.
James W. Wise	64th through 66th.
William C. Wright	67th through 70th.
Homer C. Parker	72d.
Stephen Pace	75th, 76th.
Idaho (entered Union 1890):	
Thomas C. Coffin	73d.
Illinois (entered Union 1818):	
John J. Hardin	28th.
Edward D. Baker	29th.
W. A. Richardson	31st.
William H. Bissell	32d, 33d.
William A. Richardson	37th.
John F. Farnsworth	38th.
Green B. Raum	40th.
John A. Logan	41st.
John B. Hay	42d.
John B. Hawley	43d.
Stephen A. Hurlbut	44th.
Benjamin F. Marsh	45th, 46th, 53d through 56th.
William A. J. Sparks	46th, 47th.
George R. Davis	47th.
Thomas J. Henderson	47th.
Richard W. Townshend	50th.
Walter C. Newberry	52d.
John C. Black	53d.
Hugh R. Belknap	55th.
Thomas M. Jett	55th through 57th.
George W. Prince	57th through 62d.
William F. Mahoney	58th.
Lynden Evans	62d.
Frank T. O'Hair	63d.
John C. McKenzie	63d through 68th.
Loren E. Wheeler	69th.
William R. Johnson	70th through 72d.
Burnett M. Chiperfield	72d.
Chester Thompson	73d.
Leslie C. Arends	74th through 76th.
Edwin M. Schaefer	74th through 76th.
David Wallace	27th.
Willis A. Gorman	32d.
W. McKee Dunn	37th.
Henry D. Washburn	40th.
Jasper Packard	41st.
John Coburn	42d, 43d.
Thomas M. Browne	46th.
G. W. Steele	47th through 50th.
David H. Patton	52d.
John L. Bretz	53d.
Abraham L. Brick	57th.
Elias S. Holliday	58th through 60th.
Noble J. Johnson	69th.
Samuel B. Pettengill	72d.
Forest A. Harness	76th.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

	Congresses
Iowa (entered Union 1858):	
Samuel R. Curtis	35th, 36th.
Grenville M. Dodge	40th.
William G. Donnan	42d, 43d.
John H. Gear	50th.
John A. T. Hull	52d through 61st.
I. S. Pepper	62d.
Maurice Connolly	63d.
Harry E. Hull	64th through 68th.
Thomas E. Martin	76th.
Kansas (entered Union 1861):	
James M. Miller	59th.
Daniel R. Anthony, Jr	60th through 66th.
Kentucky (entered Union 1792):	
John S. Smith	17th.
John Adair	22d.
Richard M. Johnson	22d through 24th.
William O. Butler	26th, 27th.
Linn Boyd	28th through 30th.
George A. Caldwell	31st.
Humphrey Marshall	35th.
James S. Jackson	37th.
George H. Yeamen	38th.
Lovell H. Rousseau	39th.
Frank L. Wolford	48th, 49th.
William J. Fields	62d through 67th.
Fred M. Vinson	69th.
Virgil Chapman	70th.
Andrew J. May	72d through 76th.
Louisiana (entered Union 1812):	
Philemon Thomas	22d.
Peter E. Bossier	28th.
Theodore G. Hunt	33d.
Frank Morey	41st, 42d.
Samuel M. Robertson	50th, 51st.
Robert F. Broussard	56th through 60th.
John F. Watkins	62d.
Numa F. Montet	72d through 74th.
Overton Brooks	75th, 76th.
Maine (entered Union 1820):	
Enoch Lincoln	19th.
Ephraim K. Smart	32d.
James G. Blaine	39th.
Maryland (entered Union 1788):	
George E. Mitchell	18th, 19th, 21st, 22d.
John T. Mason	27th.
Augustus R. Sollers	27th.
Alexander Evans	31st, 32d.
Joshua Vansant	33d.
George W. Hughes	36th.
John V. L. Findlay	49th.
John McDonald	55th.
James W. Denny	58th.
David J. Lewis	62d.
John Philip Hill	67th through 69th.
William D. Byron	76th.
Massachusetts (entered Union 1788):	
William Eustis	17th.
George Grennell, Jr	25th.
Benjamin Thompson	29th.
Nathaniel P. Banks, Jr	33d.
James Buffinton	34th through 37th.
Theodore Lyman	48th.
Francis W. Rockwell	51st.
John C. Crosby	52d.
Frederick H. Gillett	53d.
Butler Ames	62d.
Frederick S. Deitrick	63d.
Richard Olney 2d	64th through 66th.
Alvan T. Fuller	66th.
Louis A. Frothingham	67th through 70th.
William J. Granfield	71st.
Charles R. Clason	75th, 76th.
Michigan (entered Union 1837):	
William L. Stoughton	41st through 42d.
Alpheus S. Williams	44th.
Oliver L. Spaulding	47th.
Byron M. Cutcheon	48th through 51st.
Melbourne H. Ford	50th.
Charles E. Belknap	52d.
James S. Gorman	53d.
Roswell P. Bishop	54th.
H. Olin Young	58th through 61st.
Edwin F. Sweet	62d.
W. Frank James	66th through 73d.
Paul W. Shafer	76th.
Minnesota (entered Union 1858):	
Horace B. Strait	44th, 45th.
S. P. Snider	51st.
Fred C. Stevens	56th through 58th.
Loren Fletcher	59th.
Frederick C. Stevens	60th, 61st.
Allen J. Furlow	69th, 70th.
Paul J. Kvale	72d through 75th.
Theodore Christianson	73d.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

	Congresses
Mississippi (entered Union 1817):	
Samuel J. Gholson	25th.
John A. Wilcox	32d.
John A. Quitman	34th, 35th.
John J. McRae	35th, 36th.
George E. Harris	42d.
Charles E. Hooker	50th.
Percy E. Quin	63d through 72d.
Missouri (entered Union 1821):	
John Miller	25th through 27th.
Thomas H. Benton	33d.
Francis P. Blair, Jr	37th.
Samuel Knox	38th.
Benjamin Loan	38th.
William A. Pile	40th.
Joel F. Asper	41st.
John M. Glover	44th.
Charles H. Morgan	48th, 53d, 61st.
William M. Kinsey	51st.
John C. Tarsney	54th.
John P. Tracey	54th.
Richard M. Duncan	73d.
Dewey Short	74th through 76th.
C. Arthur Anderson	75th, 76th.
Montana (entered Union 1889):	
Martin Maginnis (Territorial Delegate)	46th through 48th.
Nebraska (entered Union 1867):	
James Laird	48th through 50th.
Ashton C. Shallenberger	64th, 65th.
New Hampshire (entered Union 1788):	
James Wilson	30th, 31st.
Gilman Marston	37th, 39th.
William N. Rogers	72d through 74th.
New Jersey (entered Union 1787):	
William Halsted	25th.
Alvah A. Clark	45th.
Edward F. McDonald	52d.
Charles Sitgreaves	39th, 40th.
Augustus A. Hardenbergh	44th.
Richard W. Parker	54th, 56th through 60th, 67th.
Elmer H. Geran	68th.
Harold G. Hoffman	70th, 71st.
Donald H. McLean	73d, 74th.
J. Parnell Thomas	75th, 76th.
New Mexico (entered Union 1912):	
Antonio Joseph (Territorial Delegate)	52d, 53d.
Thomas B. Catron (Territorial Delegate)	54th.
Pedro Perea (Territorial Delegate)	56th.
Bernard S. Rodey (Territorial Delegate)	57th.
New York (entered Union 1788):	
Reuben H. Walworth	17th.
Aaron Ward	19th, 22d through 24th.
Selah R. Hobbie	20th.
Abijah Mann, Jr	24th.
Gouverneur Kemble	25th, 26th.
James Monroe	26th.
Henry Van Rensselaer	27th.
Hamilton Fish	28th.
Charles H. Carroll	29th.
Archibald C. Niven	29th.
Dudley Marvin	30th.
John A. King	31st.
Orsamus B. Matteson	31st.
Solomon G. Haven	32d.
Bayard Clarke	34th.
John Williams	34th.
Abraham B. Olin	36th, 37th.
Mose F. Odell	38th.
John H. Ketcham	39th, 40th.
Henry W. Slocum	41st, 42d, 48th.
Clinton D. McDougall	43d, 44th.
Anson G. McCook	45th through 47th.
Egbert L. Viele	49th.
Ashbel P. Fitch	50th.
Francis B. Spinola	50th, 51st.
Fred Lansing	51st.
Hosea H. Rockwell	52d.
Newton M. Curtis	53d, 54th.
Daniel E. Sickles	53d.
George B. McClellan	54th.
George N. Southwick	54th.
John H. Ketcham	55th through 58th.
Rowland B. Mahany	55th.
William Sulzer	55th through 61st.
Thomas W. Bradley	60th through 62d.
Charles L. Knapp	61st.
Michael F. Conry	62d.
Thomas G. Patten	62d.
Daniel J. Griffin	63d.
Robert H. Gittins	63d.
Charles Pope Caldwell	64th through 66th.
Michael F. Farley	64th.
George R. Lunn	65th.
Rollin B. Sanford	65th, 66th.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

New York (entered Union 1788)—Continued.	*Congresses*
Fiorello H. LaGuardia	66th.
Frank Crowther	67th.
John J. Boylan	68th through 70th.
J. Mayhew Wainwright	68th through 71st.
James M. Fitzpatrick	72d, 73d.
Walter G. Andrews	73d through 76th.
Theodore A. Peyser	73d.
Matthew J. Merritt	74th through 76th.
North Carolina (entered Union 1789):	
Jesse Speight	21st through 24th.
James J. McKay	23d through 25th.
Edward Stanly	27th.
James A. Lockhart	54th.
Charles H. Martin	55th.
George M. Pritchard	71st.
Ohio (entered Union 1803):	
Duncan McArthur	18th.
Joseph Vance	18th through 23d.
James Findlay	21st.
John Thomson	23d, 24th.
Samson Mason	25th.
John W. Allen	26th.
Samuel Stokely	27th.
Nathaniel G. Pendleton	27th.
Joseph J. McDowell	28th.
Jacob Brinkerhoff	29th.
David Fisher	30th.
David K. Cartter	31st.
William R. Sapp	34th.
Benjamin Stanton	34th through 36th.
George H. Pendleton	35th, 36th.
Robert C. Schenck	38th, 39th.
John A. Bingham	39th.
James A. Garfield	38th, 40th.
George W. Morgan	41st.
Lewis D. Campbell	42d.
Lewis B. Gunckel	43d.
Henry B. Banning	44th, 45th.
Benjamin Le Fevre	46th.
Robert M. Murray	48th.
Charles M. Anderson	49th.
S. S. Yoder	50th.
Elihu S. Williams	51st.
Joseph H. Outhwaite	52d, 53d.
Lucien J. Fenton	54th, 55th.
John J. Lentz	55th, 56th.
Charles Dick	56th through 58th.
Beman G. Dawes	59th, 60th.
Isaac R. Sherwood	60th, 61st, 68th.
Warren Gard	63d.
William Gordon	63d through 65th.
Charles C. Kearns	66th, 67th.
John C. Speaks	68th through 71st.
Dow W. Harter	73d through 76th.
Charles H. Elston	76th.
Oklahoma (entered Union 1907):	
Bird S. McGuire (Territorial Delegate)	58th, 59th.
Jed Johnson	72d, 73d.
Oregon (entered Union 1859):	
James W. Nesmith	43d.
Pennsylvania (entered Union 1787):	
William Darlington	17th.
Thomas J. Rogers	18th.
Thomas Kittera	19th.
Robert Orr, Jr	20th.
George Burd	23d.
Joseph B. Anthony	23d, 24th.
James Irvin	28th.
Alexander Ramsay	29th.
John Dickey	30th.
Joseph R. Chandler	31st.
Thaddeus Stephens	32d.
Thomas M. Howe	33d.
John Allison	34th.
Henry C. Longnecker	36th.
Hendrick B. Wright	37th.
Archibald McAllister	38th.
Sydenham E. Ancona	39th.
Benjamin M. Boyer	40th.
James S. Negley	41st, 49th.
Charles Albright	43d.
John Reilly	44th.
Levi Maish	45th, 50th.
Harry White	45th, 46th.
T. M. Bayne	47th, 48th.
William A. Duncan	48th.
Daniel Ermentrout	49th.
Edwin S. Osborne	51st.
Henry H. Bingham	52d.
Ephraim M. Woomer	53d, 54th.
Robert Adams, Jr	57th.
James F. Burke	59th through 62d.
Willis J. Hulings	63d.
Thomas S. Crago	64th through 67th.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

Pennsylvania (entered Union 1787)—Contd.	*Congresses*
John M. Morin	63d through 70th.
Harry C. Ransley	67th through 74th.
Thomas C. Cochran	71st through 73d.
Frank J. G. Dorsey	74th, 75th.
Charles I. Faddis	73 through 76th.
Albert G. Rutherford	75th, 76th.
Rhode Island (entered Union 1790):	
Henry J. Spooner	47th, 51st.
Oscar Lapham	52d, 53d.
Adin B. Capron	56th through 61st.
South Carolina (entered Union 1788):	
Robert B. Campbell	18th.
James Hamilton	18th through 20th.
William Drayton	19th through 22d.
James Blair	21st through 23d.
Waddy Thompson, Jr	25th, 26th.
Thomas D. Sumter	26th, 27th.
James A. Black	28th.
Armistead Burt	29th through 32d.
Miiledge L. Bonham	35th, 36th.
Solomon L. Hoge	41st.
John H. Evins	45th.
George W. Dargan	49th.
George D. Tillman	50th.
Samuel J. Nicholls	64th, 65th.
Philip H. Stoll	67th.
John J. McSwain	68th through 74th.
G. Heyward Mahon, Jr	75th.
Tennessee (entered Union 1796):	
John Cocke	17th.
Samuel Houston	18th, 19th.
Robert Desha	20th, 21st.
Samuel Bunch	23d, 24th.
Abraham McClellan	25th.
Cave Johnson	26th.
W. B. Campbell	27th.
Robert L. Coruthers	27th.
William T. Haskell	30th.
Andrew Ewing	31st.
Meredith P. Gentry	32d.
Emerson Etheridge	33d.
John H. Savage	35th.
Isaac R. Hawkins	40th.
Jacob M. Thornburgh	43d, 44th.
George G. Dibrell	45th, 46th, 48th.
Lecnidas C. Houk	49th.
Joseph E. Washington	54th.
Walter P. Brownlow	55th, 56th.
Nicholas N. Cox	55th, 56th.
Charles E. Snodgrass	57th.
George W. Gordon	60th through 62d.
Kenneth D. McKellar	63d through 64th.
Hubert F. Fisher	66th through 71st.
B. Carroll Reece	68th through 71st.
Edward H. Crump	72d.
Clarence W. Turner	73d through 75th.
Joseph W. Byrns	76th.
Texas (entered Union 1845):	
Columbus Upson	46th, 47th.
S. W. T. Lanham	51st.
James L. Slayden	56th through 63d.
Daniel E. Garrett	63d, 65th, 67th, through 71st.
Harry M. Wurzbach	67th through 71st.
R. Ewing Thomason	72d through 76th.
Maury Maverick	74th, 75th.
Paul J. Kilday	76th.
Vermont (entered Union 1791):	
John Mattocks	17th.
Daniel A. Buck	20th.
Frank L. Greene	63d through 67th.
Charles A. Plumley	74th.
Virginia (entered Union 1788):	
William McCoy	17th.
John Taliaferro	19th.
Alexander Smith	20th.
George C. Dromgoole	24th.
Francis E. Rives	25th.
Walter Coles	24th through 26th, 28th.
William L. Goggin	26th, 27th.
Henry Bedinger	29th.
Augustus A. Chapman	29th.
John M. Botts	30th.
Charles J. Faulkner	32d through 35th.
Alexander R. Boteler	36th.
William Terry	42d, 44th.
Eppa Hunton	43d.
Joseph E. Johnston	46th.
George D. Wise	51st.
D. Gardiner Tyler	54th.
James Hay	55th through 64th.
Thomas W. Harrison	64th through 66th.

Members of the Committee on Military Affairs, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses—Continued

	Congresses
Washington (entered Union 1889):	
John F. Miller	66th, 67th.
Wesley Lloyd	73d.
West Virginia (entered Union 1863):	
John S. Witcher	41st.
John O. Pendleton	53d.
John M. Hamilton	62d.
Samuel B. Avis	63d.
Adam B. Littlepage	64th.
John M. Wolverton	71st, 72d.
Andrew Edmiston	74th through 76th.
Wisconsin (entered Union 1848):	
C. C. Washburne	34th.
Amasa Cobb	41st.
Edward S. Bragg	45th through 47th, 49th.
John L. Mitchell	52d.
Michael Griffin	54th, 55th.
John J. Esch	56th through 58th.
James H. Davidson	65th.
William H. Stafford	71st, 72d.
Wyoming (entered Union 1889):	
Joseph M. Carey (Territorial Delegate)	49th, 50th.
Joseph M. Carey	51st.
Frank W. Mondell	56th through 58th.
Vincent Carter	73d.

Source: Congressional Directories.

Members serving 7 or more terms on the House Military Affairs Committee from the Seventeenth to the Seventy-sixth Congresses

Members	Congresses	Terms	State
James Hay	55th through 64th	10	Virginia.
John A. T. Hull	52d through 61st	10	Iowa.
Julius Kahn	59th through 68th	10	California.
Percy E. Quin	63d through 72d	10	Mississippi.
Lister Hill	68th through 75th	8	Alabama.
W. Frank James	66th through 73d	8	Michigan.
John M. Morin	63d through 70th	8	Pennsylvania.
Harry C. Ransley	67th through 74th	8	Do.
James L. Slayden	56th through 63d	8	Texas.
Daniel R. Anthony, Jr.	60th through 66th	7	Kansas.
Daniel E. Garrett	63d, 65th, 67th through 71st	7	Texas.
John J. McSwain	68th through 74th	7	South Carolina.
Richard W. Parker	54th, 56th through 60th, 67th	7	New Jersey.
William Sulzer	55th through 61st	7	New York.

Source: Congressional Directories.

Territorial Delegates serving as Members of the House Military Affairs Committee from the Seventeenth to the Seventy-sixth Congresses

	Congresses
Alaska:	
Thomas Cale	60th.
James Wickersham	61st through 64th.
Dan A. Sutherland	68th.
Anthony J. Dimond	76th.
Arizona: Marcus A. Smith	55th.
Hawaii:	
J. Kuhio Kalanianaole	65th through 67th.
Henry A. Baldwin	67th.
William P. Jarrett	69th.
Victor S. K. Houston	70th through 72d.
Lincoln L. McCandless	73d.
Samuel W. King	74th through 76th.
Montana: Martin Maginnis	46th through 48th.
New Mexico:	
Antonio Joseph	52d, 53d.
Thomas B. Catron	54th.
Pedro Perea	56th.
Bernard S. Rodey	57th.
Oklahoma: Bird S. McGuire	58th, 59th.
Wyoming: Joseph M. Carey	49th, 50th.

Source: Congressional Directories.

Military Affairs Committee chairmen, Seventeenth to Seventy-sixth Congresses

Years	Congresses	Chairman	Number of members
1821–23	17th	William Eustis, Massachusetts	7
1823–26	17th to 19th (1st sess.)	James Hamilton, Jr., South Carolina.	7
1826–27	19th (2d sess.)	Joseph Vance, Ohio	7
1827–28	20th (1st sess.)	James Hamilton, Jr., South Carolina.	7
1828–32	20th (2d sess.) to 22d (1st sess.).	William Drayton, South Carolina.	7
1832–37	22d (2d sess.) through 24th	R. M. Johnson, Kentucky	7, 9
1837–39	25th	James J. McKay, North Carolina.	9
1839–40	26th (1st sess.)	Cave Johnson, Tennessee	9
1840–41	26th (2d sess.)	Waddy Thompson, Jr., South Carolina.	9
1841–42	27th (1st sess.)	William C. Dawson, Georgia	9
1842–43	27th (2d sess.)	Edward Stanly, North Carolina.	9
1843–47	28th and 29th	Hugh A. Haralson, Georgia	9
1847–49	30th	John M. Botts, Virginia	9
1849–52	31st to 32d (2d sess.)	Armistead Burt, South Carolina.	9
1852–55	32d (2d sess.) through 33d	William H. Bissell, Illinois	9
1855–59	34th and 35th	John A. Quitman, Mississippi	9
1859–61	36th	Benjamin Stanton, Ohio	9
1861–63	37th	Francis P. Blair, Jr., Missouri	9
1863–67	38th and 39th	Robert C. Schenck, Ohio	9
1867–69	40th	James A. Garfield, Ohio	9
1869–71	41st	John A. Logan, Illinois	9–11
1871–75	42d and 43d	John Coburn, Indiana	9–11
1875–79	44th and 45th	Henry B. Banning, Ohio	11
1879–81	46th	William A. J. Sparks, Illinois	10–12
1881–83	47th	Thomas J. Henderson, Illinois	12
1883–85	48th	William S. Rosecrans, California.	14
1885–87	49th	Edward S. Bragg, Wisconsin	14
1887–89	50th	Richard W. Townsend, Illinois	14
1889–91	51st	Byron M. Cutcheon, Michigan	14
1891–94	52d to 53d (1st sess.)	Joseph H. Outhwaite, Ohio	14
1894–95	53d (2d sess.)	William S. Foreman, Illinois	16
1895–1911	74th through 61st	John A. T. Hull, Iowa	16, 18, 20
1911–17	62d through 64th	James Hay, Virginia	21, 22
1917–19	65th	S. Hubert Dent, Jr., Alabama	22
1919–25	66th through 68th	Julius Kahn, California	22
1925–27	69th	John M. Morin, Pennsylvania	22
1927–31	70th and 71st	W. Frank James, Michigan	22
1931–33	72d (1st sess.)	Percy E. Quin, Mississippi	22
1933–37	72d (2d sess.) through 74th	John J. McSwain, South Carolina.	22, 26
1937–39	75th	Lister Hill, Alabama	26
1939–41	76th	Andrew J. May, Kentucky	26

We Must Be Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

EDITORIAL BY J. KELLY POOL, EDITOR, DAILY CAPITAL NEWS, JEFFERSON CITY, MO.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editorial writers of Missouri, and I may say of the Nation, is J. Kelly Pool, editor of the Daily Capital News, Jefferson City, Mo. In recognition of his long and distinguished journalistic career, Mr. Pool was recently honored by the Missouri School of Journalism, oldest institution of its kind in the world. Under permission granted me, I am inserting an editorial, We Must Be Ready, as written by Mr. Pool and appearing in the Daily Capital News of June 1:

WE MUST BE READY

The United States is a great and rich country, and the way of life in these United States is very dear and abundant—fondly cherished and precious beyond price. Neither must be allowed to crumble. We must prepare as we never have prepared before to defend them against attack.

We do a lot of complaining and grumbling in this land of the free, and we criticize this and we condemn that, but down deep in our hearts we like it here. Underneath our faultfinding lies the realization of how fortunate we are to be living in this, the world's garden spot. We know full well that our Nation is the most favored of all, the choicest gem in the earth's jewel box, and we are grateful for the privileges and blessings which we daily enjoy. We may fret and fuss, but our love for the grand old United States of America knows no bounds, and words tumble from our mouths in praise of its traditions, its institutions, its resources, and its God-fearing, liberty-loving people.

It is a great and rich country. We have 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of its population. We own 71 percent of the world's motor vehicles and 30 percent of the world's railroads. Twenty-two million American homes are wired for electricity. There are 30,000,000 radios in the United States. We have a purchasing power of more than Europe's half billion population, more than Asia's billion population. We carry twice as much life insurance as the rest of the world. We control, here in America, two-thirds of the world's banking resources.

Our way of life is good. Here we have freedom of speech, of the pulpit, of the press, the right of assembly, and the right to trial by jury. We are the only country in the world pensioning the aged and ministering to dependent children and giving relief stipends to the needy. We pay our school teachers more than teachers anywhere else are paid. We pay our public officials more than similar officers are paid elsewhere. We pay our laborers several times as much as they earn in other countries. We have better food, better

clothing, better homes, better churches, better schools, better automobiles, better cities and towns, better recreational centers, better institutions, and better everything than any other people under the sun. Our standard of living has no equal. Here life is safe, life is satisfying, life is complete.

These are the things which now are ours. Without them life would be but existence—unbearable, intolerable enslavement. And because they are so dear to us and mean so much to us, we must gird ourselves to defend them. With brain and brawn, might and main, by day and in darkness, we must prepare to safeguard this great and rich country and our beloved way of life.

Now of all times is no time for political quibbling, for the airing of petty differences, for the feeding of hatreds and jealousies. It is a time for concerted patriotic action. Americans all, we must put our shoulders to the wheel and move forward with determination and in unison until the goal of preparedness has been attained. We must be ready when the enemy hordes come thundering at our shores.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the distribution of public funds in the development of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Net allotments, by States, according to fiscal funds, as of Feb. 8, 1940

States	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40	Total
United States	$14,165,128	$46,499,331	$29,936,586	$139,923,556	$38,872,192	$269,396,793
Alabama	65,000	1,058,000	451,350	2,928,646	973,554	5,476,550
Arizona		145,000		433,000	125,000	703,000
Arkansas		592,000	1,205,000	3,015,500	991,000	5,803,500
California		1,200,000	310,500	226,000	67,000	1,803,500
Colorado	140,000	255,000	567,500	1,952,000	512,500	3,427,000
Delaware		405,000	5,000	468,000		878,000
Florida	164,500	70,092	545,000	780,000	274,408	1,834,000
Georgia	763,200	1,618,915	1,327,500	7,511,000	2,689,000	13,889,615
Idaho	89,750	599,000	587,000	933,000	337,000	2,545,750
Illinois	141,500	1,957,000	949,130	9,389,500	2,515,000	14,952,130
Indiana	1,426,926	3,251,000	1,409,769	8,686,500	2,381,000	17,155,195
Iowa	537,616	3,291,712	1,984,000	9,383,300	2,624,000	17,830,628
Kansas	0	664,651	1,035,000	3,518,995	542,505	5,761,151
Kentucky	261,700	1,120,000	1,014,600	5,125,420	1,137,000	8,658,720
Louisiana	0	920,407	42,000	1,502,100	600,093	3,064,600
Maine	0	0	91,000	5,000	127,000	223,000
Maryland	0	172,689	106,184	357,816	111,311	748,000
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	2,845,000	1,810,000	6,071,000	526,500	11,252,500
Minnesota	1,461,000	3,179,954	1,809,282	9,151,500	2,580,500	18,182,236
Mississippi	81,000	795,700	896,500	4,898,670	1,274,330	7,946,200
Missouri	0	1,717,000	915,000	7,125,290	1,816,410	11,573,700
Montana	155,000	560,600	194,300	1,008,700	474,500	2,393,100
Nebraska	1,832,000	2,454,750	916,450	5,007,500	490,000	10,700,700
Nevada			173,000	49,000	5,000	227,000
New Hampshire		40,000		321,137	30,863	392,000
New Jersey		245,000	12,500	162,800		420,300
New Mexico		164,000	196,000	345,000	85,000	790,000
New York			250,000	1,125,000	370,000	1,745,000
North Carolina	335,250	565,000	536,100	3,625,000	1,158,000	6,219,350
North Dakota		500,000	206,704	900,268	382,000	1,988,972
Ohio	2,549,200	3,191,600	1,790,725	5,541,500	1,271,000	14,344,025
Oklahoma	70,000	1,716,000	594,000	3,479,000	765,000	6,624,000
Oregon		337,000	137,000	502,472	134,028	1,110,500
Pennsylvania	400,000	1,550,000	626,500	2,993,700	1,665,000	7,235,200
Rhode Island						
South Carolina	648,328	25,000	550,000	2,357,310	533,690	4,119,328
South Dakota	77,000	313,000	147,090	161,500	1,040,000	1,738,590
Tennessee	238,258	1,073,000	632,500	6,110,699	541,000	8,695,058
Texas	497,500	2,245,061	1,959,965	11,950,159	3,654,000	20,306,685
Utah			172,177	396,823	20,000	589,000
Vermont		25,000		185,000	70,500	280,500
Virginia	577,800	1,066,000	685,000	3,455,000	640,000	6,423,800
Washington	13,000	836,200	600,950	695,550	1,498,500	3,644,200
West Virginia		383,000	105,000	15,000	79,000	582,000
Wisconsin	1,539,600	2,897,000	1,936,200	5,410,000	1,626,000	13,408,800
Wyoming		454,000	448,500	663,300	154,000	1,719,800

NOTE.—Funds are listed according to fiscal years appropriated and not according to years actually allotted.

The rapidity with which these funds will be recovered will depend upon the prices obtained for farm products. Butter, with a 7-year average farm price of 26 cents per pound under the New Deal, and cheese, with a 7-year average New Deal price of 13.2 cents per pound, will make these payments rather slow. The people of this country should realize more and more that these moneys can be repaid only when and if the farmer receives more for his products than it costs him to produce them. Let us hope there are better days ahead for the farmers of this country.

National Defense and the Tax Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in these days when war and carnage have brought about a state of mind that borders on hysteria even in this country, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that all of our domestic problems that we have sought so strenuously to solve for the past 8 years are still with us. The unemployed remain unemployed. The farmers must still be remembered by the Congress. The aged and infirm remain dependent to a great extent upon governmental assistance in some form. In short, the defense problem has served not to cure our ills but to increase their gravity. It, therefore, behooves us to maintain level heads in these days and proceed to the solution of our domestic problems as well as with the necessary defense measures.

Before we decided to strengthen the defenses of this Nation, we were perplexed no little by the ever-increasing tax burden. That burden is now, because of necessity, going to be more onerous. But in the true spirit of Americanism our people and our industries have agreed that additional taxes are inevitable so that we can be able to defend our sacred liberties if need be.

Not many years ago the Democratic administration brought about the rebirth of a great industry, which gives employment to millions and provides billions in revenue. I refer to the brewing industry. Yet, this industry, which suffered almost complete annihilation for more than a decade

and only within the last few years has had a chance to get its head above water, has taken the lead in assuming the responsibility for its proportionate share of the defense program.

One of the world's greatest breweries, Anheuser-Busch, is located in the district I have the honor to represent. Several days ago its president issued a statement in which he called upon the Congress to be considerate of this great industry when assessing new taxes and yet he willingly assumed the urgent necessity to accept new taxes for the purpose of defending this great land of ours. In connection with this statement I ask leave to include a brief editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 1, 1940.

WILLING TAXPAYERS

So thoroughly are the American people convinced of the need for stronger national defense that a majority of them seem ready to pay willingly the additional taxes required for this purpose. This fine attitude seems to have taken the administration rather by surprise, for Mr. Roosevelt's first statements evaded the matter of paying the bill by leaving the procedure up to Congress and suggesting an increased debt limit as the way out. Not until after messages of cooperation began deluging the White House was increased taxation, usually a taboo subject in an election year, put on the agenda.

An admirable expression of the prevailing feeling comes from a St. Louis firm, Anheuser-Busch, Inc. Through its president, Adolphus Busch III, the company states its readiness to pay the proposed additional $1-per-barrel Federal tax on beer. "The preparedness program proposed by the President transcends all other considerations," Mr. Busch says. "We stand ready to bear our fair share of any taxes imposed to meet this emergency."

This statement, we believe, speaks for the great majority of American businessmen and private citizens. In the face of the Nation's need, paying taxes for defense becomes a patriotic duty. The taxpayers' eager cooperation does not mean their vigilance over how the money is spent will be relaxed, however. On the contrary, it makes all the greater the Government's duty of making its defense investment wisely.

Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, after over 7 years of being asleep and wildly expending the resources of the country we are now to vote and increase the national debt by $4,200,000,000. It is for us now to buckle down, get to work along the lines of America first. My hope is that it is not too late. The following editorial from the Oil City Derrick, Oil City, Pa., expressed my views:

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of May 31, 1940]

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

We agree with Governor James in his Memorial Day address at the national cemetery in Gettysburg that if the vast sums spent by the Government on unemployment had been devoted to building up our defenses, and especially our highways which are all-important in case of war, there would not be so many idle workers, and the country would not be in the defenseless position it is today.

Now that Hitler has struck, the manner in which other nations have had their national virility sapped by economic agitators is becoming crystal clear.

A well-documented article in this week's Saturday Evening Post, written by W. G. Krivitsky, tells how cleverly the defeated German army generals, bent on vengeance started in, 20 years ago, to whip the "red" army of Russia into effective shape.

On the other hand the "reds" were working on the proletariat fringes in the democratic nations of Britain, France, and the United States, and organizing these volatile elements into forces determined to break down their economic structures. So much for Hitler's abuse of "red" Russia, which was purely window dressing. He and Stalin have long understood each other.

It is anything but a pretty story—this conspiracy on the part of the Reich to weaken the nations which defeated her in the World War and humiliated her through the Treaty of Versailles.

France was her chief victim. The "reds" as usual worked on the envy and hatred of the masses by organizing labor into a political force, by urging pacifism and sabotage and by diverting a large share of the national income from national defense into social security. Now the Allied army in Flanders is paying the penalty for the "red" regime of Leon Blum.

In England glib agitators elected to Parliament from the industrial sections for a time took over the reins of government.

The damage which has been done to the United States through the past 7 years of trying to establish the more abundant life may be expressed by the patent fact that not only are we now practically defenseless but we have wasted so much of our substance on social experiments that half of it would have provided us with the greatest Army and Navy in the world.

When the history of the second World War is written, German intrigue will be its most illuminating chapter. We see its operations now in the German-Russian alliance; in the easy manner in which Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium were taken; in the actions of Quislings and Leopolds, and in the organization of those damnable "fifth columns," made up of spies and traitors.

Before England and France could deal with those subversive elements they had to abandon freedom and embrace dictatorships.

As yet we have no idea how far this red menace has wormed its way into our vitals, but we do know that with American industry, the backbone of our national defense, our principal industries have been harried and hamstrung through foolish laws foisted on the Nation by well-meaning but misguided New Dealers, who have not hesitated to change the complexion of our judiciary to make these laws stick.

Now that this social program has all but bankrupted the United States, we are facing the expenditure of other billions to save America for the American people. Let us hope that we are not starting too late.

This Memorial Day—Americans Should Give Thanks That We Are at Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I was among those last week who deplored the fact that the leadership of the House failed to set aside at least an hour to respect the memory of American heroes who have given of their strength and courage in the wars which have molded this country into its present position of greatness. It seems to me that Congress is derelict in its duty when it sets aside a national patriotic day for the rest of the country to respect and then fails, itself, to recognize the debt of gratitude which we all owe to the heroic dead whose sacrifices have helped preserve this Republic.

I would not have had Congress take a holiday on Memorial Day during these trying times, but it would in no way have handicapped our activities or slowed down our legislative schedule to have set aside at least an hour to pay homage to the heroes of America. We could easily have met an hour earlier or adjourned an hour later in order to pay official recognition to Memorial Day and our entire omission of such recognition remains a black blot on the record of the current Congress.

NEEDED—A PATRIOTISM WHICH DOES NOT PENALIZE THE HEROES OF THE PAST AS IT FACES DANGERS OF THE FUTURE

Because it tells an impressive Memorial Day message and because it brings to us the refreshingly sane thinking of a great midwestern newspaperman, Fred C. Christopherson, of Sioux Falls, I have asked leave to reprint the following editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader of South Dakota. Its sincere tribute to the heroes of past wars is in striking contrast with the curious cash-at-any-price patriotism of some eastern seaboard newspapers which are now combining editorials attempting to involve America in the present war abroad with editorials criticizing this Congress because we recently passed a pension bill giving some small

measure of relief to the widows, orphans, and parents of the World War.

BAD TASTE IS ADDED TO BAD JUDGMENT

To my way of thinking, the warlike editors and columnists who would rush this country into another war, while at the same time expressing resentment that Congress has at long last voted some needed pension legislation, are adding bad taste to bad judgment, to the discredit of the papers they serve. I think it is bad judgment to try to plunge into a modern war 3,000 miles away a country so illy prepared that its soldiers would be mere suicide squads if shipped overseas to fight; and I think it is extremely bad taste for those big-money papers who now promote war to criticize this Congress for paying just one small part of its obligation to those who were drafted from farm and city to be offered as possible sacrifices in the World War. The least these present-day war salesmen could do, one would think, is to praise rather than pillory Congress for its efforts to make some amends to the soldiers and sailors of the last war and their families. Those eastern journalists who now advocate flirting with war should recognize and remember that the costs of war are great and that after any war for which a nation drafts its fighters it is axiomatic that pensions must follow to care for the human tragedies and the suffering which inevitably follow a modern conflict.

THIS MEMORIAL DAY—AN EDITORIAL

[From Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.]

There is something tragic about this Memorial Day, something that seems disturbingly futile.

We pay honor to the dead of other wars. Meanwhile a horrible war in Europe is blasting the lives out of men, women, and children by the hundreds of thousands.

Satisfaction, of course, may be derived from the fact that Americans are not being numbered today among the victims of the slaughter.

If there is any profound resolution we should make as we pay homage today to the dead of other American wars, it is to use our every energy in striving to maintain peace in America.

The time may come when this is impossible. But let us make sure that whatever course we do follow is selected in calm thought and proper understanding.

We have had many years during which to reflect upon the horrors of the first World War. We have examined our mistakes. In a sober period of reflection, we concluded that we should refrain from participation in future European wars.

Before altering that decision, if we are to do so, we should ponder seriously, thoughtfully, and carefully upon the matter.

War today is more terrible than at any previous time in the history of the world. The inventive genius of man has been employed in the construction of death-dealing instruments of a scope far surpassing those available to the armies in earlier wars. It is entirely possible that most of Europe will be a shambles before the final shot is fired in the conflict now raging on the other side of the Atlantic.

Let us pause today and give thanks that we are at peace. Let us kneel before the graves of the soldiers of other wars now in their long sleep and pledge ourselves to preserve American peace at any reasonable price.

World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. HAROLD CLUETT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. G. ASHTON OLDHAM, D. D., S. T. D., BISHOP OF ALBANY

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the address of the bishop of Albany at the annual convention, diocese of Albany, May 7, 1940:

This convention meets—as in all probability will the general convention—at a time of greatest political and national upheaval in all history. The very foundations of a civilization built up laboriously through the centuries are being shaken and the entire structure threatened with disaster. Some, perhaps much of it, ought to perish, based as it is on a pagan materialism and selfishness, and make way for something better. But the process is not a pleasant one and it fills us with dark forebodings and fears for the future. The whole drama is so vast and the issue so complicated and intertwined that the keenest intellects are unable to understand its full significance or provide unerring guidance. At times we feel utterly impotent and in the grip of forces which we can neither control nor direct.

In the midst of this chaos is the Christian Church; and, today, as is usual in times of trouble, people are turning to it with wistful hope as the only way out. And what is the church doing? Too often, alas, concerned with itself, drenched with self-regard, and even, sad to say, adding to the world's turmoil by its own petty bickerings within and without. In national and international affairs, we find its members mouthing the same shibboleths as the politicians, unable to see issues any more clearly or face them with any greater courage.

Not long ago I attended a large meeting in New York for consideration of our foreign policy. The speakers dealt with the subject from the standpoint of our material self-interest; but, during the question period, one man asked if there were not also involved issues of moral principle and whether that was not the most important consideration. The chairman replied by saying they had a bishop on the platform and, if anybody could address himself to such a question, he of all men should be able to do so; whereupon he called upon me, and my few remarks met with enthusiastic approval.

I cite this incident, not because of its personal bearing, but as an illustration of the uneasiness of mind of many people because moral issues are so much ignored in the consideration of the pressing world problems that confront us and as evidence that people naturally and rightly look to the church for light and guidance in the sphere of morals. This is the chief and often the only contribution the church has to make. We are not experts in diplomacy, nor are many of us sufficiently informed on these very complex subjects to be able to give any worth-while direction as to method. We should, however, be able to bring to bear our moral judgment and not be swept along on the tide of unreflective, superficial, and often dangerous cliches and slogans, which characterize much of our political thinking.

With this background, I ask you to consider several current slogans which appear to be accepted as axiomatic by multitudes of Americans without any reference to their moral content, for it is precisely here that clear thinking and guidance are needed.

And first, that word "neutrality," it is now used as a technical, legal device to keep us out of war. But note its literal meaning as given in the dictionary, as follows: "having no decided character, neither one thing nor the other, indifferent, indefinite, the state of being neither good nor bad"; and, as applied to a contest, it means being "friendly to each of the belligerents." Can Christians or men of any moral integrity consent to be so described? If neutrality means that we are indifferent to issues of right and wrong, that we make no distinction between godless, brutal, and rapacious governments and those who believe in liberty and justice, that we do not care how many little countries are overrun, how many thousands of innocent people are subject to the tortures of concentration camps or driven out of home and country to wander like wild beasts on the face of the earth—then it is an abhorrent thing—both in the eyes of all decent men and of God. "I would thou wert cold or hot," says the book of Revelation; "so because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." One classic instance of neutrality we Christians know well, when an individual endeavored to avoid taking a stand and literally washed his hands of an unpleasant business; and for 2,000 years since the church has chanted in her worship, "crucified under Pontius Pilate." On a moral issue no Christian can be neutral except at the loss of his immortal soul.

Isolation, a favorite word in some quarters, is another device to keep us safe and sheltered. Instead of doing so, however, it increases and intensifies the disease it aims to cure. The chief cause of this war is an arrogant and selfish nationalism, which tends to divide the world into separate self-contained units. It is contrary to the whole trend of events and a defiance of the will of God. Science has knit the world into a closely interrelated and interdependent unity; and it can only be peaceful or prosperous as this fact is recognized. God made a sphere, not a hemisphere, and man is breaking it up into fragments. God made a human race, and man divides it into races and castes and classes and clans. Science has made the world a neighborhood, and it is the church's business to make it a brotherhood. Isolation and imperialism are twin brothers, as witness recent suggestions that we acquire surrounding islands for our protection, which is precisely the suggestion Russia made to Finland. Isolation, in short, is a dangerous anachronism, a deadly foe of peace, prosperity, and democracy, and utterly out of harmony with the Christian doctrine that God has made of one blood all nations of men on the face of the whole earth. It is an impossible concept for an intelligent Christian.

Both these words, neutrality and isolation, are distorted from their true meaning and drafted into the service of our most popular slogan, "Keep America out of war," a phrase that is

purely negative in character and devoid of all ethical content. Its dynamic is too often fear and selfishness, and these always vitiate the judgment. We can see the process of moral deterioration already at work. In order to justify a selfish and not overcourageous policy, we assert, despite overwhelming evidence, that no moral issues are at stake, that all are equally guilty and that the whole affair is none of our business. With each passing act of brutality and attack on liberty, we harden our hearts to human suffering, stifle our moral indignation and shout the louder, "A plague on both your houses." When one of our Congressmen can assert that this is simply a war between two gangsters, it shows the depths of intellectual blindness or moral obliquity to which we can descend. To make the avoidance of difficulty or suffering the sole guide and purpose of action is inadequate, unworthy, and of dubious morality.

To no one of these slogans, as popularly used, can the church give its approval. Instead, it must insist that our actions be based on the solid rock of moral principle, not on fear and selfishness, that we should be primarily concerned about righteousness, not safety. If we can better serve the world by staying out of war, that is a good and valid reason. But let us be honest and realistic as we assert it. The years since the last war do not evidence on our part any great desire to serve mankind, nor do most of the utterances of press and politicians today. As Christians, however, we can accept no lower motive. We are our brother's keeper. In God's sight, we have a duty not only to ourselves but to the world.

The total absence of any such thought in connection with the recent peace rallies of college students throughout the land constitutes them a most disturbing and disgusting spectacle. There were plenty of slogans such as "The Yanks are not coming," "Bury the dead," and "Keep the U. S. A. out of imperialistic wars," as if poor Finland, Denmark, and Norway were not among the finest examples of democracy to be found—but nowhere did I read a single reference to duty or morality or service or any honest attempt to face facts and realize the true nature of this conflict. The whole idea seemed to be: "We don't care anything about right or wrong, if only we can keep safe and comfortable." Such crass selfishness, intellectual blindness, and moral obtuseness in the rising college generation bodes ill for the country. These young people might do well to return to the classics and recall those noble lines in Juvenal's Eighth Satire, in English paraphrase, as follows:

> "Count it a baseness if your soul prefer
> Safety to that which honor asks of her;
> And hold it manly life itself to give
> Rather than lose the things for which we live."

Or they might turn to a leader of our own land, the late Theodore Roosevelt, who said: "Only by putting honor and duty ahead of safety shall we stand erect before the world, high of heart and the master of our own souls."

All of which does not mean that I want America to go to war or that I have in any degree changed my attitude on this subject. I loathe war with all my soul and ardently look forward to the day when this curse of mankind will be banished from the earth—not merely from America. Some years ago I wrote a pamphlet suggesting that our aim should be, "Not keep America out of war but keep war out of the world"; and with others I have persistently endeavored to have our Nation do its part to this end—but in vain. Had this Nation or the Christian church taken this matter seriously years ago, had we thrown ourselves ardently and thoroughly into the effort to build a peaceful world, the result might be different today. Peace is indivisible. To be sure of it anywhere, it must be everywhere; and both our Christian duty and sound policy require that we cooperate with all peace-loving nations of the world as the only road to enduring peace.

My own conception of a Christian attitude for our country was set forth in an utterance of mine which has had very wide circulation and is familiar to most of you under the caption "America first," and reads as follows:

"AMERICA FIRST

"Not merely in matters material, but in things of the spirit.

"Not merely in science, inventions, motors and skyscrapers, but also in ideals, principles, character.

"Not merely in the calm assertion of rights, but in the glad assumption of duties.

"Not flaunting her strength as a giant, but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a Good Samaritan.

"Not in splendid isolation, but in courageous cooperation.

"Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples, but in sympathy, love, and understanding.

"Not in treading again the old, worn, bloody pathway which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster, but in blazing a new trail, along which, please God, other nations will follow, into the New Jerusalem, where wars shall be no more.

"Some day some nation must take this path—unless we are to lapse once again into utter barbarism—and that honor I covet for my beloved America.

"And so, in that spirit and with these hopes, I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"

This was written 16 years ago, and I see no reason to change a single word.

Today countries which hated and dreaded and tried to avoid war as much as ourselves are being sacrificed over there—Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and others to come—human beings are suffering agony and death that we may enjoy safety and security. Can we without shame accept the benefits of such sacrifice without giving some equivalent? Surely it calls for something more than complacent aloofness or selling for cash. We must match their sacrifice with our own, not necessarily in physical agony and death, but at least in moral and spiritual agony, and a determination at any cost to render equivalent service to mankind. It may be God's will that we stay out of this war. I am sure it is His will that we should more effectively use our predominant power to curb aggression and help to make this world safe for small nations; and I, for one, am deeply grateful for our President's strong words in this connection. How this can best be done is for statesmen to determine; but Christians must never forget that God has a purpose for nations as for individuals, and it is of the utmost importance that we discern and follow that purpose. If sincerely and without thought of consequences we as a nation honestly endeavor to do God's will, the way will be made clear. "In His will is our peace."

The University of Maine, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made:

America has been sailing in the doldrums. The American spirit has been temporarily depressed. People are passing through another wilderness of doubt. They ask, Are we really going on or has America passed its prime? Such questionings simply indicate that America is still a thing of growth. We are gathering our resources once again to move ahead.

In this new day that is about to dawn the University of Maine is likely to play an increasingly important role. Both in education and research there may well be greatly increased demands.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Every generation in America has added 1 year to the formal education of its youth. Four years of high school have become a commonplace of the American educational system in the last 100 years. Now we face the challenge of whether this popularizing of education shall continue and of what it shall consist.

The feeling of the futility of merely classical education for many of our youth has grown apace. Prudent fathers of ample means are today sending some of their children to trade schools.

Success in any field today is the result of highly specialized knowledge and the demands grow more and more exacting.

Technology and chemurgy are the ideas with which to conjure in the decade that lies ahead.

The other colleges in Maine are obviously not going to be able to assume any material increase in their enrollment because of the limitations under which they must carry on.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

All the old sense of educational rivalry has happily long since passed. The University of Maine is the obvious instrumentality through which any further expansion in our facilities for public education must come. Whether this will come through assembling more students at Orono or through the medium of extension centers through the State for preliminary training is a matter for educational evolution.

Let us remember there are more than 50,000 boys and girls in Maine of college age and less than 5,000 in our institutions of higher learning. Meanwhile it is interesting and profitable to recall the history of the university from its inception in 1865 under the encouragement of the Morrill Act.

GROWTH FROM SMALL BEGINNINGS

Contrast the early income of the college in 1876, when $7,104 from the Federal Government was added to $10,500 from the State with the peak of the State grant in 1929 when the State gave the university $658,272.50, now reduced this last year to $584,252.36. The Federal grant has grown steadily to the peak of $346,810.52, achieved this last year.

Every taxpayer in Maine is a sustaining member of the university, because of his annual contribution. Those of us who have

a degree from the university have a special responsibility to see that this is sympathetically understood. Tuition, meanwhile, has grown to the impressive annual amount of $332,252. The university now is one of the great business as well as educational institutions of the State with an annual budget in excess of $1,750,000.

FEDERAL AID—WHY NOT?

Centainly, critics of Federal aid will pause when they contemplate the good that has been accomplished for Maine youth in three-quarters of a century by the $6,341,610.78 received from the Federal Government in that period by the University of Maine. It is amazing and amusing sometimes to find some of the severest critics of Federal aid among those who have received a part of their education as a result of Federal aid.

Technical training in ever-broadening fields is obviously to be required in the mechanized civilization of tomorrow.

America is going into high gear again and start ahead.

The great field house and athletic field of the university stand as monuments to the devotion of its graduates. Soon the new library will mark another milestone in the evolution of its service to the State of Maine.

The field of research is as yet but scratched. Maine must not be left behind the procession in the modern marvels of chemurgy. Much has been done but much more is to come.

PROGRESS IS THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

Yankee ingenuity is still called to meet the challenge of these changing times.

Soon recovery will be here. That will mean opportunity for our youth. Training for life streamlined to accommodate the dynamics of the modern tempo will be imperatively required. We must begin to think and plan not in terms of today but of tomorrow that will so soon be here.

The future rushes on us and must not find America and particularly its youth unprepared. In the universities and colleges of the present there is being born the world of tomorrow.

Cooperation of all agencies, public and private, State and Federal, will be the guaranty that America will continue as an example of the significance of universal education in the evolution of a more ordered world.

Senator Reed's Testimony on the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th day of May, last, the Honorable James A. Reed, the gifted and distinguished gentleman from Missouri who for many years served his country so faithfully and well in the Senate of the United States, appeared as a witness before the committee charged with the investigation of the National Labor Relations Board.

I wish I had the time to read to my colleagues his evidence—evidence of extra-legal and abominable conduct on the part of the Labor Board members and their staff of employees. However, I can merely refer my colleagues to his evidence as reported in the verbatim record of the committee hearings.

At the conclusion of his testimony, Edmund M. Toland, able general counsel to the committee, realizing that the committee and the country could profit by the sage advice of Senator Reed, elicited from him a clear and succinct appraisal of the committee's proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. I quote this statement, knowing that it will be helpful to all of my colleagues who desire to give further consideration to the aforesaid amendments on the eve of their presentation to the House:

Mr. TOLAND. Based upon your years in public life, based upon your service in the House of Congress, in the Senate of the United States, based upon your long years as a member of the bar of the State of Missouri and the State and Supreme Court of the United States, will you be good enough to give the committee your opinion as to what you think, if any, are the defects in the present act, in the operation of the act by the Board, and what amendments, if any, you think the Congress of the United States should enact?

Mr. REED. That is a pretty large order. In my opinion, with reference to the way this present law has been administered is pretty well illustrated by the report of the majority of this committee. I would like to deal with that question first before coming to the other question.

I have practiced law for over 50 years, pretty actively and in many courts. I claim no superior intelligence or learning beyond that of any reasonably competent lawyer. And I shall try and make my statements as moderate as I can, because in this present hearing I have an interest, but the observations I am going to make now I make as a citizen, and I would make them if I had never heard of this case.

I have never read in my life anywhere such a catalog of improper, unjudicial, unfair rulings and acts as are set forth in this report.

If one-tenth part of the report is true, this Labor Board ought to be abolished overnight, and some kind of tribunal, if one is to exist, set up with proper safeguards for the right of litigants. I read in this report that this Board, supposedly a semijudicial body and clothed with powers in many respects, or in some respects, greater than the courts of justice possess, institutes boycotts against manufacturers, and that even before that manufacturing company has had a hearing before the Board, a process of condemnation without a hearing, and, then, a resort to a punishment which is not within the purview of the Board, for nowhere is it stated in this Wagner Act or in the Norris-LaGuardia Act that it is any part of the business or authority of the Board to attack a business by trying to take away its customers. The punishment it can impose are not to boycott and destroy a business but to prevent some particular wrong or injury.

Now, a man that will do that, a board that will do that thing, furnishes the indubitable evidence that it is prejudiced, that it is controlled by ulterior and vindictive motives, and that it is utterly unfit to sit as a tribunal anywhere under the American flag.

It is the kind of thing that is resorted to by racketeers who come to a man and demand certain compensation or money, and tell him, if he does not give it they will destroy his business, they will not permit him to sell his goods, wares, or industry. It is on a parallel, and a board that will do things of this kind ought to be inducted into the racketeers' union, if one exists.

They write a letter to Filene Store, of Boston, a very large store, in which they attack the Berkshire Mills Co., and ask the Filene Co. to bring pressure upon the Berkshire Co. Pressure for what? Manifestly, pressure to make them yield to the demands of some union. Now, here is a concern, let us take this for a moment, I have learned a little about merchandising, not much, but here is a concern that has to plan its business, buy its goods, its raw materials, employ its labor, incur overhead, and it must have customers, and when you can take away from it important customers you destroy that business, you put it into bankruptcy, you turn its labor out of employment. Here is a Board supposed to represent the United States and the justice and majesty of our laws resorting to methods of that kind.

Well, here is the firm of Weiss & Klans Co. They were engaged in business which made it desirable for them to get Government contracts, and efforts are being made to blacklist that company so that it can't get Government contracts, although it is not only entitled to get them if it bids properly but it is to the advantage of the Federal Government and the people of the United States that they should get them, if they are the lowest and best bidder. Now, this action is in no manner justified by any letter, line, or syllable of the law; it was purely an arbitrary act, and it goes to show how dangerous a thing it is to confer authority upon people who are willing to abuse it.

Here is another instance, and I am calling the attention to just a few. This is not news to the Board, but you have asked for my opinion and I am trying to give it to you in the mildest language I know how to employ.

We set up in this country an institution to loan money to companies that were in financial trouble. Why? Wholly a new thing in our governmental functions; but it is being done and largely, I think, approved because it was desirable that companies that were in financial difficulty might be tided over and not closed down, and not thereby destroy the opportunities of labor.

Well, the Board tried to have loans withheld from companies that have not been tried, so that they could go bankrupt because somebody had made an accusation against them. Now, this book is full of these things. This report ought to be read by every Member of Congress. It ought to be printed in every newspaper of the United States, in substance and effect. But we come to another thing that is charged here, and I take it upon substantial grounds, that they have taken the money of the people of the United States—your taxes and my taxes and everybody's taxes—and have been expending as much as $2,600 a month for attorneys to lobby with reference to amendments to this very measure that are now pending.

Well, when I was in the Senate, which was under a different regime than we have now, we were trying to pass laws to make it illegal to lobby. A lobbyist was supposed to be on the border line of a crook. That was the atmosphere we had at that time. That may not have been entirely right. Now we take the money of the people of the United States and hire a lot of lawyers to go over to the Capitol and try to prevent a change or alteration or an amendment to this bill.

That sort of thing is not only immoral but it is clearly illegal, and if the penalties of the law were visited as they should be, it would result in the removal from office of every one of these gentlemen who were party or privy to this infamous transaction.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Does the Senator know that the Labor Board endeavors to justify its lobbying action with the excuse that all of the other bureaus do the same thing?

Mr. REED. I didn't have that information, although I have had a suspicion of that kind, and I think most of the people in the country had.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. That still doesn't make it right, though, does it, in your estimation?

Mr. REED. That is like one thief, excusing himself for stealing a horse, by saying somebody else stole a mule. If that is going on in this country, then—and I am not going into politics—if that is part of the New Deal, they had better perform a surgical operation and cut the cancer out.

I am not going to refer to other matters in this report. You have asked me for my opinion as to amendments. I would not want to undertake to give this committee a comprehensive analysis of this bill, but there are two or three things that, if they are not taken out of the law, will result in great wrong, and they have resulted in great wrong. The first thing that I think we ought to do is to make this bill appear not as a bill attacking everybody who has a business or an industry, but I think the preamble to the bill is very unfortunately drawn. It really is susceptible of the construction that it is a general indictment of all people who employ labor. That is a doctrine that is utterly untenable, and no such implication should be in any law. That, however, in my judgment, is not the most important thing, and I am only going to mention two or three things.

In the first place, the law ought to be changed so that any person put to trial must be tried in accordance with the rules of law and evidence. When you go outside of those rules which have been developed in the course of a thousand years of jurisprudence, you are absolutely certain to introduce into every controversy matters that are improper and that prejudice the cause of justice.

The next great question, in my judgment, is the weight to be given to evidence. To say that a court is to be bound by the decision of a board if there is any evidence to sustain it, is to say that justice may be outraged every day in the year. As Judge Otis says in his opinion, susceptible of the construction that if one witness swear in a certain way, and 20 swear the other way, the mere finding of the Board is conclusive upon the courts. That is to say your rights are not to be measured by the facts as they exist, but by a misconstruction of those facts by a board or tribunal. That certainly ought to come out of this law. There ought to be a clarification of the right and privileges of plant unions.

When I read the provision in the Wagner Act that the employees of a certain factory or institution could organize and that then it would be the duty of the employer to deal with them and with them alone, it seemed to me that that created a sort of a democracy in labor that would be very desirable. They would no longer be subject to attack by the greater organizations. Their rights would be secured and they could gain the protection of the law and of the courts. That ought to be made so plain that there can be no controversy about it in the future.

The act ought to be amended so that in any case, where the rights of a citizen are being outraged, that the jurisdiction of the courts should be restored so that those rights can be protected, and until you do that, you do not have the rule of law, but you have the rule of bureaus and bureaucracies that change overnight and that may rely for their decisions upon the prejudiced opinions of some underling.

But there is one thing in all this discussion that I want to say a word about, and that is the right of a citizen of the United States to express his opinion to any other citizen of the United States with reference to any subject or matter whatsoever, provided he does not, in the doing of that, in the expression of that opinion, impinge upon the rights of some other person, or the public. To say, as it is now being attempted, that an employer cannot talk to his employee, cannot express an opinion to his employee, cannot seek to persuade that employee not to join a labor union is to deny the right of free speech.

This right of free speech doesn't exist on behalf of the man who works at the lathe and denied to the man who may be his employer. The right of those two men to exchange their views, and to do it frankly and freely, without any limitation, must be preserved. Now that has nothing to do with coercion. If, in using his right to speak, an employer were to say to one of his employees, "If you dare to do this, that, or the other thing, I will discharge you," that is coercion, and properly can be forbidden by the law. But the mere right to make an argument, to present reasons, is of an entirely different character, and yet this Board and its subordinates have been holding to the doctrine that a man can't even talk to his employee.

Now, this right of free speech lies at the foundation of all our rights. As was said by a learned judge, the right to think is of very little value if you cannot express your thoughts.

The right of free speech is not limited by the public opinion of the day. The chief benefit of the right of free speech is that ideas shall be expressed which may be contrary to the general opinion of the day. Strike it down, limit it, qualify it in any way, and you have driven a dagger through the heart of the liberty of the people of this country. It is even more important than the liberty of the press, because the right to speak is a right which inheres in every being that is born, and he can exercise it; whereas the liberty of the press, of course, is more limited as an instrumentality for each individual, and I say, as Jefferson said, that I would rather live in a country where all the rights of the people were sought to be extinguished and preserve the liberty of the press than to preserve all other safeguards the law can create.

But the right of the individual, the right of the man who works for me (and I don't mean I have employees except in my office) to come to me with his requests, and my right to go to him and suggest things that I think ought to be done, those two rights must be preserved in this country, and if they are not preserved, if this doctrine of freedom of speech is ever circumscribed or cut down, the people that will first feel the deadly effect will be the people who work with their hands and their brains for a living.

Because always in the end of life and in the end of experience, the man who is without much money and who is obliged to rely upon his daily effort for his living is the first man that feels the effect of oppression, and oppression's greatest enemy is freedom of speech, and liberty, and of the press. Civilization's greatest friend is the free exchange of ideas, and no Congress and no legislative body has any right to say that because a man works for another, they cannot discuss their mutual business and affairs.

Now, gentlemen, I have taken too much of your time. You gave me a large order and I have tried to do what I can about it. I thank you very much.

The Danger of Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHILTON (WIS.) TIMES-JOURNAL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of hysteria, it is reassuring to note the attitude of many editors throughout the country who are bending their efforts to try to keep the thought of the people of America in orderly and rational channels.

Mr. William J. McHale, editor of the Chilton Times-Journal at Chilton, Wis., in an editorial published on May 30, 1940, very clearly reflects the danger of hysteria, and I am pleased to incorporate this editorial in the RECORD in order that the people of the country may have the benefit of his splendid thoughts on this subject.

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal of May 30, 1940]

THE DANGER OF HYSTERIA

As the threat of war comes closer to America, and particularly as we become acutely aware of the magnitude of the Nazi war machine and the new terrifying devices and methods it employs, aversion for the Nazi creed mounts in this country. This aversion is magnified by the dreadful stories of suffering, hardship, and death among the millions of refugees which are streaming out of the invaded neutral countries. It is one of the greatest, most heart-rending, and pathetic mass migrations of history. The stories of "fifth columnists," those spies and traitors of the new technique and, above all, the diabolical parachutists that are dropped from the skies to murder, burn, and destroy behind the lines, fill us with loathing for the modern methods of "total war."

There are indications that the reaction to the war news in some parts of this and other American countries is inclining to place under suspicion all persons of German birth or extraction. That attitude is likely to become more general if the hysteria increases. It is an attitude which should be avoided and suppressed because it is as unfair as the things it condemns.

Nazi-ism, fascism, and communism are all fanatical ideologies, beliefs in which rabid leaders work their followers up to a pitch of religious devotion. They are all basically godless, because to survive they must do away with all opposition. The dictators set themselves up as the subjects of worship, the gods of the new paganism. Their appeal is principally to the young whose bodies and minds can be molded most readily to the pattern set by the leaders. Those who do not believe have the choice of silent submission or a prison camp, or worse. Opposition is suppressed ruthlessly. The successful dictator must stand ready to play the role of a mass murderer, and often does, to enforce submission.

The people of Germany are intrinsically no more cruel or murderous than the people of any other nation. Among them will be found as much kindness, sympathy, charity, and benevolence as among the people of any other country. Those qualities are not the exclusive possession of any race or nation. Nazi-ism is the inspiration of a leader that exalted nationalism and "raceism" as a creed. He came upon the scene at a critical time in German history when there were millions of people ready to listen to anyone who could, with some show of reason, hold out hope for better things. He gained recruits, just as fanatics in this country can

gain recruits for almost any cause. The Ku Klux Klan is a current example of the ability of leadership to win a following. Nazism, like klanism, is a rabid idea and not a racial characteristic.

So, if war hysteria should deepen, we should guard against the fallacy that because a man is an Italian he is a potential Fascist or because he is a German he is at heart a Nazi. It does not follow that all members of a nationality accept as their own all the ideas of a leader of that nationality. As Americans we have a way of disagreeing violently with our political leaders.

It is a safe guess that the vast majority of Americans of German and Italian birth and extraction in this country would shed their blood as freely and willingly for American democracy as would any other section of our population. In spying out "fifth columnists," traitors, and spies in this country, therefore, simple justice to the members of our many nationalities requires that hate and hysteria be not permitted to confuse un-American idealogies with nationalities. We will probably find as large a proportion of "fifth column" candidates among our college and university students and faculties, who claim Mayflower lineage, as we will among American citizens of German extraction.

The Gods of Valhalla

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

ORATION BY PHIL W. GROSSMAN, JR.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following oration entitled "The Gods of Valhalla," by Phil W. Grossman, Jr., Marquette University School of Law, Milwaukee, Wis.

This oration won the first prize for the State of Wisconsin in the Seabury National Peace Oratorical Contest held at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 19, 1940. The prize which Mr. Grossman, as author and speaker, was awarded was $50 cash and the opportunity to enter the manuscript in the national contest to compete with orators from other States for an additional $500 award.

The contest is sponsored annually in nearly every State by the Misses Seabury, of Maine, who seek to encourage the discussion among American youth concerning the ways to peace among the nations of the world.

There is an ancient legend—a myth that the Norsemen used to believe—that tells a peculiar story. It is the story of the pagan god, Odin, king of the gods of Asgard. Now Odin, not unlike earthly rulers subsequent to himself, had a plan—a plan to make secure his power by defeating some day—he didn't know when—the great giants who roamed through his particular heaven. To do this he needed men—fighting men—men who knew not a fear. So he summoned to his castle the souls of the bravest warriors who had been slain in earthly battles and there they would enter the ranks of the soldiers who were preparing to move against the giants; all of them receiving the promise from Odin that when each battle was completed they would return to the castle, and, by feasting in the great hall, would recover from all of their wounds.

Because of their belief in this myth the Norsemen were not afraid of being killed at war. Anyone who died a peaceful death on earth was excluded from this legendary heaven. And so it was called Valhalla, the hall of the chosen slain.

Most of us today do not consider ourselves foolish enough to believe in such false gods or such mythical promises. But on the continent of Europe, ladies and gentlemen, we have seen in our lifetime the restoration of those very same gods to the castle of Valhalla. For 7 years 60,000,000 middle Europeans have been beating their plowshares into swords because Hitler promises them that some day the "giants" will be destroyed and the great day for Aryanism will at last be had—"Unify, strengthen, conquer, and some day you will feast at the table of 'Mittel Europa.'" The Germans believe in Valhalla.

We learn that in Fascist Japan every soldier is taught that he is fighting for the supremacy of a man whom he calls "god." And the words of that god are these, "War is the supreme holy enterprise of mankind. To die at war is the greatest glory and the height of exultation." The Japanese believe in Valhalla.

One hundred and sixty-five million Russians march at the crack of a whip. March into certain death, because above them is Stalinism, which has made those men automatons, parts in an international war machine. And that twentieth-century pagan god, seated on his throne in Moscow, promises them a new world order. The Russians believe in Valhalla.

In the year 1917 we were promised that if we marched across the seas with the light of democracy shining in our eyes we would be serving the cause of peace and, incidentally, the cause of the "giants." We would fight—and 126,000 of us would die—in a war to end all wars. We, and the people of France, and the people of Great Britain were promised peace after the victory. That victory was attained, but there has been no peace. The conquerors believed that they had made secure their power by crushing an imperialistic Germany, robbing her and excluding her from the "heaven" of the democracies. Today the pendulum of power has swung the other way as the defeated one seeks revenge against the "giants" by calling out the armies of its people once again. And again the people of France and the people of Great Britain are fighting and dying because they are promised peace after victory, just as their fathers before them were promised peace after victory. They, too, believe in Valhalla.

Today you and I are wondering about the answer to just one question: "Why?" Why, in the name of peace, will nation fight nation, down to the last red drop of human blood, and down to the last faded shred of the human dream for a world without hate? Why? Because they are afraid; just as the Norse god, Odin, was afraid. They are afraid of losing their power, and in being afraid—they have lost peace. Hitler has written into Mein Kampf two alternatives viewed by today's governments as the only possibilities of national destiny. Views which are making, and always have made—war. In Mein Kampf he says, "Germany will be the world power, or Germany will be nothing at all." And because nobody wants to be "nothing at all," he proceeds to set up a system of guaranties to his people that Germany will be a world power. In this Valhallalike plan there is no room for compromise, no room for prosperity of the world community—only room for pure German supremacy.

The situation in the Orient is similar. The Japanese must be supreme in power. They, too, believe in only two possibilities for their small but ambitious state. It is to be "Japan over Asia or no Japan at all."

Returning to Russia. The Soviet objective is to sow seeds of communism in all nations. This can be done, Stalin claims, when they are weak and helpless as a result of wars between one and another. That is Russia's way to national supremacy.

The people in the democracies, on the other hand, receive no more satisfactory an answer when they demand of their governments a reply to the question, "What are we fighting for?" Great Britain's Prime Minister said, just a short while ago, "Our war aim can be stated very briefly. It is to defeat our enemy. And by that I do not mean merely the defeat of the enemy's military forces; I mean the defeat of the aggressive bullying quality which seeks to dominate other people by force."

And Winston Churchill follows with a ringing speech in which he presumes to foresee the coming of the European heaven of peace when he says, "The day will come when joy bells will ring again throughout Europe, and victorious nations, master of their foes and of themselves, will plan and build again in justice and tradition and in freedom a house of many mansions where there will be room for all." But I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that under present circumstances those are but idle words. Is there, for example, freedom in the kind of a victory which seeks the destruction of a nation? For the Allies have gone on record, by both word and act, to blot out not only Hitlerism but everything that constitutes a threat to their power politics in the western world. Can we expect justice from an empire like Great Britain, which with impunity breaks her contracts—her contract with Czechoslovakia, her contract with Poland, or her treaty with Norway, broken before the ink was dry? And if the peace is to be based on tradition, as Mr. Churchill pleads, then, indeed, do we have cause for pessimism. The Germans remember too well that at the last victor's peace in 1918, one from which they were excluded, Clemenceau, of France, walked into the Versailles conference with these words on his lips: "I don't care what kind of terms you make, so long as Germany is destroyed."

The democracies, as well, have always seen only two possibilities for their destiny; as expressed in the American book by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, which bears the title "We or They," their status is to be either that of a world power or that of nothing at all. The governments of twentieth-century nations have set themselves up as gods of modern Valhallas, blindly believing again that security will be had when they shall be victorious.

But the last chapter of our Nordic legend tells of the inevitable end. It is called Gotterdamerung—The Twilight of the Gods. They never quite succeeded in removing the giants from their heaven. Nor did the giants defeat the warriors. Contrary to all of Odin's promises, the soldiers, after one last fierce battle, passed into oblivion along with the enemy whom they had set out to destroy. It was then they learned that this was indeed no heaven, but the beginnings of hell.

Do you and I today believe in a Valhalla? Think. Do you believe that one last swoop of the democratic armies of the world will bring the kind of a peace men have dreamed of? Do you think that Germany and Russia on the one hand, or France and Britain on the other, will achieve peace whichever wins? The truth is that the most that war can do today is to determine, with a maximum of social disturbance and destruction and death, which contestant is in a position to dictate its terms. That is the folly of war. There lies the problem. I have indicated the solution—a peace, without

a victory. That means a peace pact reached by arbitration among equals and not the traditional treaty dictated by victors to vanquished. A Versailles at which will be present someone—though God grant that there be more than one—who will establish the renaissance the rebirth of the one great peace formula of all times that shall sweep away all of the myths, and impress in the minds of today's leaders the wisdom of a Christian peace. The conclusion of the present chaos can be had by recognizing that peace is not synonymous with supremacy; that national, and consequently, world prosperity—and security, too—never has been had, and never will be had without the recognition of the rights of each nation—the right to live happily and peacefully in a society planned to work by the magnificent realization of the Christian brotherhood of men of every country under the one God who made them all. That realization is the first step. But it is the essential step.

The choice left to the world is clear. It is the choice of Christianity—or war. The Christian method has never failed. It is men who have failed. That plan will work if men will seek it out, follow it, grasp and hold it. For it alone is the answer to the puzzled cry that comes from the lips of all races and echoes around the globe—"Where is our peace? We have fought for it hard and long." And the answer comes back from the ages—"All of you have been fighting, each for your own little Valhalla. And because there is no Valhalla, after all your destruction, you've never had your peace. Send those myths vanishing with the last vanishing smoke of your gunfire and make the world again the world that the One Christian God gave you the power to make of it."

It is the old, old doctrine of Christian charity. But, ladies and gentlemen, it is common sense.

Lessons From the World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES OF J. WARREN MADDEN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last week the convention in New York of one of the great independent labor organizations, the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, warmly applauded advice given them by a guest speaker in regard to the part labor should play in preparing our national defense. Drawing upon the lessons learned about efficient, large-scale production during the first World War, the speaker recited the successful effort the Nation then used to insure a minimum of interruption to production through industrial strife, while at the same time preserving the rights of workingmen to have a place in the national counsels.

The accomplishments of the War Labor Board in 1918 provide a pattern which we may study with present profit. Because I find the viewpoint of the speaker at the Ladies Garment Workers' convention to be sound and instructive, and because of the important office he holds, I wish to include in the RECORD the timely remarks of J. Warren Madden, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

In the report of your officers I find that your union membership is three times as large today as it was during the first World War period. I also find that during the past 2 years you achieved the peaceful renewal of all your association contracts. From these two facts it appears that with your union at least there can be both an increase in organized strength and a decrease in resort to the strike weapon. I know of no reason why your experience cannot be duplicated in other industries.

During the first World War there was an almost complete lack of labor organization and contractual relations in the industries providing basic war materials. Even up to the year 1935 that same condition existed. Today we find the basic iron-and-steel-producing industry about three-quarters organized and with hundreds of effective contracts, most of which have been peaceably renewed more than once. Five years ago there was no such thing as a labor organization of the rubber industry. Today nearly 50,000 rubber workers are living under labor agreements. The same may be said of the great automotive industry and the electrical-equipment industry. In copper smelting and refining, among oil workers, in shipbuilding, and on the decks of ships workers who are essential to our national defense have learned to make their demands through representatives at the bargaining table.

In summation of the notable gains in industrial stability during the past 5 years let these two facts be placed close together: During the past winter there were 4,000,000 more organized workers than there were 5 years ago; also during the past winter, although organized workers were potentially twice as capable of enforcing demands through strikes, there were fewer strikes and fewer workers involved than during any winter since the depression year of 1932.

An objective survey of labor relations in the United States would reveal them to be more stable, more productive of efficiency, and better rooted in mutual understanding than they were in 1917 or than they were in 1935. Some of the same people who cried calamity at the assertion of employee rights 23 years ago and 5 years ago still continue their lamentation. Yet it is profoundly significant that opposition to collective bargaining as a principle has disappeared during the brief period of the lift of the Wagner Act. Employers have signed contracts and have discovered that they are more secure with them than without. Mutual responsibility for the good health of the common enterprise is supplanting mutual suspicion in thousands of American plants.

In the face of this obvious change for the better in industrial relations there are those who protest that the means are wrong, that because a law works it must be tampered with, in much the manner that a small boy itches to take apart a clock. They do say collective bargaining itself is wrong. They speak kindly of that procedure itself, and, indeed, the more recently they have come around to a pronounced faith in collective bargaining the more they protest that they are its only true friends and that they must preserve it from those who have had a part in getting it established and making it work.

What is taking place in Europe today has imposed an imperative necessity to prepare as one united people for national defense. In these preparations a sound employer-employee relationship is a keystone. It is fortunate, indeed, that 5 years ago that relationship was redefined in accordance with democratic principles. Today we face whatever lies ahead in confidence not only that collective bargaining is accepted national policy but also that the principle has had sufficient application during the past 5 years to justify our faith in it as the most practical method to keep management and men working together on amicable terms.

We know from experiences with defense preparations during the first World War what shop problems are likely to throw strains upon the employer-employee relationship. In addition to such workaday questions as seniority and individual grievances we may expect the emergency to pose large-scale problems of reemployment, apprentice training, shifts to new kinds of work, the speed up and adjustments in wages and hours to meet whatever fluctuations in prices there may be in store.

These issues will spring from the emergency, not from the design of any one group or class. They will be impersonal and practical issues, yet their solution lies with human beings whose interests will often be in conflict. Surely there will be an important place for the procedure of collective bargaining to assist in a smoothly operating production of national necessities under conditions equitable to all.

Labor pitched in with good will to abide by necessary rules during the comparable emergency of the first World War. Today, as an industrial nation, we are in a stronger position, through possession of the collective-bargaining practice, to make sensible and orderly determination of emergency problems.

In the trying days which are ahead, America will need, and will have, wise counsel to plan, and a united effort to execute its national program. Labor will have, as so important an interest must have, an important place at the counsel table. And, having participated in the planning, labor will, as every other American interest will, carry out its equitable part in our common effort. Of this there can be no rational doubt, and of this I have no doubt.

Unearned Increment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson appearing in the paper this morning in which it is emphasized that we must do something more than build up a vast armament program if we are to avert in America the philosophy of dictatorship and force which is now threatening to rule Europe and the greater part of the world. I commend it to the attention of every person who would preserve for America the rich heritage that is ours.

UNEARNED INCREMENT—TAKING OUR LIBERTIES FOR GRANTED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

I am not among those who think that we are threatened with an imminent invasion, either from Mars or from the Nazis. It is something quite different with which we are threatened—the complete collapse of the world of which we are an integral part, and the redistribution and reorganization of that world, socially, economically, politically, financially, and spiritually, in such a manner as will menace our institutions, our way of life, and our possibility of independent survival.

Readjustments that affect us radically, that will amount, in fact, to a revolution, will be made while we stand helplessly by, unable effectively to protest or effectively to intervene, waiting to take what we are given—and like it.

The question is not whether we should go to war. It is an idle question, because even if we should at this moment, we could not. In spite of the fact that this "blitzkrieg" against the whole existing order has been systematically and openly prepared for 7 years, it has been the fashion to demur at those who have harped upon it as a prime fact to be considered in the world today, and to call them panicky, war mongers, and hysterical.

Now, it seems to me the hysteria is in the other camp. The country is suddenly aware that we are in a planetary crisis, and that, in a world where only the possession of force can influence events, we are unarmed. At this moment, did we possess the force, we could probably influence, modify, or even determine the whole course of history without even using the force, as Hitler determined what is happening now, not in Holland but at Munich; not by war but by his ability to make it.

There is nothing surprising about what has happened except its speed. It has been coming inexorably—yesterday, and the day before yesterday, and the day before that—this spring, and last spring, and the spring before that—and we were unarmed then, too. And many of the voices now raised in panic and denunciation of our unpreparedness are precisely the ones who have tried hardest in the past to convince the Nation that there was no cause for alarm.

What we need now is not panic, not denunciation, not unconsidered action, but awakening, analysis, and preparation—not for any eventuality but for the most likely eventualities. And part of this preparation must begin with a ruthless and unsparing self-criticism.

The balance sheet of history is mercilessly exact. Hitler's armies are battering down frontiers, armies, peoples, institutions, and a whole world, because that world has offered itself to this fate. For years it has presented such a spectacle of degeneration and decline as to invite the scourge.

We are threatened from without only because we have become weak within. That weakness is not primarily in lack of arms nor in the nefarious work of "fifth columns." The latter merely exploit our weakness—and criminals and gangsters were exploiting it long before "fifth columns" were ever formed. And then there was not a self-confessed rapist or murderer but could find some respectable lawyer to plead his case.

We have been living for a generation on unearned increment, wasting and abusing the liberties which our ancestors won for us in blood, mortgaging our children's patrimony to pay today's bills, which are our own.

Born in liberty, we have forgotten the stern fact of liberty—namely, that it involves the highest degree of personal and group responsibility. Freedom without responsibility means anarchy. When the President said, a week ago Sunday, that we do not need to abandon our democracy to match the strength of aggressors, he spoke the truth. We do not need to abandon it, but we do need to go back to it, to go back to its normal and intellectual foundations and build on them again.

Government by agitator-led masses is not American democracy. The concept that there is some sacred wisdom inherent in majorities, however ignorant, is not American democracy. The Congressman or Senator who is afraid to have a mind or his own and is unwilling to risk his political life for his convictions, reading his telegrams and studying the composition of organized groups before he can make up his mind about anything, is not a democratic statesman but merely a paid agent, and the agent, furthermore, of the most impulsive and easiest to stampede, and the movement articulately greedy and venal.

Everywhere power has been divorced from responsibility.

Our trade-unions have power without an ounce of responsibility for the productive process or for the community. Many of them are dictator-led at that. Their bosses can call strikes at their own will; they can make demands that close an industry and throw men into the streets; they resort to terror over their own members; they prevent management from exercising responsibility and do not even claim it for themselves. In behalf of labor they offend the very spirit of labor, undermining standards of work and divorcing remuneration from competency. The same, in other manifestations, holds true for industry, banking, and our intellectual life.

Profiteers are derided, in a world where profiteering is the characteristic of the day. If a banker, manufacturer, or speculator gyps or boycotts the community in the interest of heavier dividends, self-voted bonuses, and inflated profits, he is either denounced as a malefactor, or becomes an ambassador, depending upon his politics; and the while he is denounced he is emulated by the denouncers. For unearned increment has become the national dream. If you get it one way, you are a profiteer; if another, you are a contributor to "purchasing power."

Integrity, honesty, and noble passion are held up to ridicule. The independent personality is the butt of every cheap joke. Let a man emerge amongst us of truly superior quality and a thousand rats will begin gnawing at his legs to topple him down. If he is a poet, let him write one book inferior to himself and the jackals will howl with glee to proclaim him finished. Let him change his mind through the achievement of wisdom, and he will be called a renegade. A head that stands above the mass must expect to be removed.

To care about anything is to be quaintly ridiculous. Tolerance has been the watchword—that tolerance which comes of believing in nothing, loving nothing, hating nothing, the incapacity for indignation or enthusiasm, the paralysis of action—the tolerance which means that faith has gone out of the human heart and conviction out of the mind.

And this has nothing whatever to do with American democracy, which conceived a world in which personalities could emerge regardless of origin, and whose literature has exalted men and not masses.

We are weak because we have expended our savings and our substance, and mortgaged our future under a system by which those on the directors' board or in the polling booth try to vote themselves an "adequate" income, under the theory that they did not ask to be born, that the world owes them a living, and that fair remuneration is whatever the traffic will bear.

What we did from 1926 to 1929 on a world-wide scale, lending all over the world in order to create purchasing power regardless of assets—a policy which collapsed Europe and gave us Hitler—we have been doing since within our own border, and the results will be the same unless we change those ways.

We contemplate leading a hemisphere, when we cannot decently govern ourselves.

The degeneration of values and the lack of standards are what has made us spend billions without abolishing unemployment or slums or poverty. Instead of lifting the proletariat to a middle-class standard of living, we are pushing the middle classes into the proletariat. Instead of freeing the creative power of American industry under a joyful affirmation of its social responsibility and power, we are shackling it to an irresponsible bureaucracy, and under the guise of modifying capitalism are destroying all creative impulses.

Very soon we shall have to take a leading place in the world or a back seat. If it is to be the former, we must begin by making over ourselves and living in reality and not illusion. There is no cause for fear, but neither is there any cause for thinking that everything is just daisy.

The reality demands sacrificial devotion, intensely hard work by everycne, spiritual and intellectual conviction, and out of it the greatest happiness there is—that which comes of uncoerced dedication to a common and lofty cause.

Panic is the result of rude awakening from a false dream. The contemplation of reality is the beginning of creative courage and corporate salvation.

Air Defense and Our Highway Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the House has acted wisely in passing promptly this afternoon the bill authorizing the continuance of our Federal Highway Act. In his appeal for adequate national defense, President Roosevelt warned us what to expect from any attempt to spread the war to the Western Hemisphere. From Norway, the President tells us, where aggressive armies hold strategic positions, it is only 8 flying hours to Greenland. Greenland is but 6¼ flying hours from Maine. According to these statistics, Maine would become one of our first defensive lines in the event of attack from that direction.

The movement of truck troops, mechanized forces, and supplies to this northeastern corner of our Nation would demand the best modern roads that our highway engineers can design and build. I say "would demand" because these motorways do not exist at the present time. Testimony presented before the House Roads Committee, of which I am a member, revealed that there are some 6,390 miles of highways in the New England States that should be rebuilt, widened, or relocated. There are also 506 bridges that should be widened or rebuilt. The total estimated cost of this contemplated reconstruction and improvement reaches $388,223,000. Reasons for these improvements are based on

immediate peacetime needs to better traffic conditions and promote highway safety.

Based on these called-for peacetime improvements, the cost of building New England's highways to serve the dual purpose of civil and military use would probably approximate $600,000,000. This necessary road construction in New England presents a staggering problem. As the Chief Executive pointed out, this highly industrialized region would be a first target for hostile forces. Therefore, it is highly important that highways in this area provide swift transportation for mobile antiaircraft batteries and other heavy, mechanized rapid-fire equipment.

PROBLEMS ARE WIDESPREAD

The problems of New England are similar to those of other sections of our country. In Georgia and the Carolinas, as well as in the State of Washington, facts and figures for needed highway improvements probably duplicate those of the Northeastern States. I mention Georgia and the Carolinas because they are the most accessible points for flights from Bermuda. These States are exactly 3½ hours from this British possession. With the exception of Canada, Bermuda is the nearest step to our front door. I have flown there from Baltimore in a little over 4 hours. In these States, as well as in the New England Commonwealths, modern highways that directly connect important supply bases with coast defenses are necessary factors in our preparedness.

From Tampico, Mexico, to St. Louis, in the very heart of the United States, is only 5½ flight hours' distance. Likewise, McCord, an important Army air base in the State of Washington, is but 7 hours from Alaska. These scattered points in all parts of our Nation are vulnerable. We can never maintain sufficient men and fighting equipment at these sections to insure their complete defense. Thus, we must depend upon our ability to quickly move additional men, equipment, and supplies to these points over the highway. It is imperative, therefore, that immediate steps be taken to overcome our road handicaps.

Some experts say that these improvements should be treated from the long-range standpoint, that we should approach them with the ease of a peacetime stride. I cannot agree with their sentiments in this respect. I do believe we should eliminate the elements of rush and reckless, emotional haste, but I emphasize the necessity for immediate but thorough action. It is quite obvious that our military leaders believe that America is closer now to warfare on her own soil than at any other time in its recent history. With reported activities of the "fifth column" in Mexico and elsewhere close at hand, it seems but a matter of time before Texas might become the locale of concentrated military activity. May God spare us this reality. But in the meantime, gentlemen, our wisdom dictates that we take stock of our highway deficiencies and begin a program that will modernize our national-road system and make it the finest for peacetime service and, at the same time, a highly developed and definitely efficient adjunct for our mechanized defense.

Our Greatest Danger Is the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether we agreed with President Wilson as to the advisability of entering the League of Nations, very few, if any, ever doubted that he believed sincerely and wholeheartedly in our constitutional form of government. We are willing to concede that after we entered the war, he personally, did his best to speed us on our way toward effective participation in that war. Nevertheless, the sad, sad fact is that billions of dollars were spent and comparatively little was accomplished.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, 1940, gives us a concise, though by no means complete, statement of what actually happened and of how we failed at that time. That editorial is as follows:

UNPREPAREDNESS IN 1917

The United States went to war with Germany on April 6, 1917. In December 1917—8 months later—we had 165,000 men in France, some of whom sailed without rifles and were totally devoid of artillery, airplanes, tanks, machine guns, trench mortars, and other munitions and supplies produced in the United States. Through 19 months Pershing fought our war abroad almost wholly from first to last with guns, munitions, airplanes, hand grenades, and materials either borrowed or bought from the Allies in Europe.

The Ordnance Department at Washington spent nearly $4,000,000,000 from April 1917 to June 1918 in an effort to build 20,000 guns of all calibers and equip them with munitions. The Civil War was fought for less. Despite this truly vast expenditure and effort, only 133 guns and 600 shells of a single caliber reached Pershing in time for use at the front.

The Allies had perfected an effective hand grenade. The War Department rejected this and placed orders for 20,000,000 distinctive American hand grenades. These, however, were too complicated, and Pershing bought hand grenades for our troops from the British.

We spent more than a billion dollars in our 1917–18 aviation effort. No American fighting plane ever reached the front. A few American-made observation planes appeared in France, and these were so badly constructed, clumsy, and dangerous that our flyers dubbed them "flaming coffins." The Allies had produced some good fighter planes and sought to turn over to us all plans for expeditious mass production. However, we rejected these planes which had come from the laboratory of actual war and decided to produce typically American motors and planes with wasteful result.

The War Department spent $116,000,000 on gas for our chemical warfare units in France, yet Pershing fired only gas bought from the Allies.

We built three picric acid plants and seven more plants to produce phenol required for picric, and all of these produced nothing for use in the war.

We built a powder plant at Nitro, W. Va., for $70,000,000; a plant at Nashville, Tenn., for $90,000,000, and nitrate plants at Sheffield, Ala.; Muscle Shoals, Ala; Toledo, Ohio; Perryville, Md.; and Cincinnati, Ohio, costing $116,000,000 and all of these produced not one pound of powder or nitrates for use in the war. After the war these plants were sold for a salvage value which was a crime against the American taxpayer.

The War Department planned for an army of 4,000,000 men and 86,000 horses. For these were ordered 41,000,000 pairs of Army shoes, 50,000 sets of double harness, 110,000 sets of single harness, 945,000 saddles, 2,800,000 halters, 1,500,000 horse brushes, 2,000,000 feed bags, 1,000,000 horse covers, and 195,000 copper branding irons. These figures are not hearsay; they were developed in the course of a Senate investigation of war preparations.

Railroads taken over by the Government in 1917 had been paying stockholders a billion dollars annually but the administration deficit at the end of 2 years was $1,350,000,000. The taxpayers received the deficit, stockholders nothing.

The Government spent about $1,200,000,000 on army cantonments for troops in training on the cost-plus plan by which the Government paid for all materials and labor, leaving efficiency and economy to contractors. These camps cost millions more than necessary in excess of labor and wasted materials.

About $50,000,000 was spent on spruce production for airplanes, yet 92.6 percent of all spruce used for this purpose was bought independently of the main project. Railroads to carry spruce lumber were built at a cost of about $10,000,000 and were not used.

Some of the port terminals built were never used.

It might be well for those who are assigned to the pressing job of rebuilding American armaments in 1940 and 1941 to extract from the Senate records and read the evidence taken by its investigating committee early in 1918 when charges were openly made that "the Military Establishment of the United States has fallen down" because of "inefficiency in every bureau and in every department of the United States." Senator Chamberlain, a Democratic member of the Senate investigating committee, made the above charges in a speech in New York and added, "I speak not as a Democrat but as a citizen of the United States."

Complacency, inefficiency, tardiness, laxity, gross favoritism to localities, and a policy of drift summed up the 1917–18 effort. It was the most hopeless disregard for the national pocketbook known prior to the New Deal.

We are now approaching a somewhat similar period in American history. A mighty effort at rearmament for national defense must be made. The American public will again want action, will undergo sacrifices to obtain action, but above all, it will demand capacity on the part of those who will be called to serve.

LET US NOT MAKE THE SAME MISTAKE AGAIN

A few days ago, with a second world war raging across the seas, grievous disasters having overtaken Great Britain and France, President Roosevelt appeared dramatically be-

fore Congress and the Nation and told us that our security was threatened; that we were in danger from invasion by a foreign power. He then asked, has since asked, and undoubtedly will hereafter ask, for billions of dollars to prepare for national defense. Congress has already voted billions of dollars for that purpose. It will vote other billions of dollars for a like purpose.

It is the duty of Congress to see that the waste and extravagance of the Wilson administration is not repeated by the present administration. We now know from the record made by President Roosevelt and his advisers over a period of more than 7 years that he is a waster and a spender; that, though he has been given billions of dollars to prepare our national defense, he has not prepared us for the condition which he now says confronts us.

We now know that he has failed to solve our domestic problems; that every year since he has been in office he has shoved us deeper and deeper into debt; that he has taken into, and permitted to remain, in the Federal service, those who have sympathized with and given aid to the Communists, who preach the overthrow of our Government by force; that his Secretary of the Interior, Ickes, has many times spoken to groups in which there was strong communistic influence; that the First Lady of the Land has entertained Communists in her home and has told us, in substance, that such action on her part was none of our business. That neither she nor Ickes have adequately denounced the Communists or their activities.

We know that until recently the President ridiculed and denounced the Dies Committee and its investigation.

With the foregoing in mind, it would seem that our first and our foremost duty in preparing this country to meet the enemies who may come from without, or the enemies who are working in our midst, would be to, at the first opportunity, which comes in November of this year, oust the President and all those who are dissatisfied with our constitutional form of government from offices which they occupy.

They failed us during the past 7 years; it is folly to trust them longer.

America Speeds Its Air-Expansion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States, and the people of the country generally, are thinking these days about speeding our national-defense program. There is need for emphasis on the strengthening of our air forces.

MUST REDOUBLE OUR EFFORTS

For many years, in the House of Representatives, I have called attention to our lack of air defense. I shall continue to do this because I am firmly of the conviction that we must redouble our efforts to speed the air-expansion program of the United States.

Informative articles are helpful on the subject matter and I call attention at this time to a splendid piece of writing in the Sunday Star of June 2, in which Richard L. Stokes builds a factual story about the situation confronting our Nation and its air-defense facilities. The author states:

EARLIER APPROPRIATIONS

For the period between June 30, 1932, and June 30, 1940, Congress allotted $399,853,642 to the Air Corps and $322,554,779 to the Bureau of Aeronautics—a total of $722,408,421. Large expenditures have been required for such projects as the construction of airfields and stations, and the maintenance, housing and schooling of pilots and mechanics.

In actual combat strength, the net result of this investment of three-quarters of a billion dollars is that at present the Army and Navy combined possess something like 2,707 fighting planes, of which 1,128 are rated as obsolete or obsolescent. The list includes all pursuit craft, all armed reconnaissance units, all light and medium bombers, flying fortresses, and flying boats, all tactical squadrons of Marine Corps and National Guard and the full air complement of all cruisers, battleships, and carriers.

Nearly three-fifths of the Army's 520 bombers consist of 300 medium planes of the B–18 type, which were purchased 3 years ago at $65,000 each, or $19,500,000. Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, startled a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on April 30 by observing that "if you take the B–18 today and send it against modern equipment it would be suicide." Already a decision has been reached to withdraw these 300 bombers from the first line and relegate them to training duty. Classified as obsolescent are all the Army's 168 light bombers and 160 of its 460 pursuit planes.

The pride of the Air Corps is its fleet of 52 heavy bombers, popularly known as flying fortresses. The flagship is the XB–15, an experimental craft which cost $250,000 and is described as the world's most powerful bomber. It was the first military plane ever built with complete living quarters. An all-metal ship with a wingspread of 150 feet, it has four engines of 1,000 horsepower each. An international record was set when it lifted 31,680 pounds—excluding its own weight of 30 tons and that of its gasoline load—to a height of 6,561 feet. A second distinction was a voyage to Santiago, Chile, 5,000 miles away, in 28 hours and 53 minutes of flying.

BOMBERS COST $185,000 EACH

The 51 other heavy bombers are of the B–17 type, costing $185,000 each, or a total of $9,435,000. They are all-metal monoplanes with four 1,000-horsepower motors, a wingspread of 105 feet, a weight of 22½ tons and a speed excelling 260 miles an hour. In addition to their own weight and that of gasoline, planes of this type have raised a load of 11,023 pounds to a height of 34,025 feet, carried an equal load 621.4 miles at a rate of 239 miles an hour and borne their crews, without cargo, on a 2,450-mile nonstop flight from Los Angeles to New York in 9 hours and 14 minutes and 30 seconds—an average of 265 miles an hour. Officers of the Air Corps contend that its flying fortresses excel all bombers in the vital elements of speed, miles of radius, and lifting power.

Mr. Stokes then goes on to point out that the situation has shaped itself so rapidly in recent weeks that—

Pilots and crews ordered to battle in any of these heavy bombers would find themselves at "a distinct disadvantage" if pitted against the latest developments of war in the air. This was acknowledged in so many words by General Arnold, who added, by way of emphasis, "There is no question about that." The handicap rises from the fact that they are not equipped with three up-to-date features—antileak tanks, armored pilot seats, and ordnance firing explosive shells. It is a lack shared at present by every plane in both Army and Navy, including the latter's bombing and fighting aircraft and the former's celebrated pursuit planes, which have made their mark in actual warfare, particularly with regard to maneuvering facility.

"We got off on the wrong track," General Arnold confessed, with the plea that Great Britain and France were equally taken by surprise. The awakening of the Air Corps began some months ago when the DO–17, a German bomber, was shot down in Scotland. To the astonishment of Allied engineers, the tank had kept its form instead of being smashed, as would have happened with a metal container. Though pierced by 30 bullets, it still held 80 gallons of gasoline.

LEAK-PROOF TANK MASTERED

Nazi scientists had mastered a task which the Air Corps undertook several years ago and then abandoned—the production of a leak-proof tank. The framework was stamped out of fiberboard. The walls consisted of a layer of crude, uncooked rubber between two layers of cured rubber, with an outside sheath of rawhide. When a bullet passed through, the uncooked rubber expanded and filled the hole.

Members of crews were found alive in other German bombers after they had been riddled with bullets and forced to earth. It was learned that the pilot seats were enclosed in light, thin armor of hardest steel, weighing no more than 126 pounds to a plane. There are reports of German pursuit craft which continued to operate though subjected to bursts of machine-gun fire. The pilots are thought to have been equipped with helmets, breastplates, and leg pieces of steel.

The most serious discovery was that on many of their combat planes the Nazis had supplemented or replaced machine guns with small-bore, rapid-fire cannon. The latter were aimed like machine guns through the noses of pursuit craft. But in the tails of bombers had been installed turreted wells, each with two cannon having a 120-degree cone of fire. Vessels thus equipped and flying in close formation, General Arnold explained, are able to give mutual support and keep interceptor craft at a respectful distance. "That is one reason," he commented, "why pursuit planes are not getting as many bombers in this war."

TWO HUNDRED 1-POUND SHELLS A MINUTE

All American military planes are at present armed with .30- and .50-caliber machine guns, in batteries, on the largest, of as many as nine. Each weapon discharges 800 bullets a minute. It was

proved in several instances that from 3,000 to 10,000 actual hits were needed to bring down an enemy bomber. One hit from a 37-millimeter cannon has often sufficed. Fed from an ammunition belt, this gun fires up to 200 one-pound shells a minute. Its range is probably no greater than that of the .50-caliber machine gun. But range is of small importance in air battle. The most effective attacks, it has been found, are made from distances centering around 250 yards.

Though beset with awkward difficulties of technique, the addition of armor and antileak tanks offers no insuperable problem. As hurriedly as possible, military and naval pursuit planes and bombers are being sent back to the shops for equipment with these two devices. But the change of ordnance is a redesign job, so deep-seated and costly that the Air Corps has decided to forego almost entirely any effort to regun its present battle fleet. Information on this point was withheld by the Navy.

For the future, however, both sea and land establishments promise that all tactical planes put in service will be provided with leakless tanks and armor, and that such a proportion of new bombing and pursuit craft as is deemed necessary will be equipped with shell-firing cannon.

SUGGESTED PROGRAMS VARY

Suggested programs vary between General Arnold's sober estimate of 20,000 planes by the end of 1941 and President Roosevelt's reiterated demand for facilities to produce 50,000 annually. The starting point of either project will of necessity be the current resources of the Government's two air-war services. Rigid accuracy is not claimed for all the statistics that ensue. When approximations are ventured they are the closest obtainable under official regulations.

On May 24 the Air Corps, in Regular Army and National Guard, possessed some 2,900 "useful" planes. The number on the same date for the Bureau of Aeronautics, including Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and Naval Reserve, was 1,813. This gives a total of 4,713 for both establishments.

NO WAR RESERVE OF PLANES

Neither service can at present muster a single plane by way of reserve against war. "Never have we been able," testified Admiral Towers, "to get enough money to accumulate a war reserve of planes." Of the Navy's armed air force, 679 planes are assigned to sea duty. There are 3 for each of 15 battleships, or 45; an average of 4 each on 37 light and heavy cruisers, or 148; and about 81 on each of 6 aircraft carriers, or 486. The Marine Corps has about 100 combat planes.

The Air Corps utilizes some 1,560 of its planes for transport, cargo, and training purposes. For similar functions the Navy employs 108 utility planes, 15 large and 9 small transports, 230 primary training planes, and 58 for advanced training.

The personnel of the Air Corps, according to recent tables, is 43,238 enlisted men, 2,142 Regular Army officers, 1,001 Reserve officers, and 1,542 flying cadets. It listed on May 1 rated pilots to the number of 1,988, 7 nonrated officers, 30 balloon pilots, 5 balloon observers, 105 nonrated students, and no parachute troops. The total of Reserve pilots available was given at 3,300.

The latest figures at hand on the Navy's air manpower are those of June 30, 1939, which may not have increased materially to date. At that time the Navy possessed a flying-duty personnel (pilots, observers, gunners, etc.), numbering 4,633; nonflying officers, 591, and enlisted men, 17,101. The total was 22,325. The Marine Corps had a flying-duty personnel of 491, 15 nonflying officers, and 856 enlisted men.

Every 6 weeks the Army graduates 200 pilots, with commissions as second lieutenants in the Air Reserve. Their course of 9 months begins with 3 months of instruction at 1 of 9 civilian flying schools, with a combined capacity of 396 cadets. Three months of post-graduate work follow at one of the Regular Army air bases.

EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY IN TRAINING AT ONE TIME

In training at one time in the 11 flying schools are generally about 850 Army cadets. From the date of matriculation in the elementary term, it is calculated that 2 or 3 years are needed to make a first-class combat pilot. A possible reservoir of battle flyers is indicated by Robert H. Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, who told the National Aviation Forum here last week that the Authority's training program certified 10,000 civilian pilots during the past 12 months, at a rate of 30 a day; and can readily increase the number to several times 10,000 flyers in any year. They would require 1 or 2 years of added training for combat service.

I am in agreement with Mr. Stokes when he goes on to state that:

The present condition of war aviation in the United States illustrates the staggering task involved in any program of large and rapid expansion. It must occupy, in the nature of things, two primary fields. First comes the creation of new facilities for the production of material. Second is the enlistment and training of new flyers and ground crews.

SIXTY THOUSAND PLANES NEEDED

Concluding the very informative article, the writer says:

Accepting the computation that each plane requires 2 pilots and 10 men on the ground, the problem becomes one of recruiting 40,000 to 100,000 pilots and 200,000 to 500,000 enlisted aviation mechanics. It means the construction of 20,000 to 50,000 planes by an industry which is the least unprepared of the country's munitions trades; but which, according to high Air Corps officers, has attained even now, 9 months after the war began, a potential output of only 500 military planes a month, and can scarcely touch 800 before the end of the year, or as many as 1,250 earlier than February 1941.

NOT IMPRACTICABLE, THEY SAY

Even a goal of 50,000 planes is not impracticable, according to Army and Navy air chieftains and spokesmen of the aviation industry. The United States possesses the raw materials, manpower, engineering genius, industrial technique, and potential manufacturing plants. The efforts would monopolize one-seventh of the national income and a corresponding segment of the national energy. These are all factors which remain within the Republic's control.

Fighting the Enemy From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me June 1 over station WEAF entitled "Fighting the Enemy From Within":

The events of the last few weeks, and particularly the President's message on rearmament, has made it of the utmost importance that the public be thoroughly informed about the issues now confronting us.

Much is said, and much is written, about the menace of the "fifth column," without clearly defining what "fifth column" actually means. This term was invented by one of the men who fought with General Franco in Spain, to denote persons who, while not actually fighting, nevertheless sympathize with the invader. And so, in this country, there is no question that we find a large number of people who sympathize with our enemies, and give them aid and comfort. These sympathizers of the "fifth column" are not bold in asserting their views, and never proclaim to the world that they are enemies of our democracy. Some of them, while actually living under two flags, and having the protection of America, nevertheless not only fail in their allegiance to the United States, but are actually enemies of this country. It is these traitors who let the enemy know where our weakness lies, and enable the enemy to pounce upon us when we are not prepared.

President Roosevelt, in speaking of the "fifth column," likened it to the Trojan horse that betrays a nation not prepared for treachery, and told us that we must deal vigorously with spies, saboteurs, and traitors who are the actors in this new type of strategy.

As for myself, I was aware of this menace long before the expression "fifth column" became current in the United States. As early as 1933, when the Nazi Government first took power in Germany, I warned the American public against the type of propaganda which the German Government was responsible for, and which sought to weaken our national structure by arraying racial and religious groups in this country against each other. It was largely through my efforts and because of the seriousness of this menace that I found it advisable to urge the creation of a committee to investigate un-American activities. The committee then created did yeoman work in ferreting out types of propaganda which were working in this country to undermine our institutions. It was after this committee was created and did its work that the American public first came to realize the insidious methods of this new type of activity, creating a silent war of disruption, whereby the foundations of our democracy were weakened and discord was sown among our people.

I early realized that the activities of the German Government could be directed toward one aim only, and that is the destruction of our democracy and the creation of a totalitarian state.

Long before Hitler obtained power, I was in Germany on a visit, and could then already observe the tendency to world domination upon which Hitler capitalized and obtained power. Germany was even then going through a rearmament process, and in spite of the fact that it was clearly forbidden by the Versailles Treaty to rearm, the provisions of the treaty were openly flouted and disregarded, and one could see in the streets armed bands of soldiers on every corner. Perhaps, if the nations which were responsible for the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles had seen to it that the

treaty was carried out, this present conflict would never have taken place. But it is not for us to tell foreign nations what to do, and if they did not see fit to defend themselves against the menace of nazi-ism, they are paying for it heavily at the present time. God forbid that this country should find itself as unprepared as the nations of western Europe were when the invader marched in.

I also had occasion to observe that the German Government, the republican government, yielded its power to the Nazis without a fight, and without an effort to maintain itself in power. It committed suicide, and with it democracy in Germany committed suicide. It was just because the republican government in Germany was weakened by "fifth columns" which the Nazis maintained in that country that it became so easy for the Nazi Government to obtain power in Germany. It is this very method of a "fifth column" which Nazi propaganda used in this country until the committee, which I created, was able to ferret out its activities and expose them in broad daylight.

Hand in hand with rearmament in the physical sense, came a thorough training in propaganda methods. The German Government organized a special ministry for the training of propagandists for use throughout the world. Young men and women were sent all over the world as Nazi agents to spread the gospel of national socialism. A good many of our native-born crackpots were likewise enlisted in the service of German propagandists. There was always in this country a lunatic fringe, and there is hardly any movement which has no adherents. These so-called movements are always hard pressed for cash, and the only way in which they can function is by having generous donors contribute to their cause. In the absence of American contributors, the German Government realizing the importance of having a Trojan horse in our midst, cultivated these crackpot movements and lavishly contributed money for the sole purpose of the disruption of our Nation. Hence all these Silver Shirts, Friends of New Germany, The Order of '76, Christian Mobilizers, The White Knights of West Virginia, American Nationalists Party, American Crusaders, American Patriots, and a good many others with such high sounding, patriotic American names, were really the dupes of Dr. Goebbels' propaganda machine in Germany. Not only this country was involved, but Nazi agents permeate the entire North American continent, going to Mexico and Canada, as well as Central and South America, establishing branches everywhere for the sole purpose of preparing the soil, and creating a foundation for a Nazi dictatorship. All these conditions to which I called the attention of our public again and again, were either disregarded, or sometimes even ridiculed, and I was called an alarmist and what not.

The example of German propaganda did not go unheeded. Other nations with definite ideologies of their own also introduced their propaganda techniques in the United States. Thus we have propaganda from Italian sources, Russian sources, Arabian sources, and Japanese sources, and others. This propaganda is directed toward the same general principles, and that is to weaken the peace and harmony of this American Commonwealth and the destruction of our liberties.

Looking back at the history of the last decade, we find that the decade immediately following the World War from 1920 to 1930 was a decade of internal peace and harmony. The American people minded their own business, keeping away from foreign entanglements, and the Nation was prospering and constantly rising in its scale of living and its inner harmony. But the 1930's did not present this type of picture. The fury of German propaganda and the propaganda of other nations which was then unleashed against this country disrupted the harmony and peace and made this country jittery. We no longer enjoy the blessings of a free country because of this insidious propaganda which disrupted the unity of our Nation. I shudder to think how successful this propaganda has been in casting suspicion on the motives of a good many of our public men, and arrayed brother against brother, and citizen against citizen, and neighbor against neighbor.

I do not believe, however, that any congressional committee can properly ferret out this propaganda and successfully destroy it. It is something which the people of the country as a whole must become aware of, and fight in their own way. No matter how much money we see fit to appropriate for the investigation of this "fifth column" activity, the only way to actually put an end to them is by educating the American people. The American people must understand that our strength and success lie in our internal unity. Anyone who seeks to berate any particular racial group or religious group among citizens, is a traitor to America. We must never forget that the Constitution of the United States defines the term "treason," not only when war is waged against the United States, but when aid and comfort is given to the enemies of the United States. Aid and comfort given to the enemy is whenever our citizens, forgetting their obligations to their fellow citizens, seek to bring about cleavage and dissension among the various racial and religious groups composing the United States of America. Our strength lies in our unity, and destruction lies in the dissipation of our forces.

A brief year ago, the America public was still discussing the possibilities of war and peace, but the situation at the present time has reached the stage where no further discussions of this condition is possible. Europe has embarked on a bloody and terrific contest which takes every ounce of its energy and every bit of its strength. Masses of men arrayed against each other are engaged in the bloodiest carnage the world has ever seen. Nevertheless, all of us hope that the struggle of European democracy will not have been in vain, and that, after the fortunes of war have finally been settled, they will settle in favor of the cause of our democracy, and not to the advantage of Hitler and his cohorts.

The American public must realize that one cannot achieve liberty without a struggle. It will be absolutely useless for us to engage in a social program to continue along the lines of our constitutional liberty, unless our liberty is protected in the first instance. What is the use of passing laws for the benefit of the workingman, for the benefit of the wage earner, for the benefit of the poor and submerged?

What is the use of having a program of public works, of social security, of unemployment insurance, and all other social advantages which we have gained in the last few years under the enlightened leadership of our President if we shall be subject to invasion by a ruthless foe?

The situation at the present time reminds us very much of the time when Rome fell under the impact of ruthless barbarians, just as western civilization is now being trampled under foot by relentless barbarians. Just as human civilization was ground in the dust by the heel of brutal oppressors, so now western Europe and the civilized world as a whole is under the attack of a pernicious might. The nations of Europe failed to properly protect themselves against this menace and took the word of a liar and perjurer, relying on his promises and doing nothing to counteract. If the European nations followed a program of thorough rearmament, Hitler would have thought twice before he saw fit to invade any of the peace-loving nations of the western world.

Any American who lends himself willingly or unwillingly to the allurements of Nazi and Fascist propaganda becomes a warrior in the Nazi Army. Every time un-American propaganda makes its appearance in print or on the platform it destroys and weakens the fiber of our liberty and makes foreign conquest more than possible. Perhaps the secret weapon which Mr. Hitler boasts of possessing in order to bring the world to its knees is this weapon of propaganda which he uses right and left to carry out his designs against peace-loving peoples. It is this Nazi propaganda which appears to us in many forms, and, as I said before, it sometimes takes the shape of patriotism to carry out its point. It used to be said that the American flag is the last refuge of a scoundrel. Today the American flag is being used to further the cause of Nazi propaganda. A good many so-called American patriots very often, in ignorance of the true facts, fall for insidious tricks of foreign propaganda and indulge in racial or religious attacks which have no other purpose but to sow dissension among our people so that it will be easier to conquer us when the foreign invader sets foot on our soil.

This is the technique which was employed by foreign propagandists in Europe. Most of the countries which were invaded had a "fifth column," which prepared the ground for Nazi troops, and the Armies had only a small task before them. The important ground work for Nazi destruction was laid by "fifth column" activities.

I do not believe that any appropriation made by Congress can possibly wipe out the "fifth column." I do not wish to criticize the congressional committee, which at the present time is investigating un-American activities, but I doubt very much whether the activities described by me are capable of being investigated. It is not a question of finding out who the foreign propagandists are, and due to the work of our last committee we have a law on the books today which compels all foreign agents to register. I am afraid that a good many of the people who now indulge in these "fifth-column" tactics are not capable of any registration and not subject to any supervision by the police. They are, technically speaking, our own, that is, not aliens who can be deported, aliens who can be compelled to register, aliens whom we might fingerprint, but they are technically Americans, and as such not subject to any supervision by the Department of Justice, and not easy to ferret out. I believe that the remedy for this type of individual is to be found only in directing the spotlight of publicity on their doings, and on the danger which their activities may cause us.

You see, we are fighting an enemy who has no moral principles. Many years ago a Nazi spokesman openly admitted that lying, cheating, repudiating solemn obligations, or even mass murder are allowed here; the ends justify the means, the end, of course, being Nazi domination of the western world.

It is impossible to appease the rulers of Germany as the nations of western Europe have learned to their detriment and sorrow. Any concessions given to this brutal enemy only urges him on to demand more, and like a beast of prey, one drop of blood will only whet the appetite for more.

Not so long ago, our President spoke about quarantining the aggressor. At this time this quarantine should be a spiritual rather than a physical one. I believe that each of us should concur that the way to destroy Nazi aggressiveness is by a process of American education, and if we adopt a policy of a fighting Americanism instead of the complacent attitude of self-satisfied democracy, we will go a long way toward gaining our objective.

Democracy must not allow enemies from within to destroy it. Democracy must be a living and live force, ready to punish its enemies, and ready to fight for its principles, because if we do not and permit our democracy to fizzle the way it did in Germany, we may as well say good-bye to all the achievements of our peaceful Republic and get ready to become slaves of totalitarian countries. It is not the first time in the history of the world that a democracy was destroyed from within. We had examples of it in Greece.

in Rome, and in a good many city republics of the Middle Ages. Liberty and democracy are not a new concept of government, but have always been considered the ultimate good of mankind.

I cannot refrain at this time from calling the attention of our American public to the fact that it was I, who, in 1933, first accused foreign governments as being engaged in the spreading of propaganda in the United States, and it was through my efforts that a committee was organized to investigate un-American activities, of which committee Congressman McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, was made chairman. Again at my insistence laws were passed compelling foreign agents to register with the State Department. Each of these achievements was the result of months of labor, and public opinion had to be directed toward the creation of the investigating committee, and Congress saw fit to allow this committee only $30,000 for its work. Later on, when in 1937, I pleaded with the American public to give me the necessary support to have Congress authorize another committee, to investigate this serious menace toward democracy, I received a cold shoulder, and when a committee was finally organized through my persistent efforts, and given an appropriation of $100,000, it could accomplish nothing, and certainly much less than my committee of 1934.

It is this menace of totalitarianism which must be combated by all possible means, and it is wholly immaterial whether the assault comes from Nazi sources, Fascist sources, or Communist sources. All these ideologies have a common aim and purpose of bringing about a condition of affairs where the individual will have no rights, and when the state would become the master of us all.

Democracy is not only a form of government, it is also a form of life. In the tradition of American democracy we allow a free discussion of all forms of government, and taking advantage of all privileges, totalitarian ideologies are freely discussed in this country and proclaimed from the housetops. But simply because democracy is tolerant it does not follow that democracy cannot defend itself against its enemies, and it is clear that all totalitarian forms of government are enemies of American democracy.

If we cherish our liberty, if we love our institutions, if we wish to continue along the paths of the way of living to which we are accustomed, if we wish to continue in the traditions of our Constitution, and desire to live as our fathers did, then we must never permit the enemy from within to gain mastery over us. But every attempt to crush our liberty, and every attempt to make us dupes of foreign propagandists must be eradicated without any mercy.

National Defense and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. E. C. GATHINGS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address made by me over stations WMC, Memphis, Tenn.; KBTM, Jonesboro, Ark.; and KLCN, Blytheville, Ark., on Saturday, June 1, 1940, on the subject National Defense and Preparedness.

Friends of the radio audience, fellow Americans, it is a pleasure to appear on this program and discuss the most important issue before the American people today—that of national defense and preparedness. This question affects the very life and liberty of every man, woman, and child in our land.

The President of the United States is doing everything humanly possible to steer our country clear of all complications, and under his leadership, and with the solid backing of Congress, America is forging ahead with full preparation for our armed forces—for common defense. We are under no misapprehension as to the gravity of the situation abroad, or as to our duty in reference to the full protection and preservation of the life, liberty, and happiness of all American citizens.

No people under the sun have been so blessed by Providence as have the American people, and no other people have a richer heritage to protect. With the never-failing loyalty and patriotism of Americans everywhere to inspire, encourage, and support your representatives in Congress, there shall be no failure in performance of the task that lies before us.

My first admonition to you is to keep cool-headed and be of good courage, as Americans always have, and by the help of God and the wisdom of our statesmen we shall preserve, protect, and defend our liberties and our institutions. We who lived and served in the dark days of 1914 to 1918, and particularly those who trod the blood-soaked battlefields of Europe in those years, are not unaware as to the horrors of war. We all hate war and strive to preserve peace, but thoughtless is he who does not contemplate the awful fact that democracy and liberty are today fighting as never before, while communism, nazi-ism, and despotism are on the march.

We must and will move rapidly to the completion of a powerful, highly, and completely organized national defense. To neglect a matter so important is a sin against a free people.

If we do not believe Washington was right when he urged full preparation for war was the surest guaranty of peace, then we must only take a look back to 1932, when, unarmed and defenseless, yet rich and prosperous, Manchuria was ruthlessly invaded and overrun by a military despotism; then stand on the side lines and look upon bleeding and unarmed millions of Chinese as they are murdered by the speedy minions of death from the sky, both on land and on sea; or we might turn to defenseless Ethiopia and watch again the submission of a pitifully unarmed people to the power of a great military machine; and on we march until we behold the bloodless conquest of Austria; the complete subjugation of Czechoslovakia; the bloody murder of Poland; the inexcusable and ruthless invasion of heroic and honored Finland; the invasion of the Netherlands and Norway; then Holland and bleeding Belgium; and now heroic France is at the gates of the slaughterhouse.

Great Britain today is paying some of the costs of unpreparedness. Winston Churchill's amazingly frank admission in the House of Commons, that failure of the Allied campaign in central Norway was due to the overwhelming superiority of German air power. This provides the world with a grim object lesson on the dangers of neglect with respect to national defense.

Before Mr. Churchill became prime minister, he criticized Britain's "failure to maintain or regain air parity with Germany," and warned that this neglect "will condemn us for some time to come to a great deal of difficulty, suffering, and danger which we must endure with firmness until more favorable conditions can be established."

The record of events since Munich gives disturbing proof that the nation unable to defend itself becomes easy prey for greedy and unprincipled aggressors. Britain's shocking experience in Norway is well worth pondering on this side of the Atlantic Ocean in these crucial days. The same sort of indifference which afflicted England in recent years has been all too evident in the United States until the last year or so. The same outcry raised in England against military costs has been heard from many Americans. Even now there are those who contend that what has happened to the democracies of Europe could not happen here.

But these misguided individuals should not be allowed to forget that when aggression is on the march, the lust for more power and further conquests is unending. If Britain and France should fall—and it is high time that America began to think seriously about that very possibility—we would have two oceans to watch instead of one. We do not have a two-ocean fleet, because we have depended upon England to patrol the Atlantic for us. Can we afford to ignore the possibility of Nazi domination of Greenland or of Bermuda, of Nazi "fifth columns" in any of the republics to the south? And what of Japan in the Far East if democracy is crushed in Europe and we are forced to divide our fleet in order to protect both the Atlantic and Pacific shores?

America should profit by Britain's tragic lesson; that while the costs of preparedness are great, the costs of unpreparedness can be inestimably greater.

Our Government must be prepared to defend our country and our people against any aggressor. Adequate armament for national safety must be our first concern. We commend the steps thus far taken to strengthen the Army, the Navy, and the air forces. We urge that further armament be expedited. We must have an army of adequate size and training, provided with the most modern arms and equipment—a navy sufficient to protect the interests of the United States, and an air force with superior personnel and equipped with planes of the latest types.

The National Guard and all other branches of defense should be adequately trained and completely equipped. The availability of trained men and the best of material for defense must be assured.

Financial preparedness is just as necessary as military preparedness. Only if we are strong financially can we expect to carry the burden of any prolonged struggle.

We are a peaceful nation. Our Republic has long voiced its opposition to war, its support of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations, and the importance of the limitation of armaments. But under present world conditions we must be prepared to defend our country—prepared with a defense of such strength that any potential aggressor, however powerful and ambitious, will not attempt to attack us.

It is imperative that preparations go forward promptly and speedily to protect our people and our country that we may continue to live a free people. As representative of all of our people, Congress should discharge fully its responsibilities as to the national defense, as it did in the passage of legislation to keep our ships out of the war zones of belligerent nations.

It has been said that "procrastination is the thief of time," and we must look the facts squarely in the face and fearlessly and faithfully do our duty. What, then, is our duty? We are the richest land on earth in everything necessary to our protection. Our wealth of minerals and soils, the unlimited productivity of our mines, farms, and factories, and the unexcelled genius of our people are equal to the task. We must for our protection build, not the largest, but the mightiest and most effective army on the globe. Our flag, the symbol of liberty, must float above the swiftest,

most powerful navy that ever plied the seas. Our Army and Navy must be accompanied by the best air force in the whole, wide world. Our men must be the best trained and equipped soldiers and sailors in the world.

I have talked freely and assuringly about what we must and will have, and now I shall spend a few moments of time trying to tell you something about what we now have, since we are witnessing in a striking manner an exact duplication of the historic conflict of 1914 to 1918, and upon precisely the same ground, except with added speed and increased fury.

We do not yet, by any means, have all we need in the way of supplies, equipment, and ammunition, but let me assure you that I know of my own knowledge that your national-defense needs are being rapidly and efficiently provided for. Everyone in position of responsibility from the President down through the War and Navy Departments, the Cabinet officers, Senators and Representatives in Congress, and heads of executive bureaus are fully alert and aware of their responsibilities and are courageously meeting that responsibility, all determined and devoted to the objective of adequate preparedness as the only assurance of avoiding involvement in war and for the preservation of peace.

War in Europe necessitates consolidating our national strength to resist any possible attack. Indeed, there is such general agreement on the subject that the complicated nature of the problem may not be fully appreciated.

Defense of the United States is not simply a matter of manufacturing guns, airplanes, and other military equipment. In times of world crisis it is of great importance that we have an armed force on which the United States can rely to repel any immediate assault. Adequate defense, however, involves at least two vital factors in addition to trained forces and modern equipment. War machines can be no stronger than the economic systems supporting them.

The possibility of a German victory in Europe makes it imperative to tighten up the loose ends of our defense policy without further delay. The time has come to seek more positive agreements for defense of this country against aggression from any source.

There is no occasion for hysteria over a possible airplane invasion of the United States. But there is a real need for tightening up our lines of defense. And that need extends as certainly to the field of international relations as it does to the manufacture of proper equipment for the Army.

On May 16, President Roosevelt addressed a joint session of the Senate and House of the United States on the subject of national defense. I will not go into the details of his speech because most of you no doubt heard his address. He discussed the actual flying time necessary for an enemy force to reach our country from various foreign points, and the figures were amazing as well as frightening. In his address, the President stressed the need for over 800 millions of dollars for the defense of America.

It must not be assumed that the Government of the United States has not taken steps looking to the national defense. Today, the Navy is stronger, better equipped, and more efficient than at any time in its history in time of peace. Today the Army enjoys its greatest peace-time strength. The air establishment, both naval and military, is stronger than at any time in the history of the country in time of peace. During the administration of President Roosevelt, the Congress has appropriated more than $7,000,000,000 for national defense. The Congress is ready to vote for military and naval defense sums of money which will secure the safety of this Republic.

President Roosevelt laid before the country a program of national defense which will meet the support of both the Congress and the Nation. I am standing and you are standing squarely beside the President in plans for the security of these United States. It is my own view that we must build an unconquerable navy. A vast fleet of military and naval aircraft must be provided. Antiaircraft defenses and heavy artillery must be produced in increasing volume and of the most modern and scientific pattern. The strength of the Army must be augmented, and intensified training and modern equipment must be supplied to the National Guard and to the Reserves.

Congress is already working at top speed to carry out the program of President Roosevelt, and within the last 10 days the House of Representatives has passed the following legislation:

A bill from the Military Affairs Committee for the building of powder plants, ammunition-loading plants, warehouses, and other structures that may be necessary for the manufacture, maintenance, and storage of necessary supplies. The bill authorized further appropriations for the necessary expenditures in the enlistment of flying cadets up to 8,500 in number and an average of 6,000 Air Corps Reserve officers to be ordered to extended active duty. The bill further provides for an emergency fund for the President, for each and every purpose connected with the security and defense of this country, the sum of $132,000,000.

Another bill passed this week by the House of Representatives from the Committee on Naval Affairs would expedite naval shipbuilding.

Still another bill passed by the House this week, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, would authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft to a total of not less than 10,000, including 850 airplanes for the Naval Reserve. The bill further provides that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities at many points throughout the possessions of the United States.

I am glad to support our President in another phase of his program—that of preventing any man or group of men from making large profits in the manufacture and distribution of needed war materials. No one has any right to live under the stars and stripes and have it in his purpose to make a large profit out of the necessities of his Nation in the hour of its peril.

Nothing, or very little, has been said about our duty in the matter of defense against deflation. This is a deadly enemy which has come within our midst since the invasion of Holland. Today, millions of American citizens on the farms, in the factories, and businesses of the United States are losing vast sums of money on account of the deflation of values. It is advisable that immediate action be taken not only against a foreign enemy, but also against this enemy of deflation which is in our midst.

In the very first place, this country should adopt a program against subversive groups and subversive activities which, it is indicated, are going on all around us, and which seem to be given at least sympathetic toleration in some parts of the country. The administration, in my opinion, should demand the immediate enactment of legislation closing our doors to immigrants and deporting all undesirables who are aliens. The House Immigration and Naturalization Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, passed a bill last week to deport Harry Bridges to Australia because of his activities in the capacity of an alien organizer. Our work has just begun. We intend to not only close our doors to their entry into this country, we are going to clean house by deporting alien agents and sympathizers who are attempting to break down our democratic form of government. There must be no "ism" in this country except Americanism.

Subversive elements contribute to a nation's unrest. "Pink" and "red' Communists of all kinds go about behind the scenes stirring up discontent and hatred. It is their aim, their guiding principle to foster world unrest and hatred and bring about what they call their order of things by fostering war and bloodshed. When all the world is embroiled, their day of days is at hand. That is when they firmly believe they can step in and rule the world. The crying shame of all this evil planning is that America, today, is filled with these alien elements. Most of us have no idea just what a stronghold they have in this land of the free.

Fortunately, our Government has awakened to the subversive activity which is going on, and is doing something about it. The famous Dies committee is but one of our defense measures from within. Every penny we can spend to rub out such influences is well spent. If we can take care of ourselves from within, spend our money judiciously for national defense, and keep America for the Americans, we need have no fear.

Let us be thankful that we are Americans—at the same time realizing that this country has become what it is today because we have lived under a system of free government—all of which is in danger if we ever are so foolish as to let subversive influences, inside or from without, to divide us into groups, classes, factions, or sections and so bring the American way of life we have known and loved so well down into the dust.

We have witnessed what is known as the "fifth column" in the European conflict. We have it here masked in secrecy and treachery beyond reasonable recognition. While we are now under the necessity of spending billions for the preservation of our sacred institutions, we may as well begin now to perform a too long delayed duty and to spend whatever is necessary to weed out the Communists, Fascists, and other public enemies. Why should we maintain diplomatic relations with a country that hatches, finances, and promotes a vicious conspiracy to undermine and destroy our Government and its institutions, with which must go the hopes and aspirations of our children and their children for generations to come? Let us root out the Judases, Bridges, and Benedict Arnolds in America.

Much has been published of late about "fifth column" activity in Norway, Holland, and Belgium. Spy systems as pictured in popular movie versions would lead us to believe that "fifth columns" are made up of daring, glamorous people with access to valuable information. Actually, such groups are numerically small and of little effect when their activities are known, but the "fifth column" may be numerically tremendous in a country, and there is every reason to believe that such a column is active in America.

So long as political and individual expediency is more important than subscription to the fundamental doctrines of liberty, the "fifth column" will be as successful in America as it has been in Europe.

The "fifth column" is made up of those who follow a policy of expediency in place of principle. Most Americans feel that there is no immediate danger to this country from "fifth column" activities. Recognition of the fact that avowed Communists and Nazis in our midst are doing their utmost to undermine our democracy is coupled with the firm belief that they form too meager a minority to do much actual damage today or tomorrow. Apparent absence of immediate danger, however, should not lull us into a false sense of security. Recent experiences of peace-loving European nations which believed as we do that "it can't happen here" demonstrate the need for constant vigilance.

President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and the Congress are working night and day to keep us out of war, and they have better information on which to base their policies than any amateur promoters of so-called peace organizations possibly could have. They know that the best and perhaps the only way to spare us the horrors of war is to make our defenses strong enough to discourage an aggressor before they can grow great enough to reach out toward our shores.

I fear that our country is at the present time honeycombed with spies, termites that bore from within. A leopard cannot change its spots. Don't let us be caught napping as Great Britain was. Let us prepare. Another billion dollars as asked by our President

on yesterday for the security of our liberty and independence would be cheap insurance as compared to our cost in the last war. Our independence and liberty cannot be reckoned in dollars and cents.

The ruthless dictators of Europe are on the march. We may be next. They must be stopped or civilization will be retarded a thousand years. Let us prepare our defenses—two fleets, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, each at least the size of our present one. An Army and air force large enough to protect our country would eliminate unemployment and remove most persons from the relief rolls.

If we must fall into error of judgment on the questions of preparedness, let it be by overrating the dictators. Such an error would ultimately be in our favor and perhaps save the lives of many good American citizens.

Let us keep a sharp lookout for the Trojan horse and the "fifth column." Don't let us be foolish and say, "It can't happen here." It is reported by the press that in our own eastern Arkansas literature advocating nazi-ism has been distributed.

America is truly menaced. We have no choice but to make the supreme effort to guard those things which we hold most dear from the threat of alien attack. To that effort we must give our all and any attempt to divert us, from whatever source it may come, must be recognized for what it is and rejected as an undermining of the Nation's security.

It is 19 years since a nameless doughboy from a battlefield grave in France was buried among the Nation's heroes in Arlington Cemetery on November 11, 1921.

Presidents on Armistice Day lay a wreath of remembrance against the great stone, that calls almost all visiting dignitaries from foreign lands, even official spokesmen of once enemy states, to the brooding quiet of Arlington Cemetery on such occasions. Time nor the hand of man has little changed the peaceful setting of the Unknown's Tomb since November 11, 1921, when the heart of the Nation throbbed to the solemn music and lifted noble aspirations for world peace above his bier. Over in that section of this great last encampment of valor, reserved for those who fell or fought in older wars, the ranked, orderly rows of headstones have grown a bit grayer, these 19 years. Row on row, sweeping away over the swelling breasts of grassy hills and down through wooded hollows, the long, ranked columns of white headstones march. This is the final resting place of comrades at arms; and for all these unknown, whether sleeping forever in France, or in the soil of their own land, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington has become through the years the symbol at which a people pays its own endless tribute to valor. When I see the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, my heart is filled with reverence, and I turn away with a prayer for peace, full of the hope that we shall never again need to sacrifice American youth on the altar of war.

We renounce war; we renounce war because of what it does to our men. We have seen the long, long hospital trains filled with their mutilated bodies; we remember the maimed men for whom the war is not yet over. We renounce war because of what it compels us to do to our enemies, bombing their mothers in villages, and starving little children. We renounce war for the undying hatreds it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in the place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it.

This is our America, our democracy, ours to govern, ours to administer, ours to perfect, and ours to make more glorious. Every American has a solemn duty—a duty commensurate with his abilities, his resources, and his intellect. We must stamp out and purge ourselves from communism and all the other foreign "isms" and subversive influences which seek to undermine things American. We shall tolerate neither the "fifth column" nor the espionage nor sabotage of foreign agents nor the treachery of any domestic influence or group.

During this solemn time in our country's life, the President, the Senators and Representatives, the Republicans and Democrats are working hand in hand, strengthened by unity, to protect your safety. Congress may remain in session during these perilous times for several weeks. You have entrusted me with the responsibility of helping to guide America through a grave crisis, and I put that duty to you above all else. My concern is not with what the future holds for me individually but with what the future holds for this land of the free.

Keep Burning the Lamp of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESSES OF FRED TAYLOR WILSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was unable to leave Washington to deliver two commencement addresses in West Virginia. It was my good fortune to secure my friend Fred Taylor Wilson to substitute. He spoke at both Davis and Walkersville high-school graduation exercises. Mr. Wilson, whose historical books are known favorably by Members of Congress, said, in part, in his talks:

It was a source of supreme regret to Mr. RANDOLPH that he could not be with you this evening. Only the greater call of duty as a Congressman kept him away. These are serious hours in the Nation's Capital.

I need not remind you that you are leaving high school at one of the critical hours in world history. But be not dismayed. At a low period in the late World War Lloyd George, then Premier of England, announced to his people that they were at that time going through a tunnel, but light would break again. And it did. We are again going through a tunnel. You who live in West Virginia know what it means to travel through tunnels. You know that however dark it may be for a moment, if you keep traveling the light will shine again.

My theme this evening might well be called "A lamp that must be kept burning." Lord Grey, of England, some months ago gravely said that the lights of civilized life were going out one by one all over Europe. And they still are. The black-out of war now hangs over all the nations of Europe. There are many lamps in America which must be kept burning at this dark period. This evening I shall discuss only one of them, and that is the lamp of faith. As I speak to you I want to ask you to allow the rays of light from that lamp to emanate in four directions.

BRAVE SOULS ARE NEEDED

First of all, let the rays of the lamp of faith in yourselves shine on whatever the future may bring. This is the time for brave and confident souls. Your courage will be given a supreme test as you face an anxious and bewildered world.

"All the big things we know about,
Were done by self-believers.
Quitters never yet have been,
Nor will be achievers."

That does not mean that you must be vain or conceited or unduly proud, but that you must believe in your own star. You must make yourself worthy not only of your own respect but of the respect of all others. "To thine own self be true; and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

It has been many years since your speaker graduated from university. As I look back tonight to my own graduation, I find that the members of my own graduating class who have won the highest distinction were those who early in life hitched their wagons to stars and pressed confidently on. As young men you must be brave and strong and true, to keep such a faith and wear always the white flower of a blameless life. As young ladies you must keep faith first with yourselves and belong always to the beautiful, the sweet, and the good.

This lamp of faith also must turn to an ever renewed faith in your fellow man. You had better trust all men and be disappointed in a few of them than go through life cynical and skeptical of all men. Do not be too much disturbed when someone disappoints you. Remember the Master of all men, out of 12 chosen friends to assist Him in His divine mission, had 1 of them to doubt Him, 1 to deny Him, and 1 to betray Him. Whatever others may tell you, let me impress upon you that there are in America at least more men who love honor than those who love dishonor and far more women who are pure and sweet and good than there are those who wear concealed a scarlet letter. The vast majority of the folks you will know in the years to come will be worthy of your faith and love. Keep your faith in your fellow man.

Now, above all other times, keep your faith in your country. More people in America have renewed their vows of devotion to their own land in recent days than possibly in any other period of our history. More than ever before, we appreciate the great blessings that are ours. We fondle afresh the precious jewels of free speech, a free press, freedom of assembly, and, above all else, freedom of religion. For 150 years we have looked upon all these blessings, like our own liberty, as matters of course. One by one we have seen other nations lose them.

MEN BUILD A NATION

We are prone to forget the true secret of a nation's greatness.

"What builds a nation's pillars deep
And its foundations strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?

"Only men can make
A nation great and strong:
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

" 'Tis men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly;
They build a nation's pillars deep,
And lift them to the sky."

We boast of our vast territory. But Russia has far more acres of land than we have. Territory does not make a nation great. Greece and Palestine made more contributions to the world than any other two countries. But their territory was but little more

extensive than a west Texas county. We boast of our population, and, our census takers will soon tell us that we have here in America more than 130,000,000 free people. But population does not make a nation great. China, the "Rip Van Winkle" of the nations, has more than three times as many people as our country.

The greatness of a nation is determined, like the greatness of an individual, not by what it possesses but by the quality of the ideals which possess it. Our true wealth is moral and not material. Our greatest asset is our devotion to truth and not to world trade. Better have the spirit of democracy at work in a little land of limited wealth than to enjoy riches at the price of liberty. It will fall to your lot as the men and women of the future to guard well our heritage.

"America! America! God shed His grace on three;
And crown with good thy brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

Your lamp of faith must, most of all, include an ever-increasing faith in God. I am aware of the doubts which will assail you. I know something of the dark periods of intellectual anxiety through which you will pass. But keep your faith. The men and women whose names will live till the last syllable of recorded time, were all men and women of great faith. That is true of those who now guide our destinies.

TRUST IN THE ETERNITY

Above all else, it is the character of our public men which makes them great. At the memorial services held in Congress each year, but little is said of the high achievements of the dead statesmen. Their simple faith is always a source of inspiration. A study of our great men will reveal most of them coming to the twilight hour with a simple faith in God. Henry Clay, after a life of great achievement and high ambition, declared on his deathbed to the statesmen friends around him, that the honors of earth looked small in the light of eternity. Webster, the mighty Webster, when dying, asked his family to sing about his bedside, There is a Fountain Filled with Blood. At his request there was placed upon his tomb these words, "Lord, I Believe; Help Thou Mine Unbelief." I suggest the words of that tomb as your prayer as you fall asleep on this, the first evening of your graduation.

A study of the atmosphere is always fascinating. The lower portion of it called the troposphere is where we live and move and have our being. It extends upward for about 10 miles. Above that for about 90 miles more we have the stratosphere where it is said man will some day fly at more than 1,000 miles per hour. Most of us spend our lives in the troposphere of the temporal. Now and then some rare soul rises to the clear pure air of the stratosphere of the spiritual. May many of you experience that glorious ascension.

You have the message I have come to bring you. It is a simple one. There is the lamp of a great faith in yourselves, your fellow man, your country and in your God which you must keep burning in all your future years. I close with words which I have used on other occasions like this:

"I will not wish thee riches, or the glow of greatness;
But that whithersoever thou goest,
Some weary life may gladden at thy smile;
Some weary heart find sunshine for a while.
So may thy years be as a track of light
Like an angel's footsteps, passing through the night."

The Nation at the Crossroads of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS R. BALL, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore given me to revise and extend my remarks, I am including hereafter an address made by the Representative in the Congress from the Second District of Connecticut, THOMAS RAYMOND BALL, on the village green at Old Lyme, Conn., May 30, 1940, before an audience composed of the American Legion and their friends on the occasion of Memorial Day.

Congressman BALL has a distinguished war record and therefore is particularly qualified to speak on Memorial Day. Mr. BALL, although a member of an opposite political party, I have found to be wholly conscientious, always alert and attentive to his duties, and a true American in that his regard for his country transcends his party allegiance.

Mr. Commander, reverend clergy, my friends, first I want to tell you how deeply touched I am that my fellow comrades of the American Legion should ask me to speak at this service on this sacred soil on this Memorial Day morning. Many memories cluster around me as I stand here, treasured memories of other occasions when we have met together for these solemn rites, of those who, year after year, placed the flags on the graves of our soldier dead, brought here their offerings of flowers, who spoke and sang, and smiled and prayed, and who have gone from us. Many of them lie not far from here in the company of their fathers, others far away, but they are with us today, together with those of an earlier day. As St. Paul wrote "We also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses."

The first grave marked in the cemetery is that of a soldier, a valiant officer of a small but courageous band, who was laid to rest in 1676. From his day to ours the men of Lyme have been fighters, and the roll of our war dead is the sacred symbol of the devotion of Lyme's sons to God and country. From this street came the response to the Lexington alarm, on this green mingled the French fleur-de-lys and the new-born Stars and Stripes, on it young men drilled in '61, and went forth to die for the preservation of the Union—that Union of sovereign States that has made our Nation. We who stand here today recall the last of those boys in blue, as, aged and infirm, they bequeathed to us the sacred trust of cherishing the memory of the Grand Army of the Republic, and, as we honor today these men, let us not forget those other Americans who fought a lost cause, and let us fervently pray that never again shall this broad land be torn asunder.

Even more vivid than the recollections of the soldiers of the sixties are those of our own comrades of the last war. It has been fashionable in certain quarters to belittle the Allied cause in that war and to question our country's conduct and motives, but we who were part of that grim picture have no apology. We know that we were right and our victory deserved, and we realize what it would have meant for the world had the enemy then prevailed. Paid propagandists and decadent defeatists may decry the contribution made by our soldiers, sailors, marines, and loyal citizens, but the Nation as a whole is still proud of the job done and still bows with reverence before the shrine on the heights of Arlington where "rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

This is a solemn hour, fraught with much danger. The whole world is beset with the forces of evil, and in Europe the nightmare of modern warfare is no longer a dream that is spent with the morning light but a vivid reality, an accomplished fact to be taken literally and with no illusions. The diabolical ingenuity of the inventor has equipped an army with new weapons of warfare, mechanically perfect and infernally efficient, and with them the calculated cruelty of the conqueror has extinguished the national life of once-powerful peoples, and even now is threatening with extinction the Christian civilization of western Europe. Destroyed forever is the fiction that those who crave only peace can preserve it through blind isolation. The Scandinavia that seemed serene in her security against war discovered in despair that the hungry monster would not pass her by. In a few weeks we in this country have become aware of what this war means to us. We are day by day learning an awful lesson, and God grant that we may not be too late to profit by it.

The conflict across the sea is not only one of steel, of flame, of gas. Behind the smoke of battle is the unseen warfare of the spirit. The forces of fury, actuated by godless greed, are now battering at those defenses which we know must stand, the ramparts of religion and piety that protect those simple and sincere souls who seek only to live their lives in peace and quietness, earning their daily bread by honest labor. All that we know and love here at home is no longer immune from the insidious germs of an alien philosophy. The tranquility of this green and village, these churches, the fraternal and friendly groups that meet together in lodge or grange, the principles of this American Legion post, the lessons of Scouting learned by these troops, the study of sound learning and simple truth that has characterized our schools and colleges—all are imbued with the spirit of God, a spirit that receives the studied sneers of the savants, serfs, and soldiers of totalitarianism.

This Nation is at the crossroads of history. Her destiny is before her. She is ill prepared for her advance. Her national debt is colossal, her industry only convalescent from the illness of depression, and her businessmen harassed by worry and apprehension. Her labor groups are engaged in fratricidal skirmishes and at the mercy of Communist agitators; her Congress is threatened by organized bands of malcontents constantly demanding special privileges and benefits; her Army, though at a peacetime peak, is only half the size of Switzerland's; her Navy, though superb, can alone protect but part of our coasts; and the presence of a "fifth column" in our midst is a known fact. It is futile to speculate on what might have been. We must face facts, and face them squarely.

I am not trying to alarm you unduly, but in all honesty I feel that I must talk straight from the shoulder. We cannot foretell the future, and we can only attempt to judge the past. It is very likely that we shall have to tighten our belts, give up luxuries, and submit to new and heavy taxes, if we are to put our national house in order, restore our Government to solvency, and pay for the increased national defense that is absolutely essential. Our geographical situation that has served us so well in the past is apparently obsolete as an insurance of immunity from foreign aggression. To

be sure we are separated from Europe by the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific is between us and Asia, but we do not now control both of these seas, and we are definitely committed to a policy of solidarity with the other American republics that makes the whole hemisphere our responsibility, a responsibility that demands our fulfillment.

In the days to come we must realize that much will be required of us, and as problems, which only a few months ago appeared to be remote and somewhat speculative, present themselves forcefully for our immediate attention; we must be swayed by no hysteria, neither must we be stampeded by panic into reckless acts. We must keep our feet firmly on the ground, our minds clear, and our hearts loyal. No class hatred or racial or religious intolerance should have a place in our national thought. We are Americans—first, last, and always—and together we will tackle whatever job may be ours, impelled by the high resolve that in the spirit of those men for whom this day is a perpetual memorial we will be consecrated afresh, and learn anew the duty and privilege of being an American.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY DAVE BECK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech of Dave Beck, international representative of the Teamsters' Union, on national defense, given over radio station KOL in Seattle and broadcast over all stations of the Mutual System in Washington State, February 20, 1940:

Good evening, tonight I have been asked to address you on the subject of national defense, and in doing so, I shall speak primarily as an American citizen, and, secondarily, as an official of the Teamsters' Union.

And may I say in passing, that is precisely the way I approach every problem that confronts our organization—first as an American citizen.

My allegiance to labor is secondary to my allegiance to the United States, and it will ever remain so.

I ask nothing for myself or for the Teamsters' Union that is contrary to the welfare of our general citizenry.

The Teamsters' Union is primarily an organization of patriotic American citizens who pay taxes and support their families and whose interests are woven inseparably into the American system of government.

We believe in the capitalistic system, under which any man may make an honest profit on his labor or on his ideas.

The members of the Teamsters' Union are ready to defend the United States and have eloquently demonstrated their willingness in the past.

The rosters of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps during the last war emphatically prove that statement.

In every military cemetery and hospital today you will find members of the Teamsters' Union who gave their lives or their health in the service of the United States.

The Teamsters' Union is proud of those men and of the rugged American spirit which typifies our organization today.

We stand for national defense. We insist that this country be protected against the invasion of armed forces, and beyond that, we insist that we be protected against the invasion of alien propagandists seeking to poison the minds of American citizens with prejudice and falsehood.

And so, it is with pleasure that I speak on the subject of national defense, knowing that the thousands of men in the Teamsters' Union echo the sentiments that I voice tonight.

We are one organization that will make no compromise with communism. And that goes for fascism too.

In fact, fascism is nothing but communism with its neck washed.

No Communist can become a member of the Teamsters' Union, and any member who becomes a Communist ceases to be a teamster as soon as we find it out.

We don't argue with him. We just kick him out.

We admit his right to believe whatever he pleases but we maintain our rights to ostracize him. If he wants to destroy everything the Teamsters' Union stands for, let him try to destroy it from the outside. There is no room for him on the inside.

No intelligent workingman believes that communism offers anything but destruction for the wages and working conditions of labor. The Communist campaign of hatred is skillfully directed at capitalism, which unquestionably has many faults and weaknesses.

But while the Communist seeks openly to destroy capital, he works just as hard, but secretly, to destroy labor.

Communism, fascism, or any other kind of dictatorship means nothing more nor less than the nationalization of both capital and labor. It means that everybody would work for the politician in control, under whatever terms and conditions the politician imposes. And any man who maintains his right to strike, loses his right to live. They simply kill him off.

So, when we defend our industrial system, we defend the right of labor to demand just wages, reasonable hours, and healthy working conditions.

We also defend the right to strike, to educate our children, put money in the bank, and improve our economic condition to the limit of our capacity to earn or create.

That is the so-called capitalistic system, and it is the only system that permits a man to stand on a platform and publicly criticize the President of the United States or anybody else.

Labor in America is on the road to ruin if we have to seek alien advice and leadership. Let us deport these alien agitators, not only from the ranks of labor but from business, industry, or wherever we find them.

I support the Dies committee to protect us from subversive alien influences and I support the La Follette committee to protect us from equally subversive domestic influences.

I believe the Federal Government is moving effectively to defend this country at home and abroad. It has enlarged the Department of Justice to cope with the menace of the alien spies who would sabotage factories and throw American citizens out of work to help some foreign power.

The Government is enlarging our armed forces to properly defend us. I approve of those policies.

Very appropriately, National Defense Week falls between the birthdays of our two greatest Presidents. One created this Nation with the sword, and the other preserved it with the sword.

Every schoolboy knows who these men are, but for the benefit of some of the aliens in our midst who are trying to speak for American workers, I will name these two great Presidents.

They are Washington and Lincoln, men widely separated in their backgrounds and social positions. Washington was a capitalist and an aristocrat. Lincoln was a common man, raised in poverty. But their devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice spanned the gap between them.

Baron von Mannerheim, of Finland, reminds me a great deal of George Washington. This aristocratic patriot of a little nation leads his soldiers across the snow to hurl back the bloodthirsty legions of a great power bent on conquest. So did Washington.

History will record the Communist invasion of Finland as a striking parallel to our own fight for independence in 1776.

I salute Baron Mannerheim and his brave little nation. They have survived thus far because they have developed their national defense.

Our own national defenses must be strengthened. I do not pose as a military expert, and I do not attempt to say exactly how.

We send young men to West Point and Annapolis to make a life study of national defense, and when they tell us what to do, I believe we should listen to them and not to politicians or sympathizers of Soviet Russia or any other nation.

It is no secret that our standing Army is one of the smallest in the world, less than half as large as Finland's, with a nation many times as large and wealthy to protect.

It should be recruited to the minimum requirements to guard us from surprise attack at any point.

If the day ever comes when America must defend her shores from foreign aggression, we will need a strong reserve of trained men.

The time to get such a reserve is now. After war comes "it is too late" and we shall then pay the penalty of delay in a needless sacrifice of improperly trained men.

In the last war, when our troops were fighting the second-rate reserves of the German Army, our casualties were six times as great as theirs, notwithstanding the fact that, man for man, our soldiers were far superior.

Do you know why that was? It was because the Germans were trained better than the Americans. And every time a German fell, six Americans fell.

It was fortunate that we had allies in that war. We would have lost it, had that casualty rate continued. In the next war we may have to stand on our own feet, without a well-trained British Army and French Army to support us.

So, for the sake of our national safety and for the individual safety of the men who may some day be called to arms, I urge military training for the boys in the C. C. C. camps.

We should speed the fortification of Alaska. Alaska lies only 40 miles from the coast of Siberia, the Pacific rim of Soviet Russia. Russia is now fortifying Siberia. For what purpose? We can only guess. But Alaska once belonged to Russia and today nations are seizing land that once belonged to them and slaughtering the people who occupy it.

I repeat that only 40 miles separate Alaska from Russia. We are almost as close to Russia as Tacoma is to Seattle.

We should continue to develop Bremerton as the northern base of the fleet. It should be ready to handle the needs of the fleet in wartime. Bremerton should be supplemented by other coast bases, located and developed by military experts and not by chambers of commerce.

We should fortify a chain of islands across the Pacific Ocean so that war in the Pacific could be fought far at sea before a hostile navy could ever reach our shores.

The international highway to Alaska would be a lifeline to that Territory in case of invasion. We should speed its construction.

I believe we should increase the facilities for training Army and Navy officers. I advocate another Federal academy on the Pacific coast with entrance by competitive examination rather than political appointment.

I speak as the father of a boy of military age. If war comes, my son, like yours, will be called to the colors. I believe my boy owes his first duty to his country. But if he is called, I want him sufficiently trained to take care of himself. As a veteran of the last war, I know what happens to poorly trained troops.

While I emphasize the necessity for military defenses, I think we must take stock of our spiritual values. Religion, in reality, is our first line of defense. An Army, without faith to support it, is little better than an armed mob.

Religion is the bulwark of our civilization. In fact, this country was founded as a haven for religious freedom. Through our faith in a supreme destiny and a Master Architect, we have become great.

Perhaps that is why the first assault of the Nazi and the Communist is upon religion. And when religion falls, civilization totters.

I am convinced that the Nazi and the Communist want civilization to collapse, because only, in the midst of universal madness, could such doctrines survive.

The record of both Russia and Germany, under their present rulers, shows conclusively that they demand control of the mind. Any mind open to any thought of tolerance or kindliness cannot embrace nazi-ism or communism.

Therefore, the mind must be prejudiced and Almighty God is banished to Siberia or the concentration camps.

These things are serious in America today. Already too many people have taken a step toward communism by adopting a hostile attitude toward religion and all it teaches.

That is the first blow at national defense.

These are days when men and nations must be strong and righteous to survive. We must be intelligent. We must analyze the motives behind the words of those who would entice us away from the traditions of Washington and Lincoln.

Those men were sustained by their belief in divine destiny and their decisions have given America a heritage it must be strong to defend.

Those who would destroy religion would destroy the sanctity of the oath upon which rests our judicial, legislative, and executive functions of government. They would sweep away the cornerstone of justice on which our entire structure of government rests.

Let those who preach atheism preach it where the Bible is not the final and supreme standard to judge the character of men.

Let us have national defense, not only of our harbors and coast lines but of our hearts and consciences as well. When our national character dissolves, there is nothing left to defend.

Good night.

African Home For Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. THEODORE G. BILBO, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the June issue, 1940, of The Living Age, entitled "African Home for Negroes," written by me.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Living Age for June 1940]

AN AFRICAN HOME FOR OUR NEGROES

(By Senator THEODORE G. BILBO)

Ever since the first public intimation of the introduction in the United States Congress of the proposal for voluntary resettlement of American Negroes in Africa I have been bombarded with inquiries on the subject. One of the leading questions asked me is, "What do the Negroes themselves think about it?"

Naturally enough, the Negroes are divided on the subject of repatriation. There is a right wing and there is a left wing.

The response noted from the right wing has been very salutary indeed. On the day that I introduced Senate bill 2231—April 24, 1939—I had in my possession petitions signed by approximately 2,500,000 Negroes pleading with the Government to provide for their resettlement in the land of their ancestors. At least 2,000,000 of these petitioners were Negroes who belong to the school of thought represented by the Ethiopian League, headed by M. M. L. Gordon, of Chicago, a Negro woman of prodigious foresight and rugged enthusiasm for the welfare and integrity of her race. This league is dedicated to the purpose of promoting the ideals of Negro blood integrity, economic independence, and repatriation of the Negro to his fatherland. Under the guidance of President Gordon, these Negroes have been giving serious thought to the race problem for a number of years.

In 1933, when the first relief bill was pending in Congress, the Ethiopian League—known as the Peace Movement of Ethiopia—petitioned President Roosevelt not to give them alms but to give them an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves on their native heath. This petition has been acclaimed by many as the most extraordinary racial document in the history of the Nation. Did space permit, I should here reproduce this petition in full, but the following excerpts will suffice to reflect the spirit of these Negroes:

"Whereas the distress of the unemployed is most severely felt by such of the uneducated American Negroes who abhor alms, both public and private, in any guise; and whereas the removal of a half million of the poorest from a competitive labor market, at this time, would tend to relieve to that extent the condition and improve the opportunities of the remainder, we, the subjoined signatories, American citizens of African extraction, individually and collectively, join in respectfully petitioning the President to consider our proposal, confident that his conclusions will be for the best interests of our families and of the community at large.

"We are of the so-called North, most of us having been driven from a cruel and avowedly intolerant South to the cities and towns of the Middle West, without a just opportunity to earn a livelihood in our abject new state.

"We are simple-minded, sincere, law-abiding workers who have maintained traditions of simple honesty, industry, and frugality, as much from choice as from necessity. Few of us have education, but we have learned not to heed the blandishments of self-seeking politicians, imposters, and the unworthy and the undesirable products of a hectic civilization that is foreign to our nature. * * *

"Hungry, cold, and miserable, the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness in America appears futile. Given an opportunity in our own ancestral Africa, the knowledge of farming and simple farm machinery and implements which we have acquired here would enable us to carve a frugal but decent livelihood out of the virgin soil and favorable climate of Liberia, or such other well-disposed country where the Federal Government, in its wisdom, might acquire a footing for us.

"We respectfully ask that the President graciously have this matter investigated now, with a view to fulfilling the expressed desires of Abraham Lincoln in this respect. We are a liability now, and any cost of this project, no matter how great, would still, we sincerely believe, be a sound investment for the American people."

Signatures to this and similar petitions have constantly increased in the interim to bring the total number at present to about 3,000,000.

The Universal Negro Improvement Association is another Negro organization which proclaims the ideals of Negro blood integrity and which has for its objective a repatriation movement. Almost daily I receive petitions signed by hundreds of Negroes in this group.

Negroes from every State in the Union have said by means of petition, by letter, and by word of mouth, that they want to return to the land of their fathers. In a letter addressed to me by President Gordon of the Ethiopian League, this Negro leader said:

"We are Negroes who represent the industrial masses, farmers, and men of skill, and in the land of our forefathers we will not only make a living for ourselves but will be free from race prejudice and discrimination. We highly approve your opposition to the mixture of the two races; for we, likewise, detest the same thing.

This is what the Negroes in the right wing are saying. This is what they are thinking. These are the Negroes who realize that the most understanding friend they ever had, Abraham Lincoln, was one of the most fervent advocates of repatriation. They know he was on the right track when he embodied in the Emancipation Proclamation a clause proclaiming that efforts to colonize Negroes would be pursued. These Negroes know that over and over again he spoke against miscegenation or intermarriage of the white and black races. They know that if the assassin's bullet had not so soon removed Lincoln from the scene of action, the descendants of the Negro slaves would now be enjoying liberty and economic blessings in a country of their own.

Lincoln's utterances on the subject were unmistakably clear. "There is a physical difference between the white and the black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. Let us be brought to believe that it is morally right and at the same time favorable to our interest to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be."

It is of considerable moment that two outstanding Negroes in recent addresses before a large assembly of their race in New York both supported the repatriation of Negroes. I refer to Magistrate Myles A. Paige, newly appointed judge of special sessions in New York City, and Elmer A. Carter, Negro member of the State unemployment insurance appeal board. Magistrate Paige, addressing the Negro men's group of the Y. M. C. A., pointed out to his people that the Negro is outstripped in the competition for

available jobs, too often contented to let the successful competitor pay for his support. He was quoted in the press as saying that unless the Negro can win his way through, becoming a part of the working body of the country, "we're going to get our passage back." By "passage back," he meant back to Africa.

Elmer Carter, the Negro member of the New York unemployment insurance appeal board, spoke along somewhat the same lines. He emphasized that there are indications that the country will have to support 13,000,000 or more permanently unemployed persons in the future. He stressed that although Negroes are the largest racial group on relief they are returning to private industry more slowly than any other group. He is quoted as having declared that in his opinion the Negro in the United States is yet to face his greatest crisis. Discussing repatriation, Carter said that he does not see anything absurd in the possibility of transplanting the Negro to Africa in the future. He based his judgment on the fact, he said, that Germany had demonstrated the possibility of transplanting a great mass of people thousands of miles. He might have also mentioned the fact that our own Government has been spending large sums of money in colonizing Dust Bowl victims, by tens of thousands, in Alaska.

These two well-informed Negro men see eye to eye in their views of the unemployment problem and the relief situation.

It is safe to say that as high as 75 percent of those on relief rolls in many State are Negroes. The District of Columbia is a typical example. Last year's records show that approximately 8,000 out of the 10,000 relief enrollees in the District of Columbia were Negroes. This notwithstanding the fact that the population of the District is 400,000 whites and 200,000 colored. In other words, 8,000 of the 200,000 colored are on the relief rolls compared with only 2,000 of the 400,000 whites.

For the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1939, the Government's expenditure for relief amounted to $2,617,974,000. One-half of that 1 year's expenditure could be spent in providing for the resettlement of the Negro in his fatherland, and the Government would save money on the transaction. If we could effect the resettlement of from five to eight million Negroes who are now ready to go to Africa, we could solve the unemployment problem and would be able soon to do away with the necessity of these large annual appropriations for relief.

Some time ago two commissioners were sent to Liberia by the Ethiopian League to confer with the President of Liberia and to ascertain whether he would be willing to admit the American Negroes into Liberia in the event Congress should pass an enabling act. These investigators returned with the assurance that the President of Liberia is ready to receive American Negroes. Formal announcement has been made by President Barclay that millions of acres of land in Liberia are now ready and waiting to be settled by American Negroes.

An educated Negro went from my home State of Mississippi to Liberia in 1902, soon after his graduation from Jackson College in the capital city of Mississippi. He later concluded that he could render more valuable service to his people if he had a knowledge of medicine. He returned to this country and studied medicine at Meharry Medical College. Now back in Liberia, he combines preaching, teaching, medicine, and dentistry.

A titan, a man among men in Liberia, is this Dr. Jones. He insists on teaching Africans to think black and to this end was instrumental in barring from the schools all textbooks for the lower grades which contain the faces of white persons. Published reports reveal the happy estate of many American Negroes in Liberia. These reports serve to convince one that every American Negro should covet the privilege of returning to the continent of his forefathers to establish a home on the fertile lands of Africa, where he could live under a government of and by and for his own people.

Dr. Jones says that the temperature in Liberia ranges between 64 and 98 degrees and that he plants sweet potatoes 12 times a year—one each month.

Liberia lies on the southwest coast of Africa between British Sierra Leone on the west and the French colony of the Ivory Coast on the east, with a coast line on the south Atlantic of about 350 miles. It extends inland 75 to 150 miles. Most of the country is densely forested, rich in timber and in oil nuts. Plantings of about 10,000,000 rubber trees, representing an investment of about $90,000,000 are financed by the Firestone Tire Co.

The population of Liberia is entirely of the African race. The constitution provides that no white man can own land or vote in the Republic. The number of American Negroes colonized there is estimated at 20,000.

Liberia was founded in 1822 as the result of a movement by the American Colonization Society organized in Washington, D. C., in 1817. At the time this society was organized there were about 200,000 free colored people scattered throughout the Union. They enjoyed then, as now, few of the advantages of freedom. It was thought by the American Colonization Society that if a colony for the freed Negroes of the United States could be established in the land of their origin, they might, in time, with proper care and patronage by the Federal Government, become a self-supporting community and thus prepare a way of life and a home for the eventual colonization of the remaining millions of slaves who were destined to be given their freedom from slavery.

The sole purpose of the organization was to promote the cause of Negro repatriation. Land would have to be acquired for a colony, and ways and means for its settlement would need to be formed. The organizers realized that the task would be too great for a group of private citizens to undertake, so the society sought and obtained the aid of the American Government in its program. The society purchased practically all the territory that now forms the Republic of Liberia, and the first group of Negroes were transported to that country in 1822. The American Government cooperated with the colonization society and from time to time landed its recaptured slaves from vessels engaged in slave traffic in the territory of Liberia.

Within a quarter of a century the Liberian colony had so succeeded and progressed that it was able to stand on its own feet and declare itself a republic. The declaration of Liberian independence is dated as of July 26, 1847. It is a document so fraught with human appeal, so clearly indicative of sincerity of purpose that the reading of it suffices to convince the skeptical that the West Coast of Africa is the proper place of haven for the members of the black race now in this country.

Notwithstanding the severance of ties between the settlements of the Republic of Liberia and the American Colonization Society, the parent organization continued to keep in touch with the Republic and to cooperate in directing its destinies. The society was unable to take care of all who desired to migrate to their ancestral Africa, because the volunteers were in greater numbers than the society could accommodate. Vicious attacks were made on the society from certain quarters, just as my proposal has been viciously impugned by some. Despite these attacks, the American Colonization Society continued to make progress until Negroes to the total number of 12,000 had been resettled in Liberia. Among the men who were members of this organization were Francis Scott Key, John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Charles Fenton Mercer, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, James Monroe, and many others. It will be remembered that Monrovia, capital of Liberia, was named for President Monroe, who was an active member of the American Colonization Society when Liberia was founded. That society still exists, with headquarters in Washington. Colonel West, who now heads the organization, has made frequent trips to Liberia and is among the stanchest of modern advocates of Negro repatriation.

The first recorded effort to bring about colonization of American Negroes in Africa was by a committee in the General Assembly of Virginia in the year 1777. Thomas Jefferson was chairman of that committee. It reported favorably on a resolution for the emancipation and subsequent colonization of Virginia slaves. It contemplated the acquisition of territory, a gradual enforcement of the plan, not only to establish Negroes in a territory of their own but to support them until they could sustain themselves. This was Jefferson's plan in 1777, the year following the penning of the Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson spoke and wrote more fluently and more profoundly on the Negro question than did any other man of his time. On numerous occasions he entreated his countrymen, with prophetic vision, to seek by emancipation and repatriation to evade national economic disintegration and racial decline which, it now appears, may overtake us. But in spite of his frequent utterances warning the Nation against the evils that would ensue where two widely different races, equally free, were compelled to live side by side, the opposition of his day appealed to the author of the Declaration of Independence in support of the theory that the Negro should be recognized in this country upon terms of absolute equality with the white man.

The written works of Jefferson are replete with evidence that he did not include the Negro when he said, "All men are created free and equal." His expressed views on the subject, from the date he penned the classic Declaration of Independence up to the time of his death, all serve to countermand the suggestion that Jefferson had thought of the Negro enjoying equality with the white man. The following single extract will refute the claims of those who clamor for equality between the two races:

"Deep-rooted prejudices entertained by the whites, 10,000 recollections by the blacks of the injuries they have sustained, new provocations, the real distinctions which Nature has made, and many other circumstances will divide us into parties and produce convulsions which will probably never end but in the extermination of one or the other race. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, and opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. Provide an asylum to which we can, by degrees, send the whole of that population from among us and establish them under our patronage and protection as a separate, free, and independent people in some country and clime friendly to human life and happiness. I leave this to those who will live to see their accomplishment but I leave it with this admonition—to rise and be doing."

The impression prevails in the minds of some people that my proposal for the repatriation of the Negro is a product of so-called "southern prejudice." The fact is that my record of more than 20 years in public office, including 8 years as Governor of Mississippi, will confirm the statement that I have always dealt fairly and sympathetically with the Negro.

We have today about 12,500,000 Negroes in the United States; more than 8,000,000 of these live in the South. It has been the southern man who has had to deal with and attempt to solve this race problem. The low status of this part of our population is one of the South's greatest burdens and has been the cause of the South's backwardness in industrial development. It has been the source of much of our crime, our poverty, our disease, and our being labeled throughout the Nation as its economic problem No. 1.

Before the Civil War the white laboring man of the South had to compete with slave labor, and the poor white man of the South had little chance. After the Negro was freed he was more or less dependent. He was unaccustomed to his physical freedom; he was like a ship without a rudder. He was willing to work for almost any wage. This placed the white laboring man of the South in competition with the Negro freed labor of the South.

But with the wage and hour law now on the statute books, with the resultant increase of wage scales in many industries, the white man can now afford to accept many of the jobs which the Negro has been filling and at least partially maintain his standard of living. This changing condition forebodes that millions of Negroes are likely to lose their jobs to white men.

Negroes all over the country know what it means to be outstripped by the white men in competition for jobs. There is more of a certain kind of equality enjoyed by the Negro in the North, but he finds that there is less mutual understanding. Most of the trade unions in the North, as in the South, devise methods to exclude the Negro. Railroad brotherhoods deny him membership. The congenital feeling of inferiority of the colored man, the lack of native ingenuity together with the unbridgeable difference between the two races that will continue to exist so long as they exist as distinct races, all arise to thwart the Negro wherever he goes in America.

Three hundred years of contact with the white has bestowed on the Negro race a degree of superimposed learning and artisanship which can prove a blessing in carving a future for the individual in his fatherland. This being true, the American Negro has gained something by way of compensation from his sojourn in a white man's land. Repatriated in an environment intended by the Creator to be the home of the black man, the American Negro would have an opportunity, as Thomas Jefferson so aptly expressed it, "to carry back to the country of his origin the seeds of civilization, which might render his sojournment and suffering here a blessing in the end."

Educational facilities here for Negro children are not as good as we might wish to see. There is a growing discontent among the Negroes because schools for the colored are not the equal of the white schools, in the South. The Negro complains that his schools are the poorest in the country; that housing accommodations for colored pupils are neglected; that colored teachers are poorly trained.

I am one of a large number of sympathetic southerners who sincerely wish we could do better educationally by our young Negroes. But there are so many of them. By nature a prolific race, the Negro in the balmy Southland perpetuates at so rapid a rate that our public-school systems are constantly faced with new problems in providing schooling for the rising generation of colored pupils. Notwithstanding the high mortality of the Negro race—60 percent higher than that of the white race—the net gain in Negro population over a period of 10 years is about 13.6 percent, based on the period of 1920–30.

In my State we have 100,000 more colored children of school age than of white school children. It seems ironic that we have only 6,000 colored teachers as compared with 10,000 white teachers. The ratio appears inversely proportioned, and it is. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the bulk of the tax burden falls on white shoulders. A relatively small percentage indeed is paid by the Negro population. All things considered, we have done as well as we could reasonably afford to provide education for colored children and hospitals for the Negro and his family.

All the education in the world, however, cannot erase the physical and mental differences that divide the two races. The "color line," while serving as a deterrent to intermarriage in regions where it is enforced, cannot prevent illegal miscegenation. The facts speak for themselves. The most authentic records reveal, and one has but to look around among the colored population to see, that about one-third of the negroid citizens of our country are Negroes with white admixtures—mulattoes, quadroons, and octoroons. Nineteen States in the Union and also the District of Columbia even give legal sanction to intermarriage between the blacks and the whites.

It has been stated by good authorities that there are today about 20,000 Negro boys and Negro girls annually crossing the color line. That is to say, a Negro boy is a mulatto and looks white, so he goes where he is not known, and marries a white girl. The mulatto, or white-colored girl, goes where she is not known and marries a white man. Who, then, in the face of this, can say that we are not gradually heading for eventual amalgamation unless steps are taken for the physical separation of the two races?

An example of a proud civilization that crumbled and decayed as a result of becoming a mongrel race is ancient Egypt. In the beginning the Egyptians belonged to the Caucasian Race. Contact with the Negro through invasion of Negro territory and the introduction of Nubian slaves and soldiers in Egypt created the Egyptian hybrid. Stagnation overtook this once great empire and its civilization perished, reaching a climax finally in the accession of the mulatto pharaoh, Teharka, to the throne in 688 B. C.

I agree with the ethnologist, Madison Grant, that "if the purity of the two races is to be maintained, they cannot continue to live side by side, and this is a problem from which there can be no escape."

One reason some of my colleagues and other public men are afraid of the proposal for resettlement of American Negroes in Africa is that they regard it as fantastic, too visionary, too big a job. But it occurs to me that when millions of American Negroes are begging Congress to give them an opportunity to avail themselves of the land which is now waiting for them, held in trust by the Republic of Liberia, it is better sense, better judgment, and better business for the Government to pay for their transportation and upkeep until they are well on their way to being established in their new home. It would certainly be cheaper and better to care for them in that way than to let them stay in the United States and keep them indefinitely on the relief rolls.

If for no other reason than the preservation of blood integrity of the two races, repatriation of the Negro seems to me to be the only feasible solution of the race problem. I cannot think otherwise when I consider the established facts covering a period of 20,000 years, showing that whenever and wherever the white race and the black race have tried to live side by side, the blood integrity of both races has been destroyed and a mongrel race has inevitably followed.

There is nothing fantastic in the plan of repatriation of Negroes; and in putting it into effect we would simply be carrying forward the program of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and many other thoughtful statesmen of bygone days. We would simply be carrying to fruition the plan that the Great Emancipator pledged himself to carry out, the thing that he would have done had he lived to do it: "Let us be brought to believe that it is morally right and at the same time favorable to our interest to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great may be the task."

As Taft Views It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

AS TAFT VIEWS IT

Crashing prominently into the foreground these days in the thoughts of countless Americans is the official attitude this Nation should assume toward the war in Europe.

Few go so far as to suggest that we should send our armies across the Atlantic to participate in the battle.

Between the point of actual participation in the war and that of absolute neutrality, however, lies a confusion of thought.

Some persons believe we should extend credit to the Allies, permitting them to buy freely in this country without worrying too much about how and when payment is to be made. Others contend we should share with them whatever military secrets we may possess. Still others say we should give them all the supplies we can possibly provide but that we should not send our men to Europe.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT discussed this subject in a thoughtful speech a few days ago. In a summary of his address, a Christian Science Monitor correspondent enumerates the basic points of his (TAFT'S) philosophy in the following paragraphs:

"1. In modern war, he believes, the victor will emerge as exhausted as the vanquished.

"2. The United States, he contends, cannot help the Allies partially without entering the war wholly. 'If we are justified,' he says, 'in spending billions for the Allies and supporting their navies, then it would be cowardice not to support them also by men. If we admit that our safety and defense are at stake in the European war, then we cannct go halfway.'

"3. To him going to war would not preserve democracy for the world and would lose it for the United States.

"4. Even if it should so desire, he estimates, the United States, already in a vulnerable financial situation, is not able to provide effective assistance to the Allies, since it has no army to send to Europe, no adequate volume of airplanes, no sufficient material.

"5. Germany, he believes, would have neither the strength nor the need to attack the Western Hemisphere.

"6. When peace is once restored, he asserts, the United States could trade as well with Germany as with Great Britain.

"7. The seriousness of the situation produced by a German victory cannot be ignored, he realizes. It involves the possibility of a German, Italian, and Japanese alliance. It would require a change of the country's entire foreign policy. It would mean a world widely ruled by aggression and totalitarianism. It would require vast expenditures annually for armaments.

"8. Senator TAFT agrees that the prospects mentioned in the foregoing paragraph would have to be faced, but even that alternative

seems to him preferable to any industrial and financial assistance to the Allies—beyond cash-and-carry commerce—which might bring the United States into war."

It is the Argus-Leader's suggestion that all persons weigh deeply the policies that TAFT has enumerated. TAFT is a man who speaks carefully and the fact that he is a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency does not warp his viewpoints. Those who know him well insist that he would be expressing his thoughts in exactly the same way if he were a plain citizen of Ohio with no political ambitions.

The point he brings out in paragraph 2 in the classification of his views is particularly significant. If this is our war as much as it is the war of England and France, then it is quite clearly nothing short of cowardice on our part to refrain from a full participation. And if it is not our war, then why should we support the Allies?

Senator TAFT, it seems to the Argus-Leader, has outlined in an effective fashion a policy that is fundamentally American and basically sound.

In some circles in the East it is being sharply criticized. But the critics are primarily persons who believe that this is our war and that we should be fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Allies. Naturally, they object to an opinion that suggests nonparticipation directly or indirectly on the part of the United States.

Our Defense Policy and the Arms Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BLOOMINGTON (ILL.) PANTAGRAPH

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine editorial taken from the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph, the largest paper in my district.

With world conditions as we find them at this very moment, it is high time that a definite defense policy of the United States should be pronounced to all our citizens. It seems we are in total agreement that we must immediately have larger and better equipped armed forces for defense. No doubt remains but that Congress expects to carry out the wishes of our people through adequate appropriations for that purpose.

Not only the Congress, but all citizens of this great country of ours, should be fully informed and have a clear and complete understanding as to what we are to defend and how we are to defend it, if these great sums of money are to be wisely and intelligently spent.

Let us prepare to the fullest degree to defend our Nation, but we cannot afford to rush off in any direction without first knowing how and when we expect to get there. This is no time for experiments or mistakes. Our objective should be clear and concise; then we can build toward that end.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT SHOULD ANSWER ONE PERSISTENT QUESTION

Thomas E. Dewey's speech in Dallas Monday night again called attention to the greatest weakness in Mr. Roosevelt's arms program—his failure to exactly define what our defense policy should be.

The Pantagraph has made this point again and again since Mr. Roosevelt first called on the Nation to support increased armament.

Mr. Roosevelt's continued silence is disturbing. It would be a simple thing for him to say our new arms should never be used by us for anything except defense of the Western Hemisphere. He could then elaborate this policy within the framework of the Monroe Doctrine, pointing out specific weak spots in our defense framework and committing us to their defense if threatened by any power. This would help allay the fears of millions of Americans who favor arms for our defense but not for Europe's wars.

Why is Mr. Roosevelt willing to let these fears go unanswered?

It is not lack of understanding. He has shown again and again that he understands the American public mind as no other man in public life. No; Mr. Roosevelt is fully aware that this fear exists.

It cannot be lack of courage, as he has proved his courage in public affairs many times.

What can the reason be?

We can think of only one answer.

We know there are many ardent interventionists on the Atlantic seaboard who favor sending an army immediately to help the Allies. We know on the west coast there is another group of interventionists. We know that in between these extremists are millions upon millions of Americans who remember the folly of 1917 and do not want it repeated.

Mr. Roosevelt hopes to remain personally popular with these divergent groups by means of the one thing they agree about—the need for increasing our own arms.

He does not want to cross the interventionists by coming out frankly for Western Hemisphere defense.

He does not want to cross the great mass of the American people by committing himself to a war in favor of the Allies.

We do not know what to call this unless it is a particularly obnoxious brand of personal politics.

Mr. Roosevelt knows he does not have to play politics to get support for rearmament. It is merely his own popularity that he hopes to enhance by remaining silent.

This is using the surge of alarm over the Nation's security in a most unworthy manner.

Again we express the hope that Mr. Roosevelt, in the name of the national unity he so readily invokes, will give the people a detailed, specific statement of his defense policy.

It is not time for cute tricks or slick silence.

The Best Defense of American Democracy Is To Broaden the Tax Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE BARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. BARTON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the best contribution this Congress can make to national defense is to broaden the tax base so that every man and woman from the richest to the poorest may have the duty and privilege of making a direct financial contribution to America.

Probably not again in our lifetime will the opportunity for such action be so propitious. Our people today are in a mood for self-sacrifice. The desire to do something, to give something is well-nigh universal. The administration far underestimates the Nation's patriotism if it shrinks from enacting the right kind of tax measure now for fear that the people will resent such action at the polls. In the willingness to render unselfish service the public desire today is far ahead of the politicians' realization.

The people are hungry for the truth. No politician has yet had the courage to tell them the truth about our internal weakness. They have never had the fact pointed out to them that America is in the precarious position of an inverted pyramid. At the bottom of the pyramid is a little group of 3,000,000 citizens who pay an income tax and so have a personal financial interest in sound and economical government.

The top of the pyramid consists of several millions of men and women who put nothing directly into the Treasury but, in one way or another, take out. In between these two groups is the middle class, once called the "backbone of America," which neither puts in nor takes out, and so is far less concerned than it should be with the management of our country, or the selection and conduct of its public officials.

This inverted pyramid with the few contributors at the bottom and the huge masses of beneficiaries at the top is a menace to the free government. We cannot hope permanently to preserve democracy if only a handful of citizens are conscious of the cost of democracy; we cannot, in any period of severe national crisis, keep that inverted pyramid from crashing into fragments which can only be gathered up and welded together again under the iron hand of dictatorship.

In the free frontier days when national income was increasing by leaps and bounds and the cost of national government was small, it mattered little what the taxes were or how they were distributed. The Government's functions were few and far removed from the daily life of the citizen, and national revenues came largely from tariffs and excise taxes. No one felt burdened. No one was conscious that when the Government spent money it was spending his

money. The public Treasury was traditionally a generous grab-bag; citizenship in America, and membership in any organized group with sufficient votes to make its voice heard, constituted a license to take out of the common fund for one's own community, section, or group. Representatives were elected and sent to Washington in the expectation that each one would do well financially for his own constituents; and reelection too often depended on success in bringing home the bacon.

The American Congress is made up of able, patriotic men. There has never been a time in our history when its Members were not honorably representative of the best ability and purpose of the people. It is an American tragedy that these Representatives, even the ablest of them occupying the most important positions in the Congress, are, to greater or less degree, dependent for their reelection on the amount of appropriations they can secure for their individual districts. The tragedy is deepened by the fact that the non-tax-paying pressure groups are so great in numbers and so well organized that the political life of the representative depends more and more upon their favor.

This situation could, to some degree, at least, be cured if every man and woman in this country were to make an income-tax return and payment to the Federal Government. Even if the tax, in the case of the least fortunate citizens, were only a penny or two, even if the cost of collecting the tax were five times more than the amount received, the principle of universal contribution would be established. And with it would come new, lively, and critical interest in the conduct of our Government, in its cost, and the public record of its officials.

Today the Member of Congress goes back to his district and is asked, "Why didn't you get a new post office for our town? Mr. X, in the next district, got one for his." The question should be reversed. Mr. X should be asked, "Why did you induce the Congress to appropriate part of our money for a new post office when the old post office was plenty good enough?" And he should be asked that question, not by the handful of well-to-do constituents who now pay income taxes but by the whole community.

This Nation of ours is much farther down the road that leads to fascism than most of us have had the wisdom or the courage to admit. The Seventy-sixth Congress, meeting under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, may very possibly be looked back on by historians as the beginning of the end of the American experiment in democracy. Preceding New Deal Congresses had created the centralized bureaus and agencies which are the mechanics of absolutism; they had piled up the kind of debt that, when it topples over into financial chaos, creates the conditions that have usually resulted in one-man power. Thus the Seventy-sixth Congress found the progress toward one-man government already well under way.

We are hastening that progress. We are necessarily voting to the President extraordinary powers. We are necessarily setting up the machinery for the regimentation of industry, agriculture, and labor. These are the inevitable accompaniments of war preparation in a world where war now requires the total effort and capacity of the Nation. To these dictatorial powers and this regimentation of resources we are adding the menace of an incalculable public debt. Under the spur of national danger and the appeal for defense we are voting billions and hardly stopping to ask how many, or for what.

In the Washington Post of Saturday, June 1, two headlines appeared in juxtaposition. One of them read:

House Ways and Means members favor additional billion in defense taxes.

The other read:

Day's receipts of Red Cross total $14,311.

More than 2,000 volunteer workers, representing the patriotic leadership and devotion of the District of Columbia, had succeeded in gathering $14,000 as a free-will offering for the Red Cross in 1 day, a total of $72,000 since the campaign began.

Seventy-two thousand dollars extracted from the budgets of the generous residents of the District; contrast that total in real money against the billions in debt money which Congress is appropriating.

The richest university in this country is the President's alma mater, Harvard. It was founded in 1636. For 304 years it has been building its endowment, soliciting gifts from its successful alumni during their lives, and begging to share in their estates at their deaths. How much has Harvard managed to accumulate in 304 years? One hundred and forty-three million dollars, a pittance compared with our current appropriations in a single hour.

How much has Yale managed to accumulate in its 239 years? One hundred million four hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars.

How much has Columbia University managed to accumulate in its 186 years? About $87,000,000, including the endowments also of Barnard, Teachers College, and New York Post Graduate Medical School.

The united hospital fund of the richest city in the world, New York, provides in part for the annual deficits of 92 privately endowed hospitals. More than 5,000 leading citizens neglect their livelihood for weeks and pour their energies into the effort for this fund, and how much do they raise? About $2,000,000 a year.

The Greater New York fund seeks annual contributions for the citys' 393 health and welfare agencies. It enlists the cooperation of 40,000 business concerns throughout the greater city, with their 3,000,000 employees. How much does its heroic effort manage to raise? About $4,000,000.

Any sane man who contrasts our huge congressional appropriations with the comparatively meager amounts of endowment and philanthropic funds which I have instanced must realize at once that the money that government appropriates is not the same kind of money that private effort slowly and painfully accumulates. In other words, the money we are appropriating in Congress is inflated money. Whether you call it inflated or not, that is what it is. The debt now piling up at the rate this year of more than $4,000,000,000, and not counting the President's special budget for defense—this debt can never be paid in honest money. Only by inflating the hard money of the country can we pay these inflated debts, only that way or through repudiation.

Inflation or repudiation leads to dictatorship. At least that has been the uniform testimony of the past. Will history repeat itself over here? Not necessarily. Our national resources are great, our people are not merely highly educated—the Germans were also highly educated—they are endowed with the tradition of freedom, and fired by a hatred of being regimented and bossed.

They can, if they will, prevent fascism over here. But to do that they must be keenly conscious of and responsible for the economical management of their public affairs. They must feel that the Government is their Government, that its policies are their policies, and that when it appropriates money it is appropriating their money. They must be eternally vigilant, alert, and critical. They must develop a new standard by which to measure the effectiveness of public service, a standard based on preserving the Nation's resources, not squandering them at the behest of a local constituency or pressure group.

If we can educate the American people along these lines, if we can develop in them the desire to give something to America in place of an organized effort to get something from America, then and then only can America be defended. The raw materials for fascism lie all about us—mounting debt, centralized control, regimented industry, agriculture, and labor. Only one power is strong enough to save us—a united love of America sufficient to make people willing and eager for self-sacrifice. That spirit is at the moment alive in the land. More people are moved by it to a higher degree than at any time since the World War. Let us not neglect or throw away the golden opportunity thus presented.

Let us seize this chance to write a tax law which, while greatly increasing the tax burden of the more favored, will call on every citizen to contribute according to his or her means and thus help to inspire in every citizen, from the highest to the lowest, a vigilant regard for national solvency, a critical interest in national policy, and a vigorous resistance to every encroachment of one-man power.

Investigation of National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks there has been inserted into the RECORD a number of editorials appraising the activities of the National Labor Relations Board and the Smith Investigating Committee. Naturally, the newspapers carried varied comments. To rectify and round out the editorial picture drawn in the RECORD of May 24 and 28, I call attention to the following printed expressions of those most concerned with the activities of the Labor Board—labor organizations, specialists in labor affairs, and newspapers in localities which have seen and felt in the past the human and economic costs of industrial strife. Here are some excerpts:

Labor, the weekly spokesman for more than 1,000,000 railroad employees:

Last autumn Chairman SMITH became ill and turned the direction of the committee over to Toland.

Since then, at frequent intervals, Toland, or someone under his direction, has been feeding the newspapers stories designed to arouse prejudice against the Labor Board, before a witness had taken the stand.

This same disposition to get the Board was clearly manifest during the opening hearings. Instead of endeavoring to present a well-rounded picture of the situation, Toland has assumed the role of prosecuting attorney—the Board's weaknesses have been played up, its good work minimized.

Further, from Labor:

At its recent convention in New York the National Association of Manufacturers called for the drastic revision of the Wagner Act and the Wage-Hour Act. In support of that proposal the convention declared:

"For 6 years the Nation has been subjected to a national labor policy which has provoked more strikes and disputes than have occurred during any comparable period in our history."

That statement doesn't happen to be true. For the 6 years, 1933–38, inclusive, the Labor Department reports 15,249 strikes. For the 6 years from 1916 to 1921, inclusive, the same authority reports 21,018 strikes. The periods are fairly comparable, because both were marked by extremely abnormal conditions.

If the statement were true it would not prove that the Nation's labor policy—which, by the way, has been sustained almost 100 percent by the Supreme Court—imposed unwarranted hardships on any class.

A majority of the strikes during the last 6 years have been caused by the refusal of employers to obey a law which guarantees to the workers the right to organize free unions. That's practically all there is to the Wagner Act. Having failed in the courts, the lawbreakers now ask Congress to hamstring the law.

I turn now to the comments of labor periodicals which represent more than 300,000 workers. These excerpts were chosen because each one of them speaks with a background of at least 40 years of effort in behalf of such law as the National Labor Relations Act.

Official Magazine, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America:

No one can deny the fact that the Wagner Act was the greatest piece of progressive, liberal legislation ever enacted in behalf of labor. Some will deny it because of their personal, bitter, selfish, political hatreds—narrow-minded individualists who, through some accident or sharp practice, are sometimes chosen to represent labor. Yes; a few of this type, who are politically blind and thoroughly bigoted, may deny the service or the good obtained as a result of the enactment of this legislation. But those of us who lived in the early days and struggled for the right to become a member of a union, those of us who went through fires of persecution and discrimination to the extent that we were kicked around from place to place and blacklisted because it had been found out through spies, tools, enemies of the workers, that we were members of a labor union * * * those of us who can look backward and those of us who can read the history of the struggles of labor intelligently, we fully understand the benefits obtained and the freedom enjoyed today by the workers; and no small part of this freedom has been obtained through the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act.

Pattern Makers' Journal, official organ of the Pattern Makers' League of North America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor:

Let the act stand as is. * * * Opening the Wagner Act for amendments at this time will play into the hands of reactionary employers and labor baiters. The A. F. of L. may be seeking minor changes to correct inequities, but nothing short of complete emasculation will satisfy the enemies of labor once the act is opened for amendments.

We do not subscribe to the idea of killing a fly on a plate glass window with a sledge hammer. It is unwise to become that angry with anybody or any law.

The International Association of Machinists, likewise affiliated with the American Federation of Labor:

Now that it has published a report and presented a bill which reveals the true motives of the majority of the Smith committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board, labor can no longer have even an iota of confidence in this committee. Presented with a wonderful opportunity to do a statesmanlike job in separating the chaff from the wheat in the complaints that have been made against the National Labor Relations Board, the majority of the committee have now revealed that they had no interest in doing such a job at all and are merely using the high powers entrusted to them by the Congress to propagandize in favor of emasculating the most cherished rights conferred upon workers by the National Labor Relations Act. The chief emphasis in the bill and in the report submitted by the majority of the Smith committee is placed on amendments which would nullify labor's rights and curb the power of the Board to act in labor's behalf. It is little wonder, therefore, that the spokesmen for the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Manufacturers' Association have made gleeful and commendatory comments on the Smith bill.

The Brewery Worker, published by the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America:

The record of the National Labor Relations Board before the United States Supreme Court indicates that it is not the body of incompetent, unfair, and misguided zealots certain individuals and organizations would have us believe. Twenty-two cases, involving either the Board's orders or its procedure, have now been adjudged by our highest court. In 18 of these, including the 3 very important ones decided last week, the Court completely upheld the Board. In two others the decision was partially unfavorable to the Board, while in the remaining two, and only in these two, were the Board's orders reversed, with no evidence of maladministration.

These were all cases in which the administration of the Labor Act by the Board was impugned—in which it was charged that the Board had disregarded provisions embodied in the act, had taken matters into its own hands, regardless of the spirit and intent of the law.

The fact that the Supreme Court found otherwise in all but two of the cases is irrefutable evidence that the act has been fairly and honestly administered.

Specialists in labor, from coast to coast, in the course of their duties have watched the everyday activities of the Labor Board for the last few years. Here are two excerpts from such observers, one from Boston, Mass., and one from San Francisco, Calif.:

The Christian Science Monitor:

Has the National Labor Relations Board reduced strikes or increased them? * * * One fact is apt to be forgotten in after-dinner arguments about the Board—that its jurisdiction is sharply limited. It can take no part, and hence has no responsibility for strikes that are not interstate in character; nor can it intervene in cases outside its own field; disputes over the right to organize; antiunion discrimination and the like. The hope that it may promote industrial peace must be limited to the region where it has jurisdiction.

Statistics seem to show that in this particular field the decline in strikes has been most marked. Organizational strikes, which previously amounted to 50 percent, have tended to decline and the number of cases filed with the Board has steadily increased, giving the hope that legal processes are replacing the picket line.

Thus about the best reply that can be made to the flat assertions of Messrs. Frank and Wagner is that a recent trend has been established, of great potential importance toward dropping the strike weapon in organizational cases, for orderly processes of law.

The San Francisco Chronicle:

N. L. R. B. Chairman Madden might get a better press if he would take the stand before the special Smith committee of the House investigating the Wagner Act and shout: "Congressman SMITH burns down orphanages."

That would be fighting fire with fire, meeting a left with a left and a gouge with a gouge. It would be adopting the tactics and weapons and methods of the Labor Board's most vehement attackers for the past 4 years.

Instead, because this is an agency of the United States Government which is building a body of law and custom in the most controversial of all domestic fields, Chairman Madden must laboriously trace the record N. L. R. B. and act have made. Against the most injudicious charges, he must not lose his judicial calm.

The unfair thing about this entire situation is that it is much easier to remember the charges made and tall tales told about the Labor Board and its staff than it is the denials.

The side show gets the trade.

It has been getting it for 4 years. All the while there is a perfectly accurate, documented, buttressed, tested, and voluminous record which would establish the fakery and freakishness beyond question. There are now four annual reports, with statistics, tables, and charts, to support the analysis and conclusions to which the Labor Board has come in handling 25,000 cases.

There are numerous articles in the law reviews of a large number of universities throughout the country. Board practices, procedure, and principles are given a thorough workout, not by attorneys who are parties in interest in Board cases, but by students of law and others. The vast majority of these will be found favorable to the manner in which the Labor Board has conducted itself and applied the new law in a most controversial field.

The American Civil Liberties Union, which scrutinizes every action and decision of the Board, in its concern for the preservation of basic civil rights states:

Nothing in the National Labor Relations Act curtails an employer's right of free speech. * * *

The act stands as the greatest single advance yet made in guaranteeing to workers their rights to form unions and to select representatives for purposes of collective bargaining without interference by employers. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that it is in this field of industrial conflict in the light of the traditional and violent opposition of employers to trade unions that the major issues of civil liberty have arisen. The act in its few years of operation has vastly reduced the resort to violence and coercion, with consequent deprivation of civil rights, and greatly increased the free exercise of labor's rights to organize.

Historians have sufficiently traced the bloody course of industrial strife in the United States, especially in the States of Pennsylvania and Kentucky. I need not recall for you the Homestead massacre nor Harlan County; but I call your attention to two editorial excerpts emanating from these States:

The Allentown Call:

That progress is being made in labor relations is indicated in the peaceful manner in which more than a hundred thousand General Motors workers conducted their recent election, decided that 49 out of 60 plants should operate through the C. I. O. as a collective bargaining agency, and gave promise that there would be less conflict between the two big groups of organized labor which contested the right to be such bargaining agencies.

Four years ago the story was different. At that time the C. I. O. did not have anything like a majority of the workers under its wing. It could not risk an election. Then it adopted the un-American technique, the sit-down strike, which in many instances was accompanied by sabotage.

That action brought so much unfavorable public opinion and threatened so much that was valuable not only to our institutions but also to labor itself that it was outlawed. The day of the sit-down strike was over.

How much better for management, men, and the public that by the use of the ballot issues shall be decided.

Here are the central theme and conclusion of a full-page editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal:

The theme:

STRIKES DECREASE

For 2 years after the passage of this act the N. L. R. B. was helpless, paralyzed by injunctions. It became effective only after the Supreme Court upheld validity of the act, so its 5-year record really covers only 3 years of genuine activity.

Up to February 1, 1940, the Board handled 25,968 cases involving 5,805 workers. Of these 22,402 were closed. Fifty percent were closed by agreement; 16 percent dismissed by the Board of regional directors; 22 percent were withdrawn; 7 percent were closed by Board decisions.

The statement has been made, apparently unchallenged, that 42 percent were decided in favor of the employer.

In the same period, the Board intervened in some 2,614 strike cases and settled 1,973, or 75 percent. It averted 806 strikes; and held 2,630 elections affecting over a million workers.

The trend of strikes is definitely downward. The decrease last year was one-third.

Man-days of idleness caused by strikes decreased from 28,424,808 in 1937 to 9,148,273 in 1938, or about 68 percent.

The conclusion:

The Wagner Act is the Maginot line of labor's fight for freedom to organize, just as employers organize into corporations.

The report of the majority of the Smith committee is useful in that it brings into focus the whole field of labor relations, and projects clearly the fundamental issue: Shall labor retain its hard-won privilege of collective bargaining or shall this privilege be withdrawn at a time when heartening progress is being made in the reduction of strikes and the increase of productivity?

Conservation of Our Soil and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, direct flood damages in the United States exceed $100,000,000 annually. Indirect flood damages cannot be accurately estimated, wherein the loss of human lives runs into the thousand annually, and where there is a loss of millions of tons of productive soils, and the constant threat to health, and insecurity to the millions of our citizens living along the fertile valleys of the Nation.

In the early settlement of our country, our forefathers, through necessity, naturally set up our villages along the rivers of the country, and through the years these villages have grown and developed into some of the greatest cities in the world. Not only did our first towns spring up along the rivers, but the farmers in the early settlements also settled along the rivers, so that water and fuel, of so vital importance to our forefathers, could be had. These early trends to the river valleys by our forbears in the early settlement of the country are largely responsible for the present high stage of development and density in population of practically all of our river basins.

We know that millions of dollars are lost annually through interrupted transportation of commerce, interrupted communication by mail and wire. May I call your attention to the recent floods in California, in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys in 1937 and 1938, the floods of the great Southwest of recent years, and only a few weeks ago the floods of Pennsylvania and New York?

The flood losses in life, property, and precious soils are becoming greater each year, and higher crests are occurring on all our streams annually, due largely to the fact that in the development of the country as a whole we are contributing to more water run-off. For decades we have been cutting away our timber, grazing off our lands of vegetation, which formerly had a tendency to hold rainfall on the land until it could penetrate into the soil. There are many other practices which contribute materially to excessive water run-off over the country. For instance, for every mile of grade drainage and surfaced highways in the Nation we have a perfect roof of over 7 acres of land on which no appreciable amount of water can penetrate the soil, and, of course, this water must find its course to the sea by rushing through our stream systems of the country and carrying with it our productive soils that the forces of nature have been thousands of years building for us.

Several years ago when Congress first recognized the fact that flood control was a national problem, it inaugurated its first flood-control program by appropriating funds for the construction of protective works, known as the levee system. These levees were constructed along the lower reaches of our larger rivers. This policy of constructing levees for flood protection against floods was religiously pursued for several years, by and with the approval, of course, of our Army engineers.

Then for years we poured millions of Federal funds on the lower Mississippi and other large streams of the country without success. To some extent the levee system relieved the flood problems in certain areas for a while, but the flood-waters increased and the high-water marks raised from year to year until it soon became apparent that levees, however large, were not the answer to our flood-control problems.

Then along about the year 1930 our most competent engineers began making studies of the stream systems of the country to determine if a more practical solution to the problem could be found.

The findings of this intensive Nation-wide study resulted in the adoption of the 308 report by Congress in 1935, and supplemental studies and reports have been approved by Congress since 1935 until at this time Congress has approved and authorized for construction over $1,000,000,000 for flood-protective works. It is significant that a vast majority of this is for flood-retention reservoirs on the larger tributaries of our heavy flood-producing streams.

This comparatively recent change in the national policy of flood-protective works on the larger tributary streams of the country is step No. 2, and by far the most important in the Nation's efforts to meet these problems in an intelligent manner and really making headway toward solving them. May I call your attention to the fact, however, that up to this time Congress has appropriated but a small percentage of funds necessary to construct the flood-control works that heretofore have been authorized by Congress? If we are to meet and solve this problem during the present generation, Congress must have the vision and courage to make the actual appropriations necessary to corral the waters where they fall.

Although constructive progress is being made in the direction of a flood-control and soil-conservation program for the country, I feel that in our undertakings we should immediately take another important forward step toward the actual solution of one of our Nation's most challenging problems—that of flood control. Up to date we have practically ignored, so far as our flood-control policy is concerned, the serious but ever-pressing problem of soil run-off. I am fully convinced that anyone who has given the matter serious study will agree that if Congress can find a way to stop or materially check soil run-off we will have a most complete and really practical flood-control program. I am also convinced that we will profit by our mistakes and that in the near future our national policy of flood control will be to begin at the top of our watersheds to control soil and water run-off and develop downstream, instead of our past impractical policy of beginning at the bottom and working up.

Much has been said about the alarming rate at which our underground water table is falling. It must be admitted that solution to this alarming problem is to hold the water where it falls and thereby replenish this great underground reservoir so that our streams will again flow the year around, as they did in the early history of the country.

In every instance we must make the most comprehensive studies of the various basins of the country for the development of a flood-control and soil-conservation program that is best suited to the particular locality in which such basin is located, and that all allied benefits to be had are given their full consideration.

By this I mean that while a reservoir system on large tributaries is most desirable in some locations of the country, it is not a solution to the problem in many others. In many instances, it is evident that a tributary reservoir, or even a main-stem reservoir is not the solution to the flood problem that is located several hundred miles below the source of the stream. Large reservoirs are usually most desirable in the mountainous areas of the country, due to the fact that in these areas these reservoirs do not inundate thousands of acres of productive and alluvial lands. Of course, there are exceptions; for instance, where large dams are desirable in order to produce and generate electric power. In the plains section of the Nation, like Oklahoma, the policy of constructing large reservoirs on main streams, rather than upon the small tributaries, would undoubtedly defeat the purpose of flood control by inundating thousands of acres of the most alluvial lands in these areas. So far as Oklahoma is concerned, and this applies also to many other plains States, our national policy, with reference to starting additional flood-control projects, should be generally to construct smaller reservoirs in these basins in and along the headwaters of these tributary streams, so that the maximum of benefits may be had, and the distribution of same over larger areas in their respective basins. Under this system of development many benefits can be realized that would otherwise be lost by the construction of large reservoirs on the main stream and the large tributaries of our stream systems. Recently, I appeared before the Flood Control Committee of the House in support of a real comprehensive flood-control program on the Washita River basin, at which time I pointed out that any flood-control program on that basin must be by the construction of comparatively small dams on the tributaries, and not as the Army engineers have heretofore proposed, by the construction of large dams on the main stream of that river. In considering an all-round flood-control program, there are many outstanding benefits which should be considered.

First. In undertaking our flood-control development program of the Nation as a whole, every consideration must be given to our No. 1 problem of soil erosion, which is very evident in every section of the country. It is in those badly eroded areas throughout the country, where the soil has been depleted by water run-off and wind erosion; where our citizens have lost courage; where school and church houses are falling down, and where the people are drifting to the towns and cities, that has caused so much alarm. I have, in the past, repeatedly called attention to the fact that this Nation is no stronger and no more secure than the productivity of the first 6 or 8 inches of her soil. The very foundations of her free institutions, and even our Government's future security, depend upon our No. 1 resource—the soil.

Second. National defense: Today our Nation is beginning to awaken to the real necessity of a well-rounded national-defense program. What is more important in case of national emergency and war, which God forbid will ever befall us, than uninterrupted transportation and communication for the movement of troops and the implements of war? We can justify millions of dollars in expenditures for flood control and soil conservation in the interest of national defense and the security of the people. Recently this Congress, following the wise suggestion of the President, made one of the largest peacetime appropriations in history to strengthen our war machine against a possible foreign enemy. We were told that this vast amount of public funds is a good insurance policy against foreign enemies, which is true. But I submit that there is no insurance policy against our precious soil when once it is gone. How long are we going to, ostrichlike, stick our heads into the sand and fail and refuse to insure ourselves against an enemy that is ever present in our country—destructive floods and soil erosion? Should any foreign enemy be responsible for the loss of life and property damage that we are experiencing annually through floods and soil erosion, this Congress would immediately and unhesitatingly throw the full resources of this Nation against such an enemy.

Third. Our great problem today is the rehabilitation of a large percentage of our citizenship. In every project undertaken, particularly west of the hundredth meridian, every consideration should be given in this great program to the development of areas into subsistent homesteads for our now-floating population. Much has been said, but little actually done, regarding the migration westward of thousands of our good citizens seeking new frontiers, who, through no fault of their own, have been displaced and driven from their homes, partly by the march of progress and the machine age, but largely by dust storms that follow in the wake of continued droughts in badly eroded areas. Many of these good citizens who have been forced from the farms in these areas are demanding and must be given an opportunity for a self-subsistence which they are not now getting. We have practically no new frontiers left, but there is still space in the West and Middle West for thousands of these people to be rehabilitated in subsistent homesteads by the development of our water resources through irrigation, reclamation, and practical flood

control. This, to my mind, is the only practical and permanent solution for the people who are now our national responsibility. They do not belong on relief rolls, and many are begging for an opportunity to get on small homesteads, to live under their own roofs, and sit by their own firesides.

Mr. Speaker, in the past I have had much to say about our ancient enemy, soil erosion, and no doubt will have more to say about it in the future. I also expect to continue my fight for flood control based on a sane and practical approach. I sincerely hope that this Congress will give these problems serious consideration and immediately throw its efforts and the full resources of the country behind a Nation-wide program to conserve our soil and water so that we may establish with our people, both now and in the future, a sense of security, health, and happiness.

Our Mounting Nondefense Appropriations and the Imperative Need for Retrenchment

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think the sooner the people of America recognize the hard truth about our national financial situation the better it will be for everybody under our flag. It will make all of us realize what lies ahead of us in work and sacrifice.

In a world where madmen are loose, with enormous potential destructive powers, we must build up our national defenses to the highest state of perfection. I do not believe there is a nation on earth that has any intention whatever of attacking the United States, but I do not know, and I am not taking any chances. I am resolving every doubt in favor of the safety and security of our country, and I am voting for the enormous defense appropriations, and I shall continue to do all I can to help to put America in a state of complete preparedness.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I cannot be oblivious to the terrific cost of the defense program and to the absolute necessity not only of facing that problem but of putting our national finances in better order generally. While we are talking of increased taxes and raising the statutory debt limit, I propose that we attack the problem on still another front.

I believe that we should recall all of the 1941 supply bills that will become effective on July 1 and apply a 10-percent horizontal cut to all that can be cut. There would be certain necessary exceptions to such a cut, including the Postal Service, which will require all the money that has been provided to handle the ever-increasing mail; the Army and the Navy; the W. P. A. relief appropriation; the Veterans' Administration; and the interest on the public debt.

But speaking by and large a horizontal 10-percent cut could be laid down without impairing vital governmental operations, and it should be left to the head of each governmental department, bureau, or independent agency to determine how the cut should be applied to his activity.

SWEET ASSURANCE TO THE COUNTRY

I should think that $400,000,000 might be saved in this way, but the great value of such a cutting operation would be psychological. It would be sweet assurance to the country that Washington is facing the situation in a realistic way and is at last giving full recognition to the fact that we are perforce at the threshhold of a new era of common sacrifice. It would be pleasing evidence to the country that we in Congress realize that we cannot have unnecessary public buildings, recreation grounds, deluxe highways, and battleships at the same time. Knowing that Congress is at last alive to the realities and the stark necessity of pursuing a policy of the strictest economy in respect to everything except national defense the country would be better prepared to bow its back to the awful burden of debt to be imposed by the defense program, which gives every indication of mounting higher and higher.

While I have the attention of the House I desire to present some sober reflections on the altitudinal dimensions of our national deficit and some meandering speculations as to where we will land if we continue astronomical appropriations. What I shall say will have no reference to our national defense appropriations, which are in a class by themselves and must be treated as immune from criticism, but with the indulgence of the House I shall point out how I think we have gone wild in respect to other expenditures.

MOUNTING COST OF GOVERNMENT

I propose to discuss a subject which I believe is uppermost in the minds of our people, and that is the mounting cost of government. At the outset I want to make it plain that in every fiber of my being I am a Democrat, in the ancient and long-accepted meaning of that word; an old-fashioned liberal—a Jeffersonian Democrat, if you please—and I forswear none of my cherished and ingrained Democratic principles when I criticize big spending. Rather, on the contrary, I believe that I reassert orthodox and true Democratic principles, for the tutelage of Thomas Jefferson upheld and extolled economy as a primal virtue to be scrupulously applied in government. Our present national administration has done enough fine constructive things to justify an honored place in history, such as its superb handling of the banking situation, the guaranty of bank deposits, the suppression of blue-sky vendors, the saving of innumerable farms and city homes from the sheriff's hammer, and so forth, and so forth, in all of which splendid achievements I have been happy, within my limitations as a Congressman, to be a contributing factor. I yield to no one in my warm personal regard for Franklin D. Roosevelt and my admiration for his noble heart and humanitarian purposes and I am not going to enter upon any hair-splitting dissertation to try to fix the responsibility for phenomenal spending, because I believe the executive and legislative departments are about equally responsible.

But I am fed up on big spending. I have voted against $8,000,000,000 of appropriations during the 11 years I have been a Member of Congress, and as I look backward my only regret is that I did not vote against more of them. I am sick and tired of seeing money scoop-shoveled out as if the Treasury had no bottom. I believe that excessive spending not only atrophies business but weakens our national security and safety. Jefferson held that "public debt leads to misery and decay," and I shudder when I think of the mortgage big spending is placing on our children and our children's children down to the remotest generation. I am genuinely fearful that unless the bunghole is plugged the time is coming when we shall run headlong into the awful evils of (1) inflation, (2) repudiation, or (3) national bankruptcy; and then, unless the brakes can be applied, something still worse.

Whatever justification there may have been at one time for big spending as a stimulant to business and recovery no longer exists. If we have a few more spurts of the spending orgy, business, already in a state of suspended animation, will pass out with as loud a groan as its anemic condition will permit, and recovery, always skittish and hard to catch, will definitely and finally conclude that its place is not around the corner.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Our national debt has pirouetted upward to staggering proportions, and many thinking citizens, amazed and bewildered by present and continuing demands on the Treasury, are beginning to echo the wonderment of my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BOB RICH, who every day stages a little performance all his own in the House of Representatives. Regularly as clockwork, as soon as the reading clerk concludes his intonation of the daily Journal, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] may be expected to rise in his place, strike a bellicose

pose, and call the attention of the House to the rotund proportions of the national debt and the luxuriant growth of the national deficit. Every day witnesses exactly the same exhilarating proceeding. As soon as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] begins reading from the Treasury statement, the membership on the majority side starts to give him the "raspberry." As the boos swell in volume, the voice of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] correspondingly rises in crescendo. In the final episode, with jeers and catcalls almost raising the roof, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] yells in a voice that ordinarily could be heard as far as the Washington Monument, "Where are you going to get the money?" and, having put that shot across the congressional bow, he sits down, his face beaming with satisfaction.

There are fundamentals of government on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and I never could agree, the irreconcilable differences between a Hamiltonian Republican and a Jeffersonian Democrat, but I join him in wondering, "Where are we going to get the money?" And I shower upon him my warmest accolade for the public service he renders in using his leather lungs to call attention to the Gargantuan proportions of our national debt and our national deficit.

Of that same deficit it may be said that it is so robust and fleet-footed that though we have at present a very broad tax base, our revenues are never going to catch up with it unless somehow we can manage to bring about a miraculous curtailment of expenditures. Our national deficit for the fiscal year 1939 was approximately $3,500,000,000—a sum so stupendous that the finite mind cannot grasp it. If we can realize that this deficit amounts to $1,800,000 for every year since the birth of the lowly Nazarene, we may have an imperfect conception of the extent to which our spending is running away from our revenues. The close of the fiscal year 1940 will record another colossal deficit. Unluckily, there are many Members of Congress who profess to see nothing to be alarmed about in the enormous and growing deficit, and some of them are ingenious and clever enough to figure out in their own minds that it is really a good thing.

PROTECTING THE DEFICIT

The gentleman from Virginia, Judge WOODRUM, who has the keenest sense of humor of all the members of the Appropriations Committee, has a way of paying his respects to Members who flout the deficit by introducing bills carrying vast appropriations. His delicious comment on the introduction of every such measure is:

"Congressman So-and-So is doing his best to protect the deficit."

And that seems to hit off the situation admirably. There is a large school of deficit protectors in Congress, and they are all busy as the proverbial bee. They are found in both political parties. Pork is not partisan.

I do not know how well I shall be able to handle the subject I have tackled—big spending and the uncontrolled deficit—but I would be entitled to the booby prize for dumbness if I did not know something about it, for I have been a part of the appropriating machinery of Congress for a long time, or, to be exact, since March 4, 1931. Some 9 years ago JOHN N. GARNER, then minority leader of the House, and Joseph W. Byrns, ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee, both of whom were successively Speaker of the House in later years, brought about my appointment as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I entered in 1931 at the foot of a committee of 40, and to show how swiftly seniority sometimes operates, it was not long until the seniority rule made me chairman of the subcommittee in charge of what was then the largest of the regular supply measures—the one making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. This same seniority rule in which political and physical mortality are basic promotive factors, has brought me up in rank on the full panel of the committee from the bottom to the fourth position, all in a little more than 8 years.

MR. TAYLOR IS 81 YEARS YOUNG

At the head of the Appropriations Committee as its chairman is that seasoned veteran of many political and parliamentary battles, the gentleman from Colorado, EDWARD T. TAYLOR. We on the committee never think of the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, as being an old man, and if we have occasion to mention his age we say he is "81 years young." He will be 82 on June 19. Notwithstanding his age, he is a two-fisted fighter, a stickler for principle, as courageous as a lion. He is revered by all of the members of the committee. Some years ago a physical disability took him out of Congress for a long spell and it was freely predicted that when his period of hospitalization was over he would be laid on the shelf and would never never be able to resume his congressional duties, but he surprised everybody by the completeness of his comeback. Exactly the same thing happened a few years ago to the gentleman from Alabama, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, our present Speaker, who, after a long period of enforced retirement, came back better and stronger than ever. All of which proves the well-known maxim that you cannot keep a good man down.

CANNON'S KEEN MIND

Second to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, on the great committee which prepares the supply measures of the United States Government is the gentleman from Missouri, CLARENCE CANNON, who possesses one of the keenest minds with which I ever came into contact. He was Parliamentarian of the House under the late Speaker Champ Clark and is an authority of the highest distinction on parliamentary law and procedure. He is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of agricultural appropriations. Next to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, in committee rank is the gentleman from Virginia, Judge CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, who is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices bill, which covers a vast field, and in addition he is the acting chairman of the deficiencies subcommittee. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, is the chairman of record of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, but to conserve his strength he has handed over that subcommittee to the younger and superlatively capable Virginian.

JUDGE WOODRUM'S COURTLINESS AND CHARM

In Judge WOODRUM all of the courtliness and charm of the traditional southern gentleman are combined with a dynamic energy and a practical and realistic vision of the fiscal needs of the Government. Next to Judge WOODRUM on the committee is your humble servant, the author of this statement, and the subcommittee of which I am chairman, as indicated above, is the one which has charge over the far-flung activities of the Treasury Department and the Postal Service.

I have already said that I do not know whether I shall be able to do justice to my big subject of big spending, but I should be able to contribute something to the discussion because for years appropriation figures have occupied my mind by day and pestered my dreams by night, to the exclusion of practically all things else. Blackstone or some other legal luminary coined an immortal phrase when he branded the law as "a jealous mistress." Granting that is true, it has nothing on the Appropriations Committee, which is one reason why that committee has been set up in the House category as an exclusive committee. A Member who belongs to it cannot have any other committee assignment, or any other congressional work to engage his attention. If he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations it is taken for granted his hands are full. Speaking in the vernacular, I have lived, eaten, drunk, and slept appropriations until it seems to me that I have been an appropriation hound since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

FROM "HOT DOGS" TO BILLIONS

Sometimes I have a quiet little personal laugh at myself when I recall the occasions when as a young and none-too-prosperous newspaper reporter I was often hard put to raise the price of a hot-dog sandwich and a plate of beans, while now on the Appropriations Committee of the greatest government on earth, I deal in multiplied millions and find

myself in the company of fiscal experts who speak of billions without turning a hair. It is possibly because I was brought up in the school of hard knocks that I stand cheek by jowl with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BOB RICH, in wondering where all the money is coming from to meet the colossal expenditures of the Government. The appropriations for the current fiscal year 1940 carried by the one bill of which I am sponsor—the Treasury and Post Office bill—exceed seventeen hundred million dollars, or $1,700,615,054, to be exact, which in itself is an indication of the growth of this mighty Nation, since no longer ago than 1917 all of the appropriations of the Government combined were $1,628,411,644.81, or $72,203,409.19 less than the amount carried in my bill for the fiscal year 1940 upon which we are now entered. Besides the bill I am called upon to sponsor, we now have nine regular supply bills and an indeterminate number of deficiency bills every year.

In expressing the concern I so sincerely feel over our mounting appropriations I do not mean to imply that a reasonable increase has not been justified. When Congress first passed the billion-dollar mark—a billion dollars of appropriations in two sessions—Speaker Thomas B. Reed, in defending the law-making body from the verbal castigation it received on every hand, declared with acerbity: "This is a billion-dollar country." Since then we have emerged further from the "horse and buggy" days and government has taken on many varied forms and a myriad of new activities. To be reasonable, therefore, we must admit that if government, as now highly organized and specialized, is to function and these activities, all authorized by Congress, are to continue, increased appropriations are necessary. Take, for instance, the appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, with which I am most familiar. The amount carried in the 1940 Treasury and Post Office bill, $1,700,615,054, is more than the entire appropriation of the Government for any year prior to 1918, when the cost of the World War began to be reflected in our appropriation bills, and at first blush a critic might say that we should have used the pruning knife more freely, but the answer is that the great bulk of the appropriations in this measure are for personal services which could not be reduced without seriously crippling the functions of the departments.

The Postal Service, for example, employs a vast army of clerks and carriers and railway mail workers. The mails must be moved, and we must provide the necessary personnel to do it, otherwise we would be subject to the severest censure. My subcommittee is economy minded to the *n*th degree. The members, besides myself, are EMMET O'NEAL, of Kentucky; GEORGE W. JOHNSON, of West Virginia; GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas; JOHN TABER, of New York; and CLARENCE MCLEOD, of Michigan, all able men and believers in a wise economy.

MR. TABER A USEFUL MEMBER

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, also is the ranking member and bellwether of the Republicans on the full Committee on Appropriations. I want to pay him the tribute of saying that he is one of the most sincere, conscientious, and useful men I ever knew. He is a great plodder and digger and works with untiring diligence. He is never a partisan in the sense of being an obstructionist, but, on the contrary, he is a constructive force of great value to our committee and to the country, always doing his part to hold down appropriations to a basis of reason while at the same time meeting all the necessary requirements of the public service.

Of all the subcommittees, ours made the largest cut in Budget estimates for the 1940 appropriations. The Budget sent us proposed items of appropriations totaling $1,728,397,492. We had weeks of hearings, when departmental chiefs of high and low degree, from Secretary Morgenthau down, appeared before us to justify these estimates. Then we buckled our belts, sharpened our lead pencils, and settled down to the task of paring the estimates. We cut off some millions here, a few hundreds of thousands there, a few hundreds yonder, not spurning even the opportunity to clip off a lowly dollar here, there, and yonder, and when we concluded our labors and the bill passed we had cut $27,728,438 off of the estimates. This was the record of shearing estimates as far as the 10 regular supply bills of the 1940 series were concerned.

If America is to be saved from the ogre of debt it cannot be done by cutting appropriations of the regular departments of government. The governmental show must go on, metaphorically speaking, and the regular departments must continue to function if the people are to be served. There are plenty of opportunities to cut where cutting will not murder essential functions, and I propose to tell presently where I think the pruning knife can be inserted deeply and effectively in our swollen expenditures. I believe this can be done safely, and that when the swelling is removed Uncle Sam will be much relieved and improved.

A THIRTEEN-AND-A-HALF-BILLION COUNTRY

Let us take a look for a moment at the spending picture. I agree with Speaker Reed that ours is indeed a billion-dollar country, but I am loath to believe that it is a thirteen-and-a-half-billion-dollar country, measured in terms of annual appropriations, especially when our expenditures are running three and a half billion dollars in excess of our revenues, and there is no way under heaven on the basis of our present taxation to make tongue and buckle meet until the heavy spending subsides. The appropriations of the last regular session of Congress, including permanent annual appropriations and reappropriations, make up the amazing total of $13,480,216,000.39, the record of all peacetime appropriations in American history.

The Committee on Appropriations has authentic appropriation figures for every year since 1873, and we have an exact gage of how appropriations have been running year by year for 67 years. I know it will make the eyes of the big spenders bulge out when I quote figures taken from the records showing how spending has pyramided recently and if those who analyze these figures do not agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, BOB RICH, that we are headed straight for national bankruptcy, unless a halt is called I shall despair of the accuracy of their reasoning. In 1880 the population of the United States, as shown by the census taken that year, was 50,155,783. The unofficial estimate of the population in 1940 is 130,000,000. Population in the six decades has increased a little more than two and a half times. Now, let us take a look at the appropriation chart. In 1880 Congress appropriated $338,865,031.29 to run the Government. In 1940 the appropriations total $13,480,216,000.39. In other words, while population has increased two and a half times the appropriations are 40 times greater in 1940 than in 1880.

THIS WILL MAKE THE SPENDERS JUMP

And here is a comparison that will make the spenders jump: The total appropriations made by the United States Congress from 1890 to 1910, a period of 20 eventful, expanding years in the history of our great American commonwealth, amounted to $12,982,473,918.85.

The appropriations made at the single session of Congress that adjourned on August 5 last amounted to $13,480,216,000.39. By a little process of simple subtraction we find that Congress at the recent session spent $497,742,081.54 more than the total appropriations of the 20 years from 1890 to 1910. Lest there may be doubting Thomases who will question these facts I quote from the committee records the official figures of appropriations for the years mentioned:

1890	$395,430,284.26
1891	463,383,480.46
1892	524,381,815.60
1893	507,376,397.53
1894	519,535,293.31
1895	492,477,759.97
1896	496,982,585.01
1897	515,852,380.27
1898	528,735,878.33
1899	892,656,775.65
1900	698,912,982.83
1901	705,653,298.01
1902	730,241,862.51
1903	801,682,773.42
1904	752,741,659.25

1905	$781,288,214.95
1906	818,191,283.26
1907	881,953,644.09
1908	919,163,823.18
1909	1,006,431,726.96
Total	12,982,473,918.85

THIS WILL CURL THE HAIR

And here is a comparison that will curl the hair, metaphorically speaking: The total appropriations of the United States Government from 1873 to and including 1917, the year we entered the World War, were $27,946,170,839.85. The last regular session of Congress appropriated approximately half as much as was appropriated during the entire 44 years from 1873 to 1917.

The year 1890 was another census year. The total population as shown by the census that year was 62,947,714, almost half the population that is estimated in 1940. The total appropriations for 1890 were $395,430,284.26. The appropriations made at the recent regular session for the year 1940 were in amount 35 times greater than the appropriations for 1890. In 1900 when the next census was taken, the appropriations were $698,912,982.83 in a country of 75,994,575 population. With 50,000,000 more people, or less than 70 percent increase in 1940 compared with 1910, the appropriations for 1940 exceed the appropriations for 1910, 19 times. Skipping to 1930 when the official census showed America with a population of 122,775,046, only about 7,000,000 less than the official estimate of the 1940 population, the appropriations were only about one-third of the appropriations of the recent session, or in other words $4,665,236,768.04 against $13,480,216,000.39.

THREE TIMES CIVIL WAR EXPENDITURES IN ONE PEACE YEAR

The total expenditures of the United States Government for the 5-year Civil War period from the fiscal year 1862 to the fiscal year 1866, inclusive, were $4,173,189,827. This included the appropriations necessary to finance the greatest war in history up to that time. Yet for the year 1940 when the United States is at peace with the entire world, our expenditures of $13,480,216,000.39 are more than three times the expenditures of the Civil War period. Could any national treasury, even the treasury of the richest nation in the world, stand a continuation of such a strain?

In 1921 Congress enacted the law creating the Budget system, which made a revolutionary change in our appropriation procedure. Last year my subcommittee reported and Congress enacted legislation to strengthen the orderly arrangement of the budgetary processes and to implement the Bureau of the Budget more adequately with funds and personnel. Has the Budget system been a good thing? Let us see.

Before the Budget came into existence every legislative committee having to do with the functioning of the Government brought in its own appropriation bill. The legislative Committee on Agriculture prepared and sponsored the bill making appropriations for agriculture. The legislative Committee on Military Affairs prepared and brought in the bill making appropriations for the Army. The legislative Committee on Naval Affairs did the same for the Navy. The legislative Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads daddied the bill for the Post Office Department. The Budget Act separated legislative authority from the appropriating power and decreed that legislation and appropriations should be kept forever separate.

THE HOLMAN RULE

This has remained the rule ever since, with but one slight exception, that exception being the Holman rule. That grand old Indiana statesman, Judge William S. Holman, who was known far and wide as "the watchdog of the Treasury," made the eagle on every taxpayer's dollar scream before he let loose of it during his long membership on the Appropriations Committee, of which he was chairman during the Forty-fourth and Fifty-second Congresses. He accomplished one feat in particular that has made his name famous in appropriation history. How he ever managed to do it in the face of the truculent opposition of legislative committees that were fearful of being shorn of their appropriating powers no one knows, but he did induce Congress to incorporate in substantive and permanent law the principle that legislation should be in order on an appropriation bill if it can be shown definitely, and not by mere surmise or guesswork, that such legislation will reduce expenditures. That is the famous Holman rule. It has been invoked times without number, and it has withstood the parliamentary acid test. Under the aegis of that rule, as a subcommittee chairman I brought in legislation abolishing a lot of high-salaried jobs in the Customs Service which were nothing more nor less than political sinecures. Although my provision contravened existing law, the Speaker held it in order under the Holman rule. It is impossible to imagine how many millions of dollars have been saved to the taxpayers of America by the Holman rule. It will stand forever in our parliamentary system as a monument more enduring than granite or marble to the memory of a man who was a great statesman as well as a great economist.

Under the Budget system the appropriations that formerly were made through the legislative committees are now handled by subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, of which there are 10. These subcommittees act on estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau, which in this function is the direct representative of the President.

THE IMPRIMATUR OF THE PRESIDENT

Every Budget estimate bears the imprimatur of the President. It comes to the Appropriations Committee with a personal letter of recommendation from him.

Let us take up from this point the operations of the appropriating system. During the fall and winter prior to the opening of the oncoming fiscal year the various appropriations subcommittees conduct hearings on the matters under their respective jurisdictions. These hearings last from 3 weeks to 2 months and take place in the various rooms of the three floors on the west side of the House wing of the Capitol which are the commodious permanent quarters of the Appropriations Committee. In these hearings members of a subcommittee seat themselves around one side and the ends of a long table and the witnesses with their secretaries and satellites and their impediment of books and records are grouped on the other side. The hearing generally starts with the testimony of the member of the Cabinet whose departmental appropriations are under consideration and the witnesses range from the Cabinet chief himself down to and including the heads of all of the bureaus and activities in his department.

We who sit on our side of the table have the privilege, or to express it in another way—pardon the paradox—we enjoy the duress, of listening to as fine a line of special pleading as ever fell on mortal ears. Every Government official comes before us with an inflated idea of the importance of his own bureau, which is quite understandable, for if an official is deeply interested in his work he wants to see it generously nurtured, fertilized, and watered by a sizable appropriation. The trouble is that every witness is governed by his needs and ambitions—largely the latter—as the head of an activity that is his own little world, and among the thousands upon thousands of Government witnesses I have cross-examined I do not recall one whose brow was furrowed with solicitude for the welfare of the American taxpayer. Day after day and week after week we hear only ex parte evidence, and though there are many excellent cross-examiners on our subcommittees we are handicapped by getting only one side of the story, except for such admissions as we are able literally to dig out of witnesses.

Many of the executive officials display charming finesse in the strategy with which they handle their cases. The old experts frequently build up their estimates in excess of their requirements, thinking the Appropriations Committee will trim them down so that in the end they will get about what they really expect anyway. Usually the actions of a subcommittee are approved by the full Committee on Appropriations and by the House and the bill goes to the Senate. Then begins a grand rush of bureau heads who hit the trail to the Senate Committee on Appropriations where high-pressure

methods and plaintive pleas often are effective in securing a raise in items passed by the House. The result is that the final rates frequently, if not usually, are written in conference where the rules permit a compromise between the amount fixed by the House and the amount fixed by the Senate. The conferees, however, cannot go below the House amount nor above the Senate figure in reaching their final determination.

DEFICIENCIES SUBCOMMITTEE A CATCH-ALL

After the 10 subcommittees have brought in the 10 regular appropriation bills and the House has acted on the same, the work of the deficiencies subcommittee is just beginning. The deficiencies subcommittee is a sort of catch-all, a postgraduate committee over and above the 10 subcommittees into which the Appropriations Committee is divided. Its function theoretically is to handle deficiency and emergency items which for some reason or other cannot be considered by regular subcommittees, usually because of the time element. Of late years, however, the deficiencies subcommittee has had a sort of potpourri of jurisdiction over enormous relief measures such as the W. P. A. and other bills of vast proportions not coming under any regular category. As previously indicated, Chairman TAYLOR, of the full Committee on Appropriations, is chairman of the deficiencies subcommittee, but on account of his advanced age he has turned over the active chairmanship to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, while he has retained general directory authority. The other members of the deficiencies subcommittee in order of rank are CANNON of Missouri, myself, SNYDER, of Pennsylvania, O'NEAL, of Kentucky, JOHNSON of West Virginia, TABER, of New York, WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, LAMBERTSON, of Kansas, and DITTER, of Pennsylvania. The last four are Republicans, the others Democrats.

LIKE THE TEMPLE OF JANUS

It has been said that the doors of the deficiencies subcommittee, like the Temple of Janus, are never closed, and that is very nearly true. An estimate may come crashing in from the Budget Bureau at any time that will need immediate attention. If it is extra urgent in character, it will be put through Congress by resolution under unanimous consent; if not, it will be reserved for inclusion in one of the several deficiency bills that may be expected at every session of Congress.

The deficiency-appropriating system has led to monumental abuses. A practice has grown up whereby departmental officials, disappointed over failing to obtain their objectives before the regular subcommittees, will attempt to override the latter by getting their claims before the deficiencies subcommittee. The cleverness often displayed in devising arguments to give the deficiencies subcommittee a hook of jurisdiction over an item that should be presented to a regular subcommittee is a tribute to the inventive genius of the official mind, revealing an ingenuity not outshone by the inventor of the wooden nutmeg.

Formerly a deficiency appropriation bill, particularly one as far along in the session as a third deficiency, was supposed to take care of a few rag-tags and bobtails of appropriations, a mop-up bill carrying at most a few hundred thousand dollars, but not so in this era of big spending. The Budget Bureau, just before the last regular session of Congress adjourned, sent to our Appropriations Committee Budget estimates footing up the enormous total of $244,346,934.03 for inclusion in the third deficiency bill of that session of Congress. The amount thus proposed to be spent in what would ordinarily be called "a little old deficiency bill" was the equivalent of one-fourth of all the money it cost to run the entire Government back in 1909, when the economists of that day were horrified by what they regarded as the ultimate in spending profligacy—a "billion-dollar Congress." In the deficiencies subcommittee we trimmed a lot of the fat out of these swollen estimates and sent the third deficiency to the floor carrying only $53,000,000. When it got to the Senate, however, that body boosted it to the skies and we were obliged to agree on $185,168,066.38 in conference, so that it was not such a "little old deficiency bill" after all, but a pretty well stuffed legislative specimen when it emerged from the conference room.

GOOD OLD PATERNALISTIC UNCLE SAM

Among these third deficiency estimates that came to us with the O. K. of the administrative establishment on them were some which show rather graphically how far our Government is going in its tax-consuming paternalistic ventures. I shall take time to mention but two examples. Both of these come under the guise of our good-will activities in South America. It appears that in that sector, especially, good will and benevolence are leading us a long way—at the expense of the American taxpayer. We are building a pan-American highway, having already spent $2,000,000 on the project, without any assurance by treaty or otherwise that we could ever use it in case of emergency. If some foreign power, Germany, for instance, should violate the Monroe Doctrine, we could not come to the relief of South American countries by using the highway which our taxpayers' money has helped to build if Mexico or some country in Central America should say "no." It was testified that we have constructed bridges in those countries with our taxpayers' money, even before the stretches of highway are built which the bridges are to connect. We are sending our trained specialists to South American republics and paying them with our taxpayers' money to teach those peoples how to do many things which, presumably, they ought to know for their own good. In one of the estimates provision was made for sending civil-service experts from Washington to teach the natives of Brazil how to raise rubber. To me this seemed like sending coals to Newcastle; and when I asked the departmental witness, who was laboring hard to justify the estimate, what we could tell the Brazilians about raising rubber they did not already know, he replied: "They have no technicians down there." Technicians or no technicians, I insisted that we have no right to use the money wrung from our taxpayers at home to instruct the Brazilians how to raise one of the primary natural products of their own country. If I may be pardoned a pun, there is not enough rubber in my make-up to enable me to stretch my disposition far enough to approve that item. These things and many more equally fantastic we are doing, all in the name of good will. As one jokesmith remarked, it may not be long until our overflowing benevolence will take the form of sending experts to Mexico to teach the Mexicans how to make hot tamales. Then I know the world will be near the millenium.

Repeating my question, Is the Budget system a good thing? I answer unqualifiedly and unhesitatingly that it is. It has at least achieved its primary purpose of centralizing control of estimates and bringing them within the purview of an official whose vision is not limited to a single activity but takes in the Government as a whole. There is inherent in the budgetary system the power, if wisely exercised, of coordinating the regular expenditures of the Government and making them bear a reasonable relation to each other and to the whole. In these days of grandiose ideas of spending and of paternalism run rampant, God save America if we had to return to the old loose system whereby each legislative committee would sponsor its own appropriation bill!

HOW CAN APPROPRIATIONS BE REDUCED?

We come now to the question: "What can be done to reduce governmental expenditures?" Earlier in the discussion I promised some suggestions along this line, and I shall now give them, for whatever they may be worth. I sincerely believe that nothing is more important than that we shall hit the road to retrenchment and stay on that road until we reach the objective of a balanced budget. If the next President decides to lead the way toward the goal of economy, he will find an economy-minded Appropriations Committee ready to meet him more than half way and to cooperate with him to the last bend in the turnpike. Of the 40 members of the Appropriations Committee, 23, or more than half, voted against the spending-lending bill. Of the 47 Democrats in the House who voted "No" on the

spending-lending bill, 8, including the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman TAYLOR, were members of the Appropriations Committee. As now constituted, the Appropriations Committee is an economy-minded committee of conservative inclinations, and if the President chooses to lead, it stands ready to assist him in bringing the big spending program to a quick end. I make this statement flat-footedly and I will stick to it, but always with the reservation that the committee will do whatever may be necessary to relieve human distress. In this great land of ours, dedicated to Christian ideals, people must not be allowed to go hungry and naked.

I shall be unfortunate if in the foregoing description of the appropriating procedure I may have created the impression that the Appropriations Committee is responsible for permitting appropriations to be pyramided to dangerous heights. Wherever the fault rests it certainly is not with the Appropriations Committee.

The Committee on Appropriations, like every other standing committee of the House, is a creature of Congress, subject to congressional direction. If the House, whether pursuant to Executive recommendations or on its own initiative, passes bills authorizing the expenditure of vast sums of money the Appropriations Committee is helpless. It cannot go on a sit-down strike and refuse to make the appropriations that are specifically authorized. Heat, vigorously applied from above, would not permit that. It sometimes ignores authorizations unless the pressure becomes too hot and sometimes it appropriates only a part of the amounts that have been authorized, and gets away with it. But always the House, being the creator of the Appropriations Committee, has the whip hand and it can force the committee to live up to the authorizations.

AUTHORIZATIONS THE BETE NOIR OF ECONOMISTS

Authorization bills are the bete noir of the economist. Those bills are eternally knocking the economy program into a cocked hat. In these days when the United States Treasury is as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard the language of an authorization bill is a laugh. It reads:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

And so forth. Is there anyone in America with imagination elastic enough to lead him to believe that there is as much as a "thin dime" in the United States Treasury that is not "otherwise appropriated"?

And right here let me reiterate that the President is not alone responsible for all of our astronomical appropriations. Congress must bear its share of the blame, and the vehicle through which Congress usually acts when it wishes to put a drain into the Treasury is the authorization bill.

This brings me to the "blank check." One of my first and foremost recommendations is that Congress shall eschew henceforth and forevermore the blank-check appropriation. Every dollar appropriated by Congress should pass the keen scrutiny of the Appropriations Committee and be justified by competent evidence. In the last few years vast sums have been appropriated en bloc to administrative officials in the form of so-called blank checks, and as a result we have witnessed, time after time, the allocation of funds through administrative allotments for purposes which the Appropriations Committee had previously flatly rejected. This is subversive of our theory of government. Under our constitutional system appropriation measures must originate in the House, and the House should assume full responsibility.

MY THREE RECOMMENDATIONS

Summarizing, I recommend:

First. No blank checks.

Second. No further appropriations except for the most essential purposes until the Budget can be balanced.

Third. The creation of a committee on fiscal planning to facilitate the balancing of the Budget and to keep it balanced.

When I say that for the time being, at least until we can get the Government a little way out of the hole, we should suspend appropriations for nonessentials, I am giving what I believe to be one of the most salutary bits of advice I have to offer. When I speak of nonessentials, I refer to such improvements as reclamation projects, roads, river and harbor construction, public buildings, and a large variety of other similar projects and improvements which, however desirable in flush times, can wait, now that our Government is on the edge of bankruptcy. On the one hand we have been spending enormous sums on reclamation projects to bring more land into productivity, while on the other hand we have been killing little pigs and converting them into soap grease and plowing under every third row of cotton. How can we reconcile such inconsistencies?

And roads: Although the country is now beribboned from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf with hard-surfaced highways, there are those who would empty the mythical contents of an empty Treasury and place a bondage of debt on our great-grandchildren to build still more roads, forgetting that the cement dealers and equipment men get a large percentage of every dollar spent for road building.

PRODIGIOUS SUM SPENT ON ROADS

From 1933 up to and including the fiscal year 1940 our Federal appropriations for roads amounted to the prodigious total of $2,884,700,000. This includes both regular and emergency road funds. Of this amount, $1,893,700,000 has been disbursed through the Public Roads Administration of the Department of Agriculture and $991,000,000 through the three emergency agencies—W. P. A., C. W. A., and F. E. R. A. I wonder how many of our citizens can realize the magnitude of this outlay of the taxpayers' money on road building during the last 7 years. Perhaps it can be fairly well understood from the fact that it amounts to more than $4,000 for every day since the beginning of the Christian era. In the interest of the retrenchment so vitally needed to reassure business and to bring about recovery, public-building construction can well wait a while, as can improvement work on rivers and harbors.

There is nothing essential about reclamation projects, public roads, river and harbor works, and public buildings. The wise course is to put these and other nonessentials over without prejudice until better times. We have constructed public buildings all over the United States during the last 6 years, but on top of these lavish expenditures we now find a demand for a new building program so that every Member of Congress may have another new building in his district. In the name of common sense, I do not know why every Member of Congress should get a new post-office building any more than a lighthouse or a Federal penitentiary. The needs of the public service and not the wants of suffering Congressmen should be the sole guide in establishing these buildings, and there are congressional districts, plenty of them, where it is cheaper, more sensible, and just as satisfactory to the public to rent post-office quarters as it would be to invest a relatively large amount of Federal funds in a building not justified by the widest stretch of the imagination.

COMMITTEE ON FISCAL PLANNING

I invite the attention of the House to House Joint Resolution 422, which I introduced on January 15 last, providing for the creation of a committee on fiscal planning, the text of which is as follows:

> Joint resolution to create a Committee on Fiscal Planning
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby created a Committee on Fiscal Planning to be composed of the chairman, ranking majority member, and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations, the chairman, ranking majority member, and ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Director of the Budget.
>
> SEC. 2. The Committee on Fiscal Planning is directed to make a study of United States Government finances with a view to coordinating revenue and spending activities, reducing appropriations wherever it is feasible to do so, and ultimately eliminating the gap between Federal revenues and Federal expenditures.

The new committee on fiscal planning, or, in short, the planning committee, which I now propose, would establish a mechanism which would enable the Government to do for itself what every prudent businessman does in his own business. The businessman, if he is wise and forelooking, avoids going into debt by first making a survey of prospective

revenues and then cutting his cloth accordingly, so as not to exceed his income. The planning committee I suggest would have seven members—the chairman, ranking majority member, and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations; the chairman, ranking majority member, and ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee; and the Director of the Budget. The Ways and Means Committee raises the revenues to support the Government, the Appropriations Committee appropriates the revenues, and the Director of the Budget coordinates the spending agencies. If these seven officials would get their heads together they might accomplish much for the cause of economy by planning a campaign to make the revenues cover the appropriations annually and thus wipe out the deficit—a consummation devoutly to be wished. It is a plan worth trying. There is now no cooperation whatever between the revenue-raising and appropriating agencies. While such a planning committee would not be proof against the big spenders it would be, I believe, a constant force operating in favor of a balanced Budget and a measured economy, especially if its plans are given widespread publicity so as to attract the support of a wholesome public opinion. A report from such a committee that a particular Treasury-looting bill would be against the program of the planning committee and contrary to the public interest might have a deterrent effect, even in these days of congressional log-rolling and puissant hog combines.

But, in conclusion, I confess that while I may be good at proposing remedies for the big spending epidemic I am not so sure of the efficacy of my own prescriptions. Astronomical spending has acquired such a momentum in this country that the real question is, Can it be stopped?

Of one thing I am satisfied in my own mind, and that is that we will never have an adequate recovery from the spending saturnalia until the people of the United States get aroused and take the situation in their own hands and do a little high pressuring on their own hook on Members of Congress by making them understand that future political rewards will be bestowed for the money they keep in the United States Treasury, rather than for the money they siphon out of it. I am not convinced that this reversal of the public's attitude is possible nor yet am I convinced that it is impossible; for that matter, when I reflect that the people, when sufficiently stirred, sometimes change their minds in a mighty big hurry. The only debatable point with me is whether they can change their minds quickly enough to save the Nation from a debacle. Meanwhile, I shall be cudgeling my brains trying to decide in my own mind whether my friend BOB RICH is right when he says we are headed for the demnition bow-wows. I wonder. [Applause.]

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES SECCOMBE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1940

LETTER FROM AND ARTICLE BY H. F. FREASE

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE NATIONAL DEFENSES

CANTON, OHIO, *May 25, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES SECCOMBE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Just as neither Democrats nor Republicans are entirely blameless for the now publicly admitted deficiencies in our national defenses, so neither party should have the sole monopoly of suggesting and originating corrective measures.

First of all, the people, resources, ways of life, and institutions of the United States are not now, and never have been, like those of any country in Europe. Every person in the United States is here because he or his ancestor got fed up on the institutions, ways of life, and resources of some foreign country, and most of us stem from European countries.

We have immediately available in the United States under our present Federal and State constitutions, implementable by suitable detail Federal and State legislation, a reserve defense force greater than any in the world.

In the invaded countries of Europe there are a few paltry thousands of privately owned motorcars. In the United States there are over 30,000,000 registered motorcars.

Defense against "fifth column" and parachute-troop surprise attacks calls for a return to the methods of Indian fighting used in the pioneer days of our country, when every man and many a woman had a rifle and when the only defense against redskin surprise attacks from the forest was to see the redskins coming and to shoot them as they came. There was no time to call out the Army. Every man had to be first and finally for himself.

Europeans generally are unfamiliar with this kind of fighting, else 1,500 Germans would not have lasted unsupported in Oslo for 3 days.

In our country today we do not know accurately how many more citizen-owned small arms, such as hunting rifles and shotguns, there are than there were in the pioneer days, but we do know we have over 30,000,000 registered motor cars.

Every one of these 30,000,000 registered motor cars has a driver, and it is practically a sure thing that at least 1,000,000 of these drivers have rifles or shotguns.

If war broke out in the old-fashioned way after an ultimatum and a declaration, part or all of these 30,000,000 cars and their drivers would be commandeered and drafted by the relatively slow methods of Army organization.

Against surprise "fifth column" and parachute troop attacks, that would be too late.

For a starter, we should enroll a motor reserve corps of at least 1,000,000 car owners each of whom has one or more rifles or shotguns, whose registration cards should be assembled by voting districts, townships, or counties, and who would on call by radio or telephone or general alarm drive in their cars and be on the spot to shoot "fifth column" or parachute troop attackers at every and any place in these United States where such attackers would appear.

In using the word "reserve" in the proposed name "Motor Reserve Corps" for the organization as a defense force of men and materials we already have, modern Army usage is followed. To tie this in with the Federal and Ohio State Constitutions for example, substitute for the word "reserve" the word "militia."

Both the President of the United States and the Governors of the several States have long unused constitutional powers with respect to militia, which can be the foundation of a motor reserve corps organization.

Moderately speaking, then, the United States can have very soon a motor reserve corps of a million men, a million cars, and a million rifles.

If we went to the boastful extremes of certain other countries, we could truthfully say we now have in existence a motor reserve of 30,000,000 cars, since all are fundamentally available to our defense forces.

It is not now necessary to go to this extreme, but we should perfect the moderate organization.

Knowing the prompt and able attention you always give to matters of importance to your city, your State, and your country, I am thanking you in advance for your earnest consideration of the possibilities of organizing our immediately available national defenses on the above or other lines which may seem to you to be more effective.

Yours very sincerely,

H. F. FREASE.

ARMAMENT BOTTLENECK NO. 1

(By H. F. Frease)

Armament bottleneck No. 1 in the United States defense program of 1940 is dies, fixtures, gages, tools, and similar special equipment. The New Deal administration knows this, and is talking about setting up C. C. C. industrial-training camps for training mechanics and turning out the missing fundamental equipment for mass production of all kinds and classes of armament.

As in many other instances, the New Deal has apparently overlooked the provisions of existing law. Congress as long ago as June 3, 1916, provided that this special production equipment could be obtained by the Secretary of War for use by the Government and private manufacturers.

Just why this has not already been done, for example out of the billions of W. P. A. funds expended in the last 7 years, is useless now to question very much. Perhaps the Army Ordnance Department, numbering 420 officers and 4,500 men, authorized as of April 3, 1939, could not make itself heard loud enough.

The idea of C. C. C. industrial-training camps being utilized for this purpose might have some merit for turning out this production equipment in 1943, but has little immediate value because dies, fixtures, gages, and tools require machine tools for their manufacture, and the C. C. C. camps do not have any.

From the standpoint of training die and tool makers, if it is proposed to delay armament for defense until all-purpose die and tool makers can be trained, then we are faced with a delay of years, not months.

The necessities, however, do not require all-purpose die and tool makers, but rather single-purpose die and tool makers who can be quickly trained in shops already existing.

Aside from technical high schools, there is a machine shop in every first-class school of mechanical engineering in the country, and every student passing through the usual course in machine-shop practice makes something in the nature of a die, fixture, gage, or tool.

The unusual possibilities of utilizing such facilities for preparing the fundamental production equipment necessary for armaments has been amply demonstrated in the classes of Lt. Col. E. L. Lucas, O. R. C., at Mississippi State College, Starkville, Miss., where the project for 1 year was to make all the necessary special equipment for the Garand rifle, and where the project for this year is to make weld assembled shell turning lathes out of standard rolled or drawn steel sections.

Mechanical engineering students are regularly being taught to and do make and duplicate single parts. They are not expected to become all-purpose die and tool makers.

What is now needed is to duplicate existing parts whose design and specification has been laid down.

A carefully organized program for this purpose can immediately be carried out in the mechanical engineering shops of our technical schools.

Does not common sense dictate the use of these existing men, machinery, and materials?

Address to Graduating Class of Sevier County High School, Sevierville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. B. CARROLL REECE, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the address I delivered to the graduating class of Sevier County High School, at Sevierville, Tenn., May 10, 1940:

There are some ideas and opinions, along with knowledge and concept born of knowledge, which come only with time and experience, and which, by reason of that fact, you young ladies and gentlemen would not and could not be expected to know about yet.

One of the advantages of age and experience is a pleasure we older persons have in greeting a graduating class of young people such as you; of looking into your bright, eager faces, and of helping, by advice—and, may I say, speeches—to start you along the right road toward the careers in which you hope to achieve the ideals of your dreams.

Now, because I myself was once a high-school graduate, as you are, and because I recall very vividly my school experiences, I am going to get right down on a basis of real, confidential counsel and understanding with you tonight. Now this is just between us; your teachers and all of these other visitors can't share in this. It's just a matter between you graduates and myself. When I had finished school I had come to the conclusion that most of the speeches which were intended as good advice, and brilliant examples of rhetoric, were just dull, stodgy, dry-as-dust talks given by folks who liked to make speeches, and who could compel us young students to listen to them. Now, I know that probably is the way you feel about the speeches you have had to listen to all through your school days—maybe including the one you are listening to now. And—remember this is between us, and I wouldn't want it repeated to your teachers—a lot of the speeches boys and girls in school have to listen to are pretty stodgy and dry.

There is a perfectly legitimate reason for that, and it is not the impatience of youth, although youth is impatient. It is because youth has not had experiences; youth has not had to fight for its ideals; youth has not had the disillusionments that come; the world, to the eyes of youth, is still a world of tinsel and glitter; and dull care, responsibility, hard work—all are somewhere off in the future, and are not to be worried about when youth wants to frolic.

Football, baseball, basketball, tennis—thrilling contests, cheers, songs, excursions, dances—those are the world of youth.

I for one would not take from youth one bit of the impatience which is its chief characteristic. The vibrant energies, the bounding health, the beautiful dreams, the wonderful visions, the animal spirits, all of those go to make youth beautiful and wonderful and blessed. I understand, of course—now that we are being confidential with one another—I understand that impatience of youth which says, "Why hold us here to make speeches at us? Why not turn us loose to get at this job of running the world, because we can do a better job of it than you have?" And maybe you can do a better job of running the world than we have. I pray that you can.

Now, while it is true, perhaps, that it taxes your patience to listen to a lot of dry speeches, and a lot of good advice rather somberly given by your elders, don't forget this fact, my young friends: Your elders make these speeches, they offer the advice to you, because they have trodden the path that you young folks are today just setting your feet upon; these oldsters know the disappointments and the disillusionments that will come; they know the ideals that will go toppling, one by one, along life's pathway; they know the hardships and the privations that will thrust themselves into the rosy dream of youth and shatter the golden visions; and it is out of hearts filled with a warm, pulsing affection for you; it is from the depths of souls that love you boys and girls; it is from an affection that would save you if possible from the hurts of these disillusionments, and these broken ideals, and these shattered dreams, that we oldsters talk to you as we do. It is in the hope that in some way we can so prepare you that your fine, warm, generous sensibilities will not be too deeply wounded by the disappointments, and the hardships, and the cares, and the sorrows which have wounded us. It is because of a deep, keen sympathy for your youth—a youth that, with the years, has vanished for us—we seek to advise you in the hope of saving you from some of the hurts of the world. Of course, it is all futile. It never has been done. It never will be done.. Youth is youth, and life is life for each individual; you will learn, as we have learned, only by experiences; some beautiful; some harsh and unlovely; some pleasant; some that hurt deeply.

So, then, my young friends, I am not going to try today to prepare you for the hurts that the world holds in store; for the disappointments that you will meet; for the defeats you will suffer; for the ideals you will lose! for the dreams which will be shattered.

I am going to ask you to do one thing to justify the love and the care of your fathers and mothers, and the expenses paid by the taxpayers to educate you and prepare you for life; I am going to make one request of you, as a repayment, in some degree, of the great blessings you have inherited from your forefathers in this wonderful, free constitutional republic—this great beautiful, marvelous country of ours where individual freedom is still your most priceless possession. My request is this: I want you boys and girls, each and every one of you, to meet life unafraid; have that courage your fathers and mothers, and your grandfathers and grandmothers before you had; that courage which enabled them to take an ax and a squirrel rifle, go into the primeval forests, and by their own courage, thrift, energy, initiative, vision, and capacity for hard work, to carve out homes for themselves, and to carve out for you of today this great and beautiful Nation of ours—the finest, most wonderful country in which to live that has ever existed on the face of the globe.

Meet life unafraid. With chins up and chests out, with eyes to the front, take the blows the world will give you, and don't flinch. Fight back. Stand up for your rights. Determine that which is true and just and honest and honorable, and never quit fighting for it, no matter what the world seeks to do to you. Can you whip the world, you young folks? Can you bring the world into submission at your feet, to take from it all of those things to which you are rightfully entitled? Of course you can. Your fathers, and your mothers, and your grandfathers, and your grandmothers, your ancestors from the time the Declaration of Independence was signed, by courage, by faith in a living God, and by self-reliance took a world of trackless forests and unwatered plains and transformed it into this marvelous civilization we have here in America, with its unparalleled network of fine highways; its magnificent educational institutions, of which yours is one; its vast network of railroads; its fertile acres, and its wonderful cities—all of these, remember, your forefathers through self-reliance, a capacity for hard work, and an unshakable faith in God wrought from the primeval forests and the waterless plains of this continent.

There are certain facts which will impress themselves more and more upon you as you grow older, as your experience and contact with the world are broadened. One of those facts is that all of these material possessions built up by your forefathers, all of the luxuries which we enjoy today, all of the labor-saving devices, the modern means of transportation, communication, and information, all of the modern theaters, the stores, the scientifically air-conditioned offices and homes, the bright lights—all of these material things which tend to thrill us and to make life easier, also tend to soften us and to sap that ruggedness of character, that dauntless courage, that capacity for hard work, thrift, and self-denial which our forefathers and mothers possessed in such great measure. You must guard against that danger.

Another fact that will impress itself upon you is that all of these material possessions are as dross when compared to the remarkable—I should say marvelous—cultural and spiritual possessions which are being passed on to you as a heritage by your forefathers.

Just stop for a moment to think that in Europe young men and women of your age do not have the education you possess today. You are better educated, more intelligent, more adequately trained thinkers as you stand today than are most of the adults of Europe or the Orient. The boys and girls of Europe and the Orient not only have none of the luxuries you possess, they also lack many of the necessities which you accept as a matter of course. But I am referring more specifically at the moment to those great spiritual and cultural possessions as set forth in the great organic law of our Nation, the Constitution. I refer to what is collectively called the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a safeguard of the personal liberties of each one of you. It is what guarantees your right to move about as you please; to be secure in your own homes

from search and seizure; to have religious and political freedom; to have the liberty of expressing yourselves in speech or in writing; the right to a press that is still free to give you the facts about the Government and about the world; the right to pursue life, liberty, and happiness in your own way, according to your varying talents and inclinations, so long as you do not interfere improperly or unfairly with your fellow men. You will come, as the years go on, to prize these great spiritual and cultural heritages far above any material possessions which may be handed on to you by your forbears.

There is another fact you will learn as life opens up and broadens out for you, as you get out into the world. That fact is that these possessions, these rights and liberties and privileges which were established for you by your forefathers, who were willing to fight, and bleed, and die, to attain them, are not possessions which are fixed, irrevocable, always to be yours without any effort on your part to protect or maintain them. Quite to the contrary, the sooner you learn that you must constantly be alert to protect and retain these rights and liberties and privileges, the better off you will be. There are always among us those who, to satisfy their unreasoning urge to "boss" you and everybody else, are perfectly willing to steal these rights and liberties and privileges from you and to enslave you under some form of political autocracy. You always must guard against the danger of such people coming into power, or remaining in power, where they can threaten these priceless possessions.

Another fact that you will learn as you get out in the world is that there are always plenty of men and women who are willing to promise you ease, security, leisure, if you will put them in power over your government and your affairs. After they have made these glowing promises, and after they have gotten into office, and into positions of power and control over the government, these demagogs invariably and without fail begin to squander your money—the funds of the taxpayers. They are no sooner entrenched in office than they begin, at your expense, with your money, to surround themselves with their friends and henchmen who will do their bidding. They begin—these political demagogs—to pass out, at your expense, favors to certain classes or sections in order further to entrench themselves in power over you. After a few years of that sort of thing the taxpayers find their public debt has grown to ruinous proportions. They find their government officials are spending more than the revenues amount to, with the result that taxes have to be increased year after year to meet increasing deficits. This in turn means the people continue to be more and more oppressed by the tax-gatherers; an ever-increasing proportion of what they earn, or save, must be handed over to the political squanderers and plunderers and corruptionists, until finally the people rebel and, in some cases, even turn from the very principles of their government because they are so outraged and disgusted by the conduct of their public officials.

You are all fresh in your study of history; so you can readily recall that the taxgatherer has been the bane of every people in every period of which we have a recorded history. The rulers up at the top, represented by a veritable host of petty tyrants and dictators, have always lived on the very cream—the very fat of the land—while the masses, including young folks like yourselves, had to sweat and suffer, work and starve, so these selfish, bloated, corrupt political plutocrats, entrenched in positions of power and influence, might have their Lucullan feasts in their palatial palaces.

It was because they were outraged by these things, and because they made up their minds that they would not any longer yield up their rights and liberties to tyrants, that our forbears tore up their lives, root and branch, from the countries of their nativity, and sailed across uncharted seas to face the hardships of this unknown and undeveloped land.

Never forget, my young friends, that every privilege, every liberty, every right that you possess today in the United States of America was purchased for you by the suffering and the blood of your ancestors. Never forget that all of these rich material possessions which have come to you as your heritage, and over which you must soon begin to exercise control, were accumulated for you in the sweat and suffering, in the labor and the privation, in the courage and the thrift of your forbears.

Oh, I know; I know youth is impatient about these matters. It seems not worth your while now to think about these solemn facts because life stretches out before you; the future is an unexplored fairyland which your dreams have peopled with lovely beings. That is what I meant a while ago when I said that no one can prepare you by speeches or advice for the disappointments and the hardships which the world is going to thrust into your dreams to shatter some of your golden vision. As time goes on, you will come to prize more highly all of these spiritual and cultural and material possessions through an appreciation of how they were acquired for you; then you will awaken to the necessity of your doing something about the responsibility that rests upon you to protect and defend those spiritual and cultural and material possessions—to see that they are not filched from you by wily demagogs and politicians and propagandists preaching alien "isms." After all, you cannot too soon learn that you must guard these possessions or they will be filched from you. You cannot learn too soon that it is your duty not only to guard free government, personal liberty, all of these spiritual and cultural and material possessions which have come to you, in order to pass them on unimpaired to generations which are to follow you. The sooner you learn that all of these priceless possessions must be lived and used and then passed on, the better it will be for you and those who are to come after you.

You have heard the old adage, "We never miss the water till the well runs dry." There is a great philosophical truth hidden in that old saying. Those of us who have been born and have lived in these later years have never known what it is to be without the liberties, the rights, and the privileges we exercise. Naturally enough, never having been without these liberties and rights and privileges, never having had any of them denied us, it is difficult for us to imagine what it would be like not to possess them and exercise them in our everyday life.

You can get some inkling, however, of how precious these liberties and rights and privileges are when you stop to compare your own situation with that of young people of similar age in other parts of the world. How queer it would seem to you young ladies and gentlemen to have to go down to a gruff police officer and get a permit before you could have the simplest, most innocent sort of a dance; or to have to get a special permit, after harsh and searching cross-questioning, in order to organize a class society and hold meetings; or to have to get a government permit for a football game, or a baseball game, or a basketball game, or any athletic event; and yet that is exactly what the young people of Europe and the Orient today must do. They do not exercise the right of peaceable assembly as do you. For them to assemble peacefully for any purpose, social or otherwise, it is first necessary to go in the most humble spirit, in the meekest sort of way, to some petty local governmental bureaucrat and plead for a permit.

I thank God today that you young folks have never known, and I pray God today that you never will know, the horrors of hearing a loud knock on the door of your home in the dead of night, the shuffling of men's feet, the gruff voices ordering your parents to open the door, the grim seizure of your father or your brothers by uniformed men, the curt refusal of those men to answer the tearful questions as to the reason for such a terrible visitation, the taking away in custody of your father or your brothers—and from them only the most terrible surmises and the vaguest sort of rumors of internment camps, lashings, hard labor, starvation, and eventually death or broken minds and bodies; and yet these are the common experiences today of young people in Russia, Germany, Italy, and China. All over the world, except in the United States of America, boys and girls are having to go through these dreadful experiences.

It would be utterly impossible for you—here in free, secure, luxurious America—even to imagine what the boys and girls in other countries would be willing to give, what they would be willing to do, how highly they would prize and cherish the liberties, the rights, the privileges, and the luxuries which you young folks take as a matter of course.

It is a rather startling thing when we stop to realize that it has been only 149 years since the Bill of Rights became a part of the organic law of this Nation. That is not a very long time for such liberties, rights, and privileges as we have in this Nation to take root in tradition and to become fixed and secure.

Already we have seen carefully calculated and dangerous attempts to take away more and more of our freedom; more and more of our rights and privileges; more and more of the sovereignty of the States; more and more of the rights of decision of conducting our lives as we choose.

So let me entreat you to guard well these liberties and privileges and rights which are yours. Let no silver-tongued demagogs persuade you to trade off your liberty for a little fancied temporary security.

I am reminded at this point of one of Aesop's fables, which you will recall.

You will remember that in this fable a lean and hungry wolf in his lonely foraging meets a dog who has slipped his leash and strayed from home.

"You are fat and healthy," said the wolf, "while I am starving."

"Yes," replied the dog; "I was fed on fine, rich food; it is brought to me, so I do not have to forage. In return, all I have to do is to stand guard over my master's house."

"I should very much like," said the wolf, "to have a job like that and have lots of delicious food and a warm place to sleep."

"I believe," the dog said, "I can arrange such a job for you."

The dog started to lead the way toward his master's house. But on the way the wolf noticed that the hair around the dog's neck was rubbed off. He asked the reason.

"Because," the dog explained, "I must wear a collar and stay chained all day."

The wolf stopped, hesitated a moment, turned and trotted back toward the woods and his unprofitable foraging—to starvation if need be.

The moral which Aesop meant to bring out in that fable was that it is better to starve in freedom than to be fat in slavery.

You have heard a good deal of talk in the last 5 years that America has no more frontiers; that opportunities for young people are exhausted; that all of the professions are overcrowded; that industry cannot employ all the workers; that millions of American men and women and their dependents must rely on the Federal Government at Washington for a mean and meager existence.

None of these statements is true. For young men and young women who have the faith in God and in themselves, who have the self-reliance, the energy, the vision, the initiative, and the willingness to work hard, opportunities loom just as great today as ever they have for any young people in this country at any time. You know as well as I that in modern science in every direction—in chemistry and engineering—opportunities lie waiting to be appropriated by those with the energy and the vision to improve them.

One of the most successful young men in this country, of whom I read recently, came out of college at the beginning of this great depression, at a time when it appeared that all opportunities were gone and that civilization itself was about to crash. He looked about him and saw that young people everywhere were vainly seeking jobs, positions, something to do. He tried it for a while and soon saw that he was wasting both his energy and his money.

That young man had every reason in the world to sit down and grumble about the mess his forefathers had made of the country and of its rich resources. He had every right, according to some of these modern propagandists, to turn to the Government and expect a job under some petty bureaucratic tyrant for a meager stipend with which he could lead a miserable existence. I say he had every right, according to some of the modern preachments you young folks are hearing, to adopt that course. But did he? Ah, no. What do you think he did? He sat down and studied out the situation and said to himself, "If I can't find a job in industry, I will make my own job." He did just that—by opening an office and rendering a service of finding jobs for other young folks. He was so successful that he not only has a very fine business now—a new business; what you might call a depression profession—but he has been the benefactor of hundreds of other young people. Opportunities all gone? Why, to the boy or the girl of vision and imagination the world is filled with opportunities.

There have always been failures among us. There always will be failures among us, because there are always a certain percent of the people who do not possess, for some reason or other, the initiative and the vision, the courage, and the ability to hustle and get along.

There was a speech made on Lincoln's Birthday last February by the Honorable BRUCE BARTON, a Representative from New York, that I should like to see put into the hands of every schoolboy and schoolgirl in the United States of America. I want you to regard carefully the statements made by this great New York Representative concerning the immortal Lincoln. It was in part somewhat as follows:

"We are met here to honor the memory of an American who was ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed—and did not know it.

"He was born in a log cabin without heat, running water, or any modern convenience. According to a philosophy now widely current, this was a hopeless environment; it should have convinced him from the start that he was doomed to failure.

"His clothes were of crude homespun, ill-fitting, and worn until the fabric would no longer hold a patch.

"His diet of corn pone and bacon lacked essential vitamins.

"His schooling was limited to a few scattered weeks under teachers whose own schooling had been meager.

"In such circumstances he should have been told there was no hope. But no one told him this. Instead he was told he was fortunate because he had been born in a country where any boy might properly aspire to even the highest success, even the Presidency of the United States.

"He was told, also, that self-discipline and hard work were his only path to salvation, and that if he neglected them he would be poor and wretched all his life.

"It was generally accepted in those days that the privilege of self-government involved the responsibility of self-support.

"He had every excuse for discouragement, self-pity, and revolt. He should have been good material for the Communist Party; an excellent professional delegate to the congresses of American youth.

"But no one let him know the cards were stacked against him. No one suggested that it was useless to try. No one told him all the chances were gone.

"Everything government can properly do to adjust the handicaps in the game of life has the cordial approval of all right-thinking men and women. You and I would have no child born in a log cabin; no American, young or old, ill-fed, ill-clothed, or deprived of opportunity for self-respecting employment and a chance to contribute, up to the limit of his talents, to the progress of the community.

"I seek to remind you of the ancient truth that the life is more than meat and the body more than raiment. We need this reminder. All our talk for too long has been of our stomachs and our pocketbooks. We have chattered on and on about the standard of living, when it is only the standard of our inner living—the ambition, hope self-reliance, sacrifice, faith—that makes life worth living at all. Our eyes are blurred with covetousness, jealousy, and avarice; and we have almost forgotten that where there is no vision the people perish as surely as where there is no food."

There has never been a time in the United States of America, nor in the world, where young men and young women of vision were more sadly needed than today. The world requires saving, and it is both your privilege and your duty to help save it. Your own Nation needs to be protected and your own free government needs to be preserved, and it is both your privilege and your duty to protect and preserve your country and your government.

When you get out into the world, you will, if you have not already done so, meet some very persuasive talkers, both young and old, both men and women, who will try to argue and persuade you into discontentment with our constitutional form of government—into a discontentment with the way things are done in America—and they will try to persuade you to overthrow, by your votes, the "old fogies" who want to continue to operate America as America, for America.

When you meet these propagandists and proselyters, whether they be Communists, or Nazis, or Fascists, or Japanese, look them in the eye and ask them how much liberty, how much freedom exist in Russia under communism, in Germany under nazi-ism, in Italy under fascism, in Japan under monarchy. Look them in the eye and tell them that you already know that the churches have been burned; that the lodges have been broken up; that the labor unions have been dissolved; that the finest books and music, and the finest paintings and statuary in the world have been destroyed by the hands of vandals, who had neither the culture nor the decency to appreciate art; that the schools have been disrupted; that intelligence has been persecuted and penalized, and brute strength enthroned as the god of the people. Tell them you know that up at the top in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, in Japan, are a few men mad with lust for power, supported by hundreds of paid minions, all living off the masses of the people, calling themselves "the state," and preaching to the young people that they owe their lives, their love, their pleasures, their welfare, their very souls to the state. Tell those proselyters you already know "the state" is nothing more nor less, in every case and in every country, than a few men at the top, preying like vultures upon the spiritual, the cultural, and the material possessions of the people, destroying and befouling more than they can consume. If these propagandists and proselyters deny that that is the truth, tell them in their teeth that they are liars and don't be afraid to look them in the eye when you say it, because they will be liars.

Now a concluding word. I do not want to bring into this wonderful occasion today a harsh or saddening note. Therefore, I have deliberately avoided talking about war. I simply want to say one sentence: That war and all that war represents is hostile to everything you and I consider fine and decent; it is not only hostile toward man, it is hostile toward God. I shall pursue the subject no further than to say to you that so long as I have the honor to be a Member of the United States Congress I will oppose the United States ever again sending men or money into any foreign conflicts.

If any nation or any combination of nations should ever attempt to invade this country or to set up within the zone of the Monroe Doctrine bases from which they could make war upon this country, then I would say fight—fight to the last man, woman, and child, if necessary, to sweep such invaders away from our shores. But I shall never consent, for my part, to vote to put the United States of America, her men or women or her money into the age-old quarrels of Europe.

Now, as a last word, let me again urge you to face life unafraid. The only thing you really have to fear in life is fear. The only thing that can overcome you is fear. The only thing that can defeat you is fear.

Go forward from here today into other and higher educational institutions or into business or whatever activities you have planned; not only keep alive your faith in God, but never be ashamed to say so; not only pray constantly, but never be afraid to say you are a praying boy or a praying girl; you have the stuff in you; your lives are before you; your opportunities are myriad; you can aspire to the highest place in your land in any profession, in any line of work or endeavor you may choose. Ten percent of your opportunity lies in your environment. The other 90 percent lies within yourselves.

May God keep you and lead you and prosper you, that you may be good citizens, that you may be successful, spiritually and culturally as well as materially, and that you may accept this great heritage of a rich, free, enlightened Nation, and having used it for your own, pass it on, unsullied, unimpaired to those who come after you.

Federal Land-Bank Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following table, which shows the amount of Federal land-bank loans made in the United States during the fiscal years from 1934 to 1939:

Amount of Federal land-bank loans made, by States, during fiscal years from 1934 to 1939

District and State	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
District 1:						
Maine	$1,096,500	$1,103,700	$530,000	$205,500	$129,700	$68,400
N. Hampshire	375,300	169,800	103,800	73,000	79,200	66,600
Vermont	1,188,400	568,500	310,300	238,000	153,900	174,900
Massachusetts	1,623,500	993,900	458,900	529,500	421,700	241,600
Rhode Island	243,300	149,700	127,300	117,200	78,100	59,700
Connecticut	880,800	709,300	472,700	496,400	347,500	398,200
New York	7,047,200	5,485,000	2,320,400	2,331,100	1,573,200	1,654,200
New Jersey	2,092,200	1,623,600	606,200	576,000	575,100	420,500
Total	14,547,200	10,803,500	4,929,600	4,566,700	3,358,400	3,084,100

Amount of Federal land-bank loans made, by States, during fiscal years from 1934 to 1939—Continued

District and State	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
District 2:						
Pennsylvania	$4,345,200	$3,350,500	$1,109,400	$864,700	$816,400	$684,800
Delaware	263,800	225,800	74,700	68,800	57,500	28,100
Maryland	2,687,900	1,867,900	959,300	543,800	416,500	202,600
Virginia	6,246,200	3,311,100	1,182,200	725,000	670,200	548,100
West Virginia	1,302,800	832,200	315,300	240,900	197,400	256,300
Puerto Rico	51,300	795,600	832,900	347,200	250,800	141,700
Total	14,897,200	10,383,100	4,473,800	2,790,400	2,408,800	1,861,600
District 3:						
North Carolina	6,466,600	4,473,200	779,800	528,200	446,700	654,849
South Carolina	6,821,600	2,020,900	405,500	258,200	265,700	226,700
Georgia	8,603,100	2,651,000	564,600	388,900	542,208	619,500
Florida	5,663,400	1,768,600	463,100	243,700	147,000	311,000
Total	27,554,700	10,913,700	2,213,000	1,419,000	1,401,608	1,812,049
District 4:						
Ohio	20,053,900	14,605,500	3,453,700	1,974,300	1,461,700	1,884,500
Indiana	23,199,400	13,947,400	3,461,900	1,888,800	1,645,600	1,773,500
Kentucky	13,364,400	6,491,300	1,566,600	900,500	573,000	778,800
Tennessee	7,880,591	4,501,900	996,500	697,300	508,900	693,800
Total	64,498,291	39,546,100	9,478,700	5,460,900	4,189,200	5,130,600
District 5:						
Alabama	2,914,400	2,076,200	321,300	487,300	1,470,300	1,362,800
Mississippi	3,295,700	1,682,900	379,700	439,100	957,444	707,400
Louisiana	2,107,100	1,380,300	243,600	160,600	606,200	622,800
Total	8,317,200	5,139,400	944,600	1,087,000	3,033,944	2,693,000
District 6:						
Illinois	44,156,705	35,548,346	21,056,100	9,623,600	6,389,500	6,185,700
Missouri	10,786,300	6,187,000	4,957,100	1,782,300	1,536,800	964,800
Arkansas	1,507,700	1,460,500	1,263,300	611,900	596,300	481,500
Total	56,450,705	43,195,846	27,276,500	12,017,800	8,522,600	7,632,000
District 7:						
Michigan	13,664,200	15,494,000	3,802,700	1,686,000	527,900	475,100
Wisconsin	25,912,500	30,061,900	8,848,000	2,224,900	1,139,300	750,900
Minnesota	42,543,400	36,117,900	14,437,600	4,459,300	2,075,100	1,460,700
North Dakota	27,516,700	20,593,800	3,488,200	734,500		
Total	109,636,800	102,267,600	30,576,500	9,104,700	3,742,300	2,686,700
District 8:						
Iowa	62,779,200	53,521,624	24,367,100	10,354,900	5,782,600	5,287,400
South Dakota	15,632,400	18,143,200	5,494,400	1,865,900	589,800	212,900
Nebraska	38,961,100	29,653,100	11,976,000	6,369,300	3,088,900	2,954,600
Wyoming	972,100	2,177,600	735,600	486,600	369,800	343,400
Total	118,344,800	103,495,524	42,573,100	19,076,700	9,831,100	8,798,300
District 9:						
Kansas	21,899,200	38,899,700	12,216,800	3,941,400	2,657,500	2,828,800
Oklahoma	6,153,200	10,932,800	4,185,300	1,603,300	1,275,500	1,131,200
Colorado	1,850,500	5,501,400	2,337,800	1,292,600	910,500	696,100
New Mexico	345,400	1,340,000	396,100	156,600	224,700	226,809
Total	30,248,300	56,673,900	19,136,000	6,993,900	5,068,200	4,882,900
District 10:						
Texas	53,927,400	24,477,800	10,587,900	6,619,300	4,597,200	4,044,100
District 11:						
Arizona	1,159,500	1,367,300	559,700	450,900	468,400	379,300
Utah	1,526,300	3,559,300	729,000	120,600	266,500	147,000
Nevada	463,900	384,400	180,200	108,500	85,300	89,600
California	45,808,400	23,767,800	6,569,800	4,100,700	5,166,500	4,058,800
Total	48,958,100	29,078,800	8,038,700	4,780,700	5,986,700	4,674,700
District 12:						
Montana	1,556,900	1,320,100	415,200	258,800	351,800	544,500
Idaho	6,249,649	4,208,500	991,500	598,900	772,700	891,100
Washington	5,247,700	2,857,800	1,321,500	1,167,500	1,334,400	1,319,700
Oregon	5,763,300	5,412,200	1,619,900	1,353,900	1,104,800	978,500
Total	18,817,549	13,798,600	4,348,100	3,379,100	3,563,700	3,733,800
Grand total	566,198,245	449,773,870	164,576,500	77,296,200	55,703,752	51,033,849

On December 31, 1932, there were 500,537 Federal land-bank loans outstanding, amounting to $1,128,564,000, an average of $2,254 per farm, and on March 31, 1940, there were 617,328 loans outstanding, amounting to $1,890,432,312, an average of $3,062 per farm.

The significant point in connection with the above table is the concrete evidence of how the Farm Credit Administration has "bogged down." This is evidenced in the figures which show that while over $566,000,000 worth of Federal land-bank loans were made in 1934, only $51,000,000 worth of loans were made in 1939, and very few of these were original loans. In fact, most of them were a refinancing of the same farms.

Farm values declined, due largely to low agricultural prices. The farm price of butter has averaged less than 26 cents on the farms of the country during the past 7 years, and cheese has averaged only 13.2 cents per pound. Butter averaged 32 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years and 35 cents per pound the 7 pre New Deal years. Cheese averaged 14.7 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years and 17.5 cents the last 7 pre New Deal years.

The question arises, if these farms could not be paid for with 14.7-cent and 17.5-cent cheese and with 32-cent and 35-cent butter, how are they going to be paid for with 26-cent butter and 13.2-cent cheese, or the 12.7 cents per pound for cheese we have received in 1938 and 1939?

On December 31, 1932, 45 percent of the Federal loans were delinquent, and on December 31, 1939, 25 to 50 percent were delinquent, and in many farm districts that have not received the enormous subsidies from the United States Treasury, over 50 percent of all the Federal loans were delinquent.

Over 84,000 farms have been foreclosed by the Farm Credit Administration when the farmers could not pay 3½- and 4-percent interest and the New Deal has been starting up new farm owners with 40-year loans at 3-percent interest in competition with them.

Millions of dollars have been used to start up new farm owners when this money should have been used to help the farmer who was already on the farm.

New Deal low farm prices and other factors have caused a decrease in general farm values. This is shown in the following table for the Seventh Wisconsin District:

	1930	1935	1938
Adams	$6,035,149	$5,049,150	$4,944,090
Green Lake	13,713,783	10,508,441	10,162,066
Langlade	10,336,481	7,375,152	7,070,951
Marathon	39,739,976	34,271,805	33,705,991
Marquette	6,349,335	5,353,671	5,378,063
Portage	16,459,280	13,515,710	13,239,059
Shawano	21,014,718	18,062,418	17,727,053
Waupaca	24,052,013	19,700,222	19,264,993
Waushara	13,879,665	10,799,647	10,500,530
Wood	16,909,136	12,892,422	12,752,945
Total	168,489,536	137,537,638	134,745,741

Source: Wisconsin Tax Commission.

The President has twice vetoed the reduction in interest rates on Federal farm mortgages, and twice Congress has had to pass this reduction of interest over his veto.

Mr. Wallace is evidently trying to make a political issue of the low-interest rate to farmers, but the first thing he must do is to educate the members of his own party. Little support was given to Mr. Wallace's farm credit bill by the Democratic members of the Agricultural Committee of the House. Fifteen of the 25 members of the committee are of his own party. He must educate the other 80 percent of the members of the Agricultural Committee that belong to his party.

While the New York Times of May 5, 1940 quotes Mr. Wallace as saying in a brief preamble to his prepared talk that he did not believe "the Republicans know a darn thing about the farm problem. I know because I have spent 10 years trying to get them to understand it," I am sure Mr. Wallace will need all his energy to educate the members of his own party before he branches out in derision of the party of his fathers.

Importation of Silver Fox Pelts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN FUR BREEDER

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which a certain group of fox breeders of our Nation were misrepresented

before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is shown in the following editorial from the April 1940 issue of the American Fur Breeder:

[From the American Fur Breeder for April 1940]

I HAD A HUNCH—NOW I'M SURE!

There's a wild tale going the rounds that the import quota on silver foxes was secured through the political influence and maneuvering of President L. J. O'Reilly, of the American National and his satellite, Maurice Fitzsimmons, of Fond du Lac. According to the tale these two worthies suggested to administration leaders that Republican attacks on the trade-treaty program could be offset by coming to the rescue of the relatively insignificant silver-fox industry and thus prove the administration's deep concern over the welfare of American industries and the elasticity of the trade-treaty program.

I don't doubt that the gentlemen made the suggestions to the administration leaders or that these leaders found the suggestions good. In fact, the Wisconsin Fox and Fur Breeders' Association, the president of which is Mr. O'Reilly, passed and sent a resolution to the House Committee on Ways and Means thanking the administration for placing an import quota on silver fox and strongly upholding the administration's trade-treaty program. Mr. Fitzsimmons made a personal appearance before this committee and he also upheld the trade-treaty program. Part of his statements are being reprinted in this issue of the American Fur Breeder.

But to get back to the import quota and how it came about. The two gentlemen above named had no more to do with securing the quota than a thousand other fur farmers who used their influence with their Congressmen, Secretary of State Hull, the Committee for Reciprocal Information, and even the President of the United States. It was the protests from fur farmers all over the United States that poured into official Washington before Mr. O'Reilly and Mr. Fitzsimmons ever went near Washington that paved the way for the import quota.

The American silver-fox industry was given the protection of import quota restrictions because the mass of evidence pouring into Washington woke the administration up to the fact that thousands of fox farmers scattered from coast to coast would be ruined unless the flood of foreign pelts could be stemmed. And don't forget that the ruination of thousands of fox farmers would have had repercussions in the Nation's press and in the halls of Congress that would have seriously upset the administration's entire plans and policies for continuing the reciprocal-trade agreements.

To give you an idea of the distorted viewpoint of a penny-ante politician, read the deliberate attack on Ed Fromm in Mr. Fitzsimmons' remarks to the Committee on Ways and Means. Here he deliberately committed the American fur breeding industry to the administration's policy of low tariff or free trade with foreign nations. Here he delberately accused Ed Fromm of being the single, solitary stand-out—the only American fur farmer who is opposed to low tariffs and the trade-treaty program.

The statements are false to the core. Ninety-nine percent of the American fox and mink breeders believe in adequate tariff protection to insure profitable pelt values and the maintenance and safeguarding of a profitable domestic market for their products. This is the stand that Ed Fromm takes and he has repeated it many, many times. This is the stand that John Nieman takes as evidenced by his letter to his own Congressman. This is the stand that the editor of the American Fur Breeder takes and this is the stand of every honest fox and mink breeder in these United States.

The import quota restrictions did certainly save our domestic silver-fox industry from going on the rocks. We all admit that and we are all grateful to our Government for coming to our rescue. But Ed Fromm knows and I know and all the rest of us know that this is only temporary protection. And we all know that the present tariff of 35 percent on foreign silver fox is wholly inadequate to protect American market levels and American fox breeders. As American citizens and businessmen we have every right to plead our cause and our Government owes us every protection. And let no man tell you that you haven't this right or that you are a traitor to the Government if you demand your rights.

Mr. Fitzsimmons got a free ride to Washington as a member of the committee selected at the Chicago conference. On that trip he openly proclaimed that he stood for ample tariff protection for American fox breeders. So did his generalissimo, Mr. O'Reilly. And now this "misrepresentative" of the American fur-breeding industry goes to Washington again and falsely puts us on record as a shifty, vacillating group of lunkheads.

Things have come to a pretty pass in our industry when a basic agricultural industry like fur farming must depend on the machinations of cheap fur-farm politicians to defend its business interests in the Nation's Capitol. The only way to set the administration right with respect to your real attitude is to write to your bewildered Congressman and tell him you have been falsely represented and "sold down the river."

What will your choice be? A nincompoop who knows little about fur farming and who represented nobody at Washington except himself and the politicians who sent him down there, or several thousand practical, honest fur farmers who believe in the same things you and I do?

And let me add a word of warning. This is a shining example of the kind of "misrepresentation" you can expect from a Federation of Fur Farmers' Associations controlled and especially manipulated by a few politicians whose chief stock in trade always has been and always will be selfishness and chicanery. I had a hunch—now I'm sure.

Return the American Market to the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the backbone and the lifeblood of the eight northeastern Indiana counties which comprise the Fourth Congressional District. This district, which borders Michigan on the north and Ohio on the east, has more than 19,500 of the best farms in America. And the products of these farms, with all due respect to my colleagues from the Corn Belt, are as fine in quality as any in the world.

Each year the industrious farmers of my district till more than 1,000,000 acres of soil and contribute to the food supply of the Nation over 7,000,000 bushels of corn, 3,000,000 bushels of wheat and oats, 2,000,000 bushels of potatoes, 40,000,000 gallons of milk, 1,000,000 pounds of butter and wool, and 9,000,000 dozens of eggs—to mention only a few of our principal products.

Agriculture is mighty important to my district, contributing directly to the support of over 85,000 of my constituents. Indirectly it supports the entire social and economic fabric of every resident of every city, village, and hamlet in my district.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the citizens of northeastern Indiana take more than casual interest in Government policies and programs which affect—favorably or unfavorably—the welfare of the American farmer.

I believe that this interest should be encouraged, and it is the purpose of these remarks to present some facts and figures concerning a Government program—the trade-agreements program—about which I want my constituents to be more fully informed.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to produce large quantities of farm products, as the farmers of my district are doing, and quite another to find profitable markets for them. In recent years, with farm income at a shameful level and vast surpluses accumulating, it has become increasingly difficult to find such markets.

One reason for this is that the American market—our home market—no longer belongs to the American farmer. Gradually but surely it is being turned over to the farmers of other nations.

Who is to blame? The finger of guilt points directly to our own Federal Government. The trade-agreements program, fostered by the New Deal, has permitted foreign countries to import farm products—many of them duty free—at starvation prices in direct competition with our own.

In other words, while the Government is paying billions of dollars to our farmers to curtail surplus crops, it is at the same time encouraging the importation of vast quantities of these same surplus crops from abroad. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

FACTS REFUTE CLAIMS OF THE NEW DEALERS

New dealers have made persistent efforts to convince our farmers that they are being benefited by the trade-agreements program and that our imports of farm products are so trifling as to render them unimportant. The facts, however, tell a different story.

During the fiscal years of 1937 and 1938 our imports of competitive farm products averaged $537,198,000 annually. The average acreage under cultivation in the United States during these years was 341,475,000 acres; the average value of crops grown per acre was $16.02; and the acreage displaced by competitive farm imports for the period was 33,533,000 acres per year.

Does that seem like an unimportant matter?

The value of all crops grown in my congressional district during 1938 was only $16,000,000—or less than 3 percent of this amount. For the entire State of Indiana the figure was less than $165,000,000.

During 1938 the total value of all crops grown in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia was only $533,014,000. These figures, of course, refer only to crops grown, not livestock products, in the States named.

Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, summed this situation up in a recent radio speech, as follows:

> The land on American farms that has been displaced by competitive imports is larger than the reduction in acreage that has been brought about since 1933 in connection with the corn- and cotton-control program. So it will be seen that while the Government, under the guise of soil conservation, is paying the farmers of the country approximately $500,000,000 a year to reduce acreage and production, under the trade-agreements program, it is not only permitting but actually encouraging competitive imports of farm products valued at the same amount. * * * In view of all these facts it should be agreed that agricultural conditions would greatly improve if the American market were given more largely to the American farmer.

HOW THE NEW DEAL HAS ROBBED INDIANA FARMERS OF THEIR MARKETS

Mr. Speaker, to impress more clearly on the farmers of my district the significance of these competitive imports, and to illustrate how their markets have been taken away from them, I have prepared a table showing the average annual yield of principal farm products in the eight counties I represent—Allen, Adams, De Kalb, Lagrange, Noble, Steuben, Wells, and Whitley.

I am now going to give import figures for some of these crops and suggest that they compare them with the figures in the table, which appears below.

First let us consider corn, the No. 1 crop in my district and in the State of Indiana. In 1931, before the trade-agreement program went into effect, we imported only 335,000 bushels of corn. In 1936, however, under the trade-agreement program, we imported 86,000,000 bushels of corn—255 times as much. There is no better corn country in America than northeastern Indiana, but it would take my farmers more than 12 years to produce that amount of corn.

Not counting hay, which is largely used on the farm, wheat is the next largest crop in my district. What has happened to the American wheat market? In 1938, wheat imports totaled 3,829,000 bushels. The following year—1939—wheat imports rose 280 percent, as the American market was glutted with 10,747,000 bushels of foreign wheat.

The next largest crop in my district is oats. Two years ago—in 1938—our imports of oats totaled only 7,183 bushels, a comparatively small amount. But 1939 was a different story. In this year our home market was flooded with 4,293,000 bushels of oats, with severe detriment to our oat farmers.

Here are some other startling import figures:

In 1938 we imported 126,000 bushels of barley; in 1939, 776,000 bushels. In 1938 we imported 45,820,000 pounds of potatoes; in 1939, 93,859,000 pounds. In 1938 we imported 104,274,000 pounds of raw wool; in 1939, 245,970,000 pounds. In 1934 we imported 59,000 head of cattle; in 1939, 753,570 head. In 1932 we imported 34,000 pounds of pork; in 1937, 16,500,000 pounds.

These are all products of the Fourth Indiana District, all produced in large quantities under American cost standards. At one time they were sold on the American market at a fair price. Today they are sold at far below the cost of production in direct competition with low-cost foreign products.

THE AMERICAN FARMER HAS BEEN SOLD DOWN THE RIVER

Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that the New Deal has sold the American farmer down the river. I submit that the above facts substantiate this charge. The American farmer—the thrifty farmer of my congressional district—has been robbed of his just rights. His rich home market has been wrested from him and no new markets have been found to replace it. The protection he once received from a sympathetic Government has vanished.

Is it any wonder that farm prices have remained below parity or cost of production during the 7 New Deal years? Is it any wonder that our farmers are still suffering from the depression?

In this connection it is interesting to recall that in 1932 President Roosevelt, in a desperate bid for the farm vote, solemnly promised American farmers that he would protect their home market from the disastrous effects of cheap foreign competition by maintaining protective tariff rates on competitive farm products. In one of his campaign speeches he said:

> I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

That promise, along with many other preelection promises, was conveniently forgotten. As part of his good-neighbor policy toward foreign farmers, the President, through trade agreements, has drastically reduced tariff duties on 163 competitive farm products, and has invited foreign producers to flood the American market with products cheaply produced on foreign soil.

A partial list of foreign farm imports upon which duties have been reduced 25 to 50 percent under the New Deal includes: Corn, oats, barley, rye, potatoes, cattle, hogs, pork, bacon, milk, cream, cheese, chickens, ducks, turkeys, eggs, apples, berries, clover, alfalfa, and cabbages, to mention only a few.

All of these products are produced by farmers in the Fourth Indiana District, and all are produced in surplus quantities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 19,500 Hoosier farm owners and operators I have the honor to represent in Congress, I demand that the New Deal return the American market, the richest and best in the world, to the people who developed it—the American people.

Yield of principal farm products in 8 counties of Fourth Indiana District for an average year

Product	Unit	Allen	Adams	DeKalb	LaGrange	Noble	Steuben	Wells	Whitley	Total
Wheat	Bushel	598,367	350,655	481,474	420,477	485,202	278,640	211,220	241,679	3,067,714
Oats	Bushel	945,118	344,509	456,275	180,938	291,607	172,617	300,026	238,811	2,929,901
Barley	Bushel	2,478	470	3,676	3,434	2,669	8,261	200	1,400	22,588
Rye	Bushel	12,736	3,512	16,099	25,764	12,735	14,144	1,477	9,733	96,200
Mixed grains	Bushel	6,429	740	1,908	820	2,709	4,270	1,233	852	18,961
Hay	Ton	50,072	30,925	30,735	22,247	27,088	24,949	26,914	20,330	233,260
Corn	Bushel	2,044,882	778,503	843,735	416,319	831,914	400,497	1,206,780	752,073	7,274,846
Sugar beets	Ton	24,969	11,459					5,318		41,746
Potatoes	Bushel	339,002	55,945	458,100	139,037	310,747	271,541	51,203	212,829	1,838,404
Soybeans	Bushel	42,830	45,350	5,321	1,267	3,822	1,163	91,147	11,132	202,032
Milk	Gallon	7,855,767	5,504,555	5,247,570	5,243,587	4,860,045	4,277,832	4,453,562	4,285,967	41,728,885
Butter	Pound	337,919	117,999	126,870	34,969	105,938	61,907	91,136	122,949	999,687
Eggs	Dozen	1,580,117	1,326,192	1,039,072	947,437	879,869	714,222	1,074,930	1,146,330	8,708,169
Wool	Pound	161,114	76,638	131,965	110,817	124,656	143,992	104,270	99,067	952,579
Apples	Bushel	89,355	22,438	41,427	32,281	29,243	20,619	14,240	28,965	278,550
Cherries	Bushel	2,543	900	1,413	1,459	2,514	1,629	440	939	11,837
Peaches	Bushel	1,156	620	832	2,239	3,127	433	288	1,381	10,076
Pears	Bushel	18,977	8,364	10,966	5,215	6,965	3,908	11,772	4,564	70,731
Grapes	Pound	484,293	126,557	88,291	94,484	135,035	53,963	86,167	45,808	1,114,594

Source: United States Census of Agriculture for 1935.

Exports and Imports of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 the Democratic Party condemned the Republicans for having "ruined our foreign trade," and pledged themselves "to bring the Nation back to the proud position of domestic happiness and financial, industrial, agricultural, and commercial leadership in the world."

Eight years later, in 1940, we find that our foreign trade, instead of progressively improving, has steadily deteriorated under New Deal policies. The seriousness of this is forcefully brought home when one realizes that a sound economy is essential to adequate defense and preparedness.

According to the Department of Agriculture, domestic agricultural exports in 1939 were valued at $655,000,000, compared with $662,000,000 in 1932, a decrease of 1 percent. Imports of competitive agricultural products, however, were valued at $526,000,000 in 1939, compared with $296,000,000 in 1932, an increase of 77.7 percent. As a consequence, in 1939 competitive agricultural imports were 80 percent of domestic agricultural exports, compared with only 45 percent in 1932.

United States foreign trade in agricultural products, 1932–39

Year ended Dec. 31—	Domestic agricultural exports	Competitive agricultural imports [1]	Competitive imports as percentage of agricultural exports
			Percent
1932	$662,000,000	$296,000,000	45
1933	694,000,000	365,000,000	53
1934	733,000,000	413,000,000	56
1935	747,000,000	589,000,000	79
1936	709,000,000	695,000,000	98
1937	797,000,000	868,000,000	109
1938	828,000,000	477,000,000	58
1939 (preliminary)	655,000,000	526,000,000	80

[1] Competitive agricultural imports include all agricultural imports that are similar to agricultural commodities commercially produced in the United States, or that are interchangeable to any significant extent with such United States commodities.

Compiled from Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

INCREASED FARM IMPORTS

During the last 7 years the New Deal has been trying to make progress by going in all directions. While its inconsistencies are many, there is perhaps no greater inconsistency than that of its domestic agricultural policy and its foreign trade policy. The New Deal farm program operates in such a way as to impede the free movement of American farm surpluses to the markets of the world. The reciprocal trade-agreement program, on the other hand, operates so as to open our great industrial markets to the surplus products of other countries.

According to the Department of Agriculture, imports of supplementary farm products, or products that are similar to those produced in the United States, have increased from 296 million dollars in 1932 to 526 million dollars in 1939, or 77.7 percent.

Imports of cheese have increased from 12.1 million dollars in 1932 to 12.8 million dollars in 1939, or 5.8 percent.

Imports of vegetable oils increased from 29.1 million dollars in 1932 to 50.9 million dollars in 1939, or 75 percent.

Imports of flaxseed increased from 5 million dollars in 1932 to 18.4 million dollars in 1939, or 268 percent.

Imports of molasses increased from 5.8 million dollars in 1932 to 8.2 million dollars in 1939, or 41 percent.

Imports of wool increased from 2.8 million dollars in 1932 to 23.9 million dollars in 1939, or 750 percent.

Imports of unmanufactured cotton increased from 5 million dollars in 1932 to 8.3 million dollars in 1939, or 66 percent.

Imports of canned beef, including corned beef, increased from 2.1 million dollars in 1932 to 8.6 million dollars in 1939, or 310 percent.

Imports of cattle (dutiable) have increased from 1.5 million dollars in 1932 to 20.2 million dollars in 1939, or 1,250 percent.

Imports of hides and skins increased from 22.4 million dollars in 1932 to 46.6 million dollars in 1939, or 108 percent.

Imports of sugar increased from 95.8 million dollars in 1932 to 124.6 million dollars in 1939, or 30 percent.

Imports of unmanufactured tobacco have increased from 27.3 million dollars in 1932 to 36.9 million dollars in 1939, or 35 percent.

Imports of nuts have increased from 10.2 million dollars in 1932 to 14.5 million dollars in 1939, or 42 percent.

Imports of fodders and feeds have increased from 2.3 million dollars in 1932 to 11.3 million dollars in 1939, or 395 percent.

Imports of wheat, corn, and barley malt have also increased.

FOREIGN TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

A major objective of the New Deal was to increase foreign markets for our surplus agricultural products. The New Deal has not only failed to achieve this objective but has also failed to keep the markets that were already ours. According to the Department of Agriculture, total exports of all commodities have increased from 1,576 million dollars in 1932 to 3,123 million dollars in 1939, or 98 percent. Agricultural exports, however, dropped from 662 million dollars in 1932 to 655 million dollars in 1939, or 1 percent.

As indicated in the following table, farm exports were 42 percent of total exports in 1932 and only 21 percent in 1939.

Export value: Agricultural compared with all commodities, 1932–39

Year ended Dec. 31—	All commodities	Total agricultural exports	Percentage, total agricultural, of all commodities
			Percent
1932	$1,576,000,000	$662,000,000	42
1933	1,647,000,000	694,000,000	42
1934	2,100,000,000	733,000,000	35
1935	2,243,000,000	747,000,000	33
1936	2,419,000,000	709,000,000	29
1937	3,299,000,000	797,000,000	24
1938	3,057,000,000	828,000,000	27
1939 [1]	3,123,000,000	655,000,000	21

[1] Preliminary.

Compiled from Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Data are for domestic exports.

Mannerheim's Heroic Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when the illustrious deeds of all military history are written in the book of time, I am certain that high up on its pages will be written the epic of the gallant fight against overwhelming odds made by the soldiers of the Republic of Finland in its war against Russian aggression. We all of us know the thrill that came to our hearts, when, day after day, the dispatches told of the brave and almost superhuman feats of this small army, outnumbered 40 to 1.

Then, with the coming of peace, a hard peace, we have seen this same nation turn resolutely to the tasks of reconstruction. The Christian fortitude which this people have displayed should be at once an inspiration and a challenge to us here in America, who face perilous times in a maelstrom of European war.

Under leave granted me, Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks the stirring and inspiring message to the soldiers of Finland

issued by General Baron Mannerheim on the fateful March 14, following the signing of a compulsory peace with the Soviet. This message should live in history; it breathes the free spirit of a people who remain free and independent, who have preserved their democracy, preserved their institutions, preserved their religion, and preserved, above all, their souls.

FIELD MARSHAL MANNERHEIM'S ORDER OF THE DAY TO THE ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1940

Soldiers of Finland's glorious army! Peace has been concluded between our country and Soviet Russia. It is a hard peace, giving Russia practically every battlefield on which you have shed your blood for all that you hold dear and sacred. You did not want war. You loved peace, work, and progress. But the fight was forced upon you, and the deeds you have performed will shine for centuries in the annals of history.

More than 15,000 of you who went out will not see your homes again, and how many are they who have not lost forever their ability to work? But you have hit back hard, and if 200,000 of the enemy now lie beneath the frozen snows or with sightless gaze contemplate our starry skies, the blame does not lie with you. You did not hate them. You wished them no harm. You merely followed the stern law of war—to kill or die.

Soldiers, I have fought on many battlefields, but never yet have I seen your equals. I am proud of you, just as if you were my own children; equally proud of him from the northern tundras, of him from the broad plains of East Bothnia, from the Karelian woods, from Savo's villages. I am proud of those who come from the flourishing farms of Häme and Satakunta; of those from the whispering birchwoods of Uusimaa and Finland proper.

Officers and men, I thank you all. But I particularly wish to draw attention to the courage and devotion to duty of the reserve officers, and the skill with which they carried out a work which normally was not theirs. Also their sacrifice was in proportion the greatest in the war and given gladly and with unswerving loyalty.

I thank the staff officers for their ability and untiring work. Finally I thank my nearest colleagues—the chief of the general staff, the quartermaster general, the Army commanders, the corps and divisional commanders—who in many cases made the impossible possible.

I thank all the services of the Finnish Army, who in brilliant combat achieved such fine exploits and who, from the first day of the war, went with great boldness to the attack on an enemy many times stronger and armed with untried weapons. I thank them for the tenacity with which they clung to every inch of soil of their native land. The destruction of more than 1,500 Russian tanks and over 700 airplanes bears witness to the heroic deeds frequently performed by individual men.

With joy and pride I think of Finland's Lotta Svärd and of their contribution to the war, their spirit of sacrifice and untiring work in all branches, thus liberating thousands of men for the front line. With their courageous spirit they supported and stirred on the army whose gratitude and appreciation they fully earned.

A place of honor has been filled by the thousands of workers who, during the bitterest days of the war, and under air attacks, faithfully and often as volunteers, remained at their work producing the necessities of war; and also those who under enemy fire untiringly worked on the fortifications. In the name of our country I thank you all.

Despite all courage and the will to sacrifice, the Government has been forced to make a peace on hard terms. This nevertheless has its explanation.

Our army, including reserves, was insufficient; we were not equipped for a war with a great power. While our brave soldiers were defending our frontier, it was necessary with superhuman efforts to make up the deficiencies, to create a line of defense which before did not exist, and to seek the help which did not arrive. It was a question of getting arms and equipment, at a time when our country was feverishly preparing for the storm which is now sweeping over the world.

Your deeds have aroused admiration the whole world over; but after three and a half months of war we still stand alone. We did not succeed in obtaining any foreign aid, except for two battalions reinforced by some artillery and airplanes, whilst our own troops, fighting day and night, without a chance of relief, stood up to the attacks of every new enemy formation till long past physical and moral breaking point.

When at last the history of this war is written the world will see what deeds you have performed.

Without the generous help of ammunition and equipment given by Sweden and the western powers we could not have withstood for so long the innumerable guns, tanks, and airplanes which were thrown against us. Unfortunately, the splendid promise of help given us by the Western Powers could not be fulfilled, owing to our neighbors' concern for their own safety. They refused the right of passage to the Allied troops.

After 16 weeks of fierce struggle, without resting day or night, our army stands today unbeaten by an enemy which, in spite of enormous losses, has only grown in numbers.

Neither has our home front wavered, despite the innumerable air attacks which have spread death and terror among our women and children.

Our towns, which have been burned down, our villages lying far behind the front, even as far back as the western frontier, are a striking witness of what our people have had to undergo during the past months.

It is a hard fate for us now that we have been obliged to give up to a race, which is foreign and of a different philosophy and moral standards, land which we tilled for centuries by the sweat of our brow.

We will spare no effort to provide homes and better living conditions within the remaining territories for all those whose houses and property have been ruined.

And we will be prepared as before to defend our diminished mother country with the same determination and strength with which we fought for her undivided.

We have the proud knowledge that we have a historic mission to fulfill: To protect the western civilization which for centuries has been part of our heritage. We also know that we have paid to the last penny that debt which we have owed to the west.

MANNERHEIM.

America Prepare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL EXERCISES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] at the Confederate memorial exercises, Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, June 2, 1940, on the subject, America Prepare.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is fitting that we meet to pay our reverent tribute to the Confederate dead; not merely because an hour set apart for this memorial has come again in the regular succession of days, but also because the time itself draws us to the contemplation of their lives. We shall be strengthened and fortified for the patriotic duties which lie ahead of us by reflection upon the glorious sacrifices which they made for the ideals they cherished unto death. The spirit which made them immortal must be our spirit. It led them to death upon the field of battle, but it will lead us to life; to a life of freedom and liberty for ourselves and our descendants; to a life of peace and security in a world gone mad.

The first lesson which we, as their heirs of destiny, must learn is the lesson of sacrifice. A man cannot give to his country in its time of need in niggardly fashion. He must give without stint and without reservation. He cannot set a price or a condition upon his patriotism: it is a thing without price and beyond all condition. Our country has given to us, her children, more bounteously than any other nation upon the face of the earth. To be worthy of her we must give of ourselves more generously, more grandly, more gloriously than any other peoples upon the earth. To do less would prove our unworthiness, would demonstrate that a glorious heritage of valor has dwindled to a pitiable pittance of patriotism.

It is the habit of the unreflecting to look upon the events of the present and exclaim, "Strange things are abroad; new terrors such as the world has never seen stalk upon defenseless people." Such is not the case. Conquerors have ravaged inoffensive peoples since the dawn of history. Traitors have sold their country for a price, and patriots have made vain sacrifices since time began. Peace-loving peoples have been subdued by ruthless invaders and high civilizations trampled underfoot never to rise again. We need not go beyond the limits of our own hemisphere to find terrible examples. Mexico and Peru were overrun by invaders, better equipped with the instruments of war. The civilization of the Mayas and the Incas vanished from the earth. Their science and their knowledge perished with them, and all that remains are strange monuments with inscriptions we cannot read and the names of their heroes and their gods which linger in our memories and evoke a faint and momentary pity.

Their fate has for us a tragic lesson. That lesson is also exemplified in the lives of those Confederate soldiers whose memories we commemorate. It is a lesson all nations must learn on peril of their lives. It teaches us that courageous hearts alone are of no avail against superior instruments of war. Courage without material resources cannot win against a foe abundantly supplied with all the engines of war. The South had a courage that was sublime. Yet the South, from the beginning, despite the courage

of its soldiers and the transcendent genius of Lee and of Jackson, was foredoomed to lose the War between the States. Lacking the material resources, it faced an impossible task.

But it is not enough to be blessed by nature with the raw materials out of which the instrumentalities of war can be forged. These raw materials must be turned by human labor and advanced science into the weapons of war. That transformation cannot be wrought in a day. It requires long physical effort and concentrated thought. It is a task so colossal that we in America are fortunate in having as our leader a man who appreciates completely the effort that the United States must make if it is to live.

A failure to appreciate the magnitude of the task confronting them is responsible for the plight of England and France today. A nation cannot prepare to defend itself half-heartedly. One does not go to war delicately. To win wars one must prepare for war with all one's power, all one's strength, and all one's soul.

England and France, and I mean the people of England and France, the men in the streets, the workers in the fields, the toilers in the factories and mines, failed to realize that one supreme task confronted them. As a result they were all too slow in girding themselves for war. Their adversary was making ready, openly, arrogantly, yea contemptuously, for 7 years while the prospective victims of that preparation gave it insufficient heed. It was somehow beyond their ability to comprehend.

Lesser nations lived within the shadow of the growing monster and trusted too long in the principles of right and justice for their defense. They could almost hear the jangle of the war-making machinery and some of them no doubt could see the black plumes floating over the great factories forging the tools of war, but somehow they never grasped the terrible meaning of that tireless preparation. They were all too tardy in their counter-preparations, all too short of vision to combine their strength while they were free people that they might continue free.

The path of destiny was clear for them to see and they glimpsed it dimly or not at all. They heard but did not heed the rumblings of the storm. Those rumblings now come to us. Shall we heed them while yet there is time or shall we disregard them and suffer by default the destruction of all that we cherish?

We meet to honor the memory of great soldiers. I should be unworthy of the honor you have done me if I did not speak as those soldiers would have me speak. If they could rise from their graves and speak again with the tongue of the living they would not pause to seek out loved ones; with one voice they would cry out, those men in gray, those men in blue, "America, prepare!"

I can hear them now, the valiant dead, crying out to us to be valiant, to cherish and defend. I hear America make answer, "We shall cherish. We shall defend."

Just as a nation cannot live half slave and half free, so the world cannot live half slave and half free. Just as a man cannot serve two masters, so the world cannot serve two warring ideals. Those who worship brute force must inevitably come to hate those who cherish the Christian ideals of justice, temperance, and mercy. The world is too small today to contain such antagonistic faiths.

No longer do we live in a world of pleasant dreams. The clank of the tanks and the wail of the sirens have shattered our dreams. Let us face reality in a world of grim realities. The love of peace does not give any guaranty of its possession. Respect for the rights of others does not guarantee that others will respect our rights. The only guaranty of our security is in the might of our strong right hands.

In that might I have confidence. We in America have the capacity to match strength with strength, and invention against invention. The material resources are at hand. The spiritual resources are abundant in the great soul of the American people. The peril is great but the power to meet it is far greater.

The scientific progress of man has made the world small; that progress turned to war has placed the world in peril; that progress turned to defense by American hands will bring the world to safety. We have in America the foremost scientists of the world. Those scientists must forge greater and more improved weapons of defense than Germany has forged for offense. We must think in terms of the motorized, electric world of today. We must use our imaginations. Time no longer moves slowly. It travels on the wings of the morning and those who are slow in awakening to its speed awaken to a state of slavery. Distance has shrunk to an ineffective obstacle and months have been compressed into days, yea, into a matter of hours. Destruction strikes like the lightning and death rages like a hurricane. We must visualize all the possibilities of offensive and defensive action and utilize them with audacity. We have done it before. We can do it again.

The strife which gave us the heroes whose memory we cherish produced inventions which changed the art of war. The invention of the Monitor and the Merrimac revolutionized naval construction throughout the world. The wooden ship of war became a useless thing.

The development of trench warfare had its origin in the defenses of the soldiers who sleep so near at hand.

The "blitzkrieg" of today is the cavalry of J. E. B. Stuart and Nathan Bedford Forrest mounted upon the mechanical horses of this modern age.

I, for one, do not attribute to the Germans of today the qualities of supermen. The Allies made the disastrous mistake of thinking in terms of the past. Those who triumph must think in terms of the present—and the future. Action is a rule of life; it is an inexorable rule of war. Warriors do not conquer by digging holes in the ground and hiding in them.

Neither can governments hide from their obligations. The citizen chafing under the deficiencies and delinquencies of his government is a ready recruit for the "fifth column" which has played so great a part in the present war. But contented men do not revolt; satisfied citizens do not become traitors. Agitators and organizers, Fascists and Communists, can make no real converts among men and women who feel their government is a good government, a just government, an enlightened government.

During the past 7 years great progress has been made by our Government in the discharge of its duties toward all the people, the helpless, the poor, and the underprivileged. That progress and the steps leading to it must not be forgotten or cast aside.

We are not, we can never be a nation of classes. We are not and we can never be a nation in which the North, the South, the East, and the West feel themselves a section apart. In all truth the interest of one is the interest of all. Injustices and discriminations between sections should not be sought and cannot be tolerated. We as a nation face one problem. We must face it as one nation.

And so to the men and women of America, to the executive in his office, the manufacturer in his plant, the farmer in his fields, and the toilers and laborers of America, wherever they may toil, I say, "Give—give of yourself; give of your life—and give freely. The hour of your greatness is upon you. May your spirits rise and stand above all selfish things."

And to you, the youth of America, the hope of today and of tomorrow and all the tomorrows hereafter, to you, young men in the glory of your strength and the splendor of your spirit, I say, come forward and gird yourselves for the defense of your country. And may the glory of your achievements reflect the grandeur and the glory of the noblest human spirit. The greatest call, the greatest opportunity of the ages is for you. I hear your answer to that call and my faith is strengthened—justice and mercy shall not perish from the earth—the light our fathers kindled shall not be darkened.

Leading From the Rear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 3, 1940:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 3, 1940]

LEADING FROM THE REAR

An astonishing phenomenon of the national-defense crisis is the sluggishness with which Washington is following in the wake of public opinion.

The leaders of the administration and Congress aren't leading at all; they are being dragged along. For some reason they can't shake loose the fixed notion that they must stroke the voters gently in this election year. They haven't yet realized that this is one quadrennial when "politics as usual" won't go.

Congressional leaders of both parties, at the behest of the administration, lay plans to complete a minimum of legislation and adjourn for the conventions and the campaigning. Yet the common run of Senators and Representatives, who read their mail more closely than the veteran leaders do, testify that the people back home are urging them to stay on the job. That is exactly the sentiment one should expect from a people who believe in democratic government and want to see it meet the stern test of the times. But apparently the lawmakers, or at least the leaders, didn't expect any such reaction, and now can't believe that it is real. Anyhow, they are getting ready to quit—as always when June weather comes to the Potomac.

Nor can the lawmakers believe their eyes when they read constituents' letters and public-opinion polls showing that the people are ready, yea, eager, to pay taxes to make the Government financially strong. For too many years, in response to pressure groups, these legislators have been voting money which the Government didn't have for things that weren't essential.

They can't appreciate how profoundly shocked the people have been by the discovery that, despite all the billions spent in recent years, the Nation's defenses are in such poor order that America's voice carries little weight in a world where force alone counts. Not understanding how determined the American people have suddenly become to correct this condition, administration and congressional leaders are trying to slip up on the blind side of the public with a tax bill which would touch the minimum number of pocketbook nerves and raise only a fraction of the revenue needed. The bill provides a 10-percent boost in all income taxes

and in some sales taxes, with steeper increases in other excises. It would increase by 10 percent or more all the inequities in the present tax structure and, as usual, would get the bulk of the revenue by invisible taxes, levied without regard to ability to pay. The leaders don't pretend that this is an adequate tax bill, or even a fair one. They merely say that it is a measure they can pass quickly and go home. If they do, we'll bet they'll wish they hadn't.

Unless all the straws in the wind are misleading, Congressmen who go home without doing their duty are going to face some embarrassing questions. The country is united as it has seldom been in history—united in its determination that our defenses shall be made impregnable, regardless of the cost; that the Government's credit shall be made strong, whatever the sacrifices; that idle men and dollars shall be put to work to revitalize industry, no matter how many heads or pet political ideas are cracked in the process.

A lot of politicians who are still playing the game according to the old rules of avoidance and evasion are going to get hurt this election year. The "gimme" game has played out. An aroused patriotism is going to the polls.

Responsibilities of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK, AT SEVENTH REGIMENT ARMORY, NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me and carried over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. at 8:15 p. m. Sunday evening, June 2, 1940. This address was delivered at the Seventh Regiment Armory in New York City in connection with this year's observance of Young Citizens' Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am extremely happy to be here this evening and to join with you in this impressive observation of Young Citizens' Day. I congratulate those in charge of planning this occasion, and I extend to all of you my heartiest, my most sincere greeting.

This is an appropriate occasion and an appropriate hour to bring to you here and to you who may be at your radios as I speak some thoughts about the responsibilities of devoted American citizens in the emergency we now face.

We are the last bulwark of freedom left in the world that is not engaged in a Titanic struggle to preserve its way of life. There is not a capital in the whole of continental Europe that enjoys the peace that prevails at Washington. It is our responsibility to hold fast and firm to the blessings which we enjoy. As we insure our property, our homes, our communities by adequate police and fire protection, so, too, will we protect our shores from invasion that precedes destruction.

There is no longer room for doubt that our progress along the pathway of peace requires vast additions to our military defense. We are going immediately to work in providing those necessary weapons of defense. We have the wealth, the resources, and the industrial ability to produce the material requirements that are necessary for our adequate national protection.

But I say to you that our most serious enemy will not be the tanks, deadly gases, the flame throwers, nor the airplane bomber, nor any of the other terrifying implements of modern war. If we are made vulnerable to assault, it will be because we have failed to strengthen, to solidify, and to adequately provide the defenses of loyalty, of tolerance, of neighborliness, and of good will among our own people.

Here in America we must continue to educate ourselves in the strength and unity which comes from living side by side in peace and understanding. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that there are forces operating today in this country to arouse animosities among our people.

There are sworn enemies of our free system of government at work in our midst. Let us abolish those subversive forces. Let us erase them from our land. Let us clean our body politic of corrosive elements which impede and thwart the processes of representative government. Let us be good neighbors in every sense of the word. To be good neighbors we require unity, loyalty, and patriotic devotion.

The children of England, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, and other lands who settled this Nation, who built its communities, and who served in its wars, are devoted to its democratic ideals.

Regardless of religious affiliation or of racial ancestry, we must all stand shoulder to shoulder in a united aim to defend the principles of equal justice for both the big and the small, for the weak and the strong. We must not be pro-Ally, pro-British, pro-German, or pro-anything but pro-American in this crisis.

If such is our faith, it follows that we must not assume the role of a complacent, self-satisfied citizen, lulled into the inertia of slumbering half-interest.

We dare not leave the arena of human rights to the demagogue, to the subversive critic, or to the advocate of intolerance, thinking him to be a harmless nuisance. Not if our eyes, ears, and minds are alert to the grim realities of today; not if we remember that democracy is not saved by laws and by implements of war alone. But, by those who will speak for it, live for it, and, if need be, defend it against attacks from within and from without.

Our security and our stability, as a representative government, requires effectiveness in national leadership and unity among all of our people. We must not turn our backs to the domestic problems which confront the Nation, nor must we blind ourselves to what could happen in the future at the hands of those who are unfriendly to our way of life.

I am warning against the inevitable; I am advocating that we be prepared in every manner against the unpredictable. We know not what lies ahead. There is uncertainty in the minds and hearts of all free people. The apprehension grows day by day as the ruthless march of the totalitarian leadership continues. Our continent must be made safe from attacks. By land, by sea, and by air. Our people must be made secure in their lives and in their homes.

As we build strong and invulnerable our military lines of defense, let us, also, be sure that we are not permitting any Trojan horse or "fifth column" to develop under the advantages and liberties of our happy system.

We must say to our subversive critics that "If my Government means anything to me, it means that its philosophy is broad enough to protect every man in his right of political opinion; every man in his liberty of speech; and every man in his freedom of religious worship."

But we must insist that, if our democracy is to work, then the springs of liberty must not be polluted with the poison of hate, covered with the slime of proscription, or drugged with the spirit of intolerance.

We may proudly declare that here in America we oppose regimentation, we respect our democratic heritage, and we reject prejudice and persecution as panaceas to be fed to hungry and desperate men.

I exhort you to persevere with all your might and main in the defense of American institutions and in the defense of democracy as we know and enjoy it. Culture, religion, and civilization depend upon your perseverance.

You must join with all the fervor and enthusiasm of genuine patriots to forge new instruments and new methods to combat the blindness of the partisan, the passion of the jingoist, the vengeance of the bigot.

Through religion, education, understanding, and fraternalism increased unity, loyalty, and neighborliness will be achieved.

Here we live in peace and brotherhood with all our neighbors. All races, creeds, and colors can find advantage and opportunity, equality and independence, dignity and happiness within our shores. A preservation of those rights and privileges has been made possible under our free system of government. Political, social, and religious difficulties abroad should make us ever more deeply appreciative of the liberties that are ours to enjoy.

Let us say again and again that we believe in democracy. Let us repeat for all the world to hear that we believe in defending the right of man to follow the dictates of his own conscience. Let us, by action and accomplishment, demonstrate, with unmistakable emphasis, that we subscribe to a philosophy which permits and encourages freedom of rational personal and public independence in thought and in action.

I ask you to live and breathe the genuine spirit of democracy. I ask you to typify, by word and deed, the embodiment of true American principle. I ask you never to forget that American democracy stands for the enthronement of law and equity, the preservation of free Government, the right to individual liberty, the education of the poor and unfortunate, the establishment of free institutions, and the protection of life and property. I ask you to constantly sow the healthful seed of good, loyal, patriotic citizenship. With such diligence, with ample safeguards, and with a fundamental faith in our doctrine of representative government, we will be able to nip any sporadic fly-by-night movement which may arise to plague, to threaten, or to undermine our America.

The plea I make tonight is a plea for loyalty to the democratic system on the part of all our people. I cannot too fervently appeal for genuine internal loyalty which will strike at the very heart and banish from this fortunate land those who are unfriendly to the American way. After all, this is our America. This is our way of life. This is all we have striven for, fought for, and defended through a century and a half of a democratic development. We must say to the enemy of our system that we will never permit dissipation from within of the strength which upholds and supports the structure of our Republic.

Loyalty, devotion to principle, and a firmness of opposition to the enemies in our midst is the way to perpetuate, against all odds, the American philosophy of life. To uphold and to support our President, regardless of partisan considerations, is the order of the

day. Loyalty to American principles, support of our national leadership, faith in the democratic system, will keep America safe and will guarantee to our people the peaceful pursuit of happiness and opportunity which we, above all else, desire.

Acquisition of French and British Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I introduced House Joint Resolution 482 for acquisition of British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras. On April 10 I introduced House Joint Resolution 511 for acquisition of French islands in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic Ocean. Similar measures were introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ROBERT REYNOLDS, of North Carolina. Later Senator REYNOLDS and myself spoke on this subject through the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Sentiment for these proposals has been growing recently. In this connection I include an editorial from the Sunday Times, of Chicago, of June 2, 1940:

[From the Chicago Sunday Times, June 2, 1940]

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE ISLANDS

No one is seriously concerned over the idea of Herr Hitler and friends settling down in the Western Hemisphere by virtue of taking over certain properties now belonging to Great Britain, France, and Holland. The reason we're not much concerned is because we are universally agreed that we'll never permit it to happen—couldn't permit it.

That's well and good as far as it goes. But there hasn't been much specific push to ways and means to make sure "it can't happen here." The suggestion has been advanced in these columns and in other quarters that we take over all Western Hemisphere British and French possessions in part or full settlement of the debt hanging over from World War I.

This idea has received no official attention that's been publicized. Senator KEY PITTMAN was quoted as saying that "it is too early for discussion" of such a move. With that contention we disagree. There should be much public discussion. Official action will follow public sentiment. It is certainly time to have a program as to what we're going to do in case it becomes necessary for us to act.

Simply the physical aspects of taking over the possessions, either "protectively" or as owners, present a task of great magnitude. They are scattered from Miquelon, a French island off Newfoundland, 1,000 miles northeast of New York, to the Falklands, some 7,000 miles southeast of the same city.

Few realize how many of these French-British-Dutch possessions there are in the American half of the world.

ISLANDS GALORE ARE INVOLVED IN PROBLEM

On the continental mainland there are British Honduras, British, French, and Dutch Guiana. The islands are almost innumerable. Bermuda, lying due east of Charleston, S. C., is probably the best known. Then there are the Bahamas. These stretch in a long line from a point only 75 miles east of Palm Beach down past the coast of Cuba almost to Haiti. These are all British.

Next are the Leewards. These swing in an almost perfect arc halfway to Venezuela, and the Windwards complete the half-circle to Trinidad, almost touching South America. French, British, and Dutch possession of these are indiscriminately mingled.

Within the Caribbean itself—that is, between Cuba and Central America—are the Caymans and Jamaica—British. Further south, just above Venezuela, are Curacao, Aruba, and Bonaire—Dutch.

All of these are distinctly American islands, geographically speaking. But there are some others not so distinctly American about which we may be concerned. Due east of the outthrust shoulder of Brazil, almost exactly halfway to Africa, is the British island of Ascension. It is a miserable, worthless spot—but it is a possible naval and air base. To whom shall it belong if Britain falls?

Some 700 miles southeast of Ascension is an island which once played host to a distinguished Frenchman who had the delusion that he was Hitler—St. Helena, now British. Some 1,200 miles further south is a forsaken cluster of three islands known collectively at Tristan Da Cunha. Yet farther south, over toward the tip of South America, are two more clusters—the South Sandwich group and the South Georgia group, both British.

JUDICIAL QUESTIONS PRESENT DIFFICULTY

That's the Atlantic set-up. We shall not go into such detail as to the situation in the South Pacific. Suffice it to say that there are equal complications there, offering potential threats to the west coast of South America and to the Panama Canal. Turning from the purely physical problem of assuming jurisdiction and protection over such a horde of islands, there's another aspect to consider. That's the legal side.

Suppose that Hitler's drive continues to meet the success it has to date—and the possibility can't be discounted—and that he forces a peace upon Great Britain which includes cession of all these territories. Presumably that's the point where we'd step in.

And whose territory would we be occupying? British? Oh, no. Nazi Germany's! International law differs from domestic in that agreements signed at the point of a gun are legal and binding. In the eyes of international law the transfer would be a valid one. And we, the law-abiding United States, would be in the position of an international burglar or highjacker. We would be taking territory by force of arms. We would have committed an act of war against Germany.

In the eyes of some it seems like picking on a man who's down to urge our Government to take this problem up with Britain now. But there is too much at stake for such quibbles. Britain has more to lose by not talking about it than by any agreement which might be reached, and our own safety is at stake.

Too early to discuss the matter? Senator PITTMAN would have been closer to the truth if he had said there's hardly time to discuss the subject before we may be forced to act upon it.

The Airplane in Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General, at the National Aviation Forum banquet, held at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 29, 1940. The subject of the address is The Airplane in Peace and War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a tragic moment in human history. The heartbreaking struggle across the ocean is laden with significance for people the world over. We hope, we maintain, that the United States can and will escape the catastrophe of total war. Certainly all Americans, regardless of party or faction, loathe war. No party and no leader of any party desires to see the United States enter the war. I think we can avoid war, and I am convinced we will avoid entering the conflict.

But we would be faithless to ourselves, to our children, and to our country if we neglected to prepare against the attack of any conceivable enemy or combination of enemies. The world has learned to its sorrow that peaceful and honorable purposes are no protection against invasion. We have seen peace-loving, industrious, intelligent nations endeavor to remain neutral in the face of great difficulty. Yet their preference for peace did not save them. They lived in countries which were barriers to a powerful military objective. They possessed resources essential to the success of an army that asserted its right to whatever it could take.

These free peoples were the victims of a new and dreadful technique of war based largely on the airplane. Just 36 years have passed since Wilbur and Orville Wright contrived the first mechanism that lifted men above the earth in flight. It is a long cry from that simple experiment on the sand dunes at Kitty Hawk to the masses of war planes that have emerged from the distant air to inflict terror and death upon armies and helpless people. The noble machine that lifted man's spirit and enabled him to soar is being appropriated for evil purposes.

We, more than any other people, have been enabled to enrich our lives by the resource of peaceful flight. The accomplishment of American aviation in transporting people, in carrying mail and goods, is one of the finest achievements of this era. We are just at the start of that chapter in human progress. The possibilities of future development of the use of airplanes in enriching the lives of men and women beggar the imagination.

Now, however, our thoughts are compelled to turn to plans for preparing ourselves against whatever danger the future may hold. We know, if we are capable of understanding, that no nation is safe unless able to defend itself. We know, as the President has so graphically pointed out, that even our interior cities are within easy flying distance of possible airplane bases that could be used by an aggressive invader.

We have goods and riches that are coveted by other nations. If we are vulnerable, we have no reason to expect consideration. If we want to retain our material possessions, if we want to continue to enjoy our cherished liberties, we must be strong enough to defend them successfully. More than that, we must be so strong that no nation, and no army, however well equipped, will dare to risk an attack upon us.

Make no mistake, we must prepare on a scale that up to recent weeks would have seemed fantastic. American airplanes have brought Europe within less than a day from our shores. It subtracts nothing from the honor of American manufacturers, American transport organizations, and American flyers to remember that other nations are also capable of building magnificent ships, and producing daring and skillful pilots.

I am no alarmist. I do not believe the United States is in imminent danger of invasion. I do not look under the bed before retiring at night to discover lurking spies or the camouflaged guards of a "fifth column." You, too, are not afraid. But you are sane and sensible. You know, as I know, that now more than in a long period of history, national weakness invites attack.

So I say with deep regret that the energies, the inventiveness, the treasure, the human energy that we should prefer, that you would prefer, to direct toward the enrichment of the lives of the average man and woman, must for the present be turned toward preparing ourselves to repel any possible invader. We want to be friends with all mankind. We plan to invade no nation. We covet nothing that belongs to another people; and we don't want to interfere with them in the exercise of their rights and the enjoyment of their liberties.

We tolerate differences of opinion. We desire to settle peacefully, justly, actual conflicts of interest. We know that such conflicts are inevitable. But I repeat, we do not intend to be made the victim of any invader. We intend to keep the United States safe and we do not propose to let any warlike power obtain a new base on American territory that might be used in the future to endanger the peace or safety of the people of this Nation.

We have the resources, we have the skill, we have the will to keep America safe for Americans and, unless I misread the minds of my fellow citizens, that is exactly what we are going to do.

I wish that events had permitted you, and me, as one of your speakers, to concentrate our thoughts on the achievements and the problems of civil aeronautics. The exhibits we have seen show how dramatically splendid are those achievements. You, whose lives are immersed in the business of bringing these miracles to pass, know well enough how intricate and how baffling are the problems.

I congratulate you on what you have accomplished, and I hope that destiny will permit us to proceed along the highroads of peace to even more glorious success.

"Fifth Column" and Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on June 1 the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], who, I regret to say, is shortly to leave the Senate to assume judicial duties, delivered a noteworthy address before the forty-second annual meeting of the New Jersey State Bar Association at Atlantic City, N. J. The subject of the address was most timely, "Fifth Column" and Civil Liberties. The address is well worthy of perpetuation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciated the invitation to address this meeting for two reasons: First, because I practiced law a good many years myself and enjoyed the opportunity of meeting with lawyers. I hope that in the new position which I am soon to occupy I will not acquire the habit of mind which will prevent me from enjoying the companionship of lawyers. Second, I want to discuss a problem in which it seems to me lawyers as individuals are best fitted to understand and exercise influence in solving it, that because of their training and because of the position they occupy in their respective communities.

During the last few weeks a new phrase has attracted the attention of the entire world. I don't know just who coined it. I do know that I always am inclined to a certain element of alarm when an effort is made to cover a wide field by a short phrase. No problem is so simple that it can be stated in a few words. The term "fifth column" is widely accepted by millions of people who a short few weeks ago didn't know that armies marched in columns of four. Phrase-making is not the part of statesmanship. It ofttimes involves dangers more fundamental than those attempted to be inveighed against by the use of phrases. It is of supreme importance when we in America use the term "fifth column" we limit it to those activities against which we can safely protect ourselves and that by protecting ourselves against "fifth column" activities we do not destroy the very principles of government against which "fifth column" activities are directed.

We are about to spend several billion dollars for the defense of this hemisphere. We should understand the reasons behind such expenditures. First, very properly, we must defend our sovereignty and the sovereignty of other nations which for 120 years we have pledged ourselves to defend. Second, we must defend our property against seizure or destruction. Third, and most important, we must defend the philosophy of government which we acquired and have maintained at the expense of untold sacrifice.

It is of supreme importance that, during the process of defense of the first two, we do not ourselves destroy the third. It is about this problem I wish to speak tonight.

First, let me make it clear that I am in hearty accord with every legitimate effort to curb what are now popularly known as "fifth column" activities within the United States. The eyes of the people of every nation must be opened by the results of treachery and indifference in Norway, Holland, and Belgium. No one can deny the presence here of many who would just as willingly cooperate with an invading foe as would similarly minded people in these countries. No one can deny the activities of those who have taken their orders from Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. No one can deny that there are in this country men who have acquired the following of a large number of our people who are actuated solely by the hope that by an overthrow of our system they might land a position of dictatorial power. The question is not whether we should deal with them but how we should deal with them.

When in these remarks I stress the necessity for maintenance of democratic methods I do not mean to underemphasize the necessity for protection in the proper way against those who would undermine and destroy our institutions of government. However, during the last 3 weeks three alarming manifestations of hysteria have become evident. First, we have read of the organization in various parts of the country of vigilante groups self-appointed and self-constituted, which would assume the responsibility of dealing with the problem locally. Second, we have read of mayors and even Governors who have assumed for themselves extra-legal authority to deal with the problem. Third, we have seen in the Congress a flood of bills which would single out the groups of aliens in this country and deprive them of any of the privileges or the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

I need not argue with you concerning the impropriety or the danger involved in the first two of these movements. Unauthorized law is merely mob law. Justice never stems from it.

The discussion of the third group is more difficult. Each one of the bills now before the Congress contains some element of merit. The danger lies not so much in the particulars of any bill as in the fact that each is the part of a whole through which hatred and fear may be injected into the minds of the American people against a group which lives within our midst.

Hate and fear. It is through these two emotions that dictators gain power. Place in the hands of an ambitious leader the means of instilling these in the minds of a people and you take the first step toward bondage. In Germany, it was hatred for and fear of the Jews that made Hitler strong. In Russia, it was hatred for and fear of the church which led to Stalin's ruthlessness. It is always so. We in America want no dictator. We want none of Hitlerism nor Stalinism. That is why we must resist any effort to create hatred for or fear of any class or group here. I don't care what may be their race or religion or social or economic status. Once we set apart any group as our common enemy to be hated or feared we endanger the rights and liberties of every citizen in the land.

I hold no brief for aliens. Certainly, they must not be granted favors over American citizens. But the danger lies in singling them out as the objects of legislative disfavor. Whether we like it or not, we are all the descendants of aliens. No one with good sense, no one with true devotion to American ideals, can justify whipping up popular sentiment against them, just because they don't have the right to vote.

Maybe you say: After all, they are only aliens, why should we Americans worry about them? If that is your attitude, I want Abraham Lincoln to answer you. Let me quote from what he once said: "Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence."

My appeal is not on behalf of the alien—it is on our own behalf. We don't dare permit these emotions to be kindled in our midst. The fate of any individual alien who might be injured by such

legislation is not important as compared with the fate of our own people, who will ultimately be injured thereby.

We in America inherit a treasure. That treasure is not in gold or land or other resources. It is the treasure of liberty. The right to be free, the right to think and to speak, and to print, and to worship—these are our inheritances. He who strikes at them strikes at our democracy itself. He who would restrict and limit the rights of any within our shores endangers the right of all within our shores. He who would ask us to hate and fear our neighbors, just because they are not citizens, asks us to light a fire which might well consume us all. He may wrap around himself the cloak of patriotism. He may attempt to charm with impossible promises, but he cannot deceive those who truly understand American democracy, because the hate and fear he teaches is foreign to it.

Fortunately, we in America retain that spirit which prizes liberty and also have in our hands the tools with which we may make that spirit effective. The tools of our democracy are contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. They are known as the Bill of Rights. Any workman called upon to do a job, whether he is digging a ditch or building a skyscraper, knows that he must have his tools and have them in good shape.

It must not be forgotten that the very nature of these tools of democracy is such that they cannot be misused, exploited, or even neglected for long. They cannot be permitted even intermittently to lie dormant. Their nature is such that neglect and nonuse causes them to atrophy and die. Untiring alertness is the price which must be paid for their preservation.

We live today at a time when the need for this untiring alertness is greater than at any previous period in our Nation's history, this for the reason that right now three factors have merged:

1. For a full decade we have undergone a condition of depth-reaching depression. This could not have helped but to have weakened the resistance of our people. False doctrines of government acquire much more attractive color to a depressed than to a prosperous people.

2. The last two decades have seen the acceptance by the peoples of many nations of political doctrines which are the direct antithesis of those in which we believe.

3. At the moment most of the powerful nations of the world either are at war or on the verge of war. This results in a situation in which all of the nations participating feel it essential that every possible effort be made by them to influence the attitude of our people toward them and their enemies.

The concurring of these three factors presents to us the greatest danger, so far as our civil liberties are concerned, that this Nation has ever seen. Our Government and our people must necessarily afford protection against improper activities conducted from outside sources. We cannot afford to permit our actions to be controlled directly or indirectly by those who represent governments other than our own. We must, however, take care that in our desire to defend against improper outside activities we do not run the risk of destroying the civil liberties of our people and by so doing destroy our very democracy itself.

Each one of us looks upon himself as a patriotic American citizen interested only in the future welfare of our Nation and our Government. We are inclined to look upon those of whose theories we disapprove as being enemies of our Government and its future welfare. What is hard for you and me to understand is that if we prevent them from stating their point of view we at the same time deprive ourselves of the protection of the tools of democracy upon which we rely for the protection of the doctrines we espouse.

No objective in mankind's progress has been more difficult of achievement or of retention than political freedom. The common man has always desired political freedom for himself. He has, however, been slow to remember that his own freedom ultimately depends upon the equal freedom of all, even those whose views of government he may, upon occasion, dislike and even profoundly detest. It was only after centuries of struggle that the common man realized that political democracy was possible only if the rights of all men, without regard to race or religion, to express their political opinions freely and publicly were scrupulously safeguarded.

We must have an atmosphere of free expression if we are to have the benefit of fearless political discussion. This is the surest guaranty of orderly change and the surest protection against the forces of disorder. Nothing is so dangerous as the belief that any part of our political society should be beyond criticism. No one generation's judgment as to the essentials of good government can be unerring.

We must scrupulously maintain freedom of discussion if we are to develop our responsibilities as a people by choosing rationally the path we wish to follow. That is why freedom of thought and freedom of speech, with the resulting duty of making up our minds honestly and courageously, is at the very heart of the faith in democracy.

This faith in freedom of expression requires constant devotion, perhaps more so today than ever before in modern times. All about us, and all too close at hand, we see the forces of intolerance at work—forces intolerant of democracy, of science and even of religion. We have seen them in all too many shapes and forms. They preach a doctrine which is the opposite of that spirit of tolerance which is so essential to the perpetuation of our institution—democracy. Fear, hatred, distrust, and bigotry—these are the tenets of their faith.

We must realize the grave danger to civilization that lurks behind their forces. They must be dealt with resolutely if the freedom and dignity of the common man is to be preserved.

That resolute determination must carry with it an understanding of three basic principles of democratic machinery:

1. It must give to every citizen equality of opportunity to participate in government which is free from coercion or fear on the one side and free from impossible promises of reward upon the other.

2. The minority in a democratic community must recognize the right of the majority to govern. At the same time, the majority must insure to the minority the same degree of justice which it demands for itself. Failing in this obligation, the majority becomes merely a mob. When the majority becomes a mob, democracy fades out.

3. A democratitc government must be a government of law. A civilized democratic community demands that all classes within it respect its law. If respect for law is to be maintained, the law must reflect the community sense of justice and not the demands of any class or group. If the law reflects the community sense of justice, no class or group may defy or set itself above or beyond the law without bringing upon itself the just resentment of the whole community. A civilized democracy demands patience and self-restraint from all its citizens.

The very heart of our Constitution is the Bill of Rights. The rest of the document provides the framework of our governmental structure. The first 10 amendments provide the lifeblood that keeps that structure alive. Without freedom of speech, of religion, and of press, and the other guaranties of these amendments, our democracy would be but a sham and a fraud. If those rights are lost, everything in American democracy is lost.

There need be no compromise with the challenge of "fifth columnism." Our defense against it must be vigorous and effective. However, the machinery of government established within the framework of our Constitution furnishes the necessary implements with which to conduct this campaign. Let us not stray away from constitutional processes even to meet this serious challenge.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY SLATTERY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in a radio talk last night in the Washington Star National Radio Forum, Rural Electrification Administrator Harry Slattery declared that "since the inception of the R. E. A. program, the number of farms served with high-line electric power has increased by 150 percent."

Mr. Slattery gave major credit for the increase to the "new attitudes and new principles" of cooperation. R. E. A. has loaned $270,000,000, during the 5 years of its existence, to provide electrification facilities for 850,000 farm families and other rural users. Mr. Slattery states:

More than 600 R. E. A. financed rural-electric systems are now in operation. These systems are serving over half a million consumer members and new members are being added every day. Nearly a hundred other systems are being speeded to completion and each tomorrow brings to my desk reports of construction completed, lines energized, the juice turned on. These additional systems will serve half again as many farm families and other rural users. Awaiting the momentary allotment of funds for construction are plans for 75,000 miles of power line destined to bring service to many thousands more. Moneys already allotted will ultimately bring electric service to 4,000,000 rural people. Farmers in 45 of the 48 States have enlisted R. E. A. cooperation.

Benefits from the R. E. A. program are not confined to rural people, Mr. Slattery declared, but accrue to many parts of our urban commercial and social structure.

Mr. President, the address is most interesting and instructive, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The lights are going out all over Europe. The Rural Electrification Administration is helping to turn them on all over rural America."

They were striking words, spoken to me from the heart of a man high in the esteem of the American people and high in the ranks of American jurisprudence as I sat with him on a recent evening.

Those words stuck in my heart. And if a phrase can embrace all the challenge and significance of an idea, that phrase is today's inspiration for the rural-electrification program: The lights are going out all over Europe; R. E. A., as we call the Rural Electrification Administration, is helping to turn them on all over rural America. And as I speak to you tonight there are thousands of farm families along new R. E. A.-financed rural power lines from coast to coast who listen by the light, and hear by the magic of radio, that electricity has brought at long last to their farms. They know much of the story I shall tell, and I trust they hear me with approval. To all of you, I report the progress of a development for the people of rural America that is closely linked with the lives and livelihoods of every one of us.

America needs light today—light for the mind and light for the eyes. With that thought in mind I want to acknowledge with deep sincerity my gratitude for the opportunity to speak to you tonight—my gratitude to the blue network of the N. B. C. and to the Washington Evening Star. For these Star forum programs are designed to bring light to our minds. And this brief discussion of the R. E. A.'s endeavor to help bring light to the eyes of rural America will, I think, stand up to that tradition.

For more than 30 years I have been intimately associated with the conservation and electric-power program in America. Twenty-five years ago I watched the beginnings of the movement to bring the benefits of electricity to the farms of the country. I heard the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, sterling leader and statesman, repeat often the slogan which he carried on the masthead of his weekly paper, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." He was one of the first to voice the hope of bringing the blessings of electricity to the families of rural America. He had the vision.

Twenty-eight years ago I saw the great strides already achieved in rural electrification in Ontario, Canada, and on my return from that trip I saw and talked with the great Steinmetz, wizard of electricity, at work in his General Electric Co. laboratories in Schenectady. He spoke even then of his belief in a network of transmission lines that would gird this country border to border, and reach into every hamlet and every home. He had the vision.

I watched Gifford Pinchot, when first Governor of Pennsylvania, endeavor to awaken the Keystone State to the need for rural electrification. He had the vision.

In his efforts to decentralize industrial activity, Justice Louis D. Brandeis early saw the need and potentialities of electricity in small villages, towns, and on the farm. He also had the vision—and still has, I assure you.

During the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the grandfather of the present Secretary of Agriculture, affectionately known to thousands of you in the Middle West as "Uncle Henry" Wallace, urged the cooperative electrification of our rural areas.

He had the vision then. His grandson, Henry A. Wallace, the present Secretary of Agriculture, has the vision now as indicated by his achievements for the farmer's welfare, and for rural electrification.

President Roosevelt has told how, while he was visiting Warm Springs some years ago, an idea crystallized into a plan of action. The idea which he had long cherished was: "Electricity is a necessity of modern life and ought to be found in every village, every home, every farm, in every part of the United States." The plan of action was the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. All of us know he had the vision.

Today the work of the Rural Electrification Administration has brought that vision of these men and many others to a reality * * * electricity on the farm is a fact for hundreds of thousands of our people. For many more, it is on the march.

I wish it were somehow possible for you out there on the loudspeaker end of this discussion to shoot questions at me as I go along—then we'd have a real forum—but I think I can anticipate many of your possible queries.

What is this rural electrification?

Why is the Federal Government stimulating the development of electric service for unserved farm families, anyway?

Who benefits; only the farmer?

What does it cost, and who's going to pay the bill?

How is the program carried on? And—

What has been accomplished?

Let's turn the pages of the book of rural electrification on the march and sift the answers. The facts are simple and plain.

Rural electrification means, obviously enough, the taking of electric service to unserved rural areas of the Nation. But it means more than that, too. It means the extension of opportunity for farm families to live on a plane equal to that enjoyed by the family in the city. It means bringing to the farmer new tools for making a better living—doing a better job of working a livelihood from the soil. It means better sanitation and a stepped-up standard of farm health. It means increased living comfort for all the farm family—not the comfort that softens a man's muscles, but the comfort that promotes leisure and an opportunity to plan, to think, to sharpen the mind through intelligent use of leisure.

For the boy and girl on the farm, rural electrification means a renewed interest in seeking his or her place in life, in the country—not in the harried confines of a city shop, or in the too-long line that still leads to a dismal employment office.

These things are the real essence of rural electrification, and the Rural Electrification Administration and its program are designed to speed the sound development of these basic improvements for the agricultural arm of the Nation.

As late as 1925 the established private power companies had extended electric service to only about 200,000 farms. At that time there were nearly six and a half million farms in America. From 1925 until 1935 service was extended to about half a million more, but the unplanned character of these rural extensions, ofter simply short fingers reaching out from the cities, merely skimmed the cream of potential rural consumers and left more than five and a half million farms unserved.

Nine farm families in every 10 did not have, and many of them had forsaken the idea of ever being able to get, electricity.

They needed it. And it was important to the Nation as a whole that they have it. I say it was important to the Nation, because the efficiency and convenience of life in the city had developed rapidly, largely as the result of electricity, while people who lived in the country still had to get along with old-fashioned, and for some farm work almost pioneer types of equipment. Socially and economically, country and city were thrown increasingly out of balance. In terms of effective living the agricultural arm of the Nation grew proportionately weaker as the urban arm became stronger.

No one needs an economist to explain that such a situation undermines the strength and the competence of our whole social and economic organism. And a situation that did not make good economic sense had to be remedied.

The Nation could not afford to have five and a half million farm families living in the era of the kerosene lamp while the rest of the Nation, the Nation in which they had to live and make a living, went speeding on, geared up for the age of electricity.

The Nation could not afford to have more than five and a half million farm families handicapped for want of the modern tools for better living and more effective production that had become such potent instruments for progress in the city home and factory.

It was evident that electricity could bring the farm family, insofar as electric service and its attendant advantages were concerned, into closer social and economic parity with the city family. And in 1935 the growing appreciation of these facts, coupled with the need for added stimulus to national and employment industry running in low gear, set the stage for the timely establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Congress acted under the dynamic intellectual and practical leadership of such men as Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, Congressman SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and Congressman JOHN ELLIOTT RANKIN, of Mississippi—provided the funds for actually building rural power lines. Construction took the place of conversation. And the rural electrification program was under way. R. E. A. started lending money; low-cost electric service started to spread, slowly but with growing vigor into unserved rural areas; and the money used to build the lines prompted new activity in a hundred trades and crafts.

First benefits of the new rural electrification went to the farm family. Electricity lit the farmer's evening—sped his completion of a dozen nightly chores. Electricity sprang to action for the farm woman in her kitchen * * * pumped the water for her many tasks and retired the awkward pail that had bent her back on countless trips to the pump. Farm youngsters turned to their school books with more enthusiasm and less eyestrain. Across the face of isolated countrysides thousands of folks thrilled to the magic of their new-found perfect farmhand—low-cost electricity at the snap of a switch.

And across the face of industrial America a new stimulus was felt as the demands of rural-line construction piled up new orders for wire and insulators and poles and hardware, piled up new demands for the services of workers in the mines, in transportation, and in electrical-equipment factories.

The new rural electrification built new outlooks and new incentives and new tools for the farm family while it bolstered employment and the pay roll of the Nation.

Who benefits from the far-reaching program to take low-cost electricity to the Nation's farmsteads? The farm families, yes; but you and I, as well. For each fundamental improvement in the lot of one branch of our national family spreads its benefits through the whole economic and social fabric of America.

During the first 5 years of operation, concluded last month, R. E. A. lent $270,000,000 for the construction of rural power lines to serve 850,000 farm families and other rural users. A relatively small amount of this money has been made available for financing farm wiring and plumbing and for the construction of generating plants in places and in situations where electricity could not be purchased wholesale at rates which would permit the rural electric systems to provide low-cost service to their consumer members and pay out as the law requires.

Two hundred and seventy million dollars is a tremendous sum of money, but it has been lent strictly as an investment. The law under which the Rural Electrification Administration operates requires that all this money be returned to the Treasury, with interest, within 20 to 25 years.

The American people, through their Government, have made this investment in the people and the prospects of America's most basic

industry—agriculture. It is a sound investment. The cash will be repaid by the farm families who use electric service. And these families will also pay the small interest charge on that cash. But the return of actual value to you and me as taxpayers will exceed a hundredfold the money returned to the Treasury. No economist can compute the value to the Nation of the new vitality, the new standard of health and of living, the new impetus to better farm production or the whole new outlook on life in a democratic United States that is the fundamental product of the rural electrification program.

Money is the lifeblood and action is the creed of this dynamic effort to speed the electrification of rural America. But the job could not have been done as it has been done without the enlistment of new attitudes and new principles of management.

The new attitudes and the new principles are those of cooperation.

Cooperation is the idea and the method that has made possible most of the rural electrification stimulated by the R. E. A.

And cooperative principles of management—principles designed solely for the purpose of providing service, unhampered by the demand for profits—these principles are the operating device for building and maintaining the new rural electric systems.

Nearly 90 percent of all R. E. A. loans have been made to cooperative organizations of progressive farm people. Their functioning is simple, democratic, and well adapted, both to the temper and the interests of the farmer and to the job of providing electric service in rural areas.

This is how the cooperative grows and works in the field of rural electrification.

A group of farmers who want service meet and organize as a corporation. They apply to R. E. A. for a loan. The amount of the loan depends upon the amount of line that must be built, the engineering and related problems that must be met in building comprehensive service for the area to be served, and the number of farms that will use the service. After a thorough investigation of the economic, agricultural, and engineering factors that will affect the financial and service success of the cooperative—and providing, of course, that the investigation proves the feasibility of the intended construction, R. E. A. grants the loan.

All farmers who are to take service join the cooperative. Each pays a nominal membership fee into the treasury of the cooperative and this money is used to offset the expenses of organization and initial development. Each member has an equal vote and voice in the management of the cooperative, and this, I submit, is a pattern for true democracy in action.

The cooperative employs a manager and other competent personnel to handle specialized tasks of operation and management. These employees, responsible to a board of directors elected by and from the membership, run the business as any other sound business is run—always with this exception, however; that their responsibility is to the members, the folks whom they serve, rather than to stockholders. Their entire effort is directed toward the maintenance and improvement of service * * * a service job, undiluted by demand for profit.

The farmer-member's responsibility to his cooperative is simple. His sole obligation is to pay his bills for current, to use his electricity wisely and abundantly for the improvement of his home and his work, thus contributing to the financial soundness of his cooperative, and to take an active part in the affairs of his system to the end that it serve the whole farm community completely and as fully as possible.

Throughout all stages of the cooperative's organization and development the staff of the Rural Electrification Administration works with the staff and membership of the cooperative—smoothing its way in matters of law, assisting in the engineering and maintenance of the lines, helping the farm families to initiate the most practical and profit-producing applications of electricity.

That in brief is the way these rural electric cooperatives function.

All these answers to the questions which I posed myself point up the final question which always comes to the alert mind; "so what?" What does all this mean in terms of accomplishment—accomplishment we can weigh and appraise? Does it all add up to a tangible result that justifies the expenditure of time and money and tremendous effort? A practical America wants results. These are the results to date of the R. E. A. program to electrify rural America.

More than 600 R. E. A.-financed rural electric systems are now in operation. These systems are serving over half a million consumer-members and new members are being added every day. Nearly a hundred other systems are being speeded to completion and each tomorrow brings to my desk reports of construction completed, lines energized, the juice turned on. These additional systems will serve half again as many farm families and other rural users. Awaiting the momentary allotment of funds for construction are plans for 75,000 miles of power line destined to bring service to many thousands more. Moneys already allotted will ultimately bring electric service to 4,000,000 rural people.

Farmers in 45 of the 48 States have enlisted R. E. A. cooperation. Only in three States no R. E. A. power systems have been set up. There, in some instances, the farmers have been prevented in various ways from building and operating their own electric distribution systems. But I hope we will eventually bring R. E. A. to these States.

This movement for rural electrification owes no little to the firm support of the agriculture organizations like the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union, and others.

I want to take this occasion to say, too, that the success of the R. E. A. program is due in a large part to the devoted day in and day out efforts of the men and women of the R. E. A. staff, both in Washington and in the field.

Since the inception of the R. E. A. program the number of farms served with high-line electric power has increased by 150 percent. In 1935, 1 farm in 10 had central station service; today 1 farm family in 4 enjoys the new opportunity and incentive for more effective life and work on the farm that comes with the magic of electricity at the click of a switch.

These have been the physical, the tangible results of the R. E. A. program.

Less tangible, but no less real and important, are the human results.

Written in the eyes of thousands upon thousands of farm women is a joy and sense of new freedom from drudgeries inherited from the pioneers. The electric refrigerator; running water, pumped with electricity, a bright light over her sink; an electric bulb in her hen house, prompting extra egg income from her hens—these things are not mere gadgets for improved living to the farm woman—these things are symbols of a dream come true.

Better farm management, made possible by electric equipment, reflects the electrified farmer's new sense of opportunity to make his farming a more profitable and a more satisfying way of life.

Farm youngsters have a yen to stick to the old place, because the old place is a better place—as good as the city cousin's—when electricity turns on the lights.

Only they who toil in the highlands and along the river bottoms, they who work the soil to fill the larder of our Nation—they know best how great are these results. To them the new rural power lines are symbols of their modern pioneering, a new source of power for their modern progress.

In a letter to me commemorating the fifth anniversary of R. E. A., President Roosevelt acknowledged the significance of these human results in these words "* * * even in a complex industrial economy such as ours the roots of national well-being strike deeply into the soil. But particularly in times like these, all who strive to bring to the life of the American farmer new comfort, new power, and new dignity may take special pride in their task."

We do take special pride in our task. But it is the pride one feels as he accepts a challenge, such a challenge as was implied by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, when he said to our R. E. A. staff recently, "Electricity in agriculture is going to be enormously more important than any of us now appreciate."

We are challenged by many things today. Many are grim but many others are promising. America has never looked down, and she never shall, so long as her men and women, free and independent in thought and action, and can join together of their own will to accomplish common ends for the common good.

Our problems as a nation are grave, but no chaos in the tides of human affairs can match the spirit of our confidence in the future of America.

And I say to you, every one, that the electrification of rural America by and for the farmers themselves is a vital, democratic action that is proof, positive and triumphant, that our American way of life is virile, and equal to every challenge of the future.

Free Speech Under National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix a very important statement by the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, issued May 21, 1940, in opposition to the pending amendment to the National Labor Relations Act purporting to guarantee free speech. This statement is of special significance because of the widespread misunderstanding of the position heretofore taken by the American Civil Liberties Union on this issue.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, May 21, 1940.

A STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS CONCERNING A BILL IN CONGRESS TO PROTECT FREEDOM OF SPEECH FOR EMPLOYERS UNDER THE N. L. R. A.

Pending before the House of Representatives at Washington is a proposed amendment to the National Labor Relations Act originating in the so-called Smith committee which proposed to protect freedom of speech for employers. The amendment would exclude from the prohibitions of the act "any expressions of opinion with respect to any matter which may be of interest to employers or the general public, provided that such expressions of opinion are not accompanied by acts of coercion, intimidation, discrimination, or threats thereof."

At first sight it would be assumed that the American Civil Liberties Union would support such an amendment, particularly in view of the exceptions it has taken to the formulation of some orders of the National Labor Relations Board which could be interpreted as interfering with employers' expression of opinion even when not related to acts of coercion against employees. But the amendment would not merely have the effect its language suggests at first sight.

To provide that expressions of opinion shall be prohibited only when accompanied by acts of coercion ignores situations where coercion may precede or follow the expression of opinion and thus be directly associated with it. In the very difficult area of distinguishing between freedom of expression on the one hand and coercion on the other, the amendment would not cover the cases where in fact expressions of opinion are a part of a course of coercion.

Insofar as the amendment merely writes into the law the constitutional guaranty of free speech contained in the first amendment, it is wholly unnecessary. But writing it into the law in such specific language might well be interpreted by the courts as going beyond the constitutional guaranty and giving employers' speech more protection than the speech of others.

The Civil Liberties Union believes that employers' rights of free speech are adequately protected by the constitutional guaranty and need no further support in law. Nothing in the National Labor Relations Act curtails an employer's right of free speech.

It should be emphasized that despite all the controversy there has as yet been no actual interference with employers' rights of free speech by the National Labor Relations Board. There have been several orders, notably in the Ford cases, in which the Board did not, in our judgment, clearly enough define the distinction between mere opinion and coercion. But in the Ford and other cases the record of coercion was clear. The orders based upon the record, however, suggest the possibility that the distribution of antiunion literature might be considered coercive regardless of the circumstances of the distribution. The Board has not attempted to enforce any such order against an employer who had ceased a course of coercion.

The Civil Liberties Union is opposed to the amendment as unnecessary and as possibly justifying interference with the rights of employees under the guise of opinions not actually accompanied by acts of coercion, but inseparable from them.

The union is opposed not only to this amendment but to any such amendment to the National Labor Relations Act until its administration has made much clearer any abuses to be corrected. The act stands as the greatest single advance yet made in guaranteeing to workers their rights to form unions and to select representatives for purposes of collective bargaining without interference by employers. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that it is in this field of industrial conflict in the light of the traditional and violent opposition of employers to trade unions that the major issues of civil liberty have arisen. The act in its few years of operation has vastly reduced the resort to violence and coercion, with consequent deprivation of civil rights, and greatly increased the free exercise of labor's rights to organize. Practically all complaints as to the administration of the act can be met by regulations of the Board.

Broadcast of Speech of Communist Nominee for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT OF THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there has been considerable comment and controversy the past several days regarding a network broadcast of the Columbia Broadcasting System which carried the voice of the nominee for the office of President of the United States of the Communist Party.

In order to clarify its viewpoint and to explain the reasons why this broadcast took place, the Columbia Broadcasting System issued a statement on June 1, a copy of which I have before me and which I desire to be printed in the RECORD.

In addition to this explanation, I wish to have appear in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch dated May 31 which discusses the controversy.

There being no objection, the statement and dispatch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Inquiries have been received as to why the Columbia Broadcasting System could not bar Earl Browder from the air under the last sentence of section 315 of the Communications Act, which reads:

"No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate."

The fore part of this section reads:

"If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any pubic office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, and the Commission shall make rules and regulations to carry this provision into effect: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section."

The complete section permits the licensee to decide whether it will carry speeches by all the Presidential candidates or none of them. Since the Columbia Broadcasting System proposes as usual to carry speeches by the Democratic and Republican nominees and has already carried the speeches of two other nominees for the presidency, namely, that of Norman Thomas, for the Socialist Party on April 7 and that of John W. Aiken, nominee of the Socialist Labor Party, on April 28, Columbia has already begun to function in this campaign as it and practically all broadcasters always have done in this and previous campaigns, under the first part of the section. Consequently, Columbia considers itself obligated under that part of section 315 which says that if any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to broadcast, it shall afford equal opportunity to all other such candidates for that office. It would be against public policy for a Nation-wide network such as Columbia, in its efforts to render public service, not to carry speeches by any candidates for the presidency, especially of the major parties.

The law is simple and clear and there is no way in good faith to escape the meaning of its provisions. Either a network or radio station offers its facilities to all candidates, or it cannot, without violating the law, offer its facilities to any candidate for any given office. Thus it may be seen that, if the law is followed in its obvious mandate, barring of the candidate for President of the Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party, the Prohibition Party (scheduled for June 19), or the Communist Party would necessitate—unless the law be violated—barring candidates of the major parties.

"RED" CONVENTION AIR PROGRAM IS RAPPED BY C. B. S.—TWO STATIONS DROP BROADCAST, BUT SYSTEM MUST ACCEPT IT BECAUSE OF LAW

NEW YORK, May 31.—Protesting an announced broadcast Sunday of the American Communist Party's convention proceedings, officials of a radio chain and a former Congressman today demanded that the Government ban Communists from the Nation's radio lanes.

In a public statement the Columbia Broadcasting System urged revision of the communications law so that no broadcaster is compelled to give time to the candidates of any political party if it is proved to be subservient to a foreign power.

TWO STATIONS DROP IT

C. B. S. is one of three national chains scheduling the Sunday broadcast of a speech by Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party who is expected to be nominated for the Presidency.

Under present radio laws, it said, radio companies were forced to treat all candidates for public office alike.

Station WCKY, in Cincinnati, however, decided to drop out of C. B. S. network for the 15 minutes allotted to the Communist program, substituting a program of patriotic music. WCAU, at Philadelphia, also refused to broadcast the speech.

L. B. Wilson, president of WCKY, stated, "This is the time to tighten our national defenses everywhere," and added, "We are certain that it is not in the public interest to broadcast pro-Nazi, pro-Communist speeches at this time."

At the same time former Democratic Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, threatened to seek an injunction banning the Browder broadcast on the grounds that the Communist Party was not a legal or recognized political party in New York.

COMMISSION NOT TO ACT

He had earlier appealed to the Federal Communications Commission to halt the broadcasts. Having received no reply after several hours, O'Connor announced his injunction intentions were averted because he could obtain no hearing before Monday.

F. C. C. officials said later that O'Connor would be advised that the Commission "has no authority to take the action you request."

Meanwhile, the Communist convention, in its second day, received reports that the party in this country had contributed $18,000 in the last 2 years, including $5,000 in the last 6 months, to the Communist Party in Germany to aid "in its fight against the Hitler regime."

Total Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Memorial Day address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt at Arlington Cemetery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

The Nation pauses.

And once more honors its hero dead.

Memories of noble lives and glorious death cannot lessen the poignant grief for comrades who rest in silence here. Nor deaden the pain with which we recall the handclasp of past years.

"There isn't a song on the drivers' lips
As the caissons roll today.
There isn't the jest of the roaring ranks
As the columns swing their way.
* * * * *
"The blue of the fleet that swept the seas,
The brown of the wild Argonne,
The men of musket and Mauser days,
Come, shoulder to shoulder, on.

"The caissons roll and the columns swing
In the old 'One, Two, Three, Four,'
And the ranks close in where their files are blank,
The men who will march no more."

They march no more!

But the service and sacrifice of these sleeping dead have left with us a spiritual legacy which lives eternally in our hearts.

Ours is the responsibility to prove worthy of this heritage, to complete the task of those whose work is done. To protect our country and our democracy today as they protected it in the past.

To meet, with the same courage and devotion the present perils to the freedom which they won and kept for us intact.

Let us neglect no means of nourishing our ideals of humanity. One way is through the work of the Red Cross. May we all help in the fullest measure, in the names of those loved ones here who no longer need its merciful ministrations.

II. AWAKENED AMERICA

The world today is racked and torn between two mighty forces—a terrifying clash between two ideologies.

In one of these ideologies, America can find the beliefs and traditions by which this Nation, since its birth has lived. In the other, everything which America has abhorred.

In the one is the ideal of freedom, of democracy, of humanity. In the other are ruthlessness, brutality, and tyranny.

Upon the outcome of this world-shattering conflict hangs the hope of peace in our day.

There is no use pretending we have no stake in Europe's war. And there is no good to come from telling ourselves that whether the one side or the other conquers is none of our business. Every clear-thinking man and women in this Nation who is devoted to America and to the principle of popular government knows better.

Indifference to the outcome of this tragic struggle means indifference to the future of the United States of America. And the citizens of this country now recognize it. America has at last awakened.

We have lived in a dream world naively believing that the security of free nations would never be shaken.

But the roar of airplanes and the thunder of mechanized divisions, rolling through Belgium, Holland, and France, where once our own men stemmed the tide of aggression, have brought us face to face with harsh reality.

After 2,000 years of effort to establish the worth and dignity of the individual, we see the rights of mankind mercilessly swept away upon the surging flood of tyranny and oppression.

What of the centuries of laborious effort. The years of careful cultivation of democracy and freedom.

And what of the giants and heroes of civilization. The sacrificial lives of men whose only thought was to improve the world in which they lived. The lowly Nazarene giving to mankind a faith and a creed which was to prove the most enobling influence in all history. Washington, with dauntless courage, heartening his shoeless veterans at Valley Forge, to secure for America the blessings of liberty. The magnanimous Lincoln, giving his life to maintain the national unity which we now know to be our only hope of safety. Wilson striving tirelessly for an order of international brotherhood. The countless dead, whose memory we honor on this day. And those heroes of the laboratories, burning out their lives to abolish disease and suffering and to lighten the load of toil for human beings. All the selfless men of history, striving to establish on this earth a civilization which could make a life what the Almighty God intended it should be.

The ideals and work of all these heroic figures, now threatened with annihilation—men slipping back into the black depths of ignorance, passion, and barbarism—slipping back after thousands of years, into the jungle.

This is the future we face if injustice and oppression triumph in the world.

There are a few still among us who profess to believe that "regardless of which side wins this war, there is no reason * * * to prevent a continuation of peaceful relationships between America and the countries of Europe."

Such a viewpoint is based upon one or the other of two propositions, both of which have unfortunately been proved untrue.

It is not true that neutrality is any longer a guaranty of peace. We have seen one sovereign nation after another, faithfully and meticulously fulfilling its obligations as neutrals, attacked without warning, devastated, and laid waste. The time has come in world affairs in which a neutral nation is a nation which fails to protect its own interests until it is too late.

Neither is it any longer true that America's geographic isolation renders it secure against attack. For a century and a half America was safe between two mighty oceans. But that safety depended in large part upon control of the seas by a friendly naval power.

Both neutrality and isolation have become phrases capable of misleading a peace-loving people and exposing them to the destructive forces which have brought ruin and desolation to the most civilized peoples of the Old World.

Because neutrality and isolation insure no peace, it does not follow that America should go to war. It does mean, however, that we are in grave danger of having a war thrust upon us, and to avoid that unhappy event will require all the statesmanship, courage, and wisdom that a unified and determined America can summon.

III. VITAL DECISIONS SOON

Within the next few months, weeks, or, possibly, days, this Nation may be called upon to make decisions of far-reaching and vital importance to our future.

If the Japanese move toward the Dutch East Indies, we shall be confronted with the crucial problem whether we are to withdraw forever from the Orient, abandon our obligations to the Philippines, and give up our voice in the affairs of the Far East.

If the Allies lose in Europe and especially if Germany acquires all or a part of the English and French fleets, we shall be confronted with the immediate problem of occupying island bases in the North Atlantic and Carribean or tolerating German claims and probable occupation of these possessions as the legitimate spoils of war.

Whether these and a host of other equally grave issues may be averted by immediate decisions to take protective action is itself a momentous question.

If America can avoid a war by any action less than actual participation in hostilities, it is the part of wisdom to take such action.

If, by extending credits to the democracies, fighting with their backs to sea, defeat for their cause may be averted, the future welfare and safety of this country would justify such a course.

If, by following the precedent of our acquisition of the Virgin Islands, we can forestall attempts of unfriendly powers to obtain a foothold within striking distance of the Western Hemisphere, it is the legitimate exercise of our right to security to acquire those bases and fortify them for our own protection.

One thing is certain: The United States of America can never, under any circumstances, allow unchallenged an attempt to extend the political or military influence of potentially unfriendly powers to this hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine must continue to be the core of our foreign policy. In the light of conditions as they are now unfolding in Europe and in the East, compromise with that historic doctrine is unthinkable.

IV. TOTAL PREPAREDNESS

We shall do well to remember that dictators wage total war. We have seen it in Poland, in Finland, in Norway, in Belgium, in Holland, and in France.

Total war is to bring to bear upon armies and civilians; upon women and children; upon helpless and defenseless cities; all the instruments of destruction which the genius of man can devise. It is to wage economic and ideological war as well as military and naval war. It is to undermine the political, social, and industrial structure of a nation with propaganda, sabotage, and "fifth column" trickery. It is ruthless and conscienceless, com-

plete, and unlimited. The world has been horrified and stunned by the effectiveness and efficiency of total war.

America must meet the threat of total war with total preparedness. We, too, can be efficient, effective, and complete. We, too, can mobilize the physical, economic, and human resources of a rich nation and a mighty people to meet every possible and every conceivable contingency.

There is no occasion for alarm or for hysteria. But there is every reason for this country to exert itself to the utmost of its ability to attain a state of total defense for a threat of total war.

What is the utmost of our ability? What is total defense?

We need not count the cost; for whatever it is, it will be cheap. It cost America $35,000,000,000 to take part in the last war. What would it be worth to avoid total war as it is waged today?

The limits of our ability are measured, not in dollars but in the labor of human beings, the capacity of our factories, the productivity of our farms and mines, and the brains, spirit, and patriotism of our people.

We have seen the tragic proof of the superior preparation of Germany over the democracies. There are no unemployed in Germany. The labor of political prisoners is commandeered, and old men, women, and children are conscripted to promote total war.

In America we now have 9,000,000 unemployed. So long as we have idle men and idle capital, idle factories and idle mills, we are not making total preparedness. We have seen how total war is directed at the weakest point. If our strength is sapped by unemployment, we can expect the enemy to take advantage of this weakness.

Men who have long been out of work are not effective citizens. If required to defend their country, they will not make effective soldiers. Men out of work lose their skills. They lose their health. And eventually they lose their spirit, their morale, and their patriotism. Men are not eager to seize the sword to protect a jobless way of life. Nor are they willing to die for a country in which democracy means a bread line and soup kitchen.

Men fight and die for the things they love, the things they believe in, and the things they prize above life itself.

That is why total preparedness requires that we make ourselves strong all the way through. It is not enough that we develop the shell of military and naval defense. Beneath it there must be the solid foundation of internal soundness.

This war is a war of machines. But behind the machines there must be the clear, healthy brain and the indomitable spirit of the men and women of the nation—the devoted, courageous citizens, dedicated to a lofty and noble ideal of life, ready and willing to make every sacrifice to maintain and defend it.

We must never for one moment forget that an essential and vital part of our defense of America must be the maintenance of the health, morale, and economic freedom of the citizens of this country in time of peace and in time of war. And the greater the threat of war, the more necessary it is that we continue the upbuilding of the economic and social life of our Nation.

Nothing short of this will afford America that total preparedness so necessary to avert total war.

V. WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DEFEND?

America, in its preparation for complete defense, must not lose sight of what it is we are going to defend.

Totalitarian States have an ideology. And it is this philosophy that puts in those mechanized divisions a motive power more vital than the oil and gasoline which is piped into Belgium and Holland and France. In those huge armored trucks and behind the machine guns in those thundering tanks are men with a gleam in their eyes. Behind the oil-stained visors of the flyers in the Stuka diving bombers are grim faces, but faces flashing with the Nazi vision of conquest.

These men know what they are fighting for. They have a philosophy—a consuming philosophy which they have read in books, which they have had hammered into them in a thousand ways until they believe it more than they believe anything else in the world. It is a philosophy of war and destruction, of the crushing of enemies, of the glorification of a race and a man, of the subjection of every nation and every people to the will of that glorified race and that glorified man. It is a philosophy of ruthlessness, brutality, force, and aggression, but it is a complete and total philosophy of life and of death, and it gives power and drive to those waves of green-grey troops and those cold, steel columns of machines.

The aggressor has the advantage.

And yet the answer for America is not to turn aggressor. We will not meet the enemy on their own terms. We will meet them on ours. We will get ready, physically and materially. We will build the greatest military and naval and aerial defenses the world has ever seen. We will not only equal our potential enemies in military strength. We will outdo them. We will show the world what a vigilant, alert, and free people can do when danger is recognized.

And, equally important, we will enrich our ideals and rededicate ourselves to the democratic way of life. More than ever before in our history, we must make democracy a living, burning force in the lives of our people.

And the way to do this—the way to strengthen our faith and to revitalize our philosophy—is to perfect the thing we have faith in, to build our democracy wider and deeper. To build up the things we are getting ready to defend so that all of us will realize how much worth defending they are and how great would be their loss.

Let us strive even harder for economic freedom for every man and family in this land. Let us insure a job for every worker. Let us make available an education for every boy and girl. Let us clear away our slums and show a world that is destroying houses with bombs how fine and strong we can build them for our citizens. While Europe is blowing up hospitals filled with wounded soldiers, let us construct hospitals all over our country to care for sick and unfortunate men and women. Let us retain freedom of speech and discussion while even the democracies of the Old World are giving up this priceless heritage.

Let us not make the mistake of neglecting the protection of our internal resources and the strengthening and upbuilding of our people while we are building for our national defense. Let us show ourselves ready to pay in money and labor and devotion to make use of all our powers for building our Nation strong in every part.

Let us make one gigantic, convincing demonstration of how a great nation, by loyalty, wisdom, and foresight can gain security with freedom rather than lose both in a futile attempt to exchange the one for the other. Let us be sure that we yield not one article of our faith to the ideology of dictators who may one day seek to thrust their way of life upon us by force of arms.

Let us match the driving force of vaulting ambition directed toward conquest and destruction with the spiritual impetus that is generated by a consuming passion for liberty and an indomitable will to defend the civilization upon which we have lavished such great effort. And for these sacrifices that we must make and for price that we must pay we shall have not only security from aggression from outside, but a new strength and security within, knowing that we stand together as brothers in the democratic ideal of life.

VI. CONCLUSION

As we once more stand with uncovered heads on this hallowed ground may the memory of those we honor remind us that the freedom which is ours was obtained through the noble sacrifices of heroic men.

May we recognize that the blessing which we are permitted to enjoy carry the inviolable duty and the obligation to preserve them untarnished and unsullied for those who are to follow.

Above all, may we realize fully that our liberties are primarily the byproduct of a heritage of glorious and transcendent ideals—the principles of righteousness and truth and justice to and for all men. And that so long and only so long as we are capable of cherishing and preserving these eternal values as a dominant and living force among our people are we worthy of the noble estate with which we have been endowed.

Give us strength, O Lord, and hear our prayer: "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven."

Conservation and Development of Our National Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES P. POPE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, director, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the New School for Social Research, New York City, on May 16, 1940, on the subject of Conservation and Development of Our National Resources.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the desert regions of our great West there is a tree called the giant yucca. Its outstretched branches give it a strange resemblance to a signpost; and legend has it that Brigham Young and his followers, after a long, distressing trek pursuing mirages over desert wastes, hailed it as a symbol to direct them onward toward their promised land. They promptly named it the Joshua tree. In discussing the time-honored subject of conservation and development of our natural resources, I think it appropriate that we inquire whether we have yet reached the Joshua tree and whether we can determine the direction in which it points.

It is necessary first that we take a new view of the kinds of natural resources that support our national economy. We should

assess some of the more important programs of action already under way. Finally, we should examine the character and extent of the participation by the people that will be required if conservation measures are to be projected upon a scale that will achieve measurable progress.

HISTORY AND SCOPE OF SUBJECT

Some 30 years ago the attention of the Nation was dramatically called to the subject of conservation of our resources when President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, called a conference with the Governors of the 48 States at Washington to discuss the problem. From this meeting dates the serious attention to conservation which our Nation and the various States have been giving it. At that time people were thinking mainly in terms of what the Government might do to bring about a more sparing use of our exhaustible forests and irreplaceable minerals.

I would like to consider the subject somewhat more broadly. The squirrel that saves for the winter is too restricted an analogy if we are to understand the problems of conservation in an age of high technology, impoverished agriculture, and deficit regions. In recent years we have found that in a democracy conservation depends upon the solution of a larger problem. In contrast to a totalitarian scheme, we realize that the public interest in conservation must be promoted through the effective utilization of the individual initiative of the millions of land owners and custodians of our resources. Their economic practices must include the conservation of resources rather than their destruction.

So long as the frontiersmen were surrounded by the riches of nature and no thought entered their minds of the limited and exhaustible character of the resources, neither they nor anyone else thought of conservation. As time went on the speed of production and the consequent exhaustion of resources were vastly increased. Due to better organized effort and financial concentration in the cities, rural areas became impoverished. The supplies of timber and minerals were drawn upon lavishly.

It may have taken several thousand years for large sections of the Mediterranean nations to become treeless and barren because in those hand-labor eras both production and resource exhaustion were slow affairs. Today in the United States, in less than two centuries, large areas have lost most of their soil fertility and all of their good timber. The dust storms of the great plains, the gullied slopes of the South, the cut-over areas of the Great Lakes, the depleted oil reserves of the Southwest and thousands of worked-out mines in coal, iron, copper, phosphate, silver, lead, talc, and other minerals throughout the country—all testify to the speed with which our modern high technology age operates.

DIFFERENT KINDS OF NATURAL RESOURCES

It is sometimes forgotten that there are three entirely different kinds of natural resources. The first consists of exhaustible resources like minerals. Coal, iron, oil, and phosphates dwindle in supply as they are used, and become correspondingly more costly. Ultimately the supply will be entirely exhausted. The second type includes agricultural and forest products which are renewable resources, and in the third category are the inexhaustible resources of air and water.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF CONSERVATION

It is very useful for purposes of analysis that we bear these three categories distinctly in mind, particularly in connection with developing programs of public action. This is illustrated by the application of one of the great principles of conservation: that by using comparatively small quantities of some of the exhaustible resources in the right way we can multiply the quantity of the inexhaustible resources in available form for man's continuous use.

One of the best illustrations of this may be found in the use of phosphates in agriculture. A comparatively small amount of phosphate in the soil stimulates the growth of legumes and grasses which conserve the soil by their matted roots and reach into the air and capture more nitrogen than they consume. This nitrogen is deposited in the soil and enriches it for the growth of other plants necessary for food and fiber. To carry the illustration further, suppose that cattle are raised on the land. Only 6 percent of the materials in the carcasses of cattle are minerals originating in the soil. Ninety-four percent come from the air and water through the grass upon which the cattle feed. This grass has performed the miracle of drawing from the air and water most of the elements needed in its growth. The small amount of phosphate, therefore, has set in motion the forces which create a large amount of necessary, but inexhaustible, resources. Conservation, as thus defined, means a better and more abundant use of our resources.

But it is not always practicable at present for farmers to manage their businesses in a way which will accomplish the above purpose. In the Southeast, for instance, historical conditions drove farmers to supply the world with its greatest raw product—cotton. Cotton is a tilled crop, and the cotton system leaves land exposed to erosion by water. On the average, it is estimated that about 13 tons of top soil have been lost from the lands of the South for every bale of cotton shipped. Cotton fiber and oil consist almost entirely of chemical elements (carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen) which are taken from the air and water. But the land suffers from loss of the nitrogen-carrying proteins in cottonseed. Most of it has left the South in the form of cottonseed meal, and the export of cottonseed and meal over the last 75 years has been a major cause of the exhaustion of the soil of the Cotton Belt and, in turn, of low farm income. Suffice it to say that one of the underlying reasons for low income and the widespread loss of soil fertility in the Cotton Belt is the fact that we have so far been unable to produce, grow, and market cotton under conditions which would keep the loss of irreplaceable elements in the soil to a minimum; instead, this loss has been tremendously high. It can well be said that in selling cotton on the market the South has sold its soil fertility.

DEPLETION OF EXHAUSTIBLE RESOURCES

The extent to which our exhaustible and irreplaceable resources have been depleted has been described more forcibly than time will permit today. Others also have called attention to the role of technology in accelerating this process. For example, in 1938 the estimated, proven oil reserves amounted to about 15,000,000,000 barrels. In 1937, 1,250,000,000 barrels were consumed. It is difficult to imagine modern civilization without gasoline; yet experts believe that even if newly discovered fields prolong the life of our oil reserves for a century, we may face a shortage with consequent higher prices in a decade or two. Conservative estimates place our coal reserves at about 3,000,000,000,000 tons. In the year 1929, 600,000,000 tons were produced and consumed. With coal our cause for concern does not relate to the imminent exhaustion of the total supply. The problem is one of conserving superior grades accessible to centers of use.

About one-half the timber on 850,000,000 acres of land has been exhausted within the past 300 years. Although this resource is renewable by proper practices over a period varying from 25 to 100 years or more, the magnitude of the conservation problem is apparent.

SOIL LOSSES

It is certain that even our present standards cannot long be maintained unless the exhaustible elements in the soil can be preserved and replaced. It is conservatively estimated that the loss from erosion is of the value of, roughly, $400,000,000 a year, or about 1,500,000,000 man-hours of labor. One of the soil elements, phosphorus, is necessary to the life of all animals and plants. A small amount of it is found in all soils, but it is being constantly exhausted by the growth of agricultural plants and, of course, by erosion. It is roughly estimated that about 3,000,000 tons of phosphorus are removed by crops or washed into rivers or the sea every year. Only 336,000 tons are replaced as fertilizer at the present rate of fertilizer use.

In a brilliant discussion of this subject by one of the most clear-thinking of our American journalists, Jay Franklin, he makes this significant statement:

"Our enemies are of our own household. Cornfields running down the river; cottonfields draining into the Gulf of Mexico; wheat lands on the Great Plains dyeing the Missouri or powdering the cities of the distant East; forests cut down and gullies eating farms like cancers; poor whites and croppers; chiggers and hookworm; malaria; ignorance; bewilderment; apathy."

ONE-THIRD UNDERPRIVILEGED

The statement commonly made and never denied is that about one-third of our people—in large part farmers who own or cultivate the soil—are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. To a large extent these are the people on whom chief dependence must be placed for conserving and restoring the 1,000,000,000 acres of lands which have felt the grip of the long fingers of soil erosion. This is about one-half of the entire land surface of the United States. This calls for war on a hundred fronts.

Are these problems being attacked in an effective way? That remains to be seen. Perhaps the most encouraging fact is the growing sensitivity of the general public to the importance and complexity of the problem. Moreover, there are hopeful signs of progress in the work that is being done by both the Government and private industry in developing greater efficiency in the production and use of coal and petroleum, particularly in reserves at the lower quality grades.

FOREST CONSERVATION

It is not necessary to dwell upon the forest-conservation program now being carried on by both the Government and private industry. The work of fire protection, selective cutting, reforestation, and insect control is a long story in itself. One of the most interesting phases of this work is the planting of tree belts in the prairies and plains of the West. Within 5 years, 11,000 miles of tree barriers, 100 feet wide, have been planted. The trees have grown from 4 to 8 feet each year, and some of them are now about 35 feet high. When these projects were first discussed, some 6 or 7 years ago, many a Senator and Congressman laughed aloud. They said it was ridiculous and could not be done. Being a Westerner myself and knowing something of these dry plains, I, too, was skeptical of these projects, but that work is being done and the results in reducing moisture losses, in protecting cultivated crops, and in making the surroundings more attractive are a delight to one who beholds them.

WORK OF THE A. A. A.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has a widespread program in more than 3,000 counties in the United States. There are about 6,000,000 of the 9,000,000 farmers in this country who are cooperating. These participating farmers have diverted some 30,000,000 acres from soil-depleting crops to soil-building crops, such as grasses and legumes. About 5,500,000 tons of lime and fertilizer have been applied to soil-conserving crop lands. In the

far West some 25,000,000 acres of range land were reseeded in 1938 with the building of small dams, the drilling of wells, and the development of springs going on apace. Cropping systems are being changed, terracing of hillsides is going on at a rapid rate, contour cultivation, furrowing, strip cropping, and better farming methods are being encouraged. To enable these millions of farmers to carry on these conservation practices and to control surplus production, so-called conservation and benefit payments are being made to them by the Government. I think these payments were necessary in making it possible for a majority of these farmers to adopt the conservation measures in the public interest.

T. V. A. ESTABLISHED

In 1933 many of these problems of national scope were defined for solution upon a regional scale by establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority. Since the program of conservation now underway in the Tennessee Valley region of the Southeastern States is the one with which I am most familiar, possibly you might be interested in a review of some of its more important operations and results. The acute conditions in that region have been colorfully described in the report of the National Emergency Council.

CONDITION OF TENNESSEE VALLEY IN 1933

There are about 24,000,000 acres in the Tennessee Valley drainage area. On this there are about 250,000 farms supporting 1,500,000 people. These farms average 70 acres in size with about one-half in crops and pastures and the other half in woodlands. Of the 8,500,000 acres in crops and pastures, about 1,000,000 acres have become totally unfit for cultivation. Another 2,000,000 acres have lost half the topsoil, and about 4,000,000 additional acres have been subject to appreciable erosion. The rich bottomlands were suffering from floods and the uplands from erosion. The one-crop system has led to soil mining through the cultivation of cotton and corn as the principal source of cash income.

And yet this is one of the richest sections of the country in important natural resources. There are rich phosphate deposits and other minerals. Of the 18 minerals listed as critical to national defense by the War Department, 14 may be obtained in commercial quantities in the Tennessee Valley region. There was a large amount of undeveloped water power; the timber resources, although seriously depleted, were of great potential value. There were unusual possibilities for cheap water transportation on the Tennessee River.

This area offered an opportunity for the development of these resources not equalled, perhaps, by any other section in the United States. The water power could be developed by the building of a series of dams. The river could be improved for modern inland water transportation. Floods could be reduced in the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers. All of these public purposes could be served by the same series of dams. But there remained perhaps the more important task of protecting the land by controlling the water where the rain falls.

WORK OF T. V. A.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority was established it represented perhaps the most comprehensive effort ever undertaken to arrest the terrific waste of the resources throughout an entire region. It took over Wilson Dam, the hydropower plant and steam plant, and the nitrate plants which had been constructed during the World War. It proceeded with the building of other dams and power plants on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. To date, it has practically completed 6 dams and power plants and is in the process of constructing 3 more, which, with the Wilson plant, will complete a 10-dam system. Two of these dams, Norris and Hiwassee, are located on tributaries of the Tennessee River. The others are located on the Tennessee River itself. With the completion of these dams and the power facilities in connection with them, the Authority will be one of the largest wholesalers of power in the world. It will have an installed capacity of more than 1,500,000 kilowatts of electric power. It will be operating in 7 States. It is furnishing power at rates from 25 to 50 percent lower than that furnished by private power companies.

POWER SAVINGS

With the recent purchases of power facilities of companies in the Tennessee Valley area, the Authority is now supplying electricity to municipalities, cooperatives, and industries, with customers numbering about 375,000. The annual savings to these customers during the present year will amount to approximately $8,600,000. It is interesting to observe that private power companies operating in the Southeast have found it to their interest to make material reductions in rates, particularly in the domestic and rural classes of service. Indeed, since 1933 power companies throughout the United States have profited by placing in practice the time-honored principle of low prices and mass consumption.

This development of water resources in the interest of the people of the region is of far-reaching significance to the causes of conservation. The series of 10 dams, when completed, will convert the erratic and winding Tennessee into a chain of lakes. The sources of energy so developed will last forever. Loss of life and property from floods will be reduced. Cheap water transportation then available will start many low-grade commodities along the road to processing that would otherwise lie neglected and unused.

Another important phase of the conservation program of this agency is concerned with the restoration and maintenance of the fertility of the region's soils.

Since the Muscle Shoals plants were transferred to the Authority, they have been dedicated as a national laboratory for use in a program addressed to this perplexing problem. The first phase has involved the development of highly concentrated phosphate fertilizers and processes for their production in facilities designed and installed for the purpose in the Muscle Shoals plants.

T. V. A. FARM PROGRAM

As new materials are developed they are tested under scientific conditions in agricultural experiment stations operated in connection with land-grant colleges located in the seven Tennessee Valley States and in all parts of the country. Upon the basis of scientific information thus obtained, the material is then tried out by individual farmers under practical conditions. The farmers who conduct these demonstrations have been chosen for that purpose by voluntary community clubs that have been organized in nearly every community in the Tennessee Valley area. Expert guidance is provided by the county agents of the agricultural extension services which are likewise affiliated with State land-grant colleges. Thus, as sound results are observed in practice at these centers of community study, the principles can be extended and applied by others in the group. As of January 1, 1940, there were no fewer than 21,206 unit and area test-demonstration farms operating within the Tennessee Valley counties, containing a total of over 3,000,000 acres of land. Over 900,000 of these acres have been treated with concentrated phosphates manufactured by the Authority. In addition, over 500,000 acres have been terraced in these counties, and approximately 100,000,000 trees have been planted.

RESULTS

These activities are resulting in erosion prevention and land rehabilitation upon a vast scale. The results in these communities in the way of improved housing, increased and better grades of livestock and poultry, and increased incomes are definite and gratifying. Community life is definitely reflecting these results. One could supply hundreds of striking examples in pictures, in financial records, and in the testimony of those who have been benefited.

In any review of the subject of conservation there is much to support the contention of those who hold that modern technology has been a dubious blessing. However, I dislike the logic of that position for it leads to a negative conclusion. I regard the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority as demonstrating the possibilities in redirecting the processes of technology in the interest of conservation rather than exploitation.

This principle is somewhat easier to visualize in terms of large operations. It is dramatized by giant dams and extensive plants and laboratories. In reality, however, the most significant application of modern technology will be found in the solution of the problems of the thousands of small farmers, timber owners, and residents of rural areas. They must be provided with the tools that will place the practice of conservation on a paying basis at the grass roots.

NEW DEVICES

In the concluding part of this discussion, I should like to review the results of that part of the Authority's program carried on by a group of research engineers who are constantly working at the job of finding ways to develop new tools, new farm equipment, and new processes of preserving and improving farm products in the valley. They are also finding ways for the farmer to obtain the benefits of long-discovered processes and devices not heretofore available to those of small means.

Not long ago, in their studies of the needs of small farmers in the Tennessee Valley, the T. V. A. research engineers devised a new type of hay drying equipment so low in cost that it may be utilized by the small farmer. Before that, available hay-drying systems had cost from $3,500 to $10,000, which is, of course, far beyond the means of most farmers. The new hay drier may now be installed for about $300. This new device is of great importance to Tennessee farmers. Fifty-two inches of rain in a year makes hay grow well, but it also prevents its curing. With this new device hay drying begun in the field is completed in the barn by air forced through the hay with an electric blower. The cost of electricity to run this blower is only 86 cents per ton of dry hay, as compared with four times that cost in operating the large artificial heat drier. Not only that, but tests show that the barn-dried hay is richer in vitamins than the field-dried hay. The use of this machine is now spreading to other States.

It helps the farmer to do two things—conserve his soil and improve his income.

My associate, Mr. David Lilienthal, recently had occasion to describe for you another new farm implement as an example of effective results from the field administration of the Authority's program. I refer to the furrow seeder which plants grain and and distributes fertilizer in the same process in furrows on hillsides without disturbing the matted root system between the furrows. This is a remarkable device for conserving the soil while obtaining the benefit of sustained yields. Perhaps this implement may amend the thesis of a remarkable film of a few years ago entitled "The Plow That Broke the Plains," for in effect this plow builds thousands of miniature dams on the hillside to hold the rain where it falls.

Mr. Lilienthal also called attention to the community refrigerator located at Clarksville, Ga., where a community of 61 families

stored their meat and other perishable products. There are 10 other such projects located in the Tennessee Valley. In one, located in Etowah County, Ala., during the first 12 months of operation, there were stored 17,500 pounds of produce for 57 families.

Before these refrigerators were known in the South, nearly one-fourth of the farmer's pork killed and cured by him was lost. In Tennessee, farm people eat less than 5 pounds each of fresh beef a year while in Ohio each person on the farm eats 44 pounds in a year. Before the advent of walk-in coolers and other refrigerators, a large part of the fruit and vegetables of farmers was lost. As a boy in the South I saw hundreds of barrels of apples, peaches, and other fruits rot on the ground in the summer and fall, and the apple I found in my stocking on Christmas morning was a perfect delight. This apple had come 1,000 miles from the State of Ohio.

Here again a new machine has vastly improved the living conditions on the farm. With refrigeration facilities available, the southern farmer is more ready to increase his livestock in a cover-crop program to conserve his soil.

The sweetpotato is an important product in the South. Many a family depends upon it for consumption and for market. A few years ago the losses ranged from 10 percent up. Perhaps the average loss due to inadequate curing facilities was 25 percent. The market was literally flooded with sweetpotatoes at harvest time, and curing and preserving them was necessary.

A device to insure proper curing and a high quality product for the market was urgently needed. Within the last few years the use of electricity in curing and storing houses has reduced storage losses from 25 percent to 5 percent. This means a saving of one-fifth of the farmer's crop of sweetpotatoes, and an increase in the price of about 15 cents a bushel in many cases. This process, adapted and improved by the Tennessee Valley Authority, is now in use in many places in the South.

This, too, means improved incomes and less pressure on the land.

These are merely illustrations of the types of new equipment which are placed within the reach of individual farmers or small groups to be used by them in conserving products and in supplementing their incomes.

Other examples of such machinery which are the subject of study, experiment, and demonstration by the technicians of the Authority in cooperation with local institutions are a small automatic feed grinder, low-cost thresher for grains and legumes, lespedeza seed harvester, equipment for cutting and storing legume silage, scarifier for legume seeds, seed cleaner, automatic device to meter phosphoric acid for legume silage, electric pump with flexible piping for irrigation of truck crops and pastures, electric brooders for pigs and poultry, soil sterilizer, electric hot bed, dairy utensil sterilizer, water heater, improved farmyard lights and lighting systems, electrically heated drying cabinet for aging hams, and insect trap.

PORTABLE MOTOR

One of the most unique and interesting proven devices is a portable motor, which may be put to more than a dozen uses on the farm. Any machine on the farm ordinarily turned by hand can be operated with one of these small electric motors at a cost of about 1 cent per hour for electricity. Such a motor with one-fourth horsepower costs from $5 to $18. It can easily be carried around and safely plugged into any convenient outlet. It can be used to shell corn, mix concrete, churn, clean eggs, freeze ice cream, grind sausage, cut green feed, sharpen knives, and do almost anything else that the ordinary hired man can do.

In addition to research for the individual farmer are some significant contributions of technology to the development of local industry in areas now dependent for income on the shipping out of raw materials.

The quick-freezing process has been described to you by my colleague. The raising and preserving of strawberries and other fruits and vegetables relieves pressure on the land and increases financial returns to the farmers. These returns have been doubled in several communities.

The same sort of thing is being done as to methods of using the minerals located in this area, with emphasis upon the use of waste products, byproducts, and such common minerals as limestone and clays. There are projects for using scrap mica in plastic products, vermiculite for insulation, kaolin for fine china, olivene as a new source of magnesium compounds for refractories, talc for ceramic uses, silica for electric furnace operations, and special sandstones for building purposes.

At the risk of being tedious I have gone into some detail to show you the sort of machines, equipment, and processes which are being developed to supply the needs of farmers, to improve their income, and to enable them to carry out conservation practices. Not all of the devices mentioned have been invented by the specialists of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the land-grant colleges, but a number of them have been invented and patented by the Authority, and others have been improved and adapted to the needs of the farmers in this region. The main objective is, of course, to place suitable tools in the hands of the people, by whomsoever devised or invented.

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS

The most important thing of all, however, is the result of the introduction and use of these new devices. What are the benefits to the soil? What are the benefits to the farmers engaged in the program? The proof of the pudding is, of course, in the eating. I know of no better way to bring the results to you than to give you some specific instances which are typical of hundreds, if not thousands, of others.

In north Georgia, Mr. J. S. Christians is a dairy farmer. In 1936 he had 25 cows and, without any electrical equipment, made a net farm income of $975. In 1937 he obtained electric service and installed refrigeration and other equipment to enter the grade-A bottle-milk business. His farm electric equipment cost $927. A truck and other supplies cost him $1,075. This made a total of $2,344 invested in farm and home improvements. His net income for 1937 was $2,364, or an increase of $1,389 over 1936. This was an increase in net income of nearly 60 percent on his total investment in these improvements.

Mr. Henry Calloway, a truck grower on a neighboring farm, installed insect traps on 3 acres of tomatoes. These traps are electric lights with charged wires to which insects are attracted and by which they are electrocuted. Result of the lighted patch yielded over 90 percent worm-free tomatoes, while the balance of his 15 acres planted to tomatoes was a complete failure due to an infestation of corn-ear worms.

Mr. G. C. Harris lives at Ranger, Ga. He has a 600-bushel house for storing sweetpotatoes. After he had installed electricity for curing and storing sweetpotatoes he not only saved a substantial percentage of his potatoes but sold all his crop at 15 cents a bushel higher than the going prices. He says he had enough calls to have doubled his sales.

The Cooperative Cotton Mill at Wilson, Ark., of which Mr. C. W. Hoover is manager, purchased one of the first pressure cookers for processing cottonseed developed by the T. V. A. and the University of Tennessee Engineering Experiment Station. Its operations effected savings due to greater oil recovery and better quality of products in sufficient amount to liquidate the investment in 1 year. The cooker also makes it possible to process other oil seeds, such as flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans, with equal efficiency. Translate this experience to the 500 operating oil mills in the South, and the benefits accruing will mean that less dependence need be placed on cotton fiber as the basis for the South's income.

One could go on indefinitely with this recital of individual cases, but it is unnecessary. Every year adds to the list of such new devices and to the number of farmers using them.

A JOINT PROBLEM

This whole problem of conservation is of common interest to Government and private enterprise—Government because it is concerned with the public welfare and private enterprise because its solution will expand the opportunities for industry.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, one of the foremost journalists of the day, expresses this point in eloquent fashion. He sums up the significance of T. V. A. to the conservation movement in these terms:

"It is an extremely short-sighted view which says that there is here any conflict of fundamental principle with the institution of private property of free competition and private initiative. It is only on the foundation of great natural resources that a free economy can perpetuate itself. To conserve those resources is to defend the foundations of democratic capitalism; to let them be destroyed is to make a free economy impossible to maintain."

For a hundred years, with all the advance in scientific research and invention of private industry, the depletion of the Nation's vital resources has gone on at a rate unequaled in the history of the world. The obligations of the citizen, of business, and of the Government are clear and unequivocal.

Of this, Mr. Lippmann says:

"As I see them, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a modern development of the conservation movement. The underlying idea of that movement is that the natural resources of the country, its lands, forests, minerals, rivers, do not belong to one generation, but to all the generations to come, that to protect them from exhaustion and destruction is as much a matter of vital national defense as to repel a foreign invader. That to insure their soundest development for the long future the Government must take a hand, because only the Government lives long enough to wait long enough to act for a long future."

Conservation as thus defined by Mr. Lippmann does not mean a niggardly hoarding of resources, but more enlightened practices in their development and use. The T. V. A. program has shown how government can mobilize agricultural and engineering technology in cooperation with private enterprise in the service of this new type of conservation.

WAR ON A HUNDRED FRONTS

During this last hundred years we have witnessed amazing scientific progress and wealth on one hand, and startling resource depletion and poverty on the other. The eight to ten million unemployed is a stubborn, threatening fact, and the 30,000,000 ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed present a fateful challenge to this democratic Government.

I think America has accepted the challenge. I think we have decided to make a physical reconquest of our land and a social regeneration of our people. But this calls for war on a hundred fronts to conserve and develop the physical and human resources of the Nation.

This war can be won. But it will take all the skill, all the inventive genius, all the tenacity, energy, and imagination we possess; and it may take the next hundred years.

Radio Correspondents Association Completes First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY ALBERT L. WARNER

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Albert L. Warner which was published in Broadcasting magazine:

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The author of this article was for 10 years a prominent Washington newspaper correspondent and is a member of the famed Gridiron Club. His last newspaper assignment, before becoming Washington correspondent for C. B. S., was the chieftancy of the New York Herald Tribune Washington bureau. On May 20 he was elected 1940 president of the Radio Correspondents Association succeeding Fulton Lewis, Jr., M. B. S. commentator, founder, and first president of the association.]

(By Albert L. Warner)

In mid-May the radio correspondents of Washington finished their first year of complete recognition on an equal footing with the representatives of the press in the Nation's Capital. Given our own seats in the congressional galleries, our own correspondents' rooms in the Capitol, and admitted to all the Presidential and Cabinet press conferences, we were acknowledged, last June, for the first time, an important part of the Washington news-gathering corps. And this summer for the first time there will be reportorial seats assigned to radio newsmen at the national conventions.

This acceptance of the Washington radio correspondent may be explained perhaps in the fact that the May 20 meeting, this year, of the Radio Correspondents Association in Washington was attended by 40 members.

AT THE SOURCE

Forty radio correspondents in Washington. Two years ago you didn't even hear of radio news staffs. The growth is, I think, due not only to the network correspondents, whose work has been in the forefront of public attention because of the fact that they actually go on the air. It is due also to news gathering and editing staffs and to the emergence of a new type of radio correspondent who covers Washington news for a single station or regional network, and whose news is brought to the radio audience indirectly, by filing wire reports to the station he represents.

I think this is an extremely interesting development in radio's coverage of news, acknowledging something I have always felt, that radio has depended a little too much on the services of press tickers. To interpret news without having a first-hand contact with the source of that news and those who make it is a difficult job indeed. It is particularly difficult for the newsman whose report is given directly by radio.

Coming so new to radio, it's natural that I should be aware of the similarities and differences between press and radio coverage of Washington's news.

I suppose what struck me in making the change from newspaper to radio was radio's personal touch—that direct communication between the reporter and the listener, the tone of voice, the inflection, the personality which a radio correspondent inevitably inflicts upon the listener. A talk is apparently a much more personal thing to the listener than a newspaper article is to the man who reads it.

NOW A PERSONALITY

My name was on the front page of a New York newspaper with bylines over Washington articles for a good many years during a period in which there was absorbing interest in Washington activities. Except for a very occasional letter from an acquaintance, and once in a long while from an outsider, I never heard from anyone except other newspapermen. I suspect that newspapermen are the only people who bother to look at bylines over news articles in the papers.

On the other hand, I was immediately struck by the number of people who are interested in the radio speaker as a personality. My fan mail is not so voluminous that I have difficulty in answering it, but the fact that any complete strangers should take the trouble to write notes indicates what a difference there is between the way people listen to radio news and the way they read a newspaper.

One of my first postals was received from a gentleman in New Jersey who said something to this effect: "You are just a loud-mouthed anti-new dealer spouting chamber of commerce stuff. I and all my friends are going to turn off the radio when you come on."

Three weeks later I was amazed to receive another postal from the same gentleman saying: "I was mistaken. I think you are being fair. Good luck."

Then there are people who are touched off into flowery letters or into criticism by a word picture or a phrase. Not so long ago I went to a press conference conducted by the economic negotiators for Britain and France—economists who were trying to straighten out irritations in the diplomatic relations between the Allies and the United States. One of the Britishers seemed to me a typical Englishman, and I happened to mention on the air that he wore baggy trousers. A post card the next day informed me that I had insulted the English, and that my adjective had proved me a German propagandist of the worst stripe. I replied that my own trousers were frequently baggy.

Radio reporting is thus to a considerable extent subjective because of the effect of the broadcaster's personality on the listener. But the necessity for objective reporting is equally obvious. If you write for a particular newspaper, you are often writing for a particular class of readers. Some of the material emphasized in the New York Evening Post, a liberal paper, is often quite different from material emphasized in the conservative New York Sun. On the radio you have no particular group of listeners; in fact, you have the most cosmopolitan audience that you could probably find anywhere. You could not satisfy those listeners for very long if you were not reasonable, fair, and objective. You could not serve the public interest if you did not have these qualities.

A GROWING CORPS

Combining the color of events, the interpretation of them, and the personal touch with objectivity and impartiality is the task of the radio correspondent. It is not an easy one.

In Washington is growing a corps of experienced reporters, now devoting themselves to radio, who know their job and keep at it. This is the basis for any good reporting—radio or newspaper.

In Fulton Lewis, in Earl Godwin, in H. R. Baukhage, and I hope in myself, we have old-fashioned reporters who ought to know what is going on and why. In the days just before the war broke out, and onward as foreign affairs topped everything in the news, I have practiced calling on at least four or five different officials in the State Department every day, including an Assistant Secretary of State or two. This is in addition to the press conference with Secretary Hull. Add to that a visit to Congress and to the War Department and contact with the White House.

If then I could not give an ample, accurate, and fair presentation of the attitude, opinions, and predictions of official Washington, it would be my fault.

Washington's radio correspondents celebrate, in the first anniversary of their recognition as an integral part of the capital's news-gatherine machine, the recognition of the care and thoroughness and difficulty which are part of the radio correspondent's job.

Registration of Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the New York Times, of June 3, 1940:

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1940]

INCONVENIENCE FOR NONALIEN—PROPOSED REGISTRATION IS REGARDED AS PUTTING BURDEN OF PROOF ON CITIZEN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the debate on the pros and cons of registering and fingerprinting aliens, the most important aspect of the matter has escaped public attention. The chief hardship resulting from such legislation falls not on the alien but on the American citizen. Most immigrants come to the United States from countries where registration at the local police station has been a routine matter for generations. It is a feature of nations where universal military service is in force. No one, be he citizen or alien, in those countries can move three houses down the block without reporting this fact to the police.

But here is the rub. All the alien will have to do in the United States is to say he is an alien and be registered. Most aliens will have their legal documents in good order. But the American citizen, especially the native born, will have the harder job—he will have to prove that he is an American.

Do our people realize that there are millions of native born among us whose births were not registered because they lived in sparsely populated sections of the country where this was not compulsory, or the records were carelessly kept and were destroyed by fire? How will these millions prove their citizenship?

Perhaps some will recall the difficulties Will Rogers had the first time he applied for a passport and was unable to produce a birth certificate. And yet 130,000,000 Americans will have to walk around with proof of citizenship in their pockets because anyone objecting to their opinions, political activity, color of skin, or what have you can challenge them as aliens and they will be unable to prove their citizenship. The opportunities for persecution, suppression of unpopular opinions and activities, such as work for peace and labor organizing, are unlimited.

Those who don't believe this is possible need only recall the days of the Palmer raids after the World War. Or let them study a larger-scale model—the enforcement of anti-Semitic legislation in Germany, Italy, and Hungary. In these countries a Jew merely had to declare himself a full, half, quarter, or sixteenth Jew and his statement was accepted. But the greatest part of the population of these countries had to spend an amount of money estimated to have fully covered their reparations payments in order to pay lawyers and researchers to excavate three or four generations of family history, paternal as well as maternal.

No "fifth columnists" are going to be trapped by this sadistic, hysterical legislation. Any "fifth columnist" worth his hire will be smart enough to evade the law. But 130,000,000 decent Americans will rue the day they muzzled themselves thinking they put only the alien population under control.

Under the smoke screen of war hysteria this elaborate plan for police surveillance of a whole people is being smuggled into our lives. This will establish a totalitarian routine, not protect "our way of life." If all that our would-be protectors can do is imitate the very thing we fear, why not invite Heinrich Himmler to do it for us?

EDITH WYNNER.

NEW YORK, *May 29, 1940.*

Current Prices of Oils and Fats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTERS FROM HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, OF ALABAMA, AND SECRETARY HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter by Hon. FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, to Hon. Henry A. Wallace, together with a news release issued by Mr. BOYKIN and a subsequent news release from the Department of Agriculture.

Because of the severe decline in prices in lard and other pork products and the resulting falling off in the price of cottonseed oil, it appears to me that the efforts made by those cooperating is of considerable interest to the agricultural West and South.

The matters referred to follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is being sent at the request of the congressional delegation selected to visit with your own good self and which attended you at your office to discuss the current prices of oils and fats.

May I take this opportunity of first thanking you for the courtesies extended Senators CONNALLY, BILBO, ANDREWS, RUSSELL, MILLER, and LUCAS, and Representatives PACE, HARRINGTON, HARTER of Ohio, COLMER, JARMAN, HOBBS, and myself, as well as thanking you in behalf of the representatives of the National Grange, the National Farmers Guild, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, the Domestic Oils and Fats Conference, and such other representatives of agriculture as were invited to join our delegation in the conference arranged with you.

I am personally happy to extend further the congratulations of this group for the splendid work you have already accomplished in behalf of our wheat, corn, and other grain farmers. We rejoice with American agriculturists that you, Mr. Secretary, by your courageous action taken with dispatch, saved these farmers from one of the worst drastic price declines that ever occurred in so short a period during our national history.

Not alone did you arrest the "price panic" decline, in the boards of trade, but the recovery already effected in prices has proved your action was both economically and financially sound.

It is true that severe "breaks" occurred in all markets in financial, as well as commodities, in these darkened days of the European war.

It might be said that the heavy liquidation which occurred, and which for that matter is still occurring, is attributed to the discounting of the worst happenings in the foreign situation. But a floor has been put under prices in the board of trade. That class of producer can suffer no further drastic loss.

There is one class of commodity traded, however, in our own as well as in world markets that should not any longer have to endure the price trends current in its price structure. I refer to the current prices on American oils and fats.

Let me point out, Mr. Secretary, but a few market facts as to some of the price trends which prevailed in the oils and fats market even subsequent to the time you had succeeded in stopping the runaway in grain prices.

1. Chicago lard futures declined from 63 to 77 points while cash lard itself has gone off 66 points.

That the break of 68 points in the lard market occurred not only during the time that the price of corn was pegged, but actually occurred after corn had shown marked strength and recovered an actual increase above the price at which it had been pegged.

2. While the top last week on Chicago hogs fell only 15 cents per hundred, cash lard in the same market and period fell about 68 cents per hundred pounds. This was a price loss four and a half times as much as was taken on the hogs from which the lard had been rendered.

3. The prices of cottonseed oil which always follow the price of hog lard now average 1 cent lower a pound than they did a month ago. A declining 55 to 59 points last week alone makes new lows for the season.

4. Despite the fact that the prices of corn now average 9 cents per bushel above the market price of a year ago, we find that lard itself, a product of the corn-fed hogs, is selling at 1 cent less than a year ago. This establishes a new record low price for that commodity.

Above are exhibited but a few facts indicative of the current price trends. They are cited to disclose the adverse effects of current war conditions upon the domestic prices of oils and fats.

They are, however, entirely at variance with the factors which normally make for supply and demand, and which trends instead of bringing about the ruinously low prices currently received by our cotton planters and hog raisers, should, in the face of present stocks, make for an increase in the price, rather than a decrease.

Mr. Secretary, I ask that you believe with me that the present low prices which are due wholly to our domestic market-pricing system and are in no wise to increased imports. This is clearly borne out by the fact that the imports of foreign edible oils in the first quarter of 1940 were 60,000,000 pounds less than similar imports of such oils in the first quarter of 1939.

I would point out further that the present decline in the price of edible oils and fats is in no manner attributable to any slackening in exports. This is made evident by the fact that the exports of edible oils in the first quarter of 1940 total nearly 36,000,000 pounds, compared with the 8,000,000 exported in the first quarter of 1939.

Despite all arguments to the contrary, from the above it can clearly be seen that under our present trade program and policy, not alone have exports increased, but our imports of competing oils have been decreased.

That the current low prices are not due to any decline in domestic consumption is made evident by the following statistics which clearly reveal that not alone have we increased our domestic consumption of cottonseed oil, but also an increased consumption in the current year of "hog lard," unquestionably due to the beneficent action program of the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.

This contention is supported by the following table of consumption:

Monthly consumption

	Cottonseed oil		Lard (inspected)	
	1939	1940	1939	1940
	Barrels	*Barrels*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
January	229,224	267,306	79,000,000	113,981,000
February	221,916	213,350	72,000,352	62,089,000
March	306,613	243,087	73,000,314	96,000,000
April	204,924	257,324	(1)	(1)
Total	962,747	981,667	224,000,000	272,746,000

[1] April statistics official for lard not yet available.

That our cotton planters and hog raisers are now bearing the brunt of the effect of wartime conditions upon price and are taking all the loss is made evident by virtue of the fact that the price of vegetable shortening has not shown any change whatever in the last month, while the prices of the raw materials which enter into the shortening have been showing serious loss to our producers of the raw materials.

Prices

	Month ago	Week ago	May 21
Lard, loose, Chicago	5.60 cents average.	4.70 cents average.	4.65 cents average.
Crude cotton oil, S. E. Val	6 cents	5⅜ cents nominal.	5 cents nominal.
Crude cotton oil, Texas	5¾ to 5⅞ cents nominal.	5½ cents	Do.
Vegetable shortening, drums	9¼ cents pound, New York.	9¼ cents	9¼ cents.

It is because of these facts that as Representatives to Congress from the agricultural areas of the Nation we are again addressing you.

We know that you realize the problem fully well and will render all possible aid and assistance to our primary oils and fats producers.

We also know that you know that under our present cropping system that practically the entire cotton crop is mortgaged even before it is made and, furthermore, that practically the sole remaining cash crop left to millions of our cotton planters not currently mortgaged to make the crop is the cottonseed itself.

We believe further that our minds meet on the necessity of doing everything in our power not alone to protect the current prices on these commodities, on that portion of those crops now being marketed from the last crop year, but that we must act now; if the ruinously low prices which characterize the present markets are not to be reflected or actually continued as the price to be paid and received for the entire crop of cottonseed and hog lard now coming into production.

No currently informative statistics or data are now available as to the stocks of any oils and fats on hand (except the monthly report as to cottonseed oil). There is, however, a bill now pending in Congress—S. 3153—which will make these necessary data as to all oils and greases available in the future. We are hopeful that it will pass both Houses this session.

One thing, however, is patent. We know full well that simple business acumen and judgment would dictate that the processors of America's oils and fats would avail themselves of the low-priced stocks now available and that they would stock up on the disastrously low prices which now obtain in our markets and build both their inventories of raw materials as well as inventories of products in both edible and inedible products such as margarine, shortening, soaps, paints, etc.

Therefore we take this opportunity to make request that you now stabilize the prices in the domestic markets at once. Further, that you stabilize them at some figure or price that will not alone protect the current market price but, and more important still, the prices which will be paid for the cottonseed to be sold by our farmers in the cotton harvest now estimated to begin in the Rio Grande Valley in about 2 or 3 weeks.

Is it necessary to point out that if something is not done and done now, that we will again enter upon this year's cotton-picking season with wagon seed selling at a sorry price of $10 per ton, as contracted with a parity price of $28.86 per ton, estimated as parity in the month of April.

Mr. Secretary, need I remind you that this is the identical condition with which you and your Department were faced at the beginning of the last crop year. You solved the problem for our farmers then! It is far more urgent that you solve it now.

Then, as now, Congress was about to adjourn. "Wagon seed" was then selling for $12.75 per ton. The crisis was such that various members of Congress of both parties stayed on in Washington even after Congress adjourned.

Then, as now, you received practically the same delegation from Congress to ask your help in solving the same problem. Through your efforts and without a dollar loss or cost, you brought the price to "parity" then. You must do so again! As a result of your efforts our cotton and hog farmers received a better price almost through the entire year, continued to receive it until this war condition arose.

The domestic processors of our cottonseed and other domestic oils and fats are few in number. They consist mainly of the packing, the soap, the margarine, and the paint industries. If these industries are enabled now to stock up on these raw materials, you may be well assured that next year will see a buyer's market throughout the entire season. If that occurs, Mr. Secretary, the income of our cotton farmers, which is now bordering on level of poverty, will fall even below that to a level of, may I say, economic, if not social, unrest.

That this is but a temporary condition is borne out by the following facts:

1. It is conceded that the corn-hog ratio is not at this moment conductive hog feeding. This would indicate—

2. That there will be a smaller hog production than in the crop just closed.

3. That there will be a marked increase in the sizes of the hogs marketed as compared with last year.

4. That there will be a marked increase in the price of hogs this year.

5. These factors should make for a higher price for hogs, consequently, a higher price for lard and hence a higher price for cottonseed and cotton oil.

Therefore, it would follow that to positively cure the ills of our present price problem and change the trends of the same, your Department would be fully warranted to proceed, through the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation to make purchase of the entire stocks of lard in the United States with full assurance that such a purchase program would entail no loss to your Department.

Appreciating your every effort to date to help this situation we are now asking that you adopt that program, because of all of the foregoing, and in doing so you will have done so in behalf of the producers of America's oils and fats that which your own self, Department, and Commodity Credit Corporation recently did for the naval stores industry of the Nation.

The naval stores industry were, as you well know, in a similar plight. They, too, had a problem similar to this one. To cure their ills you caused the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy up all of the available supply of resin and turpentine and by the orderly marketing of these stocks not alone saved that essential industry from decadence and bankruptcy, but actually showed a profit to the Federal Government of more than $670,000 through the orderly marketing of the products acquired.

My confidence in the success of the proposed loan, dictates that I remind you, Mr. Secretary, that with a national annual consumption of 1,500,000,000 pounds of lard that the entire stocks on hand today actually represent less than a 3-month supply of that indispensable food.

I would further point out that at current prices the entire lard stocks of 272,000,000 pounds could be acquired for a sum of less than $15,000,000.

Our principal source of supply of coconut oil, which is the main commodity competing with both lard and cottonseed oil, is the Philippine Islands. Cargo rates from Manila to the United States have recently been increased 30 percent. Inasmuch as the principal areas of production of other edible oils and fats are normally found in China, India, Dutch East Indies, Africa, and with higher shipping costs under wartime conditions, these demands for our own native oils and fats will be increased, not alone at home but also abroad. Demand will arise, not alone for our present but also for our future stocks of these commodities.

Continuing decline in imports augmented by the fact that there is a marked decline in the pig census under last year's production, coupled with the acquisition of 100 percent of the lard stocks on hand, would unquestionably result in—

1. The orderly marketing of next year's crops of cottonseed, peanut, and soybean oil, of lard and all other fats and oils, both edible and inedible.

2. In a fair price for such lard and cottonseed and other such oils and fats as are now being marketed.

3. In the insurance of a fair price, based on parity in the coming crop season for the cottonseed now coming into production and upon which cottonseed prices as a result of the program will result in millions of dollars added to the income of our cotton, peanut, and soybean producers, as well as to the incomes of our hog and cattle raisers.

In lieu of the foregoing I am instructed by the congressional delegation which visited you to ask that you proceed at once to acquire all of the 272,000,000 pounds of lard on hand in the United States.

Thanking you for your every cooperation and continued courtesy in this matter, believe me,

Respectfully yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN, M. C.

AN OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY WALLACE

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1940.*

The press of Thursday carried a statement made by officials of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation in which they advised of being in the market for lard upon which they were requesting bids for 59,000,000 pounds.

It was currently reported that this purchase by the F. S. C. C. was in response to a request made by a congressional delegation, which called upon Mr. Wallace last Wednesday.

That delegation sought a conference with the Secretary in order to discuss with him the conditions which now prevail in the lard and cottonseed oil markets and the oils and fats industry in general as a result of war disturbances. The delegation was headed by Senator TOM CONNALLY and Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN (Democrat), First District, Alabama.

When interviewed as to what further action might be taken by either the Congress or the Department of Agriculture in lieu of the continued decline in prices, Mr. BOYKIN today declared:

"As spokesman for the congressional delegation which called upon Secretary Wallace, I wrote Mr. Wallace today, pointing out the need for further Federal action in order to save the Cotton South from

one of the most ruinous price periods, insofar as the sale of cottonseed is concerned, in the history of that industry. I wrote him in part:

"'As you well know, this year's cotton crop is now in the boll throughout the entire Rio Grande Valley. The picking of the cotton and crushing of the seed is expected to begin in from 2 to 3 weeks hence.'

"With hog lard selling as it did on Thursday last, at less than 5 cents a pound, the prices of cottonseed oil have now tumbled to new lows for this season. Our cotton planters are in despair. They are now convinced that without Federal assistance in the current marketing of both lard and cottonseed oil, that they will not get more than the sorry price of $10 a ton for this year's crop of cottonseed."

"Mr. Wallace knows," continued Mr. BOYKIN, "that under our present cropping system, that substantially the entire cotton crop is mortgaged even before it is made, and further, he knows that practically the sole cash crop left to millions of our cotton planters after the picking which is not mortgaged, is the cottonseed crop.

"We know that Mr. Wallace will do everything in his power, not alone to protect the current prices on the lard and cotton oil now being marketed, but are sure that he will act to prevent the ruinously low prices which characterize today's markets, from being continued as the all-season price at which our cotton planters and hog raisers would be forced to sell the entire crop of cottonseed and hog lard now coming into production.

"It was because of these facts," continued Mr. BOYKIN, "that I wrote Mr. Wallace, at the request of a large group of Senators and Representatives, asking him to stabilize the prices in the domestic markets.

"We have asked that he do this at once and to stabilize these prices at some figure or price that will not alone protect the current price structure but also the prices which, in the future, will be paid for the cottonseed to be sold by our farmers in the coming year. As I stated before, this year's picking is now estimated to begin in Texas in from 2 to 3 weeks.

"It is needless to point out," said Mr. BOYKIN, "that if something is not done and done now, our planters will enter upon this year's cotton-picking season with 'wagon seed' selling at $10 per ton or at far less than half of the partly price of $28.86 per ton, figured for cottonseed in the month of April."

Mr. BOYKIN stated that in his letter to the Secretary, he pointed out that the ruinous prices now prevailing for lard were not due to any large stocks of lard on hand, but, on the other hand, he stated the entire stock of lard now on hand in the United States did not equal the domestic consumption of lard in the first quarter of the current year.

"Neither are the low prices being paid, due to increased imports of edible oils; imports in the first quarter of this year were for 60,000,000 pounds less than in 1939, while the exports of edible oils totaled nearly 36,000,000 pounds, as compared with the 8,000,000 pounds 'exported' in the first quarter of last year."

Mr. Boykin cited facts and figures to show that the farmers in the South and the West were bearing the entire loss in this price decline, and quoted statistics to show that "loose lard" and "cottonseed oil" had declined as much as a cent in the last 30 days, while the price of "shortening" made from cottonseed oil still remains the same in the New York market now as it was a month ago.

He explained how the Commodity Credit Corporation had saved the naval-stores industry from a similar plight several years ago, and in doing so had shown a profit of more than $670,000 to the Federal Government by the orderly marketing of the naval-stores product which it acquired at that time.

He stated that in behalf of his congressional conferees he had asked that the Secretary make use of that same remedial measure, pointing out that all of the lard in the United States today could be purchased for less than $15,000,000 and that the transaction would not cost the Federal Government the loss of a single penny but would show a profit above all costs.

Declaring oils and fats to be the tenth greatest industry in the United States, Mr. Boykin concluded by saying:

"Such action by the Government would save the loss of millions of dollars to the income this year of the domestic producers of America's oils and fats."

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1940.

PURCHASES OF PORK PRODUCTS FOR RELIEF USE REACH TOTAL OF 88,600,000 POUNDS

Purchases of lard and pork products for domestic relief distribution reached a total of 88,600,000 pounds, with the buying yesterday of 32,000,000 pounds of lard and 15,000,000 pounds of salt pork, the Department of Agriculture announced today.

Previously under the program, which was authorized last December, 41,600,000 pounds of lard and pork products had been purchased. Commodities bought are used by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for distribution through the States to families on relief and for use in school-lunch programs.

Additional purchases of smoked-pork products will be made within a few days on offers which are now being received at the F. S. C. C. Invitations for the trade to submit further offers for sale of lard and salt pork will also be sent out by the F. S. C. C. in the immediate future. It is probable that additional purchases will be made when these offers are received.

The current purchases are expected by officials of the Department to prove of assistance to hog producers in helping to improve market conditions.

Lard and pork products are also being moved to relief families through the Department's food order stamp program. Up to May 1, about $2,500,000 worth of the blue surplus stamps distributed under this program had been used for the purchase of pork products. Since December, approximately 30 percent of all the surplus stamps have been spent by participating families for lard and pork. It is anticipated that about $25,000,000 will be spent for pork products under the stamp plan during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

And Now the Militia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 3:

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 3, 1940]

AND NOW THE MILITIA

The President has asked Congress for authority to call the National Guard and the reserves into active service at his discretion. The request was buried at the end of his latest message to Congress seeking another billion dollars for the Army and Navy. It is noteworthy that everything in the message except the request for authority to call the militia had been foreshadowed in White House announcements. Why a matter of such great importance was kept from the country as long as possible is Mr. Roosevelt's secret.

The parallels with 1914–17 are striking. Just as then, so now the rearmament program has been made the occasion for attempting to induce a war fever in the country. Mr. Roosevelt need not have made his melodramatic appearance before Congress on May 16 nor to have followed that with a suplementary demand for further armament credits as if the whole bill could not have been presented at once. He knew that Congress and the country were in full accord with him on the need for preparation. The most plausible explanation of his conduct was his desire to create the impression that the country is in great and growing danger of invasion and thus prepare the people mentally for participation in the war in his third term.

He has, of course, denied that his object is war, but so did his political mentor, President Wilson, in similar circumstances. Now he has followed Mr. Wilson again in preparing to call the National Guard. Mr. Wilson intimated, and it was true, that a plot was being hatched in Mexico to invade this country and it was therefore necessary to send the militia to the border. Mr. Roosevelt offers only the vaguest explanation of his request. Units of the guard may be required, he says, "to maintain our position of neutrality and to safeguard the national defense." The words can mean anything or nothing.

Mr. Roosevelt has already sent Sumner Welles, his Colonel House, to Europe to consult the heads of state in the various countries. On Washington's birthday in 1916 Colonel House had drawn up a memorandum in the British foreign office pledging American support for the Allies if it was needed. Nobody in this country knew about that secret agreement except Mr. Wilson. He accepted it as a statement of his policy, inserting only the word "probably" to qualify the commitment. As soon as the political conventions in June were out of the way he sent the National Guard to the border. He campaigned for the Presidency as the man who had kept us out of war. Five months after his reelection and less than a year after the move to the border war was declared.

Mr. Wilson, in 1914, had opposed making long-term loans to the Allies, but eventually changed his policy and permitted them. Mr. Roosevelt, who had been enthusiastic for the arms embargo, similarly changed his mind and demanded and obtained its repeal.

The parallel all along the line is close. The inference that Mr. Roosevelt is playing Mr. Wilson's game is difficult to avoid. Why did he avoid stating precisely why he wants the right to summon the Guard? It is to be hoped and expected that Congress will insist upon an answer before any such authorization is granted. If Mr. Roosevelt knows of any great danger immediately impending he has no right to keep the facts to himself. The country should

share the knowledge if only that it may be mentally and emotionally prepared for eventualities.

The people of this country want to stay out of the war. More particularly, they do not want to be led, blindfolded, into another military adventure in Europe. As long as Mr. Roosevelt refuses to tell why he wishes the power to summon the Guard, the duty of Congress is to withhold the authorization. If the danger is real, Congress will not hesitate to act.

Trade Agreements and the Balance of Trade of the United States, 1934 to 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 3 or 4 years ago one of the chief criticisms against the trade-agreements program was that through and because of it the United States was losing its so-called favorable balance of trade. Critics complained that we were buying more than we were selling. According to opponents, this condition was of serious consequence. When the excess of exports over imports in 1938 showed up to be more than a billion dollars, these critics were embarrassed and had to change their tune. That tune quickly shifted to the contention that the only reason we had a so-called favorable balance was the fact that we were exporting large quantities of so-called war materials, and they made their own classification of what constituted war materials.

It is true that the United States has and is exporting materials which are used in conducting war operations, but it so happened that in 1938 the exports of agricultural products were valued at the highest figure since 1930. Consequently that situation spoiled their export-of-war-materials story, but during the recent hearings on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act it was revived again. Whatever war or other materials are sold by the individual businessmen of this country are presumably being sold in accordance with laws passed by Congress, including the revised neutrality law, which I opposed. This selling of materials which may be used in warfare is being done, and would have been done, quite apart from any trade agreements. Those who attempt to connect this program up with the direct sale of war materials are doing so because they have such a weak case against trade agreements themselves.

Now, the European countries are not purchasing enough of our agricultural surpluses to suit me. And there have been some complaints against trade agreements, because through them foreign countries, which granted us concessions on certain products, are not forced to buy from us. Under this program we do not agree to buy a single pound of anything, nor do we usually ask the foreign countries to make such guaranties to us. Both contracting governments agree to lessen artificial trade barriers so that the business people of each country may more easily carry on commerce and trade. There is no forcing in either direction. The English and French, however, have undertaken to maintain, as far as possible, purchases of American agricultural products.

The following table gives the imports and exports and excess of exports over imports for the years 1934 to 1939:

[000,000 omitted]

	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Exports	$2,133	$2,283	$2,456	$3,349	$3,094	$3,177
Imports	1,655	2,047	2,423	3,084	1,960	2,318
Excess exports	478	236	33	265	1,134	859

It will be noted that the excess in exports over imports—although too much emphasis should not be placed on this condition—for 1939 was more than $800,000,000. A recent issue of the Journal of Commerce had the following to say regarding the size of this excess of exports and the necessity for importing products:

> It is apparent that our favorable trade balance is still so large as to reassure those fearful of a flood of foreign imports stimulated by currency depreciation abroad. In fact, it is large enough to make clear that, over the long run, something must be done to establish a better balanced foreign trade, either through a further increase in imports or through a curtailment of our exports that will be enforced by means of additional trade restrictions that other countries will impose upon purchases here by their nationals.

The excess of exports over imports for the first quarter of 1940 was twice as great as it was in 1939. Possibly the answer is that more and deeper cuts will have to be made in industrial tariffs so that such imports may enter in larger quantities.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to achieve a national defense we have vastly more to do than merely to have Congress appropriate large sums of money. No greater mistake could be made than to deceive the people of this Nation into believing that we have made any real strides toward the building of an adequate national defense merely by congressional appropriations of money. That is a necessary first step only. After that we need a group, or preferably an individual, of great executive ability to guide the construction of the national defense in order to be sure we shall get what we pay for, and that our defense when built will be the most practical, the most effective, and the most economical defense we could get.

As Col. Charles A. Lindbergh so forcefully and ably said over the radio recently, we must have a definite and clear-cut foreign policy—with regard both to countries of the Old World and the countries of the Western Hemisphere; we must follow that policy by working out an intelligent program based upon a clear concept of what our defense objectives are.

As was declared this week by the Republican minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, the Republican Party can be depended upon to give full cooperation in those things necessary for our safety and our welfare.

The danger which threatens us is too imminent to tolerate either party politics or inefficiency. As has been pointed out in the past week, there has never been a time in our history when we need the two-party system more than we do today. Destruction of this system, which provides checks in our Government, might well lead to the loss of our liberties and our security. There is no emergency of sufficient gravity to warrant abandonment of the two-party system.

There must be a cleaning out of subversive forces in the United States which otherwise might be able to sabotage to a very great degree our efforts to build an adequate national defense. Self-preservation demands that we move promptly, fearlessly, and vigorously to get rid of any "fifth columnists" in the United States.

Unification of effort and the elimination of sectional, class, and partisan prejudices and frictions do not at all mean the abolition of the two-party system in our constitutional Republic. Constructive criticism is an essential in the construction of a practical, economical, and adequate national defense. Without constructive criticism there would exist grave danger that we might in a critical moment awaken to the fact that fatal

mistakes had been made in the creation of our national defense, and we might discover such things when it would be too late to rectify those mistakes. That has been our experience in the past. Constructive criticism is highly desirable; prejudice, or merely political criticism, is to be decried.

The time has come in the United States of America when we must, as one united people, as a united free people, proceed to the vitally necessary business of creating a defense adequate to protect the Monroe Doctrine. We must create a defense that, if the occasion arises, will meet any enemy of the future either on the far shores of the Western Hemisphere or a thousand miles out at sea. In order to do this, in order to accomplish these objectives, it probably will be necessary for us not only to enter into treaty agreements with the other nations in the Western Hemisphere to provide naval and aircraft bases in those countries, but perhaps to bear a greater or less degree of the expense of building those bases.

There is no point in indulging in political incriminations and recriminations at this time. The job of making America safe lies before us. Not only must we accomplish that in the time left to us, but we must not hesitate to tax ourselves to pay, at least in part, for the creation of that defense. No fair-minded man or woman can for a moment tolerate the policy of leaving to our children and our children's children an intolerable burden of debt for our security, to be added to whatever financial burden may confront them in their day for their defense.

Only those who have lost faith in a constitutional republic can believe that a country with the riches and resources of this country and a people with the ingenuity, the intelligence, the capacity, and the ability of American people will fail to create a defense adequate to protect our constitutional form of government and the Bill of Rights. We can. We will.

Alleviating Popular Fears—Maybe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSONVILLE (FLA.) TIMES-UNION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union (independent Democrat) of April 30, 1940:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union of April 30, 1940]

ALLEVIATING POPULAR FEARS—MAYBE

Action by Congress in going far beyond Budget estimates in appropriations indicates strongly the inability of the Members to say "no" in the matter of continued excessive expenditures during an important election year. But Senator HARRISON, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and a stalwart guardian of the Treasury, has no intention of letting the public mind dwell too much on the subject. Not if he can prevent it.

The Mississippian, after a conference with the President, tells the people that the Chief Executive, speaking as the head of the Democratic Party, has passed along definite and positive orders that the Congressmen must take their hands out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The assumption is that the Senator and the President have put their heads together for the purpose of deciding that this shall be a taxless session of Congress.

How this is to be accomplished is a matter yet to be worked out, so far as the collective taxpayer is concerned, for Mr. Roosevelt informed Congress in the beginning that if his Budget estimates were not followed it would be necessary to provide additional revenue by adding to the tax levies.

Despite the warning and regardless of failure by Congress to heed the President's advice, however, the national legislators are not blind to the political sagacity of taking the taxpayer's shirt without telling him all about it. They will go ahead with the expenditures, which since last June have amounted to $7,000,000,000, more than $2,000,000,000 in excess of Government collections, and let the increasing public debt take care of the situation. The taxpayer's shirt will disappear later in the cumulative taxes and interest which will be inevitable from the course that is being followed.

What the President and Senator HARRISON have done, therefore, is enter into an agreement whereby the Executive tells Congress to proceed with its program for spending, postpone the enactment of an inclusive tax bill, and the administration will take care of the situation through its bookkeeping department.

But don't let the public be kidded into thinking that it will not feel the burden, for everything that Congress spends the people must put up. Spending now and taxing later merely mortgages the future.

The question thus posed, How much more debt can the Nation stand, is answered by the First National Bank of Boston in these words:

"In the final analysis, debt capacity of a nation is fixed by the ability and willingness of the people to meet the accumulated bills through taxation. When the point is reached that it is impossible for a government to bridge the gap between income and outgo by means of taxation or through borrowing, then the only course is repudiation or starting the printing press."

For those who advocate high taxes as a means of distributing wealth and spending the Nation into greater prosperity, attention is called to the fact that already Government is taking 25 percent of the national income. It should be obvious that the more Government takes the less there is left for living expenses, and to provide for future requirements. National wealth is increased by producing more goods and more services, not through distribution in high taxes which limit private enterprise and curtail the possibilities of relieving unemployment.

Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

ALLIANCE, OHIO, *May 11, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES SECCOMBE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECCOMBE: I am writing you as to how very dishonest I was taken by the F. H. A. As they started out I was to have a home like the Rock of Gibraltar, but it ended up not a good chicken coop. It was started in October, the fall of 1937—not finished until the first of May 1938. When I moved in it was just a small five-room one-floor plan. It took them that long to build it, and the man that did the plastering told me, after they had the plaster mixed it froze and they just thawed it out and put it on. After we moved in the plaster fell off of every room. They patched it up and it did the same, and as it rained it came right through the walls in every room just like a sieve. As there wasn't even any paper or anything back of the shingles—and they guaranteed a dry-sealed basement—the water came in from all sides of the wall even up through the cement floor, so much that it would be so deep it would get into the ash bed of the furnace.

I lived in the home 2 months and they didn't do one thing for me. All of that time they didn't even put in the window that was out when I moved in.

And I took care of everything in the financing of it as it came along just as I was supposed to. Until I moved in from then on I did just as the officer of the Mount Union Bank, where the loan was made, and the F. H. A. man from Cleveland said. No more payments from you until they make the home livable which, of course, they didn't do or wouldn't do.

I think they thought by me being a poor widow they could just do anything and I would have to take it. God only knows I have taken more than I can endure as it has gotten the best of my health by living in such a cold wet home for 2 months. I was in bed with rheumatism most of the summer.

Then after I moved out they wanted to set aside $60 to patch it up, and when we met out there the F. H. A. man from Cleveland, the attorney, the bank officer, and the contractor, this was what was said. The contractor says, "Oh, I will put this house in repair and keep it in repair if it is 5 years from now." The F. H. A. man said, "I just came from Youngstown, Ohio, where a house went to

pieces, and we can't even find the contractor," and he said this house should have never passed inspection; and who knows if it ever was inspected? I don't.

They sent two men out from Cleveland last summer to see me, and they said they couldn't even find the specification of the house in their Cleveland office, something wrong somewhere, and you should be taken care of honestly and with interest on your loss, but we can't do anything; it will have to be taken care of from Washington.

I had put $1,642.28 in that home, and why should I lose this through such dishonesty?

I have been honest in every respect to everyone, and I expect the same in return.

It seems as though the officer at the Mount Union Bank wanted me to take the rap. These are the very words he said to me: "The least you could do, Mrs. Buttermore, is stay in the home and let us quietly sell it so it won't reflect on the bank or the F. H. A." Now, I just want you to weigh that statement.

The house was sold for what the F. H. A. had in it, $4,000, and I am the loser. Is there any justice for me?

I just can't write everything as I could tell it as to what was done and said to me.

But I am certainly entitled to my great loss with interest.

Hoping I will get it very soon, as I surely and truly am in need of it,

Yours very truly,

Mrs. GAY BUTTERMORE,
Alliance, Ohio.

The Unfairness of Our Treatment of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we now learn that the Federal Government, in prosecuting the former assistant administrator of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration and the M. A. Long Co., a Baltimore reconstruction concern, has obtained a verdict of guilty of conspiracy to defraud the Government.

At the request of Bernard J. Flynn, United States attorney, the former assistant administrator's bail was increased from $3,000 to $5,000, pending the motion for a new trial. It is reported in one of the Baltimore daily newspapers that Wilbert McInerney, counsel for the former assistant administrator, told the jury—

If you were brought here to judge whether the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration did an efficient job or not, I'd like to pull up another chair and sit in on your side.

Because, if the Government set out to prove that the Government was inefficient, it did a swell job.

If the Government were half as careful about spending money as it is about collecting it, we'd pay a lot less taxes.

The same newspaper further reports that Mr. McInerney, in commenting on the question of errand boys drawing salaries at $5,200 and $6,500 a year, said:

This will shock you people here in Baltimore—shock you into insensibility. I don't say it is right; it may be wrong. Over in Washington we've gotten pretty blase about it all.

We learn from newspaper reports that Bernard J. Flynn, United States attorney, in commenting on the case at the close of the proceedings, described it as "the most important case since I've been here."

When one carefully studies the startling testimony submitted to the legislative and appropriating committees of the House by Representatives of the Government, including Administrators and Assistant Administrators of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, employees and Federal investigators, as well as other witnesses, more or less familiar with the sordid administration of this Government undertaking in Puerto Rico, the final result of the Government's case in Baltimore is not very surprising.

In order to continue a study of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, I wish to submit a statement released by W. D. Leahy, Governor of Puerto Rico and present Administrator of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, under date of May 28, 1940. Governor Leahy said:

At a time when the interests of the American people are diverted by alarming international events, the House of Representatives has proceeded to cut in half the $7,000,000 authorized by the Bureau of the Budget for the continuation of needed rehabilitation work in the most densely populated and most distressed agricultural area under the American flag. This area happens also to be one of the United States most strategic outposts for defense.

The Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, which is receiving this cut in needed moneys, has during the past years made a valuable contribution, not only to the relief situation in Puerto Rico but in providing facilities for an improvement in the standard of living of the distressed people of the island. Incident to emergency relief purposes, the P. R. R. A. has made investments in permanent reconstruction assets. These investments now have a value of approximately $20,000,000, a large part of which is self-liquidating and will be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

If the present appropriation cut is allowed to stand, it will result in the discontinuance of rural-rehabilitation activities which now are being conducted by the P. R. R. A., and will have the immediate effect of adding approximately 8,000 persons to the already swollen unemployment rolls.

Inasmuch as Puerto Rican families average five persons, this step will add about 40,000 persons to relief rolls. A cessation of rural activities at this time will mean the abandonment of work already commenced and will result in a definite loss to the investment already made by the United States Government. In my opinion, these investments should be protected.

Of even greater importance than the immediate results would be the set-back to a program which was designed to provide long-range permanent rehabilitation for this island, which, in 42 years of American occupancy, has been the recipient of many unplanned and spasmodic efforts that provided needed temporary relief but did little or nothing permanently to correct unsatisfactory conditions.

I am entirely satisfied with the manner in which the P. R. R. A. is functioning at the present time. Under a competent management, which includes agricultural and marketing experts, it now is one of the leading forces that are trying to build up a sounder economy in the island.

Now, let us look at what the Governor has to say. When the Governor refers to our attention having been diverted by alarming international events, I wish to point out to him that at least two committees of the House have been giving some very serious consideration to the program, which has been followed by the P. R. R. A. in Puerto Rico. The Governor should keep in mind that at no time are foreign affairs more important to our people than domestic problems. Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States. The record is very clear to the effect that the House and the Senate have acted too hastily and without giving proper consideration to the rights of the Puerto Rican people. Subjecting the Puerto Ricans to bureaucratic control and to dependence upon Government checks released through the office of the Administrator of the P. R. R. A. is as unfair a program as our Government could possibly impose upon the people of that island. On the other hand, protecting their industries and giving them the opportunity to work in private industry would, above all other things, preserve their independence, strengthen their moral characters, and make them proud of the continental United States and the form of government under which they reside.

If Puerto Rico is the most distressed agricultural area under the American flag, it is because the Congress, following to a considerable extent the recommendation of former Administrators of the P. R. R. A., has made it so. The fact that the island now becomes one of the most strategic outposts for defense is no reason why private industry should be destroyed, and it is no justification for the conversion of the island and its people into a collectivist state under the supervision of the present or some prospective Administrator of the P. R. R. A.

The Governor, in his statement, emphasizes that, "at the present time, under a competent management, which includes agricultural and marketing experts, it now is one of the leading forces." Since when has the Governor materially improved the management in charge of P. R. R. A. administration? It is in keeping with the facts to say that

the Governor, burdened as he is with naval and military defense problems, has not yet had sufficient time to fully comprehend the agricultural and industrial problems of Puerto Rico, as they relate to New Deal legislation and the operations of the P. R. R. A. The Governor has not yet had sufficient time to familiarize himself with the actual operating facts pertaining to the financial, industrial, and agricultural problems involved in the more than $135,000,000 of relief money—not including benefit payments—made available to the island in recent years by the Congress and the Federal Treasury.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume, for the purpose of this discussion, that if the national and international military and naval emergency, which has been pointed out by the President, is to materialize, that the Governor will, without too much delay, be removed from his present position as Governor of Puerto Rico. He is too valuable a naval expert to be kept in such a position, which demands perhaps as much as any other similar problem, a strictly business administrator. I personally regard his naval abilities so highly that the President could, in my opinion, well afford to permanently transfer the Governor back to the United States where his technical knowledge and experience could be made available to all of the citizens of this country.

If the Governor has, in recent weeks, changed the management of the P. R. R. A., the Congress should, in the light of recent testimony placed before the committees, be given detailed information pertaining to the changes made.

In no way has the Governor justified the reinstatement of the $3,500,000 which he has requested, I am informed, the Senate to include in the Senate bill so that $7,000,000 may come back to the House for confirmation when the conference report is considered.

Effect of Poll Tax on Election Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, in presenting poll-tax election figures I have been told that due to one-party supremacy in the poll-tax States election figures mean little; and that one must go to the Democratic primaries to find the true number of voters. I have, therefore, made a study of primary figures on the attached chart, which I ask to have extended in the RECORD. This covers the last three primaries in Georgia. I will present other States later.

It shows:

First. The poll tax cuts down the electorate, even in primaries, by two-thirds. Thirty-two thousand and seventy-nine persons voted in the average Georgia primary. Over 100,000 persons, more than three times as many, voted in the average non-poll-tax election.

Second. Six of the thirty successful primary candidates polled under 15,000 votes. Yet 256 non-poll-tax Congressmen each received over 45,000 votes in the last election.

Third. Thirteen of the thirty Democratic primaries in Georgia were uncontested. In 18 of the 30 elections there was not one opposition vote.

Fourth. Only 17 percent of the white population voted in the average Georgia primary. Yet 36 percent of the entire population voted in the non-poll-tax district election—more than twice as many.

Georgia Democratic primaries

District	Population	Votes cast and percent of 1930 population voting compared with elections and with other States												Vote for winner of election			
		Total primary vote				Vote for successful primary candidate				Tota election vote							
		1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average
No. 1	328,214	31,074	37,373	35,019	34,489	12,730	[1]37,373	26,991	25,698	5,392	[2]25,846	10,999	14,079	[1]5,392	[1]25,846	10,920	14,053
Percent of population voting		9.47	11.34	10.68	10.50	3.88	[1]11.34	8.22	7.81	1.64	7.86	3.34	4.28	[1]1.64	[1]7.86	3.32	4.27
No. 2	263,606	22,145	30,233	23,720	25,366	13,581	18,285	14,802	15,556	3,369	21,405	5,137	9,970	[1]3,369	[1]21,405	[1]5,137	[1]9,970
Percent of population voting		8.40	11.50	9.00	9.62	5.15	6.95	5.62	5.90	1.28	8.14	1.95	3.78	[1]1.28	[1]8.14	[1]1.95	[1]3.78
No. 3	339,870	24,712	37,358	30,876	30,982	13,679	22,970	[1]30,876	22,508	4,078	25,613	5,988	11,893	[1]4,078	[1]25,613	5,987	[1]11,893
Percent of population voting		7.28	10.90	9.08	9.10	4.03	6.75	[1]9.10	6.62	1.20	7.55	1.76	3.49	[1]1.20	[1]7.55	[1]1.76	[1]3.49
No. 4	261,234	25,033	38,151	31,901	30,712	[1]25,083	[1]38,151	11,166	24,800	5,371	24,643	5,413	11,809	5,131	[1]24,643	[1]5,413	11,729
Percent of population voting		9.60	14.61	12.42	11.76	[1]9.60	[1]14.61	4.27	9.48	2.06	9.45	2.07	4.52	1.96	[1]9.45	[1]2.07	4.48
No. 5	414,313	28,744	45,596	37,850	37,397	[1]28,744	32,769	29,837	30,450	5,206	39,753	7,103	17,354	[1]5,206	35,540	6,906	15,884
Percent of population voting		6.95	11.10	9.15	9.04	[1]6.95	7.92	7.21	7.36	1.26	9.54	1.73	4.20	[1]1.26	8.58	1.67	3.82
No. 6	281,437	20,481	30,603	25,744	25,609	[1]20,481	[1]30,603	[1]25,744	[1]25,609	3,067	[2]22,966	4,369	10,134	[1]3,067	[1]22,966	4,363	10,132
Percent of population voting		7.28	10.89	9.15	9.11	[1]7.28	[1]10.89	[1]9.15	[1]9.11	1.09	8.15	1.55	3.61	[1]1.09	[1]8.15	1.55	3.61
No. 7	270,112	34,623	40,676	36,291	37,197	18,576	[1]40,676	26,051	28,434	5,229	[2]31,465	5,623	14,106	[1]5,229	28,972	5,622	13,274
Percent of population voting		12.82	15.05	13.42	13.72	6.87	[1]15.05	9.65	10.55	1.94	11.65	2.40	5.72	[1]1.94	10.70	[1]2.40	4.91
No. 8	211,957	22,894	34,598	27,420	28,304	10,812	21,203	19,446	17,154	4,501	26,145	4,929	11,858	[1]4,501	24,695	[1]4,929	11,375
Percent of population voting		9.47	14.30	11.53	11.70	4.48	8.78	8.05	7.08	1.86	10.80	2.04	4.90	[1]1.86	10.23	[1]2.04	4.69
No. 9	218,496	30,729	42,212	31,162	34,698	15,796	22,201	[1]31,162	23,053	8,491	32,090	8,945	16,507	[1]8,491	24,353	8,934	13,926
Percent of population voting		14.05	19.30	14.22	15.89	7.23	10.15	[1]14.22	10.56	3.89	14.70	4.08	7.55	[1]3.89	11.12	4.08	6.37
No. 10	289,267	30,230	43,011	31,807	35,016	[1]30,230	[1]43,011	[1]31,807	[1]35,016	8,129	27,147	9,581	14,952	[1]8,129	[1]27,147	9,044	14,773
Percent of population voting		10.45	14.90	10.90	12.12	[1]10.45	[1]14.90	[1]10.90	[1]12.12	2.81	9.37	3.32	5.16	[1]2.81	[1]9.37	3.12	5.10
Number, total	2,908,506	270,706	379,811	311,790	320,769	189,712	307,242	247,882	248,279	52,833	277,073	68,087	132,664	52,593	261,180	67,255	127,009
Percent of population voting		9.30	13.04	10.71	11.02	6.52	10.58	8.52	8.54	1.82	9.52	2.34	4.55	1.81	8.98	2.31	4.36
Average district	290,851	27,071	37,981	31,179	32,077	18,971	30,724	24,788	24,828	5,283	27,707	6,809	13,266	5,259	26,118	6,726	12,701
All citizens over 21	1,494,096	*Percent* 18.12	*Percent* 25.40	*Percent* 20.84	*Percent* 21.46	*Percent* 12.70	*Percent* 20.58	*Percent* 16.59	*Percent* 16.63	*Percent* 3.54	*Percent* 18.55	*Percent* 4.56	*Percent* 8.86	*Percent* 3.52	*Percent* 17.48	*Percent* 4.50	*Percent* 8.50
Total white population	1,836,974	14.77	20.68	16.97	17.47	10.33	16.74	13.49	13.52	2.88	15.10	3.71	7.22	2.87	14.22	3.66	6.92
Native whites over 21	956,894	28.25	39.60	32.50	33.47	19.80	31.40	25.84	25.94	5.52	28.90	7.12	13.85	5.50	27.24	7.03	13.25

[1] Same as total vote. No opposition.
[2] Figures for Georgia Official Register where they conflicted with and where higher than those in Congressional Directory.

Georgia Democratic primaries—Continued

District	Population	Votes cast and percent of 1930 population voting compared with elections and with other States												Vote for winner of election			
		Total primary vote				Vote for successful primary candidate				Total election vote							
		1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average
Relative participation in primaries and elections based on total election vote as 100 percent		513.0	137.0	457.0	241.9	359.0	111.0	363.7	187.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5	94.3	98.7	95.6

TOTAL ELECTION VOTE

	Population	1934	1936	1938	Average
8 poll-tax States:					
Number	22,020,944	1,300,299	2,527,432	1,173,271	1,667,001
Percent		5.90	11.5	5.32	7.55
40 poll-tax-free States:					
Number	100,754,102	31,461,841	41,576,899	35,111,029	36,049,923
Percent		31.24	41.3	34.80	35.79

	1934	1936	1938	Total contests without dissenting votes	Percent of total (30) contests
Primaries with no dissenting vote	4	5	4	13	43.4
Elections with no dissenting vote	9	6	3	18	60.0

Source: Primary votes: Georgia Official and Statistical Register 1933–37; and secretary of State, Atlanta. Election votes: Congressional Directories, 1936, 1938, 1940. Population figures: U. S. Census, 1930.

T. V. A. Tax Replacements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the Republican members of the House Military Affairs Committee are in a very inconsistent position as the result of voting with certain Democratic members of that committee to table all bills relating to the replacement of taxes lost by certain counties in Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Mississippi, on account of the purchase of electric-power properties by Tennessee Valley Authority previously owned privately and subject to taxation.

One of the bills which was being considered by the committee was Senate bill 2925, passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote on April 30, 1940, and referred to the House Committee on May 1, 1940. The Senate bill is substantially the same as H. R. 7424, which was referred to the House committee on July 31, 1939.

I have been informed that certain members of the House committee who voted to table the bills were of the opinion that the county taxes should be replaced but that the State taxes should not, and it was impossible for the committee to agree upon a bill providing for county replacement only.

The said Senate bill provides for full county replacement but only a small part of the State taxes lost in all of the States except Alabama would be replaced. Alabama collects substantially all its taxes which are used for school purposes and distributes them to the counties. The Senate bill provides that the taxes lost by the counties shall be paid by Tennessee Valley Authority direct to the collecting agents thereof.

The proof introduced in the hearing before the Senate committee, page 4, shows that the Tennessee Valley Authority estimated that under section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as now in effect, the States of Alabama and Tennessee will realize the following from the 5 percent provided for:

1940:	
Alabama	$330,000
Tennessee	230,000
Total	560,000
1941:	
Alabama	353,000
Tennessee	280,000
Total	633,000
1942:	
Alabama	374,000
Tennessee	302,000
Total	676,000

This means that it is estimated that the gross receipts of Tennessee Valley Authority for said years will be:

1940	$11,200,000
1941	12,660,000
1942	13,520,000

The proof before the Senate and House committee should conclusively show that Tennessee Valley Authority is collecting from the consumers of its power 12½ percent of the gross receipts, and it will therefore realize and enter upon its books as a trust fund for the affected counties and States:

1940	$1,400,000
1941	1,582,500
1942	1,690,000

Do the Republicans of the House committee think that the Tennessee Valley Authority should not be permitted to at least reimburse the counties when it is collecting 12½ percent of its gross receipts for the purpose of paying the taxes?

Do they think that Fannin County, Ga., which realizes nothing under the present Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and which has lost 70 percent of its revenue, should be required to close its schools and default on its obligations?

Do they think that the counties of Tennessee, 67 of which are affected, such as Polk, which loses 40 percent of its revenue, should also be forced to close their schools and default upon their obligations?

It is argued that the States should not be paid anything, although said 12½ percent is being collected for the purpose of paying the taxes. The States of Alabama and Tennessee are going to be paid said amounts under the present act, the counties which are going to be virtually destroyed will receive nothing under it.

The said Senate bill will not result in full replacement of the State taxes. The county taxes amount to approximately $850,000. The lost State taxes amount to approximately $1,100,000. The percentages provided for in the Senate act are: 1940, 10 percent; 1941, 9 percent; 1942, 8 percent; 1943, 7½ percent; 1944, 7 percent; 1945, 6½ percent; 1946, 6 percent; 1947, 5½ percent; 1948 and each year thereafter, 5 percent, the percentage in the act at present.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IS COLLECTING 12½ PERCENT

Many east Tennessee counties will be seriously affected if my fellow Republicans do not assist us in at least replacing the county taxes. My colleague, Representative JENNINGS' district will be most seriously affected. There are at least one-half of the seriously affected counties in Tennessee which are Republican. Many of the others have strong and active Republican minorities. The State as a whole is, of course, normally Democratic.

I favor the passage of the Senate bill and think that the House committee should immediately meet and reconsider its action in tabling the bill. If the House committee does not think any State taxes should be replaced, then a bill providing for only county replacement should be reported and the House given an opportunity to decide the dispute.

In an effort to give expression to the view entertained by some that payments should be made to counties only, I prepared the following amendment and handed it to members of the committee when the matter was under consideration:

A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Subsection A. In order to render financial assistance to those county governments in States in which the power operations of the corporation are carried on and in which the corporation has acquired properties previously subject to State and local taxation, the board is authorized and directed to pay to the counties therein in which such properties are held, as and in the manner hereinafter defined and provided, for each fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1940, the following percentages of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the corporation for the preceding fiscal year as hereinafter provided, together with such additional amounts as may be payable pursuant to the provisions hereinafter set forth: For the fiscal year (beginning July 1) 1940, 10 percent; 1941, 9 percent; 1942, 8 percent; 1943, 7½ percent; 1944, 7 percent; 1945, 6½ percent; 1946, 6 percent; 1947, 5½ percent; 1948 and each fiscal year thereafter, 5 percent. "Gross proceeds," as used in this section, is defined as the total gross proceeds derived by the corporation from the sale of power for the preceding fiscal year, excluding power used by the corporation or sold or delivered to any other department or agency of the Government of the United States.

"The payments herein authorized are in lieu of taxes and shall constitute a charge against the power operations of the corporation, and the corporation in fixing its wholesale power rates shall include charges for operating maintenance and depreciation of the power portion of the corporation's property, also an amount sufficient to amortize the investment in power in line with the Authority's program, and in addition thereto shall charge 12½ percent of said wholesale rate, which shall be earmarked and set aside to the extent necessary for payment of the amounts provided herein for tax replacement. The balance of said 12½ percent, after making tax replacements in accordance with this section, shall be turned over to the Federal Treasury as are other surplus funds of the Authority. The Authority shall not lengthen or extend the period for amortizing the investment in power as now set up and provided for. The corporation, the property, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxations in any manner by any State, county, municipality, or any such divisions and districts thereof.

"SUBSECTION B. The payment for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among said counties in said States in the following manner: One-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to the said counties in each State the percentage thereof which the gross proceeds of the power sales by the corporation within said State during the preceding fiscal year bears to the total gross proceeds from all power sales by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year; the remaining one-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to the said counties in each State the percentage thereof which the book value of the power property held by the Corporation within said State at the end of the preceding fiscal year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the Corporation on the same date. The payments herein provided for the various counties in each State shall be apportioned by paying to each county the percentage of the proceeds for all the counties in the State entitled to an apportionment under the provision of the act in which the book value of the power property held by corporations within each county or the end of the preceding fiscal year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the corporations in all the counties in the State entitled to an apportionment hereunder on the same date. The book value of power property shall include that portion of the investment allocated or estimated to be allocable to power: *Provided*, That the minimum annual payment to each county shall not be less than the 2-year average of the State and local ad valorem property taxes levied against power property purchased and operated by the Corporation in said county plus reservoir lands related to dams constructed by or on behalf of the United States Government. The said 2-year average shall be calculated for the last 2 tax years during which said property was privately owned and operated: *Provided further*, That the minimum annual payment to all the various counties in a State in which the Corporation owns and operates power property shall not be less than $10,000 in any case. The determination of the Board of the amounts due hereunder to the respective counties shall be final.

"SUBSECTION C. The payments above provided shall in each case be made to the counties not later than July 31 of each year. The said payments shall be made direct to the counties to the extent that full replacement of taxes as defined in subsection (b) hereof to said counties is made.

"SUBSECTION D. The Corporation shall, not later than January 1, 1945, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provision of this section, including a statement of the distribution to the counties of the State hereunder; the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances; and appraisal of the benefits of the program of the Corporation to the State in which the counties thereof receive payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States and counties; and such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

The Librarian's Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Librarian's Profession," written by Mr. Archibald MacLeish, and published in the Atlantic Monthly of June 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF THE LIBRARIAN'S PROFESSION

(By Archibald MacLeish)

Nothing is more difficult for the beginning librarian than to discover in what profession he is engaged. Certain professions define themselves. Others are defined by those who practice them. The librarian's profession is of neither nature. A librarian is so called not for what he does, as the farmer who farms or the lawyer who laws, but from the place in which he does it. And the definitions of the librarians, though they are eloquent in describing the librarian's perfections, are reticent in saying what the librarian's perfections are for.

Hugo Blotius, the sixteenth-century librarian of the Hofbibliothek in Vienna, defined his profession by saying that a librarian should be learned in languages, diligent, and quiet—adding by way of reminder to his master, the Emperor, that "if not of noble blood he should be given a title to enhance the dignity of his office." Cotton des Houssayes told the general assembly of the Sorbonne in 1780 that when he reflected 'on the qualifications that should be united in your librarian" they presented themselves to his mind in so great a number, and in such character of perfection, that he distrusted

his ability not only to enumerate but even to trace a true picture of them. Pressing himself to the point, however, the learned orator (who spoke, it should be noted, in the Latin tongue) supplied the following description of the office: "Your librarian should be, above all, a learned and profound theologian; but to this qualification, which I shall call fundamental, should be united vast literary acquisitions, an exact and precise knowledge of all the arts and sciences, great facility of expression, and lastly, that exquisite politeness which conciliates the affection of his visitors while his merit secures their esteem."

One gathers that M. des Houssayes thought well of the librarian's office, but beyond that, and a certain conviction of personal inadequacy, one is little wiser than before. To be at once a profound and learned theologian, the possessor of vast literary acquisitions, the exact and precise master of all the arts and all the sciences, a facile writer and a charming gentleman possessed of that exquisite politeness which wins heads as well as hearts, is to be an unusual and admirable human being—but even to be all these things at once is scarcely a profession.

And yet it is largely in the vein of the orator of the Sorbonne and the librarian of the Hofbibliothek that the profession of the librarian is presented. Modern librarians—perhaps because they do not speak in Latin—have never been as eloquent as Cotton des Houssayes, but even modern librarians write as though the profession of the librarian had been defined when the scholarly attainments and linguistic achievements of the, perhaps, ideal librarian have been described.

The consequence is that the beginning librarian is thrown upon his own resources, upon the dictionary, and upon the familiar sentences of the great founder of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. From Sir Thomas Bodley, besides learning that a librarian should not be "encumbered with marriage nor with a benefice of cure" and that he should be "a personable scholler and qualified, if it may be, with a gentlemanlike speeche and carriage * * * able to interteine commers in aswel of other nations as our owne, with meete discourses for the place," the apprentice librarian will learn that a librarian is a keeper of a library. From the dictionary he will learn that a library is "a large collection of books, public or private." And by his own resources he will attempt to deduce what the keeper of a large collection of books, public or private, may, in actionable and intelligible language, be. Keeper, but how a keeper? Of books—but what, then, in this context is a book?

It is not an altogether simple question, and for this reason there are two meanings of the word "book," and two relations, therefore, between a book and the man entrusted with its keeping. There is one meaning which signifies a physical object made of certain physical materials in a physical shape. There is another meaning which signifies an intellectual object made of all materials or of no materials and standing in as many shapes as there are forms and balances and structures in men's minds. The two meanings overlap and are confused. Readers associate the intellectual book with the physical book, thinking of Plato's vision of the world in terms of dark green linen and a gilded name. Collectors associate the physical book with the intellectual book, imagining that because they possess a rare edition of a poet's work they somehow have possessed the poem. But the two meanings are nevertheless distinct. The physical book is never more than an ingenious and often beautiful cipher by which the intellectual book is communicated from one mind to another, and the intellectual book is always a structure in the imagination which may hang for a time above a folio page in 10-point type with a half-calf binding only to be found thereafter on a different page above a different type and even in another language.

When it is said, therefore, that a librarian is a keeper of books, it must be determined first of which of these two books he is the keeper. Is he, for one example, the keeper of the small, cloth-bound object of 110 pages of text and 6 of front matter manufactured by Macmillan & Co., Ltd., in London in 1928 and called the Tower, by W. B. Yeats? Or is he the keeper of that very different object created in many men's minds before, and now in yours, by this—these words, these symbols, images, perceptions—

> "That is no country for old men. The young
> In one another's arms, birds in the trees,
> —Those dying generations—at their song,
> The salmon falls, the mackerel-crowded seas,
> Fish, flesh or fowl, commend all summer long
> Whatever is begotten born and dies.
> Caught in that sensuous music all neglect
> Monuments of unaging intellect."

It makes a difference whether the book is the cloth and paper or the intellectual image. If it is the physical book of which a librarian is keeper, then the character of his profession is obvious enough. He is a custodian as all keepers of physical objects are custodians, and his obligations are a custodian's obligations. He is a sort of check boy in the parcel room of culture. His duty is to receive the priceless packages confided to him by the past and to redeliver them to the future against the proper stub. To perform that obligation he must be reliable, orderly, industrious, and clever. He must devise infallible and complicated ticket systems to find the parcels on the shelves. He must read the notations of origin and ownership in a dozen tongues. He must guard the wrappers from the risks of time and theft and matches and men's thumbs. He must be courteous and patient with the claimants. And for the rest he has no duty but to wait. If no one comes, if no one questions, he can wait.

But if it is not the physical book but the intellectual book of which the librarian is keeper, then his profession is a profession of a very different kind. It is not the profession of the custodian, for the intellectual book is not a ticketed parcel which can be preserved by keeping it from mice and mildew on a shelf. The intellectual book is an imagined object in the mind which can be preserved only by preserving the mind's perception of its presence. Neither is the librarian's profession the profession of the check boy who receives and guards and redelivers—receives from the past, guards against the present, and redelivers to the future—for the intellectual book is not a deposit of the past which the future has a right to call and claim. The intellectual book is a construction of the spirit, and the constructions of the spirit exist in one time only—in that continuing and endless present which is now. If it is the intellectual book rather than the physical book of which the librarian is keeper, then the profession of the librarian is not and cannot be the neutral, passive, negative profession of the guardian and fiduciary, but must become instead the affirmative and advocating profession of the attorney for a cause. For the intellectual book is the word. And the keepers of the word, whether they so choose or not, must be its partisans and advocates. The word was never yet protected by keeping it in storage in a warehouse: the preservation of the word is now, as it has always been, a cause—perhaps the greatest—not, I think, the least in danger in this time.

It makes a difference, therefore—a very considerable difference in the understanding of the librarian's profession—which of these two meanings of the book is taken. Both are held. The librarian who asserts that the sole and single strength of his profession in a distracted world is its disinterested objectivity, meaning its negative and custodial detachment from the dangers which beset the Word, thinks of the book necessarily as a physical object on his shelves for which, in its intellectual aspects, he accepts no share of risk or credit. The library trustee or the moralizing editor who demands of librarians that they stick to the job of pasting on the labels and handing out the loans, accepts, but with less honesty, the same assumption—less honesty because he speaks, not from love of the librarian's profession, but from hatred of the Word, and fear of its persuasions.

Those who love the power of the Word and who defend it take the opposite position. Shortly after William Dugard was released, through the efforts of John Milton, from Newgate prison, he published two letters by John Dury deputy keeper in 1649 of the King's medals and library, which put the case with eagerness and passion: "For if librairie-keepers did understand themselves in the nature of their work, and would make themselves, as they ought to bee, useful in their places in a publick waie; they ought to become agents for the advancement of universal learning. * * * The end of that imploiment, in my conception, is to keep the publick stock of learning, which is in books and mss., to increas it, and to propose it to others in the waie which may bee most useful unto all. His work then is to bee a factor and trader for helps to learning, and a treasurer to keep them, and a dispenser to applie them to use or to see them well used, or at least not abused."

As between these two conceptions of the profession a man can chocse only for himself and not for those who practice the profession with him. But there are, notwithstanding, certain considerations which even a novice among librarians may propose. The chief of these considerations is the nature of the times in which men live. In a different time from ours—such a time as men a generation ago considered natural and normal—it made relatively little difference whether a librarian behaved himself as a custodian of volumes or as a "factor and trader for helps to learning, and a treasurer to keep them, and a dispenser to apply them to use." A generation ago the word, the life of the mind, the monuments of unaging intellect, were not under attack. It was agreed by all civilized nations, by all governments in power, that the cultural tradition was a common treasure, that truth was an end to be sought equally by all men, and that the greatest glory and final justification of human life was the creativeness of the human spirit. In such a world the librarian who considered himself a custodian, who devoted himself to the perfection of his catalog and the preservation of his bindings, and who waited for the calls of those who had business with his collections, was not only prudent but entirely wise. There was no need for him to advocate the cause of learning or to assert the supreme importance of the contents of his library, for no one doubted the one or challenged the other. The librarian who presented himself in the years before the Great War as a champion of culture would have received the ironic welcome he deserved. What was required of him then—and what he practiced—was discretion, dignity, and a judicial calm.

But the world in which we live is not that world. The world in which we live is a world that world would have believed impossible. In the world in which we live it is no longer agreed by all governments and citizens that truth is the final measure of men's acts and that the lie is shameful. There are governments abroad, and there are citizens here to whom respect for truth is naive—governments and individuals who, when it is proved they lie, have not been shamed "either in their own or in their neighbors' eyes." In

the world in which we live it is no longer agreed that the common culture is a common treasure. There are governments abroad, and there are citizens here to whom the common culture which draws the peoples of the West together is a common evil for which each nation must now substitute a private culture, a parochial art, a local poetry, and a tribal worship. In the world in which we live it is no longer agreed that the greatest glory and final justification of human history is the life of the human mind. To many men and many governments the life of the human mind is a danger to be feared more than any other danger, and the word which cannot be purchased, cannot be falsified, and cannot be killed is the enemy most hunted for and hated. It is not necessary to name names. It is not necessary to speak of the burning of the books in Germany, or of the victorious lie in Spain, or of the terror of the creative spirit in Russia, or of the hunting and hounding of those in this country who insist that certain truths be told and who will not be silent. These things are commonplaces. They are commonplaces to such a point that they no longer shock us into anger. Indeed it is the essential character of our time that the triumph of the lie, the mutilation of culture, and the persecution of the word no longer shock us into anger.

What those who undertake to keep the libraries must consider—or so it seems to me—is whether this profound and troubling alteration of the times alters also their profession. Granted that it was not only possible but desirable for the librarian to think of his profession in negative and custodial terms in the quiet generations when the burning of books was a medieval memory, is it still possible for librarians to think of their profession in these passive terms in a time in which the burning of the books is a present fact abroad and a present possibility at home?

Granted that it was not only prudent but wise as well for the librarian to admit no positive, affirmative duty to the cause of learning in a time when learning was universally honored and the works of great art and great scholarship were admired monuments, is it still wise for librarians to admit no positive duty to learning in a time when governments abroad teach ignorance instead of knowledge to their people, and fanatical and frightened citizens at home would, if they could, obliterate all art and learning but the art and learning they consider safe?

In a division which divides all men, because it is a division drawn through everything that men believe, can those who keep the libraries—those who keep the records of belief—avoid division? In a struggle which is truly fought, whatever the economic interpreters and the dialectical materialists may say to the contrary, across the countries of the spirit, can those who hold those countries remain neutral? In an attack which is directed, as no attack in history ever was directed, against the intellectual structures of the books, can those who keep the books contend their books are only objects made of print and paper?

I can answer only for myself. To me the answer is not doubtful. To me the changes of the time change everything. The obligations of the keepers of the books in such a time as ours are positive obligations because they have no choice but to be positive. Whatever the duty of the librarian may have been in a different world and a more peaceful generation, his duty now is to defend—to say, to fight, and to defend. No one else—neither those who make the books nor those who undertake to teach them—is bound as he is bound to fight in their behalf, for no one else is charged as he is charged with their protection. No one as much as he must say, and say again, and still insist that the tradition of the written word is whole and single and entire and cannot be dismembered. No one is under obligation as he is under obligation to meet the mutilators of the word, the preachers of obscurantism, the suppressors—those who would cut off here and ink out there the texts their prejudices or their parties or their churches or their fears find hateful. And these obligations are not obligations which are satisfied by negatives. The books can be protected from the preaching demagogs and the official liars and the terrorizing mob not by waiting for attack but by forestalling it. If the cultural tradition, the ancient and ever-present structure of the mind, can still be saved, it can be saved by reconstructing its authority. And the authority of art and learning rests on knowledge of the arts and learnings. Only by affirmation, only by exhibiting to the people the nobility and beauty of their intellectual inheritance, can that inheritance be made secure.

Some years before his elevation to the bench Mr. Justice Brandeis referred to himself as "counsel for the situation." The librarian in our time, or so it seems to me, becomes the counsel for the situation. His client is the inherited culture entrusted to his care. He—he more than any other man—must represent this client as its advocate. Against those who would destroy the tradition he must bring the force of the tradition. Against those who would mutilate the monuments he must bring the beauty of the monuments. Against those who would limit the freedom of the inquiring mind he must bring the marvels of the mind's discoveries.

Keepers of books, keepers of print and paper on the shelves, librarians are keepers also of the records of the human spirit—the records of men's watch upon the world and on themselves. In such a time as ours, when wars are made against the spirit and its works, the keeping of these records is itself a kind of warfare. The keepers, whether they so wish or not, cannot be neutral.

A Question Radio Executives Should Ponder Seriously—and Answer Carefully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress realizes that the European war has confronted us all with the problem of considering the significance which the unpredictable factor of broadcasting war news has upon the steady nerves and clear thinking which must play an important part in public opinion if America is to make the wisest decisions in the present crisis.

Never before has war with all its horror and hatred been brought into the living rooms of America through the almost universal ownership of receiving sets which now exists in this country. I am sure radio executives are giving constant and careful consideration to the perplexing problem of how far to go in dramatizing over the radio the horrific scenes which are taking place daily in battle-torn Europe. Radio has a grave responsibility, today, to live up to the privileges of free speech and uncensored discretion which it enjoys in America and which it is my personal hope it may always continue to enjoy in this country.

I feel confident that the best guaranty radio can have that its freedom will not be curtailed is to demonstrate clearly in this crucial period that it merits the tremendous responsibilities of self-control which it now enjoys.

WHAT PART SHOULD RADIO PLAY IN REPORTING WAR NEWS?

Mr. Speaker, these remarks are actuated by an editorial clipped from the South Dakota State Forum, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and edited by one of the most capable and best-informed newspaperwomen in my State, Aileen Sessions Tolles. I am reprinting it as a part of my remarks because it is rather typical of many other similar editorials I have noticed in other papers and reflects a concerned state of mind revealed by letters received by many Members of Congress during the past several months and by cloak-room conversation heard in the anterooms of this Chamber almost every day. The editorial propounds a question, Too Much Radio News? which we may not be able to answer, but it is a question which we should not ignore. Letters from frantic mothers whose nerves are keyed to the breaking point by exciting and excitable radio newscasters are reaching Washington, and an emotionally upset citizenry is certainly less well prepared to mend its national defenses and step up production than is a determined and deliberate people.

What part should radio play in reporting the tragedies of a great war? Mr. Speaker, I have no answer to offer to that question but I merely propound it for the serious consideration of us all. I propound it, too, with the fervent hope that radio executives themselves will use increasing care and restraint so as not to permit the splendid convenience of radio to become a destructive wartime device in America. In wartime, I presume radio would be one of the first facilities taken over by the Government and a war involving America might spell the end of private ownership and operation of radio in this country since its influence would be needed in maintaining public morale and solidifying sentiment. Happily, America is not at war and American radio companies are privately owned and operated—incidentally they are now practically unique in all the world in this respect—and they are providing by and large the best radio programs available on the air. It would be most unfortunate if careless or overzealous commentators on the air should misuse their freedom and render such disservice to American

clear-headedness that this country would be forced to pass regulatory legislation circumscribing or censoring radio reporting. I believe the radio executives of this country recognize this danger and are sincerely trying to prevent abuses of their privilege from jeopardizing the advantages which they hold from licenses granting them virtual monopoly over favored air waves.

A CHALLENGE TO THE SELF-RESTRAINT OF RADIO

Mr. Speaker, I have a passionate devotion to the American principle of free speech. But should such freedom, when exercised over air channels which are privately owned and from which others are excluded by governmental regulations, get out of bounds to the detriment of the public morale, it would become a public problem of vital concern to the entire Nation. Wise self-restraint, now, by the radio companies themselves is, in my opinion, a far better solution to the problem of hysterical excesses and unduly exciting and provocative broadcasts than any laws which Congress could devise. Surely such restraint can prevent the necessity of new legislation to meet the problem propounded by the question of what is and what is not public-serving broadcasting of war news.

We can still too well remember the results of Orson Welles' purely fictitious broadcasting of a fanciful invasion from Mars. So real did the highly emotionalized speeches of radio speakers appear that a near-panic developed in many localities in America. Wisely, radio executives themselves took steps to prevent a repetition of such a sensational program to unnerve large portions of the populace. Confronted, too, with the problem of how much emotionalism and hysteria to convey over the air waves in reporting war news, it is my hope these same radio executives themselves, with no legislative stimulus or restraint, will use equal discretion in not permitting factual reporting to be colored by hysterical or emotional commentators whose inflections and intonations can well induce emotional upsets and develop panicky thinking if they carelessly or deliberately engage in all the histrionics of their art instead of functioning simply as reporters of news.

IS RADIO OR ARE CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS IN ERROR?

That there has already been too much of a tendency to overdramatize war news and to permit apopletic appeals and horrific hysteria to color radio dispatches is evidenced by a study of the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself. On one day last week, I counted references made by more than a dozen Senators and Congressmen to "hysterical radio reporting" which they decried as unfortunate at a time when the people of America need to search their souls and investigate the deepest recesses of their minds to arrive at decisions and conclusions which will best serve democracy and humanity in this dark hour. It does not seem possible that these Senators and Congressmen were all wrong and that radio is all right—radio, itself, should correct the excesses and emotionalism which have given rise to such frequent complaints on the floor of this House.

Newspapers, more experienced in the business of conveying news than are radio chains, are exercising commendable good taste and good judgment in their reports of war news today. Aside from a few rather notorious exceptions, the news is presented without editorial coloration, and the scourge of atrocity stories and horror pictures which prevailed during the World War and preceding our entrance into it have been held down to a minimum. Many papers have even risen to new heights of public service by carrying bylines or boxed notices to the effect that "all news coming from European capitals and battlefields during wartime is subject to censorship at its source." Such frankness and candor on the part of our better-class newspapers is a splendid token of public service and merits the commendation of all readers—it is a fine manifestation of the tradition of freedom of the press which is inherent in this country.

COMMENTATORS CULTIVATE THE "ILLUSION OF INTEGRITY"

On the other hand, especially among radio commentators who inject their personal opinions and emotions into the news, too frequently an attempt is made to create an "illusion of integrity" which leads the unwary listener to believe that what he hears is more factual or fulsome and reliable than what he reads. Obviously, such is not the case because newspapers and radio stations, alike, are limited by the same conditions in foreign countries and all are circumscribed by the same foreign censors and the same propagandists who are in the business of distorting the facts for military or psychological purposes.

THE NEWSPAPERS HAVE A LESSON FOR THE RADIO

Radio might do well to follow the examples of newspapers in reminding their public that all news is subject to censorship at the source and that in wartime it is impossible to discriminate between what is factual and what is pure propaganda in communiques and messages originating from foreign sources. In fact, a few radio programs are already issuing such precautionary announcements in connection with their programs of war news, but too many programs still utilize commentators whose egotism stirs them to try to create an "illusion of integrity" about themselves which, knowingly or unwittingly, tends to give prestige to their remarks which is not merited.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to conclude this discussion without saying a good word for the fine features of radio war reporting which I wish to commend as frankly as I have criticized the occasional excesses which it is heir to. The nightly round-up of war news from European capitals in which radio reporters from each belligerent country discuss the news which their respective censors permit, is a commendable and serviceable contribution to the group knowledge of America. So, too, are the fine, informative, and factual reports and analyses of N. B. C.'s Major General Fuqua, and of Columbia's Maj. George Fielding Elliott. Without engaging in personal dramatics, and without any hysterics, these two authorities bring to the public regular reports of war movements and developments, and their programs are of a public-serving nature. In contrast with the frequent extremes in excitation engaged in by Columbia's Kaltenborn—and to a lesser degree by N. B. C.'s Baukhage—the previously discussed programs never provoke cloakroom discussions in Congress about the dangers of unlimited radio war news.

A PROBLEM RADIO SHOULD SOLVE FOR ITSELF

The problem of what constitutes public-serving and patriotic use of the radio in broadcasting war news is a difficult one. I confess I have no answer to propose; I leave you with the question before us, and with the renewed expression of hope that America's radio executives will not permit excesses of their freedom of the air to endanger the national welfare. If this country ever goes to war, it must be as a result of serious thinking and deliberate action based on a careful consideration of America's destiny, and not as the result of hysterical and super-emotionalized broadcasting of war news by irresponsible commentators whose desire to create an effect sometimes overshadows their responsibilities to the public which gives them the freedom of expression they enjoy. Such abuses of this freedom not only jeopardizes the status of radio in this country but it puts in jeopardy the destiny of the very country itself.

The following editorial which I have previously referred to raises the question which I have not tried to answer in these remarks but to which those of us in Congress and those who serve as radio executives in America must give increasing thought as the devastating developments of the tragic European conflict become more and more heart-rending day by

day—Too Much Radio News?—an editorial by Aileen Sessions Tolles:

[From the South Dakota State Forum, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.]

TOO MUCH RADIO NEWS?

Is it possible to have too much radio news? We think it is. While we do appreciate the fact that the American people without a doubt are the best informed in the world and that is always to be desired, we also think that the broadcasting companies could be of greater benefit if they gave just one broadcast each per day.

This is not the first time that we have felt there was too much broadcasting on a given subject. When there has been a terrible flood and the newscasts were coming in constantly it had an emotional effect on the listeners that was pitiable. After all, most of us were only observers, nothing we could do, and yet the emotional strain was terrific. So it is with the war—we hear three different stories from three different countries and we wait eagerly for the next broadcast.

Often it has seemed that it is more like watching a moving picture, we hear something and immediately want the next item, forgetting that in war things cannot move with the speed of a movie. We forget that it takes weeks at least to get a large body of troops massed for action and we expect instant news and wonder why this and that has not happened.

We would like to suggest that the broadcasts be given once a day with a summary of the day. That would give the reporters a chance to sort out the important events and we feel it would relieve a great many people from undue emotional strain. Of course one can always turn off the radio, but to many who are in the home all day it is a companion that is essential to their happiness and it is turned on all day.

We think it would help to keep our emotions under control if war news was given less frequently and we did not feel we were watching a moving picture instead of events that may change history for years to come. This is the time for sober thinking and this is almost impossible with the present emotional appeal.

National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, these are crucial times. Our country faces again the need of taking adequate steps to protect and defend its greatness. As in other critical periods, we all hope and trust that the American people will respond to the exigencies of the times with their customary courage and vigor. Nor will we be disappointed in those of our people who are truly American. We have only to fear the treachery of the few who seem to be determined at all costs to destroy the unity of spirit and effort which have characterized our people.

The Congress is now at work on a program of defense which leaves us no time to waste on preliminaries. The President has called upon labor and industry to join hands with the Government in a project which is worthy of Hercules. We cannot expect to meet the challenge of the times unless we are united and organized, unless we put aside discord and division. We cannot build external peace unless we have peace within us.

This is not an idle warning. In the last few weeks we have seen the consequences of disunion and spiritual unpreparedness in other countries. We have coined new phrases to fit the destructive and subtle weapons with which conquests are now waged and won—phrases such as the "fifth column" and the Trojan horse.

It will not do to say that it cannot happen here. And, worst of all, the treachery from within has not come from our people but from persons who occupy positions of trust and power in our Government, persons who can foment and who have willfully fomented strife and discord among our people.

My sentiments may seem to be strongly phrased. The record of the National Labor Relations Board as it has been presented to this House not only justifies my statements; it calls for the most vigorous denunciation that the tongue of man can devise. This Congress gave being and power to the National Labor Relations Board to the end that national unity might be preserved, that peace between employers and labor might be fostered and improved against the coming of crises such as the one we now face. But despite our expectations we have seen the opposite result, not because the institution which we created was fundamentally wrong but because the instrument which administers it has proved to be corrupt.

The record is so plain that it cannot be questioned. The National Labor Relations Board, despite its extravagant claims to the contrary, has done little to encourage industrial peace. Indeed, the Board and its emissaries have gone about our country raising and breeding discord and differences. The Board has not awaited demands upon its jurisdiction; it has actively solicited—even created—charges against employers. It has planned campaigns to foment strikes, as its tactics before the 1937 little steel strikes will illustrate. It has traded its authority to subjugate employers against promises on the part of labor to support its appropriations. It has gone into peaceful communities and promoted turmoil by hearings prolonged for many months.

The discord which it has created has not been confined to disputes between employers and employees. The Board has turned laboring men against their own leaders to save its own skin, as shown by its efforts to enlist the rank and file of the A. F. of L. in a propaganda drive against reduction of its appropriation and in opposition to amendments to this law recommended by the executive council of the A. F. of L. It has disturbed trade relations between businessmen; by its attempts to place the sanction of its official dignity on boycotts its vengeance has reached into other branches of our Government to bring down punishment on the heads of employers whom it does not like. It has wasted Government funds to encourage people to rally to its defense in Congress; it has vilified State and local police agencies and governmental officials. It has trampled upon the constitutional guaranties of a free press and free speech, and, as I will point out, it has openly defied Congress. In short, Mr. Speaker, there is not a page in the catalog of our social, economic, and political activities on which we cannot find traces of the poisonous activities of this agency. Where Congress intended to create a physician who would heal our industrial ills with soothing remedies, it has discovered that the physician has only a prescription of poison.

This course of the Board, Mr. Speaker, is no series of unfortunate errors. The very philosophy of the Board and its henchmen is a philosophy of hate and discord. Its tactics have been predicated upon the theory—which is contrary to the spirit and purposes of the act—that there can be no peace between employers and labor. In other words, the decisions of the Board are dogma straight from Marx and Lenin. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Board's preferences for the teachings of Marx and Lenin are not merely philosophical. The Board's personnel is shot through with active adherents to their doctrines. Its sympathies in the labor movement are with those who support and advocate the totalitarian dictatorship of Stalin.

On the record as we have seen it, I do not see how any person who has at heart the interests of this Nation can defend the Board. To paraphrase a sentence which Cicero used in attacking the treason of Catiline, how long is this Board to abuse our patience?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have become aware that enemies of the best interests of American democracy have seized control of substantial elements of a powerful and militant labor organization, the Congress of Industrial Organizations. These elements have not hesitated to demonstrate their affection for international radical movements—movements which, if not checked in time, may bring this country to the same state of bloody disunion and feebleness in which other democracies have found themselves. We are not unmindful of the part which these elements may play in connection with the vital program of national defense. For ex-

ample, I can refer you to instances which occurred in the 1937 steel strikes. Among other flagrant interferences with law and order, which are common recollection, there was the dynamiting of a water main in Pennsylvania, the stoppage of the United States mail in Ohio. Yet we must remember that the General Staff of the War Department believes that the steel industry must be the industrial backbone of any planned national defense. The tactics of riot and revolution which occurred in the automobile strikes are not forgotten; yet, in the days of mechanized warfare, the automotive industry is scarcely less important than steel. I consider it most significant that shortly after the President had addressed this Congress on the subject of air defense the leader of the C. I. O. announced that his organization was prepared to organize the aeronautical workers. Does this imply that the aircraft manufacturing industry is to be given a taste of the strategy which was used against the automotive and steel industries and which is even now being used to tie up the production of cruisers and destroyers by a strike in one of our shipyards?

On a recent Sunday night the President stated, in his fireside chat, that—

> I am sure that the responsible leaders will not permit some specialized group, which represents a minority of the total employees of a plant or industry, to break up the continuity of employment of the majority. * * *

While the C. I. O. retains some of its present leaders, the President is expressing a forlorn hope. The past experiences of the automotive and steel industries with respect to sit-down strikes, slow-down programs, and production sabotage, to say nothing of acts of violence that have resulted in destruction of vital machinery, show that many members of the C. I. O., so long as they are ruled and led by the subversive agents who are now in their midst, will not hesitate to sabotage defense preparations to further their ends, which are not the legitimate ends of labor but the alien objects of the Communistic front. To prevent the break-down of vital defense preparations in the basic industries which are organized or about to be organized by the C. I. O., such as the steel, rubber, automotive, and aircraft industries, we must destroy the unholy alliance which exists between the radicals of the National Labor Relations Board and the radicals of the C. I. O.

I propose to show you, Mr. Speaker, that the National Labor Relations Board is itself a nest of radicals and subversive thinkers; that there are similar agencies within the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and that between the two groups there is a working arrangement which promises to endanger and defeat the efforts of Congress and of the President to preserve a unity of spirit in our present emergency.

The record of the committee which has been investigating the National Labor Relations Board contains so many instances of subversive tactics and subversive thinking on the part of the personnel of the Board that I can select but a few to illustrate my point.

In many instances, the records of cases before the Board demonstrate the Board's readiness to protect aliens of Communistic tendencies. The members of the Board cannot plead ignorance of this condition. A dramatic illustration of the Board's views is provided by its recent willful defiance of Congress. You will recall that our Committee on Appropriations reduced the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board and recommended that the reduction be made applicable to the funds designated for the Division of Economic Research.

There is no doubt but that this action of the committee was based upon the findings of the Smith committee that Mr. Saposs, the head of the Economic Research Division of the Board, was of "definite socialistic leanings." In the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations restored a part of this reduction, but subsequently the House and Senate conferees agreed upon the original reduction as proposed by the House. There is no question in my mind but that Congress prescribed the reduction with the specific object of abolishing the Division of Economic Research and the office of the Director. Despite this clear manifestation of congressional intent, the Board proposes to give effect to the reduction by discharging some 50 members of its staff, nearly everyone a good American, and, except for 6, all of whom have nothing to do with Mr. Saposs' activities, so that the Board may retain the services of Mr. Saposs and his henchmen.

This deliberate disregard of the will of Congress is, in my view, conclusive proof of the Board's unfitness for at least two reasons. In the first place, it is another illustration of the Board's policy of hewing to its own philosophy, regardless of the policies of the Congress. In the second place, it shows that the Board itself is openly willing to espouse the radical thinking of its personnel.

If there is any doubt that Mr. Saposs is a subscriber to the communistic dogma that there can be no peace between capital and labor, his own statements will dispel it. While an employee of this Government, in 1935, Mr. Saposs wrote that unless a movement of middle class and workers "is brought into being, capitalism will go marching on with its poverty, misery, and economic insecurity. The time is ripe; have the middle class and workers the will to rise to the occasion?" Another quotation from Mr. Saposs' writings is peculiarly important in our present emergency. In his report of the International Socialistic Labor Congress in Vienna in 1931, Mr. Saposs says:

> The international must take the position that if another war occurs, the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves.

It seems that the views of Mr. Saposs are shared by his staff as well. As late as last summer one of his underlings wrote:

> Have you heard of the news event of last week—about Wolf L.—who received his visa to Russia and is at the present moment on the high seas? I die of envy.

And another:

> I saw the New York World's Fair—the last orgasm of capitalism.

Mr. Saposs is not the only member of the Board's staff who holds to these views. Nathan Witt, secretary to the Board, who has been staunchly defended by Messrs. Madden and Smith, members of the Board, seems to subscribe to the same anarchistic philosophy. The intermediate report of the committee to investigate the Board is well worth reading on the subject of Mr. Witt. It was Mr. Witt who, with the approval of Board Member Smith, worked out with the C. I. O. a plan to entrap Inland Steel Co. into the commission of a violation of section 8 (5) of the act. In this connection, the record in the Inland case makes it worth while to digress for a moment. Before any charge was filed against the company Mr. Witt met with an officer and an attorney for the C. I. O. to work out the union strategy against the company. Witt suggested that the union ask for exclusive recognition and a written contract. Subsequently Mr. Witt described his plan of attack to Board Member Smith, who approved it, and instructed Witt to have the regional director in Chicago prepare a complaint, to be issued as soon as the trap was sprung. The program went through as scheduled, the charge was filed, and a complaint was issued. It is most significant that, contrary to the usual practice, a trial examiner was designated before the issuance of the complaint.

Other examples of Mr. Witt's philosophy might be cited. Like many other members of the Board's legal staff, Witt is a member of the National Lawyers Guild. As such, when the guild was engaged in a controversy over a resolution to condemn communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, Witt battled like a Trojan to prevent the inclusion of communism among the "isms" to be condemned.

The philosophy of discord is not confined to the Board's underlings, as is indicated by the behavior of Board Member Smith. His now famous trip to Mexico City in September 1938 to attend the meetings of the International Industrial Relations Institute provides a demonstration of his views. These meetings were held in conjunction with the International Labor Congress, in which Mr. John L. Lewis of the C. I. O. played a prominent part. The Congress was convened at the request of President Cardenas, and its guiding force was the secretary of the C. T. M., the Confederation of Mexican Workers, which might be described as the Mexican equivalent of the C. I. O. Although Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was invited, he declined to attend, stating:

> I regard it as a meeting of extreme leftists and Communists. We are of the opinion that it is being promoted for the purpose of advancing the cause of communism in Latin American countries.

As a matter of record, the symbol of communism, the hammer and sickle crossed on a red background, was prominently displayed at all of these meetings; spectators could be left in no doubt as to the solidarity of the congress with communism. Yet, as a public official of the United States Government, Mr. Smith attended these meetings, lending them open support by his presence. It is also significant that Mr. Smith was seated on the speakers' platform while the President of Mexico delivered a bitter attack against the policy of the United States with respect to the expropriation of Mexican oil properties. It is also worthy of note that some of the most prominent of the international Communists were active in the Mexican sessions such as Miss Marguerita Nelkin of Spain and Leon Jouhaux, who was subsequently jailed in France as the leader of the Communist Party and also leader of the trade union movement, the destructive tactics of which had dangerously imperiled France's armament program.

Mr. Smith seems to have enjoyed the high esteem of his fellow travelers in Mexico City for he was selected as secretary for the United States of the League Against War and Fascism. It is common knowledge that Mr. Smith's organization, which afterward became known as the American League for Peace and Democracy, was a leading communistic front group. Mr. Earl Browder, for example, praised it as a "transmission belt for communism." As late as January 1939, Mr. Smith was active in its affairs.

I cannot leave the subject of Mr. Smith without a passing reference to his intimate connection with Harry Bridges, the notorious west coast C. I. O. leader, for I have no doubt that Mr. Smith's obvious C. I. O. inclinations were to a large extent the result of his friendship with Bridges. Of Mr. Bridges little need be said. I think that Mr. Green aptly described Bridges' philosophy in his statement that "everyone in the United States knows that Harry Bridges is a Communist except Mme. Perkins and Dean Landis." Bridges' tactics on the west coast are common knowledge. The Board itself was fully aware of this, for in July of 1937 its regional director at Los Angeles wrote to the Board as follows:

> The appointment by Lewis of Bridges as C. I. O. director of the Pacific coast has added fuel to the fire smoldering during the last 6 months. Bridges is undoubtedly one of the most militant labor leaders on the coast and has a concept of national organization which very closely approaches the syndicalistic school. (It will be remembered that syndicalism was the term for communism in the labor troubles of many of the European countries that had to fight off the inroads of the Communist doctrine.) He believes that the control of industry will come through the control of transportation of raw materials flowing into the key industries.

Mr. Smith's connections with Mr. Bridges cannot be questioned. The record shows that Mr. Smith visited Bridges on a trip to the Pacific coast and on his return made a speech to the Washington staff of the Board, in which he was not sparing of his praise. On another occasion, for some mysterious reason, he invited Mr. Bridges to call him on the long-distance phone at the Government's expense. On still another occasion, Bridges presumed so far on his friendship with Smith as to write him requesting the appointment of certain employees to represent the Board in Hawaii. In his letter Mr. Bridges stated:

> At the same time, because of the employers' iron control over the whole situation in the islands, it needs a strong man and one who is not susceptible or easily swayed by the arguments, intimidations, etc.; and I hope you will do what you can to see that somebody of the type of Mr. Eagen or Mr. Edises can be immediately selected for Hawaii.

That Mr. Smith recognized Bridges' right thus to interfere in the internal management of the Board is indicated by his reply, in which he states:

> I agree with you as to the importance of having the right sort of man in Hawaii, and the Board has this very much in mind.* * *
> If you ever get to Washington I should be glad to talk these matters over with you.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could continue to enumerate the many instances in the record which indicate the utter incompetence and bias of Board Member Smith. I feel, however, that his espousal of the cause of the C. I. O. against employers and against the A. F. of L. is so notorious that a resort to further examples is unnecessary. I can honestly say that the evidence in the record that Mr. Smith attempted to boycott an employer should have led any person, with a sense of honesty and decency, to resign his position with the Board.

It seems that the philosophy of Messrs. Smith, Saposs, and Witt reflects the general attitude of many other employees of the Board. The policies of the union of board employees, known as the N. L. R. B. Union, bears this out. On its program, for example, was the support of the notorious Communist organization, the American Friends of Spanish Democracy. A contribution of at least $400 to this group was raised by the solicitation of members and by barbecues sponsored by the union and attended by the Chairman of the Board. It has made contributions to C. I. O. organizing drives and to the radical International Juridical Association, another of the communistic front organizations. Among its connections are affiliations with the notorious American League for Peace and Democracy and the Anti-War Congress. An interesting illustration of its thinking on patriotic subjects is brought out by the union's action in protesting against a ceremony held by the Anti-War Congress at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In making its protest the union stated that the ceremony was "contrary to the spirit of the antiwar movement."

As further proof, Mr. Speaker, I might direct your attention to certain statements which appear in the writings of various Board employees. One of them, an officer of the union of employees, commented on the United States Supreme Court in May 1938 that—

> The Morgan decision had us disturbed greatly for a few days, but the courts have on their "red" robes again and we are on top of the world.

Another wrote of the Russian exhibit at the world's fair that it was—

> By far the most impressive * * *. Just seeing this exhibit might work up an interest in you not only to see the country but also to become a citizen of Russia.

I promised, Mr. Speaker, to refer to certain radical and subversive tendencies which may be found in the C. I. O. In my remarks on this phase of my subject I do not mean to infer that all of the rank and file of the organization are infected with such tendencies. On the contrary, I know that that is not the case. The truth of the matter is that the Communists in this country have bored their way into the ranks of labor and by presenting a united front have been able to achieve positions of prominence and power. Unfortunately, their philosophy seems to have influenced the leadership of the movement. To my mind, it is the identity of philosophy in the Board and in the leadership of the C. I. O. which has caused the Board to espouse the latter's cause.

An event which occurred in February 1940 is most significant. On February 11 the President of the United States

made a speech on the White House lawn to the delegates of the so-called American Youth Congress. When Mr. Roosevelt administered a gentle rebuke to the organization because one of its local councils had opposed financial aid to Finland, his remarks were greeted with boos.

Shortly afterward John Lewis appeared before the same organization and, in the words of a reporter, "received an ovation from the 2,200 persons who jammed the auditorium to capacity, a reception that contrasted markedly with the perfunctory applause the delegates had given the President."

Amid laughter and cheers, Mr. Lewis poured into the receptive ears of the young citizens many words of advice different in tone, and vastly different in substance, from that which they had so reluctantly received from the Leader of the Nation. Lewis derided the President's remark that the delegates should be grateful for their right of free assembly and for the right to petition for redress of grievances; he characterized the President's friendly advice about the young members' occupying themselves with problems that they did not understand as "a head-on clash with my concept of the principles of democracy."

Mr. Lewis assured the meeting that it had only aped the actions of its elders in passing resolutions opposing Finland, favoring Russia, and otherwise flying in the face of common sense and enlightened public thought, for he stated that his own personally controlled United Mine Workers had adopted the same kind of resolution a short time before this meeting of the Youth Congress.

Mr. Lewis closed his peroration with a note of cheer and confidence that this youth group, profiting by his example, would continue its attacks on institutions as they are; would continue its criticisms of officialdom until it gained the objective of forcing the Government to acknowledge the new theory of "the world owes us a living for doing nothing," and by implication, at least, doctrines of internationalism in place of those of responsible democratic self-government.

On April 26, 1940, John L. Lewis revealed with startling clarity the position of himself and those elements of the C. I. O. which follow him in blind obedience. By a sharp attack upon the President of the United States, by a wheedling threat against the right of every Southern State which dared require of its citizens a small poll tax as a prerequisite to the exercise of the franchise, by an invitation to use the Negro vote in combination with the C. I. O. to bludgeon officialdom into granting privileges to the colored people, Mr. Lewis demonstrated, for the permanent record, that Americanism is, to the element which he represents, just another form of the "isms" which are generally and popularly condemned in conventions.

It is with peculiar pride in the high degree of patriotism of the better element of colored workers in this country that we note that Mr. Lewis' appeal reached only that Negro group which was imbued with governmental theories which by no stretch of the imagination could bear the stamp, "Made in America."

It is significant to note that the secretary of the congress, the Negro John P. Davis, also of the International Juridical Association and one time C. I. O. organizer in this city, found nothing reprehensible in Mr. Lewis' declaration of sympathy for the aspirations, ideals, and good works of the Russian super-Communist, Joseph Stalin. In fact, Davis was so encouraged by Lewis' remarks that he predicted, with confidence, that the cooperation of C. I. O.'s Labor's Non-Partisan League—recently denounced as a communistic-front organization, by the executive committee of a union formerly affiliated with the C. I. O., the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, of which David Dubinsky is president—the American Youth Congress, and the Negro element—which he represented—would bring to the Negro the first taste of victory in this generation.

It is significant to note that a man of the colored race, having perhaps the greatest experience with Negro labor problems, withdrew entirely from this convention, unable to stomach the strange marriage of C. I. O. internationalism and Negro self-seeking. A. Phillips Randolph, foremost leader of the American Negro labor movement, refused to run for reelection as president of the Negro congress, saying in words too sincere to be doubted:

> We have received donations from a large number of C. I. O. groups. We have received donations from the Communist Party. That is not a healthy condition. * * * Where you get your money, you get your ideas and your control.

When Negro Edgar Brown, president of the United Government Employees, attempted to protest against the adoption by the Congress, under Mr. Lewis' inspiration, of a resolution condemning the Roosevelt administration for daring to consider mobilization for American defense more important than the political demands of a certain element of labor, he was hissed and booed. With a simplicity that has the ring of truth, Brown stated:

> I am sure I speak the sentiments of the Negro people, but probably not of some of the white Communists in the audience.

It is significant to note that the southern Negro organizer of the American Federation of Labor, Cornelius Maiden, stated in a public release that neither he, nor the 300,000 Negroes whom he represented, had any sympathy with Mr. Lewis' activities or the action of the Negro congress. He stated that he heartily approved and was confident that the millions of Negro men and women of the South approved of the action of Phillips Randolph when he refused to become a party to the schemes of the Communists and Mr. John L. Lewis' C. I. O. to convert the national Negro conference into an agency of Moscow, Russia. Maiden was forced to admit that the invasion of our congress by the Communists and the C. I. O. will set us back, of course, and hinder our progress. Yet he pleaded that the true friends of his movement would not withdraw their valuable support from the Negro race, simply because an invading army of "reds" from white Communist groups and white C. I. O. local unions tore down the structure of our national Negro congress. It is a tragic and almost unbelievable commentary upon the power madness of John L. Lewis that to him sacrifice of the dignity of political office, combination with subversive dissentient elements, preying upon the fears and fanning the smoldering fires of greed and class-consciousness of a minority race, are all simply manipulations to gain political power, to maintain a munificent salary, and to assure his continued domination of the red labor front, no matter what the cost to the integrity of democratic institutions.

In this time of national crisis, let us search our hearts and ask:

> Can it be truly said that it is liberal to encourage the activities and dominations of this totalitarian autocrat of the labor movement?

In sharp contrast to the political opportunism of the red-infested ranks and the commissariat of the C. I. O. is the following truly American pronouncement of President William Green, delivered before the New England Labor Conference on May 25 of this year:

> The American Federation of Labor has refused at all times to compromise or traffic with the enemies of democracy. There is no room in the American Federation of Labor for Communists or Nazis. We never have wanted any part of them. We don't want any part of them now, and we never will. Their policies and their teachings are hateful to us. We have fought them at every turn, and we have defeated every effort they have made to bore from within the American Federation of Labor.

That there is a hand-and-glove connection between the radical elements of the C. I. O. and the personnel of the National Labor Relations Board cannot be denied in the face of the record before the Smith committee. The Board, through its secretary, on one occasion transmitted to all of its regional directors a memorandum prepared by the C. I. O., in which appears the advice to its members that they should "bring cases only against the main employers in your industry, in

the expectation that if the dominant corporations can be brought into line, the smaller employers will give up without a fight." In transmitting this interesting document, the secretary advised the regional directors that the Board was "of course, sympathetic with the policy expressed in this circular." Mr. Madden himself, on one occasion, recommended the hiring as trial examiner of the author of a book on the C. I. O. The application for employment, which was approved by Mr. Madden, contained the naive statement that the author and applicant would find "most attractive" a position "with the C. I. O. or one with your Board."

Another pipe line between the Board and the C. I. O. seems to be, in addition to Witt and Smith, Mr. Heber Blankenhorn, who occupies this unique official position under the color of an appointment as special investigator. Mr. Blankenhorn has been a close associate of officials of the C. I. O., and the record indicates that he has been a point of communication for information passing from one group to the other.

Blankenhorn spared no efforts to make the Board thoroughly acquainted with the best procedure for helping the C. I. O. to work out an organization in the steel industry, working so completely hand in glove with both that it became difficult to tell which was which. To illustrate, I refer to a letter from Blankenhorn to John L. Lewis (which might just as well have been written to Warren Madden), from which I quote:

> As against mythical ideas, it seems to me that your attitude of big brother and counselor and supporter is very salutary. And I noticed that it has a really inspiring effect on the young auto and rubber leaders. It puts them right on their mettle with loads of confidence.
>
> I made as careful inquiries as I could after the meetings among various people, trying to form my own dispassionate judgment, but for the life of me I cannot help but feel that you have started a real ground swell and that a widespread and what may be a pretty rapid movement is actually under way. Again congratulations on the speeches.

This public official, with a candor truly alarming, permitted himself an extraordinary latitude in sympathy in his communication to Clarence Irwin, steel organizer and C. I. O. leader, reading:

> Golden (regional director of the Board's Pittsburgh office) is shoving at Brophy (C. I. O. leader), and I am shoving at Lewis. What is so maddening is the loss of time, this when I know that the other side is very badly worried. I know that this includes Myron C. Taylor. They are scared, and we don't move.

Sometimes Blankenhorn's efforts are directed to strategic considerations, as for example in a letter to Sidney Howard, the playwright:

> Steel is the place for all good men to come to the aid of their party.

In April 1937, Blankenhorn wrote a memorandum that is quite remarkable in the annals of administrative agencies. In this letter, he discussed the manner in which the vote of Mr. Justice Roberts in favor of the constitutionality of the Wagner Act had been obtained. According to Blankenhorn, Mr. Justice Roberts' vote was controlled by the "Philadelphia and New York" interests, especially Roberts' financial connections. Mr. Blankenhorn analyzed the situation as he saw it, recalling his prophecies of January 1937 concerning the auto and the steel situation and showed, at least to his own satisfaction, that the fact that the C. I. O. had been able to sign up these industries in collective agreements was the reason why Mr. Justice Roberts had voted for the constitutionality of the act. In the course of the memorandum, Mr. Blankenhorn said: "When Lewis, in January convinced Morgan, he cast Roberts' vote." For an employee of an administrative agency to accuse a Justice of the United States Supreme Court of being influenced by "financial interests" and to retain his position thereafter, is to say the least, amazing and alarming.

In closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I can justly say that we have in this country two distinct threats to our national unity and that both groups share the same ends and move in the same direction. If ever we needed an orderly industrial process we need it now. The legitimate ends of labor must be served, but we cannot allow tactics which will destroy or cripple our industrial machinery. Nor can we permit unnecessary disputes which mask revolutionary ends by claiming to uphold the cause of labor. At the same time, we cannot tolerate in our Government an agency which espouses the radical elements of the labor movement and shapes its actions according to a philosophy that there must always be a breach between capital and labor and that the cause of labor can be advanced only by widening the breach.

It is high time that we return to the American philosophy that capital and labor have an equal share of rights and duties in industry, that the interests of the employer and the employee are mutual and not diverse. We cannot return to this view by encouraging a governmental agency to champion one element of labor, overriding the rights of employers and of other labor groups.

Patman Chain-Store Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTER FROM EDWARD J. NOBLE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Acting Secretary of Commerce Edward J. Noble to Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, regarding H. R. 1:

MAY 16, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of March 5, 1940, you enclosed a copy of H. R. 1, known as the Patman chain-store bill, and requested the views and recommendations of the Department with respect to this proposed legislation.

The bill, as introduced, provides for an excise tax on retail chain stores. After exempting the first 9 stores, the first bracket of 10–15 stores carries a tax of $50 each. At the other extreme the tax is $1,000 for each store over 500. The tax imposed would be multiplied by the number of States in which the company operates. Gasoline filling stations, restaurants owned by common carriers, and branch offices maintained by newspapers for distribution of their papers are exempted from the terms of the bill. The bill, if enacted, would become effective on July 1 following the date of its approval, and for the first year the tax would be one-half of the amount determined; for the second year three-fourths of that amount, and the full tax rate would be assessed beginning with the third fiscal year after enactment. The sponsors of this measure have submitted certain amendments to the bill which have been brought to our attention. The amount of the tax specified in section 1 of the bill has been reduced by 50 percent in each bracket, and a new subsection (c) has been added to section 1, which would make the bill inapplicable to any person who did not open, establish, operate, or maintain more than 50 retail stores in the State in which his principal place of business was located or within a radius of 100 miles of the city or town in which was located the principal place of business of said person. At the end of section 2 there has been added a new section designated 2 (a), providing that section 2 should not apply to any person opening, establishing, operating, or maintaining on the effective date of the act retail stores under the same general management, supervision, ownership, or control and located in more than one State, if during that period such person should operate only such retail stores or a smaller number thereof, but should apply to such person if the number of retail stores were increased by him during that period, or the location of any of the stores was changed. Finally, section 4 of the bill has been amended by eliminating the exemption of filling stations engaged primarily in the sale or distribution of petroleum products and not engaged in the sale or distribution of automobile tires or tools.

The effect of this bill, both in its original form and as amended, is to destroy the business of the large interstate retailing chains, and the admitted purpose of its sponsors is to accomplish that result. The bill would also seriously impair the operation of small interstate chains and large intrastate chains. The tax created by this bill would be added to tax and other restrictive legislation to which chain stores are already subjected by many States.

The Department recognizes the severe competitive pressure on small independent merchants resulting from the growth of mass distribution with multiple outlets under one ownership and management. Business mortalities and unemployment resulting from increased efficiencies and lowered cost of distribution in competitive enterprises create social problems which are the just concern of government but whose solution does not lie in legislation penalizing efficiency. Failures due to unfair competition can find relief in laws already on the statute books prohibiting discriminatory selling practices, misleading advertising, and other unethical methods of doing business. As a matter of fact, some of the unfair practices with which the chains have been charged have already been legislated against, as indicated:

(a) The Robinson-Patman Act, designed in part to prevent the abusive use of bargaining power.

(b) State unfair practice acts, now in force in 25 States, designed to eliminate loss-leader selling, a practice used more widely by chains than by independents.

(c) State fair-trade laws, now in force in 44 States, designed to eliminate loss-leader selling of trade-marked articles by permitting contract between producer and distributor.

In the opinion of this Department H. R. 1, though destroying interstate chains, would afford only temporary relief to the small independent merchant it seeks to favor.

The salvation of any retailer lies not in prohibiting a particular type of efficient competition by legislation—particularly when such legislative action is confiscatory and unjust in character and seems to destroy entirely the interests of the consumer. It lies in prohibiting unfair trade practices by all retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers. Above all, it lies in the retailer achieving for himself whatever efficiency is developed or enjoyed by a competitor by adopting or improving on the methods of that competitor by cooperative purchasing, advertising, or credit facilities and the like. It is also true that the enterprising independent often has an opportunity to secure and hold his trade by furnishing types of service and by maintaining a quality of merchandise superior to that of his competitors. The primary public interest is served only when our distributing machinery operates at lowest cost, thereby bringing to the producer a larger share of the consumer's dollar, besides making that dollar go farther than it does now. The displacements of labor and obsolescence of capital that are caused by new methods of distribution are on a par with all other problems of unemployment caused by technological advance. There is much that the Government has done and should do to ameliorate those difficulties. However, every advance that saves labor or the need for capital will more than pay its way. It would be fatal to check new methods of distribution or any other phase of technological advance merely because it does involve problems of adjustment, however serious they may be. Those problems are temporary and susceptible of solution, but a stagnated economy is the least desirable solution.

In addition to the above general statement, this Department advances the following specific objections to H. R. 1:

1. It proposes the most extreme use yet suggested for the taxing power, not to raise revenue, not as an incentive, not as a regulator, but to prohibit interstate business.

2. It would add a most vicious barrier to interstate trade of a legitimate character.

3. It would raise the cost and thereby lower the standard of living of the consumers with lowest incomes.

4. It is designed to destroy the business and the livelihood of investors and their employees who have promoted short cuts in distribution, without reference to their having engaged in any unfair or oppressive practice.

5. It is fallaciously supposed to increase employment, whereas at best it would merely shift employment from one class of establishment to an older and apparently less efficient type, resulting probably in less continuity and lower standards of employment.

6. It prevents mass production from yielding its greatest benefit through mass distribution on a national scale.

7. It opens the door for legislation penalizing all interstate businesses when intrastate sellers desire freedom from competition.

The Department has consulted many businessmen, both large and small, on the subject of this legislation. We are convinced that it is not favored by farmers, by consumers, or by any substantial group of fair-minded businessmen.

In view of the above considerations, the department is not in favor of the enactment of H. R. 1.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. NOBLE,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Assistance to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

PETITION FROM CITIZENS OF CHOUTEAU COUNTY, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition received by me from citizens of Chouteau County, Mont.:

FORT BENTON, MONT., *May 30, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR:

The undersigned citizens of Chouteau County do urgently appeal to you to use your utmost influence for legislation to assist the Allies in every way except by the sending of our soldiers overseas. Perhaps our present air force and merchant marine should be leased to the Allies; our Johnson Act be debated for repeal; and prohibition of American soldiers volunteering for foreign service be repealed. Economy and postponement have no place in our national defense. This the Allies have proved.

J. A. Hanford, Louise G. Hanford, A. E. McLeish, D. W. Flagler, Ingolf Birkeland, Elizabeth F. Birkeland, T. N. Birkeland, W. F. Anderson, Mrs. W. F. Anderson, Mabel I. Ritter, Dorothy Ritter, J. Ritter, Marian Ritter, Mrs. Oscar Johnston, Mrs. Alvin Jones, Forrest J. York, Ted Worrall, E. J. Hankins, E. R. Clark, Howard Hilton, F. H. Palmer, Mrs. Fred Pangburn, Nathan Schrader, B. W. Horn, W. H. Schurmann, Margaret Smith, Thos. K. Collins, Alvin Jones, Irvin Rust, Hazel M. Young, Fred L. Young, C. Arnst, Ira W. Vinion, H. F. Miller, J. F. White, George F. Moses, Norman Grylls, Wm. H. Jenkinson, Frank Lell, Claude F. Morris, J. E. Halley, L. H. Schultz, Cecil Cook, W. Bailey, Harry R. Morrow, Claus Wedor, Frank Elliott, Victor Eckman, E. T. Breault, Teresa Loundagin, Chas. Wildunot, A. L. Allen, Virgil Cox, Sam Watson, John Gallagher, C. W. Allen, K. Bauman, Wearn Rowe, Albert P. Kreps, Oswald Jones, E. David Carpenter, Marvin Norton, Otto Stevens, Fred F. Lenning, T. N. Tucker, Walter Davis, L. W. Prunninger, Sig. V. Smith, W. R. Hagie, Preston Baker, A. H. Jones, E. Hildred Jones, J. Kaulbach, D. Shurtliff, Howard R. Saint, Pareck Southern, C. H. Brinkman, Ezra L. Crane, Claude F. Deck, Steve Tootit, Don Cameron, Howard V. Morrow, Glen Bramlette, Rena Savage, J. A. Burchatt, G. A. Richard, Merl I. Whorlow, Frank F. Morger, Harold Roudebush, Geo. Dickens, Wm. Prunninger, Catherine Wackerlin, Leland Overholser, Alma Blase, Irma M. Campbell, Halder M. Hansen, Myrtle Bailey, M. J. Peterson, Mrs. Warren Halley, J. D. Savage, Mrs. J. D. Savage, Joe Vielline, J. F. Curtin, Oscar A. Paul, Dale Apple, F. J. Taylor, Joe F. Overholser, James Overholser, M. S. Thorpe, Amy P. Bartley.

"Fifth Columns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

RESOLUTIONS BY CZECHOSLOVAK FRATERNAL LODGES OF OHIO

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention to a most unusual action taken by representatives of Czechoslovak fraternal lodges, civic and patriotic bodies in Belmont and Jefferson Counties, Ohio, recently.

It is indeed inspiring to know that our foreign-born citizens of the Czechoslovak nationality are rising to great heights in patriotism in the face of apparent danger to the

Republic from so-called "fifth columns" working from within as well as from possible enemies from without. I am today in receipt of a resolution expressing the true sentiments of these our foreign-born brethren, and I sincerely trust that their example may inspire us all in these troublous times and help us to realize that we do have here in America a heritage worthy of our noblest efforts. The resolution to which I refer is as follows:

BRIDGEPORT, OHIO, *May 26, 1940.*

We, the representatives of the Czechoslovak fraternal lodges, civic, and patriotic bodies in Belmont and Jefferson Counties, State of Ohio, recognize that the ruthless invasion of peaceful and democratic countries in Europe by unscrupulous dictators cause us to adopt the following resolutions in order to fully exemplify our love and loyalty to our adopted country, the United States of America:

Whereas the most inhuman war in the annals of the world's history is now raging, destroying lives, property, nations, and liberties, the greatest and dearest heritage of the human race;

Whereas it has proven conclusively that in most of the nations conquered by the selfish and power-thirsty dictators that they have been materially assisted within said conquered nations by traitorous elements known now as the "fifth column": Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the above-mentioned representatives of the fraternal, civic, and patriotic bodies, pledge our allegiance to the United States of America, and to the principles for which it stands; that we in unmeasured terms renounce and condemn all persons or groups of persons directly or indirectly connected in any way with those who are either members or sympathizers of the "fifth column" or anyone who would attempt to undermine our republic form of government; and we do hereby assure our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of our continued cooperation and support in his efforts to improve our country and better the conditions of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That for the preservation of these principles we stand ready to make the supreme sacrifice should it ever be necessary.

FRANK LIDNIUKA, *Chairman.*
JAMES LEPIC, *Secretary.*

The following representatives have signed in behalf of their organizations, whom they represent:

Frank Mertl, Czechoslovak legionnaire, Lansing, Ohio.
Stephen Herink, Court Pizen, No. 115, F. of A., Bridgeport, Ohio.
Antonia Bittingl, Lodge Vlastenka Unity of Bohemian Ladies, Bellaire, Ohio.
Theresa Prokes, Lodge Dobromila, No. 46 B. L., Bridgeport, Ohio.
Marie Spirak, Bellaire, Ohio.
Karel Kerner, Lodge J. Paltgelt, 272 C. S. A., Dillonvale, Ohio.
Anna Plechaty, Lodge Kruh Asvojenych B. L., Dillonvale, Ohio.
James Fisher, Lodge C. S. P. S., Neffs, Ohio.
Bessie Dvorak, Sisters Union, No. 65, Neffs, Ohio.
Frank Marik, Branch Czechoslovak Alliance, Bellaire, Ohio.
Jos. Vavroch, Lodge Vaclav Snajdr, 251 C. S. A., Bridgeport, Ohio.
Cipryan Valachovic, Branch 456, N. S. S., Bellaire, Ohio.
Frank Pogorelski, Branch 635, N. S. S., Bridgeport, Ohio.
Math Kren, Branch Czechoslovak Alliance, Bridgeport, Ohio.
Anton Dvorak and Thomas Frubert, Branch Czechoslovak Alliance, Neffs, Ohio.
Anton Krob, veteran, World War, Blaine, Ohio.
Frank Paul, Lodge Lech, No. 310, C. S. A., Bellaire, Ohio.
James Pumpa, Neffs, Ohio.
Joseph Vild, Lodge William Kerober, C. S. A., Maynard, Ohio.
John Matuska, Catholic Sokol, No. 87, Lansing, Ohio.
Anton Latochka, Lansing, Ohio.
Marie Kren, Bridgeport, Ohio.

Suggestions for Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, entitled, "The Guardians of America's Fate," which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, June 1. The analysis which Mr. Lippmann makes in this article and the suggestions contained therein merit the critical study of all those who are primarily concerned with providing the United States quickly with an adequate national defense.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 1, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE GUARDIANS OF AMERICA'S FATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The critical problem at this moment in Washington is the organization of what may be called the high command, where decisions of transcendent political importance will have to be made almost immediately and from which over a long subsequent period of time must come the planning and the direction of the national defense. The primary responsibility is, of course, vested in the President but the President's powers are not adequate or effective without the support of Congress and without the enlistment of the energies of the people.

However, in this great business "the President" is not just the man, namely Mr. Roosevelt, who holds the office. The President is an institution, the main organ of government for the conduct of foreign affairs, for the raising and equipping of the armed forces, for the command of those forces, and for the management of the Nation's effort. It is obvious that no human being can personally exercise the whole power of the Presidency; this is beyond the capacity of the human mind, and an attempt to regard the powers of the Presidency as the personal responsibility of any man who happens to be in the White House is absolutely certain to lead to confusion and failure.

The man who is President—whatever his name or his party—must at a time like this regard the Presidency as an organized command of highly responsible men whom he selects, over whom he presides, whom he inspires, but only, in the very largest questions of policy, directs. He must not regard the defense administrators as his personal agents and his personal council any more than he would—in time of actual war—presume to tell the commander of the fleet what must be the tactical disposition of the Navy.

If this distinction between the Presidency and the man who is President is forgotten or confused, the President will attend to so many things that he will never have time or energy for the greatest things, and the administrators will become bogged down in the mire of bureaucratic timidity and jealousy.

For the great emergency in which this country finds itself, it will be well to fix clearly in our minds that the national defense has to be organized both through decisions in foreign policy and through the raising, training, and equipping of the armed forces. The decisions in foreign policy will in the present crisis have to be made in the very early stages of the defense program, long before the program has been carried out, and these decisions will be of such a character that they may determine the problem of American defense for generations to come.

President Roosevelt must be fully aware that in the next weeks or even days the country may be confronted with very hard choices affecting its vital interests and its basic security in both oceans, and in this whole hemisphere from Canada to South America. The informed in Washington have just recently begun to realize how near we may be to the necessity of taking decisions which are as momentous as any in our whole history.

They are decisions which cannot be taken by one man and his personal advisers; they are decisions like those which preceded the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine. It will be recalled that in that critical time President Monroe laid the whole matter before the elder statesmen of the Republic, in office and in retirement, before making up his mind. Mr. Roosevelt is now on the very verge of being presented with as great or greater issues than was President Monroe, issues which cannot be evaded, issues which, however they are decided, will produce momentous consequences.

It is imperative that he should take at once into his complete confidence the leaders of Congress and the elder statesmen of both parties, and that they should become prepared by first-hand knowledge of the situation in order that they may share with him the awful burden, and in order that the people may feel certain that the decisions are the best that can be made. With the help of the American leaders the President can then take the Nation into his confidence and tell them the truth of what is happening and of what is impending. This is not a question of a coalition Government or of any kind of political window dressing. This is a question of taking decisions affecting vitally the defense of America; the majority and minority leaders in both Houses of Congress, the Vice President and the Speaker, the titular heads of the Republican Party, the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, and also I believe the Chief Justice should be called upon to formulate the decisions. It is a matter for the whole Government, representing the whole people.

Whereas in these matters of the highest policy the decisions need to be taken by the President, with the advice and support of the Representatives of the Nation, in the actual organization of the national defense there is needed above all others things clearly defined responsibility and full authority.

It is amateurish, for example, to give the country the impression that its defenses are to be improved by a commission consisting of seven equally responsible persons, and we may assume, I suppose, that no one is actually thinking of making Mr. Knudsen, for example, get the consent of his six colleagues in planning and directing a program of aircraft production. Yet no one can be sure that he will not have to get their consent, or that Cabinet officers will take

orders from him, or that he will not wear himself out trying to persuade the President to crack down on obstructionists. For this reason the present organization is radically defective. Therefore, Messrs. Knudsen, Stettinius, and Budd—the men actually charged with producing the goods—will do well before they go any further to insist upon a much more workable organization. There is no use their starting to work until they have the proper tools. They do not have them now in an arrangement where they derive their own authority from the President personally and their knowledge of what the armed forces require of them from the virtually headless War and Navy Departments.

The proper solution, as Mr. Hoover has demonstrated, is to establish with all necessary powers a Munitions Administration with a single responsible head who will select the production managers to plan and direct the procurement of supplies. There should then be appointed a new Secretary of War, and a new Secretary of the Navy to tell the Munitions Administration what is needed and in what order of urgency, and also to make sure that the best commanders available are in charge of the naval and military forces. Finally, there should be appointed a new Secretary of Labor who, while protecting standards necessary to support health and efficiency, can and will support the Munitions Administration by measures to increase the productivity of the workers and by measures to train the unskilled for skilled trades.

These new posts should not be given to politicians, Republican or Democratic, for the purpose of presenting the appearance of a national government. They should be given to experienced executives for the purpose of making the national defense efficient.

The Baltimore Sun spoke the profound truth when it said yesterday that "Mr. Roosevelt and his subordinates must stop underestimating the character of the American people." They must stop flinching at the prospect of having to tell the people the hard truth about what confronts them and about what it means in the way of work and sacrifice. They can count upon the patriotism of the American people to withstand and endure the things that may now be in store for them—provided only the people know that their fate is not in the hands of any one man and that the ablest and the wisest and the strongest men available are on guard and in command.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTERS FROM J. HARRY KELLY AND ROSA A. SMITH

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the importance to non-poll-tax States of abolishing the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is becoming realized more and more. Numerous letters come into my office from citizens of non-poll-tax States, the burden of which is that because of the influence of Representatives from the poll-tax States on the legislation in Congress affecting the Nation as a whole, it is important to every citizen of the United States that these Representatives be true representatives of the people in their districts, rather than of a minority. Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer samples of such letters:

KIMBALL, S. DAK., *May 20, 1940.*

HON. LEE E. GEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: I receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regularly and check each issue for the high lights, and was particularly interested in your talk in the House on May 7, on page 5717 of the RECORD, and on pages 2756 and 2757 in the Appendix of the RECORD, which treated of the poll tax in the eight States in the South, the nonpayment of which disqualifies citizens of the right to vote. I must confess I did not know this before; and, putting it mildly, I will say it is a disgrace and, I believe, unconstitutional in our land.

Certainly no one sponsoring such a law can claim to favor a free representative government of which we Americans like to boast. I believe that any man sent to the House by the vote of so few people of his State might well have his right to vote in that body challenged, as you hinted but did not quite say. Certainly that man is not a representative of the majority of the people who will be asked—or not only asked, but required—to abide by the laws he will sponsor and help to pass. It is the most positive example of government without representation of which I have heard. I join the man who wrote in the New York Evening Post the article you had printed in the RECORD.

We, of course, in South Dakota are not affected by such a law, but if the power to restrict the right to vote in that way can be practiced in those States, why not in South Dakota eventually? We must curb this vicious practice before it extends to such a degree that the right to vote is only enjoyed by those who enjoy the good things of the Nation. I would be pleased to have a copy of your bill, H. R. 7534.

Very respectfully,

J. HARRY KELLY,
President, Kimball Townsend Club No. 1.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 20, 1940.*

Congressman LEE E. GEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: As you have sponsored a bill to free the people of the Southern States of the chain around their necks called poll tax, will say 35 years ago I lived in one of the States that imposed a poll tax on the people. Only then there were 3 classes who could not vote: women, Negroes, and the insane. I was not allowed within 100 feet of the polls. I always rebelled at the law that denied me my rights as a human being and an American citizen. So I, being the mother of 5 daughters, refused to live in a State that did not count us only as among their mules.

Now I am in California where I can go to the polls with my husband and express my views at the ballot box. So can my 5 daughters who all live in California. And we don't have to pay for this glorious privilege. Mr. Geyer, do all you can to free my southern sisters from the poll tax.

Yours for a free South,

ROSA A. SMITH.

Roosevelt and Some of His Keymen Have Coddled Members of the "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler, which indicates that Roosevelt and some of his keymen have coddled members of the "fifth column."

[From the Washington Post of May 31, 1940]

FAIR ENOUGH—UNWITTING CONSORTS

(By Westbrook Pegler)

About the same time that President Roosevelt was on the air last Sunday night warning the country against clever schemes of foreign agents two other members of the New Deal family delivered public addresses.

In New York, Mrs. Roosevelt attended a meeting of the New York Youth Congress, a subsidiary of the American Youth Congress, which is a transmission belt of the Communist Party. Harold Ickes made a speech in Cleveland.

Mrs. Roosevelt's hosts adopted a resolution consistent with the Moscow party line, condemning rearmament by the United States. They also opposed action against the Communist Party and cheered an assertion by VITO MARCANTONIO, a Congressman who runs with the Communists, that the new weapons of the United States were intended for an aggressive war on behalf of the American dollar and the British pound. Mrs. Roosevelt, who often attends meetings of transmission belt or Trojan horse organizations of the Communist Party, did not see eye to eye with the youth congress, insisting that failure to rearm might result in the needless sacrifice of many American lives.

The identity of Mr. Ickes' hosts I do not know, but the account which I read said that he "urged a vigorous campaign against 'fifth column' activities."

Just here I would point out—not that it seems necessary—that both Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Ickes have been consistently guilty of consorting with the "fifth column" of the Communist anti-American conspiracy, and that there are more deadly and stealthy enemies of the civil liberties which Mr. Ickes treasured in his speech than certain groups to which they have flagrantly and gratuitously given aid and comfort.

Mrs. Roosevelt has attended meetings of the National and World Youth Congresses, both controlled by vicious adult conspirators in Moscow, and has adorned, with her political and personal prestige,

meetings promoted by the Trojan horse Workers Alliance. Those organizations are no more innocent than the anti-American bund of the Nazi Government or the Sons of Italy, which maintains cordial relations with and promotes devotion to the Fascist, antidemocratic, anti-American Government of Italy among Americans of Italian blood. There is no more justification for the appearance of an officer of the American Government or a member of the President's personal and political family at occasions organized by the Moscow "fifth column" than for the appearance of the same persons at rallies of the bund or the Fascist order.

Mr. Ickes showed his preference or tolerance for the Communist breed of Trojan horse when he made an ostentatious political appearance under the auspices of the National Lawyers' Guild. This guild was organized as a liberal rival to the American Bar Association, for which there was need of rivalry. Soon, however, it fell under the partial control of "fifth column" lawyers—who are most numerous, incidentally, in the Washington chapter, where many of them are or were employed in the Government in the guise of liberals and New Dealers, concealing the party membership or holding the status of fellow travelers.

Ferdinand Pecora, a justice of the New York Supreme Court, a liberal, the man who conducted the Wall Street expose in the early days of the New Deal and a founder of the Lawyers' Guild, openly denounced the Trojan horsemanship of the Communists in the guild. As in the American Newspaper Guild, the American majority, occupied with their regular work and unwilling to devote their time and energies to a constant fight against Communist influence, presently found that the Communists were making the policies and decisions and following the Communist Party line.

On another occasion Mr. Ickes selected for his platform the New York Newspaper Guild, which has been notoriously communistic in policy and is now recognized by the American membership and by a larger number of nonmembers as a faithful Old Dobbin of the Trojan stables. He sat with undercover Communists and ill-disguised fellow travelers whose "clever schemes" then, as now, were designed to sabotage recovery and who today have abandoned the New Deal, because the President denounced Moscow's assault on Finland and because the New Deal is attempting to arm against Stalin and his ally, Adolf Hitler.

Mrs. Roosevelt is her own boss, and Mr. Ickes, having an official position and official responsibility, is only slightly less free. If they must run with the Communists, that is all right, but their conduct tends to confuse the meaning of the President's warnings against the "fifth column."

Recognized Military Authority Endorses Department of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTER FROM MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced House Joint Resolution 417 on January 10, 1940, providing for a survey of our national-defense needs and resources, many of the Nation's military experts have endorsed the principles of the resolution.

This morning I received the approval from Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, United States Army, a graduate of West Point, and one who served with honor and distinction in all wars in which our country participated the past 50 years.

General Rivers saw service in Cuba, the Philippines, and had a battle command in all major battles in France during the World War. At the time of his retirement he was the Inspector General of the Army at the War Department in Washington.

The attention of the membership of this House is called to the fact that General Rivers' opinion represents 50 years of military experience. Surely his views are worthy of consideration.

Therefore, I urge every Member of this House to carefully digest the contents of General Rivers' letter on the question of a Department of National Defense.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, *June 1, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VAN ZANDT: May I write you concerning House Joint Resolution 417 introduced by you? I am particularly interested in paragraph 3 of your resolution providing that the National Defense Commission created, in case your resolution should become law, shall examine into the practicability of establishing a Department of National Defense.

I assume that a Cabinet Minister of Defense would be the head of the Department of National Defense. A civilian Assistant Secretary would be at the head of each of the services, the Army, the Navy, and the United States Air Corps. These civilian assistants in charge of the three armed branches would be permanent officials, as is the case at present with the Assistant Secretary of State and other Assistant Secretaries. The President at Washington can never closely supervise 10 Cabinet Ministers. But we all know that in a crisis, when five billions are being spent on national defense, the work of each of the three great armed branches must be closely supervised.

Why not allow the President an additional Cabinet officer, a Cabinet Minister of Defense, to aid the Chief Executive in supervising the three coequal armed branches—the Navy, the Army, and the air force? The study of recent surprises concerning Great Britain's reverses in combat in Norway and later in Belgium and France ought to reveal a lesson in organization for ourselves.

My conviction is that Great Britain suffered greatly due to the lack of a cabinet minister in charge of her three armed branches. I believe that the lesson for ourselves is to have, as soon as possible, a more cohesive and coordinated fighting defensive force under a cabinet minister of defense. This controlling minister of national defense would not only inspect the relative progress of the three branches and note where deficiencies occur, but he would be in actual command of all these armed branches. The way to control is to command. Coordination of three different forces involves, or at least invites, suggestions, advice, compromise—delay.

It is interesting to recall that Goethals, who constructed the long Panama Canal, said he made use of his assistants to aid him, but that he rarely used a committee or a board of officials. He thought boards were usually narrow and wooden.

Another example is the case of John W. Weeks, of Boston, who was Secretary of War in the cabinets of Presidents Harding and Coolidge. Weeks had training and experience which fitted him well as a judge of matters such as the one we are now discussing. Weeks was a graduate of the United States Naval Academy who soon resigned from the Navy. He was successful as a businessman and as a banker. Weeks then became a Senator in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

He was earnestly in favor of a single department of national defense. From his own experience Secretary Weeks stated there was, at Washington, administrative overlapping and administrative conflict—as well as departmental antagonism between the Army and Navy. Secretary Weeks was convinced that there was great evidence of waste in our present organization. He believed that the Cabinet Minister of National Defense would be able to prevent duplication of plants and activities and wasteful expenditure of public money.

Others who made public expression of their advocacy of the single department of national defense include John J. McSwain, late chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, the late Speaker Byrns, and Lt. Gen. Robert L. Bullard. Many recollect Brig. Gen. William Mitchell's keen advocacy of the single department of defense. Some 10 principal nations have in late years adopted different forms of such a plan for their defense. Of course, Britain and some other countries have committees on national defense. That is excellent as a policy-making body. But a committee is not an effective executive organ.

We need a National Defense Trust. We have had in the past the National Oil Trust, the National Steel Trust, the National Harvester Trust, and so on.

Only by having one member of the Cabinet in charge of all the defense branches can Congress get the unpartisan and objective opinion of a civilian minister who devotes his whole time studying and inspecting the relative efficiency, progress, and needs of the three armed services. Unity of command of the President is increased by his having only one Cabinet Minister to normally consult with and to give instructions to.

Unity of command for the Navy results from having that part of the single Air Corps which goes to war under Navy command train all the time in peace under Navy command. The part of the Air Corps which goes to war with the Army trains under Army command all the time in peace. Graduates of Annapolis and West Point will continue to enter the Air Corps as at present. Graduates of the two service Academies will be assigned to the portion of the single Air Corps with which they are to serve in both war and peace. The single United States Air Corps would have its own laws for pay, promotion, and retirement. The status of the Air Corps will thus be made equal to the status of the two older services. The Chief of the United States Air Corps would control the Air Reserve at the disposition of the Minister of Defense. The Chief of the single and homogeneous Air Corps would have charge

of the research, procurement, and supply services for the Air Corps and of the land aviation schools for preliminary air training.

A natural question is frequently asked by persons who are opposed to the creation of a Department of National Defense: "Is it proper to recommend a Department of National Defense when it is well known that most of the higher officers of the Army and of the Navy are opposed to such action? We should trust our experts." I understand such an attitude. However, we are aware of the fact that probably the majority of the higher officers—the experts—are, naturally, also enthusiasts. We know also that enthusiasts are liable to make errors in judgment—errors resulting from excess of zeal. Trust the experts is a wise general policy. But in a matter of supreme and vital importance to our 130,000,000 people we are compelled to examine into and critically weigh the opinions of every one—of experts and of all others.

In conclusion, my own conviction is that the House Joint Resolution 417 is one of the most important measures before the Congress.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

Leon Blum's New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

EDITORIAL AND ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the New York Sun, of Thursday, May 23, 1940:

THAT FRENCH NEW DEAL

Congressmen might well read an article elsewhere on this page headed "Leon Blum's New Deal." When the times comes for the French to place the blame for Hitler's swift progress in this war, more than generals will be held accountable. The allied forces of communism, socialism, and plain demagoguery gathered under the banner of the Popular Front, did a job which they described as "true democracy." The Communists thought that they were working for Stalin. The Socialists thought that they were working for the workingman.

They were all working for Hitler.

LEON BLUM'S NEW DEAL—ITS EVIL EFFECT ON THE AIRPLANE PROGRAM OF FRANCE

There is food for American thought in the record of the French new deal—which Senator Caillaux once called "Rooseveltism for Lilliputians"—because of its repercussions on the French airplane industry at a time when in France defense was the nation's paramount concern.

The Popular Front Government, which fathered the new deal, came into being when French opinion, swinging violently to the Left, hailed as premier the veteran leader of the French Socialists, Leon Blum. He took office as head of a government representing Leftist political and labor organizations. Reform took precedence over recovery. A 40-hour week was established, overtime was made prohibitively costly and permitted only with official sanction. National and religious holidays, frequent in France, further reduced the working year to 240 days. Other reforms enacted provided for compulsory fortnight vacations at full pay, security of tenure for the workers, wage increases, collective security and arbitration of disputes. Right of dismissal was vested in a Workers' Committee of Discipline which sat in judgment on employers' grievances. Employers lost the right to discharge employees.

The unions drastically limited output per diem per capita and imposed regulations—often Gilbertian—for employment of their members. An immediate result was the closing, or part-time operation, of mills in the great textile belt of Lille, Roubaix, and Tourcoing. Textile manufacturers pointed out that the shortened working week, together with labor regulations which slowed production, increased their operating costs by 35 percent, to which must be added arbitrary wage increases of 15 percent. Thus production costs had risen beyond competitive levels.

Automobile manufacturers, pointing to a vertical decline in production, declared that an automobile which retailed in London for 260 pounds sterling could not be put on the market in France for less than the equivalent of 400 pounds. After 2 years of the new deal, which subordinated all interests to those of labor, unemployment had increased, and French industrial production was only 7 percent above the low of the depression, while British production had risen 57 percent and German production 109 percent.

Two years before Munich the popular front government, which believed in nationalization of public utilities, nationalized airplane factories. To each of 6 companies owning in all some 20 factories, an administrator delegate was appointed. However, the factories never obtained harmonious collaboration.

Figures of airplane production, with which the Paris press abounded after Munich, roused public opinion. It was shown that in some factories after nationalization, production in equal working time had decreased by 40 percent. In others, certain types of war material whose construction formerly required 15,000 hours of labor, were allowed 40,000 hours. Between January 1 and August 1 of that year 1938, the total number of airplanes produced by French factories was 238, representing an average output of 34 per month, against a planned average output of 100. Of the 238 planes, most had been ordered 3 years before, and were capable of little more than 210 miles an hour. The figures were the more disappointing because in January of that same year the new deal government had set on foot the largest production plan yet conceived in France, providing for production of 5,000 airplane bodies and 12,000 engines. But execution had lagged behind schedule, which itself was outmoded by events.

The subnormal production in all industry during this theorists' holiday was charged by former Premier Herriot with the impoverishment of the nation. Gaston Jeze, writing in Ere Nouvelle, called it catastrophic.

H. Z. TORRES.

What Goes On In Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on June 2, 1940:

At the conclusion of my April broadcast I announced that due to an agreement entered into by members of the American Broadcasters Association, this station could not donate time to Members of Congress. Considering the fact that this is an election year, that ruling is perfectly justified and I deeply appreciate the generosity of Station WTIC in giving me 30 minutes each month so that I could report to you on what goes on in Congress.

It was my intention to omit future broadcasts and confine my reports for the balance of this session to a monthly bulletin. However, a few of my friends felt that these broadcasts should be continued and they therefore named a committee to accept donations to make possible a continuation of this series. I am informed that money enough for two, and possibly three, broadcasts has been donated and that donations have been received from both Democrats and Republicans.

Before I go on with my announced subject, may I take a moment or two to remind you of the drive being made by the American Red Cross for $10,000,000 to carry on its work of mercy in the devastated areas of Europe. It is hard for us, 3,000 miles away from the battlefields, to visualize the suffering of innocent men, women, and children. I hope the Red Cross will succeed in raising the needed $10,000,000, and that this sum will be exceeded substantially. I am sure the people of Connecticut will gladly do their part.

The war in Europe and the efforts of our own country to improve and strengthen our own defenses has, of course, overshadowed all of the domestic legislation considered by Congress during the past month.

Since my last broadcast, the world has been horrified by the cruel attack on Norway. We read in our newspapers or hear on our radios, accounts of the ruthless attack by Hitler on the peaceloving neutral country of Norway. We saw on the screen in our theaters, the bombing and burning of Norwegian towns and cities. We stood aghast as we heard of the treacherous work of the "fifth column." The traitors within made difficult, if not impossible, the defense of that country.

Following as it did by the conquering of Czechoslovakia and the raping of Poland, we were indignant and horrified; then, like lightning, the mechanized forces of Hitler struck at Holland, Belgium, France, and Great Britain. It took just a matter of a few days to overrun and subdue Holland. Last Tuesday the King of Belgium threw down his arms and as I write these words, the most deadly battle of all time rages in France.

Where does all this tragedy leave the United States? What can and should we, as a people, do at this time? What should I, as the Representative of the people of Hartford County, do at this time of crisis? I humbly pray Almighty God to guide us in the direction we should go.

I have come to the conclusion that it is the first duty of this Congress to provide whatever is necessary to protect this country from any possible attack. While our indignation rises we must not be swept off our feet by either hysteria or propaganda. All kinds of wild hysterical suggestions have been made. It has been suggested that the national elections in November be postponed. I agree that partisanship should not affect the decisions Congress must make in connection with both national defense and our foreign policy. There should be cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government; there should, and must be, unity of purpose. Ours is a two-party system of government, and a very definite responsibility rests on the minority. When the requests of the majority are sound we should support them. When unsound we should respectfully oppose them. Sound defense and preservation of democratic methods help each other, while any attempted short cut of government control is dangerous—both to liberty and to defense. Ahead of all else at this time the Congress and the country should know the truth. We should know exactly the real strength of our Army, Navy, and air force.

Now, during the next few minutes, let us review what has taken place in Congress during the past 3 weeks. By May 10 the House of Representatives passed both the War and Navy Departments regular appropriation bills. These two bills appropriated the huge sum of more than $2,000,000,000—an all-time high in our peacetime history. These two bills, in most respects, carried out the recommendations of the ranking officers of our Army and Navy. The commanding officers of each branch of our military service had testified before the Appropriations Committee and had told the committee what their particular branch needed, and almost without exception, their requests were granted.

On the evening of May 15 the President announced that on the following day he would personally deliver a message to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives. That message was delivered on May 16. I won't take the time to go into the details of the President's message, as most of you listening today, either heard it over your radios or have read it in your newspapers. Briefly, the President asked for almost a billion dollars to be used as speedily as possible to improve and strengthen our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

As I listened to that message I was disturbed by the picture the President painted, by the woeful lack of modern mechanized equipment for our Army, by the fact that, in the light of developments in aviation abroad, all of our airplanes were obsolete. In addition to definite requests for more than three-quarters of a billion dollars, the President asked for $100,000,000 in cash and authorization for another $100,000,000 in the future, to be made available to him to care for any emergency that might develop while Congress was in recess. The country and the Congress approved the recommendations made in the President's message. This statement is borne out by the fact that in the following 12 days the House passed three separate bills carrying out the President's recommendations, with just one vote in the negative. I shall summarize the provisions of those bills in just a few minutes.

I voted for the bill giving the President a blank check for $200,000,000, much as I was opposed to that provision, simply because it was the second section of a bill written in two sections, and the provisions of the first section were sound and necessary. During the debate on this bill, it was pointed out in 1917, Congress had given President Wilson a blank check for $100,000,000. However, there is this noteworthy difference. In 1917 we were at war; today we are at peace, and with the right kind of leadership we are going to remain at peace. The President, by virtue of the emergency under which we are now operating, has power to transfer funds within the War and Navy Departments appropriation and even to spend money not authorized for the Army and Navy, as was done last September in the amount of more than $375,000,000.

On May 23 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report submitted to Congress by President Wilson showing how his $100,000,000 so-called blank check was spent. Most of it went to departments that had regular appropriations. The outstanding exception was an item of $2,100,000 spent by Mr. George Creel's committee on public information. Before I leave this subject I want to say that I deplore the fact that the President dramatized the situation by personally delivering his message to the Congress. Hardly a week goes by but what the Congress receives a message from the White House, and I can assure you that a written message receives the same attention as a message delivered in person. Dramatizing the present situation increases the hysteria, frightens our people, and does no real good.

The other two bills to which I have referred were submitted to the House by the Committee on Naval Affairs, last Tuesday, and approved by the House after 2 hours of debate on each of them. The first one eased certain restrictions now in force in connection with the purchase of naval supplies, such as ships, aircraft, munitions, and so forth. This bill permits the Secretary of the Navy to make purchases by negotiated contracts rather than by competitive bids. This is not the old cost-plus plan used during the World War, but rather provides for a definite set profit, known in advance, and made part of the contract. Many men who have studied naval procurement feel that not only will the Navy get better equipment by this method but will, in many cases, get it cheaper.

Another section of this bill permits the Secretary of War to advance 30 percent of the amount of any contract where the contractor needs the money to buy certain equipment and material. This 30 percent will, of course, be taken out of the final settlement. It does, however, make it possible for a small shipyard or aircraft factory to share in the expansion program.

The third section relates to hours and wages. The so-called Walsh-Healey Act of 1936, which limits the hours that may be worked by those filling Government contracts as well as regulating wages, certain reports, and so forth, does not apply to open-market purchases but only to contract purchases and negotiated contracts which have been ruled to be open-market purchases.

Under this bill, the standard work week is set at 40 hours, but it provides that an employee may work as much as 48 hours per week, providing he is paid time and a half for the additional 8 hours. It is further provided that if the President declares that it is necessary to work more than 48 hours per week, he may raise the limit and require that time and a half be paid the employee for all over 40 hours in any one week.

It is hoped, as a result of this whole national-defense expansion program, that thousands now unemployed will secure work. Contractors will be urged to work additional shifts, instead of making their employees work overtime. It is realized, however, that in many technical jobs it will not be possible to secure additional trained men. For example, take an engineer working on a drafting board in an effort to design a new aviation engine or a new part for a marine engine, or even an antiaircraft gun. In such cases it is just as impossible to put another man on that drafting board, to work on that problem, as it would be to paint a portrait by using three shifts of artists. It is not a case of paying time and a half for overtime, it is a case of getting the job done; of getting our badly needed equipment at the earliest possible moment. Those who say that labor would object to such a provision as the one to which I refer now are, in my humble opinion, insulting labor. The men and women to whom we refer as labor are loyal citizens, and I believe they will cooperate in this emergency as they have done in the past.

The second bill passed last Tuesday provided for the expansion of our naval air service. It provided, first, for the purchase of 7,000 airplanes, which will bring the Navy strength up to 10,000 planes of all types. It provided for the training of 16,000 pilots, and it provided for 20 additional shore bases for naval aircraft. This last item is of great importance. Up to the present time we have not provided for adequate airports for our expanded air services. At the present time, we do not have anything like enough airports to care for 20 or 30 thousand airplanes. The number of planes proposed in this bill for the Navy, and the number provided for the Army, are reasonable and we have every reason to believe that with our expanding aircraft industry, we can get delivery within a year's time.

In his message to Congress, the President asked that the aircraft industry be expanded so we could secure an annual output of 50,000 planes for our Army and Navy; this, in addition to the needs of France and Great Britain, to say nothing of our commercial needs. I fear this is a case of uncontrolled enthusiasm and a false hope. General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, when testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 3, 1940, during discussion of the capacity of the aircraft industry said, and I quote, "First, insofar as the productive capacity is concerned.

"I made the statement that we had produced 340 airplanes in January and approximately the same number in March; that we would reach a production of about 800 this fall and about 1,200 by December. I also said that I thought we would have an actual productive capacity of about 17,000 a year. I said that our absolute productive capacity would probably be, by using two and one-half shifts, somewhere between 24,000 and 30,000 annually, but apparently did not make this clear, that that is the absolute maximum productive capacity of the aircraft industry based upon expanded production of all type airplanes being manufactured by the aircraft industry—that is, low-horsepower sport models as well as commercial craft and purely military types—and means 100 percent clicking, if we secured properly qualified mechanics, all of the necessary additional facilities, the necessary administrative and directive forces in the shops, and the necessary engineers. These latter two requirements are so difficult to obtain that I do not believe that we can reach this absolute maximum productive capacity in the United States for probably 1 year or maybe 2 years after we decide that we want to reach it. In other words, the 24,000 and the 30,000 is an ideal figure that we shoot at, that we may or may not ever reach."

I am glad Congress has adopted a reasonable program, one that can be carried to completion within the time limit set.

I have referred to the President's message to Congress and to the way Congress has responded without thought of partisanship, both parties voting unanimously for the bills reported. Before leaving the subject of national defense, I want to mention, very briefly, the President's broadcast of last Sunday night. I refer to that broadcast only because it indicates a serious lack of cooperation between the Army, Navy, and the President. The President said that we have the best and largest Navy we have ever had and that is certainly true, but when the President got down

to listing the equipment the Army has "either on hand" or "on order" there is a great difference between the figures used by the President and the figures given to Congress by representatives of the War Department this past month. For example, the President said we have "3,200 of the best fighting fliers in the world." The following is taken from the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 3, and I quote:

"We have only a trained personnel to take care of 1,965 combat planes, and Congress has provided the money to train the full number of men required to operate them.

"Senator LODGE. We will have the same personnel as we have now. They have got enough personnel for 5,500 planes.

"General ARNOLD. No, sir; we do not have personnel to take care of 5,500.

"Senator LODGE. What do we have?

"General ARNOLD. We have personnel to operate 1,965 combat planes."

And so on down the list of tanks, antitank guns, antiaircraft guns, etc. All of which indicates the need of a war industries board to coordinate all defense activities. No one man can keep up with all the details of such a huge program.

I may be about to make a rash statement, in view of the events that have recently taken place abroad, but I do want to say with all sincerity that I do not believe this country is in danger of attack from abroad in the near future. I am more concerned about so-called "fifth column" activity within than I am by threat of attack from without. There isn't a bombing plane made as yet that can come across the ocean with a load and get back to its base again. It would take a navy three times as strong as our own Navy to come over here and engage our Navy on equal footing. Every thousand miles away from its home base reduces naval power by 25 percent. The ocean is still a source of defense for the United States. In spite of that, I do believe that we must prepare at once for any possible eventuality, and I will support every reasonable request made by the President to strengthen our national defense. I am thankful we still have time to prepare, but we should not delay. The experience of Great Britain and France is known to all of us.

If time will permit, I want to refer to one or two other legislative matters considered by Congress during the month of May, One is H. R. 9000 or, as it is known to the Legion, the widows and orphans bill.

This bill provided a pension for the dependent widow, orphans, or parents of a World War veteran in the amount of $20 per month. Under the provisions of this bill it was not necessary that the veteran had suffered any disability while in service. Under existing law, the widow, orphan, or parent of any World War veteran who, at the time of his death, had a 1-percent or more service-connected disability, is entitled to a pension. Under existing law, the widow of a veteran who was killed in battle or who died of a service-incurred disability, receives the inadequate maximum pension of $45 per month, or $38, if under age 50.

I feel very strongly that the passage of H. R. 9000 will definitely close the door in the face of the widows of men who actually died in the service. Time will not permit me to go into all the details of this debate, but I will be glad to send anyone interested a copy of the remarks I made in the House on this subject. However, I do want to say that no Member of Congress holds the members of the American Legion in higher regard than I do. The members of the American Legion have rendered many fine services to their country, State, and community. No organization has done more to point out the need for an improved Army and Navy than has been done by the Legion. For that reason, among others, I feel confident that the rank and file of the American Legion does not favor the passage of this pension bill at this time. That feeling is strengthened by the fact that out of 29 Legion posts in Hartford County, I heard from a representative of only 3 of these posts that favored this legislation. I did get requests from several representatives of the American Legion Auxiliary, who favored the bill. At the same time, I had a great many letters from veterans, including members of the Legion, who were opposed to the passage of this bill. I can only say, that having studied the bill and realizing the situation our country faces, I could not vote for its passage and live up to the oath of office I took in January 1939.

A few weeks ago it was quite generally believed that Congress would adjourn about June 8. The adjournment date is now very uncertain. I hope Congress will stay in session until its work has been completed, even if it takes all summer, and regardless of the effect it might have on any individual. I hope we will pass a sound tax bill. We have reached and exceeded the legal debt limit of $45,000,000,000, and it is well to note for the record that that debt was not created by any national-defense preparations. The debt adds to the seriousness of the problem we face. As the committee of the minority appointed last year to study our national defense needs reported in January, "the huge national debt is the worst crack in our armor at this time."

We must have legislation to prevent the spread of "fifth column" activities. Teeth must be put in our laws dealing with those who engage in subversive activities. The Federal Bureau of Investigation or, as it is commonly called, F. B. I., must be given more agents. In dealing with the "fifth column" activities we must again guard against hysteria. Those of us who remember the World War will remember the number of fine men and women, loyal Americans of German birth and with German names, who were hounded and, in some cases, ruined businesswise due to wartime hysteria.

It apparently has become necessary to fingerprint and register all aliens now in the United States. No law-abiding alien should object to cooperating with our Government to that extent. The records will be separate from any criminal file. Compared to the treatment of aliens in most of the countries of Europe, this is a small request to make of aliens living here. On the other hand, we must remember that there are a large number of law-abiding aliens residing here who have come here legally and who, for perfectly good reasons, sometimes due to age, cannot meet the citizenship requirements of the United States. Others are waiting only for the passage of the required time between filing intentions and the procurement of final citizenship papers. Such aliens are entitled to fair treatment. We have not forgotten that in the World War days, sons of aliens from every part of the world, enlisted in our armed forces and rendered fine service, and in many instances gave their lives for their adopted country.

Admittedly this broadcast is rather disconnected. As a rule I try to prepare the material for each monthly broadcast a week before I am due to present it to you so that necessary mimeographed copies can be prepared. This month developments came so fast that I have had to rewrite my copy three times, so I could add new material taken from messages sent to Congress by the President.

Friday afternoon the President sent another message to Congress asking for appropriations amounting to more than a billion dollars. If this request is granted, it will mean that we have appropriated more than $4,000,000,000 for national defense this year. This additional sum, according to the President, will be spent for the purchase of more cannons, ammunition, antiaircraft guns, auto-tank guns, tanks, etc. Important as these items are, the real important part of the message came in the closing paragraphs when the President asked for authority to call into the Federal service the National Guard units of the several States plus such members of the organized Reserves as he deems necessary. The Members of the House were listening intently to the reading of the message by the reading clerk, and when the request for federalizing the National Guard was read there was a quite general gasp throughout the House.

I have had very limited time to think through the far-reaching implications of this request. Certainly Congress should consider this proposition soberly and calmly. Based on all the information thus far given to Congress, I seriously doubt the wisdom or necessity of federalizing our National Guard. These are State troops, to be used in the States and by the States except in time of invasion or war. We are not at war nor is there any threat of invasion immediately apparent. I believe that the equipment of our National Guard should be modernized and, insofar as possible, mechanized. Plans have already been made by many employers to permit employees who are in the National Guard to have 3 weeks' leave, so they can have 3 weeks' training this summer instead of the regular 2 weeks Provision has also been made for an additional week for normal vacations. Money should be made available for extra drills and perhaps some week-end training, but I cannot believe that current events justify mobilizing and federalizing all National Guard units at this time. Take our own State for example. Hundreds of the men now enrolled in our National Guard hold responsible positions in our essential industries.

We need airplane engines, airplanes, machine guns, and that type of material more than any other one thing today. This latest request proves the need for calm deliberation. We must not be swept off our feet.

In the same connection, I believe we should have more details on the proposal to train enrollees of the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. for noncombatant purposes. It has been suggested that these men should be trained in the skilled trades so they can be useful in the manufacture of aircraft engines, tanks, trucks, rifles, etc. Certainly there will be expansion, and undoubtedly extra shifts in all of the factories making such equipment, but the question in my mind is should we put these boys and young men into these factories as enrollees of the C. C. C. or N. Y. A. If jobs are available for them in such factories, even as apprentices, I believe they should be discharged from the C. C. C. and taken away from the N. Y. A. and permitted to take employment where they can learn a trade and be useful to the expansion program.

This past week the House Banking and Currency Committee voted favorably on the bill which authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to set up one or more corporations, financed with funds from the Federal Treasury, to purchase reserve stores for such essential war material as rubber and tin. These essential commodities are not available in the United States. That seems like a very wise proposal, and no member of the committee raised any objection. However, the second part of the bill provided that these corporations could make loans to manufacturers of needed war material, for the purchase of raw material for plant expansion, and for the construction and operation of new factories. These new factories to be operated by the corporation. There was a good deal of opposition to the provision which allows the Government to build and operate new factories—factories that could manufacture cloth for Army uniforms, mess kits, canvas belting, as well as anything else needed by the Army or Navy. This would be in direct competition with private industry, and, at a time when we have thousands of square feet of empty factory buildings all over the country. Mr. Jesse Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, was

willing to modify the bill so that it would be clear that the Government could not build and operate factories unless private industry could not supply the needed material promptly, and at a reasonable price. The majority members, which, of course, means the Democratic members of the committee, refused to even agree to that amendment. One of the majority members made the statement: "We have the vote to pass it as it is sent to us, so why should we modify it at all?"

The following sentiment expressed by the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT is worth repeating:

"As a Republican, I am a member of an indispensable element of a self-governing society—the opposition party. Just as democracy needs a majority party at any given time in its existence, it also needs a strong, virile opposition party which, operating for the time as a minority group, exercises its perfecting influence upon government by subjecting to critical analysis and careful examination every policy or program advanced by the party in power. It is neither good politics nor patriotism for the opposition party to block legislation simply because it is the creature of the party in power, but it is equally bad politics and unpatriotic to shirk its duties of painstaking analysis and public-serving criticism to the end that Government policies may be seasoned and perfected before becoming operative upon the destiny of a free people."

When the United States is faced with grave domestic or international situations, surface thinkers and strong partisans too frequently run to the public with the idea that politics should be adjourned—this means only one thing, the adjournment of self-government in such a land as ours—that all should blindly follow the leadership whether it be good or bad, effective or ineffective, of the majority party of the moment and that opposition denotes a lack of patriotism because it refuses to "go along" with anything or everything the party in power proposes. Such a fatalistic concept of the art of self-government in this Republic is a tragic disservice to our country. It would deprive our country, when its needs are the greatest, of the most effective device it has to successfully meet the challenges that confront it.

At a time when every decision or policy may mean the success or failure of America, it is essential that every move be tested in the fierce light of public debate and forged in the crucible of honest discussion and controversy before it is accepted and adopted as the policy upon which a nation's destiny is to be gambled. At a time of emergency or crisis is no time to accept untested recipes or to resort to the devitalizing practice of taking orders instead of formulating decisions.

I wish I had more time to discuss in more detail the important proposals now before the Congress. May I again assure you that I intend to consider every request made by the President, without thought of partisanship, and will support every proposal that seems necessary to provide for the protection of this Nation and to do everything that is honorable, and that will help to keep this country out of war.

Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention and the attention of my colleagues to the following suggestions which have been approved by many of my constituents of the Seventh Indiana District:

First. Republicans and Democrats must continue to work together on the preparedness program, and it is essential that we remain in session to see that the job is completed.

Second. Emphasis should be placed on spiritual revival necessary to a revitalized democracy.

Third. Capable men should be in charge of the defense program—not bureaucrats. Let the military experts declare their needs and the industrial experts furnish those needs.

Fourth. Defense begins by accumulating raw materials that the United States lacks, such as tin, manganese, and rubber.

Fifth. We should not export any more scrap iron and tools to Japan. These are needed right here at home.

Sixth. We need planes, antiaircraft guns, tanks, antitank guns, and uniforms now.

Seventh. We should organize a home defense with constructive and sane leadership to be ever watchful of the "fifth column" movements in America.

Eighth. We need more vocational education and guidance in America to produce more skilled and semiskilled workers.

Ninth. Crop control should be stopped immediately, because we may be called upon to help feed the world.

Tenth. Let us stop "fiddling" and "bickering" despite the mistakes made in the past 7 years on national defense by the present administration.

Eleventh. We should keep individual prices from getting out of line to protect the budget of American housewives. Excessive profits should be kept in abeyance if it is the wish of the American people to have no more war millionaires.

Twelfth. We must have teamwork between industry, labor, and Government.

Thirteenth. All Americans should be ready at all times to preserve, protect, and defend our liberties, ideals, and institutions.

Enemies Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while we are not at war and we do not contemplate any war with any nation, yet there are some within our borders who appear to be urging our national-defense program on the basis of preparation for war. We do not want war—we want peace! We do not want to prepare for war—we want to prepare for our own defense in case of an attack. We do not want any part in any war, either of aggression or of defense, if it can be avoided. But in the event of an attack upon our Nation our country will rise to that emergency. We will defend our Nation, our people, and our institutions to the end.

While many of our people are frightened because of the war in Europe, yet we have within our own gates those influences which are highly dangerous to our form of government and to our people; they are enemies within, and it is insignificant by what name they are called—whether the "fifth column" or other designation—these subversive influences must be detected and the development of these dangerous agencies stopped. Those who live within our gates and enjoy the freedom of our land and who profit by our institutions should revere our form of government under our Constitution. But those who come here, and who are in disagreement with our form of government—those who would seek to destroy it—should immediately return to the land from whence they came. We have no place here for those who seek to destroy—we have room only for those who would build our Nation and who would defend it in time of peril.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., bearing date of June 3, 1940, which editorial follows:

ENEMIES WITHIN

Call them by whatever name one chooses—the "fifth column." Trojan-horse troopers, or just plain spies and saboteurs—there are enemies within our gates that the lessons of Norway and Holland have shown must be ferreted out and eradicated quickly and relentlessly. These enemies operate covertly and in varied guises, but they are fully as dangerous to the Nation's integrity as a frontal assault by armies in the open. Often they are aided and abetted (sometimes unwittingly) by fellow travelers and misguided sympathizers.

Obviously, the exposure and punishment of trained and subtle espionage agents and other violators of our sedition and neutrality laws constitute a job for experts. Vigilante and similar well-intentioned groups have neither the support of law nor the experience and training which are absolutely essential in investigating subversive activities. They can be of service in combating alien

propaganda and in putting the public on guard against un-American agitators, but they should leave the investigation and punishment of violators to authorized law-enforcement agencies. And there is no cause for fear that our Government is not aware of the situation, nor that it will not take effective action. The Dies committee is rendering a valuable service by throwing the searchlight of inquiry into dark and devious channels of un-Americanism; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation has thrown its full resources into the battle against the undercover forces of espionage, sabotage, and alien intrigue.

The latest evidence of aggressive action in the counter-espionage camp is the creation by J. Edgar Hoover, F. B. I. Director, of a new national defense investigation unit within his organization. Mr. Hoover has placed in charge of this important unit Hugh H. Clegg, a quiet but determined assistant who has distinguished himself in the F. B. I. war on kidnapers, bank robbers, and other desperadoes. Mr. Clegg has been "dean" of the Bureau's national police academy, in which post he has won the friendship, confidence, and cooperation of State and municipal police officers throughout the Nation. This association should be of great value in the difficult and highly responsible assignment which he now undertakes.

With such a set-up, there can be no need for any superagency to supervise the F. B. I. in its war on violators of Federal laws. The record of the G-men shows that they can be trusted to do a fearless, fair, and thorough job, without need for outside restraint. They are laboring under a serious handicap in their battle against spies, however. This is the ridiculous prohibition against tapping of wires used by alien plotters. Certainly no sensible person would consider the tapping of a spy's telephone for investigative purposes an invasion of any constitutional right. An exception by Attorney General Jackson to his too-broad order against wiretapping would remove this handicap, and the Star can see no justification for his hesitancy. Meanwhile, Congress should remove all doubt as to legality of wire-tapping in such major crimes as kidnaping or espionage by enacting legislation approving its use in cases involving human life or national security.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with this very important duty of making our Nation safe from within. We should profit from the experiences of Norway and Belgium and recognize the very essential and responsible duty we have to perform in order to make our own Nation safe from the hands of our own people. Every agency of government which is available and our own people should bend every effort to aid in stamping out every subversive activity within our borders. Let us make our Nation safe from the influences within, and this will strengthen us to meet any and every foe without. Let us inculcate the theme of "One for all, all for one—America" among all our people, and let us make our country safe for Americans.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked that the debt limit be again increased another billion dollars, plus, which now I understand is to be $1,200,000,000—this in addition to the $3,000,000,000 in his message of May 16. This is brought about, as the President says:

An investigation into manufacturing resources since my message of May 16 to determine the practicability of placing additional orders with industry for special material, both to provide an early expansion of existing production facilities, and to obtain increased quantities of the special weapons concerned, has caused the War and Navy Departments to submit to me an urgent and new recommendation that increased appropriations and authorizations for the national defense be made before the adjournment of the present Congress.

It is hard to believe that the War and Navy Departments did not have this in mind at the time they were considering the increase of the debt limit of $3,000,000,000 as asked by the President in his message of May 16. Again, it is strange that the Secretary of the Treasury, Morgenthau, stated before the Ways and Means Committee that last fall he appeared before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and expressed his opinion that the debt limit should be increased $5,000,000,000. There was no emergency at that time—hence it makes one question, Is it all for national-defense purposes? We must remember in the past many things have been done under the guise of national defense far different than national defense as proposed by the President.

It is true that the bill states that taxes to be collected are to be used for the purposes for which raised, to wit, solely national defense, but will they be used solely for that purpose as stated by the President in his messages of May 16 and 31?

Another significant thing is that the President in his message of May 16 recognized the existence of the "fifth column" elsewhere and the treacherous use thereof, but did not, in words, recognize the existence of the "fifth column" in this country. This is strange, as it is clearly evident at every turn that one does exist in this country. And, again in his message to Congress of May 31 in which he asked for the additional $1,200,000,000 he is silent on this great danger.

When in this country, from the President down, is it going to be realized that the danger exists in this country and then do something about it? No ship can operate successfully with two captains. It seems to me that our country is just as strong as we can successfully cope with this "fifth column" activity, and I suggest that immediate steps be taken to give authority to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to increase its force sufficiently to cooperate with our colleague the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARTIN DIES, and his committee in the remarkable work they have been doing to clean up at once this treacherous use thereof.

The President suggested in his message of May 31:

The expansion of our defense program makes it necessary that we undertake immediately the training and retraining of our people, and especially our young people, for employment in industry and in service in the Army and Navy.

May I say that we have 10,000,000 idle men and women—mostly men—a great many of these men are trained mechanics, so I do not believe we will have much of a problem to have the necessary men to carry out this program.

Again, the President states in his message of May 31:

The requirements of industry and the expanded armed forces for persons with experience in mechanical and manual fields are obviously going to be great. We do not have such trained persons in the number that will be required for the tasks that lie ahead of us if our defense is to be assured. We have, therefore, the task of training a large number in the skills and semiskills required by modern production in industry and by a highly mechanized defense force in the Army and Navy. A primary consideration in the training of skills must be not the existing distribution of workers among skilled fields but the distribution that would be required if our industrial machine and our defensive forces were fully mobilized.

May I again state that we should not worry about getting these young men trained as the manufacturers who are trained in production will look after this. Give them the orders, and they will do the job if left alone, free from Government hamstringing.

The President again, in his message of May 31, suggested:

I have instructed the representatives of the War and Navy Departments and also the representatives of the several agencies dealing with the training of young men for noncombatant services to make available to the appropriate committees of the Congress the plans and proposals which they have laid before me.

May I add again that we do not need to worry about the training of these young men for the reasons stated.

The President then, in his message to Congress of May 31, asks authority to call into active service the National Guard and Reserve personnel:

There is a specific recommendation I would make in concluding this message, that before adjournment this Congress grant me the authority to call into active service such portion of the National Guard as may be deemed necessary to maintain our position of neutrality and to safeguard the national defense, this to include authority to call into active service the necessary Reserve personnel.

This, to my mind, negatives the carrying out of the program of national defense as hundreds of thousands of these

men are skilled in various occupations necessary in national defense and they should not be called away from the part they are playing in the national-defense program unless there is an actual threat of war in this country and that possibility, as I see it, is far remote at this time. I am opposed to this increase of $1,200,000,000; it is not needed at this time. It will take years to carry out the program under the $3,000,000,000. I am strong for national defense but I do not believe in getting hysterical about it. As stated at the outstart, let us get busy and clean up the enemies of the country within, stop lukewarm opposition. Now is the time to start, although it may be a little late, before we get into the full activity of the defense program. If we do not, our program is going to be greatly interfered with.

I Dare You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

LETTER FROM MISS HARRIET HARTFORD

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Miss Harriet Hartford, of San Francisco, which is a brilliant summary of the situation by a woman who a year ago was a teacher in my little home town.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 22, 1940.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I am so deeply concerned over the turn of national events, that I feel the need of expressing an opinion to someone in Washington.

The American people as a whole are greatly harassed over the possible fall of democracy in Europe. But democracy in the United States is being undermined by a ham actor in the White House, apparently with the unqualified approval of the public and of its duly elected Representatives in Congress as well.

When Orson Welles panicked the people of the Eastern States with his War of the Worlds broadcast, many of us were surprised that people of the supposed intelligence of the American public could be stampeded into foolish actions by a mere radio play. But when the Congress of the United States is similarly rushed by Mr. Roosevelt's 50,000-airplanes broadcast into granting him billions of dollars, which they haven't got, for an armament program, which he hasn't got, one begins to wonder whether this country deserves democracy, or is mentally and spiritually equipped to carry it on.

Mr. Roosevelt began making "I dare you" speeches directed at Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan 2 years ago. The flying distances between Tampico, Mexico, and Kansas City, Mo., were substantially the same then as he says they are now, and the national defense must have been even less adequate. Yet, at that time, he said nothing about the necessity for 50,000 airplanes, the reason for this probably being that he was not a candidate for reelection then. Gen. Hugh Johnson's commentary on the last election was, "You can't beat $4,000,000,000." Mr. Roosevelt intends to make assurance doubly sure this time by seeing that he has many more than $4,000,000,000 to perpetuate himself in office.

A plan for national defense would seem to call for the close cooperation of military, naval, and industrial experts. Yet Mr. Roosevelt has suggested asking the cooperation of his political opponents, Mr. Landon and Colonel Knox, who admittedly have more common sense than Mr. Roosevelt but who are not experts such as the situation demands.

There is nothing in Mr. Roosevelt's previous record as President to insure the accomplishment of an adequate program for defense, even if he had one or were trying to secure one. He has failed completely to solve the problems of domestic economy with which he has been confronted. In fact, the only thing which he has accomplished with noticeable success is the deluding of the majority of the American people into the belief that he is a demigod, or at least a superman. If the voters reelect him for a third term, American democracy will be at an end, for the country will never be rid of him nor of his predatory family.

I hope that the Republican Members of Congress will do their utmost to bring to the American public a realization of this appalling fact before it is too late.

Sincerely yours, HARRIET HARTFORD.

Labor's Non-Partisan League and Where It Gets Some of Its Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1940

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL MINE WORKERS AUDITORS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days we hear a great deal about the plight of the poor mine worker, his lack of representation.

Herewith is a statement showing that the $1,091,862.84 was received by the International United Mine Workers of America by way of a tax on its members.

It is small wonder that by taxing these workmen, the organization was able to contribute $44,500 to that political organization known as Labor's Non-Partisan League.

In view of the fact that some other than the officials of the organization might be interested, I append the following auditor's semi-annual report.

SIX MONTHS' REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL AUDITORS

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1940.*

We, the undersigned auditors of the International United Mine Workers of America, having examined the books and accounts of the international secretary-treasurer, Thomas Kennedy, for the period commencing June 1, 1939, and ending November 30, 1939, respectfully report as follows:

INCOME

Tax	$1,091,862.84
Assessment	3,070.12
Supplies	3,313.55
Journal	34.38
Interest on certificates of deposit and bonds	9,125.55
District 28, transfer of funds	10,000.00
Local Union No. 2578, district 9, partial payment of loan made through district	500.00
Miscellaneous	33,850.96
	1,151,757.90

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and expenses	$477,773.46
Supplies	1,620.55
Office expenses	3,070.51
Printing	4,075.54
Journal	76,248.12
Telephone, postage, and express	7,154.33
Individual aid	418.65
Loan to district No. 4	1,500.00
Loan to district No. 6	5,000.00
Loan to district No. 7	3,400.00
Loan to district No. 9	10,000.00
Loan to district No. 14	4,000.00
Loan to district No. 15	2,000.00
Loan to district No. 16	1,250.00
Loan to district No. 17	40,000.00
Loan to district No. 18	2,500.00
Loan to district No. 19	178,652.57
Loan to district No. 20	10,000.00
Loan to district No. 21	4,000.00
Loan to district No. 23	16,690.00
Loan to district No. 30	5,000.00
Loan to district No. 31	4,000.00
Loan to district No. 50	17,000.00
Total loans	304,992.57
Congress of Industrial Organizations, taxes	180,000.00
Labor's Non-Partisan League, contribution	44,500.00
Metcalf, Mahan & Mahan, reporter services	881.55
Gillespie, Burke & Gillespie, attorneys, salary and expenses	2,755.67
General miscellaneous as itemized in international secretary-treasurer's report	398,897.79
Total	932,027.58
Total expenditures, including loans	1,502,388.74

RECAPITULATION

Amount on hand June 1, 1939	$2,877,381.33
Income June 1, 1939, to Dec. 1, 1939	1,151,757.90
	4,029,139.23
Expenditures June 1, 1939, to Dec. 1, 1939	1,502,388.74
Amount on hand Dec. 1, 1939	2,526,750.49

BANK STATEMENTS

Amount on deposit, Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer, United Mine Workers of America, including cash	$869,579.59
Amount on deposit, international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, including bonds	1,669,780.70
	2,539,360.29
Checks outstanding	12,609.80
Amount on hand Dec. 1, 1939	2,526,750.49

We have in our possession a certified statement from each bank in which our deposits are held showing that the amount stated in the report is on deposit in the several banks.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM FOSTER,
ARCHIE V. WOODS,
MICHAEL MEDVITZ,
International Auditors, United Mine Workers of America.

Further Support for H. R. 8748—Jones-Wheeler Farm Credit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, further petitions urging support of the Jones farm credit bill have been received from farmers and growers in my district and throughout southern California. I am glad to include with my remarks the text of these petitions and the names of the farmers signing them. It is important to remember that agriculture faces a most serious situation as a result of this war and the curtailment of its markets. We have no right to forget or neglect the problems of our people in our anxiety over foreign affairs and national defense. A "bold peasantry" is not only a "country's pride" but also perhaps the most important single element in national strength which is national defense in its fundamental aspect.

To the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, being borrowers of the Federal land bank and/or the Land Bank Commissioner, do hereby request your whole-hearted support of H. R. 8748—JONES, and we urge you to exert your efforts to secure its passage for the following reasons:

1. We believe the interest rates on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans should be permanently reduced;

2. We believe Federal land-bank borrowers should be relieved of stock liability;

3. We believe the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations should be increased;

4. We also believe that the objections to this bill as voiced by its opponents are exaggerated.

Joe J. Robler, Lloid A. West, R. F. Koonter, E. P. Jochimsen, L. Harmon, Bixby, J. L. Noggle, Steward W. Peairs, Eben C. Gapp, H. P. Reynold, Howard F. Ponds, T. C. Ryan, W. W. Forester, H. W. Freyermuth, Glen R. Clark, O. G. Keiser, Fred L. Parker, Walter M. Harris, David W. Mayer, Madien V. Ekstein, Pomona, Calif.; Ora Clark Palmer, Upland; Roy Maber, Anaheim, R. F. D. No. 2, box 168; Jos. Carroll, post office box 364, Anaheim; B. J. Heinz, Route 1, box 121, Fullerton; J. W. Heinz, 1224 North Palm Street, Anaheim; Ben Baxter, Route 3, box 203, Anaheim; Ella M. Baxter, Route 3, Anaheim; George McGuire, Route 2, box 170, Anaheim; Timothy Daly, Route 1, Buena Park; Fred Siefken, Route 2, box 100, Anaheim; Paul Neubauer, Route 4, box 231, Anaheim; C. E. Conyers, Route 1, box 368, Anaheim; Pliny C. Huddleston, Route 1, box 312, Anaheim; Lawrence J. Kelly, R. F. D. 2, box 158, Anaheim; Anna M. Rains (by Alan T. Rains, attorney in fact), Route 2, box 182, Anaheim; Dan Marschall, R. D. box 364, Anaheim; S. James Tuffree, Placentia; Earl M. Hemphill, La Mirada; Armand P. Sullivan, Route 3, box 443, Anaheim; Penelope Calder Cady, Route 1, box 108, Buena Park. W. K. Tindall; E. G. Metcalf; H. E. Knowlton; Mrs. H. E. Knowlton; E. G. Freeman; Thos. H. Deaver; Grover T. Russell; M. A. Scheerer; Louise D. Hurley; Thomas E. Jarrett; Morton H. Wood; Claire D. Ferrero; L. T. Hammersley; Elma J. Marshall; H. D. Marshall; Philip R. Feddersohn; Hazel M. Feddersohn; Laura Host; Constance A. Garnier; Amea Grazide Alvarado; Blair I. Boyer; Raimundo P. Sanchez; W. P. Alvarado; A. M. Yorta; Emelia Rowland; A. L. Kavanaugh; Dean A. Fesler, Covina; Harry G. Upham, Covina; Milton E. Nuhn, 11451 Woodley Avenue; Mrs. Jessie B. Nuhn, 11451 Woodley Avenue; Robert Wilson, 16505 Mission Boulevard; Helen H. Wilson, 16505 Mission Boulevard; J. G. Hettenger, 16119 S. F. Mission Boulevard; Emler E. Wisler, 11110 Haskell Avenue; Margaret M. Wisler, 11110 Haskell Avenue; D. E. Baldwin, 16100 Mission Boulevard; Helen E. Baldwin, 16100 Mission Boulevard; Ruth C. Elerath, J. H. Elerath, 16701 Rinaldi; Viola Curtis Peck, 440 South Arden Boulevard, Los Angeles; Ardo B. Williams, 5915 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles; Mabel E. Hendrick, 15516 Plummer Street, San Fernando; John D. Hendrick, 15516 Plumber Street, San Fernando; Mrs. Mary J. Solosth, 10000 Sepulreda; C. I. Stocking, 15906 Devonshire Street, San Fernando; Mrs. Prudence M. Stocking, 15906 Devonshire Street, San Fernando; Michele Sorce, 16204 Devonshire Street, San Fernando; Frank F. Smith, 16308 Devonshire Street; Salvatore Streva, 16518 Devonshire Street; A. E. Eckles, 16901 Devonshire Street; Mrs. Jennie B. Eckles, 16901 Devonshire Street; Mrs. E. D. McDonald, 14042 Balba Street; Flora M. Marshall, 103 South Arden Boulevard, Los Angeles; Walter Finley, 16002 Nordhoff Street, San Fernando; Carl Johnson, 18057 Rayen Street, North Ridge; Hildegard Johnson, 18057 Rayen Street, North Ridge; Mrs. Margaret C. Durant, 18111 Rayen Street, North Ridge; F. H. Schepler, 10515 Andora Street, Chatsworth; Samuel Anderson, 9557 Mason Avenue, Chatsworth; Alfred K. Brandt, box 1, Chatsworth; Marcelina Cookerly, 9531 Topango Bayon Boulevard, Chatsworth; Marie G. Turner, 10840 Santa Susana Avenue, Chatsworth; R. H. Haworth, 10901 Andora Avenue; Carlo Viarengo, 20524 Lassen Street, Chatsworth, Calif.; Ruby Mulholland, 9500 Corbin Avenue, North Ridge; Lewie R. Convira, 10845 Zelzah Avenue; Laura E. Thompson, 9951 Balboa Avenue, North Ridge; H. A. Stahl, 17140 Nordhoff Street, North Ridge, Calif.; Minnie A. Stahl, 17140 Nordhoff Street, North Ridge, Calif.; W. V. Stahl, 534 Monte Vista Avenue, Glendale, Calif.; S. B. Cowan, 15211 Mission Boulevard, San Fernando; Mrs. Milton H. Saxton, 9316 Balboa Boulevard, San Fernando; Mollie C. Plummer, 15720 Plummer Street; Anna Calagna, 17358 Plummer Street; Anna Farneris, 17750 Plummer Street; Battista Farneris, 17750 Plummer Street; Mrs. E. Ursel Andrews, 19055 Parthenior Street; Count S. Danneskiold, Cravenskiold Farm, San Fernando; Belva L. Wells, 7730 Balboa, Van Nuys; Mrs. Ida Del Gindice, 15127 Laticoy Street; Clarence William Phelps, 6624 Woodman Avenue; Catherine Helen Phelps, 6624 Woodman Avenue; Oran C. House, 6625 Woodman Avenue; Eleanor B. House, 6625 Woodman Avenue; Arthur M. Harrison, 13846 Sherman Way; W. H. Larkin, 13211 Cantora Street, Van Nuys; Louis O. Ball, 10315 Lemona, San Fernando, Calif.; Mattie C. Burrini, 14440 South Brandt, San Fernando; Mrs. Barbara L. Lipton, 17932 Mission Boulevard, San Fernando; A. O. Cuniceed, 12434 Foothill Boulevard, San Fernando; C. C. Allen, 11411 Dronfield Avenue, Poconna; M. Blanche Skillman, 11152 Mansfield, San Fernando; F. B. Acosta, 9757 Foothill Boulevard; Andrew Olsen, 9779 Foothill Boulevard; Mrs. Mina L. Foell, 7757 Woodlake Avenue, Canoga Park; Thomas A. Chandler, Canoga Park; Edward Martindale, Canoga Park; Catherine M. Martindale, Canoga Park; L. E. Hadley, box 12, Chatworth, Calif.

Labor and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY AT INTERFAITH CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful

address entitled "Labor and Unemployment," delivered by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, at the Interfaith Conference on Unemployment on June 4, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Men of good will, representative of many interests, many pursuits, and many faiths among American people, have gathered here today to survey the problem of continuing and persistent unemployment in their midst. They have come here to hold common council on our foremost national problem at a time when the world is lashed by the storm of warfare.

The breath-taking speed of world developments, the very suddenness with which we have been brought face to face with the necessities for national defense, have blurred our understanding of the implications and consequences of unemployment, have confused the issue, have, in fact, shifted the problem itself out of focus of national attention. These developments have aroused in the ranks of labor a growing and insistent realization that the Nation must not permit itself to be blinded to the basic want of its people by the lightning flashes of aggressive warfare abroad, that the roll of thunder of destruction must not drown out the call for remedy of our most fundamental organic need.

On the ability of the American people to end unemployment depends the future course of our Nation and the very survival of our democratic institutions. The strength of a democracy must be measured by the strength of all its citizens. Our political and social fabric is only as strong as the cloth in the shabby coat of the worker to whom society has so long denied the opportunity to earn a living. The idleness of men, machines, and capital has been eating into the very texture of our society for the past 10 years. Economic fabric which is not strong enough to withstand the tug and strain of conflict of peacetime forces cannot withstand the stress of wartime emergency. Our economy must be brought to full activity, for it is our economic strength which will determine our national strength. Full employment must be attained before all else. Industrial disorder and social unrest cannot be permanently eliminated until and unless unemployment is stamped out.

The job which is to be done and which we shall do is one which calls for earnest and practical cooperation of labor, management and the Government. The time has come for us to demonstrate to the world that a more thorough job in liquidating unemployment, one which yields lasting and permanent results, can be achieved through genuine teamwork of labor and management in advancing toward a common goal. This we can do if we define our goal and develop a common agreement as to the most effective methods of attack as well as the rights, obligations, and duties of each group. A general agreement as to our objectives must be made specific. A general accord as to what is to be done must be reduced to a concrete program, a week-by-week schedule necessary to carry out and complete the task. As long as one of the groups fails in its responsibility toward the others, as long as one of the teammates refuses to accord to the other his rights, no matter how great our zeal and how feverish our effort, we cannot succeed. First and foremost, therefore, is the need for a complete and unequivocal understanding between labor and management on what is to be done and how to do it.

Let us determine the size of the task before us. What is the extent of our unemployment today? On the basis of the data available from Government sources, the American Federation of Labor estimates that more than 10,000,000 persons are still without normal private employment today. This means that more than 10,000,000 wage earners in industry, agriculture, and trade are denied opportunity to earn a living through productive activity.

Several unemployment estimates have been maintained by different agencies and institutions over a period of years. Some of these estimates place the figure of total unemployment considerably higher than our estimate, while others estimate the unemployment to be slightly less. Allowing for the differences due solely to the varying definition of unemployment and the consequent inclusion or exclusion of certain groups, all of the estimates continued over a period of years by reputable institutions show amazing similarity in their final results.

Despite this fact there are those who insist that unemployment is practically nonexistent and that these estimates are a mere flight of fancy of those who make them. The final answer to these allegations will be found in the 1940 census which is now being completed. But even before the census results become available we can rest our case not only on the reasonableness and reliability of our method of making the estimate, but also on many indisputable factual sources which substantiate our general conclusions. In 1937, when business and industrial activity exceeded the 1939 levels, a voluntary registration of those unemployed showed that in the country as a whole more people were unemployed than our estimate counted at the time. The active file of the United States Employment Service, despite the extremely incomplete and limited coverage of employment-service facilities, contains a register of more than 6,000,000 people actively seeking work. This and much other corroborating evidence cannot be lightly brushed aside any more than the known and very real presence of unemployed wage earners in individual communities can be overlooked.

More and more often we hear in public discussion and read in newspapers the opinion that not only the amount of existing unemployment is grossly exaggerated, but that those who are unemployed don't really want work and are not seeking employment. Such allegations may merely reflect the wishful thinking of those far removed from the plight of the men in the street, those who close their eyes to the realities distasteful to them and shirk their responsibility in providing a remedy. Or sometimes such expressions are carefully and cleverly calculated by special pleaders to confuse the real issues and to conceal the real facts.

What are the real facts? Do the unemployed hunt for jobs, or do the jobs hunt for the unemployed? Recently the Department of Sanitation of the city of New York announced that 2,500 jobs will be available under civil service for "sanitation men." Not less than 85,000 men applied for these 2,500 jobs and by March 1940, 75,000 had taken the civil-service written examinations to qualify for physical examinations still to be held.

The Brewster Aeronautical Corporation announced last February that it would interview applicants for 250 jobs to be made available at its new aircraft plant in Newark. To tell you what happened, I'll quote from the account published in the New York Times:

"Special to the New York Times.

"NEWARK, N. J., February 26.—Nearly 20,000 job seekers, some of whom had been shivering in the chill blasts of the meadowlands here since 1 a. m., besieged the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation at Newark airport this morning.

"Amazed at the turn-out, officials of the company announced that only 250 jobs were available, which would be filled for a month. Within 6 months, they said, the force would be increased to 1,500. The concern, which has a plant in Long Island City, recently leased the municipal hangar here for the manufacture of aircraft. * * *

"A vanguard began to assemble at 1 a. m. The chill darkness became dotted with fires that were later extinguished by airport police, who feared damage to the hangar. The early birds then huddled against the lee of the giant shed.

"By 6 a. m., 2 hours before the company opened its offices, thousands were packed around the hangar. As the morning drew on highways became jammed with automobiles bearing job hunters. Traffic was snarled for several miles north and south of the field. * * *

"By opening time the crowd grew so big that 40 policemen, under Deputy Chief Frank Brex, including detectives, members of the emergency squad and radio, mounted and motorcycle officers, were required to handle it. Part of the crowd stormed the airport administration building in the belief that the hiring was being done there.

"The throng was generally peaceful, but eagerness and numbers combined to produce sporadic incidents. One man fainted as he was being squeezed through the hangar's main entrance, the steel door of which had been torn from its hinges.

"A city employee, who was distributing applications, was saved from a tramping by two ironworkers, who hoisted him into a truck. A group was about to use a beam as a battering ram against another door of the hangar when it was stopped by police."

These are just two examples, but they could be multiplied by examples taken from every community in every part of the country. They prove beyond dispute that the demand for jobs by the unemployed is very great. The desire of those unemployed to find work and to earn a decent living in private industry is as genuine as the distress of unemployment and the anguish of insecurity suffered by them and their families.

Conscious of the size and crucial importance of the task before us, I wish to place before you on behalf of the American Federation of Labor a practical, constructive program to end idleness of workers, machines, and capital. It is my earnest hope that this plan will receive not only your wholehearted endorsement, but also active participation in carrying it into effect. Our proposal consists of seven points.

1. A long-range program of permanent public works, planned in advance, which could be expanded and curtailed to offset fluctuations in private-construction activity.

A public-works program, planned in advance and based on the long-range evaluation of the requirements of growth of individual communities as well as of the entire Nation, would add infinitely more to our wealth and resources than any temporary-emergency program. We, therefore, propose the creation of a permanent public works planning board which could formulate in advance a long-term plan of public-works projects and determine the basis on which the program could be curtailed and expanded to offset fluctuations in private-construction activity and take up the slack in private employment.

Labor believes that considerations of national defense make the need for such a program immediate and urgent. Under such a program immediate priority should be given to projects which are called for by defense needs, and which will be of continuing peacetime value to the Nation. To this end we propose the construction of coastal and transcontinental express highways which are not only essential for the purposes of national defense by facilitating mobility of troops and defense weapons, but are also important as a means of stimulating business activity by providing the heretofore unavailable transportation, trade, and travel facilities. We also recommend the construction of additional airport facilities through public works projects. Such projects are vital to national defense and necessary to further progress of our commercial aviation. Con-

struction of hospitals and other public buildings urgently needed for defense as well as for welfare purposes should also be given prior consideration.

2. Continuation and expansion of slum-clearance and low-rent housing program administered by the United States Housing Authority and utilization of this program for construction of industrial housing necessitated by defense production.

The present U. S. H. A. program, by providing low-rent housing to needy families living in slums, goes straight to the heart of our most urgent economic need. At the same time the present low-rent housing and slum-clearance program has proved to be not only the most effective, but also the most economical employment program. It provides work on construction of residential housing under private contract—providing jobs where the lag in employment has been the greatest. In addition to 500,000 jobs in private building which the renewal of the present program would provide, such renewal would give employment to 750,000 workers in related building materials trades and industries.

Continuation of the U. S. H. A. program at the present pace is equally important from the standpoint of defense production. Concentration of industrial activities in centers of specialized production will necessitate the building of accommodations for workers flocking to these communities. The need should not be met by the building of temporary shacks and cantonments which blight the community and tend to create new slums. Experience of the U. S. H. A. in the construction of workers' housing, its knowledge of each local problem will make possible, in place of barracks, construction of good industrial housing with extreme speed and with assurance that this housing will not be a total loss at conclusion of emergency but a permanent asset, available to low-income families in the future. Labor, therefore, recommends the renewal of the U. S. H. A. program as provided in the Wagner-Steagall amendments to the United States Housing Act which already passed the Senate.

3. A program of Federal insurance of long-term loans made by private lending institutions for productive expansion.

This plan is proposed by the American Federation of Labor to provide a productive outlet for pent-up savings by partial insurance by Federal Government of private loans for production, approved on the condition that minimum competitive and labor standards be met.

Large-scale reemployment in private industry cannot be achieved without putting to work the investment capital which now lies idle. During the past decade capital outlays within the going industrial plants have been far below normal. Lack of long-term confidence sufficient to undertake the risk involved in the employment of venture capital has restricted new investment outlets for idle funds. Potential opportunities for productive employment of men and money are enormous.

To translate these opportunities into reality we need machinery which would facilitate the flow of private funds into new or expanded private enterprise. Instead of Government loans to industries, as a substitute investment channel, we believe preferable a method which would make available to industry private investment funds for activity most productive of employment.

Federal insurance of private loans for production would enable the Government to introduce the element of long-term stability where the absence of such stability has prevented expansion to date. We propose that the already available machinery of the R. F. C. be utilized in the administration of this program so that it could be administered at practically no additional cost to the taxpayer.

I believe that this proposal of the American Federation of Labor is the first one to provide an answer to the most baffling problem of recovery and industrial expansion. To the success of this program the American Federation of Labor pledges its support and active cooperation.

4. Maintenance of the minimum-wage and maximum-hour standards and improvement of wage and hour standards through collective bargaining to insure full measure of reemployment and increase real purchasing power to those who work.

In the presence of an immense reserve of unemployed workers there is no justification for the weakening of the existing statutory standards of hours of work. Maximum-hour requirements under our laws allow great flexibility, and none of these laws places a rigid limit on the length of the workweek or workday. Both the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act merely require that overtime compensation be paid for excessively long hours of employment. Labor believes that these laws do provide the necessary basic standards determining the length of the workweek in industry. Shortening of the hours of work is essential to achieve reemployment. Basic statutory standards, together with unrestricted right of collective bargaining, will go a long way to facilitate reemployment in industry.

5. A national program of vocational and apprentice training based on national minimum standards developed by agreements of representative groups concerned.

Despite widespread allegations of labor shortages in certain occupations, the available facts demonstrate conclusively that in every instance there is still a large surplus of unemployed workers with skill, training, and experience necessary to fill the job. Geographical distribution of available labor may be such as to create a temporary lack of readily available workers in exceptional situations.

Labor fully recognizes the need for a sound vocational education and apprentice-training program to enable the young men and women coming into industry to equip themselves for productive activity. Such training can only be useful when it is definitely related to specific employment opportunities. Workers cannot be trained in a vacuum; nor should men be apprenticed to skills in which no immediate prospect of employment exists. These considerations make it imperative that the problem of vocational education and apprentice training be approached nationally and be developed by active participation through national representatives of labor and management groups concerned in each problem.

6. Enlargement and improvement of job-placement facilities of employment services.

In carrying out a reemployment program, it is of paramount importance to create facilities for bringing together the worker and the job for which he is best fitted. With each spurt of industrial production, we have witnessed mass tragedies of workers flocking to active production centers far in excess of the current requirements. Masses of stranded workers in these situations become a burden to the community and at the same time prevent their employment in other centers of production where new activity develops. Thus, it is possible in times of expanding production that with a large surplus of labor in one community or one section of the country a shortage in a specialized occupation may develop at another point. Substantial enlargement of existing employment-service facilities must therefore play an integral part in a national program of reemployment.

7. Full measure of relief to workers and their families as long as these workers remain unemployed.

Labor considers it fundamental that until our Nation achieves full employment wage earners and their families be given adequate assistance by the community. A full and adequate program of Federal and local relief to the unemployed is therefore essential to any plan of recovery and reemployment.

Continuing unemployment is the most dangerous breach in our national defense. Forced idleness of millions of productive workers on whom their families depend for livelihood, saps the strength of the entire Nation, eats deeply into the moral and spiritual fiber of the people, and undermines their will to achieve.

National defense means not only the defense of lives, homes, communities, and resources. To the American people, national defense also means the defense of their democratic institutions, the defense of government by consent and, above all, the defense of those fundamental rights we have inherited and established as a living democracy and which make up the American way of life.

Production of implements of defensive warfare must be carried out with unstinted cooperation of all. Yet we must not forget that production of implements of war, while it adds to our national strength, contributes little to our national wealth. Jobs created by accelerated defense production are not normal jobs. We must not mistakenly consider reemployment generated by such emergency production as lasting, normal, or permanent reemployment. It is of foremost importance that national recognition be given today to a simple fact that a temporary spurt in employment called forth by munitions production not only fails to solve the unemployment problem but will only aggravate the task of readjustment which the Nation will face when the emergency is over and when our economy resumes its peacetime pace. That is why labor believes it so important that in our defense efforts we do not lose sight of our future, normal peacetime needs. In building production plant and equipment, in constructing hospitals, in building defense highways, in providing housing facilities for munitions workers, we must so plan our work as to make sure that these plants, these highways, and these houses will become permanent assets to the community and to the Nation so that they will add to our national wealth as well as to our national strength.

American labor and management in facing the problem of unemployment are facing the most difficult and the most responsible task of this generation. I feel confident that their united will shall provide our Nation with united strength to emerge victorious in this great effort.

Relief—National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTERS FROM THE CITIZENS BUREAU OF MILWAUKEE, WIS., AND DR. A. T. RASMUSSEN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter recently written by the Citizens' Bureau of Milwaukee. It presents a plan in relation to assistance for the W. P. A. workers. It specifically shows how such a plan would work

in Milwaukee in comparison with the present W. P. A. plan. It also shows the need for a change in the direction suggested, because in Milwaukee, as elsewhere in the Nation, real-estate taxes are becoming so burdensome that people cannot take care of the load.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from a citizen of my State, showing how the average citizen feels about the necessity of obtaining airplanes for a more adequate defense.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS' BUREAU OF MILWAUKEE,
May 21, 1940.

The Citizens' Bureau endorses the plan now being considered by Congress to abandon W. P. A. and substitute a system whereby the Federal Government would pay 75 percent of the cost for general relief administered by the local governments.

This is how such a plan would have operated in Milwaukee County in 1939:

During 1939 there was an average of 19,600 persons employed on W. P. A. projects in Milwaukee County. The Federal Government paid $16,690,000 for wages and materials. In addition, there was paid $4,811,000 from local taxation consisting of $4,111,000 as the sponsors' contributions, and $700,000 paid by the general relief department to supplement cases in which the families were so large that the W. P. A. wages were not sufficient. The total expenditure of $21,501,000 for W. P. A. amounted to $1,097 per case.

General relief (exclusive of W. P. A. supplementation) averaged 18,500 cases, and cost a total of $6,436,000, financed from local funds at an average of $348 per case.

The total costs for W. P. A. and general relief of $27,937,000 were therefore paid $16,690,000 by the Federal Government and $11,247,000 paid by local governments in Milwaukee County.

If the 19,600 cases on W. P. A. employment (includes relief and nonrelief cases) had been cared for by the general relief department, the cost would have been $6,821,000. The total cost of general relief would then have been $13,257,000 for 38,100 cases at $348 per case.

Under the proposed program the Federal Government would have paid three-fourths of the $13,257,000 cost, or $9,943,000. The local governments would have paid one-fourth, or $3,314,000.

The Federal Government would therefore have saved $6,747,000 and the local governments would have saved $7,933,000. The cost of the entire program would have been cut almost in half, that is, from $27,937,000 to $13,257,000, a total saving of $14,680,000.

We are enclosing a copy of a report issued by the Citizens' Bureau in April of 1938 in which we urged a public-works program instead of made work. This report pointed out that the increased cost of relief had forced local governments in Milwaukee County to reduce their regular public-works program from $15,600,000 a year down to $2,000,000 thereby putting 10,000 men out of work.

As you know, Federal regulations do not permit the employment of W. P. A. labor to carry out the usual maintenance and operation work of local governments. The result has been made work. On page 3 of the above-mentioned report the Citizens' Bureau states:

"Made work belittles and degrades the idea of work. It operates unjustly from the standpoint of relief administration. The single person and the head of a family of eight are both given the same wage."

The reduction of $7,933,000 in local taxation for relief purposes would allow this community to spend considerable of that money in needed public works.

The tax rate of the city of Milwaukee now amounts to $37.81 per $1,000 of the local assessed valuation for all purposes (city, county, schools, etc.). At the present writing it seems inevitable that there will be an increase next year of $2.50 per $1,000 due to the relief situation. This would mean the unprecedented tax rate of $40.31 in 1941.

Respectfully yours,

CITIZENS' BUREAU OF MILWAUKEE,
WALTER H. BENDER,
President.

LA CROSSE, WIS., *June 3, 1940.*

ALEXANDER WILEY,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You undoubtedly saw, as I did, Henry Ford quoted in the press as saying that the Ford Motor Co. could within 6 months manufacture airplanes for the United States Government at the rate of 1,000 per day and at one-eighth of the present cost, provided they were given expert advisers and no political interference.

I urge you to look into this, for, as one entrusted with the responsibility that is yours, you certainly owe it to our country to do all within your power to see that adequate defense measures are taken and that we get the last bit of value for every dollar expended. Further, If Mr. Ford is correctly quoted, his statement should not be lightly taken, for he has shown in the past that he knows how to produce in quantity and at a fair price. Admittedly his methods and ability made automobiles possible for most of us. Mr. Ford should certainly be consulted in the present situation and his advice given serious consideration. This is a time when we need efficient production, honest administration, and no politics.

I trust that you and your colleagues in Washington will give this your immediate and earnest attention.

Very sincerely yours,

A. T. RASMUSSEN.

America's Attitude Toward the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article by the pen of Mrs. Walter Ferguson, a columnist for the Washington Daily News, under the heading of One Woman's Opinion, which pertains to the present chaotic condition in Europe and relates particularly to our interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

ONE WOMAN'S OPINION

(By Mrs. Walter Ferguson)

As the fortunes of war seem to favor Hitler, a good many Americans, famous and obscure, say we should lend money to the Allies. They believe we ought to furnish them with war materials on credit.

No man need be ashamed of the sentiment, and certainly we cannot quarrel with any man's right to express it. Only we wish these people would voice their opinions in the proper words.

With the Allies owing us several billions for the last war, isn't it rather visionary to talk about lending them more to fight this one. Let us be honest with ourselves and, if that's the way we feel, give them outright the money and goods they need in order to carry on the struggle.

No boy's life is ever paid back. Thousands of fine American lads went to Europe in 1917. We gave generously of their blood, expecting nothing half so precious in return. We did not demand a life for a life, and were not too disappointed when we failed to receive a dollar for every dollar we contributed to the cause of human freedom.

All that generous outpouring was a noble gesture, nothing more. Beautiful, but futile. Nevertheless, we are convinced, no true American regrets that it was made. It was done because the people then living honestly felt that good would come.

Yet only evil has resulted. Many of our boys and dollars never came back. Some of us managed to work up poetic sentiments about the fact, or could, until the same martial piping began to sound upon the wind. Now the time has come to speak candidly.

Altruists who wish to lend to the Allies are building a camouflage of words to hide the truth. For lending, in this instance, can only mean giving. And if we are so sure the Allied cause is ours, and believe its loss means our downfall, then how shabby it is to talk about lending them money. Let's give them cash and war materials, asking no security in return. Certainly we owe that much to those who are fighting our war—if it is our war.

The Miracle of Lawmaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GREEN BAY (WIS.) PRESS-GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Green Bay Press-Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., for May 25, 1940:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of May 25, 1940]

THE MIRACLE OF LAWMAKING

For 2 full days the right honorable Members of the House of Representatives had debated the wage-hour bill, how low down to put the floor, how high up to raise the ceiling, where to provide the belfry for the bats, and what, if anything, to use for walls.

The House was particularly concerned with the proposal to repeal a part of the original act passed at the behest of our noble President which provided that neither floor, ceiling, walls, nor consideration should be given.

"To any individual employed within the area of production (as defined by the Administrator) engaged in handling, packing, storing, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products."

This had been the eminent and upright provision of spotless whiteness inserted in the law so that those in agricultural pursuits would not have to ring a time clock when they started in the morning and when they checked out at night.

It wouldn't be quite right to make every man in agriculture or on the edge of it hire bookkeepers just to keep track of all the data required by every employer.

But after the full 2 days of debate the right honorable Members of the House listened to this summation by Congresswoman NORTON, chairman of the committee that was to make the floor solid and the ceiling rainproof. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows the following interesting debate:

"Mrs. NORTON. We have spent 2 days debating this bill and are about where we were at the beginning. * * * I am proud of the fact that the House went on record yesterday as not approving a bill that would take from the poorest workers a miserable 30 cents an hour. * * * But, Mr. Chairman, there are many more exemptions than I would like to see there. I am unalterably opposed to exempting anyone from 30 cents an hour. So at the proper time there will be an amendment offered to strike out the exemptions on page 15.

"Mr. MCCORMACK. I am hopeful that the gentlewoman from New Jersey will submit a unanimous-consent request that all debate on her bill close at 3 o'clock, 4, or somewhere around there.

"Mr. BUCK. I endeavored to catch the meaning of the gentlewoman's suggestion that she would offer an amendment to strike out the language on page 15. Is that correct?

"Mrs. NORTON. That is right. That is the only part of the bill that exempts the wage provisions of the act.

"Mr. BUCK. In other words, the gentlewoman desires to withdraw such protection as now exists to agricultural labor entirely?

"Mrs. NORTON. Oh, now, the gentleman knows perfectly well what I have in mind.

"Mr. BUCK. I do not know. I am asking the gentlewoman whether she wants to do that or not.

"Mrs. NORTON. I stated very plainly I intended to offer an amendment to strike out the section.

"Mr. RAYBURN. It is my interpretation that the part of the bill that the gentlewoman is proposing to offer an amendment to strike leaves out this so-called area-of-production provision in the original act?

"Mrs. NORTON. That is true; and the area-of-production provision is left out in the substitute.

"Mr. RAYBURN. I thought the gentlewoman was going to offer an amendment to strike out 13 in its entirety.

"Mrs. NORTON. I misunderstood the gentleman's question.

"Mr. RAYBURN. Just what does the gentlewoman from New Jersey intend to strike out?

"Mrs. NORTON. I intend to strike from the wage provision of the bill all of those things that are listed, among other things, 13.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentlewoman point out what language in the bill she suggests be stricken out?

"Mrs. NORTON. Page 15, line 15, section 13A, down to and including 'tobacco', in line 4 on page 16.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sure the gentlewoman from New Jersey has not considered the fact that if this language is stricken out, the area of production is restored to the law.

"Mrs. NORTON. That was not my understanding.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sure that the gentlewoman does not intend that the committee bill have eliminated from it the repeal of the area of production.

"Mrs. NORTON. I agree with the gentleman entirely in that.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. Then the gentlewoman does not want to strike out from this committee substitute the language she mentioned.

"Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is correct. I see I have made a mistake. We will strike out, on page 15, line 13, all after the word 'or', down through and including the word 'tobacco' on page 16, line 4.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. There are four provisions there which eliminate both wages and hours. I am sure the gentlewoman does not want to strike that out.

"Mrs. NORTON. No; the gentleman is correct. As I stated before, I was a bit confused about the line. May I say that my only intention is to prevent any worker from getting less than 30 cents an hour.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. All these agricultural duties are exempt from both wages and hours at present, but the committee would repeal that provision and substitute for the language which puts some of those operations under the wage provision but gives them a 60-hour week. If I understand the chairman of the committee, she proposed to eliminate from this provision the telephone operator in the small exchanges, the fresh fruit and vegetables exemption, and the tobacco exemption. Is this a correct statement of what you propose to do?

"Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. But there are a good many other exemptions in section 13.

"Mr. BARDEN. In other words, if the amendment suggested is adopted, agriculture would lose practically every exemption that now exists in the law. Is not that right?

"Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact they would simply lose the wage provision and not the hour provision?"

After several more pages, in fact about 20, of this effort to find out how far down in the basement the floor had been located and how far above the rafters the ceiling had been left, Mr. BURDICK, of North Dakota, with both a sense of humor and a sharp and intelligent eye, observed:

"I usually pride myself on having some intelligence, at least enough to be properly identified as 'man' in the animal kingdom. But I confess that my mind is not entirely settled or clear as to what we are doing or intending to do. We started with the Barden bill, but before we could find out what that bill was we substituted the Ramspeck bill for parliamentary purposes only. No one attempted to tell us what that bill is or was or has been. We found our time limited and made a short cut, and, while we should have debated the Barden bill, we have been debating the Norton bill, which the author said was not her bill, so I am not sure whose bill we have been debating.

"The only author to manfully acknowledge the parentage of his bill was Mr. BARDEN, but since we have not discussed his bill, but other bills, I still do not know whether or not he is to be congratulated. He now does not know what is in his bill, because while we have discussed the Norton bill, we have amended the Barden bill. And he is completely exhausted in defending his bill, which we have not debated at all. All admit we are now back where we started, only further back. It looks to me like a 30-yard penalty for holding.

"My mind is fully at rest and my conscience clear on this piece of legislation, and I am prepared to vote—for which bill, for which title or subtitle, which substitute, I do not know. I have come, however, to one very important conclusion; I am going to vote."

And when the vote took place no one thereafter can tell what was meant by the language employed since those involved didn't have any idea themselves. It will become appropriate to call the court to order and to give the judges the supreme task of "interpreting" the act of Congress which no one in Congress can interpret.

But the floor will look lovely. It will have the sheen of smooth cement. And the ceiling will sparkle in the sunshine with little flecks of glass sprinkled over it to give the appearance of diamonds.

What matter if the floor is cardboard ready to cave in as soon as anyone steps on it? What matter if the ceiling is tissue paper ready to blow away as soon as a gentle wind comes up from the south? It's all a pretty picture anyway. And picture count.

Sweetpotatoes—Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein my testimony before the agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the subjects of Rehabilitation of the Sweetpotato Industry and Sugar—the Chlorotic Streak, a Virus Disease Threatening Louisiana Sugarcane, both of which industries add greatly to the State's annual income and furnish employment for hundreds of thousands of persons who might otherwise be on the relief rolls.

REHABILITATION OF THE SWEETPOTATO INDUSTRY—STATEMENT OF HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. DeRouen.

Mr. DEROUEN. I am appearing in behalf of an agricultural commodity that perhaps we have never helped very much or appropriated any money for, and that is the rehabilitation of the sweetpotato industry throughout 22 States. I have a list here of the

production by States and years, the acreage harvested the yield per acre, the production and the value of production, which I would like to include in the record if it is agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. How many pages does it cover, Mr. DEROUEN?

Mr. DEROUEN. It is very short.

Mr. CANNON. That may be included in the record.

Mr. DEROUEN. I secured this from the Department of Agriculture. The table referred to is as follows:

Sweetpotatoes

State	Acreage harvested			Yield per acre			Production			Value of production	
	Average 1927–36	1937	1938	Average 1927–36	1937	1938	Average 1927–36	1937	1938	1937	1938
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*		
New Jersey	14,000	17,000	14,000	137	142	105	1,980,000	2,414,000	1,470,000	$1,714,000	$1,470,000
Indiana	4,000	4,000	3,000	103	125	115	398,000	500,000	345,000	475,000	310,000
Illinois	6,000	6,000	6,000	85	85	108	501,000	510,000	648,000	388,000	356,000
Iowa	3,000	3,000	3,000	87	90	100	228,000	270,000	300,000	289,000	270,000
Missouri	11,000	14,000	12,000	82	85	85	852,000	1,190,000	1,020,000	1,035,000	714,000
Kansas	5,000	3,000	3,000	99	80	125	470,000	240,000	375,000	233,000	281,000
Delaware	7,000	6,000	5,000	127	130	100	865,000	780,000	500,000	491,000	350,000
Maryland	8,000	8,000	8,000	144	125	130	1,205,000	1,000,000	1,040,000	640,000	780,000
Virginia	37,000	39,000	34,000	116	130	105	4,282,000	5,070,000	3,570,000	3,042,000	2,142,000
North Carolina	83,000	80,000	81,000	97	96	108	7,915,000	7,680,000	8,748,000	5,683,000	5,686,000
South Carolina	58,000	57,000	66,000	85	90	80	4,898,000	5,130,000	6,468,000	3,796,000	4,204,000
Georgia	109,000	114,000	123,000	74	75	75	8,001,000	8,550,000	9,225,000	8,806,000	7,841,000
Florida	22,000	21,000	20,000	72	65	70	1,548,000	1,365,000	1,400,000	1,324,000	1,330,000
Kentucky	20,000	24,000	24,000	82	90	95	1,639,000	2,160,000	2,280,000	1,771,000	1,710,000
Tennessee	57,000	55,000	53,000	90	102	103	5,126,000	5,610,000	5,450,000	3,815,000	3,275,000
Alabama	86,000	100,000	107,000	83	88	80	7,071,000	8,800,000	8,560,000	8,272,000	6,848,000
Mississippi	74,000	82,000	87,000	94	92	89	6,819,000	7,544,000	7,743,000	6,563,000	5,807,000
Arkansas	37,000	37,000	43,000	78	95	75	2,828,000	3,515,000	3,225,000	2,847,000	2,419,000
Louisiana	92,000	90,000	99,000	71	73	70	6,494,000	6,570,000	6,930,000	4,533,000	4,504,000
Oklahoma	18,000	17,000	21,000	77	70	70	1,298,000	1,190,000	1,470,000	1,226,000	1,250,000
Texas	64,000	52,000	58,000	40	72	75	4,748,000	3,744,000	4,350,000	3,519,000	3,262,000
California	11,000	11,000	13,000	102	111	117	1,108,000	1,221,000	1,521,000	1,734,000	1,673,000
United States	824,000	840,000	883,000	86.1	89.3	86.8	70,274,000	75,053,000	76,647,000	62,186,000	56,482,000

[1] The 1938 price and value figures are preliminary.

Mr. DEROUEN. Then I have another record showing the losses that have occurred due to field losses, storage losses, black-rot losses, and wilt losses.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; that may be included in the record.

The table referred to is as follows:

Sweetpotatoes—estimated losses from diseases

	5-year average 1928–32		1936–37	
	Bushels	Value	Bushels	Value
Field disease losses (all diseases)	6,497,500	$5,652,830	7,900,000	$6,840,000
Storage losses (all diseases)	7,915,380	6,826,380	2,670,000	2,310,000
Black-rot losses	2,678,000	2,330,190	----------	----------
Wilt losses	1,963,620	1,708,350	----------	----------

Loss, $16,517,750.

Mr. DEROUEN. I would like to have both of those included in the record, because they are from the Department. This is an agricultural commodity which we believe, through experiments in our university, could be rehabilitated and brought up so that it would bring in a good revenue to the farmers in the form of adding to the diversification of their farm products.

In the scientific experiments we have carried on, progress has been made by mutation and asexual breeding of sweetpotatoes causing them not only to bloom but seed as well, which is something new. I do not think we have ever done that in this country before. Now, you might ask, "Why was that necessary?" Sweetpotatoes have a tendency to acquire the diseases that are in the land and that is the only means by which we can control diseased roots, soil and stem rot, and other diseases and insects.

Then, we have gone further than that. Experiment has shown we can control the size of the potato, making it more uniform, and also increase the nutritive or food value of the potato, such as dextrine and sucrose, and other elements.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. DEROUEN, are you actually raising sweetpotatoes now that you grow from the seed instead of the slip of the plant?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir. We are doing so now, and my purpose in appearing before the committee is to ask that a small amount of help and financial assistance be given the universities to carry on this good work. We are not asking your committee to buy any land or establish any set-up. The colleges have the set-up but they will need about $80,000 to carry out the work and pass on this valuable information and these methods to the other States.

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think they will ever arrive through scientific investigation at the point where they will be able to produce sweetpotatoes from the seed.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir; we have done it. It is not a question any more. It has been done.

Mr. LEAVY. But they have not demonstrated it on a basis broad enough yet to say that it is practical?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; I think we have. What we are trying to do now is to pass this on to the rest of the 22 States, which are New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and California.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You are asking for an increase of what amount, Mr. DEROUEN?

Mr. DEROUEN. We are not asking for an increase. This is a new item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a new item?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir. I am asking that you approve this item and include it in the appropriations for the Bureau of Plant Industry under project 4, "Vegetables investigation, Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture" (p. 210, 1940 Budget of the United States).

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has never been submitted to the Budget, has it?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has?

Mr. DEROUEN. It has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. I submitted it myself, and you will have estimates here on it. The figures on losses, from the Department of Agriculture, show that from 1928 to 1932 the losses were $16,517,750 from field disease, storage, black-rot, wilt, and so forth. Now, that deals specifically with only the four diseases mentioned above. In marketing sweetpotatoes, at this time we can only market about 50 percent of our production, because in grading about 50 percent are classed as culls due to the size and shape of the potato itself. The potato is crooked in shape, it is too large or too small, and not being uniform in size cannot qualify under United States grading.

Reverting to the matter of the submission of this item to the Budget, Mr. Chairman, I have here a copy of a letter under date of February 28, 1939, which I addressed to Mr. Daniel W. Bell, Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget. The letter is as follows:

"DEAR MR. BELL: Enclosed herein please find clipped pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1939, containing my speech on sweetpotatoes and the importance of the continuation and expansion of the research work now being conducted in connection therewith.

"The purpose of my speech and my writing you is to obtain an appropriation for this work so that the present studies and experiments conducted at Louisiana State University may be continued, a better potato produced, and additional cash income put into the pockets of the small farmers of the twenty-odd potato-producing States. I will greatly appreciate your giving this matter your serious consideration and immediate attention with a view of submitting an estimate to the House Committee on Appropriations as to the amount of money that can be profitably expended in furthering the experiments presently being conducted. This is of vital importance to us and I am sure you will appreciate the urgency of the situation and will make your recommendation as soon as possible so that it may be considered by the committee in the hearings on the 1940 Department of Agriculture appropriation.

"This appropriation item should be included in project No. 4, "Vegetable investigation, Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture" (p. 210, 1940 Budget of the United States).

"I am of the opinion that $80,000 would be adequate and cover the 21 sweetpotato-producing States, as I understand each State has its own set-up and necessary land for the experiments. I am not seeking any funds to purchase lands, merely sufficient moneys to conduct the experiments themselves.

"In closing, I would again reiterate that these experiments are to be conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, at Louisiana State University and the other State

universities of the sweetpotato-producing States, which, I understand, have the necessary lands and set-up required.

"Thanking you for your cooperation, with best wishes and kind regards, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"RENÉ L. DEROUEN, M. C."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. DEROUEN, I am sure the committee is very much interested, and I know I am, but I did not hear your statement on account of the confusion, in regard to the items that you desire increased.

Mr. DEROUEN. It is a new item.

Mr. TARVER. A new item?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; a new item, and you have never appropriated any money for that purpose before.

Mr. TARVER. How much do you desire for this item?

Mr. DEROUEN. I am told by the horticulturist at the university that about $80,000 will carry on all of the work, because they have the buildings and equipment, and there is no necessity of purchasing any land.

Mr. TARVER. Under what bureau or what subdivision of the Department of Agriculture would this be carried on?

Mr. DEROUEN. Under the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. TARVER. What subdivision?

Mr. DEROUEN. This is under project 4, included in project No. 4 under the Budget.

Mr. LEAVY. You say they are going to go to the Budget and get an estimate for it?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; I have requested Mr. Bell, of the Bureau of the Budget, to furnish the estimate.

Mr. CANNON. It has not yet been received.

Mr. DEROUEN. I understand it has not been sent over yet.

Mr. TERRY. How much have you asked?

Mr. DEROUEN. We have asked for $80,000, and think that we can carry on the work with that amount of money. It is a very small item but it will lead toward further uses of the sweetpotato and its byproducts. I will give you an illustration of what I mean. Now, where I live we can raise 100 bushels of corn to the acre without any fertilizer at all, down there in the Mississippi Valley, but it has so much water that we cannot use the corn at all. Consequently, we do not raise any corn for the market. We could raise alfalfa very profitably, and dispense with all of our sugarcane land, but here again the question of overhumidity enters. When we attempt to take the water out of it, we raise the cost so high that we are not able to compete with alfalfa grown elsewhere. What I am trying to bring to your attention is the contribution that you can make to those farmers in every State by appropriating this small sum of money to further these experiments. To the farmers, potatoes are just potatoes. They are not uniform. There is no attempt made to improve the potato.

Mr. CANNON. Have you tried dehydration in potatoes, corn, and alfalfa?

Mr. DEROUEN. No; not in potatoes. I merely cited corn and alfalfa to show you what we have to contend with. We can build up sweetpotatoes just as we did our sugarcane. After we have standardized them for markets I think we can manufacture a starch which will not harm the other starch, made of corn, and so forth, but it will take the place of sago, tapioca, and all of those starches that we bring into the country from abroad.

Mr. CANNON. What amount of sweetpotato starch is used in the production of mucilage at the present time?

Mr. DEROUEN. Well, I don't know, but I think very little.

Mr. CANNON. It is my understanding that all of the mucilage used by the Bureau of Printing and Engraving is a potato product.

Mr. DEROUEN. They use sago, and they use various kinds of starch, I believe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insofar as the adhesives that are used by the Government now for postage stamps and other purposes are concerned, they are made from tapioca starch, which is imported by Baltimore firms from the Dutch West Indies.

Mr. DEROUEN. I think we bought about 240,000 tons in 1937 of those foreign root starches.

Mr. CANNON. What is the difference between these two samples of starch? They are both sweetpotato starches, and they are both from the Laurel starch plant.

Mr. DEROUEN. There is no difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of them rubs off on the fingers a little bit more than the other.

Mr. CANNON. These are all samples of the same starch?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; they are all samples of the same starch.

Mr. CANNON. And it is made from sweetpotatoes?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEAVY. It is my recollection that last year we increased the item for investigations at Laurel, Miss.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. LEAVY. They have been carrying on work there that has proven quite valuable to the people in this industry.

Mr. DEROUEN. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since Mr. DeRouen has made an observation on the amount of foreign starch used in this country, last year the Department of Commerce advises me that 466,000,000 pounds of tapioca and sago starch were imported from the West Indies, and virtually all of the starch used for sizing in the cotton mills of this country was imported.

Mr. DEROUEN. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. The man in charge of this Laurel plant testified the other day that they are producing a product which is a satisfactory substitute for the foreign starches, and that they produced 2,000,000 pounds last year, and they have the capacity for a larger market.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are bound to have tapioca starch on the free list under the agreements with the Netherlands.

Mr. DEROUEN. We do not produce the potatoes now that we would be producing under this scientific research. The present potato throughout the United States carries about 16 to 18 percent starch on the average. What we would have to do is raise the starch content in the potato to 30 percent without disturbing the food value. We shall also have to carry on further experiments with the byproducts, because that is the most valuable.

Mr. CANNON. That is where the real profit lies, in the byproduct.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; we are experimenting with the byproduct. Give us the money to scientifically improve the potato, and we can show you very conclusively that we have developed a sweetpotato that will meet those conditions, and also protect the potato against all diseases. We are not prepared to do it by ourselves, as it is too expensive. In grading your potatoes to No. 1 grade you lose about 50 percent of them on account of the variation in size and lack of uniformity in shape. We are trying to carry on this experiment in such a way that we will not lose the food value of the sweetpotatoes and protect the land from infection. Some of the advantages of this project will be that the farmer can sell at any time a few crates or a few bushels of No. 1 sweetpotatoes out of his crop.

Mr. LEAVY. If you could bring that starch content up to 30 percent, would you then be able to capture the whole American market against the foreign market?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is what we want.

Mr. LEAVY. You think you could do that even though the starches coming in from abroad are on the free list?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is correct, because we would have reduced the cost of it by protecting the land and also improve the quality. We can save $21,000,000 a year in raising the standard of the sweetpotato. Take sugarcane—we brought the sucrose content up from 10 or 12 percent to about 20 or 30 percent.

Mr. LEAVY. You would not need a tariff wall to protect starch?

Mr. DEROUEN. I do not care to bring the tariff in now.

Mr. LEAVY. I know; but Mr. DIRKSEN stated it is on the free list.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; it is on the the free list.

Mr. LEAVY. Even though foreign starch is on the free list, it is your contention that if you raise the sweetpotato starch content to 30 percent you can drive the foreign seller off of the market?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You are not going to drive him off the market with the rate at which tapioca can be bought today.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; we would have to have some protection, either by reciprocity or tariff, or something like that; but, above all, we must standardize and bring the sweetpotato to a higher standard, as well as protect the land from diseases, insects, and infection, before anything can be done.

I want to specifically call your attention again to the fact that this money is not needed to buy land or equipment.

Mr. CANNON. It is all to be spent in personnel, is it, Mr. DEROUEN?

Mr. DEROUEN. It is all to be spent in personnel and equipment for the experiments.

Mr. CANNON. You will require material and equipment?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Will some of this be in the nature of capital investment or a recurring item?

Mr. DEROUEN. Well, I do not know. I think most in capital investment and do not believe it will be a recurring item.

Mr. CANNON. Is there any further inquiry?

Mr. DEROUEN. In conclusion, gentlemen, permit me to state that my prime purpose or motive is to secure sufficient money to continue experiments and work which will bring about the standardization of the sweetpotato, the control of soil rot, stem diseases, insects, and other blights, thereby increasing the income of the small farmers of the sweetpotato-producing States and at the same time put into cultivation much idle land which has been withdrawn from cultivation of the five major farm commodities, or crops. The increase of the starch content of the potato for commercial purposes is secondary and does not enter the picture until later when sufficient good potatoes are being produced. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me to insert this table on the importation of cassava and sago in the years 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937, I should appreciate it.

Mr. CANNON. When you revise your remarks, you may include that material in the record.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

The data referred to is as follows:

United States importation of starches

[In thousands of pounds]

Year	Cassava[1]	Sago[1]
1933	190,302	12,317
1934	176,109	12,761
1935	202,112	24,806
1936	269,504	36,434
1937	432,858	33,470

[1] Figures are for tapioca (cassava), crude, flour, and prepared.

[2] Figures are for sago, crude and flour.

Mr. Speaker, at the Louisiana State University we have been doing extensive research work in an attempt to control the many diseases and insects which are peculiar to sweetpotatoes. As you know, the sweetpotato is a tuber and is apt to contract rot from roots and infections in the ground. At this time we have produced by experiment a sweetpotato that will bloom as it has never done in this country—and will produce seed, and this is something new. We believe that by further research along the lines that we have been carrying on at the university we can furnish throughout the United States seed which can be controlled. Sweetpotatoes more or less have a tendency to acquire the diseases that are in the land, and by breeding we can treat it so the diseases will not be transferred to the new area or to the next potato that comes along. We also have in mind controlling the sizes, and we believe that through the experiments we are carrying on in Louisiana we can produce an attractive potato instead of irregular, small, or crooked potatoes.

I believe the sweetpotato industry should be delved into more thoroughly, so we may make use of some of the lands that are lying idle, and, for instance, because we may not be permitted to raise more of one crop or another, we should substitute in one crop what we lose in another.

The sweetpotato is the most important single food and feed crop in the South. It is outranked only by the Irish potato as a vegetable crop for the entire Nation. It has often been said that had it not been for the sweetpotato on many occasions a large portion of the population would have gone hungry. The sweetpotato has also aided greatly in supplying food for armies of the Revolution as well as for later conflicts.

As a food it is a particularly balanced one. It contains practically all of the growth vitamins; it is reasonably high in proteins; and is particularly high in carbohydrates, such as dextrins and sucrose.

The sweetpotato was originally introduced from the more tropical areas of North America—probably from the West Indies—and when brought under conditions of continental North America it rarely, if ever, produced seed, and therefore it has been reproduced asexually from the time it was originally introduced. Any improvements in this crop have resulted from vegetative mutations, therefore systematic improvement has been slow.

Realizing the great importance of the sweetpotato crop, the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station has made every effort to improve it in Louisiana, and in the past 2 years methods have been worked out for inducing the sweetpotato to bloom and set seed under Louisiana conditions. The past season we have been able to grow around 1,500 seedlings, and for the coming year we will probably have around 4,000, whereas in reality, under an expanded breeding program, we should have at least 15,000. Due to limited equipment and manpower our program has been hampered materially.

Our purpose in breeding the sweetpotato is threefold:

First. To improve the nutritive value, market quality, and shape. This would include breeding for high sugar and vitamin content and for a very uniform shape. Most of our varieties are very ill-shaped and the growers are able to market only about 50 to 60 percent of the crop.

Second. To breed varieties having a higher starch content than existing varieties. The importance of starch is increasing in Southern States. We are now importing over $9,000,000 worth of cassava starch per year, used primarily in the South in the manufacture of paper and in the textile mills, which could be made from the sweetpotato. Incidentally, this cassava starch is coming in duty-free under the name of cassava flour. To produce higher yields of starch would require varieties bred for that purpose. Good starch varieties should yield from 20 to 30 percent starch. Table varieties usually run around 16 to 18 percent starch.

Third. To breed varieties resistant to diseases, such as the soil, stem, and black rots. These diseases are taking a heavy toll at the present time. The soil rot in particular is threatening the sweetpotato-producing areas of Louisiana, while the stem and black rots are more severe in other important sweetpotato regions of the country.

Systematic and rapid progress with the above three items can only be made through sexual breeding.

To indicate the great interest in the sweetpotato-improvement program, delegates from practically every Southern State and representatives from States as far north as Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, and Kansas have made special trips to the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station to study the work under way there. They are anxious to see the work expanded so that they might take greater advantage of the work now under way.

We have here a challenge to American enterprise, and especially to the South, where the sweetpotato could be grown in unlimited quantities and of superior quality. The maximum capacity of the Southern States for sweetpotato production is not known. Sweetpotato growing has been more than a minor farm industry.

Never before has an appropriation been requested for this important crop. It has been estimated by the growers and horticulturists interested in the improvement of the crop that the expenditures necessary to take care of the need for improvement of this crop in the various States would require an annual appropriation of only $80,000.

In closing I wish to urge the Representatives of the various sweetpotato-producing States to join with me in appealing to the Appropriations Committee for the needed $80,000 which is necessary to carry on the investigations and research now under way. This sum should be included as an item in the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill.

I further stated to the committee:

CHLOROTIC STREAK, A VIRUS DISEASE OF SUGARCANE REPORTED IN LOUISIANA

Mr. DEROUEN. I also wish to call your attention to another emergency existing in sugarcane. In May 1928, chlorotic streak, a serious virus disease of sugarcane, was identified and reported in Louisiana by an expert of the Department of Agriculture. Since the Plant Quarantine Act was passed in 1912 no other major disease of cane has entered the United States, with the possible exception of mosaic, which may have been introduced about 1912. The manner in which chloritic streak reached the commercial cane area of the South is not known, but the supposition is that it was brought on cane cuttings by some individual in ignorance of the law. The disease does not exist at the Federal or State experiment stations, which are the only legally constituted agencies for importation of new varieties of cane.

Mosaic, also a virus disease, brought virtual ruin to the industry, the production of sugar falling from several hundred thousand tons per year to a low of 45,000 tons in 1926, after which there was a gradual rise in production, due mainly to the development of resistant varieties by the Department of Agriculture. Mosaic remains a major problem in seven States of the South. Great progress has been made in restoring production, but thus far no completely immune varieties have been produced by breeding, and the disease therefore persists.

One of the main projects of the Department of Agriculture's Division of Sugar Plant Investigation is breeding for immunity to mosaic, which is the only hope for complete elimination of the disease.

Chlorotic streak is apparently a disease of similar nature, but very little is known about it except that poor germination of seed cane and consequent faulty and deficient stands result from planting infected seed cane. This effect of chlorotic streak is a serious complication in the Southern States, because replanting is impossible, due to limited season for making the crop. In Queensland, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, where the disease has also recently appeared, serious losses may occur, but within time limits the crops may be replanted if serious stand failure results from the original planting of seed cane.

Another disastrous consequence of chlorotic streak, common to all countries, is failure of the ratoon crops; that is, the crops harvested in succeeding years from an original planting of seed cane.

Nothing is known of the manner in which the disease is spread to healthy plantations; the resistance or susceptibility of local commercial cane varieties to the disease; the environmental conditions of soil, nutrition, rainfall, and so forth, that favor or retard spread of the disease; or, in fact, any of the essential information on biology of chlorotic streak that would suggest means of combating or eliminating it.

It is fortunate that up to the present, chlorotic streak is apparently restricted to the area east of the Atchafalaya River in Louisi-

ana. The disease was not found in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, or Florida in rapid reconnaissance survey during the latter part of the past season, but the survey, due to lack of special financial provision for it, was not very complete. The tentative assumption is that in some manner unknown the disease was brought into an area centering in the southeastern part of Louisiana and gained a foothold there in the very recent past. From careful observations of the past few months it is proved that under our conditions the disease spreads to new plantings; and that fact, together with the fact that it causes poor germination, faulty stand of plant cane, and more serious injury to ratoon crops, comprises about all that is definitely known.

The situation parallels the accidental importation of mosaic which brought such great havoc and ruination to scores of thousands of farmers who depended upon cane for cash income. In the case of chlorotic streak, an earlier identification of the disease and more prompt realization of the danger makes possible the avoidance of the former disastrous experience.

An immediate study of the disease to establish the cause, manner of spread, relative effect on present commercial varieties, possibility of breeding resistant varieties, or the evolving of other measures to check or eliminate this serious threat to the industry is urgently needed. Alertness to recognize this new threat may justly be attributed to the wise provision of experts by the Congress for study of the cause of mosaic. The specialists trained in that work have made progress but are still preoccupied with a more satisfactory ultimate solution, the development of completely immune varieties, and cannot be diverted from it without sacrifice of essential features of the project.

It is the studied opinion of a committee representing 19,000 sugarcane farmers that provision for immediate, adequate study of chlorotic streak be made to prevent a repetition of the disastrous experience with mosaic and that an emergency appropriation of about $35,000 be made for that purpose. This is an emergency, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, I speak not only for my own constituency but for every farmer, processor, manufacturer, and person connected with the sweetpotato and sugar industries of the great State of Louisiana when I express and convey to the Committee on Appropriations and the membership of the House of Representatives of the United States my thanks for the sympathetic manner in which they have listened to our plea. Your generosity in appropriating the necessary funds to carry on the investigations and researches incident to the rehabilitation of the sweetpotato industry and the further promotion of Louisiana's sugar industry through the curb and control of chlorotic streak, a virus disease of Louisiana sugarcane, will long be remembered. This research will accrue to the benefit of every farmer in either industry, and the money spent will redound to the Nation as a whole in the production of better, cheaper, and more wholesome food products for the American consumer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to again express and convey to the House of Representatives the thanks and gratitude of our Louisiana farmers, as well as our sweetpotato and sugar industries.

Lake Charles, Louisiana's New Short Ship Channel to the Gulf—Our National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. RENÉ L. DEROUEN, OF LOUISIANA BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 24, 1939

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include my testimony before the Civil Functions, War Department, Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, I call the attention of the Nation to the new short ship channel from Lake Charles, La., to the Gulf of Mexico.

No American citizen can deny that the necessity of preparing an adequate national defense is the paramount task of the hour, and certainly no one can question the wisdom of completing those river and harbor projects which are so essential a part of our defense program, even as are battleships, aircraft, tanks, guns, munitions, and personnel.

The new Lake Charles ship channel is an important link in our chain of harbor and coast defenses, and this new artery of trade and commerce may well become the life line of our battle fleet, for here, in southwest Louisiana, is potentially the greatest oil-producing area in the United States. We have many great fields, both gushers and pumpers, and the oil industry is continually exploiting and developing new areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself to the completion of the Calcasieu River and Pass, La., project, the short ship channel from Lake Charles, La., to the Gulf of Mexico.

The present water route from Lake Charles to the Gulf, via the Calcasieu River, Intracoastal Canal, and Sabine River, is 75 miles, and the project now under construction—the Calcasieu River and Pass, La., channel—will shorten the distance to approximately 33 miles, and result in a great saving not only to the shippers, steamship companies, and buyers, but to the public itself. At the present time it requires a whole day to navigate the distance through the channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Lake Charles, and the large steamships arriving at the Sabine Pass after midday are forced to tie up for the night and wait until the following morning, as it is impossible to navigate the existing narrow channel after dark. Such waiting is both inconvenient and expensive.

It was our understanding when this project was initiated that this was to be a 3-year program; and unless sufficient funds are allotted for the continuation of the dredging work this year, the work on the channel and the development of the port of Lake Charles, La., and the area it serves will suffer. The channel should be completed this year and the work on the jetties begun the following year, 1941, as to undertake both phases of the work during 1940 would result in confusion and retard the use of the new channel, thereby depriving southwest Louisiana and Arkansas of the economic benefits which will accrue when this channel is completed and open to the public. The channel, it seems to me, should be completed before the work of repairing and extending the jetties in the Gulf of Mexico is undertaken, as ships could use channel even though the jetties were not complete.

In other words, this channel could be producing revenue, helping the economic condition of the area served for at least a couple of years, and national and international commerce benefited before the jetties are completed. Bear in mind that new jetties are not being constructed; the old ones are merely being repaired and extended. Common sense and business acumen point to the completion of the new channel first and the later improvement of the jetties if this project is to be completed at an early date and opened to commerce and the public.

At this point I wish to insert my statement before the House Appropriations Committee.

[Statement of Hon. RENÉ L. DEROUEN, of Louisiana, before the House Appropriations Committee on the hearings on the War Department civil-functions appropriation, 1940]

LAKE CHARLES DEEP-WATER CHANNEL—STATEMENT OF HON RENÉ L. DEROUEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. SNYDER. We have with us this morning Representative DEROUEN, of Louisiana. Mr. DEROUEN, you may proceed in your own way and give us such information as you desire.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Chairman, at this moment, I want to address myself to the river and harbor appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and, in that connection, I want to insert in the record this table showing the estimates made by the Chief of Engineers and the amounts allocated by the Bureau of the Budget for flood control and river and harbor improvements.

Mr. SNYDER. It may be inserted at this point.

The table referred to is as follows:

Estimates (76th Cong., 1st sess.)

	The Budget	Chief of Engineers
Flood control:		
General	$110,000,000	$195,525,500
Mississippi River	31,000,000	50,000,000
Sacramento River	2,000,000	1,754,400
Mississippi River, emergency	800,000	1,000,000
Power plant:		
Bonneville Dam	7,000,000	
Fort Peck Dam	2,000,000	
River and harbor:		
Improvement	30,000,000	102,975,800
Maintenance	41,135,000	51,738,210
Total	223,935,000	402,993,910

Mr. DEROUEN. May I say to you, gentlemen, that we of the Rivers and Harbors Committee are amazed at these estimates. I happen to be one of the ranking members of the committee. Mr. MANSFIELD is ill, in a hospital, and is not able to appear. We were amazed at the tremendous cuts made to $30,000,000 for the entire United States, for improvements for rivers and harbors. It is simply impossible, and you might as well have no money for that purpose.

Throughout the entire country, on the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Gulf, there are projects under contract that should go forward.

At this moment may I quote what the President of the United States said yesterday to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. He said, "I congratulate you on what you have achieved in the past;" and he then went on to recommend the continuation of projects which, by vision and foresight, and after due consideration, have proved to be good and worthy projects.

Certainly we cannot carry on these projects with this amount. If they are carried out, as intended, they would serve to create a condition of reemployment of people all over the country.

I now address myself particularly to those projects on the Gulf coast, such as the Calcasieu River and Pass, La., project; the new ship channel to Lake Charles, La.; and those on the coast between Louisiana and Texas, connecting all of the great ports on the Gulf, including Lake Charles, Houston, Beaumont, Orange, Galveston, etc. These waterways carry today 50,000,000 tons, nearly as large as the tonnage of the Great Lakes, which ranks as No. 1, so far as tonnage is concerned. The Lake Charles or Calcasieu River and Pass project was approved in 1872.

Mr. SNYDER. By the Army engineers?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes. It was of great importance because of the potential volume of raw material located in this area and valuable for purposes of national defense. In this area you find the great sulfur deposits, in Louisiana and Texas, which are used today in the manufacturing of TNT and many of our other explosives.

Mr. SNYDER. Is that the only place it is found?

Mr. DEROUEN. I mean this is the largest sulfur-producing area in the United States. There is some small production elsewhere, but I am talking about the greater volume of sulfur, as bearing on the necessity for continuing these improvements. This is one reason why we should complete this improvement as expeditiously as possible.

The port of Lake Charles was developed through local interests at an expense of $6,500,000. The report I have here indicates that it was built by local interests and turned over to the United States. This is the report of the Army engineers, approved by the Secretary of War. On page 2 of Document No. 299, Seventy-fifth Congress, covering the Lake Charles deep-water channel, ship channel, and Calcasieu River and Pass, La., you will find this statement:

"The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after considering the reports of the district and division engineers and the additional information submitted by local interests at a hearing before the Board, finds that the substantial and growing ocean commerce of the port of Lake Charles is now handicapped by the restricted dimensions of the existing channel and by the heavy and increasing barge traffic therein. The construction of the channel direct to the Gulf as recommended by the reporting officers will afford a new and shorter route for this commerce, with substantial savings in transportation costs; and provide an emergency outlet for the ocean commerce of the entire Sabine-Neches area, which in 1935 exceeded 32,000,000 tons. The prospective benefits of the improvement to the extensive water-borne commerce, especially the petroleum industry of the locality, warrant its prosecution at Federal expense."

Mr. SNYDER. What was the tonnage in 1938?

Mr. DEROUEN. About 50,000,000 tons.

Mr. SNYDER. How does that compare with the tonnage in 1933 or with 1928?

Mr. DEROUEN. There has been a 200-percent increase.

Mr. SNYDER. Since 1928?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; it has continually increased, even during the depression. Instead of the volume diminishing, it increased during a period when commerce in other parts of the Nation was at a standstill.

Mr. SNYDER. How do you account for the fact that the volume of traffic increased during the depression years?

Mr. DEROUEN. I can well understand that. This is the only section where sufficient petroleum supplies could be found to carry them over, or to meet the great demands resulting from the development within the last 10 years of automobiles, airplanes, and other petroleum-consuming motors. A condition was created where we did not have sufficient transportation facilities for the traffic involved. Consequently, barges and tankers were pressed into service in handling the agricultural and petroleum products, and as Lake Charles is the natural outlet to the sea of this area, the commerce of the port increased by leaps and bounds.

We were carrying full loads of petroleum products during all of that time. That is about the explanation of it. The East was buying raw materials, while prices were low, and storing them. This accumulation of material, particularly of petroleum, sulphur, naval stores, etc., resulted in increased traffic through the port of Lake Charles and its ship channel as water transportation offered the cheapest and most accommodating method of moving these products. Manufacturing, particularly in the East, has also played an important part in the development of the port. For instance, the Mathieson Alkali Works, of New York, built a plant at Lake Charles, La., costing about $15,000,000, and was busily engaged in the manufacture of caustic soda and many other ingredients that are used in the manufacturing of munitions. In an effort to find ways of protection, they were storing these products in the East, which accounts for barge movements during the depression period, especially in the movement of oyster shells and chemicals. Further, world-wide commerce emanated from the port; cargoes of oil, cotton, rice, grains, naval stores, petroleum, etc., going forward to Central and South America, Europe, Asia, and Australia.

In Document 172, Seventy-second Congress, containing the report of the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Lake Charles deep-water channel, dealing with the question of enlarging the channel, making it 250 feet wide instead of 125 feet, with a depth of 30 feet, the Secretary of War said, in recommending the improvement, the following:

"Based on the comparative freight rates, submitted under the appendix II, and the cargo tonnage handled through the port of Lake Charles during the calendar year 1929, the saving in freight accruing was $1,169,458.40, as compared with the rates through the nearest competing port in the instance of each commodity. This saving does not include 137,030 tons of miscellaneous cargo, principally shells, sand, and gravel for which there is no comparative rate. However, it may safely be said that these materials could not be marketed were it not for the water transportation provided by the deep-water channel."

In Document 299, Seventy-fifth Congress, the recommendation was made that it should be a 3-year program. Now, do not forget that the people have contributed $6,500,000 and an additional $3,000,000 for rights-of-way, or practically $10,000,000, already. This 3-year program contemplates straightening of the channel, shortening the distance through the river and lakes to the Gulf, and the repair, extension, and improvement of the jetties at the mouth of Calcasieu Pass in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. SNYDER. How many miles is that?

Mr. DEROUEN. It is 33 miles to the Gulf by the straight channel, and if we followed the present route it would be 75 miles. The engineers conceived the idea of shortening this for two reasons: One was that when a large ship came from the Gulf it could not enter the small channel at night, therefore it would have to remain in the Gulf until daylight before entering the channel, which raised the cost per ton-mile exorbitantly high. Secondly, the contemplated improvement would be a saving of 42 miles in the distance from the port to the Gulf of Mexico. We still have now from this point, indicated by the yellow streak [indicating] over here, 40,000,000 yards of material to be removed at this time. The first amount appropriated was the $1,000,000 last year, whereas the Army engineers had recommended $1,955,000.

Now, there are right here in this area three dredging boats, one of which is the largest dredging boat in the world, dredging material and removing it to a point a mile away. You can imagine what would happen if we do not have sufficient money to carry on this operation. These contractors would have to move away, and that would mean a loss of at least $1,000,000 to the contractors and, in addition, it would throw out of employment all of the men who are working on this channel. Of course, they would be thrown out of employment.

Mr. SNYDER. How many are there?

Mr. DEROUEN. They have about 895 men at work. I am not counting the Government officials who would be paid whether they were working or not, but I am speaking of the laboring class who would be forced on relief, also the thousands who are employed in producing the tonnage shipped through this port. We ask you to provide the $1,500,000 recommended for this year and an additional $1,000,000, making a total of two and one-half millions. I would like to say now that we had a conference with the Chief of Army Engineers, and he said this: "You ought to have more money, but my hands are tied because I have to make allocations within the Budget recommendation."

The district engineer, Col. R. W. Crawford, on March 5, made the statement in New Orleans that this work should be done at once. He said that the project was needed right now.

Mr. KERR. How much would it cost to complete this channel?

Mr. DEROUEN. About $6,000,000, but this figure applies only if completed in 3 years. And here is what Colonel Crawford said:

"NEW ORLEANS, March 4.—Oil to power the battle fleets of the United States in times of national crisis will find another exit into the Gulf of Mexico when the short-cut channel connecting Lake Charles to the Gulf is completed, Col. R. W. Crawford declared here today.

"'At present,' Colonel Crawford, who is United States district engineer for the first New Orleans district, said, 'stoppage of the Sabine Pass would temporarily shut off the movement of fuel coming out of Port Arthur, Beaumont, and Orange, Tex., as well as those from Lake Charles, La.

"'MORE DIFFICULT TO BLOCK

"'Another entry to the Gulf, such as the project which links Lake Charles directly to the Gulf through Calcasieu Pass and gives the Texas ports access there through the Intracoastal Canal, would make it more difficult to block off oil supplies.'

"Citing other advantages for the new straight-line waterway, which is being constructed through a straightened Calcasieu River and out through Calcasieu Pass, Crawford said:

"'In addition, oil that came originally from the Lake Charles district and was intended either for the Atlantic seaboard or a battle fleet, could move to the Gulf with more speed than it can over its present route—by way of the Lake Charles deep-water channel and the Sabine Pass.

"'SEVENTY MILES SAVED

"'On that particular trip, about 70 miles or approximately 10 hours' running time would be saved.

"'Under all conditions,' the colonel continued, 'the new channel will serve as an alternate pass for some 30,000,000 tons of petroleum products shipped annually to the refineries along the Atlantic seaboard.'

"Other advantages which the new channel will offer in times of national emergency, the colonel envisioned as:

"'OUTLET FOR FOOD

"'To provide a relatively speedy outlet for food from the cattle and grain sections around Lake Charles to Atlantic ports or to ships at sea.

"'In event of chemical developments in this region, to provide faster movement of such cargoes destined to points in the Gulf of Mexico.'

"The Lake Charles Channel, according to report, should be completed during 1940 or 1941."

I have here a recent report, just out, by the Corps of Engineers and the Maritime Commission, on the port of Lake Charles. This report is signed by the Chief of Engineers, and it is entitled "Port Series No. 31, 1938," covering the Port of Lake Charles, La. This report indicates the necessity of completing the project at this time.

Within this area are located plants of the Mathieson Chemical Co., of New York, and a number of the big oil companies, including the Gulf Refining Co., the Mellon oil interests of Pennsylvania, the Continental Oil Co., and many others. Here are located their main storage and loading plants. In addition to that, Swift & Co. have acquired 640 acres there, and have one of their largest plants located there. That has been done during the last 2 years, and they are employing about 1,000 men. There is a glass factory planned, which is in course of being built, and there are some alkali works also. Those people, in those industries, are seeking an opportunity to spend hundreds of millions of dollars there, and they will do so if proper port facilities are provided, thus creating new employment, thereby reducing the relief rolls. I have letters from them saying that they will have to abandon their plans unless these facilities are provided. They say, "we are ready to put men to work when these facilities are provided." All of those investments are predicated upon the completion of the work within 3 years, because the Government said to them, "you can go ahead and build your manufacturing plants, and we assure you that the facilities will be completed in 3 years." Now, if we do not complete the work in 3 years, I think those people will move away and seek other places in which to operate, and that would mean a great loss to all those States in the South bordering on the Gulf.

We had at the meeting down there representatives of some of our greatest financial and industrial institutions, including the vice president of the Missouri Pacific, the president of the Louisiana & Arkansas, and executive officers of the Texas & Pacific, Kansas City Southern, and Southern Pacific Railroads, Mr. Dan Moran, president of the Continental Oil Co., of Ponca City, Okla., and many other, representatives of leading financial and industrial institutions, and they all wanted this constructed at once. Now, we have been inviting those people to come there and build factories so as to put more men to work, and then we find ourselves defaulting on the promise, or we find that there is a default on the promise that the Government made to us. That is the situation there.

Mr. STARNES. How much money do you recommend for that project?

Mr. DEROUEN. We should have $1,000,000 more, or $2,500,000. That would keep the construction companies going.

Mr. STARNES. Would that complete the project in its entirety?

Mr. DEROUEN. No; that would only be carrying out the promise of the Government to complete it in 3 years. We of the State of Louisiana did the first job on it. In doing the first job we spent $10,000,000. The Government has said, or the report of the Chief of Engineers, approved by the Secretary of War, has recommended a 3-year program. The Government has promised to complete it within 3 years. Assurance was given to the world that it would be completed in 3 years, but now we are defaulting on that. It is a serious situation. Here is an instance where we could put men to work. The large petroleum companies want to operate in our section; they are seeking material that is produced there, and they have built many large boats and tankers for the transportation of oil, but if they are cut off because of the lack of these facilities, they will operate in other localities.

But for the operations down there you would be paying 38 cents per gallon for gasoline right now. That is what we have been saving to the country as a result of those operations. But for that you would be paying 100 percent more for sulfuric acid than you now pay, and that saving is largely attributable to water carriage or water transportation. This channel will be an integral part of our national defense and as such the project's speedy completion should be further assured by the allocation of sufficient funds to carry on the dredging work planned for the year 1940.

I am glad to have this opportunity of appearing before you, and I do hope you will see fit to grant this increase. When we do this we provide employment for men who would otherwise be out of work. It seems strange to me that in one breath we say, "Let us put men to work," and then in another breath we say, "No; we will not do that—we will not put men to work." I do not see how we can expect industry to put men to work when we say to them, "You cannot invest your capital in a way that will permit you to put men to work." We cannot expect that result when we cut off not less than $75,000,000 for projects under construction and which should be completed. Of course, there are a great many projects that should be completed, and certainly we should continue in employment those who are now on the job.

Mr. SNYDER. We thank you for your statement, Mr. DEROUEN, and you will have the privilege of revising and extending your remarks.

Mr. DEROUEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. Julian S. Schley, Chief of the United States Army engineers, on the occasion of his recent inspection of the Lake Charles deep water channel project, had this to say:

It is quite clear to me that all of you appreciate how fortunate you are in having your project authorized and money for the work allotted just when it was. We don't know just what is ahead for us in the matter of national defense.

Referring to the comparative ease with which rivers and harbors appropriations passed Congress in pre-war sessions, General Schley continued:

Now, with the tremendous Federal debt and the possibility of international trouble facing us, you would have difficulty in getting anything of the kind.

I want to emphasize the fact that your very active Congressman, Mr. DEROUEN, had much to do in giving matters a push whenever you wanted something done.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following editorial of the Lake Charles American Press, Saturday, May 25, 1940, to wit:

[From the Lake Charles (La.) American Press of May 25, 1940]

SHIP CHANNEL IS SAFE

The veto by President Roosevelt of a river and harbor appropriation a few days back makes very pointed the comment of Gen. Julian Schley that Lake Charles is fortunate in having its new ship channel already authorized and about completed. With the national debt so large, as he noted, and Congress now so bent on spending all possible funds for defense, projects like our ship channel will be forced to wait a while.

With our ship channel now about completed, we will not only avoid the risk of having it postponed for some time, but will instead have it ready for use in the event of any national emergency. One of the reasons urged for the Lake Charles ship channel was the advisability of having another outlet to the sea for oil tankers. It was pointed out in hearings that if all the oil of the productive Gulf coast in Louisiana and east Texas had to go through the one channel now being used, that possible interference with this channel would seriously cripple the shipment of vital oil supplies. With the two outlets available, we would be far safer. So, our ship channel is now being completed at a period when it may be counted as one of the very valuable contributions made to national defense.

Nevertheless, we all may be certain that it was a fine thing for Louisiana to get the appropriation for the ship channel through when it was, and we will readily believe General Schley that we are fortunate to have it now.

Aircraft Defenses—Warning to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ST. ALBANS (VT.) DAILY MESSENGER

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, in these days when the people of this country generally are thinking about speeding our national defense, there is great need for emphasis on the strengthening of our air defenses. As a warning to New England, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article containing excerpts from an address made by Brig. Gen. E. L. Daley, United States Army, more than a year ago at Worcester, Mass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Albans (Vt.) Daily Messenger of May 9, 1939]

WARNS NEW ENGLAND IT MUST BE READY—GENERAL DALEY URGES BIG EXPENDITURES FOR "SLEEP INSURANCE"

WORCESTER, MASS., May 8.—Asserting "the Atlantic has shrunk to a mere lake," Brig. Gen. Edmund L. Daley, United States Army, called upon New England today to demand $50,000,000 in aircraft defenses as "sleep insurance" in event of war.

General Daley, who will take command next month of the new United States Army department in the Caribbean, recently completed a strategical air defense of New England, which he said would be the first point of attack by a European power.

"I am here to ask you to demand aircraft defenses so you can sleep at night," General Daley told a communion breakfast of Hibernians.

"New England needs strong defensive ports, protected air bases, antiaircraft batteries, and mobile units for protection of industrial centers.

"The crucial element in European diplomacy is not that Germany has more planes but that the German air force can take off for bombing flights knowing perfectly well the country will be protected by strong ground defenses. England and France lack that defense and are feverishly trying to overcome that handicap."

Protect America's Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include a radio address given by me in New York last Monday night and broadcast through radio station WOR and the Mutual network, as follows:

Thirty million American families are now wondering to what extent the war hurricane sweeping Europe will further descend upon them. Naturally they wonder what, if anything, is being done in Washington to materially cushion the blast.

The press is filled with statements from Washington as to defense plans and programs. One message after another is submitted to Congress. Your representatives, in line with custom, act hastily and approve sweeping proposals.

Will legislation, now being "blitzkrieged" through Congress, provide our families with genuine defense? Will the equities of our people be protected? What is defense, if it fails to preserve for our people that which they have in the way of liberties and possessions?

Recent European history leads me to say that no one can absolutely answer these questions. European people allowed their governments to rush legislation, to enact it quickly, without careful thought, on the claim hurried action would provide adequate defense against invaders; yet, when the invader arrived, the nationals found what they had been led to believe would be adequate amounted to little more than a good cap pistol.

Today in the form of laws we have examples of how legislation, high-pressured through Congress in the past 7 years, has failed to produce the results originally claimed for it.

Let us remember the Banking Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act creating that Commission in 1934, the far-reaching Banking Act of 1935, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act of the same year.

The proponents of all these laws claimed their provisions—when administered—would protect the equities of our American families as represented in homes, farms, factories, public utilities, transportation, and communication facilities.

Our first world tornado since the enactment of these laws to protect our people from world economic crises is now blowing. Yet Ralph Hendershot, financial editor of the New York World-Telegram, informs us in a recent article that, despite these laws, our American families have lost about $30,000,000,000 in the market value of their securities, to say nothing of the disappearance of values suffered in the drop in prices of commodities owned by farmers and others.

Thirty billion dollars—just what does this sum represent?

Our ears are now attuned to war costs and to discussions dealing with defense programs.

Thirty billion dollars worth of equities is approximately $4,000,000,000 more than the cost we incurred in prosecuting our portion of the last World War.

It is apparent that if legislation to prevent disastrous economic wash-outs which destroy the equities of our people is possible, then that legislation has not yet been enacted. Every farm owner of beef and hides, of fats, of wheat and cotton, and every security holder who suffered violent market-price breaks in recent weeks clearly understands what I am now saying.

Let us remember the United States still is, we hope, a capitalistic country. By this I mean to say, everyone who owns property in any form is a capitalist to that extent. The families of America work, economize, and save; and they want to reinvest. This process of reinvestment provides jobs for salary and wage earners.

The free and unrestricted flow of capital, of savings, back into industry has provided our families with the highest level of individual possessions of any people on earth.

Every force which directly or indirectly interferes with the voluntary reinvestment of our savings, adds to the unemployment list. It supports those who would overthrow our private enterprise system and substitute instead one of collectivism.

Governments know the surest way to destroy the private enterprise system is to maintain unsound monetary and fiscal policies, permit instability in the buying power of the medium of exchange, and exercise arbitrary power over the issuance of securities to finance industry. They know all of this discourages the individual in making investments in private industry and in functioning capitalistically. This because it drives the investors either to hoarding or buying Government obligations. Such facilitates the substitution of state capitalism for our private enterprise system.

Let us better understand what your Congress—the board of directors of American agriculture and industry—has been doing.

Many people think the acts of Congress, to which I have referred, affect only Wall Street operators and those who buy and sell securities and commodities through the machinery of the exchanges.

But let's not be mistaken about this matter.

We must bear in mind in 1934 Congress created the Securities and Exchange Commission and gave it jurisdiction over several of the laws to which I have referred. Since this Commission began to function, its restrictions have prevented the creation of scores of new units of industry throughout this country. This interferes with obtaining needed funds for new undertakings and the expansion of old ones. It also prevents risk capital acting freely.

This means to say—as the savings of our people accumulated and could not be reinvested—idle bank deposits increased, the production and exchange of goods and services was prevented, and the relief rolls remained crowded with idle workers.

If the net effect of the Commission's administration of the several laws over which it has jurisdiction has been to prevent the reinvestment of the savings of our people and the creation of new industries, and if the failure of the Commission to liberalize its rules and regulations in the face of the present international emergency has contributed to our people losing over $30,000,000,000 within 3 weeks, then I say we should demand a complete investigation of the laws and their administration by the Commission. This would enable us to find out what is the real intent of the Commission.

Furthermore, let us remember that the Commission's jurisdiction covers not only investments held by our 30,000,000 families. Its power reaches far afield. It goes into every corner of the globe where people reside who own securities issued by our American enterprise system.

And this, incidentally, covers our securities held by the nationals of the Low Countries recently overrun by the great force now operating in Europe.

There is such a thing as international loot. How much of the aggressor's loot, if any, has been dumped on the American markets in recent weeks? We should know. By what method and in what volume can those securities and unwanted commodities, which may hereafter be obtained through conquest, be placed on the American market? Let the Securities and Exchange Commission keep the American people informed.

The S. E. C., through its rules and regulations, compels American investors holding our securities to make information, relative to their trading activities, a public matter. But this same Commission, created by your Congress through its rules and regulations, refuses to divulge information relative to dealings in American securities by foreigners.

Leslie Gould, financial editor for the New York Journal and American, declared in his column as early as last January that:

"The S. E. C. goes out of its way to make public the trading done by Americans, but when it comes to operations by foreigners it follows a policy of strict secrecy.

"Why?

"Can it be that the S. E. C. is more interested in protecting foreigners and foreign governments than Americans?

"If not, then why this un-American policy?

"Whenever anyone says anything about this being un-American, the Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman, Jerome Frank, begins to beat his chest and point to his recent book. But Mr. Frank should know it is by actions and not by words that a person really is judged."

Certainly Congress did not intend to pass laws which discriminate against Americans and in favor of foreigners. If it did, then it is time the American people found out about that.

And it should be noted at this point that the work of keeping track of raw-material prices in this national-defense program has been turned over to Mr. Leon Henderson, another member of Mr. Frank's Commission. Will Mr. Henderson follow the un-American policy to which Mr. Gould refers? If Mr. Henderson has been given the power to control the prices of raw materials, has he not actually been given the power to control industry, which cannot function without those raw materials?

In considering this question of foreign ownership of American securities it may be claimed that Treasury Department officials have more or less power to cushion the heavy foreign selling through its powers to "freeze" such holdings. It may even be pointed out that the holdings of the Low Countries were "frozen" on May 10, following the invasion. But the Treasury also "unfroze" them a few days later—and the record shows that heavy security selling began almost immediately thereafter. True, they again "froze" them; but apparently the damage had been done.

The Securities Exchange Act and rulings of the Commission provide certain prohibitions and restrictions covering purchase and sale of securities. This contributes to the development of thin markets in which there may be but few bids to buy stock in a stampede to sell, as was witnessed from May 10 to May 21.

Unquestionably, if officials of units of industry had been permitted, they would have bought their companies' securities in sufficient volume to cushion the abnormal decline. However, under the laws as now administered, they are barred from so doing.

Congress gave the Commission power to relax its rules and to exempt transactions for the protection of investors in the interest of the public. After describing the securities that would be exempted under the act—such as Government obligations and the like—it declared: "* * * and such other securities * * * as the Commission may, by such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, either unconditionally or upon specified terms and conditions or for stated periods exempt from the operation of any one or more provisions of this title which by their terms do not apply to an exempted security." Instead of so doing in this present market collapse, the Commission has adopted a policy of watching the market closely, according to its own official statements.

And how does this help the portion of 30,000,000 American families whose equities were wiped out by the recent declines? Why has the Commission refused to avail itself of the safeguards provided by Congress for the protection of investors and in the public interest?

To further illustrate the effect of these economic storms the security financing for the month of May fell two-thirds below that of April. And May financing amounted to only 50 percent of the monthly average for the first 4 months of the year.

If this same ratio of decreased financing is to govern, it is clearly evident a further substitution of state capitalism will follow hurried action on the part of Congress in giving the President the latest $1,000,000,000 requested.

These rapid-fire demands for vast appropriations by the Congress, and all in the absence of a sound tax approach and complete and definite plans as to how the funds shall be spent may well be questioned.

For Congress to so quickly grant these vast sums and at a time when the markets are demoralized, there is brought into operation an ideal atmospheric condition for wild spending, a greatly increased Federal debt, and political exploitation. Congress can meet again, and after Army and Navy officials have time to present worth-while plans. Is all of this money to be spent before next January 1? Sound procedure would afford checks and balances. Such is the very essence of defense.

The S. E. C. was created largely on the thin excuse of protecting you from losing that small sum you may have to invest in private enterprise. I am convinced, after careful consideration, that this Commission actually—through its interpretation and administration of the several laws—is preventing the free flow of our savings into private enterprise and the use of risk capital which we must have if we are to create new industries. In so doing, the Commission strangles free enterprise and prepares the way for Government ownership or state capitalism.

A free flow of savings into private industry is essential to the financing of the present defense program. Failing in this, the claim will be made that our private system has collapsed and that government must confiscate private wealth in order to raise the required funds. And don't forget—wealth in this case means equities in homes, capital levies on demand deposits, on savings accounts, on cash surrender value of life-insurance contracts, and stocks and bonds.

Consider the powerful position of the S. E. C. Created by Congress to protect your equities, it gives preferential treatment to foreigners; impedes the flow of our savings into private industry and why? Can it be the Commission employs some who are not citizens of the United States, who have been trained in other countries, and who are unfriendly to our free enterprise system?

March 25 I introduced in the House resolution 440 calling for a sweeping investigation of the S. E. C. On May 21 I introduced House Resolution 495 asking for an investigation of the recent stock market crash. Both these resolutions are now bottled up in the House Rules Committee and will remain there unless you—the 30,000,000 families—demand action on them. This is your problem, your fight. I repeat the numbers of the resolutions, House Resolutions 440 and 495.

Continued strikes and lack of plans can quickly involve the President and the Congress in a very nasty situation on this whole defense approach. Whatever our strength is at present is due to our private enterprise system. Just how much "trifling" will Messrs. Stettinius and Knudsen and the public put up with in this crucial hour? To make our productive capacity effective against that of the European aggressors, our system must be permitted to function.

The Congress could well afford to give some of its time, before adjourning, to a more thorough consideration of the national-defense plans and needs. Along with this, it could very profitably look into the matter of just who is selling our American economic system short, and with it all, make a very careful survey of the acts pertaining to banking, money and credit, and the operations of the exchanges under the powers of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Pernicious Political Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 3046

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority views on Senate bill 3046:

MINORITY VIEWS

It is a matter of deep regret that we find ourselves unable to agree with the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary with reference to S. 3046 (to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities"). We regret also that we find ourselves in disagreement with other supporters of this bill, many of whom, we are persuaded, have not thought the matter through and are attracted by the title, "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," and are giving their support because they are opposed to pernicious political activity.

There are several very basic questions which are presented by this proposed legislation. The first and most fundamental is, What sort of government do we want to live under in America? There is no doubt but that this bill presents that question. There are only two sorts of government—one of which is termed a democracy in which general classification are included republics or representative governments. That sort of government functions from the people upward. In the people is lodged the strength, the security, and the sovereignty of the Government. In the final analysis they speak the voice of government which is effectuated by their chosen representatives.

It is our view that in such a government, capacity to govern like all other human capacities is retained only by its exercise. In such a government, since the people are the source of power upon which the Government depends, that power can be preserved and increased only by its exercise, and can best be exercised only by having the governmental duties close at hand. The most fundamental, common-sense policy in such a system we hold must be to move governmental responsibilities back toward the people and hold the people inescapably to the necessity of doing in these smaller units of government whatever is within their governmental capacity. No system of government is foolproof and self-perpetuating. Of course, there are things wrong in our elections. There is something

which needs to be done all the time. There must be, or the capacity for self-government dies, and the other sort of government has to take over. Keeping elections clean is important, but the more important thing is the correction of the civic condition which makes this corruption possible. The cure for that civic condition we submit is not for some supergovernment to do that service for them, but for the people to clean up their own elections, and in the performance of that duty they will develop local leaders, develop community accomplishment, develop civic decency, develop strength by the struggle, develop consciousness of responsibility, develop pride of achievement, develop fitness to be free. These opportunities are lost if somebody else goes in and does the job for them. That is the fundamental vice in the bill.

We went into a tail spin after the World War. We went mighty low. The people are struggling out of it now. They are still confused. But they want things wrong made right. The support of this bill is evidence of that fact. But the most deadly thing that could be done to this people, to their opportunity to become fit now, would be for a supergovernmental agency to do for them the things which in their State and community governments they can do and should do for themselves, and thereby rob the people now of the strength, the pride of independence, the virtue of self-reliance, and all the other qualities which make men fit to be free and able to defend their freedom. These are the qualities which the country needs now and must have.

Even now there are signs that the people are anxious to undertake the task of gaining lost ground. It is an interesting fact, however, that the demand for Federal legislation of this sort increases in almost exact proportion to the decrease in the necessity for it. It would be impossible to have strong support for a Federal law of this kind until public opinion and public purpose to clean up politics had developed to the point that it either has been, or soon will be, done in the smaller units of government by the people themselves.

The other sort of government functions from the top downward. The only difference between them, whether that of Russia, of Italy, of Germany, or of a great centralized bureaucracy, is the kind of machinery through which they function. This bill shows them the way and establishes the precedent. First, we drain the States of resources by Federal taxation, thereby making the States dependent upon the Federal Treasury for the money upon which to operate. Then, following the plans and precedents of this bill, Washington can attach any condition it pleases to this money it sends back to the States, and the job will be completed. There is a difference in the details of procedure through which these types of government functioning from the top downward operate and perpetuate themselves, but not in essence.

If we may say so without offense, and we certainly do not mean to be offensive, it is our judgment, after a careful examination of this bill and its far-reaching effect upon the governmental structure of our States and their security, and upon the governmental capacity of their peoples, that it proposes a deeper thrust into the vitals of our democratic institutions in favor of bureaucracy than any of which we have known in the history of this Government. In the first place, it proposes a Federal activity denied by the Constitution to the Federal Government. It opens up a route around established constitutional barriers protecting the people against bureaucratic control in order to attack from the rear the reserved rights of governmental responsibilities of the States and of their smaller communities. We respectfully insist that these are not things of sentimental or academic importance merely, but they are as important as the hope and opportunity of this people to remain free.

The distinctive characteristics of this bill, as provided in section 12 (a) is the proposed extension of the Federal power over State, county, city, village, and precinct elections, including primary elections, and over the opportunity for employment of private citizens of the States and over the States themselves. Of course, there is no constitutional warrant to do this. There being no constitutional power, and no warrant in the philosophy or experience of free representative government, it is proposed by this bill to proceed indirectly through an extra-constitutional power acquired by getting more money from the people of the States than is expended for Federal purposes and sending a part of that money back to the States and their communities with the Federal power attached to control the States, their subdivisions, and citizens.

We realize that the obligation to support and defend the Constitution sits lightly upon the shoulders of many these days, but it might be mentioned, at least in passing, that this proposed legislation is without constitutional authority. By its intended and actual coercive effect, it impinges upon the sovereignty and governmental responsibility of the States and of their communities and upon the liberty of speech, action, and opportunity for employment of the private citizens of the States, in matters clearly within the exclusive governmental responsibility and capacity of the States, and that, too, with reference to one of the most basic of their governmental responsibilities—the election of their public officials.

This procedure, compelling the States to submit to a Federal control not authorized by the Constitution, by not letting them get back enough of the money, which their citizens had been compelled to pay into the Federal Treasury, to discharge their governmental duties, presents an important, fundamental question for the consideration of Members of Congress now. Shall we by the enactment of this legislation give our approval to doing and establish the precedent of doing in a circuitous way that which it is denied to us to do, both by the letter and spirit of the Constitution? In other words, are we willing to adopt the policy of blackmailing the States and their subdivisions into the surrender of their reserved powers? This bill shows the way. Just as the Supreme Court has the power to render any decision it wills to render, just as two-thirds majority of the House could expel all its opposition, we have this power by the control of this money to do this thing. The framers of the Constitution could not protect against the violation of the Constitution by certain officials of the Government from whose determination there is no appeal, except to the people.

It is provided by section 12 (b) that the deduction or fine to be levied against the States or their subdivisions specified, for each employee whom the agent of the Federal Government demands shall be discharged, and whom the State or subdivision does not discharge, is to be the amount of 2 years' salary of such person.

It is further provided by this bill that such person whom this agent demands shall be discharged may not be reemployed for 18 months by such State or subdivision in any capacity, even though the new employment may be on a project or in a capacity in which there is not one dollar contributed by the Federal Government.

This bill is far more important in its potential than in its immediate results. It is the most striking example which we have yet had of the Federal power following the Federal dollar. Congress by this bill endorses the policy and sets the precedent.

In opening the way for our rapidly developing bureaucracy to get around our constitutional barriers, in setting the precedent and in approving the policy, this bill is a rear attack upon the most intimate, vital, and necessary reserved powers of the States. We do a thing, the far-reaching consequences of which nobody can foresee.

If by this method we are to compel the States to surrender their exclusive control over their State and community elections, why may we not compel the States to a surrender of educational policy and of the schools themselves? It can be done. Why not everything? The Federal Government may tap the sources of State revenue, bring the money up here, and compel the States to do whatever Washington wants them to do under the policy of this bill in order to get their share of the money necessary to carry forward the States' own work.

This bill in section 12 (b) further provides that if an employee who has been discharged in one State succeeds in getting employment in any capacity in another State or local agency which receives loans or grants from a Federal agency, this Federal power pursues him whether he be policeman, street sweeper, or what not. This is the provision:

"Such order shall require the withholding of such amount (2 years' salary) from such other State or local agency" employing this man.

One of the prohibitions carried in this bill (sec. 12 (a)) is that "no such officer or employee shall take any active part * * * in political campaigns."

That language is followed by this language:

"All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose."

This is not some foreign dictator saying this to his people. That language is contained in this bill, which Members of Congress are in process of saying to the people who send them here.

Members of Congress and the people of the States should be advised that there is nothing in this bill that secures their people from being coerced by the Federal power which this bill establishes.

Is it not to be supposed, looking a little way down the road we are traveling, that a bureaucratic organization, seeking to perpetuate itself in power, might not "bump" these citizens off the pay roll who do not vote "right," from the standpoint of these people seeking to perpetuate themselves in power?

There is no question that they are being given the power under the provisions of this bill to do exactly that thing. We are dealing now solely with governmental power. Human nature and its disposition to use an arbitrary power does not change during the journey to Washington.

This bill does not eliminate the power of political coercion of voters but shifts it from those whom the people can control through local elections and prosecutions in their local courts to an appointed personnel operating from Washington whom the people of the communities can have no possibility of controlling.

As long as this responsibility and power is located in the communities of the States the people of the several communities at least have the governmental power and responsibility to protect themselves and their elections. They elect their chief enforcement officers. But when that power is brought to Washington, the individuals in the several communities have no possibility of protecting themselves against its arbitrary exercise. The fact that these new custodians of this power would not have to answer to the people of the communities where the power would be exercised ought to appeal to the caution and sound judgment of the Congress and the country.

Section 16 of the bill contains this language:

"Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivisions, to permit such persons to take an active part in political

management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns, * * *."

How much? We quote from the bill:

"To the extent the Commissioner deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons."

These provisions are not limited to Federal employees. They apply to every citizen who lives in these communities and has employment on jobs where these communities have got back for those jobs any part of the money which they have paid into the Federal Treasury either in taxes or in payment for bonds which they or their children or grandchildren or great-grandchildren must either pay, carry indefinitely, or repudiate.

These citizens of these communities are "permitted" by the terms of this bill to do with reference to the selection of the public officers for their communities not what their respective States permit, but what the Federal Civil Service Commission "deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons." The States themselves may be punished. This language, and it is in general harmony with the bill, we may have to remind ourselves, is not from some edict from the ruler of Russia or of Germany but is in a bill, this bill, seriously proposed and now more than half enacted by the American Congress.

There are other provisions of this bill which fall within the general governmental scope of the Corrupt Practices Act and of the Hatch bill passed last year, but it is the proposed extension of Federal power over the citizens of the States and over the elections in the States, both general and primary elections, and over the States themselves through the power to deduct Federal money where the demand of Federal agents is not complied with, which is the central, dominating characteristic and the controlling inspiration for this proposed legislation. This statement cannot be questioned.

This bill brings into clear vision not only the direction in which we are moving with reference to these two sorts of government, but also the distance which we have traveled. It also gives us a clear example of how the Federal power may be made to follow the Federal dollar.

Every student of our Government today must agree that, regardless of what may be the present attitude, only a few years ago it would have been inconceivable that the representatives of the people sent up from the several States would entertain a legislative proposition such as this bill, that can have no possible justification except upon the assumption that the people of the States have so degenerated in character and in governmental capacity that they can no longer be entrusted with the discharge of a governmental responsibility so vital to them and so completely within the governmental power of their community as their State and community elections. Just a few years ago it would have been inconceivable that chosen agents of the people of the States would ever actually favor a policy of compelling their States and their communities, in order to get back a part of the money which had been got from them, to submit to the character of degradation and governmental vassalage proposed to be imposed upon them by this bill. This bill is intended to compel an actual surrender of essential elements of sovereignty and self-respect and a surrender of their own employees to the character of bureaucratic power authorized by this bill to be exercised over them. But the worst thing is the removal from the people of the inescapable necessity to do the job of self-governing. It is perfectly ridiculous to remove that necessity and expect the power to remain. It is perfectly ridiculous for us to hope to escape some form of totalitarian government when the people shall have lost the power to govern themselves. It is our conviction that this Government is in far more danger from the inside jobs that are being done than from outside subversive activities, dangerous as they may be.

Section 12 (c) of the bill provides the right to resort to the Federal courts. Those who probably could afford to resort to these courts, however, are exempt from the provisions of the bill that—

"No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns."

Those thus exempted by the bill are the "Governor, or the Lieutenant Governor of any State, or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality (except civil-service employees); officers holding elective offices."

The little fellow without influence or money to fight his case may be ousted for the very things which these officials are specifically permitted to do. He has the right of resort to the Federal court, but in the meantime without any salary. This appointed Federal employee, under the provisions of this bill, by the coercion which this bill authorizes to be exercised over the States, may stop the salary of this State employee working on a State job. The bill provides in subsection (c) of section 12:

"Such officer or employee is suspended from his office or employment during the pendency of such proceedings [court proceedings]."

He may go even to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, as a practical matter, for the average State employee below the grade exempted by the language of the bill referred to, is about the same as telling him there is somebody in the moon who might protect him against the arbitrary power to which his Congressman had subjected him if he would go there and tell him about it.

There is now an encouraging and widespread revolution against political corruption. There are two courses we may pursue—enact a law like this bill and let the pressure of this revolution blow itself out in the enactment of a Federal law and let the people go home and go to sleep again, or to refuse to do that by defeating this bill and letting the pressure of that revolution force its way back into the States and their communities, where it will find expression in community action, and result in the promotion of the civic decency and fitness of the people to govern, in an increase of their will to govern, a belief in their right to govern, and in an increase in their confidence in their ability to govern, and in the strengthening of their determination to govern. That is what this country needs and must have if it is to survive.

We believe in the ability of the American people, even in this complex age, to maintain an efficient system of free government, but only if we preserve and increase that ability by holding in the smaller units of government which the people can control, those governmental duties which are within the governmental capacities of these units to discharge.

We do not have the slightest question as to the high purpose actuating the support of this bill. We are persuaded, however, that the anxiety to remedy conditions in certain sections has prevented an examination of the deep, far-reaching, and disastrous consequences which would result from the approval of this bill, and particularly from the precedent it would establish and the governmental policy which the Congress would thereby inaugurate and sanction of using Federal money got from the States to compel the States to surrender their independence and governmental responsibility and submit themselves and their people to the domination of a supergovernment operating from Washington.

HATTON W. SUMNERS.
ZEBULON WEAVER.
SAM HOBBS.
EDWARD W. CREAL.
DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.
JAMES M. BARNES,
W. BEN GIBBS.
ESTES KEFAUVER.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. FRED BRADLEY, at Bluefield, W. Va., on May 31:

I feel highly honored in being invited to address you. I realize and I wholeheartedly accept the responsibility placed upon me because of my friendship for, and your confidence in, my very able—my very distinguished colleague and my very good friend, the Honorable "ANDY" SCHIFFLER. In him you have a true patriot, a loyal American and a most distinguished and industrious Representative of the State of West Virginia. West Virginia should indeed feel highly honored by the representation afforded it by the Honorable ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER.

These are indeed difficult times for any one in public life to adequately express himself and avoid misinterpretation. As a matter of fact, I had rather adopted this slogan, "We in Washington hear so much, it behooves us to say so little."

Our New Deal brethren in Washington now continually prate about unity. Of course, we are a united people, patriotically dedicated to the preservation of these United States. But at this moment in Washington, the majority's idea of unity is complete capitulation of the minority. For one to dare to question—much less criticize—the will of the New Deal majority is to be branded as disloyal and unpatriotic—while to differ with the slightest whim of the President is practically treason.

Well, you and I, I know, feel differently about this question of unity. In 1918 we fought in Europe to make this world safe for democracy—we fought the war to end all wars. We know the second objective was a tragic failure. Let us not permit the first to become a complete wash-out. This is the last big democracy intact today. Let us not be guilty of creating a Hitleresque dictatorship here. Let us not confess a total abolition of democratic virile two-party government here is necessary to successfully cope with the madcap Hitler of Europe today. It is the solemn duty of the Members of the minority in our free land to keep a checkrein on the majority at all times. Therefore let no man question the loyalty nor patriotism of any duly elected minority Member of our Congress when, in these days of national concern, he frankly and from his very heart speaks forth the facts he has learned from

reams of evidence made available to him in committees, on the floor of the House, or in innumerable other ways while he is conscientiously striving to discharge his constitutional oath of office.

Oh, my friends, you recall these words of the sage:

"God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions, and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps."

So, Mr. Chairman, we here are Republicans and we're proud of it. Last Wednesday afternoon, on May 22, I heard the Majority Leader of the House make this statement, and I quote:

"* * * and in the months to come, they're going to find out (meaning we Republicans) that that glimmer of hope which they had after the election in 1938 when they had such an overwhelming victory that they left a majority of only 92 Democrats in the House—that small glimmer of hope which they had then is not flaming quite so brightly as it was a few months ago, and it will continue to flicker and flicker, and perhaps instead of carrying 46 States of the Union in November 1940 it will have then flickered out, and the vote for the Democrats will be unanimous." (And I ought to add this from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—"applause"— on the Democratic side.)

Now what is the matter with the Republican Party?

Are we going to take a statement like that lying down? Are we going to adopt a defeatist attitude? Are we going to accept, lying down, a one-party government in this country—and there is no question but that this administration and this New Deal Party expect it—are we going to take that lying down, or are you and I as true Americans going to fight our way out? It's up to you. It's up to me.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have chosen as the title of my speech tonight, Where Do We Go From Here?

In this group here I know I do not have to tell you where we are. I do not have to remind you or any other loyal Americans of the shortcomings of this administration. I do not have to remind you of the proven gross inadequacies of this administration to cope with the domestic problem. And if it can't cope with our domestic problems, how can it cope with international problems? I do not have to remind you, for example, that at the end of the preceding 144½ years before the Roosevelt administration our total public debt was approximately twenty-two and one-half billion dollars, while at this moment the national debt is almost $45,000,000,000, if not over that, thereby an increase of approximately $23,000,000,000 over 8 years. In other words, a greater indebtedness has been accumulated in 8 years than all the preceding Presidents were able to pile up in the preceding 144 years. I don't have to remind you of that. You are all aware of it. I do not have to recall to your mind the gross miscarriages of justice in the administration of the W. P. A., the farm program, the C. C. C., the social security, and other maladministered, though highly idealized and publicized, beneficent measures of the holier-than-thou New Deal.

I do not have to remind you that last week—under White House pressure—on the relief bill, if you please, we appropriated a half million dollars for the Office of Government Reports. We call it the "Ogre," and we had previously turned it down twice this year on other bills. That's a honey, that one. A glorified clipping service so the tomcats of the New Deal can learn how they sounded on the backyard fence the night before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate, I do not want to dwell on the unfortunate, the tragic developments in Europe in a world gone mad. I need not repeat them here now. We are all aware of them; not a man or woman in this room but what is sincerely concerned with them and in anguish over them. And in going into this subject also, may I say that I full well appreciate that in many parts of this Nation, perhaps in this district right here, due to administration propaganda, I may be touching on a very difficult subject. I may be sticking my head in the noose when I arise not in opposition but, at least, in a spirit of questioning the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is, indeed, fortunate that the Orson Welles' broadcast of the story of the war of the worlds preceded the recent message of the President as it was so dramatically presented to the assembled Houses of the Congress of the United States, and, incidentally, to the people of the United States and the world on Thursday, May 16. And may I say that, even in the city of Washington, it was not only presented to us so dramatically by a personal appearance of the President but it was, indeed, recorded and rebroadcast, not once but three different times, during that same evening in the city of Washington itself. Now, surely, no living, sane individual in this country can tell me that we are in so imminent danger of invasion that that was necessary. As a matter of fact, only last Sunday, in his "fireside chatter" he tried to pull the "fire" out of his dramatic message to the Congress and to reassure the people that everything is going to be all right. So, by his own words, his message to the Congress largely stands repudiated. It was publicity—it was political publicity—a political publicity stunt from start to finish. I say that and I demand or challenge a denial. It was personally and dramatically staged by the President not to arouse the Congress of the United States, not to call our attention to our state of unpreparedness, not to call our attention to the alarming state of affairs in Europe, not to call our attention to the demagogic stated need for unity in this Nation, but it was staged purely and simply for one purpose—to alarm and arouse the American people. It was the first political speech aimed at a third-term nomination.

Oh, I say to you it was well that Orson Welles months ago broadcast his war of the worlds, broadcast his imaginary parachute invasion of every city, village, and hamlet of the United States—yes, of St. Louis, Mo., and of Bluefield, W. Va.

Mr. Chairman, in the words of my good friend, the Honorable DAN REED, of New York, "I shall support an adequate defense program, but I reserve the right as a Representative in Congress to use every legitimate effort to prevent this administration from leading this Nation into the war now raging abroad. The people of this Nation have had one experience of keeping out of war until after election, and unless I miss my guess, they will not repeat the experiment of the political duplicity of 1916."

Now let us examine the President's speech of May 16 to the effect that the Congress and the President are a team as far as national defense is concerned. That, therefore, after we adjourn he would not hesitate to call us back into special session if some unusual defense requirement demanded it.

Now listen, you folks, how can you drive a team of horses when the horses are out in the field and the driver back in the barn? As far as I am concerned, it is far less important to me that I get back into my district and campaign—that I run away from my duties in Washington—than it is that I stay on the job where I belong, in Washington, during this crisis, and that the Congress remain in session and that as the President requests, we act as a team with him in this present international crisis. But do you think we'll do it? Not a bit of it. The latest dope I had when I left Washington this morning was to the effect that Congress would adjourn and be sent home with the blessings of this administration.

Congress should remain in session, the American people demand it, and I shall vote against adjournment of this session.

Just exactly what is the situation with respect to foreign purchase? This war has been going on since last September. As a matter of fact, we had Allied purchasing missions in this country before that. To date they have taken delivery on less than 800 American planes. In effect they demanded we give them the latest and best of the types we had available, not only in production or in existence, but those that we had on the drafting table as well, while balking at paying any part of the development costs.

Now I appreciate the benefit of letting someone have the latest type airplanes we can produce in order to ably cope with those last produced by the dictators. I appreciate the logic in the suggestion, albeit a rather satanical suggestion, that we must of necessity let the battle-strewn clouds of Europe be a testing ground for our fighting craft. And that based on those experiences, and based on those sales, we shall be able to build up our aircraft manufacturing industry to a point where we shall ever be able to produce the most efficient, the most effective aircraft in the greatest quantities ever known to mankind. But an aircraft on paper cannot fight. It must be on the airport ready to take the air, manned by a capable crew, equipped with the best of self-protective devices, and full of the best of fuel in order to cope with any adversary. Therefore, I sincerely feel in the interests of self-preservation, the first law of nature, that we should adopt this policy. First we must decide upon what we are going to defend; namely, the continental United States, or secondly, the continental United States and its possessions, or thirdly, the continental United States, its possessions, and South America, Canada, Greenland, and the rest of this hemisphere which comes under the Monroe Doctrine. That should determine the numbers and types of aircraft necessary to meet any and all challenges from abroad, and, having determined upon the classifications and quantities required, then I say to you, our first duty should be to order and procure in fighting condition those aircraft of the latest design of which we are capable, and having done that, let us deliver them to foreign nations off this end of the line only as many of those aircraft as we can furnish of the latest and most efficient design as we can add onto this other end of the line. In other words, I want to see the armed forces of this Nation, the aerial arm of the defenses of this Nation, kept as near to the maximum of efficiency as we are capable of maintaining it, and then—and only then—should we release our aircraft abroad.

Now, I know there are those in this Nation, there are probably those in this audience who feel that that is entirely too selfish. Who feel that perhaps the President was right when he said our frontiers are in France. There are those who perhaps entirely misguided—and I say that conscientiously because it is not founded on fact—believe that should the dictator nations conquer the Allies, we will come next. To them, I say that the only way in which I personally am willing to concede a point in this aerial argument is this. Based on the fact that we still have 3,000 miles of ocean on the Atlantic side and 5,000 on the west, based upon that fact, I might be willing for the moment to go 50-50, in other words, I might be willing to send one of our

latest and most modern ships abroad for each duplicate ship that is turned over to the armed forces of this Nation and in the interest of our own safety. No further than that would I go.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go into another phase of the President's speech. He stated:

"This means military implements—not on paper—which are ready and available to meet any lightning offensive against our American interests. It means also that facilities for production must be ready to turn out munitions and equipment at top speed."

Now that is a perfectly logical position. No man in his right mind can be critical of that, but I want to ask you this. What has the President done with the money we have appropriated for national defense during the past 8 years?

From 1925 to 1932 our annual average for Army and Navy defense and maintenance was $634,351,098. During the New Deal from 1933 to 1940 the average was $1,027,424,154, which includes the allotments of emergency funds separately allocated to defense. Now what have we gotten out of it? I'm asking you. As a Member of Congress, I can't find out definitely. The Army Air Corps, for example, will not tell me as a Member of Congress how many airplanes it actually has in modern fighting condition right at this moment. And the President himself, in his fireside chatter of last Sunday evening, utterly failed to take the American people into his confidence and disclose the true condition of our defense. There is a grave difference between "on hand and on order."

Last week Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, testified that a force of 70,000 now maneuvering in Louisiana and Texas, and the Third Division on the west coast, has no reserves of material or men. And I quote him.

"In other words," he said, "if they were bombed actually instead of theoretically today, there is no duplicate truck to take the place of the one destroyed.

"If our pilots who are operating in those maneuvers today were shot down, we have not the replacements in actual pilots to take their places. We have replacements of planes, or rather we will have them, when production comes to current orders."

General Marshall also stated to the Military Affairs Committee that as the situation now stands, the Army's lack of guns and fighting equipment makes it impossible for the United States to capitalize on its greatest national asset—man power—because without adequate material a soldier is in a hopeless, tragic situation on the battlefield. General Arnold, the Chief of the Army Air Corps, stated that our present best bomber, the twin-engined D-18, if "sent out against modern equipment would be suicide."

Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, told the committee that the Army was so short of ammunition that the situation was so serious that "it ought to be emblazoned on the Flatiron Building so that the public would know."

O Mr. President, what have you done with these billions we have given you? If you couldn't prepare our Army in peacetime, how can we trust you to prepare it in times of international crisis?

And, then, 10 days ago the President summoned to Washington the leading aircraft manufacturers of the country. They were to lay plans, as he stated, for the production of 50,000 planes annually. What happened to that? The leaders in the aircraft industry of the United States were in Washington for only 1 day, on May 20. They left the city in disgust, after attending a meeting designed to throw the aircraft industry into high gear.

After listening to the Army chief confess that this whole thing was thrown at them so fast they did not have a chance to prepare, some of those key industrialists left, charging, "It's all an administration publicity stunt; they do not even have a plan."

Mr. President, in this question of preparedness you have been as woefully inefficient, as woefully extravagant, as woefully incapable as you have been in many other of your New Deal experiments of the past 8 years. And in November of this year, Mr. President, the American public—the thinking public—is going to prove to you that neither you, nor Hitler, nor Mussolini, nor any other dictator armed with all the dictatorial powers which you have built up around you, armed with the dictatorial powers that are now prevalent in Gerat Britain and France, are going to prevail in this free America. America needs no dictatorial powers to wage a war of defense. America needs no regimentation, and will accept none, except the regimentation of patriotism which it has always had, and which, praise God, it will always retain to defend its shores and its ideals and traditions against any foreign invader.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been dwelling at length—too long, I fear—upon this subject of what we call national defense, and by that I mean our armed defenses. Now I want to dwell upon what I consider a far greater menace to our security than the threat of a foreign invader landing on our shores. I refer, of course, to the menace of the "fifth column," to the menace of the Trojan horse.

O Mr. Chairman, I appreciate every man and woman in this room, myself included; all of us were either immigrants at one time, or our ancestors were when they came to this country. For one, I shall always welcome to these shores those oppressed peoples of foreign nations, but I do insist that when they come to this country of ours, seeking the freedom which we alone can give them, that they come here openly, unembarrassed and unashamed, craving that freedom, but agreeing among all things, as a guest in my own home would do, that they live as we ask them to live—under our laws and under our ideals and traditions of government. When those do not suffice, after a trial, then I say that they are no longer welcome, any more than an unwelcome guest would be in my own home. When they do not want to live as we, their hosts, want them to live, then I say to them, "Get back where you came from because America does not want you"; and the sooner we wake up to that menace, the sooner we drive those undesirables out of this country, the better off and the more secure we'll be.

Within the past week the President has finally publicly recognized this menace. He proposed, a week ago, Reorganization Plan No. V, to take the Bureau of Immigration out of the Labor Department and transfer it to the Department of Justice, which we, in the House unanimously approved last Monday—this, after our good friend "Ma" Perkins had been shielding Harry Bridges and every other known type of criminal alien in this country for years.

You all know what a remarkable record has been achieved by the G-men—by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They have working agreements with practically every nation on earth and for many years, through interchange of fingerprints of aliens taken upon arrival in this country, they were able to stop international crooks, dope peddlers, prostitutes, spies, and other criminals at our shores.

I regret that I haven't the time this evening to even begin to tell you all I know about the existence of the Trojan horse and the "fifth column" in this Nation. There are in Bluefield, I appreciate, a great many among you who, perhaps, are members of the United Mine Workers of America and the C. I. O. I hope that every one of you in this room who has the opportunity will carefully read the speech delivered by MARTIN DIES in the House on Friday, May 17; and if I may say so—with becoming modesty—I hope you will all find an opportunity to read the speech which I made in the House on May 13, both dealing with this subject about which the President has since become concerned.

Now, let me make one point clear before I start in on this subject. I know of no organization, no body of men, in this country for whom I have a more sincere or more profound respect for their loyalty and patriotism than I do for the United Mine Workers, for the rank and file of the men in that union and in the C. I. O. But I say to you right now that if there are in your midst disloyal, un-American leaders or members, I hope and pray to God you'll have the courage to drive them out of your ranks and expose them to the public for what they are before the public loses the faith in you that I hold for you.

Now please do not misunderstand me and imagine for one moment that I am saying these "termites" are to be found only in the ranks of labor. They are to be found everywhere and anywhere, in all walks of life. We have but to look to the teachings and the utterances of these dictators to determine the classes of people whom they have imbued with their spirit, the classes of people whom they have selected to bore from within, making dupes, if you please, of honest but misguided and misinformed people in this country. Here is what Lenin himself advocates as the nucleus for the Communist Party in this country—and I quote him: "A small kernel consisting of reliable, experienced, and steeled workers with responsible agents in the chief districts and connected by all the rules of strict conspiracy." Again he says—and I quote: "Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries."

Are they here? Earl Browder, the present head of the Communist Party in the United States, has himself estimated that there are nearly 2,000,000 Americans who go with the Communist Party all the way to its full program. In an official pamphlet of the Communist Party of the United States, Leon Platt has this to say: "American workers, when called upon to go to this war against the Soviet Union, must refuse to fight the Russian workers and go over on the side of the red army. The American workers, like the Russian workers in 1917, must turn an imperialistic war into a civil war against their real enemies, the capitalist class of the United States, which exploits and oppresses the American working class." Earl Browder, before the Dies committee, testified that he would try to precipitate this country into a civil war in the event of a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. Thus, my friends, do we learn something about the aims, the villainous aims, of the conspiracy of the Communist Party financed by and acting under direct orders from the Communist headquarters in Moscow. And yet, when the American Youth Congress was in Washington some months ago, the President of the United States himself told those misguided youths that it was perfectly legal and proper for them if they so desire to become members of the Communist Party in the United States.

Now let us look at the Nazis. How does Herr Hitler operate? How did he bring about the sudden collapse of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, and Holland? Listen to his words, and I quote him:

"When I wage war, troops will suddenly appear. * * * They will march through the streets in broad daylight. * * * No one will stop them. Everything has been thought out to the last detail. They will march to the headquarters of the general staff. * * * The confusion will be beyond belief. But I shall long have had relations with the men who will form a new government—a government to suit me. We will find such men; we shall find them in every country; we shall not need to bribe them. They will come of their own accord.

"Ambition and delusion, party squabbles and self-seeking arrogance will drive them. * * * Our strategy is to destroy the enemy from within, to conquer him through himself."

Now again I want to make this clear, I cast no aspersions whatsoever on the loyalty or on the patriotism of millions of German-Americans in this country. There are many of them in my own district, as fine citizens as you and I. But I do say that there are in this country today thousands of dyed-in-the-wool Nazis who

would not hesitate for one moment to carry out the orders—and are right now acting under the orders of Herr Hitler. Just a few weeks ago in Washington, I was told by one of the key men in the Department of Justice that they had voluntarily and were carefully following the movements of thousands of foreign secret agents in this country. They were keeping track of them and keeping aware of their movements and their actions by the process of wire tapping. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has employed wire tapping for only four types of criminal cases. Kidnapping, coercion, sabotage, and espionage. They were keeping careful track of these termites and then through that old bogeyman, the cry against the violation of civil liberties in a Senate committee, pressure was put upon the Attorney General, Robert Jackson, and he issued an order prohibiting all wire tapping by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And so now these men are roaming this free land of ours at will while they are unimpeded in their attempt to bore from within and bring about the very destruction of the land you and I love so well.

I hold in my hand a list of some 563 officials and employees of this Government alone in the city of Washington who, according to testimony before the Dies committee, are members of the Communist Party or follow their leadership and carry out their orders. In my speech of the 13th, I outlined at length how the policies and aims of the Communist-controlled National Maritime Union were put into effect and are being carried out through the connivance of a man no less than Harry Hopkins' brother-in-law David K. Niles, who pulls the strings in the Department of Commerce, and who has direct contact with the topmost figures in our National Government.

Yes; it is about time we wake up in this country. I don't blame the President for becoming alarmed, because he knows these subversive elements have grown up under the very noses of, and often coddled and nourished by, some of our highest-placed officials in Washington.

Mr. President, if you are truly alarmed about a "fifth column" prove it by driving these vultures off their nests of carrion within the inner temple of your administration.

My friends, let us gird ourselves to legal preparedness against our enemies from within. As MARTIN DIES so ably stated in effect on the floor on the 17th: Our first defense against these termites should be the prompt enforcement of the laws that are now on our statute books and fully capable in most cases to cope with this Trojan horse, with this "fifth column."

By all means, let us speed up preparedness in this Nation—armed preparedness against invasion from without. Let us accomplish that preparedness under the leadership of men trained in the efficient expenditure of large sums of money, under the leadership of men trained in the efficient mass production of aircraft, of automobiles, of tractors, of munitions. Let us not entrust that responsibility alone to those men whose primary training has been in the military use of such equipment rather than in the production of it. As the President stated, arms and munitions on paper cannot defend this Nation. Let us not entrust this expenditure to starry-eyed New Deal politicians whose only claim to fame during the past years has been in their proven ability to pour money down the rat hole, to chase good dollars after bad. This huge expenditure should be directed by men who can assure a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

But finally, let us remember this. We have more problems on our home front, more local problems, more domestic problems within the confines of the Atlantic and Pacific than we had back in 1933. We still have 11,000,000 unemployed in this land, we still have a grave agricultural problem, we still have a social-security problem, we still have a mass of inefficiency in the operation of every branch of Government, and we are still continuing to spend for peaceful pursuits $8 for every $5 we are taking in. The widest breach in the wall of our national defense is the stupendous national debt which we did not have in 1933.

Let us not lose sight of those facts. Let not this White House inspired war hysteria blind us to our domestic problems. We recognize the need for preparedness, we are willing to pay for it, but those plans for the proper payment of this program should not be left over for the next administration.

As long last, due to Republican pressure, the administration leaders have recognized this fact, and so it is to be hoped that this Congress will pass a tax measure which will at least make a start toward paying this bill. However, we learn with dismay it is now proposed to raise the legal debt limit and resort to more borrowing.

We are told this is an emergency. Our greatest emergency is our national bank roll. Why in heaven's name doesn't the administration come forth with a definite plan to finance this on a pay-as-you-go basis? Fellow Republicans, this is an emergency—a national emergency—but it is our emergency and we should pay for it in cash—now. We have no right to pass this presently created debt on to our children and our children's children. It should be anything but comforting to this administration to realize that they have squandered, and wasted, and thrown away our money and credit the past few years until now the bank roll is exhausted.

Oh yes, Congress and the President should be, and are, a team, as the President stated, and should work together. I say to you again, this matter of payment should be carefully thought out and a pay-as-you-go plan decided upon. Therefore Congress should stay in session. And when I say work together I do not mean that Congress should blindly follow every whim of the occupant of the White House. At least he should be willing to reason with the 435 elected Members of the House of Representatives and the 96 Senators, elected to office just as he was by the people of the United States, by you and by me.

And so I say to you Republicans, to you young men and women before me here tonight, if there was ever a time in this land when you should bend every effort to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress, it is right in this year of 1940. It is up to you to work like you've never worked before. It is up to you to promote harmony within our ranks. It is up to you to start working right now and work to the very end of the campaign in November.

Remember this, both France and England have found it necessary "to change horses in the middle of the stream." It was their only hope.

So do not get panicky in the face of all this third-term talk. Remember this: If you draft Roosevelt, he will draft you. It's up to you to save America.

Thank you and good night.

Memorial Address to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN, AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL MASONIC MEMORIAL SHRINE, ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me last evening:

When half the world today is aflame with war and hatred, it is fitting that we should come here to this peaceful shrine to again derive fresh inspiration and hope from the life and character of that mighty man and Mason, George Washington. From any and every angle, his versatility furnishes an example for emulation. Whether in war or in peace, whether as Master Mason or country gentleman, or as engineer or President, or as banker or realtor, or in any relationship of his many-sided life—in all spheres of which he was proficient—this generation, whatever our occupation or profession, may look to him to guide us and our country in the right way.

"A people is but the attempt of many
To rise to the completer life of one;
And those who live as models for the mass
Are singly of more value than they all.

"Keep but the model safe.
New men will rise to study it."

That we are in the midst of a great world crisis is unquestionable, and mere politics of the kind that deals only with the ponderables of the situation is impotent to solve our problems. But that brand of politics, of which our first President bore the imprint was the essence of true statesmanship which took into account the imponderables, the spirit of this American Republic. These offer a solution, based as they were upon eternal verities and those true principles which our founding fathers chose in the light of mankind's experience in the quest for a stable government of the people.

Knocking at the very gateway and citadel of the birthplace of freedom is a vast military machine seeking to overthrow Christian civilization and the heritage of liberty and to establish upon their ruins the iron rule of dictatorship. Yet, thank God, there stands a valiant and courageous liberty-loving people with this challenge:

"My name is Liberty
From out a mighty land
I face the ancient sea,
I lift to God my hand;
By day in Heaven's light,
A pillar of fire by night.
At ocean's gate I stand
Nor bend the knee."

Not far from this hallowed place the Virginia Bill of Rights, older than the Declaration of Independence, was written by George Mason, farmer friend and compatriot of Washington, and an intrepid advocate of freedom. That immortal document embodied the ideals which the French philosopher Rousseau had popularized as being the "natural rights of man."

At this crucial period in our history let us for a brief moment recur to just one sentence of that basic document, the forerunner

of the Declaration, from which Jefferson drew much of his inspiration. Listen to these words, pregnant with meaning for us today as well as for those in the days of Washington and Mason:

"The blessings of liberty can only be preserved by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

This was the thought and those were the principles which animated and motivated the founders of this Republic, and upon such a foundation we should stand unswervingly against any enemy without or any enemy within seeking to undermine it.

We have no room in this country for a dictator. Washington was tempted to become one. A body of Army officers attempted to make him a monarch. Those officers planned not only a mutiny of the Army but a coup d'etat in which they had aimed to set up a monarchy. They wrote to Washington their intentions and expressed their belief that he would be an ideal monarch. This offer, Washington replied, "he must view with abhorrence and reprehend with severity." "I am at a loss," he said, "to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which seems to me to be big with the greatest mischief that can befall our country. If I am not deceived in the knowledge of myself, you could not have found a person to whom your schemes are more disagreeable. Let me conjure you then if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind and never communicate as from yourself or anyone else a sentiment of like nature."

Doubtless when some time later Washington wrote a letter to Lafayette he had in mind the one to Col. Lewis Nichols, just quoted. To Lafayette he wrote:

"There cannot in my judgment be the least danger that the President will by any practical intrigue ever be able to continue himself in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then, there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though when a people shall become incapable of governing themselves, and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes."

If Washington were alive today, he might be inclined to be specific and say, "If the people are incapable of governing themselves it makes no difference if their master be a Hitler, or a Stalin, or a Mussolini, or somebody else."

Grover Cleveland, a great President, speaking of the Constitution, said:

"To us is delivered this ark of the people's covenant, and to us is given the duty to shield it from impious hands. It has been found sufficient in the past, and it will be found sufficient in all the years to come if the American people are true to their sacred trust."

Each of us here today is a receptacle of the faith of our fathers. In us, as in a safety-deposit box, are the securities, security against tyranny, security of our persons and property, security of our rights, and a due sense of our obligations. Let us, therefore, go forth from this sacred place, with the example of Washington before us, holding fast to our priceless relics, resolved to "keep the securities of the faith intact," by adherence to the principles transmitted to us by Washington and the men who established this American Republic.

Perkins Answers Taber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins to Representative JOHN TABER, as follows:

MAY 27, 1940.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: I have just had called to my attention your speech in the House today with regard to the reorganization order transferring the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Department of Justice. You are quoted as having said:

"We are going to vote for this reorganization plan because the President has not the patriotism nor the courage to remove the Secretary of Labor, a notorious incompetent, and one who for the last 7 years has steadily and steadfastly failed and refused to enforce the immigration law, and continuously admitted and kept here those who were not entitled to stay."

I have no objection to your expressing your opinion about my competency. That is a matter of personal judgment and you are unquestionably entitled to yours. I feel, however, that I must raise objection to that part of your statement which professes to be a statement of fact, namely, "That I have for the last 7 years steadily and steadfastly refused to enforce the immigration law and admitted and kept here persons not entitled to stay." This statement is not true, nor is it a mere expression of opinion.

The immigration law has been enforced faithfully and effectively during the last 7 years. For the first 4 of these 7 years the Immigration Service was in charge of the Commissioner, Col. Daniel J. MacCormack, an officer in the United States Army with a long record of effectiveness, efficiency, and patriotism. I appointed him for these reasons and directed him to enforce the law fairly and faithfully. We were confronted on the threshold of our duties with not only certain undesirable situations of administration which had been denounced by the Wickersham committee appointed by President Hoover, but by clear evidence of corruption in certain offices. It was our duty to correct these things and we did so. We directed our attention not only at the deportation of aliens not legally entitled to remain in the country, but also took vigorous steps to prevent the illegal entrance of aliens, including the smuggling of aliens, falsification of immigration documents, fraudulent activities in naturalization proceedings, all of which were found to be going on under the administration of the law.

We have reorganized and expanded the border patrol, one of the most effective branches of the service, for the prevention of illegal entry. We completely motorized the service with radio-call system and provided for the modern supervision in training of that service. We developed a system of education and training for naturalization, which is practical and aims to enable the courts to make proper selection of those who are attached to the principles of the Constitution and so eligible for citizenship. These policies have been continued under Commissioner J. Lawrence Houghteling.

I also appointed a committee of experts, external to the Department (Dimock, Hart, and McIntyre) to study the problems of immigration. On the basis of their report a reorganization in the interests of making the service still more effective and of giving to the people in the field a better knowledge of the law and the court decisions is being set up. A classification survey of positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Field Service has been completed in the interests of greater efficiency, following the recommendations of the committee.

The changes made, at times misrepresented by some, were designed to improve the system. They have cleared up irregularities and dishonest situations, and have accomplished many of the reforms badly needed and recommended in the report of President Hoover's Wickersham committee in 1931.

Every person admitted, temporarily or otherwise, to the United States during my administration of the immigration law has been admitted in accordance with the laws as enacted by the Congress of the United States. These admissions for brief periods as temporary visitors have been under proper safeguards. In a number of deportation cases involving no subversive or criminal charges, but which would have meant separation of families and the abandonment of American citizens, I have deferred making effective final deportation orders while legislation giving relief in these cases was pending in Congress. These cases have been reported to the Immigration Committees of Congress which were considering them in connection with private bills, and with proposals for general remedial legislation.

Throughout my administration the immigration law has been enforced energetically, fairly, and humanely under my direction.

I have been in public office for many years. I have a reputation for service to the public and for faithfulness in discharge of public duty, and for placing the public interest above any other, which I am sure you will admit I should and must defend in fairness to those who have placed their confidence in me, as well as to myself. I have tolerated many expressions of opinions adverse to me personally in my administration of this Department, believing that it was not in the interest of the public to raise personal objections to the free expression of opinion, however unfavorable. Some of the expressions led to statements on the floor of the House and to impeachment proceedings. These charges finally culminated in an investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary resulting in a finding of lack of any evidence to evade responsibility to enforce the law, or of failing or neglecting or refusing to enforce the law against any alien.

Your statement of today, however, I feel I should not accept without protest. Since it was offered as fact, sir, I believe that it is in the interests of justice not only to me but to the 4,000 men and women of the Immigration Service who have faithfully carried out the law, since they cannot speak for themselves, that this letter be made public.

I know that many things are said in the heat of political controversy which one does not wish to stand by, and I am sure you will understand that I bear you no personal animosity, but wish to correct the record. I realize that these statements were made under a rule of immunity which Members of Congress have and for that reason I am sure you will be the first to wish to correct anything that is misleading therein.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

America's Greatest Danger Is Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when Roosevelt was first elected there was a vague rumor which went the rounds that he would be the last President of the United States. Very few, if any, gave that rumor a second thought but, in view of recent events, it is all too apparent that he and some of his adherents, who depend upon his coattails for their jobs, are quite convinced that he and they are quite indispensable.

In fact, the President at one time sought to disarm those who were becoming fearful that he was driving toward a dictatorship by getting up in the middle of the night and telling the public through the newspaper reporters that he had no thought of being a dictator. Perhaps he meant that when he said it but it is now certain that he has changed his mind, for last night, he said, according to this morning press, that he saw no good reason why Congress should continue in session for the duration of the emergency, as desired by the Republican Members. Sarcastically, he said, the press reports, the situation does not require Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches.

So he has evidently reached that point where he considers himself all-sufficient, notwithstanding his record of complete failure to meet the problems which have confronted him during the past 7 years. He now sees himself as a dictator, and like all dictators, cannot tolerate the presence of the people's representatives. So like a dictator, he would send the people's representatives home in order that there may be no check on his actions.

An editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 20 shed some light on what we would get with Roosevelt in the White House for another term. That editorial is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 20, 1940]

THE THIRD TERM IN ITS TRUE LIGHT

The third termers are trying, as was expected, to turn the war excitement to their advantage. They think their timing has been good. They could foresee that the news of a German drive on Paris would cause a series of shocks in this country. It would present what might be the finale of a struggle for power in a world to be shaped by the outcome. Sentiment would be deeply stirred.

Mr. Roosevelt dramatized the moment before Congress. Many people who had not lost their heads began to show signs of having them turned. Commentators and public men began to talk nonsense about the united front, the adjournment of politics, and the rally around Roosevelt, the indispensable. It was proposed that the Republican convention should not be held and that there should be no election.

This is hysteria taking high jumps. When people sober down a little they will find that the timing was not good. It put the third term in its proper light just when it should be studied in relation to external and internal difficulties.

If the remainder of this year is to be one of great anxiety for the American people it ought not to find them divided by a serious constitutional question affecting their form of government. The third term will present a constitutional question. Tradition and usage have added an unwritten provision which declares it the sense of the country that a President shall not serve more than two terms. The tradition has never been broken. The first attempt to break it, particularly at this time when dictatorship is causing so much trouble and creating so much alarm, would divide the American people as they have not been divided since Civil War days.

Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy will do that. No other man's will. He alone can divide the country and he will if he demands renomination and gets it. The United States will go at once into a disrupting struggle, one it should avoid if there are external dangers. If there were no other reasons to stop all third-term talk, the war abroad is enough. It makes Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy a national danger.

He has proved himself incompetent to manage the peacetime economy of the United States. If the country is unprepared to meet emergency it is his fault. He spent the money. As a wartime Executive he would be a greater disaster.

The third termers speak of his experience as something which will be indispensable to the Nation for another 4 years, whatever happens abroad or at home. The worse things get abroad and at home the more Mr. Roosevelt's experience, so say the third termers, will be needed to pull this country through. Against Mr. Roosevelt's experience the American people may set their own. Their experience in the two terms should convince them that they could not stand a third term. In experience against experience the people have had the worst of it.

The experience of the people has been with the deepest and most protracted depression the country ever had. It has been an experience with constantly increasing debt and taxation, of stagnation in private investment, of continued and undiminished unemployment, and of continued and undiminished subsidies and doles.

The experience Mr. Roosevelt has gained has been in doing things from which the people suffer. It is an item in his experience that he must ask, in the eighth year of his two terms in the White House, for $1,111,000,000 to be spent for relief, nearly a billion of it to be expended as he sees fit in the next 8 months.

Mr. Roosevelt's experience has made him adroit in the use of public funds in the year of a national election. The reports to Congress are full of the scandals of it. The amount Mr. Roosevelt asks to relieve destitution by methods unknown in this country until he became President is about the amount he asks for emergency defense. The emergency is one created by his administration.

These are some of the experiences Mr. Roosevelt has had in the White House and they are some of the experiences the people have had with him as head of government. The record indicates to any person who will examine it that the country would have the greatest difficulty in surviving 4 more years of this as a self-governing, representative democracy. The planned society of which Mr. Roosevelt is the chief architect has brought the country to the choice between finding another Executive or taking another form of government, which will impose on the American people the economic conditions prevailing in Europe.

The people of Europe went into economic servitude because they were not in time able to get out of conditions such as Mr. Roosevelt's experience is imposing upon this country. It may be that when the third termers refer to the value of Mr. Roosevelt's experience they mean that, having prepared the country for a collapse into either economic anarchy or economic autocracy, he is the one man fitted to manage the autocracy. If you concede that that autocracy is desirable, the point about Mr. Roosevelt's experience can be taken into consideration with more intelligence.

The Organization and Administration of Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, GOVERNOR OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address by the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, Governor of Oregon, delivered June 3, 1940, at the Conference of Governors held at Duluth, Minn. Governor Sprague spoke on The Organization and Administration of Relief. His address follows:

THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF RELIEF

The more I study the problem of relief the more I am reminded of those characters in Greek mythology whose plights are part of the common legend of mankind: Tantalus and Sisyphus. Tantalus, you recall, was punished for revealing the secrets of his father, Zeus, by being plunged chin-deep in water. When he tried to drink, the water receded from his lips. When he sought to pick the luscious fruits that hung from boughs over his head they were raised just out of his reach. His plight suggests that of thousands of people in recent years who have become "reliefers."

Probably not a Governor here but has had them haunt his office. We have seen their need, and recognized it as real; and then realized how inadequate are the efforts to satisfy that need. All of us have heard the stories over and over again, the relief check which will not quite cover the rent and the provisions; dental service needed and no money to pay for it; old people caught with their life's savings wiped out and not yet eligible for old-age assistance. We Governors have seen these beaten, despairing people

for whom an adequate supply of life's necessities seems forever out of reach. Like Tantalus, they appear doomed to continuous deprivation.

Then there was Sisyphus, crafty king of Corinth. Because he deceived Zeus he was condemned to spend his time in the lower regions rolling a stone uphill, but never getting it to the top. Always it rolled down again and he had to start his task again. The modern taxpayer suffers the fate of Sisyphus, particularly with regard to this burden of relief. He toils manfully up the slope trying to reach the crest, a plateau reached; each year he has to get under a heavier burden of public relief, until he, too, despairs.

We, as Governors, are sympathetic with the sufferings of the modern Tantalus and Sisyphus. We see the reality of human need, on the one hand, and worry also over the burden which falls on the backs of those fighting to remain self-supporting. We also know that if Sisyphus, the taxpayer, collapses, Tantalus, the reliefer, is left without hope.

I have been startled at the expansion of costs of the various public-relief programs in my own State. Back in 1932, which we regard as the depth of the depression, the total expenditure in Oregon for relief was probably not over $3,000,000—the figures have not been compiled. For 1938 the total for all programs reported by the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board amounted to $26,577,000, and for 1939 $27,664,000. However, the latter figures do not include unemployment-compensation benefits, which amounted to approximately $6,000,000 more in 1938 and $4,000,000 more in 1939.

You recall how in the early 1930's we said that if we could just get our factories to running again our relief load would ease off. Well, in Oregon, the total pay rolls of firms reporting to the State Industrial Accident Commission expanded from $74,123,000 in 1933, the low point of the depression, to $158,357,000 in 1939, or more than double. Yet the figures already quoted on the expansion of the public-welfare program during the same period show how foolish was our expectation.

It is evident, therefore, that hope is vain for any radical reduction in costs of public relief unless and until there is a radical change in public policy, both Federal and local. We must therefore regard public relief or welfare as a permanent addition to the list of publicly supported obligations on top of the older burdens of education, care of criminals, insane, and defectives, public health, and recreation. Accordingly it is important for those charged with executive responsibility in the States to develop sound, permanent programs of welfare administration. That is the theme of my paper today.

I shall relate the history and experience of welfare work in Oregon, not only because I am most familiar with the conditions of my own State, but also because I feel this administration has been singularly successful. The credit goes chiefly to my predecessors in office, but I have been happy to build on the sound foundations they laid.

In predepression years the counties in Oregon, as in most other States, were responsible for care of indigents. The poor farm was a historic and dreaded institution. In cities, private efforts for relief were often organized under the associated charities. There was, however, a growing demand for mothers' pensions and for old-age pensions to spare the impoverished aged the ignominy of being sent to the poorhouse. Our State struggled through the early depression years, with county assistance, liberal private contributions, and a measure of Federal funds for loans or public works.

In February 1933 our State legislature made its first appropriation, $15,000, to meet the costs of administering relief funds from other, chiefly Federal, sources. At a special session in December of that year, following repeal of prohibition, a State liquor monopoly was set up and $3,000,000 appropriated from its prospective profits. Since then the State's portion of welfare expenditures has been provided from proceeds of liquor control, supplemented with appropriations from the State general fund. The aggregate of the appropriations made available for this biennium are $9,260,000, and the State operates on a cash basis both for its general and its public-welfare funds.

The type of organization set up in the Emergency Act of 1933 has remained the same. The State relief committee was constituted with seven members, to be named by the Governor. The county relief committees were likewise composed of seven members, four of them to be named by the Governor, the other three to be the elected county commissioners or members of the county courts or their nominees. Responsibility for the administration was thus vested in the Governor through his power to appoint the State committee and the majority of the county committees, including the chairman. The administration was by no means centralized in the State committee or the Governor, however. The 1935 act gave the county committees the duty of examining all applications for relief and fixing the amounts, with the State committee charged with the duty of approving the grants.

The present law authorizes the State committee to supervise administration and prescribe rules and regulations to be uniform throughout the State, and old-age assistance grants are subject to State approval. The practice is, however, for the county committees to administer public welfare in the counties, without interference from the State committee unless they get out of line. The fact that the Governor is the final authority is, of course, a powerful factor in preserving cooperation between the State and local committees.

In 1939 the legislature rewrote the laws covering relief. Recognizing the permanent character of the programs, the title of the agency was changed from "public relief committees" to "public welfare commissions." Members are appointed "on the basis of interest in and a knowledge of the field of public welfare," and hold office for 4-year terms.

From the beginning, public relief in our State has been administered on a nonpolitical basis as far as the State organization could require. The first State relief committee, named by the then Governor, Julius L. Meier, was composed of high-minded, public-spirited citizens. His successor, Charles H. Martin, appointed persons of similar type; and I have retained, with only two exceptions, the appointees of my predecessor. The first State law on the subject by inference required a nonpolitical administration. It specified that appointed members of county committees should not be removed by the Governor except for cause, and then only after notice and hearing. It also authorized the county committees to appoint relief officers, who should be experienced and qualified persons, chosen solely on the basis of their executive and administrative qualifications, and with especial reference to their experience in relief work. That policy has likewise prevailed through the years.

As we look back now that law set an impossible requirement, for there were not a sufficient number of experienced and qualified persons to act as administrators of relief. The committees had to do the best they could, which meant to take the material available, train it or weed it out, and build up a competent, trained personnel.

It is because our State has operated on this basis, selection of personnel by the administrative heads on their qualifications and not on personal or political patronage, that we object vigorously to the new imposition of the Federal Social Security Board for a new so-called merit system of staff selection. We know the new machinery will prove far more costly, thus reducing the amount of funds available for assistance to the poor; and fear that it will give us a less competent and less loyal and efficient staff. How can you by formal examination measure one's understanding of human nature, or the fine balance between sympathy and moral courage which are required of case workers and administrators? We have acquiesced grudgingly in the mandate from Washington and only under threat of denial of grants to our aged, our dependent children, and our blind. I should like to see this conference adopt protest against this dictation from the Federal Government. It is fair that the Federal Government, which contributes about 30 percent of the welfare funds, should be sure that its moneys are properly expended; but that does not necessitate imposing a rigid system of personnel selection.

In Oregon virtually the entire welfare program is concentrated in the hands of the public-welfare administration, State and county. General assistance, old-age assistance, aid to crippled and dependent children, aid to blind, certification to W. P. A., N. Y. A., and C. C. C. are all handled by the same organization. This gives a unity of administration, prevents duplication of staff and friction between programs. Federal cooperation is greatly simplified. Exceptions to this administration are unemployment compensation, hardly a welfare program, which is handled by a separate commission; and maternal care, which is administered by the State board of health.

Moreover, State appropriations are made in lump sums, giving the administrative agency power to apportion funds among the several programs. Thus we avoid having appropriations for some categories excessive and for others deficient. While for some programs the demand can be charted with a fair degree of accuracy, for others, particularly general assistance, it is impossible to forecast the need exactly. A heavy winter storm may run up the cost many thousands of dollars in a single week. Flexibility in financing, therefore, has much value.

Sometimes this control works otherwise, however. Under the pressure for old-age assistance our expenditures for that purpose ran up to two-thirds of the total welfare expenditures, while the national average is just about 50 percent. Realizing this was disproportionate, the State committee adopted an order a number of months ago stopping receipt of new applications until the existing rolls could be reexamined. As a result the proportion for old-age assistance has declined to around 60 percent, a figure still somewhat out of line.

All grants are based on the existence of need, and in case of the aged, near relatives are obligated to take care of their needy kin. A saving clause of value is one in appropriation bills which limits grants "in any case only to the extent that funds for each such purpose are available." This prevents suits to enforce grants and a piling up of obligations.

Previously I referred to the administrative relationship between the State and county commissions. This same dual responsibility extends to the burden of finance. All general relief is handled on a 50–50 basis. For the other welfare programs where the Federal Government contributes one-half, the remaining one-half is divided 60 percent from the State and 40 percent from the counties. Administrative costs are all borne by the State save for some Federal contribution. Cities are exempt from any control of relief administration and from any financial burden. We believe a division of financial responsibility is important in holding costs within reasonable limits.

It is significant in the history of Oregon relief administration that there has never been any break-down, either of organization or of supplies. There has never been any major demonstration in protest. There has never been any scandal over the handling of funds or the making of appointments. During the whole period the State has had but one State administrator, Mr. Elmer R. Goudy, to whose sound judgment is due much of the credit for the success of the Oregon administration.

One thing which I have worked out is the close coordination of the welfare department with other agencies dealing with employment. For example, the employment service, also under the Governor's control, works closely with the welfare department. When seasonal work opens up, as it has recently in the berry harvest, the welfare department drops employables from its rolls in the regions affected and the employment service places them in jobs. We thus lighten the relief burden and reduce to a minimum the importation of labor at seasonal peaks.

Our employment service has also been preparing a job census showing surplus and deficiency in particular trades. This information is to be used by the vocational education department in its training program. There has been for some time a shortage of skilled metal workers, while at the same time hundreds of unskilled workers have been supported by Government welfare or relief programs. It seems to me essential to coordinate all agencies, public and private, for a constructive attack on the employment problem.

In this connection I wish to report that we have used, to excellent advantage, advisory committees for our employment service. These committees have accomplished much in getting employers and labor organizations to work together. Believe it or not, in certain lines of industry, notably general contracting, employers and labor unions have agreed to use the State employment service as the referral agency, the hiring hall. Control of the hiring hall, as you know, has been a bitterly contested point in labor relations. We feel in obtaining recognition of a neutral State service for this work, we have made an important contribution to industrial peace.

In summary our experience in Oregon justifies these principles for the organization and administration of relief:

1. Unity of organization, under a common authority, for administration of all programs, with appropriations available in lump sums, and the administrative authority given broad powers of regulation and allocation of funds.

2. Vesting authority in appointive, nonsalaried commissions, with operating staff selected on basis of qualifications.

3. Division of administrative and financial responsibility between the State and counties.

4. Close cooperation with other Government agencies looking to economic rehabilitation of those on relief.

I wish to add this comment respecting this business of relief. While there appears scant hope for "relief from relief" either for the taxpayer or the recipient of public aid, we dare not let the welfare programs be such as will encourage and develop a class of permanent mendicants. The spirit of relief administration should be that of self-help, to stimulate others to help themselves wherever it is possible. Keeping multitudes on public doles inevitably results in their deterioration as self-reliant and self-respecting citizens. The social consequences are as dangerous as the economic burden. Our social security in the future is going to depend quite as much on whether we cultivate the sense of personal responsibility for self-support among our people as whether we relieve the distress of the destitute.

An Adventure in Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the graduating class of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, June 3, 1940, from Washington, D. C., through the Mutual broadcasting network:

Although duty detains me in Washington, I am glad to have this opportunity to address the graduating class of Drake University and their assembled friends.

Commencement exercises symbolize the culmination of years of hard study and the beginning of manifold careers. This is the proper time to pause and view the trails which will be followed through life. Where these trails will lead for you, the graduates of Drake University, no one can foresee. One thing is certain—pitfalls lie on every hand and the obstacles before you can be surmounted only by superior intellect, industry, imagination, integrity, and initiative.

War is raging abroad. Its fire and flying embers menace our shores, as they did over 20 years ago. Then, as now, the United States became the jousting ground of espionage agents and saboteurs, each seeking to impede America's program of national defense, through the destruction of industry and the poisoning of public opinion.

In meeting the challenges that confront us, we all must give our best endeavors, if democracy and liberty are to survive. Life can be better, if we will unite to make it so and protect our Nation from the possible onslaughts of sadistic butchers. Today, the man who will not serve in this task of preparedness has no right to call himself an American.

On the thresholds of your careers, you must accept a sacred responsibility. The time is ripe for a rebirth of patriotic citizenship. We must put an end to chicanery, corruption, nonfeasance, and malfeasance which defeat efficiency and achievement.

It seems to be an American trait to be indifferent to civic responsibility. It is this indifference which permitted the great American public to stand idly by during recent years while crime ran rampant. Men fail in business because they underestimate the ability of their competitors. Law and order break down in a community because citizens underestimate the power of the underworld. Internal defense falls apart because a nation underestimates the potential threats which lurk on every hand. It is also, I am happy to say, an American trait to arise in times of emergency to meet all challenges. That time has now arrived.

I urge you to seek adventure in public service, not as public servants, but as public volunteers. The greatest threat confronting our Nation today lies in the apparent lack of a stout-hearted spirit of preparedness and a high moral courage to face the truth. We need a youthful spirit to insist upon and work for the rebuilding and reestablishing of the strength and sinew of national unity and preparedness, by which we may hope to avoid war and protect ourselves from the enemies within our gates.

If we would protect the future well-being of our Nation, our communities, our homes, and ourselves, we cannot wait for tomorrow, because community after community is threatened by the insidious forces of lawlessness and subversion. Within the span of your lives, unless you help to change the picture, three out of every four of you will be victimized by the forces of lawlessness, through loss of property, through injury, or even by the visitation of death itself.

Preparedness is a national necessity, whether against criminal elements or foreign foes. It is the cheapest form of safety. It is the acme of adventure in public service.

Sixteen years ago the Federal Bureau of Investigation was inspired by the interest and support of that great American, the Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, then Attorney General of the United States. Under his leadership the F. B. I. was commissioned to effectively serve the American people. His views have been subscribed to by each of his successors in office, so that today your F. B. I. is respected by the good citizens of America as much as it is feared, hated, and vilified by the scum of the underworld, conspiring Communists, and goose-stepping bundsmen, their fellow travelers, mouthpieces, and stooges.

The F. B. I. has a record of performance which has set the pace for scientific law enforcement everywhere. It now shoulders many tasks in protecting America, not only from the kidnaper, extortioner, and bank robber, but from the espionage agent and saboteur. And every dollar spent for this task by the F. B. I. over $6 are returned to the Government or to individual taxpayers.

Naturally, everyone cannot engage in such a specific adventure in public service. But today's adventurer in public service can help to clean house, to isolate the forces which produce crime, and to inoculate the community against them. Nothing is so important in the perpetuation of America as the building of homes. Unless the sanctity of the home is safeguarded the pillars of democracy crumble.

Then there is the important matter of home training, which of necessity must be a continuation of church training. The lessons taught in Sunday school must be retaught and lived in the home. The crime problem today is primarily a youth problem. It is not pleasant to face the fact that 12 percent of all murderers, 45 percent of all burglars, 32 percent of all thieves, 15 percent of all arsonists, and 52 percent of all automobile thieves arrested are under voting age. These facts point to the responsibility which you must assume in establishing homes of your own and in proving the wisdom of teaching respect for the rights of others.

Let no one tell you that family discipline, just because it is old-fashioned, has no place in America today. It is an old saying that "youth must have its fling," but at the same time it must be remembered that we cannot depart from the traditional paths of honor without ending in the shambles of character degeneration. What we need in America today is a return to the God of our fathers and a most vigorous defense against the minions of godlessness and atheism, which are allied with the powers of destruction that today threaten America's future.

Against these mass worshippers of perversion, degeneracy, and murder we must present a unified phalanx of Americanism, marshaled from every walk of life. Now is the time to put our houses in order and face the foes which, like termites, weaken the internal structure of America, masquerading as they do behind a hundred fronts.

The Communist and the bundsman represent more than a mere political party. They espouse a way of life, a fanatical worship of materialism, destruction, and the blacking out of decency. They stand for the overthrow of democratic institutions, social, governmental, and religious, even while their lying leaders in our midst seek to delude us with a mumbo jumbo of high-sounding phrases. Their "fifth-column" methods have permeated into every walk of life. By falsehood and fakery they gnaw at the Nation's vitals. Their insidious propaganda in one form or another has even gained an entry into some of our churches and many of our schools. Unless we resist their efforts on a united front, America will rue the day it let down its bars of self-respect—then it may be too late to act.

Conquering the foes of democracy is the greatest of all adventures in public service. The fulfillment of this task is of paramount importance. It means a rededication on all fronts to Americanism and its bulwarks.

The founders of our Constitution believed in a living God as we do; the would-be seducers of our liberty today believe in no God, except one of carnage and death and destruction. The confirmed criminal has nothing but sneers for the Almighty. It is the same with the multinamed "fronts" of the foreign "isms" which seek to mire us in the abysmal depths of despair. They should be reviled for what they are, a cowardly, slithering mass of humanity, too evil and too slinking to assume their true identities, crawling to their objectives while concealed in a jungle of deception. From their spokesmen you hear much of freedom of speech and freedom of worship. They want freedom of speech for themselves, while gagging others. They want freedom of action, while the hands of others are bound, so they may plunder and rob. They want freedom of worship, so they may erect the idols of Lenin and Marx and others of similar ilk. Our Constitution grants freedom to the law-abiding, but what these vermin seek is license. America has no room for these espousers of foreign ideologies, which are alien to everything we cherish.

The lying propaganda machines of un-American bodies have been working overtime, while all too many American citizens have been hoodwinked by their falsehoods and tirades and vituperations. From these same sources have come charge after charge, designed to discredit and blacken the good name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to undermine public confidence in law and order. They stop at no level in their efforts to misrepresent the organization which has made American homes safe from the kidnaper and which is now in the first line of defense against the foreign enemies of America.

Many of the Communist Party's leaders stand convicted, in courts and in the public mind, of falsehood and deceit, but they are still on the march, burrowing deeper and deeper into our system of democracy.

There is a sneer behind their every smile and a vicious lie in their every promise of Utopia. If the land whose banners they carry is Utopia, then let them go there and enjoy it. America is good enough for us and we do not want it tainted by the poisons of foreign "isms."

It is with a feeling of devotion to my country that I find myself engaged in seeking recruits this morning; in seeking volunteers in a career of public service. We owe it to ourselves and to our country to make our voices heard and to stand unified against the forces which menace America. You graduates of today are tomorrow's heroes. Without your intelligence, loyalty, common sense, and courage, America may not withstand the fakers who pretend to hand us heaven, while concealing hades of violence, destruction, and revolution. No other adventure in life is so worthy. No other cause is more just. No other aim can exceed this in glorious accomplishment. May all of us join in a crusade for the betterment of America.

Direct Relation Between the Circular and Hyperbolic Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

STATEMENT BY MIFF M. BUTLER

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends, Mr. Miff M. Butler, of Seminoe Dam, Natrona County, Wyo., has recently discovered a new relationship between pi and e and in order to date, as well as to give a partial but necessarily incomplete description of his discovery, I ask unanimous consent to insert the attached statement by Mr. Butler in the RECORD.

Mr. Butler claims that this is the first basic mathematical principle ever developed in the United States.

DIRECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CIRCULAR AND HYPERBOLIC MEASURES

In using mathematics, a number of relations of different numbers are known to exist, while other relations are felt to exist but have so far eluded exact definition.

Euler (1707–83), who evolved the figures now used for cannon fire, indicates the strange interrelation between the number 3.1416, etc., which is the result of dividing the circumference of a circle by the diameter, and the number 2.178 (whose hyperbolic logarithm is 1). Euler uses the square root of minus 1 to arrive at his relation and therefore arrives at no definite conclusion. The square root of minus 1 is the base of many figures of mathematics but defies definition. It is used, however, to correlate phenomena that are known to exist but cannot be explained and may be said to be the base of Poncelet (1788–1867) reciprocity and Riemann (1826–66) surfaces.

Three more relations that are known to exist are:

The logarithm of 10 to the base of 2.718 (e) is 2.30.

The transcendent angle and the number 10.

The number 10 may be said to be exact, but the remaining figures are obtained by questionable methods—that is they are based on the use of McLaurens series or some other method of like character, that lack definite proof though analogies show them to be very close. They may be said to be the value where two nearly parallel lines intersect and to say that the value is between these lines—that is within the convergence, but not necessarily at the end—has not, to my knowledge, been proven incorrect.

The importance of these figures is great and they form the base of energy problems and nearly all problems that contain a number of variables such as land values, insurance rates, monetary basis, etc.

It is significant that the figures below were obtained on the third trial after evolving the continuous time curve described later and that figures conservatively estimated at thousands of pages have been examined with a possible connection between the circular constant 3.1416 and the hyperbolic constant 2.718 in view.

The values obtained here are all within the convergence (above mentioned), while Poncelet reciprocity is indicated.

If the unit is taken as divided into 10 subdivisions whose values are governed by a law similar to the compound interest or snowball law, that is each number is 10 times the preceding number after 1 has been added. These 10 units are further divided into two divisions with one ten-thousandth as the beginning of one of these divisions and five ten-thousandths as the beginning of the other, so that the two numbers 5.4321 and 9.8765 are obtained.

The square root of 5.4321 is 2.33, with a remainder of .32 (decimal points disregarded), which are the logarithm of 10 to the base 2.718 and the reciprocal of 3.1416 (the circumference of circle divided by the diameter), respectively.

The square root of 9.8765 is 3.142, and the reciprocal of the remainder is 2.3, with 2.72 as a remainder, which figures are the circumference of a circle divided by the diameter plus the reciprocal of the logarithm of 10 to the base 2.718, with a remainder of 2.72 which is the hyperbolic base or number whose hyperbolic logarithm is 1.

Furthermore, the sum of these two numbers is 15.3086—one-tenth of which is 1.53, which is as high a value as the transcendent angle may reliably assume.

Mathematical respectability and correlation of these remainders is given by the equation (McMahon, 1906) the derivative of X divided by the square root of the square of X plus the square of a is the sectorial measure, the derivative of whose hyperbolic sine is the ratio X to a.

The occurrence of the above significant figures shows their direct connection by law.

CONTINUITY

In an attempt to fill out the interval from zero time to a world of stratified gas (conjectured by LaPlace and substantiated by known mineral associations) the gravity law of Newton and the bursting atom of LaMaitre are not tenable with the observations of Kepler; i. e., that the planets move about the sun in a path of an ellipse, with the sun as one focus. This conclusion is derived from the fact that the radius is the only variable and that accordingly the distance should either increase or decrease continuously and not follow Kepler's ellipse. Furthermore, the force of gravity would be much greater at the poles than at the Equator, where centrifugal force would be the only variable.

With zero time numbers immediately become essential, and, as far as I know, existing analytic geometry is inadequate. It is customary to speak of minus 1 as plus 1 rotated 180°, and then to make use of the square root of minus 1 to go from plus X to minus X in the infinitesimal distance of the "y" axis.

As a possible solution of this problem the transcendential angle (gudermanian) was drawn (Gauss-Argand diagram) with a constant unit radius times the gudermanian of the angle. The advantages of this figure is that it retains the quadrants, passes through zero continuously from $+1$ to -1, and indicates the rotation so well exemplified by the earth. The curve is made

by beginning at zero and following through continuously to 90° where it is assumed to be rotated 180° in a plane orthogonal to the above, at this point it resumes its course in the original plane and continues 90° in the same direction to zero and continues through zero into the fourth quadrant; thence through 90° to the "y" axis; thence in the same orthogonal plane as above 180° in the same direction as the previous rotation where it passes in the original plane 90° to the point of beginning.

This is a complete cycle and is my conception of time.

Orthogonal lines (not radial) may be taken to represent space (solids are circles, liquids are horizontal, and gases are hyperbolas). These same lines or those orthogonal to the Z plane circle may represent tension which will conform with the force of gravity as it is known to exist and if tension can be traversed only normal to surface, the orbit of the planets is defined.

The above orthodox (partially) Riemann-Cauchy surfaces necessitate the use of two or three foci which are indicated by taking unity and dividing into 10 units according to the gudermanian 10 (N+1) with 5 on each side of the center to obtain 5.4321 and 9.8765. Though this phase of the problem is unsolved the answer may lie in temperature phenomena unavailable to me.

RÉSUMÉ OF PROGRESS

The purpose of this work is to obtain a more secure and definite base for science—where the answer is not conclusive, it is given as a possibility for improvement.

Phenomena used for end points (considered known) are—

(1) Electrons (atomic rays)'; (2) gaseous stage (sun); (3) high-temperature minerals, i. e., chromite in peridotite with diamonds, spinels, anorthite, graphite, asbestos, and titanium irons; (4) mountain ranges; (5) igneous rock associations; (6) juvenile springs; (7) ore deposits of magmatic origin, etc.

Significant definite conclusions (partially): Limestone is of igneous origin and definitely points to the origin of cell life.

Mountain ranges are the result of reaction between ocean water and deep formations (fairly well corroborated by the location of major faults and hot ocean currents); graphite exuded from iron reacts with the hydrogen of catalyzed ocean water to form hydrocarbons (oil) and its contact with upper solutions accounts for the occurrence of sulphide ore deposits predominantly at mountain intersections and thrust faults.

An attempt to form definitions needed in science: Tension is the result of a change in motion, which in turn defines electricity and atomic structure. Rupture of tension produces heat, mostly lost energy, and rays which assume independent motion to form mass.

This should be sufficient data to indicate the field in which it is hoped to show the major role performed by the newly found relation of pi and e.

Cooperation of Eisele & Eisele, of Iron Mountain, Mich., is acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted.

MIFF M. BUTLER.

Values in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, GOVERNOR OF OREGON, AT MONMOUTH COLLEGE, MONMOUTH, ILL., JUNE 4, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address by the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, Governor of Oregon, delivered June 4, 1940, at the commencement exercises of Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. The address follows:

VALUES IN EDUCATION

On the campus of the University of Oregon stands the statue of the Pioneer Mother. A citizen of Oregon erected it in tribute to his own and to other mothers who had journeyed 2,000 miles across the continent to set up homes in a new country. The sculptor has caught and frozen in bronze the hands worn with toil, the face lined with care. Yet this pioneer mother seated there on a block of stone reveals a mood of calm serenity, almost of benignity in proof of her spiritual triumph over the hardships of life.

What inner fires burned in the souls of those men and women to drive them across prairie and desert and mountain? What unrest stirred within them; what goal attracted them? It was not so much the awakening of a nomadic spirit inherited from ancient ancestors as it was the quest for a land in which to settle, a land fuller in opportunity for themselves and their children. That inner urging was the restlessness of dissatisfaction which has driven the race and especially the American people forward.

Though the pioneers failed to realize full satisfactions for themselves, there was always hope for their children, and a consecration of purpose that the way for the children would be less rugged and painful. The means by which they hoped to smooth the path for their children was to furnish them with a better education than they themselves had enjoyed. So it was that schools were founded with the earliest fixed settlement. That is why the pioneers sacrificed to provide schools and academies and colleges. It was out of such devotion that Monmouth College was born. How fitting it is, therefore, that the statue of the pioneer mother who suffered privation to provide education for her children should stand on the campus of an educational institution. There she may see the fruit of her labors in the institution itself, and the fruit of her loins in the youth who utilize its facilities.

That spirit of parental self-sacrifice has not died out. That goal of giving a lift to children by means of an education, a college education, if you please, has not been abandoned. Assembled here today are parents for whom this is one of the great days of their lives. They see their hopes fulfilled, their dreams realized, their toil rewarded as their children today receive the diplomas and the academic degrees from Monmouth College. It is, I assure you, a day of victory for fathers and mothers as well as for young men and women.

And what is this thing we call "education"? What do you graduates have which you lacked 4 years ago? What values do you attach to your diplomas and your degrees?

Many regard this education as something which may now be cashed in the market place. To them the economic values of education stand out. There is reason for that. I recall in my high-school days the recruiters for colleges used to prove by statistics how much greater the average income of the college graduate was than that of the high-school graduate, and that of the high-school graduate greater than the eighth-grade graduate. But the past decade has taught that the law of supply and demand works with education as with corn and copper. I have known of graduates and post graduates whose professional education found no market. If the ticker tape had carried quotations on the symbols "BA" and "BS" and "MA" and even "Ph. D" the last 10 years the lows recorded would have reflected a diminishing economic value for a college education.

While better times have resulted in better placement of graduates I think we must modify somewhat our conception of the money values of education. The rising level of general intelligence, the broader spread of high-school education, plus its distinct improvement in character, increase the supply of so-called educated persons. There is growing realization that compensation should be based on quality of service and not on the scarcity factor which is involved through possession of peculiar knowledge and skills. The economic value in education which rests on exploitation of the ignorant is not a wholesome measuring stick. In brief, the economic value of your education will depend increasingly on your putting it to worthy use and less on the mere possession of a degree or the secrets of a profession.

Others may find this value in education: That it introduces one to the fraternity of the intellectually elite. Appreciation of things intellectual is one of the real benefits of education. But sometimes there develops among educated persons a social exclusiveness amounting almost to class distinction. The Phi Beta Kappa key may open the door to the friendly company of the learned; or it may open the door on a group of intellectual snobs. Respect for learning and intelligence need not go the extreme of university Brahminism. Rather I commend to you the frank confession of St. Paul, who said:

"I am debtor both to the Greek and to the barbarian."

There is another conception of education which still has its following: The idea that the brains of youth are to be shaped through formative years to conform to set patterns of thought. It is true that as the twig is bent the tree is inclined; and some take advantage of that fact. I recall observing in the high Cascades, at just below timberline, groves of small hemlock where the trunk of each tree had a crook in it 3 or 4 feet above the ground. The explanation was simple. Some previous season the snowfall had been unusually heavy and the weight of the snow bent the tree whose trunk was not strong enough to stand alone. The twist thus sustained by the immature saplings is preserved in the trees with the crooks in their trunks. A parallel to that is the description of a certain scene given by Anne Morrow Lindbergh in Listen, the Wind:

"Here there were gray, scraggly trees, their tops all bent in one direction, like seaweed swept along in the current. But the trees would never bend back again. They were caught, held in that tortured shape forever."

So it is that constant pressures warp immature minds. I am confident, however, that you who graduate from this college do not go out intellectually stoop-shouldered like those mountain hemlocks. I am sure that your minds have not been bandaged to the hard board of fixed ideas until you have become mental flatheads. An education like that is devoid of value. The training to be encouraged is like that of the fir tree in a favorable environment, whose roots spread out in the firm soil of durable reality and whose shaft rises straight to the light of truth.

What then are the great values in education? It is true that you get a fund of knowledge; but if you think your education ends with this, you have only a storage-battery conception of education, and you may find yourself at age 38 or 46 out on the road with your storage battery run down.

I conceive the great value of education to be the stimulation of the mind, so that it can utilize creatively that fund of knowledge and the constant impact of experience. This 4 years of advanced work should have resulted in the unfolding of your mental powers, in their exercise like the muscles of the body until you have developed a capacity for action based on independent thinking. There are plenty of people who can pass examinations by giving answers to questions they have learned by rote. There are too few, even among college graduates, who can attack new and unique situations and resolve them into clear solutions. This so-called higher education has set you up above your fellows on a high rung of the ladder. But from now on you must do the climbing yourself. That means you must possess alertness, you must be mentally awake and active, or someone with fewer initial advantages but with greater energy and keener awareness will pass you in the competition of life.

The question you face now and each day of your lives is this: "Will I be a routine worker, a thresher of old straw, or will I be an affirmative worker, seeking to do each job better, to explore new trails of endeavor?"

The whole progress of the human race rests on those who do creative thinking, who by purposed experimentation or alertness in discovery develop new materials and new ideas which result in the elevation of the race. Countless are the benefactors of mankind, but few of their names live in history. Who first shaped moist clay and baked it in the sun and thus invented pottery? Who first agitated cream in a goatskin bottle and discovered golden globules of butter, or learned to season curds and make mellow and nutritious cheese? Who first pounded grain in the cup of a rock and introduced the art of grinding, and who learned the property of yeast for the baking of bread? Who first learned how to lay a rafter and thatch it with straw and thus emancipated man from the dark caves of the hills? Who first drew taut the bowstring and sped the arrow to stop the wild deer in his leap? Who had imagination when he saw rock melting in the fire to run the molten stream into a mold and thus first brought metals into use? Who introduced the rites of matrimony and lifted mating humans above the animal level? Who first prescribed a rule for his fellows and laid the foundation for law and orderly society? Who first caught the rhythm of language and revealed to man the melody and the beauty of poetry? The names of these adventurers are lost in oblivion or, like Prometheus, the fire giver, survive only in legend.

As a matter of fact, each fresh achievement is usually only a short step over the frontier line of past accomplishment. Columbus did not discover America alone. Sharing honors with him were his predecessors who had invented the compass and the rudder and shaped plank to keel to frame a vessel. St. Paul might have converted all the Roman Empire by radio and been spared shipwreck and imprisonment.

The laws of sound and of electricity were the same then as now. The radio did not come by a single discovery; it was the culmination of centuries of patient experimentation in widely divergent fields. Each link in the chain was essential to ultimate success.

The challenge comes to college graduates today to make their contribution to human welfare. The greatest need appears to lie not in the field of mechanical invention but in that of successful coordination of individuals and groups. New attitudes, perhaps new mechanisms, are needed to enable people to live together more happily. For over 10 years we have lived under fearful strains, both economic and political, which reveal the difficulty of groups to adjust their relations smoothly and promptly. What creative thinking can you do in this great field, or in other fields of human interest?

There is one other great value in education besides that of self-realization as to one's mental processes and powers. That is the influence of education in raising the level of culture. Society is governed not alone by laws enacted by parliaments and legislatures. Society is controlled by the complex body of customs and habits which make up what we call the mores of the people. The mores are the resultant of many forces—of tradition, of political and economic conditions, of the play of fresh ideas. They are not fixed but constantly changing, a fact which grandmothers are constantly reminding us of, as they recall an elder and more virtuous day. Sometimes the changes are slow, like the deliberate, crunching march of a glacier. Sometimes they are swift like the flow of a river.

For a long time we have had the notion that the level of culture was constantly rising. That idea no longer seems valid. Cultures decay and the decline may result in social collapse. It requires the continuous effort of individuals to sustain the quality of community mores, and here the contributions of education are most pronounced.

Changes in customs are determined by popular taste, and naturally we must look to educated persons to cultivate the highest standards. They must, in fact, set the canons of taste—in dress, in recreation and entertainment, in morals, in the arts, in business. The competition between the wholesome and the spurious, between the genuine and the gaudy, is never ceasing. Four years in college should have taught you graduates the ability to distinguish better values in the endless succession of choices which make up the stream of daily living. You have been checking "true" and "false" on your term tests for several years; now you must make similar responses to life's questions, and there is no professor to score you on your decisions. I do not mean to preach, but I cannot emphasize too strongly your obligation as persons of education to cultivate tastes which will mark you as strong, free, self-disciplined, sincere men and women. I am not speaking now of great decisions. As you read a novel you will instinctively take the side of the heroic and the noble. But great decisions, as the psychologist will tell you, are usually the normal sequence of small decisions. Rarely does a man have strength for great denials unless he has nourished his courage with firm decisions in the small matters that make up the daily round of living. Lao Tzu, the Chinese philosopher, has left us this proverb, rich in wisdom:

"A journey of a thousand miles begins with one step." Each choice you make fashions your taste and your character. That is why great decisions seem to come easy for those of great character. The final step merely follows the pattern of the first.

The social significance of all this is apparent. The mores are but the trend of popular reactions; hence the selection of the individual helps fix the social climate of the period. You may not think much of it as you buy a magazine or patronize a movie; but the aggregate of these choices is what reveals the temper of the time. I do not mean that you should be burdened with a tremendous sense of social responsibility as you select your dresses, your reading matter, and your wall decorations. I am hoping, though, that college has served to refine your tastes so that almost instinctively you make your preference for the beautiful, the useful, and the enduring and reject the vulgar, the tawdry, and the transitory. This is the way that education yields supreme value, in lifting society from mediocrity into a rich and fertile culture.

You recall in history how civilization has been marked by cycles. Genius seems to be periodic, flashing for a time and then expiring. There was the Periclean age in Athens, followed by centuries of reversion. Rome blossomed in the Augustan age and under some of the later emperors. Then followed the night of the Dark Ages, 800 years, until the dawn we call the Italian Renaissance. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw fresh undertakings: geographical exploration, the Elizabethan age in literature. The late eighteenth century saw torches lit for liberty and democracy, at a time when political thinking was remarkably keen. For the last century we have had the machine age, of which American industrialism is an example.

Each of these periods was a cycle of intellectual ferment. The question now pressing is this: Has the last phase reached its climax? Are we at the point of mental exhaustion which precedes an era of disintegration, fast or slow? The late Oswald Spengler, pessimistic German philosopher, thought so, and predicted the decline of the West.

The present war seems to demonstrate that the culture we have known and respected has come to a final collapse. One statesman has said we have sat at the "death watch of western civilization." Even we in nations yet unscorched by the flames of war have been psychologically shell-shocked. What the fate of Europe may be we cannot now predict. But for America surely the genius of our people is not yet burned out. Our natural resources are still abundant. Our human resources are still strong in vitality; we cannot believe that a racial blend so young has exhausted itself so quickly.

In other words, we ought to look forward to a fresh flowering of the American genius. Perhaps the cycle of the machine may be superseded by a richer culture, one which employs the machine more wisely; which exalts higher values than goods; which rises above the economic and political snarls of today to planes with broader horizons. Surely we ought to aspire to such a culture. Among the leaders to plan and usher in that culture should be the graduates of our colleges and universities.

I began this address with a brief description of a statue, the Pioneer Mother. I shall close with a description of another work of sculpture, Lorado Taft's Fountain of Time which stands in the old Midway at the University of Chicago. You have heard tempus fugit—time flies. But Taft has a different conception of time. In the basin of his fountain stands a symbolic figure, Father Time, draped by a mantle which falls in sweeping folds. Across the pool of water is a bridge crowded with sculptured figures, emblematic of pressing multitudes who rise out of the waves, mount the arch, and descend again into the waters of mystery. In the procession are a variety of folk: the mother suckling her babe, the priest, the general on horseback, light-hearted girls, despairing and wretched men, the scholar, the laborer. The inscription is taken from the poet's line: "Time flies—ah, no; time stays—we go." And thus it is that the monolithic figure of Father Time waits aloof; and humanity passes on.

Let me make the application. Life, not time, is fluid. Life is not sharply segmented into generations. This human procession is continuous. It is a basket-weave of rich and poor, young and old, intelligent and ignorant, frivolous and serious. It is the impact of mind upon mind, the action and reaction of personalities in this endless stream which weave the design of the prevailing social pattern. You graduates are now part of that stream. Your contacts, your influences, your choices are molding the cast as you mount the arch for your moment of high destiny.

"Time stays—we go." The present pushes; the future beckons. The world of tomorrow lies in your hands.

Democratic Victory in November May Mean War for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD KNUTSON OF MINNESOTA

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, our New Deal administration is rapidly going down the road of intervention which leads to war. Roosevelt, in his eagerness to take part in the war now raging in Europe, has swept aside the arms embargo, and through his spokesmen, Senators PEPPER and BYRNES, is urging this country to take still more active steps leading to involvement in war. Our colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, addressed a meeting in Ohio several months ago and indicated that a Democratic victory in November may mean war for the United States.

The following news article reports the opinion held by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman KNUTSON, the only remaining House Member who voted against American participation in war in 1917:

REPRESENTATIVE KNUTSON SAYS DEMOCRAT WIN MAY MEAN WAR FOR UNITED STATES—CONGRESSMAN RECALLS WILSON BATTLE CRY AT MEETING IN OHIO

HAMILTON, OHIO, November 27.—Democratic warnings against "changing horses in midsteam" were met here last night with the argument that the "Democratic donkey has been floundering in midstream for 7 long years, and the time has come to make a change."

Flouting the Democratic feeling that the administration should be continued after 1940 was Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, of St. Cloud, Minn., speaker at the Women's Republican Club.

"I say," said Congressman KNUTSON, "that it is better to change to a horse that will head us back to our own bank rather than toward the other side, where we would inevitably become involved in foreign wars."

CITES PROMISES

Criticizing the administration for having abandoned its campaign declarations of 1932 and 1936, which were directed at maintaining American neutrality even to the point of refusing armaments to belligerents, Congressman KNUTSON reminded his listeners of the events of the Wilson administration. He referred to the "He kept us out of war" slogan used by Wilson in 1916.

"We all remember what happened then," Congressman KNUTSON went on. "Just a month and 2 days passed after Wilson's second inauguration before war was declared on Germany. Yes; Wilson kept us out of war until after the election, and history is very likely to repeat itself in 1940, if by chance the Democrats should triumph."

G. O. P., PARTY OF PEACE

"The Republican Party," he said, "is the party of peace," and to its administrations of the past he credited numerous peacetime internal improvements that have had lasting benefit to the public. "The Democrats," he went on, "are now referring to restoration of the prosperity of 1926—a Republican prosperity."

Democratic failure to restore either agricultural or labor prosperity during its 7 years in office were roundly criticized by the Minnesota Congessman. Ten million men are still looking for jobs, he said, while agricultural parity has foundered because the loss of foreign markets while our own "have been surrendered to foreign competition."

PROMISES BENEFITS

"A Republican victory next year," he said, "would promote recovery, assure America's staying out of the war, revise the national tax structure to aid in business recovery, curb unnecessary spending, repeal the dangerous discretionary authority of the President over the Nation's monetary system, amend the National Labor Relations Act, restore American markets to the American farmer and wage earner, and reject all experimental legislation not clearly helpful in promoting recovery."

Mr. KNUTSON averred that Republicans do not consider all acts of the Roosevelt administration bad. "Its difficulty is," he said, "that they will not admit their mistakes." Republicans in control would mean "elimination of the bad features and retention of the good," he said.

Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times of June 4, 1940.

This editorial expresses, I believe, the overwhelming sentiment of the American people. I think the Congress is running behind the sentiment of the people. Eventually, I believe Congress will act to give every possible aid, short of sending troops abroad, to the Allies. My fear is that we will not act soon enough.

As pointed out in the editorial, "The time to help the Allies is now, not 6 months or a year from now, when our aid may not be able to turn the tide."

A good strong declaration of our attitude toward the Allies plus sending them all planes and materials available, might now turn the tide. Later it might come too late.

Let us be realistic and squarely meet the issue.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of June 4, 1940]

OLD PLANES FOR NEW

The proposal, reportedly made by Senator PEPPER, of Florida, that this country sell immediately to the Allies older war planes now in the service of the Army and the Navy is an ingenious one. The plan would be carried out along the line of the automobile trade-in; that is to say, the Army and the Navy would select some of their older war planes and trade them in to manufacturers to apply on the cost of new models coming out in the next few months. Because title to the planes would have passed to the manufacturers they would be free to sell the planes immediately.

Some critics of the proposal contend that if the planes in question are good enough to help the Allies they would be valuable to this country in the event of any emergency in the 12 to 18 months necessary to replace them. There are factors, however, which suggest that from the standpoint of defense, this country would in no way be weakened by such an arrangement. For instance, the Army Air Corps has more than 200 two-motor bombers which even now are being replaced as obsolescent. Spokesmen for the Allied high command have been quoted in the past few days as stating that 1 airplane sent to the Allies now will be worth more than 10 sent in 6 weeks, and worth more than 100 sent in 6 months.

The Army bombers now obsolescent will be even less serviceable 6 months from now. If delivered to the Allies now they can be used to excellent account. As a matter of fact, the theory which makes it possible for the Allies to obtain priority in new-plane deliveries is that American manufacturers not only have the advantage of increasing plant capacity for which the Allied Governments pay, but also the tremendously important opportunity to perfect later models on the basis of performance in battle conditions.

To argue that sale of the older planes might weaken this country in case of emergency is to overlook the fact that the policy of giving the allied governments priority in delivery of new planes could be changed the moment this Nation's interests required newer models. The present policy of the Government in respect of plane production and delivery is based on the reasonable assumption that twice the present plant capacity could in an emergency provide planes for the Army and the Navy more than twice as rapidly as existing plants can do the job.

Those factors overlook the Allies' immediate and urgent need of virtually anything that can fly. And the matter of trading in older planes for immediate sale to the Allies concerns policy in a political sense rather than policy in a defense sense; that is, the administration will doubtless be most concerned with the implications of such a policy in the field of international relations. Despite a technical showing that the neutrality laws had in no way been circumvented, the practical effect of such a step might fit in with the contention that the German Government is concerned not with our reasons for doing or not doing any specific thing, but with the effect of our actions.

The time to help the Allies is now, not 6 months or a year from now, when our aid may not be able to turn the tide. The fundamental question which must be answered has to do with whether

the American people are prepared to face the consequences of granting to the Allies the unstinted assistance they need. Once the people reveal to the Government in Washington that they are prepared to face the consequences, help to the Allies will no longer be a matter for debate, but a matter of national policy, boldly and generously executed.

Henry Ford and National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Henry Ford made the statement that if the Government needed airplanes, he could manufacture 1,000 planes a day. He also said rather significantly that he did not want to be tied up with red tape at Washington if planes were to be produced in large quantities.

Among our industrial leaders, Henry Ford has no superiors. He made a patriotic offer to his Government, and if I am correctly advised, up to this time, that offer has not been accepted. It would appear to some of us laymen that steps should have been taken the same day the offer was made to put Mr. Ford to work.

We have had over 7 years of New Deal and "brain trusters," and foolish experiments. During all of this time the administration has been in control of our Government, has wasted its money, and has the full responsibility for present conditions. The lack of any adequate national defense is apparent to everyone in possession of the facts. In connection with a preparedness program, just as in its other policies, the New Deal has been a total failure.

It now has an opportunity to correct its mistakes and to start out with a constructive program which will give us airplanes, and adequate army, and the armament necessary for national defense. Let us hope that for one time, at least, the New Deal will quit playing politics and act with some degree of patriotism and with some degree of consideration for the American people. I, for one, would like to know why this offer of Henry Ford has not been translated into action.

Let me say to the New Deal dreamers in fairyland that other people throughout the country are asking the same question. I call attention to an editorial in the Virginia Daily Enterprise, of Virginia, Minn., for Saturday, June 1, 1940. This is one of the leading newspapers in the district I represent, and its editor is Burt D. Pearson, who comments as follows in connection with the offer made by Henry Ford:

If the Washington politicians are really interested in getting the most for the money, in improving the Nation's defense facilities, they will let the industrialists of the United States have something to say about rearmament plans. Henry Ford says he can turn out a thousand airplanes daily, providing the politicians leave him and his factories alone. "If it becomes necessary," he declared, "the Ford Motor Co. could—with the counsel of men like Lindbergh and Rickenbacker, under our own supervision, and without the meddling by Government agencies—swing into the production of a thousand airplanes of standard design a day." No one doubts Mr. Ford's ability to do just this.

Why Congressmen Are Elected Every 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1940

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling and some agitation throughout the country that Members of Congress should be elected to serve a 4-year term instead of 2. Personally and selfishly such a change might be looked upon with favor by some few Members of Congress, but when we review the debates and deliberations of those who framed our Constitution, and see why the term was placed at 2 years at the beginning, we cannot help but feel a 2-year term was and is still a wise provision.

The framers of the Constitution planned, of course, to create a Federal Government and convert the then 13 States into a more perfect union. There was no difference of opinion in that it was to be a Government expressly limited both as to its purpose and powers, and that the powers were to come from the States and the people and that such powers as were not specifically delegated were to be retained by the several States and the people. But there was some difference of opinion as to the extent of the powers to be delegated the new Government, and there was much deliberation as to what the relative rights and powers of the individual States making up the United States would be. The smaller States had a feeling that if the several States were to be represented in the Federal Government according to size or population it would be only a short time before they would have little or no influence in the new legislative body. A lot of time was consumed in discussing this one matter before reaching a satisfactory solution.

It was finally decided that the legislative body would be a Congress to be made up of two bodies—the Senate and House of Representatives. It takes the two to make the Congress, and all Members, therefore, are Congressmen, whether they be Senators or Members of the House of Representatives. However, it was not many years following the ratification of the Constitution until only Members of the House of Representatives were referred to as Congressmen.

In planning the powers and functions of the new Government, it was understood, as we have already suggested, that the several States should have someone to represent them and to see that their rights and powers were protected, and not completely absorbed by the Federal Government. Following a long discussion, it was decided the States should have two Senators each, regardless of size or population, and it was provided that they should be elected for a term of 6 years by the legislatures of the various States, it being made clear that the primary duty of the Senators was to look after and protect the rights and powers of the States. However, upon the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, it was provided that the Senators be elected by the people.

It was next planned and agreed that the people of the various States should have a separate representation in the Congress, and that such representation should be in proportion to population, and that the representatives should constitute the membership of the House of Representatives. It was emphasized in this connection that in order for the Congress to be fully advised of the wishes of the people at all times, the term of office of the Representatives should be much shorter than that of the Senators. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, believed the 2-year term for Representatives to be the strongest protection the people have in our scheme of government; that is, the right to express themselves every 2 years as to who shall be their Representatives in Congress. It was his idea that in this way Members of Congress would always be fresh from the people, and would, therefore, know the wishes of the people at all times. He had the further conviction that Members of Congress should, in the meantime, assist in keeping the people of their districts fully advised of the leading national problems in order that they might be able to give an intelligent expression of their views every 2 years. In replying to Alexander Hamilton's criticism, when he said:

The people will never be able to select capable and competent men to represent them in Congress.

Jefferson said:

Teach the people and trust the people.

It was his idea that the public should always be advised of public questions, and it is interesting to note that Congress as a body has always been mindful of this obligation.

Not infrequently legislation is proposed where Members of the Congress are quite familiar with the provisions of the proposal and, insofar as they are personally concerned, there is no real necessity for discussion or debate. However, in order that the people throughout the Nation may be equally well advised through the record, press reports, and distribution of such discussion by Members to their constituents full debate and discussions are generally permitted. A fair illustration of the point I am trying to make arose in the House of Representatives a few days ago when the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee reported H. R. 9850, a bill to strengthen our national defense—a bill in which the people of this country are vitally interested and have a right to be fully informed as to its provisions—said:

> There is no controversy in this bill whatsoever. After we had heard all the evidence and gone into executive session and considered it thoroughly section by section, even line by line, the bill is presented now with a unanimous report.

This was all true. However, the minority leader rose and suggested:

> The gentleman thinks, of course, it is necessary to have adequate debate so that the people of the country will understand the bill and the situation as to our national defense.

The chairman replied by saying there would be sufficient discussion or debate in order to advise the public fully in the matter. The debate followed and lasted an entire day. The discussions covered approximately 40 pages of printed matter, and when the vote was taken only 1 out of 435 Members voted against the bill. I make this reference to show that the primary purpose of extended debate and discussion is often to fully advise the people of the facts pertaining to the legislation, because this is not only a Government for the people, but it is a Government by the people, and in order for them to be able to function properly at all times they should have opportunity to be fully informed.

Mr. Speaker, these are not mere gratuitous statements or observations because I am firmly convinced that our democracy, about which we hear so much recently, cannot survive without an honest, fearless, and informed discharge of their duties by both the people and their representatives in Congress. A democracy cannot run itself. No government by the people ever survived any extended period of civic indifference. Good governments are not accidents. The same is true of bad governments. They are good or bad in proportion to the performance of their duties and functions by the people and their representatives, neither of whom will be able to long shift their responsibilities to the other. That great statesman and historian, George Bancroft, emphasized this point much better than I can when he said:

> The public happiness is the true object of legislation and can be secured only by the masses of mankind themselves when awakened to a knowledge and care of their own interest.

With these conceptions of a Congressman's obligation to his constituents in mind, it has been my policy to avail myself of opportunities from time to time to discuss the leading questions before Congress and distribute these discussions throughout my district in order that the people may know whether I am representing their interests or expressing their views on these matters. At the same time I am able by this practice to obtain their reaction and can better know how to represent them, because ours is a representative form of government. In an effort to follow such a policy I have distributed to as many of my constituents as circumstances would permit my views on the following matters: Our reciprocal trade-agreement policy with foreign nations; our old-age-assistance plan; the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor; the farm-tenantry problem; parity payments for agriculture; the use of W. P. A. labor for the construction of public buildings to accommodate post offices and so forth; the National Youth Administration; power development as provided for in the Clarks Hill Dam project; the antilynching bill, and so forth. Of course, it is impossible to distribute copies of all debates to all constituents, but I trust it may be possible to continue the policy described as long as I am in Congress.

If there is an increased agitation of the subject within the next 10 years as there has been in the last decade we believe the question of whether Congressmen shall be elected for a 4-year term instead a 2-year term will be submitted to the people for a decision within that time, and I have, therefore, asked for this time to make my contribution to the discussions which may follow.

Highway Officials Offer Services in Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the president of the American Association of State Highway Officials to the President of the United States tendering the full services and facilities of the State highway departments in the present emergency.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 3, 1940.*

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The following telegram has been sent to the President:

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D. C.:

"The American Association of State Highway Officials hereby tenders the full services and facilities of its membership for any service we can render in any capacity, and on any undertaking in the present emergency. The State highway departments have highly trained technical and mechanical staffs located in each of the 48 States. We have available large quantities of construction and maintenance equipment. Following the precedent established in 1917 and 1918, we again offer our services.

"HENRY F. CABELL, *President.*"

By order of the executive committee.

T'hell With Europe Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY EUGENE WARNER

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the purpose behind the organization of a club which desires to keep our country from being involved in another European mess. I do feel, however, that after the war in Europe is over America can offer tremendous assistance in rehabilitating the war-torn countries and in relieving the distress, want, and suffering occasioned by war.

American boys now lie in Flanders' Fields, which have again been soaked with the blood of Europe's youth. Over 20 years ago we fought on European battlefields "to make the world safe for democracy," but shortly after the armistice was

signed Americans realized that we were hoodwinked by Europeans.

The following news article indicates that certain correspondents covering the American Peace Commission in 1919 became disgusted with the way the French and British were hoodwinking Woodrow Wilson, and these correspondents then formed a "T'hell With Europe Club," which has now been revived.

REVIVED CLUB DEMANDS UNITED STATES SHUN EUROPE—UNIT FORMED ABROAD IN 1919 "REINCARNATED"

(By Eugene Warner)

Scene 1: The Crillon Hotel in Paris in 1919.

Scene 2: The Carlton Hotel in Washington in 1939.

Dramatis Personae: (Scene 1), Samuel G. "Sam" Blythe, a dashing young correspondent; Jay Jerome Williams, the kid reporter at the peace conference; many another famed newsman. (Scene 2), Blythe, now a noted author and political analyst; Williams, now a syndicate head, still a boy at heart, but a little heavy for juvenile roles, and Commissioner George Henry Payne, of the Federal Communications Commission.

"T'HELL WITH EUROPE"

"In 1919 the correspondents covering the American Peace Commission became disgusted with the way the French and British were hoodwinking Woodrow Wilson," Williams said yesterday. "Over the aperitifs one afternoon Blythe proposed forming a "T'hell With Europe Club,' which was noisily seconded and then and there became organized."

Yesterday Blythe and Williams, with their friend Payne, decided to revive the club, with Blythe as president and Williams as secretary-treasurer.

In his rededicatory remarks, Blythe said:

"In those dark days in 1919, when earnest Americans thought it was possible to effect an enduring peace in Europe, there were some of us who were a trifle suspicious of it all.

SO, CLUB IS REVIVED

"Came the time when Woodrow Wilson saw his nethermost garments taken by Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau and the realities of the situation came home to us. Spontaneously the T'hell With Europe Club came into existence.

"It is being revived. Its sole purpose is to keep our country from being involved in another European mess."

Suggested Relocation of British and French Capitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate and of the country to a curious article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of today by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen. This article relates to efforts by the President seeking to restrain Italy from entering the war on the side of the Nazis.

TRANS-ATLANTIC TELEPHONE COMMITMENTS

Are we to understand that the President of the United States is acting for and in behalf of Great Britain and France? Why all this excitement, and trans-Atlantic telephone commitments?

Are we to have the British Empire dumped upon our doorsteps—the bloody English Empire with all its troubles? What business of ours is it if France rules her Empire from Europe or Africa?

INTERNATIONAL MEDDLING

What business of the United States is it whether Italy goes Nazi or Ally? How does this feeble international meddling square with the sturdy Farewell Address of the Father of our Country? How can you square such Europeanism with the foreign policy of Madison and Monroe, Jefferson and Jackson, and every great American statesman from that day to this?

BRITISH "SEVENTH COLUMN"

Is there a British "seventh column" operating in the United States? Since when did we surrender our American independence to European intrigue? I say to Senators and my fellow citizens, it is time to return to Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson Americanism.

LET THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BE FOREWARNED

Mr. President, if this information be true, let the American people be forewarned. These writers are supposed to be close to the White House. I feel that the Senate and Senate committees should endeavor to learn the sources of these rumors, and, if true, decide what action should be taken in the interest of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Times-Herald of June 5, 1940]

DUCE'S PEACE TERMS TOO HIGH, PRESIDENT LEARNS BY TELEPHONE—CHIEF EXECUTIVE URGES ALLIES TO MOVE CAPITALS AND BRING WAR FLEETS HERE

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

For more than 10 days the most significant peace discussions in which President Roosevelt has yet engaged have been taking place with Premier Mussolini in an effort to stop the carnage in Europe.

At least one of these conversations took place directly between the two men by trans-Atlantic telephone. The chief purpose behind them, from Roosevelt's point of view, was to keep Italy out of the war. He believes Italy's entry would be crushing to the Allies.

WANTED BENEFITS FOR NOT FIGHTING

The conversations reached a point where Il Duce promised the President that he would keep Italy out of the war if the United States would step in and see that a peace was worked out which gave something to Italy.

For several days the discussions continued, but broke down last Friday. It was the next day, Saturday, that Nazi raiders bombed the cities of Marseille and Lyon in southern France—a gesture of support to Italy. Some observers believe that the Nazi planes actually flew from Italy.

DUCE ASKED SIX FRENCH DEPARTMENTS

The rock upon which the Roosevelt-Mussolini discussions foundered was the actual peace terms. Il Duce wanted six French departments (provinces) on the Franco-Italian border, including the famous resort towns of Cannes and Nice, also Tunis and some other French colonies in Africa. He also proposed that the southern or pro-French part of Belgium be given to France to compensate for her lost provinces, the rest of Belgium being combined with Holland under Germany.

Finally, Mussolini wanted the Maginot Line blown up and leveled off.

During all of these discussions, Germany did not come into the picture. However, it was suspected that Mussolini was in touch with his axis ally.

When Roosevelt put these ideas up to France, he got no encouragement whatsoever. The French have been willing to give Italy various African colonies, but they balk flat-footedly at ceding the French side of the Alps. Such a cession would mean that Italy would control both slopes of the Alps, thus wiping out their value as a natural barrier, and leaving France open to attack at any time in the future.

Also the demolition of the Maginot line would leave France equally exposed on the west from Germany. Thus placed in a vise between two powerful neighbors, France would virtually cease to be an independent nation.

Roosevelt had several discussions with Ambassador Bullitt regarding this, also with Ambassador Kennedy in London. Both felt that the original energy of the German drive had been spent and that from now on the Allies could hold their own, particularly if they got airplanes, tanks, and guns from the United States.

Ambassador Bullitt also felt that although Italy might come in, her troops would not be able to cross the Alps and Mussolini was not worth buying off.

PRESIDENT CALLS TWO ENVOYS

These views were not entirely shared in Washington. In fact the President was most pessimistic. He had his last conversation with Mussolini on Friday, May 31. After that Mussolini refused to see Ambassador Phillips further. On the same day Bullitt called upon Premier Reynaud, while Roosevelt summoned the French and British Ambassadors.

The President was so convinced that Italy was coming into the war and so pessimistic regarding the consequences that he advised the British to set up a new capital in Canada, bringing the fleet to western Atlantic waters, and suggested that the French establish a capital in Africa. He also told the French that their fleet would find a safe haven and receive the cooperation of the United States in American waters.

Let Us Perfect Our Labor Legislation—Retaining and Not Destroying It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it seems that much of our time this session is taken up with amendatory legislation pertaining to the wage-hour law and the Wagner Labor Relations Act. A very large part of my correspondence pertains to the proposed amendments to one or the other of these laws. Some laborers make the extreme demand that no amendments be made to either act. Other labor organizations insist on some perfecting amendments, but not too many so as to endanger the essential legislation. Many employers have insisted that amendment, and drastic amendment, of each act is imperative.

What is a reasonable attitude and course of action in regard to such legislation? Although not a union man, I am, and always have been friendly to labor. I recognize human values above dollar values, and wish to see the greatest good to the greatest number, in economics and industry as well as politically and socially. On the other hand, I recognize the interdependency of employers and employees and the basic economic need of fostering private employment to the greatest possible extent with a minimum of labor controversy. Although the Wagner Labor Relations Act was placed on the statute books before I became a Member of Congress, I recognize that it is almost as new as the wage-hour law; and because both are in the experimental stage, it stands to reason that both contain imperfections which ought to be remedied. I favor remedying such imperfections. This work is one of degree; that is, it should go as far as necessary, but not to the extent of emasculating either act.

It may be that many of our constituents do not understand that all legislation here at Washington is a result of compromise. No man can have his entire way about anything—not even the President, and I think his way is usually right. All during my very first session in Congress—the long-drawn-out session of 1937—I felt at that time we should not leave Washington in the autumn of that year until we had enacted suitable farm legislation and proper wage legislation. I so stated to many of my colleagues during that long, hot summer through which we sweltered in our offices that were not air-conditioned.

Why was I interested in wage and hour legislation? Because sweatshop conditions prevailed in parts of our country and because the rank and file of our people looked to the administration to keep a promise and take a necessary humanitarian step to better conditions. Of course, I knew that the need for such legislation was greater in the East and in the South—far greater than in the Rocky Mountain area. Of course, I knew that wages paid in the mining camps of Arizona were far above any minimum which we were apt to set by law. And, of course, I knew that in the small, isolated mining communities there was not much unemployment, and therefore no need of shortening hours in order to put more men to work.

It is extremely difficult to write a law providing uniformity in hours and wages in this great and diverse country of ours in which conditions differ so extremely. At the risk of offending, or possibly misleading, some elements of labor in my own State I worked diligently to get certain mining operations exempt from the proposed wage-hour law. I not only tried to get them exempt but, in cooperation with other western Congressmen, we actually got a considerable element of labor in mines exempted from the bill which was before the House in the special session of 1937. However, that was the act which was recommitted, and when finally revived it was in entirely different form. Therefore, I say to employers and employees alike in the mining communities of my State—the same is true of agriculture labor—that we westerners have done the very best possible to shape this necessary and wholesome legislation so as to do the most good with the least hurt to the peculiar labor situation prevailing in our part of the West.

With a change in war conditions, it may be that labor must expect some restrictive adjustment, which necessary adjustment labor will no doubt accept in a patriotic spirit for national defense.

Our great leader, President Roosevelt, has announced that he wishes a policy of national defense to be set in motion at once with determination and vigor, without the loss of our social gains or without relaxation of our humanitarian efforts. Accordingly, I believe that we should by all means retain the floor under wages, but may in certain lines of industry relax the hour requirements. In regard to the Wagner Labor Relations Act, while I favor a consideration of the proposed amendments, I fear the score or more amendments offered by the Smith committee would go too far, and I think two or three amendments, such as increasing the personnel of the Board, would be sufficient at this time. I do not look upon this proposed amendment, such as increasing the Board, as appeasement, but as a logical step in enabling this Board to carry on its weighty and highly important function.

The Air Program and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM THOMAS D. COOPER AND ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of May 28, 1940, by Hon. Thomas D. Cooper, of Burlington, N. C., in particular reference to our national defense, together with a reprint of an article from the United States News, issue of May 31, 1940, entitled "The Truth About Our Neglected Air Program."

Mr. Cooper is a prominent attorney of North Carolina, a World War veteran, and a member of the American Legion, and is intensely interested in our defense program.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLINGTON, N. C., *May 28, 1940.*

Hon. R. R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I hand you herewith a reprint of an amazing article appearing in the United States News issue of this week. To me, the article fairly rings with truth and, at my own expense, I am causing it to be distributed to a limited number of my friends and to persons in positions of influence and authority. Further, I have requested this news magazine to distribute copies to each American Legion Post in the United States.

It is my hope that the voice of the Legion may be raised in demand for sure, definite, and immediate armaments adequate for national defense, and especially for a separate air force superior in number and equipment to any the world now knows or any nation has planned. That the cost is not to be considered, either in dollars or in the heads of opposing Army and Navy officers, is conclusively proved by recent events abroad. In the President's "fireside chat" on Sunday evening he used the terms "unity of action" and "the air forces should be part of the Army and Navy." The construction to be placed upon those terms or the distinction to be drawn is all important. To be sure, there must be coordinated action, but it should be made certain that our air force be no longer subordinated to the Army and Navy. Its effectiveness being supreme, its development should be paramount. Those of us who were subjected in World War I to machine-gun strafing from the wobbly crates of that period can best understand from afar the devastating effect of the offense by air in Europe today. Take notice, too, that the

man who directs the entire military operations of Germany is the air-minded man, Goering.

We of World War I are not jittery, and we need no more babbling exhortation against panic impulses. Neither shall we be ostriches with our heads under the sand. Are we to contemplate ironically that our own genius invented the airplane and that our own air-minded prophet insisted upon its development as a potent weapon of future wars? Or shall we insist quite firmly that a 19-year-old mistake be corrected now and at once.

With assurances of high esteem,

Very truly yours,

THOMAS D. COOPER.

[From the United States News of May 31, 1940]

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR NEGLECTED AIR PROGRAM—HOW INERTIA IN THE HIGH COMMAND HAS KEPT US WEAK IN AVIATION—GENERAL MITCHELL'S PLEA FOR AIRCRAFT POWER IGNORED HERE, HEEDED IN GERMANY

President Roosevelt suddenly is demanding 50,000 war planes. Congress, with equal suddenness, wants to vote unanimously for them. Mr. Roosevelt says those planes can start rolling into production at 1,200 a month or 14,400 a year, and Henry Morgenthau, Treasury Secretary and spark plug of airplane building, talks confidently of early war-plane production of 1,600 a month, or 19,200 a year.

From the White House, from offices of Cabinet members, from Congressmen come statements that all is well, that the airplane situation is well in hand, that this country has missed no bets and is a great air power. There are frequent assurances that the United States itself is amply supplied with modern fighting planes adequate for all defense and that the only problem is to turn out fighting equipment for sale to Britain and France.

THE FACTS ABOUT OUR AIR POWER

But what really is the truth? How well did responsible officials of the Government look to its air defenses? How alert were the commanders of this Nation's armed forces to the meaning of what happened in Poland and later in Norway? What is there to show that high American officials with access to all information coming from fighting fronts all over the world in recent years really learned anything from that information and acted upon it?

The bare facts today, from official sources, are these: The United States Army possesses 2,794 planes, of which 800 are combat planes and fairly modern design, but lacking armor and armament equal to that of German planes. The Army hopes soon to be receiving 40 planes a month of a type that could stand against the best of Europe. Germany today is turning out 3,300 first-line planes each month and intends soon to step up production to 6,000.

Senators were shocked to learn from Rear Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics, that of the Navy's 3,363 planes only 1,367 are adequate for battle and that only 734 more are ordered. Delivery on the new planes cannot be expected before July 1941.

Present monthly production of war planes of all kinds in the United States—training, pursuit, bombing, etc.—is about 450, of which all but a few are going to Europe. The hope is that production can be increased to 800 a month, or 7,200 a year, by next January. References by high officials to much higher production totals are not supported by Army and Navy officials who know actual deliveries. Those references probably are to potential production of airplane bodies, if all aircraft companies start to build war craft. They are not to the planes that will be delivered in months just ahead to Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps.

Actually, the United States is far behind in the air race. It cannot now make substantial progress in that race for many months, fateful months for the world. Only a short time ago Congress was tripping up this country in its race by throwing out requested appropriations for war planes, in order to increase subsidies to farmers. Present excitement and demand for action are unable to make up for lost time.

These are facts from official sources. They emphasize the further fact that the United States failed completely to take advantage of the one military weapon that its own genius developed and that its own officers pioneered. Germany today is using the air tactics developed and urged upon this Government by American air officers, one of whom was court martialed for his trouble.

At this time there is no more revealing and no more amazing story than the story of Brig. Gen. William Mitchell and his futile attempt to convince the rulers of this Nation that the airplane could do what Germany now is proving it can do. General Mitchell commanded the air service of the First and Second Armies in the A. E. F. He comprehended the potentialities of the weapon he used.

Mitchell foresaw that the airplane could render obsolete the warship as then designed. When admirals laughed, Billy Mitchell took his case to the public. In June 1921 this Nation saw a dress rehearsal of what occurred in 1940 under war conditions off the coasts of Norway and England. With Members of Congress, foreign diplomats, and the entire American Fleet as witnesses, General Mitchell directed Army fliers who first bombed and sank a submarine, then a destroyer, then a cruiser, and then the German dreadnaught *Ostfriesland* that Admiral von Tirpitz had said was "unsinkable." This ship went down in 21 minutes.

Still the land and sea forces scoffed. Air forces were given the crumbs when money was divided up between the old-line services. Mitchell argued for a separate air force so it could get more attention from Congress and more funds for research and development. To prove and emphasize his point again, in 1923 he took out the battleships *New Jersey* and *Virginia* and sank them both with bombs.

This and the resulting controversy proved too much for the generals and admirals. In 1925 President Coolidge did not send up General Mitchell's name for reappointment. The general reverted to a colonel's commission. When, later, the airship *Shenandoah* crashed, Mitchell issued a bitter statement attacking the high officers of this country's armed services for giving Congress misinformation and for miserly treatment of aviation. He was arrested, court martialed, convicted, and suspended from the service for 5 years, a penalty that President Coolidge approved.

From then on Congress went ahead appropriating billions for battleships and diminishing millions for aircraft. Since 1921 this country has spent more than $9,000,000,000 on its Navy, of which less than $200,000,000 went for aircraft. In 1939, out of a Navy appropriation of $635,000,000, the outlay on aircraft was $24,000,000. In that same year, out of an Army appropriation of above $500,000,000, the amount spent on aircraft was $39,000,000 and for air research $3,500,000.

President Roosevelt went along with the big-battleship advocates, accepting the story that a bomb couldn't sink a warship, or, if it could, it wouldn't, because the battleship would destroy the aircraft first. Mitchell's contention was that "the only defense against air power is air power." He insisted future aircraft would mount cannon and eventually would have not only 1-pounders but cannon up to 6-inch caliber. He argued that the airplane would revolutionize warfare.

HOW GERMANY PROFITED

While the generals and admirals directing this Nation's armed services went on their way scoffing, the generals and admirals in Germany took "Billy" Mitchell's lessons and advice to heart. They studied his methods and his tactics. Today the world sees Germany on the verge of dominating Europe, while the United States is scrambling to find a way to deliver to its Army more than 40 airplanes a month that can mount the cannon that German aircraft carry and that Mitchell foresaw. General Mitchell died in 1936 and did not live to see another power demonstrate the correctness of his appraisals.

General Arnold, present head of the Army's Air Corps, had agreed with Mitchell, and in 1926 was reprimanded by the General Staff for too energetic espousal of the cause of aircraft. The general had started to fly in 1911 as one of the early pupils of the Wrights, and ever since has kept in the forefront of air development. But in the Army, as in the Navy, the Air Corps received what was left over after the remainder of the service was taken care of. The men who got ahead were those who, even if disagreeing, did not kick up too much fuss.

What really is back of America's lack of preparedness in the air at this critical time?

The answer is given by officers who know, but who, for obvious reasons, cannot permit their names to be used. That answer is covered by the one word "inertia."

In other words, in both the Army and the Navy, the ranking generals and ranking admirals—according to testimony of service officers who are acquainted with the facts—didn't know anything about airplanes and didn't want to learn, because it involved effort and a readjustment of ideas and of plans that had been developed through their years of service. The story was told of one officer in charge of an American Army who could shoe a horse and cure a horse of almost any ailment, but who was bewildered by the thought of an automobile engine and who didn't like and didn't trust any kind of machine from a radio to an automobile. Yet today's Army must be an Army of machines and of more machines, from motorcycles and tanks to trucks and airplanes.

Officers in both the Army and Navy will tell a trusted inquirer that the reports from junior officers, who know modern warfare and who know the meaning and use of war machinery, seldom are acted upon by the commanding officials of the services. It took the actual destruction of warships under battle conditions before the American Navy or the British Navy would learn the lesson that Billy Mitchell tried to teach 19 years ago. Right now the fate of an empire may turn upon that refusal by admirals to learn a lesson. Already American taxpayers are likely to be out several billions of dollars for a similar refusal.

Asked why the Navy had stood against important change in battleship design through all of the years, an important and informed officer said:

"It's because the battleship boys are more intolerant of new ideas than the devotees of the horse. The fact that there is more freedom of expression in the Army enabled some progress toward mechanization, while in the Navy the air force had more difficulty selling its ideas."

The basic trouble? As the officers of the Army and Navy air services see it, the trouble in this country lies in the way funds are budgeted.

An over-all appropriation is determined for each service, and then the funds are divided up among the branches of that service, not necessarily according to defense need, but sometimes on the basis of influence of commanding officers. The air force, as a new arm

of each service, has less voice and less influence in the distribution of funds.

In Germany the old-line army officers had to give way to younger men, and younger men, in turn, were forced to think of new ways to prepare for war and to fight a war. The new ways—which in reality represented a return to the lessons that Jeb Stuart and Bedford Forrest taught in their cavalry operations in the Civil War—caught the older generals and admirals of Britain and France off guard.

Officers in the American services, under the top ranks, argue that it is just America's luck that Germany tried out her modern methods on some other armies and navies than those of this country.

The truth happens to be, on the basis of available information, that the United States today is woefully unprepared in the air and has refused to heed the advice of its own prophets. Whether there now will be a change remains to be seen.

Broadcasting Bunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have noted from the news stories appearing in the past few days that there seems to be great confusion in the public mind about the status of the law relating to the use of radio facilities by the candidates of various parties. In view of the conflicting opinions, I admit that I myself have a great deal of misunderstanding as to exactly what the rule is or should be. In view of the uncertainties which now confront us it seems quite possible that some legislative changes which would appeal to the judgment of Congress might well be adopted if the confusion continues.

I noticed the other day that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] put into the RECORD a statement reflecting the viewpoint of one of the radio chains, which seemed to be somewhat uncertain as to what position they should take with respect to a broadcast by Earl Browder, of the Communist Party. The very able chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], when the matter was brought to his attention, expressed the opinion that the Communications Act should be amended so that no broadcaster would be compelled to give time to the candidates of any political party if it is proven to be subservient to a foreign party. He further indicated that he believed that the Communications Act should be changed so as either to relieve a broadcasting station of liability for libelous political utterances or to permit it to censor them, and that the law was written so that each candidate for public office should have the right to express his views whether we agree with him or not, adding that which would be obvious, coming from the Senator from Montana, that he had no sympathy whatever with or tolerance for the attitude and the views of the Communist Party.

I am rather inclined to believe that some clarification is needed in the interest of both the industry and the listening public; and if legislation is indicated as a necessity, I am of the opinion that it should be presented to Congress at some opportune time, in order that the Senate and Congress generally may pass judgment on the matter.

Indicative of the uncertainty which now exists, I read the other day an article by Mr. Frank Waldrop in which he expresses a somewhat opposite viewpoint to that expressed in the statement put into the RECORD by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I do not know where the logic lies in this situation; but in view of the fact that Mr. Waldrop has made this comment, and that it does present another aspect of this matter which will challenge our attention, particularly in a campaign year, when feeling will run high, I ask, merely for the sake of information and for whatever it may be worth from the viewpoint of Senators who have a feeling one way or the other, that the article by Mr. Waldrop appear in the Appendix. Therefore, I am tendering it for that purpose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCASTING BUNK

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The National Broadcasting Co. and Columbia Broadcasting System have just got smoothly away with one of the most extraordinary performances in their careers.

On Sunday afternoon last they each broadcast the Presidential nominating convention of the Communist Party, and in the evening Columbia let the nominee, Earl Browder, gobble to a Nationwide audience his notions on world affairs.

The excuse the broadcasters gave for this reckless stunt was that they were forced by Federal law and the Federal Communications Commission to perform for Browder, whether they wanted to or not.

That just plainly isn't so. Not true. False.

The incident has served very well to blacken the public name of the Communications Commission and the communications law, which, while it doubtless was a great surprise to the broadcasters, no less pleased them. Why the Commission doesn't fight back is a mystery. Its sins, in fact, are so many, however, that it probably hasn't any energy left to defend itself against sins in fancy.

But that is no excuse for two great national broadcasting networks to disseminate Communist propaganda willfully and with something aforethought, just in order to snipe at the F. C. C.

Again—they didn't have to give Browder 2 minutes' time, nor did they have to put the Communist convention on the air at all. Of course, if they felt they should let him talk in the interest of free speech that is a matter of conscience. But that they were compelled in law—get a copy of the Communications Act of 1934, turn to page 30, and read section 315. It states:

If any licensee (broadcasting station operator) shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunity to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, and the (Communications) Commission shall make rules and regulations to convey this provision into effect: *Provided* That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over matter broadcast under the provisions of this section.

No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow use of its station by any such candidate.

Doesn't that make the facts plain?

Was the convention of the Communist Party in New York City on Sunday last a legally qualified candidate for any public office?

It was not.

After the convention met and nominated a candidate, he then became a legally qualified candidate in the few States of the Union in which the Communist Party has legally qualified itself to contest for an election.

Was any broadcasting network obligated to distribute Candidate Browder's speech from New York City to the four corners of this Nation?

It was not.

The networks have no obligation to send any political program anywhere, anytime. They can give their time away or sell it, as they choose.

Poor Norman Thomas, who was nominated in the Willard Hotel here by the Socialists as a legally qualified candidate for President, with the right to contest for the election in the few States wherein the Socialist Party is qualified legally to do so, was the only official candidate for the Presidency running, up to Sunday.

After being nominated, Browder had the right to go to stations which had broadcast any speech of Thomas, provided such stations were located in States wherein the Communist Party is duly and legally qualified to contest for the Presidential office, and demand equal facilities to those given Brother Thomas.

He would also have the right hereafter to demand from stations in those States the same equality of treatment they may show any other legally qualified candidate for President.

But did the stations have to give Thomas free time? Did they have to give Browder free time? Do they have to give any candidate for public office free time?

They did not and do not. The law says so plainly.

Giving free time to candidates for public office is the broadcasters' legalized device for keeping in good with the politicians. It serves them both well—then and later—in many ways.

All of which is as it may be. They, too, have to get along in this world. But it isn't decent of them to let Browder do something he had no legal right to demand and then tell the American people they were bound to let him under the law and the rules of the Communications Commission.

The Commission ought to stand up for itself on this point. Here's one, anyhow, it could win.

Land Bank Commissioner Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the commissioner loans, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which have been made each year from 1934, the time of their inception, to 1939:

Amount of land bank commissioner loans made by States during fiscal years from 1934 to 1939

District and State	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
District 1:						
Maine	$2,146,100	$1,563,300	$817,600	$281,900	$168,500	$76,500
N. Hampshire	323,000	280,200	168,800	80,300	70,300	79,900
Vermont	882,900	493,600	237,300	153,100	112,600	102,800
Massachusetts	1,693,000	1,242,900	689,700	659,300	393,900	274,200
Rhode Island	172,800	142,200	121,700	152,200	90,500	72,100
Connecticut	980,900	917,200	578,200	459,100	343,800	340,600
New York	5,092,500	5,278,500	2,227,000	1,599,400	1,012,100	948,700
New Jersey	1,808,400	1,725,900	699,500	611,500	468,000	381,400
Total	13,099,600	11,643,800	5,539,800	3,996,800	2,659,700	2,276,200
District 2:						
Pennsylvania	5,207,800	2,963,300	837,600	572,200	355,000	299,200
Delaware	306,400	174,500	48,800	32,500	30,300	15,900
Maryland	2,508,200	1,369,950	582,000	265,800	204,600	111,300
Virginia	5,787,400	2,299,350	812,300	485,000	297,700	228,300
West Virginia	2,527,000	700,100	277,900	194,000	136,500	120,700
Puerto Rico		350,100	492,100	301,900	280,400	217,800
Total	16,336,800	7,857,300	3,050,700	1,851,400	1,304,500	993,200
District 3:						
North Carolina	9,656,554	6,326,127	1,237,390	778,310	603,425	774,830
South Carolina	8,891,971	3,145,661	841,060	357,460	353,210	289,505
Georgia	11,677,134	4,385,151	1,061,820	614,738	704,015	796,099
Florida	6,228,347	2,534,912	611,775	288,025	215,170	215,875
Total	36,454,006	16,391,851	3,752,045	2,038,533	1,875,820	2,076,309
District 4:						
Ohio	10,543,800	12,481,200	2,616,000	1,378,200	922,000	869,900
Indiana	13,518,800	11,058,100	2,876,100	1,500,300	1,098,300	1,154,900
Kentucky	11,120,400	6,856,200	1,476,800	671,500	453,400	504,400
Tennessee	8,233,100	5,640,900	1,699,600	954,900	572,700	681,900
Total	43,416,100	36,036,400	8,668,500	4,504,900	3,946,400	3,211,100
District 5:						
Alabama	5,088,175	3,683,775	757,275	523,525	773,425	750,650
Mississippi	6,612,925	2,982,475	555,975	324,275	526,625	453,375
Louisiana	3,085,250	2,382,475	414,150	196,975	366,125	299,025
Total	14,786,350	9,048,725	1,727,400	1,044,775	1,666,175	1,503,050
District 6:						
Illinois	15,725,600	18,010,400	10,818,400	4,411,300	2,520,900	2,172,900
Missouri	9,026,400	8,272,500	5,300,900	1,323,100	893,200	480,200
Arkansas	3,054,500	2,724,200	1,784,300	716,700	459,100	325,200
Total	27,806,500	29,007,100	17,903,600	6,451,100	3,873,200	2,978,300
District 7:						
Michigan	8,863,200	16,497,700	4,197,900	1,688,800	499,400	306,400
Wisconsin	16,776,150	32,335,000	7,939,600	1,590,400	672,800	369,300
Minnesota	20,336,800	26,594,900	9,553,700	2,733,900	925,400	598,400
North Dakota	15,705,900	22,282,600	3,724,200	857,800		
Total	61,682,050	97,710,200	25,415,400	6,870,900	2,097,600	1,274,100
District 8:						
Iowa	21,870,500	29,376,200	12,150,800	5,058,800	2,672,800	1,926,800
South Dakota	9,323,100	13,713,600	3,919,900	1,608,400	586,800	294,500
Nebraska	17,338,650	15,133,200	6,083,200	3,329,400	1,747,700	1,383,600
Wyoming	1,592,350	2,486,200	729,800	352,000	285,700	265,800
Total	50,124,600	60,709,200	22,883,700	10,348,600	5,293,000	3,870,700
District 9:						
Kansas	15,945,200	24,757,700	6,806,300	2,457,100	1,388,200	1,056,700
Oklahoma	7,314,100	8,950,000	2,885,300	1,201,400	703,600	586,700
Colorado	3,328,500	5,618,900	2,145,200	1,035,400	584,700	456,100
New Mexico	870,300	1,550,600	507,300	316,400	215,300	178,800
Total	27,458,100	40,877,200	12,344,100	5,010,300	2,891,800	2,278,300

Amount of land bank commissioner loans made by States during fiscal years from 1934 to 1939—Continued

District and State	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
District 10:						
Texas	$35,433,050	$16,468,550	$6,236,900	$4,198,750	$2,988,700	$2,536,350
District 11:						
Arizona	577,250	756,900	621,500	311,700	302,900	332,500
Utah	1,545,100	4,014,200	1,054,800	218,200	191,500	87,800
Nevada	232,900	350,300	186,400	80,100	51,900	49,300
California	29,288,250	18,954,200	5,805,300	3,091,600	3,031,600	2,276,000
Total	31,643,500	24,075,600	7,668,000	3,701,600	3,577,900	2,745,600
District 10:						
Montana	5,680,300	6,174,850	1,384,650	447,550	375,050	433,350
Idaho	5,530,750	4,570,050	857,550	434,350	466,200	474,100
Washington	6,247,395	3,200,450	964,750	737,200	661,150	708,950
Oregon	4,930,650	4,587,850	1,138,300	808,850	615,050	587,650
Total	22,389,095	18,533,200	4,345,250	2,427,950	2,117,450	2,204,050
Grand total	380,629,751	368,359,126	119,535,395	52,445,608	33,392,245	27,947,259

Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Accounts.

On March 31, 1940, 185,207 of the commissioner loans were first-mortgage loans, representing a value of $250,025,708, and 250,280 were second-mortgage loans, representing a total of $427,691,226, making a total of 445,487 commissioner loans, with a value of $677,716,934.

The figures in the foregoing table indicate that the making of new commissioner loans has practically ceased. While, in 1934, $380,629,751 was loaned, in 1939 only $27,947,259 was loaned. Nearly all the 1939 loans were loans on farms held by the Government and very few were original loans. This is evidence that the whole farm-loan program of the New Deal has bogged down and is approaching the condition in which it was in earlier years.

The second-mortgage commissioner loans were largely a junior mortgage to Federal land-bank loans and were made on the basis of 75 percent of the normal agricultural value of the farm. The first-mortgage commissioner loans were, in part, well secured.

At the present time many of the commissioner loans are delinquent. Even Southern States, which have had subsidies of up to 30 percent of their assessed valuation, show a very high percentage of delinquencies. In South Carolina 35 percent are delinquent. In Mississippi 48 percent are delinquent.

THE CAUSES

There are two principal reasons why there is such a high percentage of delinquencies of these loans. One is that the loans were rather generously made and in good faith. Little did anyone expect to see the shrinking not in farm values but in the selling price of the farms in many parts of our country. Land is the basis of wealth, and a consistent long-term farm-loan policy should be inaugurated that will give stability to the agriculture of the Nation.

New farmers, set up with 40-year loans at 3 percent interest, as promoted by the Bankhead-Jones bill, has not made collections of commissioner loans any more easily effected as the commissioner loans are, in most cases, for 10 to 13 years at 4 percent interest.

Taking the country as a whole, the total number of Federal farm mortgages is 1,062,815 loans of $2,478,050,246—Federal land bank, 617,328 loans, value $1,800,432,312, and commissioner loans of 445,487 loans, value $677,617,934. This is less than the subsidy to agriculture the past 7 years, though, of course, much of this subsidy money never found its way to the pockets of the real farm people of this country. There are approximately 6,800,000 farms in the United States with an estimated total farm-mortgage debt of seven to eight billion dollars.

The second reason for the high percentage of delinquencies is that agricultural products bring only about 75 percent of parity. If these loans were made when cheese averaged from 14 to 17 cents per pound, how can we expect to collect them with the 12.6- to 13.2-cent cheese we have under the New Deal. We must increase the price of farm products, lower the farmer's cost of production by reducing his taxes and his overhead, or lower his standard of living.

On December 31, 1932, there were 500,537 Federal farm loans, and of these 45 percent were delinquent. On December 31, 1939, there were 617,328 Federal land-bank loans, and 22 percent of them were delinquent. On March 31, 1940, there were 445,487 commissioner loans, and 29 percent of the loans were delinquent. In some districts over 50 percent of the Federal loans were delinquent.

The farmers of this country need and deserve a farm-loan policy which will not only have continuation of a fair rate of interest but also a permanent and definite long-term policy, so that the borrower will know exactly what his rate of interest will be and can plan accordingly. Too many changes and too many "emergencies" do not make for a constructive land-loan policy.

Rich, productive land has been a necessity for any great nation of the world, and it ever will be. Real soil has always made and always will make a great nation. Let us have as the first requisite a permanent loan policy. We should not continue a policy of 40-year loans at 3-percent interest, furnishing 100 percent of the purchase price to one class of borrowers under the Bankhead-Jones bill, charge another class of borrowers 4 percent interest on 10- to 13-year loans, with the loan based on 75 percent of the normal value, as in the commissioner loans, and then charge another class of borrowers 3½ percent interest on loans representing 50 percent of the value of the farms as in the Federal land-bank loans. These agencies must be coordinated with equal rights extended to each group. Any other program is unjust and unfair and is not in keeping with a program of the greatest good for the greatest number, the objective of every republic.

With all this talk and political propaganda in regard to the lower interest rate to farmers, it is only fair to remind you that on July 12, 1937, the President vetoed the provision for a 3½-percent interest rate for Federal land-bank loans and the 4-percent interest rate on commissioner loans.

On June 15, 1938, this "veto to extend for 2 additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans and to provide a 4-percent interest rate on land bank commissioner loans until July 1, 1940." Congress extended these rates over his veto.

The subsidies to agriculture the past 7 years would have paid off all the Federal farm loans, but these subsidies went in large sums to others than actual farm people.

Over 84,000 farm mortgages were foreclosed during the New Deal years. The average loan of less than $2,500, saw the driving of 84,000 farmers from their homes and their method of making a living at a time when the New Deal was appropriating millions of dollars to build dwelling units costing up to $5,600 for their city cousins who did not pay down 1 cent on the home. In addition the Federal Treasury is called upon for an annual subsidy of $28,000,000 for 60 years to carry on this city housing and the New Deal is now trying to get an additional subsidy of $45,000,000 for 60 years to further this program.

The farmers of this country are entitled to wages and hours accorded other groups, and they are not going to be continually satisfied with meager subsidy checks of $50 or less per farm per year average when farm products bring but 75 percent of parity and cause them hundreds of dollars loss per farm per year, average.

Twelve-cent cheese, 10-cent cotton, 5-cent hogs mean 10 cents or less per hour for the farmers of this country. A long-term, fair-interest-rate, farm-loan policy minus so many "emergencies," would be a welcomed program for the rural people of America.

Memorial Day Exercises at Antietam Battlefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF JOSEPH A. CANTREL

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel at the Memorial Day exercises, Antietam Battlefield, Sharpsburg, Md., on May 30, 1940:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS OF JOSEPH A. CANTREL AT ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD, SHARPSBURG, MD., MAY 30

Another year has gone by; another page of history has turned since last we met here to commemorate Memorial Day at this sacred spot, around the open bier of our Nation's heroes, to revere the memory of our soldier dead.

The high-sounding words and phrases then expressed, well-intentioned and well-meant, were soon forgotten, as mine shall also be before tomorrow's dawn. But should they gain root for but a fleeting hour to loose a thought upon which to meditate, my mission here will be fulfilled and my happiness complete.

Twenty-two years ago I observed Memorial Day close to the scenes which are recalled today, just as did many of the myriads of our splendid American youths who enlisted in the armed forces of our country in the World War. And, while I was not one of the scores who were cited for exceptional bravery, nor one of the many who bore the ugly wounds of conflict, yet I served close to the thousands who went to return no more.

The major portion of my service in the World War was in conjunction with the British Expeditionary Forces in northern France and Belgium, in a sector commonly known as Flanders Fields. It was my good fortune to have known and served there under Col. Franklin d'Olier, the founder of the American Legion, born to keep forever fresh the memories of our soldier dead. It was my privilege to have known and enjoyed, too, the friendship of Col. John McCrae, doctor and poet, patriot and hero, who died in January of 1918, at Wimereux, France, not far from the blood-red poppies which he so immortalized in his noble, challenging poem, and which he wrote on a page torn out of his dispatch book, in a tiny first-aid dressing station cut into the bank of the Ypres Canal, during a lull in the hottest phase of the second battle of Ypres. That poem was real, and so were the singing larks and the belching guns. Every Armistice Day there is a pilgrimage to his grave, just as there is on Memorial Day to this sacred spot of Antietam. There poppies from Flanders are scattered upon his grave, while a wounded English soldier reads the three verses of his immortal poem, inscribed on a plaque over his grave:

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks still bravely singing fly,
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead! Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved, and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch. Be yours to hold it high!
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

Oh, I wish you could but visualize with me, who has been over the ground there, the Ypres Canal in Belgium, with its exceedingly high hills and banks on either side. Colonel McCrae's dressing station was in a hole in the foot of one of the banks. During periods of the battle men who were shot actually rolled down the bank into his dressing station. A few hundred yards away were the headquarters of a regiment and many times during the 16-day battle they could be seen burying their dead whenever there was a lull. Thus, the crosses, row on row, soon grew into a good-sized cemetery; and, just as he describes it, we often heard in the mornings the larks singing high in the air, between the crack of the shells and the reports of the guns in the nearby batteries. The most gripping thing of all in his poem, however, are the abrupt and startling contrasts between joy and sorrow—life and death. The red poppies, symbols of sleep, and the hero dead, who will be sleepless unless the survivors remain faithful to the sacred cause for which they died.

Colonel McCrae is buried on rising ground above Wimereux, France, from where the cliffs of Dover, across the channel in England, are plainly visible on sunny days; he rests in historic ground upon which Napoleon's Grand Army was encamped. A short time before his death he was wheeled to the balcony of his hospital to have a final look across the channel to England. And as he gazed at the silver cliffs of Dover with evident delight he said quietly, and somewhat sadly, "Do you think those people over there know the hell the boys here are going through?" "I think so," replied the medical officer in attendance.

"Tell them this," he went on, "just tell them this," and here he quoted the terrible threat contained in his famous poem:

" 'If they break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep.'

"Tell them that, doctor, just tell them that." And a few days later he went forth to meet the eternal mystery. That was 22 years ago.

And today, as we look at the cap sheath of these memorials all about us, and at the ensign of our Republic, in spirit we see there not merely the marble sepulchres wherein lie the remains of those who made the supreme sacrifice, but we see the pallid, stark, white, pitiful, suffering faces of all of them in that shell hole cut in the canal bank at Ypres, awaiting the moment of the arrival of the messenger of death. If we listen quietly we can hear faintly, yet distinctly, their united voices coming down out of the atmosphere:

"We are the dead! Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow. Loved, and were loved, and now we lie in Flanders fields."

And can't you hear them saying to you, fellow Marylanders, and men and women of America, "You are the living, you are privileged to be trained by men and women who have the loftiest concept of freedom, liberty, justice, and equality, and who, in consequence, teach you in the highest possible way; you are privileged to have before your eyes in the lives and memories of Maryland's noble and lion-hearted sons stirring examples of exalted character and of inspiring patriotism?

"You are the inheritors of grand traditions and you enjoy the rich legacy of unblemished lives and of golden deeds. You be true to the principles taught by our venerable American institutions, you stand as an impregnable force for the security and dignity of personal uprightness, you stand for the security of your home against the malign powers that are seeking to destroy it; you stand for the security of society against the piratic hordes that are toiling for its annihilation, and you stand for justice; you stand for individual liberty under the law, and you stand for the triumph of right over might."

And can't you even hear them whispering down to all of us here assembled: "Fellow Marylanders, do you think the men and women of our Nation now know the hell we went through for the preservation of these principles?" And as each of us quietly, yet subconsciously respond, "Yes, I think they do"—we can plainly hear the challenge they fairly hurl at us when they shriek:

"IF YE BREAK FAITH WITH US WHO DIE, WE SHALL NOT SLEEP"

And I know I speak the sentiment of all of us here in answering back to them: "Go back to sleep, heroic men, we shall keep faith with you. We'll take up the torch that you did throw, and we shall ever hold it high," and

"Sleep on ye brave and fallen dead
Dear as the blood ye gave
No impious footstep here shall tread
The herbage of thy grave

"Nor shall your story be forgot
While time her record keeps
And glory guards this honored spot
Where valor proudly sleeps."

Two-Party System Necessary to Our Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN HAMILTON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Chairman John Hamilton, of the Republican National Committee, before the Italian Republican League, Waterbury, Conn., on June 5, 1940:

I am delighted to have this opportunity of addressing the Italian-Republican League, for in our veins runs the blood not of one nationality but of many nationalities. The greatest thing we have in common lies in the fact that all of our forbears, whether they came on the *Mayflower* or during that great period of immigration in the nineteenth century, or even later, came here with the hope of finding a promised land wherein they could be free men leading a life without being subjected to the anguish and bloodshed that has wrecked Europe for untold centuries.

They came here desiring to be free men in the fullest sense of the word. Having found that which they sought, our people have always tried to avoid conflicts with others, for we are hospitable people who are in no sense militant. Yet in the past when we have seen our freedom jeopardized we have fought—and bitterly—to maintain it even though it has been against our blood brothers in Europe. Out of it all we have become a great Nation—indeed we are a United States.

But those things which we possess that are worth the while have not only been established and preserved by force of arms, they have come into being through a form of representative government designed to bring to all a good life.

Tonight I say to you, advisedly, that as we take inventory we can no more afford to overlook the situation at home than abroad. It is of that on which I desire to speak.

Shortly after the middle of September I returned from Europe. Since the declaration of war I had heard little news from this country. Landing at New York I was surprised to have reporters ask me if the Republican Party would continue as an instrument of politics—whether I thought it might be possible that the Republican Party would support Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate for the third term, and finally what did I think of the proposals for a coalition.

I said that I believed the two-party system was necessary to our form of government. I stated that this system was as firmly grounded in our conception of government as though it was written into the Constitution itself. Furthermore, I said that if but one leadership or one party were left in the field to do as he or it saw fit, without check or curb, we should have lost the representative system of government and replaced it by one-man rule—call it what you will.

As the months went by and we became more accustomed to the thought of a Europe at war, we regained our composure and took a more normal attitude towards politics and government. In the 3 or 4 months preceding the first week of May of this year there were many elections, and particularly elections to fill vacancies in the National House of Representatives. The Republican Party lost none of these byelections and in practically each of them the Republican majorities were increased over the elections of 1938. In other words, the people reaffirmed their belief in the two-party system—they echoed by their ballots their belief in a strong opposition party and they forecasted Republican success in the national election of 1940.

Suddenly in the early part of May the mechanized forces of the German Reich undertook the invasion of Belgium and Holland. They swept over the Low Countries, beating back the French and British to the Somme and to the channel. As the effectiveness of the German war machine became apparent—as peace-loving people were crushed ruthlessly beneath its onrushing power, and as we saw those governments which are more nearly like ours than any others threatened with defeat and possible extinction, our national sympathies were not only aroused to a greater extent than before, but we took inventory at home to ascertain our own ability to defend our interests, particularly in the Americas.

These perfectly normal reactions were unfortunately accompanied by subtle and insidious suggestions made for purely political reasons. As in the fall of 1939, the wheels of political propaganda began to turn. Men who were more interested in using our pressing problems as springboards for their personal ambitions than in solving instant questions sought to stir up our people with thoughts and suggestions which would lay the groundwork for the destruction of the Republican Party. Once again we heard the same questions as in September.

Would it not be well, they said, to postpone our national convention? Why not accept the President as the candidate of both parties? Again there were those who suggested that we should have a coalition, and even some who went so far as to advocate the indefinite postponement of the 1940 election.

Many who in their anxiety joined in these suggestions did not see the implications of such a movement.

They did not realize that to follow such a course would be to bring about here that form of government that has created chaos in Europe. They did not sense that it was the most insidious kind of politics that dictated the thoughts of those who were attempting to sow such seeds. They did not realize that to follow these suggestions would destroy the only check upon the present administration and would leave it, or, more aptly, its leader, accountable to none, not even the people for whose benefit this Government is supposed to exist.

But, fortunately, there were men of foresight who immediately perceived the consequences of such a course. Nonpartisan publications and able and intelligent writers realized the inherent dangers

involved, and these dangers were brought forcibly to the attention of the American people. Within our own ranks there were men who appreciated both the reasons and the possible results of such tactics and they spoke their minds instantly and forcibly. We may be glad of the action taken in that regard by our Members in Congress, our Governors, and by such leaders in the party as Governor Landon and Herbert Hoover. Because of the position which these men have taken—by reason of the reaction of our party members and the public as a whole—I am able to say tonight as the chairman of the Republican National Committee that our party will continue as a vigorous and effective force in the body politic of this country, and that in preparation for the leadership which it will soon assume and in carrying out its present obligation as the minority party, its leaders will voice their honest opinion on the questions of the day.

This they will do despite the whining of those who hope to hide their failures of the past—their shortcomings with regard to their present tasks—under the cloak that any criticism is unpatriotic. If honest criticism cannot be made of this administration—if the Republican leadership is not at liberty to advise as to the future conduct of our affairs—if that leadership is not free to protest a course which they believe is not for the country's best interests—then the cause has already been lost. Lost not through the invasion of our land by hostile troops but by our giving up the greatest gift of democracy, the freedom of speech.

Many of those who would do away with our normal political activities because of the present emergency seemingly desire to apply this elimination of politics by continuing Mr. Roosevelt in the office of the Presidency.

They blandly refer to the old adage that one should not change horses in midstream. But this emergency or stream to which they refer arises primarily from the present European situation. Admittedly our stream is not as swift nor our emergency as acute as that which confronts the British and the French. But they had no qualms in violating old adages, for they not only saw fit to change their government in midstream, but when that stream was turned into a torrent by reason of the present German invasion, they also removed the active commanders of their armed forces.

They recognized that the test of the right of anyone to remain in the public service lies in his continued usefulness to the state.

It is a fair test and one that we may well apply to our present situation. I believe that we in America, faced by no such dangers as confront the British and the French, cannot have become so lacking in balance—so dependent upon a single man or a single group of men—that we will continue to entrust our future to those who have proven themselves unfitted to run the affairs of this Nation simply that we may comply with an age-old adage. If adages are to be the order of the day, let me suggest one—when a horse flounders in midstream it is better to abandon him even though one has to swim to shore.

It is in the belief it is my right as an American citizen to speak frankly and that it is my duty as a member of the Republican Party to do so, that I approach the question with which our people are most concerned today. I refer, of course, to the defense program which is now pending before the Congress and which will be uppermost in our minds for many months to come.

It is with a great deal of gratification I am able to say to you tonight that not only in this period of emergency but throughout the last 7 years the Republican leadership in and out of the Congress has supported the defense program of the administration, and today it is fully aware of the seriousness of the problems that face us. The Republican leadership recognizes the urgent need of carrying out in the most efficient and economical manner and at the utmost speed an adequate program for defense. But it has expressed the conviction that such a program can only be carried on through the establishment of the highest degree of cooperation between industrial management and labor and government. We are fully satisfied that both industry and labor are ready to play their part in such an endeavor, but we believe also that it is essential for government, and the leaders of government, to give the inspiration and the leadership if such an endeavor is to be at all effective.

If there is one requisite of such leadership in times like the present it is utter frankness with the public. Indeed, unless the public is fully informed of our present situation, we may not obtain the cooperation which we all seek.

It may be embarrassing to the President that, after having warned the country for at least 3 years of the imminence of a Eureopean war, and after having spent $7,000,000,000 on armaments during his term of office, that it should suddenly develop, through the testimony of the ranking officers of the Army and Navy, that we are pitifully unprepared, particularly in those mechanized instruments through which war is now waged. It would have been better for the country to have been apprised of these facts through a candid admission on the part of the President himself.

It was not in the interest of frankness for the President, in his last fireside chat, to summarize the condition of our national defense by referring to aircraft, antiaircraft guns, tanks, and other modern weapons of war by bulking in his report not only those weapons which are on hand but those which in his own words are "on order." Honesty required that the distinction between weapons available for use and those on order should have been clearly made. Weapons which are "on order" will not defend the United States of America any more than those which are "on order" here for the Allied Governments were able to come to the aid of those troops who were sacrificed in Flanders Field.

Immediately following the outbreak of the war the President appointed the War Resources Board, made up of eminent leaders of both industry and labor. Substantially 2 months later that Board made a report to the President of its findings in connection not only with the state of preparedness of this country but as to such steps as it deemed necessary to establish an effective approach to the question of national defense.

Time after time the Republican leaders in the House and Senate have asked that this report be made public, but the President has not seen fit to let the Nation have the benefit of the findings of the Board. Inasmuch as more than 6 months have elapsed since the filing of this report, it would be interesting to know whether or not it may not have contained proposals and suggestions which would have been helpful at the time the report was made. The spirit of frankness of which I speak would have been aided materially had that report been made public, and the errors of the administration, if any, admitted.

It was unfortunate that the President saw fit to inject into his fireside chat the question of partisan politics. This he did when he attempted to compare the present status of our armed forces under his administration with the 7 years preceding 1933. The President knows full well that the two periods are not comparable. In the 7 years preceding 1933 the world was still attempting to carry out a program of disarmament instituted under a Republican President in 1922 a program which was wholeheartedly endorsed by the Democrats in their platform of 1932, and which by their action was made a nonpartisan question.

There was during that period no foreign policy evident among the nations of Europe which would threaten to embroil the world in war. Indeed, there was no condition in the world which allows that period to be compared with the 7 years of the Roosevelt administration. As late as January 3, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt boasted, "We have sought with earnestness in every possible way to limit world armaments and to obtain the peaceful solution of disputes among all nations." If Mr. Roosevelt could say that after the developments since 1933 in Europe, how can he possibly, in good faith, charge against Republican administrations having adopted a similar attitude prior to 1933?

There is one more point that I would like to make in this connection, and that has to do with Mr. Roosevelt's implications, indeed his direct statements, that the Republican Party was not alive to the question of needed armaments when it was in power, and that under its last administration the Army and the Navy were allowed to sink to a low ebb. This charge cannot be made in reason, and surely not in good faith, for in the Democratic platform of 1932 the Republican administration was openly condemned because of the amount of money which it was spending on the armed forces of this country. I call your attention to the words of that platform. It reads as follows:

"We advocate a Navy, an Army adequate for national defense, based upon a survey of all facts affecting existing establishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually."

That was a direct condemnation of the expenditures of the Republican administration. That was the platform on which Mr. Roosevelt said he stood 100 percent. How, then, can he face the people of this country and state that the Republican Party was derelict in its obligations as to national defense?

There is in this country a demand that partisan politics, insofar as any matter is concerned which affects the security of this Nation, should be laid aside. The Republican Party has strictly adhered to such a course, and it has the right to expect that much at least from the present administration. It has the right to believe that no group in office or out will attempt to achieve behind a screen of a program of national defense political advantages which they have not been able to achieve under other circumstances. If it is necessary to have coordination in industry and labor as the most effective means of bringing their facilities into mesh for the good of the country, obviously we must have political coordination to the same end.

To that coordination the Republican Party is pledged by every word of its leadership and by its record in the past.

To that coordination it will stand pledged in the future. It only asks that it retain the right of constructive criticism to bring the facts before the people of this Nation so that they may judge the situation as it is, but, above all, that the President of the United States shall not seek to cover up the deficiencies of his administration through partisan politics at its worst.

When at the outset the President indicated that he would carry out the defense program through the present agencies of the Government, and particularly under the direction of Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Ickes, and Mr. Hopkins, the Republican leadership protested vigorously against such a course on his part.

That protest was echoed by the country, for there were none who had any doubt but that the men whom the President had mentioned were totally lacking in any qualifications for the tasks to which he proposed to assign them. Why were they not qualified?

One had spent his entire life as a social worker until he was put into the department of government having charge of commerce and business, another was a gentleman farmer before he was placed in charge of the country's finances.

The third was a Chicago lawyer and professional reformer. None of these, as far as the record shows, has ever had any practical experience in industry or business. So Mr. Roosevelt was forced to abandon the idea of letting these men carry out the program and told the country he was going to set up an Advisory Commission to take charge of producing the war munitions our country needs so badly.

But again Republicans pointed out that Mr. Roosevelt had only gone half of the way, that advisory commissions led to futile discussion and confusion, whereas the present situation calls for action. So again Mr. Roosevelt was forced to retreat by the very weight of the evidence against him, and I, for one, am very happy to learn today that Mr. Roosevelt proposes to give some real authority to two of the industrialists that he has called into the governmental service.

My one hope is that these men will be permitted to do the job without intermeddling on the part of those who have already proven their inefficiency in the last 7 years.

It is quite all right for the President to set up a board or group of men to make for efficiency in the carrying out of the rearmament program of this country, but after all this Board is not free from the laws of the United States, nor is it free from the effects of those laws upon both industry and labor. So that it seems to me we might well ask the President if further steps are not to be taken which will render the work of the Board more effective.

In this connection would it not, Mr. President, aid the very program which you advocate if you were to request of the Congress amendments to the Securities Exchange Act which would make it easier to obtain capital for the expansion of those industries which are to be called upon to manufacture and produce much of the needed arms and munitions?

Do you not believe that you should take notice of the hearings which were held in connection with the investigation of the National Labor Relations Board, and move promptly by legislation or otherwise to see that that Board is so constituted that it will be an agency, not for the advancement of the interests of any single labor group, but for all labor and for employers as well?

Inasmuch as your program looks toward the establishment of an air force second to none, would it not be well to revoke your recent order placing the Civil Aeronautics Authority under a political agency and let it operate as it did in the past, free from political interference and for the best interests of an industry which is now so vital?

Finally, do you not think that you would gain a greater cooperation from industry as a whole if those men in your Cabinet who, time after time, have attacked the business of this country were replaced by men in whom business and the public would have confidence, and who by their past experience have proven themselves fitted to carry out the greatly accentuated responsibilities of the moment?

These suggestions are not offered in the spirit of criticism of that which has gone on before. These suggestions are made with the thought that the errors of the past may be corrected and utilized to avoid similar errors in the future.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS COMPTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Lewis Compton, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, at Antietam Battlefield, May 30, 1940:

My fellow Legionnaires, distinguished guests, and residents of Washington County, 1 year ago today I had the honor and privilege of participating in the Memorial Day services of the Moriss-Frock Post of the American Legion at Hagerstown. When Congressman BYRON told me that your post had been designated to conduct the services here today at historic Antietam, and had extended an invitation to me to be with you again, I welcomed the opportunity.

Here on this field, 78 years ago, American manhood rose to a pinnacle of heroism never surpassed in all history. The names of the gallant dead of both armies are indelibly inscribed upon the imperishable and glorious pages of the history of this Nation.

The observance of Memorial Day this year, above all other years, has a greater significance than ever before. We thank Almighty God that our beloved country is at peace in a world gone mad—aflame with undeclared war and frightful invasion of peace-loving neutral nations. There is in progress today in Europe a battle, which may be the greatest in all history, the results of which may well change the destiny of the entire world.

No one can foresee what the immediate future may bring. In these ominous days war clouds gather with astonishing rapidity. Our country must be strong, for the weak have perished. One year ago today I spoke to you on the topic The Navy Builds for Peace. That is as true today as it was 12 months ago. In fact, within the past several weeks, the Congress has enabled the Navy to see its way clear to step up its building program and quickly increase its degree of preparedness to an extent not realized for years.

Let none misunderstand this salient point: The Navy builds for peace. We covet no other country, but, if others covet us, the strength of our Navy is the basic deterrent to any contemplated invasion of our shores.

The United States of America must be ready if and when it is challenged. We can be ready if we will, but time is of the essence.

Our Navy, now, as always, is our first line of defense. It must be fully prepared immediately an emergency arises. It must be strong enough and large enough to defeat any enemy or any possible combination of enemies, who may seek to dominate our shores.

You all know that during the decade preceding 1933 our Navy was permitted to fall to such an estate that instead of being the largest in the world it was a poor fourth in under-aged fighting ships. Great Britain had 138; Japan, 184; France, 124; and the United States only 101. Almost immediately upon taking office President Roosevelt initiated action, and the Congress appropriated funds, for increasing the United States Navy, to the end that this Nation might once again have a navy second to none.

Since 1933, 130 naval vessels, both combatant and auxiliary, have been placed in commission in the United Staes Navy. Sixty-six additional are actually on the building ways, and, in addition, the Naval appropriation bill for the next fiscal year is expected to provide for the commencement of 24 additional vessels, making a total—projected, building, and in commission—of 220 vessels.

While the war clouds darkened the skies and since the storm of war has come with all its fury, the Navy Department has exerted every possible effort to speed up its shipbuilding program. At the present time ships are being completed as far as 6 and 8 months in advance of the specified contract time. This represents superhuman effort, not only on the part of the Navy, but also on the part of industry and labor, to whom the thanks of all our people are due.

But it is never enough that only certain component parts of this great democracy function alertly for preparedness and peace. Today we will all agree that the past few weeks in Europe have been a frightful example of the present-day tragedy of faith in altruistic treaties and the dreadful cost of unpreparedness.

To my mind the hour has struck when Americans must knit the sinews of national military and naval strength with our commercial, labor, industrial, and social life in a manifest determination that our democracy shall survive the world chaos and the period of adjustment that must follow. To do this there can be no weak links in our American chain of strength. Our only hope is singleness of purpose and unity of effort. Without this practical idealism we are appallingly vulnerable to a coalition attack—attack from within as well as from without.

Never before in our history did "united we stand, divided we fall" mean as much as it does today to citizens of the United States of America.

Make no mistake, our fleet is ready. The Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Charles Edison, has but recently returned from an inspection of the United States Fleet in the Pacific Ocean, and witnessed the maneuvers off the Hawaiian Islands. During that time Mr. Edison was aboard six different types of fighting ships, from which he observed the fleet problem. He reported that the performance of these vessels, the smartness and precision of their crews, indicated clearly to him that the confidence of the American people in our Navy is fully justified. I can assure you

that, ship for ship and man for man, our Navy is the equal to, if not the superior of, any navy in the world. Our new ships and our aircraft are of the very best, and there has been no let-down in our high standards of personnel and training.

However, we have neither enough ships nor planes nor men to meet the threats that are looming. The Congress has just enacted emergency legislation to provide additional funds for the Navy. I can assure you that the Navy Department will scrupulously and frugally, but without delay, use the moneys provided to the end that every dollar of taxpayers' money will produce a dollar's worth of national security.

I know that here, on the fields of Antietam, it is not necessary to adjure you to keep the torch of patriotism burning brightly. By your very presence you rededicate yourselves to the ideals of your country and mine.

We who enjoy the freedom and liberty of democracy must unite in the common cause of preserving that freedom and liberty. A united America will forever preserve these heritages.